

RECEIVED-FPSC

00 JUN 12 PM 3:59



Marsha E. Rule
Senior Attorney

RECORDS AND
REPORTING

Suite 700
101 N. Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850 425-6365
FAX 850 425-6361

June 12, 2000

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

Re: Docket No. 990649-TP

Dear Mrs. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced docket are an original and fifteen (15) copies each of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.'s Objections to GTE Florida Incorporated's First Request for Production of Documents and First Set of Interrogatories.

Copies of the foregoing are being served on all parties of record in accordance with the attached Certificate of Service.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Yours truly,

Marsha Rule

- APP _____
- CAE _____
- CMP 5
- COM 5
- CTR _____
- ECR _____
- LEG 2
- OPC _____
- PAI _____
- RGO _____
- SEC 1
- SER _____
- OTH _____

MR:kfj
Enclosures

RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07177 JUN 12 8

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
DOCKET 990649-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was furnished via e-mail and overnight delivery* and/or U.S. Mail to the following parties of record on this 12th day of June, 2000:

Beth Keating
FPSC
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Donna Canzano McNulty
MCI WorldCom
325 John Knox Rd, Suite 105
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Nancy B. White
c/o Nancy Sims
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
150 S. Monroe, Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Carolyn Marek
Time Warner Communications
233 Bramerton Court
Franklin, TN 37069

Joseph A. McGlothlin
Vicki Gordon Kaufman
McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin,
Davidson, Rief & Bakas, P.A.
117 S. Gadsden St.
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Mark E. Buechele
Supra Telecommunications
Koger Center-Ellis BLDG. Suite 200
1311 Executive Center Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32301-5027

Patrick K. Wiggins
Charles Pellegrini
Wiggins & Villacorta, P.A.
2145 Delta Blvd., Ste. 200
Tallahassee, FL 32303

James C. Falvey
e.spire Communications, Inc.
133 National Business Pkwy.
Suite 200
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Richard Melson
Gabriel E. Nieto
Hopping Law Firm
P.O. Box 6526
Tallahassee, FL 32314

ACI Corp.
7337 S. Revere Pkwy.
Englewood, CO 80112

Floyd R. Self
Norman H. Horton
Messer, Caparello & Self
215 S. Monroe St., Ste. 701
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1873

Elise Kiely/Jeffrey Blumenfeld
1625 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036

Kimberly Caswell*
GTE Florida Incorporated
P.O. Box 110, FLTC0007
Tampa, FL 33601-0110

Scott Sapperstein
Intermedia Communications Inc.
3625 Queen Palm Dr.
Tampa, FL 33619

Peter Dunbar/Barbara Auger
Pennington Law Firm
P.O. Box 10095
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Michael Gross
FCTA
310 N. Monroe St.
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Charles J. Rehwinkel
Sprint-Florida, Inc.
P.O. Box 2214
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2214
MC FLTLHO0107

Brian Sulmonetti
Dulaney L. O'Roark
MCI WorldCom, Inc.
6 Concourse Pkwy, Suite 3200
Atlanta, GA 30328

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

Christopher V. Goodpastor
Covad Communications Company
9600 Great Hills Trl., Suite 150W
Austin, TX 78759

Eric J. Branfman, Morton J. Posner
Russell M. Blau & Marc B. Rothschild
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007-5116

John McLaughlin
KMC Telecom, Inc.
3025 Breckinridge Blvd.
Suite 170
Duluth, GA 30096

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

NorthPoint Communications, Inc.
Glenn Harris, Esq.
222 Sutter Street, 7th floor
San Francisco, CA 94108

J. Jeffrey Wahlen
Ausley & McMullen
P.O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Bettye Willis
ALLTEL
One Allied Drive
Little Rock, AR 72203-2177

Norton Cutler, General Counsel
BlueStar Networks
401 Church Street, 24th Floor
Nashville, TN 37201

George S. Ford
Z-Tel Communications, Inc.
601 S. Harbour Island Blvd.
Tampa, FL 33602

Jonathan Canis
Michael Hazzard
Kelley Drye & Warren
1200 19th Street, NW 5th FL
Washington, DC 20036

Rodney L. Joyce
Shook, Hardy & Bacon
600 14th St, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005-2004

Jon C. Moyle & Cathy M. Sellers
Moyle, Flanigan, Katz, Kolins, Raymond
& Sheehan
118 N. Gadsden St.
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Constance L. Kirkendall
Regulatory Manager
@link Network, Inc.
2220 Campbell Creek Blvd.
Suite 110
Richardson, TX 75082-4420



Attorney

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation into pricing of)
unbundled network elements)
_____)

Docket No. 990649-TP

Filed June 12, 2000

AT&T'S OBJECTIONS TO GTE FLORIDA INCORPORATED'S
FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTIN OF DOCUMENTS

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. (hereinafter "AT&T"), pursuant to Rules 25-22.034 and 25-22.035, Florida Administrative Code and Rules 1.350 and 1.280(b), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby submits the following Objections to GTE Florida Incorporated's (hereinafter GTEFL) First Request for Production of Documents to AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

The Objections stated herein are preliminary in nature and are made at this time for the purpose of complying with the five-day requirement set forth in Order No. PSC-00-2015-PCO-TP issued by the Florida Public Service Commission (hereinafter the "Commission") in the above-referenced docket on June 8, 2000. Should additional grounds for objection be discovered as AT&T prepares its Responses to the above-referenced set of requests, AT&T reserves the right to supplement, revise, or modify its objections at the time that it serves its Responses on GTEFL. Moreover, should AT&T determine that a Protective Order is necessary with respect to any of the material requested by GTEFL, AT&T reserves the right to file a motion with the Commission seeking such an order at the time that it serves its Responses on GTEFL.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07177 JUN 12 8

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

General Objections

AT&T makes the following General Objections to GTEFL's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents which will be incorporated by reference into AT&T's specific responses when its Responses are served on GTEFL.

1. AT&T objects to GTEFL's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents to the extent that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, not permitted by applicable discovery rules, and would require AT&T to disclose information which is privileged.

2. AT&T has interpreted GTEFL's requests to apply to AT&T'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, AT&T objects to such request as irrelevant, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive.

3. AT&T objects to each and every request and instruction to the extent that such request or instruction calls for information which is exempt from discovery by virtue of the attorney-client privilege, work product privilege or other applicable privilege.

4. AT&T 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 AT&T in response to GTEFL's requests will be provided subject to, and without waiver of, the foregoing objection.

5. AT&T 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. AT&T will attempt to note each instance where this objection applies.

6. AT&T objects to GTEFL's general instructions, definitions or specific discovery requests insofar as they seek to impose obligations on AT&T which exceed the requirements of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure or Florida law.

7. AT&T objects to providing information to the extent that such information is already in the public record before the Florida Public Service Commission.

8. AT&T objects to each and every request, general instruction, or definition insofar as it is unduly burdensome, expensive, oppressive, or excessively time consuming as written.

9. AT&T 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 GTEFL's requests seek proprietary confidential business information which is not the subject of the "trade secrets" privilege, AT&T will make such information available to counsel for GTEFL pursuant to an appropriate Protective Agreement, subject to any other general or specific objections contained herein.

10. AT&T is a large corporation with employees located in many different locations in Florida and in other states. In the course of its business, AT&T creates countless documents that are not subject to Florida Public Service Commission or FCC retention of records requirements. These documents are kept in numerous locations and are frequently moved from site to site as employees change jobs or as the business is reorganized. Rather, these responses will provide all of the information obtained by AT&T after a reasonable and diligent search conducted in connection with this discovery request. AT&T will comply with GTEFL's request that a search be conducted of those files that are reasonably expected to contain the requested information. To the extent that the discovery request purports to require more, AT&T objects on the grounds that compliance would impose an undue burden or expense.

11. AT&T objects to the definitions of "AT&T" to the extent that such definitions seek to impose an obligation on AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. to respond on behalf of subsidiaries, affiliates, or other persons that are not parties to this case on the grounds that such definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and not permitted by applicable discovery rules. Without waiver of its general objection, and subject to other general and specific objections, Answers will be provided on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. which is the entity certificated to provide regulated telecommunications services in Florida and which is a party to this docket. All references to "AT&T" in responding to GTEFL's requests should be taken to mean AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

12. AT&T objects to the definitions of "you" and "your" to the extent that such definitions seek to impose an obligation on AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. to respond on behalf of subsidiaries, affiliates, or other persons that are not parties to this case on the grounds that such definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and not permitted by applicable discovery rules. Without waiver of its general objection, and subject to other general and specific objections, Answers will be provided on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. which is the entity certificated to provide regulated telecommunications services in Florida and which is a party to this docket. All references to "AT&T" in responding to GTEFL's requests should be taken to mean AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

Objections to Specific Requests

Subject to, and without waiver of, the foregoing general objections, AT&T enters the following specific objections with respect to GTEFL's requests:

Request No. 1: AT&T objects to Request for Production of Documents No. 1 on the grounds that 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.

Request No. 2: AT&T objects to this Request for Production of Documents on the grounds that 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.

Request No. 3: AT&T objects to this Request for Production of Documents on the grounds that 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.

Request No. 4: AT&T objects to this Request for Production of Documents on the grounds that 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.

SUBMITTED this 12th day of June, 2000.



Marsha Rule
101 N. Monroe St.
Suite 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(850) 425-6365

ATTORNEY FOR AT&T
COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN
STATES, INC.

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation into pricing of)
unbundled network elements)
_____)

Docket No. 990649-TP

Filed June 12, 2000

AT&T'S OBJECTIONS TO GTE FLORIDA INCORPORATED'S
FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. (hereinafter "AT&T"), pursuant to Rules 25-22.034 and 25-22.035, Florida Administrative Code and Rules 1.340 and 1.280(b), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby submits the following Objections to GTE Florida Incorporated's (hereinafter "GTEFL") First Set of Interrogatories to AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

The Objections stated herein are preliminary in nature and are made at this time for the purpose of complying with the five-day requirement set forth in Order No. PSC-00-2015-PCO-TP issued by the Florida Public Service Commission (hereinafter the "Commission") in the above-referenced docket on June 8, 2000. Should additional grounds for objection be discovered as AT&T prepares its Answers to the above-referenced set of interrogatories, AT&T reserves the right to supplement, revise, or modify its objections at the time that it serves its Answers on GTEFL. Moreover, should AT&T determine that a Protective Order is necessary with respect to any of the material requested by GTEFL, AT&T reserves the right to file a motion with the Commission seeking such an order at the time that it serves its Answers on GTEFL.

General Objections

AT&T makes the following General Objections to GTEFL's First Set of Interrogatories which will be incorporated by reference into AT&T's specific responses when its Answers are served on GTEFL.

1. AT&T objects to the following provisions of the "Definitions" section of GTEFL's First Set of Interrogatories:

AT&T objects to the definitions of "AT&T" to the extent that such definitions seek to impose an obligation on AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. to respond on behalf of subsidiaries, affiliates, or other persons that are not parties to this case on the grounds that such definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and not permitted by applicable discovery rules. Without waiver of its general objection, and subject to other general and specific objections, Answers will be provided on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. which is the interexchange carrier (hereinafter "IXC") certificated to provide regulated telecommunications services in Florida and which is a party to this docket. All references to "AT&T" in responding to GTEFL's interrogatories should be taken to mean AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

2. Unless otherwise indicated, AT&T has interpreted GTEFL's interrogatories to apply to AT&T's regulated intrastate operations in Florida and will limit its Answers accordingly. To the extent that any interrogatory is intended to apply to matters other than Florida intrastate operations

subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, AT&T objects to such interrogatory as irrelevant, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive.

3. AT&T objects to each and every interrogatory and instruction to the extent that such interrogatory or instruction calls for information which is exempt from discovery by virtue of the attorney-client privilege, work product privilege, or other applicable privilege.

4. AT&T objects to each and every interrogatory 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 interrogatories. Any Answers provided by AT&T in response to GTEFL's interrogatories will be provided subject to, and without waiver of, the foregoing objection.

5. AT&T objects to each and every interrogatory 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. AT&T will attempt to note each instance where this objection applies.

6. AT&T objects to GTEFL's general instructions, definitions or specific discovery requests insofar as they seek to impose obligations on AT&T which exceed the requirements of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure or Florida law.

7. AT&T objects to providing information to the extent that such information is already in the public record before the Florida Public Service Commission.

8. AT&T objects to each and every interrogatory, general instruction, or definition insofar as it is unduly burdensome, expensive, oppressive, or excessively time consuming as written.

9. AT&T objects to each and every interrogatory to the extent that the information requested constitutes "trade secrets" which are privileged pursuant to Section 90.506, Florida Statutes. To the extent that GTEFL's interrogatories request proprietary confidential business information which is

not subject to the "trade secrets" privilege, AT&T will make such information available to counsel for GTEFL pursuant to an appropriate Protective Agreement, subject to any other general or specific objections contained herein.

Objections to Specific Interrogatories

Subject to, and without waiver of, the foregoing general objections, AT&T enters the following specific objections with respect to GTEFL's interrogatories:

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORIES NOS. 9: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: AT&T objects to this interrogatory 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.

SUBMITTED this 12th day of June, 2000.



Marsha Rule
101 N. Monroe St.
Suite 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(850) 425-6365

ATTORNEY FOR AT&T
COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN
STATES, INC.