1		BEFORE THE A PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	FTORID	DOCKET NO. 041114-TP
3	IN THE MATTER OF:	DOCKET NO. 041114-1F
4	COMPLAINT OF XO FLO	
5	AGAINST BELLSOUTH TO	FUSAL TO CONVERT
6	CIRCUITS TO UNES; AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING	
7	i	To the state of th
8		C VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE VENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT
9	THE OFF	ICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING, ERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY.
10	THE .PDF V	ERSION INCHODES PREFIDED LESTIMONI.
11	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING
12	BEFORE:	COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON Prehearing Officer
13	DATE:	Monday, February 7, 2005
14		Commenced at 1:30 p.m.
15	TIME:	Concluded at 1:55 p.m.
16	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
17		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
18	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, RPR
19	REPORTED BI.	Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734
20		(830) 413 6731
21		
22		
23		
24		

PARTICIPATING:

1.

TIMOTHY PERRY, ESQUIRE, McWhirter, Reeves Law Firm,

117 South Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing
on behalf of XO Communications Services, Inc.

DANA SHAFFER, ESQUIRE, 105 Molloy Street, Suite 300, Nashville, Tennessee 37201-2315, appearing via telephone on behalf of XO Communications Services, Inc.

JAMES MEZA, III, ESQUIRE, c/o Ms. Nancy H. Sims, 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1556, appearing via telephone on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

JASON ROJAS, ESQUIRE, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Call the prehearing conference
3	o order. Could I have the notice read, please?
4	MR. ROJAS: Excuse me?
5	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Could I have the notice read,
6	olease?
7	MR. ROJAS: Pursuant to notice issued January 21st,
8	2005, this time and place has been set for a prehearing
9	conference in Docket Number 041114-TP in regard to the
10	complaint of XO Florida, Inc. against BellSouth
11	Telecommunications, Inc. for alleged refusal to convert
12	circuits to UNEs; and request for expedited processing.
13	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you. Take appearances.
14	MR. PERRY: Timothy Perry of the McWhirter, Reeves
15	Law Firm, 117 South Gadsden Street on behalf of XO
16	Communications, and also on the phone is Dana Shaffer on behalf
17	of XO Communications.
18	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Meza, are you with us?
19	MR. ROJAS: Mr. Meza was on the phone right before
20	you walked in, Commissioner.
21	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Are the connections
22	still up?
23	MR. STADEN: The connection is still up.
24	MR. ROJAS: Jason Rojas on behalf of the Commission.
25	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. And Dana Shaffer is on

the phone; is that correct? 1 MR. PERRY: Yes, Commissioner. 2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry. Your name? 3 4 MR. PERRY: I'm Timothy Perry. 5 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Timothy Perry. Should we give Mr. Meza a couple of minutes or should 6 7 we proceed? MR. ROJAS: I believe the parties had some 8 preliminary matters to discuss that they brought to my 9 attention today, so it would probably be beneficial to wait for 10 11 Mr. Meza. MR. PERRY: Yeah. I'm not opposed to waiting for 12 Mr. Meza for a few minutes. 13 (Pause.) 14 MR. MEZA: Dana, I just got a call from my regulatory 15 folks saying that they can't hear us. 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: We hear you now, so watch what 17 you say. 18 MR. MEZA: Oh, thank you. I apologize for having 19 trouble hearing you, Chairman Deason. 20 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, we're glad to have you 21 22 with us. MR. MEZA: Thank you. 23 COMMISSIONER DEASON: We are in the process of taking 24 appearances. Would you please enter yours? 25

MR. MEZA: Yes. This is Jim Meza on behalf of BellSouth. MS. SHAFFER: Dana Shaffer on behalf of XO. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Preliminary matters. for an evidentiary hearing. MS. SHAFFER: And this is Dana Shaffer. If we could as a preliminary matter discuss -- I guess one thing that I'm not clear on, and Jim and I have talked via e-mail this morning, if the parties are able to reach a stipulation as to the appropriate rate, I'm not sure I understand what is left for an evidentiary hearing since the question of an obligation is a question of law. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Meza, your response.

MR. MEZA: Yes, sir. It's BellSouth's position that

	the seminal issue in the case is Issue 1, but there are several
2	factual and policy considerations that BellSouth will point out
3	during cross-examination as well as through its own witness
4	testimony that it believes the Commission should take into
5	account in addressing Issue 1.
6	MS. SHAFFER: And XO disagrees. We believe it to be
7	an issue of law. And to the extent there are policy arguments,
8	I mean those are exactly that, arguments, and should be
9	briefed.
10	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. We're going to at
11	this point I understand where we are. We're going to proceed
12	through the draft prehearing order. And are there any other
13	preliminary matters? Hearing none, then we will proceed
14	through the draft prehearing order.
15	MS. SHAFFER: Jim, can you hear them?
16	MR. MEZA: No, I'm having trouble.
17	MS. SHAFFER: Yeah. We're not hearing anything. I'm
18	sorry, Commissioner Deason.
19	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. What about now? Can you
20	hear me?
21	MS. SHAFFER: Hello?
22	MR. ROJAS: This is Jason Rojas. Can you hear me?
23	MS. SHAFFER: Hello?
24	MR. PERRY: Dana, this is Tim Perry. Can you hear

me?

1	MS. SHAFFER: I can near you, Tim.
2	MR. MEZA: Yeah. This is Jim Meza. I heard you too.
3	COMMISSIONER DEASON: What about can you hear me
4	now? This is Chairman Deason.
5	MR. MEZA: Chairman, briefly. I mean, fading.
6	COMMISSIONER DEASON: We'll take a recess to see
7	if just stay on the line, but we're just going to take a
8	recess. We'll go off the record and we'll see if we can try
9	to stay on the line.
٥ ا	MR. MEZA: Thank you, sir.
L1	(Brief recess.)
L2	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Can everyone hear me now?
13	MS. SHAFFER: Yes, sir.
L4	MR. MEZA: Yes, sir.
15	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very good. We just made a
16	minor adjustment and hopefully that will address it.
17	Mr. Rojas, speak into your microphone.
18	MS. SHAFFER: I'm sorry. You're fading.
19	MR. ROJAS: Parties, can you hear me?
20	MR. MEZA: Yes.
21	MR. ROJAS: Okay.
22	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. I understand that there
23	have been some discussions about stipulating witnesses and
24	maybe even addressing a stipulation on Issue 2.
2.5	What I intend to do at this point is proseed through

the draft prehearing order, and if we need further discussion 1 when we get to that point, we'll do so. 2 MR. MEZA: Yes, sir. 3 Sounds good. 4 MS. SHAFFER: COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. As is my custom, when we 5 6 proceed through the prehearing order, we proceed in a rather rapid fashion section by section. Unless a party indicates 7 that there is a problem or concern, question or clarification, 8 we'll just proceed through. So please feel freely -- free to, 9 to address any concerns that you have. 10 We'll begin with Section I, conduct of proceedings. 11 Section II, case background. Section III, confidential 12 information. IV, posthearing procedures. V, prefiled 13 14 testimony and exhibits. 15 VI, order of witnesses. I have a question. order indicates that if we do actually have witnesses take the 16 17 stand, that we will have direct followed by rebuttal. cases we hear direct and rebuttal simultaneously. What is the 18 desire of the parties in this proceeding? 19 MR. MEZA: BellSouth requests that we do testimony 20 simultaneously, both direct and rebuttal. 21 22 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Is there an objection? MR. PERRY: Dana, do you have a preference? 23

a preference that we hear direct and then come back with

24

25

MS. SHAFFER: I do have a preference. I mean, I have

1 rebuttal. Since we only have one witness, our witness would be 2 doing both, and that would put us at a disadvantage. COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Mr. Meza, as is normally 3 4 the case, to hear direct and rebuttal simultaneously usually 5 takes the agreement of all the parties, and the fallback 6 position is to hear direct and then rebuttal. So I think 7 that's what we'll have to do in this case. 8 MS. SHAFFER: Thank you. 9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Section VII, basic positions. 10 MR. PERRY: I would just like to note, Commissioner, 11 that there appeared to be some formatting errors in XO's basic position, and I believe I could probably just address that with 12 Mr. Rojas. 13 14 Tim, I'm going to have to rely on you MS. SHAFFER: 15 because I really -- I don't have a copy of the draft prehearing 16 order. 17 MR. PERRY: Yes, ma'am. 18 MS. SHAFFER: I mean, I've been having computer trouble, so that's probably why. 19 20 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. You can just 21 communicate with Mr. Rojas. And if there are any formatting 22 problems, you can get that clarified with him. MR. PERRY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. 23 24 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Section VIII, issues and

positions. We will begin with Issue 1. Now I understand

that -- Mr. Meza, could you --

MR. MEZA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Can you state again the reason that you believe that this issue needs to be heard at hearing as opposed to simply being briefed?

MR. MEZA: Yes, sir. It is BellSouth's position that there are several factual issues relating to the parties' attempt to amend the current agreement to take into account various changes in the law that have transpired since 2003. There is also disputes relating to whether or not XO should avail itself of the change of law obligations in the current agreement to seek the desired relief, and there's also disputes that I believe may exist in relation to what this all means in light of the final rules order or the triennial review remand order that came out on Friday. And combined with that there are several policy considerations that obviously the parties disagree on that we believe the PSC should hear in addressing the issues raised in Number 1.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Ms. Shaffer.

MS. SHAFFER: Mr. Chairman, may I respond?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes, please do. Yes.

MS. SHAFFER: It's XO's position that the disputed facts to which Mr. Meza refers really just muddy the waters.

It is a question of law. In fact, I mean, it would probably be simpler to settle this if we just would stipulate that, you

now, both parties have tried to get an amendment. We do not lave an amendment. I mean, that fact is not disputed, that there is no amendment. It's not disputed that the interconnection agreement between the parties says whatever it says. And beyond that, it's purely a legal issue to argue in prief. Policy considerations are part of an argument that's more appropriately to be briefed. We think it would be a waste of resources and time of this Commission to get down there and squabble about who said what on what date when the only relevant fact is that the parties do not currently have an amendment that specifically addresses this, and that's indisputed.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Meza, that suggestion is rather attractive.

MR. MEZA: Yes, sir, I understand that. But I think that there are -- at least BellSouth has a concern with the idea that the Commission will look at this in a vacuum.

One of the things that we believe you need to hear are implications resulting from, you know, the policy decisions XO has made regarding they will amend their agreement to make it TRO compliant for those portions of the TRO that were not impacted by USTA II, while BellSouth has taken the position that you need to make the agreement compliant with the current status of the law, and there are disputes about that that need to be flushed out. And I'm not suggesting that this would be

n all-day hearing, and, in fact, I believe that it could probably be addressed within one or two hours.

But the, the -- while there are legal issues involved in Issue 1, there are other things that we believe the commission should hear, and do not believe that briefing them in a vacuum will necessarily give you the full flavor that we believe you should have.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay.

2.4

MS. SHAFFER: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes.

MS. SHAFFER: Of course, XO, you know, strongly lisagrees. In fact, I disagree with, with Mr. Meza's statement of the facts. But more importantly, even if what he says were true, it's irrelevant. The only relevant fact is whether or not the parties have an amendment, and they don't. I don't think that's disputed between the parties.

And then with regard to any arguments concerning what the ICA may or may not say today, the agreement speaks for itself, and everything else is a legal question. I mean, I think to pull witnesses down there to get into a squabble about who's trying to do what, who said what, when it's totally irrelevant to the core issue is a waste of time. And legally it's inappropriate because there are no disputed issues of material fact, and I think that that's what we need to focus on is what are the material facts. And all of the things that

Mr. Meza refers to are immaterial.

MR. MEZA: I disagree with that.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I know you do, and I'm ready to rule. Okay?

MR. MEZA: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: We're going to allow this issue to stay in. We will allow the, the witnesses to address it.

Ms. Shaffer, to the extent that there is testimony provided that is irrelevant, you may object to it at the time.

I'm not in a position at this point to -- I'm concerned that to not allow the witnesses to address this, at least attempt to address it at the hearing may prevent all relevant information coming before the Commission. But you're certainly free to pose whatever objection at the time that you think is appropriate.

Okay. That addresses Issue 1.

Issue 2.

MR. MEZA: Yes, sir. Just to highlight to your attention that BellSouth and XO are working on a proposed stipulation that would say to some degree that if BellSouth is unsuccessful on Issue 1, that, you know, the parties stipulate that the current EEL conversion rate would apply for SPA to UNE conversions until such time as a SPA to UNE rate is established. And we're busy trying to work on the exact language of the stipulation.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Do you anticipate that that 1 'ill be accomplished? 2 MR. MEZA: I think so. Fundamentally there is one 3 lisagreement we have over whether or not there is a true-up 4 5 spect of that, and Ms. Shaffer raised that with me via e-mail his morning and I'm running that down with my clients. I do 6 not anticipate that it, that it, that we will not be able to 7 :each a stipulation, but I just don't know. 8 9 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, let me offer this to you. I, when -- in reviewing the draft prehearing order, I was 10 concerned with your, Mr. Meza, with your response to this 11 issue. I found it not responsive. It seemed to be more of a 12 continuation of your argument on Issue 1. 13 14 MR. MEZA: Well, sir, that is --COMMISSIONER DEASON: And to the extent -- I'm sorry. 15 MR. MEZA: -- exactly our point. 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry. Can --17 18 MR. MEZA: Our intent is that all of this, 2 and 3 19 are irrelevant. 20 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Meza. 21 MR. MEZA: Yes, sir. COMMISSIONER DEASON: I was not finished. 22 To the extent that Issue 2 is as it states, I would anticipate that it 23

response, a responsive response to what is asked in that issue.

is up to you to either get a stipulation or else provide a

24

1	Is that clear?
2	MR. MEZA: Yes, sir. I apologize for interrupting
3	you.
4	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very good. Any other concerns
5	with Issue 2?
6	MS. SHAFFER: No, sir.
7	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Issue 3, questions or concerns?
8	Very good.
9	Exhibit list, Section IX.
1.0	MR. PERRY: I'd just like to point out I don't
11	have the testimony with me today, but I believe that Gary
12	Case's exhibits are GC-1 and GC-2 in the draft prehearing.
13	MS. SHAFFER: I'm sorry. We can't hear you again.
14	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Can you hear me?
15	MS. SHAFFER: Yes, sir.
16	COMMISSIONER DEASON: He was just clarifying that the
17	exhibits for Witness Case should be identified as GC-1 and
18	GC-2.
19	MS. SHAFFER: Yes, sir. Thank you.
20	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Any other concerns with the
21	exhibit list? Hearing none, Section X, proposed stipulations.
22	Mr. Meza, if there is to be any stipulations, when can that be
23	provided to Mr. Rojas?
24	MR. MEZA: I anticipate having an answer to

Ms. Shaffer in the relatively near future. My, my goal would

1.	De to get it resolved this week.
2	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Rojas, is that acceptable?
3	MR. ROJAS: Yes, Commissioner.
4	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very good. Section XI, pending
5	notions. I believe there are none; is that correct?
6	MR. ROJAS: That is correct.
7	MS. SHAFFER: That's correct at this time,
8	Mr. Chairman. We reserve the right, however, based on the
9	recent FCC ruling to possibly file an additional motion.
10	COMMISSIONER DEASON: What would be the nature of
11	those motions?
12	MS. SHAFFER: Motion for summary judgment, summary
13	disposition.
14	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. I, I appreciate you
15	putting us on notice that that is a possibility. I would
16	anticipate you would discuss that with Mr. Meza during your
17	discussions on possible stipulations as well.
18	MS. SHAFFER: Yes, sir.
19	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Rojas, there are some
20	pending confidentiality matters; is that correct?
21	MR. ROJAS: Yes, sir. BellSouth has several
22	outstanding requests for specified confidential classification.
23	The original requests were not compliant with our rule, but
24	BellSouth has refiled so that it is compliant with our rule,
25	and those will the order will be forthcoming on those.

1	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay. Any concerns by the
2	parties?
3	MR. PERRY: Not with respect to BellSouth's
4	confidentiality filings. But I would just like to note for the
5	record that XO had some confidential discovery responses that
6	they filed in response to staff's discovery, and we did a claim
7	of confidentiality under 364.183. To the extent that those are
8	moved into the record at hearing, we would file a request for
9	confidential classification at that time.
10	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Is that acceptable, staff?
11	MR. ROJAS: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER DEASON: That information will be
13	treated confidential until there is a determination; is that
14	correct?
15	MR. ROJAS: Yes, sir.
16	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well.
17	Section XIII, decisions that may impact the
18	Commission's resolution. The prehearing order lists none.
19	Parties, is that correct?
20	MR. MEZA: I, I, I believe that the, the decision
21	from Friday may have some impact.
22	MS. SHAFFER: I'm sorry. I didn't hear the question.
23	MR. MEZA: Whether or not there was any decisions
24	that would impact the Commission's determination, Ms. Shaffer.
25	MS. SHAFFER: Oh, I see. I've actually, believe it

or not, read the applicable sections of the order, and we do not believe that it impacts this, this case at all.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Staff?

MR. ROJAS: Commissioner, at this time staff has also reviewed the pertinent sections of the final rules, and from a preliminary review we do not feel that it impacts this, this matter.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Section XIV, rulings. Mr. Rojas, to the extent there's been any rulings made at this prehearing conference, you can include those. I'm not sure there have been other than the fact that we are going to continue to allow testimony to be given as it relates to Issue 1, subject to appropriate objection at the time, but that was already anticipated in this draft.

Are there any other matters that need to be brought up to the prehearing officer at this time?

MR. PERRY: The only matter I would raise is given the one section that had formatting errors, I'd just like to reserve the right to go back through the issues that were filed in our prehearing statement and compare them to the prehearing order. And I can get with Mr. Rojas and make sure that everything is, is correctly reflected in the prehearing order.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Mr. Meza, do you have anything in conclusion?

MR. MEZA: No, sir. I would like to thank you for

T	Your indulgence for allowing me to participate via phone, and
2	apologize for any inconvenience or disruption to the flow of
3	the hearing for, for that participation.
4	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. Shaffer?
5	MS. SHAFFER: I thank you as well, Mr. Chairman.
6	COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm sorry. Ms. Shaffer, any
7	final matters?
8	MS. SHAFFER: No. Just I thank you for allowing me
9	to participate via teleconference. And, again, as Mr. Meza
10	said, sorry we both apologize if our teleconferencing in
11	disrupted in any way.
12	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, it's really not been a
13	disruption. I understand this is an efficient way to handle
14	matters and we are happy to accommodate.
15	MR. MEZA: Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Hearing nothing further, the
17	prehearing conference is adjourned. Thank you all.
18	(Prehearing conference adjourned at 1:55 p.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON)
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, Official Commission
5	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically
7	reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this
8	transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,
10	attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel
11	connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	DATED THIS 2005 .
13	
14	LINDA BOLES, RPR
15	FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6734
16	(850) 413-6734
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	