

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Special Access Rates for Price Cap Local Exchange Carriers	)	WC Docket No. 05-25
	)	
AT&T Corp. Petition for Rulemaking to Reform Regulation of Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier Rates for Interstate Special Access Services	)	RM-10593
	)	

**OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Sprint Corporation (“Sprint”) hereby submits this Opposition to the Joint Request for Extension of Time of the United States Telecom Association and ITTA – The Voice of Mid-Size Communications Companies (the “Joint Requesters”) filed in the above-referenced proceedings.<sup>1</sup> The Joint Request asks the Federal Communications Commission (“Commission” or “FCC”) to extend the deadline for submitting comments in this proceeding by “at least” 60 days and the deadline for reply comments for another 30 days beyond that. For the reasons set forth below, the Commission should reject summarily this excessive request for yet another delay in this important proceeding.

The Commission’s rules make clear that “extensions of time shall not be routinely granted,”<sup>2</sup> and the Joint Requesters provide no specific basis that could plausibly justify a multi-month extension. Rather, the Joint Requesters simply complain about their members’ ability to obtain access to the data, bemoan the size and complexity of the record, and assert that the current pleading deadlines do not afford their member

---

<sup>1</sup> Joint Request for Extension of Time of the United States Telecom Association and ITTA – The Voice of Mid-Size Communications Companies, WC Docket No. 05-25 (Oct. 21, 2015) (“Joint Request”).

<sup>2</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 1.46(a).

companies an adequate opportunity to review the record and prepare comments. None of these claims provides a basis for granting the requested extension.

As INCOMPAS and the Competitive Carriers Association note in their Opposition, the delay sought by the Joint Requesters “bears no relationship to the actual delay the parties have experienced, or are likely to experience, in accessing the data.”<sup>3</sup> Moreover, as the FCC previously emphasized in denying an extension request, “Commission proceedings often involve novel and important issues and significant number of comments, yet granting an extension is not the norm.”<sup>4</sup> Further, in an analogous circumstance, FCC staff rejected a request for more time by a party that claimed a delay was needed to complete a study it had commissioned, aptly observing that the requesting party was free to submit its research into the docket after the comment period had closed by filing a written *ex parte* presentation.<sup>5</sup> The Joint Requesters have the same opportunity to supplement the record in this proceeding.

As the Joint Requesters recognize, one criterion for approving extensions of time is that the delay must “cause no harm to any party in the proceeding.”<sup>6</sup> In this instance, grant of the requested delay would harm the interests of Sprint and other special access customers. Any extension necessarily would postpone the Commission’s reform of the excessive special access rates and onerous terms and conditions that the incumbent local exchange carriers (“LECs”) continue to assess. Moreover, contrary to the Joint

---

<sup>3</sup> Opposition of INCOMPAS and CCA to Request for Extension of Time, WC Docket No. 05-25, at 3 (Oct. 23, 2015).

<sup>4</sup> *Lifeline and Linkup Reform and Modernization, et al.*, Order, WC Docket No. 11-42, DA 15-1068, ¶ 4 (rel. Sept. 23, 2015).

<sup>5</sup> *Connect America Fund, et al.*, Order, 29 FCC Rcd 10468, ¶ 3 (2014).

<sup>6</sup> Joint Request at 2 (quoting *Audio Enterprises, Inc.*, Order, 3 FCC Rcd 5402 (1988)).

Requesters' assertion, such a delay would harm the broader public interest by extending the time it takes for the consumers who ultimately bear the economic burden of current special access arrangements to obtain relief.

The Commission's review of the regulatory regime governing special access rates, terms, and conditions has been pending for well over a decade without producing any decision that addresses the fundamental deficiencies in the current system. Thus, to date, the incumbent LECs have succeeded in avoiding the long-overdue reform of the current rules. The Commission should not sanction yet another extended delay.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should reject the extension sought in the Joint Request.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Charles W. McKee

Charles W. McKee

*Vice President, Government Affairs  
Federal & State Regulatory*

Sprint Corporation  
900 7th Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(703) 433-3786

October 26, 2015

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Erica A. Bettenhausen, do hereby certify that on this 26th day of October, 2015, I caused true and correct copies of the foregoing Opposition to Request for Extension of Time of Sprint Corporation to be served by electronic mail to the following:

Diane Griffin Holland  
United States Telecom Association  
dholland@ustelecom.org

Jonathan Banks  
United States Telecom Association  
jbanks@ustelecom.org

Micah M. Caldwell  
ITTA – The Voice of Mid-Size Communications Companies  
mcaldwell@itta.us

/s/ Erica A. Bettenhausen  
Erica A. Bettenhausen