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## PROCEEDINGS

(Transcript follows in sequence from
Volume 4.)
CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We're going to go back on the record.

MR. MELSON: Chairman Johnson, before
Mr. Hatch starts the cross of Mr. Varner, I believe the parties, at least, have agreed that we can stipulate Mr. Martinez's testimony. Assuming that's satisfactory with the Commissioners, I'd like to let him try to catch an airplane.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: That's fine. Do we want to do that now or take it in its proper course? It doesn't matter to me.

MR. MELSON: Okay. I'd take it in its proper course. Before I let him go I wanted to be sure I wasn't going to get hammered in two more hours.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: I don't have any questions.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.
COMMISBIONER CLARE: I guess we should assume nobody else does?

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Commissioner Jacobs, did you have any questions for Martinez? Because the witnesses -- they can stipulate.

COMMIBEIONER JACOBS: Yeah, that's fine. CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: I think we're fine.

We'll go ahead and proceed with Mr. Varner.

ALPHONBO J. VARNER
continues his testimony under oath from Volume 4

CROSB EXAMINATION

BY MR. HATCH:

0 Good afternoon, Mr. Varner. It was almost good morning but I missed it.

A Good afternoon.
$Q$ Do you have in front of you a handout that was handed out that says "8th Circuit" at the top? You can refer to those charts behind you. It's just a paper copy of the charts behind you. Do you have that?

A Yes. Those are not my charts. (Laughter)
Q Would you agree with me that the 8 th circuit held -- one of the holdings in the 8 th circuit was the fact that the incumbent LECs object to this rule, meaning the combinations, indicates that they would rather allow the entrants to access their networks to have to rebundle the unbundled network elements for them? Would you agree with that?

A I think there's a word missing in that,
though, somewhere. The sentence doesn't make sense.
Q Is the quote in red behind you?

A The quote reads the same as the one that's on the paper.

Q Would you agree that's the holding of the 8th Circuit?

A That's what I said. It looks like a word is missing. I was just trying to find it. Yes. It says "allow entrants access to their network than to have to rebundle."

Q Okay. That's fine.

And then the second page that has paragraph

II(G) (1) (g)?

A Yeah.

Q The plain language of subsection 251 (c)(3)
indicates the requesting carrier may achieve the capability to provide telecommunications services completely through access to unbundled network elements of an incumbent LEC's network. Nothing in the subsection requires a competing carrier to own or control some portion of a telecommunications network before being able to purchase unbundled network elements. You would agree that the 8th circuit held that?

A Yes.

Q And, finally, you would agree that the 8th Circuit made the following statement: "Congress recognized that the amount of time and capital investment involved in the construction of a complete local stand-beside telecommunications network are substantial barriers to entry, and thus required incumbent LECs to allow competing carriers to use their networks in order to hasten the influence of competitive forces in the local telephone business. The commission's unbundling rules facilitate the competing carriers access to these networks, and thus promote the Act's additional purpose -- the expeditious introduction of competition into the local phone markets. You would agree with that?

A There's one caveat. They're talking about the unbunding rules that they didn't vacate.

Q Now, in reaching its conclusions, would you agree with me that the 8 th Circuit rejected BellSouth's argument that CLECs must provide its own facilities in conjunction with the use of UNEs to obtain UNEs at UNE prices?

A Yes.
Q Would you also agree with me that the 8 th Circuit rejected the argument the use of UNEs solely to provide telecommunications services would
circumvent the resale provisions of $252(\mathrm{~d})(3)$ ?
A Yes.

Q And you would also agree with me that use of UNEs solely to provide telecommunications services would circumvent the joint marketing restrictions. They rejected that argument, did they not?

A Yes, they did. When combined by the ALEC; they rejected that argument under those conditions. They disagreed, however, that -- they actually had the opposite view when they were combined by the incumbent, such as BellSouth. They felt that if the incumbent were required to combine them, that it would, in fact, render the resale provision of the Act meaningless, and that would affect the joint marketing restriction. The exact opposite.

Q I'm not sure that I heard you correctly. I may have misheard you. Correct me if I'm wrong. Did you say that if the CLEC combines them, that that would obliterate the resale?

A No. If Bellsouth combined them for the CLEC.

Q Wouldn't it be more accurate to say that the 8th circuit said that if they were provided on a combined basis that that would obliterate the resale restriction?

A Yes. That's -- to do that BellSouth has to do the combining. That's how they get provided on a combined basis.

9 If they are already provided in BellSouth's network, then there's nothing for BellSouth to combine; is that correct?

A Yes. It's already combined and it was combined by BellSouth.

Q But nothing in the 8th Circuit's decision says BellSouth is precluded from combining?

A Precludes us? No, nothing precludes us. The important part of the decision says we have no obligation to do it. We can do it if we want.

Q If AT\&T obtains a loop-port combination from Bellsouth pursuant to the existing contract, it's BellSouth's position that this should be priced as though it were a retail tariffed rate less the discount; is that correct?

A Yes.
0 In this scenario, assuming AT\&T orders a loop-port combination from BellSouth pursuant to the contract, in this scenario can AT\&T specify the specific switch features that it would like in order to provide service to its own customer?

A Yes, it can. Just like if it bought it for
resale, it can do the same thing.
Q Would AT\&T be limited to those BellSouth features that are in its tariffs?

A Yes.
Q Does BellSouth in its tariffs offer stand-alone 900 blocking?

A I don't know.
Q Does BellSouth in its tariffs offer stand-alone 976 blocking?

A I don't know.
Q Does BellSouth in its tariffs offer long distance Caller ID?

A Yes.
Q Would it surprise you that BellSouth's tariffs do not offer stand-alone 900 blocking or stand-alone 976 blocking?

A No, it wouldn't surprise me at all.
Q Do BellSouth's current tariffs contain every feature that each one of its switches is capable of providing?

A Yes. With the caveat that as the switches are currently programmed, it has every one that the switches are capable of providing.

Q If there's a feature that is in a switch and it is not tariffed, does that mean that AT\&T cannot
obtain that when it orders a loop-port combination?
A All of the ones that we have in there are tariffed.

2 If you assume that there's a feature in the switch that is not tariffed, would that mean that AT\&T could not obtain that feature unless and until

BellSouth filed a tariff?
A If you assume something that doesn't exist, I would guess that's correct.

9 Now, BellSouth offers some unbundled networks -- unbundled network elements together now; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q We talked about those earlier. For instance, those on Page 17 of your direct testimony?

A Yes.
9 Now, those combinations are priced, I believe, as we discussed earlier, at the sum of the individual UNE rates; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Those rates are found in the BellSouth-AT\&T contract?

A Yes.
Q Can you cite me to any provision of the BellSouth-AT\&T contract that specifically provides for
the pricing of these combinations?
A No.
Q Do you know whether there is a provision in there that you cannot, at the top of your mind, cite to?

A There's no provision in there for pricing of combinations.

Q Let me see if I understand your proposal. If I buy one unbundled network element, then I'm entitled to the price that's in that contract; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q If I buy any two unbundled network elements in combination, then the contract is irrelevant as to the price; is that your position?

A If you buy a combination of elements?
Q Yes.
A Yes, that's correct. The contract doesn't have any price for any network element combinations.

Q Does this extend to other terms and conditions of the contract, such as provisioning of unbundled network elements and how they are going to be provisioned and when they will be provisioned?

A I don't know whether it extends to provisioning or not. I do know it extends to pricing.

Q So you don't know whether the contract would govern any of the activities related to the purchase of a combination of UNEs?

A Pricing $I$ know it doesn't. As far as anything else, I don't know whether it does or it doesn't.

Q Are you suggesting that the contract is irrelevant to -- completely, in its entirety -- to the purchase of combined unbundled network elements?

A No, I haven't. As I said, I know that it does not contain any pricings. With respect to any other aspects of combinations, I don't know what it has. You can ask Mr. Hendrix.

Q Under your proposal, if AT\&T provided --
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Varner, let me
follow up on that because $I$ keep getting confused.
I thought under the contract that when you combined network elements, that if it recreated a service, a retail service, it's your view it would be at the resale price --

WITNESS VARNER: Right.
COMMIBSIONER CLARK: -- which is retail minus wholesale.

WITNESS VARNER: Yes.
COMMIB8IONER CLARE: I also thought it said
where you combined them -- I thought the implication was where you combined services that don't recreate a retail service, that it is then the individual prices less any savings for duplicate charges.

WITNESS VARNER: No. Our understanding was that whether a replicated retail service or not, that the prices were not set in the contract for combinations.

COMMISSIONER CLARR: Okay. So then just so I'm clear, your testimony is that when it was talking about combinations, it was talking when you use a single order form, that was the only time you subtract duplicate charges?

WITNESS VARNER: I'm not quite following your question. I just want to be sure I'm answering the question you were getting at.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Mr. Melson, do you have that -- the language that you put up on the -(Counsel puts charts up on easel.)

WITNESS VARNER: That one? You mean one from your order?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes, I think so.
MR. MELSON: I'm sorry. The one from the order?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah. Where it talks
about recreating retail services. (Pause)
MR. MELSON: Here it is right here. Sorry. (Document placed on projector.)

COMMISSIONER CLARR: It says "When two or more UNEs are combined, these prices may lead to duplicate charges." Oh, wait a minute. "The recurring and nonrecurring prices or unbundled network elements in Table 1 of this attachment are appropriate for UNEs on an individual stand-alone basis." Then it says "When two or more are combined, these prices might lead to duplicate charges.

WITNESS VARNER: It was the first part of that that led to our understanding that the only prices that were there were for individual stand-alone UNEs. The combining that's talked about there is you've ordered more than multiples of those individual stand-alone UNEs on the same order.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Okay. And it's not when -- you're talking about when you order, say, two ports.
wITNESS VARNER: Not really two ports because you did, I think at first, have additional charges, but there were four of them that were identified specifically. Because --

COMMIBSIONER CLARX: Let me back up and
maybe ask it a different way.
From what I understand you saying is when you order a bunch of UNEs on the same order, you subtract duplicate charges.

WITNESS VARNER: Exactly.
COMMIssIONER CLARK: But it doesn't apply when you have combined UNEs.

WITNESS VARNER: Exactly.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's the order that dictates the savings.

WITNESS VARNER: Yes. It's ordering them together. And there were four that were identified specifically that we were to look at. And if I remember right there were 2 -wire analog loop and a 2-wire analog port on the same order. 4-wire loop and port, ISDN loop and pot, and I think it was DS-1 loop and port. That it was those four that we were to examine and see that if you ordered those together at the same time, would there be duplicate charges.

COMMISBIONER CLARK: Okay.
Q (By Mr. Hatch) Now, going back to the BellSouth-AT\&T contract, just to make sure I understood where we left this, the contract requires BellSouth to provide unbundled network elements in combinations. That's correct, you'd agree with that?

A That's correct.

Q Now, isn't it correct that the contract other provisions, in terms of provisioning intervals, DMOQs and all the other things in the contract related to the provisioning of those elements would also apply for the provisioning of those elements?

A Would you repeat that?

Q Be happy to.
Doesn't the contract between AT\&T and Bellsouth require that when $A T \& T$ provisions these elements that it is obligated to provision, that the other contract terms would govern how they are provisioned, when they are provisioned, measures of quality and all the other provisions of that contract, would they not apply to the provision of those elements?

A I think the answer to that is yes. It sounds like what you're asking me is do the contract provisions that apply to the elements apply to the elements, and the answer to that is yes.

Q Now, is it your position that if AT\&T provides its own loop and uses BellSouth's port, along with local switching, common transport and other elements, that AT\&T can obtain a combination of the port, the local switching, the common transport,
tandem switching at the sum of the network elements in the contract?

A Would you repeat that? Because it sounds like you said they were providing their own switching but also purchasing the switching from us at the same time.

Q No. If AT\&T provides its own loop --
A It's own loop.
Q It's own loop, and uses the other features, unbundled network elements that BellSouth provides, to complete its service offering, those elements would be available at the sum of the network element prices; is that correct?

A I believe that's correct, because I don't know of a retail service that would be replicated by that arrangement.

Q Then that is not consistent with your position that the sum of the network elements is not the standard under the contract for combinations that don't replicate a retail service, is it?

A No, it's not. As I said, my understanding is that under the contract there are no prices for combinations, whether they replicate retail services or not. BellSouth has proposed to provide the combinations that you see here -- that are listed in
my testimony at Page 17, at the sum of the network element prices.

So when someone has called us and asked us for those elements, or those combinations of elements, the price that we've quoted is the price, the sum of the individual element prices, but it's not stated in the contract that that is, in fact, the price that we should be charging.

Q So if it's not the contract you could unilaterally change those price at any time; is that what you're telling us?

A Well, we couldn't change the prices for the individual elements but we could change the price for the combinations of them.

Q So if today AT\&T provided its own loop and used BellSouth's port switching, common transport tandem switching, currently at the sum of the network elements that are set forth in the contract, tomorrow that price could change? Is that what you're saying?

A Yes, it could, because there is no price stated in the contract for what that -- how that combination should be priced. That's why we're here, is to resolve that so that it is identified, what the price is for the combination should be.

Q Now, when determining when a combination
duplicates a BellSouth retail service we would look at BellSouth's tariffs to make that determination. Would that be correct?

A Yes. Tariffs and contracts. When I say contracts in this case I'm talking about customer contracts, not ALEC contracts.

Q If a combination doesn't duplicate a BellSouth service, can AT\&T obtain that combination at the sum of the UNE prices if those elements are in that contract, any combination?

A As I said, no, there is no price for them in there. We've identified the list of combinations that we offer and at the sum of the network element prices. If there is another combination that AT\&T wants to offer, then they would identify it and we should negotiate what the price is. If it replicates a retail service, then we believe the price ought to be the same as for the resold service.

Q If you assume for the moment that BellSouth provides a combination to AT\&T that doesn't duplicate a Bellsouth service, and that that combination is priced at the sum of the network elements in the AT\&T BellSouth contract -- just assume that for the moment -- could BellSouth file a tariff to provide that service at a retail level, that combination?

A I don't know whether we could or not. I mean, that's just speculation as to what the service would be. It may not -- you're talking about something $I$ don't even know what it is. It may not have any applicability in a retail marketplace.

0 Let's talk about a combination of a port and common transport. That is a combination that you currently provide that does not replicate a BellSouth service; is that correct?

A That's correct.

0 Now, if BellSouth determined there was a retail market for that, could they file a tariff to offer that?

A If there was, but I don't know how there would be a retail market for that.

0 Was that a yes or a no?

A Yes, we could file a tariff, but $I$ don't believe there is a retail market for that arrangement.

0 Now, with respect to tariffs that you file with the Florida Public Service Commission, those tariffs are presumptively valid, are they not?

A I don't recall. I just don't know.

2 With all of your experience before the Commission in tariff filings you do not know?

A It's been a long time since I've looked at
that. I know that the price regulation legislation came out several years ago. If you asked me then I would have known, but I don't remember everything forever.

Q Could such a tariff be suspended by the Commission if BellSouth filed it?

A I don't know.
Q Are there any limitations that you're aware of, either in Chapter 364 or the Commission's rules, that place any limits on the price that BellSouth could place in a retail tariff for a tariffed service?

A I remember there was some price controls in the legislation. There was some specific parameters in there. I don't remember what they were.

Q If you filed a tariff for a new service, are there any limitations that you're aware of in Chapter 364 where the Commission's rules or orders limit the price BellSouth could place on that service in its tariff?

A I don't remember whether there are or there aren't.

Q Would you accept there are none in Chapter 364 or in the Commission's rules or orders?

A I have no basis for accepting it. As I said, I just don't remember.

2
Under your duplicator retail service standard, AT\&T -- well, strike that.

If AT\&T currently had a combination that was priced at the sum of the unbundled network element prices, and then AT\&T then filed a tariff to offer that at a retail level, then that price, according to your position, would then switch to the retail price minus the discount; is that not correct?

A No, that's not correct.

Q Why would that not be correct?
A Because it's if BellSouth offers it as a retail service is when the resale discount applies. If AT\&T offers it retail -- I assume everything they get from us they are going to offer somehow at retail.

Q I misspoke. I meant if BellSouth filed a tariff to offer at a retail level the combination that AT\&T currently was obtaining at the sum of that unbundled network elements in its contract, then under your position that price would change to the retail price minus the discount?

A Yes, it would. Because it would be replicating a retail service, which is, I mean, pretty easy to identify. We've gone around and around about whether port and loop and all of this stuff. It's not all that complicated, okay.

What they've asked for in their testimony is the ability to migrate an existing customer to unbundled elements, okay? What that means is that the customer is getting service, he's getting retail service today. They want to purchase all of the unbundled elements to give them that retail service. I mean, whether they are trying to replicate a retail service or not is not in dispute. That's exactly what they've asked for.

COMMISBIONER CLARK: Mr. Varner, would you be concerned with that if the price for bundling those unbundled network services was more than -- discounted the wholesale price?

WITNESS VARNER: Would I be concerned about offering it to them that way?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Right.
WITNESS VARNER: No, not really, and the
reason is this --
COMMISSIONER CLARK: The issue is price.
WITNESS VARNER: The issue is price. But the reason $I$ wouldn't be concerned about that is this: Because if it's higher than the resale price it becomes irrelevant, because they can always choose resale. They always have the option to choose resale, so if it's priced higher than the resale price they're
just not going to choose it.
COMMISBIONER CLARK: So then we should price it exactly.

WITNESS VARNER: At resale. That's what we proposed.

COMMISBIONER CLARK: If we price it exactly at resale then they can joint market.

WITNESS VARNER: NO.
COMMISSIONER CLARX: So how can they ever joint market a retail service? If they replicate a retail service --

WITNESS VARNER: How can they ever joint market?

COMMIBSIONER CLARK: Right.
WITNESS VARNER: Two ways. One is that after February of 1999 the joint marketing restriction disappears. The second is that they would quit objecting to us getting in the long distance business, so we can get in. When that happens, then the joint marketing restriction disappears. Under those two conditions.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Well, you've
effectively eliminated the other condition that Congress put out there, and that is providing service with the UNEs.

WITNESS VARNER: No. In that condition if they purchase a service and they provide it utilizing UNEs, if they do -- for example, if they were to do like other ALECs have done and purchase UNEs, combine them with their own facilities, they can joint market that. They can joint market that arrangement with whatever it is that they want. The only thing that they could not joint market would be this combination of UNEs that's solely provided by BellSouth that replicates the retail service. They couldn't joint market that arrangement with their long distance until, you know, either one of the other two conditions: Either 1999, or if we get into the long distance business. That would be the only one that is restricted. If they built their own switch, bought loops from us, put them on their switch, they could joint market that.

COMMISBIONER CLARK: Let me ask you another question. Why is it that it's cheaper, according to you, to buy UNEs and recreate a service than it is to purchase at the wholesale price if, for instance, local service is priced below cost?

WITNESB VARNER: Because not all local service is priced below cost. When you look at business local service, it's not priced below cost.

COMMIBSIONER CLARK: Residential. AS I
understood --

WITNESS VARNER: Yes. Residential you saw was very, very close, and the thing that made the difference is -- was access charges. It was the application of access charges.

COMMISEIONER CLARK: Yes, I do remember that.

WITNESS VARNER: I don't have one for the residence customer.
(Demonstrates document on projector.)

This was the chart for the residence customer. And what you can see, that if you take access charges off, if you just look at just plain old basic service, without any features, without any access charges, the unbundled element prices are high. It would probably 19 plus the 478 and the 112 , so it would be higher. The thing that turns it around is access charges. And I believe that that's why this issue that you see here is only being pressed by IXCs.

COMMIE8IONER CLARK: Let me see if $I$ can ask
it different -- IXCs pay you the access charges, right?

WITNESS VARNER: Yes.

COMMIESIONER CLARK: SO why am I incorrect
that it suggests that the price that people pay for local service, in fact, covers the cost?

WITNESS VARNER: If you're talking about, you know, like the average customer, what they pay in total?

COMMIBEIONER CLARK: NO.

WITHESE VARNER: Is that what you're talking about.

COMMIB8IONER CLARK: NO.

WITNESS VARNER: If you're just talking about basic service, you know, just plain old basic service, no features, you know, no long distance -COMMISBIONER CLARK: Yes.

WITNESS VARNER: -- nothing else, what you can see the retail price for that is $\$ 10.65$. Okay. If you assume that these unbundled network element prices are set at cost, okay, the cost of that is \$17 plus $\$ 2$ plus $\$ 4.78$.

COMMIESIONER CLARK: All right.
WITNESS VARNER: So it is priced below cost. COMMISSIONER CLARR: Got YOu. Thanks.

Q (By Mr. Hatch) So getting back to the final tariff scenario, based on your duplicate retail service standard it is conceivable that AT\&T could never get unbundled network elements at network
element prices and combinations; is that correct? Because you could always file a tariff --

A No.
Q -- to change it to a resale?

A No.
Q Isn't that what you just told me earlier?
A No, it's not. It's the opposite of what I told you.

Q All right. Let's start again. Does anything preclude BellSouth from filing a tariff to offer any particular set of combinations of network elements?

A Yes. I mean, we only file tariffs if there's a retail market for it. If there's a combination for which there is no retail market then we don't offer it. The proof of that is there are eight or nine combinations that are listed in my testimony that we do offer. We don't offer those at retail.

Q Nothing precludes you from filing a tariff to offer that as a retail offering, is there?

A Yes, there is. There's no market for it.

Q There's nothing that precludes you from putting a piece of paper that says here is an amendment to our GSST that says the following
combinations of network elements are now an official retail tariffed offering?

A Yes, there is.
Q And filing that with the Commission?
A Yes, there is. There's no market for it. There's no point in us -- we're not going to file and make a retail offering for something for which there is -- nobody wants it; nobody to sell it to.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. But that's not the question. The question is you can do it, can't you?

WITNESS VARNER: I mean, we can put the piece of paper and come down here and file it? Is that what he's asking?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I think that's what he's saying.

WITNESS VARNER: Yes, we can do that.
9 (By Mr. Hatch) And if you did that, then that would establish the retail price, and that would be the price, less the discount, and that would be the price that we would get for that combination of network elements?

A Yes. If that tariff was approved, that's what would happen.

0 I believe you made the statement in you
deposition --
COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask a question on that before you go on.

If there were not a retail market for that, and it was plain on its face that the only reason you filed it -- and even if it was presumptively valid, if that was the only reason you filed it was to perhaps circumvent something within this contract, is there some provision in this contract which would negate that, that says something about if you're not dealing in good faith that -- I'm just curious about --

WITNESS VARNER: I don't know.
COMMISSIONER DEASON: You're not really sure about that.

WITNESS VARNER: I'm just not sure. I don't know whether there is. Mr. Hendrix might know. I'm just not familiar with all of the provisions of the contract.

Q (By Mr. Hatch) Is it your testimony that the pricing standards in $252(\mathrm{~d})$ of the Act do not apply to combinations?

A That's correct. Because the 252 (d) pricing standards only apply to the obligations under 251. Combinations are not an obligation under 251. So not only do the pricing standards not apply, the
negotiation and arbitration provisions don't apply either.

Q What provision of the Act grants an exemption for combinations of UNEs from the pricing provisions of $252(\mathrm{~d})(1) ?$

A The 8th Circuit Court's opinion that combinations of network elements are not required to be provided by the ALEC. Their view was that that is not an obligation under Section 251 of the Act.

Q Do you have a copy of the Act handy?
A The Act?
Q Yes.
A No, I do not.
Q Would you turn to 251 (c) (3)
(Hands document to witness.)
A All right.
Q Could you read that (3) for me, please?
A Read it out loud?
Q Yes, please.
A "The duty to provide to any requesting telecommunications carrier for the provision of telecommunications service nondiscriminatory access to network elements on an unbundled basis at any technically feasible point on rates, terms and conditions that are just, reasonable and
nondiscriminatory in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement and requirements of this section and Section 252.
"An unbundled local exchange carrier shall provide such unbundled network elements in a manner that allows requesting carriers to combine such elements in order to provide such telecommunications services."

Q Now, would you turn over to $252(d)$ for me, please.

A Yes. (Witness complies.) I have it.
Q (d)(1). That deals with interconnection and network element charges?

A Yes. That's pricing standard.
Q That's correct. And those pricing standards are set forth in sub-A there, aren't they?

A Yes.
Q And those would be that they have to be based on cost -- the cost, without reference to rate of return or rate base proceeding, of providing the interconnection or network element, whichever is applicable, and nondiscriminatory, and may include a reasonable profit. Would that be accurate?

A Yes. That is the pricing standard.
Q So where is it in there that you see an
exemption from combinations of network elements from the pricing standards of 252 (d) (1)?

A 252 (d) only applies to 251 (c) (3) and (c)(2. And when you go to 251(c)(3) it says "An incumbent local exchange carrier shall provide such unbundled network elements in a manner that allows requesting carriers to combine such elements in order to provide such telecommunications services. This has already been interpreted by the 8 th circuit.

And what they said is that while the Act requires incumbent LECs to provide elements in a manner that enables the competing carrier to combine them, unlike the Commission, we do not believe that this language can be read to levy a duty on the incumbent LECs to do the actual combining of elements. The 8th Circuit has already interpreted that language.

Q Now, the 8th Circuit has said if we combine them to provide service, that we get them at unbundled network element prices, the sum of the element prices; is that correct?

A That's correct. And as I've said several times, if, in fact, AT\&T wants to implement the 8 th Circuit's decision in their agreement, BellSouth is perfectly willing to do that, but it has to be the whole decision.

Q Now, there is a nonrecurring cost to AT\&T to hook those up; is that correct?

A I guess there would be. I would assume there would be.

Q And that would include your proposal for collocation and other things; is that correct?

A It would be whatever method AT\&T chose to use to do that.

Q However they got hooked up, once AT\&T got them hooked up, the recurring monthly price would be the sum of the network elements as set forth in the contract for their recurring rates?

A Under the 8th Circuit's decision.
Q Right.
A Yes.
Q Now, under your position if we're buying them combined pursuant to the contract, that's a resale price, right? Less the discount?

A You're talking about the under the 8th Circuit decision or under the contract?

Q Under the contract.
A Okay. Under the contract we're saying whether you combine them or we combine them they ought to be resale. Under the 8 th Circuit's decision we're saying if you combine them, you're selling them under
network element prices; if we combine them, we'll have to see if we can agree on what the price would be. But that's not an obligation that we have.
$Q$ Now, would it be correct to say that the distinction that the 8 th circuit drew is on how they get combined?
A. Who does the combining.

Q Who does the combining.
A That's right. That's the distinction.
Q It is not -- there's no distinction drawn in the 8 th circuit decision with respect to what the recurring rate would be on a going-forward basis. The only question that the court concerned itself with was who did the combining; is that correct?

A By implication they've dealt with the price, because they've said that BellSouth does not have to do the combining. Consequently, obviously if we don't have to do it, then they haven't -- the pricing standards that apply to things that we do have to do can't apply to that. They made no decision as to what the price should be or what the price standards should be, if, in fact, we do the combining. Because that's a decision that's up to us to make whether we even want to do that or not. We're not obligated to even do it at all.

Q Who does the combining is the concern of the 8th Circuit; not what -- after they are combined, the Court made no statement as to what those rates are other than they would be available at the unbundled network element prices; is that correct?

A That's not correct at all. What the court interpreted was what BellSouth's obligation was under the Telecom Act, and it said BellSouth had no obligation to combine these elements. Since we had no obligation to combine these elements, that means that none of the provisions of the Act even apply to that. In fact, what that really means is that the commission could, if it chose to do so, just not even address this issue at all, and be perfectly within the bounds of the Act, because it's not an obligation under the Act.

Q So what you're really telling us is that an unbundled network element combination is not an unbundled network combination if you hook it up, but it is an unbundled network combination if we hook it up?

A Combination really is language that was invented by AT\&T and MCI to describe this thing.

What $I$ say is that if we hook it up and we give it to you as resale, we're giving you the
resold -- you're giving a retail service, if, in fact, it replicates a retail service. I mean, this idea, this fiction of somehow some difference between recombined elements and resale is never something that I've even understood except for trying to create confusion where there doesn't need to be any.

Q Your interim pricing standard is, is that we would be assessed a resale price less the discount even if we hook it up until the 8 th circuit is final and non-appealable; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q What possible basis do you find in the 8th Circuit's order or in the Act or any of the Commission's orders to suggest that that's the appropriate pricing standard that is otherwise consistent with a) the contract, and b) the 8 th Circuit's decisions?

A The basis for it is really one $I$ find in the Commission's order. The Commission expressed in the arbitration order that they were concerned about the -- the ALECs being able to utilize these unbundled elements combined at unbundled element prices to circumvent the resale provisions of the Order.

Well, it doesn't matter who does the combining in that case. This price over here in

Column 3 is the same whether we combine it or you combine it. It doesn't change as a result of who does the combining. If that's a concern with respect to its effect on resale, it's a concern whether you combine them or we combine them.

COMMIBBIONER CLARE: Mr. Varner, let me ask you something. It seems to me what you really like, what's the best of all possible worlds for you is if they get charged the unbundled rates but you get to keep the access charges. It strikes me that the real issue is the access charges.

WITNESS VARNER: For them. For us -COMMISBIONER CLARE: NO. FOX YOU.

WITNESE VARNER: NO.

COMMISBIONER CLARK: Well, look at the
unbundled. If you do resale it's 833; if you do unbundled 17 and \$2. And it's the 705 that makes the difference.

WITNEBS VARNER: Yes. If you're talking about which one would give us the most revenue in the short term --

COMMIESIONER CLARK: Well, I assume that's what you're concerned about.

WITNEBS VARNER: That would be a short-term decision.

COMMIASIONER CLARK: You keep saying the issue here is the price.

WITNESS VARNER: Exactly. And the price that we're saying is the right one to charge in that instance is the $\$ 30.69$.

COMMIBSIONER CLARK: And that's because you get the access, not because of the price for the resold service.

WITNESS VARNER: Actually it's both. We get \$8.33 for the basic service. We could get $\$ 17$ if it was unbundled. But our point is simply this: All we want to do is treat these things that are the same the same way. That's really all we want to do. We're not trying to get anything more than that. We just want to treat these things that are the same the same way. We're not trying to get any more than that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank You.

2 (By Mr. Hatch) When AT\&T hooks them up, they are not treating them the same way, are they? It's not same as what Bellsouth provides, is it?

A I think there's a predicate there I'm missing.

2 You just told Commissioner Clark, I believe, that you just want them treated the same way?

A Yes.

0 When AT\&T does the combining, they aren't the same thing and shouldn't be treated the same way, should they?

A As for pricing purposes I think they should be treated the same way because of the fact of the effect that it has. And then once the 8th Circuit decision becomes final, then, yes, they will be treated differently.

Q And that effect is a revenue effect?
A Which --
Q Is that the effect?
A Yes, it is. It is. I mean, the issue around all of this is not anything but price. From both sides.

Q I believe earlier you --
COMMISBIONER CLARK: Well, it's also the ability to joint market.

WITNESS VARNER: Yes. I -- yes. I think that is also a part of it.

Q (By Mr. Hatch) The joint marketing restriction, I believe you said, is going to be gone in less than a year now; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Regardless of how this proceeding turns out?
A Yes. We hope it will be gone a lot sooner.

If we can get into long distance. We wish it had been gone already.

Q I believe earlier in response to a question from Commissioner Deason you stated that the cost of providing local service and exchange access, the cost of those things, those functions, is recovered in the unbundled network element prices that you have up there on that chart; is that correct?

A Based on the cost studies and the Commission's decisions at that time, yes. And the reason I caveat that is we've done cost studies since then that would indicate that some of those prices don't cover the cost.

Q So if they recover cost, then what you're describing with your desire to keep access revenue is simply pure contribution; is that correct?

A No. Our desire to do that is the use to which that contribution has to be put, and that is to continue to be able to offer basic service in Miami at $\$ 10.65$, or whatever, when it's costing us $\$ 22$ or $\$ 23$ to do it. The only way that we're able to do that is through the contributions that come from access and vertical services and other things.

9 When BellSouth is no longer subject to price caps or price regulation, is it going to raise those
prices to its cost?
A I don't know.
Q Why would it continue to offer in a competitive market a service below its cost?

A As I said, you're asking me to speculate about a situation that $I$ don't know if it will ever get here or when it might get here. I can't speculate about that.

Q But would a rationally behaving company, in economic terms, ever price its service blow its cost?

A Some do. And for whatever reason, I don't know .

Q And that typically is illegal and deemed predatory pricing in the competitive market, would it not?

A I don't know. I don't know whether it is or not.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Varner, can I ask you a question? If the rate rebalancing bill goes through, what is your position going to be on resale and unbundling?

WITNESS VARNER: I'm going to have to make an assumption here. I have to assume that the 8 th Circuit order is not final. Okay. If you assume that we're in today's environment still, and the 8th

Circuit order is still not yet final, is still sitting out there, then it would still be the same; it's resale.

COMMISBIONER CLARE: Well, you're concerned about the fact that you're not getting the subsidy from the access charges. As I understand the rate rebalancing, it's to get access charges down to cost so there will be no subsidy, and that the local exchange prices will be rebalanced to reflect what you believe is the true cost. So then will you care if it's resale or unbundled?

WITNESS VARNER: Yes.
COMMISEIONER CLARK: WhY?
WITNESS VARNER: Because what we're providing into this thing is we're providing the same thing. There is no point or no reason for us to be able to try to distinguish between something that's indistinguishable. I mean there's no value or no purpose in it for us to do that.

When they come in and they order this third column, what they're going to get is the same thing they were to get when they came in and ordered the second column. They are going to get the same thing. The only difference is what the price is.

COMMISSIONER CLARR: I suppose that -- I
guess what I'm maybe suggesting is if the rebalancing goes through, then the prices for unbundling and for resale ought to be the same.

WITNESS VARNER: Well, they'll make movement in that direction, I think. I don't know that they will necessarily ever be the same. You're right. You start to -- you do make movement in that direction. The top line up there goes up and the access charge lines goes down. But you've got to remember that varies depending on which customer that you are, you know, how that all balances out.

So for us the simplest thing to do is, you know, if it walks like a duck, you know, talks like a duck, treat it like a duck. These things are the same; they ought to be priced the same.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Okay.
Q (By Mr. Hatch) Is it BellSouth's policy that collocation is the only way to effectuate the 8 th Circuit's decisions with respect to allowing carriers to combine elements themselves?

A No, it's not our policy. That's the only way that's currently available to do it. That's not policy.

Q That's not your policy?
A No, it's not our policy. (Pause)
(Document handed to witness.)
2 Have you seen this letter before,
Mr. Varner?
A Yes, I have.
Q Would you turn to Item 15?
MR. HATCH: For the record, Madam Chairman, this is an exhibit attached to Mr. Falcone's testimony. I believe it's Exhibit 18.

0 (By Mr. Hatch) Would you read question
No. 15 for me, please?
A $\quad 15$ says "Will BellSouth allow CLECs to combine UNEs without collocation?"

Q Could you read the answer, please?
A Yes. The answer is "BellSouth's policy is to deliver UNEs to a CLEC's collocation space for the purpose of combining unbundled network elements. AT\&T has proposed several delivery methods since the January 6th, 1998, letter. BellSouth is reviewing these methods."

Q So it's BellSouth's policy that they will require collocation to effectuate the 8th Circuit's decision that AT\&T and the other CLECs have to do their own combining; is that correct?

A No, that's not correct. Mr. Sanders, when he wrote the letter, probably should have used the
word other than "policy", he was correctly responding that that's the only method that's available. That's not BellSouth's policy. You know, people use the word "policy" and attach it to things that are not policy, and this is a case where they did that and they are wrong.

Q What is BellSouth's policy?
A All right. BellSouth's policy is to provide access to unbundled network elements as required by law. If, in fact -- right now the only method that's been identified as collocation. In fact, this answer is inconsistent on its face. Because if it was our policy to only do it under collocation, we wouldn't even be bothering to look at the other methods that AT\&T has given us. If somebody wants us to look at other methods of doing it, we're perfectly willing to do that. And if we can find some that are workable, we would be willing to agree to do those. AT\&T gave us four in this letter that we're looking at right now.

Q Did you hear Mr. Falcone's testimony earlier that BellSouth had rejected all of the alternatives that AT\&T had proposed?

A I didn't hear his testimony, but if he said that he was wrong because we haven't answered you yet.

2 Are you aware of a conversation or a voice mail that Quinton Sanders left Ray Crafton of AT\&T; a voice mail message where he rejected all of the alternatives that AT\&T had proposed and said that we are sticking with collocation?

A No, I'm not aware of any such voice mail. And I do know that BellSouth is currently evaluating those options and has not yet answered AT\&T. That I do know. I don't know anything about any other conversations that have gone on. To the extent they went on, if that's what they said, then they were incorrect. We haven't answered you yet. We will answer you within the next week or two.

Q Now, with respect to collocation, one of the options of collocation is virtual collocation; is that correct?

A Yes.
CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Hatch, how much more do you have?

MR. HATCH: Based on the way it's been going, probably about 35,45 minutes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Okay. We'll keep going for awhile.

MR. HATCH: Rats. I was hoping for a break.
COMMISBIONER DEASON: SO your estimate is
down now? You inflated it so you that could get a break?

MR. HATCH: I only wish it were true.
(Laughter)
CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Mr. Hatch, the first document you gave us, did you want it marked or no?

MR. HATCH: Not particularly. They are direct quotes out of the 8 th Circuit order and you've taken official notice of it so it's not necessary.

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: I mean the letter. The BellSouth letter.

MR. HATCH: Oh. NO. It's already an
Exhibit 18 from Mr. Falcone's --
CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: You did say that.
MR. HATCH: I was just using it for reference purposes.

Q (By Mr. Hatch) Do you recall seeing this earlier in the case with respect to Mr . Falcone, Mr. Varner?

A Yes, I do.
Q Would Figure 1 be an accurate representation of how BellSouth provides service to its customers today?

A Yeah, that's a pretty accurate illustration. And the same way we provide it to AT\&T under resale.

Q Or any other customer of yours? They are all provided in a similar fashion to this; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Now, when BellSouth provides service in this scenario, in terms of installing new service to a customer, once that loop is run to the line side of the main distribution frame, then it -- BellSouth technicians would run a cross-connect from the line side of the MDF to the line say of the MDF, and then that switch side of MDF would be hardwired to the switch port; is that correct?

A Basically that's correct. Mr. Landry is a lot more familiar with this stuff than $I$ am, but as an illustration it's fine.

Q Now, could you turn to Figure 4, I think, that you have there?

A okay.
Q Would this be an accurate representation of BellSouth's physical collocation policy or provision of physical collocation as BellSouth envisions it?

A I don't think so. I mean, all physical collocation is the yellow box on the bottom right. I don't know what else you're trying to depict here with this. This looks like a specific arrangement that
you're trying to depict. All the collocation is the box on the right.
$0 \quad$ That's the collocated space?

A That's collocated space.

Q And in order for a CLEC to combine unbundled network elements, then what Bellsouth would do, as I understand it, would be to disconnect the cross-connect that you saw in Figure 1?

A Uh-huh.

Q And then run a different cross-connect to the collocated space. Is that essentially it?

A That's not what you have here. You have a lot more than that on this. What we end up doing, you'd have the loop coming into the line side -- well, it comes into the line side of the frame. We take our cross-connect from the line side over the POT frame that's in the collocation space. We take a cross-connect from wherever -- well, the switch port is probably not on the MDF. There's on IDF somewhere in here where the switchboard is located. What you really have on the first drawing is the connection from the MDF to that IDF. So that one was missing. You come in from that IDF and come over with a cross-connect to the POT frame.

As a simplified illustration it was okay,
but it's -- you know, it's not an accurate depiction of what happens. He's got a lot of other extraneous stuff in here. I think the important point is this: If you ordered a combination of unbundled network elements, loop-port combination, it would look just like Figure 1.

Q But if we want to obtain network elements at network element prices, under the 8 th circuit's order, as you have proposed allowing us to do that, it would require that we would have, at least in one version, some collocated space; is that correct?

A You mean this is after the 8 th Circuit order goes in?

Q Assuming the 8th Circuit controls.
A Yes. The only method right now is either physical or virtual collocation. What's shown is a his physical collocation arrangement.

Q That's correct. Then if you assume Figure 4 is a little bit too busy and there are more things that are there than are typically necessary, then even under your proposal you would have a connection of the cross-connect at the line side of the main distribution frame, and that cross-connect would run to the IDF; is that correct?

A POT frame.

Q For the POT frame. Then the POT frame would be hardwired to a CLECs facilities in its collocated space; would that be correct?

A No. The POT frame is our point of demarcation with the CLEC. What happens on the other side of the POT frame is up to the CLEC. They decide what happens on the other side. We don't even know.

Q So the CLEC would have to run some cross-connect to its facilities in the collocated space, and then from those facilities back to the IDF. Is that what you said earlier?

A No. No. What happens is -- again, if you were looking at the first one, there's an IDF in the first one somewhere that he left off, for whatever reason. But what you've got is the switch -- this big heavy black line he's got up here is not right. You have got a connection from the switch to an IDF somewhere in the office. Now the little line he has with the little circles on it which represents a cross-connect --

Q Okay. Correct.
A All right. You only have one -- you're going to have one cross-connect for port; one for the switch. There would be a cross-connect running from that IDF over to the POT frame.

Q So you're saying that this scenario that he's described here never has all of the connections in it that he's describing?

A No. This is just overly busy. That's way more stuff in here. I mean, he has four cross-connects, for example. You don't have four cross-connects on a loop and a port; you only get two.

Q At least in BellSouth's case there's only one?

A Hum?
0 In BellSouth's case, the way it provides service to itself, there is only one cross-connect; is that correct?

A Actually there's two, because what you have on the front side is you've got the loop coming into the MDF.

Q Could you for the record, instead of -- do the overhead so we could see what you're referring to. (Witness complies.)

A Yeah. The loop coming in from the MDF, all right. And then you come in on the other side of the MDF, right? Somewhere over in here there's another frame where the switch is terminated and there's a cross-connect from here over to that frame where the switch is terminated. Okay? And then there's a
cross-connect from that frame back into the switch.
0 These diagrams may be too busy. Let me show you a different one.
(Hands document to witness and places it on projector.)

Now, this is from Mr. Landry's testimony. Do you recognize this diagram?

A No.

Q Would you say that this diagram is an accurate representation of how BellSouth proposes to provide physical collocation? (Pause)

A Yeah, that looks pretty accurate.
Q So what you would have, based on this diagram, is that there would be a termination point here. The jumper would run from this point to this point (indicating). That would be one cross-connect.

A No, that's really -- the cross-connect is from here over to here. (Indicating) This is the cross-connect to connect the loop to the POT bay. It's from this point around through here.

Q There's no termination here. This is a solid wire connection from this point all the way to this point. There's no termination junction here?

A I don't know whether there is or not but there's one cross-connect.

Q It's one cross-connect, but there's a termination here, the way this diagram has listed it, there's a termination here with another termination going to here.

A I don't know that's what he's trying to depict. You might ask him. All I know is what you have is you have a single cross-connect. There's a wire that takes you from here, where the loop is terminated, over to the POT bay. Likewise on the switch, where it's terminated and he has a switch terminating on the MDF. So if that's where the switch is terminated, you have a cross-connect that goes from here over to the POT bay. Now, what he's trying to depict here I don't know. You'll just have to ask him.

Q Based on at least your representation of this diagram, you would have a wire terminal at this point, and at least a wire terminal at this point. That would be one cross-connect?

A That's one, yes.
Q Then there would be a wire terminal at this point and at least one more wire terminal at this point?

A That's correct.
Q There would be four wire terminals; is that
correct?

A Yes.

Q Now, in BellSouth's version of how it provides service to its customer, there would be only two wire terminal connections; is that correct?

A If you use this diagram I think that is correct. If you assume that the switch is terminated on the MDF, okay, which may or may not be the case, then you would have a jumper from here to here. (Indicating)

Q And if Mr. Landry then says that this is a separate jumper to this point and a separate jumper to this point, then the terminals for jumpers would increase commensurately for the number of cables involved, correct?

A Yeah. If you're saying that is their wire that ends here?

Q Yes.
A Then yes, of course.
COMMIsSIONER DEABON: Mr. Hatch, I hope when you read the transcript that you'll be able to follow all of that. MR. HATCH: I hope I'll be able to explain it real well in the brief.

COMMISBIONER DEABON: Very good.

Q (By Mr. Hatch) Has BellSouth ever provisioned -- go back to -- recalling the exhibit that we discussed over there, has BellSouth ever provisioned a combination loop and port to physically collocate its space in that fashion?

A You would not provide a combination loop and port to a physical collocation. If you were providing a combination of a loop and port it would be like Figure 1 that you show.

2 So if AT\&T ordered a loop and a port, and it wanted to do the combining, what would BellSouth do?

A Well, that's not ordering a combination. If you ordered a loop and a port, we would deliver you a loop and a port to your space. It doesn't matter whether you're going to combine them together or what you're going to do with them. you just order a loop and port from us, and we deliver them to you and you do whatever you want with them.

Q Has BellSouth ever provisioned that for a CLEC?

A A loop and a port?
Q For providing service to a customer?
A When you say "that," define "that" for me.
Q Okay. Has BellSouth received an order from a CLEC that says, "I want to order a loop and I want
to order a port, and I want those cross-connects for the loop and the port brought to my collocated space to be hooked up by me"?

A I don't know whether we have or we haven't. On the same order, I just don't know.

Q So you don't know whether service has ever been provisioned in the way you are suggesting that it be provisioned, through physical collocation?

A Yes, I do. We have had people to order loops. We have had people to order ports. And we've delivered both to collocation space. Remember, whether they order them on the same order or not is irrelevant. We're going to send them -- if they order a loop, we're going to send a loop to their collocation space. If they want a port, we're going to send a port over there. So we know -- we've done that. Now, whether they've done -- what they've done with them after we've given it to them we don't know and it's really not any of our business.

8 Do you know whether CLECs are providing service to customers through the physical collocation in the way you have described it in this proceeding?

A As I said I don't know. We know that we've delivered loops to their space and ports to their space. We don't know what they've done with them in
their space.
Q Have you ever had any complaints from CLEC customers for failing to hook unbundled loops and ports up to their collocated space, thus having a customer out of service?

A Not that I recall, no.
Q You don't recall any complaints involving that scenario in the 271 proceeding?

A No, I do not.
Q In order for AT\&T or any CLEC to provide service through unbundled network elements, assuming that the CLEC does the combining, it would have to have some sort of facility in its collocated space, would it not?

A I don't know what they would need to have. They might need a roll of tape or whatever it is they are going to use to put the wires back together when they get over there.

Q So you're suggesting that a CLEC would use a roll of tape to assemble the two cross-connects that would run to its collocated space?

A I'm not suggesting what they would use. All I'm saying is that however they do that is up to the CLEC. I don't know whether they are going to need equipment or not. It could be that simple. It could
be -- you know, it could be nothing more than a barrel of wire that they use to connect one thing to another. That's the CLEC's decision and they decide how they want to do that on their side of the space, however they want to do it.

Q I believe you talked about it in your deposition about a coordinated order of an unbundled loop and unbundled port. Do you recall that?

A No, I don't. I remember talking about order coordination on the purchase of unbundled loop.

Q Turn to Page 39 of your deposition.
A I don't have it. I think Staff gave me a copy. Wait. (Witness gets document.)

Q Read lines -- to yourself. You don't necessarily have to read them out loud. Read Lines 2 through 11, please.

A Okay. (Witness complies.)
MR. PELLEGRINI: Mr. Hatch, where do you have the witness reading?

MR. HATCH: Page 39. Lines 2 through 11. WITNESB VARNER: Yes, I see it.

Q (By Mr. Hatch) Does that refresh your recollection regarding order coordination?

A No, it doesn't. That's exactly what I said. That's order coordination on the purchase of a loop.

It has nothing to do with whether you purchase a port along with it or not. If you purchase the loop by itself, that's the order coordination that applies. If you purchase a loop and a port, that's the order coordination that applies on the loop. It's not an order coordination of the loop and the port.

Q With respect to order coordination is that something that you offer? You do offer that, correct?

A Yes, we do. We really offer two varieties, manual order coordination and order coordination for a specified time of day.

Q Does that come at an extra charge?
A I'm trying to remember in Florida whether we have the two varieties of analog loops. If you have SL2 loops, then the manual order coordination comes with the loop. It isn't an extra charge. With SL1 loops, it is an extra charge and I can't remember in Florida whether we have one or both of those varieties.

Q And the purpose of your discussion of order coordination there was to indicate that that would be a means by which a customer would not be out of service for more than 15 minutes. Would that be correct?

A That's correct, at least with respect to
what BellSouth had to do in order to provision the loop.

Q Has BellSouth ever performed order coordination in the fashion you described here where the customer was only out of service for 15 minutes?

A Oh, yes, we have.
Q Do you know how long the customer was out of service?

A Less than 15 minutes.
Q Do you know whether they have provided unbundled loops and ports where the interval for out of service to the customer was longer than 15 minutes?

A Again, you asked me about the -- order coordination has to do with loops. It has nothing to do with ports. It's only applicable on loops. When you order the order coordination, that is for the loop. We don't know -- it doesn't matter what else you have ordered on that order. And so when we provision the unbundled loops under those order coordination arrangements, we provision them on the loops so that the loop is not out of service. In fact, one CLEC, I remember, where we've done that for, they've ordered -- well, several -- over a thousand loops, and we've done it -- like $99 \%$ of the time it's been 15 minutes or less.

Q How long did it take to do those orders?
A As I said, 99\% of the time it was less than 15 minutes.

9 That's the amount of time that the customer's loop was out of service. How much total time did it take BellSouth to do the thousand orders?

A You mean -- when you say "total", from when to when. You have to --

Q Exactly. From when to when? How long did it take Bellsouth to do a thousand orders?

A I guess I'm not following what -- when you want me to start the time and stop the time. These were not a thousand all in one day. They were spread out over a period of time. I mean, this was several months. We got two one day, three another day, 15 one day.

Q The way these cross-connects are provisioned it is on a manual basis where a technician actually has to disconnect the cross-connects and reconnect the cross-connects in BellSouth's side of the space; is that correct?

A We have to connect the cross-connect. If it's an existing customer, they also have to disconnect. If it's new customer, then they don't have to disconnect.
$\mathbf{Q}$ And that's strictly a manual process the way you're proposing it?

A It's a manual process. However, there's no other way to do it. You're talking about physically tying two wires together. The only way to do that is manually.

Q How many such manual cross-connects can Bellsouth do in a day?

A It depends on how many we get asked to do. We're staffed to handle the demand that's presented to us.

Q Do you have your late-filed deposition exhibits? They're probably in the Staff package.

A Yes.

Q Would you turn to Late-filed No. 2 for me, please?

A Okay. (Witness complies.)
Q Whoops, I was wrong. No. 3.

A No. 3.

Q Now, that request was with respect to how long it takes Bellsouth to provide a loop and a port. And the subcaption was how long the end user was out of service; is that correct?

A Yes. I noticed the request. I recall this request specifically from the deposition, and $I$ was
very, very clear in setting up the request -- if you go back to the deposition you'll find that what we were supposed to provide was our provisioning intervals for these various things. Because we have no information that indicates how long a customer will be out of service if you were doing some sort of a combination. All we know is how long it takes to provide the unbundled elements, and that's what we were asked to provide and that's what you have here.

Q Turn to Page 1 of 3.
A I'm sorry, I don't have a Page 1 or 3. I have a 1 of 1,2 of 3 and 3 of 3 .

0 It must have got omitted in the Staff's package.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: My Page 1 is just the question. And the diagrams or the charts, whatever you want to call them, that's on Page 2 and Page 3. MR. HATCH: I'm confused. I'm sorry. I didn't understand your question.

COMMISBIONER DEASON: That's my Page 2. MR. HATCH: You're missing, I think, one of the pages. Because $I$ have three pages as it was filed. It appears that the Staff may have missed one of pages in the copying process.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Maybe so. I do have a

Page 1 that says Page 1 of 1 . That's just the question and response that says "see attachment."

MR. HATCH: Right. And the attachment is 1 of 3,2 of 3 and 3 of 3 as $I$ have it.

Q (By Mr. Hatch) Now, with respect to the first item at the top of 1 of 3 , unbundled loops, and Item 3 is 2-wire analog voice grade loops; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q If I wanted one of those, you would be able to supply that according to these guidelines in seven days; is that correct?

A That's the targeted installation and will be seven days or less.

0 That's not a guarantee but that's what you strive to do; is that correct?

A What was your -- when you say what we strive to do.

Q It's targeted. Is that an ironclad guarantee you will for sure have it done in seven days if I order one unbundled loop.

A As much as we can guarantee anything, I mean, that's what it is. Again, these target installation intervals, or the intervals that we utilize for our own people, and were given to the

CLECs so that they would know what types of intervals we utilize for our own people when we have to provision, you know, new facilities, so that they would be able to know what type of time frames they could promise to their customers. That's what these are.

Q Go down to the bottom. It says "unbundled interoffice transport"?

A Yes.
Q Does that indicate that that you can unbundle and separately provision common transport?

MR. PELLEGRINI: Excuse me, Mr. Hatch. Do you have additional copies?

MR. HATCH: I only have the one I originally was provided, but --

MR. PELLEGRINI: It's very difficult to follow this.

MR. HATCH: If you want to take a break and get copies of it, that would be fine with me.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Why don't you just use
the --
WITNESS VARNER: What part were you on?
(By Mr. Hatch) At the very bottom of the
Page 1 of 3 , it says "unbundled interoffice transport." Does that indicate that you can obtain or
that $I$ can obtain separately provisioned unbundled common transport?

A I don't think so. I believe that's dedicated transport.
$Q \quad$ Would you turn to Page 2 of 3 , please?
A 2 of $3 . \quad I^{\prime} m$ there.
Q Okay. Now, Item 39, it says "unbundled local switching 2 -wire analog port"?

A Yes.

Q And that provisioning interval is five days?
A Yes. For one to ten.
Q For just one, one to ten. Item 44 says "switching functionality." It says the target installation interval is seven days; is that correct?
A. Yes.

Q How is it that the targeting interval for switching functionality is seven days, when the port and the switching functionality are all one and the same as you have described it in this proceeding?

A I believe in that case when they say switching functionality what they are really talking about is the combined loop, port -- not loop-port, port transport set up such that you get a combined local usage bill as opposed to individual billing for switching and individual billing for the transport.

It's a different billing arrangement. It's optional, if you will. If you want it billed that way, we will bill it that way. And that's the arrangement we're talking about here, if you want an unbundled local usage arrangement, instead of a separate transport switching arrangement.

Q Let's go back to one thing you said earlier. In any of BellSouth's engineering practices, do they ever use a roll of electrical tape to join its cross-connects together?

A I don't know. Mr. Landry can probably tell you.

Q And going back to the discussion on access charges, I believe that you stated that you are entitled to receive access charges until the Commission orders otherwise; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And that is reflected in your calculations on the chart that you showed us earlier; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Is that a recent policy of BellSouth?
A No.
Q Do you recognize this chart, Mr. Varner?
A No, I don't.

2 It looks like -- it may have been out of the arbitration.

Q Would it refresh your recollection that this was Exhibit 43 in the BellSouth/AT\&T arbitration?

A It could well have been. I do recall having a chart like -- a chart like this to try to portray these things in arbitration. This may be it.

Q Now, if you'll go down that list where it says, "interLATA interstate access."

A Yes.
Q You indicate there that if AT\&T or MCI gets unbundled network elements at unbundled network element prices, that you will not be collecting the access charges; is that correct?

A I reflect that's what MCI and AT\&T proposed. The columns are headed "MCI and AT\&T Proposal." That is what they proposed at that time and what they continue to propose. It's not what BellSouth proposed.

Q Your assumption in this chart was that we would get to keep them under our proposals; is that correct?

A No. My assumption was that that was what you proposed.

Q Does BellSouth keep the access charges in
every other of its states when unbundled network elements are provided?

A Yes.
2 Have you ever seen this document, Mr. Varner?

A No, I have not.
9 Could you read the response -- or could you read the request, please?

A "Regarding the comments on Page 13 of its application, please identify and provide the evidence regarding the potential impact from loss of access charges that are on market rates for vertical services that will occur when competitors serve business customers through unbundling, which the company claims that the Commission has."

9 Now, the caption up there indicates that this is BellSouth's response to the Attorney General's first set of data requests in Kentucky; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Would you read the response, please?
A Read it out loud or just to myself?
Q Read it out loud, please.
A "When a CLEC purchases unbundled network elements at prescribed rates, the CLEC may use these
elements in any fashion desired. Therefore, switched access traffic originating or terminating to a CLEC end user customer served by a BellSouth rebundled elements no longer subject to switched access rates -(inaudible reading) --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Varner, you may need to slow down a little bit.

WITNESS VARNER: Oh, I'm sorry. It was a long answer and I was trying to get through it. I'm sorry.
"The CLEC would pay the unbundled element rates to BellSouth for that switched access traffic where previously the IXC paid BellSouth the switched access rates. Switched access rates paid by IXCs is in the range of 3.8 cents per access minute for intrastate traffic."
"Rates approved by the Kentucky PSC for end office switching, tandem switching, and common transport when combined are in the range of half a cent per minute. This results in a revenue loss of over $86 \%$ for each access minute."
"In the case of vertical service features, the CLEC only pays the rate for unbundled local switching. No additional charges are assessed -- it says accessed -- for vertical switch features. In
each of these cases a CLEC has considerable leverage in pricing its services to assemble an attractive offering to end users, all the while using exactly the same BellSouth facilities used today."

0 So in Kentucky you don't get to keep the intrastate access charges; is that correct?

A I don't think that's correct, because what I recall of the Kentucky order, it specifically said that we would keep the access charges. What this response is evidently asking us to do is to provide the evidence regarding the potential impact if we did not get access charges at market rates on vertical services.

I don't think it's trying to say that that is what the situation is. It's saying this is what would happen if that is what the situation is. But my recollection is the Kentucky Commission's order in the arbitration proceeding was that access charges will continue to apply.

MR. HATCE: Madam Chairman, could we get this marked for identification, please?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We'll mark this as
Exhibit 25 with a -- what's the short title?
MR. HATCH: "BellSouth response to the Attorney General's data requests in Kentucky."

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Okay.
(Exhibit 25 marked for identification.)
MR. PELLEGRINI: Chairman Johnson, could I ask at this time that Page 1 of three of Mr. Varner's late-filed deposition exhibit be supplemented? It was missing from the Staff's exhibit.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. We'll make sure that that's supplemented and added to the exhibit.

MR. PELLEGRINI: Thank you.
Q (By Mr. Hatch) Now, with respect to when Bellsouth provides service to its customers, when a customer terminates service with BellSouth, BellSouth does not physically disconnect any of the unbundled network elements that were used to provide service to that customer, do they?

A Sometimes yes, sometimes no.
Q Under what circumstances would they?
A There are no real set of circumstances. It really has to do with managing the facilities and what needs to be done to overall manage the facilities.

If there is a need to reuse the facilities, then you may disconnect them. If not, then you don't. Mr. Landry can give you more detail maybe on what type situations result in our actually disconnecting them and what situations might result in leaving them
partially connected, if you will.
Q It would be correct to say that unless there is a facilities management type of problem, that BellSouth would typically leave those facilities connected when a customer terminates service; would that be correct?

A No, I wouldn't think so. It doesn't have to be a problem. We would manage the facilities as we need to. That determines -- whatever we need to do to most efficiently manage the facilities in that office would determine whether to disconnect it or not.

Q Does BellSouth provide soft dial tone?
A Yes, we do in some cases.
Q And --
A One of those management tools.
Q What is your understanding of soft dial tone?

A Effectively what you have is the service can contact 911, and I think there's something else. I can't remember, but I know that they can call 911 on the line.

Q Now, in order to provide soft dial tone, that would require that the loop be connected to the main distribution frame, that the jumper from the line side of the main distribution frame be left connected
to the line side -- or the port side of the main distribution frame, and that the port remain active; is that correct?

A I don't know about all those details. It does require that you have a loop connected to a port.
$Q$ So if BellSouth is obligated to provide soft dial tone, then in every case where it provides soft dial tone there would be no physical disruption with when a customer left BellSouth's service at that location served by those facilities?

A Probably not. When you say obligated to provide soft dial tone, $I$ had read something somewhere about an obligation to do that that $I$ really wasn't aware of.

Typically, soft dial tone is an engineering decision about how best to manage the facilities. I didn't know that there was a obligation that you do it in certain situations. Maybe there is. I just wasn't aware of it.
$Q \quad$ Where in the 8 th Circuit's decision or in the Act itself does Bellsouth find the authority to physically rip apart the network in order to provide unbundled network elements to carriers so that they may then recombine them?

A $251(c)(3)$. I mean, the answer to that is in
the question. Unbundled means separated. The whole purpose of $251(c)(3)$ was to provide carriers the ability to get parts of the network that they wanted to use, and the only way you're going to give somebody parts of something that's already put together is to take it apart so that they can get the part that they want. I mean, that's what unbundled means.

Q BellSouth is obligated to provide unbundled common transport pursuant to the Commission's orders and the contract with AT\&T, is it not?

A That's correct, we do; and we do provide it.
Q And you do not physically rip apart the common transport trunking from your switch when you provide it, do you?

A Yes, if that's what -- you know, if that's what has to be done. See, common transport is somewhat of an oddity in that it can only be unbundled on one side. You can unbundle the port from common transport, but you really can't unbundle the common transport from the port, because the only way you can get to it is through the port.

Q So you provide it on an unbundled basis, but not on an unbundled basis?

A Well, you provide it on an unbundled basis. It can be unbundled in that you can get the port
without common transport. You can get the port with dedicated transport, if you want. So you can get a port without common transport, but you can't get common transport without a port.

Q Could AT\&T run a cross-connect from the port side of its switch in a collocated space to a trunk side port in BellSouth's switch in order to obtain common transport?

A No.
$Q \quad$ Why?
A There's nothing for you to connect to. I mean, the only way you're going to get to that trunk side port is you have to go through the switch. The only access to that is through the switch. There is not something hanging out there for AT\&T to connect a piece of wire to.

Q So the only other way that it could be done would be to purchase dedicated transport?

A Only other way what could be done?
Q The only other way that we could obtain transport from AT\&T's switch that is collocated in BellSouth's CO and bypass the BellSouth switch itself to obtain transport would be dedicated transport, would that be accurate?

A Yes.

Q I think I skipped by virtual collocation. Could you describe virtual collocation for me, please?

A Virtual collocation is really an arrangement wherein a CLEC determines -- you know, they apply to us and say they want to locate some equipment in the lineup in our office. It's limited to certain types of equipment. For example, you can't virtual collocate a switch.

But then they apply to us -- they make arrangements to have the equipment installed. Then they sell the equipment to BellSouth for a nominal fee. I think it's a dollar. And then BellSouth maintains the equipment for them.

Q Now, for BellSouth to provide unbundled network elements under its proposal for disconnecting those elements and providing them to the CLEC, how would that work under a virtual collocation arrangement?

A The virtual collocation arrangement really has nothing to do with how you unbundle the elements, and if you order a loop from us, we're going to unbundle it and give it to you.

Q In a virtual collocation context, is an AT\&T technician allowed into BellSouth's office to work on the virtually collocated equipment?

A No. What you'd have to do in that arrangement is you prewire the equipment that you put in and you tell us to take the loop and terminate it at a specific place on that prewired frame, and that's what we would do.

2 Does BellSouth currently do any of that? Are there any prewired frames collocated in their cos under a virtual collocation arrangement?

A I don't know.
0 Now, if AT\&T bought or leased a frame, a prewired frame, for purposes of virtual collocation, wouldn't BellSouth's technicians be doing the combining under those circumstances?

A No, we wouldn't.
Q Why would they not?
A Because what's happened is you've instructed us to terminate unbundled network elements at specific positions on your equipment. If, in fact, those things are connected or not connected is irrelevant to us.
you will have done the combining yourself when you prewired the frame. When you prewired, you know, position 1 to position 62, or whatever it is that you did, that's when the combining was done, when you prewired the frame.

All we're doing is terminating these things where you told us to terminate them. We don't know whether they're connected together or not. That was something you did.

Q So, as I understand it, then, AT\&T has precombined those unbundled elements that it wants and it's waiting for BellSouth just to catch up?

A No. I think you've prewired your frame and you've asked us to put the elements at those positions on the frame, and that's what we're going to do.

Q Would you turn to Page 94 of your deposition, please? (Pause) You're there?

A Yes, I am.
Q Could you read the question beginning on Page -- Line 3. Just read it to yourself. You don't have to read it out loud. Down through the end of Line 8.

A Yes. I see that.
Q Now, you indicate there that there are a number of ways that they could provide virtual collocation; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And you identified a prewired frame?
A Yes.
Q What other ways could that be accomplished?

A Can't think of any. One I know is the prewired frame. Mr. Landry can probably tell you. I remember there's a couple, three more that have been discussed, but $I$ just don't remember what they are. One of them may have to do with some sort of a cross-connect panel that you could install that -you know, somehow or another you install some kind of a cross-connect panel in the space we terminate things on there, and then you make the -- you do some sort of electronic stuff with the panel. I think that's another way it could be done.
$Q$ Let's go back and talk about one thing that was discussed earlier. Do you recall the discussion surrounding the provision of operator services in the context of unbundled network elements?

A Yes, I do.
Q And I believe it was your testimony that the switch translation that acts as the routing function for operator services is the access that you're obligated to provide?

A Yes, that's the -- well, obligated to provide. We're also obligated to provide the operator services unbundled element, too, I mean, in addition; but as far as access to it, that's provided through the port, and that's provided through the switch
translation.
Q And I believe it was your testimony that with respect to the provision of operator service as a separate unbundled network element, that those costs were recovered solely by the operator services rates themselves; is that correct?

A The rates for the operator services unbundled elements.

Q And directory assistance, lumping them both together?

A Yes, even though they were separate elements, but same kind of arrangement is in place.

Q Now, do you recall that in the commission's arbitration order when the Commission established the resale discounts, it included in the revenues and expenses that BellSouth was allowed to use, for purposes of calculating the avoided costs, costs related to operator services?

A No, I don't. I remember their -- I just don't recall what all was done there. They did not exclude as avoided cost the operator services cost costs. There are some costs -- I think they really have to do with number services functions that may be avoided -- that are included in accounts that are labeled "operator services," if I remember correctly,
that they did exclude.
$Q$ So in the cost of the local service that was established for BellSouth for purposes of local service resale, operator services expenses were included in that amount; is that correct?

A No, because you are not trying to figure out the cost of local service. What you were trying to do was to figure out what costs would be avoided if, in fact, somebody was to resell the local service. And the resale discount was applicable across all resident services and all business services. It wasn't separate discounts for separate services.

So what you were identifying was the cost that would be avoided when somebody resold a resident service, regardless of which one that it was. So there was no distinction trying to be made between basic versus operator services versus features versus any other residential retail service.

Q You're correct. I may have misspoken.
With respect to establishing the avoided costs discount, operator services expenses were left in. They were not considered avoided; is that correct?

A That's right, because operator services was one of the things that could be resold. That's why it
was left in. So since it was one of the services that could be resold, then obviously those costs would not be avoided, and the costs that they were identifying was the costs that would be avoided when the service was resold. You're obviously not going to avoid the cost of the service that you're actually providing for resale.

2 Now, if AT\&T provides its own operator services in a resale context, it must pick up the cost of all of its operator services expenses; is that correct?

A That's correct.
0 Now, with respect to its resale discount that was calculated, it is also paying BellSouth for operator services expenses; is that correct, that BellSouth would not be providing?

A I don't think so. Again, the resale discount is a broad average. When you get any given arrangement, some things are going to be in it, some things are not going to be in it. So the purpose for setting the resale discount as a broad average, I believe, was to avoid sort of the administration of trying to have multiple discounts.

You could have come up with 2,000 different discounts if you wanted to, but $I$ think the Commission
opted for a single discount across all residential services, recognizing that just like any average when you do that, some situations it's going to be more appropriate for than others.

Q And a final couple of clean-ups, $I$ think. (Pause)

MR. HATCH: I'm done. Thank you very much, Mr. Varner.

WITNESS VARNER: Thank you.
CROS8 EXAMINATION

## BY MR. PELLEGRINI:

Q Mr. Varner, I want to try to clean up just a few points with you. You've testified that with the purchase of a loop and a port, an ALEC acquires access to a number of functionalities, correct?

A Yes.
$0 \quad$ Access?
A Yes.

Q However, the ALEC does not acquire those functionalities, does it?

A No, it does not.
0 Is it not true, then, that without those functionalities, an ALEC does not possess the capacity to provide basic local service?

A No, that's not correct.

Q Why is it not correct?
A For example, let's just take operator
services. Operator services is not basic local exchange service. It is a separate service. There are companies that that's their only business is operator services.

What you get when you purchase basic local exchange service is the ability to access an operator. The simplest way to think about it is what do you get for the $\$ 10.65$ you pay in Miami, okay? Anything that you don't get for the $\$ 10.65$ is not a part or -- if you've got to pay something else for it, it's not basic local exchange service.

Q So then it's your testimony, with the purchase or lease of a loop and a port giving access to these functionalities, that much alone constitutes -- or provides a capacity to provide basic local service?

A Yes, because that's what you get for the $\$ 10.65$ at the residential price in Miami. That's all you get for that. So that when you get the loop and port, you've now gotten the same things that a retail customer gets for their $\$ 10.65$.

Q Now, when AT\&T or MCI would purchase a loop and a port, either combined under the agreements or
uncombined to be recombined by AT\&T or MCI, it's your testimony that in either case, the service -- if the service provided thereby replicates an existing BellSouth retail service, it should be priced at resale, correct?

A That's correct.
Q Even in the case where the ALEC does the combining?

A Yes.
Q Now, I want to direct your attention to the 8th Circuit's order, and specifically the language which is in the middle panel behind you. Let me read you the salient phrase there. The 8 th Circuit said that it held that the new entrant -- that new entrants may obtain the ability to provide finished telecommunications services entirely through the unbundled access provisions in Section 251 (C) (3). Do you see that?

A Is that the middle?
9 The middle panel, I believe. I can't see it quite as well as I need to from here.

A I was pretty close.
Q I'm sorry?
A It was pretty close.
9 All right. Given that holding of the 8th

Circuit, how do you reconcile BellSouth's position that when the ALEC combines -- purchases unbundled elements, loops and ports and combines them itself to provide a competitive service, how is that position not in conflict with what the 8 th Circuit has held?

A Okay. When they combine it themselves -- it is in conflict with what the 8 th circuit has held. It's different. The 8th Circuit has said when they combine it themselves, that they are able to get those unbundled network elements at unbundled network element prices. So that part of it is different. But that's not what we're dealing with here.

We're dealing with what do you do in these agreements that have an obligation for us to combine and also allow them to combine these until such time as the 8th Circuit order becomes final. Once the 8th Circuit order becomes final, then the language under the 8th Circuit order will control. We put that in the agreements, and there will be no reason for us trying to deal with this.

But until it does become final, we've got to figure out, okay, well, what are we going to do in the interim time frame. And what I submit is that the right thing to do in this interim time frame, since we are obligated to combine the elements for them, would
be to treat both of the situations as resale.
Once the 8th circuit comes along and their ruling becomes final, then our obligation to combine the elements for them should be removed from the agreements in its entirety, and then if they combine them themselves, they'll get them at unbundled network elements prices. And, in fact, if they wanted that in their contract today, we'd be more than happy to give it to them today.

Q But I'm specifically focusing on the agreement as it exists today and the situation in which the ALEC would purchase, as it may, unbundled elements, loops and ports unbundled, and recombines them.

As I interpret the 8th Circuit's holding here, it would enable the ALEC to put together unbundled network elements in any manner of their choosing to provide any telecommunication service without limitation. Would you accept that interpretation?

A No. Because what you'd have to assume is that the 8th Circuit's ruling is controlling on those agreements, and those agreements specifically say that these court rulings are not binding until they're final and nonappealable. So the fact that the

8th Circuit has ruled has no impact on the agreement until that ruling becomes final and nonappealable. So then the agreement exists as if that ruling didn't -wasn't even there until such time as that ruling becomes final and nonappealable.

Q I want to ask you a question or two with reference to Issues 9 and 10 in this proceeding. Do you have handy access to the agreements, both the AT\&T and MCI agreements?

A No, I don't.
Q Okay. In Issues 9 and 10 the Commission is asked to determine whether BellSouth is required under its interconnection agreements with MCI and AT\&T to provide MCI and AT\&T with usage data for billing purposes; isn't that right?

A I think -- yes, that sounds right.
9 And BellSouth holds the position that since MCI and AT\&T provide local service only through service resale, it is therefore appropriate for BellSouth to bill and collect intrastate interLATA access charges and withhold usage data from them; is that correct?

A No, that's not correct.
Q All right. Why is that not correct?
A I mean that it's not our position.

Q Well, what then is your position? How is my statement of your position wrong?

A Well, first, it doesn't matter whether they're engaged in services of resale or not. With respect to intrastate access charges, until the Commission makes a determination -- unless the Commission decides that BellSouth is not entitled to collect access charges, then we will continue to collect intrastate access charges.

Since we are the ones that's billing the intrastate access charges, there's no reason for us to send data to AT\&T and MCI for intrastate access charges.

We do send them data, or at least have the capability to send them data, and are working for them to get it to them, for interstate access charges, since the FCC has said they're entitled to bill those; but for intrastate they're not entitled to bill them, so we don't send them the data.

Q Okay. I'm not sure my interpretation of your position is very much different from yours. But I want to direct your attention now to the AT\&T and Bellsouth agreement and specifically Attachment 7.

MR. MELSON: IS that AT\&T or MCI?
MR. PELLEGRINI: The AT\&T agreement.

MR. MELSON: I think you're looking at the MCI, Mr. Varner.

WITNESS VARNER: I am.
MR. PELLEGRINI: Attachment 7.
WITNESS VARNER: Okay. I have it.
Q (By Mr. Pellegrini) Mr. Eppsteiner
testified that Sections $1.2,2.1$ and 3.1 require BellSouth to furnish usage data. Do you see those sections?

A Yes, I do.
Q Can you explain to me why you think
Mr. Eppsteiner is wrong?
A Yes. It requires -- it's my understanding of this part of the agreement is that what it is is this is usage data that AT\&T needs to enable it to bill its customers.

Q Yes.
A So it would be things like, for example, interstate access, which is kind of a misnomer, because they're not going to bill that to anybody since they're the IXC. Things like, you know, if they were reselling toll, for example, or the toll detail to enable them to bill their customers. If they were using usage sensitive features like usage sensitive three-way calling, tell them how many times the
customer used to do that so they could bill it. Those kinds of things; measured service. It was local measured service, you know, what was the measured usage so that they can bill their customers.

So it's things that they were able to bill;
credit card calling, third number, that kind of stuff.
So it's any stuff that they would need data for in order to bill their customers is what we had to provide them.

Intrastate access is not something they bill. It's BellSouth does that billing, so there's no reason to send them that data.

Q All right. Would you turn next to the MCI agreement and Attachment 8?

A Okay.
Q Specifically, I'd like you to look at Section 4.1.1.3. I believe it was Mr. Martinez's testimony in his deposition that by virtue of that section particularly, BellSouth is required to furnish usage data to MCI.

Could you explain to the Commission why you believe Mr. Martinez to be wrong, if you do?

A Okay. Would you repeat what he said? I didn't hear all of what he said.

Q Mr. Martinez relies on Section 4.1.1.3 in
concluding that BellSouth is required to furnish usage data for all calls to MCI. Why is he wrong?

A Well, from what I recall -- you might ask Mr. Hendrix this -- there are some other parts of the agreement that also deal with MCI, provision of usage data to MCI. And essentially what it says -- what it ends up is the same thing I said for AT\&T applies to MCI.

MR. PELLEGRINI: All right. Thank you, Mr. Varner.

WITNESS VARNER: Yes.
COMMIESIONER JACOBS: I have a couple quick questions. You've indicated that the primary issue here is one of pricing. There have been some allegations, particularly I think in Mr. Falcone's rebuttal, that there are competitive issues as well, and I'd like to have you briefly expound on two of those.

One has to do with the ability of ALECs to compete against BellSouth in this market on a going-forward basis as you migrate to -- I think it's the IDLC technology, and the idea being that the ALECs are probably going to be left with the older technology as you migrate to the newer technology.

And then the other issue has to do with --
and I guess it's associated with that -- is that your ability -- I think it's under the recent change facility under switches to do the same -- to carry out the same provisioning without breaking apart these elements.

WITNESS VARNER: Okay. Let me take them in order. The idea on the IDLC of us having the newer technology while they're having the older is fictitious. They are coming into the market, have the ability to buy from the same people we buy, and when they use our equipment, they're going to be using the same equipment we use.

If they come in and they want to serve a customer, they're going to be serving the customer utilizing the same stuff that we serve the customer. And if they're buying the elements and the capabilities from us -- otherwise they can go to the same people we buy stuff from and buy it from them.

COMMIBSIONER JACOBS: I think the point of it was that if you provision them the way you propose, it would be unlikely that they would migrate to the newer technology. Is that --

WITNESS VARNER: I can't see why that -- why they would -- why that will be an issue of why they would have that kind of a contention. Because, for
example, they buy a loop from us; as we migrate -that's what they get from us is a connection from point A to point B.

Let's say we come in and upgrade our facilities, okay. That loop is going to get upgraded just like every other loop in the wire center, or every other loop in that cross-section. You're not buying a specific technology. They're buying a capability from us. And then as the network is upgraded, the capabilities, the equipment providing things, it ends up upgraded as well as the things for us is upgraded.

The second point was really an irrelevant point. We're not disputing that when AT\&T and MCI under their contract today orders a combination from us that we will provide them a combination. What that means is that when they order a combination, we're not going to break it apart. We're going to leave it exactly the same. We're going to leave it the same as it would be if they had issued us a resale order. That's what they've asked us to do in combinations.

Remember, we've talked a lot about, you
know, how can you tell when it replicates a retail service. There's a very, very easy way to tell. The order they send us says, "Send this customer to me and
give me the unbundled network elements to give him the service he already has." Okay.

That means you're replicating a retail
service. Their own order shows that that's what they're getting. All right. When they do that we're not to going to break it apart. We're not going to go through this collocation arrangement and set up all of that that's on those other diagrams that he has.

It's going to be that simple diagram
number 1. The same way the customer is getting service from BellSouth today is going to be left in place, given to him the same way tomorrow. The only issue is that are we going to price that the way that that service, you know, should be priced and is priced, which is resale, or are you going to give him, you know, a lower price for it.

But all those technical issues don't exist.
All the stuff that he brought in about collocation is really irrelevant to the issue that's at hand here because we're going to leave the network elements combined under the contract.

COMMIBSIONER JACOBS: That's it. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: HOw much redirect do you have?

M8. WHITE: None. I wouldn't dare, in the
first place. (Laughter)
MR. PELLEGRINI: Chairman Johnson, just a moment please.

Ms. WHITE: Can I object?
CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes.
Ms. WHITE: It would be one objection I could win, and I object. (Laughter)

Q (By Mr. Pellegrini) Mr. Varner, just one -- this is the final question. Are you aware that during the arbitration proceeding, AT\&T asked the Commission to remove the costs of operator services from resale because it wanted to provide its own operator services?

A I think they asked them to remove it from the avoided cost of resale; not from the cost of the services to be resold, but from the avoided cost of the resale sale, I think, is what they asked.

Q And the Commission denied AT\&T's request stating that if AT\&T wanted to charge BellSouth retail services, that it needs to provide service through UNEs. Do you recall that?

A No, I don't. I really don't. I do remember a finding about you have to take the service as it is. I recall something like that, if that's what you're referring to.

Q So the point though is, isn't it true that in order to differentiate its service, AT\&T would have to use its own operator services through UNEs?

A That differentiates its operator services.
It doesn't differentiate its basic exchange service.
Q To differentiate its service as from BellSouth's service?

A Its operator services from BellSouth's operator services. It doesn't differentiate -- if they're using unbundled network elements, always remember they're using the same equipment that BellSouth is using, the same stuff that's providing service to the retail customer. Can't do anything more with it than BellSouth can do with it because it's the same stuff.

MR. PELLEGRINI: All right. Thank you.
(Witness Varner excused.)

M8. WHITE: BellSouth would move Exhibits 22 and 23.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Show those admitted without objection.
(Exhibits 22 and 23 received in evidence.)
MR. PELLEGRINI: Staff moves Exhibit 24.
CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Show that admitted
without objection.
(Exhibit 24 received in evidence.)
MR. HATCH: AT\&T moves 25.
CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Show 25 admitted without objection.
(Exhibit 25 received in evidence.)
CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: We will take a 20-minute lunch break.
(Thereupon, lunch recess was taken at 2:20
p.m.)

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: We're going to go back on
the record. Bellsouth?
Ms. WHITE: BellSouth calls Mr. Hendrix. JERRY HENDRIX
was called as a witness on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. WHITE:
Q Mr. Hendrix, would you state your name and address for the record, please?

A Yes. My name is Jerry D. Hendrix. My address is 675 West Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia.

Q By whom are you employed?
A By BellSouth.
Q Did you previously cause to be prepared and prefiled in this case direct testimony consisting of 15 pages and rebuttal testimony consisting of 11 pages?

A Yes, I did.
Q Do you have any additions, corrections or changes to make to that testimony at this time?

A No, I do not.
0 If I were to ask you the same questions today that are posed in your prefiled direct and rebuttal testimony, would your answers be the same?

A Yes.
MS. WHITE: I'd like to have the direct and rebuttal testimony of Mr . Hendrix inserted into the record as if read.

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: It will be so inserted.

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
TESTIMONY OF JERRY HENDRIX
BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
DOCKET NO. 971140-TP
JANUARY 29, 1998
Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND COMPANY NAME AND ADDRESS.
A. My name is Jerry Hendrix. I am employed by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. as Director - Interconnection Services Pricing. My business address is 675 West Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30375.
Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE.
A. I graduated from Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia in 1975 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree. I began employment with Southern Bell in 1979 and have held various positions in the Network Distribution Department before joining the BellSouth Headquarters Regulatory organization in 1985. On January 1, 1996 my responsibilities moved to Interconnection Services Pricing in the Interconnection Customer Business Unit.
Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY?

1 A. Yes. I have testified in proceedings before the Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee Public Service Commissions and the North Carolina Utilities Commission.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss the issues identified in this docket relative to the contractual obligations contained in the BellSouth-MCIm and BellSouth-AT\&T interconnection agreements.
Q. IN YOUR OPINION, IS BELLSOUTH OBLIGATED TO COMBINE UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS?
A. Based on the Eighth Circuit Court's decision, BellSouth is not obligated to recombine unbundled network elements (UNEs). However, the Eighth Circuit Court affirmed the right of ALECs to combine unbundled elements themselves and BellSouth will provide such elements as delineated in executed interconnection agreements, at the individual rates established by the various state commissions.

Furthermore, until such time as the Eight Circuit's opinion becomes final and non-appealable, BellSouth intends to honor its contractual obligation to provision UNE combinations in those executed agreements which include language regarding the provisioning of combinations.

BellSouth has consistently taken the position that ALECs are free to use unbundled network elements recombined by BellSouth in any manner it chooses. However, in Florida, when an ALEC orders a combination of network elements or orders individual network elements that, when combined, duplicate a retail service provided by BellSouth, for purposes of billing and provisioning, such orders should be treated as resale. Consequently, requests for a migration or a "switch-as-is", should be treated as resale, with the pricing rules applicable thereto, and not as the sale of unbundled network elements.
Q. MCI ALLEGES THAT THE BST-MCI INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT SETS FORTH PRICES FOR COMBINING UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS. DOES BELLSOUTH AGREE?
A. No.
Q. WHAT IS THE HISTORY BEHIND THE LANGUAGE CONTAINED IN THE BST-MCI INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT THAT ADDRESSES THE COMBINATION ISSUE?
A. The Commission allowed MCI to combine unbundled network elements in any manner they choose, including recreating a BellSouth service, but the Commission did not rule on the pricing of recombined elements. (Order No. PSC-96-1579-FOF-TP, pages 37-38).

Negotiations with MCI revolved around trying to encompass the Commission's orders, however, there was no direction from the Commission as to how the purchase of combinations should be priced.

Furthermore, in its March 19, 1997 Final Order on Motions for Reconsideration regarding the consolidated dockets, the Commission stated: "In our original arbitration proceeding in this docket, we were not presented with the specific issue of the pricing of recombined elements when recreating the same service offered for resale....

Furthermore, we set rates only for specific elements that the parties requested. Therefore, it is not clear from the record in this proceeding that our decision included rates for all elements necessary to recreate a complete retail service. Thus, it is inappropriate for us to make a determination on this issue at this time. (Order No. PSC-97-0298-FOFTP, page 7).

In BellSouth's version of the Agreement filed on April 4, 1997, BellSouth proposed language to address the issue of how UNE combinations should be priced. BellSouth's proposed language stated that:
"negotiations between the parties should address the price of a retail service that is recreated by combining UNEs. Recombining UNEs shall not be used to undercut the resale price of the service recreated."

In the Commission's May 27, 1997 Order (Order No. PSC-97-0602-FOF-TP) the Commission required the parties to sign an agreement that included exactly the language prescribed in the Commission's previous Final Order Approving Arbitration Agreement and threatened to fine any non-signing party $\$ 25,000.00$ a day for each day after the June 10 filing date that the agreement remained unsigned. In that same order, the Commission stated:
"We expressed concerns with the potential pricing of UNEs to duplicate a resold service at our Agenda Conference, and we expressed our concerns in the Order in dicta; however, we stated that the pricing issues associated with the rebundling of UNEs to duplicate a resold service was not arbitrated.... Accordingly, BellSouth's proposed language shall not be included in the agreement." (Order page 5).

BellSouth's proposed language mirrored the Commission's language in its March 19, 1997 Order, PSC-97-0298-TP in FPSC Dockets 960846-TP and 960916-TP, wherein the Commission itself stated that it "would be very concerned if recombining network elements to recreate a service could be used to undercut the resale price of the service."

As you see, BellSouth attempted to address the pricing issue in the agreement and the Commission determined that since this issue was not arbitrated it was not appropriate for the Commission to rule upon the pricing issue. BellSouth was forced to include contract language it did not negotiate.

ISSUE \#1
Q. DOES THE BELLSOUTH-MCIm INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT SPECIFY HOW PRICES WILL BE DETERMINED FOR COMBINATIONS OF UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS THAT DO NOT RECREATE AN EXISTING BELLSOUTH RETAIL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE?
A. No, the BellSouth-MCIm Interconnection Agreement specifies prices for individual network elements.
Q. DOES THE BELLSOUTH-MCIm INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT SPECIFY HOW PRICES WILL BE DETERMINED FOR COMBINATIONS OF UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS THAT DO RECREATE AN EXISTING BELLSOUTH RETAIL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE?
A. No, the BellSouth-MCIm Interconnection Agreement does not specify how combinations of unbundled network elements should be priced.
Q. MCIm ALLEGES THAT ATTACHMENT III, SECTION 2.6 OF THE BELLSOUTH-MCIm AGREEMENT ADDRESSES THE PRICING ISSUE OF COMBINING UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS. DO YOU AGREE?
A. No. Section 2.6 states:
"With respect to Network Elements and services in existence as of the Effective Date of this Agreement, charges in Attachment I are inclusive
and no other charges apply, including but not limited to any other consideration for connecting Network Element(s) with other Network Element(s). BellSouth and MCIm agree to attempt in good faith to resolve any alleged errors or omissions in Attachment I."

This section of the agreement does not set prices for combinations. This language was agreed to in conjunction with the pricing language BellSouth tried to incorporate into the agreement, but which was rejected by this Commission. BellSouth has consistently maintained its position that unbundled network elements combined to recreate an existing retail service offering is considered resale. BellSouth would never have voluntarily agreed to a provision in the agreement that would undercut its position on combinations.
Q. ISSUE \#2 - IF THE ANSWER TO EITHER PART OR BOTH PARTS OF ISSUE 1 IS YES, HOW IS THE PRICE(S) DETERMINED?
A. Please see response to Issue \#1. The prices for unbundled network element combinations are not contained in the BellSouth-MCIm Interconnection Agreement.
Q. ISSUE \#3 - IF THE ANSWER TO EITHER PART OR BOTH PARTS OF ISSUE \#1 IS NO, HOW SHOULD THE PRICE(S) BE DETERMINED?

1 A. Mr. Varner will address the issue of how prices should be determined for combining unbundled network elements in his testimony.

## ISSUE 4

Q. DOES THE BELLSOUTH-AT\&T INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT SPECIFY HOW PRICES WILL BE DETERMINED FOR COMBINATIONS OF UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS THAT DO NOT RECREATE AN EXISTING BELLSOUTH RETAIL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE?
A. No, the BellSouth-AT\&T Interconnection Agreement does not specify how combinations of unbundled network elements should be priced.
Q. DOES THE BELLSOUTH-AT\&T INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT SPECIFY HOW PRICES WILL BE DETERMINED FOR COMBINATIONS OF UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS THAT DO CREATE AN EXISTING BELLSOUTH RETAIL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE?
A. No, the BellSouth-AT\&T Interconnection Agreement does not specify how combinations for unbundled network elements should be priced.
Q. ISSUE 5 - IF THE ANSWER TO EITHER PART OR BOTH PARTS OF ISSUE \#4 IS YES, HOW IS THE PRICE(S) DETERMINED?

1 A. Please see response to Issue \#4. The prices for unbundled network element combinations are not contained in the BellSouth-AT\&T Interconnection Agreement.
Q. ISSUE 6 - IF THE ANSWER TO EITHER PART OR BOTH PARTS OF ISSUE \#4 IS NO, HOW SHOULD THE PRICE(S) BE DETERMINED?
A. Mr. Varner will address the issue of how prices should be determined for combining unbundled network elements in his testimony.
Q. ISSUE 7 - WHAT STANDARD SHOULD BE USED TO IDENTIFY WHAT COMBINATIONS OF UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS RECREATE EXISTING BELLSOUTH RETAIL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES?
A. There are several different factors that should be considered by this commission in determining whether or not a requested combination of UNES is recreating an existing retail telecommunications service offering. The "switch as is" request is a clear example of an existing retail service offering.

A second consideration is the "switch with change". This is when an ALEC makes changes to an existing retail service offering, such as the elimination or addition of a feature, in an attempt to disguise the existing retail service offering.

A more difficult situation is to distinguish combinations which perform functions similar to the functions of an existing service offering. These combinations are distinguishable from the existing service offering in some manner, but the functions are identical.

The real test for this Commission will be to look at the core functions of the requested combination to see if those functions mirror the functions of an existing retail service offering.

Bottom line, the Commission must use its best judgment to identify UNE combinations which recreate an existing retail service offering. If the recombined unbundled elements creates a service identical to an existing retail service offering and such recombination contains the same functions, features and attributes of that existing retail offering, the combination should be considered resale and priced accordingly.

The Georgia Commission in its Order in Docket No. 6801-U, stated '...when AT\&T recombines unbundled elements to create services identical to BellSouth's retail offerings, the prices charged to AT\&T for the rebundled services shall be computed as BellSouth's retail offerings, the prices charged to AT\&T for the rebundled services shall be computed as BellSouth's retail price less the wholesale discount and offered under the same terms and conditions, including the same application of access charges an the imposition of joint marketing restrictions. In this situation, "identical" means that AT\&T is not using
its own switching or other functionality or capability together with unbundled elements in order to produce its service."

The Louisiana Public Service Commission issued similar language in its January 15, 1997 Order U-22145.
"...AT\&T may purchase unbundled elements from BellSouth and rebundle those elements in any manner that is technically feasible. This fact is undisputed by either party. The real issue is not whether AT\&T may purchase and rebundle elements in any manner they choose, but the rate of compensation for the purchase of such 'elements.'

To the extent AT\&T purchases unbundled network elements and then recombines them to replicate BellSouth services, it is reselling BellSouth's services. As Shakespeare pointed out, a rose by any other name is still a rose, and so it is with resale, even when AT\&T chooses to call it a combination of unbundled elements. Both the FCC and this Commission have issued Orders strongly supporting an aggressive resale market. This commitment to resale would be rendered meaningless if AT\&T were allowed to bypass resale through the fiction of "rebundling." Unrestricted pricing on the recombination of unbundled elements would allow AT\&T to purchase unbundled elements from BellSouth and then rebundle those elements without adding any additional capability, in order to create a service which is identical to a retail offering already being provided by BellSouth and therefore subject to mandatory resale. Such an arrangement would
allow AT\&T to avoid both the Act's and this Commission's pricing standards for resale, avoid the Act's restrictions regarding joint marketing and avoid access charge requirements. Such an arrangement would also serve as a disincentive to the ILECs to construct their own facilities."(pg. 38-39).

The Georgia and Louisiana Commission language is consistent with the concerns expressed by this Commission in its March 19, 1997 Order, PSC-97-0298-TP in FPSC Dockets 9660846-TP and 960916-TP in which the Commission stated that it "would be very concerned if recombining network elements to recreate a service could be used to undercut the resale price of the service."
Q. ISSUE \#8 - WHAT IS THE APPROPRIATE NON-RECURRING CHARGE FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING COMBINATIONS OF NETWORK ELEMENTS FOR MIGRATION OF AN EXISTING BELLSOUTH CUSTOMER;
(A) 2-WIRE ANALOG LOOP AND PORT;
(B) 2-WIRE ISDN LOOP AND PORT;
(C) 4-WIRE ANALOG LOOP AND PORT; AND
(D) 4-WIRE DS1 AND PORT?
A. Mr. Varner will discuss the appropriate non-recurring charge while the associated cost issues will be addressed by Ms. Caldwell and Mr. Landry.

1 Q. ISSUE \#9 - DOES THE BELLSOUTH-MCIm INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT REQUIRE BST TO RECORD AND PROVIDE MCIm WITH THE SWITCHED ACCESS USAGE DATA NECESSARY TO BILL INTEREXCHANGE CARRIERS WHEN MCI PROVIDES SERVICES USING UNBUNDLED LOCAL SWITCHING PURCHASED FROM BELLSOUTH EITHER ON A STAND ALONE BASIS OR IN COMBINATION WITH OTHER UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS?

Section 7.2.1.9 of Attachment III of the BellSouth-MCIm Interconnection Agreement requires BellSouth to "record all billable events involving usage of the element, and send the appropriate recording data to MCIm as outlined in Attachment VIII" of the agreement when MCI orders unbundled network elements. Interstate access records will be transmitted to MCI via the Access Daily Usage File (ADUF). ADUF is transmitted via that same transmission media used for ODUF. These files can be received over a Connect:Direct feed or on a mag tape. Whether it is appropriate to provide ADUF to MCI when MCI orders a combination of elements will be discussed by Mr. Varner.
Q. ISSUE 10 - DOES THE AT\&T-BELLSOUTH INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT REQUIRE BELLSOUTH TO RECORD AND PROVIDE AT\&T WITH DETAIL USAGE DATA FOR SWITCHED ACCESS SERVICE, LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE AND LONG DISTANCE SERVICE NECESSARY FOR AT\&T TO BILL CUSTOMERS WHEN AT\&T PROVIDES SERVICE USING UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS EITHER ALONE OR IN COMBINATION?
A. Interstate access records are available to AT\&T via the Access Daily Usage File (ADUF). ADUF is transmitted via that same transmission media used for ODUF. These files can be received over a Connect:Direct feed or on a mag tape. Again, the question of whether it is appropriate to provide ADUF to AT\&T when AT\&T orders a combination of elements will be discussed by Mr. Varner.
Q. WOULD YOU PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. Based on the Eighth Circuit's opinion which states that the Act intends that requesting carriers are to combine the UNEs themselves, BellSouth has no legal obligation to provide combined UNEs. In accordance with this opinion, BellSouth will provide the individual UNEs delineated in its executed interconnection agreements at the rates established by the various commissions. Until such time as the Eighth Circuit's opinion becomes final and non-appealable, BellSouth will accept and provision UNE combination orders from ALECs which have combination language in their interconnection agreement.

BellSouth believes that MCIm is free to use UNEs recombined by BellSouth in any manner it so chooses. In Florida, when MCIm orders a combination of UNES or orders individual UNES, which when combined duplicate an existing retail service, BellSouth will treat such orders as resale.

4 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
5
6 A. Yes.
7
8
Furthermore, neither the MCI nor the AT\&T interconnection agreements specify how combinations of unbundled network elements should be priced.
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# BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. <br> REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF JERRY HENDRIX BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DOCKET NO. 971140-TP 

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND COMPANY NAME AND ADDRESS.
A. My name is Jerry Hendrix. I am employed by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. as Director - Interconnection Services Pricing. My business address is 675 West Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30375.
Q. ARE YOU THE SAME JERRY HENDRIX WHO FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
A. Yes.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. The purpose of my testimony is to rebut the testimony filed in this docket by MCI's witness, Chip Parker and AT\&T's witness, David Eppsteiner, regarding the contractual obligations contained in the BellSouth-MCIm and BellSouthAT\&T interconnection agreements.

## Rebuttal to Mr. Parker's Testimony

Q. ON PAGE 3 OF MR. PARKER'S TESTIMONY, MR. PARKER STATES THAT THE AGREEMENT ALLOWS FOR THE MIGRATION OF EXISTING BELLSOUTH CUSTOMERS TO MCIm SERVED THROUGH UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS BY REUSING EXISTING BELLSOUTH FACILITIES. DO YOU AGREE?
A. BellSouth does not dispute that Attachment VIII, Section 2.2.15.3 of the interconnection agreement allows MCIm to purchase combinations of unbundled network elements. This provision in the agreement however, does not provide a price for such combinations. Section 2.2.15.3 merely states that "...Network Elements or Combinations that are currently interconnected and functional...shall remain connected and functional without any disconnection or disruption of functionality."

MR. PARKER STATES ON PAGE 3 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT'S DECISION "DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY INVALIDATE CONTRACTUAL PROVISIONS..." WHAT IS BELLSOUTH'S OPINION?
A. Part A, Section 2.4 of the BST/MCIm Agreement specifically states:

In the event that any final and nonappealable legislative, regulatory, judicial or other legal action materially affects any material terms of this Agreement, or the ability of MCIm or BellSouth to perform any material terms of this Agreement, or in the event a judicial or
administrative stay of such action is not sought or granted, MCIm or BellSouth may, on thirty (30) days written notice (delivered not later than (30) days following the date on which such action has become legally binding and has otherwise become final and nonappealable) require that such terms be renegotiated, and the Parties shall renegotiate in good faith such mutually acceptable new terms as may be required. In the event that such new terms are not renegotiated within ninety (90) days after such notice, the dispute shall be resolved in accordance with Section 23 (Dispute Resolution Procedures) of this Agreement.

Furthermore, Part A, Section 7 of the BST/MCIm Interconnection Agreement provides that:
[ $t$ ]his Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with applicable federal law and the laws of the state of Florida, without regard to its conflicts of law principles.

Therefore, once the Eighth Circuit's Order becomes final and non-appealable, Section 2.4 of the General Terms and Conditions section of the BST/MCI Interconnection Agreement requires that the parties re-negotiate the combination provisions.
Q. MCI'S WITNESS MR. PARKER ALLEGES THAT SECTION 8 OF ATTACHMENT 1 OF THE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT SETS FORTH PRICES FOR UNE COMBINATIONS. DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS INTERPRETATION OF THE AGREEMENT?
A. No. Section 8 of Attachment 1 specifies " $[t]$ he recurring and nonrecurring prices for unbundled Network Elements (UNEs) in Table 1 of this Attachment are appropriate for UNEs on an individual, stand-alone basis." This section does not specify the rates for combinations. It does require however, the parties to "work together to establish recurring and non-recurring charges in situations where MCIm is ordering multiple network elements."
Q. MR. PARKER CLAIMS ON PAGE 4 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT BELLSOUTH IS NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE AGREEMENT TO CHARGE A "GLUE" CHARGE TO MCI WHEN MCI ORDERS ELEMENTS IN COMBINATION. DO YOU AGREE?
A. No. The agreement does not prohibit BellSouth from charging a "glue" charge. Mr. Parker has based his assertion on Attachment III, Section 2.6 of the interconnection agreement which states:

With respect to Network Elements and services in existence as of the Effective Date of this Agreement, charges in Attachment 1 are inclusive and no other charges apply, including but not limited to any other consideration for connecting any Network Element(s) with other Network Element(s). BellSouth and MCIm agree to attempt in good faith to resolve any alleged errors or omissions in Attachment 1.

As I explained in my Direct Testimony on page 6, lines 23-25 and page 7, lines 1-13, the language in this section was agreed to in conjunction with the pricing
language BellSouth proposed be incorporated in the agreement, but which was rejected by this Commission. This section simply addresses combinations which recreate existing retail service offerings. Such combinations are considered resale and priced accordingly.
Q. MR. PARKER AGREES THAT "MIGRATION OF AN EXISTING" CUSTOMER CAN APPLY TO A RESALE OR TO THE PROVISIONING OF SERVICE THROUGH THE USE OF A LOOP/PORT COMBINATION PURCHASED FROM BELLSOUTH. MR. PARKER FURTHER STATES THAT NON-RECURRING CHARGES FOR SUCH MIGRATIONS SHOULD NOT APPLY SINCE THERE IS NO CONNECTING OR DISCONNECTING ACTIVITY. DOES BELLSOUTH AGREE THAT THE NON-RECURRING CHARGES FOR "MIGRATION OF AN EXISITING" CUSTOMER SHOULD NOT APPLY IN THESE SITUATIONS?
A. No. The "migration of an existing customer" is the same thing as resale and therefore the appropriate non-recurring charge when MCIm "migrates" an existing customer is the non-recurring charge applicable to resale, which in most cases would likely be the secondary service order charge less the wholesale discount.
Q. ON PAGE 7, MR. PARKER ASSERTS THAT THE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT DOES NOT AUTHORIZE BELLSOUTH TO TREAT COMBINATIONS OF UNES AS RESALE. DOES BELLSOUTH AGREE WITH MR. PARKER'S ASSERTION?

24 A. No. While BellSouth believes that as a result of the Eighth Circuit's decision,
A. No. Mr. Parker has based his assertion on Section 8 of Attachment 1 which simply states that when MCI orders two or more UNEs combined, "BellSouth shall provide recurring and non-recurring charges that do not duplicate charges for functions or activities that MCI does not need when two or more network elements are combined in a single order." What Mr. Parker fails to recognize is that this section of the agreement requires the parties to work together to establish a recurring and non-recurring charge in these situations. Nowhere in the agreement does it state how those combinations are to be priced.
Q. ON PAGE 7 OF MR. PARKER'S TESTIMONY, HE STATES THAT BELLSOUTH HAS NOT BEEN PROVIDING INFORMATION ON SWITCHED ACCESS USAGE AS REQUIRED BY THE AGREEMENT. IS THIS TRUE?
A. No. As I stated in my direct testimony, interstate access records are available to MCI via the Access Daily Usage File (ADUF).

## Rebuttal to David Eppsteiner

Q. DOES BELLSOUTH CONTEND THAT IT HAS NO OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE COMBINATIONS OF UNES TO AT\&T? BellSouth has no legal obligation to provide combinations of UNEs, BellSouth
has continuously stated that it intends to abide by its contractual obligation to provide unbundled network element combinations to those ALECs who have such language in their agreements. The agreement between BellSouth and AT\&T was executed when the laws governing such an agreement required BellSouth to provide AT\&T with combinations of network elements and to deliver unseparated elements previously combined. It is for this reason, and this reason only, that BellSouth agreed to provide combinations to AT\&T. However, once the Eighth Circuit's decision becomes final and nonappealable, BellSouth will have no legal obligation to continue to do so and at that time will expect to renegotiate the pertinent provisions pursuant to Section 9.3 of the General Terms and Conditions section of the agreement which states:

In the event that any final and nonappealable legislative, regulatory, judicial or other legal action materially affects any material terms of this Agreement, or the ability of AT\&T or BellSouth to perform any material terms of this Agreement, AT\&T or BellSouth may, on thirty (30) days' written notice (delivered not later than thirty (30) days following the date on which such action has become legally binding and has otherwise become final and nonappealable) require that such terms be renegotiated, and the Parties shall renegotiate in good faith such mutually acceptable new terms as may be required. In the event that such new terms are not renegotiated within ninety (90) days after such notice, the Dispute shall be referred to the Alternative Dispute Resolution procedures set forth in Attachment 1.

25 A. No. The prices set forth in Part IV, Table 1 are the prices for individual
unbundled network elements and do not pertain to unbundled network element combinations.

Section 36.1 of the General Terms and Conditions section of the agreement states that "BellSouth and AT\&T shall work together to mutually agree upon the total non-recurring and recurring charge(s) to be paid by AT\&T when ordering multiple Network Elements." Neither of these sections specifies the prices for combinations.
Q. DOES BELLSOUTH AGREE WITH MR. EPPSTEINER'S CLAIM ON PAGE 9 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT ATTACHMENT 4, SECTION 4.5 SETS THE PRICES FOR ELEMENTS THAT ARE CURRENTLY COMBINED?
A. No. BellSouth agrees that Attachment 4, Section 4.5 prohibits BellSouth from disconnecting combined elements. However, BellSouth disagrees with Mr. Eppsteiner's assertion that the price for such combinations is the sum of the individual elements as set forth in Part IV, Table 1 of the General Terms and Conditions. This section of the agreement does not address the price of such combinations, but merely states that "[e]lements or combinations that are currently interconnected and functional....will remain interconnected and functional without any disconnection or disruption of functionality."
Q. DOES BELLSOUTH AGREE THAT PART IV, TABLE 1 OF THE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT SETS FORTH PRICES FOR

COMBINATIONS AS STATED BY MR. EPPSTEINER ON PAGE 10 OF HIS TESTIMONY?
A. No. As I stated in my Direct Testimony on page 8, lines 11-12 and 19-20, the BellSouth-AT\&T Interconnection Agreement does not specify how combinations should be priced. Part IV, Table 1 of the agreement sets forth the prices for individual unbundled network elements.
Q. HOW DOES BELLSOUTH RESPOND TO MR. EPPSTEINER'S ASSERTION ON PAGE 10 OF HIS TESTIMONY THAT COMBINATIONS SHOULD NOT BE PRICED AT THE WHOLESALE DISCOUNT?
A. In Mr. Eppsteiner's testimony, at page 10, he refers to the language proposed by BellSouth to address the combination issue. Such language was in fact rejected by this Commission, although the Commission did not reject the concept upon which such language was predicated. In fact, as I stated in my Direct Testimony on page 5 , lines $14-18$, BellSouth's proposed language mirrors the concern expressed by the Commission itself in its March 19, 1997 Order in FPSC Docket 960846-TP. Furthermore, Mr. Eppsteiner continues to incorrectly point to Part IV and Table 1 of the Interconnection Agreement to be the sections which govern the pricing of combinations. "Part IV: Pricing" is the general pricing section of the agreement and Table 1 lists the prices for individual unbundled network elements. The interconnection agreement entered into between BellSouth and AT\&T does not specify how combinations of unbundled network elements should be priced.

4 A. Yes.

Q (By Ms. White) Mr. Hendrix, you have no exhibits attached to your testimony, do you?

A No, I do not.
Q Mr. Hendrix, would you please give us a summary of your testimony?

A Yes. I have a very brief summary. First, let me state $I$ served as the lead negotiator for BellSouth in both the AT\&T and MCI agreements. I'm also responsible for signing all of the interconnection agreements for the BellSouth region.

Based on the 8th Circuit opinion which states that the Act intends that ALECs combine UNEs, BellSouth has no legal obligation to provide combined UNEs. We will provide the individual UNEs as contained in those agreements.

Until the 8th Circuit is final, BellSouth will accept and provision orders from ALECs which have the combination language in it. When such orders for combined UNEs are given to BellSouth that would replicate a retail offering, BellSouth will treat such orders as resale.

Finally, the interconnection agreements do not provide prices for combined elements. In fact, the agreements require the parties to meet and negotiate prices, recurring as well as nonrecurring
prices.
That ends my summary.
Ms. WHITE: Mr. Hendrix is available for cross.

MR. PELLEGRINI: Chairman Johnson, before Mr. Hendrix's cross-examination begins, Staff would proffer Exhibit JDH-1 consisting of Mr. Hendrix's February 27, 1998, deposition transcript, as well as deposition and late-filed deposition Exhibit Nos. 1 and 2 and ask that it be marked for identification.

Chatrman Johnson: Do we have that? But I'll go ahead and mark it, and you can keep going. You can continue. Was that it, Mr. Pellegrini?

MR. PELLEGRINI: Yes.
(Exhibit 26 marked for identification.)
CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Okay. Mr. Melson? CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. BOND:

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Hendrix. Tom Bond on behalf of MCI. Just to be clear, BellSouth acknowledges that it is currently bound by the combination provisions in the MCI/BellSouth interconnection agreement; is that correct?

A Yes.
9 And you acknowledge that you are bound to
provide MCI loop/port combinations under the agreement; is that correct?

A Provide combinations, yes. But as I mentioned in my summary, when those are ordered from BellSouth, they would be billed as resale.

0 When MCI orders a loop/port combination under the agreement from BellSouth, is it correct that BellSouth intends to actually provide MCIm with resale and not a loop/port combination?

A We will provision and bill the service as resale if on that order, the service on that order would be for a loop/port combined. We would, in fact, provision and bill it as resale.

Q So you're not merely saying that BellSouth intends to price it at the resale rate, that BellSouth actually intends to provide MCI with resale; is that correct?

A I think there are two different cases. Let me first of all say almost a yes, but let me go on and explain.

As Mr. Varner mentioned, if you were to order an unbundled loop and an unbundled port to be terminated at your collocated space, then that will be billed as resale. It would actually be provisioned as UNES .

However, if you ask us to migrate a customer that is an existing customer of BellSouth and then to bill those as UNEs, we will not bill those as UNEs. That service has already been provisioned by BellSouth, and for that purpose we would bill it as resale.

Q Mr. Melson is passing out a handout, and if you could look, the first page of that is Page 7 from the Commission's order on reconsideration.

Would you agree that the Commission ruled in its arbitration order that MCI may combine UNEs in any manner they choose including recreating an existing BellSouth service?

A Yes, it says that MCI may do so.
Q And in the order on reconsideration, is it correct that the Commission stated that they were not presented with the specific issue of pricing of recombined elements when recreating the same service offered for resale?

A I think it was somewhat more broader than that. I believe what they mentioned, that this issue had not been couched before them, and so they are not addressing what the price would be for multiple UNES combined to replicate a resale service, or a resold service.

Q And the issue that you say -- that you're referring to is the specific issue of pricing of UNEs that recreate a Bellsouth service; is that correct?

A I would agree that is the basic issue.
Q Can you show me in the Commission's order on reconsideration, or in any other order that the Commission has issued, where the commission said that they would reconsider the provisioning of UNE combinations?

A You will not find the provisioning language in the order. What is cited is the need to -- well, let me go back. What is mentioned is the concern that billing these services as UNEs that would replicate a retail offering would undercut the resold services. And for that reason, when we have UNEs that would replicate an existing retail service that BellSouth offers, then it would be billed as resale.

Q My question was, are there any provisions that -- in any Commission orders where the Commission said it was reconsidering the provisioning of UNE combinations, not the pricing of UNE combinations?

A No, there is not, to my knowledge.
2 Are you aware of any Commission order where the Commission said that network elements would cease being network elements when ordered in combination?

A I don't believe that they do. I'm not aware of any cite, but network elements are network elements. They do not cease being a network element even if I bill those as resale.

Q And it's true, is it not, that in the order on reconsideration the Commission specifically stated that they would not reconsider their decision on the rebundling of network elements?

A I'm not sure that was stated just that way.
8 On the handout I passed out, if I could refer you to the first sentence on Page 7.

A Okay. But I think -- I do not know the date of this order. Could you tell me date of this order?

Q I believe it's March 19th, 1997.
A (Pause) That sentence is there. However, in a later order -- and I'm referring to the May 27th, 1997 order where the parties were required to sign the agreements, the issue -- or the statement that $I$ made about the concern on the pricing of UNEs is also mentioned in that order.

So I think you cannot take this out of context, because the issue was again talked about in reference in the May 27 th order.

Q Is it correct that the May 27th order merely referred to the pricing issue associated with
rebundling of UNEs?
A I would agree the bottom line is to pricing the issue associated with the UNEs.

Q And the May 27 th order makes no mention of provisioning of UNEs?

A No, it does not.
Q And the May 27 th order does not say that when UNEs are ordered in combination they cease being UNEs?

A No, it does not.
Q On the handout that Mr. Melson passed out, if you could turn to the next page, and I'll refer you to Section 4.1.1 of Attachment 3.

Is it correct that this section of the agreement states that when MCIm buys a loop, MCIm is granted exclusive use of that loop?

A Those words are there, yes.
Q If MCI buys a loop/port combination, is BellSouth going to recognize that MCI has exclusive use of that loop?

A We will definitely abide by what's in the agreements. So I suppose the answer is yes, if, in fact, what we're speaking of is what is contained in this agreement.

Q Now, under resale, BellSouth is required to
provide MCI for resale all telecommunication services that BellSouth offers at retail; is that correct?

A That are tariffed at retail.
Q Yeah, that Bell -- that BellSouth offers to the public at retail.

A That are tariffed. There are some retail services that may be -- and I'm drawing a blank now -but there are some retail services that may not be tariffed wherein it may be detariffed. So a retail service that is tariffed, yes, we would offer those for resale.

Q okay. Would you agree that there are potentially switch features which BellSouth could offer its end users, but that for some reason it has chosen not to offer its end users at retail or has not tariffed those offerings?

A I wouldn't couch it in that fashion. What is the -- what is required in the agreement is that we offer the features available in that switch at that time, and all retail features in that switch are, in fact, tariffed. So as to whether we have features in a switch that we choose not to tariff -- or choose not to offer to our end users, there are other factors that you would have to weigh, because not all switches in a local calling area may have the same features
available in that switch.
Q Well, let me try to rephrase it. If BellSouth has a feature in a switch that it does not offer, has not tariffed and does not offer to the public, can MCI resell that feature from BellSouth?

A No.
Q Under UNEs, is it correct that BellSouth is required to offer MCI all local switching features that are technically feasible? And I refer you on Page 6 of the attachment to Section 7.2.1.15 of Attachment 3.

A Would you give that cite again, please?
Q 7.2.1.15 of Attachment 3.
A Yes, I'm there.
Q Would you agree that that provides that BellSouth shall offer all local switching features that are technically feasible to MCI?

A I think you left off the rest of the sentence.

2 And provide feature offerings at parity to those provided by Bellsouth to itself or any other party?

A That's correct. I would agree with that. The whole sentence I would agree with.

Q If MCI buys local switching from BellSouth,
it would have the right to offer technically feasible features that BellSouth does not currently offer at retail; is that correct?

A Would you ask that again?
Q If a BellSouth switch was technically capable, if it was technically feasible for that switch to offer a certain feature, would MCI have the right under its contract to offer to provide that feature using local switching without regard to whether BellSouth had tariffed that feature?

A No, I would not agree. The language that you just cited, there is a word $A-N-D$, "and," which would mean that it would have to be feasible, and it was something that we would provide to BellSouth itself or to any other party. So those are the requirements that would have to be met.

2 So you don't believe that parity refers to if Bellsouth is providing the feature for its own customers then it must provide it at parity to MCI?

A That's correct. If you're asking me what parity means, you faded out somewhat. But if you're asking me if parity is what we offer to our own end users we must also offer to you to be able to offer to your end user customers, I would agree that is parity.

Q You are aware, are you not, that local
switching under the agreement includes the capability of routing local intralata and interlata calls; is that correct?

A Yes, I am aware of that.
Q And you're aware that local switching under the agreement includes the capability of providing carrier presubscription, that is, long distance and intraLATA toll presubscription?

A Yes, I am, and I believe that is all mentioned in the way local switching is defined in the agreement.

Q So when MCI uses local switching, it has the ability to route local intraLATA and interlata calls; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q When MCI uses local switching, BellSouth is also required to record all billable events and send the usage data to MCI; is that correct?

A Yes, and I think the key -- the answer is yes. But I think the key word that is mentioned there is also found in Attachment 3, 7.2.1.9, and that is the word "billable," and I think Mr. Varner had some questions on that earlier; and I think the key word is "billable," which would be usage that you would need to bill your end user customers.

0 Just for reference, that's on Page 5 of the handout that I passed to you, 7.2.1.9?

A Yes.
Q So you do not think that switched access is a billable event?

A It is definitely a billable event, and definitely you would have every right to get the interstate switched access usage, but as far as intrastate usage, I believe there were several questions of Mr. Varner on that issue, and I do not differ with him on that issue.

0 Do you believe that intrastate interLATA switched access is not a billable event?

A No. I would not deny, but it is a billable event that BellSouth would have for rendering bills to its carrier customers.

0 Would you agree that this says BellSouth shall record all billable events?

A Yes, and there is no doubt in my mind that we, in fact, do. What we send to the carriers would be data that is required for the -- our carrier customers to bill their end user customers.

Q When MCI orders a loop/port combination, is Bell intending to comply with this network element requirement?

A You mentioned in the cite at 7.2.1.9?

0 Yes, sir.
A I mean, yes. Perhaps I'm not understanding the question. It mentions that we will, and for those events that you would need usage to bill your end user customers, we would definitely abide by this agreement.

Q And I'm sorry I didn't make a copy of it, but are you aware that Section 1 of Attachment 3 of the interconnection agreement provides that BellSouth shall provide UNEs to MCI in accordance with FCC rules? And I could get you that copy.

A I have the agreement. Would you give me a cite, please?

Q It's Section 1 of Attachment 3.
A Yes, I would agree with that. That is the first sentence.

Q And if MCI orders a loop/port combination from Bell, is Bell intending to comply with this section?

A Yes, we will abide by the agreement, and we will provide usage, billable usage, billable events, that would allow you, MCI, to bill your end user customers, or whatever other type of customers that you may have.

MR. BOND: Thank you. No further questions. CROSS EXAMIMATION

BY MR. HATCH:
Q I have a few questions, Mr. Hendrix. I'm going to be handing out a couple of things for you, so bear with me for a minute.

MR. BOND: Chairman Johnson, while he does that, could I have the handout that I passed out marked for identification?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: 27. And a short title?
MR. HATCE: "Excerpts from Commission order and agreement."

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Okay.
MR. BOND: Thank you.
(Exhibit 27 marked for identification.)
MR. HATCE: Madam Chairman, what was just handed out from AT\&T, could I get that marked for identification, please?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: It will be marked 28 ,
"Agreement between BellSouth and AT\&T, Kentucky."
MR. HATCH: It would be excerpts from that agreement.

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Excerpts?
MR. HATCH: Yes. I have the entire agreement, which was actually -- I didn't make a full
set of copies for everybody. I wanted to give one to the witness and court reporter just for inclusion, so that the full text is available, and one for the Staff, as well as folks who needed it. If we could get that marked for identification, please.

CHAIRKAN JOHNBON: Marked as 28.
(Exhibit 28 marked for identification.) CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Wait a minute. Did I just --

MR. HATCH: Yes, I think you duplicated a number. 28 was the excerpts. I think 29 would be the --

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: She handed me something. I might have missed something, because I thought you were referring to the same document, because it's the only one that I have. Were you referring to that? Okay. So that would be 29 , and what's the short title for that? What was that?

MR. HATCH: The 29 is the full Kentucky contract.

CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Oh, that is the full contract. Okay.

MR. HATCH: 28 is just the excerpts.
CHAIRMAN JOHNBON: Got you.
(Exhibit 29 marked for identification.)

MR. HATCH: And then this final document is an order of the Kentucky Public Service Commission. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We'll mark that 30, "Order of the Kentucky Public Service Commission." (Exhibit 30 marked for identification.)

Q (By Mr. Hatch) Mr. Hendrix, do you have a copy of your AT\&T/BellSouth Florida agreement handy?

A Yes, I do.
Q And do you also have a copy of the Kentucky agreement handy? Basically what I'm going to do is do sort of a side-by-side through various provisions of the contract, so if you want to get them set up to just sort of look at both of them at the same time.

A All right.
Q Just for explanation, the excerpts provision that I gave you matches the excerpts provisions that were matched to Mr. Eppsteiner's testimony, so you'll have an understanding of basically the provisions we're going through.

A All right.
Q Would you turn to Section 1A of the Florida agreement and 1A of the Kentucky agreement?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Hatch, did you tell us to turn -- which one is it you want us to look at?

MR. HATCH: In the Kentucky agreement it's Section 1A. In the Florida agreement it's also 1A. These numbers will coincide between both agreements with the exception of one provision later on.

9 (By Mr. Hatch) Would you just read, Mr. Hendrix, the 1A provisions in both agreements so you're familiar with both contracts?

A I have.

Q Is there any significant differences in the provisions of the Kentucky $1 A$ when compared to the Florida Section $1 A ?$

A Well, the Kentucky agreement; at the very end where it states whether those elements are its own or are purchased from BellSouth in any manner that it chooses to provide service. So the last part of the paragraph is different.

Q The text is different, but would you agree with me that the $1 A$ in each of those two separate contracts specifically provides that AT\&T may obtain unbundled network elements from BellSouth and may combine them in any way it chooses?

A I would agree that that is the general framework of both agreements.

9 Okay. Would you now turn to section 29 in the contract? of both contracts, actually.

A I am there.
$Q$ Now read both of those provisions to familiarize yourself.

A (Pause) I can tell you just from the history and, you know, staying up nights trying to do this stuff.

Q They're identical, aren't they?
A Yes. And the reason is this: In negotiations we came up with what we called a base agreement. Then as we received arbitration rulings in the different states, we would go in and modify the agreement to include those rulings.

Issues on price, which was the -- I suppose the largest issue in working through all of the various states, was something that was pretty much left until the end, and we would incorporate the final order language as part of our best and final offer as to how we interpreted the language; and AT\&T did the exact same thing.

And then it was pretty much a pick and choose as to which language would actually end up in the agreements. So the base agreement is very similar and, in many cases, identical.
$Q$ Anyway, with respect to Section 29, those two provisions are identical between both contracts;
is that correct?
A I would agree.
Q And with respect to Section 29, it says that the terms and conditions to be applied to unbundled network elements, and the requirements for network elements described in Attachment 2, and the price for network elements is set forth in forth in Part 4 of agreement. That's the same on both contracts; is that correct?

A I would agree.
Q Now, go to section -- or continuing on in the Kentucky excerpts, it would be in Attachment 4.

A Which section in Attachment 4?

Q Attachment 4.
A Just Attachment 4?

Q Yes. Now, if you look at 2.2 of
Attachment 4 for both contracts --
A I am there.
Q -- the language in 2.2 for both contracts is
identical again, isn't it?
A Yes, it is.
Q Could you go to $\mathrm{A}-4,4.5$ ?
A I'm sorry?
Q A-4, 4.5. Attachment 4, 4.5.
A Okay.

9 And make sure you're familiar with both of those sections.

A I am, and they are the same.
Q They are the same. And 4.5 says that when elements and combinations are currently interconnected and functional, such elements and combinations will remain interconnected and functional without any disconnection or disruption of functionality. This shall be known as the contiguous network interconnection of network elements. Is that correct?

A That's correct. That is standard language in all of the agreements.

Q Okay. Now, go to section -- Part 4, Pricing, Section 34.

A I'm there.
Q Now, Section 34 between both contracts, would you familiarize yourself with that?

A Yes.
9 Now, with respect to the -- with the exception of the reference in the Kentucky contract to the Kentucky Commission and in the Florida contract to the Florida Commission, the language in Section 34 in Part 4 is the same in both contracts?

A Exactly right. And that simply goes back to what I had mentioned earlier as being part of the base
agreement.
Q Now go down to section 36, which is on that same page.

A I am there.
Q Now, the language in section 36 of both contracts is identical, isn't it?

A Yes, it is.
Q Now, there's a provision in the Florida agreement, 36.1 , that is not in the Kentucky agreement; is that correct?

A That is correct.
Q And 36.1 is the language concerning eliminating duplication of activities and essentially costs, charges, when unbundled network elements are combined; is that correct?

A Yes. But I think there is a key that's been overlooked throughout the hearing. If you look at 36.1, it's about halfway of the agreement, it states: "BellSouth and AT\&T shall work together to agree upon the total prices." And that's -- charges. And that's not simply the nonrecurring charges, but also the recurring charges to be paid when multiple elements are ordered.

And so that is a key difference, and it appears to me that we focus only on one part of those
charges. We do not -- or we have not focused on the recurring charges, which would be the glue charge; you know, if there's a glue charge for putting the rate elements together for AT\&T as our customer.

Q You're obligated under the contract, I believe, to provide combinations to AT\&T; is that correct?

A Yes, we are, but there is no price for those combinations.

Q And there's no price for a glue charge either, is there?

A There is no price, and I think that's why this language speaks to that, because there is no price, and we are to meet to determine what that appropriate price is.

2 Now, it's your position that when AT\&T buys combinations that replicate a BellSouth retail service, that the rate should be retail less the discount; is that correct?

A That is correct.
9 Now, this section that indicates that AT\&T and BellSouth are to work together or ultimately have the Commission decide in terms of removing duplication from combinations of network elements, that would have no meaning in the context of a combination that is
priced at resale, would it?
A Well, I think there are two different things, and I think your focus -- well, let me say, first, I do not agree.

I think there are two different things, and your focus is mainly on the first sentence. But the second part of this paragraph focuses on multiple elements wherein the first part would focus on elements combined on a single order, and those are two different things.

And I think most of the focus has been in what we studied in the cost studies -- and I'm not the cost witness -- but what we studied in the cost studies was the multiple elements on a single order, wherein the second part of that that has been overlooked focused on us working together to come up with prices when there are multiple elements.

Q But if combinations of elements, whether they include duplication or not, the provision that requires that duplication be eliminated when multiple elements are combined, that has no meaning if you price them at resale less a discount; is that correct?

A That's a difficult question to answer, because we have resale that we assess now. And, granted, if you're assessing resale, then the issue of
duplicate charges would not be raised. It would not be a relevant issue until you sit down to come up with charges as to what that charge should be when multiple elements are ordered and asked to be combined by BellSouth.

Q Could you turn to the Kentucky order for a moment, please? Could you turn to Page 21 of the Kentucky order, please? Read Section 9 that begins on Page 21, please.

A Section 11 begins on --
Q I mean, 11. I'm sorry.
A Yes, I've read it.
0 Now, that provision in the Kentucky order states that BellSouth's argument that the purchase of network elements to create a service pursuant to 251 (c) (3) must be priced at the rate for purchase of service for resale under Section 251(c)(4). The Kentucky Commission rejected that argument from BellSouth, did it not?

A That is what is stated here, and they did, in fact, reject that, $I$ believe.

Q And didn't the Kentucky Commission rule that AT\&T can combine network elements whether or not they create or duplicate a service of BellSouth, and that those network elements would be priced at the sum of
the network element prices?
A Yes, they did.
Q So Kentucky would be considered a platform state for BellSouth using the jargon. Would that be correct?

A Platform is yours, your term.
Q A UNE platform?
A Yes. As you define platform, I would agree. But we are here in Florida, and in Florida the order is quite different; and the contract that we had with AT\&T was drafted to reflect what was in the florida order.

Q Now, we just walked through the various contract provisions. What is different between the Kentucky contract and the Florida contract that says that Kentucky combinations of UNEs are priced at the sum of the network elements, while in Florida they are not?

A Well, I think the key difference is this: Granted, Attachment -- Part 4, which deals with pricing, and when you look at the various pricing elements in Part 4 they look very similar.

However, the key difference is 36.1 and the paragraph that has been overlooked in this hearing, you know, with us working together to determine what
the appropriate recurring price would be when there are multiple elements.

So I think that is the key difference and that that is a really big difference. And I think the other thing is the order, the order that's been cited in this case wherein BellSouth attempted to get language included in the agreement that was rejected, you know, when we tried to include that language to reflect what was in the order.

So as far as the agreement, 36.1 is key, and as far as something outside of the agreement, you would have the order that would indicate that this issue had not been addressed wherein it had been addressed in this state.

Q Didn't you state in your deposition that in order to accomplish pricing of UNEs at the sum of the network element prices in the contract, you would have to have explicit language directing that that be priced, combinations be priced, at the sum of the elements?

A I'm not sure those were my exact words, but the gist of what you're saying is true, that you would need to have language in the agreement. And I would hope that that agreement would have been modified to reflect what was actually ordered, since that is the
basis that we operated on in formulating this agreement as well as others throughout the BellSouth region once we put together a base agreement.

Q There's no explicit such language in the Kentucky contract, is there?

A There is no language that would point to that, but there is an order which is different from the order that we have here; and, further, we have 36.1 that is clear that the parties are to work together to come up with those prices.

Q If 36.1 were not in the Florida contract, then that contract would be virtually identical to the Kentucky contract. Wouldn't that suggest that the price of the network elements under the Florida contract would be the same as the Kentucky contract?

A I would say not, no; definitely not. As stated earlier, the attempt was made to keep everything as common as we could throughout these states and then go in and make a part of the agreements what had been ordered.

So to indicate where something is different in a given agreement and everything else is pretty much the same that we should abide by the rules in a different state, no, that doesn't make sense. We will abide by what's in this agreement.

Q But the Commission orders that when
unbundled network elements are combined, then AT\&T and BellSouth negotiate to remove duplication and tasks that AT\&T doesn't need when those elements are combined; isn't that correct?

A That's part of it. There's a second part that is missing yet, and that second part is that BellSouth and AT\&T shall work together to agree upon a total recurring and nonrecurring charge to be paid by AT\&T when ordering multiple elements. There's a second part.

8 And that would be taken, subject to the provision of the Commission's order and as reflected in 36.1 , that those recurring and nonrecurring charges for combinations of unbundled network elements be priced to avoid duplication of activities that we don't need and things that we don't use?

A You lost me after the second word. That was a real long question. Would you mind repeating it?

Q 36.1 has to be read in the context of the Commission's order that says when combinations of network elements are provided, that the price should avoid duplication of activities that we don't need and things that we don't -- that are not needed and not provided. It says that, does it not?

A As does the agreement, and that's the first part. But there is a second part that everyone has missed, and that second part begins with the second sentence.

2 And that's the part where we just avoid the duplication of things on an order. You avoid duplicate ordering provisions; is that correct?

A I do not agree with that, no.
Ms. WHITE: Mr. Hatch, Madame Chairman, Commissioners, I apologize; but I am supposed to be in an oral argument on Supra across the hall.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I thought I'd allow him to finish this dialogue, but it's taking a little longer than I thought. Let me allow this last answer to the question, and then we'll break.

MS. WHITE: Thank you.
Q (BY Mr. Hatch) So is it your position that the Commission only said that the price for -- that duplication referred only to combinations when orders were combined on a single order? Is that what your testimony is?

A No. I don't believe that's what I've stated.

Q Okay. Did the Commission require that duplication of charges and activities we don't need be
removed from the price, the recurring and nonrecurring rates for combinations of unbundled network elements?

A And the answer is yes, and that's what's quoted here in 36.1 , the first sentence.

2 And they also said when you combine unbundled network elements on a single order, duplicate costs and charges with respect to the ordering process also be removed; is that correct?

A That also is in the first sentence. And the answer is yes. I'm sorry.

0 Now, if we're required to negotiate recurring and nonrecurring rates for combinations of unbundled network elements that BellSouth will provision, then doesn't it flow that if the pricing provisions of the Kentucky contract are the same as the pricing provisions in the Florida contract, the only meaning to be given to 36.1 is we get the sum of the network elements for the combination; that's the top price, and that we then proceed to remove duplication for things that we don't need and functions that aren't provided to us pursuant to 36.1 ?

A No, I do not agree with that, and I think that flies in the face of the Act where the Act talks about the risk associated with -- of combining elements. I think one part of it is to eliminate
duplicate charges on a single order, but the other part is to reflect a market based price wherein you do not assume the risk of having to staff; you do not assume the risk of having to buy trucks; you do not assume the risk of anything else that you would have to do to put those UNEs together to actually offer a retail service. We actually assume that risk. And that price should reflect market pricing as well as the risk associated with doing such.

Q Does the Kentucky contract --
CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Hatch, I'm going to break here, and then I'll allow you to pick up at that point after we reconvene.
(Unrelated discussion off the record.)
CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We'll break until 4:00. MB. WHITE: Thank you, and I apologize. (Brief recess.)
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change $535 / 10,535 / 12,535 / 13,535 / 19,539 / 19$, 545/4, 555/2, 613/2
changes 619/9
Chapter 538/9, 53e/16, 538/22
charge $556 / 4,561 / 8,578 / 12,57 / 16,57 / 17,616 / 19$, $667 / 2,667 / 3,667 / 10,669 / 3,673 / 9$
charged 555/9
chargea $518 / 8,530 / 4,530 / 13,531 / 6,531 / 11,531 / 23$, $532 / 4,532 / 19,543 / 5,543 / 6,543 / 14,543 / 16,543 / 19$, $543 / 22,549 / 13,555 / 10,555 / 11,560 / 6,560 / 7$, $546 / 14$, $586 / 15,587 / 14,587 / 25,589 / 12,599 / 24,590 / 6,590 / 9$, $590 / 12,590 / 18,608 / 21,609 / 5,609 / 8,609 / 9,609 / 11$, $609 / 13,609 / 16,666 / 14,666 / 20,666 / 21,666 / 22,667 / 1$, 667/2, 659/1, 669/3, 673/14, 674/25, 675/7, 676/1 charging 535
chart 543/12, 5s9/8, 5e6/19, 586/24, 587/6, 587/20 charts 521/14, 521/15, 521/17, 53019, 582/16 cheaper 542/19
Chief $51 \mathrm{~g} / 22$
choome $540 / 23,540 / 24,541 / 1,649 / 12,653 / 22,663 / 21$ chooeen $662 / 15,662 / 21$
choouting $607 / 18$
chowe 551/7, 553/13
chowen 633/15
chrcles 559/19
Circuit 521/13, 521/18, 521/19, 522/6, 522/23, 523/2, 523/18, 523/24, $521 / 23,548 / 6,550 / 9,550 / 16,550 / 17$, $551 / 20,552 / 5,552 / 11,553 / 2,554 / 9,557 / 5,559 / 24$, $560 / 1,565 / 3,564 / 12,564 / 14,605 / 13,606 / 1,606 / 5$, cos/7, cosis, cos/16, cos/17, cos/1s, col/2, cos/1,

## 646/11, 646/16

Ctreutt? 52519, 550/23, 551/13, 551/24, 551/13, s5417, $561 / 19,562 / 21,561 /, 593 / 20,603 / 11,607 / 15$, co7/22
circumetances 591/17, 591/18, 597/13
circumvent $5241,52 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{s}, 547 / 8,554 / 23$
citte 527/24, 522/4, 651/2, 65/12, 652/1, 658/14
cited $650 / 11,655 / 12,671 / 5$
chamas 589/14
CLARK 518/15, 520/18, 520/21, 529/15, 529/22, 529/25, 5301, 530/17, 530/22, 530/25, 531/4, 531/18, $531 / 25,532 / 6,532 / 9,532 / 20,540 / 10,540 / 16,540 / 19$, 541/2, 541/6, 541/9, 541/14, 541/22, 542/18, 543/1, 5437, 543/21, 543/25, 54/6, 5419, 544/13, 544/19, $54121,5561,55413,555 / 15,55322,5561,55616$, 55611 , $55 / 23,557 / 16,55918,56 / 4,560 / 13,560 / 25$, 561/16
clean co3/12
clear-api 603/5
clear $530 / 10$, 502/1, 647/20, 672/5
CLEC 52418, 524/21, $567 / 5$, $56 / 4 / 5,56 / 6,564 / 8$, 574/20, 574/25, 576/2, 576/10, 576/12, 576/19, 576/24, $579 / 22,589 / 24,599 / 25,599 / 2,599 / 11,589 / 23,590 / 1$, $596 / 4,59616$
CLEC' $562 / 15,577 / 3$
CLECs $523 / 19,562 / 11,562 / 22,569 / 2,575 / 20,584 / 1$
clove 543/4, $603 / 22,605 / 24$
colncide 662/3
collect 608/20, 6098 , $609 / 9$
collecting 587/13
collocate 574/5,596/8
collocated $567 / 3,567 / 4,567 / 11,56 / 111,569 / 2$,
569/9, 575/2, 576/4, 57/13, 576/21, 593/6, 595/21, 596/25, 597/7, 648/23
collocation $551 / 5,561 / 18,562 / 12,562 / 15,562 / 21$, $563 / 11,563 / 13,564 / 5,564 / 14,564 / 15,566 / 20,566 / 21$, $566 / 23,567 / 1,567 / 17$, 5ce/16, 5ce/17, 571/11, 574/7, 575/8, 575/11, 575/15, 575/21, 596/1, 59/2, 596/3, 596/17, 596/19, 596/23, 597/4, 597/11, 59/21, 613/7, 61518
Column 555/1, 560/21, 560/23
columna 587/16
combination 525/14, 525/21, 527/1, 528/14, 528/16, $529 / 3,533 / 24,535 / 22,535 / 24,535 / 25,53677,536 / 8$, $536 / 10,536 / 14,536 / 20,536 / 21,536 / 25,537 / 6,537 / 7$, $539 / 3,539 / 16,542 / 8,545 / 15,546 / 21,553 / 18,553 / 19$, 553/20, 553/22, 56e/4, 564/5, 574/4, 574/6, 574/8, 574/12, 582/7, 614/15, 614/16, 614/17, 646/18, 647/22, 6466, c49/9, 650/25, 652/8, 652/18, 657/23, 65818, 667/25, 675/18
combinations $518 / 8,521 / 21,527 / 17,529 / 1,529 / 7$, $52: / 19,529 / 12,531 / 5,53 / 11,532 / 25,534 / 19,534 / 23$, $53 / 125,533 / 4,533 / 14,536 / 12,545 / 1,54 / 11,545 / 17$, 5461, 547/21, $547 / 24,54 / 4,34 / 7,550 / 1,614 / 21$,
 6679, $667 / 17,667 / 24,66118,67 \omega 16,671 / 19,673115$, $673 / 21,674 / 19,673 / 2,675 / 12$
combine 524/12, 52516, 542/4, 549/6, 5507, 550/12, 55011, 551/23, 551/25, 552/1, 553/9, 553/10, 555/1, 553/2, 555/5, $561 / 20,562 / 12,567 / 5,574 / 15,606 / 6$, 606/s, C06/14, $606 / 15,606 / 25,607 / 3,607 / 5,646 / 12$, $649 / 11,662 / 21,669 / 23,675 / 5$
combined $524 / 7,521 / 10,524 / 20,524 / 24,525 / 3$, 525/7, 525/8, 529/9, 529/18, 530/1, 539/2, 531/5, $531 / 10,532 / 7,551 / 17,552 / 6,533 / 2,551 / 22,585 / 22$, 595/23, 589/19, 604/25, 615/21, 646/13, 646/19. $646 / 23,64 / 12,649 / 24,666 / 15,669 / 9,66 / 21,66 / 4$, 673/2, 673/5, 674/20
combinet 52418, cas/2, cocks
combining $52 / 2,525 / 10,531 / 15,550 / 15,552 / 7$, 552/2, 552/14, 552/17, 552/22, 553/1, 554/25, 555/3, $557 / 1,562 / 16,562 / 23,574 / 11,57 / 112,597 / 13,597 / 21$, 597/24, 605/8, 675/24
Commenced 51/18
commensurately 573/14
comments 589/s
COMMISSION 519/1, 51监23, 519/17, 537/20, $537 / 24,5316,54614,55013,553 / 12$, $551 / 19,586 / 16$, 589/15, ccol14, 602/25, coe/11, col/6, c09/7, 611/21, $61611,61618,649 / 10,64 / 16,6507,650 / 19,650 / 23$, $650 / 24,651 / 5,659 / 11,661 / 2,661 / 4,665 / 21,665 / 22$, 667/23, 66918, 662/22, 673/1, 674/18, 674/24 Comminalen's $523 / 10,539 / 5,534 / 17,538 / 23$, 55414, 554/19, 559/10, 590/17, 5s4/9, ce0/13, 649/9, 65at, 673/13, 673/21
COMMISSIONER 51815, 518/16, 520/18, 520/21, $520 / 23,521 / 1,529 / 15,529 / 22,529 / 25,530 / 4,530 / 17$, $539 / 22,53 / 25,531 / 4,531 / 15,531 / 25,532 / 6,532 / 9$, $532 / 20$, $54 / 10,540 / 16,540 / 19,541 / 2,541 / \%, 541 / 9$, 541/14, 541/22, 542/18, 543/1, 543/7, 543/21, 543/25, 5446, 54/9, 54/13, 54/11, 54/21, 546/7, 546/15, $547 / 2,547 / 13,5556,55 / 13,55 / 15,553 / 22,556 / 1$, $5566,54 / 17,55 / 23,557 / 16,55 / 4,559 / 18,560 / 4$,

5ca/13, 560/25, 561/16, 564/25, $573 / 20,573 / 25$, $522 / 15,502 / 20,532 / 25,544 / 20,5036,612 / 12,613 / 19$, 615/22, 651/23
Commingioners 520/10, 674/10
common $533 / 23,533 / 25,535 / 16,537 / 7$, 594/11, $595 / 2,59 / 18,59 / 9,59 / 13,59 / 16,59 / 18,59 / 19$, 5931, 593/3, 5\%3/4, 593/3, 672/18
Communications 518/4
compantes couls
company 559/s, se:/14
compared $652 / 10$
compel 518/6
compete 612/20
cempeting $522 / 20,523 / 7,523 / 11,550 / 12$
competition $523 / 13$
competitive 523/9, 559/4, 559/14, 606/4, 612/16
competitor stern
complitiatis $576 / 2,576 / 7$
complete 523/4, 534/11
complicated 539/25
complies 549/11, 57/19, 577/17, 581/17
comply 518/7, 657/24, 659/19
concelvable $541 / 24$
cencerti 553/1, 555/3, 555/4, 650/12, 651/19
concerned $540 / 11,540 / 14,540 / 21,552 / 13,554 / 20$,
555/23, 5ce/4
concluding $612 / 1$
conchuaions $523 / 17$
condition 541/23,542/1
conditions $524 / 3,528 / 21,541 / 21,542 / 13,548 / 25$,
549/2, $664 / 4$
Conference 518/19
conflict COW/5, COC/7
confused $529 / 16,582 / 18$
confudea 554/6
Cengrean 5232, 541/24
conjunction $523 / 20$
cemmet $571 / 19,577 / 2$, $500 / 22,595 / 11,585 / 15$
commected 5921 , $592 / 5,592 / 23,592 / 25,593 / 5$, 597/19, 59e/3
connection 567/21, 568/21, 569/17, 571/22, 614/2
connections 570/2,573/3
considerable $590 / 1$
condatent 534/17, 554/16
congtitutes cow/17
construction $523 / 4$
contact 592/19
contalia 526/18, 529/11
contained $646 / 15,652 / 23$
contention $613 / 25$
context $59 / 23,599 / 15,602 / 9,651 / 22,667 / 25,673 / 20$ contiguons 665/9
continue 559/19, 559/3, 587/18, 599/19, 609/1, 647/13 conthimes 521/5
conthraing 660/11
contract $519 / 20,525 / 15,523 / 22,527 / 22,527 / 25$, 529/10, 529/14, 529/18, 528/21, 529/1, 529/7, 529/17, 530/7, 532/22, 532/23, 533/2, 533/4, 533/9, 533/12, $533 / 14,533 / 18,534 / 2,53 / 19,53 / 22,535 / 7,535 / 9$, $536 / 18,535 / 21,536 / 10,536 / 23,539 / 18,547 / \%, 547 / \%$, 547/18, 551/12, 551/17, 551/20, 551/21, 551/22, 554/15, 594/10, $607 /$, $614 / 15,615 / 21,655 / 3,660 / 20$,
 670/14, 67/115, 671/17, 672/5, 672/11, 672/12, 672/13 672/15, 675/15, 675/16, 676/10
 C63/25, $66 / 1 / 8,66 / 17,66 / 19,66 / 16,665 / 23,666 / 6$ contribution 559/16, 55918
contributions 559/22
control 522/21, cod 18
controlling 607/22
contrels 539/12, 569/14
converation 564/4
convertations sselio
coordinated 577/7
ceordination $577 / 10,577 / 23,577 / 25,579 / 3,579 / 5$, 578/6, $578 / 7,57 / 10,578 / 15,573 / 21,579 / 4,579 / 14$, 579/16, 579/20
coples 54/13, 594/19, 660/1
copy $521 / 15,548 / 10,577 / 13,659 / 8,658 / 12,651 / 7$, 661/9
copying 5e2/24
Corperation 518/5
Correct 52/17, 525/6, 525/18, 527/9, 527/12,
527/19, 527/20, 528/11, 528/18, 532/25, 533/1, 533/2, 534/13, 53/14, 536/3, 537/9, 537/10, 539/8, 539/9, $53910,54511,547 / 22,549 / 15,550 / 20,550 / 21,551 / 2$, $551 / \mathrm{K}, 552 / 4,552 / 14,553 / 5,55316,554 / 10,55411$, 557/22, 557/23, 554/8, 559/16, 562/23, $562 / 24,56116$, $5663,566 / 12,566 / 13,56411,564 / 18,564124,569 / 3$, 5c9121, 57/13, 572/24, 573/1, 573/5, 573/7, 573/15, $5781,57 / 24,578 / 25,589 / 21,581 / 23,583 / 3,583 / 12$, $583 / 16,585 / 14,506 / 16,506 / 20,596 / 21,597 / 14$,

507/22, 591/19, 59120, 5906, 5927, 592/2, 592/6,
 coan11, coa/12, coph15, co3/15, co3/25, cow/1, cos/3, costs, coen22, cce/23, coenh, 647/23, 64922, 64977, C4e/17, C49/16, $65 / 3,651 / 24,652 / 14,653 / 2,6847$, $654 / 23,655 / 3,655120,656 / 3,656 / 14,656 / 18,664 / 1$,
 667/19, $667 / 20$, 669/22, 670/5, 673/5, 674/7, 675/3 corrections 619/8
correctly 524/16, 563/1, 600/25
COA 597/7
cont 542/22, $542 / 24,542 / 25,54 / 2,54 / 17,54 / 20$, 549/19, 551/1, 558/4, 559/5, 559/9, 551/11, 55913, $559114,559 / 1,559 / 4,559110,560 / 7,560 / 10,600 / 21$, $\mathbf{\omega} 01 / 2,601 / 7,601 / 13,602 / 6,602 / 9,61615,616 / 16$, ccel12, cce/13
conting 558/20
 602/3, $602 / 4,616 / 11,666 / 14,675 / 7$
conch 63/17
couched 649/22
Councel 530/19
couple 599/3, 603/3, 612/12, 659/5
conrte 520/13, 520/16, 573/19
Court 552/13, 553/3, 55316, 607/24, 660/2
Court's 548/6
cover 559/13
covers 54/12
Crafton 56/2
create 551/5, 669/15, 669/24
credit 611/6
Crom 519/4, 519/8, 520/7, 521/7, 603/10, 647/4, 647/17, 659/2
cromeconnect $566 / 9,567 / 4,567 / 10,567 / 16,557 / 18$, $567124,569 / 22,569 / 23,5691,56920,569 / 23,569 / 24$, $570 / 12,570 / 24,571 / 1,571 / 16,571 / 17,571 / 19,571 / 25$ 572/1, 572/7, 572/12, 572/19, 590/22, 593/5, 59\%/ 5993
crom-conmects $570 / 5,570 / 7,575 / 1,576 / 20,589 / 17$. 5e0/19, 580/20, 581/7, s8ch10
crone-extmination 647/6
croas-tection 614/7
CSR 518/22,518/23
curions 547/11
currently $526 / 22,535 / 17,537 / 4,539 / 3,539 / 17$, 561/22, 564/7, 597/6, 647/21, 655/2, 665/5
contomer $525 / 24,536 / 5,540 / 2,540 / 4,543 / 10$, 543/13, 54/4/4, 561/10, 566/1, 566/7, 573/4, 574/22, $576 / 5,578 / 22,579 / 5,579 / 7,579 / 12,590 / 23,590 / 24$, $582 / 5,589 / 3,591 / 12,591 / 15,592 / 5,593 / 9,604 / 23$, $611 / 1,613 / 14,613 / 15,614 / 25,615 / 10,617 / 13,649 / 1$, 649/2, 667/4
customer's 560/5
customers $565 / 22,575 / 21,576 / 3,594 / 3$, 589/14,
$591 / 11,61 / 16,610 / 23,611 / 4,611 / 2,65 / 19,65 / 24$, 656/25, $657 / 16,657 / 22,6586,651 / 24$

## 1

## dare 615/25

data $519 / 11,59418,590 / 25$, col/14, cos/21, co9/12, 609/14, c09/15, 609/19, 610/3, 610/15, 611/7, 611/12,
$611 / 20,612 / 2,612 / 6,656 / 18,657 / 21$
DATE 51817, 651/12, $651 / 13$
day $578 / 11,550 / 13,590 / 15,590 / 16,581 / 1 /$
day $583 / 12,583 / 14,593 / 20,585 / 10,585 / 14,585 / 17$
deal COS/20, 612/5
dealing 547/10, COK/12, coc/13
deale 54312, 670/20
dealt 552/15
DRASON 518/13, 547/2, 547/13, 558/4, 564/25,
$573 / 20,573 / 25,582 / 15,582 / 20,582 / 25$, $589 / 6$
dechde 569/6,577/3, 657/23
decider 609/7
decition 525/9, $525 / 12,550 / 23,550 / 25,551 / 13$,
$551 / 20,551 / 24,552 / 11,552 / 20,552 / 23,555 / 25,557 / 7$,
562/22, 577/3, 593/16, 593/20, 651/7
decisions 554/17, 559/10, 561/19
dedicated $585 / 4,593 / 2,595 / 14,593 / 23$
detine 574/23,670/8
defined 656/10
delfver 552/15, 574/13, 574/17
delivered $575 / 11,573 / 24$
delivery 562/17
demand $581 / 10$
demarcation $569 / 5$
Demonetratee 543/11
denied 616/18
deny 657/14
depends 531/9
deplet $566 / 24,567 / 1,5726,572 / 14$
depletion 5691
deponition $547 /$, $577 / 7,577 / 11,581 / 12,581 / 25$,

532/2, 531/5, 58/12, 611/18, 647/3, 647/9, 671/15
dowertibe 533/23, 596/2
demeribed $57 / 2,575 / 22,579 / 4,585 / 19$, cch/s
docerifing 55:15, 570/3
deetre sse/15, 55\%17
dectred 5891
detall 591/23, 610/22
details $593 / 4$
detartifed 633/s
determination $536 / 2$, $609 / 6$
determine 592/11, $609 / 12,667 / 14,670 / 25$
determined 537/11
determines 592/9, 59/4
determining $535 / 25$
diatram 571/7, 571/9, 571/14, 572/2, 572/17, 573/6,
615/9
diagrams 571/2, 542/16, 615/5
dial 592/12, 592/16, 592/22, 593/7, 593/8, 593/12, 593/15
dialogue 674/13
dictates $532 / 10$
difier $67 / 11$
difierence $543 / 3,554 / 3,555 / 18$, $564 / 24,665 / 24$,
670/19, 670/23, 671/3, 671/4
differences 662/3
differentiate $617 / 2,617 / 5,617 / 5,617 / 9$
difierentiates 617/4
ditilicult sedic, cce/23
Direet 519\%, 519/7, 527/15, $565 \%$, $603 / 10$, co9/22,
612/19, 619/4, 619/12, 61915
direeting $671 / 18$
direction 551/5, 561/7
directory 600/
ditagreed 524/s
diappears 541/17, 541/20
discomrect $567 / 7,589 / 19,590 / 24,580 / 25,581 / 13$, 591/22, 592/11
dinconmecting 591/24, 596/15
dirconasection c6ER
diseount $525 / 18,539 / 8,539 / 12,539 / 20,506 / 20$,
551/18, $55 / 13,601 / 10, ~ 601 / 21, ~ 602 / 13, ~ c 02 / 18, ~ c 02 / 21, ~$
603/1, $667 / 19,669 / 22$
discounted 540/12
dincount COO/15, C01/12, C02/23, CO2/25
diecusped 527/18, 574/3, 599/4, 599/13
diecustion $578 / 20,586 / 13,599 / 13,676 / 14$
diepute scols
ditaputing 614/14
disruption 593/8, 665/3
dietance $526 / 12,541 / 18,542 / 11,542 / 14,54 / 12$,
35\%1, 6567
distinction 552/5, 552/9, 552/10, $\mathbf{6 0 1 / 1 6}$
ditinguinh 5ce/17
dintribution $536 / 5,569 / 23,592 / 24,592 / 25,593 / 2$
DMOQ. 533/4
DOCKET 518/3
Document 531/3, 543/11, 54/15, 562/1, 5656,
571/4, 577/13, $5 \times 9 / 4,6 c 0 / 15,661 / 1$
docin't 529/14, 524/1, 527/R, 52/118, 529/4, 529/6,
$532 / 6,533 / 9,536 / 7,536 / 20,53 / 6,534 / 24,535 / 2$,
574/14, $577 / 24,579 / 17,592 / 7,609 / 3,61715,617 / 9$,
$672 / 24,673 / 4,675 / 14$
dollar 5\%/12
doubt 657/9
drafted 690/11
drawing 567/21, 653/7
drawn 552/10
drew 532/5
DS-1 532/16
duck 561/13, $551 / 14$
duplicate $530 / 4,539 / 13,531 / 6,531 / 11,532 / 4$,
$532 / 19,536 / 7,536 / 20,54 / 23,66911,699 / 24,674 / 7$, 67517, 6761
duplicanted 66010
duplicates 536/1
duplication c6e13, 667/23, c69/19, 6c9/20, 673/3,
673/16, 673/23, 674/6, 674/19, 674/25, 675/20
dupllatior 539/1
durting 616/10
duty $543 / 20,550 / 14$

## E

## equel 530/19

## Easley 512/19

eany 539/23, 614124
economic 359/10
effeet $555 / 4,557 / 6,557 / 9,557 / 11$
effectante 561/18, 552/21
efliciently $592 / 10$
efight 546/17
electrical 506/9
lectronic $599 / 10$
clement $529 / 9,529 / 19,53 / 12,535 / 2,536 \%, 536 / 13$ $539 / 4,54316,54116,5451,549 / 13,54921,530 / 19$,
 $59911,599 / 23,600 / 4,60 / 11,651 / 3,65724,67011$, 67117
clement: $513 / 3,521 / 23,522 / 15,522 / 23,527 / 11$, $529 / 13,524 / 16,52122,529 / 9,52914,531 / 3,532 / 24$, $533 / 3,533 / 6,533 / 11,533 / 16,533 / 19,333 / 20,533 / 24$, $534 / 1,53410,534 / 11,534 / 11,533 / 4,535 / 13,535 / 11$, $536 \mathrm{~s}, 53 \mathrm{k} 22,53 \mu / 15,54013,5496,34 / 25,545 / 12$,
$546 / 1,546 / 22,5497,544 / 23,549 / 5,549 / 7,559 / 1$, $5506,5507,550 / 11,550 / 15,551 / 11,533 / 4,353 / 10$, $554 / 4,53422,561 / 20,362116,363 / 9,557 / 6,566 / 5$,
 $599 / 4,591 / 14,593 / 23,596 / 15,59 / 16,596 / 20,597 / 17$,
 coa/2s, $607 / 4,607 / 7,607 / 13,607 / 17,613 / 5,613 / 16$, $615 / 1,615 / 20,617 / 10,646 / 23,649 / 18,680 / 24,60 / 25$, $651 / 2,651 / 3,61 / 2,662 / 13,662 / 20$, $664 / 5$, 6646 , 664/7, 665/3, 665/6, $665 / 10,66 / 14,66 / 22,667 / 4$, 667/24, 6ce/8, 6ce/s, 66i/14, 668/17, 668/18, 668/21, (669/4, $669 / 15,669 / 23,669 / 25,670 / 17,670 / 22,671 / 2$; $671 / 20,672 / 14,673 / 2,673 / 4,673 / 10,673 / 15,673 / 22$, $675 / 2,675 / 6,675 / 13,673 / 18,675 / 25$
elliminate
eliminated 541/23, 668/20
elliminating 666/13
employed 6191
and $567 / 13,581 / 22,59933,599 / 17,590 / 3$, 59816 , $633 / 14,63 / 15,633 / 23,653 / 22,63 / 24,656 / 25$, $657 / 22,681 / 5,658 / 23,662 / 13,663 / 16,663 / 21$
end! 573/17, 612/7, 61411, 647/2
engatged cos/4
engincering 5968, 593/15
entallied $529 / 10,596 / 15,609 / 7$, 609/17, 609/1 entrant $605 / 14$
entrants $521 / 22,322 / 9,603 / 14$
entry 5236
environment 559/25
envidiont 566/21
equipment $576 / 25,596 / 3,594 / 7,59610,596 / 11$, $59 / 13,396 / 25,597 / 2,597 / 18,613111,613112,61410$, 617/11
Replanede 519/30
ectablich 54671
entabliwhed coan4, $601 / 3$
enablinhing $601 / 20$
entimite 5642s
evaluating 3647
event 6775, 657K, 657/13, ce7hs
event 66717, 67/h5, 630/5, 659/22
evidence sq8/10, 590/11, $617 / 23,6182,618 / 6$
Examiantion $519 / 4,519 / 6,519 / 4,521 / 7,603 / 10$, 61/19, 647/17, 65\%2
examine $532 / 18$
exception csy/4, cos/20
Ercerpity 519/17, 519/18, 659/11, 659/21, 659/23. ccol11, $6 \cos 23,61 / 15,651 / 16$, © 6412
exchange $549 / 4,550 / 3,558 / 5,56015,60 / 4,6048$, 60413, $617 / 5$
exclucle 600/21, $601 / 1$
exchative $\mathbf{6 2 / 1 6}$, $652 / 15$
Ercute 59/12
excured $617 / 17$
exemption $54 / 4,550 / 1$
exhbit $562 / 7,562 / 8,56513,574 / 2,587 / 4,590 / 23$,
$591 / 2,591 / 5,591 / 5,591 / 4,617 / 24,618 / 2,618 / 6$,
$647 / 7,647 / 9,647 / 15,659 / 15,660 / 7,660 / 25,6 \leqslant 1 / 3$
EXFIBITS $519 / 9,581 / 13,617 / 19,617 / 23,64 / 2$ exint 527/5, 615/17
exicting $525 / 15,540 / 2,500 / 23,603 / 3,649 / 2,649 / 2$, 650/16
endras 607/11, coa/3
expeditiove 523/13
expenses $600 / 16,601 / 4,601 / 21,602 / 10,602 / 15$
expericice 537/23
explanation 661/15
explielt 671/18, 672/4
expound 612/17
expremed 35419
extend 52s/20
extemaly 524/24, 52e/2s
extrancous 568/2

553/12, 554/1, 557/5, 560/5, 563/10, 563/11, 579/22, $587 / 15,601 / 9,607 / 7,607 / 25,646 / 23,640 / 12,652 / 23$, $653 / 21,67 / 20,66921$
fathory 653/23
facied 655/21
filling $576 / 3$
falth 347 h 1
fampliarive 663/3, $663 / 17$
Enhion 366/2, 574/5, 579/4, 589/1, 653/17
PCC Cos/17, 65/11
fearible $541 / 24,654 / 9$, 654/17, 655/1, 653/6, 655/13
fenture $526 / 19,326 / 24,527 / 4,527 / 5,65 / 3,634 / 5$,
65420, 655/7, 653/3, 65/10, 65318
features $525 / 23,526 / 3,5349,543 / 15,54 / 12$,
509122, se9/25, $601 / 17,61012,633 / 13,633 / 19$,
$633 / 20,653 / 21,653 / 25,664 /, 64 / 16,653 / 2$
Pebruary 541/16, 647/
foe 59612
fietion 554/3
fictition 613/9
Pigure 565/21, 566/16, 567/8, 569/6, 569718, 574/9, $601 / 5,601 / 4,606 / 22$
tile $53 / / 24,537 / 12,537 / 17,537 / 19,545 / 2,543 / 13$, 546/6, 546/13
nisd $527 / 7,5306,53 \% 15,539 / 5,539 / 15,547 / \mathrm{K}$,
54777, 582/23
flling 545/10, 545/20, 346/4
Ilinge $537 / 24$
find 522/4, 55412, 55418, 563/17, 582/2, 593/21, 65010
finding 616/23
tire 520/12, 521/1, 521/2, 522/11, 56/15, 584/9
finith 67413
Inimhed 605/15
five $380 / 10$
Hes 675/23

$661 / 7,661 / 21,662 / 2,662 / 11,6621,66322,6667$,
6709, 67011, 670/15, 67017, 672/11, 672/14, $673 / 16$
thow 67514
foem 646/25, 64/3, 665/6, 669/5, 669/11
focused 667h, 66 16
fecuate cser
tocusdug wo7ho
tolle $660 / 4$
follow 529h16, 573/21, 580/17
forlow 52012, 618/1
forces 533/s
form $530 / 12$
formulinting 67211
found $527 / 21,656 / 21$
fear $531 / 23,532 / 12,532 / 17,563 / 19,570 / 5,570 / 6$, 572/25
frame $5664,567 / 15,567 / 6,567 / 4$, $569 / 23$, 569/25,
$569 / 1,569 / 4,5696,569 / 25,570 / 23,570 / 24,571 / 1$,
$592 / 24,592 / 25,593 / 2,597 / 4,597 / 10,597 / 11,597 / 22$,
$597 / 25,59 / 4,59 / 10,59 / 23,599 / 2,606 / 23,606 / 24$
framen $594 / 4,5977$
framework 662/23
frent 521/12, 570/15
function 599/18
functional 66516,6657
functionalities c03/15, $603 / 20,603 / 23,604 / 16$
functionality $585 / 13,585 / 17,585 / 18,585 / 21,665 / 1$
functions 558/6, $600 / 23,675 / 21$
furnifh 610/8, 611/19, 612/1
e
GARCIA 518/16, 546/9, 546/15, 584/20, 661/23
Geacral's sexh1, 590/2s
Georgia $61 / 25$
didet 671/22
the $6 \leqslant 7 / 2,667 / 3$, $667 / 10$
folay-forward 552/12, $612 / 21$
sovern 529/2, 533/12
grade si3/T
Granted 652/16, 668/25, 670/20
cranta 348/3
GSET 345/25
guarantee 53/15, 5*3/24, 5e3/2x
guen $320 / 11,527 / 9,551 / 3,561 / 1,390 / 11,613 / 1$
guldelinea 53311

## hall 599/19

hammered $320 / 17$
hand 1 31,
,
handing 659/5
handle 581/10
handont 521/12, 649/7, 651/10, 652/11, 657/2, 65\%/3
Fande 54t13, 571/4
handy 549/10, coek, 651/7, 661/10
hanging 593/15
happy $533 / 3$, c07/4
hardwired 56/11, 559/2
haten 523/8
headed 597/16
heavy 569/16
held 521/h9, 522/23, $603 / 14$, cor/s, com

hish 543/16
hifluer $540 / 22,540 / 25,543 / 1$ :
himtory 603/5
holdine 542/5, 603/25, se7/15
holding $321 / 19$
holde coltr
hoek 551/2, 533/19, 533/20, 553/24, 5349, 57/3
hooked 551/\%, 551/10, 575/3
hooke s5elt
hope $577 / 25,573 / 20,573 / 23,671 / 24$
bopling S6404
hourt 520/17
Hnm $570 / 10$

## !

ID 519/10, 526/12
Liem 554/2, 612/22, 613/7
Identical 663/7, 663/23, 663/25, 661/20, 666/6, 672/12
Identitication $590 / 21,591 / 2,67 / 10,67 / 15,65 \% / 9$,
$659 / 15,65918,660 / 5,660 / 7,660 / 25,661 / 5$
ldentified $531 / 24$; $532 / 12,33 / 23,53 / 112,563 / 11$, 5sel23
Identify 536/15, 539/23, 30e/10
identiyity $601 / 13,602 / 3$
IDF $567 / 15,567 / 22,367 / 133$, $569 / 24,369 / 10,369 / 13$, 56917. 569/25

IDLC 612/22, 613/7
II 522/13
Plengal 59n3
Moutration 563/24, 56/15, 567/25
impact $598 / 11$, 590/11, 603/1
traplement 550/22
mplliction 5301, 552/13
mandmle 59N/
tnelmalom $6 \mathrm{Ce} / 2$
Inconatimtent $563 / 12$
tincerperate 663/16
mearreet 543/25, 56/12
tncrease 573/14
merumbent $521 / 20,522 / 19,523 / 7,52 / 111,52 / 12$, 560/4, 55011, 550/15
tmilicate $55 / 12,578 / 21,584 / 10,58 / 25,597 / 11$,
59/119, 671/12, 672/21
mdicated $612 / 13$
indicates 521/21, $322 / 16,592 / 5,59 / 16,657 / 21$
indienting 571/16, 571/18, 573/10
indietinguinhable $560 / 1$ :
infated $365 / 1$
influence 523/3
information 592/s
Inverfed 519/7, 619/16, 619/1
matall 5996, 59977
installation 583/13, 583/24, 585/4
installed $59 / 6 / 10$
Installing 566/5
intructed $597 / 16$
intercennected 665/5, 665/7
fnterconnection $38 / 112,54 / 21$, cas/13, ci/he,
64612, 647/23, 658110, 665/10
fotertin 5SN7, 6A6/33, 6a/24
interLATA $587 / 9,609 / 20,6 \times 12,68 / 13,65 / 12$
interolilice spis, $58 / 2 / 4$
interpret $\mathbf{0} 7 / 15$
miterprefation $607 / 20$, 699/29
interpreted 55/19, 55/16, 3537, 663/1
interitate $577 / 9,69966$, 610/19, 657/
interval 579/11, 58510, 585/14, 583/16
intervalis $533 / 3,532 / 4,503 / 24,394 / 1$
IntraLATA 646/2, 656/3, 66/13
intruatute 50916,5906 , $609 / 20$, $69 \% / 5,6099$,
cesh1, co9/12, coph1s, $611 / 10,657 / 5,67 / 12$
mbroduetion $323 / 13$
havented 53/23
tavertment $523 / 4$
Freaclad st3/19
Irrelevant 52:/14, 539/2, 50/23, 575/13, 597/19,
61413, 615/19
ISDN $532 / 16$
Hae $340 / 19,540 / 20,543 / 20,53 / 14,555 / 11,356 / 2$, $557 / 12,612 / 13,612 / 25,613 / 24,615 / 13,613 / 19$,

64917, 648/21, 650/1, 650/2, $650 / 4,651 / 18,651 / 22$, $651 / 25,652 / 3, \operatorname{cs7} / 10,65 / 11,663 / 14$, बce/25, $6 \leqslant 9 / 2$, 671/13
finued $614 / 20,600 / 7$
Iranea coent, sce/11, $612 / 16,615 / 17,663 / 13$
Item $562 / 5,583 / 6,583 / 7,53 / 7,50 / 2 / 2$
IXC 599/13, 61021
IXC $543 / 20,343 / 22,549 / 14$

## 3

JACOBS 51/16, 520/23, 321/1, 612/12, 613/19, 615/22
January 56211
jargen $670 / 4$
IDHE1 519/16, $647 / 7$
JERRY 519/5, 61e/15, 61e/23
JOR 518/16
JOHNSON 518h4, 520/4, 520/6, 52012, 520/20, $320 / 23,521 / 2,56111,564 / 22,56515,56510,565 / 14$, $500 / 22,591 / 1,591 / 3,591 / 7,615 / 23,616 / 2,6163$, $617 / 21,617 / 25,61 / 4,61 \mathrm{H7}, 61 \mathrm{k} 2,619 / 18,647 / 5$, $64711,64716,6597,65 / 10,659 / 13,65919,659 / 23$ ceak, scehi, $66 / 13$, sca/21, cce/24, $651 / 3,674 / 12$, 67611
joh 5acts
Johat 524/5, 524/14, 541/7, 341/19, 541/12, 341/16, $341 / 19,342 / 8,3425,342 / 2,342110,342 / 17,357 / 17$, 557/2
JOY 518/22
JULIA 51/14
jrimper 571/15, 573/9, 573/12, 582/24
jumpert 573/13
janction 571/23

## \%

KELLY 518/22
Kentucky 519/12, s19/1s, s19/20, 519/21, ses/18, $59917,59 / 5,590 / 1,59017,590 / 25,659 / 20,600 / 19$, $661 / 2,661 / 4,661 / 9,661 / 22,662 / 1,662 / 10,662 / 12$,
 660/18, 6c9/22, 670/3, 670/15, 670/16, 672/5, 672/13, 672/15, 675/15, 67/110
key 65c/19, $65 / 20,666 / 23$, cech16, 666/24, $670 / 19$. 670/23, 671/3, $671 / 10$
knowledge 6sa/22
known 53e/3, 6659

## 4

labeled cool25
language $522 / 13$, $530 / 13$, $530 / 14,550 / 16,553 / 22$, 60sh11, 606117, 646/18, 650/10, 653/11, 663/17,
 6 $6 / 13,671 / 7,671 / 4,671 / 11,671 / 23,672 / 4,672 / 6$ largent 663/14
inte-flied $5 * 1 / 12,301 / 15,591 / 3,647 / 5$
later 61/16, $642 / 4$
Laminter 521/17, 565/4, 6161, 6167
Lav 563/10
hand $331 / 5,531 / 11$, cach
lempe cel/is
lemed sollle
lenve $592 / 4,61418,614 / 19,615 / 20$
lenving 591/2s
LRC's 522 19
LEC $521 / 20,523 / 7,350 / 11$, $500 / 13$
lad 531/13
wh. $332 / 23,54 / 2,369 / 4,592 / 25,593 / 9$, $601 / 21$, 602/1, 612/23, 615/11, 654/58, 663/16
legal c46/13
legislation $339 \mathrm{n}, 539 / 13$
LBON S1A/16
letter 562/2, 562/18, 362/25, 563/19, 563/10, 563/11
level $53 \mathrm{~m} / 25,53 \%, 539 / 16$
levertge $59 \% 1$
Levy sem14
Himlt 539/17
finathetion corns
Ihmattationa $539 / 3,539 / 16$
limitted 526/2, 596/6
Haitts 538/10
Hae 561/3, 56677, 566/9, 566/10, $567 / 14,567 / 15$,
$367 / 16,548 / 22,56916,56911$, $592 / 21,592 / 24,593 / 1$, $59 / 15,59 / 17,652 / 2$
Haes $561 / \mathrm{S}, 577 / 14,577 / 15,577 / 20$
Hneup sedk
Hot 53ch12, 587/5
Hated 53/23, 545/17, 572/2
Whtie 569/19, 569/15, $569 / 19,509 / 7,674 / 13$
locel $523 / 5,523 / 4,523 / 13,533 / 23,533 / 25,512 / 22$,

542/23, $342 / 25,5412,549 / 4,550 / 5,551 / 5,560 / 8$, stash, ses/24, se6/4, ste9/23, ce1/2, $601 / 3, \operatorname{co1/7}$,
 $611 / 2,633 / 25,65418,63 / 16,6425,653 / 265 / 25$, 6562, $65 / 5,65110,65 / 12,68113,66 / 16$
loente 3465
located 567/20
locetion 593/10
loep 532/44, 532/15, 532/16, 533/22, 5347, 534/3, 5343, $535115,539 / 4,5667,56714,5707,57915$, $57020,571 / 19,5728,574 / 4,5746,5748,574 / 10$, 574/13, 574/14, 574/16, 574/21, 574/25, 575/2, 575/14, $577 / 1,577 / 10,577 / 25,57 / 2,57 / 4,571 / 5,57 / 6$, 57/116, 5792, 579/17, 579/21, 550/5, 591/21, 503/21, $585 / 22,592 / 23,593 / 5,596 / 21,597 / 3,603 / 14,604 / 13$, $604 / 21,604 / 24,6141,614 / 5,614 / 6,6147$, 648/22, 652/15, 652/16, 652/20
loop-port $525 / 14,525 / 21,527 / 1,569 / 5,585 / 22$ loop/port 649h, 6496, 649/9, 649/12, 652/18, 67723, 687/18
leope $542 / 16,575 / 10,575124,576 / 3,57 / h 4,57115$, 57/117, 579/11, 579/14, 579/15, 579/19, 579/21, 579/24, 533/6, 59377, 606/3, $607 / 13$
low segh11; 5e9ho
luat 673H1
lond 54/18, $577 / 15,58922,594 / 23,59 / 16$ lower $615 / 16$
lumping ceots
hunch 618/4, 618/9

|  |
| :---: |
|  |

Madam 562/6, 590/20, 659/16

## Madame 674\$

mall 56N/2,5613,36N6
main 506/8, 569/22, 592/24, 592/25, 593/1
maintains $596 / 13$
manage $591 / 20,592 / 8,592 / 10$, 593 M 6
management 592/3, 592/15
managins $591 / 19$
mmaner $549 / 3$, scols, sceh12, $607 / 17$, 649/12, $662 / 14$
manail 57e/10, 578/15, seNis, 581/1, 581/3, $581 / 7$ manually $5 \neq 1 / 6$
March 518h7, 651/14
mark $590 / 22,647 / 12,661 / 3$
marked $565 / 6,590 / 21,591 / 2,64710,64715,65 \%$, $65915,659 / 17,659 / 19,660 / 5,660 \%$, 6607, $660 / 25$, 661/3
market $537 / 12,537 / 15,537 / 15,341 / 7,361 / 10$,
54113, $542 / 5,5424,542 / 8,342 / 11,542 / 17$, 545/14, 545/15, 545/22, 546/5, 547/4, 557/17, 559/4, 559/14, $\operatorname{seg} 12,550 / 12,612 / 20,6139,676 / 2,676 / 8$ markettoz $524 / 5,524 / 4,541 / 16,541 / 20,557 / 20$ marketplace 537/5
marlcetin 523/14
Martinex 520/44
matched 661/17
mintehes $651 / 16$
Matter $516 / 3,520 / 14,534 / 4,57414,579 / 17,609 / 3$


601/24, 610/2, 611/13, 611/20, 612/2, 612/5, 612/6,
$612 / 8,61414,6463,647 / 24,648 / 1,64 \% 6,641 / 16$,
$69 / 11,64914,652 / 15,62 / 19,63 / 1,645,6519$,
65/17, 64125 , 6517, 65S/19, 65612, 65616, 65613, 687/23, 65t/11, 65/ 11 , 65t/23
MCI/Reliseuth 647/22
MCIm (19ne, 652/15
MDF $366 / 10,566 / 11,567 / 19,567 / 22,570 / 16,570120$, 570/22, 572/11, 573/:
meaning $521 / 21,667 / 25,668 / 21,67517$
menninglicss $524 / 14$
mencured 611/2, 611/3
meancures $533 / 13$
meet 646/24, 657/14
mention $62 / 4$
mentioned 648/4, $649 / 21,649 / 21,650 / 12,651 / 20$, $66 / 10,656 / 20,659 / 1,665 / 25$
mentions 659/4
meamage $56 / 3$
met 655/16
method $351 / 7,563 / 2,563 / 10,568 / 15$
methods 562/17, 562/19, 563/14, 563/16
Metro 518/5
Minmal stshis, co4no, coune
midide 605/12, 605/19, 605/20
migrate $540 / 2,612 / 21,612 / 24,613 / 21,6141,649 / 1$ mind $529 / 4,65719,673 / 19$
minus $529 / 23,539 / 1,539 / 20$
minute $331 / 6,399 / 15,599 / 20,599 / 21,659 / 6,660 / 9$ minute $56 / 21,578 / 23,579 / 5,579 / 9,579 / 12$,
579/23, 580/3
minheard 52417
mimemer 610/19
minoed $521 / 10$, sea/23, ccor14, c74/3
minding $521 / 2$, s22/5, ses/22, $567 / 22,532 / 21$,
$5916,673 / 7$
mimpole 539/15
mintpoken se1/19
modified 671/24
modthy 663/11
moment $536 / 19,536 / 24,6163,6697$
monthly 551/10
monthe stents
morning s21/16
Motiom siv/4
move 617/19
movement $361 / 4,361 / 7$
moves 617/24, $618 / 3$
Mr. Bond 519/3, 647/18, 659/1, 6597, 639/14
Mr. Epppteiner 610/6, 610/12
Mr. Eppetelner's $\mathbf{6} 1 / 17$
Mr. Friconc S6/He
Mr. Palone") 562/7, 563/21, 54813, 612/15 Mr. Heteh $519 / 4,519 / 8,520 /$, 521/\%, 532/21, $54 / 22,546 / 11,547 / 19,556 / 14,567 / 20,561 / 17,562 / 6$, $552 / 9,54115,54 / 24,561 / 24,545 / 3,565 / 5,545 / 7$, $56512,56515,56 / 17,573 / 20,573 / 23,574 / 1,577 / 18$, $577 / 24,577 / 22,592 / 18,5 \times 2 / 21,5 * 3 / 3,50^{2} / 5$, $50 / 112$, $54414,59418,594 / 23,53 / 20,590 / 24,591 / 10,603 / 7$,

 6749, 67417, 676/11
Mr. Fiendrix 529/13, 547/16, 612/4, 612/14, 618/21, $619 / 16,646 / 1,64 / 4,647 / 3,647 / 19,659 / 4,661 / 6,652 / 6$ Mr. Hendris's 647 K , 647/7
Mr. Landry $366 / 13$, $573 / 11$, $586 / 11$, $591 / 23$, $599 / 2$
Mr. Lendry's 571K
Mr. Marthea 611/22, 611/2s
Mr. Martinem's 52019, $611 / 17$
MR. MELSON $520 / 6,520 / 15,530 / 17,530 / 23$, 531/2, $699 / 24,610 / 1,647 / 16,649 / 7,632 / 11$
Mr. Pelletrini $519 / 4,577 / 15,59 / 12,59 / 16,591 / 3$, $531 / 5,603 / 11,603 / 25,610 / 4,6106,612 / 5,616 / 2$, $616 / 1,617 / 16,617 / 24,647 / 8,647 / 13,647 / 14$
Mr. Sanders sexi24
Mr. Varnar s2eff, 521/3, 321/5, 529n15, 340/10, $535 / 6,559 / 15,5623,56515,566 / 24,588 / 5,599 / 6$, $603 / 5,603 / 12,6102,612 / 10,6164,64921,66 / 21$, $607 / 19$
Mr. Varner's $591 / 4$
Me. Whlte $519 \%$, 615 ns , $61 \mathrm{c} / 4$, 6106 , $617 / 19$, $61814,618 / 24,619 / 15,6461,647 / 3,674 / 5,67416$ multiple ca2/23, 649/23, c66/22, 66977, 66t14, $66417,66920,669 / 3,671 / 2,673 / 10$
maltples $531 / 16$

## N

NAME $\mathbf{3 1 9 / 2 , 6 1 9 2 1 , 6 1 9 / 2 3}$
Hectemery skev, scti20
meed sa46, $57 / 615,57616,57624$, 599/7, 591/21,
 $67314,67317,673123,67 / 25,675 / 20$
needed cca/4, 673/24
trede 581/20, 610/15, 616/20
megate 347/s
megotinte 53/16, 616/25, 673/3, 67511
nergotintion 349/1
nepotintiom 663/9
megotiator $646 / 7$

522/21, 522/22, 523/3, 523/5, 527/11, 524/3, 529/13, $329 / 19,529 / 22,529 / 7,529 / 18,531 / 7,532 / 44,5341$, $53410,53412,534 / 14,53511,535 / 17,536 / 13,536 / 22$, $539 / 4,539 / 18,540 / 12,54 / 16,544 / 25,345 / 11,546 / 1$, $546 / 22,34177$, $34123,549 / 3,549 / 13,349 / 21,350 / 1$, $550 / 5,550 / 19,551 / 11,552 / 1,553 / 5,553 / 11,533 / 19$, $553 / 20,5597,562 / 16,56319,357 / 6,364 / 4,569 / 7$, 568/3, 576/11, 587/12, se9/1, 58/24, 591/14, 593/22, $593 / 23,5943,59 / 15,59 / 17,59915$, 60/4, $606 / 10$, $607 / 6,607 / 17,614 \mathrm{~s}, 6151,61524,617 / 10,65 / 24$, $60425,651 / 2,651 / 3,61 / m, 657 / 24,66 / 20,64 / 5$,
 66923, 67011, 67e17, 671/17, 672/14, 6732, 67315, 673/22, 673/2, 675/6, 675133, 67511
networks 521/22, 523/1, 523/11, 527/11
new s39/15, scck, 590/24, 584/3, 603/14
newrer $612 / 24,613 /, 613 / 22$
nifght 663/5
ntace 545/17
nominal $596 / 11$
noz-appealable 53410
momappealable co7/25, cou/2, cou/s
nandinermminatory sal22, 54/1, 549/22
noarceurtas $531 / 7,551 / 1,64625,66 / 21,6739$,

## 673/14, 67511, 673/12

Now 647/9
notice 565/9
NUMBER 519/10, 573/14, 590/20, 600/23, 603/15, $611 / 6,615710$, 6 co/it
numberis $662 / 3$

## 0

## eath 521/K

oblect 521/29, 616/4, 61677
oblecting 541/1t
oblection 616/6, 617/22,610/1, 619/5
oblignted $533 / 11,352 / 24,593 / 6,593 / 11,5346$, $59970,59971,599 / 22,606 / 25,667 / 5$
obligation $52513,547 / 24,5499,552 / 3,533 / 7$, $563 / 5,53310,553 / 15,593 / 13,593 / 17$, $60 / 14$, $607 / 3$, 646/13
oblistion 547/23
obllterate $524119,534 / 24$
obtatm 523/21, 527/1, 537/6, 533/24, 536\%, 549/7, 54425, $36 / 1,595 / 7,595 / 20,595 / 23,605 / 15,652 / 19$ obtainme $539 / 17$
obtaint $523 / 14$
oddity 39417
ofter 526t, 526/8, 526/11, 526/15, 536/13, 536/15, $537 / 13,53 \% / 5,539 / 14,53916,543 / 11,545 / 16,543 / 15$, $545 / 21,554 / 19,559 / 3,578 / 8,5799,633 / 10,653 / 14$, $653 / 15,653 / 19,653 / 23,654 / 4,65 / 4,654 / 16,655 / 1$, $655 / 2,655 / 7,655 / 2,655 / 22,655 / 23,663 / 17$, 676/6 oftered 649/19
ontering $534 / 11,540 / 15,545 / 21,546 / 2,54677,59 / 3$, $44 / 29,640 / 14$
oftering: 653/16, 654/20
ofters $527 / 10,539 / 11,339 / 13,65017,653 / 2,653 / 4$ afine $559 / 18,589 / 18,59210,596 / 6,39624$
Otmeial $518 / 23,546 / 1,565 \%$
ond 543/14,544/11
older 612/23, 613/8
omitted 5*2/13
operated $672 / 1$
operater $599 / 14,599 / 19,599 / 22$, coo/3, 600/5, coent, coen1s, coe/21, ca0/25, col/4, c01/17, 601/21, $601 / 24,6025,602 / 10,602 / 15,64 / 2,6043,604 / 5$, $601 / 4,616 / 11,616 / 13,617 / 3 ; 617 / 4,617 / \mathrm{h}, 617 / \mathrm{s}$ opinipn 348\%, 64611
opponed ses/24
eppenthe $524 / 10,524 / 15,545 / 7$
opted say
option 540/24
optional sedr
optione 561/4, 564/15
oral 67411
Order 51877, 519n17, 519/21, 523/8, 525/23, 530/12,
$530 / 21,530 / 24,531 / 17,531 / 19,532 / 3,532 / 9,532 / 15$, $5491,550 / 7,54 / 13,564 / 19,53420,554 / 23,559 / 24$, $560 / 1,569 / 24,56 \mathrm{ck}, 56715,5616,56 \mathrm{H} / 12,57416$, $574 / 24,57 / 1 / 5,575 / 1,57 / 4 / 5,573 / 5,575 / 10,575 / 12$, $575 / 13,576110,577 / 7,577 / 9,577 / 23,577 / 25,57813$, $574 / 4,574 / 5,574 / 7,57410,578 / 15,579 / 20,579 / 1$, $579 / 3,579 / 13,579 / 16,579 / 18,579 / 19,593 / 21,590 / 8$, $590 / 17,592 / 22,593 / 22,595 / 7,596 / 21,600 / 14$, ces/11, 60./16, ca/h17, 60/11, 611/3, 61377, 614/17, 614/20, 614/25, 615/4, 617/2, cu9/11, 64e/22, 649/9, 649/11, $649 / 15,650 / 5,60 / 6,65 / 11,650 / 23,651 / 5,651 / 13$, $651 / 16,651 / 17,651 / 20,651 / 23,651 / 24,652 / 4,652 / 7$, $60 / 11,661 / 2,661 / 4,663117,668 / 9,66 / 14,66 \% 6$, 669/1, 669/13, 6704, 67012, 671/5, 671/9, 671/12, 671/16, 672/7, 672/4, 673/13, 673/21, 674/6, 674/20, 67516, 67611
ordered $531 / 16,532 / 15,560 / 22,568 / 4,574 / 10$, $574 / 13,579 / 18,579 / 23,649 / 4,69 / 25,62 / 4,66123$, 6694, 671/25, 672/20
erdierity $532 \mathrm{h1}, 571 / 12,673 / 10,67417,675 / 4$ arders $523 / 20,527 / 1,539 / 17,539 / 23,55 / 14,500 / 1$, $5096,509 / 10,36116,5949,61415,646117$, 646/1s, 64621, 6466, 650/19, 657/23, 65/15, 673/1, 67419 orifinally sew/4
origlnatin $599 / 2$
overhead 57018
overlooked 66617, 66116, $670 / 24$

## ア.

## p. <br> packare 511/13, 592/14

Pagee 511/12, $592 / 12,582 / 24,619 / 5,619 / 6$ pald $599 / 13,599 / 14,666 / 22,673 / 9$
 paper 521/15, 522/4, 545/24, 546/13 paragraph 522/12, $662 / 16$; $664 / 7,670 / 24$ parameter: 53en3
parthy 654/29, $653 / 17,655 / 15,63 / 21,63 / 22,653 / 24$ part 525/12, 531/12, 537/19; 504/22, 5246, 604/11, 606/11, 61M14, 662/15, 663/17, 66/77, 66/13, 665/23, 665/25, 666/25, 6647, 669/3, 66015, 670/20, 670/22, $671 / 19,673 / 6,673 / 7,673 / 11,674 / 2,67433,6745$, 675125, 6762
partios s207, 64/24, 651/17, 672/9
part 594/3, 5248, 612/4
party ce4/21, cstis
pamed 651/1e, 653/11, 657/2, 659/
paming 6497
Panse $531 / 1,561 / 25,571 / 11,59 / 12,6036,651 / 15$, 663/4
pay 543/22, 344/1, 54/44, 599/11, 604/10, $60 / 112$ paying co2/14
payy 599/23
Peachtree 612/24
performed $579 / 3$
period se0/14
phone 523/14
plarave cat/13
phytien $566 / 20,566 / 21,566 / 22,568 / 16,568 / 17$,
$571 / 11,574 / 7,575 / 1,575 / 21,593 / \mathrm{B}$
physically 574/4, 591/4, 591/13, 593/22, 59/12
pick 602/9, 663/20, 676/12
plece 545/24, 546/13, 595/16
PLACE 519/15, 539/10, $531 / 11,539 / 1$, 597/4,
600/12, 615/12, 616/1
placed 531/3
place 571/4
plationm 6703, 6706, 6707, 6705
plua 343/17, 34/11:
point $546 / 6,541 / 24,556 / 11,560 / 16,5693,359 / 4$, 571/14, $571 / 15,571 / 16,571 / 24,571 / 22,571 / 23$, 572/16, 572/21, 572/23, 573/12, 573/13, 613/19, 614/3, 614/13, 614/14, 617/1, 672/6, 67/6/3
point ce3/13
policy $561 / 17,561 / 21,561 / 23,561 / 24,561 / 25$, $562 / 4,562 / 20,5631,563 / 3,563 / 4,5637,5631$, $56 / 13,566 / 20,56 / 72$
pert $532 / 15,532 / 16,53217,533 / 21,533 / 25,535 / 16$, $537 \mathrm{~K}, 53924,56412,567 / 11,569 / 23,57017,574 / 4$, 574n, 5741, 57410, 57413, 57414, 57411, 574/21, 575h, 5752, 57515, 57316, 577/i, 57/h, 57/4, $5746,581 / 21,5851,585 / 17,545 / 22,54523,593 \mathrm{~h}$, $593 / \mathrm{n}, 593 / 5,59 / 11,594 / 20,39 / 21,594 / 25,593 / 1$, $59313,59514,59515,595 / 7,59513,599 / 25,60314$, cov/15, col/22, co4/25, cas/22
portion 522/21
portriay $307 / 6$
ports $531 / 20,531 / 21,57510,573 / 24,576 / 4,579 / 11$, 579/15, 606/3, 607/13
poeed 61912
poatilion $523 / 16,528 / 15,533 / 21,53 / 11$, $339 / 7$,
$539 / 19,551 / 16,559 / 20,597 / 23,606 / 1,606 / 4$, 606/17, c0e/25, $6091,609 / 2,609 / 21,67 / 16,67417$
ponitions 597/18, 559/9
pomerem 603/23
poneible 544/12, 555/8
pet $532 / 16,567 / 16,567 / 24,569 / 25,56911,569 / 4$, 569/6, 569/25, 571/19, 572/9, 572/13
POTAMI 518/23
potemtial see/11, s90/11
practices 506/8
prechude 54510
prechuded $523 / 10$
Preclude 523/11, 345/20, 345/23
precomblned 50\%
predetory 559/4
prodicate $53 / 21$
Prenled 5197, 619/4, 61912
prepared 619/3
preverlbed ses/2s
prumerted $581 / 10,649 / 17$
premed 543/20
prembecription 6567, 636/
premuptively $371 / 21,547 \mathrm{k}$
pretty 539/22, 565/24, 571/12, 603/22, 605/24, 663/15, 663/20, 672/27
prewire $597 / 2$
prewired $597 / 4,597 / 7,597 / 11,597 / 2,597 / 25$,

price 52910, 529/15, 32419, 529/24, 533/5, 33/7, $535 / 10,535 / 13,53 / 19,535 / 20,53 / 124,536 / 11$, $536 / 16,536 / 17,539 / 1,539110,539 / 12,53911,539 / 6$, $539 / 7,539 / 19,539 / 20,54 / 11,540 / 13,54 / 19,540 / 20$, $540 / 22,540 / 25,541 / 2,541 /, 542 / 21,54 / / 1,54 / 115$, $54619,546 / 20,546 / 21,551 / 10,551 / 13,552 / 2,552 / 15$, $552 / 21,354 / 3,55 / 25,556 / 2,566 / 3,55677,357 / 13$, $554 / 24,559 / 25,559 / 10,560 / 24,604 / 20,615 / 13$, 615/16, 64e/15, 619/23, 663/13, 66N6, 667/4, 657/10, $667 / 12,667 / 14,667 / 15,666 / 22,671 / 1,672 / 14,673 / 22$, 674/18, 675/1, 675/19, 6762, 676/8
priced 53116, 527/17, 535/21, 53/22, 539/4, 540/25, $54 / 22,54124,541 / 25,54120,561 / 15,605 / 4,613 / 14$. 61515, 6691, 65916, 6cp25, 670/16, 671/19, 67316 pricea 523/11, 53 $/ 3,5347,531 / 5,531 / 7,531 / 10$, $531 / 14,53 / 11,534 / 22,535 \mathrm{~h}, 535,535 / 12,5369$, 534/13, 53N8, $54316,54 / 17,5441,35 \mathrm{M} 19,3521$, $553 / 3,53 / 22,539 / 7,53 / 12,550 / 1,5040,561 / 2$, 5645, 597/13, 606/11, 607/7, 646/23, 64625, 647/1, 6c6/20, 669/17, 670/1, 671/17, 672/10
pricting 52:1, 5246, 521/25, 5214, 547/20, 547/22, $34 / 23,54 / 4,54 / 14,34 / 15,54 / 24,3 \times 2 / 2,53 / 11$. 5147 , 554/5, $557 / 4,559 / 14,57 / 2,612 / 14,64911$, 6502, 650/21, 651/19, $651 / 25,652 / 2,66 / 14,670 / 21$, 671/16, 673114, 673116, 6768
pricing 529/11
primary 612/13
problem 592/3, 592/9
proceed 521/3, 675hs
proceeding 549/20, 557/24, 575/22, 576/8, 595/19, 59月15, cach7, 616/10
PROCLEDINGS 519/13
procew 581/1, 581/3, 582/24, 675/3
profiter 6477
profit 549/23
programmed 526/22
projecter 531/3, 543/11, 571/3
promite 58/3
promote 523/12
preef 543/16
propenal 528/8, 52914, 551/5, 569/21, 587/16, 596/15 proposaly 567/21
propere se7/11, 613/20
propened 531/24,51/5, 562/17, 563/23, 564/4, $5619,547 / 15,597 / 17,577 / 19,587 / 24$
propemen 571/10
propoling $501 / 2$
provile $522 / 17,523 / 19,523 / 25,52 / 4,32 / 24$, $532 / 24,33424,536 / 24,537 / 8,542 / 2,549 / 20,549 / 5$, $5407,560 / 5,507,56011,550 / 1 t, 563 / 3,363 / 25$, $571 / 11,5746,57610,581 / 21,582 / 3,532 / 6,592 /$, seene, $500 / 10,591 / 14,592 / 12,592 / 22,5936,593 / 12$, $593 / 22,5942,534$, $59 / 11,53 / 14,59 / 22,594 / 4$,
 60sh5, 606/4, 607/15, 609/14, caphs, 611/9, 614/6. $616112,616 / 20,64613,646 / 14,646 / 23$, c4e/1, calk, 64is, $648 / 16,653 / 1,65420,653 / 4,655 / 14,653 / 19$, 64971, 659/22, 662/15, 667/5
providen $537 / 25,533 / 22,534 / 7$, 534/10, 53/20, $556 / 20,565 / 22,566 / 5,570 / 11,573 / 4,591 / 11,593 / 7$, 602 5 , c04117, 65415, 653/10, 662/19
providon $524 / 13,527 / 24,523 / 3,528 / 6,533 / 11$,
$531 / 15,347 / 9,549 / 3,549 / 21,566 / 20,579 / 1,379 / 19$,
$579 / 20,54 / 3,59411,59914,60033,612 / 5,613120$,
 669/13, 673/13, 675/14
provisioned $529 / 23,533 / 13,574 / 2,574 / 4,574 / 19$, 575/7, 575/4, 580/17, 585/1, 648124, 649/4
provimiontin $529 / 21,52 / 25,533 / 3,533 / 8,533 / 6$,
$582 / 3,595 / 10,613 / 4,650 / 3,650 / 10,650 / 20,651 / 5$ providions 52 $/ 1,533 / 3,533 / 10,533 / 14,533 / 19$, 547/17, 549/1, 546/5, 553/11, 54/23, 605/17, 667/22,
 $663 / 25,670 / 14,67417,67515,67516$
PSC 5187, 519/21, 509/17
FUBLIC $51 / 21,531 / 20,63 / 3$, $64 / 3,661 / 2,661 / 4$ purchere 522/22, 533/2, 529\%, 540/5, 542/2, 542/4, 542h1, $577 / 10,57 / 125,57 / 11,5712,5744,505 / 18$, se3t14, 604h, 60415, 69424, 607/12, 669/14, 669/16 purchased $662 / 14$
purchanat se9024, 606/2
purchasing 534/s
pare ssent
purpone $523 / 12,360 / 19,562 / 16,578 / 20,50 / 2$, ca2/20, 649/s
parpene $357 / 4$, 563/16, 597/11, 60017, 601/3, cheris
put $530 / 14,541 / 24,542 / 16,546 / 12,354 / 15,57617$, $59 / 5,597 / 2,5943,6061 t, 607 / 16,6723,6766$ puts 530/19
putting s4624, 667/3

## 0

quality 533/14
quention $530 / 15,530 / 16,542 / 19,546 / 10,547 / 2$, 552/13, $359 / 3,559 / 19,562 / 9,582 / 16,582 / 19,543 / 2$. $59 / 11,598 / 14,603 / 6,6169,650 / 18,658 / 4,668 / 23$, 673/19, 674/15
questions $520 / 19,520 / 24,612 / 13,619 / 11,656 / 23$, $67 / 10,6591,659 / 4$
quick 612/12
Quinton $56 / 2$
quil 341/17
quote $522 / 2,522 / 3$
quoted 535/5, 675/4
quotes $565 \%$

## a

ralee 558/25
ralied csent
range se3/15, se9/19
rate $525 / 17,54919,549 / 20,552 / 12,559 / 19,560 / 6$, 588/23, 649/15, $667 / 3,667 / 18$, c69/16
ratee $527 / 19,527 / 21,54 / 24,551 / 12,553 / 3$, $553 / 9$, $58 / 12,52 / 25,50 / 4,53 / 12,54914,50 / 117,59 / 12$ ceets, 6eat7, 675/2, 675/12
rationally 55\%
Rats 564/24
Ray $56 / 2$
reaching 523/17
read shan17, 54e/18, 550/14, 552/9, 562/13, 573/21, $577 / 14,577 / 15,598 / 7,59418,54 / 21,54922,59 e / 23$, 593/12, $599 / 14,59 / 15,59 / 16,605 / 12,619 / 17,662 / 5$, 663/2, 659/3, $669112,673 / 20$
readint 577/19, 589/5
reads 522/3
reason 540/18, 540/21, 547/5, $547 / 7,559 / 11,559 / 11$, scal16, $569 / 15,606 / 19,609 / 11,611 / 12$, $650 / 15$, 653/14, $653 / 8$
reasonable 549/25, 549/23
rebalanced $560 / 9$
rebalancing 559/19, 560/7, 561/1
rebundle 521/23, 522/10
rebundled 509/3
rebundling 651/8, 652/1
Rebuttal 51977, 612/16, 619/5, 619/13, 619/16
recall $537 / 22,555 / 17,576 / 6,57677,577 / 4,581 / 24$,
$577 / 5,590 / 8,599 / 13,600 / 13,600 / 20,612 / 3,616 / 21$,

## 61/24

recalling 574/2
recetve sed/15
recelved 574/24, 617/23, 618/2, 61\&/6, 663/10
recess 618/s
recollection 577/23, 597/3, 590/17
recombloe 593/24
recombined 554/4, 605/1, 649/18
recomblnes $607 / 13$
reconcle 606/1.
recomnect spa/19
reconsider 6sers, 651/7
recondideration 649/, 649/15, 60/6, 651/6
reconaliering 650/20
recenveric 676/13
recerd 520/5, 562/6, 57/17, 618/13, 618/22, 619/17, 656/17, 657/18, 676/14
recover 559/14
recovered 554/5, 600/5
recreate 539/2, 542/20, 650/3
recreated 529/18
recrenting 531/1, 649/12, (49/18
recurring $518 / 8,531 / 7,551 / 10,551 / 12,552 / 12$, $64 / 25,66622,667 / 2,671 / 1,673 / 9,673 / 14,6751$, 675/12
red 522/2
redirect 615/23
reference $549 / 19,565 / 16,6097,651 / 23,657 / 1$, 66s/20
reflect $560 / 9,587 / 15,670 / 11,671 / 9,671 / 25,676 / 2$, 67618
reflected 596/18, 673/13
refrech 577/22, 597/3
region (46/10,672/3
refalition 539/1, 53e/25
reject 609/21
rejected 523/18, 523/24, 524/6, 524/8, 563/22, 56/3, 66918, 671/7
related 529/2, 533/4, cow/1s
relien 611/25
remita 593/2, C65/7
remember $532 / 14,538 / 3,539 / 12,539 / 14,539 / 20$,
539/25, $543 / 7,551 / 9,573 / 11,577 / 9,578 / 13,578 / 17$,
579/22, $592 / 20,599 / 3,59914$, coe/19, 600/25, 614/22,
616/22, 617/11
rempove 616/11, 616/14, 673/3, 675/19
removed $607 / 4,675 / 1,675 / 8$
removing 667/23
render 524/13
readering 657/15
repent $53347,534 / 3,611 / 23$
repenting 673/19
rephrase 68/2
repilcmate $534 / 20,534 / 23,537 / 8,540 / 7$, 541/10,
646/20, $643 / 24,650 / 13,650 / 16,667 / 17$
repicated 530/5, 534/15
replicates 53/116, 542/10, 554/2, cos/3, 614/23
replicating 539/22, 615/3
R RPORTED 518/22
reporter $660 / 2$
Reporters 518/23
Reporting 518/22
reprementiation 565/21, 566/19, 571/10, 572/16
represents scontis
requent $581 / 20,581 / 24,581 / 25,532 / 1,589 / 8$, $616 / 18$
requesting $522 / 16,549 / 20,54 \% / 5,550 / 6$
requeats 519/12, sea/18, 5se/25
requitre $533 / 10,562 / 21,56 / 10,592 / 23,593 / 5,610 / 7$, 64624, 674/24
requited $523 / 5,52412,54 / 7,56319$, coen12,
611/1s, 612/1, 651/17, 652/25, 653/18, 63/18, 65617, 657/21, 673/11
requirement 657/25
requifrements 549/2, 6s5/16, 664/5
requile $522 / 20,532 / 23,550 / 11,610 / 13$, c6e/20 remale $5241,52413,52419,52424,526 / 1,52920$, 53912, 540/22, 540/24, 540/25, 541/4, 541/7, 545/4, 551/18, 551/24, 553/25, 554/4, 554/8, 554/23, 555/4, $555 / 16,559 / 20,560 / 3,560 / 11,561 / 3,565 / 25,600 / 15$, C01/4, $601 / 10,602 / 7,602 / 9,602 / 13,602 / 17,602 / 21$, $605 / 5,607 / 1,609 / 19,609 / 4,614 / 20,615 / 15,616 / 12$,
$61615,616 / 17,64621,648 / 5,644 / 8,641 / 11,648 / 13$,
649/15, 649/16, 649/24, 649/6, 649/19, 649/24, 65017,
$651 / 4,652 / 25,653 / 1,653 / 11,664 / 1,668 / 22,664 / 24$,
668/25, $669 / 17$
resell 601/9, 654/5
reselling $610 / 22$
reshdence 543/10, 543/12
readent c01/10, $\mathbf{6 0 1 / 1 4}$
Residential $543 / 1,543 / 3,601 / 18,603 / 1,604 / 20$
reaold $53 / 18,554 / 1,556 / 4,601 / 14,601 / 25,602 / 2$,
c02/5, 616/16, 649/24, 650/14
resolve 535/23
respeet 529/11, 537/19, 552/11, 555/3, 561/19,
$564 / 14,565 / 18,578 / 7,578 / 25,581 / 20,583 / 5,591 / 10$,
$601 / 3,601 / 20,602 / 13,609 / 5,663 / 24,664 / 3,665 / 19$,
67577
reaponding 563/1
response $519 / 11$, $559 / 3$, $583 / 2,588 / 7$, 589/17,
589/21, 590/10, 590/24
responaible 646/9
rest 654/18
restricted 542/15
reatriction 524/15, 524/25, 541/16, 541/20, 557/21 reatrictions 521/3
reault 555/2, 591/24, 591/25
reselts sse/20
retill $525 / 17,529 / 19,529 / 2,530 / 3,530 / 6,531 / 1$,
$534 / 15,534 / 20,534 / 23,53 / 11,536 / 17,536 / 25,537 / 5$,
537/12, 537/15, 537/18, 531/1, 539h, 539/6, 5397,
$53912,53913,539 / 14,53916,53919,539 / 22,540 / 4$,
$540 / 5,540 / 7,541 / 10,541 / 11,542 / 10,54 / 15,54 / 23$,
$545 / 14,545 / 15,545 / 19,545 / 21,546 / 2,5467$, 546/19,
547/4, 554/1, 554/2, 601/18, 604/22, 605/4, 614/23,
$615 / 3,61 / 19,617 / 13,646 / 20$, $650 / 14,660 / 16,653 / 2$,
$653 / 3,653 / 5,653 / 6,653 / 8,63 / 9,653 / 15,653 / 20$,
655/3, 667/17, 667/18, 676/7
return 549/20
rense 591/21
revenue $535 / 20,557 / 9,559 / 15$, $589 / 20$
revenues 600/15
reviewing 562/18
rip 593/22, $594 / 12$
rlek 675124, 676/3, 676/4, 676/5, 67677, 676/9
roll $57 / 116,576 / 20$, $586 / 9$
Reom 518/20
route 656/13
routing 599/18, 656/2
RPR 518/22, 51\&/23
rule $521 / 20,669 / 22$
ruled caen, 649/10
rules $523 / 10,523 / 16,539 / 9,539 / 17,539 / 23$, $659 / 12$, 672/23
rultage $607 / 3,607 / 22,60 e / 2,608 / 3$, c09/4
rulingt $607 / 24,663 / 10,663 / 12$
run $566 / 7,566 / 9,567 / 10,569 / 23,569 / 6,571 / 15$,
57/21, 595/5
rumming 569/24
RUTHE 518/23

## s.

## sale 61617

Sander: Sc1/2
sathefactory $520 / 10$
saving 530/4, 532/10
anw 543/3, 567/8
scenario $525 / 20,525 / 22,54 / 23,566 / 6,57 / 41,576 / 8$ second $522 / 12,541 / 17,560 / 23,614 / 13$, c6e/7, 661/15, 673/6, 673/7, 673/11, 673/18, 674/2, 674/3

Section s49/9, 549/3, cos/17, 611/17, 611/19, 611/25, $652 / 13,652 / 14,65410,6594,659 / 15,65420,661 / 21$,


c69/e, ces/10, $669 / 17$
Seetions 6107, 610/s, 665/2
sell 546/8, 55/11
melling 551/25
send $575 / 13,575 / 14,575 / 16, \cos / 12$, cem/14, ce9/15,
ces/19, 611/12, 614/25, 656/17, $657 / 20$
sance 5291, 672/24
manditive 61 Ch 4
rentence $522 / 1,651 / 11,651 / 15,651 / 19,65 / 24$,
csen1, ccek, 674/4, 675/4, 675/9
separate $573 / 12,5065$, $600 / 4,600 / 11,601 / 12$, col/4, 662/18
separated 5941
separately $584 / 11,5451$
requerace $520 / 2$
serve 5ee/13, $613 / 13,613 / 15$
served 598/3, 593/10, 64677
SERVICE $518 / 1,525 / 24,529 / 19,530 / 3,530 / 6$,
$534 / 11,53 / 15,53420,536 / 1,536 / 8,536 / 17,53618$, $536 / 21,536 / 25,537 / 2,537 / 9,537 / 20,53 / 11,539 / 15$, 53/18, 5391, 539/12, 539/22, 540/4, 540/5, 540/6, $540 / 4,541 / 10,541 / 11,541 / 24,542 / 2,542 / 10,542 / 20$, 542/22, 542/24, 542/25, 543/15, 54/2, 544/11, 544/12, $54 / 24,549 / 22,550 / 18,554 / 1,551 / 2,556 / 8,556 / 10$, 559/5, 559/19, 559/4, 559/10, 565/22, 566/5, 566/6, 57/112, 573/4, 574/22, 575/6, 575/21, 57/6, 57/611, $579 / 23,579 / 5,579 / 1,579 / 12,57 / 121,590 / 5,581 / 23$,
592/6, 509/22, 591/11, 591/12, 591/14, 592/5, 592/18, $593 / 9,600 / 3,601 / 2,601 / 4,601 / 7,601 / 9,601 / 15$, 601/18, $602 / 4,6026,603 / 24$, cot/4, co4/h, cow/13, cou/1s, cas/2, cos/3, cas/4, cos/4, co7/18, cosh18, 609/19, 611/2, 611/3, 614/24, 615/2, 615/4, 615/11, $615 / 14,616 / 20,616 / 23,617 / 2,617 / 5,617 / 6,617 / 7$, 617/13, $64 / 10$, 64/11, 649/4, 649/13, $649 / 18,649 / 24$, $649 / 25,650 / 3,650 / 16,653 / 10,661 / 2,661 / 4,662 / 15$,

Services 518/6, 522/17, 523/25, 524/4, 530/2, 531/1,
$534 / 23,540 / 12,549 / 8,55014,55923,589 / 12,590 / 2$,
$550 / 13,599 / 14,599 / 19,599123,600 / 5$, $600 / 7,600 / 18$,
 c01/21, co1/24, c02/1, $602 / 2, \operatorname{co2} / 10,602 / 15$, co3/2, cous, couk, cos 116 , cos/4, 61611, 616/13, $616 / 16$, $616 / 20,617 / 3,617 / 4,617 / \mathrm{s}, 617 / 9,650 / 13,6 \mathrm{co} / 4$,
633/1, 6337, 653/3
serving 613/14
net 51 /7, $530 / 7,535 / 18,54 / 17,549 / 11,549 / 16$,
$551 / 11,593 / 23,59418,591 / 18,615 / 7,660 / 1,651 / 12$, $64 / 7$
eetting 532/1, 602/21
seven $533 / 11,593 / 14,533 / 20,53514,585 / 17$
abort $555 / 21,550 / 23$, 65S10, CCO/17
short-term 553/24
show 571/2, 574/9, 617/21, 617/25, 618/4, 650/5 ahow $615 / 4$
side $566 / 7,566 / 10,566 / 11,567 / 14,567 / 15,567 / 16$,
569/22, $569 / 6,569 / 7,570 / 15,570 / 21,577 / 4,590 / 20$,
$592 / 25,593 / 1,59418,595 / 6,595 / 7,593 / 13$
side-by-tide $661 / 11$
sides 557/14
sipm 651/17
digning 646/9
atmple 576/25, 615/9
simpleat 561/12, 604/9
atmpithed $567 / 25$
dingle $53 \mathrm{a} / 12,572 / 7,603 / 1,669 / 9$, c6eh14, $674 / 20$,
675K, 67/11
䗑 669/2
ditting scarl
dituntion 5sot, ssen15, seah6, ce7/11
etturations 591/24, 591/25, 593/18, c03/3, 607/1
aldipped 596/1
SLi 57816
SL2 579/15
alow 5997
soft 592/12, 592/16, 592/22, 593/6, 593/7, 593/12, 593/15
molid 571/22
sort 576/13, 582K, 599/5, 599/9, 602/22, 661/11, 651/13
seunds 533/18, 534/3, cae/16
Southern $518 / 4$
epace $562 / 15,567 / 3,567 / 4,567 / 11,567 / 17$, $564 / 11$,
569/3, $569 / 10,574 / 3,574 / 14,575 / 2,575 / 11,575 / 15$,
57/24, $575 / 25,57 / 1 / 1,57 / 14,57 / 13,57 / / 21,577 / 4$,
580/20, 593/6, 599/8, 648/23
apecified 579/11
specily 525/22
apeculate 559/s, $559 / 7$
epeculation 537/2

## spread seo/13

Starf $577 / 12,511 / 13,582 / 23,617 / 24,647 \%, 660 / 4$, 6763
Sterl's 592/13, 591/6
wtined $581 / 10$
stand-alone $526 / 6,526 / 5,520115,526 / 16,531 / \%$,
531/14, 531/17
etand-bedile 523/5
mandiard 534/19, 539/2, 544/24, 549/14, 549/24,
3547, 53/15, 6K5/11
thadards $347 / 20,347 / 23,547 / 25,34915,560 / 2$,
352/19, 352/21
start $595 / 9,561 / 7,589 / 12$
atarte $520 / 7$
atate $61821,6467,6704,671 / 14,671 / 15,672 / 24$
statement $523 / 2,546 / 25,353 / 3,609 / 2,61 / 18$
Stintem 519/4, 399/1, 616/12, 652/13, 662/13, 663/11,
663/15, 666/18, 669/14, 672/19
trayhat 663/5
aticking 564/3
tifipulate 320/9, 520/2s
thop sea/12
Street 61e/24
strike 539/2
atrike 55510
atrive 583/16, 593/17
stualled 669/12, 669/13

stuf $539 / 4,36 / 14,569 / 3,570 / 3,59910,611 / 5$,
$611 / 7,613 / 15,613 / 1 \mathrm{~g}, 615 / 1 \mathrm{~g}, 617 / 12,617 / 15,663 / 6$ onb-A 54916
subcaption 581/22
tublect $559 / 24,539 / 4,673 / 12$
submith 606/23
subaection 522/15, 522/20
subaldy $560 / 5,560 / 3$
subtrmet $530 / 12,532 / 4$
sum $527 / 11,54 / 1,53 M 12,53412,5381,535 / 5$,
$535 / 17,536 / 9,536 / 13,536 / 22,539 / 4,539 / 17,550 / 19$,
551/11, (69/25, 67017, 671/16, 671/19, 675/17
sumamary 646/3, 646/6, 647/2, 648/4
supplemented 591/5, 591/:
supply $583 / 11$
surpriee $526 / 14,526 / 17$
surrounding 59\%14
SUSAN 518ns
suspended 530/5
ewtich $525 / 23,526 / 24,527 / 5,539 / 7,542 / 15,542 / 16$,
$560 / 11,566 / 12,567 / 18,369 / 15,569 / 17,569 / 24$,
$574 / 23,57025,571 / 1,572 / 10,572 / 11,573 / 7,599 / 25$,
$594 / 13,593 / 6,595 / 7,595 / 13,595 / 14,593 / 11,595 / 22$,
$5 \% / 1,599 / 11,599 / 25,633 / 13,653 / 19,633 / 20,653 / 22$,
654/, 6513, 655/5, 653/7
switchboard $567 / 20$
wwitched $590 / 1,589 / 4$, $599 / 12,599 / 13,599 / 14$, 657/4, 677/4, 657/13
switches 526/19, 526/21, 326/23, 613/3, 653/24 wiltching $533 / 23,533 / 25,534 / 1,53 \mathrm{M} / 4,534 / 5$,

 $655 / 3,656 / 1,65 / 5,65610,656 / 12,656 / 16$ swera 61曾17

## 3

Table 531/\%
talk $337 \mathrm{k}, 599 / 12$
talked 527/14, 531/15, 577/6, $614 / 22,651 / 22$
thliking $523 / 15,530 / 10,330 / 11,531 / 19,536 / 5,537 / 3$, $54 / 3,5447,54 / 10,551 / 19,535 / 19,571 / 9,561 / 4$,
535/21, 54c/4
talles 53a/25, 561/13, 675/23
Tallahamee 518/21
tanciem 5341, 535/17, 599/1息
tape $576 / 16,57620,5069$
target $393 / 23,595 / 13$
tarceted 533/13, 583/19
targetins $585 / 16$
tarfif $527 / 7,536 / 24,537 / 12,537 / 17,537 / 24,530 / 5$, 53/h1, $334 / 15,534 / 19,539 / 5,539 / 16,544 / 23,545 / 2$, $54 / 10,545 / 20,54 / 23,653 / 22$
taritifed $525 / 17,526 / 25,527 / 3,527 / 5,539 / 11,546 / 2$,
$653 / 3,653 / 6,653 \%, 653 / 10,63 / 16,653 / 21,65 / 44$, 45/he
tartitis $526 / 3,526 / 5,526 / 8,526 / 11,526 / 15,526 / 18$, 3362, 530/4, 337/19, 537/21, 34513
terke 673/3
technical 61s/17
sechuichan 580/19, 59/24
techrichans sters, $597 / 12$
techrelegy $612 / 22,612 / 24,613 / 4,613 / 22,61 / 4$
Telnowin 5s3/e
telecommunication sol/18, 653/1

Telocemmamications 511/3, 5196, 518/5, 522/17, $529 / 21,523 / 5,523 / 25,524 / 4,54 / 21,54122,5497$, ssert, cesh16, 61817
telephoase 523/9
ten 545/11, 505/12
term 353/21, 670/6
terminal $572 / 17,572 / 18,572 / 21,572 / 22,573 / 3$ termalanly $572 / 25,573 / 13$
termanate $597 / 3,59717,599 / 2,599 / 2$
terminated $570 / 23,570 / 25,572 / 9,572 / 10,572 / 12$, 57377, 649/23
terminatee $591 / 12,592 / 5$
terminating $572 / 11,399 / 2,599 / 1$
termination $571 / 14,571 / 21,571 / 23,572 / 2,572 / 3$ terms $523 / 20,533 / 3,533 / 12,544 \mathrm{mi}, 549 \mathrm{~h}, 559 / 10$, 566k, ©64/4, 667/23
TRRRY 51:/15
teatified $603 / 13,61077$, 618/18
Terthanomy $519 / 7,520 / 9,5216,527 / 15,530 / 10$, $533 / 1,340 / 1,34573,547 / 19,562 / 8,563 / 1,36374$, $571 / 6,599 / 17,600 / 2,60414,605 / 2,611 / 18,613 / 4$, $619 / 8,619 / 9,61 \% 13,619 / 16,646 / 2,64 / 5,661 / 17$. 674/21
text ccal3, 662/17
Thenk $356 / 17,391 / 9,603 / 7$, 61399, 612/9, 613/22, 617/16, 6891, 659/14, 674/16
Thanks 54/21
Thereupon 618/s
they've $340 / 1,540 / 9,532 / 15,352 / 16,575 / 17,375 / 25$, 579/23, 614/21
third $560 / 20,611 / 5$
thouanad $579 / 23,300 / 6,300 / 10,500 / 13$
three sse/15, 582/22, $591 / 4,599 / 3$
three-way 610/23
TIME SIE $11,523 / 3,530 / 12,532 / 19,534 / 6,535 / 10$, $537 / 25,55910,571 / 11,579 / 24,580 / 2,580 / 4,540 / 6$,
$560 / 12,550 / 14,59 / 4,597 / 17,591 / 4,606 / 15,606 / 23$,
co6/24, 608/4, 619/9, 653/20, 661/13
thmes 550/22, 610/2s
thic 590/23, 659/10, 660/17
toll $610 / 22,636 / 3$
Tom 647/1s
tone 592/12, 592/17, 592/22, 593/7, 5931, 593/12, 593/15
tool 592115
top $521 / 13,528 / 4,361 / R, 583 / 6,67319$
tratic $599 / 2,509 / 12,509 / 16$
Tranteript 320/2, 573/21, 647/
tramelation 599/18, 600/1
Tranamivelon 512/5
tranepert $533 / 23,533 / 25,533 / 16,537 / 7$, $584 /$, $58411,594 / 25,585 / 2,545 / 4,505 / 23,59 / 25,506 / 5$, $599 / 19,59 / 9,59 / 13,59 / 116,59 / 19,59 / 20,593 / 1$, $593 / 2,593 / 3,5934,593 / 2,593118,593 / 21,593 / 23$ treat $556 / 12,556715,561 / 14,607 / 1,646 / 29$
ircated 55624, 557/2, 577/5, 557/1
treating 586/19
truckiki 676/4
true $560 / 10,5653,603 / 22,617 / 1,61 / 5,671 / 22$ truak $5936,598 / 12$
truaking 501/13
turn she/14, $549 / 9,562 / 5,566 / 16,577 / 11,531 / 15$, $592 / 10,525 / 6,59 \mathrm{M} / 11,611 / 13,652 / 12,661 / 11,661 / 24$, 661/24, 65916, 66977
turnan 543/18, 557/24
two $520 / 17,528 / 13,531 / 4,531 / 10,531 / 19,531 / 21$, 341/15, 541/20, 542/12, 56/13, 570/7, 570/14, 573/5, $576 / 20,57 / \%, 57 / 114,58 / 13,581 / 5,6046,612 / 17$, $649 / 18,662 / 18,663 / 25,663 / 2,664 / 5,666 / 9$ tying selis
type 594/4, 591/23, 592/3, 653/24
typel 584/4, 596/6

## U

mabundle $58 / 11,59 / 18,59 / 19,596 / 20,59 / 22$ unbundled $521 / 23,522 / 18,522 / 22,527 / 10,527 / 11$, 528/9, $528 / 13,52822,529 / 9,531 / 7,532 / 24,53410$, $539 / 4,539 / 18,540 / 3,54 \%, 340 / 12,543 / 16,54 / 16$, $54 / 25,543 / 23,54 / 4,549 / 5,550 / 5,350 / 115,553 / 4$, $553 / 19,553 / 19,533 / 20,554 / 21,55422,353 / 9,355 / 16$, $555117,55611,35977,560 / 11,562 / 16,363 / 9,557 / 5$, $568 / 4,57613,576 / 11,577 / 1,577 / 4,57 / 10,579 / 11$. 579/19, se2/6, 583/6, si3/21, 5947, 594/24, s95/1, 5957, 586/4, $587 / 12,5981,595 / 24,589 / 11,569 / 23$, $591 / 13,593 / 23,594 / 1,59 / 7,5941,59 / 17,59 / 22$, $59 / 23,594 / 24,594 / 25,59 / 14,597 / 17,5916,599 / 15$, s9s/23, ccou/4, $600 / 2, \cos / 17,606 / 2, ~ c 0 / 410, ~ c e 7 / 5$. $607 / 12,607 / 13,607 / 17,615 / 1,617 / 10,649 / 22,66120$, 661/4, 666/14, 673/2, 673/15, 675/2, 675K, 673/13 unhundilige $523 / 10,523 / 16,55 \% / 21,561 / 2$, 39414 unconblned cast underent 680/14

UNE 523/21, 527/19, 5369, 650/2, 650/20, 650/21, 6707
UNE: $523 / 20,52321,52324,524 / 4,529 / 3,531 / 8$, $531 / \mathrm{s}, 531 / 15,531 / 17,532 / 3,532 / 7,541 / 25,542 / 3$, $542 / 4,542 / 5,542 / 20,5414,352 / 12,562 / 15,616 / 21$, 617/3, ch6/12, 646/14, 646/1s, chen2s, 619/3, 649/11, $649 / 23,60 / 2,650 / 3,650 / 15,651 / 19,652 / 2,652 / 3$, $652 / 5,6215,652 \mathrm{~h}, 6517$, 651/11, 670/16, 671/16, 676 6
unflaterally $335 / 10$
unthe $5 \operatorname{son} 13$
upfrade 614/4
upgraded 614/3, 61410, 614/11, 614/12
 $61024,611 / 4,611 / 20,612 / 1,612 / 5$, 65618, 63624, c57/5, $657 / 5,4 \times 1 / 5,658 / 22$
neer $581 / 22,399 / 3,65 / 24,64 / 25,657 / 22,659 / 3$, $658 / 23$
yare $5903,633 / 14,633 / 15,633 / 23,655 / 23$
utinfe $53 / 21,343 / 25,5 / 4 / 2$
utifing s/2/2, $613 / 13$

## y

## vacnte 523/16

valld $337 / 21,347 / 5$
valus 560118
varies 561/10
varietien 579/9, 579/14, 37 /19
VARNER 519/3, $321 / 5,529 / 21,52924,53 \mathrm{~N} / 5$,
$530 / 14,530 / 20,531 / 12,531 / 21,532 / 5,532 / 8,532 / 11$, $540 / 14,540 / 17,540 / 20,541 / 4,541 / 4,541 / 12,541 / 15$, $34 / 1,542 / 23,543 / 3,54319,543 / 24,5443,54 / 7$, $54410,54414,54 / 20,546 / 12,546 / 17,547 / 12$, $547 / 15,535112,55 / 14,53519,58524,56 / 3,5569$, $557 / 1 \mathrm{f}, 559 / 22,560 / 12,560 / 14,561 / 4,577 / 21,581 / 22$, $599 / 8,603 / 9,610 / 3,610 / 8,612 / 11,613 / 6,613 / 23$, 61717
verilon 564/10, 573/3
vertien 559/23, 589/12, 589/22, 599/25, 590/12 view $524 / 10,529 / 19,54 / 18$
virtual $56 / 115,564 / 16,596 n, 546 / 2,5863$, $590 / 7$, 59/17, 596/19, $596 / 23,597 / 8,59711,59 / 20$ virtue 611 If
volce $561 / 1,5613,5646,583 / 7$
VOLUME $51 t / 11,320 / 3,321 / 6$

## w

wait $531 / 5,577 / 13,660 / 3$
waiting 5987
walked 670/13
walk $361 / 13$
Wednendiny 518/17
week 561/13
welfh 663/24
Wet 618/24
Wherever 367/18
wholeank 529/33, 549/13, 542/21
Wheogn 581/18
wiling $560 / 24,563 / 16,563 / 14$
win 6167
wire $571 / 22,572 / 5,572 / 17,572 / 15,572 / 21,372 / 22$, $572 / 25,573 / 5,573 / 16,577 / 2,593 / 16,614 / 6$
wires 57617, sis1/6
with 559/1, 563/3
withhold $608 / 21$
WITNBSS $529 / 21,529 / 24,330 / 8,530 / 14,530 / 20$, 531/12, 531/21, 532/5, 532/, 532/11, 54/14, 540/17, $340 / 20,341 / 4,541 / 4,341 / 12,341 / 15,542 / 1,542 / 23$, $343 / 3,543 / 3,543 / 24,54 / 3,544 / 7,54 / 10,54414$, $34 / 20,54 / 12,54 / 17,547 / 12,347 / 5,34 / 15$,
$549 / 11,555 / 12,55614,585 / 19,585 / 24,556 / 3,356 / 9$, $557 / 18,559 / 22,560 / 12,560 / 14,561 / 4,5621,570 / 19$, $571 / 4,577 / 13,577 / 17,577 / 19,57 / 111,351 / 17,59 / 22$, 599/t, ca3/9, 610/3, 610/3, 612/11, 613K, 613/23, 617/17, 61816, 660/2, 669/13
WITNESGIS $5191,520 / 25$
word $521 / 25,522 / 7,563 / 1,563 / 3,653 / 12,65 / 20$, 656/22, 666733, 673/18
words 652/17, 671/21
werk $396 / 17,526 / 24,666 / 19,667 / 22,672 / 9$, 673/ worlable 563/17
working 609/15, 663/14, 669/16, 670/25
werlde stste
wrong $52417,563 / 5,563 / 25,561 / 18,609 / 2,61 \omega 12$, 611/22, 6122
wrote s6ans


