RUTLEDGE, ECENIA, PURNELL & HOFFMAN

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

STEPHEN A. ECENIA
JOHN R. ELLIS
KENNETH A. HOFFMAN
THOMAS W. KONRAD
MICHAEL G. MAIDA
J. STEPHEN MENTON
R. DAVID PRESCOTT
HAROLD F. X. PURNELL

GARY R. RUTLEDGE

POST OFFICE BOX 551, 32302-0551 215 SOUTH MONROE STREET, SUITE 420 TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301-1841 OF COUNSEL: CHARLES F. DUDLEY

TELEPHONE (850) 681-6788 TELECOPIER (850) 681-6515 GOVERNMENTAL CONSULTANTS:

PATRICK R. MALOY AMY J. YOUNG

August 16, 1999

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director
Division of Records and Reporting
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Betty Easley Conference Center, Room 110
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

HAND DELIVERY

BECHARIO AND

Re:

RECEIVED & FILED

Docket No. 990455-TL

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed herewith for filing in the above-referenced docket on behalf of Omnipoint Communications MB Operations, LLC and Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership are the original and fifteen copies of the Joint Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-99-1541-PCO-TL.

Please acknowledge receipt of these documents by stamping the extra copy of this letter "filed" and returning the same to me.

Thank you for your assistance with this filing.

APP ____

AFA

CMULLONI CTR _____ EAG

MAS Enclosures

SEC Trib.3
WAW

Done 8130199

Lenneth A. Hoffmar

Sincerely.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

09724 AUG 168

PSCHED CARDERARDATING

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	_)	Filed: August 16, 1999
Region.)	
County and Monroe County/Keys)	
for the 305/786 Area Code - Dade)	
Proposed Numbering Relief Plan)	Docket No. 990455-TL
In re: Request for Review of the)	

JOINT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER NO. PSC-99-1541-PCO-TL

Intervenors Omnipoint Communications MB Operations, LLC d/b/a Omnipoint Communications and Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership/Sprint PCS (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Intervenors"), pursuant to Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code, hereby move for reconsideration of that portion of Order No. PSC-99-1541-PCO-TL ("Order Establishing Issues") which includes two issues addressing number conservation measures for determination by the panel in this docket. These issues should be addressed by the full commission on a generic, comprehensive basis in Docket No. 981444-TP, Number Utilization Study: Investigation into Number Conservation Measures or the comprehensive number conservation rulemaking to be initiated by the Commission staff pursuant to Order No. PSC-99-1393-S-TP issued July 20, 1999 in Docket No. 990373-TP. In support of this motion, Intervenors state as follows:

- 1. On August 5, 1999, the Prehearing Officer issued the <u>Order Establishing Issues</u> which includes the following issues concerning number conservation measures:
 - 3.a) What is the Commission's authority to order conservation measures in connection with the relief plan(s) approved in issue one for the 305/786 NPA?

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
09724 AUG 16 ST

b) To the extent the Commission has authority, what number conservation measure(s), if any, should be implemented in the 305 and 786 NPAs and, if so, what is the appropriate implementation schedule?

The above-stated number conservation measures issues were included in the Order Establishing Issues without the opportunity for affected parties, including the Intervenors seeking relief herein, to appear before the Prehearing Officer and address their concerns with the inclusion of these issues in this docket. The failure to afford the Intervenors the right to appear before the Prehearing Officer and present arguments in opposition to the inclusion of number conservation measure issues in this docket is both inconsistent with standard Commission practice and in violation of basic due process guarantees. Moreover, having not been allowed an opportunity to present argument on these issues, the traditional, established standard for ruling on a motion for reconsideration cannot apply here since the Intervenors were not granted an initial opportunity to raise points of fact or law to the Prehearing Officer prior to the issuance of the Order Establishing Issues. Accordingly, fairness and due process require that the full panel address the issues raised in this motion on a de novo basis rather than subject to the higher burden placed on a party who seeks reconsideration of a Commission order.

2. Intervenors maintain that it is inappropriate and premature for this panel to address number conservation measures in this docket. The Commission currently has a petition pending before the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") requesting authority to implement a

¹The standard for determining whether reconsideration is appropriate is set forth in <u>Diamond Cab Co. of Miami v. King</u>, 146 So.2d 889, 891 (Fla. 1962). In <u>Diamond Cab</u>, the Florida Supreme Court held that the purpose of a petition for reconsideration is to bring to an agency's attention a point of law or fact which it overlooked or failed to consider when it rendered its order.

variety of number conservation measures.² Until the FCC rules on the Commission's petition, any attempt to address these issues is premature and would only lead to an unnecessary expenditure of time and resources of the parties and Commission. With direct testimony currently scheduled to be filed on August 24, 1999, there is no reasonable or practical way for the parties to address number conservation measures through testimony in this docket, even if the FCC rules on the Commission's petition prior to August 24, since parties would need a reasonable time to: (a) analyze the FCC's order concerning what authority may be granted to the Commission, if any, to implement specific number conservation measures;³ (b) analyze the extent of the Commission's authority to implement number conservation measures in response to a delegation of authority from the FCC; and (c) prepare testimony.

3. In addition, any lawful implementation of number conservation measures is a matter of significant public interest and should ultimately be reflected in comprehensive statewide Commission policies and rules, considered and adopted by the full Commission. Currently, the Commission has an open docket, Docket No. 981444-TP entitled Number Utilization Study: Investigation into Number Conservation Measures, where number conservation issues, such as those articulated by the Prehearing Officer, could be taken up on a statewide basis. In addition, and

²See Florida Public Service Commission Petition to Federal Communications Commission for Expedited Decision for Grant of Authority to Implement Number Conservation Measures, FCC File No. NSD-L-99-33.

³Intervenors recognize that the FCC has already stated that "states do not require any additional delegation of authority from the (FCC) to engage in rate center consolidation." See In the Matter of Numbering Resource Optimization, et. al., Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CC Docket No. 99-200, RM No. 9258, NSD File Nos. L-99-17 and L-99-36 (rel. June 2, 1999), at ¶ 117.

perhaps more appropriately, the Commission has directed its staff "to initiate rulemaking in anticipation of necessary authority from the FCC for conservation measures," including any which may be raised in the instant docket. Intervenors maintain that such rulemaking, including the notice requirements for rulemaking outlined in Section 120.54, Florida Statutes, provides the most appropriate process for consideration and promulgation of any rules implementing number conservation measures, so long as such rules are a lawful exercise of the Commission's statutory authority.

WHEREFORE, Intervenors respectfully request that the panel assigned to this docket reconsider the Order Establishing Issues by removing Issue Nos. (3)(a) and (3)(b) from the issues to be resolved in this docket and that such issues be addressed in Docket No. 981444-TP and/or the number conservation measure rulemaking to be initiated by the Commission staff pursuant to Order No. PSC-99-1393-S-TP issued July 20, 1999 in Docket No. 990373-TP.

Respectfully submitted,

KENNETH A. GOFFMAN, ESQ.

Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, P.A.

P. O. Box 551

Tallahassee, FL 32302

(850) 681-6788 (Telephone)

(850) 681-6515 (Telecopier)

Counsel for Omnipoint Communications MB Operations, LLC d/b/a Omnipoint Communications

and

⁴Order No. PSC-99-1393-S-TP issued July 20, 1999 in Docket No. 990373-TP, at 5.

CHARLES REHWINKEL, ESQ. Post Office Box 2214 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (850) 847-0244

Counsel for Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership/Sprint PCS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Joint Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-99-1541-PCO-TL was furnished by U. S. Mail this 16th of August, 1999, to the following:

Nancy White, Esq. c/o Nancy Sims BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 150 South Monroe Street Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556

Angela Green, Esq. 125 S. Gadsden Street Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1525

Lockheed Martin IMS
D. Wayne Milby
Communications Industry Services
1133 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Diana Caldwell, Esq.
Division of Legal Services
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Room 370
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Charles J. Rehwinkel, Esq. Susan Masterton, Esq. Sprint-Florida, Incorporated Post Office Box 2214 Tallahassee, FL 32399-2214 MC FLTLH00107

Floyd R. Self, Esq. Messer, Caparello & Self P. O. Box 1876 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876 Bruce May, Esq. Holland & Knight P. O. Drawer 810 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Donna McNulty, Esq. MCI WorldCom 325 John Knox Road The Atrium, Suite 105 Tallahassee, FL 32303

KENNETH A. HOFFMAN, ESQ.

Omni\990455.recon