

October 8, 2003

Ms. Blanca S. Bayó Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

via Overnight Mail

Re: Docket No. 030852-TP In re: Implementation of Requirements Arising from FCC Triennial UNE Review: Location-Specific Review for DS1, DS3 and Dark Fiber Loops, Route-Specific Review for DS1, DS3 and Dark Fiber Transport

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed please find an original and fifteen (15) copies of this letter for filing in the above docket.

In accordance with the instruction given at the preliminary hearing held in the above matter on October 6, 2003, I write on behalf of Florida Digital Network, Inc., d/b/a FDN Communications ("FDN") to respond to certain preliminary and procedural matters discussed at the hearing.

With regard to the document AT&T handed out at the October 6 hearing, a document with the heading, "Proposed Modifications to Orders Establishing Procedure" (hereinafter "Proposed Modifications"), FDN has a number of comments and questions.

The Proposed Modifications document seems to suggest that its entire contents be incorporated into the Order Establishing Procedure. However, FDN agrees with the Prehearing Officer's indication that a number of the provisions in the Proposed Modifications are better suited to being stipulations and need not be addressed in any order modifying the Order Establishing Procedure.

FDN has not attempted to delineate herein which provisions of the Proposed Modifications are better suited to being stipulations, but FDN has particular concern with those provisions that address region-wide discovery obligations/limitations. The Proposed Modifications seem to state, for example, that if AT&T took the deposition of a BellSouth witness in a Tennessee TRO case, another carrier would be foreclosed from taking the deposition of that witness in Florida, regardless of whether that other carrier

LOCAL

LONG DISTANCE

operates in other BellSouth states. To this sort of outcome and other potentially unfair outcomes that may result from imposition of the region-wide approach, FDN has serous concerns. FDN understands the desire to conserve resources but questions the ramifications of imposing region-wide obligations/limitations. At this time, FDN does not agree that it would be appropriate to modify the Order Establishing Procedure to address the region-wide discovery issues suggested in the Proposed Modifications. However, the parties are certainly free to make stipulations regarding region-wide discovery as they deem appropriate.

FDN submits the Proposed Modifications are somewhat unclear in at least one request regarding delivery and receipt of electronic submissions. Off the record, Mr. Henry of AT&T indicated to me that as long as an email is sent before midnight on the date an item is due, it should be considered timely served. The Proposed Modifications go on to indicate the clock for a response to an item so served begins with "receipt," but receipt is not clearly delineated. FDN maintains that if a document is served electronically after 5:00 p.m., the response clock should start the following business day.

The Proposed Modifications contemplate only electronic service of documents on parties (via email or URL), with paper originals and copies being filed with the Commission. FDN does not object to this idea in principle, but believes that the one week time permitted for a paper follow-up after a party's request may not be appropriate in all cases. Presumably, if a party is requesting a paper copy, there is a reason for the request and, in some instances, the need may be urgent or a response date may be triggered. FDN would therefore suggest that there be greater flexibility for providing the paper copy depending on need and the size of the document. FDN suggests that if a Commission Order addresses this subject, the Order provide that a paper follow-up copy be provided to the requesting party "promptly and, wherever possible, within the time frame requested."

Finally, BellSouth verbally suggested at the October 6 hearing that the Commission permit parties to serve interrogatories and other discovery on nonparty carriers. In an October 7 letter, BellSouth suggests that the Commission simply decree that all entities that have Commission certificates be involuntarily made parties to this proceeding and Docket No. 030851. FDN believes that both BellSouth suggestions are problematic, and, in any event, such sweeping and serious substantive action would warrant pleadings and consideration by the full Commission. Briefly stated, the Commission would at least need to consider its authority for and the necessity, fairness, administrative and logistical burdens, and evidentiary and procedural implications² of making all certificated entities parties by force. Further, the Commission should not delegate any of its information gathering authority to BellSouth (as BellSouth's October 7 letter suggests) simply because BellSouth asks for the convenience and benefit of such. The Commission is perfectly capable of identifying and gathering what information, if any, the Commission

LOCAL

¹ The BellSouth and FCCA Joint Emergency Motion filed September 24, 2003, mentions that the two sides to that filing were discussing discovery to nonparties. But no motion has been made on the subject to date.

² Among the procedural implications to consider is the applicability of the Proposed Modifications currently under advisement.

desires from the regulated community at large for purposes of the TRO cases. The workshop scheduled for October 28 illustrates the Commission's ability and designs in that regard.

If you have any questions regarding the enclosed, please call me at 407-835-0460.

Sincerely,

Matthew Feil

General Counsel

FDN Communications

C: Parties of Record (by email only)
Adam Teitzman (by email and U.S. mail)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was sent by e-mail and regular mail to the persons listed below, other than those marked with an (*) who have been sent a copy via overnight mail, this \(\frac{1}{2} \) day of \(\frac{1}{2} \) \(\f

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. R, Douglas Lackey/Meredith E. Mays c/o Ms. Nancy H. Sims 150 South Monroe Street Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556 nancy.sims@bellsouth.com

Mr. Adam Teitzman
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
ateitzman@psc.state.fl.us

McWhirter Law Firm Vicki Kaufman 117 South Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 vkaufman@mac-law.com

Verizon Florida, Inc.
Richard Chapkis
One Tampa City Center
201 North Franklin Street (33602)
P.O. Box 110, FLTC 0007
Tampa, FL 33601-0110
Richard.chapkis@verizon.com

Covad Communications Company Mr. Charles E. Watkins 1230 Peachtree Street, N.E. 19th Floor Atlanta, GA 30309-3574 gwatkins@covad.com

Florida Cable Telecom Assoc., Inc. Michael A. Gross 246 East 6th Avenue Suite 100 Tallahassee, FL 32303 mgross@fcta.com

Matthew Feil
Scott A. Kassman
FDN Communications
390 North Orange Avenue
Suite 2000
Orlando, FL 32801

(407) 835-0460 mfeil@mail.fdn.com skassman@mail.fdn.com

1