

Matilda Sanders

From: terry.scobie@verizon.com  
 Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2005 8:58 AM  
 To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us  
 Cc: Richard Chapkis; Kimberly Caswell; David Christian; demetria.c.watts@verizon.com  
 Subject: Docket No. 040156-TP - Verizon Florida's Response to Petitions for Intervention

Attachments: 040156-VZ FL Response to Interventions.pdf



040156-VZ  
sponse to In

The attached filing is submitted in Docket No. 040156-TP on behalf of Verizon Florida Inc. by

Richard A. Chapkis  
 201 N. Franklin Street, FLTC0007  
 Tampa, Florida 33602  
 (813) 483-1256  
 richard.chapkis@verizon.com

(See attached file: 040156-VZ FL Response to Interventions.pdf)

The attached .pdf document contains 9 pages - transmittal letter (1 page), certificate of service (1 page), service list (2 pages), and Response to Petitions for Intervention (5 pages).

Terry Scobie  
 Executive Adm. Assistant  
 Verizon Legal Department  
 813-483-2610 (tel)  
 813-204-8870 (fax)  
 terry.scobie@verizon.com

- CMP \_\_\_\_\_
- COM \_\_\_\_\_
- CTR \_\_\_\_\_
- ECR \_\_\_\_\_
- GCL \_\_\_\_\_
- OPC \_\_\_\_\_
- MMS \_\_\_\_\_
- RCA \_\_\_\_\_
- SCR \_\_\_\_\_
- SEC   1
- OTH \_\_\_\_\_

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
 02308 MAR-8 05  
 FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK



Richard A. Chapkis  
Vice President -- General Counsel, Southeast Region  
Legal Department

FLTC0007  
201 North Franklin Street (33602)  
Post Office Box 110  
Tampa, Florida 33601-0110

Phone 813 483-1256  
Fax 813 204-8870  
richard.chapkis@verizon.com

March 8, 2005 – **VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

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

Re: Docket No. 040156-TP  
Petition for Arbitration of Amendment to Interconnection Agreements With  
Certain Competitive Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio  
Service Providers in Florida by Verizon Florida Inc.

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing is Verizon Florida Inc.'s Response to Petitions for Intervention of XO Florida, Inc. and Allegiance Telecom of Florida, Inc.; Covad Communications Company; IDT America Corporation; and KMC Telecom in the above matter. Service has been made as indicated on the Certificate of Service. If there are any questions concerning this filing, please contact me at 813-483-1256.

Sincerely,

/s/ Richard A. Chapkis

Richard A. Chapkis

RAC:tas  
Enclosures

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
02308 MAR-8 05  
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that copies of Verizon Florida Inc.'s Response to Petitions for Intervention of XO Florida, Inc. and Allegiance Telecom of Florida, Inc.; Covad Communications Company; IDT America Corporation; and KMC Telecom in Docket No. 040156-TP were sent via U. S. mail on March 8, 2005 to the parties on the attached list.

/s/ Richard A. Chapkis

---

Richard A. Chapkis

Staff Counsel  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

ALEC, Inc.  
3640 Valley Hill Road  
Kennesaw, GA 30152-3238

Sonia Daniels  
AT&T  
1230 Peachtree St. N.E.  
Suite 400  
Atlanta, GA 30309

LecStar Telecom, Inc.  
Michael E. Britt  
4501 Circle 75 Parkway  
Suite D-4200  
Atlanta, GA 30339-3025

American Dial Tone  
Larry Wright  
2323 Curlew Road, Suite 7C  
Dunedin, FL 34683

MCI WorldCom Comm.  
Dulaney O'Roark, III  
6 Concourse Parkway  
Suite 600  
Atlanta, GA 30328

MCI WorldCom Comm./  
Intermedia Comm./MCI metro  
Access/Metropolitan Fiber  
Donna C. McNulty  
1203 Governors Square Blvd.  
Suite 201  
Tallahassee, FL 32301-2960

Director-Interconnection Services  
Level 3 Communications, LLC  
1025 Eldorado Boulevard  
Broomfield, CO 80021-8869

NewSouth Comm. Corp.  
Keiki Hendrix  
Two N. Main Street  
Greenville, SC 29601-2719

Supra Telecommunications  
and Information Systems Inc.  
Ann H. Shelfer  
1311 Executive Center Drive  
Suite 220  
Tallahassee, FL 32301-5067

Eric Larsen  
Tallahassee Telephone Exchange Inc.  
1367 Mahan Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308

The Ultimate Connection L.C.  
d/b/a DayStar Comm.  
18215 Paulson Drive  
Port Charlotte, FL 33954

USA Telephone Inc.  
d/b/a CHOICE ONE Telecom  
1510 NE 162<sup>nd</sup> Street  
North Miami Beach, FL 33162

Kellogg Huber Law Firm  
A. Panner/S. Angstreich  
1615 M Street, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036

James C. Falvey  
Xspedius Management Co.  
7125 Columbia Gateway Dr.  
Suite 200  
Columbia, MD 21046

Tracy Hatch  
AT&T Communications  
101 N. Monroe Street  
Suite 700  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Norman Horton/E. Gary Early  
Messer, Caparello & Self  
215 S. Monroe Street  
Suite 701  
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Competitive Carrier Group  
c/o Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
1200 19<sup>th</sup> Street NW, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20036

Local Line America, Inc.  
Amy J. Topper  
520 S. Main Street, Suite 2446  
Akron, OH 44310-1087

Mario J. Yerak, President  
Saluda Networks Incorporated  
782 NW 42nd Avenue, Suite 210  
Miami, FL 33126




Patricia S. Lee  
Florida Public Svc. Comm.  
Div. of Comp. Markets &  
Enforcement  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Sprint Comm. Company  
Susan Masterton  
P. O. Box 2214  
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214

Swidler Law Firm  
Russell M. Blau  
3000 K Street NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Time Warner Telecom  
Carolyn Marek  
233 Bramerton Court  
Franklin, TN 37069-4002

Genevieve Morelli  
Brett H. Freedson  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
1200 19<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036



ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition of Verizon Florida for Arbitration ) Docket No. 04Q156-TP  
of Amendment to Interconnection Agreements ) Filed: March 8, 2005  
with Certain Competitive Local Exchange )  
Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio )  
Service Providers in Florida by Verizon )  
Florida Inc. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**VERIZON FLORIDA INC.'S RESPONSE TO PETITIONS FOR INTERVENTION OF  
XO FLORIDA, INC. AND ALLEGIANCE TELECOM OF FLORIDA, INC.;  
COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY; IDT AMERICA CORPORATION;  
AND KMC TELECOM**

On February 24, 2005, XO Florida, Inc. and Allegiance Telecom of Florida, Inc.; DIECA Communications Inc. d/b/a Covad Communications Company; and KMC Telecom II LLC, KMC Telecom V, Inc., and KMC Data LLC filed Petitions to Intervene in this arbitration. IDT America Corp. filed its Petition to Intervene on February 25, 2005. Verizon did not name these companies as parties in its September 9, 2004 Petition for Arbitration that is the basis for this proceeding. Each Petitioner argues that it is entitled to intervene because it "will lose any meaningful opportunity to exercise its rights under its Agreement with Verizon if the Commission does not permit immediate intervention in this docket." (Covad Petition, at 3-4, 2, 5; XO/Allegiance Petition, at 2, 4, 5; IDT Petition at 2, 3-4, 5; KMC Petition, at 2-3, 4, 5.) The Petitioners have misunderstood the nature and purpose of this proceeding.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02308 MAR -8 05

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

This docket concerns arbitration of a *new* amendment to implement findings in the *Triennial Review Order*<sup>1</sup> and *Triennial Review Order on Remand*.<sup>2</sup> It does not concern interpretation of *existing* interconnection agreements. All of the issues identified for resolution in this case address what provisions should be included in the new amendment. *None* of them ask the Commission to resolve any dispute about the interpretation of particular interconnection agreements. See Order Establishing Procedure, Order No. PSC-04-1236-PCO-TP, App. A.

Potential disagreements between Verizon and the Petitioners about the proper construction of their interconnection agreements do not affect Verizon's right, as the sole petitioner for arbitration, to designate the parties with which it wishes to arbitrate a *TRO* amendment. And Verizon's decision not to name the Petitioners as parties to this arbitration does not affect their rights under their interconnection agreements, including the opportunity to file a contract enforcement action in accordance with any applicable dispute resolution provisions in those agreements.

Other state commissions that have considered arguments like those the Petitioners make here for intervention have correctly ruled that the *TRO* arbitrations are not the appropriate place to entertain disputes about interpretation of interconnection agreements. In the analogous *TRO* arbitration in Vermont, the Commission held that the "purpose of this proceeding is to arbitrate proposed changes to interconnection agreements, not to interpret language in existing agreements to which no party seeks

---

<sup>1</sup> Report and Order and Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, *Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*, 18 FCC Rcd 16978 (2003) ("*TRO*"), vacated in part and remanded, *United States Telecom Ass'n v. FCC*, 359 F.3d 554 (D.C. Cir. 2004), cert. denied, *NARUC v. United States Telecom Ass'n*, Nos. 04-12, 04-15 & 04-18 (U.S. Oct. 12, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> Order on Remand, *Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*, FCC 04-290 (Feb. 4, 2005) ("*TRRO*").

changes.”<sup>3</sup> Likewise, an arbitrator with the Rhode Island Commission determined that “[r]egardless of who is correct on the merits, the purpose of this arbitration is not to interpret individual[] ICAs but to amend ICAs. This issue is not within the scope of this arbitration.”<sup>4</sup> And the New York Commission also held that Verizon’s arbitration petition “concerns proposed amendments to Verizon’s interconnection agreements,” not “whether Verizon has the right, under its current interconnection agreements, to cease providing unbundled network elements.”<sup>5</sup>

These other commission decisions are sensible, as well as legally correct. There is no need for the Commission to interpret any interconnection agreement at this time. Rather, the Commission should resolve disputes about the proper construction of specific interconnection agreement provisions only in the context of concrete, factual disputes brought by particular CLECs under the relevant dispute resolution provisions in their agreements.

The Commission has a longstanding policy against intervention in arbitration proceedings under section 252 of the Act.<sup>6</sup> It has repeatedly held that the possibility

---

<sup>3</sup> Order Re: Verizon Motion of Withdrawal, *Petition of Verizon New England Inc. for Arbitration*, Docket No. 6932, at 4 (Vt. PSB Aug. 25, 2004) (“Vermont Order”) (Exhibit 1).

<sup>4</sup> Second Procedural Arbitration Decision, *Petition of Verizon-Rhode Island for Arbitration*, Docket No. 3588, at 5 (RI PUC Aug. 187, 2004) (Exhibit 2).

<sup>5</sup> Ruling Allowing Verizon to Withdraw Arbitration, *Petition of Verizon New York Inc. for Consolidated Arbitration*, Cases 04-C-0314, et al., at 6 (NY PSC Sept. 22, 2004) (Exhibit 3).

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., *Complaint and/or Petition for Arbitration by Global NAPS, Inc. for Enforcement of Section VI(B) of its Interconnection Agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.*, Order No. PSC-99-2526-PCO-TP483 (1999) (“GNAPs Order”); *Complaint of WorldCom Technologies, Inc. Against BellSouth Telecomm., Inc. for Breach of Terms of Florida Partial Interconnection Agreement under Sections 251 and 252 of the Telecomm. Act of 1996*, Order No. PSC-98-0642-PCO-TP (1998) (“WorldCom Order”); *Petition by Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc. for Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Concerning Interconnection Rates, Terms, and Conditions, Pursuant to the Federal Telecomm. Act of 1996*, Order No. PSC-98-0007-PCO-TP (1998); *Petition for Approval of Interconnection Agreement Between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and Time Warner AxS of Florida, L.P. and Digital Media Partners*, Order No. PSC-96-1092-PCO-TP (1996).



that an arbitration decision may affect the terms of other parties' interconnection agreements in the future is not enough to justify intervention.<sup>7</sup>

The Prehearing Officer did, nevertheless, relax this policy in this consolidated arbitration by permitting Sprint to intervene. (Order Granting Intervention, Nov. 5, 2004 (without interpreting Sprint's interconnection agreement)). Petitioners, likewise, note that they may file their own arbitration petitions on the issues in this case and that the "interests of administrative economy" would be served by allowing their intervention. (Covad Petition, at 4; XO/Allegiance Petition at 4; IDT Petition, at 4; KMC Petition, at 4.)

Although Verizon opposes intervention on the basis that this *TRO* amendment arbitration may somehow affect Petitioners' existing contracts, Verizon would not oppose intervention on the basis of administrative efficiency, "to eliminate the need for the Commission to review numerous individual arbitration petitions as to similar interconnection agreement issues." *Id.*

Under Florida law, "[i]ntervenors take the case as they find it." Fla. Admin. Code ch. 25.-22.039. Therefore, if Petitioners are allowed to intervene, they cannot, in any event, raise new issues concerning interpretation of their interconnection agreements, but must confine their presentations to the issues already identified for resolution.

---

<sup>7</sup> WorldCom Order, at 3; GNAPS Order, at 7.

Petitioners have, likewise, lost the opportunity to submit direct testimony, which was filed on February 25, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Richard A. Chapkis

Aaron M. Panner  
Scott H. Angstreich  
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN,  
TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.  
Sumner Square  
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 326-7900  
(202) 326-7999 (fax)

---

Richard A. Chapkis  
Verizon Florida Inc.  
201 North Franklin Street, FLTC0717  
P. O. Box 110  
Tampa, FL 33601  
(813) 483-1256  
(813) 204-8870 (fax)

Kimberly Caswell  
Associate General Counsel,  
Verizon Corp.  
201 N. Franklin Street, FLTC0007  
Tampa, FL 33601  
(727) 360-3241  
(727) 367-0901 (fax)

*Counsel for Verizon Florida Inc.*

March 8, 2005