1	FLORIDA PUBL	IC SERVICE COMMISSION
2		
3	To Aba Wattan of	: Docket No. 921074-TP
4	In the Matter of	: Docket No. 930955-TP
5	Expanded Interconnection Phase II and Local	: Docket No. 940020-TP
6	Transport Restructure.	: Docket No. 931196-TP
7		
	SECOND DAY	- MORNING BESSION
8		VOLUME 4
9	Pages 3	92 through 525
10		
11	PROCEEDINGS:	HEARING
12	BEFORE:	CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON
13	BEFORE.	COMMISSIONER SUSAN F. CLARK COMMISSIONER JULIA L. JOHNSON
14	* *	
15	DATE	Tuesday, August 23, 1994
16	TIME	Reconvened at 9:30 a.m.
17		
18	PLACE:	FPSC Hearing Room 106 101 East Gaines Street
19		Tallahassee, Florida
20		
21	REPORTED BY:	JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR Chief, Bureau of Reporting
22		SYDNEY C. SILVA, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter
23		and LISA GIROD JONES, RPR, CM
24	APPEARANCES:	
25	(As heretofore	noted.)
		DOCUMENT NUMBER

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION U9234 SEP-7.

INDEX WITNESS - VOLUME 4 Page Mo. Mame: JERRY D. HENDRIX Direct Examination By Ms. Peed Prefiled Direct Testimony Inserted Cross Examination By Mr. Adams Cross Examination By Mr. Hoffman Cross Examination By Ms. Bryant Cross Examination By Mr. Tye Cross Examination By Mr. Wiggins

EXHIBITS - VOLUME 4 Identified Admitted Mumber: (Hendrix) JDH-1 through 3 (Hendrix) Letter Dated February 7, 1994 to Bill Wert from Quinton Sanders (Hendrix) IXC First Set of Interrogatories, Item No. 11

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(Hearing reconvened at 9:30 a.m.)
3	(Transcript continues in sequence from Volume
4	3.)
5	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Call the hearing to order.
6	Ms. Canzano, any preliminary matters?
7	MS. CANZANO: Yes, Staff would like to take
8	official recognition of two Commission orders. And that
9	would be Commission Order No. 24877 issued on August 2nd,
10	1991, and Order No. 25546 issued 12-26, 1991. And both of
11	these are in Docket No. 890183-TL.
12	MS. PEED: What was the docket number again, I'm
13	sorry, Donna?
14	MS. CANZANO: 890183-TL. Which is the generic
15	investigation into operations of alternate access vendors.
16	CHAIRMAN DEASON: And what was that first order
17	number again, please?
18	MS. CANZANO: 24877.
19	MR. FONS: Is this going to be an exhibit?
20	MS. CANZANO: We just ask that it be recognized.
21	MR. FONS: Add that to Exhibit No. 1?
22	MS. CANZANO: Yes. If that's okay.
23	CHAIRMAN DEASON: And the Commission will take
24	recognition of its own orders.
25	MS. CANZANO: Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Any other preliminary matters?
2	Mr. Carver, I believe your witness is next.
3	MS. PEED: Southern Bell calls Jerry Hendrix,
4	please.
5	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Hendrix was here yesterday
6	and was sworn yesterday; is that correct?
7	MS. PEED: Yes, he was.
8	JERRY D. HENDRIX
9	was called as a witness on behalf of Southern Bell
10	Telephone and Telegraph Company and, having been duly
11	sworn, testified as follows:
12	DIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY MS. PEED:
14	Q Good morning, Mr. Hendrix. Could you state
15	your name and work address for the record, please?
16	A My name is Jerry D. Hendrix. My work address
L7	is 675 West Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia.
18	Q And by whom are you employed and could you
19	briefly describe your job responsibilities?
20	A Yes. I am employed by BellSouth as a manager.
21	I manage switched access services for the nine BellSouth
22	states.
23	Q Did you cause to be filed on May 23rd, 1994,
4	30 pages of testimony with three exhibits?
اء,) Vec T did

1	Q And do you have any corrections to that
2	testimony?
3	A I believe I have one, and that change is on
4	Page 26, Line 13, I wanted to add two other states:
5	South Carolina and Tennessee.
6	Q And with the exception of those corrections,
7	if I asked you these same questions, would your answers
8	be the same?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Do you have any corrections to your exhibits?
11	A No, I do not.
12	MS. PEED: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have these
13	exhibits marked for identification purposes.
14	CHAIRMAN DEASON: They will be identified as
15	Composite Exhibit 26.
16	(Composite Exhibit No. 26 marked for
17	identification.)
18	MS. PEED: And I would also ask that the
19	testimony be entered into the record as if read from the
20	stand.
21	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Without objection, it will be
22	so inserted.
23	

1	SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY
2	TESTIMONY OF JERRY D. HENDRIX
3	BEFORE THE
4	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
5	DOCKET NO. 921074-TP
6	MAY 23, 1994
7	
8	
	WILL YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS
	ADDRESS?
ıı	
	YES. I AM JERRY D. HENDRIX. MY BUSINESS ADDRESS
	IS 675 WEST PEACHTREE STREET, ATLANTA, GEORGIA.
13 14	15 0/5 WEST PERCURNED STREET, TOTAL STREET,
	BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
	BI WHOM ARE TOO EMILECTED THIS IN MINISTER
16	I AM EMPLOYED BY BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS,
18	INC., D/B/A SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH
19	COMPANY IN FLORIDA ("SOUTHERN BELL"), AS A MANAGER
20	IN REGULATORY AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.
21	
22 Q.	PLEASE GIVE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF YOUR BACKGROUND
23	AND EXPERIENCE.
24	
25 A.	I WAS GRADUATED FROM MOREHOUSE COLLEGE IN ATLANTA,

1	GEORGIA IN 1975 WITH A BACHELOR OF ARTS DEGREE. I
2	BEGAN EMPLOYMENT WITH SOUTHERN BELL IN 1979 AND
3	HELD VARIOUS POSITIONS BEFORE JOINING THE
4	HEADQUARTERS REGULATORY ORGANIZATION IN 1985.
5	
6 Q.	WHAT ARE YOUR JOB RESPONSIBILITIES?
7	
8 A.	I AM CURRENTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERSTATE AND
9	INTRASTATE SWITCHED ACCESS SERVICE ISSUES
10	THROUGHOUT THE NINE STATE BELLSOUTH REGION. MY
11	PRIMARY JOB RESPONSIBILITIES INCLUDE HANDLING
12	SWITCHED ACCESS TARIFFS AND RATE DEVELOPMENT AS
13	WELL AS RESOLVING OTHER SWITCHED ACCESS ISSUES.
14	PRIOR TO ASSUMING MY CURRENT RESPONSIBILITIES, I
15	HANDLED TOLL ISSUES AS WELL.
16	
17	IN ADDITION TO DAILY MANAGEMENT OF ISSUES CONNECTED
18	WITH MY RESPONSIBILITIES, I HAVE TESTIFIED OR
19	PARTICIPATED IN PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE GEORGIA,
20	KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, NORTH CAROLINA,
21	SOUTH CAROLINA, TENNESSEE AND THE FLORIDA PUBLIC
22	SERVICE COMMISSIONS ("COMMISSIONS") REGARDING TOLL
23	AND/OR SWITCHED ACCESS MATTERS AND ISSUES.
24	
25 Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

1	
2 A.	THE PURPOSE OF MY TESTIMONY IS TO EXPLAIN SOUTHERN
3	BELL'S PROPOSED SWITCHED ACCESS LOCAL TRANSPORT
4	RESTRUCTURE TARIFF FILED WITH THIS COMMISSION ON
5	SEPTEMBER 22, 1993 AND SUBSEQUENTLY REVISED ON
6	JANUARY 5, 1994 AND MAY 16, 1994. ADDITIONALLY, I
7	WILL RESPOND TO CERTAIN ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THIS
8	DOCKET.
9	
10	THE SWITCHED ACCESS LOCAL TRANSPORT RESTRUCTURE, AS
11	PROPOSED BY SOUTHERN BELL, WILL ENSURE RATE AND
12	STRUCTURE UNIFORMITY BETWEEN THE INTRASTATE AND
13	INTERSTATE JURISDICTIONS. IT WILL ALSO PROMOTE
14	EFFICIENT USE OF SOUTHERN BELL'S NETWORK BY
15	ALLOWING PRICING OF SWITCHED ACCESS TRANSPORT
16	SERVICE WHICH MORE CLOSELY REFLECTS THE WAY THE
17	SERVICE IS PROVIDED AND COSTS ARE INCURRED.
18	
19 Q.	CAN YOU PROVIDE A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE
20	DEVELOPMENTS THAT LED TO THE FILING OF THIS TARIFF?
21	
22 A.	YES. IN 1982, THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
23	THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ENTERED THE MODIFICATION
24	OF FINAL JUDGMENT (MFJ) IN UNITED STATES V. WESTERN
25	ELECTRIC AND AMERICAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH

1	COMPANY. THE MFJ IN PART REQUIRED THAT CHARGES FOR
2	BELL OPERATING COMPANY (BOC) ORIGINATING AND
3	TERMINATING TRAFFIC OF THE SAME TYPE BETWEEN BOC
4	END OFFICES AND FACILITIES OF INTEREXCHANGE
5	CARRIERS (IXCS), WITHIN AN EXCHANGE AREA, BE EQUAL
6	FOR EACH UNIT OF TRAFFIC DELIVERED OR RECEIVED.
7	THIS MEANT THAT SIMILARLY SITUATED IXCS WOULD BE
8	CHARGED THE IDENTICAL RATE FOR EACH UNIT OF TRAFFIC
9	THAT WAS ORIGINATED OR TERMINATED ON THE SYSTEM OF
10	AN INDIVIDUAL BOC. THE COURT'S PURPOSE IN IMPOSING
11	THIS "EQUAL CHARGE" REQUIREMENT WAS TO ENSURE THAT
12	"NEW" IXCS WERE NOT DISADVANTAGED BY THE
13	PRE-EXISTING COLLOCATION ARRANGEMENTS OF AT&T.
14	UNDER THE TERMS OF THE MFJ, THIS REQUIREMENT
15	EXPIRED ON SEPTEMBER 1, 1991.
16	
17	IN AUGUST 1991, JUST PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION OF THE
18	"EQUAL CHARGE" REQUIREMENT WHICH HAD BEEN EMBEDDED
19	IN VARIOUS TARIFFS, THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
20	COMMISSION, (FCC) ISSUED AN ORDER AND NOTICE OF
21	PROPOSED RULEMAKING, IN DOCKET NO. 91-213,
22	ADDRESSING THE SWITCHED ACCESS TRANSPORT RATE
23	STRUCTURE. THE COMMISSION CONCLUDED THAT THE
24	"EQUAL CHARGE" RATE STRUCTURE SHOULD BE CHANGED.
25	SPECIFICALLY, THE FCC PROPOSED A MORE COST-BASED

1	TRANSPORT RATE STRUCTURE AND PRICING PLAN.
2	
3	THE GOALS OF THE FCC IN SUGGESTING ITS PROPOSED
4	CHANGES WERE TO:
5	
6	1. ENCOURAGE EFFICIENT USE OF TRANSPORT
7	FACILITIES BY ALLOWING PRICING THAT
8	REFLECTS THE WAY COSTS ARE INCURRED,
9	2. FACILITATE FULL AND FAIR
10	INTEREXCHANGE COMPETITION, AND
11	3. AVOID INTERFERENCE WITH THE
12	DEVELOPMENT OF INTERSTATE ACCESS
13	COMPETITION.
14	
15	AFTER CONSIDERING THE EXTENSIVE EVIDENCE PRESENTED
16	BY THE INTERVENORS IN DOCKET NO. 91-213, THE FCC
17	ADOPTED A NEW SWITCHED TRANSPORT RATE STRUCTURE,
18	REPLACING THE "EQUAL CHARGE" RATE STRUCTURE. THE
19	NEW STRUCTURE WAS EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 30, 1993.
20	
21 Q.	ISSUE 1. [TURNING TO FLORIDA'S INTRASTATE SWITCHES
22	ACCESS SERVICE] HOW IS SWITCHED ACCESS PROVISIONED
23	AND PRICED TODAY?
24	
	CONTRACTOR AND TO AVAILABLE MAINLY TO TYCE

1	FOR THEIR USE IN FURNISHING THEIR SERVICES TO END
2	USERS, PROVIDES A COMMUNICATIONS PATH BETWEEN AN
3	IXC'S TERMINAL LOCATION AND THE END USER'S
4	PREMISES.
5	
6	SWITCHED ACCESS SERVICE IS PROVIDED IN EIGHT
7	SERVICE CATEGORIES. THERE ARE FOUR SERVICE
8	CATEGORIES OF STANDARD AND OPTIONAL FEATURES CALLED
9	FEATURE GROUPS (I.E., FEATURE GROUPS A, B, C, AND
10	D). THERE IS ALSO AN 800 ACCESS TEN DIGIT
11	SCREENING SERVICE, A 900 ACCESS SERVICE AND TWO
12	UNBUNDLED BASIC SERVING ARRANGEMENTS WHICH ARE OPEN
13	NETWORK ARCHITECTURE TYPE SERVICES. THESE SWITCHED
14	ACCESS SERVICE CATEGORIES ARE DIFFERENTIATED BY
15	THEIR TECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS, E.G., WHETHER THE
16	CONNECTION TO THE CENTRAL OFFICE SWITCH IS LINE
17	SIDE OR TRUNK SIDE, AND HOW THE END USER ACCESSES
18	THE IXC'S SERVICE FOR MAKING LONG DISTANCE CALLS.
19	
20	THERE ARE THREE CATEGORIES OF RATES AND CHARGES
21	THAT APPLY TO SWITCHED ACCESS SERVICES. THESE ARE
22	MONTHLY RECURRING RATES, USAGE RATES AND
23	NONRECURRING CHARGES. THE MONTHLY RATES ARE
24	FLAT RECURRING RATES THAT APPLY TO A SPECIFIC RATE
	TO SUPPLY THE CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF THE P

1	USAGE RATES ARE RATES THAT APPLY ONLY WHEN A
2	SPECIFIC RATE ELEMENT IS USED AND ARE ACCUMULATED
3	OVER A BILLING PERIOD, TYPICALLY 30 DAYS, AND
4	BILLED ALONG WITH THE MONTHLY CHARGES. THESE APPLY
5	ON A PER ACCESS MINUTE BASIS OR ON A PER CALL
6	BASIS. NONRECURRING CHARGES ARE ONE-TIME CHARGES
7	THAT APPLY FOR A SPECIFIC WORK ACTIVITY (I.E.,
8	INSTALLATION OF NEW SERVICE OR CHANGES TO AN
9	EXISTING SERVICE).
10	
11 Q.	WHAT ARE THE MAJOR SWITCHED ACCESS USAGE RATE
12	ELEMENTS?
13	
14 A.	THERE ARE FOUR MAJOR SWITCHED ACCESS RATE ELEMENTS.
15	THEY ARE:
16	
17	1. CARRIER COMMON LINE,
18	- ORIGINATING
19	- TERMINATING
20	2. LOCAL SWITCHING,
21	- LOCAL SWITCHING 1
22	(FEATURE GROUPS A AND B)
23	- LOCAL SWITCHING 2
24	(FEATURE GROUPS C AND D)
25	- LOCAL SWITCHING 3 AND 4

1	(LINE SIDE AND TRUNK SIDE BASIC
2	SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS)
3	3. CARRIER ACCESS CAPACITY (BHMOC), AND
4	4. LOCAL TRANSPORT
5	
6	ALL OF THESE RATE ELEMENTS ARE ASSESSED ON A PER
7	MINUTE OF USE BASIS EXCEPT FOR THE BHMOC. THIS
8	ELEMENT, WHICH HAS BEEN IN PLACE SINCE JANUARY,
9	1984, IS BILLED ON A MONTHLY BASIS PER ORDERED
10	BHMOC INSTALLED, ALTHOUGH SOUTHERN BELL DOES NOT
11	CHARGE FOR THIS ELEMENT.
12	
13 Q.	ISSUE 2. HOW IS LOCAL TRANSPORT STRUCTURED AND
14	PRICED TODAY?
15	
16 A.	CURRENTLY, SWITCHED ACCESS LOCAL TRANSPORT HAS A
17	USAGE SENSITIVE RATE STRUCTURE. LOCAL TRANSPORT
18	SERVICE IN FLORIDA IS NOT DISTANCE SENSITIVE AS IS
19	THE CASE THROUGHOUT THE OTHER BELLSOUTH STATES AND
20	IN THE INTERSTATE JURISDICTION.
21	
22	IN DOCKET NO. 820537, ORDER NO. 12765, ISSUED
23	DECEMBER 9, 1983, THE COMMISSION ORDERED THAT AN
24	AVERAGE MINUTE OF USE TRANSPORT CHARGE BE
25	INDIPMENTED WITHIN EACH ACCESS AREA. THE

1		COMMISSION DEFINED ACCESS AREA AS THE GEOGRAPHIC
2		AREA SERVED BY AN EXISTING TOLL CENTER. THE BOTTOM
3		LINE IS, REGARDLESS OF THE DISTANCE, ALL TRANSPORT
4		MINUTES OF USE ARE ASSESSED THE SAME RATE PER
5		MINUTE OF USE. FURTHER, BECAUSE OF THE EQUAL
6		CHARGE RULE, THE RATES FOR SOUTHERN BELL'S SWITCHED
7		ACCESS TRANSPORT SERVICES ARE ON A PER MINUTE OF
8		USE BASIS REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE CUSTOMER IS
9		USING DEDICATED FACILITIES OR TANDEM FACILITIES.
10		
11		A DEPICTION OF SOUTHERN BELL'S CURRENT INTRASTATE
12		SWITCHED ACCESS RATE STRUCTURE IS SHOWN IN HENDRIX
13		EXHIBIT 1.
14		
15	Q.	ISSUE 19. SHOULD THE COMMISSION MODIFY ITS PRICING
16		AND RATE STRUCTURE REGARDING SWITCHED TRANSPORT
17		SERVICE?
18		
19		A) WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SWITCHED EXPANDED
20		INTERCONNECTION.
21		
22		B) WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SWITCHED
23		EXPANDED INTERCONNECTION.
24		
25	A.	THE COMMISSION SHOULD MODIFY ITS POLICY ON PRICING

1	AND RATE STRUCTURE REGARDING SWITCHED TRANSPORT
2	SERVICE REGARDLESS OF WHETHER SWITCHED EXPANDED
3	INTERCONNECTION IS IMPLEMENTED. EQUALLY IMPORTANT
4	IS THAT SWITCHED EXPANDED INTERCONNECTION SHOULD
5	NOT BE IMPLEMENTED PRIOR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
6	LOCAL TRANSPORT RESTRUCTURE.
7	
8	THE COMMISSION'S PRICING POLICY IS GROUNDED IN ITS
9	DESIRE TO FOSTER INTEREXCHANGE COMPETITION. THE
10	TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY HAS EXPERIENCED
11	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES AND THE PREVIOUSLY STATED GOAL
12	HAS NOW BEEN REALIZED. IN FACT, AS OF MAY 1994,
13	THERE ARE MORE THAN 300 FIRMS CERTIFICATED TO
14	PROVIDE IXC SERVICES IN FLORIDA. BY FOSTERING SUCH
15	COMPETITION, THE COMMISSION ENCOURAGED INEFFICIENT
16	USE OF THE LOCAL EXCHANGE COMPANY'S PUBLIC SWITCHED
17	NETWORK. IT IS NOW APPROPRIATE TO MOVE TO AN
18	INTERIM STRUCTURE AND PRICING PLAN ADOPTED BY THE
19	FCC AND PROPOSED HERE BY SOUTHERN BELL. THE
20	PROPOSED STRUCTURE WILL FOSTER IXC CARRIER
21	COMPETITION AS WELL AS ACCESS COMPETITION AND WILL
22	PROMOTE MORE EFFICIENT USE OF THE PUBLIC SWITCHED
23	NETWORK.
24	
25 Q.	ISSUE 21. SHOULD SOUTHERN BELL'S PROPOSED LOCAL

1	TRANSPORT	RESTRUCTURE TARIFF BE APPROVED?
2		
3 A.	YES. SOU	THERN BELL'S PROPOSED RESTRUCTURE OF
4	SWITCHED	ACCESS TRANSPORT SERVICE TARIFF SHOULD BE
5	APPROVED	FOR MANY REASONS:
6		
7	ı.	TO MIRROR THE INTERSTATE SWITCHED
8		TRANSPORT RATES AND STRUCTURE
9		APPROVED BY THE FCC (EXCLUDING THE
10		INTERCONNECTION CHARGE);
11		
12	II.	TO MORE CLOSELY REFLECT THE WAY
13		TRANSPORT IS PROVIDED AND COSTS ARE
14		INCURRED;
15		
16	III.	TO PROMOTE EFFICIENT USE OF SOUTHERN
17		BELL'S NETWORK;
18		
19	IV.	TO MOVE TOWARD A MORE COMPETITIVE
20		ENVIRONMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF
21		INTEREXCHANGE SERVICE; AND
22		
23	v.	TO FACILITATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF
24		ACCESS COMPETITION.

1 Q.	COULD YOU ADDRESS IN MORE DETAIL EACH OF THE
2	REASONS SET FORTH ABOVE?
3	
4 A.	YES.
5	
6	I. TO MIRROR THE INTERSTATE SWITCHED TRANSPORT
7	RATES AND STRUCTURE APPROVED BY THE FCC;
8	
9	SOUTHERN BELL IS PROPOSING TO RESTRUCTURE THE
10	SWITCHED TRANSPORT SERVICE TO MIRROR THE INTERSTATE
11	SWITCHED TRANSPORT RATES AND STRUCTURE APPROVED BY
12	THE FCC IN 1993 (EXCLUDING THE INTERCONNECTION
13	CHARGE) TO SIMPLIFY TRANSPORT ISSUES. HAVING THE
14	SAME RATES AND STRUCTURE WILL ELIMINATE THE
15	INEFFICIENCY OF MAINTAINING A DIFFERENT SET OF
16	RATES AND STRUCTURES FOR THE INTERSTATE AND THE
17	INTRASTATE JURISDICTIONS, AND WILL ELIMINATE
18	CONFUSION FOR OUR SWITCHED ACCESS CUSTOMERS. IN
19	ADDITION, APPROVAL OF THIS TARIFF FILING WILL
20	LESSEN ANY INCENTIVE FOR MISREPORTING PERCENT
21	INTERSTATE USAGE (PIU).
22	
23	II. TO MORE CLOSELY REFLECT THE WAY TRANSPORT IS
24	PROVIDED AND COSTS ARE INCURRED;
25	

1	UNDER THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE, THE SPECIFIC
2	APPLICATION OF SWITCHED TRANSPORT RATES WILL BE
3	DEPENDENT UPON THE IXC'S ORDER FOR SWITCHED
4	TRANSPORT, THE IXC'S ROUTING REQUEST AS WELL AS THE
5	CAPACITY OF THE TRANSPORT DEDICATED TO THAT IXC FOR
6	ITS USE. THE UNDERLYING PREMISE IS THAT DIFFERENT
7	COSTS ARE ASSOCIATED WITH THE SWITCHED ACCESS
8	ROUTING OPTIONS (I.E., ACCESS TANDEM SWITCHED
9	(COMMON) OR DEDICATED) AVAILABLE TO SWITCHED
10	TRANSPORT CUSTOMERS.
11	
12	III. TO PROMOTE EFFICIENT USE OF SOUTHERN BELL'S
13	NETWORK;
14	
15	UNDER THE "EQUAL CHARGE" STRUCTURE, THERE ARE FEW,
16	IF ANY, INCENTIVES FOR IXCS TO BE EFFICIENT WITH
17	RESPECT TO THE SWITCHED ACCESS SERVICES ORDERED
18	BECAUSE EVERY IXC IS CHARGED ON A MINUTE OF USE
19	BASIS NO MATTER WHAT FACILITIES ARE UTILIZED. THIS
20	CAUSES IXCS TO ORDER FACILITIES THEY DO NOT NEED
21	AND/OR CANNOT FULLY UTILIZE. UNDER THE PROPOSED
22	RESTRUCTURE, HOWEVER, THERE WILL BE A GREATER
23	INCENTIVE TO UTILIZE TRANSPORT EFFICIENTLY IN THAT
24	CUSTOMERS ORDERING DEDICATED TRANSPORT WILL PAY THE
25	COST OF THE TYPE OF TRANSPORT ORDERED (I.E., IN THE

1	CAPACITY OF VOICE GRADE AND/OR DS0, DS1, DS3)
2	REGARDLESS OF THE NUMBER OF MINUTES OF USE FOR
3	WHICH IT IS UTILIZED. ALSO, THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE
4	RECOGNIZES DIFFERENCES IN ROUTING ARRANGEMENTS AND
5	ENCOURAGES IXCS TO ORDER THE ROUTING ARRANGEMENTS
6	WHICH ARE MOST EFFICIENT FOR CARRYING THEIR
7	TRAFFIC.
8	
9	IV. TO MOVE TOWARD A MORE COMPETITIVE
10	ENVIRONMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF
11	INTEREXCHANGE SERVICE; AND
12	
13	THE PROPOSED RESTRUCTURE, WHICH REFLECTS THE WAY
14	COSTS ARE INCURRED, MOVES TOWARD A MORE COMPETITIVE
15	ENVIRONMENT FOR THE PROVIDERS OF INTEREXCHANGE
16	SERVICES. UNDER THE PRESENT EQUAL CHARGE
17	STRUCTURE, IXCS WHICH EFFICIENTLY UTILIZE
18	FACILITIES DEDICATED TO THEM ARE REQUIRED TO
19	SUBSIDIZE IXCS WHICH DO NOT. FOR INSTANCE, IXCS
20	WHICH UTILIZE DEDICATED TRANSPORT AT THE FULL
21	CAPACITY BEAR NOT ONLY THE COSTS OF THAT SERVICE,
22	BUT ALSO A PORTION OF THE COSTS OF THE TRANSPORT
23	SERVICES USED BY OTHER IXCS WHO ARE NOT EFFICIENT.
24	THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE MOVES CLOSER TO AN
26	APPANCEMENT IN WHICH FACH IXC WILL BEAR THE COSTS

1	OF THE TRANSPORT SERVICE IT ORDERS, BASED UPON
2	ROUTING AND CAPACITY. ON THE OTHER HAND, THE
3	PROPOSED RESTRUCTURE STILL RECOGNIZES THE EXISTENCE
4	OF IXCS WHICH MAY NOT BE POSITIONED TO TAKE FULL
5	ADVANTAGE OF A DEDICATED RATE STRUCTURE. SUCH
6	CUSTOMERS CAN ALSO CONTINUE TO ORDER USAGE-BASED
7	ACCESS TANDEM SWITCHED (COMMON) TRANSPORT.
8	
9	V. TO FACILITATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESS
10	COMPETITION.
11	
12	THE ADOPTION OF THIS RATE STRUCTURE FACILITATES THE
13	DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESS COMPETITION IN THE SWITCHED
14	TRANSPORT ARENA. THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE ALLOWS
15	SOUTHERN BELL TO OFFER ITS SWITCHED ACCESS
16	CUSTOMERS AN EFFICIENT STRUCTURE WHICH MORE CLOSELY
17	REFLECTS THE FACILITIES UTILIZED AND COSTS INCURRED
18	BY EACH CUSTOMER. THE ACCESS ENVIRONMENT TODAY IS
19	INCREASINGLY COMPETITIVE, AS IS EVIDENCED BY THE
20	FACT THAT IXCS AND OTHER LARGE CUSTOMERS ARE ABLE
21	TO BYPASS SOUTHERN BELL'S SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS.
22	GIVEN THE INCREASINGLY COMPETITIVE ACCESS
23	ENVIRONMENT, SOUTHERN BELL MUST BE AFFORDED A
24	SWITCHED ACCESS RATE STRUCTURE THAT ALLOWS IT TO
	COMPANY OF THE COMPANY ON FROM SWITCHED ACCESS

1	SERVICES TO BASIC SERVICE WILL BE JEOPARDIZED.
2	
3 Q.	HAVING DISCUSSED THE NEEDS AND REASONS FOR THE
4	CHANGES YOU HAVE PROPOSED, CAN YOU GIVE A MORE
5	DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE TARIFF ITSELF?
6	
7 A.	YES. UNDER THE SWITCHED TRANSPORT RESTRUCTURE,
8	RATES WILL BE MORE CLOSELY ALIGNED WITH THE WAY
9	TRANSPORT IS PROVIDED AND COSTS ARE INCURRED. AS
10	STATED ABOVE, THE APPLICATION OF SWITCHED TRANSPORT
11	RATES WILL BE DEPENDENT UPON THE IXC'S ROUTING
12	REQUEST (ACCESS TANDEM SWITCHED (COMMON) OR
13	DEDICATED) AND THE CAPACITY ORDERED. SWITCHED
14	TRANSPORT WILL HAVE THREE GENERAL RATE COMPONENTS:
15	
16	1. INTEROFFICE TRANSPORT
17	A. SWITCHED COMMON TRANSPORT
18	B. SWITCHED DEDICATED TRANSPORT,
19	2. SWITCHED LOCAL CHANNEL, AND
20	3. INTERCONNECTION.
21	PLEASE SEE HENDRIX EXHIBIT 2 ILLUSTRATING THESE
22	COMPONENTS.
23	
24 Q.	PLEASE DISCUSS THE RATE ELEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH
25	CWITCHED COMMON TRANSPORT.

1	
2 A.	SWITCHED COMMON TRANSPORT INVOLVES TRAFFIC THAT IS
3	SWITCHED THROUGH SOUTHERN BELL'S ACCESS TANDEM.
4	THIS TRAFFIC WILL BE USAGE SENSITIVE AND DISTANCE
5	SENSITIVE WITH THE RATE BEING ASSESSED ON A PER
6	MINUTE OF USE, PER MILE BASIS. GENERALLY, THE
7	TRANSPORT MILEAGE WILL BE MEASURED FROM THE IXC'S
8	SERVING WIRE CENTER TO THE IXC'S DESIGNATED END
9	OFFICE JUST AS IT IS TODAY. THE RATE ELEMENTS
10	ASSOCIATED WITH SWITCHED COMMON TRANSPORT INCLUDE:
11	
12	1. ACCESS TANDEM SWITCHING - CHARGED PER
13	MINUTE OF USE, AND
14	2. SWITCHED COMMON TRANSPORT - CHARGED PER
15	MINUTE OF USE, PER MILE.
16	
17 Q.	PLEASE DISCUSS THE RATE ELEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH
18	SWITCHED DEDICATED TRANSPORT.
19	
20 A.	SWITCHED DEDICATED TRANSPORT INVOLVES TRAFFIC THAT
21	WILL BE CARRIED OVER DEDICATED FACILITIES BETWEEN
22	THE IXC'S SERVING WIRE CENTER AND DESIGNATED END
23	OFFICE OR OTHER DESIGNATED POINTS. THESE
24	FACILITIES WILL BE BILLED A MONTHLY FLAT-RATE
25	CHARGE, BASED ON THE CAPACITY ORDERED BY THE IXC.

1	THE CAPACITY OPTIONS ARE:
2	
3	1. VOICE GRADE (1 VOICE GRADE CIRCUIT),
4	2. DSO (1 VOICE GRADE CIRCUIT),
5	3. DS1 (EQUIVALENT TO 24 VOICE GRADE
6	CIRCUITS), AND
7	4. DS3 (EQUIVALENT TO 672 VOICE GRADE
8	CIRCUITS)
9	
	. PLEASE DISCUSS THE SWITCHED LOCAL CHANNEL.
11	
	. ALL CUSTOMERS, WHETHER USING SWITCHED COMMON OR
	SWITCHED DEDICATED FACILITIES, ARE REQUIRED TO
	PURCHASE A SWITCHED LOCAL CHANNEL. THE SWITCHED
	LOCAL CHANNEL WILL PROVIDE THE IXC AN ENTRANCE
	FACILITY FOR THE TRANSPORT OF TRAFFIC BETWEEN THE
	IXC'S PREMISES AND THE IXC'S SERVING WIRE CENTER.
	THE SWITCHED LOCAL CHANNEL WILL BE BILLED AT A
	MONTHLY FLAT-RATE CHARGE, BASED ON THE CAPACITY
20	ORDERED. THE CAPACITY OPTIONS ARE:
21	
22	1. VOICE GRADE (1 VOICE GRADE CIRCUIT),
23	2. DS1 (EQUIVALENT TO 24 VOICE GRADE
24	CIRCUITS), AND
25	3. DS3 (EQUIVALENT TO 672 VOICE GRADE

1		CIRCUITS)
2		
3	Q.	PLEASE DISCUSS THE INTERCONNECTION RATE COMPONENT.
4		
5	A.	THE INTERCONNECTION CHARGE IS THE THIRD COMPONENT
6		OF THE PROPOSED TARIFF. THIS RESIDUALLY PRICED
7		RATE COMPONENT IS DESIGNED TO ENSURE THAT THE
8		FILING IS REVENUE NEUTRAL TO SOUTHERN BELL IN ORDER
9		TO MAINTAIN THE CONTRIBUTION FLOW TO BASIC SERVICE.
10		
11		
12	Q.	HOW WILL SOUTHERN BELL'S FILING AFFECT ITS SWITCHER
13		ACCESS SERVICES CUSTOMERS?
14		
15	A.	SOUTHERN BELL ANTICIPATES THE IMPACT TO BE MINIMAL.
16		AS HENDRIX EXHIBIT 3 SHOWS, ALL SWITCHED ACCESS
17		SERVICE CUSTOMERS WILL CONTINUE TO PAY THE SAME
18		RATES FOR CARRIER COMMON LINE (CCL), LOCAL
19		SWITCHING AND INTERCONNECTION. THESE CHARGES
20		REPRESENT MORE THAN 95% OF THE AVERAGE SWITCHED
21		ACCESS RATE PER ACCESS MINUTE. THE SWITCHED ACCESS
22		CHARGES THAT ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE 95% WILL VARY
23		DEPENDING ON THE CUSTOMER'S ORDERING OPTION, I.E.,
24		ACCESS TANDEM SWITCHED (COMMON) OR DEDICATED. THE
25		DIFFERENCE IN THE HIGHEST RATE (TANDEM SWITCHING)

1	PER ACCESS MINUTE OF USE (\$.04686) AND THE LOWEST
2	RATE (DS3) PER ACCESS MINUTE OF USE (\$.04573) IS
3	APPROXIMATELY ONE TENTH (1/10TH) OF A CENT.
4	
5 Q.	ISSUE 20. IF THE COMMISSION CHANGES ITS POLICY ON
6	THE PRICING AND RATE STRUCTURE OF SWITCHED
7	TRANSPORT SERVICE, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SHOULD
8	THE NEW POLICY BE BASED ON:
9	
l o	A) THE INTRASTATE PRICING AND RATE STRUCTURE OF
11	LOCAL TRANSPORT SHOULD MIRROR EACH LEC'S
12	INTERSTATE FILING, RESPECTIVELY.
13	
14	B) THE INTRASTATE PRICING AND RATE STRUCTURE OF
15	LOCAL TRANSPORT SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY
16	COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS IN THE TRANSPORT
17	MARKET.
18	
19	C) THE INTRASTATE PRICING AND RATE STRUCTURE OF
20	LOCAL TRANSPORT SHOULD REFLECT THE UNDERLYING
21	COST BASED STRUCTURE.
22	
23	D) THE INTRASTATE PRICING AND RATE STRUCTURE OF
24	LOCAL TRANSPORT SHOULD REFLECT OTHER METHODS.

1 A.	IF THE COMMISSION CHANGES ITS POLICY ON THE PRICING
2	AND RATE STRUCTURE OF SWITCHED TRANSPORT SERVICE,
3	THE NEW POLICY SHOULD BE BASED ON THE COMPETITIVE
4	CONDITIONS IN THE MARKETPLACE AND SHOULD MIRROR
5	EACH LEC'S INTERSTATE FILING. THE MARKET-BASED
6	RATES, OF COURSE, MUST COVER THEIR INCREMENTAL
7	COSTS. ONCE THIS COST TEST IS MET, THE LEC SHOULD
8	HAVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO PRICE TRANSPORT SERVICES
9	CONSISTENT WITH MARKET CONDITIONS AND DEMANDS.
10	FURTHER, A POLICY OF MIRRORING THE SWITCHED ACCESS
11	TRANSPORT SERVICES RATE STRUCTURE AND PRICING PLAN
12	ELIMINATES THE INEFFICIENCIES OF MAINTAINING A
13	DIFFERENT SET OF RATES AND STRUCTURES, LESSENS ANY
14	IMPETUS FOR MISREPORTING PIU AND ELIMINATES
15	CONFUSION FOR OUR CUSTOMERS.
16	
17 Q.	HOW WERE THE PROPOSED TRANSPORT RATES ESTABLISHED?
18	
19 A.	AS STATED ABOVE, THE PROPOSED TRANSPORT RATES
20	MIRROR THE EFFECTIVE INTERSTATE RATES WITH THE
21	EXCEPTION OF THE INTERCONNECTION CHARGE. THE
22	PROPOSED INTERCONNECTION CHARGE IS AT A LEVEL TO
23	ENSURE REVENUE NEUTRALITY FOR THIS FILING AND TO
24	HELP MAINTAIN SATISFACTORY LEVELS OF CONTRIBUTION
25	TO BASIC SERVICE.

1	
2 Q.	ISSUE 14. SHOULD ALL SWITCHED ACCESS TRANSPORT
3	PROVIDERS BE REQUIRED TO FILE TARIFFS?
4	
5 A.	THE COMMISSION SHOULD NOT REQUIRE THE LECS AND
6	OTHER TRANSPORT PROVIDERS TO FILE TARIFFS. THIS
7	DECISION SHOULD BE LEFT TO THE TRANSPORT PROVIDERS.
8	FEDERAL RULES REQUIRE SOUTHERN BELL TO FILE TARIFFS
9	AND SOUTHERN BELL WILL COMPLY WITH THOSE RULES AS
10	LONG AS THEY ARE IN PLACE. ONCE THESE RULES ARE
11	REMOVED, SOUTHERN BELL WOULD EXPECT EQUAL PRICING
12	FLEXIBILITY AS IS ENJOYED BY ITS COMPETITORS.
13	
14 Q.	ISSUE 17. SHOULD THE LECS PROPOSED INTRASTATE
15	SWITCHED ACCESS INTERCONNECTION TARIFFS BE
16	APPROVED?
17	
18 A.	SOUTHERN BELL FILED AN ILLUSTRATIVE EXPANDED
19	INTERCONNECTION TARIFF ON MARCH 31, 1994. THE
20	ILLUSTRATIVE TARIFF MIRRORS THE INTERSTATE FILING
21	FOR THE SAME SERVICE. SUBJECT TO ANY REQUIRED
22	REVISIONS THAT MAY COME OUT OF THIS DOCKET,
23	SOUTHERN BELL SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO FILE ITS FINAL
24	TARIFF WITH THE COMMISSION AND IT SHOULD BE

24

25

APPROVED.

1	
2 Q.	ISSUE 18. SHOULD THE LECS BE GRANTED ADDITIONAL
3	PRICING FLEXIBILITY? IF SO, WHAT SHOULD IT BE?
4	
5 A.	YES. AT A MINIMUM, THE COMMISSION SHOULD ALLOW THE
6	LOCAL EXCHANGE COMPANIES TO HAVE THE OPTION OF
7	IMPLEMENTING ZONE PRICING FOR TRANSPORT SERVICES
8	WITH A RATE CHANGE INTERVAL OF 14 DAYS AS ALLOWED
9	BY THE FCC RULES AND PROCEDURES PURSUANT TO PRICE
10	CAP REGULATIONS. THIS OF COURSE WILL REQUIRE A
11	WAIVER OF THE 60 DAY REQUIREMENT IN THE FLORIDA
12	STATUTE 364.05(1). BEING ABLE TO MAKE RATE CHANGES
13	WITH A SHORTER APPROVAL INTERVAL WILL ALLOW
14	SOUTHERN BELL TO RESPOND MORE QUICKLY TO
15	COMPETITIVE PRESSURES AND MEET COMPETITION IN A
16	MORE TIMELY FASHION. ADDITIONALLY, THE LOCAL
17	COMPANIES SHOULD BE GRANTED THE FLEXIBILITY TO ZONE
18	PRICE OTHER ACCESS SERVICES AS WELL. THE NEED FOR
19	THIS FLEXIBILITY IS EXPLAINED MORE FULLY IN THE
20	TESTIMONY OF DAVID B. DENTON IN RESPONSE TO ISSUES
21	4 AND 15.
22	
23 Q.	ISSUE 22. SHOULD THE MODIFIED ACCESS BASED
24	COMPENSATION (MABC) AGREEMENT BE MODIFIED TO
25	INCORPORATE A REVISED TRANSPORT STRUCTURE (IF LOCAL

1	TRANSPORT RESTRUCTURE IS ADOPTED) FOR INTRALATA
2	TOLL TRAFFIC BETWEEN LECS?
3	
4 A.	NO. SOUTHERN BELL'S RECOMMENDATION IS THAT THE
5	CURRENT MABC PLAN, RATES AND RATE STRUCTURE REMAIN
6	IN PLACE. ONCE LOCAL TRANSPORT RESTRUCTURE IS
7	FULLY IMPLEMENTED AND THE COMMISSION DETERMINES
8	THAT IT IS APPROPRIATE TO INTRODUCE THE PROPOSED
9	TRANSPORT STRUCTURE INTO THE MABC, THEN ALL
10	TRANSPORT RATES SHOULD REFLECT THE WAY THE SERVICE
11	IS PROVISIONED BETWEEN THE LOCAL EXCHANGE
12	COMPANIES. THIS PROVISIONING ARRANGEMENT COULD BE
13	EITHER COMMON OR DEDICATED, AND SHOULD EXCLUDE THE
14	LOCAL CHANNEL RATE ELEMENTS SINCE IT DOES NOT
15	REFLECT THE WAY SERVICES ARE JOINTLY PROVIDED.
16	
17 Q.	ISSUE 23. HOW SHOULD THE COMMISSION'S IMPUTATION
18	GUIDELINES BE MODIFIED TO REFLECT A REVISED
19	TRANSPORT STRUCTURE (IF LOCAL TRANSPORT RESTRUCTURE
20	IS ADOPTED)?
21	
22 A.	FIRST, SOUTHERN BELL BELIEVES THAT IT IS NOT
23	APPROPRIATE TO ADDRESS ACCESS IMPUTATION IN THIS
24	PROCEEDING. FURTHERMORE, IMPUTATION REQUIREMENTS
25	ARE NO LONGER NEEDED AND SHOULD BE ELIMINATED SINCE

1	IT IS CONTRARY TO THE INTENT OF COMPETITION. ONLY
2	A SELECT FEW ARE ASSURED OF BENEFITING FROM
3	IMPUTATION - IXCS AND OTHER TOLL PROVIDERS. THESE
4	REQUIREMENTS ARTIFICIALLY RAISE TOLL RATES FOR LECS
5	SUCH THAT IT MASKS THE TRUE LOW COST TOLL SERVICE
6	PROVIDER.
7	
8	IF THE DECISION IS TO MAINTAIN SUCH BURDENSOME AND
9	UNNECESSARY REQUIREMENTS, THE COMMISSION'S
10	IMPUTATION GUIDELINES SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO REFLECT
11	THE AVERAGE TRANSPORT COST, NOT RATE, PER ACCESS
12	MINUTE OF USE. THE AVERAGE TRANSPORT COST SHOULD
13	BE DETERMINED BY WEIGHTING THE TRANSPORT OPTIONS
14	BASED ON DEMAND. THIS IS A REASONABLE APPROACH
15	SINCE IT TAKES INTO CONSIDERATION ALL TRANSPORT
16	RATE ELEMENTS.
17	
18	SECOND, THE REQUIREMENT FOR A SEPARATE ACCESS LINE
19	FOR SOUTHERN BELL'S AND OTHER LECS' HIGH VOLUME
20	TOLL OFFERINGS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED. WITH THE
21	LEVEL OF COMPETITION IN THIS STATE AND THE SERVICE
22	OPTIONS THAT ARE AVAILABLE IN THE MARKETPLACE, THIS
23	REQUIREMENT IS NO LONGER APPROPRIATE.
24	
25	LASTLY, IXCS AND OTHER TOLL PROVIDERS SHOULD BE

1	REQUIRED TO FOLLOW THE SAME IMPUTATION GUIDELINES
2	FOR THEIR INTRASTATE TOLL SERVICES. THERE IS NO
3	EQUITY IN PLACING THESE REQUIREMENTS ON THE LECS
4	WHILE THE IXCS AND OTHER TOLL PROVIDERS HAVE
5	FREEDOM FROM THESE ONEROUS AND UNNECESSARY
6	IMPUTATION REQUIREMENTS.
7	
8 Q.	HAS LOCAL TRANSPORT RESTRUCTURE BEEN APPROVED IN
9	OTHER BELLSOUTH STATES?
10	
1 A.	YES. AS OF THIS DATE, LOCAL TRANSPORT RESTRUCTURE
12	HAS BEEN APPROVED IN ALABAMA, KENTUCKY, AND NORTH
13	CAROLINA, South Carolina and Tennessee.
4	
5 Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.
6	
7 A.	SOUTHERN BELL IS PROPOSING TO RESTRUCTURE ITS
18	SWITCHED ACCESS TRANSPORT SERVICE IN FLORIDA. ITS
9	PROPOSED TRANSPORT RESTRUCTURE SHOULD BE APPROVED
20	FOR MANY REASONS:
21	
22	I. TO MIRROR THE INTERSTATE SWITCHED TRANSPORT
23	RATES AND STRUCTURE APPROVED BY THE FCC;
24	
) E	HAVING THE CAME STRUCTURE AND RATES THAT ARE IN THE

	INTERSTATE JURISDICTION WILL SIMPLIFY TRANSPORT
1	
2	ISSUES, ELIMINATE THE INEFFICIENCY OF MAINTAINING A
3	DIFFERENT SET OF RATES AND STRUCTURES FOR THE
4	INTERSTATE AND THE INTRASTATE JURISDICTIONS, AND
5	WILL ELIMINATE CONFUSION FOR OUR SWITCHED ACCESS
6	CUSTOMERS. IN ADDITION, APPROVAL OF THIS TARIFF
7	FILING WILL LESSEN ANY INCENTIVE FOR MISREPORTING
8	PERCENT INTERSTATE USAGE (PIU).
9	
LO	II. TO MORE CLOSELY REFLECT THE WAY TRANSPORT IS
11	PROVIDED AND COSTS ARE INCURRED;
12	
13	UNDER THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE, THE SPECIFIC
14	APPLICATION OF SWITCHED TRANSPORT RATES WILL BE
15	DEPENDENT UPON THE IXC'S ORDER FOR SWITCHED
16	TRANSPORT, THE IXC'S ROUTING REQUEST AS WELL AS THE
17	CAPACITY OF THE TRANSPORT DEDICATED TO THAT IXC FOR
18	ITS USE. THE UNDERLYING PREMISE IS THAT DIFFERENT
19	COSTS ARE ASSOCIATED WITH THE SWITCHED ACCESS
20	ROUTING OPTIONS (I.E., ACCESS TANDEM SWITCHED
21	(COMMON) OR DEDICATED) AVAILABLE TO SWITCHED
22	TRANSPORT CUSTOMERS.
23	
24	III. TO PROMOTE EFFICIENT USE OF SOUTHERN BELL'S
25	NRTWORK:

1	
2	UNDER THE PROPOSED RESTRUCTURE THERE WILL BE A
3	GREATER INCENTIVE TO UTILIZE TRANSPORT EFFICIENTLY
4	IN THAT CUSTOMERS ORDERING DEDICATED TRANSPORT WILL
5	PAY THE COST OF THE TYPE OF TRANSPORT ORDERED
6	(I.E., IN THE CAPACITY OF VOICE GRADE AND/OR DSO,
7	DS1, DS3) REGARDLESS OF THE NUMBER OF MINUTES OF
8	USE FOR WHICH IT IS UTILIZED. ALSO, THE PROPOSED
9	STRUCTURE RECOGNIZES DIFFERENCES IN ROUTING
lO	ARRANGEMENTS AND ENCOURAGES IXCS TO ORDER THE
11	ROUTING ARRANGEMENTS WHICH ARE MOST EFFICIENT FOR
12	CARRYING THEIR TRAFFIC.
13	
14	IV. TO MOVE TOWARD A MORE COMPETITIVE ENVIRONMENT
15	FOR THE PROVISION OF INTEREXCHANGE SERVICE;
16	AND
17	
18	THE PROPOSED RESTRUCTURE, WHICH REFLECTS THE WAY
19	COSTS ARE INCURRED, MOVES TOWARD A MORE COMPETITIVE
20	ENVIRONMENT FOR THE PROVIDERS OF INTEREXCHANGE
21	SERVICES. THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE MOVES CLOSER TO
22	AN ARRANGEMENT IN WHICH EACH IXC WILL BEAR THE
23	COSTS OF THE TRANSPORT SERVICE IT ORDERS, BASED
24	UPON ROUTING AND CAPACITY. ON THE OTHER HAND, THE
25	PROPOSED RESTRUCTURE STILL RECOGNIZES THE EXISTENCE

- 28 -

1	OF IXCS WHICH MAY NOT BE POSITIONED TO TAKE FULL
2	ADVANTAGE OF A DEDICATED RATE STRUCTURE. SUCH
3	CUSTOMERS CAN ALSO CONTINUE TO ORDER USAGE-BASED
4	ACCESS TANDEM SWITCHED (COMMON) TRANSPORT.
5	
6	V. TO FACILITATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESS
7	COMPETITION
8	
9	THE ADOPTION OF THIS RATE STRUCTURE FACILITATES THE
10	DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESS COMPETITION IN THE SWITCHED
11	TRANSPORT ARENA. THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE ALLOWS
12	SOUTHERN BELL TO OFFER ITS SWITCHED ACCESS
13	CUSTOMERS AN EFFICIENT STRUCTURE WHICH MORE CLOSELY
14	REFLECTS THE FACILITIES UTILIZED AND COSTS INCURRED
15	BY EACH CUSTOMER. GIVEN THE INCREASINGLY
16	COMPETITIVE ACCESS ENVIRONMENT, SOUTHERN BELL MUST
17	BE AFFORDED A SWITCHED ACCESS RATE STRUCTURE THAT
18	ALLOWS IT TO COMPETE OR THE CONTRIBUTION TO BASIC
19	SERVICE WILL BE JEOPARDIZED.
20	
21	ADDITIONALLY, AT A MINIMUM, THE COMMISSION SHOULD
22	ALLOW THE LOCAL EXCHANGE COMPANIES TO HAVE THE
23	OPTION OF IMPLEMENTING ZONE PRICING FOR TRANSPORT
24	SERVICES WITH A RATE CHANGE INTERVAL OF 14 DAYS AS
25	ALLOWED BY THE ECC PHILES AND PROCEDURES PURSUANT TO

1	PRICE CAP REGULATIONS. BEING ABLE TO MAKE RATE
2	CHANGES WITH A SHORTER APPROVAL INTERVAL WILL ALLOW
3	SOUTHERN BELL TO RESPOND MORE QUICKLY TO
4	COMPETITIVE PRESSURES AND MEET COMPETITION IN A
5	TIMELY FASHION. THE LOCAL COMPANIES SHOULD BE
6	GRANTED THE FLEXIBILITY TO ZONE PRICE OTHER ACCESS
7	SERVICES AS WELL.
8	
9	FINALLY, IMPUTATION REQUIREMENTS ARE NO LONGER
10	NEEDED AND SHOULD BE ELIMINATED. IF THE DECISION
11	IS TO MAINTAIN SUCH BURDENSOME REQUIREMENTS, THE
12	COMMISSION'S IMPUTATION GUIDELINES SHOULD BE
13	MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE AVERAGE TRANSPORT COST, NOT
14	RATE, PER ACCESS MINUTE OF USE. THE REQUIREMENT
15	FOR A SEPARATE ACCESS LINE FOR SOUTHERN BELL'S AND
16	OTHER LECS' HIGH VOLUME TOLL OFFERINGS SHOULD BE
17	ELIMINATED. WITH THE LEVEL OF COMPETITION IN THIS
18	STATE AND THE SERVICE OPTIONS THAT ARE AVAILABLE IN
19	THE MARKETPLACE, THIS REQUIREMENT IS NO LONGER
20	APPROPRIATE.
21	
22 Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
23	
24 A.	YES.
25	

- 9	
1	Q (By Ms. Peed) Have you prepared a summary of
2	your testimony?
3	A Yes, I have.
4	Q Would you please give that summary at this
5	time?
6	A Yes. Thank you.
7	Southern Bell filed to restructure switched
8	transport to mirror the interstate filing that was made
9	in compliance with the FCC order. The filing was made
LO	here in Florida on September 22nd, 1993.
1	The current structure is a usage-sensitive
12	structure. The charge is assessed on a
.3	per-minute-of-use basis; unlike the other states the
4	current structure is not a distance-sensitive structure.
.5	Under the new structure, transport is being
6	changed to more closely reflect the way Southern Bell
.7	and the other LECs incur costs.
8.	Southern Bell filed to mirror the interstate
9	rate for many reasons.
0	The first reason is parity with interstate was
1	an item that has been expressed to Southern Bell by
2	various customers.
3	The second reason is if you had the same rates
4	in both inter- and intrastate, it helps the customers in

trying to reconcile their bills. That was one of the

main reasons, as well as the third reason is that it eliminates a problem that we have in the reporting of the percent interstate usage. And that is a real problem for us even now given that the structure is in place in the interstate, but not in all of the states.

Furthermore, and finally, the main reason is that it will promote efficient use of the services that we provide to our customers.

There are many customers purchasing access in this state, hundreds. Only two in this hearing are opposing the rates, and then only certain rates.

has been filed in all nine states with the same rates. It has been approved in five states; two states we've not gone to hearings where the tariff is in place, and in Tennessee the hearing officer approved a tariff. But there are further arguments that will take place. So we're waiting for four other states, all of which have either gone to hearings, or will be going to hearings. So of the nine states, we have the tariff in place in five.

There was a lot of talk yesterday about what actually all we were doing. I'm sorry for bending the chart, but they have been used in various states.

But very simply what we're talking about is

this piece of transport here, and I'll come back to this chart. First, let me get just point out exactly what we have now.

various charges, you have the carrier common line charge. We're not talking about the carrier common line charge. What I've done I've made copies, made them a little easier to follow. They are attached to the testimony that was filed.

We're not talking about the carrier common line charge.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Where is that again?

WITNESS HENDRIX: Right there. We're not

talking about the local switching charge that takes place

at the end office. We're not talking about any other

charges that some of the other carriers, local companies

may have, such as the busy hour minute charge. What we're

talking about is the transport fees between this point and

that point; that's all we're talking about. This is the

current structure.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: I'm sorry. I was looking down when you said "all we're talking about is this point to that point." Which point, the end office?

WITNESS HENDRIX: The transport piece between the end office and the serving wire center and the

customer premises, that's all we're speaking of.

IXC.

The question was asked yesterday, well, isn't that a small part of the revenues? Yes, it's about 16% of our switched access. We're talking millions and millions of dollars. So it may be small as far as a percentage; it is a large pot of dollars that we're talking about.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me interrupt you just for a minute. When you have a wire serving center, wire center serving customers.

WITNESS HENDRIX: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. And then you also have a little piece that has customer premises.

WITNESS HENDRIX: Right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And I assume that means an

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct.

commissioner CLARK: All right. So they are not necessarily located at the wire center, that's an issue of virtual collocation or actual. Okay.

witness Hendrix: That's correct. As a matter of fact, the piece between the customers premises and the serving wire center, as I will show you later, it's called the local channel. Okay. And this piece between the customer serving wire center and the end office is called

the interoffice channel.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

WITNESS HENDRIX: Then, of course, you have the access tandem where calls can be routed directly from this point to that point, or may very well be routed through the access tandem. And that is the way transport is provided to customers now.

There are options available to customers in the need structure. Yesterday the focus was on dedicated transport. And what that means, in a general sense, is transport that is dedicated to a given customer, between this point and that point here.

(Indicating) It may be a DSO; it may be a DS1; it could be a voice rate service or it very well could be a DS3 service.

And yesterday we talked a lot about, well, what actually are we talking about is DS1s, DS3s and DS0 services. The DS0 service, in simple terms, is a single voice grade path. The DS1 is 24 voice grade path. And DS3, 28 DS1s, 672 voice grade paths.

Then when we talk about tandem switch we're talking about the usage-sensitive type service option that the customer could come in and purchase from us. So these are dedicated and this is a usage-sensitive type service.

1 2 is 3 % 4 Cc 5 gc 6 se 7 dc 8 er

The other option, as I just mentioned, which is under the usage here, is whether the term is "common." Common simply means that it is used in a common network for all customers; all customers may be going through the tandem. And that is a usage-sensitive service. That's also known as tandem switching. So I don't want to throw out new terms, but I'm wanting to ensure that the focus is on exactly what we're talking about, which is still the transport piece.

Now, Florida is the first state where issues have been taken with the local channel. And when I say the first state, the first BellSouth state. And the states where we've gone to hearings, it's been on the interoffice piece, not the local channel. The local channel is the piece between the customer's premises and the circuit wire center. But here we have issue with both, or they are taking issue with both the local channel as well as the interoffice.

Under the new structure, there are new elements. We talked about the carrier common line. We also have what has been termed as the RIC, that is the charge that customers would pay us to interconnect with us. We talked about the local switching. We talked about the access tandem switching, calls that are being switched through the tandem.

Now, all of those charges, the carrier common line, the RIC, local switching, the access tandem switching, are all usage charges.

In other words, if I were to look at those usage charges and look at the average carrier common line rate that is paid by customers, the local switching, the RIC, total those up by the options, the three options, the tandem switching, the DS1 and DS3, you can see in every case more than 95 -- which represents more than 95% of the total access charge, all customers are paying the same. The difference, as I mentioned our reason for being here, is the transport piece. That transport piece will vary depending on the option that is chosen by the customer. And those options again are DS1, DS3 and the tandem switching.

So what we're talking about in this case is the 5% of the total access charges that a customer would actually pay. That's what we're talking about. And at issue is whether the rates filed by Southern Bell are the appropriate rates. And we believe that they are.

One, because it responds to the request that as been made by customers for us to mirror interstate rates.

The second reason is that would cover our costs to provide those services.

The third reason is that it eliminates

problems in billing, and the PIU problem is a major problem. And PIU, what we're talking about, if a customer has got 100 minutes, and his usage is 70% interstate, 70 of those minutes will be billed at the interstate rate; 30% will be billed at the intrastate rate. Well, that is a problem for us now by not having the same structure and the same rates in place between inter- and intrastate. That is a real problem for us.

know, we talked about PIU over the years in this state
and we were ordered to set up a local company group, and
that local company group, which is made up of all the
smaller LECs as well as the major LECs, we are to have
some plan as to customers, how we would go about
auditing customers. Because it was a serious problem.
What we're talking about is money that may be shown to
the intrastate that probably should be interstate or
maybe shown to interstate that probably should be
intrastate. And what we have some customers doing is playing
it to their benefit, and that is the problem that you have
when you have rates that are actually different.

Now, if you were to look at Features A, B, D,
7, 8 and 9 -- 900 services, if you were to look at those
services and you had a PI/PIU on these usage services,
usage services of 70, you would think as a result of

services. With local transport filing, we have asked carriers to report to us the PIU for the local channel, the PIU for the dedicated, the interoffice, and the multiplexing that they may have. Multiplexing is usually when you're breaking a service down, if I have a DS3 that has 672 voice grade-type circuits and I want to break that down to have DS1, then I have to break that down to ensure that I can take it over that DS1 service.

At one of the other hearings, Mr. Joe mentioned that it's like a traffic cop. In other words, funneling the traffic through, and insuring that it's on the right path, or the right voice rate path. So that's what we're talking about here.

But they were to give us a PIU for each of these new elements. These elements are new to switch.

They've always been under special. But with special, if 10% of the usage is interstate, the whole circuit is interstate. But with switched, you give us a usage number and we will break that number down in portion of usage based on what you give us in inter- and intrastate.

So if I have a 70% PIU on the services, you would think that I would have close to a 70 here since those are the same services. Well, folks, that's not happening. They're playing a game. And what they're

doing is saying there's 70 here, but this may be a 30.

Why? Because the structure is not in place. And so I'm going to do what is beneficial to my company to skew that to ensure that I'm not actually harmed. That is the problem where you have different rates and you have different structures.

So in simple terms, just in summary, what
we're talking about is the local channel and we're
talking about the transport piece. We're not speaking
of the carrier common line that we talked about earlier.
We're not speaking of the busy hour minute charge; we're
not speaking of the local switching charge. We're
talking about the transport pieces that were carried
traffic from the carrier's premises to the end office.
So that is what is at issue, which would represent
somewhere in the neighborhood of 3 to 5% of the total
charge that's billed to the carrier on a
per-access-minute basis.

Now, granted this is just one end of access, so if a carrier is using access on both ends and you add the double, double this, but the growing trend is to target customers with high volume usage and to use dedicated here and special here. You do have some of the special on both ends. But this is what we're talking about. The access charges are between 3% to 5%

of what a carrier would pay on a per-minute-of-use basis. And the rates filed by Southern Bell, all those rates mirror the interstate except for the red, which is priced to keep Southern Bell neutral. The second part of my summary --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: May I interrupt you just a minute. You had made a comment that local transport is 16% of the switched access revenues.

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Now, do I understand this, that in the restructuring -- what is the relationship of the 95% here to your 16%? Is there any relationship?

WITNESS HENDRIX: Okay. No. The 16t -- if I
looked at total switched access dollars, the transport
piece of total switched access dollars, which would
include your carrier common line, your local switching,
and all other elements, transport is about 16t of that
total dollar minimum. This is on an average
per-access-minute basis. These are the charges, 1, 2,
3 -- 1, 2 and 3 would be the charges made by all
customers, the tandem, DS1 and DS3 services, and the
difference would be in the local transport, which is this
piece here.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Does that mean -- I guess, what I understand that to mean is instead of the local

transport bringing in 16% of the revenues, it will only 1 bring in 5. 2 WITNESS HENDRIX: No, it will still bring in 3 16%. Perhaps a piece is a little misleading is the red 4 charge here, that's all in the transport piece. That has 5 been taken out of the number because all customers would 6 pay that on a per-access-minute basis. So that's been 7 lumped in into 1, 2 and 3. 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: What you have noted 9 interconnection IC charge, that's the RIC? 10 WITNESS HENDRIX: That is what's on the RIC. 11 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. So if I added the 12 RIC and what the new local transport cost will be, I 13 should come up to 16% of the revenues? 14 WITNESS HENDRIX: I have to do that; I can't 15 think that fast on my feet yet. 16 17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. WITNESS HENDRIX: But it may. And I'll check 18 that out. 19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. But at any rate this 20 is a revenue neutral proposal? 21 WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct. 22 I hope that helped in explaining what we're 23 talking about and the services that we're talking about. 24

COMMISSIONER CLARK: It helped me.

WITNESS HENDRIX: Approval of Southern Bell's filing coupled with the zone pricing plan that was also filed, will provide the first step in allowing Southern Bell to compete with the other carriers and other customers that may be able to provide access in the transport marketplace.

The second part of my focus is on the imputation of access. The marketplace is changing. We do not believe that imputation is still needed. We believe that the customers that are to benefit from imputation being in place are not really benefiting. Changes should be made if, in fact, the imputation standard is to be kept in place and changes are actually needed.

MS. KAUFMAN: Excuse me, I hesitate to interrupt at this point in the summary, which has been quite lengthy, but I don't believe Mr. Hendrix addresses changes in imputation standards in his direct testimony.

MS. PEED: On Page 24 of his direct testimony he answers the issue how should the Commission's imputation quidelines be modified?

MS. KAUFMAN: In a general way but not in the detail he's gone into here. He doesn't give us a proposal.

MS. PEED: I believe he was saying that they're no longer needed. He just mentioned that they should be

1 eliminated contrary to the intent of competition. his summary is appropriate. I'm sure he can wrap it up 2 3 pretty quickly. CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'm going to ask you to keep your -- your summary has been very helpful and we 5 6 appreciate that, but it is established procedure that 7 summaries are limited to the scope of what's contained in the prefiled direct and I'm going to ask you to keep it to that. 8 9 WITNESS HENDRIX: Well, let me sum it up that Southern Bell believes that the imputation requirements 10 are no longer needed with the changes that are taking 11 12 place in the marketplace. And finally, the transport tariff filed by 13 14 Southern Bell should be approved for the reasons stated earlier. 15 16 That concludes my summary. MS. PEED: Thank you, Mr. Hendrix. 17 Mr. Chairman, the witness is available for cross 18 examination. 19 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Adams. 20 CROSS EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. ADAMS: 22 Good morning, Mr. Hendrix. 23 Q

Q A couple of points of clarification on the

Good morning.

24

25

A

summary I think before we start. You corrected Page 26 1 of your testimony, I believe, where there are five 2 states listed, it's on Lines 11 through No. 13. 3 A Yes, I did. Am I correct, Alabama has allowed the rates to 5 take effect subject to a later hearing which has not 6 7 occurred? Yes, that's correct. But the rates are --A 8 The rates are approved. 9 Q 10 A Right. But there's been no Commission --11 Q 12 A No Commission hearing or review of the rates. No, but the rates were approved. A 13 Right. Kentucky, there was no challenge to 14 Q the rates in Kentucky; is that right? 15 16 That's correct, on none of them, but the rates 17 are approved. Now, North Carolina, the Commission heard 18 Q arguments but declined to have an evidentiary hearing; 19 is that correct? There was no testimony, no witnesses? 20 That's not true, no. LDDS was present, I was 21 22 present, AT&T was present. We all spoke to the issue of the tariff. They took it under advisement and issued an 23

order stating that the rates should be allowed to go in,

I believe on February 23rd, so they heard from all

24

1	parties in that docket and then finally issued an order
2	approving the tariff.
3	Q All right. They heard but they declined to
4	hold an evidentiary hearing?
5	A That's because they had the evidence. They
6	had the evidence to hear and to rule.
7	Q Now, Tennessee had a hearing before an
8	administrative law judge; is that right, or hearing
9	examiner?
10	A Yes. And an order was issued approving the
11	tariff.
12	Q By the hearing examiner?
13	A That's correct.
14	Q And the Commission is still considering it?
15	A They will, yes, but an order was issued
16	approving the tariff.
17	Q Right. Okay. And also just in terms of
18	you mentioned there are only two opponents here among
19	the interexchange carriers. Of course, Interexchange
20	Access Coalition which I represent, has got five
21	members. I just want to point that out. Have other
22	carriers other than AT&T expressed support for the
23	BellSouth rates in Florida, other interexchange
24	carriers?

Not in total. But the fact that they are not

1	here, the very opportunity to oppose the tariff you
2	know, as the old saying, "silence is golden."
3	Q Silent majority, is that what we're talking
4	about?
5	A Well, they're definitely silent.
6	Q Let's look at Page 11 of your testimony, you
7	talk about your five reasons for proposing the transport
8	structure that you propose.
9	λ Yes.
10	Q And the first one of those is mirroring the
11	FCC's interstate structure.
12	A That's correct.
13	Q And you're aware, right, that there is no
14	challenge to the structure itself?
15	A I am aware of that, yes.
16	Q Okay. And you're also you also said, I
17	think, you don't want to mirror the residual
18	interconnection charge; is that right? You have a
19	different charge in Florida?
20	A That's correct.
21	Q Is the Florida charge higher or lower than the
22	federal charge?
23	A The current pending charge well, initially
24	when the filing was made the charge was 1.3 cents.

Since that time Southern Bell has reduced access by \$50

1 million. As a result of that change that reduced the charge to .00518. If we were to go in and mirror the 2 new rates that went in at the federal level that would 3 increase the charge just slightly to .00533, the current interstate charge is .00525. 5 So Florida is slightly lower at this point --6 7 No --A 8 Q -- your proposed --9 -- slightly higher. Slightly higher because 10 of the 7.1 interstate filing. Okay. On your chart there that you were 11 Q 12 discussing a second ago, and it's up on the easel, you 13 have the chart at the bottom with the numbers on it, 14 just so I understand this, the structure that we're talking about mirroring is Items 4, 5 and 6; is that 15 16 right? Local channel, access tandem and interoffice? Exactly right. 17 A 18 Okay. And those are the same as the federal? Q We would propose that they be the same as 19 A 20 federal, yes. 21 Right. And if I add those up correctly, and Q 22 add the residual interconnection charge, I get .00751. 23 A It depends on which one you add up.

you're proposing to mirror, plus the residual connection

Right. I added the bottom three. The three

24

1	charge.
2	A It depends on which one you add up. You've
3	got three different options here.
4	Q Oh, I'm sorry, I'm adding tandem switched.
5	A Okay.
6	Q So that would mean that the total, if I added
7	correctly, is .0751 for Items 3, 4, 5 and 6, for the
8	things we're talking about mirroring? Do you want to
9	check my math?
10	A Yes, I do.
11	Q Please. (Pause)
12	A And what was your number?
13	Q .00751. Did I do it right?
14	A That is correct.
15	Q Good. And of that amount .00518 is a residual
16	interconnection charge?
17	A That's correct.
18	Q So that's roughly two-thirds?
19	A Roughly.
20	Q Okay. So of the amount we're talking about
21	mirroring, two-thirds is actually not mirrored; is that
22	correct? The residual interconnection charge is the
23	piece that is not mirrored and represents two-thirds of
24	the total?

Yes, it does.

Q Okay. Thank you.

And your second reason here you talk about "more closer reflect the way transport is provided and costs are incurred." And that's elaborated, really, at the bottom of Page 12 and continued on to Page 13 of your testimony.

Q You say, on Page 13, in last sentence, Line through, "The underlying premise is that different costs are associated with the switched access routing options, i.e., access tandem switched, common or dedicated, available to switched transport customers." What does that sentence mean, "The underlying premise is that different costs are costs are associated with switched access routing options"?

routed through the tandem, and you're going -- Bell will incur costs based on the option that you choose. And since you have tandem switching, if you choose not to be routed through the tandem but you want to assume the risk -- which is a major risk to purchase DS1 or DS3 service, remembering that DS3 service is a 672 voice grade, so whether you pump a minute over that service or not you will provide to Bell monthly the charge for that DS3. So it simply means that the customer has the option of either assuming the per-minute charge or

assuming the risk of a DS1 or DS3 service that he would pay on a monthly flat rate basis, provided that his traffic patterns are such that he could warrant it.

- Q Does it suggest that it's preferable to have prices that reflect cost?
- A It is preferable to have prices, one, that cover your cost and that reflect what is in the marketplace.
 - Q Okay. Let's go to No. 3 then.
 - A Let me expound on that.

when you look at the prices that are being charged by other customers, let's say one customer -- I went in and looked at the rates in this state for a DS1 and DS3 services. Bell's prices, while they cover Bell's cost, you know, we should be allowed to set our prices to compete with what the market is dictating to us that we need to do. And if you look at the prices of other carriers in this state, you know, there's a big gap. What you all are asking us to do, you are not doing.

You know, when you look at the 9.6 -- the FCC said we will assume your rates to be reasonable if your ratio of DS1 to 3 is a 9.6 or higher. Bell is about 15.

But I went in and pulled a tariff of a carrier opposing this tariff in this state, and I have the

actual tariff pages. And then when you look at their rates, it's almost a 1-for-1 all the way up to a 5 -- a 5-to-1 or a 1-to-1. So what is actually being done or what is trying to be done is to derail the LECs so that they can have the market to go out and do whatever they want to do or buy from other vendors.

Another party Opposing this tariff says, "I go out and purchase DS3s from other sources, but I think your DS1 should be 22-to-1." Now, that's not right. We should be allowed to set our rates, as long as our rates cover cost. And we cover cost. And we should not be dictated to by our customers as to what our rates should actually be when there are other motives on the basis of that customer. We should be allowed to do that.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Are you suggesting that the alternative carriers, the people that will be in the market to provide alternatives on the local transport charge, will be pricing predatorily; they will not cover their costs in order to get the customers?

WITNESS HENDRIX: I think they will recover their costs, but the people they are buying the services from, they are able to provide lower rates. In other words, they do not follow the 28-to-1 or the 22-to-1 that is trying to -- that some of the carriers are trying to press on us or put on us. That is not the relationship

between our DS1 and DS3 rates.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

Q (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Hendrix, do those same people have the luxury of revenue neutrality? Do they get to raise the rates for somebody else when they lower the rates for someone and come out with the same amount of money?

A I begin to wonder exactly what they do have.

I know I've reduced rates by \$50 million but I checked one of your client's tariffs and I have yet to see that flow through. So perhaps you have a better -- I mean, perhaps you're better; because I reduced raise 50 million and perhaps you just pocket the money, so you're probably better off.

Q You think the 50 million went all to one of my clients?

A No.

Q You think maybe AT&T got a bulk of that since they are the largest carrier? It was an across-the-board reduction; it didn't go to an individual company.

A I'm sure they do.

Q Okay.

A But you received the benefit of us reducing access.

Q Well, let's get back to the subject at hand, if we could.

Your Reason No. III here for proposing your tariff is, "To promote efficient use of Southern Bell's network." This is Page 13 of your testimony.

Now, starting on Line 21 of that page, you say, "Under the proposed restructure, however, there will be a greater incentive to utilize transport efficiently in that customers ordering dedicated transport will pay the cost of the type of transport ordered."

Again, as with Reason No. II, doesn't that suggest that prices and costs should have a relationship?

A Not necessarily, no.

Q So you're going to promote efficiency by covering costs but not having prices relate to those costs?

A Well, perhaps you missed what I mentioned earlier. A customer purchasing a DS1 or DS3 service assumes the risk to buy that service whether he pumps a minute over it or whether he pumps no minutes over it. That is the risk. That is a choice. And a customer in this marketplace is not going to go out and buy a DS3 if it does not warrant it. And so it is promoting

efficient use, because that customer is going to look at
what he can actually use and go out and buy that
service.

The same with a customer that may want to use tandem switched service. He cannot warrant a DS1 or DS3 service and so he will use the tandem switch.

Customers purchasing that service -- and I
think the point that is missing here is that those
customers assume a risk and they are going to ensure
that they can justify purchasing that service;
otherwise, it just isn't a smart business person or a
smart business company to go out and do that.

- Q Well, let's talk about that for a second. Can customers buy tandem switched transport and dedicated transport?
 - A Oh, yes, they can.

- Q Do some customers do that?
- A Oh, yes. I would say, since you mentioned

 AT&T, AT&T is by far probably our largest volume tandem

 switch user. AT&T may have a lot of DS1s. Your

 customers have a lot of DS-1s in this state. So you use

 tandem, they use tandem; you use dedicated, they use

 dedicated.
- Q So it's possible to buy dedicated transport and tandem transport. Doesn't that allow you to pack as

many minutes as you can into the dedicated transport and then always buying a little less than you might need and 2 overflow the rest on a tandem switched transport? 3 Wouldn't that be a smart business decision for an 5 interexchange carrier to make? 6

- Yes, I have no problem with that.
- So what risk is there when you can always Q underbuy what you need on dedicated and overflow the excess on the tandem switch?
 - Well, I'm not --

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- What risk are we looking at here? 0
- I'm not sure that you underbuy on dedicated just to have the luxury of overflow to tandem switch. That's not smart. So I would think that if a customer is going to buy a dedicated service that he will ensure that there's adequate usage to warrant that service.
- So you can, basically, just buy it for what you know of, rather than underbuy --
 - I'm sorry? A
- Rather than underbuy, you would just buy for Q what you know to be your traffic volume. And then if you get lucky and have more, you have an outlet; you don't have to buy more than you might need?
- The point that you're missing, I think, is exactly what is dedicated service.

When we tariff the dedicated service, the dedicated service allows customers, whether switched or special; if it's a DS3 service they can put special access on it, they can put switch on it, and that is making more efficient use of the services ordered by that customer. That is the option. That is a risk that he's going to take, assuming that he can fill that pipe. But there's little risk in probably purchasing tandem switching because that is on a minute-of-use basis.

Q Right. So whatever risk there is -CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Adams, let me interrupt
for just a second.

MR. ADAMS: Sure.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: How is it that the restructure is going to result in greater efficient utilization of the network?

WITNESS HENDRIX: What happens is -- well, first, let me start: Southern Bell and BellSouth has filed to waive charges, nonrecurring charges, allowing customers to groom. In other words, to put as much traffic as they can over given services.

For instance, if I go out and purchase a DS3
service, and I have 11 DS1s for special and probably I
have the need of 15 DS1s for switched, I can put those
over the same DS3 service option. That is allowing for

efficient use of the service.

And so this option, these price options that have not been available to customers before, as far as DS1 and DS3 and switched, will allow customers to more readily do that now; and the fact that we're waiving the charges is actually giving the impetus to move forward and to make that happen.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'm not so sure I understand that answer.

WITNESS HENDRIX: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: What is the difference between the pricing structure now and the way you're proposing it be restructured that it's going to result in customers making decisions which is going to result in greater efficient utilization? What signals are you proposing sending to the customer so that they will make the correct decisions to correctly utilize the network?

WITNESS HENDRIX: Okay. Today, since access transport is on a per-minute-of-use basis, if I need trunks or if I think I need trunks, I'm going to order trunks to have spares. Well, tomorrow --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Now who makes the decision -if a customer orders and it's strictly their rate is on a
minute usage, it seems to me there's an incentive to
overorder.

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct. And that was the point I was making. If it's on a minute-of-use basis, then he's going to overorder trunks that are probably needed just to ensure that those trunks are actually there for peak periods or whatever. That's on a minute-of-use basis.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Now, you, as the provider, do you review that and say, "No, you don't need this type -- this amount of capacity"?

witness Hendrix: We try to work with the customers to ensure that it's really not a problem, and we try to help them situate themselves to order actually what it is needed. But there are many cases wherein customers would simply order just in case there are peak periods or other periods, just to have spares.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: So what you're saying is that with the fixed cost of the dedicated cost of those facilities, if they order them, they are going to be required to pay the rate which you contend is cost-based.

I believe you will contend is cost-based.

WITNESS HENDRIX: Well, they will be required to pay that rate if they order the dedicated service, whether they have any usages or --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: That's where the risk comes in that you're talking about.

1 WITNESS HENDRIX: Exactly. And as far as 2 cost-based, we cover the cost to provide that service. Does that mean that the contribution on a 3 voice grade basis is the same for DS1, DS3 service? And 5 the answer is no. And what we're saying is that we cover costs, but we should be allowed to price that 6 7 service to meet the market. 8 CHAIRMAN DEASON: And you want the flexibility to price a DS1 in relation to a DS3 as the market 9 10 dictates. 11 WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct. 12 CHAIRMAN DEASON: As long as you cover your costs. 13 WITNESS HENDRIX: As long as I cover costs. 14 CHAIRMAN DEASON: If for some reason you try to 15 16 have too high of a rate, obviously, there are options available? 17 18 WITNESS HENDRIX: Oh, yeah. CHAIRMAN DEASON: So that's the nature of the 19 20 competition. WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct. 21 22 CHAIRMAN DEASON: When you refer to the market conditions, especially the degree of competition, what 23 24 options and rates are available as an alternative?

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct.

1	Q (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Hendrix, on that note,
2	what options are there? Are there competitive tandem
3	switched switched interoffice transport networks in
4	Florida?
5	A Well, I think that's the purpose we're here
6	now in this docket is to talk about whether there would
7	be others or not that could provide the transport
8	services.
9	Q So if an interexchange carrier today wants to
10	buy tandem switched transport from somebody other than
11	BellSouth in BellSouth's territory, where do they go
12	today?
13	A Perhaps you can tell me. There was one
14	carrier that mentioned that they are buying DS3s from
15	some other carrier now.
16	Q No, I'm talking about tandem switched service
17	A Tandem?
18	Q Uh-huh.
19	A Okay. Now, as far as the state of Florida,
20	you come to Bell. But and I'm glad you mentioned
21	that the FCC has issued an order that requires us to
22	hand off the signaling, wherein other vendors can
23	provide tandem switched transport.

switched access service, that is a PIU service.

Now, the key is, when you're talking about a

24

much of that usage is going to be intrastate, how much is going to be interstate, when the FCC is requiring us to hand off the signaling to that AAV for them to provide tandem switched transport? So the option is not there now but it will be; and I think September, the latter part of September is when we have to file the tariff at the federal level.

So you will have that option at the federal level and customers may very well skew it and show it all interstate when it really should be perhaps 30% intra and 70% inter.

Q Have you had inquiries from people who were going to buy that service?

A No, but that doesn't mean that it's not going to happen. We were ordered to actually do it in the docket -- I believe the docket is 911441; other customers petitioned to be able to provide tandem switching.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Let me interrupt again. What is it that the FCC ordered, and how would that be implemented?

witness Hendrix: We have to file a tariff that would require BellSouth to hand the signaling off to allow other entities to provide tandem switching transport.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Okay. Exactly what is tandem

1	switching transport? Is that providing a switched
2	service?
3	WITNESS HENDRIX: Yes, through the access
4	tandem.
5	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Now, is that an intrastate
6	service, or is it it goes through the calculation of
7	the PIU?
8	WITNESS HENDRIX: The PIU.
9	CHAIRMAN DEASON: So part of that would be
10	intrastate.
11	WITNESS HENDRIX: It could be, yes.
12	CHAIRMAN DEASON: How is that allowed under
13	current Florida law?
14	WITNESS HENDRIX: Right. But I would venture to
15	say, given the PIU problems that we've got with having
16	different rates in different states, that you're going to
17	probably have some of this intrastate traffic that's going
18	to show up as interstate traffic.
19	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Well, my question is,
20	regardless if there's only one minute of intrastate, how
21	is that allowed by Florida law?
22	WITNESS HENDRIX: It's not allowed unless you
23	approve it.
24	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Well, we can approve it; but
٦	is this continue to Plantis law up coult arrests

something that's contrary to the law.

witness Hendrix: That's true, but the point I'm making is the FCC has ordered us to make that filing.

That filing will allow for tandem switched traffic to go through the other carrier's tandem. And the point I'm making is that some of that traffic may very well be intrastate traffic; it may show up as 100% interstate.

Just as customers have the impetus to skew the usage now, there may be a greater impetus to actually do that. So while no one can offer it in the state now, it could be offered soon on an interstate basis or in some of the intrastate traffic we'll leave.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I see what you're saying,
that there would be an incentive to what would in reality
be intrastate to be classified as interstate.

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct.

commissioner CLARK: I think there's more of an incentive. They'll have to do it, otherwise, they'll be providing what -- perhaps providing local switched service, which they can't do.

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would assume 100% of it is going to be listed as interstate.

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Now is this one of the

categories of services to where if it is 10% or greater interstate it is assumed to be 100% interstate?

witness Hendrix: No. This is strictly we're talking switched access services. This would be strictly based on the PIU that is given to us; and if it's a 70/30 split, 70 being interstate, normal switched services would be billed as 70% at the interstate rate and 30% at the intrastate rate. But since it is not allowed on an intrastate basis, we'll probably be 100% interstate for that switched traffic. This is not special access traffic; it's switched traffic.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: And it's only for special access that the 10% rule comes up?

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct.

Q (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Hendrix, on your tandem switched traffic, your originating tandem switched minutes, what percentage of those are measured jurisdictionally?

A Are you asking today or consistent with the order?

Q Today.

22 A Well, we know if it's Feature Group D we can
23 measure.

Q 100%?

A I would say yeah.

Q Okay. So this PIU problem we're talking about doesn't apply to that?

A No, that's not true. You would still have the problem. Let's say if I hand off Feature Group A, B, or 700, which is a D service; 800, which is usually a D service; your 900 is D service; I think the 500 service that may be tariffed shortly is a D service. So the PIU problem does not go because of we're able to measure the NTSD.

Q Let's go back to your reasons here. I like your fourth reason on Page 14 of your testimony, "To move toward a more competitive environment for the provision of interexchange service." We have been talking about that some, anyway. I like this one because you use the word "costs" four times in his this one paragraph.

The first sentence says, "The proposed restructure, which reflects the way costs are incurred, moves toward a more competitive environment for the providers of interexchange services." We've probably said this several times already, "reflects the way costs are incurred"?

A Uh-huh.

- Q Does that mean you cover your costs?
- A If you're asking what that sentence means?

Q Right.

- A Is that your question?
- Q Yes.

earlier, if AT&T has got traffic going through the tandem, then I incur tandem switching costs. If AT&T was to purchase a DS1, I will incur the DS1 dedicated cost. If LDDS wants a DS3, then I will incur that dedicated DS3 cost. So that's what that sentence means: That if you want to be switched through the tandem, that is the type of cost I will have; if you want to be dedicated, DS1, 3, DS0, then those are the types of costs that I'm going to have. That's what it means.

Q Okay. Let's go on, Line 24 says, "The proposed structure moves closer to an arrangement in which each IXC will bear the costs of the transport service it orders, based upon routing and capacity."

In order for the carriers to make the right decisions, I think Chairman Deason was asking this earlier, don't the prices have to reflect these costs? Aren't the costs only relevant to what decisions they drive if the prices are reflective of those costs?

A I'm not really -- you know, costs, as we're talking here, are two different things. There are two different costs, let me say it that way. The first cost

is the cost that I incur in providing you the service.

The second cost is the cost which is a rate that I charge that's your cost.

Q Right.

A So which costs are we talking about?

Q What I would like to do is relate the two and that's what I am asking is that it seems to me you're talking about your costs; but your prices to us which are our costs, as you point out, don't reflect your costs, so I'm confused as to how that promotes efficiency. You're urging my clients to make the right decision when their cost doesn't reflect your cost.

A Okay. First, let me say, as I mentioned probably two other times, the rates proposed by Southern Bell cover Southern Bell's costs. Let me say that. Let me also -- I don't think I mentioned this earlier -- the rates that are filed in this tariff were rates that the PCC required us to use, which are the 9-1-92 special access rate on the interstate level with some adjustments that were required in the rate as a result of other orders. So those are the rates.

When I say, one, we cover costs, and then we price the service in accordance to what the market allows us to price the service at, okay? So I'm a little confused as to where my costs, as long as I cover

costs in my rate, should impact you. And the only way 1 that it can is if you were wanting to dictate to me as 2 to what my rates should actually be. 3 Well, I thought you said that we were Q encouraging efficient use of your network --5 6 That's correct. -- by incentivizing interexchange carriers to 7 purchase services from you based on the cost of providing those services, so that they wouldn't order 9 too much or too little? 10 I think you added some words because that's 11 A not what this says. 12 Well, I'm just trying to understand. Q 13 Well, let me tell you what this says. A 14 Okay. 15 0 Okay. What this says is that if I incur costs 16 for tandem switching service, then the rates that I have 17 for that tandem switching service will cover those 18 19 costs. If a carrier has a DS1 service, first, my 20 rates are going to cover those costs. If it's a DS3 21 service, first, my rates will cover those costs. 22 Now, if a carrier chooses to purchase a DS1 or 23

DS3 service, then he's going to ensure that he has

adequate traffic to warrant that service. That is what

24

this is saying. He purchased the service, that's the
way I incur costs. If he switched through to tandem, a
dedicated customer does not incur a tandem switching
charge, so he's not going to pay it.

Q Okay. So I guess to sum it up, then, would you agree that your prices cover your incremental costs but they don't necessarily vary in relation to the variance in your incremental costs?

A Exactly right.

Q Okay. On Page 16 of your testimony, just a little clarification point here, on Lines 7 through 9, you say, "Under the switched transport restructure, rates will be more closely aligned with the way transport is provided and costs are incurred." "More closely aligned," does that mean more closely than today under the current rules?

- A Under the current per-minute-of-use charge?
- Q Right. Is that what the reference is to?
- A Exactly.
- Q On Page 21 of your testimony, I guess this, the top, Line 1, sums up your view that market pricing is appropriate and not cost-based pricing as long as incremental costs are covered?
 - A What you stated sums up my view well, yes.
 - Q Thank you. We talked about this a little bit.

In the transport arena you see competition developing for DS3 service, DS1 service and tandem switched transport service, all three of those?

A Yes, I do.

- Q You think in the near term?
- A Yes, I do. I think it's here.
- Q Tandem switched transport?

us to file tariffs and you have an order, and for the reason I mentioned earlier about the impetus to probably misreport the PIU on that traffic. As far as your DS1 and DS3 services, if you were to look at your own client's tariff, you know, it will show, for instance, while we're competing in this market, it will show that the ratio of DS1 to DS3 service for your own client is nowhere near what you're asking us to actually do. And it just so happens that -- well, I'd better not say who those services are given to or who those services are sold to.

But, for instance, on a route between -- a DS1 route between Miami and Tampa you charge \$5,760. Well, let me do it this way. Let me go to one that's close. Gainesville to Tallahassee is 129 miles; your DS1 rate was \$7,900. If I look at Tallahassee to Jacksonville, your DS3 rate, which is 153 miles, so those are close --

1	Q What are you reading from there?
2	A Your tariff.
3	Q My tariff?
4	A LDDS or ATC's tariff. Your DS3 for that same
5	route was \$9,000 let me finish.
6	Q I'm sorry. I'm just trying to figure out what
7	question I asked that caused us to be reading the
8	tariff.
9	A Competition. Competition. And I'm just
10	looking at your rates that you charge for your DS1 and
11	DS3 services, okay, and the ratio.
12	Q Are these interoffice transport services that
13	LDS is selling?
14	A Well, I would think that two cities 120 miles
15	apart would be interoffice.
16	Q You think they would be between two telephone
17	company offices?
18	A I'm just reading from your tariff.
19	Q You don't think those are special access type
20	services?
21	A Well, special access is a DS1-type service,
22	isn't it, in a DS3?
23	Q Is that really relevant to wnat we're talking
24	about here?
25	A Oh, yes. Competition is what we're talking

470 about. Competition, but not competition in general. 2 We're not talking about --3 Well, I think that was your question you asked 5 I asked you about -- I asked you about 6 Q competition in tandem switched transport and you said, 7 "It's here." 8 No. 9 And I don't understand where that --10 I gave you the answer there. Now, I am about 11 A to give you the answer to the DS1 and 3, and what we're 12 actually facing now. 13 CHAIRMAN DEASON: This discussion is lively and 14 interesting. I'm just going to ask you not to talk at the 15 same time, okay? The court reporter can't record it when 16 you talk at the same time. 17 You asked me the competition in the 18 marketplace, the tandem switch, DS1 and DS3 services 19

I finished the tandem switch, now I'm going to the DS1 and 3.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Please proceed.

WITNESS HENDRIX: Thank you.

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the route that I gave was Gainesville to Tallahassee, which was 129 airline miles, your rate is \$7,850. Tallahassee to Jacksonville, for your DS3 you have a rate -- which is 153 airline miles -- you have a rate of \$9,700. If you were to look at the ratio there, that is a 1.2-to-1. Now, what you're asking is somewhere for Bell to set its rate at about a 22-to-1 or higher.

Now, to me that's not fair. Is competition here? Are we facing it? The answer is yes. This is evidence of it here.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I hate to interrupt. You're comparing a DS1 with a DS3?

WITNESS HENDRIX: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: The differential was a 1.2?

WITNESS HENDRIX: Yes -- no, that is the ratio.

In other words, when we filed our tariff, the FCC said if you look at your DS1 and your DS3 rates, and the ratio was

those rates are reasonable. Okay. The rates that Bell

a 9.6-to-1 or greater, that means 9.6 DS-1s to a DS3, then

filed here are 15-to-1. Sprint has asked for a 22-to-1,

and IAC has asked for something probably a little bit

greater.

But I'm saying when you look at what the marketplace is doing in this state and what's being given to customers, the ratio in that one instance I gave was a 1.2 DS1 -- I mean, DS1s to a DS3. And what

they are really wanting us to do is to have a ratio that
is larger so that they could undercut our prices and we
stand no chance of being able to compete in this market.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: When you use the term "they,"
who are "they"?

WITNESS HENDRIX: Anyone that is providing a dedicated transport; and in this one case I mention here, this is from the ATC tariff.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: So as a competitor to you providing that service?

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Now, what about the people that want to utilize that service?

WITNESS HENDRIX: Want to utilize this service?

CHAIRMAN DEASON: In some instances wouldn't

clients of Mr. Adams want to, instead of constructing

those facilities themselves, utilize your service?

Wouldn't that be more efficient for them to do?

they may choose to do that, if it's to their benefit; or they may come and use us, if it's to their benefit to come to Bell. And a lot of that will depend on the area; it will depend on the customer and whether this customer is even -- or whether this carrier customer can even operate in this area or whether there is services provided to

customers in this area. So there are various factors.

But the point that I was making is that the market, and based on what we're facing now, where we're being asked to set our rates is not consistent with where the market, the other players, are setting their rates.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Well, I guess my concern is that when you use the term "they," I think you're using it more in terms of your competitors.

WITNESS HENDRIX: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: But "they" also can be your customers.

want very much for them to be our customers and we would like very much for them to stay with us. But we should be allowed also to set our rates in such a way that we can maintain them as customers.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Is the bottom line of your concern that if you're forced into a certain structure that you cannot respond to competition, that they will become your competitors and not your customers?

witness Hendrix: Not the structure but the rates. If I'm forced to a certain rate level and if I'm forced to set my rates based on certain formulas other than just covering costs, then I will not be able to

compete with other transport providers in the marketplace because of my rate levels. 2 (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Hendrix, speaking of 3 Q customers, who is your biggest customer for access transport service in Florida? 5 Well, it shouldn't come as any surprise, I 6 would assume AT&T is. 7 Without revealing any proprietary information, 8 Q would you say they buy more than half of all of the 9 access transport service you sell? 10 WITNESS HENDRIX: Mr. Tye, how do you want me to 11 answer that? (Laughter) 12 MR. TYE: I don't know yet. 13 WITNESS HENDRIX: I know the answer but --14 MR. ADAMS: I'm not asking for a specific 15 number, I just want to know whether AT&T buys more that 16 17 half. MR. TYE: I think access percentage are 18 proprietary confidential business information, 19 Mr. Chairman, and I know that Southern Bell has gone to 20 great lengths to maintain the confidential nature of that 21 information. I don't think that anybody in the IAC would 22 like to have their percentage revealed on the public 23

record, and so I would object to Mr. Hendrix answering

24

25

that question.

MR. ADAMS: I'm not asking for a specific 1 percentage, just a ballpark figure of --2 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Just ask him if it is 3 significant. I mean, you could say greater than 50. And then once he answers to that, then you can say, "Well, is 5 it between 50 and 75?" I mean, that's ballpark. 6 You can get too specific, and I'm reluctant to 7 have the witness specify a number either greater or less 8 than a specific number. 9 MR. ADAMS: Okay. 10 (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Hendrix, would you say 11 Q that AT&T buys more than all the other interexchange 12 carriers combined? 13 MR. TYE: I object. Mr. Hendrix has already 14 answered that AT&T is the largest in the state. That 15 seems to be the point that counsel is trying to make here 16 and perhaps that's as far as we ought to go on the public 17 record, Mr. Chairman. 18 MR. ADAMS: Okay. I withdraw the question. 19 (By Mr. Adams) I have a letter here that 20 is -- I'd like to get an exhibit number for a letter. 21 CHAIRMAN DEASON: It will be identified as 22 Exhibit No. 27. 23 (Exhibit No. 27 marked for identification.) 24 MR. ADAMS: This letter is not subject to a

1	request for confidentiality, but some accompanying
2	documents which are now being distributed are, so I'm
3	going to be careful about asking questions on this,
4	Mr. Hendrix.
5	Q (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Hendrix, to your knowledge,
6	did BellSouth meet with AT&T in the process of
7	developing the rates that are Mr. Hendrix, do you
8	want a minute to look at that?
9	A Yes, thank you.
10	MS. PEED: Mr. Chairman, do you mind if I move
11	closer to my witness as far as these documents are
12	concerned?
13	CHAIRMAN DEASON: I have no objection. The only
14	available seat is right beside him, if that's where you
15	want to sit.
16	MR. ADAMS: Do we have an exhibit number?
17	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes, it was identified as
18	Exhibit 27.
19	witness Hendrix: I'm ready.
20	Q (By Mr. Adams) To your knowledge, did
21	BellSouth meet with AT&T in the process of developing
22	the rates that you're proposing today?
23	A I met with AT&T, MCI, Sprint and called Brian
24	Simonnetti (phonetic) to let him know who I was going to

be calling, also. It is a common thing to meet with

mentioned, these are our customers, I want to keep them.

So, you know, you try to be up-front with the customers,

so the answer is I met with a whole bunch of carriers.

Q Including AT&T.

- A Including AT&T.
- Q Okay. And you've meet personally with them, then, obviously, from your answer.

A Yes. But, you know, when you look at the rates that were filed, I mean, what were the choices? You either file the interstate rates or you file the rates in the initial filing, which I think was a -- we looked at the special access rates on an intrastate basis. And then after reviewing the problems that we saw in filing those rates, thought it was more appropriate to file the interstate rates.

And the meeting was pretty much, as the AT&T witness mentioned, it pretty much wanting to know what our plans were. Because you're a customer to us, we want to keep you and keep the other customers also.

- Q Do you know who Quinton Sanders is?
- A Yes, I do.
 - Q Can you tell me who he is?
- A Well, I think it's at the top of the letterhead.

1	Q Right. The letterhead says he's the director
2	of AT&T Regional Account Team for BellSouth; is that
3	correct?
4	A That's him.
5	Q Okay. And do you know who Bill West is?
6	A He's with yes he is access vice president.
7	Q For AT&T, correct?
8	A For AT&T, that's correct.
9	Q Okay. So this letter was written from Quinton
10	Sanders to Bill West February 7th, 1994, that's the date
11	that's on the letter?
12	A Correct.
13	Q And it addresses meetings with AT&T concerning
14	development of the rates we're talking about today?
15	A No, it does not.
16	Q All right. What does it address?
17	A Well, let's think back first. I filed the
18	tariff September 22nd, 1993.
19	Q In Florida?
20	A I modified the tariff in January, I think, the
21	first time. So both of those dates are prior to the
22	February 7th date. The only things that I've done to
23	the tariff since is to go in and make changes to keep
24	parity with the interstate rates.

Q In the first paragraph in the letter there,

there's a black and indented statement with a little heading that says, "End In Mind." 2 A Yes. 3 You understand the introduction of that, the first paragraph, says, "You've asked that we develop an 5 outline addressing the issues associated with potential price reductions for switched access services. Further, 7 you asked we develop an 'End-in-Mind Statement' to focus discussions between AT&T and BellSouth. Following is 9 that information." 10 So do you understand, then, there are four 11 bullet points here under "End In Mind." 12 Are you asking me if I understand them, or do 13 I --14 Yes, do you understand what those are? 15 Q I acknowledge that they are there. 16 Well, first of all, I assume you acknowledge 17 that they are there. 18 19 A Yes. Do you understand what they are referring to? 20 For example, let me ask you this. "To move 21 toward switched access price levels consistent with 22 AT&T's expectations," do you know what Mr. Sanders meant 23 by that? 24

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Obviously, that would mean to reduce access.

But, you know, when you reduce access, you don't just reduce it for AT&T. You get the benefit, that \$50 million, where you're not reducing your toll rates, you have got benefit of that \$50 million.

As I mentioned, we have hundreds of access customers, so when I go in to change a tariff, whether it is for carrier common line, local switching, transport or whatever, it's not strictly for AT&T. You get the benefit. So perhaps AT&T is doing a lot of your leg work for you.

- Q I wish that were the case. In April of this year did you file a new federal tariff or revise your federal tariff?
 - A That's our annual filing, yes.
- Q Right. And you changed the rates for these services at the federal level; is that correct?
- A I changed rates for certain switched access services, yes.
 - Q Did you change the DS3 rates?
- 20 A Yes, I did. I changed it to mirror the 21 special access like a DS3 rate.
 - Q Was that a 20% reduction?
 - A I believe that's close.
 - Q Approximately? You don't have to be exact.
 Did you reduce the DS1 and tandem switched

rates accordingly?

- A Let me tell you exactly what I did.
- Q Okay.
- A I reduced the voice grade local channel rate from \$27.14 to \$25. I increased the voice grade fixed rate from 18.09 to 23.30. I reduced the voice grade transport interoffice rate from 2.26 to 1.90. I reduced the dedicated -- and that was the dedicated, too, and I reduced the dedicated DS3 interoffice, not the fixed, just the interoffice piece from 253 to 200. I also reduced the DA RIC rate from 00317 to 00269. There were also other changes in the local switching rate and the carrier common line rate.
- Q Maybe I can simplify the question a little bit. I believe you told me in other states that you agreed with me that that filing reduced DS3 rates by 20%.
 - A I agree with you here, too.
- Q Okay. And left DS1 and tandem switched rates essentially unchanged.
 - A That's correct. And I just stated that.
 - Q Thank you.
- A And that was -- and the reason I reduced the DS3 rates was to gain parity with the special access DS3 LightGate rate for interoffice.

1	Q To your knowledge, that wasn't related to an
2	effort to move towards switched access price levels
3	consistent with AT&T's expectations?
4	A No. As a matter of fact, until you showed me
5	this letter here, I had not seen this letter, and I was
6	the one that made the pricing decisions as to what
7	should happen on the federal level.
8	Q Okay. The BellSouth interoffice network
9	operates at a DS3 level; is that correct?
10	A The interoffice I believe is about 92% fiber.
11	Q And so that would mean that it operates at a
12	DS3 level?
13	A Mainly.
14	Q Okay. So help me understand, a typical call
15	would originate at someone's residence, just a
16	hypothetical call. We're at someone's residence, we
17	pick up the phone, the call goes first to the closest
18	end office, correct, or the end office the residence is
19	connected to; is that right?
20	A That is correct.
21	Q Okay. At that end office, then, is that where
22	it enters the interoffice network?
23	A That's correct.
24	Q And is that the point at which it becomes

25 multiplexed up to a DS3?

1	A That's correct.
2	Q Okay. And then it travels through that
3	interoffice network to the interexchange carrier point
4	of presence?
5	A That's correct.
6	Q And then you hand it off to the interexchange
7	carrier?
8	A That's right.
9	Q Okay. And that happens is that rate
10	regardless of what the interexchange carrier is using
11	DS3, DS1 or tandem switched transport?
12	A If it's over my interoffice, it's regardless.
13	Q Okay. If a carrier is buying DS1 or tandem
14	switched transport, when it receives it at its point of
15	presence, then you have to multiplex it down from DS3
16	down to DS1 or whatever you hand off?
17	A That's correct.
18	Q So that multiplexer on the receiving end, just
19	before it goes to the point of presence, that's the
20	difference between the DS3 and DS1 service?
21	A Not necessarily, no.
22	Q In terms of cost, is that not true?
23	A No, not necessarily. There are other factors.
24	The multiplexer would be one of the factors,
25	which is really an error in the numbers that were a part

of your witness' testimony. Because he assumes -- I'm
assuming he assumes one, and that's what is stated in
the verbiage, but the fact is -- well, let me put it
this way: If I were a teacher and he gave me that, I
would have to fail him because he did not do a thorough
job, because he did not look at all of the costs, the
number of multiplexers needed, nor did he look at the
cost for the state, nor did he look at the field
factors. And so it is terribly flawed.

- Q First, I should give you some personal advice, don't teach in a public school.
 - A I do not. I work for BellSouth.
- Q You get in trouble with those belts in public schools.

We propounded some interrogatories to Southern
Bell dated February 23rd, 1994, out of the responses
here. Do you have those available.

- A No, but I know which one you are speaking of.
- Q Okay. No. 11.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A It talks about the main difference between --
- Q It doesn't say the main difference. The question is, "For the typical interoffice fiber link, identify every difference in equipment and facilities used by Southern Bell to provide a DS1 and DS3."

And If you'd like, I can read you the entire

response, but the last sentence of it is, "Therefore, the difference between the provisionings of a DS3 and a DS1 is a 3-to-1 multiplexer required for DS1 service."

A Okay. And as I said --

- Q Are you telling me that's incorrect?
- assuming that it only took one, then that is the case. But what I'm saying is that there are more than one—there's more than one multiplexer usually on average that is used. And on top of that, which I think the Sprint witness got to, you have the field factors. He used a 79.

service and you want to know what is the main difference, the main difference would be the multiplexer that you have to put on. But it takes more than one, and then you would have to consider the field factors.

Furthermore, your question was very limited in what it asked for. It asked for the equipment and facilities; it did not ask as to what other factors. You had limited your question to equipment and facilities that are used.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Adams, how much more do you have for this witness? Substantial or more than 50%.

(Laughter)

MR. ADAMS: More than all other questioners 1 combined. No, I'd say significant. Not substantial but 2 significant. 3 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Very well. That helps a lot. That's not confidential. 5 We'll take a ten-minute recess at this time. 6 7 (Brief recess taken.) 8 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Call the hearing back to 9 10 order. MS. WILSON: My witness arrived last night. 11 He's going to be here only -- it's my understanding his 12 flight leaves at 4:30, and I request that he be placed on 13 the stand right after lunch. I understand there's just 14 limited cross examination for him, so it shouldn't be a 15 problem to take him out of order right after lunch. 16 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Any objection? Okay. We'll 17 make that accommodation. 18 MS. WILSON: Thank you. 19 MR. ADAMS: In that regard I have good news. I 20 managed to eliminate a lot of the questions I had still on 21 my list here during the break. I think we covered a lot 22 of the information already. 23 I'd like to ask for an identification number 24

for IXC's First Set of Interrogatories, Item No. 11. I

487 think it has been distributed. CHAIRMAN DEASON: Yes, that will be identified 2 as Exhibit No. 28. 3 (Exhibit No. 28 marked for identification.) (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Hendrix, just a couple of 5 questions on that. Give me, where appropriate, a yes or no answer and then your explanation. 7 Just one sort of final question on this 8 multiplexer issue. It's my understanding that only one 9 multiplexer is needed to reduce a DS3 down to a DS1 at the point of interface with the carrier network; would 11 you agree with that? Usually. But then if it's going over the DS3 13 interoffice, you have DS1s that may become an office service, or at the other end you have a multiplexer there also. 16 But at the point of interconnection there is 17 Q just one, right? 18 At that single point, yes, but there are other 19 points along the interoffice. 20

Q So my understanding is that you're essentially standing by the answer, interrogatory answer, Item No. 11?

A I'm standing by -- I'm sorry?

21

22

23

24

25

Q I was just going to restate it. You look like you needed my clarification.

1	A No, I'll let you restate it.
2	Q Okay. You're taking a position that this
3	answer is correct as written.
4	A Considering the narrow focus of how the
5	question was asked, yes.
6	Q Okay.
7	With regard to tandem switching costs, subject
8	to check and without revealing the actual proprietary
9	figures, would you agree that the economic cost of the
10	tandem switching element is less than 40% of the
11	proposed price?
12	A Subject to check, I would think.
13	Q Okay. And that price is the price, the 20% of
14	the interstate revenue requirement for tandem switching;
15	is that right?
16	A With the other 80 input in the interconnection
17	charge, the 20 being in the tandem switch.
18	Q Right. But the less than 40% is less than 40%
19	of the 20%, correct?
20	A Let me ensure that I understand.
21	First, I agreed subject to check
22	Q Right. Understood.
23	A that the costs was 40% of the rate.
24	Q Less than.
25	A Less than 40% of the rate.

1 Q Right. Subject to check, I agreed, to that. 2 Okay. And the second question --3 Okay. Go ahead. The second question was the rate that we just 5 discussed is set at 20% of the interstate revenue 6 requirement, correct? 7 That's correct. We mirrored the interstate 8 9 rates. Right. So the less-than-40% number is applied 10 to the 20% number, that is what I'm trying to --11 Is applied to the rate. 12 Okay. Do all the rates you propose -- the DS3 13 rates, the DS1 rates and the tandem switching rate --14 have contribution included above your incremental cost? 15 I'm sure it does, yes. 16 Is the contribution the same in each case? 17 No, and that's the very point I made earlier. 18 As long as we cover costs, Southern Bell would need the 19 freedom to set the rates based on what the market 20 pressures are. So the contribution percentage that you 21 have in a DS1 versus a DS3, versus tandem switching, it is not the same, but the same thing would hold true in 23 the marketplace. Your DS1 and your DS3 costs are not 24

the same and it's obvious by the numbers I gave you

earlier.

on top of that, if you look at the basis, the genesis, of where those rates came from, they were the 1992 special access rate. Those rates were not the same. The contribution on those levels were not the same. And that's been a common practice throughout; when the customers take the risk to purchase a DS3 services, or a DS1 service, knowing that they would have to be able to justify that, we price that service based on market. The contribution is not the same.

In a competitive marketplace you can't have that, or you shouldn't have that. You should be able to price according to what the market would actually bear or what it will dictate to you as to what your rate levels would actually need to be for the services that you offer.

- Q In a competitive marketplace you wouldn't have revenue neutrality? So you're telling me that tandem transport --
 - A Not necessarily.
- Q Let me ask you this. Tandem switched transport --

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'm going to have to ask both the witness and the attorney once again not to speak at the same time.

MR. ADAMS: Okay. CHAIRMAN DEASON: The court reporter is having 2 an extremely hard time. I'm having a hard time just 3 listening. 5 MR. ADAMS: Sorry. (By Mr. Adams) Well, let me just ask a simple 6 0 7 question, then. I hadn't finished answering the question. 8 CHAIRMAN DEASON: The witness may answer the 9 previous question and then we will continue. The contribution -- well, to be revenue 11 neutral, as Bell is, in a competitive marketplace you 12 could be revenue neutral and still be competitive. 13 There's no problem in actually doing that. You may go in and increase rates on certain services and certain 15 mileage bands, and reducing others, and that's to meet the market need. You may increase rates during your off 17 periods, off peak times, and reduce the peak rates. 18 That's revenue neutral. There's nothing wrong with 19 that. 20

So I do not agree with what you are saying.

- Would you agree with me that tandem switched Q prices have more contribution than the DS3 prices?
 - I don't know.

21

22

23

24

25

You don't know what the amounts of

contribution are in each of your prices?

A I would say in looking at the cost studies, and I don't have them here, but in looking at them, that's probably true. I just don't have the numbers to verify that. That may be true.

Q You don't know what the levels of contribution are in your proposed prices?

A I know what the rate levels are. I know that

I cover costs -- hold on a minute. On a percentage

basis it probably is higher.

Q I'm sorry?

A On a percentage basis it's probably higher.

Q Okay.

A But that's fine, because you're pricing your service to meet the market. There's no guidelines in a competitive marketplace that says as long as I cover costs that the contribution levels must be equal. That that is not the way you do it, nor is it the way the other vendors or carriers do it.

I'm finished. Thank you.

Q Okay. Do you believe that the Florida EAEA rate structure promotes economic efficiency?

A Do I believe the Florida EAEA rate structure promotes economic efficiency? (Pause) I don't understand your question.

1	Q The average rate using the average rate per
2	minute as the basis for the pricing?
3	A What is your question? Are you asking me
4	equal rate per unit of traffic?
5	Q No. The current EAEA average rate per minute
6	structure, does that promote economic efficiency?
7	A I want to answer the question, but I want to
8	ensure I understand the question.
9	Q You're proposing a departure from that, I
10	believe.
11	A Okay. If you're asking me if the rate that I
12	currently have promotes efficiency? The one rate?
13	Q The intrastate rate in Florida.
14	A No, I do not believe that.
15	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Hendrix, what rate were
16	you referring to when you were referring to an EAEA rate?
17	WITNESS HENDRIX: I am referring to the
18	transport rate that I currently charge, which is was
19	just reduced from 0154 to 00706. That is the rate, which
20	is the one rate there is no distant-sensitive rates for
21	transport in this state. You have just the one rate that
22	is assessed on a per-minute basis, so that's the rate that
23	I'm thinking that was being asked.
24	And the fact that it is on a minute-of-use

basis, and there is no impetus in carriers being

1	efficient in the services that they order, so I do not
2	belief that it would promote efficiency in the use of
3	the services or in the services that are ordered.
4	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Now, what's the significance
5	to the deaveraging aspect of the proposed rate?
6	WITNESS HENDRIX: When you speak of deaveraging
7	
8	CHAIRMAN DEASON: I thought that was the
9	question. Maybe I'm mistaken.
10	WITNESS HENDRIX: I'm not sure I understood that
11	to be the question.
12	MR. ADAMS: No. The question was just whether
13	he believes that the postalized, nondistant-sensitive
14	pricing structure per minute of use promotes economic
15	efficiency.
16	CHAIRMAN DEASON: I apologize. I thought I
17	heard something in that question concerning some type of
18	deaveraging of some sort.
19	MR. ADAMS: No.
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: In fact it is averaging. I
21	assume by postal rates you mean everybody pays
22	MR. ADAMS: Exactly.
23	COMMISSIONER CLARK: The same no matter how far
24	it goes.
	Distance inconsitive

1	Q I'd like to ask the witness to look at a
2	document here.
3	MS. PEED: Do you have a copy for me?
4	MS. KAUFMAN: I apologize, I do not, but you're
5	certainly welcome to look over the shoulder with us.
6	(Pause)
7	Q (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Hendrix, can you identify
8	the document?
9	A I'm sorry?
10	Q Can you tell me what the document is?
11	A The brief of Southern Bell in Docket 880812.
12	Q Can you flip to the page with the little
13	yellow tab on it and read the underlined sentence for
14	me?
15	A Okay. "It is equally clear that the creation
16	of the EAEAs and the use of average transport rates have
17	fostered economic efficiency within the state."
18	Q Do you disagree with that statement?
19	A Well, this was filed back in 1990. I mean
20	we're in what is today? My 19th wedding anniversary,
21	August 23rd, 1994. We're talking over four years.
22	Q Right. So the economic theories have changed
23	in that time?
24	A Well, the marketplace has changed. I mean, a
	whole lot of things have changed since that time. If

you look at the report that was put out by Mr. Roy

Jeeter (phonetic) that talks about the things that have

changed in the marketplace -- have you seen this? The

marketplace has changed.

We're talking a different era. We're talking

access providers coming in. We're talking people being

able to provide special access and private line-type

services. We're talking a totally different market

9 here.

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We're talking things happening at the federal level that would allow you to come and locate in my offices on a virtual basis. We're talking signaling, handing off the signaling so that you can provide tandem switch.

The marketplace has changed.

- Q So you agreed with it then but not now?
- A I didn't write it.
- Q I understand that.
- A But I would agree, given that point in time back in January 1990, that it was probably appropriate then. But now the marketplace has changed.

MR. ADAMS: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Hoffman.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOFFMAN:

Q Mr. Hendrix, my name is Ken Hoffman. I'm representing Teleport Communications Group. I just have a few questions for you.

I think in one of your discussions with Chairman Deason you mentioned a nonrecurring -- a waiver of a nonrecurring charge. Can you tell me a little bit more about that?

A Yes, which one do you want to know because there's a whole bunch. The first one -- is there one that you want to know about? Because I could just run down the list.

Q The one that you mentioned in your discussion with the Commissioner.

A Okay. Well, I mentioned that in general, so I might as well cover the whole gamut.

The first one was as a result of the order that was issued for local transport that would allow carriers to move their traffic from a dedicated to a tandem switched basis or from a tandem switched to a dedicated basis, and we will waive charges to allow that to happen.

The other charge waiver that was filed later will allow carriers to groom. In other words, by grooming, I mean if you have special and switched

services and you want to put those on a single pipe, then we will waive charges to actually allow you to do that. And still the waiver of dedicated to common or common to dedicated was in place.

The other waiver that was filed in July would allow carriers, if they have certain high cap type services that was purchased out of the special access tariff, to place switched services on those high cap services. And the whole purpose was to incent customers to be efficient in the routing of the services that they order from us and in the use of those services.

- Q With respect to each of those three waivers of nonrecurring charges that you just described, has permission been sought by Southern Bell to implement the waiver of those nonrecurring charges at the FCC?
 - A That was what I just gave you, was the --
 - Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.
 - A That's what I just gave you.
- , Q The FCC?

- A Yeah. But the first waiver where a carrier is able to move from dedicated to common or common to dedicated with switched services, that was filed even before the local transport tariff was filed here.
- Q Have any of those requests to waive those nonrecurring charges been filed in Florida with the

Florida Public Service Commission?

A That was what I just mentioned, the first one was filed here and approved.

- Q What about the other two? Have the other two?
- A No, because we don't have the local transport tariff. That would assume that the local transport tariff was in.
- Q With respect to the nonrecurring charge which addresses the switch from dedicated to common and common to dedicated, what costs are incurred with those charges where the rate is being waived? Do you understand what I'm trying to ask?

A Well, yes, I do.

and wants to be dedicated -- in other words, rather than being switched through the tandem they are now wanting to go from the certain wire center to the end office -- then you would have the charge at least on one end of that service to move it to that dedicated end office.

And if it's dedicated wanting to become tandem route, then at least on one end of that interoffice you have the charge of moving that customer's traffic back to be a tandem route.

Q So at least with respect to that situation you just described, there are certain costs that Southern Bell would incur when the customer goes from tandem to dedicated or dedicated to tandem that are not being recovered through a rate.

A That's correct.

- Q Is that correct?
- A That's correct.
- Q Now, if you had a customer such as AT&T which wished to switch its local transport from Southern Bell to an AAV, would Southern Bell waive the nonrecurring charge for the interconnector or AT&T?

is that the order from the FCC -- and, furthermore, we're talking two different dockets. At least at the federal level, you're talking docket, I believe, 91213 and 91141; so you're talking two different dockets that were handled at two different times, okay? So the waiver applied to the transport piece; the collocation docket is a different docket. So the charges in that case were not waived. The FCC was very clear in stating as to which charges would actually be waived and those charges were associated with the local transport piece, not the collocation docket.

Q If I understood your answer, Mr. Hendrix, I think what you're telling me is that if a customer wished to change providers -- if the Commission

authorizes competition for local transport for switched access services -- if a customer wishes to change providers of the local transport piece from Southern Bell to an AAV, either the AAV or the customer will have to pay a charge that would not have to be paid if the customer had stayed on Southern Bell's network; is that correct?

A You understood me clearly. I mean, that's just like -- well, you may want to do it, but I don't want to tell my wife I'm going to pay you to leave me.

(Laughter) Okay. And so --

Q I understand.

MR. WIGGINS: That's why he's been married 19 years.

A So to me it's the same thing. Why would I want to pay a carrier to leave me?

Q (By Mr. Hoffman) So all other things -- I'm sorry.

- A I want to incent the carriers to say with me.
- Q Essentially, then, this serves as motivation for the customer to stay on your network rather than switching to an AAV?

A Exactly right, which not only will benefit Bell, but the end users of the state benefit because that switched traffic is here with me.

1	MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. I have no further
2	questions.
3	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Ms. Caswell. Ms. Bryant.
4	CROSS EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. BRYANT:
6	Q Good morning, Mr. Hendrix. Chanthina Bryant
7	on behalf of Sprint.
8	You stated earlier that under the equal charge
9	structure that all carriers were treated the same; is
10	that correct?
11	A I don't believe so I said that. I think what
12	I said was that given the charges that we have here, 1,
13	2 and 3, all of those charges are paid by the carriers.
14	And then I mean, the rates are the same for all
15	carriers. Now, when you get into the DS1, the DS3 and
16	your tandem switched, it's based on the option that the
17	carriers order.
18	Q But under the old structure all carriers paid
19	the same based on a per-minute-of-use?
20	A Under the old structure, yes.
21	Q Is that correct?
22	A That's correct.
23	Q And under the new structure would you agree
24	with me that all carriers are no longer treated the

1	A No.
2	Q Doesn't it depend on which service carriers
3	are able to subscribe?
4	A That was going to be my answer to your
5	question. All carriers ordering a DS1 or a DS3
6	service if everybody in this room wanted a DS1
7	service, you come to Bell and I'm going to treat you al
8	alike. Everybody gets the same rate. Now, if you want
9	the risk and you want the DS3 service, all DS3 customers
.0	come to Bell and I will treat you all exactly alike.
.1	All tandem switched customers, you come to Bell and I'l
.2	charge you the same rate.
.3	The services that the customers order are
4	different; so based on that service, I would treat them
.5	all the same.
.6	Q But didn't you state earlier in response to
.7	IAC's questioning that that would be risky \$5 do that i
8.	you didn't have a sufficient amount a sufficient
.9	volume to place on a DS3
0	A I stated
1	Q that's going to subscribe to those
2	services?
2	a Its corry for cutting across you. Are you

finished?

Yes, I am.

A I'm sorry.

and purchase a DS1 or a DS3 service and did not have adequate volume to justify that service, that's not a good business decision that that customer is making.

He's going to purchase the service based on his need for that service, so it is a risk that he's assuming.

because whether he puts a minute or no minutes over that DS1 or any dedicated service, he will remit to Southern Bell on a monthly basis the cost for that service — the rate for that service, rather.

- Q Well, if it's not a good business decision, is it probable that carriers will do that?
 - A Do what?
- Q To subscribe to services where they don't have a sufficient amount of traffic?
- A I don't think so.
- Q Or inadequate?
- Market is changing to the point that you're going to have to look once, look twice, and look three times probably to ensure that the service that you are ordering is the best service that you can order to service this area. And so it is not wise, nor do I see carriers moving, to simply order a DS3 service for the

sake of having it.

Q Well, didn't you also state that the contribution is different based on those services?

A Yes, I did.

Q So customers subscribing to the DS1 would pay more -- contribute more to common costs than say a customer subscribing to a DS3?

A Well, let me put it this way -- and the answer is yes, but let me put it this way: A customer buying your UltraWATS service is going to contribute more to Sprint than a customer -- I mean, will contribute less to Sprint than a customer buying your message toll service. Your message toll rate, average rate, may be 20, 22 cents. Your UltraWATS, depending on whether it is dedicated or totally dedicated or switched-end dedicated, let's say that's around 10 cents. So the contribution that you get from that service is likely to be higher on your message toll service than it is on your UltraWATS service.

So the same principle applies here, that if a customer as a larger volume customer can justify a DS3 and in a given area on a voice grade basis, then perhaps the contribution that he's going to pay is less, but he's guaranteeing me more. Likewise, on a DS1, the contribution may be greater, but he's not guaranteeing

me as much as a DS3 customer is. That's the market.

Q Well, Mr. Hendrix, it sounds like you're providing discounts based on volume and larger customers are rewarded by paying less based on the amount of volume that they are purchasing.

A Well, I don't agree totally with what you're saying. The customer on a per-minute-of-use basis, if he's got adequate traffic to justify a DS3, if you were to convert that a minute-of-use basis, perhaps his minute-of-use charge is smaller than the tandem switched customer or the DS1 customer. But that is not given to only certain size customers.

If I am a small carrier and I have adequate traffic from one given customer that would mean that I could go out and purchase a DS1 or a DS3 service, then that's fine, I may put in a dedicated service. In that same area, AT&T may be the largest carrier in that area but they don't have that customer so they may use tandem switch.

So it is not based on the size of the carrier.

It is based on the market that that customer is actually servicing.

The second point is this: In Georgia, when we went through these same hearings, we send out 495 letters to carriers asking them to provide us the

impact. Well, some of them did; some of them didn't.

But out of 495, we got 10 back. Half of those customers saw increases, wherein half probably saw decreases. And some of the ones seeing decreases were very small carriers and that was because of the market that they've actually targeted. It has nothing to do with the size of the carrier.

mean that certain carrier rates will go up in rural areas? The answer is no. AT&T, as I mentioned, is the largest tandem switched customer probably. If anything, in those rural areas -- and they've testified to this -- those rural customers are probably going to see benefits because those carriers in those rural areas are going to have to get on with more marketing to those customers in that area, so the quality of service or the options for those customers are not going to go down. So it is not based on customer size; it is based on the market that that customer is serving.

Q You say it's not based on customer size. ANd you used AT&T as an example. And you said AT&T can purchase a DS3 or they can use a tandem switch, but would a smaller IXC have that option? If they don't have a sufficient volume of traffic, they don't have the option of purchasing a DS3 or, like you said earlier, it

wouldn't be a good business decision to do that, would it?

A Well, I think you may have misstated some of what I said. But let me go back to what I said.

It is based on whether a customer can purchase a dedicated service or whether he's going to use tandem switched that's based on the customers and the market that that customer is servicing. It is not based on size. And that's it. That is the point.

The customer size may not have anything to do with it. Just like in Georgia, you know, the one customer that I have cited is, you know, a very small customer. They saw a decrease. They sent me a copy of their summary bill; they saw a decrease and it's because of the market. They have a given customer that they are servicing. It has nothing to do with of the customer's size.

I happen to know -- I don't know if I should say this -- but I happen to know that if you look at the percent of the type of services that are ordered by carriers, people seem to think that AT&T has got all of these DS3s. Well, I can tell you that's not the case.

You'd be surprised who has got the DS3 services.

Q Thank you, Mr. Hendrix. You've stated that your primary rationals for pricing your services the way

that you have is based on the marketplace.

A Based on the marketplace, and our initial step is to mirror the interstate rates. And the reason we mirrored it, as I mention in my summary, was because our customers that had asked, you eliminate some of the problems with the PIU, as we call it, percent interstate usage; you eliminate some of the problems with customers trying to verify their bills. And so there are some benefits, but the mirroring of the interstate rates is our first step in responding to what the market pressures are.

- Q And you also stated that the contribution depends on the services purchased, that there's less contribution in the DS3 than the other services --
 - A I said on a --
 - Q And all of that is in response to competition?
- A I'm sorry. I missed the last part of your question because I was being rude, I cut across you.
- Q I'm sorry, that your services were priced based on the marketplace.
 - A That's correct.
- Q Let me just sum up by asking you that in the instance -- well, should the PSC approve competition in the switched access market; and to the extent that any legislative changes are necessary, would you go back and

revisit your prices for DS1 services and tandem switching?

A Oh, yeah. I'm going to tell you, I'm going to do what's in the best interests of my customers and what's in the best interests of Bell. And the other thing that we filed, we filed a zone price plan here; and let's face it, zone pricing have -- the plan that we filed, which is the same plan that was filed at the federal level, you have three different zones, Zones 1, 2 and 3, and it's based on density.

what does that say? That says that at some point if zone pricing is approved I will go in and have different rates in those zones. And those rates will be based on what the pressures are and what I need to do in pricing that service to meet the market. So I will make changes.

- Q Depending on the marketplace?
- A That's correct.

MS. BRYANT: Thank you. I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Tye.

MR. TYE: Just a few, Mr. Chairman.

CROSS EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. TYE:

Q Mr. Hendrix, looking at Exhibit 27, have you still got a copy of that over there? That's the letter

to Bill West from BellSouth.

A Yes, I do.

Q Okay. Would you take a look first at the paragraph that starts "End in Mind" and the first bullet point thereunder, which is, "To move towards switched access price levels consistent with AT&T's expectations."

Is it your understanding that AT&T's

expectations are that switched access price levels will

approach incremental cost?

A Yes, I am aware of that.

Q Okay. And that's around a penny a minute in Florida, is it not, intrastate?

A I've seen that number floating around in various states. I don't think I can reveal from the stand here without my Counsel telling me I can do so what those costs are.

Q Okay. It was my understanding, I think
Southern Bell gave us that in the rate case and it was
not a proprietary number. I don't think we asked for
the specific number, but I believe that it was around a
penny a minute, but if -- do you all have an objection
to that, Mary Jo?

MS. PEED: I'm sorry, I didn't participate in the rate case. I don't know if we gave that or not. If

we didn't try to protect it in the rate case it's not a proprietary number. I have to leave that to you.

- Q (By Mr. Tye) That's not an unrealistic number, is it, in your opinion?
 - A Neither is a nickel.

- Q The point is if in fact access levels,
 Southern Bell's access levels, are eventually reduced to
 that level, all the IXCs are going to share the benefits
 of those reductions; is that correct?
 - A Yes. Let me add something to my yes answer.

The problem with going with rates that are different -- other than the problems that were mentioned earlier -- that are different from the rates that Southern Bell filed, as AT&T has just asked, their goal is to get down to cost.

Well, one other party in this docket has argued that my transport rates be cost-based. And in looking at those rates, the rates proposed by that party, it's lower, but there's a catch to that. You take the money, you put it in the RIC.

Well, General stated that there's no cost in the RIC. I do not agree. I believe there are some costs in the RIC. But with the pressure that would be placed on the RIC both at the federal level and, as AT&T stated here, their goal is to get it down to cost, then

you can't simply say, "Let's go to this structure, my rates or lower and you're better off and we're going to take all of that money and throw it over here in the RIC." Because then we've got another battle to face, another battle to fight.

your cake and then you have your ice cream here.

Wherein, you get lower rates here and we're going to keep pounding on you, Bell, to get your RIC down. And not only that, we're going to tell you how you need to set your rates and the contribution that you have in each rate level cannot be but such.

so your goal is to get down to cost. I understand that. We are a long way from cost. We still have other rates that will be reduced in this state on 10-1-95 and 10-1-96; but it just points out the problem in going with other rates other than the rates filed by Bell here, because it's not as simple as putting it in the RIC and you're better off.

And I don't think you want to come up six months from now and have another docket, when you go in and you talk about, "But what should we do about access charges?" I'm sorry, Mr. Tye, I gave you a clock.

Q That's okay. Given that answer I think it's safe to say that AT&T and Southern Bell didn't

necessarily agree on all of the points in this letter; 1 is that correct? 2 I think that's very safe to say. 3 Okay. Now, Mr. Hendrix, were you here Q yesterday when I was asking some questions of Mr. Lee, 5 GTE's witness, regarding the use of a reconfigured as opposed to a historical network? 7 Yes, I was here. 8 Now, it's my understanding that Southern Bell 9 has based its rates in this proceeding on a historical 10 network; is that correct? 11 Yes, we did. 12 And that's consistent with the approach 13 adopted by the FCC; is that correct? That is correct. A 15 Okay. Now, with respect to your statement 16 about access imputation requirements -- and I think that 17 began on Page 24 of your testimony. Would it be safe to say that Southern Bell has never been a proponent of 19 access imputation requirements? 20 I think that's very well put, yes, I'd agree. 21 Now, the access charges, the portion of access 22 Q charges we're dealing with here in this docket today 23

comprises about 15% of the total package; is that

24

25

correct?

If you include the interconnection and all of 1 that, focusing strictly on transport, exactly right. 2 Yes. Okay. And that's the only part that 3 Q will change as a result of this proceeding; is that 5 correct? That's correct. 6 Okay. And what you're doing there is you're 7 Q not eliminating that portion of access charges, you're 8 just kind of stirring it around and coming up with a new 9 way to recover it; is that correct? Well, what you're saying is right; but in 11 tying that to the imputation of access, I think you have 12 to look at the broader picture. And the broader picture 13 in this docket is there are other issues that you're talking about here other than transport. 15 We're talking a major step in allowing other 16 customers and other vendors to come in and to provide 17 some of the same type services. So the marketplace will 18 change; and given the change in the marketplace and the 19 nature of the marketplace, imputation is not needed. 20 Are you saying, Mr. Hendrix, that your 21 22

competitors are likely to provide -- strike that. Let's look at what we are talking about here.

As I understand it, in expanded interconnection, we're talking about perhaps your

23

24

competitor being able to provide the facility between 1 the end office and the IXC's POP; is that correct? 2 That's one of them. 3 We're not talking about your competitor being able to provide -- in this case, being able to provide 5 the local loop out to the end user's premise, are we? Okay. No, we're not talking about but you 7 A left out the other part. 8 I understand that and we'll get to that in a 9 minute. 10 11 A Okay. Now, the local loop, the local loop is 12 something that you receive compensation for on the basis 13 of a carrier common line charge; is that correct? That's correct. 15 And anyone that wants to use your local loop 16 is going to have to pay that carrier common line charge; 17 is that correct? 18 That's correct. 19 And that's not going to be changed to go away 20 as a result of this proceeding; is that correct? 21 That's correct. 22 Okay. Now, then you've got your local 23 switching charges. And we're not talking here today 24

about your competitors being able to provide that local

switching function either, are we?

- A That's not what we're talking about now.
- Q And so anybody that wants to provide interexchange service to your end users out there in your service territory is going to have to pay that local switching charge also; is that correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q And we're not talking about that going away as a result of this proceeding; is that correct?
 - A Not as a result of this.
- MR. TYE: Okay, thank you, sir. I have no further questions.
- A But the second part that was missing, you said you were going to get to that.
 - Q (By Mr. Tye) Okay. What did I --
 - A Would you like for me to get to it?
- Q Well, it's inevitable. Go ahead and get to it, Mr. Hendrix. (Laughter.)
- A The second part that is missing is this part here that is the interoffice piece. We talk about local channel and someone situating themselves here, which means that we would lose this piece. But what happens if they come and sit here? You lose the interoffice piece. So that was the piece that was missing. So it's not that small piece, you know, local channel or

whatever dollars associated with that, but it's also this interoffice piece.

Q Okay. But anyone who would want to use an AAV, for instance, would have to pay the AAV for that piece in addition to paying Southern Bell for the local switching and the carrier common line. Wouldn't you agree with that?

A Yeah. But Southern Bell has lost that revenue, that transport interoffice piece as well the local channel piece, depending on where the carrier chooses to situate himself.

Q Yes, sir, I understand that. But an interexchange carrier would still have to pay somebody for that piece in addition to paying Southern Bell for the local switching piece and the carrier common line; isn't that correct?

A Yes. But if you look at the rate that I quoted earlier and you look at Sprint's witness that mentioned they're purchasing DS3s from an AAV, and Mr. Metcalf mentioned yesterday -- let me see, I have his exact words -- that an AAV will never price higher than the LECs. So tariffs are not required now. And I paraphrase that part.

so you're talking about the carriers being able to go to someone else to purchase a service at a

rate that's lower than what Bell would be able to offer that rate, and that would hold true especially if we go with some other option that's being offered up in this docket. But we stand to lose the interoffice as well as the local channel piece.

Q Okay. But let's talk for a minute, we're talking about access imputation at this time. Would it be safe to say that all of those pieces, the rates that you charge for those pieces today are in excess of their incremental cost?

A Oh, yeah.

Q And, in fact, the rates that an IXC would have to pay to you or to somebody else for those services would be out-of-pocket costs to the IXC; would you agree with that?

A I would agree that no one is going to go in and give a carrier transport for free, so they would have to incur some cost. But the point is, what is that level of costs that we're talking about? And as was testified to yesterday, those costs are obviously lower than what the LECs' costs are. LECs' rates.

Q I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you,
Mr. Hendrix. How much is your carrier common line
charge in Florida today?

A I used to be able to commit that stuff to

1	memory. I'm getting old.
2	I'm wanting to say the terminating is .0260.
3	I've got it here if you'll bear with me. (Pause)
4	The originating I believe is .260 and
5	terminating is .02927.
6	Q Okay. The originating is 2.6 cents a minute,
7	is that the correct way to state that?
8	A That's correct.
9	Q And the terminating is how much?
10	A 2.9 cents.
11	Q All right. 2.9 cents. So then on both ends
12	of that call, we're talking about almost, 6 cents a
13	carrier common line only; is that correct? 5.5 cents?
14	A If you're using two ends.
15	MR. TYE: Okay. Thank you, sir. I have no
16	further questions, Mr. Chairman.
17	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Mr. Wiggins, how extensive is
18	your questioning?
19	MR. WIGGINS: Well, I actually have just a few
20	questions which are susceptible to short answers.
21	(Laughter) Although Mr. Hendrix may feel the need to be
22	complete in his explanation. So I would think not very
23	long at all. I think it would be worth giving it a shot.
24	CHAIRMAN DEASON: Go right ahead.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. WIGGINS:

Q Good morning, I think. No, good afternoon.

Pat Wiggins for Intermedia.

I was actually a little confused by an answer you gave to Ms. Bryant and I wanted to clarify what it is you're doing as opposed to why.

I understood you in answer to one of

Ms. Bryant's question to say that you were not going to

discriminate among customers; that if someone came for a DS1,

they were going to get the same price as another person coming

for a DS1. It didn't matter whether it was AT&T or LDDS, it

would be the same rate; similarly for DS3s.

Does that fairly characterize your testimony?

- A That's correct.
- Q But isn't it also true that it depends on what the market is saying? That in some circumstances if the market is saying to Southern Bell, "Oh, no, we need to cut a special deal for this DS1 for LDDS, otherwise we lose its traffic," then that person may, in fact, get a lower rate than another person subscribing to DS --
 - A Not offering that --
 - Q sir?
- A I'm not offering that. I'm a little confused as to the question.

Q Under your market pricing approach, isn't it the intent to give some customers different prices for DS1s than other customers?

The switched access DS1s, I have not offered the CSA authority for DS1s in this docket, so I will have to tariff the rates. I would believe all customers would pay the same.

Q Oh, excellent.

Let me revisit just for a moment to be clear about the local transport segment.

If I understand your answers to Mr. Tye correctly, if Intermedia is able to physically or virtually collocate with one of your end offices and they're able to carry the transport of the switched access traffic to an IXC's point of presence, that would replace the interoffice channel segment of your switched access product; is that correct?

- A as well as the local channel in that case.
- Q Okay. The local channel?
- A Local and interoffice.
- Q The local and interoffice.
- A That's correct.
- Q Okay. Let's take a look at the local channel segment for a moment. That is -- excuse me. That is this right here? (Indicating)

1	A That's correct.
2	Q Okay. Do you know whether Intermedia will
3	have to pay a functionally equivalent charge to your
4	Company in its interconnection arrangement?
5	A That is the cross-connect charge is what they
6	would pay. That's been tariffed in the federal tariff
7	and the rate is not the rate of a local channel.
8	Q In terms of function, though, it's the same?
9	A The function is the same. But it's not the
10	same rate.
11	Q Now, assuming that the interoffice what did
12	you call that exactly?
13	A Interoffice channel.
14	Q Not the is that what you're calling what
15	the collocator pays
16	A Oh, no. That's the cross-connect element that
17	the collocator would pay.
18	Q Okay. The element that the collocator pays,
19	the cross-connect element, the one that allows them to
20	make the handshake to exchange the traffic, that
21	however, is, in fact, the functional equivalent of the
22	local channel irrespective of how it's priced. Would
23	you agree with that?
24	A That is correct.
25	Q Okay. Now, it's clear, isn't it, that

Intermedia would like to be a competitor of Southern 1 Bell for the switched access transport. Is that your 2 3 understanding? Yes, it is. In fact, they would like to eat your lunch if 5 given a chance, correct? 6 And I'll be careful what I pack for lunch. 7 A Good. I want to put a chart back up here. 8 0 If we look at your bar graph and look at the 9 interoffice channel segment, it is the yellow sliver, is 10 it not? 11 That is correct. 12 So that's the revenues that Intermedia wants 13 to feed off of, correct? 14 Not necessarily, no. You missed a point. You 15 missed the local channel. It's the yellow and the purple. 16 The yellow and the purple? Q 17 That's correct. 18 This and this. (Indicating) Q 19 That's correct. 20 But we've already established that in order to 21 Q feeding off of this they will be paying you something, a 22 cross-connect charge that's the functional equivalent of this 23

Not at the same rate level. That's correct.

payment you would be receiving from the IXC, correct?

24

MR. WIGGINS: No further questions. 1 CHAIRMAN DEASON: I hate to break at this point 2 but we are going to break for lunch, Mr. Poucher. And I 3 just recognized, Mr. Hendrix, we're going to -- when we reconvene we're going to take up, is it Mr. Smith? 5 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, we'd have no problem 6 if you'd like to finish with Mr. Hendrix before you put 7 Mr. Smith on the stand. Just so long as he can make his 4:30 flight. My understanding is there is just a few 9 parties that have questions for him and they may be 10 limited questions. 11 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Okay. Well, given that, 12 perhaps we will reconvene with Mr. Hendrix. I think 13 Mr. Poucher has some questions, Staff will have some questions, but I think we should be able to finish with 15 Mr. Hendrix shortly after we reconvene, hopefully. 16 MS. WILSON: That's great. Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN DEASON: Okay. We will recess for 18 lunch at this time. We will reconvene at 1:30 p.m. 19 (Thereupon, lunch recess was taken at 12:15 20 p.m.) 21 (Transcript continues in sequence in Volume 22 23 5.) 24