BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Investigation into pricing of) unbundled network elements - Sprint)

and Verizon track

Docket No. 990649B-TP

Filed: February 25, 2002

AT&T, MCI AND FDN'S OBJECTIONS TO VERIZON FLORIDA, INC.'S SECOND SET OF INTEROGATORIES

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC (hereinafter "AT&T"), MCI WorldCom, Inc. (hereinafter "MCI") and Florida Digital Network, Inc. (hereinafter "FDN"), pursuant to Rules 25-22.034 and 25-22.035, Florida Administrative Code and Rules 1.350 and 1.280(b), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, hereby submits the following Objections to Verizon Florida, Inc.'s (hereinafter "Verizon") Second Set of Interrogatories to AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC, MCI WorldCom, Inc., and Florida Digital Network, Inc.

The Objections stated herein are preliminary in nature and are made at this time for the purpose of complying with the ten-day requirement set forth in Order No. PSC-01-1592-PCO-TP issued by the Florida Public Service Commission (hereinafter the "Commission") in the above-referenced docket. Should additional grounds for objection be discovered as AT&T, WorldCom and FDN prepare its Responses to the above-referenced set of requests, AT&T/MCI/FDN reserve the right to supplement, revise, or modify its objections at the time that it serves its Responses on Verizon. Moreover, should AT&T/MCI/FDN determine that a Protective Order is necessary with respect to any of the material requested by

DOCUMENT ALMORA - DATE

02212 FEB 25 N

Verizon, AT&T/MCI/FDN reserve the right to file a motion with the Commission seeking such an order at the time that it serves its Responses on Verizon.

General Objections

AT&T/MCI/FDN make the following General Objections to Verizon's Second Set of Interrogatories which will be incorporated by reference into AT&T, WorldCom and FDN's specific responses when its Responses are served on Verizon.

- 1. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to Verizon's Second Set of Interrogatories to the extent that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, not permitted by applicable discovery rules, and would require AT&T, WorldCom or FDN to disclose information —— which is privileged.
- 2. AT&T/MCI/FDN have interpreted Verizon's requests to apply to AT&T/MCI/FDN's 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, AT&T/MCI/FDN object to such request as irrelevant, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive.
- 3. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to each and every request and instruction to the extent that such request or instruction calls for information which is exempt from discovery by virtue of the attorney-client privilege, work product privilege or other applicable privilege.

- 4. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to each and every request insofar as the request is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, imprecise, or utilizes terms that are subject to multiple interpretations but are not properly defined or explained for purposes of these requests. Any Responses provided by AT&T/MCI/FDN in response to Verizon's requests will be provided subject to, and without waiver of, the foregoing objection.
- 5. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to each and every request insofar as the request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this action. AT&T/MCI/FDN will attempt to note each instance where this objection applies.
- 6. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to Verizon's general instructions, definitions or specific discovery requests insofar as they seek to impose obligations on AT&T, WorldCom and FDN which exceed the requirements of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure or Florida law.
- 7. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to providing information to the extent that such information is already in the public record before the Florida Public Service Commission.
- 8. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to each and every request, general instruction, or definition insofar as it is unduly burdensome, expensive, oppressive, or excessively time consuming as written.
- 9. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to each and every request to the extent that the information requested constitutes "trade secrets" which are privileged pursuant to Section 90.506, Florida Statutes. To the extent that Verizon's requests seek proprietary

confidential business information which is not the subject of the "trade secrets" privilege,

AT&T/MCI/FDN will make such information available to counsel for Verizon pursuant
to an appropriate Protective Agreement, subject to any other general or specific
objections contained herein.

- different locations in Florida and in other states. In the course of its business, AT&T/MCI/FDN create countless documents that are not subject to Florida Public Service Commission or FCC retention of records requirements. These documents are kept in numerous locations and are frequently moved from site to site as employees change jobs or as the business is reorganized. Rather, these responses will provide all of the information obtained by AT&T/MCI/FDN after a reasonable and diligent search conducted in connection with this discovery request. AT&T/MCI/FDN will comply with Verizon's request that a search be conducted of those files that are reasonably expected to contain the requested information. To the extent that the discovery request purports to require more, AT&T/MCI/FDN object on the grounds that compliance would impose an undue burden or expense.
- 11. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to the definitions of "AT&T", "MCI" and "FDN" to the extent that such definitions seek to impose an obligation on AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC, MCI WorldCom, Inc. or Florida Digital Network, Inc. to respond on behalf of subsidiaries, affiliates, or other persons that are not parties to this case on the grounds that such definition is overly broad, unduly

burdensome, oppressive, and not permitted by applicable discovery rules. Without waiver of its general objection, and subject to other general and specific objections, Answers will be provided on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC, MCI WorldCom, Inc. or Florida Digital Network, Inc. which is the entity certificated to provide regulated telecommunications services in Florida and which is a party to this docket. All references to "AT&T", "MCI" or "FDN" in responding to Verizon's requests should be taken to mean AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC, MCI WorldCom, Inc. or Florida Digital Network, Inc.

12. AT&T/MCI/FDN object to the definitions of "you" and "your" to the extent that such definitions seek to impose an obligation on AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC, MCI WorldCom, Inc. or Florida Digital Network, Inc. to respond on behalf of subsidiaries, affiliates, or other persons that are not parties to this case on the grounds that such definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and not permitted by applicable discovery rules. Without waiver of its general objection, and subject to other general and specific objections, Answers will be provided on behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC, MCI WorldCom, Inc. or Florida Digital Network, Inc. which is the entity certificated to provide regulated telecommunications services in Florida and which is a party to this docket. All references to "AT&T", "MCI" or FDN in responding to Verizon's requests should be taken to mean AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC, MCI WorldCom, Inc. or Florida Digital Network, Inc.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

INTERROGATORY NO. 25: What cost of capital does each member of the ALEC Coalition use to evaluate local exchange projects? As to each member of the ALEC Coalition, please specify whether this cost of capital is after-tax or before-tax. Please fully describe the cost of equity models that each member of the ALEC Coalition uses to develop the cost of capital and specify all model assumptions and inputs.

OBJECTION:

AT&T, and WorldCom object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Florida Digital objects to this interrogatory on the basis that it seeks information that is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The interrogatory seeks cost of capital information which Florida Digital uses to evaluate local exchange projects. As a small ALEC, Florida Digital's corporate structure, business profile, investment risk, and cost of capital are so drastically different from the corresponding characteristics of a large LEC like Verizon that information regarding Florida Digital's cost of capital is irrelevant to the issues in this case. The Commission

ruled in the BellSouth phase of this docket that only information on companies comparable to the LEC may be germane to an evaluation of LEC cost of capital when setting UNE prices. See Order No. PSC-01-1181-FOF-TP at 169. Florida Digital also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that the interrogatory requests highly sensitive, confidential, proprietary information and is designed to harass Florida Digital rather than being reasonably tailored to obtain information that could be of any relevance or use in this proceeding.

INTERROGATORY NO. 26: Please identify all suppliers that have available for purchase NGDLC RT equipment that has the functionality to support multi-carrier operation and 2-wire analog loop unbundling.

OBJECTION: AT&T, WorldCom, and FDN object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome.

INTERROGATORY NO. 27: Please identify all switch vendors that have available for purchase digital circuit switching equipment and associated application software that has the functionality to support multi-carrier GR-303 operation and 2-wire analog loop unbundling.

OBJECTION:

AT&T, WorldCom, and FDN object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome.

INTERROGATORY 31: Please specify what value for the number of equivalent business days Dr. Ankum believes should be used in a switching cost study.

OBJECTION:

AT&T, WorldCom and FDN object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

SUBMITTED this 25th day of February 2002.

TRACY W. HATCH, ESQ.

FLOYD R. SELF, ESQ.

MESSER, CAPARELLO & SELF, P. A.

Post Office Box 1876

Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876

(850) 222-0720

Attorney for AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC

and

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

and

Matthew Feil, Esq. Florida Digital Network, Inc. 390 North Orange Avenue, Suite 2000 Orlando, Florida 32801

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of AT&T, MCI and FDN's Objections to Verizon Florida, Inc.'s Second Set of Interrogatories in Docket 990649B-TP has been served on the following parties by Hand Delivery (*) and/or U. S. Mail this 25th day of February, 2002.

Jason Fudge, Esq.*
Division of Legal Services, Room 370
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

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

Claudia Davant-DeLoach, Esq. AT&T 101 N. Monroe St., Suite 700 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Virginia Tate, Esq.
AT&T
1200 Peachtree St., Suite 8068
Atlanta, GA 30309

Jeffrey Whalen, Esq. John Fons, Esq. Ausley Law Firm P.O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Michael A. Gross
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
& Regulatory Counsel
Florida Cable Telecommunications Assoc., Inc.
246 E. 6th Avenue
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Kimberly Caswell Verizon Select Services P.O. Box 110, FLTC0007 Tampa, FL 33601-0110

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

Mr. Brian Sulmonetti WorldCom, Inc. 6 Concourse Parkway, Suite 3200 Atlanta, GA 30328 Marc W. Dunbar, Esq.
Pennington, Moore, Wilkinson, Bell & Dunbar, P.A.
P.O. Box 10095
Tallahassee, FL 32302-2095

Charles J. Rehwinkel Sprint-Florida, Incorporated MC FLTHO0107 P.O. Box 2214 Tallahassee, FL 32399-2214

Mark Buechele Supra Telecom 1311 Executive Center Drive, Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Carolyn Marek
Vice President of Regulatory Affairs
Southeast Region
Time Warner Communications
233 Bramerton Court
Franklin, TN 37069

Ms. Wanda Montano US LEC of Florida, Inc. 6801 Morrison Blvd Charlotte, NC 28211-3599

Vicki Kaufman, Esq.
Joe McGlothlin, Esq.
McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin,
Davidson, Rief & Bakas, P.A.
117 S. Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL. 32301

Patrick Wiggins Charles Pellegrini Katz, Kutter Law Firm 106 East College Avenue, 12th Floor Tallahassee, FL 32301

Richard D. Melson Hopping Green Sams & Smith, P.A. P.O. Box 6526 Tallahassee, FL 32314 BlueStar Networks, Inc. Norton Cutler/Michael Bressman 5 Corporate Centre 801 Crescent Centre Drive, Suite 600 Franklin, TN 37067

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

Ms. Catherine F. Boone Covad Communications Company 10 Glenlake Parkway, Suite 650 Atlanta, GA 30328-3495

Florida Digital Network, Inc. 390 North Orange Avenue, Suite 2000 Orlando, Florida 32801

Mr. Don Sussman Network Access Solutions Corporation Three Dulles Tech Center 13650 Dulles Technology Drive Herndon, VA 20171-4602

Rodney L. Joyce Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP 600 14th Street, NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20005-2004

Michael Sloan Swidler & Berlin 3000 K Street, NW #300 Washington, DC 20007-5116

George S. Ford Z-Tel Communications, Inc. 601 S. Harbour Island Blvd. Tampa, FL 33602-5706

Lisa Korner Butler
Vice President Regulatory & Industry Affairs
Network Plus, Inc.
41 Pacella Park Drive
Randolph, MA -2368

Andrew O. Isar Miller Isar, Inc. 7901 Skansie Avenue, Suite 240 Gig Harbor, WA 98335

Tracy W. Hatch