



**F.B. (Ben) Poag**  
Director

**Regulatory Affairs**  
Box 2214  
Tallahassee, FL 32316  
Mailstop FLTLH00107  
Voice 850 599 1027  
Fax 850 878 0777

February 6, 2002

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

RE: Docket No. 010774-TP: Petition of the Citizens of the State of Florida to initiate rulemaking which will require telephone companies to give customers reasonable notice before customers incur higher charges or changes in services, and allow them to evaluate offers for service from competing alternative providers.

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing are an original and fifteen copies of Sprint – Florida, Inc.'s post-workshop comments in the above referenced docket.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (850) 599-1027.

Sincerely,

*for* F. Ben Poag  
Director – Regulatory Affairs

Enclosure

cc: Martha Carter Brown

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01432 FEB-6 02

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In Re: Petition of The Citizens of the State of Florida to initiate Rulemaking which will require telephone companies to give Customers reasonable notice before customers incur higher Charges or changes in services, and allow them to evaluate Offers for service from competing alternative providers

Docket No. 010774-TP  
Filed: February 6, 2002

**SPRINT – FLORIDA, INC.’S COMMENTS ON DRAFT RULE 25-4.1105**

Sprint supports the draft rule 25-4.1105 as developed by Commission staff on January 15, 2002. Sprint believes the Staff’s draft is a reasonable compromise between the parties who advocate that a rule is not necessary weighed against the burdensome rule requirements proposed by OPC. Further, the Staff’s draft effectively addresses the intent of the rule, i.e.; to give customers advanced notice of price increases. Furthermore, Staff’s proposal can be implemented without substantial additional costs to consumers.

The rules as proposed by OPC are very detailed and restrictive in how customers must be noticed. Sprint believes such precise and restrictive notice requirements will significantly increase costs which would ultimately be borne by subscribers. Further, the OPC proposed rules are so restrictive and burdensome that they would potentially pose a barrier to entry by CLECs.

With respect to OPC’s draft rule proposal, Sprint incorporates by reference its comments filed on August 30, 2001.