BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Consideration of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s entry into interLATA services pursuant to Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 960786-TL

/

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

AND EXHIBIT

OF

RODNEY PAGE

ON BEHALF OF

ACCESS INTEGRATED NETWORKS, INC.

JULY 20, 2001

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE U 8887 JUL 20 E

1 0. Please state your name and business address. 2 Α. My name is Rodney Page. My business address is 4885 Riverside Drive. Suite 3 101, Macon, Georgia 31210. 4 0. What position do you hold with ACCESS? 5 Α. I am Vice President for Marketing and Strategic Development. 6 What is the purpose of your testimony? **O**. 7 A. The thrust of the testimony of BellSouth witness Cynthia Cox is that all is 8 healthy and well with respect to the development of competition in Florida. In 9 my testimony I will show that, to the contrary, the development of competition 10 is being hampered by overt conduct on the part of BellSouth. I will recount some 11 of ACCESS' negative experiences with BellSouth that I believe should bear on 12 the Commission's evaluation of whether BellSouth has shown the degree of 13 compliance with its obligations under the 1996 Telecommunications Act that is 14 a condition precedent to its entry into the interLATA toll market. 15 Q. Which issues will you address? 16 My testimony pertains to Issue 2, which addresses whether BellSouth has Α. provided interconnection and access in the manner required by the Act; and Issue 17 18 3, which addresses whether BellSouth is providing unbundled network elements 19 on terms that are just, reasonable, and non-discriminatory. 20 Q. Please describe ACCESS Integrated Networks, Inc. 21 Α. ACCESS is a small but growing ALEC that provides alternative local exchange service in the nine states in which BellSouth is the ILEC. ACCESS' 22 headquarters are in Macon, Georgia. ACCESS currently has 57,000 access lines, 23

2business customers. Our business plan includes service to smaller communities3in which business customers typically do not have as many alternatives as those4located in larger metropolitan areas.5To serve its customers, ACCESS utilizes unbundled network elements6(the "UNE-P" platform) that it obtains from BellSouth. Accordingly, ACCESS'7ability to provide service of high quality to its customers is dependent upon the8degree to which BellSouth fulfills its obligations to ACCESS.9Q.9Describe ACCESS' experiences with BellSouth that bear on BellSouth's10application for authority to enter the interLATA market.11A.At the outset, I wish to provide the perspective from which I offer these12comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied13in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In14applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the15Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old16but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees.17ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes18and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the19relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of20the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman21involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in	1		of which some 3,000 are in Florida. ACCESS serves small to medium sized
4 located in larger metropolitan areas. 5 To serve its customers, ACCESS utilizes unbundled network elements 6 (the "UNE-P" platform) that it obtains from BellSouth. Accordingly, ACCESS' 7 ability to provide service of high quality to its customers is dependent upon the 8 degree to which BellSouth fulfills its obligations to ACCESS. 9 Q. 9 Describe ACCESS' experiences with BellSouth that bear on BellSouth's 10 application for authority to enter the interLATA market. 11 A. 12 comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied 13 in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In 14 applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the 15 Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old 16 but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees. 17 ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes 18 and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the 19 relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of 10 the 1996 Act will be a	2		business customers. Our business plan includes service to smaller communities
5 To serve its customers, ACCESS utilizes unbundled network elements 6 (the "UNE-P" platform) that it obtains from BellSouth. Accordingly, ACCESS' 7 ability to provide service of high quality to its customers is dependent upon the 8 degree to which BellSouth fulfills its obligations to ACCESS. 9 Q. 9 Describe ACCESS' experiences with BellSouth that bear on BellSouth's 10 application for authority to enter the interLATA market. 11 A. 11 A. the outset, I wish to provide the perspective from which I offer these 12 comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied 13 in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In 14 applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the 15 Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old 16 but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees. 17 ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes 18 and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the 19 relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of 20<	3		in which business customers typically do not have as many alternatives as those
6(the "UNE-P" platform) that it obtains from BellSouth. Accordingly, ACCESS'7ability to provide service of high quality to its customers is dependent upon the8degree to which BellSouth fulfills its obligations to ACCESS.9Q. Q. Describe ACCESS' experiences with BellSouth that bear on BellSouth's10application for authority to enter the interLATA market.11A.At the outset, I wish to provide the perspective from which I offer these12comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied13in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In14applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the15Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old16but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees.17ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes18and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the19relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of20the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman21involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the22impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	4		located in larger metropolitan areas.
7 ability to provide service of high quality to its customers is dependent upon the 8 degree to which BellSouth fulfills its obligations to ACCESS. 9 Q. Describe ACCESS' experiences with BellSouth that bear on BellSouth's 10 application for authority to enter the interLATA market. 11 A. At the outset, I wish to provide the perspective from which I offer these 12 comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied 13 in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In 14 applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the 15 Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old 16 but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees. 17 ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes 18 and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the 19 relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of 20 the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman 21 involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the 22 impact of BellSouth's behavior on the developm	5		To serve its customers, ACCESS utilizes unbundled network elements
8 degree to which BellSouth fulfills its obligations to ACCESS. 9 Q. Describe ACCESS' experiences with BellSouth that bear on BellSouth's application for authority to enter the interLATA market. 11 A. At the outset, I wish to provide the perspective from which I offer these comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees. 17 ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	6		(the "UNE-P" platform) that it obtains from BellSouth. Accordingly, ACCESS'
9 Q. Describe ACCESS' experiences with BellSouth that bear on BellSouth's application for authority to enter the interLATA market. 11 A. At the outset, I wish to provide the perspective from which I offer these comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees. 17 ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	7		ability to provide service of high quality to its customers is dependent upon the
10application for authority to enter the interLATA market.11A.At the outset, I wish to provide the perspective from which I offer these12comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied13in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In14applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the15Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old16but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees.17ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes18and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the19relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of20the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman21involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the22impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	8		degree to which BellSouth fulfills its obligations to ACCESS.
11A.At the outset, I wish to provide the perspective from which I offer these12comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied13in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In14applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the15Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old16but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees.17ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes18and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the19relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of20the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman21involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the22impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	9	Q.	Describe ACCESS' experiences with BellSouth that bear on BellSouth's
12comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied13in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In14applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the15Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old16but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees.17ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes18and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the19relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of20the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman21involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the22impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	10		application for authority to enter the interLATA market.
13in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In14applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the15Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old16but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees.17ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes18and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the19relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of20the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman21involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the22impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	11	А.	At the outset, I wish to provide the perspective from which I offer these
14applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the15Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old16but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees.17ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes18and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the19relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of20the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman21involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the22impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	12		comments. My understanding is that stated in overall terms, the test to be applied
Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees. ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	13		in this case is whether BellSouth has fully opened its network to competition. In
16but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees.17ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes18and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the19relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of20the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman21involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the22impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	14		applying the test, as it has been formulated into more specific issues, I urge the
ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	15		Commission not to take an overly mechanical approach to its task. To use an old
and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	16		but apt phrase, there is a danger of not seeing the forest because of the trees.
 relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue 	17		ACCESS' experience is that BellSouth engages in conduct that impedes
20 the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman 21 involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the 22 impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	18		and stifles competition. In what follows, I am not offering a legal opinion; the
 involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue 	19		relationship between the facts that I will describe and the legal requirements of
22 impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue	20		the 1996 Act will be argued by the attorneys. However, as a businessman
	21		involved in the implementation of the 1996 Act in the marketplace, I can see the
23 2(f) asks whether BellSouth has satisfied "other associated requirements" for the	22		impact of BellSouth's behavior on the development of competition. Subissue
	23		2(f) asks whether BellSouth has satisfied "other associated requirements" for the

.

1 item. One such "associated requirement" is the obligation in Section 251(c)(2)2 that such interconnection be of a quality at least equal to that which BellSouth 3 provides to itself. It appears to me, for instance, that if BellSouth interacts 4 negatively with ACCESS' customer relationships in a way it does not with its 5 own customers, and in a manner that undermines in the marketplace the 6 competition that the 1996 Act was intended to facilitate, then the Commission 7 should question whether BellSouth is offering interconnection and access of a 8 quality at least equal to that which is provides to itself.

9

Q. Please describe the negative experiences to which you refer.

10 A. We have found, to our profound disappointment, that BellSouth frequently 11 endeavors to create doubt or concern in the minds of ACCESS' customers or 12 potential customers regarding the quality of service they will receive if they 13 switch to or remain with ACCESS.

The experiences range from the claim that a customer will lose its listing 14 15 in the directory if it changes to ACCESS, to the message that a customer's maintenance will suffer as a result of changing from BellSouth to ACCESS, to 16 claims that ACCESS' service will be completely unavailable after a date certain. 17 These activities are perhaps more subtle and insidious than the measurements 18 19 typically associated with the competitive checklist of the Act. However, their impact on competition is obvious. Can BellSouth be said to comply with the 20 requirement that it offers white page listings if it attempts to instill fear in 21 22 ACCESS' customers that those listings will be unavailable? Can BellSouth be said to offer interconnection and access to a competitor on just and reasonable 23

terms if it tells (falsely) its competitors' customers that they will soon have no
 telephone service?

3 As Vice President for Marketing, I have gained personal knowledge that 4 the instances are numerous and widespread. We have been able to document 5 some of them through affidavits of customers. I have appended several such affidavits to my testimony as Exhibit No. _____ (RP-1), pgs.1-23. While most 6 7 of these particular customers are located in Georgia, one of the affidavits was 8 prepared by a customer in Florida. However, many customers are reluctant to 9 provide such documentation because of their concern that their telephone service 10 will suffer in some way as a consequence. We find that the problems detailed 11 here are representative of those that occur throughout BellSouth's service area.

12

Q. Please describe some of the specific encounters.

A. In his affidavit (Exhibit No. ___ (RP-1), p. 1 of 23), Charles Vance states unequivocally that BellSouth threatened to refuse to maintain the service on his business' telephone line(s), and to delete his company from the yellow pages if he switched his local telephone service to ACCESS.

Connection would not be listed there unless it returned to BellSouth as a customer.

1

2

23

Michael McDevitt's affidavit (Exhibit No. ____ (RP-1), p. 4 of 23) and Susan Kennedy's affidavit (Exhibit No. ____ (RP-1), p. 5 of 23), demonstrate the influence that an incumbent LEC like BellSouth can have in dealing with its former customers. In the case of McDevitt Air, BellSouth misrepresented the process that the company would have to go through to obtain DSL service so that McDevitt would transfer all of the company's telephone lines back to BellSouth's retail division.

Carol Duffey's affidavit (Exhibit No. ___ (RP-1), pgs. 6 and 7 of 23) is 10 indicative of two realities for ALECs. First, BellSouth has no interest in giving 11 12 ALECs the ability to interconnect with its facilities in a manner that will allow 13 a company like ACCESS to become an effective competitor. Second, when 14 ALECs are unable to obtain access that is "equal" to an incumbent's facilities, and thus cannot provide the same degree of quality customer service as 15 BellSouth, their customers will inevitably return their telephone service to 16 BellSouth. 17

18The affidavits of Carol Roberts (Exhibit No. _ (RP-1), pgs. 8-11 of 23),19Mary Parker (Exhibit No. _ (RP-1), pgs. 12-15 of 23), and Raymond Parker20(Exhibit No. _ (RP-1), pgs. 16-19 of 23), all of whom are associated with21Parker & Bramlett Memorials, describe BellSouth's blunt message that22customers who leave BellSouth will receive inferior maintenance service.

The affidavits of Daniel Becton (Exhibit No. __ (RP-1), pgs. 20 and 21

1of 23) and Jimmie Smith (Exhibit No. __ (RP-1), pgs. 22 and 23 of 23),2demonstrate outrageous conduct. TelChoice, acting as an agent of BellSouth,3contacted ACCESS's customers to induce them to return to BellSouth. The agent4informed them that their respective businesses would lose their telephone service5after a certain date. In one instance, the customer was told that ACCESS had, or6was about to, file for bankruptcy relief. None of these statements are true.

7 Q. Please summarize your testimony.

8 A. To assess whether BellSouth has complied with its obligation to open its network 9 to competition, it is necessary to look at the bigger picture as well as its 10 component parts. BellSouth's practice is to diminish, through its actions in the 11 marketplace, the opportunity of ACCESS to compete that the provisions of the 12 1996 Act were intended to afford. The Commission should conclude that 13 BellSouth has not complied with its legal obligations and should not be allowed 14 to enter the interLATA market.

- 15 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 16 A. Yes.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p.1 of 23

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF GEORGIA DEKALB COUNTY

Personally appeared before me an officer duly authorized to administer oaths, CHARLES VANCE, who after being duly sworn deposes and says that he is the owner of FURNITURE RESTORATION, INC. OF ATLANTA located at 3660 North Peachtree Road, Chamblee, Georgia 30341, and that in late July or early August of the year 2000, I contacted BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH") to inquire about the legitimacy of Competitive Local Exchange Companies (CLECs) after a receiving a sales call from Dick Coons, an agent with ACCESS INTEGRATED NETWORKS, INC. ("ACCESS"). I also wanted to verify certain details of the telephone service proposal made to me by Mr. Coons.

During my telephone conversation with a BELLSOUTH customer service representative, I was told that if my business switched its local telephone service to ACCESS the following would occur: (1) my business would not receive any service maintenance, and (2) my company would lose its yellow page listing at the end of the year (i.e. 2000). I was subsequently contacted by BELLSOUTH and asked about the incident recited above. I informed BELLSOUTH's representative(s) of everything contained in this Affidavit. My business still has its local (business) telephone service with BellSouth.

HARLES VANCE, AFFIANT

Sworn to and subscribed before me this <u>25</u> day of <u>Price</u>, 2001 Notary Public G:\DMB\Client Folders\Access\271 Officiant\VancoAffidavit-toor ersion.wpd 2004 Public Comparison and subscribed before me MARCH String Comparison and subscribed before me MARCH String Comparison and subscribed before me this <u>25</u> day of <u>Price</u>, 2001

STATE OF ALABAMA <u>MENGAN</u>COUNTY

Personally appeared before me an officer duly authorized to administer oaths, CATHY SPARKS, who after being duly sworn deposes and says that she is the <u>Readilespire</u> of THE CARPET CONNECTION located at 2713 Spring Place, Unit T, Decatur, Alabama, and that on or about September 19, 2000, she contacted Party Anderson, an agent with ACCESS INTEGRATED NETWORKS, INC. ("ACCESS"), CARPET CONNECTION'S local phone service provider, and informed her that CARPET CONNECTION was no longer listed in directory assistance.

all there is a

Ms. Sparks learned that CARPET CONNECTION had been deleted from directory assistance when she was contacted by a frustrated customer trying to reach her about a business matter. After this conversation, she verified the accuracy of the customer's statement by calling directory assistance, and requesting CARPET CONNECTION'S telephone number—only to be informed that CARPET CONNECTION was not listed.

Prior to contacting Patty Anderson, Ms. Sparks called BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH") to inquire as to why CARPET CONNECTION had been deleted from directory assistance. She spoke with BELLSOUTH representative, Gwen Wilson. Ms. Wilson informed her that CARPET CONNECTION was no longer listed in directory assistance due to an error on ACCESS' part. Ms. Wilson also informed her that because CARPET CONNECTION was no longer a customer of BELLSOUTH, CARPET CONNECTION would no longer be listed in directory assistance. Ms. Wilson even placed Ms. Sparks on hold to confirm this "fact" with her supervisor.

Upon hearing this information, Ms. Sparks became influiated with ACCESS, and, after her conversation with Ms. Wilson she then contacted Patty Anderson to discuss the representations that Ms. Anderson had made to her when the two had initially discussed the possibility of CARPET CONNECTION switching its local (business) telephone service from BELLSOUTH to ACCESS. Ms. Sparks informed Ms. Anderson that because of Ms. Wilson's statements she felt as though Ms. Anderson had misrepresented the quality of the telephone services that ACCESS could provide to CARPET CONNECTION..

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p.3 of 23

An ACCESS customer service representative subsequently informed MssParks that ACCESS had conducted an internal investigation, and discovered that the conversion order it had placed on CARPET CONNECTION'S behalf included the same directory listing that the company had as a customer of BELLSOUTH. Brandee Johnson, an Access customer service representative, telephoned Ms. Sparks and assured her that CARPET CONNECTION would be included in directory assistance. Ms. Johnson also informed Ms. Sparks that are would handle the marter personally. Ms. Sparks informed Ms. Johnson that while she enjoyed working with ACCESS, if the matter was not resolved by the end of business the next working day (i.e. September 20, 2000) CARPET CONNECTION would have no choice but to switch its local (business) phone service back to BELLSOUTH. Ms. Johnson made the necessary calls, and confirmed for Ms. Sparks on September 20, 2000 that CARPET CONNECTION was once again listed in directory assistance.

Shortly after the "directory assistance" incident, CARPET CONNECTION'S telephone service was disconnected. Once again, Ms. Sparks contacted Party Anderson and asked her to look into the matter. She also contacted BELLSOUTH, but the representative that she spoke with informed her that it was not BELLSOUTH'S problem. The company's service was eventually restored as a result of ACCESS's efforts.

Finally, on February 13, 2001, Ms. Sparks was contacted by a BELLSOUTH representative about switching CARPET CONNECTION'S telephone service back to BELLSOUTH. She informed this person that CARPET CONNECTION was pleased with the level of service provided by ACCESS. The BELLSOUTH representative then informed Ms. Sparks that ACCESS was simply making money off of BELLSOUTH's services, and that there was not point in the company using ACCESS when BELLSOUTH could sell CARPET CONNECTION the same telephone services for much less. Ms. Sparks declined to switch CARPET CONNECTION'S local telephone service to BELLSOUTH, and the company is still a customer of ACCESS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this <u>30th</u>/day of May . 2001

ti fun

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p.4 of 23

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF GEORGIA CHATHAM COUNTY

Personally appeared before me an officer duly authorized to administer oaths, MICHAEL McDEVITT, who after being duly sworn deposes and says that: he is the President of MCDEVITT AIR ("MCDEVITT") located at 600 W. 51st Street, Savannah, Georgia 31405, and that in late February or early March of 2001, MCDEVITT switched from ACCESS INTEGRATED NETWORKS, INC. ("ACCESS") to BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH") as the company's local telephone service provider as a result of statements made to either him or Susan Kennedy, Systems Administrator of MCDEVITT, by a BELLSOUTH representative. This BELLSOUTH representative stated unequivocally that unless MCDEVITT returned all eight of its telephone lines to BELLSOUTH it would be unable to get DSL service from BELLSOUTH. MCDEVITT transferred all eight of its telephone lines to BELLSOUTH from ACCESS as a direct result of this assertion by the BELLSOUTH representative.

Shortly after the aforementioned conversation took place, Ms. Kennedy received a telephone solicitation from a company called TELECHOICE, LLC ("TELECHOICE"). The TELECHOICE representative that Ms. Kennedy spoke with was Maegan Johnson. Ms. Johnson informed Ms. Kennedy that BellSouth was attempting to "win back" some its former customers, and that MCDEVITT could save a significant amount of money on its local telephone service bill if the company returned to BELLSOUTH. Ms. Kennedy informed me of her conversation with Ms. Johnson shortly after it took place. Although, MCDEVITT had already decided to switch its local telephone service back to BELLSOUTH in order to get DSL service, the company was able to get the BELLSOUTH "win back" rates as well.

MICHAEL MCDEVITT AFFLANT

Sworn to and subscribed before me day of /lyry, 2001 Notary Public

G:\DMB\Client Folders\Access\271 Complaint\McDevitt Afficavi2.wpd

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p 5 of 23

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF GEORGIA CHATHAM COUNTY

マンズ ひょうしょう ひょうかい

Personally appeared before me an officer öuly authorized to administer oaths, SUSAN KENNEDY, who after being duly sworn deposes and says the following: that she is the Systems Administrator for MCDEVITT AIR ("MCDEVITT") located at 600 W. 51st Street, Savannah, Georgia 31405, and that in late February or early March of 2001, MCDEVITT switched from ACCESS INTEGRATED NETWORKS, INC. ("ACCESS") to BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH") as the company's local telephone service provider as a result of statements made to either her or Michael McDevitt, President of MCDEVITT, by a BELLSOUTH representative. This BELLSOUTH representative stated unequivocally that unless MCDEVITT returned all eight of its telephone lines to BELLSOUTH it would be unable to get DSL service from BELLSOUTH. MCDEVITT transferred all eight of its telephone lines to BELLSOUTH from ACCESS as a direct result of this assertion by the BELLSOUTH representative.

Shortly after the aforementioned conversation took place, Ms. Kennedy received a telephone solicitation from a company called TELECHOICE, LLC ("TELECHOICE"). The TELECHOICE representative that she spoke with was Maegan Johnson. Ms. Johnson informed her that BellSouth was attempting to "win back" some its former customers, and that MCDEVITT could save a significant amount of money on its local telephone service bill if the company returned to BELLSOUTH. Although, MCDEVITT had already decided to switch its local telephone service back to BELLSOUTH in order to get DSL service, the company was able to get the "win back" rates as well.

Sworn to, and subscribed before me ∼day of⁄ Lel 2001 Notary Public

G:\DMB\Client Folders\Access\271 Complaint\Kennedy Affidavit.wpd

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p.6 of 23

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF GEORGIA BIBB COUNTY

Personally appeared before me an officer duly authorized to administer oaths, CAROL DUFFEY, who after being duly sworn deposes and says that she is a customer service representative with ACCESS INTEGRATED NETWORKS, INC. ("ACCESS"), and that on or about November 22, 2000, ACCESS sent an order to BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH") requesting that approximately six (6) telephone lines be transferred from one premises to another on behalf of customer, IMMCO, INC. ("IMMCO"). My contact with IMMCO was a gentleman by the name of Dr. Rameesh.

On December 1, 2000, Dr. Rameesh called ACCESS back and modified IMMCO's order to request that the first two phone lines end with the numbers -8835 and -8845. ACCESS sent a new order that same day, and BELLSOUTH gave ACCESS a due date of December 14, 2000 with respect to same.

The December 1, 2000 order was delayed because BELLSOUTH claimed that the requested numbers (i.e. 678-762-8835 and 8845) were not available. I called these numbers, and each phone number played a message indicating that they had been disconnected or were temporarily out of service. A BELLSOUTH representative named Sarah told me that these numbers did not appear to be available, but that she would check to verify that this was indeed the case.

On December 15, 2000, a different BELLSOUTH representative (named Melody) left a message on my voice mail informing me that while 678-762-8835 and 8845 were not available, 678-772-8835 and 8845 appeared to be. Melody went on to state, however, that the due date for IMMCO's order would now be December 22, 2000. I requested that BELLSOUTH attempt to expedite the matter, and find telephone numbers for our customer ending in -8835 and -8845 immediately.

On December 18, 2000, Melody called me back and informed me that the due date could not be moved up at all, and that after exhausting all possibilities there were no numbers available ending in -8835 and -8845.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p. 7 of 23

BELLSOUTH eventually did agree to move up the due date from December 22, 2000 to December 19, 2000, but still maintained that telephone numbers ending in -8835 and -8845 were not available for this customer. I contacted Dr. Rameesh on or about December 18, 2000, to inform him of this situation, and he advised me that he had taken IMMCO's business back to BELLSOUTH. Dr. Rameesh stated that BELLSOUTH was coming to his business that morning, and that IMMCO would be receiving the original numbers that he had requested (i.e. 678-762-8835 and 8845) from ACCESS. Dr. Rameesh also informed me that BELLSOUTH told him that it could not find any evidence in its system that ACCESS had ever placed an order on IMMCO's behalf.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this <u>Lu</u> day of <u>May</u>, 2001

Notary Public

VIT COMMISSION EXPIRES DEC. 27. 2009

STATE OF GEORGIA

Personally appeared before me an officer duly authorized to administer oaths, CAROL ROBERTS, who after being duly sworn deposes and says that she is the office manager of PARKER & BRAMLETT CUSTOM MEMORIALS ("PARKER") located at 1568 U.S. Hwy 19 South, Leesburg, Georgia 31763, Georgia, and hereby attests to the following:

That in February of 2001 PARKER ordered two telephone jacks from BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH"). At the time of the order, PARKER used ACCESS INTEGRATED NETWORKS, INC. ("ACCESS") as its local telephone service provider.

On March 1, 2001, Raymond Parker called an ACCESS customer service representative to report problems with PARKER'S telephone service. The problem stemmed from two telephone lines that were running through a telephone jack installed by BELLSOUTH. ACCESS was able to establish a dial tone, but the two telephone lines continued to run through this one telephone jack.

On April 8, 2001, Raymond Parker contacted ACCESS again about "buzzing" and "humming" noises that were coming from the aforementioned telephone lines. Mr. Parker also informed ACCESS that "call waiting" was not working as well.

On April 9, 2001, David Lowrey, an ACCESS representative, called PARKER and spoke with Mary Parker, Mr. Parker's wife and a part time bookkeeper for PARKER. Mr. Lowrey informed Mrs. Parker that a BELLSOUTH technician would be at PARKER'S Albany, Georgia office (hereinafter the "Office") by 1:00 p.m. that day. Greg, BELLSOUTH technician identification number PNHWYFY (hereinafter "BELLSOUTH Technician Greg"), called PARKER and confirmed to Carol Roberts, PARKER'S officer manager, that he would be at PARKER'S Office by 1:00p.m. Mrs. Roberts waited for BELLSOUTH Technician Greg to arrive, but she eventually had to leave the office at 3:15 p.m. to meet with prospective clients. At the time Mrs. Roberts left, she had not received a telephone call from BELLSOUTH Technician Greg to advise her that he would be running late.

Mrs. Parker arrived at the office at 3:45 p.m., and witnessed BELLSOUTH Technician Greg leaving the premises. Mrs. Parker was unable to get the technician's attention, but did find a note with his pager number. She immediately paged him. At 3:50 p.m., Mr. Parker, now back in the Office, received a telephone call from BELLSOUTH Technician Greg.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p. 9 of 23

BELLSOUTH Technician Greg informed Mr. Parker that he was already on another job, and that he would not be able to return to address the service problem that day. Having already waited two weeks for BELLSOUTH to dispatch a technician to resolve this problem, Mr. Parker demanded that BELLSOUTH Technician Greg return to PARKER's Office to fix the aforementioned telephone problem(s). BELLSOUTH Technician Greg told Mr. Parker that he would "not tell him what to do," and that because PARKER now used ACCESS as its local telephone service provider he did not have to come back at all. Mr. Parker informed BELLSOUTH Technician Greg that he would contact his supervisor. BELLSOUTH Technician Greg told Mr. Parker that he could do whatever he wanted to do. Mr. Parker then stated that had he been at PARKER at, or even near, the appointed time, someone from PARKER would have been there to let him in. Mr. Parker then told BELLSOUTH Technician Greg that he was not to come back to PARKER'S Office. After this conversation took place, Mr. Parker called ACCESS to report what had happened.

On April 10, 2001, another BELLSOUTH technician named Mike, BELLSOUTH technician identification number BWKIGGB (hereinafter "BELLSOUTH Technician Mike"), arrived at PARKER's Office at approximately 8:55 a.m. BELLSOUTH Technician Greg arrived in his personal red pickup truck, and parked at an adjacent property for approximately 20 minutes. Mrs. Roberts witnessed both technician's arrival, but is unsure as to whether the two had contact while BELLSOUTH Technician Mike "worked" on PARKER's telephone problems. BELLSOUTH Technician Mike confirmed to Mrs. Roberts that BELLSOUTH Technician Greg was indeed sitting in his personal truck on a property adjacent from PARKER's Office. BELLSOUTH Technician Mike checked the outside box, and informed Ms. Roberts that he was not coming inside to perform any work due to the fact that PARKER had switched its local telephone service to ACCESS. Ms. Roberts immediately called David Lowrey with ACCESS to advise him of this statement. Mr. Lowrey asked to speak with the BELLSOUTH Technician Mike. Mr. Lowrey requested that the technician go inside the premises, and fix that jack that BELLSOUTH had originally installed. BELLSOUTH Technician Mike fixed the jacks, and then used the telephone to make numerous telephone calls.

After BELLSOUTH Technician Mike finished making his telephone calls, he informed Ms. Roberts that he was going to change the "memory card" outside the building and then change it on the BELLSOUTH's end as well. After spending some time outside the PARKER Office building, BELLSOUTH Technician Mike left the premises. After BELLSOUTH Technician Mike's departure, Ms. Roberts did not receive any telephone calls at the PARKER Office. Mrs. Parker attempted to call the Office later that morning, and when she did the person on the other end of the telephone answered "Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company," a direct competitor of PARKER'S. Ms. Parker thought that perhaps she had dialed the wrong number, and therefore tried dialing PARKER'S Office telephone number again. Once again, the person at the other end of the telephone answered "Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company."

17.5

Mr. Parker also attempted to call PARKER'S Office, and the same thing occurred. One of PARKER'S vendors, Allgood Granite Company, attempted to call PARKER'S Office as well only to have its call forwarded to Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company.

Mrs. Parker then called a neighboring business, Ferrell Gas, and asked one its employees to go over to the PARKER Office and tell Ms. Roberts to call PARKER's Camilla office. Ms. Roberts called Mrs. Parker as instructed, and Mrs. Parker explained to her that PARKER'S incoming telephone calls were being forwarded to the aforementioned competitor.

Given the events noted above (with respect to BELLSOUTH Technicians Greg and Mike), Mr. Parker, Mrs. Parker, and Ms. Roberts suspected that at least one of the BELLSOUTH technicians (i.e. Mike) had done something to cause PARKER's incoming telephone calls to be forwarded to its direct competitor, Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company.

Mr. Parker called ACCESS and spoke with David Lowrey and Brent Tate, and informed them that PARKER's incoming telephone calls were being forwarded to a direct competitor. These ACCESS customer service representatives advised Mrs. Parker and Ms. Roberts that he should go to PARKER'S Office, pick up the telephone, and dial 73 and then the "pound" symbol to stop the call forwarding from occurring. Ms. Roberts did as instructed, and PARKER'S incoming telephone calls were no longer forwarded to Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company.

On April 11, 2001, Mr. Parker telephoned BELLSOUTH and spoke with customer service representatives Kim Osbourne and Randy Darnell. These BELLSOUTH representatives told Mr. Parker that it was against the law for them to tell him the name of the supervisors of the aforementioned BELLSOUTH technicians. Ms. Osbourne also told Mr. Parker that because PARKER had switched its local telephone service to ACCESS, BELLSOUTH was no longer responsible for the actions of its own technicians. Mr. Parker asked to speak to Ms. Osbourne's supervisor, but she refused his request. Mr. Parker then spoke with Mr. Darnell.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p. 11 of 23

Mr. Damell also informed Mr. Parker that it was against the law for him to disclose the names of his superiors for the South Georgia area, due to the fact that PARKER now had he local telephone service with ACCESS. Mr. Parker informed Mr. Daniell that he was going to contact the Georgia Public Service Commission about what had taken place with BELLSOUTH's technicians, and asked him whether he still wished to refuse to allow him to speak with the technicians' supervisors. At this point, Mr. Datnell became very solds with Mr. Parker, and told Him that he could do whatever he wanted to do, but that he would not give him any of the information that he had requested. Mr. Parker then hang up the telephone.

CAROL ROBERTS, AFFIANT

subseribel before me 2001 אטובאע באוכם אטובאעוב

THE IS: 11 -91

υĽ

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF GEORGIA してく COUNTY

Personally appeared before me an officer duly authorized to administer oaths, MARY PARKER, who after being duly sworn deposes and says that she is a part time bookkeeper for PARKER & BRAMLETT CUSTOM MEMORIALS ("PARKER") located at 1568 U.S. Hwy 19 South, Leesburg, Georgia 31763, Georgia, and hereby attests to the following:

That in February of 2001 PARKER ordered two telephone jacks from BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH"). At the time of the order, PARKER used ACCESS INTEGRATED NETWORKS, INC. ("ACCESS") as its local telephone service provider.

On March 1, 2001, Raymond Parker called an ACCESS customer service representative to report problems with PARKER'S telephone service. The problem stemmed from two telephone lines that were running through a telephone jack installed by BELLSOUTH. ACCESS was able to establish a dial tone, but the two telephone lines continued to run through this one telephone jack.

On April 8, 2001, Raymond Parker contacted ACCESS again about "buzzing" and "humming" noises that were coming from the aforementioned telephone lines. Mr. Parker also informed ACCESS that "call waiting" was not working as well.

On April 9, 2001, David Lowrey, an ACCESS representative, called PARKER and spoke with Mary Parker, Mr. Parker's wife and a part time bookkeeper for PARKER. Mr. Lowrey informed Mrs. Parker that a BELLSOUTH technician would be at PARKER'S Albany, Georgia office (hereinafter the "Office") by 1:00 p.m. that day. Greg, BELLSOUTH technician identification number PNHWYFY (hereinafter "BELLSOUTH Technician Greg"), called PARKER and confirmed to Carol Roberts, PARKER'S officer manager, that he would be at PARKER'S Office by 1:00p.m. Mrs. Roberts waited for BELLSOUTH Technician Greg to arrive, but she eventually had to leave the office at 3:15 p.m. to meet with prospective clients. At the time Mrs. Roberts left, she had not received a telephone call from BELLSOUTH Technician Greg to advise her that he would be running late.

Mrs. Parker arrived at the office at 3:45 p.m., and witnessed BELLSOUTH Technician Greg leaving the premises. Mrs. Parker was unable to get the technician's attention, but did find a note with his pager number. She immediately paged him. At 3:50 p.m., Mr. Parker, now back in the Office, received a telephone call from BELLSOUTH Technician Greg.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p. 13 of 23

BELLSOUTH Technician Greg informed Mr. Parker that he was already on another job, and that he would not be able to return to address the service problem that day. Having already waited two weeks for BELLSOUTH to dispatch a technician to resolve this problem, Mr. Parker demanded that BELLSOUTH Technician Greg return to PARKER's Office to fix the aforementioned telephone problem(s). BELLSOUTH Technician Greg told Mr. Parker that he would "not tell him what to do," and that because PARKER now used ACCESS as its local telephone service provider he did not have to come back at all. Mr. Parker informed BELLSOUTH Technician Greg that he would contact his supervisor. BELLSOUTH Technician Greg told Mr. Parker that he could do whatever he wanted to do. Mr. Parker then stated that had he been at PARKER at, or even near, the appointed time, someone from PARKER would have been there to let him in. Mr. Parker then told BELLSOUTH Technician Greg that he was not to come back to PARKER'S Office. After this conversation took place, Mr. Parker called ACCESS to report what had happened.

On April 10, 2001, another BELLSOUTH technician named Mike, BELLSOUTH technician identification number BWKIGGB (hereinafter "BELLSOUTH Technician Mike"), arrived at PARKER's Office at approximately 8:55 a.m. BELLSOUTH Technician Greg arrived in his personal red pickup truck, and parked at an adjacent property for approximately 20 minutes. Mrs. Roberts witnessed both technician's arrival, but is unsure as to whether the two had contact while BELLSOUTH Technician Mike "worked" on PARKER's telephone problems. BELLSOUTH Technician Mike confirmed to Mrs. Roberts that BELLSOUTH Technician Greg was indeed sitting in his personal truck on a property adjacent from PARKER's Office. BELLSOUTH Technician Mike checked the outside box, and informed Ms. Roberts that he was not coming inside to perform any work due to the fact that PARKER had switched its local telephone service to ACCESS. Ms. Roberts immediately called David Lowrey with ACCESS to advise him of this statement. Mr. Lowrey asked to speak with the BELLSOUTH Technician Mike. Mr. Lowrey requested that the technician go inside the premises, and fix that jack that BELLSOUTH had originally installed. BELLSOUTH Technician Mike fixed the jacks, and then used the telephone to make numerous telephone calls.

After BELLSOUTH Technician Mike finished making his telephone calls, he informed Ms. Roberts that he was going to change the "memory card" outside the building and then change it on the BELLSOUTH's end as well. After spending some time outside the PARKER Office building, BELLSOUTH Technician Mike left the premises.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p. 14 of 23

After BELLSOUTH Technician Mike's departure, Ms. Roberts did not receive any telephone calls at the PARKER Office. Mrs. Parker attempted to call the Office later that morning, and when she did the person on the other end of the telephone answered "Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company," a direct competitor of PARKER'S. Ms. Parker thought that perhaps she had dialed the wrong number, and therefore tried dialing PARKER'S Office telephone number again. Once again, the person at the other end of the telephone answered "Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company."

Mr. Parker also attempted to call PARKER'S Office, and the same thing occurred. One of PARKER'S vendors, Allgood Granite Company, attempted to call PARKER'S Office as well only to have its call forwarded to Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company.

Mrs. Parker then called a neighboring business, Ferrell Gas, and asked one its employees to go over to the PARKER Office and tell Ms. Roberts to call PARKER's Camilla office. Ms. Roberts called Mrs. Parker as instructed, and Mrs. Parker explained to her that PARKER'S incoming telephone calls were being forwarded to the aforementioned competitor.

Given the events noted above (with respect to BELLSOUTH Technicians Greg and Mike), Mr. Parker, Mrs. Parker, and Ms. Roberts suspected that at least one of the BELLSOUTH technicians (i.e. Mike) had done something to cause PARKER's incoming telephone calls to be forwarded to its direct competitor, Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company.

Mr. Parker called ACCESS and spoke with David Lowrey and Brent Tate, and informed them that PARKER's incoming telephone calls were being forwarded to a direct competitor. These ACCESS customer service representatives advised Mrs. Parker and Ms. Roberts that he should go to PARKER'S Office, pick up the telephone, and dial 73 and then the "pound" symbol to stop the call forwarding from occurring. Ms. Roberts did as instructed, and PARKER'S incoming telephone calls were no longer forwarded to Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company.

On April 11, 2001, Mr. Parker telephoned BELLSOUTH and spoke with customer service representatives Kim Osbourne and Randy Darnell. These BELLSOUTH representatives told Mr. Parker that it was against the law for them to tell him the name of the supervisors of the aforementioned BELLSOUTH technicians. Ms. Osbourne also told Mr. Parker that because PARKER had switched its local telephone service to ACCESS, BELLSOUTH was no longer responsible for the actions of its cwn technicians. Mr. Parker asked to speak to Ms. Osbourne's supervisor, but she refused his request. Mr. Parker then spoke with Mr. Darnell.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p. 15 of 23

Mr. Darnell also informed Mr. Parker that it was against the law for him to disclose the names of his superiors for the South Georgia area, due to the fact that PARKER now had its local telephone service with ACCESS. Mr. Parker informed Mr. Darnell that he was going to contact the Georgia Public Service Commission about what had taken place with BELLSOUTH's technicians, and asked him whether he still wished to refuse to allow him to speak with the technicians' supervisors. At this point, Mr. Darnell became very suide with Mr. Parker, and told him that he could do whatever he wanted to do, but that he would not give him any of the information that he had requested. Mr. Parker then hung up the telephone.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 30 day of MAY, 2001 Wotary Public AT THE CLERK'S PLEASURE.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p. 16 of 23

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF GEORGIA

Personally appeared before me an officer duly authorized to administer oaths, RAYMOND PARKER, who after being duly sworn deposes and says that he is the owner of PARKER & BRAMLETT CUSTOM MEMORIALS ("PARKER") located at 1568 U.S. Hwy 19 South, Leesburg, Georgia 31763, Georgia, and hereby attests to the following:

That in February of 2001 PARKER ordered two telephone jacks from BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH"). At the time of the order, PARKER used ACCESS INTEGRATED NETWORKS, INC. ("ACCESS") as its local telephone service provider.

On March 1, 2001, Raymond Parker called an ACCESS customer service representative to report problems with PARKER'S telephone service. The problem stemmed from two telephone lines that were running through a telephone jack installed by BELLSOUTH. ACCESS was able to establish a dial tone, but the two telephone lines continued to run through this one telephone jack.

On April 8, 2001, Raymond Parker contacted ACCESS again about "buzzing" and "humming" noises that were coming from the aforementioned telephone lines. Mr. Parker also informed ACCESS that "call waiting" was not working as well.

On April 9, 2001, David Lowrey, an ACCESS representative, called PARKER and spoke with Mary Parker, Mr. Parker's wife and a part time bookkeeper for PARKER. Mr. Lowrey informed Mrs. Parker that a BELLSOUTH technician would be at PARKER'S Albany, Georgia office (hereinafter the "Office") by 1:00 p.m. that day. Greg, BELLSOUTH technician identification number PNHWYFY (hereinafter "BELLSOUTH Technician Greg"), called PARKER and confirmed to Carol Roberts, PARKER'S officer manager, that he would be at PARKER'S Office by 1:00p.m. Mrs. Roberts waited for BELLSOUTH Technician Greg to arrive, but she eventually had to leave the office at 3:15 p.m. to meet with prospective clients. At the time Mrs. Roberts left, she had not received a telephone call from BELLSOUTH Technician Greg to advise her that he would be running late.

Mrs. Parker arrived at the office at 3:45 p.m., and witnessed BELLSOUTH Technician Greg leaving the premises. Mrs. Parker was unable to get the technician's attention, but did find a note with his pager number. She immediately paged him. At 3:50 p.m., Mr. Parker, now back in the Office, received a telephone call from BELLSOUTH Technician Greg BELLSOUTH Technician Greg informed Mr. Parker that he was already on another job, and that he would not be able to return to address the service problem that day. Having already waited two weeks for BELLSOUTH to dispatch a technician to resolve this problem, Mr. Parker demanded that BELLSOUTH Technician Greg return to PARKER's Office to fix the aforementioned telephone problem(s). BELLSOUTH Technician Greg told Mr. Parker that he would "not tell him what to do," and that because PARKER now used ACCESS as its local telephone service provider he did not have to come back at all. Mr. Parker informed BELLSOUTH Technician Greg that he would contact his supervisor. BELLSOUTH Technician Greg told Mr. Parker that he could do whatever he wanted to do. Mr. Parker then stated that had he been at PARKER at, or even near, the appointed time, someone from PARKER would have been there to let him in. Mr. Parker then told BELLSOUTH Technician Greg that he was not to come back to PARKER'S Office. After this conversation took place, Mr. Parker called ACCESS to report what had happened.

On April 10, 2001, another BELLSOUTH technician named Mike, BELLSOUTH technician identification number BWKIGGB (hereinafter "BELLSOUTH Technician Mike"), arrived at PARKER's Office at approximately 8:55 a.m. BELLSOUTH Technician Greg arrived in his personal red pickup truck, and parked at an adjacent property for approximately 20 minutes. Mrs. Roberts witnessed both technician's arrival, but is unsure as to whether the two had contact while BELLSOUTH Technician Mike "worked" on PARKER's telephone problems. BELLSOUTH Technician Mike confirmed to Mrs. Roberts that BELLSOUTH Technician Greg was indeed sitting in his personal truck on a property adjacent from PARKER's Office. BELLSOUTH Technician Mike checked the outside box, and informed Ms. Roberts that he was not coming inside to perform any work due to the fact that PARKER had switched its local telephone service to ACCESS. Ms. Roberts immediately called David Lowrey with ACCESS to advise him of this statement. Mr. Lowrey asked to speak with the BELLSOUTH Technician Mike. Mr. Lowrey requested that the technician go inside the premises, and fix that jack that BELLSOUTH had originally installed. BELLSOUTH Technician Mike fixed the jacks, and then used the telephone to make numerous telephone calls.

After BELLSOUTH Technician Mike finished making his telephone calls, he informed Ms. Roberts that he was going to change the "memory card" outside the building and then change it on the BELLSOUTH's end as well. After spending some time outside the PARKER Office building, BELLSOUTH Technician Mike left the premises.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit _____ (RP-1), p. 18 of 23

After BELLSOUTH Technician Mike's departure, Ms. Roberts did not receive any telephone calls at the PARKER Office. Mrs. Parker attempted to call the Office later that morning, and when she did the person on the other end of the telephone answered "Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company," a direct competitor of PARKER'S. Ms. Parker thought that perhaps she had dialed the wrong number, and therefore tried dialing PARKER'S Office telephone number again. Once again, the person at the other end of the telephone answered "Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company."

Mr. Parker also attempted to call PARKER'S Office, and the same thing occurred. One of PARKER'S vendors, Allgood Granite Company, attempted to call PARKER'S Office as well only to have its call forwarded to Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company.

Mrs. Parker then called a neighboring business, Ferrell Gas, and asked one its employees to go over to the PARKER Office and tell Ms. Roberts to call PARKER's Camilla office. Ms. Roberts called Mrs. Parker as instructed, and Mrs. Parker explained to her that PARKER'S incoming telephone calls were being forwarded to the aforementioned competitor.

Given the events noted above (with respect to BELLSOUTH Technicians Greg and Mike), Mr. Parker, Mrs. Parker, and Ms. Roberts suspected that at least one of the BELLSOUTH technicians (i.e. Mike) had done something to cause PARKER's incoming telephone calls to be forwarded to its direct competitor, Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company.

Mr. Parker called ACCESS and spoke with David Lowrey and Brent Tate, and informed them that PARKER's incoming telephone calls were being forwarded to a direct competitor. These ACCESS customer service representatives advised Mrs. Parker and Ms. Roberts that he should go to PARKER'S Office, pick up the telephone, and dial 73 and then the "pound" symbol to stop the call forwarding from occurring. Ms. Roberts did as instructed, and PARKER'S incoming telephone calls were no longer forwarded to Hall Funeral Home and Monument Company.

On April 11, 2001, Mr. Parker telephoned BELLSOUTH and spoke with customer service representatives Kim Osbourne and Randy Darnell. These BELLSOUTH representatives told Mr. Parker that it was against the law for them to tell him the name of the supervisors of the aforementioned BELLSOUTH technicians. Ms. Osbourne also told Mr. Parker that because PARKER had switched its local telephone service to ACCESS, BELLSOUTH was no longer responsible for the actions of its own technicians. Mr. Parker asked to speak to Ms. Osbourne's supervisor, but she refused his request. Mr. Parker then spoke with Mr. Darnell.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p. 19 of 23

Mr. Darnell also informed Mr. Parker that it was against the law for him to disclose the names of his superiors for the South Georgia area, due to the fact that PARKER new had its local telephone service with ACCESS. Mr. Parker informed Mr. Darnell that he was going to contact the Georgia Public Service Commission about what had taken place with BELLSOUTH's technicians, and asked him whether he still wished to refuse to allow him to speak with the technicians' supervisors. At this point, Mr. Darnell became very suide with Mr. Parker, and told him that he could do whatever he wanted to do, but that he would not give him any of the information that he had requested. Mr. Parker then hung up the telephone.

RAYMOND PARKER, AFFIANT

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 29 day of may, 2001 May D. Rekley Notary Public By Commission Expires April 19, 2002.

AFFIDAVIT OF DANIEL BECTOM

STATE OF FLORIDA	
COUNTY OF DUVAL	

·)

Before me, the undersigned Notary Public in and for said county and said state, appeared DANIEL BECTON, who after being duly sworn, deposed and stated as follows:

1. My name is Daniel Becton. I am over 21 years of age and I am competent to make the statements contained in this affidavit based upon my personal knowledge.

2. I am the President of Planogramming Solutions, Inc. in Jacksonville, Florida. I am responsible for contracting for Planogramming's telephone service.

Planogramming currently has a contract with Access Integrated Networks, Inc.
 ("Access"), pursuant to which Access provides Planogramming with telephone service.
 Planogramming has used Access telephone service since May 2000. I have been satisfied with the telephone service Planogramming has received from Access.

4. On or about April 23, 2001, I was contacted by James Presson. Mr. Presson did not identify himself as being affiliated with TelChoice or any other telemarketing firm, although I had received previous solicitation calls from Mr. Presson during which he referred to himself as a BellSouth representative. He suggested that Planogramming should switch back to the "original" services of BellSouth so that I could feel more certain regarding our telephone service.

5. Mr. Presson advised me that Planogramming would lose its telephone servicewith Access after April 30, 2001. Mr. Presson said he knew this would happen because he was given an intercompany memo which stated that customers of Access Integrated would lose their telephone service on May 1, 2001.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit _____ (RP-1), p. 21 of 23

I was surprised to hear that Planogramming's telephone service with Access would be interrupted. Planogramming's telephone service is a serious matter. I knew that if Planogramming lost its service the loss would negatively impact Planogramming's business. I did not authorize the BellSouth representative that contacted me, nor any other 7. BellSouth representative, to switch Planogramming's telephone service from Access to BellSouth or any other company.

Further Affiant saysth not.

ector

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the <u>9th</u> day of <u>May</u> , 2001.

SI ons



My commission expires: <u>September 2</u>6,2003

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit ____ (RP-1), p. 22 of 23

AFFIDAVIT OF JIMMIE SMITH

STATE OF GEORGIA)
	•)
COUNTY OF COBB)

Before me, the undersigned Notary Public in and for said county and said state, appeared JIMMIE SMITH, who after being duly sworn, deposed and stated as follows:

1. My name is Jimmie Smith. I am over 21 years of age and I am competent to make the statements contained in this affidavit based upon my personal knowledge.

2. I am the office administrator of DANA, Inc. f/k/a Napa Echlin National in Atlanta, Georgia. As DANA's office administrator, I am the individual responsible for contracting for DANA's telephone service.

3. DANA currently has a contract with Access Integrated Networks, Inc. ("Access"), pursuant to which Access provides telephone service for DANA. DANA has used Access telephone service for approximately two years and we have been satisfied with the service Access provides.

4. On April 24, 2001, a woman who identified herself as "Samantha Wright with BellSouth" called me at DANA. Ms. Wright never mentioned or otherwise indicated that she worked for TelChoice or any other telemarketing firm.

5. Ms. Wright asked me if I would considering switching DANA's telephone service from Access to BellSouth. I advised her that I was satisfied with Access's service, so I had no intention to switch DANA to BellSouth.

6. Ms. Wright stated that BellSouth employees were given an intercompany memo that morning stating that Access was going out of business on April 30, 2001.

Docket No. 960786 Witness Rodney Page Exhibit (RP-1), p. 23 of 23

7. I was surprised to hear that Access was having any financial difficulties and in particular that Access was going out of business at any time. I feared that if Access went out of business, DANA would lose its telephone service, which would negatively impact DANA's business. Furthermore, as the person responsible for selecting DANA's telephone service provider, I was concerned that I would be held responsible if the telephone service was interrupted.

8. I advised Ms. Wright that if Access did go out of business, then DANA would consider switching its service to BellSouth. However, I advised Ms. Wright that if Access was not going out of business, DANA did not intend to switch its service.

9. I did not authorize the BellSouth representative who contacted me, nor any other BellSouth representative, to switch DANA's phone service from Access to BellSouth or any other company.

Further Affiant sayeth not.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the \underline{AH} day of \underline{MQU} , 2001.

Mariny Public, Henry County, Georgia My commission expires: By Commission Expires Oct 8, 202

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibit of Rodney Page has been furnished by (*) hand delivery or by U. S. Mail on this 20th day of July, 2001, to the following:

(*) Beth Keating Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Jeremy Marcus Blumenfeld & Cohen 1625 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Suite 300 Washington DC 20036

Nancy B. White c/o Nancy Sims BellSouth Telecommunications, inc. 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400 Miami Florida 32301

James Falvey e.spire Communications 131 National Business Parkway, Suite 100 Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Michael Gross Florida Cable Telecommunications Assoc. 246 E. 6th Avenue Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Kim Caswell GTE Post Office Box 110 FLTC0007 Tampa, Florida 33601

Richard Melson Post Office Box 6526 Tallahassee, Florida 32314 Scott Sapperstein Intermedia One Intermedia Way MC FLT-HQ3 Tampa, Florida 33619-1309

Donna McNulty 325 John Knox Road, Suite 105 Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Floyd Self/Norman Horton Messer Law Firm Post Office Box 1876 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Pete Dunbar/Karen Camechis Pennington Law Firm Post Office Box10095 Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Susan S. Masterton Sprint Post Office Box 2214 MC: FLTLH00107 Tallahassee, Florida 32316-2214

Ken Hoffman Rutledge Law Firm Post Office Box 551 Tallahassee, Florida 32302-0551

Andrew Isar Ascent 3220 Uddenberg Lane, Suite 4 Gig Harbor, WA 98335 Matthew Feil Florida Digital Network, Inc. 390 North Orange Avenue, Suite 2000 Orlando, Florida 32801

Angela Green, General Counsel Florida Public Telecommunications Assoc 125 S. Gadsden Street, Suite 200 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1525

Patrick Wiggins Katz, Kutter Law Firm, 12th Floor 106 East College Avenue Tallahassee, Florida 32301

John Marks, III Knowles Law Firm 215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 130 Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Scheffel Wright Landers Law Firm Post Office Box 271 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 W. Madison Street, Suite 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

Rodney L. Joyce 600 14th Street, N.W., Suite 800 Washington DC 20005-2004

Catherine F. Boone Covad Communications Company 10 Glenlake Parkway, Suite 650 Atlanta, GA 30328-3495

John Kerkorian MPower 5607 Glenridge Drive, Suite 300 Atlanta, GA 30342 CWA (Orl) Kenneth Ruth 2180 West State Road 434 Longwood, FL 32779

ITC[^] DeltaCom Nanette S. Edwards 4092 South Memorial Parkway Huntsville, AL 35802-4343

Network Access Solutions Corporation 100 Carpenter Drive, Suite 206 Sterling, VA 20164

Swidler & Berlin Richard Rindler/Michael Sloan 3000 K. St. NW #300 Washington, DC 20007-5116

Suzanne F. Summerlin IDS Telcom L.L.C. 1311-B Paul Russell Road, Suite 201 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 Jim Lamoureux AT&T Communications, Inc. 1200 Peachtree Street, NE, Room 8068 Atlanta, GA 30309

Willie Gordon Daufmon for

Joseph A. McGlothlin McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold & Steen, P.A. 117 S. Gadsden Tallahassee, Florida 32301 Telephone: (850) 222-2525 Facsimile: (850) 222-5606 jmcglothlin@mac-law.com

Mark D. Baxter Stone & Baxter, LLP 577 Mulberry Street, Suite 1111 Macon, Georgia 31201-8256 Telephone: (750) 750-9898 Facsimile: (750) 750-9899 mbaxter@stoneandbaxter.com

Attorneys for ACCESS Integrated Networks, Inc.