# 12/29/20088:35:48 AM2age 1 of 2

## **Ruth Nettles**

From:	Cooper, Roberta G [EQ] [Roberta.G.Cooper@Embarq.com]
Sent:	Friday, December 26, 2008 3:09 PM
То:	Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc:	Susan Masterton
Subject:	070699-EQ Response to Request for Oral Argument
Attachments	: 070699 EQ Response to Request for Oral Argument 12-26-08.pdf

Filed on Behalf of:	Susan S. Masterton
<b>J J</b>	Senior Counsel
	Embarq Florida, Inc.
	1313 Blair Stone Road
	Tallahassee, FL 32301
	Telephone: 850/599-1560
	Email: susan.masterton@embarq.com

Docket No. \_\_\_070699\_\_\_\_\_

 Title of filing:
 Embarq Florida, Inc.'s Response In Opposition To Intrado Communications, Inc.'s

 Request For Oral Argument

Filed on behalf of: Embarq

No of pages: \_\_\_\_5\_\_\_\_

*Description:* <u>Embarq Florida, Inc.'s Response In Opposition To Intrado Communications, Inc.'s</u> <u>Request For Oral Argument</u>



DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE 1 1 8 9 6 DEC 29 8 FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

12/29/2008

### 12/29/20088:35:48 AM2age 2 of 2

Roberta G. Cooper Legal Specialist EMBARQ

Voice: 850-599-15631 Fax: 850-878-0777 Email: Roberta.G.Cooper@embarq.com

1313 Blair Stone Road |Tallahassee, Florida 32301 Mailstop: FLTLHO0201

Voice | Data | Internet | Wireless | Entertainment

This e-mail is the property of EMBARQ and may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender and delete all copies of the message.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

12/29/2008

EPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

Voice Data Internet Wireless Entertainment



Embarg Mailstop: FLTLHOO102 1313 Blair Stone Rd Tallahassee, FL 32301 embarg.com

December 26, 2008

## FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Ms. Ann Cole Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 070699-TP

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed please find Embarq Florida, Inc.'s Response in Opposition to Intrado Communications Inc.'s Request for Oral Argument in the above referenced docket matter.

Copies are being served on the parties in this docket pursuant to the attached certificate of service.

If you have any questions regarding this electronic filing, please do not hesitate to call me at (850) 599-1560.

Sincerely,

/s/ Susan S. Masterton Susan S. Masterton

Enclosure

DOCUMENT NUMBER- CATT 1 1896 DEC 29 8 FPSC-COMMISSION CITY

Suisan S. Masterton service collevse Voice: (850) 599-1560 Faix: (850) 878-0777 suisan.masterton@embarg.com

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 070699-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by regular U.S. Mail and electronic mail on this  $26^{th}$  day of December, 2008 to the following:

#### Florida Public Service Commission

Lee Eng Tan 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 <u>ltan@psc.state.fl.us</u>

#### **Florida Public Service Commission**

Division of Competitive Markets & Enforcement Michael Barrett 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 <u>mbarrett@psc.state.fl.us</u>

#### Intrado Communications Inc.

Rebecca Ballesteros 1601 Dry Creek Drive Longmont, CO 80503 Rebecca.Ballesteros@Intrado.com

#### Messer Law Firm

Floyd Self 2618 Centennial Place Tallahassee, FL 32308 fself@lawfla.com

### **Cahill Law Firm**

Chérie R. Kiser Luke Nikas Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP 1990 K Street, N.W., Suite 950 Washington, DC 20006 <u>ckiser@cgrdc.com</u>

> /s/ Susan S. Masterton Susan S. Masterton

#### **BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In re: Petition by Intrado Communications, Inc. for arbitration of certain rates, terms, and conditions for interconnection and related arrangements with Embarq Florida, Inc., pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Section 364.162, F.S.

## EMBARO FLORIDA, INC.'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO INTRADO COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Embarq Florida, Inc. ("Embarq"), in accordance with Rule 25-22.022, F.A.C., hereby files its Response in Opposition to the Request for Oral Argument ("Request") on the Motion for Reconsideration ("Motion") filed by Intrado Communications, Inc. ("Intrado") on December 18, 2008.

Intrado requests oral argument apparently on the basis that the Commission has not yet heard oral argument on the "threshold issue" raised in the proceeding (Request at page I) and that the written pleadings are an insufficient basis for the Commission to render its decision (Request at page 2). Embarq believes that the record developed through the hearing and the post-hearing Briefs subsequently filed by the parties provided a more than sufficient basis for the Commission's Order. The services that Intrado intends to provide in Florida were the subject of much testimony and discussion at the hearing and in the parties' post-hearing briefs. It is incredulous that Intrado now claims that the Commission failed to understand or consider the nature of Intrado's service offerings and that oral argument is necessary for the Commission to do so.

EDGUMENT NUMBER-DATE

In addition, at the hearing, the parties were afforded ample opportunity to present their positions to the Commission, through opening presentations, witness summaries and through cross-examination. To the extent counsel for either party believed that additional argument was necessary to fully present its case, such argument could have been requested at the pre-hearing conference or even during the hearing itself. Intrado made no such request at these procedurally appropriate times.

In accordance with Rule 25-22.0022, F.A.C., oral argument is solely within the Commission's discretion and should be granted only when oral argument "will aid the Commissioners in understanding and evaluating the issues to be decided." The Commission fully considered the issues raised in Intrado's Motion on the basis of the comprehensive record developed in the proceeding. The Motion and Embarq's Response in Opposition to the Motion provide a sufficient basis for the Commission to rule on the Motion and oral argument will add nothing to assist the Commission in making this ruling.

Wherefore, the Commission should deny Intrado's Request for Oral Argument and should deny Intrado's Motion, for the reasons set forth in Embarq's Response.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> However, should the Commission decide to grant Intrado's Request, Embarq requests that it be allowed to argue in response.

Respectfully submitted this 26<sup>th</sup> day of December 2008.

/s/ Susan. S. Masterton Susan S. Masterton, Esq. P.O. Box 2214 1313 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, FL 32301 (850) 599-1560 (Phone) (850) 878-0777 (Fax) susan.masterton@embarg.com

COUNSEL FOR EMBARQ FLORIDA, INC.