



Susan S. Masterton Attorney Law/External Affairs
Post Office Box 2214
1313 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214
Mailstop FLTLH00107
Voice 850 599 1560
Fax 850 878 0777
susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com

June 9, 2003

Ms. Blanca Bayo', Director Division of the Commission Clerk & Administrative Services Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 COLVED TRSC
COMMISSION
COMMISSION

RE: Docket Nos. 981834 & 990321-TP; Sprint's Objections to Staff's Sixth Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 36-36) and Seventh Request for Production of Documents (Nos. 35-45)

Dear Ms. Bayo':

Enclosed for filing are the original and 15 copies of Sprint's Objections to Staff's Sixth Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 36-46) and Seventh Request for Production of Documents (Nos. 35-45). Copies are being served on the parties to this docket, pursuant to the attached Certificate of Service.

Please acknowledge receipt of this filing by stamping and initialing a copy of this letter and returning same to the courier. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 850/599-1560.

Sincerely,

Susan S. Masterton

Enclosures

CAF
CMP
COM
CTR
ECR
GCL
OPC
MMS
SEC
OTH

RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

05119 JUN-98

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK-

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition of Competitive Carriers for DOCKET NO. 981834-TP Commission action to support local competition BellSouth

Telecommunications, Inc.'s service territory.

In re: Petition of ACI Corp. d/b/a Accelerated DOCKET NO. 990321-TP Connections, Inc. for generic investigation to ensure that BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, and GTE Florida Incorporated comply with obligation to provide alternative local exchange carriers with flexible, timely, and cost-efficient physical collocation.

Filed: June 9, 2003

SPRINT -FLORIDA, INCORPORATED'S OBJECTIONS TO STAFF'S SIXTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 36-46) AND STAFF'S SEVENTH REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (NOS. 35-45)

Sprint-Florida, Incorporated ("Sprint"), pursuant to Rule 28-106.206, Florida Administrative Code, and Rules 1.340, 1.350 and 1.280(b), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby submits the following Objections to Staff's Sixth Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 36-46) and Seventh Request for Production of Documents (Nos. 35-45) served on Sprint via e-mail on May 30, 2003.

INTRODUCTION

The objections stated herein are preliminary in nature and are made at this time for the purpose of complying with the ten-day requirement set forth in Order No. PSC-02-1513-PCO-TP ("Procedural Order") issued by the Florida Public Service Commission ("Commission") in the above-referenced docket. Should additional grounds for objection be discovered as Sprint prepares its responses to the above-referenced requests, Sprint reserves the right to supplement,

revise, or modify its objections at the time that it serves its responses on Staff. Moreover, should Sprint determine that a Protective Order is necessary with respect to any of the material requested by Staff, Sprint reserves the right to file a motion with the Commission seeking such a order at the time that it serves its answers and responses on Staff.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Sprint makes the following General Objections to Staff's Sixth Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 36-46) (Sixth IRR) and Seventh Request for Production of Documents (Nos. 35-45) (Seventh POD). These general objections apply to each of the individual requests and interrogatories in the Sixth IRR and Seventh POD, respectively, and will be incorporated by reference into Sprint's responses and answers when they are served on Staff.

- 1. Sprint objects to the requests to the extent that such requests seek to impose an obligation on Sprint to respond on behalf of subsidiaries, affiliates, or other persons that are not parties to this case on the grounds that such requests are overly broad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and not permitted by applicable discovery rules.
- 2. Sprint has interpreted Staff's requests to apply to Sprint's regulated intrastate operations in Florida and will limit its responses accordingly. To the extent that any request is intended to apply to matters other than Florida intrastate operations subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, Sprint objects to such request to produce as irrelevant, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive.
- 3. Sprint objects to each and every request and instruction to the extent that such request or instruction calls for information that is exempt from discovery by virtue of the attorney-client privilege, work product privilege, or other applicable privilege.

- 4. Sprint objects to each and every request insofar as the request is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, imprecise, or utilizes terms that are subject to multiple interpretations but are not properly defined or explained for purposes of these requests. Any responses provided by Sprint to Staff's requests will be provided subject to, and without waiver of, the foregoing objection.
- 5. Sprint objects to each and every request insofar as the request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this action. Sprint will attempt to note in its responses each instance where this objection applies.
- 6. Sprint objects to Staff's discovery requests, instructions and definitions, insofar as they seek to impose obligation on Sprint that exceed the requirements of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure or Florida Law.
- 7. Sprint objects to providing information to the extent that such information is already in the public record before the Commission, or elsewhere.
- 8. Sprint objects to each and every request, insofar as it is unduly burdensome, expensive, oppressive, or excessively time consuming as written.
- 9. Sprint objects to each and every request to the extent that the information requested constitutes "trade secrets" which are privileged pursuant to Section 90.506, Florida Statutes. To the extent that Staff's requests proprietary confidential business information which is not subject to the "trade secrets" privilege, Sprint will make such information available in accordance with the protective order in this docket issued by the Commission, Order No. PSC-03-0222-PCO-TP, subject to any other general or specific objections contained herein.
- 10. Sprint is a large corporation with employees located in many different locations in Florida and in other states. In the course of its business, Sprint creates countless documents that

are not subject to Commission or FCC retention of records requirements. These documents are kept in numerous locations that are frequently moved from site to site as employees change jobs or as the business is reorganized. Therefore, it is possible that not every document will be provided in response to these discovery requests. Rather, Sprint's responses will provide, subject to any applicable objections, all of the information obtained by Sprint after a reasonable and diligent search conducted in connection with these requests. Sprint shall conduct a search of those files that are reasonably expected to contain the requested information. To the extent that the discovery requests purport to require more, Sprint objects on the grounds that compliance would impose an undue burden or expense. To the extent that Staff requests herein documents that have previously been produced to other parties in response to previous discovery, then without limiting any of the foregoing objections, Sprint incorporates herein by reference its objections to that previous discovery.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS: SIXTH IRR

In addition to the foregoing general objections, Sprint raises the following specific objections to the following individual interrogatories in the Sixth IRR:

36. With regard to Staff's PODs 35 and 36, please explain how the cost of land and buildings were estimated or developed for these cost studies.

Please see objections to PODs No. 35 and 36.

- 37. With regard to Staff PODs 35 and 36, what is the cost per square foot of floor space used by Sprint in each of the xDSL and Frame Relay cost studies?
 - A. If the estimated or derived cost per square foot of floor space varies between these studies please explain why such differences exist. (I.e. explain why the cost per square foot of floor space has changed over time and/or why the cost per square foot for floor space is not the same for both xDSL and Frame Relay.)
 - B. If the estimated or derived cost per square foot of floor space that appears in Sprint's xDSL or Frame Relay cost studies is different than the per square foot

cost supported by Sprint in this proceeding please quantify and describe in detail the source of these differences.

Objection: Please see objections to PODs No. 35 and No. 36.

- 38. The following interrogatory references the State Of North Carolina Utilities Commission Raleigh Docket No. P-100, SUB 133j. Order Issued December 28, 2001. Page 256 "The Commission concludes that it is appropriate to apply Sprint's proposed nonrecurring charge of \$559.81 per cage and \$25.37 per linear foot for construction of a cage to BellSouth and Verizon."
 - A. Please quantify and describe in detail the source of the variation in collocation cage engineering and construction costs proposed by Sprint in this proceeding and those proposed by Sprint and subsequently adopted by the North Carolina Utilities Commission in the aforementioned order.

Objection: Sprint objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that the information requested is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this action. Sprint's collocation cost studies in North Carolina, involving a separate Sprint affiliate, are not relevant to a determination of Sprint's collocation costs in Florida.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS: SEVENTH POD

In addition to the foregoing general objections, Sprint raises the following specific objections to the following individual requests in the Seventh POD:

35. Please provide electronic copies of, and all supporting documents for, the three most recent cost studies submitted to the FCC for xDSL service in Florida. If electronic copies are not available please provide in paper format.

Objection: Sprint objects to this POD on the grounds that the information requested is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this action. Sprint's xDSL service is an interstate service subject to the jurisdiction of the FCC. Any cost studies developed to support Sprint's prices for this interstate

service are not relevant to this proceeding, the purpose of which is to develop TELRIC-based charges for collocation pursuant to sections 251 and 252 of the Telecommunications Act, as the TELRIC-based cost standard set forth in the Act does not apply to Sprint's xDSL service.

36. Please provide electronic copies of, and all supporting documents for, the three most recent cost studies submitted to the FCC for retail Frame Relay service in Florida. If electronic copies are not available please provide in paper format.

Objection: Sprint objects to this POD on the grounds that the information requested is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this action. Sprint's frame relay service is an interstate service subject to the jurisdiction of the FCC. Any cost studies provided to support Sprint's prices for this interstate service are not relevant to this proceeding, the purpose of which is to develop TELRIC-based charges for collocation pursuant to sections 251 and 252 of the Telecommunications Act, as the TELRIC-based cost standard set forth in the Act does not apply to Sprint's frame relay service.

37. Please provide all documents used to support or derive your answer to Staff's Interrogatory 38.

Objection: Please see objection to Interrogatory No. 38.

- 41. Regarding folder Security Investment WP. Column G provides the square footage for a number of central offices. The note at cell G3 indicates that the data was obtained from the Segis Database. For each Sprint central office in Florida please provide in an Excel spreadsheet:
 - A. The central office CLLI name
 - B. The Square footage for each CLLI

- C. A "yes" or "no" indication regarding if collocation currently exists at each central office.
- D. The embedded and current building investment. The current investment should be estimated by multiplying the embedded investment by the current/book ratio.
- E. Please provide the work papers associated with the development of the current/book ratios.

Objection: Sprint objects to this interrogatory because the requested documents do not exist. To the extent that Sprint is being requested to create such documents for all of Sprint's central offices in Florida, such request is overly broad and unduly burdensome for Sprint, as Sprint would be required to search and compile voluminous records for Sprint's 100+ central offices in Florida to create the requested documents.

42. Please provide electronic copies of, and all supporting documents for, the cost studies filed by Sprint in FPSC Docket 990649B-TP. To the extent that electronic files are not available please provide in paper format.

Objection: Sprint objects to this interrogatory as such documents are publicly available as part of the record in Commission Docket No. 990649B-TP. In addition, a request for Sprint to reproduce such documents, including voluminous costs studies and supporting work papers as well as numerous discovery responses, for the purpose of discovery in this docket is overly broad and would impose an undue burden and expense on Sprint.

DATED this 9th day of June 2003.

Swon S. metst

SUSAN S. MASTERTON
P.O. Box 2214
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214
(850) 599-1560 (phone)
(850) 878-0777 (fax)
susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com

ATTORNEY FOR SPRINT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 981834-TP & 990321-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by U.S. Mail this 9th day of June, 2003 to the following:

Jason Rojas, Staff Counsel Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870

Nancy B. White c/o Nancy H. Sims BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 150 S. Monroe Street Suite 400 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1556

Pennington Law Firm Peter Dunbar/Marc W. Dunbar Post Office Box 1009 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Florida Cable Telecommunications Association, Incorporated Michael A. Gross 246 E. 6th Avenue, Suite 100 Tallahassee, FL 32303

FCCA c/o McWhirter Law Firm Vicki Kaufman 117 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, Florida 32301

MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. Donna McNulty 1203 Governors Square Blvd. Suite 201 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-2960

Messer Law Firm Floyd Self/Norman Horton Post Office Box 1876 Tallahassee, Florida 32302 MediaOne Florida
Telecommunications, Inc.
c/o Laura L Gallagher, P.A.
101 E. College Ave., Suite 302
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.
Tracy W. Hatch
215 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Katz, Kutter Law Firm Charles Pellegrini/Patrick Wiggins 12th Floor 106 East College Avenue Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems, Inc.
Mark E. Buechele
2620 S.W. 27th Avenue
Miami, FL 33133

Verizon-Florida, Incorporated Richard Chapkis c/o David Christian 106 East College Avenue, Suite 810 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-7704

ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. Nanette Edwards Messer, Caparello & Self Post Office Box 1876 Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876 Network Telephone Corporation Brent E. McMahan 815 South Palafox Street Pensacola, FL 32501-5937

KMC Telecom, Inc. Mr. John D. McLaughlin, Jr. 1755 North Brown Road Lawrenceville, GA 30043-8119

Florida Digital Network, Inc. Matthew Feil, Esq. 390 North Orange Ave., Suite 2000 Orlando, FL 32801

Beth Keating, Esq. Division of Legal Services Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870

Susan S. Masterton