Meredith E. Mays Senior Regulatory Counsel

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 150 South Monroe Street Room 400 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (404) 335-0750

March 3, 2006

VIA ELECTRONIC AND US MAIL

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

Re: Docket No. 041269-TL

Dear Ms. Bayó:

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth") submits this letter in response to two recent letters, filed on February 23, 2006 and February 24, 2006 by NuVox and Xspedius ("Joint Petitioners").

With respect to the Joint Petitioners' February 23, 2006 letter the Commission has already addressed the request for *sua sponte* review and BellSouth will not belabor that point here. BellSouth notes, however, that the Joint Petitioners' contention that this Commission's line conditioning ruling is "at odds" with a rulings from the Georgia Public Service Commission is inaccurate. Exhibit A, attached to Joint Petitioners' February 23, 2006 letter included an excerpt of the Georgia Commission's Motion addressing certain issues. At page 49, the Georgia Commission made clear "BellSouth is obligated to condition lines to enable a requesting CLEC to provide advanced services to the CLEC's customers to the same extent that BellSouth would condition lines to provide advanced services to its own customers." (emphasis supplied). Contrary to the Joint Petitioners' contention, this aspect of the Georgia Commission is fully consistent with this Commission's decision to require line conditioning at parity.

Concerning the Joint Petitioners' February 24, 2006 letter, the Joint Petitioners requested this Commission take notice of decisions from Georgia, North Carolina, and the FCC. To the extent the Commission takes official

¹ BellSouth acknowledges that the North Carolina Commission has not adopted its position on commingling. BellSouth is evaluating its options concerning this

recognition of these cases, BellSouth requests also that the Commission take official notice of recent decisions from South Carolina, Louisiana, and Vermont pursuant to Florida Statutes, Section 120.569(2)(i).

The South Carolina decision can be publicly accessed using the following link, which reflects the February 28, 2006 vote in the Change of Law proceeding in South Carolina (Docket No. 2004-316-C):

http://dms.psc.sc.gov/matters/matters.cfc?Method=MatterDetail&MatterID=17820 5. The Public Service Commission of South Carolina adopted BellSouth's reasoning and position on all 271-related issues, including commingling and line sharing.

On February 22, 2006, the Public Service Commission of Louisiana ruled on specific issues related to Section 271 and line sharing. Although a written order is not yet available, a brief summary of the Louisiana Commission's Rulings follows. With respect to Section 271, the Louisiana Commission declined to order BellSouth to include 271 elements in 252 agreements, and it likewise declined to set rates for these elements. Concerning line sharing, the Louisiana Commission rejected a December 2005 finding by an Administrative Law Judge that the commission has jurisdiction to set rates for line sharing under Section 271. The official Minutes of the Louisiana Commission's February 22, 2006 Open Session are not yet available. When they become available, BellSouth will file them in this docket.

On February 27, 2006, the State of Vermont Public Service Board ("Vermont Board") entered its decision in Docket No. 6932, a proceeding involving Verizon's request to modify its interconnection agreements to effectuate FCC orders including the *TRO* and the *TRRO*. The Vermont decision is publicly available at: http://www.state.vt.us/psb/orders/2006/files/6932fnl.pdf.

The Vermont Board adopted in part, and rejected in part, a recommended decision of the hearing officer. With respect to line sharing, the Vermont Board adopted the recommendation of the hearing officer and ordered the inclusion of the FCC's transitional plan. See Vermont decision, pp. 156-157. With respect to fiber to the home loops, the Vermont modified the recommended decision of the hearing officer, and found that the fiber unbundling rules apply to all customer classes, and were not limited to mass market customers. See Vermont decision, p. 257.

aspect of the North Carolina decision. BellSouth notes also that on March 1, 2006 the North Carolina Commission released its decision in Docket No. P-55, Sub 1549, its generic change of law docket. The North Carolina Commission properly concluded that it had no authority to compel BellSouth to include Section 271 checklist items in Section 251/252 interconnection agreements and also ruled that CLECs must delete interconnection agreement provisions requiring BellSouth to offer delisted UNEs, which includes line sharing.

Finally, the Joint Petitioners cited to the FCC's *Qwest Forbearance Decision*, WC Docket No. 04-223 (rel. Dec. 2, 2005). BellSouth does not agree with Joint Petitioners' characterization that the *Qwest Forbearance Decision* confirmed its view on commingling. The FCC did not refer to the federal commingling rule in its *Qwest Forbearance Decision* nor did the FCC indicate in any way that it had reversed its decision in the *TRO* in which the FCC was very clear that BellSouth and other RBOCs have no obligation to combine 271 elements or to combine elements that are no longer required to be unbundled pursuant to Section 251(c)(3) of the Act.² Indeed, the FCC has no reason to disturb its ruling considering it was affirmed by the D.C. Circuit Court, which made clear that the FCC had "decided that, in contrast to ILEC obligations under § 251, the independent § 271 unbundling obligations didn't include a duty to combine network elements."³

To the extent the Qwest Forbearance Order provides any guidance relevant to the current posture of this docket, the Commission should take particular note of paragraphs 9 and 101, which describe the extent of the FCC's fiber relief and does not limit that relief to mass market customers. Commission should also review paragraphs 7, 96, and 100 of the Qwest Forbearance Order, which describe the Section 271 checklist item 4 requirement as an obligation to provide local loops (not line sharing, as certain CLECs claim). The Qwest Forbearance Order is available in its entirety http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-05-170A1.pdf.

BellSouth has served copies of this letter to the parties shown on the attached Certificate of Service.

Sincerely,

Meredith E. Mays

cc: All Parties of Record

Jerry Hendrix R. Douglas Lackey

Nancy B. White

² See TRO at ¶ 655, n. 1989. The TRO, as originally issued, had this language at note 1990. After the TRO Errata the footnotes were renumbered.

³ USTA II, 359 F.3d at 589. Significantly, the Section 271 checklist obligates BellSouth to provide local loop transmission "unbundled from local switching and other services", local transport "unbundled from switching or other services", and switching "unbundled from transport, local loop transmission or other services." BellSouth's Section 271 obligation was referred to by the FCC and the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals as an "independent" obligation. See USTA II at 590; TRO at ¶ 653.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Docket No. 041269-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via

Electronic Mail and U.S. Mail this 3rd day of March, 2006 to the

following:

Adam Teitzman
Michael Barrett
Staff Counsels
Florida Public Service
Commission
Division of Legal Services
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Tel. No. (850) 413-6199
ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us
mbarrett@psc.state.fl.us

Florida Cable Telecommunications Assoc., Inc. Michael A. Gross 246 E. 6th Avenue Suite 100 Tallahassee, FL 32303 Tel. No. (850) 681-1990 Fax No. (850) 681-9676 mgross@fcta.com

Vicki Gordon Kaufman
Moyle Flanigan Katz Raymond
& Sheehan, PA
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Tel. No. (850) 681-3828
Fax. No. (850) 681-8788
vkaufman@moylelaw.com
Atty. for FCCA/CompSouth

Norman H. Horton, Jr.
Meser, Caparello & Self, P.A.
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701
P.O. Box 1876
Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876
Tel. No. (850) 222-0720
Fax No. (850) 224-4359
nhorton@lawfla.com
Represents NuVox/NewSouth/Xspedius

John Heitmann
Garret R. Hargrave
Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP
Suite 500
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
iheitmann@kelleydrye.com
ghargrave@kelleydrye.com
Tel. No. (202) 887-1254
Represents NuVox/NewSouth/Xspedius

Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esq.
Martin P. McDonnell, Esq.
Rutledge, Ecenis, Purnell & Hoffman
P.O. Box 551
Tallahassee, FL 32302
Tel. No. (850) 681-6788
Fax. No. (850) 681-6515
Represents XO
ken@reuphlaw.com
marty@reuphlaw.com

Dana Shaffer XO Communications, Inc. 105 Molloy Street, Suite 300 Nashville, Tennessee 37201 Tel. No. (615) 777-7700 Fax. No. (615) 850-0343 dana.shaffer@xo.com

Donna Canzano McNulty, Esq. MCI
1203 Governors Square Blvd.
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Telephone: 850 219-1008
donna.mcnulty@mci.com

De O'Roark, Esq. (+)
MCI
6 Concourse Parkway
Suite 600
Atlanta, GA 30328
de.oroark@mci.com

Floyd Self, Esq.
Messer, Caparello & Self, P.A.
Hand: 215 South Monroe Street
Suite 701
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Mail: 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
Tel. No. (786) 455-4239
steve.chaiken@stis.com

Matthew Feil (+)
FDN Communications
2301 Lucien Way
Suite 200
Maitland, FL 32751
Tel. No. (407) 835-0460
mfeil@mail.fdn.com

Tony Mastando, Esq. (+)
Director - Regulatory
ITC^DeltaCom
4092 S. Memorial Parkway
Huntsville, AL 35802
Tel. No. (256) 382-3856
Fax. No. (256) 382-3936
tony.mastando@itcdeltacom.com

Raymond O. Manasco, Jr.
Gainesville Regional Utilities
Hand: 301 S.E. 4th Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601
Mail: P.O. Box 147117, Station A-138
Gainesville, FL 32614-7117
Tel. No. (352) 393-1010
Fax No. (352) 334-2277
manascoro@gru.com

Charles A. Guyton
Steel Hector & Davis LLP
215 South Monroe Street
Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1804
Tel. No. (850) 222-2300
Fax. No. (850) 222-8410
cquyton@steelhector.com
Atty. for City of Gainesville

Adam Kupetsky
Regulatory Counsel
WilTel Communications, LLC
One Technology Center (TC-15)
100 South Cincinnati
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103
Tel. No. (918) 547-2764
Fax. No. (918) 547-9446
adam.kupetsky@wiltel.com

Jonathan S. Marashlian, Esq.
The Helein Law Group, LLLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 700
McLean, VA 22102
Tel. No. (703) 714-1313
Fax. No. (703) 714-1330
jsm@thlglaw.com
Atty. for Azul Tel.

Charles (Gene) E. Watkins (+)
Senior Counsel
Government & External Affairs
Covad Communications Company
1230 Peachtree Street NE
Suite 1900
Atlanta, GA 30309
Tel. No. (678) 528.6816
Fax No. (678) 528.6806
Cell No. (404) 915.0018
qwatkins@covad.com

Bill Magness bmagness@phonelaw.com

William R. Atkinson Sprint Nextel 3065 Cumberland Circle Atlanta, GA 30339 Tel. No. (404) 649-4882 Fax. No. (404) 649-1652 bill.atkinson@sprint.com Marsha E. Rule
Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, P.A.
Post Office Box 551
Tallahassee, FL 32301-0551
Tel. No. (850) 681-6788
Fax. No. (850) 681-6515
marsha@reuphlaw.com
Counsel for Sprint Nextel

Meredith Mays

(+) signed Protective Agreement
(*) via FedEx