

ORIGINAL



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

August 17, 2001

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

RECEIVED-FPSC
01 AUG 17 PM 4:19
COMMISSION
CLERK

Re: Docket No. 010795-TP Sprint's Proposed Issue List

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing is the original and seven (7) copies of Sprint's Proposed Issue list. Copies of this have been served pursuant to the attached Certificate of Service.

Please acknowledge receipt and filing of the above by stamping the duplicate copy of this letter and returning the same to this writer.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Susan S. Masterton
Susan S. Masterton

Enclosure

APP
CAF
CMP
COM
CTR
ECR
LEG
OPC
PAI
RGO
SEC
SER
OTH


RXM
FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
10199 AUG 17 01
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
DOCKET NO. 010795-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by hand delivery*, U.S. Mail and facsimile this 17th day of August, 2001 to the following:

Verizon Florida, Inc.
Kimberly Caswell
Post Office Box 110
FLTC0007
Tampa, Florida 33601-0110

Ms. Mary Anne Helton, Esq.*
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850



Susan S. Masterton
Susan S. Masterton

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition by Sprint) Docket No.010795-TP
Communications Company Limited)
Partnership for arbitration with) Filed: August 17, 2001
Verizon Florida Inc. pursuant to)
Section 251/252 if the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996)
_____)

**SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP'S
PROPOSED ISSUES LIST**

Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership ("Sprint") proposes the following issues for the Commission's consideration in Docket No. 010795-TP:

ISSUE 1: In the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement:

- (A) For the purposes of reciprocal compensation, how should local traffic be defined?
- (B) What language should be included to properly reflect the FCC's recent ISP Remand Order?

ISSUE 2: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement:

- (A) Should Sprint be permitted to utilize multi-jurisdictional interconnection trunks?
- (B) Should reciprocal compensation apply to calls from one Verizon customer to another Verizon customer, within the same local calling area, utilizing Sprint's "00-" local dial around feature?

ISSUE 3: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement, should Verizon be required to provide custom calling/vertical features, on a stand alone basis, to Sprint at wholesale discount rates?

ISSUE 4: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement, should Verizon be required to make dark fiber cross connects available to Sprint at intermediate offices?

ISSUE 5: (A) For the purposes of the new interconnection agreement, should Verizon be required to provide unbundled packet switching to Sprint at any technically feasible point, including remote terminals and central offices?

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

10199 AUG 17 2001

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

(B) Should Sprint's notice to and negotiations with Verizon require that VADI be required to be made a party to the interconnection agreement and this arbitration and be bound by the outcome?

ISSUE 6: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement, should Sprint be permitted to transmit UNE and access traffic over the same facilities?

ISSUE 7: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement, should Verizon be required to provide multiplexing as a UNE?

ISSUE 8: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement, should Verizon be required to provide Remote Terminal information as requested by Sprint in its proposed language?

ISSUE 9: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon, interconnection agreement are Verizon's proposed charges for unbundled network elements (UNEs) and loop conditioning reasonable and in conformance with the requirements established by this Commission and the FCC?

ISSUE 10: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement, should Sprint be required to utilize Verizon's loop qualification database to qualify DSL loops?

ISSUE 11: What proposed language regarding coordinated testing should be incorporated into the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement?

ISSUE 12: Should changes made to Verizon's Commission-approved collocation tariffs, made subsequent to the filing of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement, supercede the terms set forth at the filing of this agreement?

ISSUE 13: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement, what interval should be established for the provision of transport facilities for new collocations?


ISSUE 14: What should be the appropriate collocation rates to be included in the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement?

ISSUE 15: For the purposes of the new interconnection agreement, should Sprint be required to permit Verizon to collocate equipment in Sprint's central offices?

ISSUE 16: For the purposes of the new Sprint/Verizon interconnection agreement, should Verizon be allowed to remove half-ringer network interface devices (NIDS) from DSL-capable loops only upon Sprint's request?

ISSUE 17: Should this docket be closed?

Respectfully submitted this 17th day of August 2001.



Susan S. Masterton
P.O. Box 2214
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850-599-1560

AND

Joseph P. Cowin
7301 College Blvd.
Overland Park, KS 66210
(913) 534-6165

ATTORNEYS FOR SPRINT