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January 17, 2000

Blanca S. Bayo<br>Director- Division of Records and Reporting<br>Florida Public Service Commission<br>2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.<br>Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dear Ms. Bayo:
We are writing to you with reference to Docket No. 991930-TC.
In reviewing the Docket, we noticed an apparent oversight that we discussed with Mr. Ray Kennedy of the Public Service Commission and would like to now ensure is considered before the proposed changes to the rules are finalized.

Part of the proposed changes concerns the routing of $0+$ local and 0 -calls. The language in some cases indicates that "all end user dialed $0+$ local and 0 -calls shall be routed to a provider of local exchange telecommunication services". See Section 25-24.515 (12). Upon review with Mr.
Kennedy, it was confirmed that this is the proper language.
In other portions of the docket, the language used is "the" provider of local exchange telecommunications services. Accordingly to Mr. Kennedy, this was an oversight and the word the should be deleted and substituted with the word a.

Inotherwords, it is not intended that $0+$ local and 0 -traffic be required to be routed to the provider of local dial tone. Rather, the intent is that such calls may be routed to any company qualified as a provider of local exchange telecommunication services, even if that company is not providing the local dial tone for the line from which the calls are placed. For example, Bell South could provide the local dial tone, but Sprint could carry the $0+$ local and 0 - traffic for that line (ANI).

We would appreciate it, if the final rules would embody the proper language throughout the text. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

cc: Ray Kennedy- PSC
Angela Green -FPTA

