



FILED

DEC 24 1998

December 23, 1998

Missouri Public Service Commission

The Honorable Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge Missouri Public Service Commission 301 West High Street, Floor 5A Jefferson City, MO 65101

Re: Case No. TO-98-115

Dear Judge Roberts:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission in the above-referenced case are an original and fourteen (14) copies of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's Reply to Comments of AT&T Re: Proposed Briefing Schedule.

Also enclosed is an additional copy to be file stamped and returned to us in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you for bringing this matter to the attention of the Commission.

Sincerely,

Katherine C. Swaller

tomaller

Enclosures

cc: Parties of Record

6B.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI



In the Matter of AT&T Communications of the)		
Southwest, Inc.'s Petition for Second Compulsory	5		
Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the)		
Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Establish an)	Case No. TO-98-1	15
Interconnection Agreement with Southwestern Bell	i)		
Telephone Company.)		

REPLY OF SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY TO COMMENTS OF AT&T RE: PROPOSED BRIEFING SCHEDULE

COMES NOW Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (Southwestern Bell) and for its Reply to Suggestions Regarding Proposed Briefing Schedule states as follows:

- 1. Southwestern Bell is interested in obtaining an expeditious briefing schedule given the extensive time period that has passed since the hearings in this case (the hearings were completed on September 4, 1998), but is flexible with regard to the specific dates to be ordered.
- 2. The tone of AT&T's response is surprising since counsel for Southwestern Bell talked to counsel for AT&T on two occasions prior to filing the Motion to Establish Briefing Schedule to determine whether the proposed schedule would be acceptable and if not what type of schedule would work for AT&T. AT&T's counsel indicated that the proposed dates seemed reasonable, but that he needed to consult with his client before agreeing. Southwestern Bell promised to hold off for a few days before filing the proposed motion so that AT&T could provide its input. Although SWBT waited for nearly a week, the requested input was never received.
- 3. It is somewhat ironic that AT&T seeks to portray Southwestern Bell as unreasonable in seeking a briefing schedule to resolve issues that <u>AT&T</u> chose to

arbitrate. If AT&T was serious about local competition in Missouri, it would also want those matters resolved.

4. Southwestern Bell is also confused by AT&T's statements about the burden of having to prepare a brief prior to a ruling on Southwestern Bell's Motion to Strike. The issues about which AT&T complains, and which the Parties will need to be briefed if the Motion to Strike is not ruled upon, are issues raised by AT&T.

WHEREFORE, Southwestern Bell urges the Commission to issue an order setting an expeditious briefing schedule.

Respectfully submitted,

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

PAUL G. LANE #27011 LEO J. BUB #34326

ANTHONY K. CONROY #35199 KATHERINE C. SWALLER #34271

Attorneys for

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company

One Bell Center, Room 3536

St. Louis, Missouri 63101

(314) 235-4099 (Telephone) (314) 331-2193 (Facsimile)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing document were served on the following parties by first-class postage prepaid, U.S. Mail on December __22, 1998.

Katherine C. Swaller

PENNY G. BAKER MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 301 W. HIGH STREET, SUITE 530 JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101

MICHAEL F. DANDINO SENIOR PUBLIC COUNSEL OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL 301 W. HIGH STREET, SUITE 250 JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101

PAUL S. DeFORD LATHROP & GAGE 2345 GRAND BLVD., SUITE 2500 KANSAS CITY, MO 64108

CARL J. LUMLEY LELAND B. CURTIS 130 S. BEMISTON, SUITE 200 CLATYON, MO 63105

MARK WITCHER AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHWEST 919 CONGRESS, SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701