BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

RE-FILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MICHAEL R. HUNSUCKER

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Michael R. Hunsucker. I am Director-Regulatory Policy, for Sprint Corporation. My business address is 6360 Sprint Parkway, Overland Park, Kansas 66251.

Q. Are you the same Michael R. Hunsucker that filed direct testimony in Phase II of this proceeding?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide rebuttal testimony on behalf of Sprint Corporation to the

testimonies of Verizon witness Edward C. Beauvais, PH.D. and BellSouth witness John Ruscilli.

ISSUE 13 : How should a "local calling area" be defined, for purposes of determining the applicability of reciprocal compensation?

Q. BellSouth (Direct Testimony of John Ruscilli, page 12, lines 12-22) suggests that ''local calling area" should be "defined as mutually agreed to by the parties...". Do you believe that the definition of "local calling area" is best left to the negotiation process?

A. No, I do not. Based on Sprint's experiences, both as an ILEC and an ALEC, this is one of the most contentious areas of the negotiation process. Sprint believes that the industry is best served by the Commission adoption of a minimum standard for the definition of a "local calling area". As I stated in my direct testimony, Sprint believes that the "local calling area" should be based on the ILEC's local calling scope, including any non-optional or mandatory EAS. This definition would be used to define what is

local versus non-local for reciprocal compensation purposes only. This is not intended to place any restrictions on an ALECs ability to define its own retail local calling area for pricing its services to its end users. This definition would be limited to the application of reciprocal compensation for the termination and transport of local traffic.

Q. Does that conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.