

Charles J. Rehwinkel

ORIGINAL

100 No. 2214 1 districts 11 of some Markey 11 (116-80) man 5-01 of 114-5 1 and 18 (145)

January 2, 1998

Blanc Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 971194-TL

Dear Ms. Bayo:

OTH

Sprint-Florida, Incorporated ("Sprint") regretfully submits this letter in protest of the blatantly improper filing by Wireless One Network, L.P. ("Wireless One") on December 31, 1997 Sprint received a faxed copy at about 4:00 p.m. that day. The letter indicates that filing was made via Federal Express, presumably for delivery on December 31.

Sprint does not object to the two sentence Request for Oral Argument, per se. A party can always ask to be heard on an item post-hearing, although the Commission has uniformly denied such requests. Sprint does not object to Oral Argument so long as new evidence is not introduced. Of course, Sprint is not requesting Oral Argument either. If Oral Argument is granted, Sprint would expect to participate.

Sprint does have a fundamental objection to the three page Memorandum in Support included with the Request. The Memorandum is nothing more than a supplemental brief and response to the staff recommendation. Such a filing is prohibited in an agenda conference item noticed for participation by the Staff and Commissioners only. For that reason alone it should be stricken

ACK AFA APP CAF	Sprint further requests that the staff assigned to this matter refrain from reading or considering the Memorandum and that the filing not be distributed to the Commissioners' assigned to hear the case. Distribution and subsequent consideration would constitute a denial of Sprint's due process rights. Communications with the staff and commissioners outside of the record by one party without meaningful opportunity for participation by the other party are improper and could bias the presentation or outcome of a matter that has been to hearing and for which the record is
LEG .	Sprint files this letter regretfully because this matter has been marred by procedural wrangling. The company does not wish to add to this aspect of the docket, but we cannot sit idly by while. Wireless One seeks to improperly comment on the staff recommendation and influence the course of deliberations. Sprint views this a very serious matter and requests that the Commission act
OPC _ RCH _	DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
SEC _	
WAS _	00000
0711	FPSC-Residence and the

Bayo Letter Page 2

expeditiously in response to this letter. I request that Sprint be notified prior to January 6, 1998 whether (and if so, to whom) the Memorandum in Support has been distributed.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call me at 850/847-0244

Sincerely,

Charles J. Rehwinkel

cc: Beth Keating, Esq. (by fax and hand delivery)
Will Cox Esq. (by fax and hand delivery)
Bill Adams Esq. (by fax and U.S. Mail)