

02819

1

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

2

3

In the Matter of the Pricing) DOCKET NO. UT-960369
4 Proceeding for Interconnection,)
Unbundled Element, Transport)
5 and Termination, and Resale)

6

In the Matter of the Pricing) DOCKET NO. UT-960370
6 Proceeding for Interconnection,)
Unbundled Elements, Transport)
7 and Termination, and Resale for)

8

U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.)
)

9

In the Matter of the Pricing) DOCKET NO. UT-960371
9 Proceeding for Interconnection,)
10 Unbundled Elements, Transport and)

11

Termination, and Resale for) VOLUME 13
Pages 2819 to 2842

12

GTE NORTHWEST INCORPORATED)
)

13

14

A post-hearing conference in the above matter was
15 held on July 20, 2000 at 1:07 p.m., at 1300 South Evergreen
16 Park Drive Southwest, Olympia, Washington before
17 Administrative Law Judge ROBERT WALLIS.

18

19

20 The parties were present as follows:

21

22 THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION, by SHANNON SMITH, Assistant Attorney General and
23 JING Y. ROTH, Regulatory Consultant

24 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)

25 WASHINGTON AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ADVISOR,
by DR. DAVID GABLE

02820

1 GTE NORTHWEST by JENNIFER McCLELLAN, Attorney at
Law, (by bridge) with Laura Brevard, Linda Casey, Patty
2 Nelson, and Joan Gage (all appearing by bridge)

3 AT&T by MICHELLE SINGER-NELSON, Attorney at Law (by
bridge)

4 TRACER and RHYTHMS LINKS, INC. By ART BUTLER,
5 Attorney at Law (by bridge)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 Constance F. Chambliss, CSR

24 Court Reporter

25 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
COLLOQUY

02821

1

P R O C E E D I N G S

2

JUDGE WALLIS: Let's be on the record, please.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

This is a post-hearing conference in the matter of Commission Dockets UT-960369, et al, and we are convened today pursuant to a notice of post-hearing conference, dated July, 11, 2000, to address some technical questions arising from the parties' presentations and briefing in post-hearing process regarding Phase III of this proceeding. Actually, I think these questions may predate that.

11

12

13

14

15

16

I would like to begin by stating that my name is Robert Wallis, W-a-l-l-i-s. I'm the presiding Administrative Law Judge. And with me in the hearing room is Commission staff. I'm going to call for appearances, starting with Commission staff and then move to the bridge line.

17

18

19

MS. SMITH: Shannon Smith, Assistant Attorney General, representing Commission staff. And with me this afternoon is Jing Roth of Commission staff.

20

JUDGE WALLIS: For GTE, on the bridge line?

21

22

23

24

MS. McCLELLAN: Representing Horizon Northwest, Incorporated, formerly known as GTE Northwest, Incorporated. With me I have Laura Brevard, Linda Casey, Patty Nelson, and Joan Gage.

25

JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you. For AT&T?

02822

1 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
COLLOQUY

2 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Michelle Singer-Nelson, on
3 behalf of AT&T, and with me is Arlene Starr.

4 JUDGE WALLIS: For Tracer?

5 MR. BUTLER: Art Butler for Tracer and. . .

6
7 (Clarifying interruption
made by court reporter.)

8 JUDGE WALLIS: Could you state the name of your
9 second client more slowly, and spell it for the court
10 reporter, please.

11 MR. BUTLER: Rhythms, R-h-y-t-h-m-s, Links,
12 L-i-n-k-s, Inc., I-n-c.

13 JUDGE WALLIS: Let's proceed to the subject of
14 today's conference. The Commission notice of July 11
15 posed questions for responses from GTE and AT&T. I will
16 acknowledge the fact that GTE has been renamed, and for
17 convenience and consistency and clarity in the record,
18 I'm going to continue to use the term GTE. And the
19 post-hearing documents will likely continue to use that
20 term, even though we now know that the name has changed.

21 Ms. McClellan, is GTE prepared to respond to the
22 questions in the notice?

23 MS. McCLELLAN: Yes, it is.

24 JUDGE WALLIS: Could you please proceed now and
25 make that response.

02823

1 MS. McCLELLAN: Okay. For the question in
2 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
3 response to Section 2.A of AT&T's submission, Linda COLLOQUY
4 Casey, who can address the questions of GTE's methods
5 used to calculate disconnection costs for the resale
6 engineers . . .

7
8 (Clarifying interruption
made by court reporter.)

9 JUDGE WALLIS: The court reporter is unable to
10 understand what you're saying, Ms. McClellan.

11 MS. McCLELLAN: Okay. Let me start over.

12 The notice indicated that Section 2.A of AT&T's
13 submission, they had questions about the methods GTE used
14 to calculate disconnection costs for the resale,
15 engineered, and unbundled loop engineered rate
16 categories.

17 I have Linda Casey, who can explain the method used
18 by GTE to calculate these costs.

19 JUDGE WALLIS: Ms. Casey?

20 MS. CASEY: Yes. This is Linda Casey with GTE,
21 and in response to that question I'll be passing the
22 explanation portion of this over to Laura Brevard, who is
23 our pricing person. Actually, the question that they are
24 asking here does not refer specifically to this cost
25 calculation, but rather how those costs are then

02824

1 translated into the prices that were presented and the
2 differences between the two filings.

3 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
4 I'll let Laura go ahead and explain that now. COLLOQUY

5 MS. BREVARD: The difference between the
6 filing --

7 JUDGE WALLIS: Is this Ms. Brevard?

8 MS. BREVARD: I'm sorry. This is Laura Brevard
9 with GTE.

10 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you. Please proceed.

11 MS. BREVARD: The rights that are developed in
12 the spreadsheet, which is marked Exhibit 2.B - the
13 differences between this study or these rates, filed in
14 June, compared to the previous study or rates that were
15 filed in November, this study, filed in June, includes
16 disconnection rates or resale engineered, nonengineered,
17 resale services, plus rates for loops and ports.

18 And those numbers are all - or those rates are based
19 on specifics costs for those service categories or those
20 U and E or resale categories. However, in the previous
21 filing, the November '99 filing, those costs were
22 weighted together to produce one disconnect rate that
23 applied to all services.

24 JUDGE WALLIS: Let me interject at this juncture
25 and ask now if people are better able to hear us than

02825

1 before. We've had our technician in, who has made some
2 adjustments to the equipment on the bridge line.

3 Can you hear us any better?

4 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
5 COLLOQUY
(Brief discussion held
6 off the record.)

7 JUDGE WALLIS: I want to thank Mr. Singleton for
8 rushing to our assistance.

9 Now, Ms. Brevard, had you completed your response?

10 MS. BREVARD: Yes I, have.

11 JUDGE WALLIS: Does GTE have anything further in
12 response?

13 MS. McCLELLAN: No, sir.

14 JUDGE WALLIS: Does AT&T or Tracer Rhythms Links
15 have any questions about the statement?

16 MS. STARR: This is Arlene Starr at AT&T. And I
17 guess GTE's response - I understood that from their
18 filing. I'm not sure that it really addresses the
19 comments that were made, though. I guess just to be sure
20 that I do thoroughly understand - maybe get to the right
21 page here - so GTE is saying what previously for all
22 types of orders was the thirteen something - thirteen
23 nineteen, I believe - is now comprised of the several
24 components of eighty-seven eighteen, eighty nineteen.
25 And then there are several in the five and six dollar

02826

1 range. Is that correct?

2

(Request by reporter
to Judge for identification
of speakers.)

3

4

MS. McCLELLAN: Yes.

5

CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)

COLLOQUY

6

MS. STARR: I guess my first comment would be,

7

just in the overall - my comments really focuses on the

8

overall magnitude of the price increase for the two

9

services, the resale services and the unbundled loop,

10

which is the disconnect charge, now is eighty-seven

11

eighteen and eighty nineteen, which on a combined basis,

12

between install and disconnect, increases the overall

13

nonrecurrent charge quite significantly.

14

And I guess a more specific question, in going back

15

in the documentation and trying to follow the numbers

16

through - and I'm referring now to Exhibit 2.B, Page 15

17

of 17, of GTE's exhibits, which is one example of coming

18

up with a disconnect rate; in this particular case the

19

eighty-seven eighteen, which is for the engineered resale

20

services loop.

21

And it seems to be that number is - first of all,

22

there are - let's see - five categories of possible cost,

23

where GTE has numbers, ordering, provisioning, and

24

dispatch, disconnect, the CO activity and field install.

25

And for disconnect there are amounts associated with all

02827

1 categories, except for the field install.

2 So I just wanted to clearly understand, I guess, how
3 those were determined. And part of my question is based
4 on - because Exhibit 2.C, which GTE provided to show more
5 detail of their non-recurring cost, there isn't any page
6 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
7 in Exhibit 2.C for disconnect, so there's no further COLLOQUY
8 supports.

9 And then my I guess the second part of the question
10 is it seems to be that the eighty-seven eighteen is a
11 weighted number between the basic and complex. And I
12 guess my understanding was that these costs were not
13 supposed to be, if possible, I guess, based on
14 weightings, but on actual activities and times associated
15 with developing non-recurring costs, and not a weighting,
16 which GTE has been doing in their previous studies.

17 So I'm not sure if those are questions necessarily
18 or comments, kind of disagreeing with GTE's methodology.

19 JUDGE WALLIS: Very well. Tracer?

20 MR. BUTLER: We have no questions.

21 JUDGE WALLIS: Commission staff?

22 MS. SMITH: No questions.

23 JUDGE WALLIS: Dr. Gable?

24 DR. GABLE: I have two things. First, just as a
25 follow-up to what Ms. Starr just said, for the placement

02828

1 of an order is there a separate charge for a basic versus
2 a complex? Do you have different rates for a basic
3 versus a complex? Or do you just have one rate that is a
4 weighted average of those two types of activities?

5 MS. BREVARD: This is Laura Brevard with GTE. On
6 the ordering side, you're correct, we don't have a basic
7 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
8 and complex ordering charge. There is only one ordering COLLOQUY
9 charge, and we try - what we wanted to do is make sure
10 that the disconnect structure matched the ordering
11 structure. And that is why these are weighted. That is
12 why we've weighted basic and complex costs to arrive at
13 this rate.

14 DR. GABLE: And my second question is that as the
15 discussion here this afternoon illustrates, a lot of the
16 cost of the removal is associated with, say, a field
17 visit. And the field visit costs that are included in
18 both the November and the June filings, are they the same
19 costs that were in the original studies; it's just a
20 matter of that reported cost are showing up differently
21 today, because you're aggregating differently?

22 MS. BREVARD: That is correct.

23 DR. GABLE: Okay. So then just as a last
24 question on this topic, you said that the numbers which
25 AT&T focused on in their filing were these numbers -

02829

1 where either of disconnect costs of right around \$80 or
2 whatever, and your explanation is, "Well, they are high,
3 because previously we had a weighed average, and now this
4 is less of a weighted average."

5 Can you show us that we would end up - we could
6 apply the weights that were used in the November filings,
7 apply them to the rates that were filed in the June
8 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
9 COLLOQUY
filing, and we would end up with the same rate that was
10 filed in November?

11 So let me pull out, to make sure that I'm making my
12 point clearly - let me refer to Page 5 of AT&T's filing,
13 where they say that initially there was a disconnect rate
14 of thirteen nineteen, and now it's gone up to
15 eighty-seven eighteen. And that eighty-seven eighteen
16 was, in effect, embedded in that thirteen nineteen rate.

17 Can you, if not right off the top of your head - if
18 you can, right off the top of your head, that's fine -
19 can you provide us something that shows that if you apply
20 the weights that were used to develop the thirteen
21 nineteen figure, if you were to apply those same weights
22 to the different rates that were filed in June 9, you
23 would end up back at the thirteen nineteen rate?

24 MS. BREVARD: I can't do it off the top of my
25 head. It's not as simple as just weighting together the

02830

1 numbers that now appear on the schedule. There were some
2 previous weightings that were done previously. But
3 basically, there is a weighting between these two
4 engineered numbers for disconnects, the eighty-seven and
5 the eighty.

6 And then there's a further weighting between the
7 nonengineered services of five sixty-one, five sixty, and
8 six fifty-six, to arrive at the thirteen nineteen. But
9 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
10 basically, there's a - we used an eight percent of COLLOQUY
11 engineered service orders. And 92 percent applied to the
12 nonengineered service order disconnect rate to produce
13 the thirteen nineteen.

14 DR. GABLE: Judge Wallis, can I issue what I
15 guess would be a Bench Request, asking that GTE make such
16 a showing?

17 JUDGE WALLIS: Yes.

18 DR. GABLE: So Ms. Brevard, do you understand the
19 nature of my request?

20 MS. BREVARD: Yes, I do.

21 DR. GABLE: So I would like to ask that, that you
22 make the submission to the Commission.

23 MS. BREVARD: Okay.

24 DR. GABLE: And then if you could, in making that
25 filing, provide documentation on where the weights that

02831

1 you're going to be providing in this new filing, where
2 those weights show up in the November 18th filing.

3 MS. BREVARD: Okay.

4 JUDGE WALLIS: When can you have that document to
5 the Commission?

6

7 (Request by reporter to
8 Judge that bridge speakers
identify themselves.)

9 MS. BREVARD: I believe I could complete that by
10 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
COLLOQUY
11 the end of the day on Tuesday.

12 JUDGE WALLIS: Is that Ms. Brevard?

13 MS. BREVARD: Yes.

14 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you. Is there anything
15 further regarding the question for GTE?

16 DR. GABLE: I have nothing further.

17 JUDGE WALLIS: Very well. Let's move on, then,
18 to the question for AT&T. Ms. Singer-Nelson?

19 MS. STARR: Yes, this is Arlene Starr for AT&T.
20 And the second part of our comment had to do with the
21 electronic and manual order numbers that were provided by
22 GTE. Let me get my pages out for that.

23 Previously what GTE had done in their November
24 filing was listed a manual order charge of ten
25 sixty-seven. And that was added to each order, to come

02832

1 up with a manual price. And what they have done in this
2 filing now is they have provided separate electronic and
3 manual numbers and the differences between electronic and
4 manual. The manual are higher by anywhere between
5 nineteen and fourteen.

6 And Exhibit - let me get the right page here, too -
7 5A . . . Excuse me. Actually, I'm not sure why I said -
8 I didn't mean 5A - 2B, again, which is the detail of
9 GTE's compliance filing. And for example, I went through
10 the five categories that I mentioned earlier on the
11 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
12 ordering provisioning to disconnect and so on, to see COLLOQUY
13 where the differences were between the manual and the
14 electronic.

15 And it seems to be the only place there was a
16 difference was in the ordering category. I guess I just
17 wanted to understand from GTE why that is the only
18 category that has a difference, and should there be some
19 other cost differentials between manual and electronic,
20 other than ordering?

21 MS. CASEY: This is Linda Casey, and I'll respond
22 to that.

23 The reason that the manual ordering costs are
24 reflected and there are no differences between manual and
25 electronic in the other categories, such as provisioning

02833

1 and installation, is that GTE's current processes in
2 place for everything except ordering reflects the
3 processes that are in place for all orders received.

4 There is no difference in processing orders, once
5 you get the order into GTE's ordering system. It's the
6 up-front order receipt process that is either
7 electronically or manually received.

8 Does that answer your question, or would you like to
9 follow that up?

10 MS. STARR: I think that makes sense. I guess it
11 just seems that perhaps there might be other processes
12 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
13 that would have differences. But if - you know, I guess COLLOQUY
14 GTE's answer is in their case, it's not.

15 MS. CASEY: That's correct.

16 JUDGE WALLIS: Does AT&T have anything further?

17 MS. SINGER-NELSON: No. Thank you.

18 JUDGE WALLIS: Do other parties want to comment
19 on the dialogue that just took place? Dr. Gable, do you
20 have any follow-up questions?

21 DR. GABLE: I do not.

22 JUDGE WALLIS: The notice invited Commission
23 staff to explain its details, demonstrating . . . Let's
24 see. . . I'm sorry. Staff was asked to be prepared to
25 identify adjustments that should be made.

02834

1 Does staff wish to make any comments at this time?

2 MS. ROTH: This is Jing - last name is Roth,
3 R-o-t-h. I think the notice said that GTE should go on
4 first to prepare to explain why their filing is in
5 compliance with the Commission order. And then I would
6 on behalf of Commission staff --

7 MR. GABLE: Excuse me, Ms. Roth. This is David
8 Gable. I've I'm having trouble hearing you. Could you
9 speak up, please?

10 MS. ROTH: Sure. I'll start again.

11 I'm reading the notice of post-hearing conference,
12 last paragraph, that stated that GTE should prepare to
13 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377) COLLOQUY
14 explain the details demonstrating that its filing
15 complies with the Commission order. So I was just asking
16 Judge Wallis a question about, should GTE go ahead and
17 explain? Then I would follow up on those adjustments
18 that I recommend that GTE make in the filings.

19 JUDGE WALLIS: Has GTE responded to this
20 question?

21 MS. CASEY: This is Linda Casey. Yes, GTE did
22 file a detailed explanation in their June compliance
23 filing. I believe that that was labeled as Exhibit 5.A
24 in the documentation that was submitted. In that
25 documentation we had set out the paragraph within the

02835

1 various orders that we were to follow and how we made
2 those adjustments and how those translated in different
3 costs from the initial study to the filing that was
4 submitted subsequently, based upon the order.

5 Are there any questions specific to that exhibit
6 that I can answer or clarify?

7 MS. ROTH: I guess we have, between GTE . . .
8 Oh, this is Jing Roth of the Commission staff. And I
9 guess reading Exhibit 5.A, I think we should just
10 concentrate on Paragraph 454 of the 17th Supplemental
11 Order.

12 MS. CASEY: This is Linda Casey. If you'll just
13 give me a minute to get to that paragraph, I'll be with
14 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
15 you. COLLOQUY

16 MS. ROTH: I have to find it, too.

17 MS. CASEY: Is that Paragraph 454 of the 8th
18 Supplemental Order?

19 MS. ROTH: No, the 17th. That's what you used.
20 Exhibit 5.A, Page 4, I guess you have cited several times
21 in those - Page 5.

22 MS. CASEY: Oh, yes. I'm with you, yes.

23 MS. ROTH: Okay. Now, what I'm looking at is
24 Staff Request Response to Bench Request No. 128.

25 MS. CASEY: Yes?

02836

1 MS. ROTH: Basically, the Commission in that
2 order said GTE should make those adjustments outlined in
3 the response to Bench Request No. 128. And then on Page
4 109 of 17th Supplemental Order it stated that - as for
5 example, it said, "Reduce the time estimates for due date
6 assignment by 50 percent."

7 Now, you know, if you look at staff's comment - we
8 recently filed on Page 4, either look at this
9 Commission's order or go back to my testimony, the
10 productive hours for LSR, a due date assignment, that
11 category, I have 0.016. And in GTE's recent filing I
12 still have 0.02 productive hours per LSR. That's in a
13 table, those numbers I read.

14 MS. CASEY: Yes, I see that.

15 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)

16 MS. ROTH: Okay. On Page 4. So this is just one
17 example of basic, nonengineered, ordering cost for
18 unbundled loop. That's the example I was giving. So I'm
19 trying to understand why GTE is still using 0.02, for
20 instance, versus 0.016, as was originally in my testimony
21 and I assume in Staff Bench Request Response again.

22 So in my opinion, just for example in this, GTE is
23 not complying - complies with the 17th Supplemental
24 Order, Paragraph 454.

25 MS. CASEY: This is Linda Casey again, and I'll

02837

1 respond to that. The adjustment, as we read it in the
2 Bench Request, said that we should make a 50 percent
3 reduction in the number that was displayed in our study,
4 which we did, which would have been the 0.016, the way
5 staff has explained it. However, we rounded it up to two
6 decimals, because that is the format of our study. So
7 it's really a question of how many decimals we were
8 required to carry our 50 percent reduction out to.

9 MS. ROTH: Then let's pass that. Then following,
10 you have that table that we have on Page 4.

11 MS. CASEY: Yes, I do.

12 MS. ROTH: Now, following, for instance, error of
13 correction on those type of ordering, there's one
14 example, you have .02. Staff or regional recommendation
15 is .00. There is no error of correction, so --

16 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
17 COLLOQUY

18 MS. CASEY: I can respond to that. This is Linda
19 Casey. The approach that GTE took to interpreting the
20 request made in the order was to go through Bench
21 Requests, where they refer to various sections of the
22 Bench Request. And we saw documentation in the order
23 that told us to make the adjustments, as outlined in
24 Paragraph B and Paragraph C of Bench Request No. 128.

25 Since we did not see references to adjustments that
we should make, outlined as in Section A of the Bench

02838

1 Request, we did not perform those adjustments. We did
2 not think that they were being ordered.

3 MS. ROTH: You know, staff took the position that
4 - the Commission has adopted the - all the adjustment
5 staff made in its original file testimony - I think it's
6 a confidential, Exhibit C JYR-4. So and then the Bench
7 Request is actually a follow-up by the Bench, asking
8 staff to explain in detail of Staff Confidential Exhibit
9 JYR-4 and dash 5 and dash 6, so --

10 MS. CASEY: This is Linda Casey. I do understand
11 your interpretation.

12 MS. ROTH: So we have a different opinion as to
13 interpretation. It's not - we have a difference in
14 interpretation, but not you disagree with the numbers.

15 MS. CASEY: Yes, exactly. GTE took the approach
16 that we tried to follow the letter of intent of the
17 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
18 order, as it was outlined. And we were very specific,
19 when it referred to sections, to go those sections and
20 make those adjustments. We saw no reference --

21 JUDGE WALLIS: Excuse me, Ms. Casey. We have a
22 problem on our end with feedback. Are you noticing that,
23 as well? Do you hear a whine?

24 MS. CASEY: It's probably because I was standing.
25 Is this better now?

02839

1 JUDGE WALLIS: Please proceed.

2 MS. CASEY: Again, we saw no reference. Since we
3 did see references to Section B and C of the Bench
4 Request, we made those adjustments. There was no
5 specific reference to Section A; therefore, we did not
6 believe we were being instructed to make those
7 adjustments.

8 MS. ROTH: In Section A I did discuss all of
9 those numbers.

10 MS. CASEY: I beg your pardon?

11 MS. ROTH: I said, I understand what you're
12 saying, but in the Response to Bench Request, the part of
13 Section A is what actually talks about your productive
14 hours and the ordering charge. But since you didn't
15 think the order asked to you read --

16 MS. CASEY: Again, if you could point me to a
17 specific reference in the order that would have indicated
18 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
19 we should have made those, then perhaps I would COLLOQUY
20 understand better, if we --

21 MS. ROTH: The Paragraph 454, and then if
22 you . . . Well, I don't know how to describe it, but --

23 MS. CASEY: We followed it this way . . . This
24 is Linda Casey still. We followed it this way: In that
25 Paragraph 454 it refers us to Paragraph 468 and 469 and

02840

1 473 of the Eighth Supplemental Order.

2 If you go to those paragraphs of the Eighth
3 Supplemental Order, it told us in 468 to take a
4 six-minute non-see (phonetic) order input work time. We
5 made that adjustment. And then Commission has noted
6 we've made that adjustment. In Paragraph 469 it asked us
7 to adjust the probability of assignment activity to 15
8 percent, and it has been noted that we have made that
9 adjustment. And in Paragraph 473 it asked us to change
10 the disconnect time to six minutes and the central office
11 time to two minutes for analyzation and three minutes to
12 disconnect the jumper. And it's been noted that we made
13 those adjustments.

14 MS. ROTH: Okay. Then --

15 MS. CASEY: -- is what that Paragraph 454
16 indicated that we should do in those paragraphs --

17 MS. ROTH: Right. Right after that sentence that
18 you just cited for Paragraph 454, I'm reading from the
19 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
20 order right after that. It said, "This adjustment should
21 be made in a manner consistent with staff witness's
22 Roth's study, explained in response to Bench Request
23 No. 128."

24 MS. CASEY: And we felt we were consistent with
25 the methodology that was outlined there, in the Bench

02841

1 Request overall.

2 MS. ROTH: Yeah, so it's overall. So I guess,
3 you know, you and me can argue, but I think we have made
4 our point that, you know, we have a different
5 interpretation of the order.

6 JUDGE WALLIS: Very well. And I think what the
7 notice asked is for a clarification, to understand where
8 the parties were coming from.

9 Dr. Gable, do you believe that the parties have
10 provided that to you?

11 DR. GABLE: Yes, they have. I just have one
12 question for staff, and that is: If the Commission were
13 to agree with staff's view that the modifications
14 identified on Page 4 of staff's June 28th, 2000 filing
15 should be implemented, would - and that those changes
16 should be implemented throughout the study, would that
17 then address your concern at Page 5, where you say, "The
18 above illustration is just one example of GTE's
19 noncompliance"? Or is there something else that the
20 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
21 Commission needs to address in addition to the items that
22 are identified in the table at Page 4?

23 MS. ROTH: No, there is no additional
24 adjustments. It is very well put by you: If GTE goes
25 through its study to make those changes in that table

02842

1 listed on Page 4, where they apply - for instance, if
2 they have different ordering charges - putting those
3 numbers in. That would resolve - some of the rates would
4 be lowered, and that is the point that we're trying to
5 make.

6 MS. CASEY: This is Linda Casey. Just for one
7 more point of clarification, I was unable to locate a
8 reference for the field visit determination change from
9 .02 in your table to .00. If you could please direct
10 me, specifically, to where it is in the Bench Request or
11 in one of the orders, for us to make that adjustment, I
12 would appreciate that.

13 MS. ROTH: Okay. Let me try to find that, but
14 let me make sure that Dr. Gable's answer . . . Did I
15 answer your question?

16 DR. GABLE: Yes, you did.

17 MS. ROTH: I'm not sure I can put my finger on
18 that - Commission adopted. Could I get back to you on
19 that?

20 MS. CASEY: Certainly.

21 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)
22 COLLOQUY

23 MS. ROTH: Could I call Joan Gage, if I can find
24 a reference?

25 MS. GAGE: Yeah, that's fine, Jing.

DR. GABLE: Actually, since that is - now GTE is

02843

1 sort of raising that as an issue. I think it would be
2 good if you filed it with the Commission, so I could also
3 see the response.

4 MS. ROTH: Sure, because right now I have a lot
5 of paper in front of me. I really couldn't find the
6 number.

7 JUDGE WALLIS: All right. Are there any other
8 questions that need to be addressed at this time?

9 Dr. Gable, do you have any other further questions?

10 MR. GABLE: I do not.

11 JUDGE WALLIS: Do any of the parties have any
12 further questions?

13 MS. McCLELLAN: GTE does not.

14 JUDGE WALLIS: I've heard no affirmative
15 response, and therefore, I will adjourn this conference.

16 Thank you all very much for attending, and we will
17 be off the record.

18 (Concluded at 2:25)

19

20

21

22 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)

23 C E R T I F I C A T E

24

25 As Court Reporter, I hereby certify that

02844

1 the foregoing transcript is true and accurate and
2 contains all the facts, matters, and proceedings
3 of the hearing held on: July 20, 2000.

4

5

CONTINENTAL REPORTING

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 CONTINENTAL REPORTING SERVICE, INC., (206) 624-DEPS (3377)

25