

JOHN N. HUGHES
ATTORNEY AT LAW
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION
124 WEST TODD STREET
FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY 40601

TELEPHONE: (502) 227-7270

JNHUGHES@fewpb.net

TELEFAX (502) 875-7059

September 22, 2006

Ms. Beth A. O'Donnell
Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615

RECEIVED

SEP 22 2006

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

Re: Sprint Spectrum L.P. and SprintCom, Inc, d/b/a Sprint PSC: Case Nos. 2006-00215, 2006-00217, 2006-00218, 2006-00220, 2006-00252

Dear Beth:

Below are the Responses to the "Supplemental Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents to CMRS Carriers" served on Sprint PCS electronically on September 14, 2006 by Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. ("Ballard"), Duo County Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. ("Duo County"), Logan Telephone Cooperative, Inc. ("Logan"), West Kentucky Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. ("West Kentucky"), and North Central Telephone Cooperative Corporation ("North Central"). A separate Petition for Confidentiality is being filed for certain information requested in the Interrogatories

Five original copies of the Responses and the Petition for Confidentiality are being filed. Five additional copies of each document are also being filed. These Responses are being served electronically on parties to each case. The Confidential information is being provided to parties with an executed confidentiality agreement.

Submitted by:


John N. Hughes

124 West Todd Street

Frankfort, KY 40601

and

William R. Atkinson

Sprint Nextel

233 Peachtree St., N.E., Suite 2200

Atlanta, GA 30309

Counsel for: Sprint Spectrum L.P., on behalf of
itself and Sprintcom, Inc. d/b/a Sprint PCS

Petition of North Central Telephone Cooperative)
Corporation, For Arbitration of Certain Terms and)
Conditions of Proposed Interconnection)
Agreement with American Cellular Corporation)
f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant To the)
Communications Act of 1934, As Amended by the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996)

Case No. 2006-00252

**RESPONSE OF SPRINT PCS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL INTERROGATORIES
AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO CMRS CARRIERS
SUBMITTED BY BALLARD, DUO COUNTY, LOGAN, WEST KENTUCKY,
AND NORTH CENTRAL**

Sprint Spectrum L.P., on behalf of itself and SprintCom, Inc., d/b/a Sprint PCS (“Sprint PCS”); hereby files this response to the “Supplemental Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to CMRS Carriers” served on Sprint PCS electronically on September 14, 2006 by Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. (“Ballard”), Duo County Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. (“Duo County”), Logan Telephone Cooperative, Inc. (“Logan”), West Kentucky Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. (“West Kentucky”), and North Central Telephone Cooperative Corporation (“North Central”).

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Sprint PCS objects to these Supplemental Interrogatories and Requests to the extent that they seek information that is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

2. Sprint PCS objects to each Supplemental Interrogatory and Request involving documents or information that are (1) subject to the attorney-client privilege, (2) attorney work-product, or (3) prepared in anticipation of litigation.

3. Sprint PCS objects to each Supplemental Interrogatory and Request to the extent that it seeks to impose obligations on Sprint PCS that exceed the requirements of the Kentucky Rules of Civil Procedure or other applicable Kentucky law.

4. Sprint PCS objects to each Supplemental Interrogatory and Request to the extent that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, imprecise, calls for speculation or to the extent it utilizes undefined or insufficiently defined terms or phrases.

5. Sprint PCS objects to each Supplemental Interrogatory and Request to the extent that it requires the production of documents or information that is in the public domain, or on record with the Commission or the Federal Communications Commission, or which is already in petitioners' possession, custody or control.

6. Sprint PCS objects to each and every one of these Supplemental Interrogatories and Requests to the extent that they seek to have Sprint PCS create documents or information not in existence at the time of the discovery request.

Without waiving any of the above objections, Sprint PCS responds as follows:

INTERROGATORIES

1. Identify each person who participated in the consideration and preparation of your answers to these Discovery Requests and identify to which particular Discovery Request each person was involved in answering.

ANSWER: Shelley Jones, Contract Negotiator, Access Planning for Sprint PCS, 6330 Sprint Parkway, Overland Park, Kansas, 66251, Office Phone: 913-762-4463; Mark Koval, Manager, Interconnection Support, 6450 Sprint Parkway, Overland Park, Kansas, 66251, Office Phone: 913-315-9219; and Randy Farrar, Senior Manager,

Interconnection Support, 6450 Sprint Parkway, Overland Park, Kansas, 66251, Office Phone: 913-315-9841.

2. State whether you have existing physical interconnection with the network(s) of any telecommunications service provider in the local exchange area of the Company; if the answer to this interrogatory is in the affirmative, identify all locations at which you have such physical interconnection, and identify the entity (if any) with which you have such physical interconnection.

ANSWER: To the extent this Interrogatory seeks information on physical interconnection with parties other than Petitioners or transit providers that Sprint PCS utilize to exchange 251(b)(5) traffic with Petitioners, Sprint PCS objects on the basis that it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Sprint PCS further objects on the basis that it is overbroad, and vague and ambiguous such that Sprint PCS cannot determine exactly what is being requested. Subject to these objections and without waiving them, Sprint PCS responds as follows: Sprint PCS switches are not directly connected “in the local exchange area of the Company” to any other telecommunications service provider.

3. State whether you have existing physical interconnection with the network(s) of any telecommunications service providers in the Commonwealth of Kentucky; if the answer to this interrogatory is in the affirmative, identify all locations at which you have such physical interconnection, and with respect to each such location,

identify the entity (if any) with which the CMRS Carriers have such physical interconnection.

ANSWER: To the extent this Interrogatory seeks information on physical interconnection with parties other than Petitioners or transit providers that Sprint PCS utilize to exchange 251(b)(5) traffic with Petitioners, Sprint PCS objects on the basis that it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Sprint PCS further objects on the basis that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous. Subject to these objections and without waiving them, Sprint PCS responds as follows: Sprint PCS currently is physically interconnected with the following third party carriers at the locations indicated:

Location	Entity
LSVLKYAP2GT	BellSouth
WNCHKYMA02T	BellSouth
LSVLKYWE1GT	BellSouth
DAVLKYMA01T	BellSouth
MDVIKYMA02T	BellSouth
BWLGKYMA01T	BellSouth
OWBOKYMA1GT	BellSouth
RDCLKYXA1GT	Brandenberg
LXTNKYXA01T	Alltel
EZTWKYXA05T	Alltel
SMRTKYXA02T	Alltel
GLSGKYXR01T	South Central
LSVLKYJTDS0	BellSouth

4. State whether you have existing physical interconnection with the network(s) of any telecommunications service providers in the MTA(s) in which the Company's local exchange service area is located; if the answer to this interrogatory is in the affirmative, identify all locations at which you have such physical interconnection,

and with respect to each such location, identify the entity (if any) with which you have such physical interconnection.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS refers to and incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory 3 above.

5. State whether you have existing physical interconnection with the network(s) of any telecommunications service providers in the LATA('s) in which the Company's local exchange service area is located; if the answer to this interrogatory is in the affirmative, identify all locations at which you have such physical interconnection, and with respect to each such location, identify the entity (if any) with which you have such physical interconnection.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS refers to and incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory 3 above.

6. With respect to each MTA within which you provide service, identify and describe the extent to which CMRS service coverage is made available within the Company's local exchange service area(s).

ANSWER: Sprint PCS objects on the basis that it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Sprint PCS objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the use of the phrase "identify and describe the extent to which CMRS service coverage is made available within the Company's local exchange service area(s)." Sprint further objects on the basis that the information is in the public domain,

or on record with the Commission. Subject to these objections and without waiving them, Sprint PCS responds as follows: Coverage maps for Sprint PCS may be found on the public Internet at <http://www1.sprintpcs.com/explore/coverage/NatwideNetwk.jsp> or <http://coverage.sprintpcs.com/IMPACT.jsp>.

7. Identify the location of every antenna by which you provide CMRS service in the MTA('s) within which the Company is located.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS objects on the basis that it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Sprint further objects on the basis that the information is in the public domain, or on record with the Commission. Subject to these objections and without waiving them, Sprint PCS responds as follows: Antenna locations for Sprint PCS may be found on the public Internet at <http://www.sprint.com/pcsbusiness/coverage/towermaps.html>.

8. Identify the location of every antenna by which you provide CMRS service in each MTA in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. For each such location identified, identify the corresponding MTA in which such antenna is located.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS refers to and incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory 7 above.

9. State the date upon which you first sought to deliver traffic to the Company by means of a transit relationship with BellSouth or any of its predecessors in

interest ("transit service provider"), and state whether such attempted transit traffic delivery to the Company was permitted by the transit service provider.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS objects on the basis that it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Sprint PCS further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it is vague and ambiguous and imprecise with respect to the use of the phrase "date upon which you first sought to deliver traffic..." Subject to these objections and without waiving them, Sprint PCS responds as follows: Any Sprint PCS originated traffic sent to, and accepted by a transit service provider for delivery to a Company has been sent pursuant to a Kentucky Public Service Commission approved interconnection agreement.

10. State the date upon which you first sought to deliver traffic to the Company by means of a transit relationship with Windstream or any of its predecessors in interest ("transit service provider"), and state whether such attempted transit traffic delivery to the Company was permitted by the transit service provider.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS refers to and incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory 9 above.

11. State the date upon which you first sought to deliver traffic to the Company by means of a transit relationship with any third-party (other than those identified in the preceding two interrogatories) ("transit service provider"), identify the transit service provider through which this delivery was sought to be accomplished, and

state whether the transit service provider permitted such attempted transit traffic delivery to the Company.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS refers to and incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory 9 above.

12. Identify all agreements by which you first sought to deliver traffic to the Company by means of the transit arrangements described in the preceding three interrogatories. If no such agreements exist, so state your answer. If such traffic delivery was sought to be accomplished pursuant to an unwritten agreement, describe the terms of such agreement, identify the date (or approximate date, if no exact date is available) of such agreement, and identify all persons involved in negotiating such agreement for you and the third-party.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS refers to and incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory 9 above.

13. For traffic originated by you that is currently delivered to the Company by means of a transit arrangement with any of the transit service providers identified in the preceding interrogatories, indicate (for each transit service provider) the percentage of your traffic transited to the Company that is: (i) Type I interconnection traffic; and (ii) Type II interconnection traffic.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to these objections and without waiving them, Sprint

PCS responds as follows: 100% of the traffic originated by Sprint PCS that is delivered to Petitioners by means of a transit service provider is Type II interconnection traffic.

14. For traffic originated by you that is currently delivered to the Company by means of a transit arrangement with any of the transit service providers identified in the preceding interrogatories, identify (for each transit service provider) the scope of geographic areas from which your end-users originate such traffic.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS objects on the basis that it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Sprint PCS further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the use of the phrase “identify (for each transit service provider) the scope of geographic areas from which your end-users originate such traffic.”

15. For traffic originated by you that is currently delivered to the Company by means of a transit arrangement with any of the transit service providers identified in the preceding interrogatories, please indicate (for each transit service provider): (i) what call detail records you create; (ii) what call detail records you create and provide to the transit service provider; and (iii) what call detail records you create and provide to the Company.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS objects on the basis that it is not relevant to any issue in this proceeding, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible

evidence. Sprint PCS further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the use of the phrase “call detail record” and that it is overly broad. Sprint PCS further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it assumes or implies that Sprint PCS has any responsibility to identify and measure Sprint PCS originated traffic terminated to a petitioner, much less create and provide records regarding such traffic, and affirmatively states to the contrary that it is each petitioner’s responsibility to make arrangements to identify and measure the traffic originated by Sprint PCS that terminates on the petitioner’s network. *See, In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, First Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 15499 para. 1045 (rel. August 8, 1996). Subject to these objections and without waiving them, Sprint PCS responds as follows: i) Sprint PCS switches generate information for end user billing; ii) Sprint PCS switches send industry standard signaling that provides industry standard call information for Sprint PCS-originated traffic; and iii) Sprint PCS does not “create or provide” anything “to the Company”, beyond the information the Company may capture from Sprint PCS’ industry standard signaling.

16. For traffic originated by you that is currently delivered to the Company by means of a transit arrangement with any of the transit service providers identified in the preceding interrogatories, please describe (for each transit service provider) the specific interconnection trunking arrangement that you have in place with the transit service provider for the delivery, transit, and receipt of traffic to and from the Company. For purposes of this interrogatory, the phrase "specific interconnection trunking arrangement"

should be construed to include, but not be limited to, information regarding whether such trunks are dedicated solely for the delivery and receipt of mobile CMRS traffic.

ANSWER: Pursuant to the Sprint PCS-BellSouth interconnection agreements, Sprint PCS has 2-way interconnection trunk arrangements in place between Sprint PCS switches and BellSouth tandems over which Sprint PCS can i) send traffic that is destined for BellSouth or a third-party that is interconnected with BellSouth, and ii) receive traffic from BellSouth that is either originated on BellSouth's network or a third-party network that is interconnected and chooses BellSouth to transit its originated traffic to Sprint PCS.

17. Identify and describe all call detail record you provide to (i) any transit service provider identified in the preceding interrogatories, or (ii) the Company, and state whether such records can be used to determine the location of the cellular site serving your end-user customer(s) at the beginning of each call placed or received by your end-user customer.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS refers to and incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory 15 above.

IV. REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

1. Produce all documents identified in, referenced, referred to, reviewed, consulted, or relied upon in any way in responding to any of the Interrogatories or Requests for Admission propounded herein.

ANSWER: Confidential Exhibit 1 contains all responsive documents.


2. Provide representative call detail records for all call detail records identified in answer to Interrogatories 15 and 17.

ANSWER: Sprint PCS refers to and incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory 15 above. No "call detail records" were identified.

3. Provide all documentation (including, but not limited to, source documentation) used to determine the percentages of Type I and Type II interconnection traffic you transit to the Company.

ANSWER: Confidential Exhibit 1 contains all responsive documents.

Submitted by:



John N. Hughes

124 West Todd Street

Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

(502) 227-7270 (v)

(502) 875-7059 (f)

-and-

Douglas C. Nelson

Sprint Nextel

233 Peachtree Street, NE

Suite 2200

Atlanta, Georgia 30303

(404) 649-0003 (v)

(404) 649-0009 (f)

Counsel for: Sprint Spectrum L.P.,
on behalf of itself and Sprintcom,
Inc. d/b/a Sprint PCS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served on the parties listed below by electronic mail, or by depositing same in the United States mail, First Class and postage prepaid, the 22nd day of September, 2006.

William G. Francis
Francis, Kendrick and Francis
504 First Commonwealth Bank Building
311 North Arnold Avenue
Prestonsburg, KY 41653-0268

James Dean Liebman
Liebman & Liebman
403 West Main Street
P. O. Box 478
Frankfort, KY 40602-0478


NTCH-West, Inc.
Suite E
1970 North Highland Avenue
Jackson, TN 38305

Thomas Sams
NTCH, Inc.
1600 Ute Avenue, Suite 10
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

John E. Selent
Holly C. Wallace
Edward T. Depp
Linda Bandy
Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP
1400 PNC Plaza
500 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, KY 40202
**Counsel for West Kentucky, Ballard
Rural, South Central,
Duo County, Brandenburg Telephone,
Foothills Rural,
Gearheart Communications, Logan
Telephone, Mountain Rural,
North Central, Peoples Rural, Thacker-
Grigsby**

Bhogin M. Modi
Vice President
ComScape Communications, Inc.
1926 10th Avenue, North
Suite 305
West Palm Beach, FL 33461

tip.depp@dinslaw.com
SELENT@DINSLAW.com
HWALLACE@DINSLAW.com


Counsel for Sprint PCS

COMMONWELATH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

RECEIVED

SEP 22 2006

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

Petition of Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement With American Cellular f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Case No. 2006-00215

Petition of Duo County Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement With Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, GTE Wireless of the Midwest Incorporated d/b/a Verizon Wireless, and Kentucky RSA No. 1 Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Case No. 2006-00217

Petition of Logan Telephone Cooperative Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement With American Cellular f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Case No. 2006-00218

Petition of West Kentucky Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement with American Cellular f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Case No. 2006-00220

)
Petition of North Central Telephone Cooperative
Corporation, For Arbitration of Certain Terms and
Conditions of Proposed Interconnection
Agreement with American Cellular Corporation
f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant To the
Communications Act of 1934, As Amended by the
Telecommunications Act of 1996

Case No. 2006-00252

PETITION FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

Sprint Spectrum L.P., on behalf of itself and SprintCom, Inc., d/b/a Sprint PCS (“Sprint PCS”) respectfully petitions the Kentucky Public Service Commission (“Commission”), pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, Section 7 and all other applicable law, for confidential treatment of each of the attached documents, in their entirety, that are being produced in its response to the “Supplemental Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to CMRS Carriers” (“Supplemental Interrogatories”) submitted by the Petitioners in the above-captioned cases. The documents to be afforded confidential treatment are being produced by Sprint PCS in response to Request for Production of Documents Nos. 1 and 3 in the Supplemental Interrogatories. Information for which confidential treatment is requested includes four network switch and/or trunk diagrams depicting specific, highly proprietary aspects of Sprint PCS’ network as well as the representative schematic of Sprint PCS’ internal network. Thus the entirety of the documents is deemed highly proprietary and confidential. In support of its Petition, Sprint PCS respectfully states as follows:

1.

Petitioners have requested, and Sprint PCS will provide, “all documents identified in, referenced, referred to, reviewed, consulted, or relied upon in any way in

responding to any of the Interrogatories or Requests for Admission” and “all documentation (including, but not limited to, source documentation) used to determine the percentages of Type I and Type II interconnection traffic you transit to the Company.” Sprint PCS would not as a matter of company policy publicly disclose the information it has identified as responsive except as required by law or pursuant to a court order or subpoena. Sprint PCS’ internal policies are directed toward non-disclosure of the information in question. In fact, the information will not be disclosed to any personnel of Sprint PCS except those who need to know in order to discharge their responsibilities. There is no significant interest in public disclosure of the attached information. Any public interest in favor of disclosure of the information is outweighed by the competitive interest in keeping the information confidential, thereby enabling Sprint PCS to successfully compete for business in Kentucky and other states. Disclosure of the information in question would put Sprint PCS at a competitive disadvantage. Moreover, the public interest would be best served by the nondisclosure of the materials in question because competition would thereby be promoted. The Regulations of the Commission contemplate the filing of such information under Protective Agreement.

2.

The information that Sprint PCS seeks to be afforded confidential treatment also constitutes a trade secret under the two prong test of KRS 365.880: a) the economic value of the information is derived by not being readily ascertainable by other persons who might obtain economic value by its disclosure; and, b) the information is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy. Both of the statutory tests are met in this instance. Only Sprint PCS is in a position to know the

essential elements of the document produced in its response to the "Supplemental Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to CMRS Carriers" submitted by the Petitioners in the above-captioned cases. The economic value of this information is derived by Sprint PCS maintaining the secrecy of the information, since its competitors could obtain economic value through its disclosure.

3.


Pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, Section 7(3), temporary confidentiality for the enclosed information should be maintained until the Commission enters an Order as to this Petition. Once the Order regarding confidentiality has been issued, Sprint PCS would have twenty (20) days to seek alternative remedies pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, Section 7(4).

4.

Sprint PCS and Petitioners have executed a Protective Agreement, and Sprint PCS will produce the documents to Petitioners subject to that agreement.

WHEREFORE, Sprint PCS petitions the Commission to treat as confidential all of the information contained in the documents identified in this Petition.

Respectfully submitted this 22nd day of September, 2006.



John Hughes
124 West Todd Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
(502) 227-7270 (v)
(502) 875-7059 (f)

-and-

Douglas C. Nelson
Sprint Nextel
233 Peachtree Street, NE
Suite 2200
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 649-0003 (v)
(404) 649-0009 (f)

Counsel for: Sprint Spectrum L.P.,
on behalf of itself and Sprintcom,
Inc. d/b/a Sprint PCS

Confidential Exhibit 1 Submitted Pursuant to Protective Agreement.

**AFFIDAVIT OF SHELLEY JONES
IN SUPPORT OF SPRINT PCS' PETITION FOR CONFIDENTIALITY**

STATE OF KANSAS)
) ss.
COUNTY OF JOHNSON)


Shelley Jones, being first duly sworn on oath, states as follows:

1. I am a Contract Negotiator, Access Planning, for Sprint PCS. In that capacity, I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth in this affidavit and am authorized to make this affidavit on behalf of Sprint PCS.
2. Sprint PCS is requesting that four documents be afforded confidential treatment in their entirety in the above-referenced petition. The documents contain network switch and/or trunk diagrams depicting specific, highly proprietary aspects of Sprint PCS' network as well as the representative schematic of Sprint PCS' internal network.
3. The contents of the documents would allow a competitor to easily deduce how much traffic Sprint PCS carries in particular areas and/or network efficiencies designed by Sprint PCS and therefore give the competitor highly sensitive commercial information related to market share, market penetration and costs. If disclosed, this could cause substantial competitive harm to Sprint PCS.
4. These documents, in their current form, are not made public due to their competitively sensitive nature and it would be very difficult if not impossible for a competitor to obtain all of the information found in these documents from other sources. If the information were available to competitors in this format, it could be used to harm Sprint PCS

competitively in the marketplace. In the highly-competitive wireless marketplace, such information is closely guarded.


5. Additionally, these documents in their unaltered form contain information not disclosed to personnel of Sprint PCS who do not need to have it in order to discharge their responsibilities.

FURTHER AFIANT SAYETH NOT.



Shelley Jones

Subscriber and sworn to before me this 22nd day of September, 2006.


Notary Public Stephanie L. Mahurin

