ALL-STATE LEGAL SUPPLY CO. 1-800-222-0510 EDS11 RECYCLED

B

...elia Nogales
...ederal Regulatory Relations

1275 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 383-6423

PACIFIC TELESIS
Group-Washington

RECEIVED
SEP 8 1989

September 8, 1989

Ms. Donna R. Searcy
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Defendant's Responses to Complainant's First Set of Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents, Clark-Bader, Inc., d/b/a TMC Long Distance v. Pacific Bell Telephone Company, File No. E-89-85

Dear Ms. Searcy,

On behalf of Pacific Bell ("Pacific"), and in accordance with Section 1.729(d) of the Commission's rules (47 C.F.R. Section 1.729(d)), please find enclosed a copy of Pacific's responses to Clark-Bader, Inc. d/b/a TMC Long Distance ("TMC")'s first set of interrogatories and request for production of documents in the above-referenced proceeding.

Pacific considers specific documents contained in Pacific's responses to be confidential and proprietary. Pacific has stamped these documents "confidential" and believes they qualify for protection from public inspection under Section 0.457(d) of the Commission's Rules (47 CFR Section 0.459). These documents include, inter alia, detailed descriptions of Pacific's network, technical and engineering practices and performance records, financial data and confidential business plans, information compiled at the request of legal counsel in anticipation of litigation, and commercial information or trade secrets proprietary to third parties which Pacific believes it is obligated to hold in the same degree of confidence as its own proprietary information. Due to the scope of discovery in this proceeding and the volume of documents directed to be produced, separation of confidential or privileged documents from other documents would be impracticable. Therefore, Pacific requests that all of the responses filed be protected from public inspection.

Pacific does not customarily disclose such documents to the public. Pacific would not have disclosed them but for the Enforcement Division's directive in this proceeding and the

complainant's written agreement to hold them in confidence. Such documents are also customarily guarded from competitors. Pacific believes that competitive and financial harm could result from their public disclosure. For instance, access to Pacific's network information and business plans for certain competitive services (such as high speed digital private line services) would inform Pacific's competitors of its technical capabilities and competitive strategies.

If the Commission does not agree that Section 0.457(d) applies to protect these documents from public disclosure, Pacific requests that they be withheld from public inspection pursuant to Section 0.459 of the Commission's rules (47 C.F.R. Section 0.459).

The Commission should grant this request because Pacific has presented a case for nondisclosure consistent with the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. Section 552) by a preponderance of evidence provided in the preceding paragraphs.

Please stamp and return the provided copy of this transmittal letter to confirm your receipt.

Please feel free to call me should you or your staff have any questions.

Sincerely,

Celia Nogales

Celia Nogales

cc: All parties of record (w/o enclosures)

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
SEP 1 1989
DOCKETED
AND DISPATCHED

In the Matter of Clark-Bader, Inc., d/b/a TMC Long Distance, Complainant, v. Pacific Bell Telephone Company A Pacific Telesis Company, Defendant.	File No. E-89-85

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSES TO COMPLAINANT'S
FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST
FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENT

INTRODUCTION

Pacific Bell ("Pacific") hereby responds to Complainant's First Set of Interrogatories ("Interrogatories") and Request for Production of Documents filed in the above-referenced case on May 15, 1989. The Commission's Rules provide that without prior Commission approval, discovery is limited to thirty single interrogatories, including subparts.[1] In the Commission's order adopting its formal complaint rules, the Commission stated that it had adopted this limit "both to reduce the opportunity for abuse and to induce parties to

[1] Section 1.729(a).

carefully consider the relevance of the information requested."[2] The Commission observed:

> [U]se of the limited discovery should not be abused. In this regard, we stress that we will strictly monitor the discovery process. . . . Parties are warned that we will not permit misuse of these procedures and will invoke sanctions for abuse when appropriate.[3]

The Commission stated furthermore that interrogatories exceeding this limit would be subject to motions to strike, and that parties must obtain approval to propound additional questions.[4]

Including subparts, as the Commission's rule requires, TMC's Interrogatories totalled many more than thirty. At the same time, in further violation of the Commission's rules, TMC made an unauthorized request for production of documents. Accordingly, as the Commission suggested in the Formal Complaints Order, Pacific moved to strike TMC's interrogatories, without prejudice, with leave for TMC to file new interrogatories that complied with the Commission's rules.

At a status conference held on July 28, 1989, at the direction of the Enforcement Division staff, TMC in effect repropounded its first set of interrogatories and Pacific agreed

---

[2] Amendment of Rules Governing Procedures To Be Followed Where Formal Complaints Are Filed Against Common Carriers, CC Docket No. 86-498, Report and Order (Proceeding Terminated), 3 FCC Rcd 1806 (1988) (the "Formal Complaints Order"), at para. 41.

[3] Id. at para. 40.

[4] Id. at para. 41.

to respond them by September 8, 1989.[5] Pacific's responses are based on its understanding of the Enforcement Division's directive. In answering TMC's Interrogatories, Pacific does not waive its objection that they fail to comply with the Commission's rules concerning interrogatories and other forms of discovery. Pacific expressly reserves the right to contend that it has been irreversibly prejudiced by the Commission's failure to enforce its rules and strike TMC's interrogatories.[6]

Pacific and TMC entered into an agreement on September 6, 1989, governing discovery and protection and exchange of confidential information in this proceeding. Most of the documents contained in the exhibits to Pacific's responses are proprietary and confidential and have been so marked pursuant to that agreement.

INTERROGATORY 1

In addition to PacBell's tariff references, describe in detail the technical and service differences between PacBell's Feature Group C ("FGC") access service, Feature Group D ("FGD") access service that is routed through an access tandem, and FGD direct trunking access service, specifically including, but not limited to, the differences in timing parameters, software steps,

---

[5] TMC also agreed to provide further answers to Pacific's interrogatories.

[6] For instance, despite the fact that TMC has been allowed to propound more than the thirty interrogatories permitted by the Commission's rules without good cause shown, the Enforcement Division staff stated at the status conference on July 28, 1989 that Pacific would not be granted leave to propound additional interrogatories except by filing a motion showing good cause therefor.

hardware steps, holding steps, signaling (i.e., a comparison of CCS6 vis-a-vis the methods of signaling used for IXCs other than AT&T), management controls, and overflow controls between the three types of services, and the differences, if any, among these access services and the access services (FGC, FGD through an access tandem and FGD direct trunking) available and provided in LATA No. 732 from 1985 to the present.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome, overbroad, and vague and ambiguous. To the extent that material differences between (sic) Feature Group C access service, Feature Group D access service, and FGD direct trunking service exist which are not described in Pacific's tariffs, they would be described in technical reference publications already available to TMC and other interexchange carriers. Furthermore, inasmuch as Pacific's service obligations with respect to Feature Group C and Feature Group D access service are described in its tariffs, any technical and service characteristics not described in such tariffs are irrelevant.

Without waiving its objections, Pacific provides documents responsive to Interrogatory 1 in Exhibit 1 hereto. In addition, a record of network management controls applied at the end office level in LATA No. 732 in 1988 is provided in Exhibit 13 hereto. Records of network management controls applied prior to 1988 have not been retained. In addition, a record of blockages equal to or exceeding 1% of calls at the tandem level in LATA No. 732 from 1987 and 1988 is provided in Pacific's answer to Interrogatory 2. No other records of tandem level blockage have been retained. In the record of network management controls provided in Exhibit 13, where "CT" appears under the

column headed "TO OFFICE", it stands for "common transport" and indicates that where controls were applied, they were applied equally to all common transport trunks (i.e. trunks carrying undifferentiated traffic of a number of IECs). Where "CT" does not appear, no network management controls were applied to IEC traffic.

INTERROGATORY 2

(1) Provide the busy hour grade of service that PacBell's interoffice facilities between end offices and the access tandem used in LATA No. 732 from 1985 to the present in the provision of FGD access services, and the interoffice facilities used to provide FGC access services in LATA No. 732, are engineered to provide, including, but not limited to, a discussion of the methodology used to determine the appropriate number of facilities required to meet the stated grade of service and the percentage of calls that the grade of service is designed to block.

(2) Provide the busy hour grade of service that was actually achieved on a daily basis for access service that was routed from the various end offices in LATA No. 732 to the Northern Telecom DMS-200 access tandem switch during the period 1985-1988 and the number of calls processed during the busy hour each day; and if there is a discrepancy in the grade of service engineered and that actually achieved, explain fully the discrepancy and the reasons therefor, and provide the identity of all persons responsible for instituting, operating or managing the busy hour grade of service for access service in LATA No. 732 from 1985 to the present; and provide all documents, including traffic reports and raw data, reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, and if such reports are not maintained by PacBell or are not available, provide a full explanation as to why such reports are not kept; and in lieu of such reports, provide an estimation of the requested data, including a description of how the estimation was achieved.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly

burdensome. Without waiving these objections, Pacific makes the following response.

Pacific's interoffice facilities between the end offices and its access tandems are engineered to meet the grade of service tables set out in Pacific's tariffs (e.g., Tariff F.C.C. No. 128, Section 6.5.6). The number of facilities required to meet this grade of service is estimated periodically in general trunk forecasts ("GTFs"). A sample frame from the current GTF is contained in Exhibit 2. The GTFs for 1985 to the present are stored on microfiche. At TMC's request, Pacific will make them available for inspection and copying, subject to confidential treatment and at TMC's expense, at Pacific's offices in San Diego.

Samples of service data, showing actual grade of service on interoffice facilities, are also provided in Exhibit 2. Service data have also been retained since 1986 on microfiche and can be made available for inspection and copying, subject to confidential treatment and at TMC's expense, at Pacific's offices in San Diego.

Exhibit 2 also contains Northern Telecom, Inc. ("NTI")'s most current engineering bulletin for the DMS-100/200 family of switches, and Bellcore generic requirements (i.e., guidelines) for LATA switching systems. In accordance with these guidelines, the DMS-200 was engineered to block 1.5% of calls on an Average Busy Season Busy Hour, 8% of calls on a Ten High Day Busy Hour, and 20% of calls on the High Day Busy Hour. No data have been

retained from 1985 or 1986 to show blocking at the tandem level. In 1987 and 1988 blocking occurred as follows:

Date	Time	% Calls Blocked	No. of Calls Blocked
6/22/87	10 AM	7.6	16,202
6/29/87	Switch failure		
11/30/87	10 AM	1.1	1,979
1/4/88	10 AM	3.8	7,242
1/25/88	11 AM	7.8	13,220
2/1/88	10 AM	2.1	3,889
2/1/88	11 AM	11.1	18,580
2/8/88	10 AM	4.5	8,086
2/9/88	10 AM	1.2	2,053
2/16/88	10 AM	13.4	18,834
2/29/88	10 AM	1.7	3,149
3/9/88	10 AM	1.2	2,023
3/11/88	10 AM	1.1	1,816
3/14/88	11 AM	1.2	1,960
6/27/88	10 AM	1.9	3,041
7/11/88	10 AM	1.2	2,006

All of these blockages occurred during the busy hour. With the exception of the switch failure on June 29, 1987, the DMS-200 thus has exceeded Bellcore blocking guidelines on only two occasions since 1987. All common transport trunk groups, i.e., all IECs routing traffic through the tandem (including AT&T), would have been affected by these blockages in equal measure.

Further Bellcore generic requirements and NTI technical specifications exist which are too voluminous to produce at this time. They can be made available for inspection and copying, subject to confidential treatment and at TMC's expense, at Pacific's offices in San Diego.

INTERROGATORY 3

Supply the exact dates on which AT&T was converted from FGC to FGD access service for each central office switch in LATA No. 732 and the rates AT&T was charged for its FGC access service from 1985 to the date AT&T was converted from FGC to FGD, and the rates AT&T was charged for its FGD service after such conversion; and provide specification to any PacBell tariff provisions governing same, and all cost support data submitted to the Federal Communications Commission in support of same.

Pacific objects to Interrogatory 3 on the grounds that it seeks information, namely tariff provisions, rates, and tariff cost support data submitted to the Federal Communications Commission, that is already publicly available to TMC. Pacific also objects to Interrogatory 3 on the grounds of relevance, since there is no material difference between FGC and FGD access that would affect service to end users, and no legal requirement that AT&T's FGC service be converted to FGD service immediately following end office conversion. Without waiving these objections, Pacific responds as follows.

Responsive documents are provided in Exhibit 3. These documents show that the majority of the end offices in LATA No. 732 where AT&T had FGC access service were converted to FGD in 1986. Due to problems with AT&T's ability to receive FGD signalling from DMS-100 end office switches, of which the Commission took explicit note in 1986,[7] the remainder were

---

[7] See Investigation into the Quality of Equal Access Services, TDX Petition for Rulemaking, RM-5196, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 86-248, released May 23, 1986, at para. 9 and note 21.

converted from FGC to FGD access in 1987 and (in three instances only) the first week of January 1988.

INTERROGATORY 4

Itemize all controls and/or diagnostic tests applied from PacBell's Anaheim Network Control Center and/or any other location to the Northern Telecom DMS-200 90T tandem switch located at 650 Robinson Avenue, San Diego, California (hereinafter the "Tandem"), or to any central office or any equipment therein that feeds the Tandem, beginning on the date the Tandem first became operational and continuing through the end of 1988, including an explanation as to why these controls were implemented and the effect these controls had on traffic that was routed over interoffice facilities from end offices in LATA No. 732 and/or routed through the Tandem; the grade of service during the busy hour, on a daily basis, for every day during that period; any treatment messages that were employed, the content of such messages, and the number of calls during the busy hour, on a daily basis, that received the treatment messages; and the number of calls during the busy hour, on a daily basis, that received no answer to their calls. Identify all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, and if such documents are not maintained by PacBell or are not available, provide a full explanation as to why such documents are not kept, and in lieu of such documents, provide an estimation of the requested data, including a description of how the estimation was achieved, and all persons and participants involved in making the estimation.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome. Without waiving these objections, Pacific provides documents responsive to Interrogatory 4 in Exhibit 4, which contains the DMS-200 trouble log for 1987 and 1988. Responsive documents are also contained in Exhibits 1, 2, and 3.

INTERROGATORY 5

Describe the plans PacBell had prior to and at the time of equal access conversion in LATA No. 732 to employ more than one access tandem switch in LATA No. 732, including identification of the persons involved in developing, implementing or abandoning such plan, and any documents, events, occurrences, meetings or negotiation sessions reflecting or relating to such plan(s), its or their creation, implementation, or abandonment, and all persons and participants involved in any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving these objections, Pacific provides fundamental planning documents responsive to Interrogatory 5 in Exhibit 5.

INTERROGATORY 6

Identify each carrier, including PacBell, that presently has, or has had at any time, access traffic routed through the Tandem, including the percentage of that carrier's total access traffic in LATA No. 732 that is or was routed through the Tandem, the percentage of the total traffic routed through the Tandem that represents that carrier's traffic, the specific type of PacBell traffic that was routed through the Tandem, the length of any post-dial delay experienced by callers of that carrier, the dates on and circumstances under which blocking and/or "controls" were imposed on that traffic, the busy hour grade of service for every carrier's trunk group on a daily basis, and with respect to AT&T, the percentage of AT&T's total access traffic in LATA No. 732 that originated from the end offices with "step-by-step switches" that had traffic routed through the Tandem, and all documents relating to any of the foregoing, and if such documents are not maintained by PacBell or are not available, provide a full explanation as to why such documents are not kept, and in lieu of such documents, provide an estimation of the requested data, including a description of how the estimation was achieved; and identify all persons and participants involved with any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and calls for information not within Pacific's possession or control. Without waiving these objections, Pacific responds as follows.

Documents responsive to Interrogatory 6 have already been provided in Exhibits 1-4. Documents further responding to Interrogatory 6 are provided in Exhibit 6.

INTERROGATORY 7

Provide the dates on which PacBell recommended FGD direct trunking to TMC as the alternative to utilization of the Tandem, the exact description of the FGD direct trunking (e.g., full span, i.e., 24 circuit basis) that was offered to TMC on each date, including applicable rates and charges; indicate whether such recommendations were made in writing, by telephone, at a meeting, etc.; identify all persons and participants for PacBell who made such recommendations; and identify all documents, in addition to any tariffs, reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and requests information (i.e. applicable rates and charges and tariffs) already available in Pacific's tariffs.

Without waiving these objections, Pacific provides documents responsive to Interrogatory 7 in Exhibit 7.

INTERROGATORY 8

Provide the dates on which PacBell recommended FGD direct trunking or any other alternative to access service

through the Tandem to all other IXCs receiving access services from PacBell in LATA No. 732 from 1985 to the present; and identify all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, and all persons and participants involved therewith.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving such objections, Pacific responds as follows. Documents responsive to Interrogatory 8 are already contained in Exhibit 7. Documents further responsive to Interrogatory 8 are contained in Exhibit 8.

INTERROGATORY 9

Identify all "instructional recordings" pertaining to blocked calls or other controls or processing procedures of the traffic of IXCs and of PacBell itself utilized by PacBell in LATA No. 732 between 1985 to the present, supply the content of the message on such recordings, explain fully the circumstances under which each such recording was employed, and all persons and participants having responsibility for the use of such "instructional recordings" in general and specifically as to the use of such "instructional recordings" as applied to TMC.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and vague and ambiguous. Without waiving such objections, Pacific provides responsive documents in Exhibit 9.

INTERROGATORY 10

Explain fully the reasons why PacBell chose to employ a Northern Telecom DMS-200 switch in San Diego, and identify all documents reflecting or relating to the foregoing, including, but not limited to, engineering forecasts, demographic studies and reports, other reports, raw data, switch configurations supplied to PacBell by Northern Telecom, and any information provided to

Northern Telecom by PacBell for Northern Telecom's use in configuring the configuration of PacBell's switch, and identify all persons and participants involved in any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and vague and ambiguous. Without waiving these objections, Pacific provides responsive documents in Exhibit 5.

INTERROGATORY 11

(1) With respect to the failure of the Tandem on June 29, 1987, provide the exact date and time on which the Tandem failed, the cause therefor, the exact date and time on which the Tandem was fully reactivated, the actions taken to reactivate the Tandem, the persons and participants involved, a complete description of all maintenance, inspection procedures and other actions instituted after the Tandem's failure, including an explanation of how such procedures differ from the maintenance and inspection procedures employed prior to the Tandem's failure; and identify all persons and participants involved and all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, including, but not limited to, technical reports and maintenance reports, and all persons and participants involved with any of the foregoing.

(2) Provide a complete list of all carriers whose traffic was affected by the failure, including the percentages of each carrier's total access traffic that was affected by the failure, and all documents relating to the foregoing, and if such documents are not kept by PacBell or are not available, provide a full explanation as to why such documents are not kept, and in lieu of such documents, provide an estimation of the requested data, including a description of how the estimation was achieved, and all persons and participants involved in any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and vague and ambiguous. Without waiving these objections, Pacific responds as follows.

Documents responsive to delineated subpart (1) of Interrogatory 11 are contained in Exhibit 4.

Documents responsive to delineated subpart (2) of Interrogatory 11 are contained in Exhibit 6.

Documents responsive to both delineated subparts of Interrogatory 11 are contained in Exhibit 10.

INTERROGATORY 12

With respect to the May 13, 1987 failure of the peripheral device attached to the Tandem, discussed on p. 25 of PacBell's Answer to TMC's Complaint, provide a complete description of the peripheral device, including its function, manufacturer, model number, and how it was or is interconnected to the Tandem; the exact time that the peripheral device failed, the cause therefor, and the exact time that the device was fully reactivated, the actions taken to reactivate the device, the persons involved, a complete description of all maintenance and inspection procedures instituted after the failure, including an explanation of how such procedures differ from the maintenance and inspection procedures employed prior to the failure, and a complete list of each carrier whose access traffic was affected by the failure, including the percentage of that carrier's total access traffic in LATA that was affected; and identify all persons and participants involved and all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, and if such documents are not maintained by PacBell or are not available, provide a full explanation as to why such documents are not kept, and in lieu of such documents, provide an estimation of the requested data, including a description of how the estimation was achieved, and all persons and participants involved in making the estimation.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving these objections, Pacific responds as follows.

A detailed description of the peripheral device (a digital trunk controller, or DTC) is contained in Northern

Telecom Practice 297-1001-103 (Description of Peripheral Modules), which Pacific believes is publicly available. A DTC can terminate up to 20 T-carrier spans (480 trunks). Span assignments are constantly changing as systems are added, disconnected, or rearranged, and records exist only for the most current assignment. However, the common transport trunks terminated on the DTC which failed would have carried the undifferentiated traffic of numerous IECs. A trouble ticket and other documents responsive to this interrogatory are contained in Exhibit 4.

INTERROGATORY 13

Provide a complete log and/or other materials detailing each and every occurrence of switch failure, switch-over to redundant processor, processor cool-start, processor warm-start, and/or any other incident planned or unplanned which in any way involved the functioning of the Tandem's processors, software, hardware and/or peripherals, which may be connected to that switch during the period 1985-1988. Provide the exact date and time of each such incident, the cause therefor, the duration of the incident, the effect of the incident on the call processing capacity of the Tandem, the actions taken to resolve the incident, the persons and participants involved, a complete description all maintenance, inspection procedures and other actions instituted after such incidents, including an explanation of how such procedures differ from the maintenance and inspection procedures employed prior to any such incidents; and identify all persons involved and all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, including but not limited to, technical reports and maintenance reports.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and vague and ambiguous. Without waiving such objections, Pacific provides documents responsive to this interrogatory in Exhibit 4.

INTERROGATORY 14

Identify the event, occurrence, meeting, negotiation session, and any documents relating thereto at which and during which PacBell informed TMC that utilization of a DACs machine would enable TMC to order FGD direct trunking on a per-circuit basis; and identify the PacBell persons who discussed this issue with TMC and the PacBell participant(s) with authority over the use of the PacBell DACs machine(s) in LATA No. 732; and identify all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and vague and ambiguous. Without waiving such objections, Pacific responds as follows.

Documents responsive to this interrogatory are contained in Exhibit 7. Members of Pacific's Carrier Marketing Department who were present at the meetings described therein included Ken Korba, Tom Broadhead, Lee Duer, Dennis Wheatley, and Thomas David.

INTERROGATORY 15

For each DACs machine installed by PacBell in its central offices in LATA No. 732, provide the date on which the machine was installed, the type of traffic which was carried over the DACs, the IXCs, if any, who were provided with access service through the DACs machine and the limitations, if any, on the use of the DACs for any type of traffic or on its use by any particular carrier; and identify all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, and all persons and participants involved with any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving such objections, Pacific makes the following response.

Responsive information is contained in the Declaration of Jon Green (Exhibit 7).

INTERROGATORY 16

Identify the access time study performed by PacBell on TMC's traffic in October 1986, and any other access time studies relating to the use of the Tandem in LATA No. 732 and otherwise, including, but not limited to, the specific date(s) and time(s) of day on which such study(ies) was (were) performed, the length of the study(ies), the specific location(s) where the test(s) was (were) performed; identify all PacBell persons and participants that were present at the study(ies), a description of how the data was recorded and whether any follow-up studies were made, including any measures that were taken to verify that the test results were accurate; identify all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, including any recordation of raw data, and if such documents are not maintained by PacBell or are not available, provide a full explanation as to why such documents are not kept, and in lieu of such documents, provide an estimation of the requested data, including a description of how the estimation was achieved; and identify all persons and participants involved in the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and seeks documents already in TMC's possession. Without waiving these objections, Pacific provides responsive documents in Exhibit 11.

INTERROGATORY 17

Identify any meetings, events, occurrences or negotiation sessions held by PacBell, and all persons and participants therein that discussed, developed, issued and/or implemented, either directly or indirectly, PacBell's corporate policy in the 1980-1986, or other relevant time frame, concerning the viability of the reseller and/or small IXC market and the desirability or undesirability of devoting PacBell's corporate resources and facilities to the provision of access or other

services to this market; identify the PacBell persons and participants involved with or attending the meetings, events, occurrences or negotiation sessions, and as to each, state his/her past (from the date of the meeting(s) to present) and present (if a reassignment has been made) job titles, job descriptions, their primary, secondary and other supervisors; identify the PacBell officers to which these supervisors report; describe the specific authority each of the persons, supervisors and officers have, had, and exercised (whether directly or by delegation) in connection with development and application of said policy, the afore-referenced events, occurrences, meetings and negotiation sessions, and all internal PacBell discussions, meetings, events, occurrences, or negotiation sessions relating or pertaining to the preparation and planning by PacBell of said policy and meetings; describe all internal discussions, meetings, events, occurrences or negotiation sessions relating or pertaining to any plans, actions, strategies, negotiations and governmental contacts (state or federal) that occurred and were pursued, created, developed and implemented by PacBell in response to and as follow-up to said policies, meetings, events, occurrences or negotiation sessions; identify all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, including the internal PacBell documents reflecting or relating to, either directly or indirectly, the company's policy with respect to resellers and small IXCs; and indicate the persons (whether PacBell's or others) responsible for creating such documents and to whom such documents were directed.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving such objections, Pacific provides responsive documents, including company business plans for 1986, 1987, and 1988, in Exhibit 12.

INTERROGATORY 18

With respect to PacBell's statement in its Answer, at p. 25, n. 16, that "[l]imited capacity on some common transport trunks caused some IEC calls to be blocked in 1986 . . .", provide the specific dates and times on which such blocking occurred, including the total elapsed time of each incident; the IXCs whose calls were blocked on the dates and times specified above; the percentage of that carrier's total access traffic in LATA No. 732 that was blocked; the specific number of common

transport trunks that were affected; the cause for the limited capacity of such trunks; the busy hour grade of service provided by these trunks on a daily basis during the period in question; identify all persons and participants involved with and all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, and if such documents are not maintained by PacBell or are not available, provide a full explanation as to why such documents are not kept, and in lieu of such documents, provide an estimation of the requested data, including a description of how the estimation was achieved; and identify all persons and participants involved with any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving these objections, Pacific responds as follows.

See answer to Interrogatory 2. Samples of data, showing actual grade of service (i.e., blocking) on interoffice facilities including common transport trunks, are provided in Exhibit 2. These data have been retained since 1986 on microfiche and can be made available for inspection and copying, subject to confidential treatment and at TMC's expense, at Pacific's offices in San Diego.

INTERROGATORY 19

With respect to PacBell's statement in its Answer, at p. 27, that "[on] several occasions between February and April of 1988, peak hour traffic was intentionally blocked on some trunks from end offices to the DMS-200 . . .", identify the end offices involved, the specific number of occasions on which calls were blocked, including the dates and times on which blocking occurred and the total elapsed time of each incident; the specific carriers whose traffic was blocked on the occasions identified above and the percentage of each carrier's total access traffic in LATA No. 732 that was blocked; the persons and participants who made the decision to intentionally block traffic and provide the basis for such decision; and all documents reflecting or

relating to any of the foregoing, and if such documents are not maintained by PacBell or are not available, provide a full explanation as to why such documents are not kept, and in lieu of such documents, provide and estimation of the requested data, including a description of how the estimation was achieved, and all persons and participants involved in making the estimation.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving these objections, Pacific provides a responsive document in Exhibit 13.

INTERROGATORY 20

With respect to PacBell's statement in its Answer, at p. 16, that PacBell "offered central office multiplexing to TMC . . .", identify the specific date(s) on which such an offer was made, the specific persons who made such an offer on behalf of PacBell, the specific TMC personnel to whom such an offer was made, and whether the offer was in writing or via an oral contact; provide a complete description of the multiplexing that was offered, including the rates and charges (both recurring and non-recurring) for such service; and identify all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing, and all persons and participants involved with any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving these objections, Pacific provides responsive documents in Exhibit 7.

INTERROGATORY 21

In connection with the September 8, 1986 meeting between PacBell and TMC, discussed on p. 11 of PacBell's Answer, identify the persons and participants involved with, or attending the meeting on behalf of PacBell, and as to each, state his/her past (from the date of the meeting to present) and present (if a

reassignment has been made) job titles, job descriptions, their primary, secondary and other supervisors; identify the PacBell officers to which these supervisors report; describe the specific authority each of the persons, supervisors and officers have, had, and exercised in connection with said September 8, 1986 meeting, and all internal PacBell discussions, events, occurrences, meetings or negotiation sessions relating or pertaining to the preparation and planning by PacBell for said September 8, 1986 meeting, and all internal discussions, events, occurrences, meetings or negotiation sessions relating or pertaining to any plans, actions, strategies, negotiations and governmental contacts (state or federal) that occurred and were pursued, created, developed and implemented by PacBell in response to and as follow-up to said meeting on September 8, 1986; provide the substance of all matters discussed at said meeting on September 8, 1986; and identify all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving such objections, Pacific responds as follows.

Pacific's records record the fact that on September 8, 1986, Ken Korba, then a member of the TMC Account Team, met with Mr. Bader and discussed direct trunking service with him. Mr. Korba is no longer employed by Pacific. For that reason, except for documents contained in Exhibit 7, Pacific does not possess any information or documents further responsive to this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY 22

With respect to PacBell's statement in its Answer, at p. 25, that PacBell ordered an additional 4ESS switch from AT&T Technology, and that its plans "called for the traffic originally supposed to be switched by the DMS-200 to be divided, geographically, between the DMS-200 and the 4ESS", describe fully the facts, circumstances, and policies which formed the basis for

this decision to add the 4ESS and divide traffic between the "DMS-200" and the 4ESS, and the exact manner in which traffic was divided between the two switches, including the specific carriers whose traffic was switched to the 4ESS and the percentage of each carrier's total access traffic in LATA No. 732 that was handled by each switch, and the criteria used by PacBell to determine which carrier's traffic was switched off the Tandem, and the persons and participants involved with any of the foregoing.

Pacific objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving such objections, Pacific provides responsive documents in Exhibit 14.

INTERROGATORY 23

With respect to PacBell's statement in its Answer, at p. 26, that in January 1988 the Tandem "unexpectedly lost still more processing capacity", and that as a result, PacBell "resumed rapid deloading of traffic from the DMS-200, urged IECs to order direct access service wherever feasible, and took other steps to minimize demand on the processing capacity of the switch", identify the carriers that had their traffic deloaded from the "DMS-200", including the percentage of each carrier's total LATA No. 732 access traffic that remained on the "DMS-200" and the criteria utilized by PacBell to determine which traffic was removed from the "DMS-200", including an explanation of the criteria used by PacBell to determine whether the ordering of direct access traffic would be "feasible" and an identification of the persons and participants responsible for making such a determination; identify the specific IECs who were "urged" to order direct access service at that time, the specific recommendations made to those IECs and the basis for such recommendations; specify the "other steps" that PacBell took to minimize demand on the "DMS-200"; provide a list of all features added, activated, removed, deactivated or altered in any manner in the Tandem and identify the effects of such action on the Tandem's call handling capacity according to any information provided by Northern Telecom to PacBell or which PacBell may have been otherwise aware of; and identify all documents reflecting or relating to any of the foregoing.