BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

STATE OF MISSOURI

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Arbitration Meeting

September 9, 2010

Jefferson City, Missouri

Volume 1

In the Matter of

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company) d/b/a AT&T Missouri's Petition) for Compulsory Arbitration of) Unresolved Issues For An) F Interconnection Agreement with) : Global Crossing Local Services,) Inc and Global Crossing) Telemanagement Inc.)

File No. IO-2011-0057

DANIEL JORDAN, Presiding REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

REPORTED BY: NANCY L. SILVA, CCR TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

1 APPEARANCES ROBERT GRYZMALA, Attorney at Law (via telephone) 2 1 AT&T Center, Room 3516 St. Louis, Missouri 63101 3 314.235.6060 FOR: Southwestern Bell Telephone Company 4 d/b/a AT&T MISSOURI 5 TIM JUDGE (via telephone) 6 101 West High Street 7 Jefferson City, Missouri 65109 573.638.0261 8 FOR: Area Manager - Regulatory of AT&T Services 9 10 MARK JOHNSON (via telephone) LISA GILBREATH 11 Sonnenschein, Nath & Rosenthal 4520 Main Street, Suite 1100 Kansas City, Missouri 64111 12 816.460.2655 13 FOR: Global Crossing Local Services, Inc., and Global Crossing Telemanagement, Inc. 14 15 16 TED PRICE, Attorney at Law (via telephone) 225 Kenneth Drive 17 Rochester, New York 14623 585.255.1401 Global Crossing Local Services, Inc., 18 FOR: and Global Crossing Telemanagement, Inc. 19 20 WILLIAM VOIGHT Missouri Public Service Commission 21 P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, Missouri 63102 22 573.751.4140 Staff of the Missouri Public Service 23 FOR: Commission 24 25 2

1	JUDGE JORDAN: We'll go on the
2	record. The Commission is calling the case with
3	File No. IO-2011-0057, and this has to do with
4	AT&T's petition for arbitration of an
5	Interconnection agreement.
6	My name is Daniel Jordan. I'm a
7	regulatory law judge with the Missouri Public
8	Service Commission, and I've been assigned as
9	arbitrator to this case. We are on the record
10	today for this, the initial arbitration
11	meeting. I'll begin with entries of
12	appearance. Let's start with the Petitioner.
13	MR. GRYZMALA: Good morning, your
14	Honor. This is Bob Gryzmala for the reporter
15	that would be G-r-y-z-m-a-l-a appearing on
16	behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company,
17	doing business as AT&T, Missouri at 1 AT&T
18	Center, Room 3516, St. Louis 63101. And we have
19	one of the folks from my company along with me.
20	Hi. My name's Tim Judge. I'm from
21	AT&T, and my place of business is 101 West High
22	Street, Jefferson City, Missouri.
23	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Is that
24	everybody
25	MR. JOHNSON: For Global Crossing 3

Г

1	Local Services and Global Crossing Telemanagement,
2	Mark Johnson and Lisa Gilbreath Gilbreath is
3	spelled G-i-l-b-r-e-a-t-h of the law firm
4	Sonnenschein, Nath & Rosenthal. Our address is 4520
5	Main Street, Suite 1100, Kansas, Missouri 64111.
6	And Mr. Price will also enter his
7	appearance.
8	MR. PRICE: This is Ted Price. I'm senior
9	counsel for Global Crossing Local Services and
10	Global Crossing Telemanagment, and my address is
11	225 Kenneth Drive, Rochester, New York 14623.
12	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you. Anyone else for
13	Respondent?
14	MR. JOHNSON: NO.
15	MR. PRICE: NO.
16	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. I want to also
17	introduce a member of the arbitrator's advisory staff
18	who is present at this meeting today also. Go ahead
19	and introduce, yourself please.
20	MR. VOIGHT: Good afternoon. It's Bill
21	Voight, and as the parties are aware, the arbitrator
22	has appointed myself, Myron Couch, and Colleen Dale
23	to be members of the arbitrator's advisory staff. Of
24	those three persons I am the only one present here
25	today.

1	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Here's what I want
2	to do today. I want to cover get a general idea
3	of what issues remain between the parties and talk
4	about the sort of procedure that we want to follow
5	for this arbitration.
6	As you know, legislation from Congress
7	set some time limits, and so does the Commission's
8	regulation. They are cramped time limits bordering
9	on the fantastical, but with seasoned counsel, I'm
10	confident we can accomplish what we need to
11	accomplish.
12	I'm going to start with getting a read of
13	what of the issues that remain between the
14	parties. I've read the statement attached to the
15	petition, and though I know that Respondent's
16	responsive pleading is not due until next week, I'd
17	like to ask Respondent whether those issues are still
18	in dispute between the parties.
19	MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor this is Mark
20	Johnson.
21	Yes, the issues as stated in the disputed
22	points list are still in dispute. I can tell you,
23	however, that we will not be adding any issues. In
24	fact, Mr. Price, on behalf of Global Crossing, in
25	discussions with his counterparts at AT&T, have had

1	
1	input or did have input into the preparation of
2	the DPL prior to its filing, so we believe that it
3	states all of the issues that are before you for
4	decision.
5	And in response to a question that
6	Mr. Gryzmala raised to me yesterday via e-mail having
7	to do with whether Global Crossing would raise an
8	issue concerning porting, I just Bob, I'm sorry I
9	didn't respond to you, but the answer is, no, we're
10	not going to be raising that as an issue.
11	MR. Gryzmala: Okay. Thank you.
12	MR. JOHNSON: So the DPL does, we believe,
13	set forth accurately the issues that are in dispute.
14	JUDGE JORDAN: Mr. Gryzmala, did you have
15	anything to add to that?
16	MR. GRYZMALA: No, only, your Honor, that
17	as these types of matters go, I think Mark and I
18	would be very amenable to seeing if there are any
19	additional or any of these issues that can be
20	pulled off the table. I mean, that's what we believe
21	is appropriate for our business interests, if I can
22	say so. To the extent we can, it would make the task
23	easier.
24	So those decisions will go on, and I think
25	the rules contemplate that, but nothing specific at

Γ

1	this time, your Honor.
2	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Well, thank you for
3	that clarification, and I want to commend the parties
4	on narrowing the issues as much as they have to only
5	three points, as I read, attached in the schedule
6	attached to the petition.
7	MR. JOHNSON: I think there are six
8	issues.
9	MR. GRYZMALA: Let me go through them,
10	your Honor, very briefly, so as to elucidate since we
11	filed the petition.
12	JUDGE JORDAN: Sure.
13	MR. GRYZMALA: There is a void
14	compensation issue, which is Issue No. 1.
15	JUDGE JORDAN: Right.
16	MR. GRYZMALA: There is a dark fiber
17	issue, which really comes in two pieces, one having
18	to do with
19	JUDGE JORDAN: Mr. Gryzmala, you've cut
20	out. Mr. Gryzmala?
21	MR. GRYZMALA: to do with a right to
22	reclaim after one year. I'll just put it that way.
23	JUDGE JORDAN: Would you say that again.
24	The connection cut out briefly while you were
25	talking.

Г

1	MR. GRYZMALA: The first issue is about a
2	void. That is the appropriate compensation for what
3	is called in our business Voice over Internet
4	Interconnected Voice over Internet Protocol service.
5	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay.
6	MR. GRYZMALA: And that is the first
7	issue.
8	The second subject is something called
9	dark fiber which, you know, we can all work on as we
10	move along but, basically, your Honor, dark fiber's a
11	piece of naked copper strand.
12	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
13	MR. GRYZMALA: And the issue has to do
14	with a sealic, a weather sealic has an opportunity
15	or an ability to obtain more than 25 percent, so
16	that's kind of a watchword, 25 percent.
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
18	MR. GRYZMALA: And the other issue is, if
19	you don't use it within 12 months, then we have the
20	right to reclaim it. I'm being crude, but that's two
21	issues under dark fiber, which gives us three in
22	total.
23	Now, the No. 4 issue is what we call in
24	the business "routine network modifications." That
25	is Issue 3 on the DPL.

1	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay.
2	MR. GRYZMALA: There were issues, I
3	believe, that were litigated in a prior state in
4	Kansas, as a matter of fact but those issues were
5	not advanced by AT&T in its petition here. I think
6	there are two of them, so for whoever spoke up from
7	six, I think that's how we got from, like, six to
8	three.
9	MR. PRICE: Yeah. This is Ted Price. My
10	apologies. I had received a word version of the
11	DPL
12	MR. GRYZMALA: Oh.
13	MR. PRICE: that I've modified that has
14	been given to our negotiator by AT&T's negotiator,
15	and that included six issues, and I see that the one
16	you submitted includes only three, so I don't
17	understand that, and obviously that means we're going
18	to have to go back and resubmit this.
19	I don't know what happened to the issues
20	with UNI combinations and commingling.
21	MR. GRYZMALA: Right. We can take that
22	offline but, I mean, my understanding was that we
23	were not proposing to advance an issue where there
24	was none, and Ted this is Bob Gryzmala it may
25	very well be my impression was that it was going

Γ

1	to be agreed-to language or that we were going to
2	withdraw our proposal, but please clarify that
3	through the negotiator, folks.
4	MR. PRICE: Yeah. Yeah. I mean, I
5	received a word version that I marked up, and those
6	issues were in that Word version and somebody took
7	them out, so those issues need to go back.
8	I never heard anything about agreeing to
9	those. We we those are still in the dispute.
10	MR. GRYZMALA: Well, we didn't mean to
11	suggest that Global was agreeing to our language. I
12	mean, I think there's an answer here, but I
13	understand, Mark, and you obviously have the right to
14	resurrect those two items, you know, if there's been
15	a mistake made here.
16	MR. PRICE: I'm telling you right now for
17	the record that there has been a mistake made.
18	MR. GRYZMALA: Okay.
19	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. I think we'll
20	probably be able to clear that up by the time we get
21	the responsive pleading, and certainly by the time we
22	get the statement of unresolved issues. Does anyone
23	object to that?
24	MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, on behalf of
25	Global Crossing, no. We think that's the proper way

to do it.

1

2	MR. GRYZMALA: Same for AT&T, your Honor.
3	JUDGE JORDAN: All right. Well, I
4	appreciate the parties' efforts to clarify this and
5	to resolve the issues. And I think this is a good
6	time to remind the parties that the Public Service
7	Commission does offer mediation services as well, and
8	we can have one of the regulatory law judges assist
9	with the negotiation, if you think that would be
10	helpful probably not me because I'm the arbitrator
11	in the case, but I know Mr. Gryzmala has participated
12	in mediation of telecommunications issues, and I just
13	want to remind the parties that that is available,
14	too, as an alternative to help resolve these issues.
15	So having gotten some idea of what the
16	issues are and I understand that what the issues
17	are may still be at issue let's talk about the
18	kind of procedure that the parties envision. The
19	regulation specifically discusses discovery, and the
20	scope and the timing are a subject of this initial
21	arbitration meeting.
22	Do the parties want to say anything about
23	discovery and perhaps a schedule for that procedure?
24	I'll start with Petitioner.
25	MR. GRYZMALA: Judge, I wouldn't foreclose

1	discovery; on the other hand, at present I don't know
2	of any
3	JUDGE JORDAN: Mr. Gryzmala
4	MR. GRYZMALA: very, very limited.
5	We'd like the opportunity, obviously, because I know
6	too little about all of the issues to foreclose that
7	possibility. I would not think it'd be extensive, if
8	at all.
9	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. And does Respondent
10	have anything to add to that?
11	MR. JOHNSON: Yes, your Honor. Thank
12	you.
13	I'm not sure that we intend to engage in
14	any discovery. I think that our position on that
15	would probably be the same as Mr. Gryzmala's. We
16	certainly want to reserve the right, but we don't
17	anticipate that there would be any need to engage in
18	any substantial discovery. I mean, for example, I
19	don't envision that there would be any depositions.
20	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
21	MR. JOHNSON: It would be purely discovery
22	by interrogatory or data request, however you want to
23	refer to it.
24	JUDGE JORDAN: Right, and, yes, the
25	Commission's regulations do provide for data

Г

1	requests, a somewhat less formal means of discovery.
2	As the date for the hearing grows closer,
3	of course, the time for discovery grows shorter, so
4	the parties wanting to reserve their right to
5	discovery is fine by me, but be mindful that time
6	limitations for responding may also need to be
7	altered.
8	Unless somebody has something to add to
9	that topic, I want to move on to the possibility of
10	prefile testimony.
11	Anything more in discovery?
12	(No response.)
13	JUDGE JORDAN: I'm not hearing anything,
14	so let's go on to prefile testimony.
15	MR. GRYZMALA: Well, Judge, can I offer
16	one thing? This is Bob Gryzmala.
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Please.
18	MR. GRYZMALA: I would only I would
19	only submit that it would be prudent if we would all
20	agree that to the extent discovery is issued at all,
21	the parties understand that it would be submitted in
22	a manner so that responses are due no later than the
23	hearing.
24	I don't know that this has happened before
25	in your docket, but it's very difficult to deal with

Γ

1	discovery requests when you're in a hearing room
2	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
3	MR. GRYZMALA: or after the hearing is
4	closed and it goes into briefing or whatever the
5	case. I mean, in an orderly manner discovery can
6	proceed, and we may not even need any here.
7	JUDGE JORDAN: Right.
8	MR. GRYZMALA: But if we do I mean, I
9	think the fuse for answering them or answering
10	discovery responses is pretty short, generally, and I
11	think people it says in fact, I think it says
12	the response normally will be required in five
13	working days; is that right?
14	JUDGE JORDAN: I think that's as to data
15	requests.
16	MR. GRYZMALA: Yes, sir, so, I mean, if we
17	can agree that counsel would not issue the parties
18	shall not issue discovery unless such discovery is
19	intended to be answered within a time prior to the
20	hearing.
21	MR. JOHNSON: I don't have any problem
22	with that. I think that that that's only
23	sensible.
24	MR. GRYZMALA: Yes. That's all we would
25	have to say, your Honor, on that, if we could all

Г

1	have that, you know, understanding.
2	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, I think that's
3	prudent. I have watched hearings. I've never done a
4	hearing at the PSC where discovery continued through
5	a hearing, but I have seen it happen and
6	MR. JOHNSON: It's not pretty.
7	JUDGE JORDAN: it strikes me as yes,
8	I strikes me as very awkward and not to say tardy and
9	untidy at the best, so I think that's prudent, and
10	I'd be amenable to putting out an order stating that,
11	if the parties would be like me to do so.
12	MR. GRYZMALA: Perfect. Thank you, your
13	Honor.
14	MR. JOHNSON: I would agree with that.
15	JUDGE JORDAN: Let's talk about prefile
16	testimony, because that's something the regulation
17	governing this procedure specifically mentions. Do
18	the parties intend to file prefile testimony? We'll
19	start with Petitioner again.
20	MR. GRYZMALA: AT&T would anticipate that,
21	your Honor.
22	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay.
23	MR. JOHNSON: On behalf of the Respondent,
24	we also anticipate filing prefile discipline.
25	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. That can be very

Γ

1	helpful for advancing issues at hearing, so certainly
2	I have no problem with that; however, it does bring
3	up the issue of timing, and as we get into timing
4	issues, the matter starts to get more complicated.
5	I think that moves me into well, first,
6	if we're going to file prefile testimony, are the
7	parties considering rebuttal and surrebuttal?
8	MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, on behalf of the
9	Respondent, I handled this a similar case well,
10	I guess you'd say same arbitration in Kansas, and we
11	did have both direct and rebuttal. We did not have
12	surrebuttal
13	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay.
14	MR. JOHNSON: but I just wonder if
15	perhaps the you know, the right way to approach
16	the scheduling would be to, in essence and Bob and
17	I kind of talked about this yesterday is to work
18	our way backwards.
19	You know, the 270-day date and I know
20	that in your order you said that the you know, the
21	220 days you know, you have to file your final
22	report within 220 days of the initial demand for
23	negotiation.
24	JUDGE JORDAN: The draft report.
25	MR. JOHNSON: No, I believe, your Honor,

1	that's the final report. The draft report and we
2	have to work backwards from that.
3	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay.
4	MR. JOHNSON: And it would seem to me that
5	for scheduling purposes, you know, maybe a good
6	approach is to work from that 220-day period, which
7	is November 8, I think; isn't that right?
8	JUDGE JORDAN: Yes.
9	MR. JOHNSON: and then actually, I
10	did this last night. I worked my way backwards
11	through the calendar, and I have sort of a
12	comprehensive proposal to make on dates for various
13	milestones through the case that I think will allow
14	Bob and me to do what we're supposed to do and yet
15	present you with our filing with sufficient time for
16	you to work your way through them.
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, that sounds that
18	sounds good, and I appreciate your work on a time
19	line.
20	Here's what I have in mind: I'd like the
21	parties to submit a proposed procedural schedule to
22	me, and it sounds like something you could jointly
23	file pretty quickly. Am I correct about that?
24	MR. JOHNSON: I can get these dates to Bob
25	right after we finish.

1	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, that's good. And
2	when would you anticipate filing a joint proposal
3	with me?
4	MR. JOHNSON: I hope we can do it early
5	next week.
6	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, that sounds good to
7	me. Can you give me just a rough idea of what kind
8	of time line you're considering?
9	MR. JOHNSON: Sure. Knowing that you do
10	have some discretion on the for lack of a better
11	way of putting this the time line that's contained
12	within the regulation
13	JUDGE JORDAN: Correct.
14	MR. JOHNSON: and not for the time line
15	that's prescribed in the federal act
16	JUDGE JORDAN: Correct.
17	MR. JOHNSON: what I was thinking about
18	was telescoping some of the periods set forth in the
19	regulations. For example, this is sort of working
20	our way backwards.
21	JUDGE JORDAN: Yes.
22	MR. JOHNSON: With your 220-day deadline
23	being November 8, then what we would do is rather
24	than you have 15 days to consider our comments to
25	your draft report, that we give you ten days to do

Г

1	that, and then, you know, basically what we would do
2	is this, you know, 220 days on November the 8th
3	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
4	MR. JOHNSON: comments on your draft
5	report being due by October 29.
6	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
7	MR. JOHNSON: or yes. And that
8	gives you ten days to finalize your report.
9	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
10	MR. JOHNSON: And then let's see. We
11	would have seven days after the hearing to brief the
12	case and then you would have ten days to prepare your
13	draft report, whereas in the rules, I think those
14	periods are set out is like ten days to brief and
15	you have fifteen days to prepare your draft report.
16	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. And where, roughly,
17	are you looking at for the hearing date?
18	MR. JOHNSON: I was thinking, like, last
19	week September, first week of October.
20	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Let me
21	look at my calendar here. Last week of September,
22	first week of October? I was thinking something
23	similar.
24	MR. JOHNSON: Okay.
25	JUDGE JORDAN: Roughly speaking,

1	Mr. Gryzmala, without demanding a commitment from you
2	right here and now, is that about what you're
3	thinking?
4	MR. GRYZMALA: Yeah, let me just speak
5	to your Honor, I haven't seen Mark's, you know,
6	noodling and proposal
7	JUDGE JORDAN: Right.
8	MR. GRYZMALA: but we'll look at it
9	real hard. Just listening to this, I can tell you
10	and this is no news to Mark. I mean, he knows who
11	our witnesses are. He saw them in Kansas.
12	JUDGE JORDAN: Right.
13	MR. GRYZMALA: MS. Folentez Nazolick will
14	probably submit testimony. I know that she has a
15	vacation scheduled already for the last week of
16	September. Let me let me be candid and offer
17	something maybe a little more direct.
18	JUDGE JORDAN: Let's hear it.
19	MR. GRYZMALA: You know, the problem
20	occurs because the act envisions a 270-day fuse in
21	order to resolve the case, 270 days after the request
22	for negotiation was already made. And the other
23	the other constrict is or the other constricting
24	item is the Commission's rule requiring that your
25	Honor has to issue his final report 50 that's

1	5-0 days before the Commission makes a decision.
2	Here's where I think the best place would
3	be. You may or may not decide it's palatable and the
4	advisory staff may not or they may. We would not at
5	all be we would not at all object, and we can see
6	benefit in extending the Commission's date for
7	decision into January.
8	There are arguments that the act
9	contemplates 270 days. Subject to Mark Johnson's
10	thought, I don't know that Global Crossing would care
11	if we took another month. AT&T can see advantage in
12	that.
13	As it is, the Commission, under the order
14	that you issued, your Honor, would have a matter
15	before it over the holiday. The statutory deadline
16	is the day after Christmas. Their decision would be
17	set at agenda, I gather, December 22. I don't know
18	their vacation plans.
19	I mean, I just think I want to be
20	creative here and come to the best resolution. If it
21	be, on the other hand, that there is definitive legal
22	thought at the Commission or its staff advisory group
23	that 270 cannot be extended, well, this just this
24	goes nowhere.
25	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, I'll gi∨e you my

reflections on that because --

1

2 MR. GRYZMALA: Yeah, sure. I mean, we did 3 this -- I will say this, if I recall properly --4 maybe Bill Voight can speak to this -- when we had 5 the Missouri Post-M2A arbitration five years ago, I am almost certain that the hearing, and then Judge 6 7 Thompson's decision followed -- and the Commission's 8 approval of that decision -- followed 270 days. Ι 9 may be wrong, Bill, but I seem to remember that was our distinct recollection. 10 JUDGE JORDAN: I don't find that out of 11 12 the realm of possibility at all indeed. FCC 13 decisions suggest that the FCC does not care at all when the State commission makes its decision until 14 15 that 90th day afterwards, at which point it must take 16 jurisdiction over the matter. It must take up the 17 matter, I should say. 18 MR. GRYZMALA: Right. JUDGE JORDAN: But I also have to tell 19 20 I don't take any comfort in that, because as we vou: 21 all know, when an agency says one day does not bind 22 it the next, and the FCC may have said something 23 completely different yesterday, or it may say 24 something different on December 27, so I feel 25 obligated to hold to the 270th day as set forth in

United States statutes. 1 2 MR. GRYZMALA: Okay. 3 JUDGE JORDAN: So that's my feeling on 4 that. 5 MR. GRYZMALA: Okay. JUDGE JORDAN: I -- I -- I certainly 6 7 understand the benefits of having more time, but I 8 just don't feel like we do, so that's -- that's 9 where -- that's my perspective. MR. GRYZMALA: Okay. Having said that --10 11 JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh. 12 MR. GRYZMALA: -- we'll look very hard at 13 Mark's proposal, Mr. Johnson's proposal. I just wonder if there's any wiggle room with the 50 days 14 15 under the advance notice, that -- that is 50 days 16 before the Commission's decision, I gather, which 17 would be pegged for December 22. 18 JUDGE JORDAN: Right. 19 MR. GRYZMALA: Arbitrator report comes in 20 on November 8. Frankly, I mean, again, I'm just 21 trying to be creative here. If we were having an 22 arbitration with a dozen see lacks, a dozen, you 23 know, parties, as it was several years ago, with 24 issues aplenty --25 JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.

Г

1	MR. GRYZMALA: 50 might be something
2	very much needed, and it may well have been. We have
3	a much more limited situation here, your Honor.
4	JUDGE JORDAN: You know, I see that.
5	Compared to the arbitration reports that I've looked
6	at so far, narrowing this to somewhere between three
7	and six issues is pretty darn good, I have to say.
8	MR. GRYZMALA: I agree.
9	JUDGE JORDAN: And the time limit in the
10	regulation is something over which I have a little
11	bit of discretion to modify, so I think if there's
12	flexibility, that's probably where it is, especially
13	given the parties' good work on narrowing the
14	issues. That's my perspective on that.
15	MR. GRYZMALA: Right. I think Mr. Johnson
16	and I have enough respect for the processees and the
17	personnel and the Commission we would not put that on
18	a short fuse; on the other hand, we can take
19	advantage that we don't, maybe, necessarily need to
20	accord 50 days for the issues on the plate.
21	JUDGE JORDAN: All right. Well
22	MR. GRYZMALA: Do you have a sense as to
23	what you might think might be workable, your Honor,
24	or maybe the staff has a comment on that so Mark and
25	I could work backwards from the arbitrator's report?

Г

1	JUDGE JORDAN: Does staff staff doesn't
2	really have anything to say on that?
3	MR. VOIGHT: (Shook head.)
4	JUDGE JORDAN: NO?
5	Nor comment there?
6	MR. VOIGHT: (Shook head.)
7	MR. GRYZMALA: Okay.
8	JUDGE JORDAN: I am going to consider in
9	my mind I'm going to start with the time limits as
10	set out in the regulation. Since I've never done an
11	arbitrator's report, I don't have any experience
12	against which to measure it, so that's as far as I
13	can take you. I understand your idea about shrinking
14	the 50 days.
15	MR. GRYZMALA: Right.
16	JUDGE JORDAN: I think that's where our
17	flexibility lies, but I sure don't want to I'm
18	going to stay pretty close to that just because I
19	don't have any experience with which to back up any
20	estimate. That's that's that's my inadequacy,
21	I confess, my inexperience speaking.
22	MR. JOHNSON: Judge, to help in the
23	scheduling process, I wonder and again,
24	Mr. Gryzmala and I spoke about this yesterday
25	we we can't envision, given the limited number of

Г

1	issues and probably the limited number of witnesses,
2	there's going to be we can't envision that this
3	hearing is going to take more than a day.
4	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, you know, you've
5	anticipated my next question, and I appreciate you
6	doing that.
7	Mr. Gryzmala, would you concur with that
8	estimate?
9	MR. GRYZMALA: Absolutely I would, sir.
10	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, that's very good to
11	know.
12	MR. JOHNSON: And there is a possibility,
13	of course, you know, depending on the commissioner's
14	pleasure, and they can attend the arbitration hearing
15	and they can ask questions, but there is a
16	possibility of waiver of cross.
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay.
18	MR. JOHNSON: That's how we handled it in
19	Kansas.
20	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay.
21	MR. JOHNSON: But, you know, here we have
22	five commissioners instead of three in Kansas, so you
23	have five people who can ask questions even if the
24	parties don't want to ask any questions.
25	JUDGE JORDAN: Right.

Г

1	MR. JOHNSON: So I think we probably I
2	think if there's one thing we can do today
3	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
4	MR. JOHNSON: is maybe at least target
5	some dates for hearing.
6	JUDGE JORDAN: Yes, and I hope to have
7	some kind of general framework, which you're helping
8	me with as to that, as to that matter, so let's talk
9	about well, we've already discussed the last week
10	of September and the first week of October for a
11	one-day hearing. Those, for me, are looking pretty
12	good.
13	MR. JOHNSON: Okay. well, again this
14	is Mark Johnson.
15	Bob and I talked about this yesterday.
16	We we all have, including and I also spoke with
17	Mr. Price about this as well. We all have various
18	commitments that kind of constrain our availability.
19	JUDGE JORDAN: Sure.
20	MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Price is in New York,
21	and so he has to travel.
22	What we've kind of come down to is, it
23	would be best if we could agree on a couple of dates
24	that are in the middle of the week, strangely
25	enough.

Γ

1	JUDGE JORDAN: Huh. Huh. Huh. Okay.
2	Okay. Well, if you're asking me about my schedule,
3	it looks pretty good for that first full week of
4	October, the 5th, 6th, and the 7th. Pretty much I
5	can accommodate the parties. Let me put it that
6	way.
7	And Mr. Johnson, you'll be sending your
8	draft schedule to Mr. Gryzmala, but I can tell that
9	you
10	MR. JOHNSON: For example, I'm out of the
11	box. I teach a course at the University of Kansas
12	Law School don't tell anybody in Jefferson City I
13	do that but that's on Tuesdays, so I'm out of the
14	box that day, but the 6th and the 7th work for me.
15	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, great.
16	MR. JOHNSON: So here's what I will do. I
17	will send my sort of proposed schedule to Bob, and he
18	and I will then talk, and I hope to be able to make a
19	joint proposal to you, an agreed proposal
20	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.
21	MR. JOHNSON: and that would include a
22	hearing date.
23	JUDGE JORDAN: Yes, that's that's what
24	I'm looking for. That's the thing that I want to
25	come out of these discussions today.

1	MR. GRYZMALA: May I ask, your Honor
2	this is Bob Gryzmala.
3	JUDGE JORDAN: Yes.
4	MR. GRYZMALA: You know, Mark, you have a
5	little bit of advantage because you tried the similar
6	case in Kansas, and I wasn't there.
7	MR. JOHNSON: Right.
8	MR. GRYZMALA: I only heard tell, but my
9	understanding was and I'm not lobbying for a
10	similar course here, but just again, trying to come
11	to the best results.
12	I understand that the issues there were
13	presented on a combination of vehicles, that is, for,
14	you know, a couple of issues where testimony and
15	briefing for the Voice over Internet Protocol issue
16	was limited or exclusively the subject of briefing.
17	There was not a hearing where the witness took a
18	chair
19	JUDGE JORDAN: Oh, golly.
20	MR. PRICE: in that hearing mode. Is
21	that is that right? I mean, are we looking at
22	something different in Missouri?
23	MR. JOHNSON: I don't think we are, Bob.
24	I think that what happened in Kansas was the parties
25	agreed that there were certain issues that were

1	simply legal in nature, a void compensation being one
2	of them
3	MR. GRYZMALA: Okay.
4	MR. JOHNSON: and there was no
5	testimony provided on those issues.
6	MR. GRYZMALA: Okay.
7	MR. JOHNSON: There were a couple of
8	issues that which there were some factual
9	disagreements, and that did, because of their sort of
10	relatively obscurity, did require
11	JUDGE JORDAN: Oh, he's cutting out too.
12	It's our it's our connection.
13	MR. JOHNSON: We did not have a hearing.
14	We stipulated the evidence pardon me the
15	pretrial testimony into evidence.
16	MR. GRYZMALA: I'm sorry. Mark, I lost
17	you for about 30 seconds.
18	JUDGE JORDAN: So did I, and I
19	occasionally lose Mr. Gryzmala too.
20	MR. JOHNSON: Okay.
21	MR. GRYZMALA: I'm just going to pick up.
22	Maybe that's better.
23	MR. JOHNSON: Well, Bob is correct. We
24	did have prefile testify on a few of the issues,
25	largely to explain the parties' positions to the

Commission.

1

2	We then stipulated the prefile testimony
3	into evidence, waived cross-examination, and the only
4	proceeding the we had before the Commission is
5	when the commissioners asked the lawyers to come in
6	to answer some questions that they had, so they were
7	not evidentiary issues. It was largely largely
8	asking questions about the applicable law.
9	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, counsel has again
10	anticipated another issue I wanted to bring up, which
11	is the possibility of resolving some of these issues
12	without an evidentiary hearing. Now, let me throw in
13	my perspective as to that.
14	Following the contested case procedure
14 15	Following the contested case procedure model, as this arbitration does, there will have to
15	model, as this arbitration does, there will have to
15 16	model, as this arbitration does, there will have to be some evidentiary basis for applying any provision
15 16 17	model, as this arbitration does, there will have to be some evidentiary basis for applying any provision of law, and that can come in a number of ways. An
15 16 17 18	model, as this arbitration does, there will have to be some evidentiary basis for applying any provision of law, and that can come in a number of ways. An evidentiary hearing is but one. There's also the
15 16 17 18 19	model, as this arbitration does, there will have to be some evidentiary basis for applying any provision of law, and that can come in a number of ways. An evidentiary hearing is but one. There's also the possibility of stipulations as well, stipulated
15 16 17 18 19 20	model, as this arbitration does, there will have to be some evidentiary basis for applying any provision of law, and that can come in a number of ways. An evidentiary hearing is but one. There's also the possibility of stipulations as well, stipulated facts, and if the parties want to submit something
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	model, as this arbitration does, there will have to be some evidentiary basis for applying any provision of law, and that can come in a number of ways. An evidentiary hearing is but one. There's also the possibility of stipulations as well, stipulated facts, and if the parties want to submit something an issue on stipulated facts, then the Commission can
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	model, as this arbitration does, there will have to be some evidentiary basis for applying any provision of law, and that can come in a number of ways. An evidentiary hearing is but one. There's also the possibility of stipulations as well, stipulated facts, and if the parties want to submit something an issue on stipulated facts, then the Commission can simply decide that issue without an evidentiary

Г

1	judgment. I'm very skeptical of its use in a
2	contested case context unless it's on stipulated
3	facts, so that's my perspective as to that but, yes,
4	I did want to bring up the idea of dispositive
5	motions, and maybe that's something that the parties
6	can work into their procedural schedule as well. Any
7	ideas on that?
8	MR. JOHNSON: Judge, this is Mark
9	Johnson.
10	Certainly I'll talk about that with
11	Mr. Gryzmala. I don't know that using the summary
12	judgment procedure is I I I say
13	"necessary" that may not be the right word but
14	we found in Kansas it was entirely satisfactory, at
15	least from a procedural point of view, for the
16	arbitrator.
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
18	MR. JOHNSON: And Kansas follows a
19	somewhat similar procedure where there's a staff
20	attorney who's appointed as arbitrator.
21	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
22	MR. JOHNSON: We submitted the case to him
23	on not stipulated testimony. You know, it was
24	testimony that we essentially stipulated as to its
25	admissibility.

1	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
2	MR. JOHNSON: And then he relied on that,
3	you know, on testimony, on that testimony, to support
4	his determination of the issues that were more than
5	just, you know, legal in nature.
6	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
7	MR. JOHNSON: For example, in the DPL that
8	was filed with the petitions here and, you know,
9	based on what Mr. Price has said, we'll probably be
10	adding a couple issues, but based solely on what you
11	have before you, it would be our feeling that Issue
12	No. 1, which is which goes to void compensation
13	is a legal issue
14	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
15	MR. JOHNSON: and for which evidence is
16	probably not needed.
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, yeah, and that's the
18	impression that I got from looking at that, and my
19	concern is the prospect of taking away someone's
20	right to hearing without their consent.
21	MR. JOHNSON: Well, we wouldn't I'm not
22	proposing that you know, I'm moving that this
23	issue be taken off the table from a factual point of
24	view. I would only propose to do that if AT&T also
25	agreed with it.

1	JUDGE JORDAN: You know, in that case, if
2	we have an agreement to waive hearing, then that's
3	fine.
4	MR. JOHNSON: Right. Absolutely. That's
5	one question that is a live question, whether the
6	parties can agree that we can dispense the prefile
7	testimony and simply brief this issue, that issue, or
8	the other, and void is a good candidate, your Honor,
9	that we'll have to take on.
10	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, that sounds
11	promising. I just want the parties to bear in mind
12	that anything any facts that they want to apply
13	this law to, any factual basis has to be in the
14	record.
15	I would need an evidentiary basis to apply
16	any facts that the parties are asserting. If it goes
17	through a motion, then if I see something in a
18	motion, an assertion of fact, an allegation, I'll
19	want a citation to the record, something in the
20	record.
21	You know, I just wanted to alert the
22	parties to that, because that's what we have to do.
23	If you want a decision from the Public Service
24	Commission, then you have to give us an evidentiary
25	basis for it, so that's my only caution on that.

1	Anything else the parties want to add on
2	that issue?
3	(No response.)
4	JUDGE JORDAN: I'm not hearing anything.
5	Of course, maybe the line's gone out again.
6	MR. JOHNSON: No, we're here.
7	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Then I think, you
8	know, that's about all I had to discuss.
9	What else would the parties like to
10	discuss today?
11	MR. GRYZMALA: Just one point, your
12	Honor. Maybe we can just sort of hold this we may
13	not need it, and I don't want to predict the
14	outcome. Let's say under a hypothetical scenario the
15	parties brief a legal issue of Issue 1, which is
16	void
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
18	MR. GRYZMALA: we submit prefile on the
19	remainder
20	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
21	MR. GRYZMALA: and we waive cross. The
22	question becomes: Because this is, you know, a time
23	we're all looking at, you know, schedules,
24	pocketbooks, and what have you, do people get on a
25	plane and come to a hearing?

Г

1	JUDGE JORDAN: Right.
2	MR. GRYZMALA: Now, in today's world, if
3	Mark and I both agree to waive cross, there's no
4	reason for anybody to get on a plane
5	JUDGE JORDAN: Uh-huh.
6	MR. GRYZMALA: you know, or staff to
7	have to expend resources of that kind but, on the
8	other hand, I mean, in all candor, it has been
9	expressed to us from time to time that we need to set
10	a hearing date nevertheless because the judge or
11	I'm sorry a commissioner or more than one
12	commissioner may have a question, so I just only
13	entertain that we may have a hearing at the end of
14	the day, we may feel as parties that we want to have
15	a live hearing, but in the event we don't, I think we
16	all should be mindful that's kind of been the
17	traditional position we've heard through the years.
18	I don't know if the commissioners would
19	wanted a hearing even if the parties don't. You know
20	what I mean?
21	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, Mr. Gryzmala, I think
22	you raise a the critical issue there is whether a
23	commissioner or arbitrator or the arbitrator's
24	advisory staff feels the need to be in the same
25	room

1 Right. MR. GRYZMALA: 2 JUDGE JORDAN: -- with one of the 3 witnesses. 4 MR. GRYZMALA: Right. 5 JUDGE JORDAN: I'm not led to the process of an evidentiary hearing. If the parties feel that 6 7 they can get a decision from the Commission without 8 an evidentiary hearing --9 MR. GRYZMALA: Right. JUDGE JORDAN: -- but that all comes to --10 11 we're not the only players. 12 MR. GRYZMALA: Right. I --13 JUDGE JORDAN: We're not the only players. I tell you what that leads me to. 14 That 15 leads me to the possibility of some kind of 16 dispositive motions, kind of submission on stipulated 17 exhibits, perhaps stipulated facts. 18 If you do that, my sense is that it will have to be very complete, and you'll want to aim 19 20 pretty high; that is, make it so that commissioners -- even commissioners -- will not 21 22 have -- will not feel the need for anyone to take the 23 stand. 24 MR. GRYZMALA: Okay. That's just a -- I 25 just thought I'd bring it up, your Honor.

1	JUDGE JORDAN: I think that's a very good
2	point. I'm glad you raised it.
3	MR. GRYZMALA: Sometimes it happens where
4	there's no hearing and no one comes on a plane, and
5	sometimes, you know, there will be a question, you
6	know, that, you know, we need to have folks there
7	for, you know.
8	JUDGE JORDAN: And sometimes nobody wants
9	a hearing except a commissioner.
10	MR. GRYZMALA: That's right. That's
11	exactly right.
12	JUDGE JORDAN: But if the commissioner
13	wants a hearing, the commissioner gets a hearing.
14	MR. GRYZMALA: That's exactly right, your
15	Honor.
16	JUDGE JORDAN: All right. What else would
17	the parties like to raise with me right now?
18	MR. GRYZMALA: I don't believe Tim,
19	Judge, unless you have anything, I don't believe AT&T
20	would.
21	MR. JOHNSON: I don't have anything, Bob.
22	MR. GRYZMALA: Okay. Nothing from AT&T,
23	your Honor, but I would have a comment to the parties
24	before we close.
25	JUDGE JORDAN: Feel free.

Г

1	MR. GRYZMALA: I would just invite Mark
2	and Ted to join me on my conference bridge so we can
3	clear up a couple of items immediately after the
4	call, if I can convey that information, but otherwise
5	that's all I have for this particular procedural
6	prehearing conference, your Honor.
7	JUDGE JORDAN: Well, I think that's
8	constructive. I appreciate the parties' continued
9	communication. I just have a feeling it's going to
10	make life that much easier for the arbitrator and
11	ultimately the Commission.
12	Mr. Johnson, anything else you feel you
13	need to add today?
14	MR. JOHNSON: NO.
15	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Then what I'll do is
16	I will when I get off this line I'll head straight
17	to my office and start drafting an order that will
18	set forth the matters that we have discussed,
19	including what we discussed about the due date of
20	discovery, prefile testimony, and also the filing of
21	a joint proposed schedule, and so that's what I'm
22	going to do.
23	One last chance to add anything before we
24	go off the record and I hang up.
25	MR. GRYZMALA: Oh. Don't hang up, please,

Г

1	
1	your Honor. I just want to give the call-in
2	information if Mark and Ted are available.
3	MR. JOHNSON: Sure. I am.
4	JUDGE JORDAN: Should I leave this
5	connection open then?
6	MR. GRYZMALA: Yes, just for a moment or
7	so, your Honor, if you would.
8	JUDGE JORDAN: I don't mind at all.
9	MR. GRYZMALA: Okay. Mark, Ted, does your
10	time permit just for about five minutes, maybe?
11	MR. JOHNSON: Sure.
12	MR. GRYZMALA: Okay. The telephone number
13	would be 469.227.9331.
14	Tim, if you could join, we'd appreciate
15	it.
16	MR. PRICE: Okay. We'll call you in a
17	minute.
18	MR. GRYZMALA: Judge, that's all. We
19	don't need a line open any longer here at AT&T.
20	JUDGE JORDAN: All right. Does anybody
21	else need this line open?
22	MR. JOHNSON: NO.
23	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Then I believe I'm
24	done at this end.
25	Thank you very much for your help in this

1	matter and the thought you put into it so far. With
2	that we will go off the record.
3	MR. GRYZMALA: Okay.
4	MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Judge.
5	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you, counselors.
6	MR. GRYZMALA: Thank you.
7	JUDGE JORDAN: I'm going to hang up now.
8	Have a good day.
9	(The hearing concluded.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER			
2	I, Nancy L. Silva, CCR, within and for the			
3	State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the			
4	witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing			
5	hearing was duly sworn by me; that the			
6	testimony of said witness was taken by me to the			
7	best of my ability and thereafter reduced to			
8	typewriting under my direction; that I am neither			
9	counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of			
10	the parties to the action in which this			
11	hearing was taken, and further, that I am not			
12	a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel			
13	employed by the parties thereto, nor financially			
14	or otherwise interested in the outcome of the			
15	action.			
16				
17				
18	Nancy L. Silva, CCR			
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

	ARBITRATION MEET	TING 09-09-2010	
1	25:14	action	34:18
1 1:8,25 2:2	5-0 21:1	42:10,15	allow 17:13
3:17 7:14 33:12 35:15 101 2:6 3:21	573.638.0261 2:7	actually 17:9 add 6:15 12:10 13:8	already 20:15,22 27:9
1100 2:11 4:5	573.751.4140 2:22	35:1	altered 13:7
12 8:19	585.255.1401	39:13,23	alternative
14623 2:17 4:11	2:17	adding 5:23 33:10	11:14
15 18:24	5th 28:4	additional 6:19	am 4:24 17:23 22:6 25:8 40:3 42:8,11
$\frac{2}{2 2:25}$	63101 2:3 3:18	address 4:4,10	amenable 6:18 15:10
2010 1:6	63102 2:22	admissibility 32:25	answer 6:9 10:12 31:6
22 21:17 23:17	64111 2:12 4:5	advance 9:23 23:15	answered 14:19
220 16:21,22 19:2	65109 2:7 6th 28:4,14	advanced 9:5 advancing	answering 14:9
220-day 17:6 18:22	7	16:1	anticipate
225 2:16 4:11 25 8:15,16	7th 28:4,14	advantage 21:11 24:19 29:5	12:17 15:20,24 18:2
27 22:24	8	advisory	anticipated
270 20:21 21:9,23 22:8	8 17:7 18:23 23:20	4:17,23 21:4,22 36:24	26:5 31:10 anybody 28:12
270-day 16:19 20:20	816.460.2655 2:12 8th 19:2	afternoon 4:20	36:4 40:20 anyone 4:12 10:22 37:22
270th 22:25	OLII 19.2	afterwards	anything 6:15
29 19:5	9	22:15	10:8 11:22
3	9 1:6 90th 22:15	against 25:12 agency 22:21	12:10 13:11,13
3 3:25 8:25	90LN 22:15	agenda 21:17	25:2 34:12 35:1,4
30 30:17 314.235.6060	A ability 8:15	ago 22:5 23:23	38:19,21 39:12,23
2:3 3516 2:2 3:18	42:7 able 10:20	agreed 28:19	aplenty 23:24
360 2:21	28:18	29:25 33:25 agreed-to	apologies 9:10
4	Absolutely 26:9 34:4	10:1	appearance 3:12 4:7
4 8:23	accommodate 28:5	agreeing 10:8,11	appearing
4520 2:11 4:4 469.227.9331	accomplish	agreement 1:13 3:5	3:15 appears 42:4
40:13	5:10,11 accord 24:20	34:2 ahead 4:18	applicable 31:8
5	accurately	aim 37:19	apply
50 20:25	6:13	alert 34:21	34:12,15
23:14,15 24:1,20	act 18:15 20:20 21:8	allegation	applying 31:16

	ARBITRATION MEET	ING 09-09-2010	
appointed 4:22 32:20	availability 27:18	bordering 5:8 box 2:21	Christmas 21:16
appreciate 11:4 17:18 26:5 39:8 40:14	available 11:13 40:2 aware 4:21	28:11,14 bridge 39:2 brief	citation 34:19 City 1:7
approach 16:15 17:6	away 33:19 awkward 15:8	19:11,14 34:7 35:15	2:7,12,22 3:22 28:12 clarification
appropriate 6:21 8:2	<u>B</u>	briefing 14:4 29:15,16 briefly	7:3 clarify 10:2
approval 22:8 arbitration	backwards 16:18 17:2,10	<pre>briefly 7:10,24 bring 16:2</pre>	11:4 clear 10:20
1:5,12 3:4,10 5:5 11:21 16:10	18:20 24:25 based 33:9,10	31:10 32:4 37:25	39:3 close 25:18
22:5 23:22 24:5 26:14 31:15	basically 8:10 19:1	business 3:17,21 6:21 8:3,24	38:24 closed 14:4
arbitrator 3:9 4:21	basis 31:16 34:13,15,25	C	<pre>closer 13:2 Colleen 4:22</pre>
11:10 23:19 32:16,20 36:23 39:10	bear 34:11 becomes 35:22	calendar 17:11 19:21	combination 29:13
arbitrator's 4:17,23	begin 3:11 behalf 3:16 5:24 10:24	<pre>call-in 40:1 candid 20:16</pre>	combinations 9:20 comes 7:17
24:25 25:11 36:23	15:23 16:8 believe	candidate 34:8	23:19 37:10 38:4
Area 2:8 arguments	6:2,12,20 9:3 16:25	candor 36:8 care 21:10	<pre>comfort 22:20 commend 7:3</pre>
21:8 asserting 34:16	38:18,19 40:23 Bell 1:11 2:4	22:13 case 3:2,9 11:11 14:5	comment 24:24 25:5 38:23
assertion 34:18	3:16 benefit 21:6	16:9 17:13 19:12 20:21	comments 18:24 19:4
assigned 3:8	<pre>benefits 23:7 best 15:9</pre>	29:6 31:14 32:2,22 34:1	commingling 9:20
assist 11:8 AT&T 1:11 2:2,4,8 3:17,21 5:25 9:5 11:2	21:2,20 27:23 29:11 42:7 better 18:10	<pre>caution 34:25 CCR 1:23 42:2,18 Center 2:2 3:18</pre>	commission 1:1 2:21,23 3:2,8 11:7 21:1,13,22 22:14 24:17 31:1,4,21
15:20 21:11 33:24 38:19,22	30:22 Bill 4:20 22:4,9	certain 22:6 29:25	34:24 37:7 39:11
40:19 AT&T's 3:4 9:14	bind 22:21 bit 24:11 29:5	certainly 10:21 12:16 16:1 23:6 32:10	commissioner 36:11,12,23 38:9,12,13
attached 5:14 7:5,6	Bob 3:14 6:8 9:24 13:16	CERTIFICATE 42:1	commissioners 26:22 31:5 36:18 37:21
attend 26:14 attorney 2:2,16 32:20	16:16 17:14,24 27:15 28:17	certify 42:3 chair 29:18	<pre>commissioner' s 26:13</pre>
42:12	29:2,23 30:23 38:21	chance 39:23	Commission's 5:7 12:25

	ARBITRATION MEE	11NG 09-09-2010	
20:24 21:6 22:7 23:16	constructive	crude 8:20	demand 16:22
	39:8	cut 7:19,24	demanding
commitment 20:1	contained 18:11	cutting 30:11	20:1 depending
commitments	contemplate	D	26:13
27:18	6:25	d/b/a 1:11	depositions
communication 39:9	contemplates	2:4	12:19
	21:9	Dale 4:22	determination
company 1:11 2:4 3:16,19	contested 31:14 32:2	Daniel 1:19 3:6	31:25 33:4 different
Compared 24:5	context 32:2	dark 7:16	22:23,24
compensation	continued	8:9,10,21	29:22
7:14 8:2 30:1 33:12	15:4 39:8	darn 24:7	difficult 13:25
complete	convey 39:4	data 12:22,25	direct 16:11
37:19	copper 8:11	14:14	20:17
completely	correct 17:23	date 13:2 16:19 19:17	direction
22:23	18:13,16 30:23	21:6 28:22	42:8
complicated		36:10 39:19	disagreements
16:4	Couch 4:22	dates	30:9
comprehensive	counsel 4:9 5:9 14:17	17:12,24	discipline
	31:9 42:9,12	27:5,23	15:24
Compulsory 1:12	counselors	day 21:16	discovery 11:19,23
	41:5	22:15,21,25 26:3 28:14	12:1,14,18,2
concern 33:19	counterparts	36:14 41:8	1
concerning 6:8	5:25	days 14:13	13:1,3,5,11,
	couple 27:23	16:21,22	20 14:1,5,10,18
concluded 41:9	29:14 30:7	18:24,25	15:4 39:20
concur 26:7	33:10 39:3	19:2,8,11,12 ,14,15 20:21	discretion
	course 13:3	21:1,9 22:8	18:10 24:11
conference 39:2,6	26:13 28:11 29:10 35:5	23:14,15	discuss
confess 25:21	COURT 1:24	24:20 ^{25:14} deadline	35:8,10
confident	cover 5:2	18:22 21:15	discussed 27:9
5:10	cramped 5:8	deal 13:25	39:18,19
Congress 5:6	creative	December	discusses
connection	21:20 23:21	21:17 22:24	11:19
7:24 30:12	critical	23:17	discussions
40:5	36:22	decide 21:3	5:25 28:25
consent 33:20	cross 26:16	31:22	dispense 34:6
consider	35:21 36:3	decision 6:4	dispositive
18:24 25:8	cross-	21:1,7,16	32:4 37:16
considering 16:7 18:8	examination	22:7,8,14 23:16 34:23	dispute
		37:7	5:18,22 6:13
constrain 27:18	Crossing 1:13,14	decisions	10:9
	2:13,18 3:25	6:24 22:13	disputed 5:21
constrict 20:23	4:1,9,10 5:24 6:7	definitive	distinct 22:10
constricting 20:23	10:25 21:10	21:21	docket 13:25

	ARBITRATION MEE	TING 09-09-2010	
done 15:3	essentially	5:9	42:4
25:10 40:24	32:24	FCC	formal 13:1
dozen 23:22	estimate 25:20 26:8	22:12,13,22	forth 6:13 18:18 22:25
DPL 6:2,12 8:25 9:11	event 36:15	federal 18:15 feel 22:24	39:18
33:7	everybody	23:8 36:14	framework
draft 16:24 17:1 18:25	3:24	37:6,22 38:25 39:12	27:7
19:4,13,15	evidence 30:14,15	feeling 23:3	Frankly 23:20
28:8	31:3 33:15	33:11 39:9	free 38:25
drafting 39:17	evidentiary	feels 36:24	full 28:3
Drive 2:16	31:7,12,16,1 8,22	fiber 7:16	fuse 14:9 20:20 24:18
4:11	34:15,24	8:9,21	
due 5:16	37:6,8	fiber's 8:10 fifteen 19:15	<u> </u>
13:22 19:5 39:19	exactly 38:11,14	file 1:12 3:3	gather 21:17 23:16
duly 42:5	example 12:18	15:18	general 5:2
-	18:19 28:10 33:7	16:6,21 17:23	27:7
<u> </u>		filed 7:11	generally 14:10
early 18:4	except 38:9 exclusively	33:8	gets 38:13
easier 6:23 39:10	29:16	filing 6:2 15:24 17:15	getting 5:12
efforts 11:4	exhibits	15:24 17:15 18:2 39:20	Gilbreath 4:2
else 4:12	37:17	final 16:21	G-i-l-b-r-e-
35:1,9 38:16 39:12 40:21	expend 36:7	17:1 20:25	a-t-h 4:3
elucidate	experience 25:11,19	finalize 19:8	GILBREATH 2:10
7:10	explain 30:25	financially 42:13	given 9:14
e-mail 6:6	expressed	fine 13:5	24:13 25:25
employed	36:9	34:3	gives 8:21
42:9,13 employee	extended 21:23	finish 17:25	19:8
42:12	extending	firm 4:3	glad 38:2 Global
engage	21:6	first 8:1,6 16:5	1:13,14
12:13,17	extensive 12:7	19:19,22	2:13,18 3:25 4:1,9,10
enter 4:6	extent 6:22	27:10 28:3	5:24 6:7
entertain 36:13	13:20	five 14:12 22:5	10:11,25 21:10
entirely		26:22,23	golly 29:19
32:14	F fact 5:24 9:4	40:10	gone 35:5
entries 3:11	14:11 34:18	flexibility 24:12 25:17	gotten 11:15
envision 11:18 12:19	facts	Folentez	governing
25:25 26:2	31:20,21 32:3	20:13	15:17
envisions	34:12,16	folks 3:19 10:3 38:6	great 28:15
20:20	37:17	foreclose	group 21:22
especially 24:12	factual 30:8 33:23 34:13	11:25 12:6	grows 13:2,3
essence 16:16	fantastical	foregoing	Gryzmala 3:14 6:6,11,14

	ARBITRATION MEET	TING 09-09-2010	
7:19,20 9:24 11:11 12:3	7:17 11:15 23:7,10,21	39:6 40:1,7 hope 18:4	information 39:4 40:2
13:16 20:1 25:24 26:7	head 25:3,6 39:16	27:6 28:18 Huh 28:1	initial 3:10 11:20 16:22
28:8 29:2 30:19 32:11	hear 20:18	hypothetical	input 6:1
36:21	heard 10:8	35:14	instead 26:22
G-r-y-z-m-a-	29:8 36:17		intend 12:13
1-a 3:15	hearing	<u> </u>	15:18
GRYZMALA 2:2 3:13 6:16	13:2,13,23 14:1,3,20 15:4,5 16:1	I'd 5:16 15:10 17:20	intended 14:19
7:9,13,16,21 8:1,6,13,18 9:2,12,21	19:11,17 22:6 26:3,14	37:25 idea 5:2	Interconnecte d 8:4
10:10,18 11:2,25 12:4	27:5,11 28:22	11:15 18:7 25:13 32:4	<pre>Interconnecti on 1:13 3:5</pre>
13:15,18 14:3,8,16,24	29:17,20 30:13	ideas 32:7 ɪ'll 3:11	interested 42:14
15:12,20 20:4,8,13,19 22:2,18	31:12,18,23 33:20 34:2 35:4,25	7:22 11:24 21:25 32:10 34:18	interests 6:21
23:2,5,10,12 ,19	36:10,13,15, 19 37:6,8 38:4,9,13	39:15,16 I'm 3:6,20	Internet 8:3,4 29:15
24:1,8,15,22 25:7,15 26:9 29:1,4,8	41:9 42:5,11	4:8 5:9,12 6:8 8:20	interrogatory 12:22
30:3,6,16,21 35:11,18,21	hearings 15:3 help 11:14	$\begin{array}{c} 10:16 & 11:10 \\ 12:13 & 13:13 \\ \end{array}$	introduce 4:17,19
36:2,6	25:22 40:25	23:20 25:9,17	invite 39:1
37:1,4,9,12, 24 38:3,10,14,1	helpful 11:10 16:1	28:10,13,24 29:9	10-2011-0057 1:13 3:3
8,22 39:1,25	helping 27:7	30:16,21 32:1	isn't 17:7
40:6,9,12,18 41:3,6	hereby 42:3	33:21,22	issue 6:8,10
Gryzmala's	here's 5:1 17:20 21:2	35:4 36:11	7:14,17
12:15	28:16	37:5 38:2 39:21 40:23	8:1,7,13,18, 23,25 9:23
guess 16:10	he's 30:11	41:7	11:17
	ні 3:20	immediately	14:17,18 16:3 20:25
<u> </u>	high 2:6 3:21	39:3	29:15
hand 12:1 21:21 24:18	37:20	impression 9:25 33:18	31:10,21,22
36:8	hold 22:25 35:12	inadequacy	33:11,13,23 34:7 35:2,15
handled 16:9 26:18	holiday 21:15	25:20	36:22
hang 39:24,25	Honor 3:14	Inc 1:14 2:13,18	issued 13:20 21:14
41:7	5:19 6:16 7:1,10 8:10	include 28:21	issues 1:12
happen 15:5	10:24 11:2	included 9:15	5:3,13,17,21
happened 9:19	12:11 14:25 15:13,21	includes 9:16	,23 6:3,13,19
13:24 29:24	16:8,25	including	7:4,8 8:21
happens 38:3	20:5,25	27:16 39:19	9:2,4,15,19 10:6,7,22
hard 20:9 23:12	21:14 24:3,23 29:1	indeed 22:12	10:0,7,22 11:5,12,14,1
haven't 20:5	34:8 35:12	inexperience	6 12:6
having 6:6	37:25 38:15,23	25:21	16:1,4 23:24 24:7,14,20
			, ,

	ARBITRATION MEET	TING 09-09-2010	
26:1 29:12,14,25	28:19 39:21	,25 16:13,24	last 17:10 19:18,21
30:5,8,24	jointly 17:22	17:3,8,17 18:1,6,13,16	20:15 27:9
31:7,11 33:4,10	Jordan 1:19 3:1,6,23	,21 19:3,6,9,16,	39:23
it'd 12:7	4:12,16 5:1	20,25	later 13:22
item 20:24	6:14 7:2,12,15,19	20:7,12,18	law 1:19 2:2,16 3:7
items 10:14	,23	21:25 22:6,11,19	4:3 11:8
39:3	8:5,12,17 9:1 10:19	23:3,6,11,18	28:12 31:8,17
it's 4:20	11:3	,25 24:4,9,21	34:13
13:25 15:6 21:3 30:12	12:3,9,20,24	25:1,4,8,16,	lawyers 31:5
32:2 39:9	13:13,17 14:2,7,14	22 26:4,10,17,2	leads
I've 3:8 5:14	15:2,7,15,22	0,25	37:14,15
9:13 15:3 24:5 25:10	,25 16:13,24 17:3,8,17	27:3,6,19 28:1,15,20,2	least 27:4 32:15
2113 23110	18:1,6,13,16	3 29:3,19	leave 40:4
J	,21 19:3,6,9,16,	30:11,18 31:9	led 37:5
January 21:7	20,25	32:8,17,21	legal 21:21
Jefferson 1:7 2:7,22 3:22	20:7,12,18 21:25	33:1,6,14,17 $34\cdot1$ 10	30:1 33:5,13
28:12	22:11,19	34:1,10 35:4,7,17,20	35:15
Johnson 2:10	23:3,6,11,18 ,25	36:1,5,10,21 37:2,5,10,13	legislation 5:6
3:25 4:2,14 5:19,20 6:12	24:4,9,21	38:1,8,12,16	less 13:1
7:7 10:24	25:1,4,8,16 26:4,10,17,2	,19,25 39:7,15	let's 3:12
12:11,21 14:21	0,25	40:4,8,18,20	11:17 $13:1415:15$ $19:10$
15:6,14,23	27:3,6,19 28:1,15,20,2	,23 41:4,5,7	20:18 27:8
16:8,14,25 17:4,9,24	3 29:3,19	judges 11:8	35:14
18:4,9,14,17	30:11,18 31:9	judgment 32:1,12	lies 25:17
,22 19:4,7,10,18	32:17,21	jurisdiction	life 39:10
,24 24:15	33:1,6,14,17 34:1,10	22:16	limit 24:9
25:22 26:12,18,21	35:4,7,17,20		limitations 13:6
27:1,4,13,14	36:1,5,21 37:2,5,10,13	Kansas 2:12	limited 12:4
,20 28:7,10,16,2	38:1,8,12,16	4:5 9:4	24:3 25:25 26:1 29:16
1 29:7,23	,25 39:7,15 40:4,8,20,23	16:10 20:11 26:19,22	limits 5:7,8
30:4,7,13,20	41:5,7	28:11	25:9
,23 32:8,9,18,22	judge 1:19	29:6,24 32:14,18	line 17:19
33:2,7,15,21 34:4 35:6	2:6 3:1,7,20,23	Kenneth 2:16	18:8,11,14 39:16
34:4 55:6 38:21	4:12,16 5:1	4:11	40:19,21
39:12,14	6:14 7:2,12,15,19		line's 35:5
40:3,11,22 41:4	,23	L lack 18:10	Lisa 2:10 4:2
Johnson's	8:5,12,17 9:1 10:19	lacks 23:22	list 5:22
21:9 23:13	11:3,25	language	listening
join 39:2 40:14	12:3,9,20,24 13:13,15,17	10:1,11	20:9 litigated 9:3
joint 18:2	14:2,7,14	largely 30:25	little 12:6
Jee =0.2	15:2,7,15,22	31:7	

	ARBITRATION MEET	TING 09-09-2010	
20:17 24:10 29:5 live 34:5 36:15 LLC 1:24 lobbying 29:9 Local 1:13 2:13,18 4:1,9 longer 40:19 lose 30:19 lost 30:16 Louis 2:3 3:18	ARBITRATION MEET 9:22 10:4,10,12 12:18 14:5,8,16 20:10 21:19 22:2 23:20 29:21 36:8,20 means 9:17 13:1 measure 25:12 mediation 11:7,12 meeting 1:5 3:11 4:18 11:21	<pre>morning 3:13 motion 34:17,18 motions 32:5 37:16 move 8:10 13:9 moves 16:5 moving 33:22 Myron 4:22 myself 4:22 </pre>	notice 23:15 November 17:7 18:23 19:2 23:20 nowhere 21:24
<u>Main 2:11 4:5</u> Manager 2:8 manner 13:22 14:5 Mark 2:10 4:2 5:19 6:17 10:13 20:10	<pre>member 4:17 members 4:23 mentions 15:17 middle 27:24 milestones 17:13 mind 17:20</pre>	<pre>name's 3:20 Nancy 1:23 42:2,18 narrowing 7:4 24:6,13 Nath 2:11 4:4 nature 30:1 33:5</pre>	9:17 10:13 12:5 occasionally 30:19 occurs 20:20 October 19:5,19,22 27:10 28:4 offer 11:7
21:9 24:24 27:14 29:4 30:16 32:8 36:3 39:1 40:2,9 marked 10:5 Mark's 20:5 23:13 matter 1:10	25:9 34:11 40:8 mindful 13:5 36:16 minute 40:17 minutes 40:10 Missouri 1:2,7	Nazolick 20:13 necessarily 24:19 necessary 32:13 negotiation 11:9 16:23 20:22	13:15 20:16 office 39:17 offline 9:22 Oh 9:12 29:19 30:11 39:25 Okay 3:23 4:16 5:1 6:11 7:2 8:5
9:4 16:4 21:14 22:16,17 27:8 41:1 matters 6:17 39:18 may 9:24 11:17 13:6	2:3,4,7,12,2 1,22,23 3:7,17,22 4:5 22:5 29:22 42:3 Missouri's 1:11 mistake 10:15,17	negotiator 9:14 10:3 neither 42:8 network 8:24 nevertheless 36:10 news 20:10	0:11 7:2 8:5 9:1 10:18,19 12:9 15:22,25 16:13 17:3 19:16,24 23:2,5,10 25:7 26:17,20 27:13 28:1,2
14:6 21:3,4 22:9,22,23 24:2 29:1 32:13 35:12 36:12,13,14 maybe 17:5 20:17 22:4 24:19,24 27:4 30:22 32:5 35:5,12 40:10 mean 6:20	<pre>mode 29:20 model 31:15 modifications 8:24 modified 9:13 modify 24:11 moment 40:6 month 21:11 months 8:19</pre>	<pre>night 17:10 nobody 38:8 none 9:24 noodling 20:6 nor 25:5 42:9,13 normally 14:12 nothing 6:25 38:22</pre>	30:3,6,20 35:7 37:24 38:22 39:15 40:9,12,16,2 3 41:3 one-day 27:11 open 40:5,19,21 opportunity 8:14 12:5 order 15:10

	ARBITRATION MEET	TING 09-09-2010	
16:20 20:21 21:13 39:17	23:9 24:14 31:13 32:3	35:18 39:20 prehearing	37:5 processees
orderly 14:5	petition 1:11	39:6	24:16
otherwise 39:4 42:14	3:4 5:15 7:6,11 9:5	preparation 6:1	promising 34:11
outcome 35:14 42:14	Petitioner 3:12 11:24 15:19	prepare 19:12,15	<pre>proper 10:25 properly 22:3</pre>
P	petitions 33:8	prescribed 18:15	proposal 10:2 17:12 18:2
<pre>P.O 2:21 palatable</pre>	pick 30:21	present 4:18,24 12:1	20:6 23:13 28:19
21:3	piece 8:11	17:15	propose 33:24
pardon 30:14 participated	<pre>pieces 7:17 plane 35:25</pre>	presented 29:13	proposed 17:21 28:17 39:21
11:11 particular	plans 21:18	Presiding 1:19	proposing
39:5 parties 4:21	plate 24:20 players	pretrial 30:15	9:23 33:22 prospect
5:3,14,18 7:3	37:11,14	pretty 14:10 15:6 17:23	33:19 Protocol 8:4
11:4,6,13,18 ,22 13:4,21	pleading 5:16 10:21	24:7 25:18 27:11 28:3,4	29:15
14:17 15:11,18	please 4:19 10:2 13:17	37:20	<pre>provide 12:25 provided 30:5</pre>
16:7 17:21	39:25	Price 2:16 4:6,8,15	provision
23:23 24:13 26:24 28:5	pleasure 26:14	5:24 9:9,13 10:4,16	31:16
29:24 30:25 31:20 32:5	pocketbooks 35:24	27:17,20 29:20 33:9	prudent 13:19 15:3,9
34:6,11,16,2 2 35:1,9,15	point 22:15	40:16	PSC 15:4
36:14,19 37:6	32:15 33:23 35:11 38:2	prior 6:2 9:3 14:19	Public 1:1 2:21,23 3:7 11:6 34:23
38:17,23 39:8 42:10,12	<pre>points 5:22 7:5</pre>	probably 10:20 11:10	pulled 6:20
42:10,13 pegged 23:17	porting 6:8	12:15 20:14 24:12 26:1	purely 12:21
people 14:11	position	27:1 33:9,16	purposes 17:5
26:23 35:24	12:14 36:17	problem 14:21 16:2 20:19	putting 15:10 18:11
percent 8:15,16	positions 30:25	procedural	0
Perfect 15:12	possibility	17:21 32:6,15 39:5	question 6:5
perhaps 11:23 16:15 37:17	12:7 13:9 22:12 26:12,16	procedure 5:4 11:18,23	26:5 34:5 35:22 36:12
period 17:6	31:11,19 37:15	15:17 [´] 31:14 32:12,19	38:5
periods 18:18 19:14	Post-M2A 22:5	proceed 14:6	questions 26:15,23,24 31:6,8
permit 40:10	<pre>predict 35:13</pre>	proceeding	quickly 17:23
<pre>personnel 24:17</pre>	prefile 13:10,14	31:4 PROCEEDINGS	R
persons 4:24	15:15,18,24 16:6 30:24	1:4 process 25:23	raise 6:7
perspective	31:2 34:6	P. 11000 - 1100	36:22 38:17

	ARBITRATION MEE	11NG 09-09-2010	
raised 6:6 38:2	16:22,24 17:1 18:25	resurrect 10:14	sense 24:22 37:18
raising 6:10	19:5,8,13,15 20:25 23:19	ROBERT 2:2	sensible
rather 18:23	24:25 25:11	Rochester	14:23
real 20:9	REPORTED 1:23	2:17 4:11	September 1:6
really 7:17	reporter 3:14	room 2:2 3:18	19:19,21
25:2	42:1	14:1 23:14	20:16 27:10
realm 22:12	REPORTING	36:25	service 1:1
reason 36:4	1:24	Rosenthal 2:11 4:4	2:21,23 3:8 8:4 11:6
rebuttal	reports 24:5	rough 18:7	34:23
16:7,11	request 12:22	_	services 1:13
recall 22:3	20:21	roughly 19:16,25	2:8,13,18
received 9:10	requests 13:1	routine 8:24	4:1,9 11:7
10:5	14:1,15	rule 20:24	seven 19:11
reclaim 7:22	require 30:10		several 23:23
8:20	required	rules 6:25 19:13	Shook 25:3,6
recollection	14:12	19.19	short 14:10
22:10	requiring	<u> </u>	24:18
record 3:2,9	20:24	satisfactory	shorter 13:3
10:17 34:14,19,20	reserve 12:16 13:4	32:14	shrinking
39:24 41:2	-	saw 20:11	25:13
reduced 42:7	resolution 21:20	scenario	Silva 1:23
refer 12:23	resolve	35:14	42:2,18
reflections	11:5,14	schedule 7:5	similar 16:9 19:23
22:1	20:21	$\begin{array}{c} 11:23 \ 17:21 \\ 28\cdot2 \ 8 \ 17 \end{array}$	29:5,10
regulation	resolving	28:2,8,17 32:6 39:21	32:19
5:8 11:19	31:11	scheduled	simply 30:1 31:22 34:7
15:16 18:12 24:10 25:10	resources	20:15	31:22 34:7
31:24	36:7	schedules	sir 14:16
regulations	respect 24:16	35:23	26:9
12:25 18:19	respond 6:9	scheduling	situation 24:3
regulatory	Respondent	16:16 17:5 25:23	-
1:19 2:8 3:7	4:13 5:17 12:9 15:23	School 28:12	six 7:7 9:7,15 24:7
11:8	16:9		skeptical
related 42:9	Respondent's	scope 11:20	32:1
relative	5:15	sealic 8:14	solely 33:10
42:12	responding	seasoned 5:9	somebody 10:6
relatively 30:10	13:6	second 8:8	13:8
	response 6:5	seconds 30:17	someone's
relied 33:2	13:12 14:12 35:3	seeing 6:18	33:19
remain 5:3,13		seem 17:4	<pre>somewhat 13:1</pre>
remainder 35:19	responses 13:22 14:10	22:9	32:19
	responsive	seen 15:5	somewhere
remember 22:9	5:16 10:21	20:5	24:6
remind 11:6,13	resubmit 9:18	send 28:17	Sonnenschein 2:11 4:4
	results 29:11	sending 28:7	
report		senior 4:8	sorry 6:8

	ARBITRATION MEE	11NG 09-09-2010	
30:16 36:11	37:16,17	27:8 28:18	26:10,18
sort 5:4	stipulations 31:19	32:10	28:13,23,24 30:22 32:3,5
17:11 18:19 28:17 30:9	straight	talked 16:17 27:15	33:17
35:12	39:16	talking 7:25	34:2,4,22,25 35:8 36:16
sounds 17:17,18,22	strand 8:11	tardy 15:8	37:24
18:6 34:10	strangely	target 27:4	38:1,10,14 39:5,7,21
Southwestern	27:24 Street 2:6,11	task 6:22	40:18
1:11 2:4 3:16	3:22 4:5	teach 28:11	thereafter 42:7
speak 20:4	strikes	Ted 2:16 4:8 9:9,24 39:2	there's
22:4	15:7,8	40:2,9	10:12,14 23:14 24:11
speaking 19:25 25:21	subject 8:8 11:20 21:9	telecommunica tions 11:12	26:2 27:2
specific 6:25	29:16	Telemanagemen	31:18 32:19 36:3 38:4
<pre>specifically 11:19 15:17</pre>	submission 37:16	t 1:14	thereto 42:13
	submit 13:19	2:13,18 4:1	Thompson's
spelled 4:3	17:21 20:14	Telemanagment 4:10	22:7
spoke 9:6 25:24 27:16	31:20 35:18 submitted	telephone	throw 31:12
st 2:3 3:18	9:16 13:21	1:11 2:2,4,6,10,1	TIGER 1:24
staff 2:23	32:22	6 3:16 40:12	Tim 2:6 3:20 38:18 40:14
4:17,23 21:4,22	substantial	telescoping	today 3:10
24:24 25:1	sufficient	18:18 ten 18:25	4:18,25 5:2 27:2 28:25
32:19 36:6,24	17:15	19:8,12,14	35:10 39:13
stand 37:23	suggest 10:11 22:13	testify 30:24	today's 36:2
start 3:12	Suite 2:11	testimony 13:10,14	topic 13:9
5:12 11:24 15:19 25:9	4:5	15:16,18	total 8:22
39:17	summary 31:25 32:11	16:6 20:14 29:14	traditional 36:17
starts 16:4	support 33:3	30:5,15 31:2	TRANSCRIPT
state 1:2 9:3 22:14 42:3	supposed	32:23,24 33:3 34:7	1:4
stated 5:21	17:14	39:20 42:4,6	travel 27:21
statement	sure 7:12 12:13 18:9	thank 4:12 6:11 7:2	tried 29:5
5:14 10:22	22:2 25:17	12:11 15:12	trying 23:21 29:10
states 6:3 23:1	27:19 40:3,11	40:25 41:4,5,6	Tuesdays
stating 15:10	surrebuttal	that's 6:20	28:13 types 6:17
statutes 23:1	16:7,12	8:16,20 9:7 10:25	typewriting
statutory 21:15	sworn 42:5	14:14,22,24	42:8
stay 25:18	T	15:2,9,16 17:1	
stipulated	table 6:20	18:1,11,15	 Uh-huh
30:14	33:23 taking 33:19	20:25 23:3,8,9	8:12,17
31:2,19,21 32:2,23,24	talk 5:3	24:12,14	12:20 14:2 19:3,6,9,20
, , ,	11:17 15:15	25:12,16,20	23:11,25

	ARBITRATION MEE	TING 09-09-2010	
27:3 28:20 32:17,21 33:1,6,14 35:17,20 36:5	35:21 36:3 waived 31:3 waiver 26:16 wasn't 29:6	17:2,6,16,18 24:13,25 28:14 32:6 workable 24:23	
ultimately 39:11	watched 15:3	worked 17:10	
35:17,20 36:5 ultimately	wasn't 29:6	workable 24:23	
30:1 33:12 34:8 35:16	witness 29:17 42:4,6		
Voight 2:20 4:20,21 22:4 25:3,6	witnesses 20:11 26:1 37:3		
Volume 1:8	wonder 16:14 23:14 25:23		
<u>waive</u> 34:2	work 8:9 16:17		