```
STATE OF MISSOURI
 1
 2
                    PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
 3
 4
                    TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
 6
                     Prehearing Conference
 8
                         October 15, 2003
                     Jefferson City, Missouri
 9
                            Volume 1
10
11 Delta Phones, Inc.,
12
                Complainant,
13 v.
                                     ) Case No. TC-2004-0064
14 Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P.,)
  d/b/a Southwestern Bell Telephone )
15 Company.
16
17
                 KENNARD L. JONES, Presiding,
                      REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.
18
19
20
21
22
23
  REPORTED BY:
   KELLENE K. FEDDERSEN, CSR, RPR, CCR
25 ASSOCIATED COURT REPORTERS
```

1 APPEARANCES: 2 ROBERT J. GRYZMALA, Senior Counsel SBC Missouri One SBC Center, Room 3516 St. Louis, Missouri 63101 (314)235-6060FOR: Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. d/b/a SBC Missouri. MARK W. COMLEY, Attorney at Law Newman, Comley & Ruth 601 Monroe, Suite 301 8 P.O. Box 537 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 9 (573) 634-2266 10 FOR: Delta Phones, Inc. 11 MICHAEL DANDINO, Senior Public Counsel P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-780 12 (573)751-485713 FOR: Office of the Public Counsel 14 and the Public. 15 MARC D. POSTON, Senior Counsel P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 16 (573) 751-3234 17 FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	P	R	\cap	C	F.	F.	D	Т	Ν	G	S
<u> </u>	_	Τ.	\circ	\sim	نند	نند	$_{\rm L}$		ΤΛ	G	\sim

- JUDGE JONES: This is Case No. TC-2004-0064,
- 3 Delta Phones, Incorporated vs. Southwestern Bell Telephone
- 4 Company, L.P., doing business as Southwestern Bell Telephone
- 5 Company.
- 6 My name is Kennard Jones, and I'm the
- 7 presiding judge over this matter. And if those of you
- 8 present would please stand and introduce yourselves, I'd
- 9 appreciate it. Mr. Poston.
- 10 MR. POSTON: Marc Poston appearing for the
- 11 Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission.
- MR. COMLEY: Mark W. Comley appearing on
- 13 behalf of Delta Phones, Inc.
- MR. GRYZMALA: Good morning, your Honor. I'm
- 15 Bob Gryzmala appearing on behalf of Southwestern Bell
- 16 Telephone Company, L.P.
- JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
- 18 Normally prehearing conferences are set to try
- 19 to facilitate some sort of settlement between the parties.
- 20 That apparently won't happen in this case. So my -- I have
- 21 several primary concerns. One is that we set a procedural
- 22 schedule with direct testimonies and evidentiary hearing
- 23 dates.
- 24 Another of my concerns is Staff's Data
- 25 Requests to Delta Phones during Staff's investigation in

- 1 this matter. And thirdly, I'm concerned with the
- 2 determination of disputed and undisputed amounts that are at
- 3 issue in the matter, and from what I understand,
- 4 Southwestern Bell's not having been paid at all for services
- 5 since March, this is what they allege, and we'll discuss
- 6 that further today.
- 7 So when we're done here today, I'd like for
- 8 you-all to get together and establish a procedural schedule
- 9 so that we can move towards a hearing if it's necessary. I
- 10 don't know, but I'd like to at least have that in mind.
- 11 And I'm going to ask Mr. Poston, has Delta
- 12 complied with Staff's Data Requests?
- 13 MR. POSTON: Delta has complied with all but
- 14 three Data Requests. Data Request 2, 9 and 14 have not been
- 15 answered.
- JUDGE JONES: And Mr. Comley, is there a
- 17 reason why 2, 9 and 14 haven't been answered?
- 18 MR. COMLEY: Judge, all I can tell the court
- 19 is that at this time I do not know when or if ever those
- 20 Data Requests will be responded to.
- 21 JUDGE JONES: Is there a reason why they won't
- 22 or --
- 23 MR. COMLEY: I have no information on that.
- JUDGE JONES: It doesn't appear in the record
- 25 that anything's been filed in opposition to those requests.

- 1 MR. COMLEY: That is exactly right.
- JUDGE JONES: Do you oppose them?
- MR. COMLEY: I don't oppose them, no.
- 4 JUDGE JONES: Not you personally, but does
- 5 Delta oppose them?
- 6 MR. COMLEY: As far as I know, they do not, it
- 7 does not.
- JUDGE JONES: You don't know why they haven't
- 9 responded or if they will?
- 10 MR. COMLEY: I have no idea.
- JUDGE JONES: Mr. Poston, what's Staff's
- 12 position on those Data Requests? It doesn't seem like
- 13 you're going to get that information. How does Staff feel
- 14 about that?
- 15 MR. COMLEY: I've discussed this over with
- 16 Staff. In the event we don't get these Data Requests, we
- 17 would move to dismiss this complaint for failure to be able
- 18 to investigate and confirm or -- to confirm the allegations
- 19 made in the complaint. We can't investigate without answers
- 20 to those Data Requests.
- JUDGE JONES: Okay. There were 16 Data
- 22 Requests made. It sounds like 13 have been satisfactorily
- 23 answered. Correct me if I'm wrong, but my initial purpose
- 24 in wanting Staff to investigate this matter was to determine
- 25 what amounts were owed Southwestern Bell and what amounts

- 1 have been paid. Is Staff unable to complete that goal
- 2 without Data Requests 2, 9 and 14?
- 3 MR. POSTON: Can you give me a minute to
- 4 confer?
- JUDGE JONES: Sure.
- 6 MR. DANDINO: Your Honor, while they're
- 7 conferring, can I enter my appearance?
- 8 JUDGE JONES: If Public Counsel would like to
- 9 enter their appearance.
- MR. DANDINO: Good morning, your Honor.
- 11 Michael Dandino, Office of the Public Counsel, Post Office
- 12 Box 7800, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102, representing the
- 13 Office of the Public Counsel and the Public. I apologize,
- 14 your Honor, for my lateness.
- MR. POSTON: Your Honor, the Data Requests 2,
- 16 9 and 14 are not meant to answer the question what amounts
- 17 are owed and what amounts are not in dispute, what amounts
- 18 are in dispute.
- 19 JUDGE JONES: Okay. What do those Data
- 20 Requests address?
- 21 MR. POSTON: We specifically listed them in
- 22 our filing. We have sent subsequent Data Requests that are
- 23 follow-ups to the initial set trying to pin down the amounts
- 24 that you're asking about, but the 2, 9 and 14 --
- 25 JUDGE JONES: I see in the pleading, in the

- 1 motion that you filed there is a Data Request 2 under
- 2 paragraph 6. There is a Data Request 9 and 14. Are those
- 3 the same Data Requests that you are now referring to?
- 4 MR. POSTON: Right.
- 5 JUDGE JONES: I'll just take notice of those.
- 6 Now, Mr. Comley, Southwestern Bell has stated
- 7 that no amounts have been paid for their services since
- 8 March of this year. Is that true?
- 9 MR. COMLEY: I do not know the answer to that,
- 10 Judge. I have not been given information that refutes that,
- 11 but I do not know whether it is true.
- 12 JUDGE JONES: Do you know if any amounts have
- 13 been paid at all? Do you know anything about what has been
- 14 paid to Southwestern Bell?
- MR. COMLEY: I know what we have responded to
- 16 in the Data Requests about the amounts that are in dispute
- 17 and not in dispute. That is the extent of my knowledge.
- JUDGE JONES: Okay.
- 19 MR. COMLEY: And it is based entirely upon
- 20 what the witnesses who have responded to the Data Requests
- 21 have advised me. I have done no independent inquiry about
- 22 any of this.
- JUDGE JONES: Okay. Looking at this
- 24 complainant's statement of disputed and undisputed charges,
- 25 it appears that the total undisputed amount is \$70,818.07.

- 1 However, from the complaint filed in July 2003, I gather an
- 2 undisputed amount of \$208,760.
- 3 MR. COMLEY: The witness who prepared that
- 4 schedule will have to explain the discrepancy between those
- 5 two numbers.
- 6 JUDGE JONES: So someone else prepared these
- 7 numbers and you put them in the form of a pleading and
- 8 submitted them?
- 9 MR. COMLEY: Exactly.
- 10 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Well, Delta -- although
- 11 Delta has partially complied with Data Requests, they
- 12 haven't fully complied with Data Requests and it doesn't
- 13 sound like they want to.
- 14 Also, it appears that Delta hasn't paid any
- 15 money to Southwestern Bell, and if they have, they certainly
- 16 haven't paid the amount that's due with regard to the
- 17 services that have been provided.
- 18 Mr. Comley, is there any reason the Commission
- 19 shouldn't dismiss this complaint?
- 20 MR. COMLEY: Judge, I'm not going to be in a
- 21 position of arguing about that matter right now.
- 22 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Well, beyond that, I have
- 23 nothing further. Does anyone have anything else they'd like
- 24 to add?
- MR. GRYZMALA: Your Honor, I would like to

- 1 make a comment.
- JUDGE JONES: Yes, you may, Mr. Gryzmala.
- 3 MR. GRYZMALA: I would like to take a moment
- 4 to confirm a couple of questions, the answers to questions
- 5 that your Honor asked.
- 6 My information is that currently approximately
- 7 \$1.6 million are owed to SBC by Delta Phones, of which about
- 8 \$1.5 million is past due. My client has confirmed, has
- 9 authorized me to represent to the court that the only
- 10 payment -- rather the last payment made was as was reflected
- 11 in the pleadings earlier, about \$154,000 on March 25th,
- 12 2003.
- 13 From my review of the pleading file, there is
- 14 an allegation very early on that about \$554,000, I believe,
- 15 was in dispute under Delta's version of events. That
- 16 leaves, given the math, about \$1 million not in dispute.
- 17 I don't want to belabor the point, your Honor,
- 18 but my client, SBC Missouri, needs to have a prompt and firm
- 19 recommendation to the Commission to revisit its August 19
- 20 order not to disconnect service. Prompt because time has
- 21 passed without any payment whatsoever. Whether the
- 22 undisputed amount be \$1 million, \$200,000 or \$70,000,
- 23 nothing has been paid.
- 24 Firm because, with all due respect to opposing
- 25 counsel, his client has effectively thumbed its nose at the

- 1 interconnection agreement which this Commission well knows
- 2 contains Section 9.3 which has to do with the escrow
- 3 provisions, the payment of disputed -- or rather undisputed
- 4 amounts, the remainder being placed into an appropriate
- 5 escrow arrangement strikes a fair balance.
- 6 The Commission approved that, and Delta has
- 7 thumbed its nose at it. That's why it needs to be firm.
- 8 It's thumbed its nose at the Staff's DRs. It's thumbed its
- 9 nose at every turn, betting that no action will be taken,
- 10 but yet it needs to be taken, your Honor.
- 11 We have generated discovery in response to the
- 12 discussion in the prehearing -- order setting prehearing
- 13 conference order. We generated DRs, Data Requests yesterday
- 14 to Delta Phones, to update you on that status.
- But at this point we request one of two
- 16 things, either a very prompt hearing, an immediate hearing,
- 17 which may be difficult given, as I understand it, the
- 18 availability of suitable hearing rooms, or an Order from the
- 19 Commission that effectively turns around its August 19 Order
- 20 and conditions -- conditions continued service to Delta by
- 21 SBC Missouri upon Delta's payment of the undisputed amounts
- 22 owed SBC and its escrow within three days from the date of
- 23 the Commission's Order directing same, that is the escrow of
- 24 the disputed amounts.
- 25 Your Honor, I don't want to take much more

- 1 time, but something needs to be done. I don't mean to
- 2 suggest that other states dictate what the State of Missouri
- 3 does, but the Commission can take notice of what we said in
- 4 our pleadings and our files about what the states of Kansas,
- 5 Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky, I believe North
- 6 Carolina was just referred to in last Friday's filing. We
- 7 must do something.
- I am concerned, my client is concerned that we
- 9 are not going to be able to arrange a suitable hearing date
- 10 on an immediate basis, so that we again are pleading for an
- 11 Order that turns around the August 19 Order in the limited
- 12 sense of conditioning further service based upon what I
- 13 outlined earlier, prompt payment, prompt compliance with the
- 14 interconnection agreement that this Commission approved.
- That's all I would have, your Honor.
- JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Gryzmala. Is
- 17 there anything from anyone else?
- 18 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, just a brief
- 19 response. I know that you have listened to the arguments of
- 20 the parties about how the disputed amounts between us have
- 21 been calculated. I'd remind the court that we have really
- 22 the unverified statements of the company with respect to
- 23 what they consider to be disputed amounts based upon records
- 24 which allegedly have not been verifiable by Delta. I know
- 25 we've gone in circles about that.

I will repeat that at this stage I ha	ve very
---------------------------------------	---------

- 2 little information to provide in answer to the Commission's
- 3 questions about the discrepancies between the amounts that
- 4 are in dispute and the amounts that are stated in the
- 5 pleadings that have been filed so far, and I do not know
- 6 whether or not the Data Requests will be responded to on a
- 7 timely basis if at all. And that's how I can explain those
- 8 things.
- 9 At the same time, I think that Delta Phones'
- 10 position has been that they do not have verifiable
- 11 information from Southwestern Bell upon which to base a
- 12 reasoned judgment about what is owed. And that has been, I
- 13 think, the controversy between the parties and it's still a
- 14 controversy between them.
- JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Comley.
- 16 Mr. Poston?
- 17 MR. POSTON: Nothing.
- JUDGE JONES: Mr. Dandino?
- MR. DANDINO: I have nothing, your Honor.
- 20 JUDGE JONES: With that, then, I will leave
- 21 you-all to figure out a procedural schedule. I'm sure
- 22 you'll hear from the Commission soon. Thank you.
- 23 WHEREUPON, the recorded portion of the
- 24 prehearing conference was concluded.

25