

Lisa C. Creighton  
(816) 932-4461  
l3c@sonnenschein.com

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL

4520 MAIN STREET SUITE 1100  
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64111

January 11, 2000

(816) 932-4400  
FACSIMILE  
(816) 531-7545

**VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS**

Mr. Dale Roberts  
Executive Secretary  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
301 West High Street, Suite 530  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

**FILED**

JAN 12 2000

Missouri Public  
Service Commission

Re: In the Matter of the Petition of DIECA Communications, Inc. d/b/a Covad  
Communications Company For Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms,  
Conditions and Related Arrangements With Southwestern Bell Telephone  
Company  
Case No. TO-2000-322

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission are the original and 14 copies of page 5 of the  
direct testimony of Bernard Chao which was filed with the Commission on January 7, 2000.  
Page 5 was inadvertently omitted from the original filing.

The testimony of Mr. Chao was transmitted via electronic mail to Southwestern Bell  
Telephone company, so the copy they have is correct and complete; however, a copy of this letter  
and page 5 is being sent to Southwestern Bell. By copy of this letter, two copies of page 5 are  
being sent to the Office of Public Counsel, and one copy to the Office of General Counsel.

If you should have any question, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for  
your assistance.

Very truly yours,

*Lisa Creighton /cmw*  
Lisa C. Creighton

LCC/cmw  
Enclosures

cc: Office of Public Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
Paul G. Lane, Esq.

1 already agreed to by the parties. Furthermore, as I mentioned a earlier, both the FCC and the  
2 Texas Commission have ordered SWBT to abandon Selective Feeder Separation/Binder Group  
3 Management.

4 **Q. Should Covad pay for labor associated with SFS as part of the loop qualification**  
5 **charge?**

6 A. Obviously not. Covad should not pay for costs that are not incurred.

7 **Q. Are their any other costs that SWBT should not incur?**

8 A. Yes, Covad should not have to pay for qualification charges that assume a manual  
9 interface. The Texas Commission has ordered SWBT to develop and deploy enhancements that  
10 will allow CLECs, including Covad, to have real-time electronic access to loop qualification  
11 information. SWBT is ordered to fully mechanize as soon possible and must be so mechanized  
12 by June 1, 2000. In Missouri, SWBT has agreed to develop and deploy the same enhancements,  
13 but has yet committed to a time frame. One would assume that mechanization in Missouri will  
14 occur concurrently with, or least shortly after, the implementation of the same process in Texas.  
15 Public Utility Commission of Texas, Arbitration Award, Docket Nos. 20226 and 20272,  
16 November 30, 1999, at 62 attached hereto as Exhibit A.

17 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

18 A. Yes. However, I may offer rebuttal testimony.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28