

Anthony E. Gay
Regulatory Counsel
Law Department



ORIGINAL

Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
1717 Arch Street, 32NW
Philadelphia, PA 19103

May 15, 2002

Tel: (215) 963-6023
Fax: (215) 563-2658
Anthony.E.Gay@verizon.com

Via Overnight Express Mail
James J. McNulty, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2002

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Re: Petition of US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc. for
Arbitration with Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. Pursuant to
Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996
Docket No. A-310814F7000

Dear Secretary McNulty:

Enclosed, for filing with the Commission, is an original and three copies of Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.'s Prehearing Conference Memorandum in the above-captioned matter.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

Anthony E. Gay
Anthony E. Gay

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

AEG/slb
Enc.

Via Hand Delivery
cc: Honorable Louis G. Cocheres

Via Overnight Express Mail
cc: Attached Certificate of Service

71

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Anthony E. Gay, Esq., hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.'s Prehearing Conference Memorandum, upon the participants listed below in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code Section 1.54 (related to service by a participant) and 1.55 (related to service upon attorneys).

Dated at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, this 15th day of May, 2002.

VIA UPS OVERNIGHT DELIVERY


RECEIVED
MAY 15 2002
PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Linda C. Smith, Esquire
Dilworth Paxson LLP
305 North Front Street
Suite 403
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1236

Charles F. Hoffman, Esquire
PA Public Utility Commission
Office of Trial Staff
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Irwin A. Popowsky, Esquire
Office of Consumer Advocate
Forum Place, 5th Floor
555 Walnut Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Carol F. Pennington, Esquire
Office of Small Business Advocate
Commerce Building, Suite 1102
300 North Second Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101



Anthony E. Gay, Esquire
VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA INC.
1717 Arch Street, 32NW
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 963-6023

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Petition of US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc. for
Arbitration with Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the
Telecommunications Act of 1996

)
)
)
)
)
)

Docket No.
A-310814F7800

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2002

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

VERIZON'S PREHEARING CONFERENCE MEMORANDUM

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.222 and Administrative Law Judge Louis G.

Cocheres's May 10, 2002 Prehearing Conference Order, Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.

("Verizon") submits this Prehearing Conference Memorandum.

I. Background Of The Proceeding

On April 26, 2002, US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc. ("US LEC") filed its Petition for Arbitration to establish a new Interconnection Agreement with Verizon. The parties have been negotiating the issues presented in this arbitration for several months in connection with proceedings underway in several jurisdictions. In the course of those negotiations, the parties have resolved two of the eleven issues that US LEC originally presented to the Commission for arbitration, numbers 7 and 10. Many of the remaining issues involve demands by US LEC that go beyond the requirements of section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("the Act").

MAY 16 2002

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

II. Identification Of The Issues To Be Resolved

As of the date of this Prehearing Conference Memorandum the following issues remain unresolved:

ISSUE NO.	SUMMARY OF ISSUE
1A	<p>Is US LEC permitted to select a single Interconnection Point (“IP”) per Local Access and Transport Area (“LATA”) and to select the interconnection method?</p> <p>US LEC’s Position: Yes.</p> <p>Verizon’s Position: US LEC is entitled to select a single physical point of interconnection (“POI”) in each LATA and to select a technically feasible method of interconnection.</p>
1B	<p>Which party should bear the financial responsibility of delivering Verizon’s originating traffic to the US LEC-IP?</p> <p>US LEC’s Position: Verizon should bear the financial responsibility of delivering its originating traffic to the US LEC-IP.</p> <p>Verizon’s Position: US LEC must bear its fair share of the costs of the interconnection architecture it chooses.</p>
2	<p>Should Verizon be permitted to force US LEC to designate its collocation site at a Verizon end office as the US LEC-IP where Verizon will deliver its traffic?</p> <p>US LEC’s Position: No. Under the Act, US LEC has the right to determine where the IP(s) will be established, and as stated in Issue 1, US LEC’s switch serves as US LEC’s IP in the same manner as Verizon’s switches serve as Verizon’s IPs.</p> <p>Verizon’s Position: US LEC would not be forced to designate a collocation site at a Verizon end office as an IP. However, if US LEC, which is not currently collocated in any Verizon end office, chooses to establish such a collocation arrangement but not to designate the collocation site as an IP, it should nonetheless become financially responsible for traffic at that point, through the establishment of a virtual IP at that end office.</p>
3	<p>Is US LEC entitled to reciprocal compensation for terminating “Voice Information Services” traffic?</p> <p>US LEC’s Position: Yes.</p> <p>Verizon’s Position: No.</p>

ISSUE NO.	SUMMARY OF ISSUE
4	<p>Should US LEC be required to provide dedicated trunking at its own expense for Voice Information Service traffic that originates on its network for delivery to Voice Information Service providers served by Verizon?</p> <p>US LEC's Position: No.</p> <p>Verizon's Position: Yes.</p>
5	<p>Should the term "terminating party" or the term "receiving party" be employed for purposes of traffic measurement and billing over interconnection trunks?</p> <p>US LEC's Position: The term "terminating party" should be utilized.</p> <p>Verizon's Position: The term "receiving party" is more accurate and should be used.</p>
6A	<p>Should the parties be obligated to compensate each other for calls to numbers with NXX codes associated with the same local calling area?</p> <p>US LEC's Position: Yes.</p> <p>Verizon's Position: Reciprocal compensation does not apply to interexchange traffic, which is defined by reference to the actual originating and terminating points of the complete end-to-end communication without regard to the NXX code associated with the called party's number.</p>
6B	<p>Should Verizon be able to charge originating access to US LEC on calls going to a particular NXX code if the customer assigned the NXX is located outside of the local calling area associated with that NXX code?</p> <p>US LEC's Position: No.</p> <p>Verizon's Position: Intrastate and interstate charges are governed by the parties' access tariffs and thus are not properly before the Commission in this proceeding, which concerns the parties' local interconnection agreement.</p>
8	<p>What compensation framework should govern the parties' exchange and termination of ISP-bound traffic in the event the FCC's Internet Order is vacated or reversed on appeal?</p> <p>US LEC's Position: In the event the Internet Order is vacated or reversed on appeal, the parties should continue to compensate each other at the rates set forth in the FCC's Internet Order, but waive any other terms and conditions of that Order (e.g., the growth caps and new market restrictions).</p> <p>Verizon's Position: The parties obligations are and will be governed by federal law.</p>

ISSUE NO.	SUMMARY OF ISSUE
9	<p>Should Verizon be permitted to change its non-tariffed charges during the term of the agreement, or must such charges remain fixed for the entire term?</p> <p>US LEC's Position: Although tariffed charges may change during the term of the agreement due to changes in applicable tariffs, non-tariffed charges must remain fixed for the term of the agreement.</p> <p>Verizon's Position: Applicable tariff charges take precedence over charges set out in the agreement; regulatory decisions modifying applicable charges should be incorporated into the agreement.</p>
11	<p>Should Verizon's proposed insurance requirements be adjusted to coverage levels that are consistent with the insurance that US LEC currently maintains?</p> <p>US LEC's Position: Yes.</p> <p>Verizon's Position: US LEC should be required to maintain a commercially reasonable level of insurance.</p>

III. Identification Of Disputed Material Facts

The unresolved issues in this proceeding principally involve disputed matters of law and policy. To the extent that the parties' testimony or discovery identifies disputes over material facts, Verizon proposes that the parties submit a joint statement, prior to the Arbitration hearing, identifying those facts and the parties' respective positions.

IV. Stipulation Of Uncontested Facts

Because this arbitration proceeding principally involves disputes over legal requirements and regulatory policy, Verizon respectfully submits that a stipulation of uncontested facts is inapplicable.

V. Proposed Schedule

Verizon believes that it would be appropriate to have post-hearing opening briefs and reply briefs, filed simultaneously by the parties, with reply briefs limited to issues raised in the parties' opening briefs. US LEC has indicated that it prefers a single round

of post-hearing briefing. In all other respects, the parties have agreed to the proposed procedural schedule set out below:

DATE	EVENT
May 17, 2002	Prehearing Conference
May 21, 2002	Verizon Answer to Petition due
May 31, 2002	Prefiled Testimony due
June 7, 2002	Exchange of Discovery
June 25, 2002	Responses to Data Requests due
July 9, 2002	Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony due
Week of July 15	Arbitration Hearings
Two weeks from Expedited Transcript	Post-Hearing Briefs due to ALJ
[One week from Opening Brief]	[Post-Hearing Reply Brief]

Once the ALJ issues his recommended decision, further proceedings should be governed by the Commission's procedural rules.

VI. Proposal For Submission Of Evidence

Verizon and US LEC have conferred and agreed upon the following proposal for submission of evidence:

- (a) evidence (witness testimony) should be submitted under oath;
- (b) briefs (and, in Verizon's view, reply briefs) are necessary for full explication of the issues.

VII. Recommendations For Expediting The Orderly Conduct And Disposition Of The Proceeding


In connection with this proceeding, the parties anticipate that they may be required to file with the Commission, and furnish to each other, nonpublic proprietary information and documents that contain competitively sensitive information. The parties believe that

the arbitration of this matter will be substantially facilitated by the adoption of appropriate protective orders to govern the treatment of proprietary materials. Accordingly, the parties will file motions requesting the entry of such orders as appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia A. Conover
Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.

Of Counsel



Anthony E. Gay
Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
1717 Arch Street, 32NW
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Ph: (215) 963-6023
Fx: (215) 563-2658
anthony.e.gay@verizon.com

Aaron M. Panner
Scott H. Angstreich
Kellogg, Huber, Hansen,
Todd & Evans, P.L.L.C.
1615 M Street, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 326-7900
apanner@khhte.com
sangstreich@khhte.com

Dated: May 15, 2002

Counsel for Verizon
Pennsylvania Inc.

DILWORTH PAXSON LLP

LAW OFFICES

ORIGINAL

DIRECT DIAL NUMBER:
(717) 236-4812

Linda C. Smith
smithlc@dilworthlaw.com

May 15, 2002

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Secretary James P. McNulty
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
2nd Floor West
Commonwealth Keystone Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

**RE: In Re: Petition of US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc. for Arbitration with
Verizon-Pennsylvania, Inc. Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the
Telecommunications Act of 1996
Docket No. ~~A-301814F7000~~**

A-310814 F7000

Dear Secretary McNulty:

Enclosed please find the original and three copies of the Prehearing Memorandum requested by ALJ Cocheres in his order dated May 10, 2002.

Copies have been served on the parties listed on the attached certificate of service. The ALJ has also been provided with a copy.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

Linda C. Smith /sw

Linda C. Smith

LCS/sw
Enclosure

RECEIVED
02 MAY 15 PM 12:46
Linda C. Smith
SECRETARY'S BUREAU
WILMINGTON DE

305 N. FRONT STREET • SUITE 403 • HARRISBURG PA 17101-1236
(717) 236-4812 • FAX (717) 236-7811 • www.dilworthlaw.com

17869-1

PHILADELPHIA PA

MEDIA PA

CHERRY HILL NJ

TURNERSVILLE NJ

WILMINGTON DE

47

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

ORIGINAL
A-31081467000
Docket No. ~~A-301814F7000~~
DOCUMENT
FOLDER

In Re: Petition of US LEC of Pennsylvania :
Inc. for Arbitration with Verizon-Pennsylvania :
Inc. Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the :
Telecommunications Act of 1996 :

Docket No. ~~A-301814F7000~~

PREHEARING MEMORANDUM OF
US LEC OF PENNSYLVANIA INC.

US LEC of Pennsylvania Inc. ("US LEC"), by undersigned counsel and in accordance with the Administrative Law Judge's Prehearing Conference Order, hereby submits the following Prehearing Memorandum in the above-captioned case.

US LEC filed its Petition for Arbitration ("Petition") against Verizon on April 26, 2002, requesting that the Commission arbitrate unresolved issues in the negotiation of an interconnection agreement with Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc. ("Verizon") pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

As set forth in its Petition, the attorneys of record and contacts for US LEC are as follows:¹

DOCKETED
JUN 0.1 2002

RECORDED
02 MAY 15 PM 12:47
T.M.J.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

¹ US LEC requests that all of its counsel be placed on the service list and served with copies of all filings and correspondence made in this proceeding.

Linda C. Smith
DILWORTH PAXSON LLP
305 N. Front Street
Suite 403
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1236
(717) 236-4812 (telephone)
(717) 236-7811 (facsimile)
lsmith@dilworthlaw.com

Richard M. Rindler
Robin F. Cohn
Michael L. Shor
SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF
FRIEDMAN, LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7775 (telephone)
(202) 424-7645 (facsimile)
mlshor@swidlaw.com

US LEC responds to the issues addressed in the Administrative Law Judge's Prehearing Conference Order as follows:

1. Identification of Issues to Be Resolved

Although US LEC's filed Petition set forth eleven (11) unresolved issues, the parties have resolved their differences with respect to two (2) of the issues since the date of the filing. US LEC requests that the resolved issues—Issue 7 (transit) and 10 (billing disputes)—be withdrawn from the scope of this proceeding. To the extent the Commission requires a formal withdrawal of the resolved issues, US LEC hereby makes such a request. The remaining issues to be resolved by the Commission include the following:

Issue 1: Is US LEC entitled to select a single Interconnection Point ("IP") per Local Access and Transport Area ("LATA"), to select the interconnection method, and to require Verizon to bear the financial responsibility to deliver its originating traffic to the IP chosen by US LEC?

Issue 2: Should Verizon be permitted to force US LEC to designate its collocation site at a Verizon end office as the US LEC-IP where Verizon will deliver its traffic?

Issue 3: Is US LEC entitled to reciprocal compensation for terminating “Voice Information Services” traffic?

Issue 4: Should US LEC be required to provide dedicated trunking at its own expense for Voice Information Service Traffic that originates on its network for delivery to Voice Information Services providers served by Verizon?

Issue 5: Should the term “terminating party” or the term “receiving party” be employed for purposes of traffic measurement and billing over inter-connection trunks?

Issue 6: (A) Should the parties be obligated to compensate each other for calls to numbers with NXX codes associated with the same local calling area?; and (B) Should Verizon be able to charge originating access to US LEC on calls going to a particular NXX code if the customer assigned the NXX code is located outside of the local calling area associated with that NXX code?

Issue 8: What compensation framework should govern the parties’ exchange and termination of ISP-bound traffic in the event the compensation framework in the FCC’s Internet Order is vacated or reversed?

Issue 9: Should Verizon be permitted to change its non-tariffed charges during the term of the agreement, or must such charges remain fixed for the entire term?

Issue 11: Should Verizon’s proposed insurance requirements be adjusted to coverage levels that are consistent with the insurance that US LEC currently maintains?

2. Identification of Disputed Material Facts

The unresolved issues raised by US LEC in its Petition involve mixed questions of disputed facts and questions of law and policy. US LEC will attempt to reach agreement with Verizon as to which material facts are disputed, and will apprise the Commission of the parties' progress in this regard.

3. Stipulation of Uncontested Facts

The unresolved issues raised by US LEC in its Petition involve mixed questions of disputed facts and questions of law and policy. US LEC will attempt to reach agreement with Verizon as to which facts are uncontested, and will apprise the Commission of the parties' progress in this regard

4. Scheduling Oral Arbitration Proceedings Confined to the Material Facts Disputed by Participants

US LEC agrees to work with Verizon in resolving the matters at issue in this proceeding in an expeditious, efficient manner. US LEC submits that the oral arbitration proceedings should not be confined to the material facts disputed by the parties, but should also include the disputed legal and policy issues raised in its Petition. The parties have discussed a proposed schedule, which is set forth below.

5. Determinations as to:

- a) whether evidence must be submitted under oath;
- b) whether evidence should be prefiled;
- c) whether preliminary documentary statements should be required; and
- d) whether memoranda or briefs are necessary

The parties agree that prefiled testimony be submitted under oath, and US LEC intends to present the testimony of Wanda Montano and Frank R. Hoffmann, Jr., in

support of the disputed issues raised in its Petition. US LEC believes that the prefiled testimony can function in lieu of documentary statements to inform all interested parties and the Commission about the disputed issues. US LEC recommends that briefs be filed at the completion of the hearing. US LEC recommends that the following schedule be adopted:

Verizon Response to US LEC Petition .	May 21
Simultaneous Direct Testimony	May 31, 2002
Simultaneous Exchange of Discovery	June 7, 2002 ²
Any Objections to Discovery	June 12, 2002
Simultaneous Discovery Responses	June 25, 2002
Simultaneous Reply Testimony	July 9, 2002
Hearing	Week of July 15, 2002
Post Hearing Brief	2 weeks from receipt of expedited transcript

Once the ALJ has issued his proposed decision, the parties' rights to take exception and to reply to those exceptions are set forth in the Commission's rules. In this regard, US LEC does not believe that a Post Hearing Reply Brief is necessary. The parties—and the Commission—all are intimately familiar with the issues raised here and have litigated them previously. Given the right to take exceptions from the ALJ's proposed hearing, there is sufficient opportunity to address all possible positions and arguments in a single round of post-hearing briefs.

Although US LEC does not believe that reply briefs are necessary, should the ALJ decide to permit reply briefs they should be limited to replying to what was set forth in

² The parties have agreed to sign a Protective Order to govern their exchange of discovery.

the initial "Direct" round of submissions. To the extent either party introduces new material in a "reply" format, the other party should have the right to seek leave to reply to that new material or to ask the ALJ to strike the new matter if there is insufficient time to permit a full and complete reply.

Finally, to the extent that the proposed schedule set forth herein would not permit the ALJ or the Commission to resolve the disputed issues within the statutory nine month period set forth in section 252(b)(4)(C) of the Telecom Act, US LEC hereby waives its right to insist upon resolution within that time period.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda C. Smith^{sw}
Linda C. Smith
DILWORTH PAXSON LLP
305 N. Front Street
Suite 403
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1236
(717) 236-4812 (telephone)
(717) 236-7811 (facsimile)
lsmith@dilworthlaw.com

Michael L. Shor^{sw}
Richard M. Rindler
Robin F. Cohn
Michael L. Shor
SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7775 (telephone)
(202) 424-7645 (facsimile)
mlshor@swidlaw.com

Dated: May 15, 2002

RECEIVED
02 MAY 15 PM 12:47
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing document upon the participants listed below via hand carry unless otherwise noted.

*Julia A. Conover, Esquire
Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc.
1717 Arch Street 32 NW
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone (215) 963-6001
Fax (215) 563-2058
E-mail julia.a.conover@verizon.com

Irwin A. Popowsky, Consumer Advocate
Office of Consumer Advocate
5th Floor, Forum Place
555 Walnut Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1921

Office of Trial Staff
2nd Floor, West
Commonwealth Keystone Building
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Carol Pennington, Acting Small Business Advocate
Office of Small Business Advocate
Commerce Building, Suite 1102
300 North Second Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101

*Gregory M. Romano, Esq.
1515 North Courthouse Road
Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22201
Phone (703) 351-3125
Fax (703) 351-3659
E-mail gregory.m.romano@verizon.com

* Denotes served via Federal Express and e-mail


Linda C. Smith

Dated: May 15, 2002

RECEIVED
02 MAY 15 PM 12:47
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Anthony E. Gay
Regulatory Counsel
Law Department

ORIGINAL



Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
1717 Arch Street, 32NW
Philadelphia, PA 19103

May 16, 2002

Tel: (215) 963-6023
Fax: (215) 563-2658
Anthony.E.Gay@Verizon.com

RECEIVED

MAY 16 2002

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Via Overnight Express Mail
James J. McNulty, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: Petition of US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc. for
Arbitration with Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. Pursuant to
Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996
Docket No. A-310814F7000


Dear Secretary McNulty:

Enclosed, for filing with the Commission, is an original and three copies of the Motion For Admission Pro Hac Vice of Aaron Panner, Esquire, and of the Motion For Admission Pro Hac Vice of Scott Angstreich, Esquire, on behalf of Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. in the above-captioned matter.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

Sincerely yours,


Anthony E. Gay

AEG/slb
Enc.

Via Overnight Express Mail
cc: Honorable Louis G. Cocheres
Attached Certificate of Service

97

RECEIVED

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

MAY 16 2002

I, Anthony E. Gay, Esq., hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of
Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.'s Motion For Admission Pro Hac Vice of Aaron Panner,
Esquire and of Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.'s Motion For Admission Pro Hac Vice of Scott
Angstreich, Esquire, upon the participants listed below in accordance with the
requirements of 52 Pa. Code Section 1.54 (related to service by a participant) and 1.55
(related to service upon attorneys).

Dated at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, this 16th day of May, 2002.


VIA UPS OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

Linda C. Smith, Esquire
Dilworth Paxson LLP
305 North Front Street
Suite 403
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1236

Charles F. Hoffman, Esquire
PA Public Utility Commission
Office of Trial Staff
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Irwin A. Popowsky, Esquire
Office of Consumer Advocate
Forum Place, 5th Floor
555 Walnut Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Carol F. Pennington, Esquire
Office of Small Business Advocate
Commerce Building, Suite 1102
300 North Second Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101



Anthony E. Gay, Esquire
VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA INC.
1717 Arch Street, 32NW
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 963-6023

RECEIVED

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

MAY 16 2002

_____)
)
Petition of US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc. for)
Arbitration with Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.)
Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996)
 _____)

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Docket No.
A-310814F7000

MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO HAC VICE OF

AARON PANNER, ESQUIRE

Pursuant to Rule 301 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Admission, I, Anthony E. Gay Esquire ("Movant"), an active member of the bar of this Commonwealth, respectfully move for the admission pro hac vice of Aaron Panner, Esquire for the purposes of representing Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. in this proceeding. In support hereof, movant states as follows:

1. Mr. Panner is a member in good standing of the Bars of the State of Massachusetts, the State of New York, and the District of Columbia.
2. Mr. Panner is an attorney with Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans, P.L.L.C., 1615 M Street, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036-3209.
3. Mr. Panner has not been subject to any disciplinary action.
4. Mr. Panner is of good character.


DOCUMENT
FOLDER

DOCKETED

JUN 03 2002

Wherefore, movant respectfully requests this Commission to admit Aaron Panner, Esquire as counsel for Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. in the above-captioned action.

Respectfully Submitted,



Anthony E. Gay
Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
1717 Arch Street, 32N
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 963-6023

Attorney for
Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.

Dated: May 16, 2002

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Petition of US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc. for)	
Arbitration with Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.)	
Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the)	Docket No.
Telecommunications Act of 1996)	A-310814F7000

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ADMISSION
PRO HAC VICE OF AARON PANNER, ESQUIRE**

Upon consideration of Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice of Aaron Panner,
Esquire, it is this _____ day of May, 2002,

ORDERED that the Motion is hereby GRANTED; and it is further

ORDERED that Aaron Panner, Esquire is admitted pro hac vice for the purposes
of representing Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. in the above-captioned action.

Administrative Law Judge Louis G. Cocheres

RECEIVED

MAY 16 2002

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Docket No. A-310814F7000'S BUREAU

Petition of US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc. for
Arbitration with Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the
Telecommunications Act of 1996

**MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO HAC VICE OF
SCOTT ANGSTREICH, ESQUIRE**

Pursuant to Rule 301 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Admission, I, Anthony E. Gay, Esquire ("Movant"), an active member of the bar of this Commonwealth, respectfully move for the admission pro hac vice of Scott Angstreich, Esquire for the purposes of representing Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. in this proceeding. In support hereof, movant states as follows:

1. Mr. Angstreich is a member in good standing of the Bars of the State of New York and the District of Columbia.
2. Mr. Angstreich is an attorney with Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans, P.L.L.C., 1615 M Street, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036-3209.
3. Mr. Angstreich has not been subject to any disciplinary action.
4. Mr. Angstreich is of good character.


DOCUMENT
FOLDER

DOCKETED

JUN 03 2002

Wherefore, movant respectfully requests this Commission to admit Scott Angstreich, Esquire as counsel for Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. in the above-captioned action.

Respectfully Submitted,



Anthony E. Gay
Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
1717 Arch Street, 32N
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 963-6023

Attorney for
Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.

Dated: May 16, 2002

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Petition of US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc. for)
Arbitration with Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.) Docket No.
Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the) A-310814F7000
Telecommunications Act of 1996)

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ADMISSION
PRO HAC VICE OF SCOTT ANGSTREICH, ESQUIRE**

Upon consideration of Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice of Scott Angstreich,
Esquire, it is this _____ day of May, 2002,

ORDERED that the Motion is hereby GRANTED; and it is further

ORDERED that Scott Angstreich, Esquire is admitted pro hac vice for the
purposes of representing Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. in the above-captioned action.

Administrative Law Judge Louis G. Cocheres

OALJ Hearing Report

Please Check Those Blocks Which Apply

Docket No.: A-310814F7000	YES	NO
Case Name: US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc.	Prehearing Held: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Hearing Held: <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Testimony Taken: <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Transcript Due: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Hearing Concluded: <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Location: Harrisburg	Further Hearing Needed: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Date: 05/17/2002	Estimated Add'l Days: one	
ALJ: Louis G. Cocheres	RECORD CLOSED: <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reporting Firm: Commonwealth Reporting	Briefs to be Filed: <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Bench Decision: <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	REMARKS: One hearing is scheduled on July 17, 2002 in Harrisburg.	

DOCUMENT FOLDER

DOCKETED

JUN 08 2002

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF OALJ
JUN 10 2002 PM 1:47
BUREAU

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY - Incomplete information may result in delay of processing.

Name and Telephone Number	Address	Who are you representing?
Linda G. Smith 2002 HIA ST HARRISBURG PA 17101-1236	Dilworth Paxson LLP 305 N. Front St. Ste 403 City: Harrisburg State: PA Zip: 17101-1236	US LEC
Telephone: 717-236-4812	E-mail Address: SmithLC@dilworthlaw.com	Fax Number: 717-236-7811
Michael L. Shor Robin F. Cohn Richard M. Rindler	Swidler, Berlin, Sheroff, Friedman LLP 3000 K Street, NW City: Washington State: DC Zip: 20007	US LEC
Telephone: 202-424-7500	E-mail Address: mlshor@swidlaw.com	Fax Number: 202-424-7645
Julia A. Conover Anthony E. Gay	1717 Arch St 32nd floor City: Philadelphia State: PA Zip: 19103	Verizon-PA
Telephone: 215-963-6023	E-mail Address: Anthony.E.Gay@Verizon.com	Fax Number: 215-563-2658

Check this box if additional parties or attendees appear on back of form.

Danielle Lammes
Reporter's Signature

Note: Completion of this form does not constitute an entry of appearance, see 52 Pa. Code §§1.24 and 1.25.

Name and Telephone Number	Address			Who are you representing?
Aron Panner	Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans PLLC 1615 M Street, NW Suite 400 <small>City</small> Washington <small>State</small> DC <small>Zip</small> 20036-3209			Verizon - PA
Telephone:	E-mail Address:			Fax Number:
	<small>City</small>	<small>State</small>	<small>Zip</small>	
Telephone:	E-mail Address:			Fax Number:
	<small>City</small>	<small>State</small>	<small>Zip</small>	
Telephone:	E-mail Address:			Fax Number:
	<small>City</small>	<small>State</small>	<small>Zip</small>	
Telephone:	E-mail Address:			Fax Number:
	<small>City</small>	<small>State</small>	<small>Zip</small>	
Telephone:	E-mail Address:			Fax Number:
	<small>City</small>	<small>State</small>	<small>Zip</small>	
Telephone:	E-mail Address:			Fax Number:
	<small>City</small>	<small>State</small>	<small>Zip</small>	
Telephone:	E-mail Address:			Fax Number:
	<small>City</small>	<small>State</small>	<small>Zip</small>	
Telephone:	E-mail Address:			Fax Number:

Note: Completion of this form does not constitute an entry of appearance, see 52 Pa. Code §§1.24 and 1.25.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Office Of Administrative Law Judge
P.O. Box 3265, Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE

May 20, 2002

In Re: A-310814F7000

(See letter dated 05/08/2002)

US LEC of Pennsylvania, Inc.

Petition for arbitration with Verizon Pennsylvania Inc. Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Hearing Notice

This is to inform you that a hearing on the above-captioned case will be held as follows:

Type: Initial

Date: Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Location: Hearing Room 3
Plaza Level
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Presiding: Administrative Law Judge Louis G. Cocheres
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
Telephone: (717) 783-5452
Fax: (717) 787-0481

DOCKETED
MAY 23 2002

Attention: You may lose the case if you do not come to this hearing and present facts on the issues raised.

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

If you intend to file exhibits, 2 copies of all hearing exhibits to be presented into evidence must be submitted to the reporter. An additional copy must be furnished to the Presiding Officer. A copy must also be provided to each party of record.

Except for those individuals representing themselves, the Commission's rules require that all parties have an attorney; therefore, you should have an attorney of your choice file an entry of appearance before the scheduled hearing.

If you are a person with a disability, and you wish to attend the hearing, we may be able to make arrangements for your special needs. Please call the scheduling office at the Public Utility Commission:

- Scheduling Office: 717-787-1399.
- AT&T Relay Service number for persons who are deaf or hearing-impaired: 1-800-654-5988.

pc: Judge Cocheres
Steve Springer, Scheduling Officer
Beth Plantz
Docket Section
Calendar File