

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

1200 19<sup>TH</sup> STREET, N.W.

SUITE 500

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

(202) 955-9600

FACSIMILE

(202) 955-9792

www.kelleydrye.com

NEW YORK, NY  
LOS ANGELES, CA  
CHICAGO, IL  
STAMFORD, CT  
PARSIPPANY, NJ

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM  
HONG KONG

AFFILIATE OFFICES  
BANGKOK, THAILAND  
JAKARTA, INDONESIA  
MANILA, THE PHILIPPINES  
MUMBAI, INDIA

RECEIVED

DEC - 6 2001

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

December 6, 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ROBERT J. AAMOTH  
DIRECT LINE (202) 955-9676  
E-MAIL: raamoth@kelleydrye.com

**Via Hand Delivery**

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

*Re: Ex Parte Presentation in CC Docket No. 96-98*

Dear Ms. Salas:

Yesterday Jerry Watts, Steve Moses, and the undersigned attorney, on behalf of ITC ^DeltaCom Communications, Inc., met with Kyle Dixon in Chairman Powell's office. The attached *ex parte* letter accurately describes the contents of the meeting. In addition, the parties discussed the attached letter from a Director of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority in support of the pending waiver request.

Please address any inquiries to the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Robert J. Aamoth

cc: Kyle Dixon

No. of Copies rec'd 074  
List ABCDE

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

1200 19<sup>TH</sup> STREET, N.W.

SUITE 500

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

(202) 955-9600

COPY

NEW YORK, NY  
LOS ANGELES, CA  
CHICAGO, IL  
STAMFORD, CT  
PARSIPPANY, NJ

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM  
HONG KONG

AFFILIATE OFFICES  
BANGKOK, THAILAND  
JAKARTA, INDONESIA  
MANILA, THE PHILIPPINES  
MUMBAI, INDIA

FACSIMILE

(202) 955-9792

www.kelleydrye.com

DATE STAMP & RETURN

October 29, 2001

RECEIVED

ROBERT J. AAMOTH

DIRECT LINE (202) 955-9676

E-MAIL: raamoth@kelleydrye.com

OCT 29 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Via Hand Delivery

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

*Re: Ex Parte Presentation in IB Docket No. 96-98*

Dear Ms. Salas:

On October 25, 2001, representatives of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. ("ITC^DeltaCom") met with the Common Carrier Bureau regarding ITC^DeltaCom's petition dated August 16, 2001 in this proceeding. In that petition, ITC^DeltaCom sought a ruling from the FCC that it is entitled to obtain the so-called enhanced extended loop ("EEL") for a specific network configuration identified in the petition. ITC^DeltaCom was represented by Jerry Watts, Steve Moses, Tim Ford and the undersigned attorney, while the Common Carrier Bureau was represented by Dorothy Attwood, Jeffrey Carlisle, Chris Libertelli, Kathy Farroba and Brent Olson. In addition, the ITC^DeltaCom representatives met with Sam Feder from Commissioner Martin's offices on this subject on the same day.

In the meetings, ITC^DeltaCom emphasized that its petition is narrowly tailored. The petition applies to a specific network configuration – an end-to-end DS1 EEL without the use of a collocation arrangement where there is channelized usage of a Special Access DS3 entrance facility – that is particularly suitable for ITC^DeltaCom's business plan of providing a suite of voice and data services to business customers in secondary and other underserved markets. Further, ITC^DeltaCom has not sought UNE rate ratcheting for the DS3 entrance facility as part of this request. ITC^DeltaCom noted that obtaining this EEL is critical to its ability to sustain entry into many smaller cities in its service region, and that ITC^DeltaCom may be forced to exit one or more of those

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas  
October 29, 2001  
Page 2

markets if this request is not granted quickly. (I have attached a list of cities that ITC^DeltaCom serves on a facilities basis in the U.S. Southeast.)

Further, we emphasized that granting our petition would promote local competition in historically underserved markets without in any way compromising the FCC's ongoing consideration of policy and legal issues regarding EELs in the above-referenced docket. We noted that the Commission indicated in its *Supplemental Order Clarification* in this docket in June, 2000 that it would entertain petitions where the requesting carrier satisfies the "significant amount of local traffic" standard. There is no dispute on the record that ITC^DeltaCom satisfies the local usage test under the third safe harbor, and therefore the petition should be granted.

At the Bureau's request, ITC^DeltaCom performed calculations regarding its cumulative average circuit costs under various scenarios. For purposes of these calculations, ITC^DeltaCom used applicable services and rates from Alabama. On a per-DS1 basis, granting the petition would reduce ITC^DeltaCom's cumulative average costs for loop and transport (including entrance facilities) by approximately 11% in the first month, and the size of the reduction would rise to 37% after 24 months, based on conservative growth assumptions. By contrast, having redundant EEL and Special Access entrance facilities would increase ITC^DeltaCom's cumulative average costs for loop and transport (including entrance facilities) over the current situation by 55% in the first month. While the cost penalty of maintaining redundant Special Access and EEL facilities would go down over time, at no time would it be more efficient for ITC^DeltaCom to maintain redundant entrance facilities than to operate via the EEL configuration requested in the petition. After 24 months, the redundant entrance facility configuration would be 32% more costly on a per-DS1 basis than the EEL configuration.

Lastly, ITC^DeltaCom wishes by this letter to clarify for the record that its petition includes not only the network configuration where it obtains a DS1 interoffice facility from the ILEC on a UNE basis, but also the configuration where there is no interoffice transport facility at all (*i.e.*, a DS1 loop is muxed directly onto a DS3 entrance facility). We request that the order granting our request apply to both configurations.

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas  
October 29, 2001  
Page 3

The attached letters in support of ITC^DeltaCom's petition were distributed at both meetings.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert J. Aamoth

cc: Dorothy Attwood  
Jeffrey Carlisle  
Sam Feder  
Kathy Farroba  
Chris Libertelli  
Brent Olson

COMMISSIONERS:

LAUREN "BUBBA" McDONALD, JR., CHAIRMAN  
ROBERT E. BAKER, JR.  
DAVID L. BURGESS  
BOB DURDEN  
STAN WISE



DEBORAH K. FLANNAGAN  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

HELEN O'LEARY  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

## Georgia Public Service Commission

(404) 656-4501  
1 (800) 262-8813

244 WASHINGTON STREET, S.W.  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334-8701

FAX: (404) 656-3341  
[www.psc.state.ga.us](http://www.psc.state.ga.us)

September 28, 2001

Via Facsimile and Regular Mail

The Honorable Michael K. Powell  
Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Petition of ITC^DeltaCom For Waiver in Docket No. 96-98

Dear Chairman Powell:

This is to advise you of my support of the EEL's Waiver Request filed by ITC^DeltaCom on August 17, 2001.

I agree with ITC^DeltaCom's statements regarding the implications for serving secondary markets where there is generally a lack of facilities based competitive options. During this time of constrained capital markets in the telecom sector, policy makers at the state and federal level should take all prudent steps to provide incentives to emerging local competitors to serve secondary and rural markets.

Again, I urge you to approve this waiver and to move ahead as expeditiously as possible to remove unnecessary limitations on the use of EEL's.

Sincerely,

David L. Burgess  
Commissioner

cc: All Commissioners  
Dorothy Atwood

STATE OF ALABAMA  
ALABAMA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
P O BOX 991  
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA 36101-0991

JIM SULLIVAN, PRESIDENT  
JAN COOK, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER  
GEORGE C. WALLACE, JR., ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

WALTER L. THOMAS, JR.  
SECRETARY

October 18, 2001

Dorothy Attwood, Chief  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Petition of ITC^DeltaCom for a Waiver in Docket No. 96-98

Dear Ms. Attwood:

This letter is to advise you that the Alabama Public Service Commission (APSC) supports the petition filed by ITC^DeltaCom on August 17, 2001, for a waiver of the enhanced extended link (EEL) safe harbor requirements established in the *Supplemental Order Clarification* in Docket 96-98.

Having reviewed the filing and the comments of other parties the APSC believes the granting of this waiver, at this time, is justified and will ultimately benefit the consumers of Alabama. The two non-rural ILECs in Alabama account for 90% of the access lines in the state. There are numerous secondary and rural markets in Alabama where there is generally a lack of facility based competitive options. The APSC agrees with ITC^DeltaCom's statements that given the increased cost of capital over the last eighteen months, the company's ability to obtain EELs for the provision of local services will play a critical role in its entry and exit decisions in the secondary and rural areas. In its petition, ITC^DeltaCom is seeking a very limited waiver to efficiently serve its local exchange customers and not to bypass the ILECs special access tariffs. Both state and federal policy makers should take all prudent steps to provide incentives to emerging local competitors to serve secondary and rural markets.

The Alabama Commission urges you to approve this waiver and to move ahead as expeditiously as possible to remove unnecessary limitations on the use of the EELs.

Respectfully,  
Alabama Public Service Commission

By:   
Mary E. Newmeyer  
Federal Affairs Advisor

*Cities Served by ITC^DeltaCom, Inc.*

ALABASTER	AL	GURLEY	AL
ALBERTVL	AL	HANCEVILLE	AL
ALEXANDRCY	AL	HARTSELLE	AL
ANNISTON	AL	HAZELGREEN	AL
ATHENS	AL	HOLTVILLE	AL
ATTALLA	AL	HUNTSVILLE	AL
AUBURN	AL	HURTSBORO	AL
BAYMINETTE	AL	JACKSON	AL
BELLEFONTN	AL	JACKSONVL	AL
BESSEMER	AL	JASPER	AL
BIRMINGHAM	AL	KILLEN	AL
BOAZ	AL	LAFAYETTE	AL
BREWTON	AL	LEIGHTON	AL
CALERA	AL	LEXINGTON	AL
CARBONHILL	AL	LINDEN	AL
CENTREVL	AL	LIVINGSTON	AL
CHELSEA	AL	MADISON	AL
CHILDERSBG	AL	MAPLESVL	AL
CITRONELLE	AL	MARION	AL
CLANTON	AL	MCINTOSH	AL
CLAYTON	AL	MOBILE	AL
COLUMBIANA	AL	MONTEVALLO	AL
CORDOVA	AL	MONTGOMERY	AL
COURTLAND	AL	MOULTON	AL
CULLMAN	AL	MT VERNON	AL
DADEVILLE	AL	MUNFORD	AL
DALEVILLE	AL	NEWVILLE	AL
DECATUR	AL	OHATCHEE	AL
DEMOPOLIS	AL	OPELIKA	AL
DORA	AL	PARRISH	AL
DOTHAN	AL	PHENIXCITY	AL
EUFAULA	AL	PIEDMONT	AL
EUTAW	AL	PINSON	AL
FAIRHOPE	AL	PRATTVILLE	AL
FLOMATON	AL	RED BAY	AL
FLORENCE	AL	RUSSELLVL	AL
FORT DEPOSIT	AL	SELMA	AL
FORT PAYNE	AL	SHEFFIELD	AL
GADSDEN	AL	SYLACAUGA	AL
GARDENDALE	AL	TALLADEGA	AL
GOODWATER	AL	THOMASVL	AL
GRAYSVILLE	AL	TOWN CREEK	AL
GREENSBORO	AL	TROY	AL
GUNTERSVL	AL	TRUSSVILLE	AL

*Cities Served by ITC^DeltaCom, Inc.*

TUSCALOOSA	AL	STAUGUSTIN	FL
TUSKEGEE	AL	STPETERSBG	FL
UNIONTOWN	AL	STUART	FL
VINCENT	AL	TALLAHASSE	FL
W BLOCTON	AL	TAMPA	FL
WARRIOR	AL	TAMPACEN	FL
WETUMPKA	AL	TAMPAEST	FL
YORK	AL	TAMPANTH	FL
BELLEGLADE	FL	TAMPASTH	FL
BOCA RATON	FL	TAMPAWST	FL
BRONSON	FL	TRENTON	FL
CEDAR KEYS	FL	VERO BEACH	FL
CHIPLEY	FL	WILDWOOD	FL
CLEARWATER	FL	WPALMBEACH	FL
CRAWFORDVL	FL	YULEE	FL
CROSS CITY	FL	ZEPHYRHILLS	FL
CRYSTALRIV	FL	ADAIRSVL	GA
DADE CITY	FL	ALBANY	GA
DAYTONABCH	FL	ATHENS	GA
DELAND	FL	ATLANTA	GA
DELRAY BCH	FL	ATLANTA NE	GA
EASTORANGE	FL	ATLANTA NW	GA
FORTPIERCE	FL	ATLANTA SO	GA
FTLAUDERDL	FL	AUGUSTA	GA
GAINESVL	FL	BAINBRIDGE	GA
JACKSOLBCH	FL	BARNESVL	GA
JACKSONVL	FL	BOGART	GA
LAKE CITY	FL	BOWDON	GA
LAKELAND	FL	BRANCH	GA
LYNN HAVEN	FL	BREMEN	GA
MELBOURNE	FL	BUCHANAN	GA
MIAMI	FL	BUFORD	GA
MOUNT DORA	FL	CARROLLTON	GA
NWSMYRNBCH	FL	CARTERSVL	GA
OCALA	FL	CEDARTOWN	GA
ORANGEPARK	FL	CIRCLE	GA
ORLANDO	FL	CLERMONT	GA
PACE	FL	COLUMBUS	GA
PALATKA	FL	CONCORD	GA
PALM COAST	FL	CONYERS	GA
PANAMACITY	FL	COVINGTON	GA
PENSACOLA	FL	CUMMING	GA
PNAMACYBCH	FL	FLOWERY	GA
PNTVDRABCH	FL	FLOWEYBRCH	GA
SANFORD	FL	GAINESVL	GA

*Cities Served by ITC^DeltaCom, Inc.*

GRANTVILLE	GA	JACKSON	MS
GRIFFIN	GA	MADISON	MS
JACKSON	GA	MERIDIAN	MS
KINGSTON	GA	PASCAGOULA	MS
LAGRANGE	GA	PURVIS	MS
LULA	GA	VICKSBURG	MS
LUTHERSVL	GA	WIGGINS	MS
MACON	GA	YAZOO CITY	MS
NEWNAN	GA	BELMONT	NC
ROCKMART	GA	BURLINGTON	NC
ROME	GA	CARY	NC
ROOPVILLE	GA	CHAPELHILL	NC
SANDERSVL	GA	CHARLOTTE	NC
SENOIA	GA	DURHAM	NC
SOCIAL	GA	GASTONIA	NC
SOCIALCRCL	GA	GREENSBORO	NC
SPARTA	GA	HUNTERSVL	NC
STATHAM	GA	RALEIGH	NC
TALLAPOOSA	GA	WINSTN SAL	NC
TEMPLE	GA	AIKEN	SC
THOMASVL	GA	ALLENDALE	SC
VALDOSTA	GA	ANDERSON	SC
VILLA RICA	GA	BAMBERG	SC
WARNERRBNS	GA	BARNWELL	SC
ZEBULON	GA	BATESBURG	SC
ABBEVILLE	LA	BELTON	SC
BATONROUGE	LA	BENNETTSVL	SC
BOGALUSA	LA	BLACKSBURG	SC
BROUSSARD	LA	BLACKVILLE	SC
COVINGTON	LA	BLENHEIM	SC
HOUMA	LA	BLUE RIDGE	SC
KENNER	LA	CAMDEN	SC
LAFAYETTE	LA	CENTRAL	SC
MANDEVILLE	LA	CHARLESTON	SC
MONROE	LA	CHERAW	SC
MORGANCITY	LA	CLEMSON	SC
NATCHITCS	LA	CLINTON	SC
NEW IBERIA	LA	CLIO	SC
NEWORLEANS	LA	COLUMBIA	SC
BILOXI	MS	COWPENS	SC
BRANDON	MS	DARLINGTON	SC
CLINTON	MS	DENMARK	SC
ENTERPRISE	MS	DILLON	SC
GULFPORT	MS	EASLEY	SC
HATTIESBG	MS	EASTOVER	SC

*Cities Served by ITC^DeltaCom, Inc.*

FLORENCE	SC	GALLATIN	TN
FOLLYBEACH	SC	KNOXVILLE	TN
FOUNTANINN	SC	MURFREESBO	TN
GAFFNEY	SC	NASHVILLE	TN
GREENVILLE	SC	SMYRNA	TN
GREER	SC		
HARTSVILLE	SC		
HONEA PATH	SC		
ISLE PALMS	SC		
JOANNA	SC		
JONESVILLE	SC		
LAKE VIEW	SC		
LATTA	SC		
LYMAN	SC		
MARION	SC		
MCCOLL	SC		
MTPLEASANT	SC		
MULLINS	SC		
NO AUGUSTA	SC		
ORANGEBURG	SC		
PACOLET	SC		
PELZER	SC		
PENDLETON	SC		
PICKENS	SC		
PIEDMONT	SC		
PROSPERITY	SC		
SALEM	SC		
SENECA	SC		
SIX MILE	SC		
SOCIETY HL	SC		
SPARTANBG	SC		
SRNGFLSLLY	SC		
ST GEORGE	SC		
SULLIVNSIS	SC		
SUMMERVL	SC		
TIMMONSVL	SC		
TRAVESREST	SC		
UNION	SC		
WESTMINSTR	SC		
WILLIAMSTN	SC		
YORK	SC		
CHATTNOOGA	TN		
CLEVELAND	TN		
COLUMBIA	TN		
FRANKLIN	TN		

# TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Sara Kyle, Chairman  
Lynn Greer, Director  
Melvin Malone, Director



460 James Robertson Parkway  
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0505

November 30, 2001

The Honorable Michael K. Powell, Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Petition of ITC^DeltaCom for Waiver in CC Docket No. 96-98

Dear Chairman Powell:

It was a pleasure meeting you and listening to your comments at Vanderbilt University earlier this month. As a follow-up to our conversation, I am writing this letter to advise you that, consistent with previous decisions of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority, I support competing local exchange companies' ("CLECs") use of enhanced extended links ("EELs"). EELs provide an efficient, cost-effective method for CLECs to serve multiple markets with minimal capital. Without sufficient access to EELs, some CLECs have to purchase duplicative switching equipment for each market it wishes to serve. Such duplicative investment is often uneconomical in the smaller, rural markets that are common in Tennessee.

The availability of EELs improves the attractiveness of market entry for CLECs as well as consumer benefits from competition. During this time of constrained capital markets in the telecommunications sector, policy-makers at the state and federal levels should take all prudent steps to foster competition in all markets, but especially in the secondary and rural markets where competition is developing more slowly. Accordingly, the Tennessee Regulatory Authority has supported competitive entrants' use of EELs in order to encourage the spread of competition throughout the state.

As you review the above-referenced petition of ITC^DeltaCom for waiver, I hope you recognize the benefits currently and potentially accruing to consumers from ITC^DeltaCom's and other CLECs' use of EELs. I also urge you to eliminate any unnecessary limitations of which ITC^DeltaCom seeks a waiver. Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any assistance.

Sincerely,

H. Lynn Greer, Jr.

Attachment (Senator Frist's June 20, 2001, comments in the Congressional Record)

Telephone (615) 741-2904, Toll-Free 1-800-342-8359, Facsimile (615) 741-5015  
[www.state.tn.us/tra](http://www.state.tn.us/tra)

c: Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin  
Senator Bill Frist  
Senator Fred Thompson  
Congressman Ed Bryant  
Congressman Bob Clement  
Congressman John J. Duncan, Jr.  
Congressman Harold E. Ford, Jr.  
Congressman Bart Gordon  
Congressman Van Hilleary  
Congressman William L. Jenkins  
Congressman John S. Tanner  
Congressman Zach Wamp  
Dorothy Atwood, FCC Common Carrier Bureau

critical in order to guarantee a healthy generation of children in America. To this end, I, along with my Senate and House colleagues, have introduced the Immigrant Children's Health Improvement Act, 582 and H.R. 1143, to give States the option to provide health care coverage through Medicaid and CHIP.

Legal immigrant children who came to this country after August 22, 1996 are no different than those who arrived before that date or kids who were born on American soil. Our children go to school together, study together and play together.

On this World Refugee Day, I call upon the Congress and the President to work in earnest to eliminate the arbitrary designation of August 22, 1996 as a cutoff date for allowing children to get health care.

Let us treat the hard working people in our nation, regardless of their immigration status, with fairness and dignity.

#### TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am increasingly concerned about the stalled promise of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. There are many indications that the pro-competitive course we charted in 1996 when we enacted the Telecommunications Act is not moving as quickly as we intended. In response to that landmark law, hundreds of companies invested billions of dollars in an effort to bring a choice of service provider to local consumers. Yet the competitive telecommunications industry has virtually collapsed in the past year. Every day brings reports of competitors declaring bankruptcy, shutting down operations, or scaling back plans to offer service. Even in my home State, five competitive local exchange carriers with major operations in Tennessee have gone bankrupt.

We have all read recent reports of the difficulties that competitive telecommunications firms are facing in the current economic downturn. For those that continue to struggle in operation, stock prices have plunged, and the capital market has virtually dried up. While telecommunications companies captured an average of two billion dollars per month in initial public offerings over the last two years, they raised only \$76 million in IPOs in March, leading numerous companies to withdraw their IPO plans.

The difficulty in entering local markets has also caused nearly all competitors to scale back their plans to offer service. Covad had established offices in Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis and Nashville, but is now closing down over 250 central offices, and will suspend applications for 500 more facilities. Rhythms has cancelled plans to expand nationwide. Net2000 has put its plans for expansion on hold. Numerous other competitors, such as DSL.net, have resolved to focus on a

few core markets. Each of these decisions has been accompanied by hundreds of eliminated jobs. In all, competitive local carriers dismissed over 6500 employees nationwide in the last year while attempting to remain in business. Tennessee is among the hardest hit States.

The repercussions of these events on consumers is significant. Competitors reinvested most of their 2000 revenues in local network facilities. Competitors that declared bankruptcy in 2000 had planned to spend over \$600 million on capital expenditures in 2001. Those competitive networks will not be available to consumers.

In this uncertain financial climate, it is imperative that we maintain a stable regulatory framework. The 1996 Telecom Act established three pathways to a more competitive local telecommunications marketplace: a new entrant could purchase local telephone services at wholesale rates from the incumbent and resell them to local customers; a competitor could lease specific pieces of the incumbent's network on an unbundled basis, using what the industry calls unbundled network elements; or a competitor could build its own facilities and interconnect them with the incumbent's network. Each of these alternatives must remain available to new entrants. Making fundamental changes to the structure of the 1996 Act will destabilize the already shaky competitive local exchange industry, depriving consumers of even the prospects for meaningful choice.

Recent press reports indicate that investors will not sink more money into local competitors when there is a "growing view that regulators are working against the new entrants." We need to ensure that the market-opening requirements of the 1996 Act are vigorously implemented. Without a supportive regulatory environment, there will be no more capital flowing to new entrants in the local telecommunications market spurring competition and lower consumer prices. This was not the promise of the Telecommunications Act I voted for in 1996.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred November 7, 1998 in Easton, MA. An Easton teenager threw a large rock at a 17-year-old boy he thought was gay, kicked him in the head and yelled, swore, and called the victim a "fag." The victim suffered a broken nose and a concussion. A week before the assault, the perpetrator told friends he hated gay people and thought they should be beaten up.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 805 TO ESEA

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate passed, by unanimous consent, an important amendment that will protect our children from pesticide exposure in our Nation's schools. Inadvertently, Senators BOXER and REID were left off this amendment as original cosponsors. I would like the record to reflect that Senator BOXER and Senator REID should have been listed as original cosponsors of amendment #805 to H.R. 1, the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act.

I regret this unfortunate oversight, as these two Senators are largely responsible for the passage of this amendment. They have as much claim to authorship of this important effort as any Member of this body. If not for their commitment to the protection of our Nation's children, we would not be celebrating the passage of this amendment today. Were it not for Senator BOXER's unwavering commitment to protecting our children, as she has done with the introduction of the Children's Environmental Protection Act, the Senate would not even be having this debate. Were it not for Senator REID's understanding of the important issues facing the Senate, and his advocacy as a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, this amendment would not have enjoyed the support that it has.

I thank my friends for their support and ask that the Senate recognize Senator BOXER and Senator REID as original cosponsors of the School Environmental Protection Amendment.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, June 19, 2001, the Federal debt stood at \$5,641,114,076,861.51, five trillion, six hundred forty-one billion, one hundred fourteen million, seventy-six thousand, eight hundred sixty-one dollars and fifty-one cents.

One year ago, June 19, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,649,976,000,000, five trillion, six hundred forty-nine billion, nine hundred seventy-six million.

Five years ago, June 19, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,120,985,000,000, five trillion, one hundred twenty billion, nine hundred eighty-five million.

Ten years ago, June 19, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,498,343,000,000, three trillion, four hundred ninety-eight billion, three hundred forty-three million.

Fifteen years ago, June 19, 1986, the Federal debt stood at \$2,039,961,000,000,