



Joyce Beasley
General Attorney

June 10, 1996

Room 3258D2
295 North Maple Avenue
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920
908 221-6502
FAX 908 953-8360

Via Facsimile

Connie E. Nicholas, Esq.
Attorney
GTE Telephone Operations
600 Hidden Ridge
HQEO3H44
P. O. Box 152092
Irving, Texas 75015-2093

Dear Connie:

Thank you for your letter dated June 4 and the California materials you enclosed with it. I appreciate the constructive tone of your letter, and certainly want to maintain it in our further dealings with one another.

The negotiations in which AT&T has engaged GTE are for the purposes set forth in the 1996 Act. To the extent that our joint objective is the achievement with and for our clients of a negotiated agreement, our requests for information are intended only to facilitate that process and minimize the number of issues that remain unresolved at the close of our negotiations. I would urge you to view our requests for cost studies, for interconnection agreements and other information in that context.

In this regard, it appears that I should clarify both the letter and the spirit of my proposal on interconnection agreements. It is certainly not my suggestion that AT&T have 30 days' access to those agreements. Rather, it is our proposal that the agreements be made available to AT&T, for some reasonable amount of time, *during* a 30 day period. So, for example, you and I might agree that during the period June 15 through July 15, AT&T representatives might visit your offices in Irving:

AGBR 000295

000720

Connie E. Nicholas, Esq.
June 10, 1996
Page Two

- a. On a fixed number of days (e.g., 4), beginning not earlier than June 15 and ending not later than July 15;
- b. During normal business hours;
- c. To review all GTE intercompany agreements at that location; and
- d. To take notes; and identify those agreements to be copied for AT&T and at AT&T's expense.

Neither of course do we propose that GTE assemble all such agreements in a single location. We want reasonable and sensible access to the documents. We don't expect them in one location nor in 100 locations around the country. We can probably work with something in between. Would one or two locations per state or region be workable? We would be pleased to work with you on the sequence and timing of this review of GTE documents by AT&T.

Your representatives have suggested, no doubt correctly, that many or most of the 2800+ agreements have little or no bearing on our pending provisioning and other requests under the Act. That will be quickly apparent to our AT&T document reviewers, and enable them just as quickly to conclude their review.

I thank you again for the constructive tone of your letter. We can work effectively together, I am sure, to help our clients accomplish their agreement.

Sincerely,


Joyce Beasley

AGBR 000296

000720 A

