ANDREW D. SHORE Senior Regulatory Counsel

SallSouth Telecommunications, Inc 150 South Monroe Street Froom 400 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (404) 335-0765

April 21, 2005

Mrs. Blanca S. Bayó
Division of the Commission Clerk and
Administrative Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: 041114-TP – Complaint of XO Florida, Inc. Against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for Refusal to Convert Circuits to UNEs and for Expedited Processing

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed are an original and fifteen copies of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony Shelley W. Padgett, 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. Copies have been served to the parties shown on the attached Certificate of Service.

Sincerely,

Andrew D. Shore

Enclosures

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

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 041114-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via

Electronic Mail and First Class U.S. Mail this 21st day of April, 2005 to the following:

Jason Rojas
Staff Counsel
Florida Public Service
Commission
Division of Legal Services
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Tel. No. (850) 413-6179
jrojas@psc.state.fl.us

Vicki Gordon Kaufman (+)
Moyle Flanigan Katz Raymond
& Sheehan, PA
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Tel. No. (850) 681-3828
Fax. No. (850) 681-8788
vkaufman@moylelaw.com
Represents XO

Dana Shaffer XO Florida, Inc. VP, Regulatory Counsel 105 Molloy Street, Ste. 300 Nashville, TN 37201 Tel. No. (615) 777-7700 Fax. No. (615) 850-0343 dana.shaffer@xo.com

Andrew D. Shore

1		BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
2		SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
3		SHELLEY W. PADGETT
4		BEFORE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
5		DOCKET NO. 041114-TP
6		APRIL 21, 2005
7		
8	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
9		
10	A.	My name is Shelley W. Padgett. My business address is 675 W. Peachtree Street,
11		Atlanta, Georgia 30375.
12		
13	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME SHELLEY W. PADGETT WHO PROVIDED DIRECT
14		AND REBUTTAL PANEL TESTIMONY AS WELL AS SUPPLEMENTAL
15		DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET?
16		
17	A.	Yes.
18		
19	Issue	4a: If the Commission finds in favor of XO on Issue 1, which circuits are
20	eligil	ole for conversion?
21		
22	Q.	MR. CASE TESTIFIED ON PAGE 5, LINES 2-3 THAT "BELLSOUTH HAS
23		ACKNOWLEDGED THAT IT IS LEGALLY OBLIGATED" TO CONVERT
24		XO'S CIRCUITS TO UNES. IS THAT ACCURATE?
25		

1	A.	No. BellSouth has acknowledged that it has a legal obligation to convert eligible
2		special access circuits to individual UNEs to the extent that the parties'
3		interconnection agreement provides for such conversions. Unfortunately,
4		however, XO has refused to incorporate all changes in law into its Interconnection
ζ.		Agreement with BellSouth and is attempting to circumvent the change in law
$\epsilon$		process and obtain only those changes in the law that are favorable to XO.
~3		Furthermore, as detailed in my supplemental direct testimony, many of the
8		circuits XO has requested to convert would not be eligible for conversion under
9		any circumstances.
10		
Parent i	Q.	MR. CASE STATES ON PAGE 9, LINES 1-3 THAT XO'S
12		INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH BELLSOUTH ALREADY
13		ALLOWS COMMINGLING. IS THAT ACCURATE?
14		
15	A.	The parties' Interconnection Agreement does allow commingling in certain
16		limited circumstances. I mistakenly said in my supplemental direct testimony that
17		there were no commingling provisions in the Interconnection Agreement.
18		Importantly, the commingling addressed in the Interconnection Agreement is not
19		applicable to the issues in this proceeding.
20		
21	Q.	WHAT ARE THE CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH THE
22		INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT ALLOWS COMMINGLING?
23		
24	A.	The Interconnection Agreement allows XO to order a new combination of a UNE
25		loop and a special access interoffice transport facility; in other words, a new

ğ		commingled EEL. Specifically, Attachment 2, Section 5.7.1 states:
2		"Additionally, BellSouth shall make available to XO a combination of an
3		unbundled loop and tariffed special access interoffice facilities. To the extent XO
4		will require multiplexing functionality in connection with such combination,
5		BellSouth will provide access to multiplexing within the central office pursuant to
6		the terms, conditions and rates set forth in its Access Services Tariffs. The tariffed
7		special access interoffice facilities and any associated tariffed services, including
8		but not limited to multiplexing, shall not be eligible for conversion to UNEs as
9		described in Section 5.5."
10		
11	Q.	WHY ARE ONLY NEW COMMINGLED EELS AVAILABLE PURSUANT
12		TO THIS PROVISION?
13		
14	A.	There is no provision in the Interconnection Agreement that allows for XO to
15		convert a portion of a combination of elements. Therefore, the parties could not
16		have intended that this provision allow XO to order anything other than a new
17		commingled EEL. The fact that the provision quoted above uses the future tense
18		is further evidence of the parties' clear intent.
19		
20	Q.	IS XO'S CONTRACTUAL RIGHT TO $\underline{\text{NEW}}$ COMMINGLED EELS AT ISSUE
21		IN THIS CASE?
22		
23	A.	No. XO has requested to convert portions of some circuits to create commingled
24		EELs.
25		

-	Q.	IF THE COMMISSION FINDS IN FAVOR OF XO ON ISSUE 1, SHOULD XO
2		BE ALLOWED TO CONVERT LOOPS TO CREATE COMMINGLED EELS?
3		
4	A.	No. The Interconnection Agreement does not provide for converted commingled
5		EELs. To the extent XO seeks to convert loops combined with other elements,
6		until its Interconnection Agreement is amended to include both the right to such a
7		conversion and the accompanying service eligibility criteria, XO should not be
8		allowed to convert these elements. When XO has amended its Interconnection
9		Agreement to include these provisions (as well as the other changes necessitated
10		by changes in law) XO will have the ability to convert the circuits it seeks to
11		convert, provided that it can comply with the relevant terms of the
12		Interconnection Agreement.
13		
14		However, if the Commission decides to allow XO to convert circuits to
15		commingled EELs, which it should not, the Commission should also require XO
16		to comply with the requirements in the TRO regarding loops combined with other
17		elements, that is, the service eligibility criteria.
18		
19	Q.	MR. CASE DISTINGUISHES BETWEEN AN EEL AND A "STAND-ALONE
20		LOOP COMMINGLED WITH SPECIAL ACCESS TRANSPORT" (P. 9, L. 11-
21		12). PLEASE COMMENT.
22		
23	A.	Although an EEL strictly speaking is comprised of UNEs, Mr. Case ignores the
24		fact that a "stand-alone loop commingled with special access transport" is a
25		commingled EEL and is subject to the same service eligibility criteria as an EEL.

1		Paragraph 593 of the TRO says: "To ensure that our rules on service eligibility
2		are not gamed in whole or in part, we make clear that the service eligibility
3		criteria must be satisfied (1) to convert a special access circuit to a high-capacity
4		EEL; (2) to obtain a new high-capacity EEL; or (3) to obtain at UNE pricing part
5		of a high-capacity loop-transport combination (commingled EEL)."
6		
7	Q.	ARE THE CIRCUITS LISTED IN MR. CASE'S EXHIBITS GC-3 AND 4 "THE
8		SUBJECT OF APPROPRIATE REQUESTS TO CONVERT" (CASE, P. 12, L.,
9		7-8)?
10		
11	A.	No. First, XO's Interconnection Agreement with BellSouth does not allow XO to
12		request a conversion for a stand-alone element. Second, even if the Commission
13		decides Issue 1 in XO's favor, not all of the circuits listed in Exhibits GC-3 and 4
14		are eligible for conversion. Specifically, only 251 of the 389 circuits listed on
15		Exhibit GC-3 and 109 of the 266 circuit listed on Exhibit GC-4 are stand-alone
16		loops. Only 22 and 45 of those circuits listed on Exhibits GC-3 and GC-4,
17		respectively, are commingled EELs that terminate in a collocation arrangement.
18		

19 Issue 4b: If the Commission finds in favor of XO on Issue 1, what is the appropriate 20 effective date of conversion for each eligible circuit?

24

Q. WHAT IS THE APPROPRIATE EFFECTIVE DATE FOR CONVERSION OF
 EACH ELIGIBLE CIRCUIT?

1	A.	As stated in the direct panel testimony of Ms. Willis and myself as well as my
2		supplemental direct testimony, the appropriate effective date for conversion
3		would be a date following 1) an effective amendment to the parties'
4		Interconnection Agreement making the agreement compliant with current law,
5		specifically the TRO and the TRRO; 2) receipt by BellSouth of an accurate
6		spreadsheet from XO listing the relevant circuits and other required information;
7		and 3) allowing a reasonable period of time for BellSouth to complete the work.
8		BellSouth would suggest that thirty (30) days would be the appropriate effective
9		date.
10		
11.		If the Commission determines, however, that XO is not required to amend its
12		Interconnection Agreement to be entitled to the conversion of special access to
13		UNE provisions of the TRO, which it should not do, the Commission should find
14		that the effective date for any conversion is thirty (30) days from the receipt of a
15		clean, error-free spreadsheet from XO pursuant to the ordering provisions in place
16		for CLECs who have amended their agreements.
17		
18	Q.	MR. CASE CLAIMS ON PAGE 11, LINES 8-10 THAT THE TRO REQUIRED
19		THAT ANY PENDING CLEC CONVERSION REQUESTS BE TRUED-UP TO
20		THE "CORRECT PRICING." IS THAT ACCURATE?
21		
22	A.	No. The TRO required that for pending <u>EEL</u> requests that had not been converted
23		(whether or not they would actually be converted due to the change in the
24		qualifying criteria, i.e., the TRO's service eligibility criteria), CLECs were

1		entitled to a true-up to the effective date of the TRO. Specifically, paragraph 589
2		of the TRO states:
3		As a final matter, we decline to require retroactive billing
4		to any time before the effective date of this Order. The
5		eligibility criteria we adopt in this Order supersede the safe
6		harbors that applied to EEL conversions in the past. To the
7		extent pending requests have not been converted, however,
8		competitive LECs are entitled to the appropriate pricing up
9		to the effective date of this Order.
10		There is nothing in this paragraph that addresses the conversion or requested
11		conversion of individual elements.
12		
13	Q.	WHEN WERE XO'S CONVERSION REQUESTS MADE?
14		
15	A.	XO has made three formal requests via the New Business Request ("NBR")
16	•	process and one informal request for conversion by letter dated December 14,
17		2004, from Laura Inniss of XO to Jerry Hendrix of BellSouth. XO submitted the
18		first NBR in February 2002. Mr. Case does not mention this request in his
19		supplemental direct testimony. XO submitted its second NBR addressing
20		conversions in March 2003. XO submitted a third NBR to rearrange and convert
21		circuits from Global Crossing to XO and was made in July 2004. Mr. Case also
22		fails to mention this request in his testimony. These last two requests are the only
23		ones made after the effective date of the TRO.
24		

1	Issue	4c: If the Commission finds in favor of XO on Issue 1, is XO entitled to any
2	billing	g credits as a result of such conversion, and if so, what is the amount of such
3	credit	(s)?
4		
5	Q.	IS XO ENTITLED TO ANY CREDITS AS A RESULT OF XO'S
б		CONVERSION REQUESTS?
7		
8	A.	No. XO is not entitled to any billing credits for conversions of stand-alone
9		elements. As previously discussed, XO's Interconnection Agreement with
10		BellSouth does not allow XO to request a conversion for a stand-alone element.
11		However, even if the Commission decides Issue 1 in XO's favor, BellSouth
12		should not be penalized for complying with the terms of its Interconnection
13		Agreement.
14		
15	Q.	WHY ARE THERE REVISED EXHIBITS SWP-8 AND SWP-9 ATTACHED
16		TO THIS SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
17		
18	A.	In the course of preparing this supplemental rebuttal testimony, I discovered that
19		had not included all of the relevant special access rate elements that would be
20		included in any conversion to UNEs. The revised exhibits account for these
21		elements.
22		
23	Q.	DO THE REVISED EXHIBITS SWP-8 AND SWP-9 SHOWING
24		CALCULATIONS OF ANY POSSIBLE BILLING CREDITS COMPARE
25		WITH MR, CASE'S EXHIBITS?

ł	A.	Not directly. First, my calculations include only those circuits which might be
2		eligible to convert under the requirements of the TRO: stand-alone loops and, as
3		an additional possibility which XO only even began to argue in Mr. Case's late
4		filed exhibits to his deposition, commingled EELs which terminate in a
5		collocation arrangement. Mr. Case's calculations include some circuits without
6		loop elements.
7		
8		Second, my calculations show the amounts from the first request made by XO as
9		well as from the effective date of the TRO. Mr. Case's show the amounts from
0		thirty days following the March 2003 and December 2004 requests only.
1		
12		In the interest of comparison, I have recalculated Exhibits SWP-8 and SWP-9 to
13		show the difference between the UNE and special access rates for the loop
14		elements as of thirty days from the March 2003 or December 2004 requests,
15		whichever was earlier. These calculations are contained in Exhibit SWP-10 and
16		SWP-11.
17		
18	Q.	ARE THE CALCULATIONS IN SWP-10 AND SWP-11 (OR GC-3 AND GC-4)
19		RELEVANT?
20		
21	A.	No. First, XO is not entitled under any scenario to billing credits for the March
22		2003 request, because it was made prior to the TRO. There was no obligation for
23		BellSouth to convert stand-alone elements to UNEs prior to the effective date of
24		the TRO, as explained in my supplemental direct testimony.

1 Second, for the December 2004 request, BellSouth relied upon the terms of its 2 Interconnection Agreement with XO. As previously noted, the Interconnection 3 Agreement contains no provisions allowing for conversions such as those 4 requested by XO. To the contrary, the Interconnection Agreement requires the 5 parties to negotiate changes in law such as this new conversion requirement prior 6 to incorporating them into the Interconnection Agreement, and specifically states 7 that changes to the Agreement cannot be made without a written amendment. 8 BellSouth should not be held liable for a change to its Interconnection Agreement 9 not made in writing at least until the point that the Commission itself clearly 10 overrides the terms of the Agreement between the parties. 11 12 DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL Q. 13 **TESTIMONY?** 14 Yes. 15 A.

## Billing Difference for Standalone Loops

is in Morning	Lola)SEATLoop(Charges)	ล เปล่นไฟเลียงกับ (สมัยใช้ยะ)	Tore Difference
Mar-02			
Арг-02	The state of the s	menterior of the transfer of the enterior of t	The state of the s
May-02	TO STATE A CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE OF THE ST		AND THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE P
Jun-02	the first the state of the stat	to an investigation to investigation to the content of the content	en i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
Jul-02	The Committee of the Co		The same is a first trade-contraction of the first same in the fir
Aug-02	Seek to the control of the control o		and the second s
Sep-02	<ul> <li>Committee the State of the Stat</li></ul>		form of manufactures and account of the second control of the seco
Oct-02	term (f. 1) - negari majoritas, ir gereneralises for recolor potentier proposed proposed proposed proposed in a	in a travia de la compansa a favaldada e de diferença <del>de destina</del> de elemente	Section of the contraction of the section of the se
Nov-02	reference to the control of the cont	maninista minare, kinte janton in , , , , un ternitoriorialista nasi unandiaprialajuris, nita quei *	for a contrary a selection relation of a contrary of selection of the contrary of a co
Dec-02	and the state of the description of the state of the stat	en delen er en er en	AL BARRASSA PROGRAMMAN POR CONTRACTOR AND TO CONTRACTOR AND TO CONTRACTOR AND TO CONTRACTOR AND TO CONTRACTOR AND CONTRACTOR A
Jan-03	et ti ment an atomorphism i par que es que que man		Annual Control of the
Feb-03	s for the control of the second sections	Mounteh vikker in Carl form for as as accombination for new comments after the message is a size of	
Mar-03	The state of the s	the control of the co	
Apr-03			The state of the s
May-03			
Jun-03			
Jul-03		and the second s	
Aug-03			
Sep-03			
Oct-03	Andrews .		
Nov-03	West and the second		
Dec-03	en total and the control of the cont		
Jan-04	kan in noon too and a state of the other of the order of the order of the order of the other other of the other o		
Feb-04	The state of the s		A second and a second s
Mar-04	and the contraction of the contr	magasta dan nan ay ng 18 at na 18 gang na 18 gantan dan kapasta kababbanggan a magaman yapa na 18 kilo na 18 m	
Apr-04	minimization and all the second control of t		
May-04			Company and the second
Jun-04	en menerala nela en el meneral a meneral per a un mandado della colonida del persona del persona del persona d		
Jul-04	No. 18 - 1 Annie March and Annie Anderson and Annie		S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
Aug-04	The control of the Management of the Control of the	processors by the fig. of the contribution of	grant manner and the same of t
Sep-04	on the control of the selection because an all the second of the enderstance of the decision endeaded	N. A. B. W. B. A. 1, 1970 D. 1974 D. 1970 D. 1	Company of the second second second second
Oct-04			
Nov-04		are designed to the second control of the second	
Dec-04			
Jan-05	gaddinistani, i — i — i salahirin karamata ya kara kara kara kara <mark>Mahada</mark> — ya asi ugungan ma <b>ya gad</b> a	e gallendagaga i filosof den encent de la las les entendes entendes entendes de la desenviolence de la la bete	
Feb-05			

Total since first request Total since TRO

Page 1 of 1

## Billing Difference for Commingled EELs

BillMontik	Total SPA Loop Charges	WolarUNE Coop Charges	Total Difference
01-Mar-02		1	
01-Apr-02	<ol> <li>And the Link Condense and Administration of the Condense and Transfer and Administration of the Condense and Condense and</li></ol>	The contract of the National Contract of the State of the Contract of the Cont	
01-May-02	- мерене и имет и пересоставо на 1 <del>4 година (14 година 14 година) и постори и постори и постори постори и постори</del> -	gi an and a strong transmission and section are section and section and section and section are section and section are section and section are sectio	
01-Jun-02			
01-Jul-02		**************************************	a company and a second
01-Aug-02	Section of the Sectio	ne recommendation and the second	g
01-Sep-02		August 1971 - The Control of the Con	
01-Oct-02	AND	The second secon	
01-Nov-02	The second section is a second section of the second section s		
01-Dec-02	The state of the s		
01-Jan-03	The second secon		
01-Feb-03	2. Printer our discrete 4. Model and description of the discrete formers. The Letter 1. Control of the discrete of the discrete out of the discrete of the discrete out of the discrete		
01-Mar-03	The first reprint the control of the		
01-Apr-03	Sivertransproper survivario como proportional de la propertir el maringo e un internet incomenda indexe. El como como como como como como como com	The second section of the second second section of the second section of the second section of the second section sect	
01-May-03		1	
01-Jun-03	former and any and any page page and deformable behavior approximation community and an endown in a section of		
01-Jul-03			
01-Aug-03			
01-Sep-03			and the second s
01-Oct-03			
01-Nov-03		3	1
01-Dec-03			
01-Jan-04	Ĥ	3	ing of the second second second second
01-Feb-04	manager graph was a consequence and a consequence of the consequence o		
01-Mar-04	edicare, and the experience of the control of the c		
01-Apr-04		The second secon	Annual Control of the
01-May-04		en grant en	ngangan sa gana mananga pangan pagangan pa <del>landa Madalada kanda sa sa sa sa sa sa sa</del>
01-Jun-04	entre de la companya della companya	The state of the s	
01-Jul-04	<b>La la companya de la companya del companya del companya de la companya del la companya de la co</b>	The state of the s	Language and a second
01-Aug-04	to Control of the Con		1
01-Sep-0	the fact was proved to the analysis of the second second to the second to the second to the second second to the s	The lates were the control of the co	A STATE OF THE STA
01-Oct-0	transference (who is not a contract of the con	A series and the series of the	
01-Nov-0	and the control of th	and the second programment of the second position and the second confidence of the second confid	Section of the property of the section of the secti
01-Dec-0-	the first production the control of	and france we also have employing a control to the reserve the	, of a region of the second contraction of the second contraction and the second contraction of
01-Jan-0		And the second contract of the second contrac	The transport of the second se
01-Feb-0	5		1

Total since first request Total since TRO

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 041114-TP Revised Exhibit SWP-10

Billing Difference for Standalone Loops Requested March 2003 and December 2004

	730gi 528163 (General)	
	Tigla/SPARoon Charges   Molejatikus tabik mereta	afold Difference
May-03		
Jun-03	The second secon	The second section of the second section
Jul-03	Make 10 of Ballion and the group of the control of	The second secon
Aug-03	The state of the s	1
Sep-03		
Oct-03		
Nov-03		
Dec-03		and a rest such tradition of the sound to the
Jan-04		
Feb-04		
Mar-04		
Apr-04		
May-04		
Jun-04	·	
Jul-04		
Aug-04		
Sep-04		
Oct-04	The state of the s	Andrew Commission to the supplemental transfer and transf
Nov-04		
Dec-04		
Jan-05		
Feb-05		

Total since request Total since TRO

	sage December 2004 (Galacte	The state of the s
a salika da kara da ka	Talification Charges Michaelia	en e de la
Jan-05		
Feb-05		

Total since request Total since TRO

## Billing Difference for Commingled EELs Requested March 2003 and December 2004

	AND THE SECOND PROBLEMS OF THE SECOND PROBLEM
Ere de dialitation de la company	ាំ ព្រោះនៅវីវិស្សិតថា Chales (a orden) ។ បង្ហាញ់ក្រាំតិខ្លែន និសាតវិទ្យាកែកម្មាន។
May-03	
Jun-03	
Jul-03	
Aug-03	
Sep-03	
Oct-03	
Nov-03	
Dec-03	
Jan-04	
Feb-04	
Mar-04	
Apr-04	
May-04	
Jun-04 ·	
Jul-04	
Aug-04	
Sep-04	
Oct-04	
Nov-04	
Dec-04	THE RESERVE OF THE PROPERTY OF
Jan-05	the state of the s
Feb-05	

Total since request Total since TRO

	ezay December 2004 tëque	
Silla Vice in Head to	Micral SPALEOOD Charges 10191	The consultation of the const
Jan-05		
Feb-05	1	

Total since request Total since TRO