

ORIGINAL
RECEIVED FASO
C. JAN 28 AN IO: 48
COMMISSION
CLERK

January 26, 2004

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

via Overnight Mail

Re: Docket No. 030851-TP Implementation of Requirements Arising from FCC Triennial UNE Review: Local Circuit Switching for Mass Market Customers

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed please find an original and seven (7) copies of FDN Communications Prefiled Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael P. Gallagher.

If you have any questions regarding the enclosed, please call me at 407-835-0460.

Sincerely,

Matthew Feil

LOCAL

FDN Communications

General Counsel

AUS CAF CMP COM 5±1 CTR ECR SCL)PC IMS TEC TH

LONG DISTANCE

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Implementation of requirements arising) Docket No. 030851-T	P
from Federal Communications Commission)	
triennial UNE review: Local Circuit Switching)	
for Mass Market Customers.)	
)	

PREFILED SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

MICHAEL P. GALLAGHER

SUBMITTED BY:

FDN COMMUNICATIONS

Filed January 28, 2004

1	Q. I lease state your name and address.
2	A. My name is Michael P. Gallagher. My business address is 390 North
3	Orange Avenue, Suite 2000, Orlando, Florida, 32801.
4	Q. Are you the same Michael P. Gallagher who provided rebuttal
5	testimony in this proceeding?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony in this
8	proceeding?
9	A. The purpose of my surrebuttal is to address the supplemental rebuttal
10	filed by FCCA witness Gillan on January 22, 2004, and briefly comment on
11	certain aspects of the rebuttal testimony of the BellSouth and Verizon
12	witnesses regarding batch processing.
13	Q. On pages 2 through 5 of his supplemental rebuttal and in
14	Confidential Exhibit No (JPG-10), FCCA witness Gillan alleges that
15	BellSouth's named trigger companies are not "actively" providing
16	service to the mass market and do not have sufficient market share to
17	justify a finding of nonimpairment for local circuit switching. Do you
18	agree with Mr. Gillan?
19	A. I do not believe the FDN/Mpower numbers Mr. Gillan used are what
20	he says they are or show what he claims they show. Further, as I explained in
21	my rebuttal testimony, FDN is a trigger company under the TRO and the

embellishments witnesses like Mr. Gillan suggest the Commission should make to the trigger tests of the TRO are unwarranted.

Mr. Gillan supplemental rebuttal was filed January 22 and surrebuttal in this case was due on January 28. The FCCA did provide FDN with the FDN/Mpower numbers included in Mr. Gillan's supplemental exhibit.

However, prior to filing this surrebuttal, FDN had not obtained a detailed explanation of what is included in the confidential data Mr. Gillan says he relied on in arriving at those numbers, namely BellSouth's responses to Item No. 3 of an AT&T Subpoena and AT&T Interrogatory No. 125. Once an explanation of the underlying data is received and reviewed, FDN may supplement this surrebuttal testimony. Therefore, while FDN is without the benefit of knowing precisely what data BellSouth provided AT&T, FDN can regardless maintain that the confidential data Mr. Gillan reports for FDN/Mpower in his supplemental rebuttal is not what Mr. Gillan says it is.

Mr. Gillan reports and relies on numbers for "In-service UNE Loops." But Mr. Gillan's numbers for FDN/Mpower cannot be reconciled with what FDN reported to the PSC for FDN/Mpower in FDN's confidential response to the staff's data request; and the figures in FDN's response to the data request reflect what FDN knows to be correct. As I stated in my rebuttal, FDN serves approximately two-thirds of the total UNE-L loops BellSouth witness Ruscilli reported in his direct testimony — more than three times the number Mr. Gillan reports for FDN in his supplemental rebuttal. Considering

1	that the information Mr. Gillan cites for FDN is not correct, the rest of his
2	analysis and conclusions are likewise probably incorrect.
3	In any case, as I indicated in my rebuttal, Mr. Gillan's arguments (and
4	other CLEC witness arguments) that trigger companies must meet additional
5	criteria, such as meeting unspecified growth criteria to be "actively"
6	providing service or meeting some kind of threshold market share criteria, are
7	not appropriate considerations under the TRO.
8	Q. BellSouth witness Ainsworth states on page 3, lines $11-14$, and on
9	page 11, lines $17-18$, of his rebuttal that BellSouth designated the batch
10	hot cut process to convert UNE-P arrangements "given the
11	predominance of UNE-P arrangements" and because the TRO more or
12	less intended the batch process only for UNE-P conversions. Does FDN
13	agree?
14	A. No. As I mentioned in my rebuttal testimony, a batch process is defined
15	in the TRO rules as:
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	[A] process by which the incumbent LEC simultaneously migrates two or more loops from one carrier's local circuit switch to another carrier's local circuit switch, giving rise to operational and economic efficiencies not available when migrating loops from one carrier's local circuit switch to another carrier's local circuit switch on a line-by-line basis.
23	(Emphasis added.) The rule does not restrict batch processing to one-time
24	conversions from UNE-P to UNE-L. If the FCC meant for the state

commissions to approve in 9 months a batch process just for one-time UNE-P
conversions, the FCC could have easily said so in the rule, but it did not.
Instead, the FCC said that if the state commissions deem a batch process
necessary to alleviate impairment, then the state commissions have to
approve in 9 months a batch process as stated in the rule – a process that must
encompass cutovers from the ILEC's to a UNE-L CLEC.

Q. Do BellSouth and Verizon take consistent positions on the question of which services must be eligible for batch processing?

A. No, they do not. Verizon's batch proposal, though falling short in other respects, at least recognizes that ILEC-to-CLEC UNE-L cuts are required to be eligible for batch processing, consistent with the TRO. In the Verizon Panel's rebuttal testimony on page 9, lines 22 – 25, the Panel acknowledges, "Verizon's batch hot cut process . . . will govern the 'everyday' conversions of customers from Verizon to a CLEC, if requested by the CLEC, in addition to the transition of the embedded base of UNE-P to UNE-L." By contrast, BellSouth's batch process covers only one-time conversions from UNE-P to UNE-L, and therefore falls short of the TRO requirement. So, if the Commission finds that a batch process is necessary, BellSouth's proposal fails to comply from the start.

Q. Verizon and BellSouth persist in defending their batch proposals in their rebuttal cases. What must the Commission consider in establishing a batch process?

1	A. The Commission should consider the comments above and those I
2	mentioned in my rebuttal. If the Commission approves a batch process, the
3	Commission will have done so to alleviate sources of impairment and to
4	improve hot cut efficiencies. So, for example, a CLEC could have the option
5	of coordinating/designating due dates and times for multiple orders in the
6	same CO without extended intervals. If a CLEC had 10 orders for a given
7	CO and wanted them all worked on one day within a set time period, the
8	CLEC should be able to do so. And, since the ILEC would work a batch of
9	orders at one time in one CO, redundant labor costs associated with first loop
10	NRCs should be reduced, and, in particular, order coordination charges for
11	the orders in the batch should be significantly reduced.
11	the orders in the batch should be significantly reduced. Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
12	Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
12 13	Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
12 13 14	Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
12 13 14 15	Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
12 13 14 15 16	Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Docket 030851-TP

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was sent by e-mail and regular mail to the persons listed below, other than those marked with an (*) who have been sent a copy via overnight mail, this 27th day of agreement, 2004.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
D. Lackey/M. Mays/N. White/J. Meza/A. Shore c/o Ms. Nancy H. Sims
150 South Monroe Street
Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556
nancy.sims@bellsouth.com
linda.hobbs@bellsouth.com
chantel.stevens@bellsouth.com
douglas.lackey@bellsouth.com
meredith.mays@bellsouth.com

McWhirter Law Firm Vicki Gordon Kaufman 117 South Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 ykaufman@mac-law.com

nancy.white@bellsouth.com

Verizon Florida, Inc.
Richard Chapkis/Kimberly Caswell
One Tampa City Center
201 North Franklin Street (33602)
P.O. Box 110, FLTC 0007
Tampa, FL 33601-0110
richard.chapkis@verizon.com
david.christian@verizon.com
terry.scobie@verizon.com

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC
Ms. Lisa A. Sapper
1200 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 8100
Atlanta, GA 30309-3579
lisariley@att.com

Mr. Adam Teitzman/Jason Rojas Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 ateitzma@psc.state.fl.us jrojas@psc.state.fl.us jsusac@psc.state.fl.us wgarcia@psc.state.fl.us vmckay@psc.state.fl.us plee@psc.state.fl.us **Covad Communications Company** Mr. Charles E. Watkins 1230 Peachtree Street, N.E. 19th Floor Atlanta, GA 30309-3574 gwatkins@covad.com

Florida Cable Telecom Assoc., Inc. Michael A. Gross 246 East 6th Avenue Suite 100 Tallahassee, FL 32303 mgross@fcta.com

AARP 200 West College Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

AT&T
Tracy Hatch
101 North Monroe Street
Suite 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1549
thatch@att.com

ITC DeltaCom
Ms. Nanette S. Edwards
4092 South Memorial Parkway
Huntsville, AL 35802-4343
nedwards@itcdeltacom.com

KMC Telecom III, LLC Marva Brown Johnson, Esq. 1755 North Brown Road Lawrenceville, GA 30043-8119 marva.johnson@kmctelecom.com

Messer Law Firm Floyd Self/Norman Horton P.O. Box 1876 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876 fself@lawfla.com nhorton@lawfla.com

Sprint Communications Corp.
Susan Masterton
P.O. Box 2214
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214
susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com
chrystal.whitt@mail.sprint.com

Allegiance Telecom, Inc. Charles Gerkin, Jr., Esq. 9201 N Central Expressway Dallas, TX 75231 charles.gerkin@allegiancetelecom.com

Moyle Law Firm
Jon Moyle, Jr.
The Perkins House
118 N Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
jmoylejr@moylelaw.com

Florida Competitive Carriers Assoc C/O McWhirter Law Firm Joseph McGlothlin/Vicki Kaufman 117 South Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 jmcglothlin@mac-law.com

MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc.
Ms. Donna C. McNulty
1203 Governors Square Boulevard
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301-2960
donna.mcnutly@mci.com

MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. De O'Roark, Esq.
Six Concourse Parkway
Suite 3200
Atlanta, GA 30328
de.oroark@wcom.com

Xspedius Communications Ms. Rabinai E. Carson 5555 Winghaven Boulevard Suite 300 O'Fallon, MO 63366-3868 rabinai.carson@xspedius.com

Allegiance Telecom, Inc. (IL) Theresa Larkin 700 East Butterfield Road Lombard, IL 60148 terry.larkin@algx.com

Casey & Gentz, LLP Bill Magness 919 Congress Avenue, Suite 1060 Austin, TX 78701

Supra Telecom
Jonathan Audu
1311 Executive Center Drive Suite 220
Tallahassee, FL 32301-5027
jonathan.audu@stis.com

BellSouth BSE, Inc Mr. Mario L. Soto 400 Perimeter Center Terrace Suite 400 Atlanta, GA 30346-1231 mario.soto@bellsouth.com

NewSouth Communications Corp. Jake E. Jennings
Two North Main Center
Greenville, SC 29601-2719
jejennings@newsouth.com

Comm. South Companies, Inc. Sheri Pringle
P.O. Box 570159
Dallas, TX 75357-9900
springle@commsouth.net

Granite Telecommunications, LLC Rand Currier/Geoff Cookman 234 Copeland Street Quincy, MA 02169-4005 rcurrier@granitenet.com

Phone Club Corporation Carlos Jordan 168 S.E. 1st Street, Suite 705 Miami, FL 33131-1423 phoneclubcorp@aol.com

Tier 3 Communications
Kim Brown
2235 First Street, Suite 217
Ft. Myers, FL 33901-2981
steve@tier3communications.net

Sprint (KS)
Kenneth A Schifman
6450 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHN0212-2A303
Overland Park, KS 66251-6100

Supra Telecom Jorge Cruz-Bastillo 2620 S.W. 27th Avenue Miami, FL 33133-3005 jorge.cruz-bastillo@stis.com

Access Integrated Networks, Inc. Mr. Mark A. Ozanick 4885 Riverside Drive, Suite 107 Macon, GA 31210-1148 mark.ozanick@accesscomm.com

Firstmile Technologies, LLC Michael Farmer 750 Liberty Drive Westfield, IN 46074-8844 mfarmer@gotown.net

Miller Isar, Inc. Andrew O. Isar 7901 Skansie Avenue, St. 240 Gig Harbor, WA 98335 aisar@millerisar.com

Ben Johnson Associates, Inc. John Nesmith 2252 Killearn Center Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32309 jn@benjohnsonassociates.com

Universal Telecom, Inc.
Jennifer Hart
P.O. Box 679
LaGrange, KY 40031-0679
Jenniferh@universaltelecominc.com

Sprint (NC) H. Edward Phillips, III 14111 Capital Boulevard Mailstop: NCWKFR0313-3161 Wake Forest, NC 27587-5900 Z-Tel Communications, Inc. Thomas Koutsky 1200 19th Street, NW Suite 500 Washington, DC 20036 tkoutsky@z-tel.com Michael B. Twomey, Esq. PO Box 5256
Tallahassee, FL 32314-5256
miketwomey@talstar.com

Office of the Public Counsel
C/O The Florida Legislature
Charles J. Beck, Deputy Public Counsel
111 Wets Madison Street
Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400
beck.charles@leg.state.fl.us

Matthew Feil
Scott A. Kassman
FDN Communications
390 North Orange Avenue
Suite 2000
Orlando, FL 32801
(407) 835-0460
(407) 447-6636
mfeil@mail.fdn.com
skassman@mail.fdn.com