AUSLEY & MCMULLEN ORIGINAL

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW MELCENTED

227 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET P.O. BOX 391 (ZIP 32302) TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301 18501 224 9115 FAX (8501 222-7560

August 26, 1998

AUG 26 Process

RECOVER AND

BY HAND DELIVERY

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

> Re: Access by Telecommunications Companies to Customers In Multi-Tenant Environments; Docket No. 980000B-SP

Dear Ms. Bayn:

Enclosed for filing in the above docket are the original and fifteen (15) copies of Sprint's Comments.

Also enclosed is a diskette containing the above Comments originally typed in Microsoft Word 97 format which has been saved in Rich Text format for use with Word Perfect.

Please acknowledge receipt and filing of the above by stamping the duplicate copy of this letter and returning the same to this writer.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

		RECEIVED	& FILED	
ACK		N	29	
AFA	-	PSC-BUR	EAU OF R	ECORDO
APP			\smile	
SAF				- C
CMU/	JJW/	bjd		
CTR				
EAG	Enclo	osures		
LEG	cc:	All Parties of	of Record (w	(encls.)
LIN				
0.00				
RCH				
SEC				
WAS				
OTH				

Sincerely,

U9296 AUG26 8

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Access by Telecommunications Companies to Customers in Multi-Tenant Environments DOCKET NO. 980000B-SP FILED: August 26, 1998

SPRINT'S COMMENTS

Sprint-Florida, Inc. and Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership ("Sprint"), submit the following Comments on the issues being discussed in this proceeding.

I

General Comments

Based on the discussions at the second workshop and the initial comments filed by the participants, Sprint offers the following as a concise statement of its positions on the issues in this proceeding. Sprint believes that these points should serve as the foundation for the policy recommendations in the Commission's report to the Legislature.

 Tenants in multi-tenant environments should have direct access to their telecommunications carrier of choice;

 Ensuring telecommunications carriers' nondiscriminatory and technology-neutral direct access to tenants in MTEs is important to the achievement of effective telecommunications competition in Florida;

3. In light of the recent changes to Florida's Administrative Procedures Act, and in an abundance of caution, the FPSC should recommend statutory changes to ensure that the Commission has jurisdiction to require direct access to tenants in MTEs.

> DOCUMENT NI MBER-DATE 09296 AUG 26 8 FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

4. Direct access to tenants should also be granted for an entire building or property under common ownership. That is, once a telecommunications carrier is granted access to one tenant within an MTE, it should not be required to renegotiate with the MTE owner to serve additional tenants on that property. Requiring a carrier to negotiate access with an MTE owner on a tenant-by-tenant basis unnecessarily slows access and raises the transactions cost for all parties involved.

5. Direct access includes installation, maintenance and repair access to those spaces and facilities on or within an MTE property used by a telecommunications carrier to provide telecommunications services to a tenant, including, but not limited to, easements, inside wiring, telephone closets, riser cables, conduit and rooftops;

6. In general, "multi-tenant environment" should be defined broadly to include all non-transient tenancies (both residential and commercial, and existing and new). This includes, without limitation, apartment buildings, certain dormitories and condominiums, but excludes hotels;

 All telecommunications services as defined in 47 U.S.C. § 153(43) provided by a telecommunications carrier, regardless of access media used, should be included in "direct access."

 Exclusive MTE access contracts should be presumed anticompetitive and unlawful;

9. If a telecommunications carrier is responsible for installing telecommunications facilities within an MTE, they should be responsible for repairing property damage caused by such installation, and for indemnifying property owners for damages and liability resulting from such installation;

2

 The maintenance of E911 capability for each tenant in an MTE remains the serving telecommunications carrier's responsibility.

While there may be differences on emphasis and wording, Sprint believes that most telecommunications carriers operating in Florida would agree with these basic points.

\$51 J [6]

п

Other Comments

Based on the initial written comments and the discussions at the second workshop, Sprint offers the following comments on two of the most contentious issues identified in this proceeding.

A. Demarcation Point

10. 151 /58.

The definition of demarcation point is an area that needs further detailed analysis by the Commission and interested persons. While changing the definition of demarcation point may be appropriate, Sprint is not prepared, based on the information developed in this proceeding, to propose a change from the current rule to an MPOE or any other approach. The Commission should identify the "demarc" point as an area for further study, and initiate an appropriate proceeding to explore whether changes to its existing rule are appropriate.

B. Compensation

Historically, local exchange companies have not been required to pay compensation to place facilities from the property boundary to the demarcation point, and it seems abundantly clear that the 1996 Act was not enacted to give landlords the opportunity to extract monopoly rents from any carrier seeking to serve the tenants in a MTE. If customers in

3

an MTE desire service from any carrier and existing facilities cannot be used by the carrier to provide that service, any payment for the access required to install the necessary facilities at the property should be included in the rental charge paid by the tenant or allocated as a matter of separate contract between the landlord and tenant, but should not involve payment by the carrier.

DATED this 26th day of August, 1998.

MONICA M. BARONE Sprint 3100 Cumberland Circle Atlanta, GA 30339

ATTORNEY FOR SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP CHARLES J. REHWINKEL Sprint-Florida, Inc. Post Office Box 2214 Tallahassee, FL 32316

ATTORNEY FOR SPRINT-FLORIDA, INC.

1/

J. JEPFRY WAHLEN Ausley & McMullen Post Office Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302

ATTORNEYS FOR SPRINT-FLORIDA, INC.

h.\data\jjw\utd\uster.doc

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Sprint's Comments has been furnished by U. S. Mail this 26th day of August, 1998 to the following:

Nancy B. White BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Lara E. Howley Community Associations Institute 1630 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Norman H. Horton, Jr. Messer, Caparello & Self Post Office Box 1876 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1876

Kimberly Caswell GTE Service Corporation Post Office Box 110, FLTC0007 Tampa, FL 33601-0110

Michael E. Katzenstein OpTel Telecom, Inc. 1111 W. Mockingbird Lane, Suite 1000 Dallas, TX 75247

Philip L. Verveer/Gunnar D. Halley Willkie Farr & Gallagher Three Lafayette Center 1155 21st Street NW Washington, DC 20036 Matt Sullivan Greater Orlando Association of Realtors Post Office Box 587 Orlando, FL 32802-0587

Robert Scheffel Wright Landers & Parsons, P.A. Post Office Box 271 Tallahassee, FL 32302-0271

Jodi L. Chase Florida Apartment Association Broad and Cassel 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Julie S. Myers Smith, Bryan & Myers 311 E. Park Avenue Tallahassee, FL 32301

Kenneth A. Hoffman Rutledge, Ecenia et al. Post Office Box 551 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1841

Barbara D. Auger Pennington, Moore et al. Post Office Box 10095 Tallahassee, FL 32302-2095