BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation into appropriate methods to compensate carriers for exchange of traffic subject to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.	)	Docket No. 000075-TP Filed: February 12, 2001

MEDIAONE FLORIDA TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S OBJECTIONS TO BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES

MediaOne Telecommunications Florida, Inc. ("MediaOne"), pursuant to the Order Establishing Procedure (PSC-00-2229-PCO-TP), objects to BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s ("BellSouth") First Set of Requests for Production of Documents and First Set of Interrogatories both dated February 2, 2001, and says:

INTRODUCTION

This is a generic docket intended to develop generic policies concerning specific reciprocal compensation issues that have been the subject of prior arbitrations before the Commission. The vast majority of BellSouth's discovery requests inappropriately seek vast amounts of company specific information which are well outside the scope of this generic docket. As stated in the prefiled direct testimony of Dr. Lee Selwyn, the FCC has determined that the applicable reciprocal compensation rates for the exchange of local traffic should be presumptively symmetric and based on the incumbent local exchange company's costs using the "total element long incremental cost" (TELRIC) methodology. Accordingly, the alternative local exchange company specific information requested by BellSouth is outside the scope of discovery under Rules 1.280(b), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. The Commission has no need for and should not burden MediaOne with the obligation of researching, developing and securing the vast amount of company specific information

requested by BellSouth. The company specific information sought by BellSouth, if properly tailored by relevancy and scope, could only be useful to the Commission in resolving a company specific arbitration.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. MediaOne objects to the Request for Production of Documents and the Interrogatories to the extent that they are intended to apply to matters other than Florida intrastate operations subject to the jurisdiction of the Florida Public Service Commission. MediaOne objections to such Request for Production of Documents and Interrogatories as being irrelevant, overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive.

2. MediaOne objects to each and every request for production of documents and every interrogatory insofar as the request for production of documents and interrogatories are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and are not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket.

3. MediaOne objects to every request for production of documents and every interrogatory to the extent that such request for production of document or interrogatory calls for information that is exempt from discovery by virtue of the attorney-client privilege, work product privilege, or other applicable privilege.

4. MediaOne objects to each and every request for production of document and every interrogatory insofar as any of them is overly broad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, or excessively time consuming as written.

5. MediaOne objects to each and every request for production of documents and every interrogatory to the extent that the information requested enjoys statutory "trade secrets" privilege pursuant to Section 90.506, Florida Statutes.

6. MediaOne objects to each and every request for production of documents and interrogatory that would require the disclosure of customer specific information, the disclosure of which is prohibited by Section 364.24, Florida Statutes. Without waiving any general objections or specific objections stated herein, MediaOne will fully respond to requests for "proprietary confidential business information" as defined by Section 364.183(3), Florida Statutes, that are requested in the requests for production of documents and interrogatories that are not subject to Section 364.24, Florida Statutes, in the event MediaOne's general objections and/or specific obligations concerning the specific request are denied by the Prehearing Officer or the Commission. MediaOne will make such information available to BellSouth upon the proper execution of the confidentiality agreement.

7. MediaOne objects to every request for production of documents and every interrogatory insofar as the request for production of documents and interrogatories are vague, ambiguous, overly broad, imprecise or utilize terms that are subject to multiple interpretations and not properly defined. Any answer provided by MediaOne in response to these requests for production of documents and interrogatories will be provided subject to, and without waiver, of the foregoing objection.

8. MediaOne objects to providing information to the extent that such information is already in the public record before the Commission or other state commissions.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

Request for Production of Documents

> 2. Produce all maps, plats, diagrams, schematics, or any other document reflecting the location of MediaOne's customers served by each switch MediaOne has in Florida.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 2 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 4. Please provide any and all written agreements and/or contracts entered between MediaOne and its ISP customers, as well as an explanation of any oral agreements entered into with such ISP customers.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 4 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 6. Produce all documents that refer, reflect or describe the network architecture used by MediaOne to deliver traffic to ISPs.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 6 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

7. Produce all documents that refer, relate or describe MediaOne's delivery of traffic to ISPs located outside the rate center in which the call to the ISP originated.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 7 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, is vague, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

8. Produce all documents that refer, relate or describe MediaOne's collection of reciprocal compensation for its delivery of traffic to ISPs located outside the rate center in which the call to the ISP generated.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 8 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, is vague, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

9. Produce all documents that refer or relate to any projections, estimates, studies, calculation, or budgets developed by or on behalf of MediaOne that reflect the amount of reciprocal compensation MediaOne expects to receive from BellSouth in Florida in the years 2001 and 2002.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 9 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

10. Produce all documents that refer or relate to any projections, estimates, cost studies, calculations, or budgets developed by or on behalf of MediaOne that reflect the volume of calls MediaOne expects to receive from BellSouth customers to Internet Service

Providers ("ISPs") served by MediaOne in Florida in the years 2001 and 2002.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 10 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

11. Produce any cost study or other information, data or documentation concerning the actual cost incurred by MediaOne to transport ISP traffic from the point of interconnection with BellSouth to the ISP customer's location or server being served by an MediaOne switch.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 11 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

12. For Florida, please produce all documents reflecting, on an annual basis, (a) the total amount billed by MediaOne for service to each ISP customer from inception of service to present, (b) the amounts of any credits, rebate, or adjustments given to such customer, and (c) the total amount of revenue collected from such customer, from inception of service to present.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 12 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

13. For Florida, please produce all documents reflecting MediaOne's total dollar investment in the state, including the total dollar investment in switches, outside plant, and support assets.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 13 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, is vague, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 14. For Florida, please produce all documents separately reflecting the total number of (1) ISP customers in Florida; (2) business customers other than ISPs; and (3) residential customers.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 14 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 15. For Florida, please produce all documents reflecting the total number of end users customers that MediaOne serves using the own network ("on-net" customers) within the state.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 15 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 16. For Florida, please produce all documents reflecting, on an annual basis, the total revenues that MediaOne expects to earn from its ISP customers for the years 2001 and 2002.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 16 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 17. Produce all documents concerning minutes of use or invoices for minutes of use under any interconnection agreement between MediaOne and any other entity, including but not limited to

documents that describe or constitute any plan or method for increasing minutes of use.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 17 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, is overly broad and unduly burdensome, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

18. Produce all documents referring, relating or pertaining to the relationship between MediaOne and any ISP that MediaOne owns, or with which it has an affiliation or in which it has an interest.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 18 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

19. Produce all documents referring, relating or pertaining to any reciprocal compensation billed by MediaOne to BellSouth and generated by traffic delivered to an ISP owned by or affiliated with MediaOne or in which MediaOne has an interest.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 19 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

20. Produce all documents referring, relating or pertaining to the payment to or by MediaOne or any other ILEC or ALEC of reciprocal compensation for ISP-bound traffic.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 20 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of

this generic docket, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 21. Produce all documents referring or relating to forecasted growth of MediaOne's local market in Florida over the next 24 months.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 21 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, is overly broad and unduly burdensome, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 22. Produce all documents referring or relating to historical growth of MediaOne's local market in Florida over the past 24 months.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 22 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, is overly broad and unduly burdensome, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 23. Produce all documents referring, relating or pertaining to any agreements to which MediaOne is a party that involves the sharing of any reciprocal compensation received by MediaOne from BellSouth.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Request for Production of Document No. 23 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Interrogatories

> 4. Identify all documents which refer or relate to any issue raised in Phase I of the Generic ISP Proceeding.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth Interrogatory No. 4 on the grounds that the phrase "documents which refer or relate to any issue raised in" is vague, overbroad and unduly burdensome.

> 6. Has MediaOne requested that any state commission outside of BellSouth's region arbitrate, pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, any of the issues raised in the Generic ISP Proceeding? If the answer to this Interrogatory is in the affirmative, please identify the specific issue on which arbitration was sought; identify the state commission before which MediaOne sought arbitration, including the case name, docket number, and date the petition was filed; and describe with particularity the state commission's resolution of the issue and identify the state commission Order in which such resolution was made.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Interrogatory No. 6 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, and the requested information is available to BellSouth in publicly filed documents. However, in an effort to fully comply with BellSouth's request, MediaOne intends to identify any state commission outside of BellSouth's region wherein MediaOne requested the Commission to arbitrate the issues raised in this generic ISP proceeding.

> 7. Identify the number of access lines in Florida for which MediaOne provides local telephone service.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 7 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, and not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 8. Please state the total number of end user customers that MediaOne serves within the state of Florida, separated into residential and business customers.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 8 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, and not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence..

9. Please state the total number of end user customers that MediaOne serves off of its own network ("on-net" customers) within Florida.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 9 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

10. Please state the total number of MediaOne's on-net customers in Florida that are Internet Service Providers ("ISPs").

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No.10 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

11. Please state on a monthly basis the total amount of revenue that MediaOne expects to earn from providing services within Florida to its end-user customer for the years 2001 and 2002.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 11 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

12. Please state on a monthly basis the total amount of revenue that MediaOne expects to earn from providing services within Florida to its "on-net" end-user customer for the years 2001 and 2002.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No.12 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

13. For the Florida ISP customers identified in response to Interrogatory No. 9, please state, on an annual basis, (a) the total amount MediaOne expects to earn for service to those customers for

the year 2001 and 2002; (b) the amounts of any credits, rebate, or adjustments expected to be given to such customers for the years 2001 and 2002; and (c) the total amount of revenue MediaOne expects to collect from such customers for the years 2001 and 2002.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 13 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

14. Please provide MediaOne's total dollar investment in Florida, including total dollar investment in switches, outside plant, and support assets.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 14 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

15. Please provide the total number of switches MediaOne has deployed in Florida.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 15 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

16. Identify any cost study or other data or documents concerning the actual cost to MediaOne to transport ISP traffic from the point on interconnection with BellSouth to the ISP server being served by a MediaOne switch.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 16 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

17. Does MediaOne contend that there is a difference between the place where a call "terminates" for jurisdictional purposes and the

place where a call "terminates" for reciprocal compensation purposes? If the answer to the foregoing is in the affirmative, please: (a) explain in detail the distinction between call termination for jurisdictional and reciprocal compensation purposes; (b) state the date and describe the circumstances when MediaOne first concluded that there was a distinction between call termination for jurisdictional and reciprocal compensation purposes; (c) state the date and describe the circumstances when MediaOne first stated publicly that there was distinction between call termination for jurisdictional and reciprocal compensation purposes; (d) identify all documents that refer or relate to or support a distinction between call termination for jurisdictional and reciprocal compensation purposes; (e) identify all internal MediaOne memoranda or other documents that discuss, relate to or touch upon the issue of whether reciprocal compensation may be owed for calls delivered to ISPs.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 17 on the grounds that the information requested is company specific, overly broad and unduly burdensome, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Nonetheless, MediaOne will respond to the unnumbered first question and item (a).

18. Has MediaOne provided telecommunications services to any person with whom MediaOne has entered into any arrangement or agreement that involves the sharing of reciprocal compensation received by MediaOne from BellSouth? If the answer to the foregoing is in the affirmative, identify the person, describe the telecommunications services MediaOne has provided, and identify all documents referring or relating to such telecommunications services.

MediaOne objects to BellSouth's Interrogatory No. 18 on the grounds that the information requested is proprietary and confidential. Nonetheless, MediaOne agrees to and intends to make that information available subject to the proper execution by BellSouth of a confidentiality agreement.

22. Fully describe all of MediaOne's facilities, including switches, within Florida, including the manufacturer and model information.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 22 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of Phase I of this generic docket, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 23. Does MediaOne own or have an interest in an ISP? Is MediaOne affiliated in any way with an ISP (other than a customer relationship)? If so, explain in full the nature of such interest or affiliation.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 23 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 24. State the actual cost incurred by MediaOne to transport ISP traffic from the point of interconnection with BellSouth to the ISP server being by a MediaOne switch.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 24 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

> 25. State the number of resold lines MediaOne has in Florida, broken down by residence and business lines, if not provided in response to an earlier interrogatory.

MediaOne objects to Interrogatory No. 25 on the grounds that the information requested is overly broad and unduly burdensome, company specific, not relevant to the subject matter of this generic docket, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

WHEREFORE, MediaOne respectfully requests that the Commission sustain each of the objections set forth herein.

Respectfully submitted this 12th day of February, 2001.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esq.
Martin P. McDonnell, Esq.
Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, P.A.
P. O. Box 551
Tallahassee, FL 32302
(850) 681-6788 (Telephone)
(850) 681-6515 (Telecopier)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing was furnished by U. S. Mail to the following this 12th day of February, 2001:

Diana Caldwell, Esq.
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Room 370
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Elizabeth Howland
Allegiance Telecom, Inc.
1950 Stemmons Freeway, Suite 3026
Dallas, TX 75207-3118

Morton Posner, Esq.
Regulatory Counsel
Allegiance Telecom, Inc.
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 205
Washington, DC 20036

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

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

Michael A. Gross, Esq.
Florida Cable Telecommunications, Asso.
246 East 6th Avenue
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Mr. Paul Rebey
Focal Communications Corporation of Florida
200 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1100
Chicago, IL 60601-1914

Global NAPS, Inc.
10 Merrymount Road
Quincy, MA 02169

Scott Sapperstein
Intermedia Communications, Inc.
3625 Queen Palm Drive
Tampa, Florida 33619-1309

Donna Canzano McNulty, Esq.
MCI WorldCom
325 John Knox Road, Suite 105
Tallahassee, FL 32303-4131

Laura L. Gallagher, Esq.
MediaOne Florida Telecommunications, Inc.
101 E. College Avenue, Suite 302
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Norman Horton, Jr., Esq.
Messer Law Firm
215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 701
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1876

Jon Moyle, Esq.
Cathy Sellers, Esq.
The Perkins House
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Herb Bornack
Orlando Telephone Company
4558 SW 35th Street, Suite 100
Orlando, FL 32811-6541

Peter Dunbar, Esq.
Karen Camechis, Esq.
P. O. Box 10095
Tallahassee, FL 32302-2095

Charles R. Rehwinkel, Esq.
Susan Masterton, Esq.
Sprint-Florida, Incorporated
Post Office Box 2214
MS: FLTLHO0107
Tallahassee, FL 32316

Mark Buechele
Supra Telecom
1311 Executive Center Drive, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Kimberly Caswell, Esq.
Verizon Select Services, Inc.
P. O. Box 110, FLTC0007
Tampa, Florida 33601-0110

Charlie Pellegini, Esq.
Patrick K. Wiggins, Esq.
P. O. Drawer 1657
Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Robert Scheffel Wright, Esq.
John T. LaVia, III, Esq.
P. O. Box 271
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Wanda G. Montano, Esq.
US LEC Corporation
Morrocroft III
6801 Morrison Boulevard
Charlotte, NC 28211

Carolyn Marek
Time Warner Telecom of Florida, L.P.
233 Bramerton Court
Franklin, TN 37069

Joseph A. McGlothlin, Esq.
Vicki Gordon Kaufman, Esq.
117 South Gadsen Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Michael R. Romano, Esq.
Level 3 Communications, LLC
1025 Eldorado Boulevard
Broomfield, Colorado 80021

Marsha Rule, Esq.
AT&T
101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1549

By: Martin P. McDonald for
KENNETH A. HOFFMAN, ESQ.

Att\MediaOne.objections