Kimberly Caswell
Vice President and General Counsel, Southeast
Legal Department



FLTC0007 201 North Franklin Street (33602) Post Office Box 110 Tampa, Florida 33601-0110

Phone 813 483-2606 Fax 813 204-8870 kimberly.caswell@verizon.com

February 20, 2001

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records & Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 990362-TI

Initiation of Show Cause Proceeding Against GTE Communications Corporation for Apparent Violation of Rule 25-4.118, F.A.C., Local, Local Toll,

or Toll Provider Selection

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Please find enclosed for filing an original and fifteen copies of Verizon Select Services Inc.'s Opposition to The Office of Public Counsel's Request for Ruling on First Motion to Compel in the above matter. Service has been made as indicated on the Certificate of Service. If there are any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at 813-483-2617.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Caswell

KC:tas

Enclosures

CAF CMP COM 5 CTR ECR LEG

APP

OPC
PAI
RGO

SER OTH

RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02331 FEB 20 =

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Initiation of Show Cause Proceeding
Against GTE Communications Corporation
for Apparent Violation of Rule 25-4.118, F.A.C.,)
Local, Local Toll, or Toll Provider Selection

Docket No. 990362-TI Filed: February 20, 2001

VERIZON SELECT SERVICES INC.'S OPPOSITION TO THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL'S REQUEST FOR RULING ON FIRST MOTION TO COMPEL

Verizon Select Services Inc. (VSSI) (formerly GTE Communications Corporation) asks the Commission to deny the Request for Ruling on First Motion to Compel (Request for Ruling), filed by the Office of Public Counsel (OPC) on February 8, 2001.

The Motion to Compel underlying OPC's Request concerns its requests for production of all documents "relating to compensation plans" and performance objectives and results for all officers of GTE Communications Corporation (now VSSI) for 1997-1999. (OPC document requests 17 and 18, Sixth Set of Requests for Production of Document.) As VSSI pointed out in its January 23, 2001 Response to the OPC's Motion to Compel (Response), VSSI objected to OPC's requests because they are overbroad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous. VSSI stands on these objections. As VSSI explained in its Response, OPC would have VSSI produce documents well beyond those sufficient to establish compensation, and OPC seeks documents that have nothing to do with long-distance sales. As such, much, if not most, of the information sought is not relevant to this proceeding.

Once again, VSSI vigorously denies OPC's allegations in its Motion to Compel, repeated in the Request for Ruling, that VSSI was "well aware" of a "huge slamming problem" and that it failed to take timely action to stop slamming. As the Direct 0.2331 FEB 20.5

Testimonies of VSSI witnesses Caliro and Owens prove, these allegations are plainly false, and no amount of discovery will change this fact.

In any event, in the spirit of cooperation, VSSI agreed to work with OPC to determine which documents were potentially relevant and responsive to OPC's requests. Without withdrawing its objections, VSSI agreed to permit OPC to review responsive documents. After such review, the parties were to try to come to some accommodation as to the relevancy and use of the documents OPC designated for production.

VSSI's agreement with OPC remains in force. Since OPC served its requests, VSSI has continued (and will continue) to diligently search for responsive documents, even though it denies their relevancy. However, VSSI's search has turned up few documents. VSSI has permitted OPC to review these documents. But VSSI cannot produce documents it cannot find and that may no longer exist. In this regard, VSSI notes that there have been numerous personnel changes and major company reorganizations since 1997-1999, the years covered by OPC's requests.

For these reasons, VSSI reiterates its belief, stated in its Response to OPC's Motion to Compel, that a ruling on OPC's Motion is not necessary. VSSI will continue to search for potentially responsive documents, even though such documents may not be relevant. But an Order compelling VSSI to produce documents it does not have would be a waste of the Prehearing Officer's time and effort.

Respectfully submitted on February 20, 2001.

By: Luthay | Kimberly Caswell

Post Office Box 110, FLTC0007

Tampa, Florida 33601 Telephone: 813-483-2617

Attorney for Verizon Select Services Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that copies of Verizon Select Services Inc.'s Opposition to The Office of Public Counsel's Request for Ruling on First Motion to Compel in Docket No. 990362-TI were sent via overnight delivery on February 19, 2001 to:

Lee Fordham
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Charles J. Beck, Deputy Public Counsel
Office of Public Counsel
111 W. Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Par Kimberly Caswell