BOCUMENT RUMAFR-DATE

BEFORE THE 1 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 3 DOCKET NO. 980800-TP In the Matter of 4 Petition for emergency relief: 5 by Supra Telecommunications &: Information Systems against 6 BellSouth Telecommunications : Inc., concerning collocation: 7 and interconnection agreements. 8 9 10 11 PREHEARING CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS: 12 COMMISSIONER E. LEON JACOBS, JR. 13 **BEFORE:** Prehearing Officer 14 Monday, September 21, 1998 15 DATE: Commenced at 1:30 p.m. TIME: 16 Concluded at 2:00 p.m. 17 Betty Easley Conference Center PLACE: Room 152 18 4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida 19 20 JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR REPORTED BY: Chief, Bureau of Reporting 21 22 23 24

APPEARANCES:

SUZANNE F. SUMMERLIN, 1311-B Paul Russell
Road, Suite 201, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing
on behalf of Supra Telecommunications and Information
Systems, Inc.

NANCY B. WHITE, 150 South Monroe Street,
Suite 400, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on
behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

BETH KEATING, Florida Public Service

Commission, Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard

Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850,

appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (Hearing convened at 1:30 p.m.) 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We're all here again. Counsel, read the notice. 5 MS. KEATING: This time and place have been noticed for a prehearing conference in 980800-TP. 6 7 purpose is as set forth in the notice. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Take appearances. 8 9 MS. WHITE: Nancy White on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications. 10 MS. SUMMERLIN: Suzanne Summerlin on behalf 11 12 of Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems. 13 MS. KEATING: Beth Keating appearing for Commission Staff. 14 15 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Let's see, we 16 have some preliminary matters, I believe. 17 MS. KEATING: Yes, Commissioner, there are a few motions that I believe can be taken up as a 18 19 preliminary matter. 20 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. As you can see 21 from the Draft Prehearing Order, there are several 22 outstanding motions. The motions regarding Supra's 23 motion to dismiss BellSouth's motion for

reconsideration, and BellSouth's answer in this

docket, Staff is prepared to draft a recommendation

24

for the Commission panel regarding those motions. feel that would be the most appropriate way to handle those motions. 3 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Okay. I'm looking 4 5 at the Draft Prehearing Order Page 15. 6 MS. KEATING: Right. 7 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry. MS. KEATING: There are two motions for oral 8 argument regarding that motion. And then there's Supra's September 2nd motion to dismiss BellSouth's 10 Motion for Reconsideration and Motion to Strike 11 BellSouth's answer to Supra's complaint in this 12 docket. And then there's BellSouth's opposition to 13 Supra's Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Strike and 14 15 BellSouth's own Motion to Strike Supra's motion. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So we would take these 16 17 all to agenda for the full Commission. 18 MS. KEATING: That's what Staff suggests. 19 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. I'm inclined to 20 go along with that. I'll hear from the parties. 21 I think it's appropriate that it MS. WHITE: be heard by either the panel -- are you saying the 22 panel or the full Commission? 23 MS. KEATING: The panel is fine. 24

MS. WHITE: I think that would be

1 appropriate. 2 MS. SUMMERLIN: I think so too. 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Then we'll continue 4 and go with that recommendation. 5 MS. SUMMERLIN: If I can just interpose 6 something, we're filing a response today with a 7 request for it to be considered being out of time. It's a couple of days late. But we're putting that in 8 9 today. 10 MS. KEATING: A response to BellSouth's motion to strike your motion. 11 12 MS. SUMMERLIN: For the sanctions, yeah. 13 MS. KEATING: Okay. Supra has also filed a 14 motion for leave to file direct testimony of Mr. Ramos 15 and Nilson one day late. As I understand it, there's no objection. 16 17 MS. WHITE: No objection. 18 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. It's granted. 19 And let's see, there is a -- okay, that's "E" and "F"? No, "E" is for request for production of documents. 20 And that we're going to --21 22 MS. WHITE: That I think was just a motion 23 for temporary protective order --24 MS. KEATING: Right.

-- because some of the

MS. WHITE:

information BellSouth gave Supra in response to that discovery was proprietary, but Supra and BellSouth 2 have entered into a protective agreement, so I think that's pretty much taken care of. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: All right. 5 leaves us then with just a request for opening 6 7 statements at hearing. MS. KEATING: There's also one other thing I 8 need to point out. We had discussions at the end of 9 last week regarding filing of rebuttal testimony. 10 There was some difficulties due to walk-throughs that 11 were being conducted out of town and the scheduling of 12 this docket. 13 Staff would suggest that the date for filing 14 rebuttal testimony that's indicated in the Order of 15 Procedure be extended to today in order to allow the 16 parties to file their rebuttal testimony today. 17 **COMMISSIONER JACOBS:** Okay. 18 I have no problem with that. MS. WHITE: 19 MS. SUMMERLIN: I don't have any objection 20 21 to that. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Granted. 22 The last thing is Supra's MS. KEATING: 23 request for opening statements at the hearing. 24

I think --

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

1	MS. WHITE: Well, I was just going to say I
2	don't think it's necessary, but if the Prehearing
3	Officer believes that it would be helpful to him and
4	to the rest of the panel, then BellSouth would accept
5	that.
6	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: How about three
7	minutes?
8	MS. SUMMERLIN: Five, maybe? Five minutes.
9	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. This is a good
10	day. We'll go with five.
11	MS. WHITE: Ms. Keating, do you want to go
12	and take up Supra's motion for leave to amend the
13	petition? Because I don't think we really have any
14	objection to that. I'm not sure whether I'm required
15	to answer it but I have no objection to the
16	petition for emergency relief being amended to conform
17	to the issues.
18	MS. KEATING: Staff recommends granting it
19	then.
20	MS. WHITE: I don't agree with the relief
21	they are asking for, but I don't object to it being
22	amended.
23	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry. I was in a
24	fog there for a moment.

MS. SUMMERLIN: Since it was my motion I

guess I can explain what we were trying to do.

At the issue identification meeting in this case we talked about the issues that needed to be addressed. One of the issues that Supra identified at that meeting was the issue of the equipment to be physically collocated, or the equipment that Supra wants physically collocated. And that's not specifically brought up in the original petition for emergency relief. So I'm trying to cover that issue.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: So, granted, all we're doing is to amend your petition?

MS. SUMMERLIN: Amend my initial petition for emergency relief to conform to the issues that everybody has agreed to.

MS. WHITE: BellSouth has no objection to that. We don't agree to the relief requested but we don't have any objection to the conformance.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: We'll grant that, so the petition will be amended.

Does that take care of the preliminary matters?

MS. KEATING: Yes, sir, it does.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Great. Great.

If the parties don't have anything else, we'll go on to the Prehearing Order, and we'll do it

section by section. Section 1, 2 or 3.

MS. SUMMERLIN: Supra just has a couple of minor little points in the case background.

There's a statement that Supra asks that we require BellSouth to permit Supra to physically collocate its switch equipment. I would suggest we might want to say "telecommunications equipment" because it may be more than just switch equipment. You know, these are not real significant problems at all. Also we don't have North Dade Golden Glades which were -- I have tried real hard to be real consistent with that name.

There's also the issue, that I would suggest maybe adding to the end of the sentence there, it's telecommunications equipment in BellSouth's Golden Glades and West Palm Beach Gardens central offices. And that BellSouth be required to meet the three-month time frame for physical collocation in the offices for which Supra has applied, which is one of the issues in the case. That's just a suggestion.

MS. WHITE: Well, I guess I don't have a objection to two of the three requests that

Ms. Summerlin's made.

I disagree that it's telecommunications equipment, because I believe that's one of the issues

in the case. If she'd just like to just say "to physically collocate its equipment in BellSouth's 2 North Dade Golden Glades" then I could accept that. 3 4 MS. SUMMERLIN: That's fine. That's okay. 5 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. You got the others? 6 7 MS. KEATING: Yes, sir. 8 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: That takes care of 9 Section 1 and 2 and 3. Section 4. Okay. Section 5. Anything there? 10 MS. WHITE: Section 5 -- I'm sorry. 11 12 mind. 13 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Section 6. Move on to Section 6. 14 15 MS. WHITE: Sorry about that. I think we do need some discussion on Section 6. 16 17 Ms. Summerlin has indicated that she does not want to combine direct and rebuttal testimony at 18 19 this time. And that she wants her direct witnesses to 20 go first, then all of BellSouth's witnesses, direct 21 and rebuttal, and then the rebuttal of her three witnesses at the end. 22 23 And I guess I have a problem with that. way I understood it traditionally goes is if you're 24

not going to put on direct and rebuttal first, I mean

together, then Supra, because they are the complainant, would put on their direct first,

BellSouth would put on its direct; then Supra put on its rebuttal and BellSouth put on its rebuttal. And she's asking that it be they put on their direct first, then all of our witnesses come, then Supra gets to put on its rebuttal last and I don't think I agree with that.

commissioner Jacobs: Okay. I assume then if the petitioner wants to separate direct and rebuttal you'd want to do the same.

MS. WHITE: I hate to do that, because it's going to take a lot longer for this hearing and I think we have only one day set for this hearing. But I'm very leery about having all of her direct and then all of my direct and rebuttal and then her rebuttal. It just concerns me.

commissioner Jacobs: Is that an accurate
reflection?

MS. SUMMERLIN: Yes. What I'm concerned about is putting on my three witnesses and then having five BellSouth witnesses for the rest of the hearing. That's what I'm concerned about. So that's why I'm talking about separating out direct and rebuttal.

I'm also concerned that when one party is

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

coming to the Commission and asking for relief as the complainant -- or as the plaintiff, if you correlate this to other proceedings, the plaintiff or complainant has a right to put on their direct case. The other party has a right to put on its rebuttal case, and then the initial complaining party should be allowed an opportunity to rebut. And that's all I'm trying to get by saying that my witnesses should be allowed to rebut at the end of BellSouth's testimony.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Do our rules express on order of witnesses?

MS. KEATING: No, sir, they don't. They are not that specific.

Staff still thinks that these can be taken up direct and rebuttal together. But if they are separated out, it just seems more appropriate to have the complainant go first and then BellSouth and then rebuttal in the same fashion.

commissioner Jacobs: BellSouth, are all of your witnesses going to do rebuttal or is it just the one with the asterisk?

ms. white: No. All of my witnesses have rebuttal -- excuse me, I'm sorry. All of my -- let me start over again.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I'm sorry. Mr. Rubin

and Mr. Ream.

MS. WHITE: But so do Mr. Thierry,
Mr. Bloomer and Mr. Milner. Mr. Mayes is the only one
that has direct and not rebuttal. And Mr. Rubin and
Ream have no direct. So I guess that's what concerns
me about if we do split it up, you're putting on a lot
of people.

MS. SUMMERLIN: My concern -- you know, it's just very simple. I'm not trying to be difficult here. But the problem for me is that I end up with the end of this hearing the Commission having heard five BellSouth witnesses in a row doing their rebuttal and I'm concerned about that. And that's the only reason. And I think there is all kinds of support legally for it to be appropriate for the complaining party to put on its direct case, the rebutting or the other party in the case to put on its case, then the complaining party have a chance to do rebuttal at the end. I think that's a very appropriate way to present the case.

commissioner Jacobs: Well, here's my
thinking. I think we've historically, I think, done
it as Staff counsel has described. And my first
thought is that probably most of the rebuttal is going
to have -- the rebuttal will provide the petitioner an

opportunity for cross examination, which probably should take up a good part of that rebuttal testimony. So from that standpoint, I'm of the opinion that the prospect of influencing the Commission by a series of witnesses could be somewhat ameliorated by the cross examination that you provided. And if there were -- this is the last question -- if somebody wanted to redirect, could they -- that -- you'd do that right after you cross examine, but what if she wanted to do redirect after one of her witnesses -- one of their witnesses?

MS. KEATING: To bring back one of her own witnesses?

concerned, you'd have some lasting point you could bring out on your redirect, but put it after their witnesses. I don't know if that's a procedure we've done before or not.

MS. KEATING: I don't believe so,

Commissioner. I believe that unless there was some agreement between the parties, and I don't believe that's procedurely appropriate.

But, Commissioner, I want to point out I'm concerned. We've only got one day for this. And if it, you know -- as it is, there are a number of

witnesses. And if we break these out, we're going to have trouble keeping within one day.

commissioner Jacobs: Is there that potential that some of these could be stipulated? Do they all need to testify? Okay.

I'm going to go with Staff's recommendation. Parties are free to come back, and, at hearing, decide that you want to do rebuttal and direct together. But if you choose to separate out, then I think we'll just follow the order as described where we have direct by the petitioner, direct by the respondent and then rebuttal and then rebuttal.

MS. WHITE: Okay.

MS. SUMMERLIN: Okay.

MS. WHITE: Then let me, if I may, give
Ms. Keating the order that I'd like to see my
witnesses in for direct and then rebuttal.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay.

MS. WHITE: On direct Mr. Thierry would be number one. Mr. Mayes would be number two.

Mr. Bloomer would be number three. And Mr. Milner would be number four. Then on rebuttal it would be Mr. Thierry number one. Mr. Bloomer number two.

Mr. Rubin number three. Mr. Ream number four and Mr. Milner number five.

1	MS. KEATING: Okay. And for Supra? Is
2	there some order preferred other than what is in the
3	draft?
4	MS. SUMMERLIN: We have the direct for Ramos
5	and Nilson will be fine the way you've got it. And
6	then the rebuttal would be Ramos, Nilson and Graham.
7	MS. KEATING: Just to make sure I understand
8	it, are we going with the splitting of direct and
9	rebuttal?
10	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I quit frankly left
11	that up to the parties. My ruling is if we do
12	separate it out, then the order should be as we
13	described. But they are free to come to hearing with
14	an agreement they'd like to combine them.
15	MS. SUMMERLIN: Yeah. I want to split them
16	out for right now.
17	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Does that take
18	care of that? Move on to Section 7. Basic positions.
19	How about issue I'm sorry, any revisions on basic
20	positions? None.
21	We'll move on to Section 8, issues and
22	positions. Issue 1. Revisions of the parties
23	positions there.
24	Issue 2. No modifications.
25	Issue 3. Now, is it Ms. Summerlin, does

your comment regarding the North Dade apply to the wording of these issues as well? I remember you indicated that the North Dade should be in there as well, or is that a separate issue?

MS. SUMMERLIN: It's the whole name of its central office. It's not a big deal. It's if

Ms. Keating wants to put it in there, fine. The reason I'm sensitive to it is I have been trying to be consistent in what I have been doing and it's a pain because you have four words for the name of the central office. Then it's West Palm Beach Gardens.

commissioner Jacobs: The reason I brought it up is because I notice it's in Issue 3(A), it's named that, where in the other issues it's not. If it's not a confusing factor, we don't want to make it one.

MS. KEATING: We can go back and make it consistent.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Other than that,

Issue 3(A). Any revisions to the party's positions there?

MS. SUMMERLIN: On Issue 3(A) there was just a little typo on the Complaint. And the request for physical collocation was denied as opposed to were denied -- but it may have been that you intended or

whoever did it was to say requests were denied. don't know. Whichever way you want to do it is fine. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: 3(A) the wording on 3 the issue or the position --4 5 MS. SUMMERLIN: Supra's position. Just a couple of typographical-type things. 6 7 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Without modification I don't have any problem. 3(B). No 8 modifications there. 9 3(C). All right. 10 Issue 4. No modifications. 11 And Issue 5. Okay. Hearing none, we'll 12 move on to Section 9. 13 MS. WHITE: BellSouth had some additions to 14 15 the exhibit list as a result of the rebuttal testimony that was filed after our prehearing statement was 16 filed. I had given Ms. Keating a list of those 17 exhibits so she could add them to the final Prehearing 18 19 Order. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: All righty. We'll 20 21 note that Exhibit List 4 of BellSouth will be amended as per documentation from counsel. 22 23 MS. SUMMERLIN: Supra just has one exhibit for Mark Graham, that's MCG-1. You may want to put 24

MCG-1. We reason the RT for rebuttal testimony.

1 MS. KEATING: MCG-1. Is there a title? 2 MS. SUMMERLIN: Mr. Graham's resume. 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Are those all of the 4 amendments? Okay. 5 Section 10, remains the same. 6 MS. SUMMERLIN: Commissioner, this is really 7 not a stipulation of an issue, but this might be a time to bring up the fact that we might want to talk a little bit about how we're going to deal with the video tape things. I think BellSouth is concerned 10 11 about it because they consider it to be proprietary 12 information. It's kind of an unusual deal. 13 Well, I think we can work that MS. WHITE: 14 out. I guess one of my concerns was how we're 15 going -- are we just going to put it in the record, stipulate both our tapes into the record maybe at the 16 17 beginning of the hearing as a preliminary matter? And 18 I guess I needed to know from Ms. Keating how many 19 copies of our tape and how many copies of 20 Ms. Summerlin's tape you needed for the court reporter and the --21 22 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: May I ask a question? 23 These are video tapes of --24 MS. WHITE: Video tapes of the inside of

central offices; not of any testimony from a president

or anything.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Bad day to bring that up.

MS. WHITE: Yeah, sorry. I'm sure that both Ms. Summerlin and myself are going to want the Commission to see parts of the video; hopefully not all because this is a one-day hearing. It's out of our central office; it is considered proprietary by BellSouth. So we will have to make arrangements with Ms. Keating to set the room up so that the Commissioners and the parties can view the video tapes without the audience being aware. I don't think we have to go so far as shutting down the hearing room but maybe if everyone that's viewing it is on this side of the table (indicating) --

MS. KEATING: We haven't quite figured out how to do that yet but we're working on ideas.

commissioner Jacobs: One thing you might want to do is have them show it only on the monitor and folks can stand around there.

MS. KEATING: That's what we were thinking about doing. The problem is if counsel for the parties and Staff also need to be able to view it at the same time, so it may require -- I was thinking if we could get additional --

1	MS. SUMMERLIN: A couple of VCRs.
2	MS. KEATING: screens in. But I think w
3	can work it out.
4	MS. WHITE: So how many copies should we
5	bring to the hearing with us?
6	MS. KEATING: And they are both going to be
7	filed confidential? I believe there's only one copy
8	that needs to be brought in, and that's the one copy
9	that will be put in the record.
10	MS. WHITE: I guess also another this is
11	a practical question, I guess I would do a request for
12	confidential classification on both of our video
13	tapes. But, again, there won't be anything to
14	underline or redact, because the whole thing is
15	confidential, so I'll just do the best we can.
16	MS. KEATING: I think we can work around
17	that, especially in view of the medium.
18	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Yeah.
19	MS. SUMMERLIN: Do you think one copy is
20	going to be enough if we're going to have
21	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Normally, if I'm not
22	mistaken, the one copy gets filed and kept in the
23	vault.
24	MS. SUMMERLIN: What I was thinking of was
25	just the practicality of having everybody look at it.

I don't know if you can use one to put on various videos or VCRs around here, or if you're going to need like one for a separate VCR.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I suspect they just hook them into the internal system, but you may want -- what I would suggest doing, Counsel, would you contact Robby and the Staff, and be sure you can plug into the in-house system. If you can't, then work out how many VCRs you have in the hearing room.

Ms. KEATING: Another good point that

Ms. Brown just brought up is the audio. I don't know

if the parties were intending to run the audio at the

time they are running the video tape. It may be

possible that we have headphones or maybe the parties

could agree to run the video tapes with the audio

muted.

commissioner jacobs: I'm sorry, I cut you
off.

MS. KEATING: I think we can check to see if there's a possibility to obtain headphones for the participants, or perhaps we can work out something where the audio is muted.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Is it just describing --

MS. WHITE: Describing the equipment and

what it's used for and -- it's just describing the various pieces of the central office.

MS. SUMMERLIN: It will be important for that to be able to be heard by the Commissioners.

commissioner Jacobs: You couldn't provide
it in writing, in other words, provide a script for
the Commission and --

MS. SUMMERLIN: I believe that the only utility of this video tape will be achieved if you are hearing what the person is saying. They are pointing out this is such and such and that's such and such and if you don't have that, you won't know what's going on.

MS. KEATING: Ms. Brown participated in that walk-through last week, and it was her understanding the actual audio might not really reveal any confidential information.

MS. WHITE: Let me do this -- and we need to do this anyway, Ms. Summerlin -- when I get my video tape back I will give a copy to you; if you would do the same. Then I will look at both of them. If I can agree just to use her video tape, then we'll be limited to one video tape instead of dueling video tapes. And I will also check both of them whether we could just let the audio go. I just don't remember.

1	It was a long day and I don't remember everything that
2	was said. But I will commit to check that.
3	MS. KEATING: Another suggestion might be is
4	try to have it transcribed.
5	MS. WHITE: But I think Ms. Summerlin is
6	absolutely right on that. I don't think it's really
7	going to have the because you're going to be trying
8	to read and watch at the same time and it's just not
9	going to work, I don't think.
10	MS. SUMMERLIN: The whole idea is to see it
11	and the comments on paper it will be real hard to
12	follow that.
13	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I guess as a very last
14	option you could put in bleeps.
15	MS. WHITE: But I don't want anybody to
16	think our central offices are pornographic or
17	anything. (Laughter)
18	MS. KEATING: I think
19	MS. WHITE: I think we can work something
20	out.
21	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. If you need to
22	figure that out we can get back together again.
23	The motion we've ruled on. Does that take
24	care of everything?
25	MS. KEATING: I think it does.

I	1
1	COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Any other matters
2	coming before us today? All right. This hearing
3	stands adjourned.
4	(Thereupon, the hearing concluded at
5	2:00 p.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON)
3	I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of
4	Reporting, Official Commission Reporter,
5	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing Conference in Docket No. 980800-TP was heard by the Prehearing Officer at the time and place herein
6	stated; it is further
7	CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been
8	transcribed by me; and that this transcript, consisting of 25 pages, constitutes a true
9	transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
10	DATED this 21st of September, 1998.
11	
12	
13	
14	To the second se
15	JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR Florida Public Service Commission
16	Chief, Bureau of Reporting
17	(850) 413 - 6732
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	