ORIGINAL

Legal Department

J. Phillip Carver
Senior Attorney

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
150 South Monroe Street
Room 400
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(404) 335-0710

September 26, 2003

Mrs. Blanca S. Bayó
Director, Division of Records and Reporting
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket Nos. 981834-TP and 990321-TP (Generic Collocation)

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed are an original and fifteen copies of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Surrebuttal Testimony of W. Bernard Shell, which we ask that you file in the captioned docket.

A copy of this letter is enclosed. Please mark it to indicate that the original was filed and return the copy to me. On September 25, 2003, copies were served via Electronic Mail and U.S. Mail to the parties shown on the attached Certificate of Service.

Sincerely,

J. Phillip Carver

J. Phillip Carver (CKA)

cc: All Parties of Record
Marshall M. Criser III
R. Douglas Lackey
Nancy B. White

AUS
CAF
CMP
COM 5 + org
CTR
ECR 2
GCL 1
OPC
MMS
SEC 1
OTH

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
Docket No. 981834-TP and 990321-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via Hand Delivery (9-26-03) (*), First Class U.S. Mail and Electronic Mail this 25th day of September, 2003 to the following:

Beth Keating, Staff Counsel
Adam Teitzman, Staff Counsel (*)
Florida Public Service Commission
Division of Legal Services
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Tel. No. (850) 413-6212
Fax. No. (850) 413-6250
bkeating@psc.state.fl.us
ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us

FPSC Staff By E-Mail Only:
amaurey@psc.state.fl.us
bgardner@psc.state.fl.us
bcasey@psc.state.fl.us
cbulecza@psc.state.fl.us
david.dowds@psc.state.fl.us
jrojas@psc.state.fl.us
jschindl@psc.state.fl.us
jebrown@psc.state.fl.us
lking@psc.state.fl.us
mbrinkle@psc.state.fl.us
plee@psc.state.fl.us
pvickery@psc.state.fl.us
plester@psc.state.fl.us
sasimmon@psc.state.fl.us
sbbrown@psc.state.fl.us
scater@psc.state.fl.us
tbrown@psc.state.fl.us
vmckay@psc.state.fl.us
zring@psc.state.fl.us

Joseph A. McGlothlin
Vicki Gordon Kaufman (+)
Timothy Perry
McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin,
Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold,
& Steen, P.A.
117 South Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Tel. No. (850) 222-2525
Fax. No. (850) 222-5606
Attys. for FCCA
Attys. for Network Telephone Corp.
Attys. for BlueStar
Attys. For Covad (+)
jmcglothlin@mac-law.com
vkaufman@mac-law.com
tperry@mac-law.com

Richard A. Chapkis (+)
Terry Scobie
Verizon Florida, Inc.
One Tampa City Center
201 North Franklin Street (33602)
Post Office Box 110, FLTC0007
Tampa, Florida 33601-0110
Tel. No. (813) 483-2606
Fax. No. (813) 204-8870
Richard.chapkis@verizon.com
terry.scobie@verizon.com

Paul Turner
Supra Telecommunications & Info. Systems, Inc.
2620 S.W. 27th Avenue
Miami, FL 33133
Tel. No. (305) 476-4247
Fax. No. (305) 476-4282
pturner@stis.com

Susan S. Masterton (+)
Sprint Comm. Co. LLP
1313 Blair Stone Road (32301)
P.O. Box 2214
MC: FLTLHO0107
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214
Tel. No. (850) 847-0244
Fax. No. (850) 878-0777
Susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com

Sprint-Florida, Incorporated
Mr. F. B. (Ben) Poag
P.O. Box 2214 (MC FLTLHO0107)
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214
Tel. No. (850) 599-1027
Fax. No. (407)814-5700
Ben.Poag@mail.sprint.com

William H. Weber,Senior Counsel
Gene Watkins
Covad Communications
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
19th Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Tel. No. (404) 942-3494
Fax. No. (404) 942-3495
wweber@covad.com
gwatkins@covad.com

Rodney L. Joyce
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, L.L.P.
600 14th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005-2004
Tel. No. (202) 639-5602
Fax. No. (202) 783-4211
Counsel for Network Access Solutions
rjoyce@shb.com

Verizon Florida, Inc.
Ms. Michelle A. Robinson
%Mr. David Christian
106 East College Avenue
Suite 810
Tallahassee, FL 32301-7704
Tel. No. (813) 483-2526
Fax. No. (813) 223-4888
Michelle.Robinson@verizon.com
David.Christian@verizon.com

Ms. Lisa A. Riley
Virginia C. Tate
1200 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 8066
Atlanta, GA 30309-3523
Tel. No. (404) 810-7812
Fax. No. (404) 877-7646
lriley@att.com
vctate@att.com

Florida Digital Network, Inc.
Matthew Feil, Esq.
390 North Orange Avenue
Suite 2000
Orlando, FL 32801
Tel. No. (407) 835-0460
Fax. No. (407) 835-0309
mfeil@floridadigital.net

Catherine K. Ronis, Esq.
Daniel McCuaig, Esq. (+)
Jonathan J. Frankel, Esq.
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering
2445 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-1420
Tel. No. (202) 663-6000
Fax. No. (202) 663-6363
catherine.ronis@wilmer.com
daniel.mccuaig@wilmer.com

Jonathan Audu
c/o Ann Shelfer
Supra Telecommunications and
Information Systems, Inc.
1311 Executive Center Drive
Koger Center - Ellis Building
Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32301-5027
Tel. No. (850) 402-0510
Fax. No. (850) 402-0522
ashelfer@stis.com
jonathan.audu@stis.com

Mickey Henry
AT&T
1200 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 8100
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3523
Tel. No. (404) 810-2078
michaeljhenry@att.com

Mellony Michaux (by e-mail only)
AT&T
mmichaux@att.com

Roger Fredrickson (by e-mail only)
AT&T
rfrederickson@att.com

Tracy W. Hatch, Esq. **(+)**
AT&T Communications of the
Southern States, LLC
101 North Monroe Street, Ste. 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Tel. No. (850) 425-6360
Fax No. (850) 425-6361
thatch@att.com

Floyd Self
Messer, Caparello & Self
Post Office Drawer 1876
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701
Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876
Tel. No. (850) 222-0720
Fax. No. (850) 224-4359
Co-counsel for AT&T
fself@lawfla.com

J. Phillip Carver

J. Phillip Carver (ltl)

(+) Signed Protective Agreement

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF W. BERNARD SHELL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NOS. 981834–TP AND 990321-TP

SEPTEMBER 26, 2003

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION.

A. My name is W. Bernard Shell. My business address is 675 W. Peachtree St., N.E., Atlanta, Georgia. I am a Manager in the Finance Department of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as "BellSouth"). My area of responsibility is economic costs.

Q. ARE YOU THE SAME W. BERNARD SHELL THAT FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET?

A. Yes. I filed direct testimony on February 4, 2003.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to the testimony of Mr. Steven Turner, representing AT&T Communications of the Southern States, L.L.C. ("AT&T") and the testimonies of Mr. Rowland Curry and Mr. David Gabel representing the Florida Commission Staff. My testimony will address certain statements made regarding collocation costs. Additionally, in preparing my responses and re-looking at the cost

studies, I discovered a need to correct one of the cost elements (Element H.1.37, Security Access System per square foot).

Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE CORRECTION TO ELEMENT H.1.37 AND ITS IMPACT.

A. This element develops the recurring cost per square foot to place security access system card readers in central offices. To develop this cost per square foot, BellSouth divides the total cost by the state-specific average square footage of the central offices. BellSouth used Georgia's average square footage instead of Florida's by mistake. The correction uses Florida's number as intended. The net effect of this change is that the proposed cost goes from $.0125 per square foot to $.0101 per square foot. Attached are revised Exhibit WBS-1 (the complete cost study on CD-ROM and the revised pages to the paper portion) and revised Exhibit WBS-2 (cost summary) containing the corrected number.

Q. BEFORE YOU SPECIFICALLY ADDRESS THE BELLSOUTH'S COLLOCATION COST STUDIES, CAN YOU ADDRESS MR. TURNER'S STATEMENTS REGARDING A SINGLE COST MODEL AND CONSISTENCY ACROSS COST DEVELOPMENT AMONG INCUMBENT LOCAL EXCHANGE COMPANIES ("ILECS").

A. Yes, while BellSouth agrees with Mr. Turner that its model, the BellSouth Cost Calculator©, is a wonderful model, BellSouth does not support the use of a single

model for all ILECs for reasons explained below. Moreover, given that each ILEC has its own operational procedures for provisioning collocation and its own network infrastructure and planning guidelines, cost development by the various ILECs is not exactly the same.

Q. MR. TURNER CLAIMS THAT THE "DISPARATE COSTS AND RATES FOR COLLOCATION INDICATES THAT THE RESULTS ARE INACCURATE AND INCONSISTENT WITH COST-BASED TELRIC PRINCIPLES." (PAGE 3, LINES 15-17) IS HE CORRECT?

A. No. The foundation of Mr. Turner's contention is that "the underlying investments should be similar" among the three companies providing collocation in Florida. (Page 3, line 15) This assumption is false and, therefore, so is his conclusion. The companies have unique rate structures that dictate the network components that need to be considered in the development of the investments and thus, what is reflected in the cost-based rates. The FCC's TELRIC principles do not mandate that the rate structures utilized by the incumbents must be identical. Thus, there is no merit in Mr. Turner's supposition that varying cost results mean that the cost studies do not adhere to the TELRIC guidelines.

Additionally, contrary to Mr. Turner's allegation, the companies have unique purchasing agreements for the network components, land, and buildings required for collocation. This Commission has recognized in its UNE orders that it is proper to accurately portray the company-specific inputs. For example, in its May 25, 2001 Order in Docket No. 990649-TP, the Commission ruled that "inputs adopted for use

in determining UNE prices shall be BellSouth specific." (Page 188, Order No. PSC-01-1181-FOF-TP) Nothing proffered by Mr. Turner should alter the Commission's ruling with respect to collocation. In fact, acceptance of Mr. Turner's erroneous claim of a common set of investments would violate previous Commission's rulings that company-specific input is appropriate.

Q. MR. TURNER ALSO CONTENDS THAT "A SINGLE COLLOCATION COST MODEL CAN READILY BE USED FOR ALL THREE INCUMBENTS IN FLORIDA." (PAGE 7, LINES 17-18) PLEASE COMMENT.

A. Mr. Turner's simplistic assertion is not realistic. He requests that this Commission adopt the BellSouth Cost Calculator© for use in determining collocation costs. While the model may be "readily" available for BellSouth, the same conclusion cannot be made for Sprint and Verizon.

First, the model is the intellectual property of BellSouth. Therefore, BellSouth is entitled to compensation on the use of its intellectual property as well as the time required to train others on the use of it. This compensation would be in the form of a licensing fee. BellSouth believes that it deserves to be paid for the effort required to develop and maintain the model. Under no circumstances should the Commission require BellSouth to turn over its model without compensation. On the other hand, use of BellSouth's model by the other ILECs, with compensation, would raise the costs to them. Thus, AT&T's proposal would necessarily leave an adverse, and unfair, impact either on BellSouth (if its intellectual property is taken without

compensation) or on other ILECs (in the form of increased costs).

Second, existing Sprint/Verizon data feeds would likely need to be altered or scrapped entirely to generate the inputs required by the adopted model. Finally, the issue of model administration and maintenance would need to be resolved. The question of who has ultimate control over the algorithms and methodology inherent in the model would need to be answered. BellSouth would require that prior to any model modification, notification and approval be obtained.

While BellSouth would not have to expend the time required to develop new inputs, pay the potential on-going expense, and maintain the support of a Florida-specific model as would Sprint and Verizon, BellSouth does not support the use of a standardized model. As stated above, BellSouth would need to spend time training the other ILECs and maintaining the model for use by all ILECs. This position was articulated in BellSouth's response to the Commission's request on this subject. (February 28, 2003 letter to Patricia A. Christensen Re: UNE Costing Workshop Comments)

What Mr. Turner does not appear to realize is that the model used to complete a cost study is not considered a cost driver. Cost drivers are things that impact cost studies, such as the assumptions used and input data associated with the cost elements. The cost model is just a tool that accepts inputs, makes the appropriate calculations, and produces the outputs. Such things as a company's network plans, budget, and operations procedures drive the assumptions and input data. Additionally, the cost model does not determine the cost elements or the rate structure used. Simply put,

Mr. Turner's proposal for a single model would cause the ILECs to spend more time and more costs with no real effect on the resulting cost numbers.

Q. PLEASE LIST THE AREAS OF THE COLLOCATION COST STUDIES THAT WILL BE ADDRESSED.

A. The cost-related areas discussed in my testimony are as follows:

- DC power
- Nonrecurring elements associated with planning, engineering, installation times, space availability report, and cable records
- Floor space
- Space Preparation
- Cage construction
- Cable rack capacity
- Fill factors

Q. HOW IS DC POWER ADDRESSED IN BELLSOUTH'S COLLOCATION COST STUDY?

A. BellSouth makes DC power available for an Competitive Local Exchange Carrier's ("CLEC's") physical collocation space at a BellSouth Power Board or a BellSouth Battery Distribution Fuse Bay ("BDFB"), at the CLEC's option, within the premises. The CLEC's certified vendor must engineer and install fuses and power cables from the collocation space to the BDFB. The CLEC's certified engineer must also engineer and install power cables from the collocation space to the Power Board, if this option

is chosen. Recurring charges for DC power will be assessed per ampere per month based upon the BellSouth Certified Supplier engineered and installed power feed fused ampere capacity. Therefore, BellSouth developed the recurring costs for power based on the assumption that the charge would be per-fused amp, as opposed to per-used amps. "Fused" refers to the protection device rating. Protection devices are fuses or circuit breakers.

Q. ON PAGE 19 AND 20 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. TURNER ASSERTS THAT POWER AUGMENTS ARE NOT PRICED ON THE SAME BASIS AS A COMPREHENSIVE POWER PLANT. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. Mr. Turner is incorrect in his assertion that the power augment jobs for collocation are priced differently than a total power plant job would be priced. He states on the top of page 20 that "[a]ugments, by nature, do not provide the scale economies in the derivation of the DC power investment that BellSouth benefits from based on its installation of a comprehensive DC power plant." However, BellSouth's cost study is based on BellSouth operating under a standard regional contract with its vendor for the DC power plant components, regardless of the size of the power job. The same vendor that installs BellSouth's day-to-day power equipment to serve its end users also installs BellSouth's power equipment to serve the CLECs desiring to collocate in the central office. Regardless of the size of the central office or the size of the power needs, the same price that applies for a comprehensive DC power plant also applies for a smaller augment. BellSouth's cost studies used data from actual collocation projects throughout the region to determine the expected regional forward-looking investment per DC amp. Data was taken from 711 projects. Costs that would not

apply on a forward-looking basis, such as power cabling, were backed out. An average of all the data was taken to produce the forward-looking investment per amp. Again, the standard regional contract pricing would apply on the augments.

Q. PLEASE REPOND TO MR. TURNER'S STATEMENT (PAGE 20, LINES 20 AND 21) THAT USING AUGMENTS "CONTRADICTS THE REQUIREMENTS OF A TELRIC COST STUDY."

A. The FCC has specifically allowed incumbent local exchange carriers to recover the cost of central office modifications, including power upgrades/augments, required to meet a collocator's needs. In its Advanced Services Order (Order FCC 99-48), paragraph 51 states:

> We conclude, based on the record, that incumbent LECs must allocate space preparation, security measures, and other collocation charges on a pro-rated basis so the first collocator in a particular incumbent premises will not be responsible for the entire cost of site preparation. For example, if an incumbent LEC implements cageless collocation arrangements in a particular central office that requires air conditioning and power upgrades, the incumbent may not require the first collocating party to pay the entire cost of site preparation.

This language clearly allows ILECs such as BellSouth to recover the costs of preparing collocation space including power upgrades (augments). Since the FCC established the TELRIC principles, it presumably would not have allowed the ILECs

to recover site preparation cost if doing so conflicted with TELRIC principles. Site preparation includes the cost of power upgrades or augments. As such, BellSouth's methodology for developing the investment per DC amp is compliant with TELRIC principles. It is simply a way of pro-rating the cost of collocation power requirements among CLECs on a reasonable and nondiscriminatory basis.

Additionally, Mr. Turner (page 20, lines 9 – 13) references paragraph 677 of the FCC's First Report and Order (dated August 8, 1996). He is addressing Total Service Long Run Incremental Cost ("TSLRIC"). However, paragraph 678 of this same order states:

> While we are adopting a version of the methodology commonly referred to as TSLRIC as the basis for pricing interconnection and unbundled elements, we are coining the term "total element long run incremental cost" (TELRIC) to describe our version of this methodology.

Therefore, while TSLRIC and TELRIC have similarities, the collocation studies are based on TELRIC principles. As stated above, BellSouth's methodology for developing the investment per DC amp is compliant with TELRIC principles.

Q. MR. CURRY, ON PAGE 8 OF HIS TESTIMONY, ALSO STATES THAT BELLSOUTH HAS NOT ESTABLISHED AN APPROPRIATE TELRIC FOR DC POWER AND REFERS TO THE FCC'S INTERCONNECTION PRICING RULES. DO YOU AGREE WITH HIS ASSESSMENT?

A. No. Mr. Curry references paragraph 682 from the FCC's Local Competition Order (CC Docket No. 96-98 released August 8, 1996). The reference is correct, however, as stated above the FCC established the TELRIC principles, and it presumably would not have allowed the ILECs to recover site preparation cost if doing so conflicted with TELRIC principles. The FCC addressed collocation in the Local Competition Docket where it established rules to implement the collocation requirements of the 1996 Telecommunication Act. The FCC reviewed collocation again in the Advanced Services Docket (CC Docket No. 98-147, order released March 31, 1999) and strengthened the collocation rules to reduce costs and delays faced by competitors that seek to collocate equipment in an incumbent LEC's central office. It is after this additional review of collocation that the FCC stated that the ILECs can recover the cost for site preparation. The only stipulation contained in the FCC order was that the total cost of site preparation would be pro-rated so that the first collocator in a particular central office would not be responsible for the entire cost. Consistent with this directive, BellSouth has developed a way of pro-rating the cost of collocation power requirements among CLECs on a reasonable and nondiscriminatory basis. This same cost methodology has been used in all BellSouth states.

Moreover, in approving BellSouth's applications for in-region interLATA authority in Georgia and Louisiana on May 15, 2002 (FCC Order 02-174, ¶210 and 211), in Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina on September 18, 2002 (FCC Order 02-260, ¶231 and appendix H, ¶21), and in Florida and Tennessee on December 19, 2002 (FCC Order 02-331, appendix D, ¶21), the FCC concluded that BellSouth provides collocation based on TELRIC principles. For example, in FCC Order 02-260 it states the following:

As stated above, checklist item 1 requires a BOC to provide "interconnection in accordance with the requirements of a section 251(c)(2) and 252(d)(1). Section 252(d)(1) requires state determinations regarding the rates, terms, and conditions of interconnection to be based on cost and to be nondiscriminatory, and allows the rates to include a reasonable profit. The Commission's pricing rules require, among other things, that in order to comply with its collocation obligations, an incumbent LEC provide collocation based on TELRIC. [Paragraph 21 in appendix H]

For the foregoing reasons, we reject commenters' allegations of error and find that BellSouth complies with checklist item 1. [Paragraph 231]

Q. ON PAGES 23 AND 24, MR. TURNER PRESENTS SOUTHWESTERN BELL'S INVESTMENT PROPOSAL IN TEXAS AS A COMPARISON TO BELLSOUTH'S POWER JOBS. HE IS USING THIS AS AN EXAMPLE OF PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DATA TO CHALLENGE THE REASONABLENESS OF BELLSOUTH'S INVESTMENT PER AMP DATA. PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR ASSESSMENT OF THE SOUTHWESTERN BELL DATA.

A. The Southwestern Bell investment numbers for Texas are not relevant to determining BellSouth's costs in Florida. These numbers are based on Southwestern Bell's approach to constructing a DC power plant, its supplier costs, its assumptions on quantity of items and cable distances, etc. Nonetheless, I will provide a few

comments on Mr. Turner's Exhibits SET-3 and SET-4.

- The exhibits seem to only account for one BDFB. An office equipped with a 2500 amp or a 4000 amp power plant would certainly have multiple BDFBs. A 2500 amp power plant should have 2 to 4 BDFBs and a 4000 amp power plant should have at least 3 to 5 BDFBs. Thus the total cost for BDFBs should be greater.
- The exhibits do not indicate the distance of the BDFB cable run assumed. Cabling cost is sensitive to the distance of the cable run, with the cost increasing exponentially with distance.
- From reviewing the exhibit, it is not evident if the cost of a power plant controller or monitor was included. Monitors are required to control the rectifiers and to report power plant alarms. Such costs should be included, which would increase the total cost.

It is unreasonable for AT&T to argue, based on cost support presented by another company in another state, that BellSouth's costs in Florida are too high. The two companies may have different operating procedures and different supplier costs. These different procedures and supplier costs have a real impact on projected investment per amp. Based on a review of the exhibits, it appears that Southwestern's costs may be understated, and there is no need to rely on such data for BellSouth. BellSouth's study is based on real jobs for provisioning power in its region.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MR. CURRY'S COMMENTS ON PAGES 6 AND 7 OF HIS TESTIMONY REGARDING BELLSOUTH'S POWER CONTRUCTION COST PER AMP FOR THE VARIOUS CENTRAL OFFICES SHOWN.

A. Mr. Curry is correct that these power jobs represent power augments or upgrades due to collocators' requests or projected power needs. As stated previously, the FCC allows ILECs to recover the cost of power augments as part of its collocation site preparation work. The key point is that each power job could trigger different power equipment needs. There are different power components that may be at or near exhaust in various central offices at the time a CLEC requests power. Some of these components can only be purchased in "chunks" of capacity. Mr. Curry agrees on page 7 that "[p]ower plant investments are often characterized as 'lumpy' investments." Some examples of the power capacity components are: rectifiers, battery distribution fuse bays, and standby AC plants. Any combination of these items, as well as others, may be exhausted by an individual power demand request. For that reason, it would be misleading to analyze each individual central office project power construction cost per amp. Thus, BellSouth chose to develop a regional number using 711 actual projects to ensure that a sufficient number of jobs were used to develop a reliable forward-looking investment per DC amp. Attached, as Exhibit WBS-4, is a copy of the results of the 711 projects. While there are extreme cases at either end of the distribution of projects, the average across the 711 projects accurately pro-rates the real-world cost to provision an amp of power capacity based on collocators' requests or projected needs. In some cases, BellSouth had to pre-provision power, earlier than normal, to ensure that sufficient power capacity existed to meet the ordered collocation provisioning intervals. A power job could take up to 26 weeks to complete. If power capacity were not available, the provisioning interval would be missed.

Q. MR. TURNER, ON PAGES 24 THROUGH 26, ALLEGES THAT

BELLSOUTH HAS MADE A CALCULATION ERROR IN DETERMINING THE POWER INVESTMENT PER AMP. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No, I do not. Dividing the incremental investment in the Gainesville-Main central office power plant by the total rectifier capacity (amps) added to the office, as stated on page 25 of Mr. Turner's testimony, does not produce a number that represents BellSouth's total forward-looking investment per amp. This is because additional equipment investment is required. To produce these additional rectifier amps of power would require use of other power equipment for which investments are not shown in the analysis; thus, this number would understate true forward-looking investment per amp. For example, there could be additional investment associated with batteries, power cabling, and fuse bays. The true investment associated with providing the total capacity (amps) of the rectifiers would be greater.

Further, Mr. Turner is obviously targeting an extreme example of the actual power projects. What he does not mention are the many cases where the data shows CLECs being provided power without triggering a power project. In those cases, BellSouth obviously is showing no construction costs even though power is being provided and zero cost are shown in the study. Again, while there are extreme cases at either end of the distribution of projects, the average across the 711 projects accurately pro-rates the real-world cost to provision an amp of power capacity.

Q. MR. TURNER MAKES A RECOMMENDATION ON THE APPROPRIATE INVESTMENT PER DC AMP ON PAGE 26. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. Mr. Turner recommends that the Commission use the $165.80 investment figure used by BellSouth in a cost study filed in Florida in 1997 in Docket Numbers 960846-TP, 960757-TP, and 971140-TP. The collocation power cost study in that docket was the very first power cost study performed by BellSouth, and actually underestimated the cost for BellSouth to provision an amp of –48V DC power. The first study was based on a long list of assumptions and performed before any significant activity with collocation in BellSouth's central offices. By contrast, the current cost study producing the $286 per fused amp investment is more reliable because it is based on actual power construction projects associated with actual collocation power requests and is more reflective of the power investment that BellSouth expects to incur on a going-forward basis.

Q. ON THE TOP OF PAGE 9, MR. CURRY RECOMMENDS THAT BELLSOUTH RECALCULATE ITS DC POWER INVESTMENT USING AN INCREMENTAL, BUILDING BLOCK OF CAPACITY APPROACH. DO YOU AGREE?

A. I do not agree. I believe that the approach taken by BellSouth meets the FCC TELRIC requirements and allows BellSouth to recover the costs it expects to incur.

Q. MR. TURNER, ON PAGES 28 THROUGH 30, PROPOSES THAT THE AC POWER COMPONENT OF THE DC POWER CHARGE BE REDUCED. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. Mr. Turner bases his recommendation on data taken from the U.S. Department of

Energy Estimated U.S. Electricity Utility Average Revenue per Kilowatt Hour to Ultimate Consumers by Sector, Census Division, and State, Year-to-Date (November) 2002 and 2001. BellSouth also used the U.S. Department of Energy average when the cost study was developed. BellSouth used $.07 per kilowatt-hour using the Commercial user category. Mr. Turner states that the Industrial user category is appropriate, which includes a rate of $.053 per kilowatt-hour. The Commercial user category in Mr. Turner's Exhibit SET-5 for Florida shows $.07 and $.067 per kilowatt-hour for 2001 and 2002, respectively. Mr. Turner's support for the Industrial category is (1) his experience with ILECs and (2) his claim that ILECs normally have load-sharing arrangements. As to his first point, Mr. Turner does not provide any detail on his experience with ILECs, or state whether that experience includes BellSouth. As to his second point, load sharing/curtailment agreements are rate riders offered by the power company to be used in conjunction with base rates. BellSouth utilizes these rate riders in conjunction with our base rates, which are commercial, where they are economically and operationally feasible. Further, while BellSouth may have some load-sharing arrangements with some power companies in certain central offices, this is by no means the case in the majority of BellSouth's central offices. Thus, Mr. Turner's vaguely defined "experience" with ILECs is inconsistent with the rates BellSouth actually pays for AC power.

Additionally, Mr. Turner makes a statement that, in Georgia, he "obtained copies of invoices for two of BellSouth's central offices and learned that BellSouth actually incurs costs that are much lower than the $0.07 per kilowatt hour that BellSouth seeks here." Mr. Turner based his assessment on two AC power bills for one month. AC power charges are seasonal and the total charge varies as demand varies. The AC

power charges could also vary by central office. One month and a couple of central offices are not enough data to make a reasonable determination. Again, BellSouth used the U.S. Department of Energy average when the cost study was developed. The Department of Energy average for the Commercial user category in Mr. Turner's Exhibit SET-5 for Georgia shows $.067 per kilowatt-hour for 2001, when BellSouth filed the Georgia study.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MR. TURNER'S COMMENTS ON PAGE 29 CONCERNING BELLSOUTH'S 85% EFFICIENCY FACTOR FOR RECTIFIER LOSSES WHEN CONVERTING COMMERCIAL AC POWER TO DC.

A. Mr. Turner simply says that BellSouth should use the rectifier efficiency that he claims exists in AT&T's network. He provides no data to support that claim. Because rectifier efficiency can vary by technology and type, BellSouth chose to use a number that is used by Telcordia in many of its economic studies. Telcordia uses an average figure of 85%. It is interesting to note that Mr. Turner's Exhibits SET-3 and SET-4, the Southwestern Bell DC power investment proposal and the Texas PUC approved investment, both include the use of an 85% rectifier efficiency.

Q. MR. TURNER PROVIDES A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROVISIONING OF DC POWER ON PAGES 30 – 34 OF HIS REVISED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY. HIS MAIN POINT, ON PAGE 34, LINES 5 – 7, IS THAT THE RATE STRUCTURE MUST BE ORGANIZED AROUND ACTUAL USAGE TO ACHIEVE A COST-BASED SYSTEM. DO YOU AGREE?

A No. BellSouth provisions DC power to collocators by ensuring that there are sufficient "load amps" available to meet the collocators' requirements. In other words, if a collocator requested 40 amps of power (load amps), BellSouth would ensure that 40 amps of DC power plant infrastructure existed and was reserved for the collocator's use. Given that there is a technical requirement to size fuses at 1.5 times the equipment load, BellSouth developed the recurring cost for power based on the assumption that the charge would be per-fused amp, not per-used amp. To account for using per-fused amps, BellSouth multiplies the per-used amp cost by a factor of .6667 (1/1.5) to develop the power charge to the CLEC. Therefore, if a CLEC informs BellSouth that it will need 40 amps of power to operate equipment in a BellSouth central office, the cost-based rate will already account for the use of a 60-amp fuse and the rate being based on 60 amps [40 amps * 1.5 = 60 amps].

Thus, BellSouth developed its cost based on the load amps and the requirement to place fuses at 1.5 times the equipment drain. The DC power plant infrastructure cost is not impacted by actual usage. This cost is based on the collocator's requested load amps.

Q. MR. TURNER RECOMMENDS REDUCING THE WORK TIMES ASSOCIATED WITH FIBER ENTRANCE CABLE INSTALLATION ON PAGES 35 THROUGH 38 OF HIS REVISED TESTIMONY. DO YOU AGREE WITH HIS RECOMMENDATIONS?

A. No. His reasons for reducing the work times are based on a misunderstanding of BellSouth's procedures for installing entrance cable. Despite what Mr. Turner states

in his testimony, BellSouth always installs the entrance cable through the manhole into the cable vault up to the splice point. This is never done by a CLEC or it certified vendor. He is correct that most of the current interconnection agreements state that the CLEC will provide and install the riser cable, which is the cable that runs from the collocation space in the central office to the splice point in the cable vault. For that reason, BellSouth is filing cost support for cost elements H.1.65 and H.1.66. These cost elements recover the cost of BellSouth installing the fiber entrance cable from the manhole to the splice point in the vault and splicing the fibers. It also recovers the costs associated with planning the riser cable installation. It does not include the cost to install the riser cable.

Cost element H.1.5 recovers the cost of BellSouth installing the fiber entrance cable from the manhole to the splice point, the cost to install the riser cable, and the splicing of the fibers. This element would still apply where an agreement does not require a CLEC to install the riser cable.

Q. MR. TURNER ALSO CLAIMS (ON PAGE 35) THAT THE WORK TIME FOR THE COMMON SYSTEMS CAPACITY MANAGER ASSOCIATED WITH RISER CABLE INSTALLATION SHOULD BE REMOVED BECAUSE THE CLEC INSTALLS THE RISER CABLE. HOW DO YOU RESPOND?

A. The Common System Capacity Manager work time is valid. This work time is associated with planning the riser cable installation, such as which route the cable should take. This work is required whether BellSouth is installing the riser cable or a CLEC's certified vendor is installing the riser cable. This work time is appropriate

for elements H.1.5 and H.1.65.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MR. TURNER'S SUGGESTED REDUCTION, ON THE TOP OF PAGE 37, OF THE WORK TIME FOR THE OUTSIDE PLANT ENGINEER.

A. The Outside Plant Engineer work time is also valid. Mr. Turner contends that the work time should be reduced because he interprets the Interconnection Agreement language, which states that CLECs will install riser cable, to mean that the Outside Plant Construction group will not install the entrance cable from the manhole to the vault. BellSouth will always install the entrance cable. It is the riser cable, the cable that runs from the collocation space in the central office to the splice point in the cable vault, that the CLEC will install. Therefore, given that Mr. Turner's sole basis for reducing this work time is his misinterpretation of the Interconnection Agreement, the work time should not be changed. The work time is appropriate for elements H.1.5 and H.1.65.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MR. TURNER'S SUGGESTED REDUCTION, ON PAGE 37, OF THE WORK TIME FOR OUTSIDE PLANT CONSTRUCTION.

A. As stated previously, BellSouth is filing cost support for cost elements H.1.65 and H.1.66. These cost elements recover the cost of BellSouth installing the fiber entrance cable from the manhole to the splice point in the vault and splicing the fibers. Cost element H.1.5 recovers the cost of BellSouth installing the fiber entrance cable from the manhole to the splice point, the cost to install the riser cable, and the

splicing of the fibers. BellSouth has already shown a reduction in the work time for Outside Plant Construction in element H.1.65 as a result of the CLEC installing the riser cable. That reduced work time is 5.25 hours. Given that BellSouth continues to install the fiber entrance cable from the manhole to the vault, that reduced work time is appropriate.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MR. TURNER'S SUGGESTED REMOVAL, ON PAGE 38, OF THE COST FOR MANHOLE CONTRACT LABOR.

A. Because BellSouth continues to install the fiber entrance cable from the manhole to the splice point in the vault, the manhole contract labor is required, and is appropriately included.

Q. MR. TURNER SUGGESTS THAT BELLSOUTH SHOULD HAVE TWO RATE ELEMENTS FOR ENTRANCE CABLE INSTALLATION. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. Mr. Turner suggests having one element that includes the cost of splicing and one that does not. Alternatively, he suggests developing a weighted cost based on the percentage of installations that require splicing. BellSouth has proposed fiber entrance cable installation collocation elements H.1.65 and H.1.66, which separate the nonrecurring cost of labor to pull the fiber cable from the nonrecurring cost to splice the fibers. Thus, if a splice is not required due to the type of cable, the splicing charge, element H.1.66, would not apply. Contrary to Mr. Turner's assertion, collocators would <u>not</u> be charged for spicing when the splicing is not done.

Q. SECURITY ACCESS LABOR TIMES ARE DISCUSSED ON PAGES 38 THROUGH 39 OF MR. TURNER'S TESTIMONY. DO YOU AGREE WITH HIS RECOMMENDATIONS?

A. No. Mr. Turner makes three recommendations regarding the security access labor times, none of which have merit. First, Mr. Turner's recommendation is to use the labor time of 0.2 labor hours per card instead of the 0.8583 labor hours per card that he says is used in BellSouth's study. What Mr. Turner apparently overlooks is that both labor times are used in the study. The 0.2 labor hours are for the customer contact person to verify contractual status for billing and provisioning purposes and to ensure that the order is placed. The 0.8583 labor hours are for contract labor to administer the ordering, programming and distribution of access cards. Each is a valid and appropriate work time that applies to the labor involved in two different functions.

His second recommendation is for the Commission to modify BellSouth's cost for replacing a security card so that it will not be more than the cost to initially provide one. However, Mr. Turner is mistaken in the belief that the charge BellSouth proposes to replace a security card is greater than the charge to initially provide a security card. The cost element for new card activation is H.1.38 and the cost element to replace lost or stolen card is H.1 40. The cost for H.1.38 is $38.95 and the cost for H.1.40 is $28.78. Therefore, no change is required.

Mr. Turner's third recommendation is that the Commission set the Security Key costs equal to those for the Security Card because, he contends, this will be consistent with

TELRIC. Mr. Turner bases his recommendation on the belief that BellSouth did not provide support for the times or costs associated with the Security Key, and also that the physical key would not be required in the future. Again, Mr. Turner is mistaken. BellSouth did provide support for the Security Key study. The support for the Security Key work times and costs are in the file labeled, "FLphycol.xls". Furthermore, there are cases when keys will be required in the future. For example, there could be a need for internal keys (keys to gain access to secure areas inside central office) and to access secure gateways. In addition, the FCC, in the Advanced Services Order, paragraph 48, made clear that ILECs can recover reasonable security cost. Hence, the Security Key costs are appropriate in a TELRIC study.

Q. ON PAGES 40 AND 41 OF MR. TURNER'S TESTIMONY, HE ADDRESSES ALLEGED PROBLEMS WITH THE SUBSEQUENT APPLICATION COST. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. The first alleged problem is that the Job Grade 58 function shows 6.5 hours for the initial application and 7.5 hours for subsequent applications. Mr. Turner claims that subsequent applications generally require less labor (page 40, lines 13 – 14). This claim is not correct, at least in this case. The Job Grade 58 function is performed by the Account Team Collocation Coordinator ("ATCC"). Two of the functions performed by the ATCC are: 1) to gather response data from the various interdepartmental network and real estate coordinators and review them for compliance with the Agreement or Regulatory requirements, and 2) to respond to the interdepartmental coordinators' questions. For the first function listed, the ATCC is gathering information to respond to the CLEC's request for collocation (e.g.,

information on space, alternative arrangements, power, entrance facility duct space, and building related requirements). For the second function, the ATCC responds to questions from the interdepartmental team on issues relating to the Agreement.

An additional hour is shown for the subsequent application because it takes longer, on average to perform these two functions on subsequent applications than the initial one. This is primarily due to CLECs typically having new Agreements or amendments to Agreements or Regulatory requirements changes since the initial collocation space was established. The ATCC would spend more time to ensure the interdepartmental team is aware of differences so they can properly respond to the augment request. They would review prior applications as well to ensure the current application can be processed as requested. The ATCC would also spend more time reviewing the responses from the interdepartmental team. For example, while a prior Agreement may have allowed for Point of Termination ("POT") Bays or POT Bay connections, the current one may not. This will require the ATCC to verify whether that arrangement can be provided as requested. There are simply opportunities for more conflicts to occur when augmenting an arrangement.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS THE SECOND ALLEGED PROBLEM.

A. The second alleged problem Mr. Turner identified with the development of the subsequent application cost concerns the time shown for the Outside Plant Engineer ("OSPE"). Mr. Turner contends that no time should be included because, he claims, engineering is almost never required for subsequent applications. However, the OSPE must review every application, both initial and subsequent, and determine

whether work is required. The amount of time included is only 30 minutes. This 30 minutes is an average. There are situations when this review could take less time and there are situations when this review could take more time. In either case, a response is required by the OSPE on all applications, including subsequent applications.

Q. WHAT IS THE THIRD ALLEGED PROBLEM?

A. The third problem Mr. Turner alleges regarding the development of the subsequent application cost concerns the fact that the level of work required by Parsons Engineering is assumed to be the same as for the initial application. Mr. Turner is not totally correct. While the Parsons Engineering fee input for the initial and subsequent application is the same, the actual amount of engineering work would not be the same. The Parson's engineering fee input is based on the average amount of work performed on both initial and subsequent applications. There would likely be more engineering work associated with the initial applications than subsequent applications, as a general rule, however, their fee is based on an average of both. Thus, the Parsons Engineering fee, as included in the BellSouth's cost study, should apply on both the initial application and subsequent application. If the fee were reduced on the subsequent applications, as Mr. Turner proposes, then it would have to be correspondingly raised for initial applications.

Q. MR. GABEL, ON PAGES 38 THROUGH THE TOP OF PAGE 41, ADDRESSES THE COST TO PROCESS AN APPLICATION AND THE ENGINEERING COST AFTER A CLEC HAS ACCEPTED THE APPLICATION. HE STATES THAT SPRINT AND BELLSOUTH EXPECT

TO BE LESS EFFICIENT BECAUSE THEIR WORK TIMES AND ACTIVIES ARE GREATER THAN VERIZON'S. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. Mr. Gabel has reached the erroneous conclusion that each ILEC providing collocation will have the same expected work activities and work times. The expected work activities and work times are based on each company's processes and procedures. These procedures would be based on the current network infrastructure, network planning, network forecasts, etc. For example, collocation application review time could potentially be affected by: 1) the amount of collocation and other central office activity, 2) the amount of available space typically seen in central offices, 3) the budget for central office work, and 4) the number of central offices in the state. BellSouth has estimated its work times and work activities based on the requirements associated with its procedures and network. BellSouth is unable to address why Verizon can perform this function in less time, but believes that it is not appropriate to simply assume that Verizon is more efficient. A more reasonable assumption is that the work times are different because the actual work that is necessary differs from one company to the next.

Mr. Gabel refers to Paragraph 690 of the FCC's First Report and Order in the Local Competition Docket (CC Docket No. 96-98, Released August 8, 1996) in footnote 46 of his testimony (page 36). He states on page 36, "TELRIC calls for costs to be based on those incurred by an efficient firm." As additional useful information, paragraph 685 of the FCC's First Report and Order, which ends with basically the same words referred to in paragraph 690, states the following:

This benchmark of forward-looking cost and existing network design most closely represents the incremental costs that incumbents actually expect to incur in making network elements available to new entrants. (emphasis added)

BellSouth bases its work times and activities on its network and what it expects to incur as a result of reviewing a collocation application.

Q. MR. GABEL REFERS (AT PAGE 38 AND PAGE 40) TO TWO EXHIBITS, EXHIBITS DJG-3 AND DJG-4. IS THE BELLSOUTH INFORMATION SHOWN ON THOSE EXHIBITS ACCURATE?

A. BellSouth's work times shown in Exhibit DJG-3 are correct. However, BellSouth's work times shown in Exhibit DJG-4 are not correct. BellSouth's "post acceptance" work function is called Space Preparation – Firm Order Processing (cost element H.1.45). Firm Order Processing recovers costs associated with receiving, reviewing, and processing a collocation firm order. A CLEC submits a firm order to notify BellSouth to move forward with the collocation installation work after reviewing the application response. BellSouth's total work time is 5.5 hours and applies for all physical collocation firm orders.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MR. GABEL'S RECOMMENDATION (PAGE 39) THAT THE RATE STRUCTURE MIRROR THE WAY VERIZON CALCUALTED ITS PROPOSED COSTS BY INCLUDING A "PRE-ACCEPTANCE FEE" AND A "POST ACCEPTANCE FEE."

A. BellSouth has been operating, and continues to operate, under a similar rate structure. BellSouth has application fees (e.g., H.1.1, H.1.46) that apply for work associated with a CLEC submitting an application to request a specific collocation arrangement. The application fee recovers costs associated with various activities, such as reviewing application for accuracy, processing the application, review of application by different departments, and compiling responses on the specific application. Thus, these rate elements correspond to Mr. Gabel's "pre-acceptance fee" element.

BellSouth also has a cost element called Space Preparation – Firm Order Processing. As stated above, Firm Order Processing recovers costs associated with receiving, reviewing, and processing a collocation firm order. A CLEC submits a firm order to notify BellSouth to move forward with the collocation installation work after reviewing the application response. Therefore, BellSouth's rate structure agrees with Mr. Gabel's recommendation.

It should be noted that the recurring Space Preparation cost elements (elements H.1.41, H.1.42, and H.1.43) allow BellSouth to recover the cost of engineering, design, and modification of the network infrastructure and the building to meet a collocator's specified requirements.

Q. MR. TURNER, ON PAGE 42, STATES THAT BELLSOUTH'S SPACE AVAILABILITY REPORT NONRECURING CHARGE IS OUT OF RANGE WITH WHAT SOME OTHER STATES HAVE ORDERED. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. First, Mr. Turner's analysis did not include charges for any of BellSouth's states, which he obviously has access to, and could have included. If Mr. Turner had reviewed the Commission approved charges for other states in BellSouth's territory, he would have seen that BellSouth's proposed charge in Florida is not out of line. In fact, it is the lowest. For example, the nonrecurring charge ordered in Alabama in its UNE cost docket is $1,075.12, the charge ordered in South Carolina in its UNE cost docket is $1,077.57, and the nonrecurring charge ordered in Louisiana in its UNE cost docket is $1,044.07. BellSouth proposed nonrecurring charge of $572.66 for Florida is appropriate and is based on its latest review of this activity.

BellSouth is entitled to recover its cost of providing space availability reports to CLECs. To develop the cost, BellSouth first determined the work groups involved and the amount of time they would require to produce a report. Then the work time was multiplied by the appropriate labor rate and factors to calculate the cost for developing the report.

To produce the report requires one group to interface with the CLEC and two other groups to make an assessment and compile data of current space availability, current and future space demand, current and future associated power and air conditioning needs, etc. BellSouth is not aware of what assumptions are used by other companies in the development of their charge for providing a space availability report. However, the marked difference between the approved charges in the out-of-region states Mr. Turner cites to and the charges described above approved in BellSouth's region suggest that the charges in these out-of-region states reflect different activities, etc. In other words, the existence of these differences demonstrates that the rates in the out-

of-region states are a poor basis for comparison.

Q. PLEASE RESPOND TO MR. TURNER'S STATEMENT THAT HE "IS CONFIDENT" THAT BELLSOUTH HAS AT ITS DISPOSAL A COMPUTER AIDED DESIGN SYSTEM TO MAINTAIN A SPACE INVENTORY FOR USE IN DEVELOPING A SPACE AVAILABITLIY REPORT (PAGE 43)?

A. The way Mr. Turner has phrased his statement suggests that he has no actual knowledge on this point. Further, BellSouth does not, in fact, have such a system. While BellSouth does have a computer aided design (CAD) system that it uses to maintain floor space drawings for company purposes, the CAD system is not real-time. It is updated on a scheduled basis. Further, given that BellSouth has over 1600 central offices, it is not reasonable to assume that the CAD system will have the current information at any point in time. As a result, Mr. Turner is incorrect to the extent he suggests BellSouth is seeking to recover the costs of building an inventory; rather BellSouth is seeking to recover the cost that will be incurred in preparing a report requested by a CLEC. It should be noted that BellSouth has received less than five CLEC requests for these reports in all nine states. Thus, the report is just an option that is made available to CLECs, but which they rarely choose to utilize.

Q. ON PAGES 43 AND 44, MR. TURNER EXPRESSES TWO CONCERNS WITH THE COST DEVELOPMENT FOR THE COPPER ENTRANCE CABLE INSTALLATION NONRECURRING CHARGE. HOW DO YOU RESPOND?

A. First, as stated in my direct testimony and as addressed by Mr. Milner's testimony

regarding issue 4 in phase I, BellSouth does not believe that ILECs should be required to provide copper entrance facilities. If the Commission accepts BellSouth's position in phase I of this proceeding, then this issue becomes moot. These cost elements are being provided for the sole purpose of providing the Commission with complete information in order to make a final decision regarding the elements.

However, in response to Mr. Turner's first concern, BellSouth always installs the entrance cable (fiber or copper) from the manhole to the splice point in the vault, therefore, the manhole contract labor is valid.

Mr. Turner's second concern is related to the fact that BellSouth has two cost elements for the copper entrance cable. He lists them as H.1.57 and H.1.58. H.1.57 is comparable to H.1.5 (fiber entrance cable). Element H.1.57 recovers the cost to perform functions other than splicing, e.g., pulling the entrance cable from the manhole to the vault and placing the cable on racks in the vault. In contrast, Element H.1.58 recovers the cost to splice copper pairs. H.1.58 is a new cost element. This new element recovers the additional cost associated with the need to perform many more splices for copper cables than fiber cables. For fiber cable, BellSouth would splice the number of fibers in the cable (e.g., if a 24 fiber cable was used, then 24 fibers would be spliced). However, if a relatively small copper cable of 1200 cable pairs was used, then BellSouth splices 1200 pairs. Thus, there would be a need to establish a new cost element and both charges are appropriate. There are connection and test activities performed in both cost elements.

Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF CABLE RECORDS

CHARGES.

A. Cable Records charges apply for work required to build cable records in company systems. The cables belong to the collocator. The collocator's certified vendor runs the cables (e.g., voice grade/ DS0 and DS1) from the collocation space to the distribution frame. The collocators' specific distribution frame termination locations are needed for the collocator to place orders to cross-connect network elements (e.g., unbundled loops) to their collocated equipment.

The work activities associated with building cable records are one-time or nonrecurring. Once the records are built, there would be no need to make a change unless requested to do so by the CLEC.

Q. MR. TURNER, ON PAGES 44 AND 45, STATES THAT THERE SHOULD NOT BE A CHARGE FOR CABLE RECORDS WORK. WHY IS IT APPROPRIATE FOR BELLSOUTH TO APPLY A NONRECURING CHARGE FOR INPUTTING CABLE RECORDS FOR CLECS?

A. The only reason this work would be done is to comply with the request of a CLEC desiring to collocate equipment in BellSouth's central office. In other words, the work is strictly driven by a collocation application and the need to input new information in current systems for the benefit of the collocator. BellSouth has simply developed a standard rate for the activity associated with manually inputting carrier-specific cable termination information into our systems. Since BellSouth performs this work solely at the request of a CLEC, BellSouth should be able to recover the

one-time costs associated with such work.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MR. TURNER'S CONCERNS WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLLOCATION CABLE RECORDS CHARGE.

A. Mr. Turner does not claim that cable records should not be kept. Instead, he wrongly assumes that other rate elements and factors (e.g., the maintenance factor) used to develop recurring rates duplicate the functions and labor that comprise the elements that recover cable records costs. Regarding the other rate elements, Mr. Turner believes that the labor time that BellSouth includes for the Circuit Capacity Manager ("CCM") function in cable records is duplicative of functions and labor cost captured in the Application cost and Subsequent Application cost elements (H.1.1 and H.1.46). This is not true. The CCM labor time and functions associated with the application responses (elements H.1.1 and H.1.46) are strictly associated with reviewing the collocation application requirements (e.g., shelves, bays, frame terminations), interfacing with other network groups, and providing input to the final application response to the CLEC. These activities occur prior to a CLEC accepting an application response.

Once a CLEC accepts an application response by submitting a bona fide firm order, BellSouth's space preparation work begins. Additionally, the cable records work begins. The CCM interfaces with CLECs, obtains the equipment inventory utilization of the frames, and interfaces with other network individuals to develop the initial frame assignments based on CLECs' applications and firm orders. This activity can occur anytime between the receipt of a firm order and BellSouth's completion of its

work at the collocation site.

During the application review phase, the CCM verifies equipment availability and other associated equipment requirements. After the firm order is received the CCM obtains specific frame utilization information and coordinates with CLECs and/or CLECs' certified vendors to develop the initial assignment of frame locations and works with other network groups to ensure that the actual facility assignments are included in required databases for CLECs. Thus, the work is not duplicative.

Regarding factors, BellSouth does not recover cable records costs via factors. The manual effort to update cable records is not recovered by maintenance or any other factors used by BellSouth. Factors do not recover the manual effort to input the CLEC's cable information into BellSouth's systems. For example, maintenance factors recover the cost of performing routine work to prevent trouble, including inspecting and reporting on the condition of plant investment. The cable records work is not associated with BellSouth's normal repair and maintenance of systems. Therefore, the proposed nonrecurring charges do not over-recover costs.

Q. ON PAGES 50 AND 51, MR. GABEL DISCUSSES COLLOCATION CABLE RECORDS. HE RECOMMENDS THAT BELLSOUTH PROVIDE IN ITS SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE FUNCTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS SERVICE, THE BASIS FOR ITS TIME ESTIMATES, AND ADDRESS THE DEGREE TO WHICH SPRINT AND VERIZON SEEK COST RECOVERY OF SIMILAR ACTIVITIES. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. As stated above, Cable Records charges apply for work required to build cable records in company systems. The cables belong to the collocator. The collocator's certified vendor runs the cables (e.g., voice grade/ DS0 and DS1) from the collocation space to the distribution frame. The collocators' specific distribution frame termination locations are needed for the collocator to place orders to cross-connect network elements (e.g., unbundled loops) to their collocated equipment.

There are several groups involved in the process of identifying frame terminations, assigning frame terminations, verifying frame terminations, and notifying CLECs', via circuit facility assignments, of final frame assignments. The CCM is the group that interfaces with CLECs and the other BellSouth network groups. The CCM obtains the equipment inventory utilization of the frames and works with the CLEC or CLEC's certified vendor on the initial assignment on the frames. This activity could include several phone calls, several meetings, and a site visit to the central office. Once the CLEC's certified vendor installs the cables on the frame, BellSouth must verify that the correct terminations were made before facility assignments are input in the required databases. These activities can occur anytime between firm order and completion of the space preparation.

Once the frame terminations are verified, the CCM works with the other network groups to provide the needed information for them to begin the process of inputting the assignments in databases. The other groups are: COSMOS [computer system for main frame operations]/Switch, Address & Facility Assignment ("AFIG"), Loop Capacity Management ("LCM"), and Circuit Provisioning Group ("CPG"). All of the groups, except CPG, just handle voice grade frame information. The CPG works with

DS1, DS3 and Fiber frame terminations.

The LCM, upon receiving the information from the CCM, investigates existing collocation cables at the same office, assigns new cable range and name (being careful not to duplicate any cable ranges already being used), and creates terminal name and count including unique address to identify the collocation terminal. This information is provided back to the CCM and also to the AFIG and COSMOS/Switch for input into databases. The COSMOS/Switch group inputs the voice grade (2 wire and 4-wire) frame information into COSMOS/Switch by first establishing the inventory range and then inputting the frame location and any remarks. The AFIG identifies cable and pair range and builds the inventory in the loop/local facility assignment control system ("LFACS"). The AFIG also places restrictions on the collocator's facilities to keep BellSouth from accidentally assigning them for other use.

The CPG, upon receiving the information from the CCM, inputs the customer information for DS1s, DS3s, and Fiber cables into the Trunk Integrated Records Keeping System ("TIRKS").

Q. NOW THAT YOU HAVE PROVIDED AN EXPLANATION OF THE FUNCTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS SERVICE, WHAT IS THE BASIS FOR THE TIME ESTIMATES?

A. BellSouth has estimated its work times and work activities based on the requirements associated with its procedures and network. BellSouth must ensure that frame assignments are made correctly before beginning the process of entering this

information into the databases. If the information is not entered correctly, CLECs requesting connection to unbundled elements (e.g., unbundled loops or unbundled ports) will not be able to establish that connection. Without the correct information in the databases, when the order is placed the assignments will not cross connect the right terminations on the frames. Therefore, the CCM must work with the CLEC and the other network groups to ensure that the correct facility assignments are made and input into the databases. Additionally, this is not a new function for BellSouth. BellSouth charged for this function in the past via Additional Engineering Charges. Establishing the Cable Records charge simply allows BellSouth to provide this function using a standard charge.

Q. CAN YOU ADDRESS THE DEGREE TO WHICH SPRINT AND VERIZON SEEK COST RECOVERY OF SIMILAR ACTIVITIES?

A. BellSouth cannot know with complete confidence the answer to this question. However, BellSouth believes that both Verizon and Sprint recover this cost in other cost elements. For example, Verizon may recover this cost in its Facility Pull charges (e.g., Elements 12 and 13) and Cable Termination charges (e.g., Elements 15 – 18) since they seem to be associated with cross connections and installing the cable from the collocation space to the frame. Sprint may recover this cost in its Administrative & Project Management Fees (Elements 2, 4, and 7). The description of the Regional Transmission Engineer functions (page 8 of 17 of Davis Exhibit JRD-2) include engineering work for cross connects and updating the circuit assignment system. This description is under Administration & Project Management Fees. Therefore, BellSouth believes that Verizon and Sprint seek cost recovery for this activity, which

is only reasonable. Moreover, BellSouth does not have the above-described Sprint and Verizon cost elements in its list of cost elements.

Q. MR. TURNER ADDRESSES THE FLOOR SPACE COST ON PAGES 45 – 49 OF HIS TESTIMONY. HIS BASIC ALLEGATION IS THAT SINCE THE INVESTMENT USED BY BELLSOUTH IN ITS STUDY IS GREATER THAN PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DATA ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS SPACE INVESTMENT, IT IS INCONSISTENT WITH TELRIC PRICINCIPLES AND SHOULD BE REJECTED. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. Mr. Turner basically contends that BellSouth's investment amount is improper and non-compliant with TELRIC because he can find a way to develop a lower investment number based on data that does not relate to BellSouth's network. Specifically, Mr. Turner states that publicly available investment data from R.S. Means should be used because it contains information that is verifiable and can be reviewed.

The floor space charge allows BellSouth to recover the cost of the building space being occupied by collocators. Obviously, the use of actual costs for BellSouth's actual telephone-company building additions are more reflective of the costs that BellSouth will incur in providing floor space to CLECs on a going forward basis than publicly available data that does not relate to BellSouth. There is no reason to believe that the costs incurred recently are not reflective of future expenditures.

The R.S. Means publication simply estimates construction costs based on past

construction jobs. R.S. Means averages jobs done across the nation. It is dependent upon contractors reporting information to it. The user of the average national data from R.S. Means must then use a modifier to adjust for the size of the building. The user must also use a factor to adjust the national average to make it a state/city average. R.S. Means can be best described as an estimator.

The investment number used by BellSouth is based on actual jobs in BellSouth central offices in Florida. Thus, this number reflects the cost of provisioning collocation, which meets TELRIC requirements. TELRIC principles do not require that the information must be publicly available. BellSouth simply believes it is better to use actual data to determine realistic investment numbers rather than to manipulate an estimate based on national averages to arrive at an artificially low investment number.

Q. MR. GABEL, ON PAGES 12 – 22, ADDRESSES FLOOR SPACE AND SPACE PREPARATION COSTS. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE FLOOR SPACE COST ELEMENT.

A. The Floor Space cost element is a recurring cost element that recovers the cost of the building space being occupied by CLECs. It includes the costs for lighting, heating, air conditioning, and other allocated expenses and associated maintenance of the building.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR SPACE PREPARATION COST ELEMENTS.

A. Space Preparation cost elements allow BellSouth to recover the cost of engineering, design, and modification of the network infrastructure and the building to meet a collocator's specified requirements. Such modification could include:

- Augmenting air conditioning cooling capacity
- Reworking ventilation ducts
- Adding cable racking
- Adding or moving light fixtures

BellSouth's Space Preparation costs consist of four cost elements. Only one of them is nonrecurring. The other three are recurring costs. The nonrecurring Space Preparation cost element is called Firm Order Processing and it recovers costs associated with receiving, reviewing, and processing a collocation firm order. A CLEC submits a firm order to notify BellSouth to move forward with the collocation installation work after reviewing the application response.

The three recurring cost elements are: 1) C.O. Modification per square foot, 2) Common Systems Modification per square foot for cageless collocation, and 3) Common Systems Modification per cage for caged collocation.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE SPACE PREPARATION – C.O. MODIFICATION PER SQUARE FOOT.

A. This element recovers the costs associated with the building design, construction and modification work associated with preparing a central office space for collocation. For example, it would include the following types of work:

- heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
- electrical
- architectural

This element applies for both cageless and caged collocation.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE SPACE PREPARATION – COMMON SYSTEMS MODIFICATION PER SQUARE FOOT.

A. This element recovers the costs associated with the installation and modification of network infrastructure (e.g., cable racking, stanchions, AC main feed to bay, fiber ducts) required to prepare the central office for cageless collocation. Note that this element would only apply with cageless collocation.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE SPACE PREPARATION – COMMON SYSTEMS MODIFICATION PER CAGE.

A. This element recovers the costs associated with the installation and modification of network infrastructure (e.g., cable racking, stanchions, AC main feed to bay, fiber ducts) required to prepare the central office for caged collocation. Note that this element would only apply with caged collocation.

Q. ON PAGES 13 AND 14 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. GABEL EXPRESSES THREE CONCERNS WITH THE METHOD USED BY BELLSOUTH TO ESTIMATE FLOOR SPACE INVESTMENT. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. First, Mr. Gabel is concerned that not enough central offices are represented to be a statistically valid sample. As stated above, the floor space charge allows BellSouth to recover the cost of the building space being occupied by collocators. BellSouth believes that the use of actual costs for its actual telephone-company central office building additions are reflective of the costs that BellSouth will incur in providing central office floor space to CLECs on a going forward basis. There is no reason to believe that the costs incurred recently are not reflective of future expenditures. All building additions shown were made to existing central office buildings. As for the number of observations used, BellSouth used 100% of the building additions with final numbers for the years 2001 and 2002. These were the most current jobs. The numbers are unbiased in that we did not selectively remove any jobs from the study.

Mr. Gabel's second concern is with the degree of variation in the cost per square foot shown from one of the central office building additions to the next. The cost per square foot by central office does vary. This variation is due to the specific requirements at each central office. For example, some building additions could trigger the need for a new air conditioning system or other high cost items. Additionally, the code requirements in one city could be more stringent than in another city.

Third, Mr. Gabel states that the data used by BellSouth is not appropriate for a TELRIC study because BellSouth has "used incremental rather than total demand in its space study." (Page 14, lines 11 – 20) He refers to paragraph 682 in the FCC's First Report and Order in the Local Competition Docket (CC Docket No. 96-98, Released August 8, 1996) in footnote 10 of his testimony (page 14). He states on

page 14, "The FCC's pricing order requires that TELRIC cost estimates be obtained 'by dividing the total cost associated with the element by a reasonable projection of the actual total usage of the element'." BellSouth has, in fact, done this. The total cost of the building additions have been divided by the total useable square footage added, which include both space used by BellSouth and other parties (i.e., total cost divided by actual total usage). This methodology, since it is based on the most current expenditures, is reflective of forward-looking space cost for both BellSouth and collocators. Moreover, given that the FCC's collocation rules (specifically FCC Rule 51.323(f)(1)) do not require ILECs to lease or construct additional space to provide for physical collocation when existing space has been exhausted, BellSouth does not believe that there is TELRIC requirement to develop an investment based on reconstructing all central offices in the state and dividing by the total central office space in all central offices in the state.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MR. GABEL'S CLAIM (PAGE 16, LINES 2 – 7) THAT BELLSOUTH'S INVESTMENT ESTIMATE IS SIGNIFICANTLY OUT OF LINE WITH THE ESTIMATES OF VERIZON AND SPRINT.

A. Mr. Gabel seems to believe that BellSouth's methodology for developing the investment for the Floor Space cost has led to an investment per square foot that is significantly more than TELRIC and what the other party's in this docket have proposed. Based on my review of the other party's filing, I do not agree. While it does appear that BellSouth's investment per square foot is greater than Verizon's, it also appears that BellSouth's investment is less than Sprint's.

Moreover, as stated above, in approving BellSouth's applications for in-region interLATA authority in all of its nine states, the FCC concluded that BellSouth provides collocation based on TELRIC. The same Floor Space cost development process that Mr. Gable criticizes was in use at the time the FCC made that determination. BellSouth's Floor Space cost/rate is reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

Q. MR GABEL ADDRESSES SPACE PREPARATION CHARGES ON PAGES 17 AND 18. HE STATES THAT BELLSOUTH HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT THE COSTS REPORTED ON H.1.41 ARE FROM A RANDOM SAMPLE AND REPRESENTATIVE OF THE LOCATIONS WHERE THE COMPANY INCURS SPACE PREPARATION COSTS. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. As stated above, Space Preparation cost elements allow BellSouth to recover the cost of engineering, design, and modification of the network infrastructure and the building to meet a collocator's specified requirements. BellSouth's Space Preparation costs consist of four cost elements. The three recurring cost elements are: 1) C.O. Modification per square foot, 2) Common Systems Modification per square foot for cageless collocation, and 3) Common Systems Modification per cage for caged collocation. Although Mr. Gabel criticizes BellSouth's space preparation charges in general, his comments really only address element H.1.41, which is the C.O. Modification per square foot element. Specifically, Mr. Gabel contends that BellSouth has not shown that its sample is representative.

This element recovers the costs associated with the building design, construction and

modification work associated with preparing a central office space for collocation. To develop this forward-looking investment, BellSouth started with final investment data from actual collocation projects over a certain time period. Costs that would not apply on a forward-looking basis, such as barrier walls, were backed out. This data was obtained region-wide due to the limited quantity of collocation projects with final costs. Attached, as Exhibit WBS-5, is a copy of the data. All available projects during the time period with final costs were used. A weighted-average of the data from all nine states was taken to produce the forward-looking investment per square foot of $121.11. A total of 123 projects encompassing 594 firm order collocation sites were used. Thus, the investments shown for element H.1.41 are representative of locations where the company incurs space preparation costs.

The FCC, in paragraph 51 of its Advanced Services Order, specifically allows ILECs to recover the costs of preparing collocation space. It states:

> We conclude, based on the record, that incumbent LECs must allocate space preparation, security measures, and other collocation charges on a pro-rated basis so the first collocator in a particular incumbent premises will not be responsible for the entire cost of site preparation.

BellSouth's methodology for developing the investment per square foot or per cage is simply a way of pro-rating the cost of collocation space preparation requirements among CLECs on a reasonable and nondiscriminatory basis.

Q. MR. GABEL STATES THAT (PAGE19) BELLSOUTH'S TARIFF

REQUIREMENTS AT TERMINATION OF OCCUPANCY MEANS THAT THE CLEC IS INAPPROPRIATELY REQUIRED TO BOTH MAKE THE SPACE READY FOR ITSELF (AT THE TIME OF OCCUPATION) AND MAKE THE SPACE READY FOR THE NEXT COLLOCATOR AS WELL. IS HE CORRECT?

A. No. The tariff simply requires the CLEC to remove its equipment/property and to return the space in the same condition when first occupied by the CLEC. The CLEC is only responsible for removing its equipment, not BellSouth's equipment. The CLEC is not required to remove any items of investment (e.g., racks and power bays) BellSouth has included in its study. Therefore, the space preparation charges only apply once.

Additionally, on page 20, Mr. Turner states that depreciation rates reflect the cost of removing plant (telecommunications equipment). He is correct. Depreciation rates do reflect the cost of removing BellSouth's depreciable equipment. It does not reflect the cost of removing CLEC equipment. Since the tariff only requires the CLEC to remove its equipment (and not BellSouth's equipment), there is no over charge.

Q. ON PAGES 20 AND 21, MR. GABEL EXPRESSES CONCERN WITH BELLSOUTH'S APPLICATION OF THE SPACE PREPARATION CHARGE. HE BELIEVES THAT BELLSOUTH DISCRIMINATES AGAINST COMPETITORS BY CHARGING THEM FOR SPACE PREPARATION, WHILE NOT INCLUDING THE COSTS OF SPACE PREPARATION IN ITS RETAIL COST STUDIES. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. First of all, when a CLEC uses collocation to provision its network, BellSouth incurs specific costs for preparing that collocation space as well as assigning a portion of that building for use only by that collocator. The FCC allows ILECs to recover the cost of collocation. Specifically, as stated above, paragraph 51 of the FCC's Advanced Services Order allows ILECs to recover the costs of preparing collocation space.

For BellSouth's retail services, the services range from a voice grade loop which uses everything from the main distribution frame to a circuit switch, to a Digital Subscriber Line service, which uses a digital subscriber line access manager ("DSLAM") as well as high capacity services that uses synchronous optical network ("SONET") equipment with speeds ranging from 1.544 megabits to gigabits. Similarly, the CLEC can offer the same type of services depending on the equipment they choose to deploy. BellSouth's infrastructure includes central office buildings that house everything from circuit switches to DSLAM and SONET equipment. CLECs infrastructure includes buildings it may own and purchased collocation space, again housing similar equipment. BellSouth in its retail offerings recover the costs of its buildings by assigning the cost on a per circuit investment basis. Hence, BellSouth has chosen its methodology for recovering building-related costs from its end users. It should be noted that the price for retail offerings are not set at cost. Similarly, the CLEC can choose to recover its costs from its end users in any method it chooses. The important distinction is that provisioning a circuit out of a DSLAM or switch to an end user does not entail the same costs as providing central office space and its preparation for a collocator.

Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. GABEL'S RECOMMENDATION FOR BELLSOUTH TO USE VERIZON'S METHODOLOGY FOR ESTIMATING FLOOR SPACE COST?

A. No, I do not. As previously stated, the FCC has found BellSouth's costs for collocation to be TELRIC compliant. Mr. Gabel offers no concrete evidence that BellSouth's costs are not TELRIC compliant. He simply uses a methodology that produces a lower cost, based on the apparent (incorrect) belief that this is what TELRIC requires. To the contrary, the FCC allows for a range of reasonableness for TELRIC pricing. Paragraph 30 in FCC Order 02-260 states:

> We will, however, reject an application if "basic TELRIC principles are violated or the state commission makes clear errors in factual findings on matters so substantial that the end result falls outside the range that the reasonable application of TELRIC principles would produce."[1] We note that different states may reach different results that are each within the range of what a reasonable application of TELRIC principles would produce.

Costs and rates must be developed on a company specific basis as stated previously. For example, BellSouth has approximately 200 central offices in Florida and approximately 130 have collocation. Verizon has fewer central offices and fewer central offices with collocation in Florida. This simple difference between the two companies would have a real impact on the procedures and planning within the state,

[1] Verizon Pennsylvania Section 271 Application Order, CC Docket No. 01-138, 16 FCC Rcd 17419, 17453, para. 55.

which would impact the resulting cost estimates. Verizon's methodology of reconstructing all central offices in the state by using the embedded investment (adjusted using the current cost to booked cost factor) divided by the total demand is not a more accurate method than BellSouth's method of looking at situations where building additions have occurred. BellSouth has divided the total cost associated with the recent building additions by the total useable square footage added, and thus reflected the forward-looking cost of floor space.

Q. THE SPACE PREPARTION COST ELEMENT IS DISCUSSED IN MR. TURNER'S TESTIMONY ON PAGES 55 - 57. HE STATES THAT HE HAS A CONCERN WITH THE INVESTMENT NUMBER AND THE ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY. PLEASE CLARIFY THIS PART OF HIS TESTIMONY AND RESPOND.

A. Mr. Turner appears to be very confused as to what BellSouth is proposing for the space preparation cost element. BellSouth's space preparation cost elements consist of four elements as stated above. Mr. Turner specifically addresses the space preparation – central office modification element. This element recovers the costs associated with the building design, construction and modification work associated with preparing a central office space for collocation, such as, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning.

To develop this forward-looking investment, BellSouth started with final investment data from actual projects over a certain time period. Costs that would not apply on a forward-looking basis, such as barrier walls, were backed out. This data was obtained

region-wide due to the limited quantity of projects with final costs. A weighted-average of the data from all nine states was taken to produce the forward-looking investment per square foot of $121.11.

Mr. Turner is also confused in that that the items he highlighted on page 55, line 22 (cage cost set fee, barrier wall, and card reader) were specifically backed out of the study where they may have been included in the actual projects. These items were highlighted on some support papers and Mr. Turner must have assumed that they were included in the study. Therefore, that concern should be resolved.

Q. MR. TURNER, ON PAGES 52 – 55, PROPOSES THAT THE CAGE PREPARATION COST BE DEVELOPED USING R. S. MEANS. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. First, it should be noted that the construction of the collocation cage can be done by a certified vendor if the CLEC chooses. There is no requirement that BellSouth construct the cage.

However, if BellSouth does construct the cage, it should be able to recover its costs. Mr. Turner is basically stating that the investment is not correct because he can find a way to show that a lower investment number can be developed. Again, he states that investment data from R.S. Means should be used because it contains information that is verifiable and can be reviewed. As stated previously, R.S. Means publication simply estimates construction costs based on past construction jobs and at best can only be described as an estimator.

The investment numbers used by BellSouth for cage construction are based on actual contractor quotes and actual prices from manufacturers. BellSouth simply believes it is better to use actual data rather than manipulate a national average investment.

Q. PLEASE ADDRESS MR. TURNER'S REASON FOR REMOVING THE DUST PARTITION COST (PAGES 54 - 55).

A. Mr. Turner supports his position that the dust partition cost should be removed primarily on his observation of Lucent Technologies personnel installing framing equipment. Lucent is not a good choice for comparison, since Lucent is an equipment installers. Equipment installation does not typically create dust. BellSouth uses general contractors to construct cages in Bellsouth central offices. Cage construction does create dust, and therefore, it is appropriate for BellSouth to include the dust partition in its cost study.

Q. MR. TURNER, ON PAGES 49 THROUGH 51, QUESTION THE CABLE RACK CAPACITY USED BY BELLSOUTH IN DEVELOPING THE CABLE SUPPORT STRUCTURE COST FOR FIBER ENTRANCE CABLE. HE STATES THAT THE CAPACITY WAS NOT DONE CORRECTLY AND PRESENTS HIS PROPOSAL. PLEASE RESPOND.

A. Mr. Turner states that BellSouth's proposed capacity of 30 cables is understated, and he proceeds to develop a number that will lower costs by using information from Bell Labs. Mr. Turner does not state when the Bell Labs data was developed. From reviewing the table included in his testimony on page 50 and reading his testimony, it

appears Mr. Turner arbitrarily chose a fiber rack size of 12 inches. From there, he used the table to estimate the number of DS1 cables that should be placed in that rack. Then he converts the number of DS1 cables to a number of fiber cables using the assumption that three DS1 cables equal one fiber cable in diameter.

Mr. Turner's process starts with an arbitrary assumption of the cable rack size and ends with an assumption that 3 DS1 cables equal one fiber cable. His analysis is not representative of the size racks BellSouth would use or BellSouth's procedures for placing fiber cable in racks.

BellSouth developed the fiber entrance cable support structure costs based on the following assumptions:

- Collocator private entrance cable rack is a 5 inch width rack
- BellSouth standards for maximum pile-up height on a 5 inch rack is 5 inches.
- The quantity and size of riser cables is at the discretion of the collocator; BellSouth's assumption was an average riser cable diameter of approximately .75 inches.
- Cable racks are equipped with cable retaining brackets and cables are run unsecured
- Physical fill of rack is estimated at 70% of theoretical maximum or approximately 30 riser cables.

Therefore, BellSouth cable rack capacity is based on BellSouth's standards and the actual cable racking used. BellSouth does utilize a systematic approach for determining the capacity of cable racks. Mr. Turner's proposal should be rejected.

Q. MR. TURNER STATES (PAGES 51 AND 52) THAT BELLSOUTH SHOULD USE THE SAME FILL FACTOR IT USES FOR ITS FRAME EQUIPMENT IN THE POT FRAME COST STUDY. DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. The Point of Termination ("POT") bay/frame was initially a required termination arrangement for CLECs collocating in BellSouth's central office. As a result of FCC orders, BellSouth does not require CLECs to use this termination and it is totally optional. In fact, it has not been offered by BellSouth as a required termination point since 1999. The only CLECs that continue to receive charges for this item are the ones that happen to have older Agreements containing that rate element. This is essentially a grandfathered offering.

For the reason stated above, BellSouth does not treat POT frame termination the same as its frame terminations (e.g., the 2-wire terminations on the main distribution frame ("MDF")) that are used by BellSouth's customers and the CLECs. The POT frame terminations are only used by a CLEC that continues to have the grandfathered option in its Agreement. At some point in time, there will be no new terminations on these frames.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.

FLORIDA DOCKETS 981834-TP, 990321-TP

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

COLLOCATION COST STUDIES

REVISION 1

SEPTEMBER 26, 2003

EXHIBIT WBS 1

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE DOCUMENTS

REVISED

2. Next, BellSouth determined the forward-looking, efficient architecture, engineering, and provisioning procedures required to provide the functionality for each of the UNEs or combinations. This was accomplished through the use of models, special studies, and the involvement of key BellSouth personnel, such as cost analysts, product managers, and network employees.

3. Costs associated with the material and equipment required to provision each UNE or combination were developed (UNE modeling).

4. BellSouth ensured that the costs associated with supporting structures and installation of material and equipment were appropriately included.

5. BellSouth determined the economic cost of each UNE by converting the installed investment into its capital costs and operating expenses, and included the appropriate amount of shared and common costs and taxes.

6. Additionally, BellSouth developed the nonrecurring costs associated with provisioning the unbundled network elements and combinations determined above.

ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF DOCUMENT

Section 1 - The remaining pages of Section 1 provide a flowchart of the TELRIC study process and a summary of results.
Section 2 - Includes an explanation of the TELRIC methodology, and the recurring and nonrecurring cost development process.
Section 3 - Contains a description and explanation of the models and price calculators used.
Section 4 - Describes each of the factors and loadings used in the studies and explains their development.
Section 5 - Contains a description of the UNEs and an overview of the study process for each category of UNEs.

REVISED

FLORIDA DOCKET NOS. 981834-TP, 990321-TP
SECTION 1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth) is herewith filing Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost (TELRIC) studies, including shared and common costs, (i.e., the economic cost) for unbundled collocation elements in compliance with the Florida Public Service Commission's (FPSC) Order dated November 4, 2002. The capital structure, depreciation lives, salvage values and tax factors used in these studies are in compliance with FPSC Orders issued in Docket No. 990649-TP. Other factors and loadings have been updated to reflect the latest available inputs. The study period is years 2003-2005.

Revision 1: This revision is to use Florida assignable central office square footage in the calculation of Element H.1.37, Security Access system – Security system per square foot per central office.

OVERVIEW

Historically, BellSouth prepared Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC) studies to support tariff prices for telecommunications services. The LRIC result, which considered only the volume sensitive costs, constituted the price floor for the service in question, and was one of a number of factors considered when establishing the price for a service. BellSouth also conducted Total Service Long Run Incremental Cost (TSLRIC) studies that addressed not only the volume sensitive costs but also considered the directly attributable volume insensitive costs. TSLRIC studies were used to ensure that the service was not being subsidized. With the advent of local competition as envisioned by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act), it became necessary for BellSouth to conduct cost studies to determine the costs associated with certain components or elements of its telecommunications network. BellSouth's TELRIC studies comply with the requirements of the Act and are in compliance with the FCC's as well as the Florida Public Service Commission's rules and regulations issued to implement the provisions of the Act.

In order to develop the economic costs associated with UNEs and combinations, BellSouth initiated the basic study process as follows.

1. BellSouth first identified the UNEs to be studied based on requests by competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) and any requirements imposed by regulators.

REVISED

BellSouth Cost Calculator 2.6 - Element Summary Report

Study Name:	Florida Collocation - Rev 1
State:	Florida
Scenario:	State Average
Study Type:	TELRIC

Cost Element	Description	Recurring	Non Recurring	Non-Recurring First	Non-Recurring Additional	Non-Recurring Initial	Non-Recurring Subsequent
H.0	COLLOCATION						
H.1	PHYSICAL COLLOCATION						
H.1.1	Physical Collocation - Application Cost - Initial		$2,785				
H.1.1	Physical Collocation - Application Cost - Initial - Disconnect Only		$1.20				
H.1.5	Physical Collocation - Fiber Entrance Cable Installation, per Cable		$1,473				
H.1.5	Physical Collocation - Fiber Entrance Cable Installation, per Cable - Disconnect Only		$43.84				
H.1.6	Physical Collocation - Floor Space per Sq. Ft.	$5.28					
H.1.7	Physical Collocation - Cable Support Structure per Fiber Entrance Cable	$5.19					
H.1.8	Physical Collocation - Power per Fused Amp	$7.26					
H.1.9	Physical Collocation - 2-Wire Cross-Connects	$0.0208		$7.32	$5.37		
H.1.9	Physical Collocation - 2-Wire Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$4.58	$2.71		
H.1.10	Physical Collocation - 4-Wire Cross-Connects	$0.0416		$8.00	$5.75		
H.1.10	Physical Collocation - 4-Wire Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$5.00	$2.69		
H.1.11	Physical Collocation - DS1 Cross-Connects	$0.3786		$7.88	$6.25		
H.1.11	Physical Collocation - DS1 Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$1.35	$0.9899		
H.1.12	Physical Collocation - DS3 Cross-Connects	$4.16		$32.40	$31.03		
H.1.12	Physical Collocation - DS3 Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$11.15	$10.98		
H.1.13	Physical Collocation - 2-Wire POT Bay	$0.0300					
H.1.14	Physical Collocation - 4-Wire POT Bay	$0.0600					
H.1.15	Physical Collocation - DS1 POT Bay	$0.4238					
H.1.16	Physical Collocation - DS3 POT Bay	$3.78					
H.1.17	Physical Collocation - Security Escort - Basic, per Half Hour			$33.65	$22.05		
H.1.18	Physical Collocation - Security Escort - Overtime, per Half Hour			$44.63	$28.89		
H.1.19	Physical Collocation - Security Escort - Premium, per Half Hour			$55.62	$35.73		
H.1.23	Physical Collocation - Welded Wire Cage - First 100 Sq. Ft.	$189.73					
H.1.24	Physical Collocation - Welded Wire Cage - Add'l 50 Sq. Ft.	$18.61					
H.1.31	Physical Collocation - 2-Fiber Cross-Connect	$1.71		$28.26	$25.85		
H.1.31	Physical Collocation - 2-Fiber Cross-Connect - Disconnect Only			$13.78	$11.01		
H.1.32	Physical Collocation - 4-Fiber Cross-Connect	$3.34		$37.92	$35.51		
H.1.32	Physical Collocation - 4-Fiber Cross-Connect - Disconnect Only			$18.20	$15.44		
H.1.33	Physical Collocation - 2-Fiber POT Bay	$12.89					
H.1.34	Physical Collocation - 4-fiber POT Bay	$17.39					
H.1.37	Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Security System per square Foot per Central Office	$0.0101					
H.1.38	Physical Collocation - Security Access System - New Access Card Activation, per Card		$38.95				
H.1.39	Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Administrative Change, existing Access Card, per Card		$8.84				
H.1.40	Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Replace Lost or Stolen Card, per Card		$28.78				
H.1.41	Physical Collocation - Space Preparation - C.O. Modification per square ft.	$2.38					
H.1.42	Physical Collocation - Space Preparation - Common Systems Modification per square ft. - Cageless	$2.50					
H.1.43	Physical Collocation - Space Preparation - Common Systems Modification per Cage	$84.93					
H.1.45	Physical Collocation - Space Preparation - Firm Order Processing		$287.36				
H.1.46	Physical Collocation - Application Cost - Subsequent		$2,236				

REVISED

09/12/2003

Recurring Cost Summary

Florida

H.1.37 - Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Security System per square Foot per Central Office

	Volume Sensitive			Volume Insensitive		
	Direct Cost	Shared Cost	TELRIC	Direct Cost	Shared Cost	TELRIC
Recurring Cost Development Reports	$0.0095	$0.0000	$0.0095	$0.0000	$0.0000	$0.0000
LABOR EXPENSES:						
OTHER EXPENSES:						
Total Monthly Cost	$0.0095	$0.0000	$0.0095	$0.0000	$0.0000	$0.0000
Gross Receipts Tax Factor			X 1.0017			X 1.0017
Cost (Including Gross Rec Ftr)			$0.0095			$0.0000
Common Cost Factor			X 1.0652			X 1.0652
Monthly Economic Cost			$0.0101			$0.0000

Total Monthly Economic Cost: **$0.0101**

000148

REVISED

Source: BSCC 2.6

09/12/2003

Investment Development - Volume Sensitive

Florida

H.1.37 - Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Security System per square Foot per Central Office

Description	FRC	Sub FRC	A Material	B Inflation Factor	C=AxB Adjusted Material	D1 Plug-in Inventory Factor	D2 Mat'l Factor	D3 Telco Factor	D4 Plug-in Factor	D5 Hardwire Factor	E=Cx(D1xD2 x...xD5) In-Plant Investment	F Supporting Equipment &/or Power Loading	G=ExF Total Investment
						In-Plant Factors (Default = 1)							
Buildings - COE	10C	00	$0.5134	1.0844	$0.5568	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	$0.5568	NA	$0.5568
Land - COE	20C	00	$0.0272	1.0844	$0.0295	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	$0.0295	NA	$0.0295
											$0.5863		$0.5863

000149

REVISED

Source: BSCC 2.6

09/12/2003

Network Switch, Circuit, and Operator RTU Investment Development - Volume Sensitive

Florida

H.1.37 - Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Security System per square Foot per Central Office

Description	FRC	Sub FRC	A=Prev Page Col G Investment	B Ntwk Switch RTU Factor	C=AxB Ntwk Switch RTU Investment	D Ntwk Circuit RTU Factor	E=AxD Ntwk Circuit RTU Investment	F Ntwk Operator RTU Factor	G=AxF Ntwk Operator RTU Investment
Buildings - COE	10C	00	$0.5568	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000
Land - COE	20C	00	$0.0295	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000
				FRC 560C:	$0.0000	FRC 660C:	$0.0000	FRC 860C:	$0.0000

000150

REVISED

Source: BSCC 2.6

Land, Building, Pole and Conduit Investment Development - Volume Sensitive

Florida
H.1.37 - Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Security System per square Foot per Central Office

Description	FRC	Sub FRC	A=Prev Pag Col G Investment	B Land Factor	C=AxE Land Investment	D Building Factor	E=AxD Building Investment	F Pole Factor	G=AxF Pole Investment	H Conduit Factor	I=AxH Conduit Investment
Buildings - COE	10C	00	$0.5568	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000
Land - COE	20C	00	$0.0295	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000
				FRC 20C:	$0.0000	FRC 10C:	$0.0000	FRC 1C:	$0.0000	FRC 5C:	$0.0000

0001151

REVISED

09/12/2003

Recurring Direct Cost Development - Volume Sensitive

Florida

H.1.37 - Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Security System per square Foot per Central Office

Description	FRC	A Investment	B=AxFtr Depreciation & Factor	C=AxFtr Cost of Money & Factor	D=AxFtr Income Tax & Factor	E=AxFtr Plant Specific Expense & Factor	F=AxFtr Ad Valorem Expense & Factor	I=(B+C+D+E+F) Direct Cost
Buildings - COE	10C	$0.0000	$0.0000 0.0207	$0.0000 0.0798	$0.0000 0.0358	$0.0000 0.0517	$0.0000 0.0074	$0.0000
Buildings - COE	10C	$0.5568	$0.0115 0.0207	$0.0445 0.0798	$0.0200 0.0358	$0.0288 0.0517	$0.0041 0.0074	$0.1088
Poles	1C	$0.0000	$0.0000 0.0427	$0.0000 0.0643	$0.0000 0.0289	$0.0000 0.0229	$0.0000 0.0074	$0.0000
Land - COE	20C	$0.0000	$0.0000 0.0000	$0.0000 0.1024	$0.0000 0.0460	$0.0000 0.0000	$0.0000 0.0074	$0.0000
Land - COE	20C	$0.0295	$0.0000 0.0000	$0.0030 0.1024	$0.0014 0.0460	$0.0000 0.0000	$0.0002 0.0074	$0.0046
Conduit Systems	4C	$0.0000	$0.0000 0.0118	$0.0000 0.0735	$0.0000 0.0330	$0.0000 0.0016	$0.0000 0.0074	$0.0000
Intangibles - Network Switch Software RTU	560C	$0.0000	$0.0000 0.3333	$0.0000 0.0476	$0.0000 0.0213	$0.0000 NA	$0.0000 0.0074	$0.0000
Intangibles - Network Circuit Software RTU	660C	$0.0000	$0.0000 0.3333	$0.0000 0.0476	$0.0000 0.0213	$0.0000 NA	$0.0000 0.0074	$0.0000
Intangibles - Operator Services Software RTU	860C	$0.0000	$0.0000 0.3333	$0.0000 0.0476	$0.0000 0.0213	$0.0000 NA	$0.0000 0.0074	$0.0000
		$0.5863	$0.0115	$0.0475	$0.0213	$0.0288	$0.0044	$0.1134
	Monthly Costs (Totals / 12):		$0.0010	$0.0040	$0.0018	$0.0024	$0.0004	$0.0095

000152

REVISED

Source: BSCC 2.6

09/12/2003

Recurring Telric Cost Development - Volume Sensitive

Florida

H.1.37 - Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Security System per square Foot per Central Office

Description	FRC	A Investment	B=Prev Rpt Col 1 Direct Cost	C Shared Cost Factor	D=AxC Shared Cost	E=B+D TELRIC
Buildings - COE	10C	$0.0000	$0.0000	0.0001	$0.0000	$0.0000
Buildings - COE	10C	$0.5568	$0.1088	0.0001	$0.0000	$0.1089
Poles	1C	$0.0000	$0.0000	0.0144	$0.0000	$0.0000
Land - COE	20C	$0.0000	$0.0000	0.0000	$0.0000	$0.0000
Land - COE	20C	$0.0295	$0.0046	0.0000	$0.0000	$0.0046
Conduit Systems	4C	$0.0000	$0.0000	0.0097	$0.0000	$0.0000
Intangibles - Network Switch Software RTU	560C	$0.0000	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000	$0.0000
Intangibles - Network Circuit Software RTU	660C	$0.0000	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000	$0.0000
Intangibles - Operator Services Software RTU	860C	$0.0000	$0.0000	NA	$0.0000	$0.0000
			$0.1134		$0.0000	$0.1135
Monthly Costs (Totals / 12):			$0.0095		$0.0000	$0.0095

000153

REVISED

Source: BSCC 2.6

CALCULATOR INPUT FORM - MATERIAL/INVESTMENT DATA

Instructions:

1. Use this worksheet to record material and/or investments to be input into the Calculator calculations.
2. All amounts shown are per unit (e.g., per call, per loop, per MOU).
3. Input data, by Cost Element, leaving no blank lines. On next row after last line of data, type END in Cost Element Column.
4. All data on this form should be cell-referenced to study workpapers.
5. Do NOT change columns, headings, sheet name.

State	Cost Element #	FRC	Sub FRC	Volume Sensitive $ Amount	Volume Insensitive $ Amount
FL	H.1.6	10C	00	$268.700	
FL	H.1.6	20C	00	$14.238	
FL	H.1.7	357C	16	$282.272	
FL	H.1.8	377CP	00	$286.000	
FL	H.1.9	377C	05	$0.693	
FL	H.1.9	377C	11	$0.103	
FL	H.1.10	377C	05	$1.387	
FL	H.1.10	377C	11	$0.206	
FL	H.1.11	357C	01	$14.123	
FL	H.1.12	357C	01	$155.344	
FL	H.1.13	357C	01	$1.119	
FL	H.1.14	357C	01	$2.238	
FL	H.1.15	357C	01	$15.810	
FL	H.1.16	357C	01	$140.912	
FL	H.1.23	10C	00	$9,654.118	
FL	H.1.23	20C	00	$511.546	
FL	H.1.24	10C	00	$947.000	
FL	H.1.24	20C	00	$50.179	
FL	H.1.31	357C	01	$63.862	
FL	H.1.32	357C	01	$124.579	
FL	H.1.33	357C	01	$481.070	
FL	H.1.34	357C	01	$648.707	
FL	H.1.37	10C	00	$0.513	
FL	H.1.37	20C	00	$0.027	
FL	H.1.41	10C	00	$121.110	
FL	H.1.41	20C	00	$6.417	
FL	H.1.42	357C	56	$131.150	
FL	H.1.43	357C	56	$4,454.550	
FL	H.1.48	357C	01	$0.029	
FL	H.1.49	357C	01	$0.044	
FL	H.1.50	377CP	00	$61.440	
FL	H.1.51	377CP	00	$122.880	
FL	H.1.52	377CP	00	$184.320	
FL	H.1.53	377CP	00	$425.470	
FL	H.1.56	357C	16	$7.649	
FL	H.1.71	377CP	00	$429.000	
	END				

REVISED

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
193		Material Price			Network Planning & Support		
194		Projected Actual Utilization			Network Planning & Support		
195		Fiber Capacity			Network Planning & Support	24	
196		Number Required			Network Planning & Support	4	
197		**POT Bay Shelf Coupler Panel**	**357C**	**01**			
198		Material Price			Network Planning & Support		
199		Projected Actual Utilization			Network Planning & Support		
200		Fiber Capacity			Network Planning & Support	6	
201		Number Required			Network Planning & Support	4	
202		**POT Bay SC Coupling**	**357C**	**01**			
203		Material Price			Network Planning & Support		
204		Projected Actual Utilization			Network Planning & Support		
205		Number Required			Network Planning & Support	4	
206		**POT Bay Excess Fiber Cable Storage Shelf**	**357C**	**01**			
207		Material Price			Network Planning & Support		
208		Projected Actual Utilization			Network Planning & Support		
209		Fiber Capacity			Network Planning & Support	48	
210		Number Required			Network Planning & Support	4	
211							
212	**H.1.37**	**Physical Collocation: Security Access System - Security System per Square Foot per Central Office**					
213		**Card Reader Access System**					
214		Installed Cost (quantity 2)	**10C**	**00**	Property & Services Mgmt		
215		Projected Actual Utilization	**20C**	**00**	Property & Services Mgmt		
216		Average Assignable Square Footage			Property & Services Mgmt	21,998.00	
217		**Project Management**					
218		Labor Time (hours)			Property & Services Mgmt	3.5	
219		• Receive collocation application - determine if new card reader system is needed.					
220		• Assign card reader project to consultant.					
221		• Coordinate card reader installation project with affected parties, i.e. consultant, facility					
222		manager, central office supervisor & capacity manager to determine path of travel for					
223		collocators, number of doors where readers are required, which doors to place readers on,					
224		location of control panel, power source for system, (I.e. AC or DC) interior keying scheme					
225		and project scope and schedule.					
226		• Review and approve authorization for card reader system installation.					
227		• Order network transport line.					
228		• Monitor, track and report progress of project.					
229		• Field inspections as needed.					
230		• Subsequent approvals, if additional costs are incurred.					
231		• Coordinate turn-up of system with network installers and Siemens.					
232		• Review invoices.					
233		• Closeout project.					
234		Labor Rate (per hour) JFC 30XX			Property & Services Mgmt	$66.200	
235							
236	**H.1.41**	**Physical Collocation: Space Preparation - Central Office Modification per Square Foot**					
237		Materials & Labor Investment per sq. ft.	**10C**	**00**	Corporate Real Estate (CRES)	$121.110	
238			**20C**	**00**	Corporate Real Estate (CRES)		
239							

REVISED

000023

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Florida				
2	Physical Collocation: Development of Security Access System Investments, per Square Foot, per Central Office				
3	Study Period: 2003-2005				
4					
5	H.1.37				
6	Item / Description			Source	Amount
7	Description	FRC	Sub FRC		
8					
9	**Development of Land Investment:**				
10					
11	Percent Land (to Land & Bldg. total)			INPUTS_Recurring Line 9	0.0503
12					
13	Percent Building (to Land & Bldg. total)			INPUTS_Recurring Line 10	0.9497
14					
15	Land / Building Ratio			Line 11 ÷ Line 13	0.0530
16					
17	**Card Reader Access System**	10C	00	INPUTS_Recurring Line 214	[redacted]
18					
19	Projected Actual Utilization			INPUTS_Recurring Line 215	[redacted]
20					
21	Card Reader Access System - per C.O.			Line 17 + Line 19	$11,062.000
22					
23	**Project Management**				
24					
25	Labor Time (hours)			INPUTS_Recurring Line 218	3.5
26					
27	Labor Rate (per hour) JFC 30XX			INPUTS_Recurring Line 234	$66.200
28					
29	Project Management Cost per C.O.			Line 25 × Line 27	$231.700
30					
31	Total Building Investment per C.O.			Line 21 + Line 29	$11,293.700
32					
33	Average Assignable Square Footage			INPUTS_Recurring Line 216	21,998.00
34					
35	**Bldg Investment per Square Foot per CO**	10C	00	Line 31 ÷ Line 33	$0.513
36					
37	Land / Building Ratio			Line 15	0.0530
38					
39	**Land Investment per Square Foot per CO**	20C	00	Line 35 × Line 37	$0.027
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					

REVISED

000046

Element Summary Report

Study Name:	Florida Collocation - Rev 1
State:	Florida
Scenario:	State Average
Study Type:	TELRIC

Cost Element	Description	Recurring	Non Recurring	Non-Recurring First	Non-Recurring Additional	Non-Recurring Initial	Non-Recurring Subsequent
H.0	COLLOCATION						
H.1	PHYSICAL COLLOCATION						
H.1.1	Physical Collocation - Application Cost - Initial		$2,785				
H.1.1	Physical Collocation - Application Cost - Initial - Disconnect Only		$1.20				
H.1.5	Physical Collocation - Fiber Entrance Cable Installation, per Cable		$1,473				
H.1.5	Physical Collocation - Fiber Entrance Cable Installation, per Cable - Disconnect Only		$43.84				
H.1.6	Physical Collocation - Floor Space per Sq. Ft.	$5.28					
H.1.7	Physical Collocation - Cable Support Structure per Fiber Entrance Cable	$5.19					
H.1.8	Physical Collocation - Power per Fused Amp	$7.26					
H.1.9	Physical Collocation - 2-Wire Cross-Connects	$0.0208		$7.32	$5.37		
H.1.9	Physical Collocation - 2-Wire Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$4.58	$2.71		
H.1.10	Physical Collocation - 4-Wire Cross-Connects	$0.0416		$8.00	$5.75		
H.1.10	Physical Collocation - 4-Wire Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$5.00	$2.69		
H.1.11	Physical Collocation - DS1 Cross-Connects	$0.3786		$7.88	$6.25		
H.1.11	Physical Collocation - DS1 Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$1.35	$0.9899		
H.1.12	Physical Collocation - DS3 Cross-Connects	$4.16		$32.40	$31.03		
H.1.12	Physical Collocation - DS3 Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$11.15	$10.98		
H.1.13	Physical Collocation - 2-Wire POT Bay	$0.0300					
H.1.14	Physical Collocation - 4-Wire POT Bay	$0.0600					
H.1.15	Physical Collocation - DS1 POT Bay	$0.4238					
H.1.16	Physical Collocation - DS3 POT Bay	$3.78					
H.1.17	Physical Collocation - Security Escort - Basic, per Half Hour			$33.65	$22.05		
H.1.18	Physical Collocation - Security Escort - Overtime, per Half Hour			$44.63	$28.89		
H.1.19	Physical Collocation - Security Escort - Premium, per Half Hour			$55.62	$35.73		
H.1.23	Physical Collocation - Welded Wire Cage - First 100 Sq. Ft.	$189.73					
H.1.24	Physical Collocation - Welded Wire Cage - Add'l 50 Sq. Ft.	$18.61					
H.1.31	Physical Collocation - 2-Fiber Cross-Connect	$1.71		$28.26	$25.85		
H.1.31	Physical Collocation - 2-Fiber Cross-Connect - Disconnect Only			$13.78	$11.01		
H.1.32	Physical Collocation - 4-Fiber Cross-Connect	$3.34		$37.92	$35.51		
H.1.32	Physical Collocation - 4-Fiber Cross-Connect - Disconnect Only			$18.20	$15.44		
H.1.33	Physical Collocation - 2-Fiber POT Bay	$12.89					
H.1.34	Physical Collocation - 4-fiber POT Bay	$17.39					
H.1.37	Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Security System per square Foot per Central Office	$0.0101					
H.1.38	Physical Collocation - Security Access System - New Access Card Activation, per Card		$38.95				
H.1.39	Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Administrative Change, existing Access Card, per Card		$8.84				
H.1.40	Physical Collocation - Security Access System - Replace Lost or Stolen Card, per Card		$28.78				
H.1.41	Physical Collocation - Space Preparation - C.O. Modification per square ft.	$2.38					
H.1.42	Physical Collocation - Space Preparation - Common Systems Modification per square ft. - Cageless	$2.50					
H.1.43	Physical Collocation - Space Preparation - Common Systems Modification per Cage	$84.93					
H.1.45	Physical Collocation - Space Preparation - Firm Order Processing		$287.36				
H.1.46	Physical Collocation - Application Cost - Subsequent		$2,236				

Element Summary Report

Study Name:	Florida Collocation - Rev 1
State:	Florida
Scenario:	State Average
Study Type:	TELRIC

Cost Element	Description	Recurring	Non Recurring	Non-Recurring First	Non-Recurring Additional	Non-Recurring Initial	Non-Recurring Subsequent
H.1.46	Physical Collocation - Application Cost - Subsequent - Disconnect Only		$1.20				
H.1.47	Physical Collocation - Space Availability Report per C.O.		$572.66				
H.1.48	Physical Collocation: Co-Carrier Cross-Connect Fiber Cable Support Structure, per Linear Ft. per Cable	$0.0008					
H.1.49	Physical Collocation: Co-Carrier Cross-Connect Copper or Coaxial Cable Support Structure, per Linear Ft. per Cable	$0.0012					
H.1.50	Physical Collocation - 120V, Single Phase Standby Power Cost	$5.26					
H.1.51	Physical Collocation - 240V, Single Phase Standby Power Cost	$10.53					
H.1.52	Physical Collocation - 120V, Three Phase Standby Power Cost	$15.80					
H.1.53	Physical Collocation - 277V, Three Phase Standby Power Cost	$36.47					
H.1.54	Physical Collocation - Security Access - Initial Key, per Key		$23.28				
H.1.55	Physical Collocation - Security Access - Key, Replace Lost or Stolen Key, per Key		$23.28				
H.1.56	Physical Collocation - Copper Entrance Cable Support Structure, Per Each 100 Pairs	$0.1406					
H.1.57	Physical Collocation - Copper Entrance Cable Installation, Per Cable		$1,510				
H.1.57	Physical Collocation - Copper Entrance Cable Installation, Per Cable - Disconnect Only		$43.84				
H.1.58	Physical Collocation - Copper Entrance Cable Installation, Per Each 100 Pairs		$18.56				
H.1.59	Subsequent Application for Co-Carrier Cross Connect per Occurrence		$564.81				
H.1.60	Physical Collocation - Power Reduction Application Fee		$409.50				
H.1.61	Physical Collocation - Administration Only Application Fee		$760.91				
H.1.61	Physical Collocation - Administration Only Application Fee - Disconnect Only		$1.20				
H.1.62	Physical Collocation - Connecting Facility Assignment (CFA) Resend, per CLLI		$79.52				
H.1.63	Physical Collocation - Copper Entrance Cable Installation, per cable (0 Mh to Vault Splice)		$1,195				
H.1.63	Physical Collocation - Copper Entrance Cable Installation, per cable (0 Mh to Vault Splice) - Disconnect Only		$43.84				
H.1.64	Physical Collocation - Copper Entrance Cable Installation, per each 100 pair		$18.56				
H.1.65	Physical Collocation - Fiber Entrance Cable Installation, per cable (0 Mh to Vault Splice)		$994.12				
H.1.65	Physical Collocation - Fiber Entrance Cable Installation, per cable (0 Mh to Vault Splice) - Disconnect Only		$43.84				
H.1.66	Physical Collocation - Fiber Entrance Cable Installation, per each fiber		$7.43				
H.1.71	Physical Collocation: Power per Used Ampere	$10.87					
H.2	VIRTUAL COLLOCATION						
H.2.1	Virtual Collocation - Application Cost		$1,241				
H.2.1	Virtual Collocation - Application Cost - Disconnect Only		$1.20				
H.2.2	Virtual Collocation - Fiber Entrance Cable Installation, per Cable		$1,473				
H.2.2	Virtual Collocation - Fiber Entrance Cable Installation, per Cable - Disconnect Only		$43.84				
H.2.3	Virtual Collocation - Floor Space Per Sq. Ft.	$5.28					
H.2.4	Virtual Collocation - Power per Fused Amp	$7.26					
H.2.5	Virtual Collocation - Cable Support Structure, Per Entrance Cable	$4.54					
H.2.6	Virtual Collocation - 2-wire Cross Connects	$0.0201		$7.32	$5.37		
H.2.6	Virtual Collocation - 2-wire Cross Connects - Disconnect Only			$4.58	$2.71		
H.2.7	Virtual Collocation - 4-wire Cross Connects	$0.0403		$8.00	$5.75		
H.2.7	Virtual Collocation - 4-wire Cross Connects - Disconnect Only			$5.00	$2.69		
H.2.8	Virtual Collocation - DS1 Cross Connects	$0.3786		$7.88	$6.26		
H.2.8	Virtual Collocation - DS1 Cross Connects - Disconnect Only			$1.35	$0.9915		
H.2.9	Virtual Collocation - DS3 Cross Connects	$4.16		$32.40	$31.03		
H.2.9	Virtual Collocation - DS3 Cross Connects - Disconnect Only			$11.15	$10.98		

Element Summary Report

Study Name:	Florida Collocation - Rev 1
State:	Florida
Scenario:	State Average
Study Type:	TELRIC

Cost Element	Description	Recurring	Non Recurring	Non-Recurring First	Non-Recurring Additional	Non-Recurring Initial	Non-Recurring Subsequent
H.2.10	Virtual Collocation - Security Escort - Basic, Per Half Hour			$33.65	$22.05		
H.2.11	Virtual Collocation - Security Escort - Overtime, Per Half Hour			$44.63	$28.89		
H.2.12	Virtual Collocation - Security Escort - Premium, Per Half Hour			$55.62	$35.73		
H.2.16	Virtual Collocation - 2-Fiber Cross Connect	$1.75		$28.26	$25.85		
H.2.16	Virtual Collocation - 2-Fiber Cross Connect - Disconnect Only			$13.78	$11.01		
H.2.17	Virtual Collocation - 4-Fiber Cross Connect	$3.50		$37.92	$35.51		
H.2.17	Virtual Collocation - 4-Fiber Cross Connect - Disconnect Only			$18.20	$15.44		
H.2.20	Virtual Collocation - Maintenance in the CO - Basic, per Half Hour			$54.05	$22.05		
H.2.21	Virtual Collocation - Maintenance in the CO - Overtime, per Half Hour			$72.18	$28.89		
H.2.22	Virtual Collocation - Maintenance in the CO - Premium, per Half Hour			$90.31	$35.73		
H.3	ASSEMBLY POINT						
H.3.1	Assembly Point: 2-Wire Cross Connects	$0.2452		$7.32	$5.37		
H.3.1	Assembly Point: 2-Wire Cross Connects - Disconnect Only			$4.58	$2.71		
H.3.2	Assembly Point: 4-Wire Cross Connects	$0.4903		$8.00	$5.75		
H.3.2	Assembly Point: 4-Wire Cross Connects - Disconnect Only			$5.00	$2.69		
H.3.3	Assembly Point: DS-1 Cross Connects	$7.28		$7.88	$6.26		
H.3.3	Assembly Point: DS-1 Cross Connects - Disconnect Only			$1.35	$0.9915		
H.4	ADJACENT COLLOCATION						
H.4.1	Adjacent Collocation - Space Cost per Sq. Ft.	$0.1666					
H.4.2	Adjacent Collocation - Electrical Facility Cost per Linear Ft.	$4.62					
H.4.3	Adjacent Collocation - 2-Wire Cross-Connects	$0.0194		$7.32	$5.37		
H.4.3	Adjacent Collocation - 2-Wire Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$4.58	$2.71		
H.4.4	Adjacent Collocation - 4-Wire Cross-Connects	$0.0388		$8.00	$5.75		
H.4.4	Adjacent Collocation - 4-Wire Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$5.00	$2.69		
H.4.5	Adjacent Collocation - DS1 Cross-Connects	$0.3708		$7.88	$6.26		
H.4.5	Adjacent Collocation - DS1 Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$1.35	$0.9915		
H.4.6	Adjacent Collocation - DS3 Cross-Connects	$4.14		$32.40	$31.03		
H.4.6	Adjacent Collocation - DS3 Cross-Connects - Disconnect Only			$11.15	$10.98		
H.4.7	Adjacent Collocation - 2-Fiber Cross-Connect	$1.70		$28.26	$25.85		
H.4.7	Adjacent Collocation - 2-Fiber Cross-Connect - Disconnect Only			$13.78	$11.01		
H.4.8	Adjacent Collocation - 4-Fiber Cross-Connect	$3.33		$37.92	$35.51		
H.4.8	Adjacent Collocation - 4-Fiber Cross-Connect - Disconnect Only			$18.20	$15.44		
H.4.9	Adjacent Collocation - Application Cost		$2,763				
H.4.9	Adjacent Collocation - Application Cost - Disconnect Only		$1.02				
H.4.16	Adjacent Collocation - 120V, Single Phase Standby Power Cost per AC Breaker Amp	$5.26					
H.4.17	Adjacent Collocation - 240V, Single Phase Standby Power Cost per AC Breaker Amp	$10.53					
H.4.18	Adjacent Collocation - 120V, Three Phase Standby Power Cost per AC Breaker Amp	$15.80					
H.4.19	Adjacent Collocation - 277V, Three Phase Standby Power Cost per AC Breaker Amp	$36.47					
H.6	Physical Collocation In The Remote Terminal (RT)						
H.6.1	Physical Collocation In The Remote Terminal - Application Fee		$612.23				

Element Summary Report

Study Name:	Florida Collocation - Rev 1
State:	Florida
Scenario:	State Average
Study Type:	TELRIC

Cost Element	Description	Recurring	Non Recurring	First	Non-Recurring Additional	Non-Recurring Initial	Non-Recurring Subsequent
H.6.1	Physical Collocation In The Remote Terminal - Application Fee - Disconnect Only		$270.35				
H.6.2	Physical Collocation In The Remote Terminal - Per Rack/Bay	$154.59					
H.6.3	Physical Collocation In The Remote Terminal - Security Access Key		$23.28				
H.6.4	Physical Collocation in the RT - Space Availability Report per premises requested		$223.91				
H.6.5	Physical Collocation in the RT- Remote Site CLLI Code Request, per CLLI Code Requested		$73.39				
H.7	COLLOCATION CABLE RECORDS						
H.7.1	Collocation Cable Records - per request					$1,515	$973.64
H.7.1	Collocation Cable Records - per request - Disconnect Only					$256.35	$256.35
H.7.2	Collocation Cable Records - VG/DS0 Cable, per cable record					$646.84	$646.84
H.7.2	Collocation Cable Records - VG/DS0 Cable, per cable record - Disconnect Only					$362.41	$362.41
H.7.3	Collocation Cable Records - VG/DS0 Cable, per each 100 pair					$9.11	$9.11
H.7.3	Collocation Cable Records - VG/DS0 Cable, per each 100 pair - Disconnect Only					$10.80	$10.80
H.7.4	Collocation Cable Records - DS1, per T1TIE					$4.52	$4.52
H.7.4	Collocation Cable Records - DS1, per T1TIE - Disconnect Only					$5.35	$5.35
H.7.5	Collocation Cable Records - DS3, per T3TIE					$15.81	$15.81
H.7.5	Collocation Cable Records - DS3, per T3TIE - Disconnect Only					$18.73	$18.73
H.7.6	Collocation Cable Records - Fiber Cable, per Cable Record					$169.96	$169.96
H.7.6	Collocation Cable Records - Fiber Cable, per Cable Record - Disconnect Only					$149.97	$149.97
H.9	COLLOCATION - BRSDD						
H.9.1	Bellsouth Remote Site DLEC Data (BRSDD), per Compact Disc per Central Office		$208.02				

Region		
Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ 16,154,045	$ 506,867	$ 37,656

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
$ 429.00	$ 13.46	$ 442.46

Alabama

Sample of Power Construction for Collocation

CLLI	Power Plant Construction ($$$)	CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	CLEC Requested DC Amps
ALBSALMA	$ 40,700		80
ALBSALMA			30
ALBSALMA			32
ANTNALMT	$ 19,554		120
ANTNALMT			32
ANTNALOX			32
ANYTOWN			46
ANYTOWN			40
BRHMALOX			60
BRHMALOX			30
BRHMALOX			32
BRHMALCH			140
BRHMALCH			60
BRHMALCH			30
BRHMALCH			360
BRHMALCP			30
BRHMALCP			140
BRHMALCP			32
BRHMALEL			30
BRHMALEL			140
BRHMALEL			32
BRHMALEN			30
BRHMALEN			140
BRHMALEN			32
BRHMALEW			30
BRHMALEW			140
BRHMALFS			60
BRHMALFS			30
BRHMALFS			32

Summary

Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ 318,666	$ -	6,467

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
$ 49.27	$ -	$ 49.27

BRHMALHW		100
BRHMALHW		230
BRHMALHW		30
BRHMALHW		31.25
BRHMALMT		60
BRHMALMT		60
BRHMALMT		31.25
BRHMALOM		30
BRHMALOM		46
BRHMALRC		60
BRHMALRC		30
BRHMALRC		31.25
BRHMALVA		60
BRHMALVA		30
BRHMALVA		31.25
BRHMALWL		30
BRHMALWL		32
BSMRALHT		30
BSMRALMA	$ 46,000	140
BSMRALMA		30
BSMRALMA		31.25
DCTRALMA	$ 20,580	22
FRHPALMA		22
GDSDALMT		32
HNVIALLW		22
HNVIALMT	$ 21,979	100
HNVIALMT		22
HNVIALPW	$ 40,247	140
HNVIALPW		22
HNVIALRW		140
HNVIALUN		140
HNVIALUN		22
MOBLALAP		140
MOBLALAP		13
MOBLALAP		22
MOBLALOS	$ 41,200	230
MOBLALOS		13

MOBLALOS		22
MOBLALPR		140
MOBLALPR		22
MOBLALSA		22
MOBLALSE		22
MOBLALSF		22
MOBLALSH		140
MOBLALSH		40
MOBLALSH		13
MOBLALSH		22
MOBLALSK		140
MOBLALSK		60
MOBLALSK		22
MOBLALAZ	$ 25,013	60
MOBLALAZ		20
MOBLALAZ		180
MOBLALAZ		22
MTGMALDA		100
MTGMALDA		32
MTGMALDA		22
MTGMALMT	$ 20,893	100
MTGMALMT		230
MTGMALMT		32
MTGMALMT		22
MTGMALNO	$ 21,700	32
MTGMALNO		22
OPLKALMT	$ 20,800	22
PHCYALMA		140
PHCYALMA		22
PNSNALMA		30
PRVLALMA		32
PRVLALMA		22
TSCLALDH		32
TSCLALDH		22
TSCLALMT		230
TSCLALMT		32
TSCLALMT		22

TSCLALNO

22

AL

Florida

Sample of Power Construction for Collocation

CLLI	Power Plant Construction ($$$)	CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	CLEC Requested DC Amps
BKVLFLJF	$ 21,000		46
BKVLFLJF			23.9
CCBHFLMA	$ 21,000		23.9
COCOFLMA			23.9
COCOFLME	$ 21,000		23.9
DELDFLMA	$ 21,000		23.9
DYBHFLMA	$ 41,430		23.9
DYBHFLOB			23.9
DYBHFLPO	$ 28,000	$ 25,500	598
DYBHFLPO			23.9
EGLLFLBG	$ 69,000		0
FRBHFLFP	$ 21,000		46
FRBHFLFP			40
FTPRFLMA			23.9
FTPRFLMA			31.3
GLBRFLMA			23.9
GLBRFLMC			23.9
GSVLFLMA	$ 1,019,201		230
GSVLFLMA			31
GSVLFLMA			23.9
GSVLFLMA			513
GSVLFLNW	$ 21,000		23.9
HBSDFLMA			23.9
HTISFLMA			23.9
JCBHFLAB			7.11
JCBHFLMA	$ 22,006		46
JCBHFLMA		$ 22,345	40.1
JCBHFLMA			7.11
JCBHFLMA			40

Summary

Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ 11,908,997	$ 380,829	22,585

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
$ 527.29	$ 16.86	$ 544.15

JCBHFLMA			39.6
JCVLFLAR	$	21,000	40.1
JCVLFLAR			33.9335
JCVLFLAR			46
JCVLFLAR			7.11
JCVLFLAR			40
JCVLFLAR			39.6
JCVLFLAR			12
JCVLFLBW	$	21,000	35.44
JCVLFLBW			69.9335
JCVLFLBW			40.1
JCVLFLBW			46
JCVLFLBW			81.11
JCVLFLBW			40
JCVLFLBW			10
JCVLFLBW			72.68
JCVLFLBW			39.6
JCVLFLBW			110.1
JCVLFLBW			12
JCVLFLCL	$	21,000	35
JCVLFLCL			33.9335
JCVLFLCL			46
JCVLFLCL			40.1
JCVLFLCL			7.11
JCVLFLCL			77.6
JCVLFLCL			72.68
JCVLFLCL			40
JCVLFLCL			10
JCVLFLCL			39.6
JCVLFLCL			46.9
JCVLFLFC	$	21,000	40.1
JCVLFLFC			7.11
JCVLFLFC			40
JCVLFLFC			39.6
JCVLFLJT	$	31,399	46
JCVLFLJT			31
JCVLFLJT			40

JCVLFLLF	$	84,000	33.9335
JCVLFLLF			46
JCVLFLLF			40.1
JCVLFLLF			40
JCVLFLLF			39.6
JCVLFLNO	$	41,612	32.241
JCVLFLNO			46
JCVLFLNO			40.1
JCVLFLNO			7.11
JCVLFLNO			31
JCVLFLNO			72.68
JCVLFLNO			40
JCVLFLNO			39.6
JCVLFLOW	$	29,000	40.1
JCVLFLOW			46
JCVLFLOW			40
JCVLFLOW			39.6
JCVLFLRV	$	156,133	30.641
JCVLFLRV			46
JCVLFLRV			40.1
JCVLFLRV			7.11
JCVLFLRV			40
JCVLFLRV			72.68
JCVLFLRV			39.6
JCVLFLSJ	$	145,299	35.44
JCVLFLSJ			33.9335
JCVLFLSJ			46
JCVLFLSJ			40.1
JCVLFLSJ			7.11
JCVLFLSJ			31
JCVLFLSJ			40
JCVLFLSJ			10
JCVLFLSJ			72.68
JCVLFLSJ			39.6
JCVLFLSJ			360
JCVLFLSJ			30
JCVLFLSM	$	155,006	35.44

JCVLFLSM					33.9335
JCVLFLSM					46
JCVLFLSM					40.1
JCVLFLSM					7.11
JCVLFLSM					12
JCVLFLSM					40
JCVLFLSM					10
JCVLFLSM					466
JCVLFLSM					39.6
JCVLFLSM					110.1
JCVLFLSM					30
JCVLFLWC	$	36,340			46
JCVLFLWC					40.1
JCVLFLWC					7.11
JCVLFLWC					40
JCVLFLWC					39.6
LKCYFLMA	$	52,000			23.9
LKMRFLMA	$	42,000			38.4
LKMRFLMA					11.125
LKMRFLMA					15.5
LYHNFLOH					23.9
MDBGFLPM					40
MLBRFLMA	$	165,745			16.27
MLBRFLMA					23.9
MLBRFLMA					130
MLTNFLRA					23.9
MNDRFLAV					46
MNDRFLAV					46
MNDRFLAV					40.1
MNDRFLLO	$	126,373			46
MNDRFLLO					40.1
MNDRFLLO					7.11
MNDRFLLO			$	38,000	72.2
MNDRFLLO					40
MNDRFLLO					12
NSBHFLMA	$	21,000			23.9
ORLDFLAP	$	132,015	$	107,000	102

ORLDFLAP				35
ORLDFLAP				9.5
ORLDFLAP				40.199
ORLDFLAP				3.6
ORLDFLAP				11.125
ORLDFLAP				33.9335
ORLDFLAP				7.11
ORLDFLAP				72.68
ORLDFLAP				40.39
ORLDFLAP				39.6
ORLDFLAP				12
ORLDFLCL	$	256,343		9.5
ORLDFLCL				40.199
ORLDFLCL				11.125
ORLDFLCL				7.11
ORLDFLCL				645
ORLDFLCL				43.08
ORLDFLCL				40.39
ORLDFLCL				72.68
ORLDFLCL				39.6
ORLDFLCL				40
ORLDFLCL				53
ORLDFLCL				110.11
ORLDFLMA	$	76,703		35.44
ORLDFLMA				8
ORLDFLMA			$ 25,684	360
ORLDFLMA				14.70
ORLDFLMA				11.13
ORLDFLMA				81.11
ORLDFLMA				43.08
ORLDFLMA				72.68
ORLDFLMA				12
ORLDFLMA				10
ORLDFLMA				40.2
ORLDFLMA				466
ORLDFLMA				40.39
ORLDFLMA				39.6

ORLDFLMA					40
ORLDFLPC					35.44
ORLDFLPC					8
ORLDFLPC					7.11
ORLDFLPC					11.125
ORLDFLPC					72.68
ORLDFLPC					10
ORLDFLPC					39.6
ORLDFLPH	$	106,492			35.44
ORLDFLPH					8
ORLDFLPH					40.199
ORLDFLPH			$	25,800	76.08
ORLDFLPH					11.125
ORLDFLPH					7.11
ORLDFLPH					72.68
ORLDFLPH					10
ORLDFLPH					40.39
ORLDFLPH					39.6
ORLDFLSA	$	48,076			35.44
ORLDFLSA					40.199
ORLDFLSA			$	32,600	360
ORLDFLSA					8
ORLDFLSA			$	46,900	194.5
ORLDFLSA					11.125
ORLDFLSA					33.9335
ORLDFLSA					72.68
ORLDFLSA					7.11
ORLDFLSA					39.6
ORPKFLMA	$	29,495			46
ORPKFLMA					40.1
ORPKFLMA					7.11
ORPKFLMA					40
ORPKFLRW	$	21,450			7.11
ORPKFLRW					40
OVIDFLCA					40.199
PACEFLPV					23.9
PCBHFLNT					23.9

PLTKFLMA	$	41,000			23.9
PNCYFLCA	$	20,556			23.9
PNCYFLMA	$	380,812			23.9
PNCYFLMA					457.1
PNSCFLBL	$	79,200			30
PNSCFLBL					28
PNSCFLBL					35.44
PNSCFLBL					23.9
PNSCFLFP	$	21,560			35.44
PNSCFLFP					33.9335
PNSCFLFP					23.9
PNSCFLHC					41
PNSCFLHC					23.9
PNSCFLWA	$	196,760			33.9335
PNSCFLWA					23.9
PNSCFLWA					466
PNVDFLMA	$	45,000			7.11
PNVDFLMA					40
PTSLFLMA	$	42,209			31
PTSLFLMA					23.9
PTSLFLSO	$	37,568			23.9
BCRTFLSA	$	146,259			31
SBSTFLMA					23.9
SNFRFLMA	$	85,000			40.199
SNFRFLMA			$	57,000	49.38
STAGFLMA	$	19,124			40.1
STAGFLMA					40
STAGFLMA					23.9
STAGFLSH	$	21,295			40
STAGFLSH					23.9
STAGFLWG					46
STRTFLMA	$	27,142			31
STRTFLMA					23.9
STRTFLMA					40
TTVLFLMA	$	20,727			23.9
VRBHFLMA	$	30,000			23.9

BCRTFLMA	$	131,837	69
BCRTFLMA			11.937
BCTRFLMA			154
BCTRFLMA			31.2
BCRTFLMA			30
BCRTFLMA			17.55
BCRTFLMA			58
BCRTFLMA			11.125
BCRTFLMA			16
BCRTFLMA			19.8
BCRTFLMA			120
BCRTFLMA			39.6
BCRTFLMA			156
BCRTFLBT	$	297,558	31
BCRTFLBT			15.5
BCRTFLBT			58
BCRTFLBT			31.2
BCRTFLBT			30
BCRTFLBT			11.125
FTLDFLCR	$	38,632	58
FTLDFLCR			17.55
FTLDFLCR			120
FTLDFLCR			39.5
FTLDFLCR			31
PMBHFLCS	$	194,399	69
PMBHFLCS			11.937
PMBHFLCS			55
PMBHFLCS			17.55
PMBHFLCS			58
PMBHFLCS			120
PMBHFLCS			110.11
FTLDFLCY	$	128,664	69
FTLDFLCY			13
FTLDFLCY			11.937
FTLDFLCY			128.7
FTLDFLCY			46
FTLDFLCY			58

FTLDFLCY		11.125
FTLDFLCY		17.55
FTLDFLCY		120
FTLDFLCY		88
FTLDFLCY		39.5
FTLDFLCY		30
FTLDFLMR	$ 537,313	69
FTLDFLMR		11.937
FTLDFLMR		174
FTLDFLMR		23.44
FTLDFLMR		55
FTLDFLMR		17.55
FTLDFLMR		40
FTLDFLMR		58
FTLDFLMR		11.125
FTLDFLMR		10
FTLDFLMR		19.8
FTLDFLMR		120
FTLDFLMR		19.25
FTLDFLMR		39.6
FTLDFLMR		297
WPBHFLGA	$ 117,513	15.7
WPBHFLGA		11.125
WPBHFLGA		58
WPBHFLGA		31
WPBHFLGA		156
WPBHFLGA		110.11
WPBHFLGA		31.2
WPBHFLGA		54.4
WPBHFLHH	$ 157,059	112
WPBHFLHH		46
WPBHFLHH		11.937
WPBHFLHH		58
WPBHFLHH		17.55
WPBHFLHH		31
WPBHFLHH		54.4
WPBHFLHH		31.2

FL

WPBHFLHH			30
FTLDFLJA	$	90,187	76.08
FTLDFLJA			119
FTLDFLJA			39.5
HLWDFLPE	$	69,608	69
HLWDFLPE			55
HLWDFLPE			17.55
HLWDFLPE			11.937
HLWDFLPE			58
HLWDFLPE			76.08
HLWDFLPE			20.2
HLWDFLPE			11.125
HLWDFLPE			16
HLWDFLPE			120
HLWDFLPE			86
HLWDFLPE			30
FTLDFLPL	$	175,230	58
FTLDFLPL			11.125
FTLDFLPL			17.55
FTLDFLPL			120
FTLDFLPL			341
FTLDFLPL			39.5
FTLDFLPL			30
BCRTFLSA	$	146,259	31
BCRTFLSA			16
BCRTFLSA			58
BCRTFLSA			31.2
BCRTFLSA			15.5
BCRTFLSA			17.55
FTLDFLSU	$	224,696	69
FTLDFLSU			11.937
FTLDFLSU			39.5
FTLDFLSU			54.4
FTLDFLSU			110.11
HLWDFLWH	$	132,629	69
HLWDFLWH			17.55
HLWDFLWH			11.937

HLWDFLWH		58
HLWDFLWH		76.08
HLWDFLWH		11.125
HLWDFLWH		120
HLWDFLWH		86
HLWDFLWH		30
WPBHFLAN	$ 171,719	112
WPBHFLAN		11.937
WPBHFLAN		11.125
WPBHFLAN		19.8
WPBHFLAN		17.55
WPBHFLAN		31
WPBHFLAN		54.4
WPBHFLAN		31.2
WPBHFLAN		30
WPBHFLAN		53
MIAMFLAP	$ 56,301	7.11
MIAMFLAP		39.6
MIAMFLAE	$ 21,188	39.6
MIAMFLAL	$ 48,024	54.46
NDADFLAC	$ 19,923	110.11
NDADFLAC		39.6
NDADFLAC		54.46
MIAMFLBA	$ 28,000	39.6
MIAMFLBA		54.46
MIAMFLBR	$ 20,095	39.6
MIAMFLBR		54.46
MIAMFLBC	$ 20,009	39.6
MIAMFLBC		78
NDADFLBR	$ 484,221	39.6
NDADFLBR		54.46
MIAMFLCA	$ 20,141	39.6
MIAMFLCA		54.46
MIAMFLDB	$ 171,981	39.6
MIAMFLFL	$ 54,036	39.6
MIAMFLFL		54.46

NDADFLGG	$	213,678	39.6
MIAMFLGR	$	176,389	0
MIAMFLGR	$	468,859	39.6
MIAMFLGR			54.46
MIAMFLHL	$	130,321	39.6
HMSTFLMA	$	26,494	0
MIAMFLIC	$	580,406	54.46
KYWSFLMA	$	26,836	0
MIAMFLME	$	36,899	39.6
MIAMFLNM	$	19,699	39.6
MIAMFLNM			54.46
MIAMFLNS	$	20,108	39.6
MIAMFLNS			54.46
NDADFLOL	$	22,085	39.6
NDADFLOL			54.46
MIAMFLOL	$	40,934	39.6
MIAMFLOL			54.46
MIAMFLPL	$	114,654	39.6
MIAMFLPL	$	731,329	39.6
MIAMFLPL			40
MIAMFLPL	$	465,187	39.6
PRRNFLMA	$	48,123	39.6
MIAMFLPB	$	20,079	39.6
MIAMFLPB			54.46
MIAMFLRR	$	142,437	39.6
MIAMFLSH	$	19,904	39.6
MIAMFLSH			54.46
MIAMFLSO	$	568,147	110.11
MIAMFLSO			39.6
MIAMFLSO			54.46
MIAMFLWD	$	99,000	39.6
MIAMFLWD			54.46
MIAMFLWM	$	19,877	39.6
MIAMFLWM			54.46

Georgia

Sample of Power Construction for Collocation

CLLI	Power Plant Construction ($$$)	CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	CLEC Requested DC Amps

Summary

Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ -	$ -	0

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Kentucky

Sample of Power Construction for Collocation

CLLI	Power Plant Construction ($$$)	CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	CLEC Requested DC Amps
LSVLKYWE	$ 370,670	$ 500	7
LSVLKYWE			40
LSVLKYBM	$ 29,000	$ 1,000	7
LSVLKYBM		$ 656	31.25
LSVLKYSM	$ 21,000	$ 1,000	7
LSVLKYSM		$ 656	31.25
LSVLKYAN	$ 129,502	$ 1,000	7
LSVLKYAN			40
LSVLKYAP	$ 284,019	$ 1,000	81
LSVLKYAP		$ 656	31.25
LSVLKYBM	$ 89,699	$ 1,000	7
LSVLKYBM		$ 656	31.25
LSVLKYBR	$ 146,000	$ 1,000	7
LSVLKYBR		$ 1,312	31.25
LSVLKYSL	$ 21,000	$ 1,500	7
LSVLKYSL			40
LSVLKYVS	$ 21,000	$ 1,000	7
LSVLKYVS			40
LSVLKYFC	$ 21,000	$ 1,000	7
LSVLKYFC			40
LSVLKYJT	$ 177,841	$ 1,000	7
LSVLKYJT			40
LSVLKYHA	$ 20,383	$ 1,500	7
LSVLKYHA			40
FRFTKYMA	$ 103,000		22
GRTWKYMA	$ 38,000		22
GRTWKYMA			31.2
RCMDKYMA	$ 133,000	$ 1,312	22
RCMDKYMA			31.2

Summary

Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ 1,655,244	$ 20,372	800

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
$ 2,069.96	$ 25.48	$ 2,095.44

WNCHKYMA	$ 50,130	$ 2,624	22	
WNCHKYMA			31.2	
WNCHKYMA			23.8	

Louisiana

Sample of Power Construction for Collocation

CLLI	Power Plant Construction ($$$)	CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	CLEC Requested DC Amps
ALXNLAMA	$ 18,504		29.9
ALXNLAMA			39
ALXNLAMA			60
BRSSLAMA			30
BRSSLAMA			29.9
BTRGLAOH	$ 37,510		62
BTRGLAOH			29.9
BTRGLAOH			33.93
BTRGLAOH			31.2
BTRGLAGW	$ 50,386		82.5
BTRGLAGW			30
BTRGLAGW			16.27
BTRGLAGW			4.8
BTRGLAGW			360
BTRGLAGW			73
BTRGLAGW			31.2
BTRGLAIS	$ 19,900		33.93
BTRGLAMA	$ 108,872		62
BTRGLAMA			4.8
BTRGLAMA			255
BTRGLAMA			33.93
BTRGLAMA			31.2
BTRGLASW			60
BTRGLAWN	$ 42,000		33.93
BTRGLAWN			31.2
BTRGLASB	$ 35,000		30
BTRGLASB			62.5
BTRGLASB			33.93
BTRGLASB			40

Summary

Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ 1,864,760	$ -	6,657

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
$ 280.10	$ -	$ 280.10

BTRGLASB			31.2
BTRGLASB	$	18,409	29.9
CVTNLAMA	$	71,000	7.11
CVTNLAMA			31.2
HOUMLAMA	$	50,200	255
LKCHLAMW	$	18,504	4.8
KNNRLABR	$	67,000	7.11
KNNRLABR			46
KNNRLABR			60
KNNRLABR			31.2
KNNRLAHN	$	21,000	60
KNNRLAHN			7.11
KNNRLAHN			46
KNNRLAHN			31.2
LFYTLAMA	$	63,688	16.1
LFYTLAMA			30
LFYTLAMA			72.5
LFYTLAMA			16.27
LFYTLAMA			230
LFYTLAVM	$	50,386	7.1
LFYTLAVM			30
LFYTLAVM			72
LFYTLAVM			60
LKCHLADT	$	31,882	62
LKCHLADT			4.8
LKCHLADT			230
LKCHLAUN	$	31,882	62
LKCHLAUN			11.7
LKCHLAUN			60
MNVLLAMA	$	35,000	7.11
MNVLLAMA			31.2
MONRLADS	$	31,143	107
MONRLAMA	$	18,504	29.9
MONRLAMA			107
MRCYLAIN	$	41,000	255
NWIBLAMA	$	55,000	255
NWORLAAR	$	20,000	7.11

NWORLAAR		46
NWORLAAR		31.2
NWORLABM	$ 20,000	62.5
NWORLABM		31.2
NWORLACA	$ 55,000	7.11
NWORLACM		7.11
NWORLACM		46
NWORLACM		31.2
NWORLAFR	$ 20,000	46
NWORLAFR		31.2
NWORLAMA	$ 175,368	96.5
NWORLAMA		76
NWORLAMA		16.27
NWORLAMA		81
NWORLAMA		46
NWORLAMA		11
NWORLAMA		31.2
NWORLAMC	$ 21,000	60
NWORLAMC		7.11
NWORLAMC		46
NWORLAMC		31.2
NWORLAMR	$ 40,000	7.11
NWORLAMR		46
NWORLAMR		31.2
NWORLAMT	$ 65,184	62.5
NWORLAMT		13.27
NWORLAMT		7.11
NWORLAMT		46
NWORLAMT		480
NWORLAMT		11
NWORLAMT		31.2
NWORLASC	$ 70,000	7.11
NWORLASC		40
NWORLASC		31.2
NWORLASK	$ 71,000	60
NWORLASK		7.11
NWORLASK		46

NWORLASK		31.2
NWORLASW	$ 84,766	13.27
NWORLASW		255
NWORLASW		7.11
NWORLASW		46
NWORLASW		31.2
SHPTLABS	$ 59,509	29.9
SHPTLABS		33.93
SHPTLACL		33.93
SHPTLAHD	$ 37,510	29.9
SHPTLAHD		33.93
SHPTLAQB	$ 39,000	33.93
SHPTLASG	$ 50,568	29.9
SHPTLASG		33.93
SHPTLAMA	$ 21,000	33.93
SHPTLAMA	$ 37,085	29.9
SLIDLAMA	$ 61,000	7.11
SLIDLAMA		46
SLIDLAMA		31.2
SLPHLAMA		29.9

Mississippi

Sample of Power Construction for Collocation

CLLI	Power Plant Construction ($$$)	CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	CLEC Requested DC Amps

Summary

Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ -	$ -	0

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

North Carolina

Sample of Power Construction for Collocation

CLLI	Power Plant Construction ($$$)	CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	CLEC Requested DC Amps
WNSLNCFI	$ 24,000		20
WNSLNCFI		$ 14,393	60
WNSLNCFI			36
GNBONCAS	$ 132,004		45
GNBONCAS			20
GNBONCAS		$ 26,641	76
GNBONCAS			33.93
CHRLNCRE	$ 40,804	$ 29,239	76
CHRLNCRE			3
CHRLNCBO	$ 39,000	$ 10,500	180
CHRLNCBO		$ 10,500	180
SLBRNCMA	$ 19,500		7
SLBRNCMA		$ 14,393	0
CHRLNCUN	$ 13,500		3
CPHLNCRO	$ 19,500		15

Summary

Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ 288,308	$ 105,666	755

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
$ 381.90	$ 139.97	$ 521.87

South Carolina

Sample of Power Construction for Collocation

CLLI	Power Plant Construction ($$$)	CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	CLEC Requested DC Amps
CLMASCDF	$ 39,690		73
CLMASCDF			50
CLMASCSA	$ 78,380		73
CLMASCSA			195

Summary

Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ 118,070	$ -	391

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
$ 301.97	$ -	$ 301.97

Tennessee

Sample of Power Construction for Collocation

CLLI	Power Plant Construction ($$$)	CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	CLEC Requested DC Amps

Summary

Total Power Plant Construction ($$$)	Total CLEC Dedicated Cable ($$$)	Total CLEC Requested DC Amps
$ -	$ -	0

Power Construction $$$ / Amp		
Plant Only	Cable Only	Total
#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

STATE	AVG COST PER SQUARE FOOT	WEIGHTING	ADJUSTED AVG COST
Alabama	$110	0.094	$10.34
Florida	$198	0.306	$60.57
Georgia	$69	0.133	$9.18
Kentucky	$33	0.032	$1.05
Louisiana	$105	0.092	$9.62
Mississippi	$11	0.024	$0.26
North Carolina	$116	0.133	$15.42
South Carolina	$136	0.067	$9.15
Tennessee	$46	0.119	$5.51
	$92		**$121.11**

Note: Weighting based on number of firm orders received between April and November 1999.

UNIT COSTS:

cage cost set fee	$7,071
barrier wall 1hr cost/ft	$100
barrier wall wire cost/ft	$60
card reader	$14,237
card reader - pad only	$2,640

Data Points =	123
FOs 4/1-8/31/99	594
Percentage =	21%

Note: Many data points represent more than one collocator/firm order, thus percentage above is low.

PROJECT I.D.	PROJECT #WBS#	NUMBER OF CAGES	BARRIER WALL (Lin. Ft.)	COMMON AREA (Square Ft.)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTRUCTION	ASBESTOS COST	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
ALVLMA.DLT	734808-82651	0	0	252	0	$4,662	$15,528	$948	$21,138	$21,138	$83.88
OPLKALMT.DLT	734808-82671	0	0	100	1	$6,571	$30,781	$754	$38,106	$23,869	$238.69
AUBNALMA.DLT	734808-82591	0	0	120	0	$7,970	$16,096	$874	$24,940	$24,940	$207.83
BRHMALCH.DLT	734808-85931	0	0	243	1	$189	$18,533	$0	$18,722	$16,082	$66.18
BRHMALEL.DLT	734808-86781	0	0	53	1	$4,427	$15,553	$0	$19,980	$5,743	$108.36
BRHMALEN.AKJ	734808-87961	1	0	325	0	$4,558	$16,250	$0	$20,808	$13,737	$42.27
BRHMALEW.DLT	734808-85941	0	0	414	1	$3,781	$43,762	$0	$47,543	$33,306	$80.45
BRHMALWE.DLT	734808-86771	0	0	320	0	$818	$12,442	$0	$13,260	$13,260	$41.44
HNVLALUN.DLT	734808-83851	0	0	138	0	$662	$9,625	$0	$10,287	$10,287	$74.54
MOBLALSF.DLT	734808-82431	0	0	220	0	$7,048	$27,332	$0	$34,380	$34,380	$156.27
BRHMALFS.ATX	734808-82581	0	34	553	0	$29,424	$88,579	$0	$118,003	$114,603	$207.24

PROJECT I.D.	PROJECT #WBS#	NUMBER OF CAGES	BARRIER WALL (Lin. Ft.)	COMMON AREA (Square Ft.)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTRUCTION	ASBESTOS COST	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
MTGMALDA.DLT	734808-82411	1	0	200	0	$5,691	$19,966	$0	$25,657	$18,586	$92.93
TSCLALDH.NKH	734808-87121	0	0	400	1	$3,637	$21,593	$0	$25,230	$10,993	$27.48

WIRE MESH WALL

Average **$109.81**

1 HOUR WALL

PROJECT ID	PROJECT ID & WBS #	# OF CAGES	# OF RACKS	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COLLOCATION SQ FT	COMMON AREA (SQ FT)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTR	ASBESTOS COSTS	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
JCBHFLMA.DLT.01	734808-81291	2	1	21.5	308	887	1	$27,294	$74,565	$1,360	$103,219	$73,550	$82.92
JCVLFLCL.ATX.02	734808-80141	1	0	0	400	520	0	$17,751	$34,209	$0	$51,960	$44,889	$86.33
JCVLFLCL.FDW.03	732822-25751	1	0	0	200	260	0	$20,181	$30,105	$0	$50,286	$43,215	$166.21
ORLDFLCL.FDW.03	734808-80811	1	0	98	200	260	1	$33,571	$31,016	$0	$64,587	$37,399	$143.84
ORLDFLCL.ICF.01	732822-22941	1	0	96	300	399	1	$32,759	$51,734	$0	$84,493	$57,425	$143.92
ORLDFLCL.LVC.01	732822-25741	1	0	263	400	2475	1	$44,572	$124,270	$1,183	$170,025	$132,937	$53.71
ORLDFLMA.FDW.05	732822-25921	1	0	0	200	260	0	$27,431	$54,736	$0	$82,167	$75,096	$288.83
PNVDFLMA.DLT.01	734808-81571	0	1	0	8	225	0	$15,949	$36,463	$0	$52,412	$52,412	$232.94
MIAMFLWM.NVE.02	734808-80101	1		0	100	305	0	$20,389	$40,761	$0	$61,150	$54,079	$177.31
MIAMFLBA.NVE.03	734808-82031	4		0	100	310	0	$18,074	$75,432	$0	$93,506	$65,222	$210.39
MIAMFLBA.FIM.01	734808-80931	1		0	100	300	0	$37,393	$68,407	$0	$105,800	$98,729	$329.10

PROJECT ID	PROJECT ID & WBS #	# OF CAGES	# OF RACKS	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COLLOCATION SQ FT	COMMON AREA (SQ FT)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTR	ASBESTOS COSTS	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
MIAMFLSO.NVE.01	734808-82051	1			115	130	0	$11,881	$25,310	$2,047	$39,238	$32,167	$247.44
MIAMFLSO.FIM.01	734808-81041	4		0	100	130	0	$27,504	$53,943	$0	$81,447	$53,163	$408.95
MIAMFLBR.NVE.01	734808-80181	2		0	400	520	0	$18,062	$94,171	$0	$112,233	$98,091	$188.64
PRRNFLMA.AKJ.07	734808-81741	1		0	100	690	0	$14,452	$135,674	$0	$150,126	$143,055	$207.33
MIAMFLFL.AKJ.02	734808-82201	1		0	100	130	0	$13,459	$14,480	$1,738	$29,677	$22,606	$173.89
MIAMFLBA.AKJ.04	734808-86081	1		0	100	130	0	$17,144	$15,585	$0	$32,729	$25,658	$197.37
MIAMFLAP.OVC.03	734808-81501	1			100	130	0	$13,323	$21,409	$2,076	$36,808	$29,737	$228.75
MIAMFLAP.AKJ.02	734808-81581	1			100	130	0	$11,550	$21,230	$0	$32,780	$25,709	$197.76
MIAMFLAP.ATX.01	734808-80281	1			400	1200	0	$31,177	$121,019	$0	$152,196	$145,125	$120.94
MIAMFLWD.AKJ.02	734808-81651	1			100	130	1	$17,015	$29,624	$0	$46,639	$25,331	$194.85
PRRNFLMA.NVE.03	734808-82021	1			100	130	0	$10,668	$25,154	$0	$35,822	$28,751	$221.16

PROJECT ID	PROJECT ID & WBS #	# OF CAGES	# OF RACKS	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COLLOCATION SQ FT.	COMMON AREA (SQ FT)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTR.	ASBESTOS COSTS	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
PRRNFLMA.ATX.01	734808-83271	1			400	520	0	$19,470	$86,020	$0	$105,490	$98,419	$189.27
MIAMFLBR.FIM.01	734808-80921	1			100	1680	1	$36,405	$142,162	$1,042	$179,609	$158,301	$94.23
MIAMFLBC.AKJ.02	734808-81731	1			100	1809	0	$22,725	$195,235	$0	$217,960	$210,889	$116.58
MIAMFLSO.AKJ.05	734808-81841	1			100	130	0	$12,906	$22,402	$0	$35,308	$28,237	$217.21
MIAMFLWM.FIM.03	734808-80631	1			100	305	0	$19,092	$20,712	$0	$39,804	$32,733	$107.32
MIAMFLWM.ACI.04	734808-81961	1			100	305	0	$19,344	$21,217	$0	$40,561	$33,490	$109.80
MIAMFLFL.FIM.02	734808-81641	1			100	130	0	$9,318	$14,083	$0	$23,401	$16,330	$125.62
FTLDFLJA.FIM.06	734808-82081	1		5.5	100	1,640		$14,264	$78,951	$0	$93,215	$85,814	$52.33
PMBHFLCS.OVC.03	732822-25111				100	130		$24,558	$38,614	$3,452	$66,624	$66,624	$512.49
PMBHFLFE.AKJ.03	734808-82221	1			100	130		$12,528	$42,730	$1,208	$56,466	$49,395	$379.96
PMBHFLMA.ATX.02	734808 81011	1			400	1,668		$32,359	$140,133	$0	$172,492	$165,421	$99.17

PROJECT ID	PROJECT ID & WBS #	# OF CAGES	# OF RACKS	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COLLOCATION SQ FT	COMMON AREA (SQ FT)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTR.	ASBESTOS COSTS	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
HLWDFLPE.ATX.01	734808 83101	1			400	520		$19,607	$42,248	$0	$61,855	$54,784	$105.35
HLWDFLPE.AKJ.07	734808 86061	1			100	130		$18,685	$33,833	$0	$52,518	$45,447	$349.59
HLWDFLPE.OVC.04	732822-25101				100	130		$19,124	$27,412	$253	$46,789	$46,789	$359.91
											Average		**$198**

PROJECT I.D.	PROJECT # WBS	# OF CAGES	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COMMON AREA (Square Ft.)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTRUCTION	ASBESTOS COST	COMPLETE TOTAL CONSTRUCTION	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
ALPRGAMA.NVE	734808-82311	2	0	273	0	$7,950	$30,221	$0	$38,171	$24,029	$88.02
ATLNGAAD.NVE	732822-26051	3	0	680	1	$12,674	$51,656	$0	$64,330	$28,880	$42.47
ATLNGABH.AKJ	734808-82391	3	0	589	1	$11,866	$41,842	$0	$53,708	$18,258	$31.00
ATLNGACS.AKJ	734808-80451	4	0	1,000	0	$15,753	$39,414	$0	$55,167	$26,883	$26.88
ATLNGAEP.AKJ	732822-25761	2	0	500	0	$11,026	$23,470	$0	$34,496	$20,354	$40.71
ATLNGAGR.AKJ	734808-83491	1	78	1,002	1	$16,812	$106,087	$0	$122,899	$93,791	$93.60
ATLNGAPP.ATX	734808-80411	3	0	1,064	0	$30,654	$52,408	$0	$83,062	$61,849	$58.13
ATLNGATH.ATX	734808-80081	3	0	962	0	$13,490	$35,155	$0	$48,645	$27,432	$28.52
ATLNGAWD.OVC	734808-80761	2	10	550	0	$12,433	$29,277	$0	$41,710	$26,968	$49.03
CHMBGAMA.ATX	734808-82821	2	23	2,002	1	$23,947	$110,705	$0	$134,652	$104,893	$52.39
CHMBGAMA.OVC	732822-25151	1	0	500	0	$13,301	$28,942	$0	$42,243	$35,172	$70.34
CLMBGAMT.CJY	732822-25551	3	0	1,323	1	$31,893	$255,458	$0	$287,351	$263,498	$199.17
CMNGGAMA.NVE	732822-24771	4	60	1,200	1	$17,696	$101,158	$0	$118,854	$72,733	$60.61

PROJECT I.D	PROJECT # WBS	# OF CAGES	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COMMON AREA (Square Ft.)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTRUCTION	ASBESTOS COST	COMPLETE TOTAL CONSTRUCTION	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
CNYRGAMA.OVC	732822-25161	4	10	1,493	1	$20,007	$75,276	$0	$95,283	$52,138	$34.92
CRTNGAMA.OVC	734808-81911	3	0	930	1	$27,655	$235,268	$0	$262,923	$239,070	$257.06
CRVLGAMA.NVE	734808-80781	2	0	695	1	$13,593	$49,465	$0	$63,058	$34,679	$49.90
CVTNGAMT.NVE	734808-82381	2	23	455	1	$22,653	$60,942	$6,157	$89,752	$59,993	$131.85
DGVLGAMA.OVC	732822-25771	3	8	770	1	$21,583	$67,814	$0	$89,397	$53,467	$69.44
DLTHGAHS.OVC	732822-25851	2	0	417	0	$16,860	$42,602	$0	$59,462	$45,320	$108.68
GRFNGAMA.DLT	734808-81921	3	0	924	1	$9,871	$50,638	$0	$60,509	$25,059	$27.12
JNBOGAMA.AFY	734808-81891	2	0	855	0	$8,282	$26,032	$0	$34,314	$20,172	$23.59
LGVLGACS.OVC	732822-25571	0	29	322	1	$18,554	$54,482	$0	$73,036	$57,089	$177.30
LLBNGAMA.NVE	734808-82321	5	24	1,124	0	$21,252	$70,719	$1,417	$93,388	$56,569	$50.33
LRVLGAOS.AKJ	734808-80521	4	0	800	0	$13,064	$29,519	$0	$42,583	$14,299	$17.87
MRTTGAMA.OVC	732822-25171	2	0	1,102	0	$21,910	$22,523	$0	$44,433	$30,291	$27.49
NRCRGAMA.NVE	734808-82181	5	0	1,128	1	$11,097	$47,391	$0	$58,488	$20,493	$18.17

PROJECT I.D.	PROJECT # WBS	# OF CAGES	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COMMON AREA (Square Ft.)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTRUCTION	ASBESTOS COST	COMPLETE TOTAL CONSTRUCTION	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
NWNNGAMA.OVC	732822-25561	4	0	1,304	1	$24,153	$106,991	$14,242	$145,386	$114,462	$87.78
PANLGAMA.OVC	732822-25811	2	0	1,547	0	$8,221	$27,302	$0	$35,523	$21,381	$13.82
RSWLGAMA.OVC	732822-25961	3	38	755	0	$17,929	$74,183	$8,943	$101,055	$77,562	$102.73
SMYRGAMA.AKJ	734808-80491	1	0	255	0	$7,433	$18,526	$0	$25,959	$18,888	$74.07
SNMTGALR.OVC	732822-25901	3	61	826	0	$17,003	$51,724	$0	$68,727	$43,842	$53.08
TUKRGAMA.OVC	732822-25951	3	0	937	0	$19,737	$63,827	$0	$83,564	$62,351	$66.54
WDSTGACR.AFY	734808-81901	2	0	605	0	$9,152	$36,018	$0	$45,170	$31,028	$51.29
									Average		**$69.21**

Card Reader pad added

1 HOUR WALL

PROJECT I.D.	PROJECT #	# OF CAGES	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COMMON AREA (Square Ft.)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTRUCTION	ASBESTOS	COMPLETE TOTAL CONSTRUCTION	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
LSVLKYAP.BWI	734808 80901	1	0	130	1	$4,258	$23,401	$0	$27,660	$6,352	$48.86
LSVLKYJT.AKJ	734808 87191	0	0	332	0	$2,730	$2,904	$0	$5,634	$5,634	$16.97

Average **$32.92**

PROJECT ID	COLLOCATOR	PROJECT ID & WBS #	# OF CAGES	# OF RACKS	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WAL	COLLOCATION SQ FT	COMMON AREA (SQ FT)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTR	ASBESTOS COSTS	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
ALXNLAMA	LUW	734808-83981	1	0	9.5	200	413	0	$12,480	$19,923	$0	$32,403	$24,762	$59.96
BRSSLAMA	LUW	734808-85461	1	0	28	206	268	0	$8,964	$26,933	$0	$35,897	$27,146	$101.37
MONRLAMA	LUW	734808-84121	1	0	31	200	1140	0	$16,198	$82,737	$0	$98,935	$90,004	$78.95
SHPTLABS	LUW	734808-86021	1	0	25	180	380	1	$4,473	$117,403	$0	$121,876	$99,068	$260.71
SHPTLAMA	LUW	734808-84131	1	0	0	200	993	0	$12,466	$48,324	$0	$60,790	$53,719	$54.10
SHPTLASG	LUW	734808-85481	1	0	20	200	310	1	$6,603	$39,133	$0	$45,736	$23,228	$74.93

Average **$105.00**

PROJECT ID	PROJECT ID & WBS #	# OF CAGES	# OF RACKS	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WAL	COLLOCATION SQ FT	COMMON AREA (SQ FT)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTR	ASBESTOS COSTS	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
JCSNMSCP.DLT.01	734808-83861	0		68	5.4	543	0	$4,738	$6,817	$0	$11,555	$7,475	$13.77
BILXMSED.KMM.01	734808-86591	1		0	240	1113	0	$2,381	$9,665	$0	$12,046	$4,975	$4.47
GLPTMSTS.KMM.01	734808-86571	0		15.7	200	917	0	$1,803	$7,246	$0	$9,049	$8,107	$8.84
BILXMSMA.KMM.01	734808-86581	1		0	200	341	0	$2,321	$10,304	$0	$12,625	$5,554	$16.29

Average **$10.84**

PROJECT ID	PROJECT ID & WBS #	# OF CAGES	# OF RACKS	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COLLOCATION SQ FT	COMMON AREA (SQ FT)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTR	ASBESTOS COSTS	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
CARYNCCE.AKJ.04	734808-81421	2			200	641	0	$12,248	$62,615	$0	$74,863	$60,721	$94.73
CARYNCWS.AKJ.02	734808-81551	1			100	338	1	$8,791	$76,861	$0	$85,652	$64,344	$190.37
CHRLNCSH.ATX.01A	734808-82841	2			600	1518	0	$13,252	$57,127	$0	$70,379	$56,237	$37.05
RLGHNCGL.ATX.01	734808-83551	1			400	2400	0	$21,691	$150,659	$0	$172,350	$165,279	$68.87
CPHLNCRO.AKJ.03	734808-81451	3			300	390	0	$9,260	$15,629	$0	$24,889	$3,676	$9.43
CPHLNCRO.ATX.01	734808-83451	1			357	357	0	$12,913	$35,374	$0	$48,287	$41,216	$115.45
GNBONCAS.ATX.01	734808-83441	5			800	1040	0	$19,030	$74,976	$0	$94,006	$58,651	$56.40
RLGHNCGL.AKJ.04	734808-81431	4			400	494	0	$10,172	$39,354	$0	$49,526	$21,242	$43.00
RLGHNCJO.AKJ.03	734808-81801	2			200	260	0	$8,914	$36,046	$0	$44,960	$30,818	$118.53

PROJECT ID	PROJECT ID & WBS #	# OF CAGES	# OF RACKS	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COLLOCATION SQ FT	COMMON AREA (SQ FT)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTR	ASBESTOS COSTS	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
CHRLNCLP.DLT.01	734808-85121		3		8	265	0	$4,193	$36,201	$0	$40,394	$40,394	$152.43
RLGHNCHO.ATX.01	734808-83541	2	1		587	743	0	$24,022	$261,938	$0	$285,960	$271,818	$365.84

Average **$115.74**

PROJECT I.D.	PROJECT #WBS#	NUMBER OF CAGES	BARRIER WALL (Lin. Ft.)	COMMON AREA (Square Ft.)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTRUCTION	ASBESTOS COST	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
CHTNSCDP.DLT	734808 85601	0	0	770	0	$12,473	$53,053		$65,526	$65,526	$85.10
CHTNSCDT.CJY	734808 82441	3	105	2086	0	$26,365	$250,364		$276,729	$245,016	$117.46
CHTNSCNO.DLT	734808 80351	2	70	760	1	$25,925	$219,632		$245,557	$210,178	$276.55
CHTNSCWA.KMM	734808 84521	1	94	1660	0	$10,586	$138,151		$148,737	$132,266	$79.68
CLMASCSA.DLT	734808 80121	0	32	290	1	$19,052	$58,124		$77,176	$61,019	$210.41
CLMASCSW.KMM	734808 84511	1	0	615	0	$8,706	$9,014		$17,720	$10,649	$17.32
SPBGSCMA.DLT	734808 80111	2	80	1272	0	$23,804	$305,954	$14,082	$343,840	$321,698	$252.91
SPGCSCWV.KMM	734808 84541	1	0	1008	0	$30,761	$25,980		$56,741	$49,670	$49.28

WIRE MESH WALL

Average **$136.09**

1 HOUR WALL

PROJECT I.D.	PROJECT #	# OF CAGES	LINEAR FT. BARRIER WALL	COMMON AREA (Square Ft.)	CARD READER	TOTAL COST DESIGN	TOTAL COST CONSTRUCTIO	ASBESTOS COST	TOTAL COST	ADJUSTED TOTAL COST (LESS FIXED RATES)	ADJUSTED COST PER SQUARE FOOT
KNVLTNBE.BWI	734808-85801	0	0	300	1	$9,449	$22,477	$0	$31,926	$17,689	$58.96
KNVLTNWH.BWI	734808-85831	0	0	420	0	$2,525	$2,144	$0	$4,669	$4,669	$11.12
MMPHTNGT.BWI	734808-85501	0	0	190	0	$6,273	$9,147	$0	$15,420	$15,420	$81.16
MMPHTNGT.AKJ	734808-88411	1	0	225	0	$3,104	$11,124	$0	$14,228	$7,157	$31.81
MMPHTNMA.BWI	734808-80911	6	0	1980	0	$13,082	$121,277	$0	$134,359	$91,933	$46.43
MMPHTNMT.BWI	734808-85871	0	0	300	0	$4,058	$7,563	$0	$11,621	$11,621	$38.74
MMPHTNSL.BWI	734808-85521	1	0	946	0	$4,039	$12,107	$0	$16,146	$9,075	$9.59
NSVLTNIN.AKJ	734808-88381	1	0	225	0	$3,440	$21,351	$0	$24,791	$17,720	$78.76
NSVLTNMC.BWI	734808-83431	2	34	584	0	$6,493	$27,925	$0	$34,418	$18,236	$31.23
OKRGTNMT.DSE	734808-88721	0	0	200	0	$3,278	$11,652	$0	$14,930	$14,930	$74.65

Average **$46.24**