

M E M O R A N D U M

April 21, 1993

APR 25 1993

TO: KATHERINE SMITH, SECRETARY, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM: TIMOTHY J. DEVLIN, DIRECTOR, AUDITING AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS DIVISION *TD*

RE: DOCKET 920260-TL, SOUTHERN BELL

In a memorandum I sent to you, dated April 16, 1993, I requested that Documents 10549-92 and 10552-92 be returned in their entirety to Southern Bell, crossed-referenced as part of Document No. 11612-92. Please note that Document 10549-92 is a one of two documents identified as a response by the Company to Staff's Third Request for Production of Documents (POD), Item No. 94A. Document No. 10549-92 includes Pages F01B03Z 00330 through F01B03Z 00353. Also note that Document 10552-92 is the Company's response to Staff's Third POD, Item No. 91. It includes Page F01B03Z 00275 through Page F01B03Z 00302.

In addition to the documents referenced above, there are three other documents cross-referenced to Document No. 11612-92. They are Document Nos. 10550-92, 10551-92, and 10553-92, and they are also responses to Staff's Third POD.

Please return to the Company portions of Document No. 10553-92 which the Company claimed were confidential (Pages F01B03Z 00410 through F01B03Z 00413 and Pages F01B03Z 00467 through F01B03Z 00470). Document No. 10553-92 is one of two documents identified as the Company's response to the Staff's Third POD, Item No. 94A. The remainder of these documents can be placed in the non-confidential file.

The other two documents contained in Document No. 11612-92, identified as Document No. 10550 (Pages F01B03Z 0008 through F01B03Z 00052) and Document No. 10551 (Pages F01B03Z 00209 through F01B03Z 00224), pertain to auditing matters. Document No. 10550 is the Company's response to Staff's Third POD, Item No. 82, and Document No. 10551 is the Company's response to Staff's Third Production of Documents, Item No. 86. Staff believes that the Company failed to file a Request for Confidentiality within 21 days following its Notice of Intent to request confidential treatment. Therefore, Document Nos. 10550 and 10551 should now be moved from the confidential file to the non-confidential file.

The last matter to be addressed in Document No. 11612-92 is that in its actual request for confidential treatment, the Company referenced Items 80 and 89. However, these two items were never filed with the Commission. Staff does not believe that the Company ever filed its Intent to Request Confidential Treatment on these two items. In addition, the Company failed to supply line-by-line justification relating to Items 80 and 89 on Attachment A of Document No. 11612-92. Therefore, its requests relating to Items 80 and 89 can not be addressed.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04576 APR 23 93

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

*Returned
4/29/93*

*Return to
Staff portions
"declassified"
files*

to Staff

I believe this memo has addressed confidentiality concerns regarding Document Nos. 10549-92 through 10553-92 and 11612-92 in their entirety. Please call Sylvia Johe if you have any additional questions. Thanks.

cc: Bill McNulty (Auditing and Finance Division)
Charlie Murphy (Division of Legal Services)