

Richard A. Chapkis
Vice President -- General Counsel, Southeast Region
Legal Department



FLTC0007
201 North Franklin Street (33602)
Post Office Box 110
Tampa, Florida 33601-0110

Phone 813 483-1256
Fax 813 204-8870
richard.chapkis@verizon.com

October 28, 2004 – **VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director
Division of the Commission Clerk
and Administrative Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 040156-TP
Petition for Arbitration of Amendment to Interconnection Agreements With
Certain Competitive Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio
Service Providers in Florida by Verizon Florida Inc.

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing is Verizon Florida Inc.'s Withdrawal of its Opposition to Sprint's
Petition for Intervention in the above matter. Service has been made as indicated on
the Certificate of Service. If there are any questions concerning this filing, please
contact me at 813-483-1256.

Sincerely,

/s/ Richard A. Chapkis

Richard A. Chapkis

RAC:tas
Enclosures

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that copies of Verizon Florida Inc.'s Withdrawal of its Opposition to Sprint's Petition for Intervention in Docket No. 040156-TP were sent via U.S. mail on October 28, 2004 to the parties on the attached list.

/s/ Richard A. Chapkis

Richard A. Chapkis

Staff Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

ALEC, Inc.
3640 Valley Hill Road
Kennesaw, GA 30152-3238

Lisa Sapper
TCG South Florida
1200 Peachtree St. N.E.
Suite 8100
Atlanta, GA 30309-3579

LecStar Telecom, Inc.
Michael E. Britt
4501 Circle 75 Parkway
Suite D-4200
Atlanta, GA 30339-3025

Stephen D. Klein, President
Ganoco, Inc.
1017 Wyndham Way
Safety Harbor, FL 34695

MCI WorldCom Comm.
Dulaney O'Roark, III
6 Concourse Parkway
Suite 600
Atlanta, GA 30328

MCI WorldCom Comm./
Intermedia Comm./MCImetro
Access/Metropolitan Fiber
Donna C. McNulty
1203 Governors Square Blvd.
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301-2960

Director-Interconnection Services
Level 3 Communications, LLC
1025 Eldorado Boulevard
Broomfield, CO 80021-8869

NewSouth Comm. Corp.
c/o Jon C. Moyle, Jr.
Moyle, Flanigan, Katz,
Raymond & Sheehan, P.A.
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Supra Telecommunications
and Information Systems Inc.
2620 SW 27th Avenue
Miami, FL 33133

Eric Larsen
Tallahassee Telephone Exchange Inc.
1367 Mahan Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32308

The Ultimate Connection L.C.
d/b/a DayStar Comm.
18215 Paulson Drive
Port Charlotte, FL 33954

USA Telephone Inc.
d/b/a CHOICE ONE Telecom
1510 NE 162nd Street
North Miami Beach, FL 33162

Kellogg Huber Law Firm
A. Panner/S. Angstreich
1615 M Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

James C. Falvey
Xspedius Management Co.
7125 Columbia Gateway Dr.
Suite 200
Columbia, MD 21046

Tracy Hatch
AT&T Communications
101 N. Monroe Street
Suite 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Norman Horton/Floyd Self
Messer, Caparello & Self
215 S. Monroe Street
Suite 701
Tallahassee, FL 32302

The Ultimate Connection
c/o Andrew M. Klein
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
1200 19th Street NW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Local Line America, Inc.
c/o CT Corporation
1200 South Pine Island Rd.
Plantation, FL 33324

Mario J. Yerak, President
Saluda Networks Incorporated
782 NW 42nd Avenue, Suite 210
Miami, FL 33126

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition of Verizon Florida Inc. for)	Docket No. 040156-TP
Arbitration of an Amendment to Interconnection)	Filed: October 28, 2004
Agreements with Competitive Local Exchange)	
Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service)	
Providers in Florida Pursuant to Section 252 of)	
the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended,)	
and the <i>Triennial Review Order</i>)	
_____)	

**VERIZON FLORIDA’S INC.’S WITHDRAWAL OF ITS
OPPOSITION TO SPRINT’S PETITION FOR INTERVENTION**

Sprint Communications Company L.P. (“Sprint”) asked to intervene in this arbitration on September 29, 2004, even though Sprint had sought (and obtained) dismissal of Verizon Florida Inc.’s (“Verizon”) original arbitration petition.¹ Verizon opposed Sprint’s petition to intervene, pointing out that Sprint had not made clear whether it even wished to amend its interconnection agreement or whether it agreed to be bound by the results of the arbitration. Verizon Opposition, at 5.

After Verizon filed its Opposition, the prehearing officer issued a procedural order making clear that all parties participating in this proceeding will “be bound by the ultimate findings in this proceeding.”² By intervening in this arbitration, Sprint will be bound by its results. The October 19 ruling thus removes the concern that Sprint could participate in this arbitration as a party, but then deny that it is bound by the Commission’s rulings here. Therefore, Verizon withdraws its Opposition to Sprint’s petition to intervene.

¹ See Verizon’s Opposition to Sprint’s Petition for Intervention at 1-3 (filed Oct. 11, 2004) (“Opposition”), at 1-3.

² Order Establishing Scope of Proceedings and Initial Schedule, Order No. PSC-04-1016-PCO-TP (Oct. 19, 2004) (“October 10 Order”), at 1.

Verizon's withdrawal of its Opposition to Sprint's intervention does *not*, however, change its position that Sprint's contract does not require amendment before Verizon may discontinue UNEs that are no longer required under federal law.³ But, as Verizon pointed out in its Opposition, it is *not* necessary to interpret the Verizon/Sprint contract now, outside the context of a concrete dispute about discontinuation of a specific UNE (and there are no such disputes at this time).⁴ Verizon Opposition, at 3, 5-7. If such a dispute does arise in the future, Verizon reserves the right to argue that Sprint's existing interconnection agreement permits it to cease providing UNEs that are not subject to a federal unbundling obligation.

Because Verizon is withdrawing its Opposition to Sprint's petition for intervention, Verizon understands that the further briefing on Sprint's petition that was requested in Order number PSC-04-1053-PCO-TP, issued on October 27, is no longer necessary.

³ As Verizon explained in its Opposition, its contract with Sprint provides, in the clearest language, that arbitration is not necessary to incorporate new legal developments. The parties expressly agreed that new regulations and judicial decisions would "automatically supersede" "any" term or condition of the agreement that "conflict[ed]" with the new regulation or judicial decision. Sprint/Verizon Interconnection Agreement, §1.2. Although arbitration with Sprint is not necessary to implement elimination of Verizon's unbundling obligations, allowing Sprint to unnecessarily amend its contract will probably do no harm, except in terms of a loss in administrative efficiency.

⁴ The October 27, 2004 Order requesting further briefing on Sprint's petition for intervention mistakenly recited that Verizon had argued that ruling on Sprint's petition "would"—instead of "would not"—require an interpretation of Sprint's agreement. See Order No. PSC-04-1053-PCO-TP, at 2.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Richard A. Chapkis

Aaron M. Panner
Scott H. Angstreich
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN,
TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.
Sumner Square
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 326-7900
(202) 326-7999 (fax)

Richard A. Chapkis
Verizon Florida Inc.
201 North Franklin Street, FLTC0717
P. O. Box 110
Tampa, FL 33601
(813) 483-1256
(813) 204-8870 (fax)

Kimberly Caswell
Associate General Counsel,
Verizon Corp.
201 N. Franklin Street, FLTC0007
Tampa, FL 33601
(727) 360-3241
(727) 367-0901 (fax)

Counsel for Verizon Florida Inc.

October 28, 2004