

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

ILLINOIS BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY) DOCKET NO.
) 02-0864
Filing to increase Unbundled) PREHEARING
Loop and Nonrecurring Rates.)
(Tariffs filed December 24, 2002))

Springfield, Illinois
January 23, 2003

Met, pursuant to notice, at 1:00 P.M.

BEFORE:

MR. DONALD L. WOODS, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

MS. LOUISE A. SUNDERLAND
MR. KARL B. ANDERSON
225 West Randolph
Floor 25D
Chicago, Illinois 60606

(Appearing on behalf of Illinois Bell
Telephone Company via teleconference)

MR. BILL COBB
100 Congress Avenue
Suite 2000
Austin, Texas 78701

(Appearing on behalf of Covad
Communications via teleconference)

SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
Cheryl A. Davis, Reporter, CSR License #084-001662

1 APPEARANCES:

(Cont'd)

2 MR. CARMEN L. FOSCO
 MS. MARY STEPHENSON
 3 MR. MICHAEL LANNON
 160 North La Salle Street
 4 Suite C-800
 Chicago, Illinois 60601

5 (Appearing on behalf of the Staff of the
 6 Illinois Commerce Commission via
 teleconference)

7 MR. MATTHEW L. HARVEY
 8 160 North La Salle Street
 Suite C-800
 9 Chicago, Illinois 60601

10 (Appearing on behalf of the Staff of the
 Illinois Commerce Commission)

11 MS. CHERYL HAMILL
 12 222 West Adams
 Suite 1500
 13 Chicago, Illinois 60606

14 (Appearing on behalf of AT&T
 Communications of Illinois, Inc.)

15 MR. HENRY KELLY
 16 O'Keefe, Ashenden, Lyons & Ward
 30 North La Salle
 17 Suite 4100
 Chicago, Illinois 60602

18 (Appearing on behalf of Covad
 19 Communications)

20
 21
 22

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

2 MR. OWEN MACBRIDE
3 Schiff, Hardin & Waite
4 6600 Sears Tower
5 Chicago, Illinois 60606

6 (Appearing on behalf of the Allegiance
7 Telecom of Illinois, Inc., McLeodUSA
8 Telecommunications Services, Inc.,
9 Nu Vox Communications of Illinois,
10 Inc., RCN Telecom Services of Illinois,
11 Inc., and TDS Metrocom, L.L.C. via
12 teleconference)

13 MR. THOMAS H. ROWLAND
14 Rowland & Moore
15 77 West Wacker Drive
16 Suite 4600
17 Chicago, Illinois 60601

18 (Appearing on behalf of Cimco
19 Communications, XO Communications of
20 Illinois, and Forte Communications via
21 teleconference)

22 MS. SUSAN L. SATTER
MR. RANDY CLARKE
100 West Randolph
Chicago, Illinois 60601

(Appearing on behalf of the People
of the State of Illinois via
teleconference)

MR. DARRELL TOWNSLEY
205 North Michigan Avenue
11th Floor, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Email: darrell.townsley@wcom.com

(Appearing on behalf of WorldCom,
Incorporated)

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

2 MR. MICHAEL W. WARD
3 1608 Barclay Boulevard
4 Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089

5 (Appearing on behalf of the Illinois
6 Public Telecommunications Association,
7 Data Net Systems, L.L.C., and TruComm
8 Corporation)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

WITNESSES

DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS

(None)

EXHIBITS

MARKED

ADMITTED

(None)

PROCEEDINGS

1
2 JUDGE WOODS: At this time we'll call for
3 hearing Docket 02-0864, Illinois Bell Telephone
4 Company. This is a filing to increase unbundled
5 loop and nonrecurring rates.

6 This cause comes on for hearing January 23,
7 2003, before Donald L. Woods, an Administrative Law
8 Judge appointed by the Illinois Commerce Commission
9 under the authority of the Public Utilities Act.
10 The cause was set today for a status hearing to
11 discuss scheduling and other matters.

12 I'll begin by taking the appearance of the
13 parties, please, beginning with SBC.

14 MS. SUNDERLAND: On behalf of Illinois Bell
15 Telephone Company, Louise A. Sunderland and Karl
16 Anderson, 225 West Randolph Street, Chicago,
17 Illinois 60606.

18 JUDGE WOODS: And I thought I may have heard
19 somebody else ring in on the telephone. Do we have
20 other parties appearing by telephone today?

21 MR. COBB: Yes. Bill Cobb on behalf of Covad
22 Communications, 100 Congress Avenue, Suite 2000,

1 Austin, Texas 78701.

2 JUDGE WOODS: Anyone else on the telephone?
3 Okay. We'll take the appearances of the parties in
4 Springfield.

5 MR. KELLY: I'll start off.

6 MS. SUNDERLAND: Wait. There are more parties
7 up here in Chicago.

8 JUDGE WOODS: Oh, okay.

9 MR. ROWLAND: On behalf of Cimco
10 Communications, XO Communications of Illinois, Forte
11 Communications, Thomas Rowland of the law firm of
12 Rowland & Moore, 77 West Wacker, Suite 4600,
13 Chicago, Illinois 60603.

14 MS. SATTER: Susan L. Satter and Randolph
15 Clarke, appearing on behalf of the People of the
16 State of Illinois, 100 West Randolph Street,
17 Chicago, Illinois 60601.

18 MR. FOSCO: We have some of the Staff attorneys
19 in Chicago, so appearing on behalf of Staff of the
20 Illinois Commerce Commission, Carmen Fosco, Mary
21 Stephenson, and Michael Lannon, and in Springfield
22 we would have Matt Harvey, 160 North La Salle

1 Street, Suite C-800, Chicago, 60601.

2 MR. MACBRIDE: Owen MacBride, 6600 Sears Tower,
3 Chicago, Illinois 60606. I'm appearing on behalf of
4 Allegiance Telecom of Illinois, Inc., McLeodUSA
5 Telecommunications Services, Inc., Nu Vox
6 Communications of Illinois, Inc., RCN Telecom
7 Services of Illinois, Inc., and TDS Metrocom, LLC.

8 JUDGE WOODS: Anyone else? Okay. Well take
9 the appearances in Springfield.

10 MR. KELLY: I'll go ahead and start. Henry
11 Kelly with O'Keefe, Ashenden, Lyons & Ward, 30 North
12 La Salle Street, Suite 4100, Chicago, Illinois
13 60602, appearing on behalf of Covad.

14 MR. TOWNSLEY: Appearing on behalf of WorldCom,
15 Incorporated, Darrell Townsley, 205 North Michigan
16 Avenue, Suite 1100, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

17 MS. HAMILL: Appearing on behalf of AT&T
18 Communications of Illinois, Inc., Cheryl Hamill, 222
19 West Adams, Suite 1500, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

20 MR. HARVEY: As previously noted, for the
21 Staff, Matthew L. Harvey.

22 MR. WARD: For the Illinois Public

1 Telecommunications Association, Data Net Systems,
2 L.L.C., and TruComm Corporation, Michael Ward, 1608
3 Barclay Boulevard, Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089.

4 JUDGE WOODS: Any additional appearances? Let
5 the record reflect -- is there someone else on the
6 phone? No? -- no response.

7 As previously indicated, this matter was
8 conferred for a status hearing to discuss
9 scheduling. I have been previously presented two
10 e-mails, one from Ms. Sunderland on behalf of SBC,
11 one from Mr. MacBride on behalf of what I would term
12 the CLEC partners as well as Staff. The e-mails
13 both contain proposed schedules. The schedules are
14 quite different. I've indicated to the parties
15 before beginning today that I will take this matter
16 under review and intend to impose a schedule on the
17 parties. That schedule should be out and served
18 from the office of the Chief Clerk by tomorrow,
19 Friday, January 24th.

20 In addition, in those discussions Mr. Harvey on
21 behalf of Staff indicated that it may be advisable
22 for the parties to hold a workshop between the

1 filing of Staff and Intervenor direct testimony and
2 the next filing date. I would like to encourage
3 that process in the event the parties believe it
4 would bear fruit, but as I indicated to Mr. Harvey,
5 the general policy is for the examiners to stay out
6 of the workshop process.

7 I would endeavor to have enough time between
8 the filing date for direct testimony by Staff and
9 Intervenors and the next filing date to allow a
10 workshop to be held in case that's what the parties
11 want to do.

12 We also discussed the necessity of holding an
13 additional status hearing prior to the commencement
14 of the evidentiary hearings in this matter. The
15 general consensus was that no such status hearing
16 would be necessary. However, in the event there
17 were discovery problems or other problems that the
18 parties found that they couldn't work out on their
19 own, that any party to this docket would be free to
20 motion up a hearing in the event that that was
21 necessary.

22 The only other matter that I would intend to

1 address today is that there are a number of
2 petitions to intervene. Has any party that's
3 attending the hearing today not previously filed a
4 petition to intervene? Has everyone filed?

5 MR. WARD: I've not yet on behalf of my three
6 clients. I would ask orally to request leave to
7 intervene, and I will have that filed with the
8 Clerk's Office early next week when I get back to
9 Chicago.

10 JUDGE WOODS: Any objection to Mr. Ward's
11 clients being allowed to intervene?

12 MS. HAMILL: None.

13 JUDGE WOODS: Okay. Hearing no objection, at
14 this time all pending petitions to intervene are
15 granted. Mr. Ward's oral motion for intervention is
16 granted, and I would ask that he does follow up with
17 a letter to the Chief Clerk so he can be added to
18 the service list.

19 MR. WARD: Thank you.

20 JUDGE WOODS: Anyone else want to raise any
21 matter at this time?

22 MR. WARD: I have one additional matter. I

1 have not seen the schedules that were circulated
2 except for one. I don't know which one it was I
3 saw.

4 MR. KELLY: That's the Louise one.

5 MR. WARD: Which one?

6 MR. KELLY: That's Louise's. That's
7 Ameritech's.

8 MR. ROWLAND: Mike, I think you saw the one
9 from the other day, so that was probably from
10 Cheryl.

11 MR. WARD: That was from Cheryl?

12 MR. ROWLAND: Yeah.

13 MR. WARD: All right. The one I saw I had one
14 requested amended date, and I don't know which one
15 has been submitted to the ALJ.

16 MS. HAMILL: Owen, I'm assuming that the
17 schedule that you sent to Judge Woods is the same
18 one that we had circulated earlier?

19 MR. MACBRIDE: Yeah. I forwarded it to Judge
20 Woods, your e-mail, and to Louise that had our
21 proposed schedule.

22 MS. HAMILL: Okay.

1 But nonetheless, to the extent the Judge
2 considers that schedule, I request that the initial
3 brief date be moved back from Tuesday the 12th to
4 Tuesday [sic] the 15th so I have at least five days
5 to write a brief.

6 MR. HARVEY: Well, again, the Staff -- as long
7 as there's a tradition, I think we should hold to
8 it, denying Mr. Ward the relief he seeks.

9 JUDGE WOODS: Since neither of these schedules
10 are going to be the one that's adopted, it's a
11 little premature to discuss vacations.

12 MR. MACBRIDE: Judge, this is Owen MacBride.
13 Are you intending to allow the parties to speak to
14 their schedules here?

15 JUDGE WOODS: No. Since I'm going to be
16 imposing the schedule in the first place, I don't
17 see any fruit in discussing individual schedules.
18 You're just going to have to live with what you get.

19 MR. FOSCO: Well, Your Honor, can I --

20 MR. MACBRIDE: No. What I meant is --

21 JUDGE WOODS: No, no.

22 MR. MACBRIDE: No. I meant can we -- for

1 example, on behalf of the CLECs can we explain why
2 we proposed the schedule we proposed?

3 JUDGE WOODS: I'm sure it's because you believe
4 it's reasonable, you know. I don't know what you
5 want to say other than you think it's reasonable.
6 SBC thinks its schedule is reasonable. I'm going to
7 have to impose a schedule. There's no point in
8 belaboring the transcript with why people think that
9 their schedules are reasonable. It's just that
10 simple, so.

11 MR. MACBRIDE: All right. Well, I mean can we
12 be allowed to make a record?

13 JUDGE WOODS: If you wish.

14 MR. MACBRIDE: Thank you. Mr. Fosco would like
15 to say something first.

16 MR. FOSCO: Well, Your Honor, I was just going
17 to say that I think that there's a -- I mean Staff
18 did talk to the CLECs, and while we were agreeable
19 to that schedule, that was not the only eleven-month
20 schedule that we were agreeable to, and there seemed
21 to be a fundamental difference between the schedule
22 proposed by Ameritech and the schedule that Staff,

1 the CLECs, and Intervenors were contemplating.

2 You've indicated that you want to consider
3 these two schedules and then come up with a
4 schedule. I would suggest to you that if you made
5 some ruling on the general length of time within
6 which you would like to see this proceeding
7 completed, the parties could probably work on a
8 schedule within those guidelines because I know that
9 counsel for Ameritech had expressed some concerns
10 about the CLECs' schedule that Staff thought they
11 might be able to accommodate some of those, and I
12 would assume the CLECs feel the same way.

13 I just feel that we're going to get a schedule
14 in this fashion that -- I mean not only won't maybe
15 no one be happy with in terms of the overall length,
16 but I think that's immaterial, but in terms of the
17 details, I do think we could probably work something
18 out once we know the parameters we're working with.

19 JUDGE WOODS: Prior to this docket being
20 noticed up for hearing, I did send an e-mail to
21 Mr. MacBride who was attempting to prepare a
22 schedule in which I told him that I fully intended

1 to have this matter to the Commission by October 24,
2 2003.

3 MR. FOSCO: Okay. And that's what we -- the
4 schedule that we worked out with the CLECs did that.

5 MR. MACBRIDE: Yes. The Staff and CLECs'
6 schedule, Your Honor, took, you know, that into
7 account and provides for the post-exceptions
8 proposed order to be provided on October 24th and
9 consistent with the other -- the time frames you had
10 advised me as to the time frames you needed to
11 prepare the HEPO and the PEPO.

12 JUDGE WOODS: Right, and with the August 6th
13 reply briefs on exceptions date in the SBC proposed
14 schedule, it also gets the matter to the Commission
15 before October 24, 2003, so. You both think your
16 schedule is reasonable. I haven't heard anything
17 yet that's going to sway me one way or the other.
18 I'm going to have to look at it and see what I think
19 is fair.

20 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, in speaking in behalf
21 of the CLECs' schedule, the only thing I would point
22 out is that the CLECs, and I assume Staff as well,

1 are going to need some time in order to develop some
2 responsive testimony to respond to the new cost
3 study methodologies and models that Ameritech or SBC
4 have put forth. They've identified a direct
5 testimony deadline for the Intervenors of February
6 28th. In all honesty, that just does not give us
7 enough time to prepare our analysis of the very
8 extensive cost studies that Ameritech and SBC have
9 provided. We know that they've had a lot of time to
10 develop those cost studies. We know that they've
11 worked with Staff and educated Staff on some of the
12 methodologies before they filed those testimonies,
13 and I just point out that the CLECs have not had
14 that opportunity to do so.

15 MR. HARVEY: Well, and if I might expand
16 somewhat on that, on Mr. Kelly's point, the Staff
17 has had some opportunity to review the responsive
18 filing. We have been pretty diligent about that.
19 We've promulgated discovery at this point, and all
20 of this is leading us to the conclusion that we
21 would have a very difficult time responding to the
22 Company's filing any earlier than late April or

1 early May. We feel that this is -- we -- based on
2 the company has filed testimony of 13 witnesses.
3 They're using new cost models. They were developing
4 these as early as 2001 I believe. They were doing
5 preliminary runs as early as June 17th of 2002, and
6 all this leads to the conclusion that they've had
7 ample time to prepare their case and that their case
8 is a very detailed one.

9 I would add one other point and that is that
10 this cost model as far as we can tell does have one
11 real advantage that we've identified and that is the
12 fact that they're pretty transparent and user
13 friendly, so we are in a position here, if we get
14 sufficient time to do it, to do something that I
15 think the Commission will greatly appreciate and
16 that's for everybody to use the model to develop
17 their own set of rates, and I think that's something
18 that has been a real issue and concern of the
19 Commission's. It's been a real problem in these
20 rate cases, and we here today can set a schedule
21 that will allow us to give the Commission not only a
22 -- well, we'll be in a position to not only tell the

1 Commission, yeah, here's what's bad and good about
2 this model, but, you know, we can't do anything
3 about it, but we'll be able to generate some rates
4 based on our assessment of the model, and we think
5 it's really worth the Commission -- it's worth the
6 extra time to get that kind of a record in place for
7 a decision in this case.

8 MS. HAMILL: Your Honor, if I may, not to
9 belabor the record, I just wanted to point out from
10 a historical perspective that the TELRIC case -- at
11 least in my tenure in Illinois we have not completed
12 a cost case yet within eleven months, much less
13 fewer than eleven months. I did some calculations.
14 The TELRIC case, 96-0486, took 17 months. 98-0396
15 took three years, but keep in mind was abated
16 temporarily during the merger proceeding, and the
17 00-0700 case which dealt with switching and
18 transport, as Your Honor is well aware, took 20
19 months.

20 When you come up with your schedule, I would
21 appreciate it if you would take into consideration
22 the fact that there are 145 rate elements here, a

1 new loop model, a revisitation of economic lives,
2 cost of capital, fill factors, nonrecurring charges,
3 which, Your Honor, because SBC has not in the past
4 several years submitted cost studies for
5 nonrecurring charges, we'll need to address not just
6 the rate level of what NRCs ought to be, but what
7 rate elements ought apply at all, which always adds
8 a level of complication and then a little bit labor
9 intensive. We also have a brand-new shared and
10 common cost model here as well as annual cost
11 factors.

12 Also, the February 28th date that SBC proposes,
13 we would request that Your Honor impose anywhere
14 from a seven to ten business day discovery
15 turnaround time. We would like to have time before
16 our testimony is due to do at least a couple rounds
17 of discovery just because some of the stuff is new
18 to Illinois and new to many of the witnesses that we
19 will be using in this docket.

20 So I guess my major point is we haven't done a
21 case in eleven months. I think that if we have
22 eleven months, I don't see the downside to taking

1 the time that we have and putting it to the best use
2 and getting it right.

3 MR. WARD: As long as we're making the record
4 addressing the matter, most weighting upon Your
5 Honor's mind, my vacation is -- (laughter) -- one
6 year in advance. It was done last August. It is
7 from August 1st to August 11th, since that
8 information is not otherwise before you, and I am a
9 sole practitioner, and I'd appreciate that be taken
10 into consideration so I could participate in this
11 proceeding.

12 JUDGE WOODS: So we want hearing between the
13 1st and the 11th.

14 (Laughter)

15 MR. WARD: And I see the rulings have never
16 changed, have they?

17 MR. MACBRIDE: Judge, this is Owen MacBride
18 again. On behalf of my five clients, I'd like to
19 make three points.

20 One, we agree with Staff that this is -- and
21 Ms. Hamill that this is a complex case that is going
22 to require the full statutory time period. I've

1 done fifteen rate cases before this Commission,
2 electric, gas, and telephone on behalf of
3 incumbents, and this is as complex as any that I've
4 been involved in, and the only case of those fifteen
5 that I've been involved in that we got done in less
6 than the statutory time period was a rate decrease
7 case, and that still took six months.

8 But to the schedule specifically that we
9 propose, a number of my clients and some of the
10 other CLECs are jointly retaining one expert
11 consulting firm to present testimony, and, in fact,
12 the day after this case was filed I was in contact
13 with Ameritech to try and get the underlying cost
14 studies and negotiate proprietary information,
15 proprietary agreements and so forth, and we were
16 able to get the underlying proprietary materials and
17 get them to our consultant within about two weeks
18 after the case was filed, but in developing our
19 proposed schedule pursuant to your direction, we did
20 talk to our consultant as well as to individual
21 witnesses that the various CLECs anticipate using,
22 you know, and did confirm that May 1 was about the

1 earliest date that they thought they'd be able to
2 get through all the material and put together a
3 thorough direct case.

4 Now, we sent our proposed schedule to SBC on
5 Tuesday morning, and we didn't get a counterproposal
6 till this morning about 10 o'clock, so I've
7 attempted to contact our joint consultant but wasn't
8 able to to see if he had any, you know, play in that
9 approximate May 1 date for direct testimony.

10 My third comment is that if you do feel that
11 you want to shorten the schedule so that -- from
12 what we've proposed so that it in effect does use
13 the entire eleven-month time period, just speaking
14 for my five clients, not the other CLECs, you know,
15 I would prefer that time be taken out of the various
16 briefing periods. I mean that's -- writing the
17 briefs is up to the lawyers. My consultant and my
18 witnesses need the time that we proposed here to be
19 able to prepare direct testimony and then analyze
20 other parties' rebuttal and prepare a rebuttal
21 product. So while we think, you know, our schedule
22 is appropriate, if you look to shorten it, I

1 personally would prefer that you take time out of
2 the briefing periods as opposed to out of the
3 testimony filing dates that we proposed.

4 MR. HARVEY: With the utmost regret, I have to
5 concur with Mr. MacBride on that latter point. My
6 clients need the time. I can just ruin my life for
7 a couple weeks in the summer.

8 JUDGE WOODS: Good.

9 MS. SUNDERLAND: This is Louise Sunderland.
10 Seeing as how the parties seem to be not taking the
11 Examiner's -- the Administrative Law Judge's
12 direction on this and seem to be creating a record,
13 I guess I need to respond to what's been said here.

14 MR. TOWNSLEY: Do you want me to throw my
15 weight behind what everybody else has said first,
16 Louise?

17 MS. SUNDERLAND: No, I just assumed that.

18 MR. TOWNSLEY: Okay. Go right ahead.

19 MS. SUNDERLAND: As I indicated in the e-mail,
20 this case is a much, much narrower case than the
21 standard UNE docket. Ms. Hamill referenced the 17
22 months that it took to do the original UNE docket.

1 I haven't checked her dates, but I assume she's
2 accurate. That was the very first time in Illinois
3 that we had ever done a UNE proceeding. Virtually
4 every UNE that the company offered was at issue in
5 that proceeding, and we were basically starting from
6 scratch there.

7 This case is an entirely different proposition.
8 We have stripped it down to loops and a relative
9 handful of nonrecurring charges. The issues are not
10 new to people. The TELRIC process is not new the
11 people. This is not a case of the magnitude that
12 requires a full eleven-month process.

13 With respect to the multi-state CLECs like AT&T
14 and MCI, the studies are based on models that are
15 used throughout the SBC region. They are involved
16 in UNE dockets in Texas and in California that use
17 the same models. It's our view that this can be
18 done, it should be done in considerably less than
19 the full eleven-month schedule.

20 And with respect to the suggestion that we take
21 all the time up front and then compress the back end
22 of the schedule, in my view, that risks the

1 situation where if you take too much time out of the
2 briefing cycle, the briefs themselves, which I think
3 the Administrative Law Judge relies on to present
4 all of the contested issues in a concise and orderly
5 fashion, the quality of those briefs become
6 compromised. It's definitely our position that we
7 can and should get this docket started earlier than
8 May 1 and then make sure that the time intervals in
9 the rest of the docket permit the parties to do a
10 quality job.

11 JUDGE WOODS: Anybody else?

12 MS. SATTER: This is Susan Satter. I just
13 wanted to say in response to the comments that some
14 parties might have seen this data in other states.
15 My office certainly has not, and so I would ask that
16 that not really be a consideration just for those
17 parties who are just doing Illinois, and the
18 February 28th date would be way too short for my
19 office.

20 MR. TOWNSLEY: And just to follow on to that,
21 I'm not quite sure, Louise, that your representation
22 of what has happened in California and Texas is

1 quite accurate. It is my understanding that in
2 California we have the interim rates that were set
3 there based actually on things that occurred in this
4 state in Docket 00-0700 and that there is an ongoing
5 case there that has yet to be completed. So to the
6 extent that we're involved there, that may be true,
7 but I may be using different experts here, and I
8 certainly have my own learning curve that I have to
9 deal with, and so just because we're involved in
10 other states, you know, doesn't carry a lot of
11 weight with me.

12 It's also my understanding that Texas is still
13 the case that it's underway and is far from being
14 completed, so to the extent that you say things have
15 been tossed out there that we should understand, I
16 take issue with that.

17 MS. SUNDERLAND: I did not intend to imply that
18 either the Texas or California dockets are
19 completed. My only point was that your client is
20 quite familiar with the models and the approach
21 we're using here because it's fundamentally the same
22 as what's being used in Texas and California.

1 MR. HARVEY: Speaking for the Staff, my client
2 is not, to my knowledge, involved in other states,
3 so.

4 JUDGE WOODS: Okay. As far as discovery goes,
5 I would decline at this time to impose any strict
6 discovery deadlines. I would certainly encourage
7 that discovery responses be filed quickly. My
8 understanding in these cases is that there's
9 discovery and then there's discovery, and some
10 require more time than others. If there are
11 problems, they can be brought to the attention of
12 the Examiner, and I'll deal with those issues as
13 they come up.

14 I haven't heard anything that would allow me at
15 this time to simply pull the schedule out of thin
16 air. It's going to take some thinking, and, again,
17 as I noted previously, the ruling on the schedule
18 should be available and served by the office of the
19 Chief Clerk tomorrow. To that end, for today only
20 we'll place this on general continuance with the
21 schedule to be forthcoming tomorrow.

22 A final matter, I think a lot of the parties in

1 Chicago are representing numerous companies. To
2 that end, I'd ask that everyone up there please fill
3 out an appearance sheet and have Mr. Fosco on behalf
4 of Staff send that down interoffice so we can make
5 sure we get all the appropriate appearances.

6 MR. HARVEY: If I might suggest one thing, too,
7 Judge.

8 JUDGE WOODS: You may.

9 MR. HARVEY: Just before we close. Mr. Fosco
10 has very industriously put together a side-by-side
11 comparison of the competing schedules, and if that
12 would be of any assistance to you in making your
13 decision, I can forward it to you and circulate it
14 to the parties as well, if that's something that
15 makes your life easier.

16 JUDGE WOODS: As long as it can be done today
17 so I can start looking at it.

18 (Whereupon said document was handed
19 to Judge Woods by Mr. Harvey.)

20 MR. HARVEY: I'll send that around to the
21 parties.

22 JUDGE WOODS: Okay. This matter is continued

1 generally pending the issuance of a schedule.

2 (Whereupon the case was continued

3 generally.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22