ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

AT&T

**Leonard J. Cali**
Vice President
Federal Government Affairs

Suite 1000
1120 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202 457-2120
FAX 202 263-2794
lcali@att.com

RECEIVED

SEP 13 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

September 13, 2000

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room TWB-204
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Notice of Ex Parte Presentation:

Funding Mechanism of the Universal Service Fund, CC Docket No. 96-45; Policy and Rules Concerning the Interstate, Interexchange Marketplace, Implementation of Section 254(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, CC Docket No. 96-61; Access Charge Reform, CC Docket No. 96-262; Request for Emergency Relief of the Minnesota CLEC Consortium and the Rural Independent Competitive Alliance, DA 00-1067; Mandatory Detariffing of CLEC Interstate Access Services, DA 00-1268; In the Matter of the Application for Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations from MediaOne Group, Inc., Transferor, to AT&T Corp., Transferee, CS Docket No. 99-251; Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in Markets for the Delivery of Video Programming, CS Docket No. 00-132

Dear Ms. Salas:

Yesterday, C. Michael Armstrong, AT&T Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, James W. Cicconi, AT&T General Counsel and Executive Vice President, and I met with Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth and Rebecca Beynon, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth. We discussed a number of issues that touch upon matters related to the referenced proceedings. Specifically, we discussed the competitive marketplace distortions introduced by the assessment of a carrier's universal service fund contributions based on prior year revenues, and by interexchange

Recycled Paper

geographic rate averaging requirements. In addition, we discussed AT&T's view that many CLECs charge exorbitantly high rates for their access services, and that interexchange carriers have no duty to purchase such services. We also discussed AT&T's concern that the Commission's cable ownership and attribution rules are arbitrary and overly restrictive. Our comments on these issues were consistent with AT&T's written submissions in the referenced proceedings.

For each of the referenced proceedings, two copies of this Notice are being submitted in accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules.

Sincerely,

cc: Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth
Rebecca Beynon