

1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2 STATE OF MISSOURI

3 _____
4 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

5 ARBITRATION MEETING

6 February 3, 2006

7 Jefferson City, Missouri

8 Volume 1
9 _____

10 Petition of Socket Telecom, LLC for)
11 Compulsory Arbitration of)
12 Interconnection Agreements with)Case No. TO-2006-0299
13 CenturyTel of Missouri LLC and Spectra)
14 Communications, LLC Pursuant to Section)
15 252(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act)
16 of 1996)

17 _____
18 KENNARD L. JONES,
19 REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.
20 _____

21 REPORTED BY:
22 TRACY L. THORPE, CSR, CCR
23 MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

LARRY W. DORITY, Attorney at Law
Fischer & DORITY
101 Madison Street, Suite 400
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
573-636-6758
FOR: CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC
Spectra Communications Group, LLC

DAVID F. BROWN, Attorney at Law, via telephone
HUGHES & LUCE
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 900
Austin, Texas 78701
512-482-6867

FLOYD R. HARTLEY, JR., Attorney at Law, via telephone
KARA ALTENBAUMER-PRICE, Attorney at Law, via telephone
HUGHES & LUCE
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
2147-939-5500

CARL J. LUMLEY, Attorney at Law, via telephone
Curtis, Oetting, Heinz, Garrett & O'Keefe
130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200
Clayton, Missouri 63105-1913
314-725-8788
FOR: Socket Telecom

BILL MAGNESS, Attorney at Law, via telephone
Casey, Gentz & Magness
98 San Jacinto Boulevard, Suite 1400
Austin, Texas 78701
512-480-9900
FOR: Socket Telecom

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 JUDGE JONES: We're here for the matter of the
3 petition of Socket Telecom, LLC for compulsory arbitration of
4 interconnection agreements with CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC
5 and Spectra Communications, LLC pursuant to Section 252(b)(1)
6 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. This is Case
7 No. TO-2006-0299.

8 My name is Kennard Jones. I've been appointed
9 the arbitrator in this matter. First, I'm going to introduce
10 my advisory staff present here, Natelle Dietrich, Mike
11 Scheperle, Adam McKinnie and Larry Henderson.

12 At this time, I'll take entries of appearance
13 beginning with Socket.

14 MR. LUMLEY: Thank you, Judge. This is Carl
15 Lumley calling from St. Louis. I'm with the Curtis, Heinz law
16 firm. My address is 130 South Bemiston, suite 200, Clayton,
17 Missouri 63105 and we're representing Socket Telecom in this
18 matter.

19 Also on the line is Bill Magness, and I'll let
20 him make his entry and note for the arbitrator that we have a
21 petition for entry pending. And I understand present in the
22 hearing room is Socket representative Matthew Kohly.

23 MR. MAGNESS: Yes, good morning, your Honor.
24 My name is Bill Magness. I'm with the law firm of Casey,
25 Gentz and Magness. My address is 98 San Jacinto Boulevard,

1 suite 1400, Austin, Texas 78701 representing Socket.

2 JUDGE JONES: Thank you.

3 And for CenturyTel.

4 MR. DORITY: Thank you, Judge. Let the record
5 reflect Larry W. DORITY with Fischer and DORITY, PC. Our
6 address is 101 Madison, suite 400, Jefferson City, Missouri
7 65101.

8 Also participating today are outside counsel
9 from the state of Texas. And we, too, your Honor, have
10 petitions for leave to appear pending at this point. That
11 would be David F. Brown with the Hughes and Luce, LLP firm.
12 David is located at 111 Congress Avenue, suite 900, Austin,
13 Texas 78701.

14 And also participating this morning is
15 Mr. Floyd R. Hartley. Mr. Hartley's address is Hughes and
16 Luce, LLP, 1717 Main Street, suite 2800, Dallas, Texas 75201.

17 Also participating on behalf of CenturyTel this
18 morning in the hearing room are Arthur Martinez and Becky
19 Powell. Participating on the telephone are Max Cox, Susan
20 Smith and Calvin Simshaw.

21 JUDGE JONES: Thank you. First, does anyone
22 object to these petitions for leave to enter appearance of
23 David brown, Floyd Hartley and Kara Altenbaumer-Price?

24 Hearing no objections, then their motions are
25 granted.

1 Also, there's a motion for leave to file an
2 errata petition for arbitration. Are there any objections to
3 that motion?

4 Hearing none, that motion is granted.

5 Now, the bigger motion is the motion that has
6 to do with release of confidential information. I'm not quite
7 sure I understand it. I know there have been successors in
8 interest and GTE and AT&T had an agreement, Socket wants
9 CenturyTel to -- or I should say rather Socket wants
10 information that was confidential in a 1997 arbitration Report
11 and Order.

12 Mr. Dority, you oppose that?

13 MR. DORITY: Yes, your Honor. We do at this
14 time. We filed our response to motion for administrative
15 notice. And I think in a nutshell, our message there is that
16 it is too broad in scope at this point. And at this point in
17 time, we're not sure that there's been any showing of
18 relevance or materiality.

19 And as far as the standard protective order
20 that is normally issued by this Commission, it, by its own
21 terms, indicates that those materials would be used for the
22 purposes of that particular proceeding.

23 And we also filed a motion for a
24 reconsideration of your order shortening time wherein you made
25 AT&T Communications of the Southwest -- I'm sorry, you didn't

1 make them a party, but you did ask them to file a response.
2 And we suggested that the other real party and interest, that
3 being GTE Midwest, Incorporated, who was a party to that
4 arbitration, should also have the opportunity to react to the
5 motion and the request to declassify confidential information.

6 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Mr. Lumley --

7 MR. LUMLEY: Yes, sir.

8 JUDGE JONES: -- why do you want that
9 information?

10 MR. LUMLEY: Your Honor, as you noted, the
11 existing agreement between Socket and the CenturyTel companies
12 is, in the case of CenturyTel of Missouri, the adopted
13 AT&T/GTE agreement with a couple recent changes and in the
14 case of Spectra, is essentially that same document with a
15 series of specific sections deleted. And those two additions
16 and deletions were recently approved by the Commission in some
17 separate cases that we've noted in the materials.

18 The proposal that Socket has made in the
19 current arbitration include the continuation of existing
20 language that comes from that original underlying agreement.
21 And the only information that we've asked to move into this
22 case is the Commission's decision in full. And as you've
23 noted, portions of that decision are currently still under a
24 protective order status.

25 I think there was a misunderstanding in the

1 AT&T response that I saw that suggested we were seeking the
2 entire record in that case, and that's certainly not what we
3 asked for. It's just the order.

4 We believe it's pertinent to have the
5 Commission's precedent in terms of its decisions on various
6 contract sections that we believe, you know, have worked
7 between the parties and should continue on; and therefore,
8 that's why we would like that precedent to be made available.

9 Obviously because of the protective order
10 status, it's not readily available simply from the
11 Commission's files, but the Commission's rules do allow it to
12 take notice of matters that are in its files.

13 The additional part of our request that I think
14 has been misunderstood, and it's set forth in paragraph 7, is
15 that we're not asking for public disclosure of this
16 information, but rather that it be moved into this case and
17 subject to the protective order.

18 And I would suggest that given the relationship
19 of that order to the existing agreement between the parties,
20 that if I were to send discovery to AT&T or Verizon or to
21 CenturyTel or to Spectra, they would have to respond and
22 produce that order, again, subject to the protective order in
23 this case.

24 But given the fast track of an arbitration
25 proceeding, we think it would be prejudicial to require us to

1 go through, you know, what could be, you know, 20 to 45 days
2 of delay of a discovery process when the information is
3 already in the Commission's files and we're not asking to
4 change its protected status in terms of public access.

5 We're just trying to make sure that it can be
6 brought to the Commission's attention in this case through the
7 use of attorneys and outside experts that sign the appropriate
8 nondisclosure documents. So that's our view in a nutshell.

9 JUDGE JONES: I don't know why now, but for
10 some reason I was thinking that you wanted access to cost
11 information.

12 MR. LUMLEY: I believe there is such
13 information included in the Report and Order, yes.

14 JUDGE JONES: But do you want --

15 MR. LUMLEY: That information supports the
16 Commission's decision on certain rates that we would want to
17 continue on as part of our position in this case.

18 JUDGE JONES: So is that a yes?

19 MR. LUMLEY: Yes, sir.

20 JUDGE JONES: And, Mr. Dority, why would you
21 have a problem with that?

22 MR. DORITY: Because that is not our
23 information. That is GTE Midwest, Incorporated doing business
24 as Verizon's information, your Honor.

25 If I could refer you -- and in one of the

1 Commission's earlier orders where they addressed the
2 situation -- and I have not seen this information myself. I
3 am not standing in the shoes of Verizon in terms of that
4 particular documentation.

5 The Commission itself, I believe, conducted --
6 had their Staff conduct a 16-week investigation regarding this
7 type of costing information that they're referring to. And
8 the Commission notes that because GTE will perhaps be required
9 to disclose extraordinarily confidential information,
10 including trade secrets and other proprietary matter, AT&T
11 will not participate in these meetings. So even the other
12 party to that arbitration was not allowed to participate in
13 meetings.

14 And I guess there was information or schedules
15 that that Staff report ultimately concluded and perhaps that
16 is what was made as an attachment to the Report and Order.
17 I have not seen that confidential information. I do not know.

18 And that's why we're suggesting that if -- that
19 surely GTE Midwest, Incorporated should have the opportunity
20 to react to it. AT&T has reacted to it and has opposed the
21 release of the information.

22 And, Mr. Hartley, I don't know if you had
23 anything you wanted to add at this point, but I would
24 certainly welcome that, if you'd like.

25 MR. HARTLEY: I think Mr. Dority's hit on the

1 primary objections, that administrative notice may not be the
2 proper vehicle at this time, in addition to administrative
3 notice primarily being focused on fact.

4 The rules do allow the Commission to refer to
5 its filings of evidence when noted with specificity or
6 particularity. Part of the problem here is we don't know what
7 Socket is after with any level of detail.

8 The next part, as Mr. Dority explained, is the
9 relevance or materiality. How is it relevant to the successor
10 interconnection agreement what may or may not have undergone
11 in the prior agreement eight, nine years ago? And as
12 Mr. Dority's explained, there would be substantial
13 confidentiality issues that AT&T obviously has and Verizon
14 also may have as well.

15 JUDGE JONES: Well, let me ask this of
16 CenturyTel. Cost studies are relevant in this arbitration; is
17 that right? What it cost CenturyTel to do things is going to
18 be relevant?

19 MR. DORITY: That is correct, and you hit it on
20 the head. What it costs CenturyTel to do these things, that's
21 correct.

22 JUDGE JONES: Well, since you phrased your
23 response that way, then are the costs as reflected in the '97
24 order relevant to what it would cost CenturyTel to do things?

25 MR. DORITY: That's something that I think we

1 would like to have the opportunity to discuss. And I guess at
2 this point, Judge, in relation to the scheduling, which is
3 another issue that I know you intend to take up this morning,
4 we are going to request the opportunity to perhaps go off line
5 and visit with Socket regarding some particular concerns we
6 have related to the scheduling issue.

7 And, you know, I'm most willing to visit with
8 Socket about this particular issue as well and perhaps we can
9 report back to you after we've had those chance for those
10 discussions.

11 JUDGE JONES: Well, is that the most recent
12 cost study that -- well, Socket -- or I should say CenturyTel
13 is a successor interest to GTE; is that right?

14 MR. DORITY: We acquired the GTE Verizon
15 properties, your Honor.

16 JUDGE JONES: Doesn't that make those cost
17 studies relevant to some degree?

18 MR. DORITY: It may well. Susan Smith, Cal
19 Simshaw, do you want to jump in here and offer your
20 perspectives on that?

21 MS. SIMSHAW: Well, this is Cal Simshaw. I
22 think, your Honor, yeah, to some extent. The commonality
23 obviously being the assets, the telephone plant, for instance,
24 to the extent that it hasn't been replaced or retired in the
25 intervening nine years.

1 But there are other aspects, as you know, of
2 cost studies regarding corporate overheads and things of that
3 nature that obviously are not common that Verizon may have
4 had -- Verizon GTE may have had certain dynamics associated
5 with that that are different from the CenturyTel perspective.
6 So to give you a precise answer to the question without the
7 ability to review what it is that is on file, it's impossible
8 to say to what extent it may be relevant.

9 JUDGE JONES: So don't you want to know whether
10 or not it's relevant, Mr. Simshaw? Wouldn't you want to have
11 the ability to see that information and know whether or not it
12 is relevant, whether it can be used to benefit this
13 arbitration?

14 MR. SIMSHAW: To see it, perhaps. But to just
15 automatically, you know, put it into the record and move on,
16 no.

17 JUDGE JONES: I don't understand the difference
18 between you seeing it and not putting -- how do you get to see
19 it without making it a part of this case?

20 MR. SIMSHAW: Well, it may be that we can get
21 it from the source.

22 JUDGE JONES: Is your relationship with the
23 source such that -- when you say "the source," what do you
24 mean?

25 MR. SIMSHAW: GTE Verizon.

1 JUDGE JONES: Is your relationship with those
2 companies such that you would be able to get that information
3 from them?

4 MR. SIMSHAW: Your Honor, this is moving so
5 fast I don't have an answer to that at the moment.

6 JUDGE JONES: It's got to move fast. We have a
7 May 9th deadline.

8 MR. SIMSHAW: I don't have an answer to that.

9 JUDGE JONES: You don't know whether or not
10 your relationship with GTE is as such that you can get this
11 information?

12 MR. SIMSHAW: We have not had that discussion.

13 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Mr. Lumley, is there
14 anything else you'd like to add?

15 MR. LUMLEY: Well, I suppose what I would add
16 is that to the extent you're concerned about AT&T's response,
17 I would like the opportunity to confer with them and allay
18 their concerns, because I think they've misunderstood our
19 request in terms of both the scope of what we've asked for and
20 the degree of release of the information that we've asked for.
21 But short of that, I think you understand our position.

22 JUDGE JONES: I have a feeling that my order to
23 AT&T was probably misplaced. I'm thinking that you want cost
24 information about GTE rather than AT&T; is that correct?

25 MR. LUMLEY: I suspect that the information

1 attached to the Commission's order doesn't have much to do
2 with AT&T, yes.

3 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Do you have any questions

4 MS. DIETRICH: I don't know who can answer
5 this. This is Natelle Dietrich. Are rates going to be an
6 issue in this arbitration?

7 MR. LUMLEY: Yes.

8 MS. DIETRICH: Mr. Dority, do we have
9 CenturyTel cost studies that would address current costs?

10 MR. DORITY: At this point we have not filed
11 anything. Our responsive pleadings are not due until next
12 week.

13 MS. DIETRICH: Right. But, I mean, would there
14 be CenturyTel cost studies that would be available that would
15 take care of the concern whether we need to consider GTE's
16 costs or not?

17 MR. DORITY: I believe that is the case, yes.
18 And, again, we're hoping to have some conversations with
19 Socket as to the scope and breadth of what contested issues
20 are going to remain. And we're working through those as
21 diligently as we can.

22 MS. DIETRICH: And then you mentioned getting
23 feedback from GTE on the request of Socket. In your filing --
24 I haven't had a chance to read it yet -- did you give the
25 Commission contact information for GTE, or how do we get GTE's

1 input?

2 MR. DORITY: I mean, as -- I think we can -- we
3 can probably provide that to the Commission in terms of their
4 general counsel that I believe is located in Dallas, Texas.

5 MS. DIETRICH: I mean, it's GTE Midwest and --

6 MR. DORITY: GTE Midwest, Incorporated doing
7 business as Verizon Midwest was the entity --

8 MS. DIETRICH: And they are still doing
9 business?

10 MR. DORITY: -- doing business in Missouri that
11 sold the properties in 2002 to CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC.
12 And I'm relatively certain we can provide a contact name for
13 the Commission.

14 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Do either of you have
15 questions?

16 Well, I'm going to have to -- I'm going to
17 think about this issue a little more. In the meantime, I hope
18 you guys can just work it out. Keeping in mind that we do
19 have a limited amount of time here and that if cost
20 information -- even though it's 10 years old, I believe it's
21 the most recent cost information. If it can be helpful in
22 this arbitration, then it seems like you all are going to work
23 with that.

24 Other than scheduling, are there any other
25 issues that I haven't addressed?

1 MR. LUMLEY: Judge, did you take up
2 Mr. Magness's entry?

3 JUDGE JONES: I haven't. I don't have it in
4 front of me. Has he petitioned to appear?

5 MR. LUMLEY: Yeah. That was filed on
6 January 19th.

7 JUDGE JONES: I don't know why we don't have
8 that. Has he paid the \$100 to Supreme Court of Missouri?

9 MR. MAGNESS: Yes, I have.

10 JUDGE JONES: Does anyone oppose his entry?

11 MR. DORITY: No, Judge.

12 JUDGE JONES: It's granted. You may appear,
13 Mr. Magness.

14 MR. MAGNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

15 JUDGE JONES: Those of you who aren't here,
16 unfortunately, don't have the benefit of a hearing calendar.
17 I have copies here of the judicial hearing calendar -- or I
18 should say adjudication hearing calendar. We know May 9th is
19 the date that a final order from the Commission has to come
20 out. It's on a Tuesday.

21 MR. LUMLEY: Judge Jones --

22 JUDGE JONES: Yes.

23 MR. LUMLEY: -- Judge, I think technically it's
24 May 6th.

25 JUDGE JONES: Is it May 6th?

1 MR. LUMLEY: Yeah, unfortunately.

2 JUDGE JONES: Is that a Saturday?

3 MR. LUMLEY: I believe it is.

4 JUDGE JONES: Then that would mean May 4th or
5 May 5th possibly as the last day.

6 MR. LUMLEY: I think that's technically day
7 270. Let's see.

8 JUDGE JONES: Today is February 3rd --

9 MR. DORITY: Judge, if I may interject, as your
10 Honor may be aware, this Commission has extended the deadline
11 in other arbitrations, most recently in the ones that we have
12 been involved directly with was in the CD telecom proceeding
13 Case No. XO-2005-0277.

14 While Socket's petition for arbitration
15 reflects that the formal request for negotiations was sent on
16 August 9th, 2005, as Mr. Lumley alluded to earlier, the first
17 couple of months of that intervening time frame starting with
18 the August date was truly spent working on an addendum to the
19 existing agreement to which CenturyTel of Missouri and Socket
20 were operating, and that was the underlying AT&T/GTE
21 agreement.

22 As part and parcel of those negotiations, we
23 were also able to enter into an interim arrangement between
24 Socket and Spectra Communications Group, which is the other
25 party to this arbitration.

1 So, you know, the first 60 days, if you will,
2 at least were spent focusing upon a new addendum, a new
3 agreement on behalf of Spectra and Socket that was only
4 approved by this Commission -- I think it was about 60 days to
5 the day from here back in December -- I believe it was
6 effective December 3rd the Commission approved those two new
7 agreements under which these companies are presently
8 operating.

9 Having said that, obviously our responsive
10 pleading has not been filed at this point. That's due next
11 Tuesday, I believe, on the 7th.

12 We would like to have the opportunity to visit
13 with Socket this morning and perhaps we can go off line for a
14 short amount of time to discuss the possible resolution of
15 issues that we have identified and as will be reflected in our
16 filing next week.

17 We think that all parties would be well served
18 to give ourselves a little more time to identify what are
19 truly the issues that are out there and give ourselves and the
20 arbitrator and advisory staff the opportunity to have a
21 realistic schedule to address the issues.

22 We're not suggesting that we're going to be
23 wanting to push this off indefinitely. In the CD matter I
24 think we used a 60- to 90-day extension. We would like to
25 have the opportunity to visit with Socket regarding that

1 perspective. And I interjected now, your Honor, just because
2 it looked like we were headed down a path of looking at the
3 May 5th deadline as being absolute and working backwards and I
4 guess we would like to have the privilege and opportunity to
5 perhaps visit with Socket for a little while this morning to
6 see if there might be some opportunities to extend that.

7 JUDGE JONES: Mr. Lumley, are you on the same
8 page with Mr. Dority in that regard?

9 MR. LUMLEY: Well, unfortunately not, your
10 Honor. We've had some discussions about potential extensions,
11 and I don't believe anybody representing Socket today has any
12 authority to agree to an extension.

13 JUDGE JONES: Does that mean you disagree to
14 one or you can't agree to one right now?

15 MR. LUMLEY: Well, I think the company
16 management does not want an extension.

17 JUDGE JONES: Well, Mr. Dority, if all the
18 parties don't agree to an extension, I'm not willing to grant
19 one. I don't think I can. In other words, I think if one
20 party wants the May 5th deadline, by federal law, I've got to
21 give that. If all the parties agree, I'm able to extend it.
22 So we'll have to stick with that deadline.

23 MR. DORITY: That may be an issue that we will
24 want to address in our responsive pleading due on Tuesday as
25 well.

1 JUDGE JONES: You mean from a legal standpoint
2 whether it can be extended?

3 MR. DORITY: Yes, sir.

4 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Well, I'll tell you what.
5 The problem that's going to come up is if -- you'll file
6 something Tuesday that says why you think it should be able to
7 be extended, Mr. Lumley will file something in response saying
8 why he doesn't think it should be extended and then there's a
9 time period where I'll file some order in response to both
10 those positions -- or I should say enter an order in response
11 to both those positions while time is being ate up.

12 MR. DORITY: I appreciate that, Judge. And
13 that's why I was truly hopeful that Socket would at least
14 extend us the courtesy this morning of going off line and
15 giving us a chance to at least visit about that issue.

16 MR. LUMLEY: I didn't mean to suggest that
17 we're not willing to discuss things, but I don't want to
18 mislead anybody. And the Judge asked the direct question, I
19 wanted him to be clear on what I could do today.

20 JUDGE JONES: Well, let's see. After the
21 evidentiary hearing, we'll have briefs, preliminary report,
22 comments --

23 MR. LUMLEY: Judge, if you don't mind me
24 interrupting you, one of our suggestions to help with the time
25 constraints is to eliminate the preliminary report step, just

1 allow the parties to present their case to you and have you
2 make your decision. And if we have limited comments, you
3 know, we could interject those while the Commission is
4 considering your final decision. That seemed to work pretty
5 well in the M2A proceedings and provides, you know,
6 substantial amount of leeway.

7 JUDGE JONES: Well, let me write down
8 everything that I think normally would happen and then we'll
9 go back and see what doesn't have to happen and you all can
10 help me out here.

11 After what would be a preliminary report, we'd
12 have comments and then is it oral arguments after that, after
13 the comment period?

14 MR. DORITY: That's correct, Judge.

15 MR. LUMLEY: I think the oral arguments come
16 after the final report. Although obviously as the arbitrator,
17 if you wanted us to --

18 JUDGE JONES: No. I want to do it like it
19 would normally be done first and then make changes.

20 MR. DORITY: I believe that has all the piece
21 parts.

22 MR. LUMLEY: I think under Rule 36 the oral
23 argument is at the discretion of the Commission after your
24 final report, if I remember correctly.

25 JUDGE JONES: So there are two comments,

1 comments on draft and comments on final.

2 MR. DORITY: Correct.

3 MR. LUMLEY: Right.

4 MR. DORITY: Judge, would it be helpful, if
5 Mr. Lumley is willing to at least visit with us about the
6 scheduling issue, if we could take a brief recess off the
7 record and perhaps the parties can at least -- we have not had
8 the opportunity to discuss what Mr. Lumley is suggesting in
9 terms of deleting, you know, some of the stages that
10 Chapter 36 envisions at this point. And perhaps if we had a
11 little time to chat about that, we might be able to move
12 things along. I just don't know, but I'm willing to try.

13 MR. LUMLEY: I think that's worthwhile.

14 JUDGE JONES: So what you all want to do is go
15 off the record, talk about scheduling and then what?

16 MR. DORITY: We'll notify you when we're ready
17 to go back on the record and hopefully report anything that we
18 may have been able to come to agreement on.

19 JUDGE JONES: Okay.

20 MR. DORITY: Or at least give you a status
21 report of where we are. And then we may have to take up where
22 we are right now, but I guess in my mind it would make sense
23 to give us a chance to visit since we have all of the
24 participants at least on the phone.

25 MR. LUMLEY: I agree.

1 JUDGE JONES: Go ahead. You agree with what
2 Mr. Dority just said?

3 MR. LUMLEY: Yes, sir.

4 JUDGE JONES: For the benefit of your all's
5 discussion -- I didn't realize there were two comment periods.
6 In light of that then, I'd be willing to forego the
7 preliminary report and have the comments on the final report
8 and then oral argument before the Commission, if necessary.
9 That's, of course, up to the Commission.

10 And I will also tell you this. After the
11 post-hearing briefs are filed, I'll need at least a week and a
12 half to write the report. So keep that in mind while you all
13 talk about that.

14 MR. LUMLEY: Does that translate to 10 days
15 or --

16 JUDGE JONES: Is translates to seven working
17 days.

18 MR. LUMLEY: Seven working days. Okay.

19 JUDGE JONES: Okay. We'll go ahead and go off
20 the record.

21 (A recess was taken.)

22 JUDGE JONES: We're back on the record with
23 Case No. TO-2006-0299.

24 The parties believe that it might be beneficial
25 to this arbitration to continue this matter of this initial

1 arbitration meeting until Monday afternoon. That would be
2 February 6th. And I'm going to set it for 2:00 p.m. Is that
3 fine with everyone?

4 MR. DORITY: Yes, your Honor

5 JUDGE JONES: Okay. At 2:00 p.m.

6 MR. LUMLEY: Can we have call-in arrangements,
7 Judge Jones?

8 JUDGE JONES: I'll try to get another number
9 today and see if I can get something out early this afternoon.

10 MR. DORITY: Thank you, Judge. And if that
11 becomes a problem, let me know and we'll be glad to try to
12 arrange a bridge and get you the information as well.

13 JUDGE JONES: Is that all we need on the
14 record?

15 With that then, we'll go off the record.

16 WHEREUPON, the arbitration meeting was
17 continued until February 6, 2006 at 2:00 p.m.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25