HOPPING GREEN SAMS & SMITH

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

123 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET

POST OFFICE BOX 6526

TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32314

(850) 222-7500

FAX (850) 224-8551

FAX (850) 425-3415

Writer's Direct Dial

(904) 425-2313

June 28, 2000

GARY V. PERKO MICHAEL P. PETROVICH DAVID L. POWELL WILLIAM D. PRESTON CAROLYN S. RAEPPLE DOUGLAS S. ROBERTS D. KENT SAFRIET GARY P. SAMS TIMOTHY G. SCHOENWALDER ROBERT P. SMITH DAN R. STENGLE W. STEVE SYKES

RIGINAL W. STEVE

Blanca S. Bayó Director, Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

> Re: UNE Docket No. 990649-TP

Dear Ms. Bayó:

JAMES S. ALVES

RALPH A. DEMEO

WILLIAM H. GREEN

WADE L. HOPPING

LEIGH H. KELLETT

ERIC T. OLSEN

GARY K. HUNTER, JR.

ROBERT A. MANNING

FRANK E. MATTHEWS

RICHARD D. MELSON ANGELA R. MORRISON SHANNON L. NOVEY

JONATHAN T. JOHNSON

BRIAN H. BIBEAU

RICHARD S. BRIGHTMAN

PETER C. CUNNINGHAM

KEVIN B. COVINGTON

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Rhythms Links Inc. are the original and fifteen copies of its Objections to BellSouth's First Set Of Interrogatories and First Request For Production of Documents.

By copy of this letter, this document has been furnished to the parties on the attached service list.

Very truly yours,

Richard D. Melson

RDM/kcg Enclosures

Parties of Record

APP GAL (CMP) COM CTR **ECR** LEG OPC PAI RGO

SER

RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-FUREAU OF RECORDS mu

129471.3

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07880 JUN 288

FREE-RECORDS/REPORTING

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation into pricing of)	Docket No. 990649-TP
unbundled network elements)	
		Filed: June 28, 2000

RHYTHM'S OBJECTIONS TO BELLSOUTH'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Rhythms Links Inc. ("Rhythms"), pursuant to Rule 28-106.206, Florida Administrative Code and Rules 1.340 and 1.280(b), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby makes the following objections to BellSouth Telecommunications Inc.'s (BellSouth's) First Set of Interrogatories and First Request for Production of Documents to Rhythms.

These objections are preliminary in nature and are made at this time for the purpose of complying with the five-day requirement set forth in the June 8, 2000 procedural order issued by the Commission in this docket. Should additional objections be discovered as Rhythms prepares its responses, Rhythms reserves the right to supplement, revise or modify its objections at the time it serves its responses on BellSouth.

General Objections

Rhythms makes the following general objections to BellSouth's First Set of Interrogatories and First Request for Production of Documents (the "requests") which will be incorporated by reference into Rhythms' specific responses when they are served on BellSouth.

1. Rhythms objects to the requests to the extent that such requests seek to impose an obligation on Rhythms to respond on behalf of it parent, subsidiaries and affiliates or other persons

07880 JUN 288

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

that are not parties to this case on the grounds that such requests are overly broad, unduly burdensome and not permitted by applicable discovery rules.

- 2. Rhythms has interpreted BellSouth's requests to apply to Rhythms' regulated intrastate operations in Florida and will limit its responses accordingly. To the extent that any request is intended to apply to matters other than Florida intrastate operations subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, Rhythms objects to such request as irrelevant, overly broad and unduly burdensome...
- 3. Rhythms objects to BellSouth's definitions and instructions insofar as they seek to impose obligations on Rhythms that exceed the requirements of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure or Florida law, including the obligation to supplement its responses.
- 4. Rhythms objects to BellSouth's definitions of "telephone exchange service," "switch," "cable," "digital circuit equipment," and "interLATA service" insofar as the use of such definitions would bring within the scope of the requests information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding or is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 5. To the extent that any request calls for confidential, proprietary business information of Rhythms, Rhythms will provide such information only subject to the protective agreement between the parties.

Objections to Specific Interrogatories

Subject to, and without waiver of, the foregoing general objections, Rhythms makes the following specific objections with respect to BellSouth's interrogatories:

<u>Interrogatory No. 4</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

<u>Interrogatory No. 5</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

<u>Interrogatory No. 6</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

Interrogatory No. 7: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

<u>Interrogatory No. 8</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

<u>Interrogatory No. 9</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

Interrogatory No. 10: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, the lives that

an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting are irrelevant.

Interrogatory No. 11: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

Interrogatory No. 12: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

Interrogatory No. 13: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting are irrelevant.

<u>Interrogatory No. 16</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

<u>Interrogatory No. 17</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

<u>Interrogatory No. 18</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

Interrogatory No. 19: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

<u>Interrogatory No. 20</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

<u>Interrogatory No. 21</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

Interrogatory No. 22: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

<u>Interrogatory No. 23</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

Interrogatory No. 24: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

Interrogatory No. 25: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

Interrogatory No. 26: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

Interrogatory No. 27: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

Interrogatory No. 28: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.

<u>Interrogatory No. 29</u>: Rhythms objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject

matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

Objections to Specific Requests for Production

Request No. 1: Rhythms objects to this request on the grounds that the is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, documents identified in response to interrogatories calling for information on the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

Request No. 2: Rhythms objects to this request on the grounds that the request (1) is overly broad and unduly burdensome, (2) is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and (3) is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, documents reflecting the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

Request No. 3: Rhythms objects to this request on the grounds that the request (1) is overly broad and unduly burdensome, (2) is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and (3) is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, documents reflecting the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms

uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

Request No. 4: Rhythms objects to this request on the grounds that the request (1) is overly broad and unduly burdensome, (2) is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and (3) is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding. FCC Rule 51.505 states that the total element long-run incremental cost (TELRIC) of an element should be based on the ILEC's forward-looking costs. Thus, documents reflecting the lives that an ALEC such as Rhythms uses to depreciate its plant and equipment for internal use or financial reporting purposes are irrelevant.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 28th day of June, 2000.

HOPPING GREEN SAMS & SMITH, P.A.

By: Prie D. Mu

Richard D. Melson P.O. Box 6526 Tallahassee, FL 32314 (850) 425-2313

GARY COHEN
JEREMY MARCUS
Blumenfeld & Cohen
1625 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-6300

Attorneys for Rhythms Links Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing was furnished to the following parties by U.S. Mail or hand delivery (*) this 28th day of June, 2000.

*Beth Keating Staff Counsel Florida Public Service Commission Division of Legal Services 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

*BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Nancy B. White c/o Nancy H. Sims 150 S. Monroe Street, Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556

Joseph A. McGlothlin Vicki Gordon Kaufman McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold, & Steen, P.A. 117 South Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Andrew O. Isar Telecommunications Resellers Association 4312 92nd Avenue, N.W. Gig Harbor, WA 98335

Floyd Self/Norman Horton, Jr. Messer, Caparello & Self P.O. Drawer 1876 215 S. Monroe Street Suite 701 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876

Florida Public Telecom Assoc. Angela Green, General Counsel 125 S. Gadsden Street # 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1525 Marsha Rule AT&T Communications 101 N. Monroe Street Suite 700 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Susan Hither Rick Heater M.C. Communications, Inc. 3301 Worth Buffalo Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89129

James C. Falvey, Esq. e.sper Communications, Inc. 133 National Business Parkway Suite 200 Annapolis Junction, MA 20701

Jeremy Marcus Kristen Smith Blumenfeld & Cohen 1625 Massachusetts Ave. NW Suite 300 Washington, D.C. 20036

Terry Monroe Vice President, State Affairs Competitive Telecomm. Assoc. 1900 M. Street, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036

Kimberly Caswell GTE Service Corporation One Tampa City Center 201 North Franklin Street Tampa, FL 33601-0110 Carolyn Marek
Vice President of Regulatory
Affairs
Southeast Region
Time Warner Communications
233 Bramerton Court
Franklin, TN 37069

Mark Buechele Supra Telecom Koger Center Ellis Building, Suite 1311 Executive Center Drive Tallahassee, FL 32301

Donna Canzano McNulty, Esq. MCI WorldCom 325 John Knox Road Suite 105 Tallahassee, Fl 32303

Michael A. Gross VP Reg. Affairs & Reg. Counsel Florida Cable Telecomm. Assoc. 310 North Monroe Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

TCG South Florida c/o Rutledge Law Firm Kenneth Hoffman P.O. Box 551 Tallahassee, FL 32302-0551

Karen M. Camechis Pennington, Moore, Wilkinson & Dunbar P.O. Box 10095 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Scott A. Sapperstein Sr. Policy Counsel Intermedia Communications 3625 Queen Palm Dr. Tampa, FL 33619

Robert Rigings
Marc B. Rothschild
Swidler Berlin Shereff
Friedman, LLP
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007-5116

Cathy Boone Covad Communications, Co. 9600 Great Hills Trail Suite 150W Austin TX, 78759

Charles J. Rehwinkel Sprint P.O. Box 2214 Tallahassee, FL 32316

Bettye Willis
ALLTEL Communications
Services, Inc.
One Allied Drive
Little Rock, AR 72203-2177

J. Jeffrey Wahlen Ausley & McMullen P.O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Florida Digital Network, Inc. 390 N. Orange Ave., Suite 2000 Orlando, FL 32801

KMC Telecom, Inc. John McLaughlin Suite 170 3025 Breckinridge Blvd. Duluth, Ga 30096

MCI WorldCom, Inc. Mr. Brian Sulmonetti Concourse Corporate Center Six Six Concourse Parkway Suite 3200 Atlanta, GA 30328

NorthPoint Communications, Inc. Glenn Harris, Esq. 22 Sutter Street, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108

Office of Public Counsel Stephen C. Reilly c/o The Florida Legislature 111 W. Madison Street, Rm. 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 Holland Law Firm Bruce May P.O. Drawer 810 Tallahassee, FL 32302

John Fons Ausley & McMullen P.O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Norton Cutler General Counsel BlueStar Networks, Inc. 40 Church Street 24th Floor Nashville, TN 37201

George S. Ford Chief Economist Z-Tel Communications, Inc. 601 South Harbor Island Blvd. Tampa, FL 33602

Jonathan E. Canis Michael B. Hazzard Kelley Dry & Warren, LLP 1200 19th Street, NW, Fifth Floor Washington, DC 20036

Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Esq.
Cathy M. Sellers, Esq.
Moyle, Lanigan, Katz, Kaolins,
Raymond & Sheeran, P.A.
The Perkins House
118 N. Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Rodney L. Joyce Shook, Hardy & Bacon, L.L.P. 600 14th Street, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20005-2004

Cleartel Communications, Inc. 1255 22nd Street N.W. 6th Floor Washington, DC 20037

Constance Kirkendall @link Networks, Inc. 2220 Campbell Creek Blvd. Suite 110 Richardson, TX 75082-4420

John Spilman Broadslate Networks of Florida, Inc. 675 Peter Jefferson Parkway Suite 310 Charlottesville, VA 22911

Global NAPS, Inc. 10 Merrymount Road Quicny, MA 02169

Network Access Solutions Corporation 100 Carpenter Drive, Suite 206 Sterling, VA 20164

Mark Ortlieb SBC Telecom, Inc. 130 E. Travis, Rm. 5-K-03 San Antonio, TX 78205

Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership 3100 Cumberland Circle Mailstop GAATLN0802 Atlanta, GA 30339

Charles J. Pellegrini Wiggins Law Firm P.O. Drawer 1657 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Rie D. La

Attorney