

ORIGINAL

Matilda Sanders

From: Peg Griffin [pgriffin@moylelaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2005 3:24 PM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: Vicki Gordon Kaufman; Diana K. Shumans; Adam Teitzman; Michael Barrett; Michael Gross; Nancy Sims; Nancy White; Meredith.mays@bellsouth.com; nhorton@lawfla.com; jheitmann@kelleydrye.com; ghargrave@kelleydrye.com; Ken Hoffman; marty@reuphlaw.com; Dana.Shaffer@xo.com; wmontano@uslec.com; Tracy Hatch; soniadaniels@att.com; Donna McNulty; De.oroark@mci.com; fself@lawfla.com; steve.chaiken@stis.com; mfeil@mail.fdn.com; nedwards@itcdeltacom.com; Susan Masterton; manascoro@gru.com; cguyton@steelhector.com; jerry@orlandotelco.net; adam.kupetsky@wiltel.com; jsm@thlglaw.com; bmagness@phonelaw.com; GWatkins@Covad.com; Everett.boyd@sablaw.com; David.adelman@sablaw.com; jkrutchik@ststelecom.com

Subject: E-filing - Docket 041269-TP

Attachments: Motion to Compel POD Bell 10-13-05.pdf

CMP _____
 COM 3
 CTR _____
 ECR _____
 GCL _____
 OPC _____
 RCA _____
 SCR _____
 SGA _____
 SEC I
 OTH Kump.

Attorney responsible for filing: Vicki Gordon Kaufman
 118 N. Gadsden Street
 Tallahassee, FL 32301
 Telephone: (850) 681-3828
 Facsimile: (850) 681-8788
 vkaufman@moylelaw.com

Docket No and title: In Re: Petition to Establish Generic Docket to Consider Amendments to Interconnection Agreements Resulting from Changes of Law Docket 041269-TP

Filed on behalf of: Competitive Carriers of the South, Inc. (CompSouth)

Number of pages: 7

Document attached: Motion to Compel Production of Documents from BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

Peg G. Griffin
 Assistant to Vicki Gordon Kaufman
 Moyle, Flanigan, Katz, Raymond & Sheehan, P.A.
 118 N. Gadsden Street
 Tallahassee, FL 32301
 Telephone: (850) 681-3828
 Facsimile: (850) 681-8788
 E-mail: pgriffin@moylelaw.com

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE
 09871 OCT 13 06
 FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

Tax Advice Disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS under Circular 230, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments), unless otherwise specifically stated, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (1) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any matters addressed herein.

The information contained in this electronic mail transmission may be attorney/client privileged and confidential. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us

immediately by telephone collect at 561-659-7500. Thank you.

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition to Establish Generic Docket
To Consider Amendments to Interconnection
Agreements Resulting from Changes of
Law.

Docket No. 041269-TP

Filed: October 13, 2005

**COMPETITIVE CARRIERS OF THE SOUTH, INC.'S MOTION TO COMPEL
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS FROM
BELL SOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

Competitive Carriers of the South, Inc. (CompSouth), pursuant to rule 28-106.303, Florida Administrative Code, file this Motion to Compel BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth) to respond to CompSouth's First Request for Production of Documents (No. 1). As grounds for the motion, CompSouth states:

1. On September 21, 2005, CompSouth, pursuant to Rule 1.350, Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, and Rule 28-106.206, Florida Administrative Code, filed and served its First Request for Production of Documents (No.1) to BellSouth.

2. Production Request No.1 asked BellSouth to provide:

Separately for each state in the BellSouth region, please provide a copy of Part II of BellSouth's Form 477 Local Competition Report Response to the FCC for data as of June 30, 2005.

3. On October 3, 2005 BellSouth filed and served General and Specific Objections to this Production Request (as well as to an interrogatory).

4. BellSouth made one specific objection¹ to CompSouth's request:

BellSouth objects to Request No. 1 on the grounds that it is not relevant to the subject matter of this docket and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

¹ BellSouth included 11 "General Objections" in its objections. None of these "general" objections (other than number 5, which is the same as BellSouth's "specific" objection) are related to CompSouth's production request.

5. As this Commission is well aware, the standard for discovery is very broad and relevancy is liberally interpreted. (Order No. PSC-05-0546-PCO-TP) The information CompSouth seeks in Production Request No. 1 is clearly relevant to the issues in this docket.

6. As CompSouth explains below, the document requested is directly relevant to the number of UNE arrangements in Florida (and other states²) and, as such, is relevant to the subject matter of this docket.

7. Issues 3 and 4 in this proceeding concern how to determine the number of “business lines,” which is then used to determine whether particular wire centers satisfy certain thresholds used to determine impairment for high capacity loop and transport facilities.³ The number of UNE Loop arrangements (as well as the number of business UNE-P arrangements), are two components used by BellSouth to calculate the alleged number of Business Lines used in the impairment analysis.⁴

8. There is substantial dispute in this proceeding as to whether BellSouth correctly determined the number of UNE-L arrangements. The higher the number of UNL-arrangements that BellSouth claims, the more unbundling relief it gains. Because of this incentive, it is important to cross-check the number of UNE-L arrangements BellSouth claims here (where the

² By agreement among the parties, discovery requested in one state may be extended to all states in the BellSouth region.

³ Issue 3(i) includes the issue how should “Business Line” be defined, while Issue 4(b) asks “What procedures should be used to identify those wire centers that satisfy the FCC’s Section 251 non-impairment criteria for high-capacity loops and transport?”

⁴ Specifically, the FCC defines “Business Line” as follows (C.F.R. § 51.5):
Business line. A business line is an incumbent LEC-owned switched access line used to serve a business customer, whether by the incumbent LEC itself or by a competitive LEC that leases the line from the incumbent LEC. The number of business lines in a wire center shall equal the sum of all incumbent LEC business switched access lines, plus the sum of all UNE loops connected to that wire center, including UNE loops provisioned in combination with other unbundled elements. Among these requirements, business line tallies (1) shall include only those access lines connecting end-user customers with incumbent LEC end-offices for switched services, (2) shall not include non-switched special access lines, (3) shall account for ISDN and other digital access lines by counting each 64 kbps-equivalent as one line. For example, a DS1 line corresponds to 24 64 kbps-equivalents, and therefore to 24 “business lines.”

data is being used to identify areas of non-impairment), with the number of UNE-L arrangements that BellSouth identifies where its incentives are more neutral. The only source of state-specific UNE data that BellSouth routinely files are its biannual local competition reports with the FCC (Form 477), which is the data being requested by CompSouth in its request for production.

9. CompSouth has already identified a *substantial* discrepancy between the number of UNE-L arrangements that BellSouth claims existed in Florida at the end of 2004 with the number that of such arrangements that it filed with the FCC for the same period. This discrepancy could be inflating the number of business lines that BellSouth asserts in this proceeding by over 210,000 lines.⁵

10. The document being requested by CompSouth in its request for production is the UNE data that BellSouth provided to the FCC for the period ending June 30, 2005. This data will show whether the discrepancy identified by CompSouth is growing or declining, and thus whether the impairment claims being made by BellSouth in this proceeding are becoming more or less suspect (relative to its federal data).

11. As indicated, the data requested by CompSouth has already been filed by BellSouth and will, at some point (typically in December or early January) be publicly released by the FCC.⁶ This data is necessary for CompSouth to have the most current information concerning BellSouth's UNE volumes in order to evaluate BellSouth's claims in this proceeding with respect to Issues 3 and 4. The data is directly relevant to the issues and will be provide critical admissible evidence concerning one of the key issues in the proceeding (*i.e.*, has BellSouth properly calculated the number of business lines).

⁵ See CompSouth Supplemental Response to Staff's Interrogatory No. 27, filed October 12, 2005.

⁶ <http://www.fcc.gov/wcb/iatd/comp.html>

12. Counsel for CompSouth has contacted counsel for BellSouth in an attempt to resolve this discovery dispute; however, BellSouth counsel has stated that BellSouth will not respond to this request.

WHEREFORE, CompSouth requests that the Commission grant this motion to compel and require BellSouth to immediately provide CompSouth with the documents responsive to Request for Production of Documents No.1.

s/Vicki Gordon Kaufman
Bill Magness
CASEY, GENTZ & MAGNESS, L.L.P.
98 San Jacinto Blvd., Ste. 1400
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: 512/480-9900
Fax: 512/480-9200
bmagness@phonelaw.com

Vicki Gordon Kaufman
MOYLE FLANIGAN KATZ RAYMOND &
SHEEHAN, PA
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Telephone: 850/681-3828
Fax: 850/681-8788
vkaufman@moylelaw.com

Attorneys for CompSouth

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion To Compel Production Of Documents From Bell South Telecommunications, Inc. was served on the following by electronic mail or U.S. Mail this 13th day of October 2005:

Adam Teitzman
Michael Barrett
Florida Public Service Commission
Division of Legal Services
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee FL 32399-0850
ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us
mbarrett@psc.state.fl.us

Michael A. Gross
Florida Cable Telecommunications
Assoc., Inc.
246 E. 6th Avenue, Suite 100
Tallahassee FL 32303
mgross@fcta.com

Nancy White
c/o Nancy Sims
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
150 S. Monroe Street, Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556
Nancy.sims@bellsouth.com
Nancy.white@bellsouth.com
Meredith.mays@bellsouth.com

Norman H. Horton, Jr.
Messer, Caparello & Self, P.A.
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701
P.O. Box 1876
Tallahassee FL 32302-1876
nhorton@lawfla.com

John Heitmann
Garret R. Hargrave
Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP
1200 19th Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington DC 20036
jheitmann@kelleydrye.com
ghargrave@kelleydrye.com

Kenneth A. Hoffman
Martin P. McDonnell
Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman
P.O. Box 551
Tallahassee FL 32302
ken@reuphlaw.com
marty@reuphlaw.com

Dana Shaffer
XO Communications, Inc.
105 Molloy Street, Suite 300
Nashville TN 37201
Dana.Shaffer@xo.com

Wanda Montano
Terry Romine
US LEC Corp.
6801 Morrison Blvd.
Charlotte NC 28211
wmontano@uslec.com

Tracy W. Hatch
Senior Attorney
AT&T
101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700
Tallahassee FL 32301
thatch@att.com

Sonia Daniels
Docket Manager
AT&T
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
4th Floor
Atlanta GA 30309
soniadaniels@att.com

Donna Canzano McNulty
MCI
1203 Governors Square Blvd.
Suite 201
Tallahassee FL 32301
donna.mcnylty@mci.com

De O'Roark
MCI
6 Concourse Parkway, Suite 600
Atlanta GA 30328
De.oroark@mci.com

Floyd Self
Messer, Caparello & Self, P.A.
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701
P.O. Box 1876
Tallahassee FL 32302-1876
fself@lawfla.com

Steven B. Chaiken
Supra Telecommunications and
Info. Systems, Inc.
General Counsel
2901 S.W. 149th Avenue, Suite 300
Miramar FL 33027
steve.chaiken@stis.com

Matthew Feil
FDN Communications
2301 Lucien Way, Suite 200
Maitland FL 32751
mfeil@mail.fdn.com

Nanette Edwards
ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc.
7037 Old Madison Pike, Suite 400
Huntsville AL 35806
nedwards@itcdeltacom.com

Susan Masterton
Sprint Communications Company
Limited Partnership
P.O. Box 2214
Tallahassee FL 32316-2214
susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com

Raymond O. Manasco, Jr.
Gainesville Regional "Utilities"
P.O. Box 147117
Station A-138
Gainesville FL 32614-7117
manascoro@gru.com

Charles A. Guyton
Steel Hector & Davis LLP
215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 601
Tallahassee FL 32301-1804
cguyton@steelhector.com

Herb Bornack, CEO
Orlando Telephone Systems, Inc.
4558 S.W. 35th Street, Suite 100
Orlando FL 32811
jerry@orlandotelco.net

Adam Kupetsky
Regulatory Counsel
WilTel Communications, LLC
One Technology Center (TC-15)
100 South Cincinnati
Tulsa OK 74103
adam.kupetsky@wiltel.com

Jonathan S. Marashlian
The Helein Law Group, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 700
McLean VA 22102
jsm@thlglaw.com

Bill Magness
Casey Law Firm
98 San Jacinto Blvd., Suite 1400
Austin, TX 78701
bmagness@phonelaw.com

Charles (Gene) Watkins
Covad Communications Company
1230 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 1900
Atlanta, GA 30309
GWatkins@Covad.com

C. Everett Boyd, Jr.
Sutherland Asbill Law Firm
3600 Maclay Blvd. S., Suite 202
Tallahassee, FL 32312-1267
Everett.boyd@sablaw.com

D. Adelman/C. Jones/F. LoMonte
Sutherland Law Firm
999 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30309
David.adelman@sablaw.com

AzulTel, Inc.
2200 S. Dixie Highway, Suite 506
Miami, FL 33133-2300

STS Telecom
12233 S.W. 55th Street, #811
Cooper City, FL 33330-3303
jkrutchik@ststelecom.com

s/Vicki Gordon Kaufman
Vicki Gordon Kaufman