24

APPEARANCES:

MANCY WHITE and NANCY SIMS, 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1556, appearing on behalf of Bellsouth Telecommunications, Inc.

JOSEPH A. McGLOTHLIN and VICKI KAUFMAN,
McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Rief and
Bakas, 117 South Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida
32301, appearing telephonically on behalf of Florida
Competitive Carriers Association and
Telecommunications Resellers Association.

MONICA BARONE, Florida Public Service

Commission, Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard

Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870,

appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

ERICK SORIANO, appearing telephonically on behalf of Intermedia.

MARSHA RULE, TRACY HATCH, AT&T

Communications of the Southern States, Inc., 106 East

College Avenue, Suite 1410, Tallahassee, Florida

32301, appearing telephonically on behalf of AT&T of

the Southern States.

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
2	RICHARD D. MELSON, Hopping Boyd Green Sams
3	and Smith, 123 South Calhoun Street, Tallahassee,
4	Florida 32314, appearing telephonically on behalf of
5	MCI.
6	NORMAN H. HORTON, JR., Messer, Vickers,
7	Caparello, Madsen, Goldman & Metz, P. O. Box 1876,
8	Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876, appearing
9	telephonically on behalf of LDDS.
10	ROBERT S. COMEN, Pennington, Culpepper,
11	Moore, Wilkinson, Dunbar & Dunlap, P.A., 215 South
12	Monroe Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, and JOHN
13	LOMBARDI, appearing telephonically on behalf of Time
14	Warner.
15	BILL WILLINGHAM, Rutledge, Ecenia,
16	Underwood, Purnell and Hoffman, P. O. Box 551,
17	Tallahassee, Florida 32302-0551, appearing
18	telephonically on behalf of TCG.
19	
20	
21	
22	

_	• • • • • •
2	(Hearing convened at 8:00 a.m.)
3	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We're here for the status
4	conference to hear the Motion to Compel. Arguments on
5	the Motion to Compel in Docket 960786-TL.
6	Let me go through the names that I have on
7	our notice list and see if we have everybody on the
8	call. If I call your name, could you give who you
9	represent and your address please?
LO	Tracy Hatch. Or Marsha Rule. (No response)
ιı	Joe McGlothlin.
L2	MR. McGLOTHLIN: I'm on the phone with Vicki
13	Kaufman in my office. We represent the FCCA.
L4	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Floyd Self.
L5	MR. HORTON: Chairman Johnson, this is Doc
L6	Horton, representing WorldCom.
17	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Richard Melson.
18	Mr. Melson? (No response)
19	Is there somebody on a cell phone? We're
20	getting a real bad connection here.
21	Tom Boyd. Oh, Tom Bond. (No response)
22	Richard Rindler. (No response)
23	Benjamin Fletcher. (No response)
24	Jeffery Walker. (No response)
25	Robert Cohen.

1	
1	MR. COHEN: This is Bob Cohen. I'm
2	representing Time Warner, and I'll be the one for Time
3	Warner today.
4	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Very good.
5	Andrew Izar. (No response)
6	Nancy White.
7	MS. WHITE: I'm sorry. You all are fading
8	in and out. Yes, Nancy White, representing BellSouth,
9	150 West Flagler Street, Miami, Florida 33130.
10	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Pat Wiggins. Anyone from
11	Intermedia? (No response)
12	Ken Hoffman.
13	MR. WILLINGHAM: This is Bill Willingham on
14	behalf of Teleport. We're at 215 South Monroe Street,
15	420, in Tallahassee.
16	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Anyone on the call that I
17	didn't call?
18	MR. SORIANO: Chairman, this is Erick
19	Soriano, representing Intermedia Communications. I'm
20	with Kelly, Drye and Warren in Washington, D.C.
21	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Very good.
22	Anyone else?
23	MR. MELSON: Commissioner, this is Richard
24	Melson. I just joined, representing MCI.
25	MS. RULE: Marsha Rule, representing AT&T,

also just joined. 2 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. If you could hold one second, we're going to see if this is our -- I'm 3 going to try to call back. This may be our line. So 5 we'll call right back in. We'll go off the record. 6 (Discussion off the record.) 7 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Go back on the record. Did anyone else join in that I did not announce 8 earlier that they were on the call? 10 MR. LOMBARDI: John Lombardi from Time 11 Warner in Denver. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. The gentleman that 12 13 was speaking was he from Time Warner, the gentleman on the cell phone? 14 15 MS. WHITE: That was Bob Cohen. 16 MR. LOMBARDI: He is our outside counsel. His office is Tallahassee. He's probably on his way 17 to his office. 18 19 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Oh, very good. Well, I'm glad we have Time Warner representation on the call, 20 21 because we could not accommodate the cell phone. 22 Staff? 23 We're going to go back on the record. Staff? 24 25 MS. BARONE: Yes, this Monica Barone, 2540

Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida

2 32399-0854, appearing on behalf of the Commission

3 Staff.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. We're here on the Florida Competitive Carriers Association Motion to Compel.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: That's correct,
Chairman Johnson.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. If you could then proceed.

on the Motion to Compel answers to Interrogatory

No. 3. This is the July '97. The interrogatory was
served on BellSouth in July 26, '96. We're coming up
on the anniversary of the service of the
interrogatory, still trying to get a responsive
answer.

Interrogatory No. 3 was for BellSouth to provide a narrative description with respect to each criterion of the checklist it is presently providing to describe the arrangements, services, facilities, or means of access that BellSouth is presently and actually providing. And I ask you, Chairman Johnson, to bear in mind the specific request that was made as I described, the motion and the reason for it.

. .

August 16th, 1996. On September 9th you granted our Motion to Compel based upon the inadequacy of that answer. On September 19th BellSouth filed a motion for reconsideration. In May of 1997 the Commission denied the motion for reconsideration and that was memorialized in an order on May 23rd. On June 16th of this year BellSouth provided an answer in which it said, "If you wait until June 24th, eight days from now, and if you negotiate and sign a nondisclosure agreement, and if you come to Atlanta, we will let you review approximately 100 binders of materials in response to your request for a narrative description."

We filed this Motion to Compel based upon what we believe is BellSouth's inappropriate attempt at underlying documents or its obligation to provide us with a good-faith effort to provide a narrative description that's responsive to our request.

Now, BellSouth's answer to our motion is primarily that BellSouth prepared these materials specifically in response to our interrogatory and that is, in fact, a narrative description. Quoting from Page 2, in the answer BellSouth says, "BellSouth has prepared a narrative answer to FCCA's Interrogatory 3, filled 87 binders. This narrative was originally

prepared for filing in Georgia and specific response to FCCA's interrogatory, the filing was modified to include Florida-specific information where appropriate. And later at Page 5 of its answer BellSouth says, and I quote, "FCCA propounded an extremely broad interrogatory and BellSouth has set out a broad carefully organized response and provides a narrative statement they assert it wants." Now, what I want to take is those elements of BellSouth's answer.

The next piece of information that bears on this is the fact that according to counsel for BellSouth, the binders that were to be made available in Atlanta on June 24th, eight days after the answer was due, are the same binders BellSouth provided, filed with the Commission and delivered to parties, including the FCCA on the 7th.

I think that's significant because it indicates that the representation that the materials were compiled specifically for the purpose of answering Interrogatory No. 3 is incorrect.

And in addition to that, we received on the 8th of July, the day after the binders were filed with the Commission, prefiled testimony of Keith Milner for BellSouth. At Pages 2 and 3 of his prefiled testimony

Mr. Milner states as follows:

"Question: What is the purpose of your testimony being filed today?

"Answer: I will discuss the format and contents of material provided to the Florida Public Service Commission in support of BellSouth's filing of its draft statement of generally available terms or SGAT. This material consists of 86 volumes of printed material furnished to this Commission on July 7th, 1997."

specifically in response to the FCC interrogatory as
BellSouth represented in its answer, but the materials
are prepared and designed to support the contention of
BellSouth that it can fulfill Section 271 by virtue of
an SGAT, even if particular items have not been
requested, a purpose far different than the
interrogatory, which is premised upon BellSouth
providing information as to the services it is
actually and presently providing.

In addition to the fact that materials were not prepared in response to the interrogatory, they were prepared for a very different purpose and much of the content of an SGAT bearing on items that have not been requested, irrelevant to the interrogatory.

I'd like to point out also that both in the answer to the interrogatory and in the response to the motion, BellSouth contended that the binders contained proprietary information. Yet, when the same materials were filed with the Commission and delivered to the parties there was no proprietary information contained in any of the binders. And so the answer contained an additional unnecessary hurdle because the negotiation and execution of these agreements is always measured in days, even if they are not particularly controversial. Sometimes they are.

Now, as to the representation that the binders are a narrative and are not consistent with the underlying documents, that we would have to review -- I'm happy to let those materials speak for themselves. I haven't had much of an opportunity to audit the numerous binders. I'm sure that you have seen them stacked up somewhere, that virtually at random, and without any scientific study at all, I pulled out for purposes of this argument, the two binders addressing the FERC interfacing device. They are 4-23, in Volume 1; 4-3, Volume 2. And as I say, I chose these for purposes of argument, but it really doesn't matter which ones you pick up. But I'd like for you, Chairman Johnson, and Staff counsel, as you

take this motion under advisement, and as you consider whether BellSouth is right or wrong when it maintains that it has provided a narrative response, to look at these two binders or any others and gauge whether the many manual instructions, computer printouts, procedures, form sample letters and work instructions represent a narrative description as we requested or whether they are, in fact, the type of underlying documents that we claim that they are.

I think if you'll give those two volumes even a cursory glance, you'll conclude, as we have, that the representation by BellSouth that it has filed a narrative response instead of a compilation of underlying documents is incorrect. So there's no proprietary information as was represented. It was not prepared in response to our interrogatory as was represented. It does not address — is not limited to those items that are actually presently being provided as represented. And there's no proprietary information. And there is a huge number of underlying documents that do not comport to the representation that there's a narrative description.

So we think that the answer is grossly insufficient. We think that as a consequence to that our ability to prepare our case is being prejudiced.

We think that BellSouth has not met its obligations to provide discovery. I'd like to remind you that the entire purpose of opening this docket was to prevent parties -- to begin the discovery process knowing that at the time that BellSouth made its filing the parties would be scrambling because of the time crunch to prepare their cases.

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's unfortunate that so many times in these Commission proceedings the scheduled hearing date provides preparation. Sometimes I know that's unavoidable. But where the Commission was cognizant of that and opened the proceeding a full year in advance of the hearing so that parties could take care of their needs by early discovery. I think it's very unfortunate that we're in this position, despite our efforts early on, finding ourselves prejudiced. And that's why when counsel for BellSouth suggested yesterday that the Motion to Compel was now moot because we have in hand the binders that they were going to make to us available, I strongly disagreed. BellSouth has delivered to us everything they intend to say about the 14 criteria, the timing of that information and it's available to us and the form in which it was provided to us has injured our ability to prepare our case.

For that reason I ask that you find, first of all, that BellSouth has not met its discovery obligations, that their answer to a straightforward interrogatory was insufficient because of -- it's apparent now that we have the filings in hand that BellSouth didn't do anything to answer the interrogatory.

Secondly, that as a consequence of that, we're entitled to an extension of time to prepare any testimony that we feel is necessary to address the extent to which BellSouth has implemented fully the onus of the checklist. I'll reserve a little bit of time for response.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. BellSouth?

MS. WHITE: Yes, Nancy White for BellSouth.

I'm not quite sure where to start. If you believe Mr. McGlothlin, BellSouth has undertaken a massive conspiracy in specifically keeping FCCA in the dark. Nothing could be further from the truth.

If you will recall, if we want to go back into the past, when Mr. McGlothlin and the FCCA first propounded their interrogatories, Interrogatory No. 3, which is the basis of this discussion, said from their Interrogatory No. 1 which is essentially, "What track are you going to take, BellSouth? Track A or Track

B?" Even a year ago FCCA was trying to force BellSouth into a corner, make decisions that had not been -force them to make decisions that had not been made
yet. BellSouth had a valid objection to Interrogatory
No. 1 and, therefore, to the interrogatories that went
towards that one.

б

We made that objection. We had a right to make that objection, we believed in that objection.

The Chairman found against us. The Prehearing Officer found against us. We had a right to appeal that finding. We took that right. There's nothing wrong with BellSouth exercising its right.

When the full Commission decided that
BellSouth needed to answer these questions, and this
was mostly based on one, but, of course, the follow-up
questions went along with it, BellSouth started to see
what it had. As Mr. McGlothlin is correct, we had put
together several binders for a filing of our 271 case
in Georgia. In Georgia they were going for a
statement of generally approved terms and conditions,
I believe it was strictly Track B, and that's the way
Georgia was preparing its case. There was no
Florida-specific information in those binders.

At that point BellSouth had not made a decision yet as to whether it was going to file a

statement of generally available terms and conditions in Florida; and, therefore, whether the 87 binders needed to be filed per the Commission's procedural orders as evidence of BellSouth's meeting the commitments of the checklist.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

When we received the interrogatory and there was the decision by this Commission that we had to answer this interrogatory, the FCCA states in its own motion on Page 4, quote, "FCCA called on BellSouth to provide the particulars as to any checklist item it is providing in sufficient technical, geographical, qualitative and quantitative detail to enable FCCA to gauge the sufficiency of the status of each checklist item," end quote. That's what these 86 binders do. They contain seven sections, including narratives. Seven sections on each one of these issues. It takes the technical service description, the activity with regard to that, the testing, ordering procedures, the provisioning procedures, the maintenance procedures, and miscellaneous other information. It contains everything FCCA has asked for. I just think they don't like the size of it. That is why we said we were working on doing the Florida-specific information, which was not going to be ready until June 24th. That's why we said, "Come see it if you

want to see it." Instead of taking Bell South up on that offer, FCCA determined that it would be better to file a Motion to Compel.

So they are incorrect that these were prepared for the case, not this FCCA, because a decision was not made until very recently to file these 87 binders with the Commission. And I'm not here to debate whether BellSouth may or may not have made the right or wrong decision with regard to that and that was our decision to make.

He is also correct that at first they were deemed to be proprietary. When the time came that we decided that we were going to file these binders with the Commission, we looked very, very closely at whether there was a way we could say these were not proprietary because, frankly, nobody wanted to go through the Commission procedures that you have to deal with when something is proprietary. Nobody wanted to have to try to redact parts of 87 binders. We were very lucky in that they decided, "Okay. We can live with releasing the information; it is not proprietary." So, you know, I'm sorry we had a belief that it was at first. We relooked at it closely and decided it wasn't.

It is a narrative. We were perfectly doing

the right thing in inviting the FCCA to come look at it if they want to. It seems to me that, essentially, FCCA really wants two things. They want a shorter summary than what they have, and they are just as able to concoct that shorter summary as BellSouth is.

Because in order to do that shorter summary, BellSouth would have to go to the '87 binders in order to bring that together. FCCA can do the same thing.

And, also, what they really want is an extension of time in which to file their testimony. This is the second bite at the apple. We've already talked about this at one of the earlier conferences; I believe it was an issue ID conference. BellSouth was agreeable to giving the intervenors some extra days on which to file testimony, but now they're trying to take that even further and that should not be allowed. Because if you give them more time then it minimizes the time that BellSouth has to file rebuttal testimony, and you can imagine the amount of testimony that's going to be filed opposing BellSouth and that's just not fair and not right.

Finally, BellSouth has made a good-faith effort to answer the interrogatory. We're sorry that Mr. McGlothlin and the FCCA doesn't like that answer. We're sorry that they don't like the fact that we have

exercised our right with regard to objections and appeals. We're sorry that they don't like the fact that maybe we didn't make -- maybe BellSouth didn't make decisions on which way it wanted to go with regard to the 271 filing earlier. But that's life. This is the way the case is, and we feel like we've done everything we can do. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Rebuttal?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Go ahead.

has always asked for information bearing on those criteria, ranges of service that BellSouth is presently actually providing. Ms. White's reference to the indecision of BellSouth doesn't support her argument, because whether or not they knew which way they were going at the time, the 87 binders from Georgia were always intended to support an SGAT. So those binders were always aimed at a direction very different from the purpose of the interrogatory. And so her argument simply doesn't wash.

Secondly, we're not contending there's a conspiracy. What we're contending is that BellSouth has not met its discovery obligation. And I think one of her statements is very telling. She says why

doesn't the FCCA go to the 87 binders and distill a narrative response? BellSouth simply doesn't want to make the effort, and the law is that they have to make a reasonable effort to provide the information we want.

2

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

The rules of civil procedure state that where the parties do not have the -- an equivalent ability to work with these massive documents that the decision maker takes into account who has the better ability to provide the information. BellSouth's employees are the ones who are knowledgeable about their efforts to implement the checklist requirements and BellSouth is in a better position of providing the information. They can't thrust that on the FCCA. think if you'll take just a few minutes to look at the volumes that I've identified or any others, it will be clear to you that many of these documents, computer printouts, instruction manuals are simply unintelligible without a narrative description coming from someone who works with the document and is in a position to describe the content of those documents.

We do ask for an extension of time, not because we're trying to delay the proceeding, not because we're trying to put BellSouth in a prejudiced position, but because of BellSouth's failure to

provide us the discovery responses which we're entitled. We need an extension that so that can prepare our case appropriately.

for you, Mr. McGlothlin -- and I understand your request for the narrative, but -- well, maybe I don't understand. I know you're asking for more specificity for this stuff to be streamlined in a narrative form, and you've just mentioned that in looking at -- I'm not sure which volume you were looking at, but you were suggesting that it needed more explanation. I'm wondering exactly what you want BellSouth to provide to you. I'm just a little confused as to what kind of direction you would like for us to give them and what form would it take.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Chairman Johnson, the thrust of Interrogatory 3, what components of the checklist is BellSouth presently and actually providing?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: And to support your contention that you're presently and actually providing that, tell us which services are being made available. Which facilities are being used and tell us how you are doing it, and show us that you can do

it to the extent necessary to comply with the law.

And to answer that requires more than documents that

are really prepared for BellSouth's internal use, your

instruction manuals, their forms, their work

instructions, temporary work instructions. What the

question calls for is someone who works in the area

and who is familiar with this data who is in a

position to describe and explain -- explain, I think,

is the operative word -- the answer to that question.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Are you suggesting, then, that what -- that BellSouth needs to take one more step? They need to take those volumes and prepare a narrative that describes what is in each and relating that back to the question as the way it was posed?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: That's correct,
Chairman Johnson.

chairman Johnson: So it's not that you're saying that this information that was provided couldn't be useful, you're saying but for it to be useful you need something else.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And that even if you had gone to Atlanta to just look at the volumes there, that, too, would have been insufficient. You would have needed more explanation.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: That's correct. And many times, Chairman Johnson, the discovery takes place in two steps. There's the interrogatory that asks for the narrative explanation, and the party may or may not request the responding party to provide backup documents. What we have here is the backup documents without the narrative explanation, and it's not something we can work with.

12 l

binders are the narrative. If you will look at the attachment to our answer to the Motion to Compel, it specifically goes through each checklist item and says, "Here are the access we're providing to unbundled network elements." So if you look in this binder, you get a physical description of the element, and so on and so forth. The same with the BellSouth retail services available for resale, it cannot be any plainer. These binders were put together -- he's talking like one person can do this narrative that he's now looking for. That's not the case. These binders were put together by hundreds of people, not like that's one person who knows everything there is to know about everything on this list.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: I didn't say one person is going to do it, but I did say with respect to each of

the components a person knowledgeable about the efforts and activities of BellSouth would be in a position to explain and describe what has --3 MS. WHITE: And that's what they have done 4 5 in the binders. That is what they have done in the binders. 6 7 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. White. Ms. White, hold up, hold up. Mr. McGlothlin, hold up. Hold up. 8 (Simultaneous conversation.) We've got to go this in a more organized fashion. 10 l Let's go way back to Ms. White's earlier 11 comment as to why you think the narrative has been 12 l provided. 13 l You cited to an attachment. What were you 14 citing to? 15 l MS. WHITE: Well, it's the Attachment A to 16 17 I our response to their Motion to Compel. 18 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. MS. WHITE: It's three pages -- five pages 19 20 that talk about the binders. The fact that they list 21 || like, for example, each binder is interconnected with the checklist item, and it says like, for example, if

you look under Checklist Item 7, nondiscriminatory

operator call completion services, under that, like

access to 911 directory assistance service and

from 71 to 77 that's everything we're providing, that's a list right there of everything we're providing under Checklist 7. And if you look at operator call processing in Binder 71, you will see a description of that item, you will see what activity we've had on that item, you'll see the testing we have performed on that item, you will have a copy of the ordering procedures, the provisioning procedures, the maintenance procedures, and anything else that's relevant about that item.

2

3

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Now --

MS. WHITE: You know, essentially, I mean, you can do a narrative that takes all of the 87 binders and takes the binder parts out and just writes it, and then you're going to end up with what, 40,000, 80,000 pages?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Mr. McGlothlin, could you respond to that point as to the way she just walked through that suggesting that this attachment -and let's use her Checklist Item 7, as to how you could walk through this that they've categorized it and that if you go to that particular element it provides the information that you requested. isn't that sufficient? Or do you agree with that?

MR. McGLOTHLIN:

I disagree.

In Attachment

A there's a three-page index to the 86, 87 binders. All it does is it relates by a one-line subject matter reference, relates the number of the volume to the subject of the contents. And it's no more than a very cryptic table of contents to 87 binders. There's no narrative there. And I don't have in front of me the particular volume she referred to, but they are all very similar. And, again, looking at Section 43, the network interface device, it is roughly, I'm guessing, maybe — one volume is about 500 pages, and it has a section on testing, yes, and test results. By the way, the testing is included according to the witness to support the proposition that it's available even if not requested, a SGAT type of a content as opposed to anything responsive to our interrogatory.

Yes, there are procedures, and having been through the recent docket involving the intraLATA business practices, you've seen similar internal documents, manuals, procedures, routines that are prepared for their internal use as opposed to being descriptive and explanatory of what goes on. There are forms, there are computer printouts, there's a section called provisioning procedures, and, again, an internal document that contains matrixes. There's a section called temporary work instructions, again, for

the internal purposes and containing some matrixes that are unintelligible without explanation.

So a quick and cursory review of any of these documents will belie the claim that this is a narrative, descriptive body of material. And for that reason we think it is not responsive to the interrogatory.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. Staff, do you have a question?

MS. BARONE: Yes. Mr. McGlothlin, I have a question for you. Are you basically saying that you want BellSouth to work from the agreements themselves where Bell is actually, presently providing services and then describe from that agreement with that company the actual qualitative, technical, geographical and pricing information based on that agreement?

MR. McGLOTELIN: The Interrogatory No. 3

does tie to the first interrogatory, which asks

BellSouth to identify the agreements in place on which

it relies for the proposition that it implemented

checklist items. Yes, and we're not asking that they

specify who the agreement is with or the location of a

particular item, but that is a starting point for

developing the information bearing on the checklist

items that BellSouth contends has actually implemented and is presently providing. 2 MS. BARONE: Okay. I'm trying to 3 4 understand, then. So you're not interested in specific agreements per se, but you want that 5 information in a aggregate form? I'm trying to understand exactly what you're wanting. 7 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I think we are talking past 8 each other. I'm not sure what you mean by "aggregate 9 form." 10 With respect to each checklist item that 11 BellSouth claims it has implemented by virtue of an 12 agreement that has been implemented, we would like 13 BellSouth to describe how it has accomplished that 14 implementation, what facility is being used, that type 15 of information. 16 MS. WHITE: And I have to interject one more 17 18 time, that is exactly what is in the binders. 19 MS. BARONE: I have a question for 20 BellSouth. 21 MS. WHITE: Sure. MS. BARONE: Can you point to me which 22 23 tab -- because I have the list of sections for each binder -- can you point to me which tab contains the

geographical data?

MS. WHITE: Nancy, can you help me out on 1 2 that? I don't have the binder in front of me. MS. SIMS: Well, the problem -- we've got 3 the technical description up front, and that gives you 4 a description of what the service is and briefly how it's provisioned. And then we have the live activity. 6 7 Now, we've been really, really restricted in how much information we can give about the live 8 activity because of the customer-specific information, 10 and all of the live activity gives is how many we have in service at this time and how many we've provided. 11 MS. WHITE: But it does say in Florida, 12 13 right? 14 MS. SIMS: Right. This is all 15 Florida-specific, yes. MS. WHITE: So if you're asking is there 16 17 information broken down into like cities of Florida or parts of Florida, the answer is not at this time. 18 19 It's not in the binders right now because the ALECs 20 consider that proprietary information. 21 MS. SIMS: Right. We have been trying to stay away from having it, you know, located like 22 Orlando, Miami. I think we that probably have some 23 specific examples in testimony in some areas. But in

the binders we've done total Florida. But it does

show how many are in service or how many are being 2 provided. MS. BARONE: Okay. And then in each 3 section, do you -- you break it down into actually 4 what's actually being provided in Florida. Of course, 5 you know, we just got the binders, so we haven't been 6 able to look through those. 7 MS. WHITE: Yes. You mean like. 8 9 MS. BARONE: Can you point to a section now, because we have --10 MS. SIMS: Live activity. Look at live 11 activity. 12 l MS. BARONE: Okay. We have Book 7, 13 checklist item, operator services and directory assistance. So we're going to look at live activity 15 16 right now. MS. SIMS: Okay. 17 MS. BARONE: And I see that in Florida you 18 have 11 inward trunks. Is that correct? 19 MS. SIMS: I don't have the binder in front 20 of me. I mean, I'll take your word for it. 21 MS. BARONE: That's what we have here. 22 I mean, that's 23 MS. SIMS: Yeah. Florida-specific information. In each binder behind 24 the tab of live activity, it's how many we have in 25

1	service or how many we've provided. And then the
2	technical description gives the description of what
3	the service is and how it's provisioned. And I guess
4	I'm kind of at a loss as to what else that we can
5	provide.
6	MS. BARONE: Okay. Mr. McGlothlin, have you
7	had a chance to look at the binder?
8	MR. McGLOTHLIN: I have not. I don't have
9	that one available to me at the moment.
10	MS. BARONE: Is the type of information that
11	we've just described the type of information that
12	you're seeking in this request?
	,
13	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number
1	
13	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number
13	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number installation, I suppose would fit into the response,
13 14 15	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number installation, I suppose would fit into the response, but it doesn't describe how it was being provided and
13 14 15 16	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number installation, I suppose would fit into the response, but it doesn't describe how it was being provided and to what extent or what facilities are being used.
13 14 15 16 17	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number installation, I suppose would fit into the response, but it doesn't describe how it was being provided and to what extent or what facilities are being used. MS. WHITE: That's the technical description
13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number installation, I suppose would fit into the response, but it doesn't describe how it was being provided and to what extent or what facilities are being used. MS. WHITE: That's the technical description does that. That should be in the front.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number installation, I suppose would fit into the response, but it doesn't describe how it was being provided and to what extent or what facilities are being used. MS. WHITE: That's the technical description does that. That should be in the front. MS. SIMS: That should be in
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number installation, I suppose would fit into the response, but it doesn't describe how it was being provided and to what extent or what facilities are being used. MS. WHITE: That's the technical description does that. That should be in the front. MS. SIMS: That should be in MS. WHITE: In the front.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Same as to the number installation, I suppose would fit into the response, but it doesn't describe how it was being provided and to what extent or what facilities are being used. MS. WHITE: That's the technical description does that. That should be in the front. MS. SIMS: That should be in MS. WHITE: In the front. MS. SIMS: the front. There's a tab that

MS. SIMS: Okay.

MS. BARONE: Mr. McGlothlin, does that answer the --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: He doesn't have it.

MS. BARONE: He doesn't have that? I guess we're still trying to find out, Mr. McGlothlin, what information that you still need so that we can help you here.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Monica, I have not had a chance to do these binders to answer the question is the information here. But assuming it is here, it's here on July 7th instead of June 16th. Assuming for the sake of argument for a moment that the information is in the live activity and the technical description, the binder I have, again, 4-3, that's about -- looks like maybe nine pages of about 500. So for that reason I contend that their answer was not appropriate at that time.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Could you say that again?
You faded out for a while, but why do you believe the
answer was not appropriate? And I know you were
referring to a specific volume that we aren't looking
at, but why was the answer inappropriate?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: They refer to 87 binders, each of which have several hundred pages. And if now the contingent is that within those 500 or 600 pages,

there's nine or ten that contain the information, then it was inappropriate for BellSouth to say, "Come to Atlanta to see it."

and I'm just trying to follow this and see how it works and this has been helpful to look through one of the particular binders. But how else would you do it? Because you want the follow-up information and you want the summary. I guess you're suggesting they should have just sent you the summary, but then that would have been out of context because you would have then needed to have the background information, also, to view it in a comprehensive manner, I would think.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: We asked for the narrative description and that's what -- you know, if you want to make the case that that's all they had to give us, fine and good, but we deserved it, we were entitled to it and on June 16th.

MS. WHITE: And I'm sorry I have to speak up again, but that is not all they asked for. They asked for a narrative description. It's sufficient technical, geographic, qualitative and quantitative detail.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes, the narrative description was to include enough detail.

MS. WHITE: Well, that means the whole binder, not just a technical description.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Well, I disagree.

MS. WHITE: Well, a technical description doesn't give you the qualitative; it doesn't give you the quantitative.

really -- and I know Staff is also, and I'm trying to figure out, first of all -- and we'll address when you got the information later, but we're still trying to address whether or not this information is adequate.

You know, whether it was available on the 7th or the 24th, that's a separate issue that I'll handle separately, but I want to ensure that we have all of the discovery items that have been requested.

And I'm still trying to better understand, if I -- after reviewing this, if I determined that something else needed to be provided, I'm having difficulty right now determining what that something else would be. So let's try to, one more time, for my edification and for something for me to reflect on.

In addition to what you have now, the binders with the tabs, and the explanation as provided, what else do you believe that BellSouth should be providing to you?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Chairman Johnson, bear with me as I explain that. I'm not in a position this morning to say whether the binders do or do not contain the information that would satisfy the interrogatories. I simply have not had an opportunity to work with them to the extent that it's fair to answer that question. But for the sake of argument, if we want to assume that the information that is responsive to the question can be found and distilled from the 87 binders, and that BellSouth need not provide any in addition, I would contend that seeing it now instead of being told to come to Atlanta to find it in 87 binders on June 24th is not responsive to the interrogatory. It was not sufficient to meet their obligations under the rules of discovery and that we have been injured in our ability to prepare the case in time.

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

that a little more. You are stating that BellSouth, in responding, when they stated that -- that because of the voluminous nature of the documents that you should come to Atlanta, that that was inappropriate?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. Yes. Because

BellSouth had an obligation to provide the narrative explanatory descriptive response to our interrogatory

that would have made it unnecessary to travel to Atlanta and review 87 binders.

20 l

I reject categorically the proposition that the 87 binders are the answer to the interrogatory. Perhaps the answer can be distilled from the information in those binders. But, again, if you look at the nature of that information, I think you'll agree readily that the bulk of the materials are internal documents that do not correspond or do not answer the interrogatory.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. White, any closing comments?

MS. WHITE: Yes. I guess I'm still lost.

Green, but the bottom line is if -- and this has been the rule of thumb as long as I have been practicing at this Commission -- that if you have voluminous amount of documents that are responsive to the question you can ask the party to come see them. That's never been a problem that I've known of. I think it goes back to whether or not you consider the 87 binders to be an error. I think absolutely it is. The problem seems to be some of it is very technical, and I'm sure FCCA has experts that can look at that. I don't pretend to understand every single thing that is in the 87 binders, but if what Mr. McGlothlin and the FCCA is

looking for is a, you know, step by step brought down into you know high school English of exactly what is going on I don't think that that's a requirement that BellSouth has to meet. I think we've met the discovery requirements and we should not be penalized and they issue not be begin extra time.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Staff, any closing questions?

motion you requested an extension of time to file testimony. You didn't indicate which testimony. Do you mean direct and rebuttal, or direct, just rebuttal, which one?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Perhaps I'm not clear on the distinction being made there. Our working assumption is that the direct testimony deadline would be for the purpose of submitting testimony. We were in a position to -- on that day because we knew of the issues and that the rebuttal deadline had the opportunity to include any additional testimony that is responsive to the filing that BellSouth made on July 7th; is that correct?

MS. BARONE: Right.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Okay. And we're talking about the rebuttal deadline.

1 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. 2 MS. BARONE: Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any closing comments? MR. McGLOTHLIN: If I may, just one very 4 quick one. 5 I think Ms. White in her last remarks went 6 7 to the crux of the question. She said that the rule of thumb is when you have a voluminous number of documents, you can call the party to come see them. Well, that is the case when we're talking about a request to produce documents. It's not the case where 11 we have posed interrogatories that the other side has 12 an obligation to answer. And since BellSouth and the other parties are not in equivalent positions in terms of their ability to distill answers from underlying 15 documents, BellSouth has an obligation to answer these interrogatories. 17 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Staff, do you have 18 19 MS. BARONE: Yes. Mr. McGlothlin, are you 20 still asking for a narrative in addition to what has 21 22 been filed? MR. McGLOTHLIN: Monica, again, I can't 23 request -- if, in fact, these binders are containing 24

information that we can work with. But I don't know

that to be the case and so I am asking at this point. 2 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I'm going to rule on this 3 later, but I'm still trying -- particularly based on Mr. McGlothlin's last point that you haven't had an opportunity to make a determination. You haven't had 6 an opportunity to review all of the volumes to determine whether or not the narrative in the volumes is sufficient. 8 I'll tell you what, we're going to look at 9 the information that's been provided and review the arguments that have been made today and make a 11 determination as to the sufficiency of the response. 12 We will also make a determination as to -- even if it 13 is sufficient, whether or not it was timely provided 14 and whether or not anything else would need to be done 15 if it was not provided in a timely manner. 16 We will get back with the parties within --17 probably by tomorrow on that. 18 Any final comments? 19 MR. McGLOTHLIN: None from me, Commissioner. 20 21 Thank you. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Any from you 22 Ms. White? 23 24 MS. WHITE: No, thank you. Okay. Then we'll issue a 25 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:

```
ruling sometime tomorrow probably. Take care. Bye.
               (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at
 2
    10:25 a.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON) 2 3 I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Status Conference in Docket No. 960786-TL was heard by the Prehearing 5 Officer at the time and place herein stated; it is further 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript, consisting of 40 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 10 DATED this 9th day of July, 1997. 11 12 CSR, RPR 13 Chief, Bureau of Reporting Official Commission Reporter 14 (904) 413-6732 15 16 17 18 19 20

21

22

23

24