



RECEIVED

Edward Phillips
Attorney

JUN 13 PM 1:04
T.R.A. DOCKET ROOM

NCWKFR0313
14111 Capital Blvd
Wake Forest, NC 27587-5900
Voice 919 554 7870
Fax 919 554 7913
edward.phillips@mail.sprint.com

January 11, 2006

Chairman Ron Jones
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37243

Re: Supplemental Response of Sprint Nextel Corporation to Data Requests No. 1 of
the Tennessee Regulatory Authority – Docket No. 05-00240

Dear Chairman Jones:

Please find attached the original and 13 copies of Sprint Nextel's Supplemental Response to Question No. 1 of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority's Data Request No. 1. Information marked as **confidential** is being filed under seal in a separate envelope and should be afforded the usual protections pursuant to the terms of the Protective Order entered on November 9, 2005. Under cover of this letter, a copy of this filing including the **confidential information** is being served upon counsel for the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

An extra copy of this letter is enclosed. Please stamp it "Filed" and return to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. Should you have questions or concerns with this filing, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Phillips

HEP:sm

Attachments

cc: Don Scholes (w/attachments)

Tennessee Regulatory Authority, Docket No. 05-00240
Application of Sprint Nextel Corporation for Approval of the Transfer of Control of United
Telephone-Southeast, Inc.; Sprint Long Distance, Inc.; and Sprint Payphone Services, Inc. from
Sprint Nextel Corporation to LTD Holding Company
TRA Data Request No. 1

Question 1:

Have the petitioners filed similar petitions or notices in other states? If so, provide a listing of states and action taken.

Response:

Sprint Nextel Corporation ("Sprint") has filed similar applications in thirteen (13) other states. Approvals of the applications have been granted in a number of states while procedural action has occurred in all remaining states where approval has not been granted. Please note that the states in which recommendations for approval or actual approval has been obtained are discussed in some detail while those states in which only procedural action has occurred are merely listed. The (13) thirteen states in which applications have been filed are as follows:

Florida On October 13, 2005, the Florida Public Service Commission ("FPSC") issued Order No. PSC-05-0985-PAA-TP "Notice of Proposed Agency Action - Order Approving Transfer of Control" in Docket No. 050551-TP. The Communication Workers of America ("CWA") filed its protest of the proposed agency action on October 27, 2005. On December 20, 2005, the FPSC dismissed the CWA's protest based on lack of standing under Florida law. A copy of the FPSC order is attached.

Kansas

Minnesota On November 17, 2005, the Minnesota Department of Commerce recommended approval of Sprint Nextel's application for transfer of control. The Minnesota Public Utilities Commission entered an order in Docket No. P6474, P430/PA-05-1352 adopting the Department of Commerce's recommendation to approve the transfer of control. A copy of the January 6, 2006 order is attached. Please note that the Minnesota order has the Department of Commerce report attached, and that attachment contains confidential information which is being filed under seal.

Missouri

Tennessee Regulatory Authority, Docket No. 05-00240
Application of Sprint Nextel Corporation for Approval of the Transfer of Control of United
Telephone-Southeast, Inc.; Sprint Long Distance, Inc.; and Sprint Payphone Services, Inc. from
Sprint Nextel Corporation to LTD Holding Company
TRA Data Request No. 1

Nebraska	On November 1, 2005, the Nebraska Public Service Commission ("Nebraska PSC") voted unanimously to approve Sprint Nextel's application for transfer of control (Application No. C-374). The Nebraska PSC issued its order on that same day, a copy has already been provided to the Authority Staff in a previous supplemental response.
Nevada	On December 5, 2005, the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada voted unanimously to approve Sprint Nextel's application of transfer of control in Docket No. 05-8032. The Nevada Commission has yet to issue its order.
New Jersey	
Ohio	On December 7, 2005, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio voted unanimously to approve Sprint Nextel's application for transfer of control. This action is memorialized by the Ohio Commission's order entered in Case No. 05-1040-TP-ACO. A copy of the Ohio order is attached.
Pennsylvania	A hearing was held on December 2, 2005. Sprint Nextel is awaiting a decision from the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.
South Carolina	On December 8, 2005, the Public Service Commission of South Carolina entered Order No. 2005-690 in Docket No. 2005-246-C approving Sprint Nextel's application for transfer of control. A copy of Order No. 2005-690 is attached.
Virginia	
Washington	
Wyoming	On October 25, 2005, the Wyoming Public Service Commission voted unanimously to approve Sprint Nextel's application for transfer of control. This material was updated in a prior supplemental response filed on November 3, 2005; however, the order had not yet been entered. The Wyoming Commission entered its order on December 2, 2005. A copy of the Wyoming Order is being provided with this update.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served a copy of Sprint Nextel Corporation's Supplemental Response to Question No. 1 of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority's Data Request No. 1 upon counsel for the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO by depositing a copy in the United States Mail, first-class postage prepaid.

This 11th day of January, 2006.

Donald L. Scholes
Branstetter, Kilgore, Stranch & Jennings
227 Second Avenue North, Fourth Floor
Nashville, TN 37219



Edward Phillips
Sprint Nextel Corporation

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Joint application for approval of transfer of control of Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, holder of ILEC Certificate No. 22, and Sprint Payphone Services, Inc., holder of PATS Certificate No. 3822, from Sprint Nextel Corporation to LTD Holding Company, and for acknowledgment of transfer of control of Sprint Long Distance, Inc., holder of IXC Registration No. TK001, from Sprint Nextel Corporation to LTD Holding Company.

DOCKET NO. 050551-TP
ORDER NO. PSC-06-0033-FOF-TP
ISSUED: January 10, 2006

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY, Chairman
J. TERRY DEASON
LISA POLAK EDGAR
ISILIO ARRIAGA

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS AND ADOPTING
ORDER NO. PSC-05-0985-PAA-TP AS FINAL AND EFFECTIVE

BY THE COMMISSION:

I. Case Background

By Order No. PSC-05-0985-PAA-TP (PAA Order), issued October 13, 2005, we approved the transfer of control of Sprint-Florida and Sprint Payphone from Sprint-Nextel to LTD Holding Company. Thereafter, on October 27, 2005, the Communications Workers of America (CWA) filed a Petition for a Formal Administrative Hearing protesting the PAA Order. On November 3, 2005, Sprint Nextel Corporation, LTD Holding Company, Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, and Sprint Payphone Services, Inc., collectively filed a Motion to Dismiss. On November 9, 2005, CWA filed a Response and Request for Oral Argument.

On December 6, 2005, oral argument was held. We subsequently voted to defer our decision on whether to grant Sprint's Motion to Dismiss, and whether to reconsider the PAA Order to the December 20, 2005 Agenda Conference. This Order memorializes our decision at the December 20, 2005 Agenda Conference.

II. Standard of Review

Formal adjudicatory proceedings under the Administrative Procedures Act use many of the pleadings, and processes of litigation in circuit court. The motion to dismiss is one such

pleading. And although in both civil litigation and formal administrative proceedings the motion to dismiss is basically the same pleading, the context requires a significant conceptual distinction.

A motion to dismiss in an administrative adjudicatory proceeding before the Florida Public Service Commission tests the sufficiency of a petition. *Cf. Varnes v. Dawkins*, 624 So.2d 349, 350 (Fla. 1st DCA 1993) (function of motion to dismiss in civil cases is to test sufficiency of complaint). Rule 28-106.204(2), Florida Administrative Code, specifically authorizes such motions.

In an administrative petition the petitioner seeks some personal relief from proposed agency action. Rule 28-106.201(2), Florida Administrative Code, specifies the content of a petition. A petition must plead competently three key elements:

- (1) "...an explanation of how the petitioner's substantial interests will be affected by the agency determination: and
- (2) "a statement of the specific rules or statutes the petitioner contends require reversal or modification of the agency's propose action."
- (3) "a statement of the relief sought by the petitioner, stating precisely the action petitioner wishes the agency to take with respect to the agency's proposed action."

In short, the Rule requires the petitioner to state how the proposed agency action hurts it, why this matters, and what the agency should do about it.

Returning now to the motion to dismiss before this Commission, its basic function is therefore to test the the sufficiency of the petition with respect to (1) substantial injury, (2) statutory right and (3) requested relief. In the instant case, Sprint's motion to dismiss focuses on the first element, CWA's affected substantial interests, i.e., CWA's "standing" to demand a hearing.¹

In determining the sufficiency of the petition, we confine our consideration to the petition and the grounds asserted in the motion to dismiss. *Cf. Flye v. Jeffords*, 106 So. 2d 229 (Fla. 1st DCA 1958). Moreover, we construe all material facts and allegations in the light most favorable to CWA in determining whether the petition is sufficient. *Cf. Matthews v. Matthews*, 122 So. 2d 571 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1960).

¹ "Standing to demand a hearing" and "standing to participate in a proceeding as a party" both refer to the right of one whose substantial interest are being affected by the agency action, and these terms are used interchangeably

III. Parties' Arguments

A. CWA's Petition

CWA's alleges that its substantial interests are affected in two ways. First, the proposed organizational changes will "result in degradation in the quality of local telecommunication service it currently receives." Petition at 3. Next, the proposed changes will result in a loss of jobs by CWA workers in Florida. Id.

Rule 28-106.201(2), Florida Administrative Code, also requires that disputed issues of fact be alleged. CWA identifies the following issues as being in dispute:

- 1) Whether after the spin-off, Sprint-Florida will be able to provide efficient and reliable communications service;
- 2) Whether after the spin-off, Sprint-Florida will have the ability to raise capital to invest in networks, employees and systems to continue providing high quality service;
- 3) Whether the newly created holding company, LTD Holding Company, will possess the financial capability to assist Sprint-Florida to provide quality service to its customers in Florida;
- 4) Whether sufficient assets not owned, but jointly used by Sprint-Florida, will be transferred to Sprint-Florida; and
- 5) Whether the level of debt and equity is such that LTD Holding Company will obtain investment grade debt ratings.

CWA concludes, without citing specific authority, that Section 364.33, Florida Statutes, and this Commission's various decisions interpreting that law, require reversal of the PAA Order.

B. Sprint's Motion to Dismiss

Sprint argues that CWA has cited no statutory provisions or issues that would support its standing to pursue a hearing on the PAA Order. Sprint contends, rather, CWA seeks to establish standing by alleging that, as a customer of Sprint, CWA would be harmed by any degradation in service quality that results from the transaction. Sprint alleges that this allegation is not within CWA's general scope of interest and activity and is not appropriate for CWA to assert on behalf of its members. Sprint argues that CWA's assertion that the transfer of control will result in a loss of jobs by CWA workers in Florida, is outside the scope of this Commission's jurisdiction and review under Section 364.33, Florida Statutes. Sprint states that both of these alleged injuries are entirely speculative and, therefore, insufficient to establish standing under Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code.

Sprint further argues that CWA has not alleged any facts evidencing that the transfer of control will impair Sprint's ability to continue to comply with the Florida laws and Commission rules relating to service quality or with its statutory carrier of last resort obligations.

Sprint argues that CWA's allegations of prospective service degradation are mere conjecture and any such alleged future injury would be far too remote to give CWA standing to pursue its Petition. Indeed, in dismissing a CWA protest in another transfer of control proceeding, this Commission expressly held that speculation regarding job losses is insufficient to confer standing. This Commission ruled in Order No. PSC-98-0702-FOF-TP (*MCI*)² as follows:

The only allegation raised by CWA of the impact that the merger will have on CWA and its members is that the merger may result in a decrease in jobs for CWA workers in Florida. CWA can, however, only speculate as to the long term effects the merger may have on the market, and, ultimately, on jobs for communications workers. Such conjecture regarding future economic harm or possible loss of jobs . . . is too remote to establish standing in a proceeding conducted pursuant to Section 364.33 . . .

Sprint concludes that the purported injuries identified by CWA are purely speculative and are beyond the scope of this proceeding. In addition, the purported injuries are outside the general scope of CWA's interest and activity and are not appropriate for CWA to assert on behalf of its members. Accordingly, Sprint states that, CWA has failed to establish any element necessary to establish standing to pursue its Petition. In addition, CWA's Petition fails to state a cause of action for which relief can be granted and is procedurally deficient. Sprint therefore requests that we dismiss CWA's Petition and declare the PAA Order to be final.

C. CWA's Response

In its Response, CWA contends that, as a Sprint customer, it is significantly impacted by any actions taken by Sprint that affect the level of service that CWA receives. CWA alleges that the divestiture of Sprint's holdings and assets will result in a financially weaker company with fewer resources to meet the demands of a growing Florida population. Consequently, CWA further alleges that as a result of a weakened Sprint, it will be injured by a degradation in quality of service. CWA also alleges that LTD Holding Company will be over-burdened with debt resulting in its inability to raise sufficient capital to invest in service, infrastructure, and maintenance of existing customers. CWA contends that a disproportionate debt to equity ratio would adversely affect CWA in that it would have to deal with service diminution and higher rates. Furthermore, CWA alleges that the spin off of LTD Holdings Company does not represent an equitable allocation of assets and debts to ensure a viable entity. As such, CWA contends that the proposed certificate transfer will ultimately result in its substantial and immediate injury.

² In re Request for Approval of Transfer of Control of MCI Communications Corporation and MCI Telecommunications Corporation to TC Investments Corp., Order No. PSC-98-0702-FOF-TP at 19 (1998)

CWA contends that its allegations of injury are not speculative. CWA further contends that it is purely a customer concerned with the affects of the transfer in question and not affiliated in any other way with Sprint. Furthermore, CWA asserts that its complaint is not entirely based on economic grounds. CWA also contends that dismissing a customer's complaint, in this instance, for lack of standing would render Section 364.33, Florida Statutes, meaningless.

Contrary to Sprint's argument in its Motion to Dismiss, CWA contends that it has satisfied Section 120.80(13)(b), Florida Statutes, by raising allegations in direct conflict with the findings in this Commission's PAA Order; i.e. that the new entity will have the same financial abilities to provide service and that the transfer will serve the public interest.

Furthermore, CWA contends that it is irrelevant whether it meets the requirements for associational standing since CWA, and not its members, is the recipient of bills and service provided by Sprint.

In addition to the first prong of the Agrico test, CWA concludes that it meets the second prong because it has alleged the type of injury that this proceeding is designed to protect. As such, CWA asserts that it has demonstrated that it is substantially and immediately affected by this Commission's PAA Order.

IV. Standing

In order to establish standing, a petitioner must show: (1) that he will suffer injury in fact which is of sufficient immediacy to entitle him to a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing; and (2) that his substantial injury is of a type or nature which the proceeding is designed to protect. Agrico Chemical Co. V. Department of Regulation, 405 So.2d 478, 482 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1981). The first prong of the test involves the degree of the injury, and the second prong – which is sometimes called the “zone of interest” test – involves the nature of the injury. Id.

A. “Injury in Fact”

The “injury in fact” must be both real and immediate and not speculative or conjectural. There is no case on all fours with the instant dispute. Nevertheless, International Jai-Alai Players Assn. v. Florida Pari-Mutuel Commission, 561 So.2d 1224, 1225-26 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1990) is instructive. In that case, the International Jai-Alai Players Association appealed a final order of the Florida Pari-Mutuel Commission denying the Association standing before the Commission to contest an application by jai-alai fronton owners to change their playing dates. The Association alleged, *inter alia*, that the contemplated changes in the jai-alai playing dates would aid the fronton owners in their labor dispute with the Association, and thus would either break or prolong the ongoing strike of the Association to the economic detriment of its members. The Court found this alleged injury too remote and speculative.³

³ The Court also found that this injury did not satisfy the second part of the test in Agrico, i.e., that protection of the job interests of the players was not within the zone of interest created by the statute.

In the instant case, a trade union argues that proposed changes will injure both it and its members. In the International Jai-Alai case, the players association argued that the contemplated changes in operating hours would directly affect their employment relation with the frontons, and thus their substantial interests. The Court found this too remote to establish standing. Here, CWA argues as its second basis for standing that contemplated organizational changes will require logistical changes that will affect directly the employment relation of the CWA members with Sprint. This is even more remote.

CWA's first basis for standing, however, is that the proposed changes will result in degradation of service to it as a customer. As to this claim, International Jai-Alai is inapplicable. Thus, we must determine whether this alleged basis for standing satisfies the Agrico two-prong test.

1) Sufficient Immediacy

The case law provides no explanation of the term "sufficient immediacy" that can be used as a litmus test to reject an alleged harm as too remote. We thus look to the ordinary meaning of the words. The key word here is "immediacy," which means "the condition of being immediate." American Heritage Dictionary. "Immediate" enjoys several definitions, but the first seems most useful: "Acting or occurring without interposition of another agency or object; direct: *an immediate result*."

This definition allows us to identify precisely why CWA's alleged injury is not an "injury in fact" of sufficient immediacy within the meaning of the Section 120.57(2), Florida Statutes. Specifically, this Commission's proposed agency action directly and immediately affects Sprint, not CWA or its members. The changes contemplated by Sprint may have consequences, such as degradation of service, that may affect CWA or its members. But even assuming that this happens, the effects on CWA and its members will not be "immediate." This is not to deny that these effects, if they occur, can trace a casual chain back to the approval of Sprint's restructuring. Rather, it is to discern that the causal chain has too many links in it to view the downstream effects as "direct" or "immediate."

B. "Zone of Interest" Test

As previously stated, satisfying the second prong of the test hinges on whether the alleged injury is of the type the proceeding is designed to protect. Section 364.33, Florida Statutes, authorizes this Commission to give prior approval to transfers of control. There are no standards in this particular statutory provision, or elsewhere, applicable to approving a transfer of control. Moreover, we are not specifically authorized to review an ILEC's capital structure, *inter alia*, prior to approval of a transfer of control. Nevertheless, we believe that a public interest standard may be applied to our decisions under Section 364.33, Florida Statutes. Section 364.01, Florida Statutes, appears to provide this Commission some guidance in the approval process, in that we can reject an application for transfer of control if, after reviewing the relevant information, it finds that the transaction would not be in the public interest.

Proceedings conducted pursuant to Section 364.33, Florida Statutes, are simply not designed to provide in-depth analysis of potential long term financial possibilities. CWA's allegations regarding Sprint's potential inability to raise future capital, as well as other future financial effects, are not the types of concerns to be addressed through the transfer of control process, nor are the allegations ripe for consideration. If Sprint fails to fulfill any payment obligations that may arise in the course of doing business in Florida, or fails to meet service quality standards, such issues may be addressed through a complaint proceeding. We conclude that CWA has not sufficiently alleged that Section 364.33, Florida Statutes, is designed to protect the potential harms it is alleging in its Petition.

C. Decision

Based on the foregoing analysis, we find that CWA has failed to adequately allege standing to proceed to an evidentiary hearing. Therefore, Sprint's Motion to Dismiss is granted.

V. Transfer of Control

A. Jurisdiction

1) Section 364.33, Florida Statutes

We have authority under Section 364.33, Florida Statutes, to approve an application for transfer of control. This provision does not provide specific standards which we may follow in making our decision to approve a transfer of control. However, Section 364.01, Florida Statutes, implies a public interest standard that we may follow when deciding whether to approve or deny transfers of control, among other transactions.

The legislative intent in Section 364.01, Florida Statutes, is clear: this Commission is to exercise its jurisdiction in order to protect "the public health, safety, and welfare" as it relates to basic local telecommunications services. Based on the clear intent of the Florida Legislature, we should base our decisions on whether to grant applications for transfer of control if it satisfies the public interest. There is little guidance on what constitutes the "public interest." It appears that in most cases that what is in the public interest is left up to the interpretation of the particular administrative body charged with upholding that interest.

B. Financial Viability

In the various states that Sprint Nextel Corporation (Sprint Nextel) has applied for approval of the transfer of control of its local wireline division (LTD Holding Company or LTD), certain parties in these proceedings have raised a variety of concerns that they believe support their position that the transaction as it is currently structured is detrimental to the public interest. One of the main arguments against approval of the proposed transaction is that the former Sprint operating companies and their new parent, LTD, will be weaker, more financially constrained entities after their spin-off from Sprint Nextel than before the separation and as a result the customers of these entities will experience a degradation in service.

The parties allege that the asset and debt allocation to LTD by Sprint Nextel is not fair and equitable. As a result, they contend that LTD will have a capital structure that has significantly more debt leverage compared to the pre-transaction LTD capital structure. Moreover, the parties argue that LTD will be constrained by certain terms and conditions of this new bank debt and bond debt that will limit its financial flexibility. In addition to the \$7.25 billion of debt Sprint Nextel has announced it will allocate to LTD, it has also been announced that LTD will pay an annual dividend of \$300 million a year. As the deal is currently structured, it is the position of these parties that the significant increase in debt leverage, with the accompanying restrictions, and the planned dividend payment will severely constrain the cash resources that LTD will have available to it to invest in its business and new networks and services.

Sprint Nextel contends that the operating companies will be fiscally unaffected by the change in their parent company. Sprint Nextel states that the anticipated capital structure for LTD will not limit its financial flexibility nor will the anticipated capital structure prevent the company from having numerous financing alternatives for accessing capital in the future. Based on the results of its consultant's analysis of the transaction, it is Sprint Nextel's contention that LTD will have adequate capital and that neither the level of debt nor the anticipated dividend policy should limit the company's ability to invest in its network and employees at the levels required to maintain its current or an improved level of quality of service. For these reasons, it is Sprint Nextel's position that the operating companies and LTD will continue to possess the financial capability to generate sufficient cash flow to pay expenses, service debt, and pay a dividend to its shareholders following the transfer of control.

Numerous documents were reviewed in relation to Sprint Nextel's proposed spin-off of its local wireline division. As the transaction is currently structured, the accounting for the spin-off will occur at the LTD parent level. At this time there are no plans to push any of the debt down to the operating company level. This supports Sprint Nextel's contention that the transaction will have only a minimal impact on the financial statements of Sprint - Florida, Inc. (Sprint - FL) and the other operating companies. In addition, the cash flow projections prepared by Sprint Nextel and its consultant appear to support Sprint Nextel's position that LTD will generate sufficient cash flow to meet its operating needs and maintain quality service.

The rating agency and investment analyst reports identify certain concerns. The local wireline service is a declining business while the wireless service and Internet are the growing parts of the telecommunications industry. If LTD's access lines decline at an accelerating rate due to increased competition from cable, VOIP, and wireless substitution, its revenues and cash flow would also decline and erode key credit measures. As a stand-alone entity, LTD will not benefit from the revenue growth of the diverse businesses of the former consolidated company. Finally, while Sprint Nextel has chosen to focus on a market value approach to valuing LTD, it is readily apparent that on a book value basis LTD will have significantly greater debt leverage than either Sprint Corporation before the merger or Sprint Nextel after the separation. It is important to note, however, that Sprint Nextel does not believe that a book value comparison is relevant in this case.

We note that Standard and Poor's (S&P) currently assigns a corporate credit rating of triple B minus (BBB-) to Sprint – FL. Moreover, S&P has placed its ratings on the debt of the local wireline division of Sprint Nextel on CreditWatch with negative implications. The local division is comprised of Sprint – Florida, Inc., Centel Corporation, Centel Capital Corporation, Central Telephone Company, and Carolina Telephone & Telegraph Company. The implications were revised to “negative” from “developing” reflecting the potential that the local wireline company could be rated below investment grade after its spin-off from Sprint Nextel. Specifically, S&P stated:

Despite the relatively moderate proposed capital structure, strong EBITDA margins, and good discretionary cash flow characteristics, we are concerned about industry-wide business risk from rising cable telephony and wireless substitution, which could eventually weaken the financial profile. (Research Update: Sprint Nextel Corp. Local Division's Ratings Remain on CreditWatch Negative, November 10, 2005)

S&P states that it expects to determine the final ratings near the time of the spin-off, but intends to provide further clarity on the probable outcome as appropriate in the months preceding the spin-off. While it appears unlikely that S&P will assign an investment grade rating to LTD, there are indications that other rating agencies may assign LTD an investment grade rating under certain scenarios.

The FCC approved the Sprint Nextel merger with the commitment that the new local wireline company that is being spun off will receive an equitable debt and asset allocation at the spin-off so that it will be a financially secure entity.

In addition to the FCC, the transfer of control of the local wireline division has been approved by 5 of the 14 state commissions required to review the transaction. It is anticipated that the remaining state commissions will rule on this matter some time during the first quarter of 2006. The spin-off of the local wireline company is expected to be completed in the second quarter of 2006.

The allocation of the assets and debt in the spin-off of LTD appears reasonable. However, we recognize that there is some uncertainty with whether LTD will receive an investment grade rating following the spin-off. In order to provide this Commission with a means of assessing the financial viability of the new entity following the spin-off, Sprint Nextel has volunteered to provide certain documents. First, LTD will file with this Commission all credit rating agency reports concerning LTD Holding Company that are issued while Sprint – FL continues in its role as the “carrier of last resort.” Second, LTD commits that, at the time of separation, it will have the financial measures of other local exchange companies that have debt that is rated investment grade. In the event that two out of the three major credit rating agencies do not assign an investment grade corporate credit rating to LTD at the time of the spin-off, then LTD will file with this Commission a report that demonstrates that its primary financial

measures (such as EBITDA interest coverage and debt-to-EBITDA) presented to the major credit rating agencies fall within investment grade ranges, and that the non-investment grade ratings are the result of factors other than the financial measures of LTD.

C. Service Quality

We have expressed concern about the possible deterioration of Sprint's service quality due to Sprint's financial situation when the transfer of control is completed. Sprint is currently operating under a Service Guarantee Program (SGP) whereby it has obtained waivers of the service rules, but credits customers when the service rule objective is missed. Using the rule requirements as a benchmark for comparing Sprint's service prior to the implementation of the SGP and afterward, it appears that the service quality has declined.

Discussions between our staff and Sprint were held in order to address our concerns with Sprint's declining service quality. As a result, Docket Number 050918-TL was established to provide a supplemental commitment by Sprint to improve installation and repair intervals. Sprint submitted a commitment letter which will be addressed at the January 5, 2006 Agenda Conference.

We will continue to have the same authority under Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, to address service quality issues after the transfer of control is completed.

D. Decision

We find that the spin-off will result in no change to Sprint-Florida's balance sheet and have minimal impact on its income statement. Accordingly, we find that the allocation of assets and liabilities appear reasonable. In addition, Sprint should have the financial ability to improve its service quality. Therefore, we hereby find that the spin-off would not be contrary to the public interest. Recognizing that there has been further review of Sprint's financial viability and there will be further consideration of Sprint's quality of service in another docket, the previously issued PAA Order is adopted as a final order.

Based upon the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that Sprint's Motion to Dismiss is hereby granted. It is further

ORDERED that Order No. PSC-05-0985-PAA-TP is hereby adopted as final and effective. It is further

ORDERED that this docket is closed as there are no further proceedings.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 10th day of January, 2006.

BLANCA S. BAYÓ, Director
Division of the Commission Clerk
and Administrative Services

By: /s/ Kay Flynn
Kay Flynn, Chief
Bureau of Records

This is a facsimile copy Go to the Commission's Web site,
<http://www.floridapsc.com> or fax a request to 1-850-413-
7118, for a copy of the order with signature

(S E A L)

KS

Commissioner Deason dissented from the Commission's decision to grant Sprint's Motion to Dismiss. Commissioner Arriaga dissented from the Commission's decision to adopt Order No. PSC-05-0985-PAA-TP as final and effective.

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request:
1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard,

ORDER NO. PSC-06-0033-FOF-TP

DOCKET NO. 050551-TP

PAGE 12

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water and/or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.