EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

BELLSOUTH

Ben G. Almond
Executive Director-
Federal Regulatory

Suite 900
1133-21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202 463-4112
Fax: 202 463-4198

EX PARTE

January 25, 1995

RECEIVED

JAN 2 6 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RE: Dockets 94-103, 94-105 and 94-107, Petitions of the States of Hawaii, California and Louisiana, respectively to Extend its Rate Regulation of Commercial Mobile Radio Services (CMRS), Ex-Parte Presentation

Dear Mr. Caton:

In accordance with the requirements of Section 1.1200 et. seq. of the Commission's Rules, you are hereby notified that on January 25, 1995, David G. Frolio, William H. Brown and Ben Almond, all of BellSouth Corporation, met in a series of meetings with Rudy Baca; Ruth Milkman; Michael Wack, Doron Fertig, Stanley P. Wiggins, Jr., and Julia Kogan; all of the FCC, to discuss associated issues and comments filed on behalf of BellSouth Corporation and certain of its subsidiaries in the above referenced dockets. The attached document was used for discussion purposes.

Please associate this notification with the dockets in the referenced proceedings.

If there are any questions in this regard, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ben G. Almond

Ben G. Almond
Executive Director-Federal Regulatory

Attachment

cc: Rudy Baca
Ruth Milkman
Michael Wack
Doron Fertig
Stanley P. Wiggins, Jr.
Julia Kogan

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List A B C D E

AGENDA FOR EX PARTE MEETING

JANUARY 25, 1995

RECEIVED

JAN 2 6 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

1. Hawaii and Louisiana have failed to meet the burden of proof necessary to continue rate regulation of CMRS rates.

   A. Hawaii

      i. Rate of return analysis does not demonstrate unjust or unreasonable rates

      ii. No evidence of unjustly or unreasonably discriminatory rates

   B. Louisiana

      i. No evidence of unjust or unreasonable rates

      ii. No evidence of unjustly or unreasonably discriminatory rates

      iii. Customer complaints do not support LPSC's allegations of unjust rates

   C. The FCC should dismiss these petitions expeditiously.

2. California

   A. Confidentiality issue

   B. Other Issues