

ORIGINAL
FILE COPY

F. HOPPING GREEN SAMS & SMITH
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

123 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 6526
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32314
(904) 222-7500
FAX (904) 224-8551
FAX (904) 425-3415

JAMES C. GOODLETT
GARY K. HUNTER, JR.
JONATHAN T. JOHNSON
ROBERT A. MANNING
ANGELA R. MORRISON
GARY V. PERKO
KAREN M. PETERSON
MICHAEL P. PETROVICH
LISA K. RUSHTON
R. SCOTT RUTH
JULIE R. STEINMEYER
T. KENT WETHERELL, II

OF COUNSEL
CARLOS ALVAREZ
W. ROBERT FOKES

JAMES S. ALVES
BRIAN H. BIBEAU
KATHLEEN BLIZZARD
ELIZABETH C. BOWMAN
RICHARD S. BRIGHTMAN
PETER C. CUNNINGHAM
RALPH A. DeMEO
THOMAS M. DeROSE
WILLIAM H. GREEN
WADE L. HOPPING
FRANK E. MATTHEWS
RICHARD D. MELSON
DAVID L. POWELL
WILLIAM D. PRESTON
CAROLYN S. RAEPPE
DOUGLAS S. ROBERTS
GARY P. SAMS
ROBERT P. SMITH
CHERYL G. STUART

Writer's Direct Dial No.
(904) 425-2313

August 21, 1996

ACK _____
AFA _____
APP _____
CAF _____
CMU _____
CTR _____
EAG _____
LEG _____
LIN _____
DPC _____
RCH _____
SEC _____
NAS _____
DTH _____

Ms. Blanca S. Bayó
Director, Records & Reporting
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

960833-TP

Re: Docket No. 960846-TP

Dear Ms. Bayó:

On behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCImetro Access Transmission Services, Inc. (MCI), I have enclosed for filing in the above docket the original and 15 copies of the testimony of Don J. Wood and Don Price.

Canzano
Storg

By copy of this letter this document has been provided to the parties on the attached service list.

RECEIVED & FILED

Very truly yours,

Richard D. Melson

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

Richard D. Melson

RDM/cc
Enclosures
cc: Parties of Record

79858.1

Wood
DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
08878 AUG 21 96
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Price
DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
08879 AUG 21 96
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing was furnished to the following parties by hand delivery this 21st day of August, 1996.

Donna Canzano
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Nancy White
c/o Nancy Sims
BellSouth Telecommunications
150 S. Monroe Street, Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Tracy Hatch
AT&T
101 N. Monroe St., Suite 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301

and by UPS Delivery to:

Nancy White
BellSouth Telecommunications
675 West Peachtree St., Ste. 4300
Atlanta, GA 30375

Richard D. [Signature]

Attorney

1 DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DON J. WOOD

2 ON BEHALF OF MCI

3 DOCKET NO. [REDACTED]

4 AUGUST 21, 1996

ORIGINAL
FILE COPY5
6 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.7 A. My name is Don J. Wood, and my business address is 914 Stream Valley
8 Trail, Alpharetta, Georgia 30202. I provide consulting services to the
9 ratepayers and regulators of telecommunications utilities.10
11 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE.12 A. I received a BBA in Finance with distinction from Emory University and an
13 MBA with concentrations in Finance and Microeconomics from the College of
14 William and Mary. My telecommunications experience includes employment
15 at both a Regional Bell Operating Company ("RBOC") and an Interexchange
16 Carrier ("IXC").17 I was employed in the local exchange industry by BellSouth Services,
18 Inc. in its Pricing and Economics, Service Cost Division. My responsibilities
19 included performing cost analyses of new and existing services, preparing
20 documentation for filings with state regulatory commissions and the Federal
21 Communications Commission ("FCC"), developing methodology and computer
22 models for use by other analysts, and performing special assembly cost
23 studies. I was employed in the interexchange industry by MCI
24 Telecommunications Corporation, as Manager of Regulatory Analysis for the
25 Southern Division. In this capacity I was responsible for the development and
26 implementation of regulatory policy for operations in the southern U. S. I

1 then served as a Manager in the Economic Analysis and Regulatory Affairs
2 Organization, where I participated in the development of regulatory policy for
3 national issues.

4

5 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TESTIMONY BEFORE STATE**
6 **REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?**

7 **A. Yes. I have testified on telecommunications issues before the regulatory**
8 **commissions of twenty-three states, the District of Columbia, state courts, and**
9 **have presented comments to the FCC. A listing of my previous testimony is**
10 **attached as Exhibit ___(DJW-1).**

11

12 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

13 **A. I have been asked by MCI Telecommunications Corporation ("MCI") to**
14 **describe the methodology that MCI believes should be used for accurately**
15 **determining the relevant costs of unbundled network elements to be provided**
16 **by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BST") pursuant to the Federal**
17 **Telecommunications Act of 1996. I will also describe the results of applying**
18 **this methodology in the state of Florida, and provide an overview of the model**
19 **used to develop these costs.**

20 My testimony is divided into three sections: Section I introduces the
21 basis for the costs developed by MCI for the unbundled network elements and
22 describes how those costs -- and the underlying methodology used to develop
23 them -- are consistent with sound economic costing principles generally and
24 with the FCC's August 8, 1996 First Report and Order in CC Docket 96-98

1 specifically. Section II describes how the model used to develop these costs
2 operates, and Section III identifies the inputs used and reports the results of
3 this analysis. I will refer to the methodology used as the Hatfield Model
4 ("HM"), and will discuss the results obtained using Version 2.2, Release 2, of
5 that model.

6

7 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EXPERIENCE REVIEWING COST MODELS
8 AND METHODOLOGIES.

9 A. While employed in the BellSouth Service Cost organization, I had the
10 opportunity to work with a number of cost models and to analyze and review
11 the manner in which these models were used in the cost development process.
12 Since that time, I have reviewed incremental cost studies performed by each of
13 the seven regional Bell Operating Companies ("RBOCs") and a number of Tier
14 1 Local Exchange Companies ("LECs"), including BST. My review has
15 included an evaluation of the methodologies, computer models and
16 spreadsheets, and inputs/assumptions used. I have also been asked by
17 regulators to develop detailed rules to be used by the LECs when performing
18 TSLRIC studies.

19 Two constant sources of frustration have been present throughout this
20 process: 1) The lack of publicly available information related to the LEC
21 studies, and 2) the lack of independent and objective cost data to be used as a
22 benchmark for the evaluation of the LEC-provided data.

23

1 **Section I: Description of the Cost Principles Implemented by the Hatfield Model**

2

3 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ORIGIN AND PURPOSES OF THE HATFIELD**
4 **MODEL.**

5 **A. The Hatfield Model was developed by Hatfield Associates, Inc. of Boulder,**
6 **Colorado at the request of AT&T and MCI. Its purposes are to 1) estimate**
7 **the costs of the unbundled network elements described in § 252 (d) (1)(A) and**
8 **(B) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and 2) to develop an estimate of**
9 **the cost of basic exchange telephone service that is the subject of universal**
10 **service funding mechanisms. Complete documentation describing the**
11 **operation of the model in detail is being developed and can be made available**
12 **upon request.**

13 The HM derives some of its inputs and methods from version 1 of the
14 **BCM Plus model, a successor to the Benchmark Cost Model ("BCM"), which**
15 **was originally developed by US WEST, NYNEX, MCI, and the local services**
16 **operation of Sprint (on July 3, 1996, US West and Sprint Corporation**
17 **presented version 2 of the BCM to the FCC. NYNEX and MCI are not**
18 **sponsors of BCM2. A careful review indicates that the purported**
19 **enhancements in BCM2 are already present in the Hatfield Model).**

20

21 **Q. HAS THE HATFIELD MODEL EVOLVED OVER TIME?**

22 **A. Yes. Originally, the Model was used to produce estimates of the TSLRIC of**
23 **basic local exchange service as part of an examination of the cost of universal**
24 **service. A second version, referred to as the Hatfield Model V.2.2, Release 1**

1 was then developed to estimate costs for unbundled network elements only.
2 Version 2.2, Release 2, used to produce the results in this testimony, considers
3 both unbundled elements and basic local exchange service. It also incorporates
4 a number of enhancements over earlier versions, the ultimate effect of which is
5 to increase the degree of certainty associated with the results it calculates.

6

7 **Q. WHAT ARE THE KEY PRINCIPLES AND ATTRIBUTES OF THE**
8 **HATFIELD MODEL?**

9 **A. The model uses sound economic costing principles to estimate the relevant**
10 **costs. Its operations can be readily scrutinized, and a large number of its**
11 **inputs can be set, by users. It includes all network elements and associated**
12 **costs that are necessary to provide the unbundled elements and local exchange**
13 **service considered by the model.**

14

15 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PUBLIC NATURE OF THE MODEL.**

16 **A. Version 2.2, Release 1 of the model has been available through the**
17 **International Transcription Service of Washington, DC, for some time.**
18 **Release 2 of the model will shortly be available from the same source, and**
19 **will be made available in this proceeding. The new release will be**
20 **accompanied by complete documentation that describes the operation of the**
21 **model. In addition, a considerable effort has been expended to facilitate the**
22 **setting of many inputs by the user of the model through a graphical interface,**
23 **and it is anticipated that this interface will be available when the model is**
24 **released, or shortly thereafter.**

1 The inputs to the model, both those adjustable by the user and those
2 incorporated into the model itself, are readily visible to the user. The model
3 runs as a set of Excel spreadsheets, and those spreadsheets can be examined by
4 the user.

5
6 Q. WHY IS IT IMPORTANT THAT COST MODELS CAN BE PUBLICLY
7 REVIEWED IN THIS FASHION?

8 A. Previously lacking such open cost models, regulators and intervenors have
9 been forced to rely on cost studies produced by the incumbent Local Exchange
10 Carriers (ILECs) as the only available source of cost data. Attempts to
11 review, analyze, and verify the cost data produced by such models have met
12 with, at best, only limited success.

13 As described above, two constant sources of frustration have been
14 present throughout the process of reviewing such models. First, the lack of
15 publicly available information related to the ILEC studies has often made a
16 meaningful review difficult or impossible. The inputs and assumptions used
17 by the respective ILECs, when made available, have often been subject to
18 proprietary protection. Similarly, the mechanized cost models have often
19 remained "black boxes" because of the inability of intervenors (and often
20 regulators) to test either the accuracy of the algorithms or the sensitivity of the
21 model to inputs and assumptions. The second source of frustration has been
22 the lack of independent and objective cost data to be used as a benchmark for
23 the evaluation of the LEC-provided data. Without such an objective data
24 source, it has been impossible for either regulators or intervenors to ascertain

1 the reasonableness of ILEC cost estimates.

2 In contrast to the difficulty often experienced when attempting to
3 evaluate ILEC cost studies and the underlying models, a review of the Hatfield
4 Model can be direct and straight-forward. Complete and detailed
5 documentation of the model is available, including descriptions of both the
6 model algorithms and the inputs and assumptions used. Because the model is
7 publicly available and its inputs can be varied by the user, it possible to
8 directly evaluate the model for accuracy and to ascertain the sensitivity of the
9 model to changes in various inputs. Because this level of review is possible, it
10 is possible for the reviewer to conclude that the model produces both
11 reasonable and verifiable cost data.

12 In summary, a fundamental issue with any cost study is the integrity of
13 the assumptions, calculations and input values used to develop the ultimate
14 outputs. The only method to test the reliability of the final product is to make
15 all of the data as well as the methodology accessible for independent scrutiny
16 and evaluation. The Hatfield Model uses clearly documented and visible
17 methodologies which are verifiable, and non-proprietary data obtained from
18 publicly-available sources. Both the inputs and outputs to the Hatfield Model
19 are open for inspection and analysis. Inputs can be varied as appropriate, and
20 sensitivity testing can be conducted by varying these inputs. The results are
21 all subject to challenge and verification.

22

23 Q. YOU STATED THAT THE HATFIELD MODEL CALCULATES COSTS
24 USING A METHODOLOGY THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE

1 "FORWARD LOOKING ECONOMIC COST"-BASED STANDARD
2 ADOPTED BY THE FCC. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE STATED BASIS FOR
3 THE FCC'S METHODOLOGY.

4 A. In its August 8, 1996 First Report and Order in CC Docket 96-98 ("Order"),
5 the FCC concluded that because "the prices of interconnection and unbundled
6 elements...are critical terms and conditions of any interconnection agreement,"
7 it was necessary to "set forth the methodological principles" to be used when
8 determining relevant costs and rates (para. 618). The FCC outlines in some
9 detail a "cost based pricing methodology based on forward looking economic
10 costs" which it concludes is the approach for setting prices that best furthers
11 the goals of the 1996 Act" (para. 620), and that will "give appropriate signals
12 to producers and consumers and ensure efficient entry and utilization of the
13 telecommunications infrastructure" (para. 630). This methodology is to be
14 used to determine costs and rates for unbundled network elements,
15 interconnection, and collocation (paras. 628, 629).

16 In order to develop a national standard for the calculation of forward
17 looking economic costs, the FCC identified the following criteria to be used:

18 Use of a long run assumption. The term long run, in the FCC's
19 methodology, "refers to a period long enough so that all of a firm's costs
20 become variable or avoidable" (para. 677). The HM uses this assumption
21 when identifying relevant investments and expenses.

22 Definition of increment to be studied total demand. The FCC states
23 that "the increment that forms the basis for a TELRIC study shall be the entire
24 quantity of the network element provided, and that "all costs associated with

1 providing the element shall be included in the incremental cost" (para. 690).
2 The HM studies an increment equal to the entire quantity of the network
3 element, both as the incumbent uses the network element to provide its own
4 retail services and as it provides that network element to other carriers on an
5 unbundled basis. All costs that an efficient incumbent LEC would incur to
6 provide the network element are included.

7 Use of a forward-looking methodology. The FCC concluded that the
8 relevant costs should be the costs that "a carrier would incur in the future"
9 (para. 683), and that a "forward-looking economic cost methodology based on
10 the most efficient technology deployed in the incumbent LEC's current wire
11 center locations" (para. 685). The HM utilizes existing wire center locations,
12 and develops investments using the most efficient, currently available
13 technologies for the provision of loop facilities, switching, interoffice
14 transport, and signalling.

15 The inclusion of a "reasonable profit." The FCC concludes that "the
16 concept of normal profit is embodied in forward looking costs because the
17 forward looking cost of capital...is one of the forward-looking costs of
18 providing the network elements," (para. 700), and that because a normal profit
19 is represented by the LEC's forward looking cost of capital, "no additional
20 profit is justified under the statutory language" (para. 699). The HM includes
21 a forward looking cost of capital in the costs that it calculates, and does not
22 provide an additional "markup" over this level.

23 Embedded costs should not be included. The FCC concluded that a
24 cost methodology based on embedded costs, or a "markup" to reflect the

1 difference between forward-looking and embedded costs, "would be pro-
2 competitor -- in this case the incumbent LEC -- rather than pro-competition,"
3 and went on to state that "we reiterate that the prices for interconnection and
4 network elements critical to the development of a competitive local exchange
5 should be based on the pro-competition, forward looking, economic costs of
6 those elements, which may be higher or lower than historical embedded costs.
7 Such pricing policies will best ensure the efficient investment decisions and
8 competitive entry contemplated by the 1996 Act" (para. 705). The HM is
9 based on forward looking economic costs, and embedded investments are not
10 used.

11 Universal Service Subsidies should not be included. The FCC
12 concluded that "funding for any universal service mechanisms adopted in the
13 universal service proceeding may not be included in the rates for
14 interconnection, network elements, and access to network elements" (para.
15 712). The HM does not include these costs in its calculations.

16 Access to Cost Data/Burden of Proof. The FCC notes that "the
17 incumbent LECs have greater access to the cost information necessary to
18 calculate the incremental cost of the unbundled elements of the network.
19 Given this asymmetric access to cost data, we find that incumbent LECs must
20 prove to the state commission the nature and magnitude of any forward
21 looking cost that it seeks to recover" (para.680, 696). The HM calculates
22 costs using the best publicly available data that has been identified. The
23 model is designed to permit calculations of cost based on LEC-provided data if
24 the LEC has met the burden of proof that these data will accurately identify

1 forward looking costs.

2 Use of generic forward looking cost models. While the FCC stated
3 that it had not had ample time to review the Hatfield Model specifically, it
4 stated that the HM and similar generic models "appear best to comport with
5 the preferred economic cost approach discussed previously" in the Order (para.
6 834), and that the HM and similar models "appear to offer a method of
7 estimating the cost of network elements on a forward looking basis that is
8 practical to implement and that allows state commissions the ability to examine
9 the assumptions and parameters that go into the cost estimates" (para. 835).
10 Of those models referred to by the FCC in this section, only the Hatfield
11 Model is based on publicly available data and permits scrutiny by both
12 commissions and interested parties.

13 Inclusion of specific types of cost and application of principle of cost
14 causation. The FCC states that unbundled network elements should be priced
15 at "the forward looking costs that can be attributed directly to the provision of
16 services using that element, plus a reasonable share of the forward looking
17 joint and common costs" (para. 673), and indicates that "costs must be
18 attributed on a cost-causative basis. Costs are causally related to the network
19 element being provided if the costs are incurred as a direct result of providing
20 the network elements, or can be avoided, in the long run, when the company
21 ceases to provide them" (para. 691). The FCC goes on in subsequent
22 paragraphs of the Order to define these terms and to give illustrative examples
23 (See paras. 678,679,682, 690, 691, 694, 698). The HM uses cost-causative
24 principles to identify forward-looking costs with specific network elements. It

1 includes in the cost of network elements all the costs that the FCC specifically
2 discussed in its order as being part of the direct cost of network elements.
3 Specifically, the HM includes all "investment costs and expenses related to
4 primary plant used to provide that element" (para. 682), and attributes
5 "incremental costs of shared facilities and operations...to specific elements to
6 the greatest extent possible" (para. 682). The HM specifically attributes "the
7 costs of conduits shared by both transport and local loops, and the costs of
8 central office facilities shared by both local switched and tandem switching...to
9 specific elements in reasonable proportions" (para. 682). For both dedicated
10 and shared investments, the HM includes "the forward-looking costs of capital
11 (debt and equity) needed to support investments required to produce a given
12 element" (para. 691).

13 The FCC's rules require that overhead costs be included to the extent
14 that they vary with the output of particular network elements (despite their
15 accounting classification), and thus are part of the TELRIC of those elements.
16 The FCC also requires, to the extent that there are any such overhead costs
17 that are common to several wholesale elements, or to wholesale and other
18 functions, that the prices of of network elements include "a reasonable share
19 of common costs." The procedure of estimating the overhead costs of a
20 wholesale-only carrier, which is what Hatfield does by adding the 10%
21 markup, satisfies the FCC requirements. While statistical evidence and a
22 growing literature on activity-based accounting systems suggest that many of
23 the costs that have traditionally been considered "overhead" costs should
24 actually be considered service-specific or element-specific costs, the Hatfield

1 Model method for treating overhead costs renders any precise distinction
2 between element-specific and "common" overhead costs unnecessary. Insofar
3 as the 10% markup captures all of the relevant overhead costs, it includes any
4 element-specific costs and a reasonable share of any "common" overhead
5 costs. This approach ensures that each network element recovers at least its
6 "reasonable" share of such common costs, to the extent that they exist.
7 Moreover, if regulators set prices for network elements equal to the costs that
8 the Hatfield Model reports for each element, these prices would allow a firm
9 that is engaged solely in providing network elements on a wholesale basis
10 (with no retail functions) to recover all of its economic costs of doing
11 business, including a reasonable profit, but no more. From this vantage point
12 also, the Hatfield approach lies well within the bounds of reasonableness.

13 In conclusion, the Hatfield Model complies with the detailed
14 explanation of the cost methodology adopted by the FCC and the results of the
15 Model should be used to establish rates for unbundled network elements in
16 Florida.

17

18 Q. HAVE REGULATORS AND ECONOMISTS ENDORSED THE HATFIELD
19 MODEL?

20 A. Yes. With reference to an earlier version of the model, which lacks a number
21 of the features and enhancements incorporated into Release 2, the Washington
22 Utilities and Transportation Commission concluded the following (See WUTC
23 Docket No. UT-950200, Fifteenth Supplemental Order, page 82):

24 The Commission rejects USWC's cost studies for local

1 service and the local loop. The most reasonable and
2 accurate measure of incremental cost for these services
3 on this record is provided by the Hatfield model ... We
4 are satisfied that it accurately reflects costs incurred by
5 USWC and that, if it errs, it likely errs on the high side.

6

7 Nationally prominent economists have also endorsed the HM. In an
8 affidavit submitted in response to the FCC's April 19, 1996, Notice of
9 Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 96-98, Professors William J.
10 Baumol, Janusz A. Ordover and Robert D. Willig state in paragraph 38 that:

11 We have reviewed the costing model constructed for
12 AT&T and MCI by Hatfield Associates, Inc., a
13 telecommunications consulting firm. The object of the
14 current Hatfield model is to estimate the total costs of
15 building and operating a network, using efficient,
16 forward-looking technology, to supply all "basic"
17 narrowband services (essentially all local and intraLATA
18 toll service, including carrier access) currently supplied
19 in the United States. We conclude that the Hatfield
20 Model follows reasonably closely the TSLRIC principles
21 discussed in Section II. Where limitations on the
22 availability of data have forced the designers of the
23 model to use approximations that deviate from the
24 theoretical ideal, the shortcuts adopted tend to

1 overestimate, not underestimate, true TSLRIC. Further
2 the model is extremely flexible: whenever values are
3 available, they can readily be substituted for the values
4 used currently.

5

6 **Section II: Constituents and Operation of the Hatfield Model**

7 **Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE HATFIELD**
8 **MODEL'S OPERATION.**

9 **A. The Hatfield Model employs a methodology based upon engineering standards**
10 **and methods applicable to the local exchange network in order to estimate the**
11 **costs that would be incurred by an efficient firm to provide the unbundled**
12 **network functions and basic exchange service that are considered by the**
13 **model. Specifically, these costs would be incurred by an efficient LEC to**
14 **provide the specified functions and services using a network designed to**
15 **provide narrowband, voice-grade telephone services. The Hatfield Model is a**
16 **table-driven system that is adaptable to any LEC or geographic area, provided**
17 **the appropriate state-specific and company-specific information is available and**
18 **input into the model.**

19

20 **Q. HOW DOES THE HATFIELD MODEL RELATE TO THE BCM?**

21 **A. A key constituent of the HM is BCM-PLUS, which was derived from the first**
22 **version of the BCM ("BCM1"). However, BCM-PLUS, and the remaining**
23 **modules of the HM, use BCM1 only as an initial step in the development of**
24 **the investment associated with the feeder and distribution components of the**

1 local loop. The Hatfield Model adds network components not included in
2 BCM1. It also applies BCM1 output to its own switching investment module.
3 The switching module in the Hatfield Model contains separate, user-changeable
4 factors for switching investment, construction, installation, floor space and
5 frames. This disaggregation provides for a thorough determination of wire
6 center costs. The same module determines the investment in interoffice call
7 transport and signaling facilities.

8 BCM-PLUS, together with the Hatfield Model, improve on BCM1 in a
9 number of ways. First, the HM uses a 1995 estimate of households per
10 Census Block Group (CBG), whereas BCM1 used 1990 census data. Second,
11 the HM accounts for multi-line residences, and business, special access, and
12 payphone lines, which were excluded from the loop facilities calculation in the
13 BCM1. In doing so, it uses a database showing the number of employees per
14 CBG that was not identified at the time BCM1 or earlier versions of the HM
15 were written. Third, the HM estimates costs according to the line density --
16 that is, the number of *lines* served per square mile -- rather than the number of
17 *households* per square mile. Fourth, the HM increases the amount of
18 distribution cable in the two highest density ranges, and decreases it in lowest
19 density range, consistent with the amount of cable that would actually be
20 required for such a line density. Fifth, the HM estimates structure costs
21 independently of the cost of the cable itself, whereas the BCM1 estimated
22 structure costs as a multiplier of cable costs. In addition, the HM includes
23 cable installation (placement) costs, which tends to increase the per-foot cost of
24 the cable. Sixth, the Hatfield Model includes costs associated with network

1 elements that were not included in the BCM1, such as the drop wire, network
2 interface device, terminal, and serving area interface portions of the local
3 loop, and the facilities necessary to connect LEC end offices (interoffice
4 facilities). These are perhaps the most significant changes; there are a number
5 of additional minor changes.

6 As already noted, U S WEST and Sprint recently released a new
7 version of the Benchmark Cost Model ("BCM2"). BCM2 incorporates many,
8 but not all, of the modifications that the Hatfield Model made to BCM1.

9
10 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INPUT DATA USED BY THE HATFIELD
11 MODEL.

12 A. The Hatfield Model uses seven primary categories of input data: CBG data,
13 business employee data, cable and installation cost data, wire center data,
14 traffic data, expense data, and ARMIS-reported data on the number of
15 residence and business lines. The CBG data used by the Hatfield Model are:
16 1) number of households in each CBG; 2) CBG land area; 3) CBG position
17 relative to the nearest wire center; and 4) geological factors including rock
18 depth, rock hardness, water table depth, and surface texture. The business
19 line data provide the number of business employees by CBG; this information
20 is used to distribute the ARMIS-reported number of business, special access,
21 and payphone lines by CBG.

22 The wire center data provides the location of existing wire centers in
23 each LATA, as well as the location of existing tandem switches and signal
24 transfer points.

1 Network traffic is estimated using dial equipment minutes and call
2 attempt statistics. These inputs are used to appropriately size investment in
3 switching, signaling, and interoffice facilities, as well as to calculate usage-
4 sensitive costs for several of the unbundled network elements.

5 The information necessary to estimate future recurring expenses
6 associated with operating and maintaining the telephone network comes from
7 two sources. Forward-looking expense information is used if it exists in the
8 public domain. Where no such data is available, selected expense data
9 reported by the LECs in ARMIS is used because it is the best publicly
10 available data.

11

12 **Q. WHAT ARE THE FUNCTIONAL MODULES THAT COMPRISE THE**
13 **HATFIELD MODEL?**

14 **A. The Hatfield Model contains six functional modules. They are:**

- 15 • Line Multiplier Module;
- 16 • Data Module;
- 17 • Loop Module;
- 18 • Wire Center Investment Module;
- 19 • Convergence Module; and
- 20 • Expense Module.

21 An overview of each of the modules is provided below.

22

23 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE LINE MULTIPLIER MODULE?**

24 **A. In order to calculate costs on a per line basis, the HM uses estimates of the**

1 total number of lines (including residential, business, public telephone and
2 special access lines) within each CBG. CBG input data contains the number of
3 households, not number of lines, in each CBG. The line multiplier module
4 determines a ratio of total residential lines reported in ARMIS to total
5 households, and applies this ratio to the number of households in each CBG to
6 estimate the number of residential lines by CBG. It estimates the number of
7 business, special access, and payphone lines by distributing the corresponding
8 ARMIS numbers among CBGs proportionally to the number of employees in
9 each of the CBGs.

10 Because the network is sized to provide all loops, not just residential
11 loops, and because the total line density may be substantially different than the
12 residential line density, the model subsequently categorizes and reports costs
13 within CBGs according to total line density (i.e., total lines served per square
14 mile) rather than residential line density. Line density is broken into six
15 categories, or density ranges: 0-5, 5-200, 200-650, 650-850, 850-2,550 and
16 greater than 2,550 lines per square mile, respectively.

17

18 Q. WHAT FUNCTION IS PERFORMED IN THE DATA MODULE?

19 A. The Data Module uses CBG data and line totals to determine the quantity and
20 type of outside loop plant facilities required, based upon density and distance
21 of the CBG from the wire center. In doing so, it basically employs the same
22 methodology as does the BCM1, although there are a few exceptions, such as
23 1) as already discussed, the length of distribution cable is changed for the
24 highest and lowest line density zones; 2) the fiber-copper breakpoint -- that is,

1 the feeder length below which copper cable, and above which fiber cable, are
2 used -- becomes a user input; and 3) fiber cable is assumed to have a higher
3 equivalent line capacity than is assumed by BCM1. The HM also separately
4 considers the amounts and costs of underground and buried cable, whereas
5 they were combined in the BCM1. The Data Module also calculates outside
6 plant structure (poles, conduits) costs associated with placing and installing
7 cable under varying terrain and population density conditions.

8

9 **Q. WHAT FUNCTION IS PERFORMED BY THE LOOP MODULE?**

10 **A. The Loop Module, which is also part of BCM1, determines the size and type**
11 **of cable required to serve each CBG, given loop lengths, fill levels, and**
12 **population density. The Module then uses the distribution and feeder lengths**
13 **calculated in the Data Module as well as cable price information to determine**
14 **the total required loop investment for each CBG including supporting structure**
15 **investment.**

16

17 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE WIRE CENTER MODULE?**

18 **A. The Wire Center Module calculates wire center and interoffice facilities**
19 **investments. This module quantifies investments associated with end office**
20 **switches, wire centers, trunks, tandems (including operator tandems, and**
21 **operator positions), signaling links, signal transfer points (STPs), and service**
22 **control points (SCPs). Some of the elements it considers, such as the cost of**
23 **the SCPs and operator positions, are relevant only to unbundled network**
24 **elements; the remainder are germane to both unbundled elements and the cost**

1 of basic local service. The module uses the total number of access lines, the
2 location of wire centers, and network traffic data to determine required
3 switching, trunking, and signaling investments.

4 The module sizes network facilities sufficient to serve the total demand
5 created by all users and uses of the network. The Hatfield Model derives its
6 switch investment estimates by using both typical per line prices paid for by
7 Bell Operating Companies, GTE and other independents for end office
8 switches (according to a published source), and by using Table 2.10 of the
9 FCC's Statistics of Communications Common Carriers, which provides the
10 average number of access lines served by a LEC switch.

11

12 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE CONVERGENCE MODULE?

13 A. The Convergence Module modifies the loop investment calculated in the Loop
14 Module to account for network elements omitted from BCM1. It combines the
15 modified loop investment with the wire center, interoffice, and signaling
16 investment calculated in the Wire Center Module. For each of the six density
17 ranges, the convergence module reports the number of lines by type, number
18 of households and investment in categories such as distribution, feeder, end
19 office switching, tandems, and trunks.

20

21 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE EXPENSE MODULE.

22 A. The Expense Module uses the outputs from the Convergence Module to
23 determine annual capital carrying costs, operations and maintenance expenses,
24 and support expenses associated with the investments needed for a local

1 telecommunications network. This module uses the best publicly available
2 information to estimate future expenses and reports the annual cost for each
3 unbundled network element. The module requires as inputs appropriate
4 assumptions regarding the cost of capital (cost of debt, cost of equity, and
5 debt/equity ratio); the economic lives of various categories of network
6 equipment and facilities, and the relationship between investment and
7 expenses. It produces the appropriate unit cost of various unbundled network
8 elements and of basic exchange service. These units vary by type of element
9 and service: for instance, the cost of unbundled local switching is reported as
10 both cost per port and cost per minute of use; while the SCP cost unit is
11 messages. Basic local exchange service is reported as the cost per line per
12 month for the service, whose elements have been defined previously. The
13 results are reported by line density zone, using the ranges I have defined
14 previously.

15
16 Q. YOU PREVIOUSLY REFERRED TO HATFIELD MODEL VERSION 2.2,
17 RELEASE 1. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE KEY DIFFERENCES
18 BETWEEN HATFIELD MODEL VERSION 2.2 RELEASE 1 AND
19 RELEASE 2.

20 A. The key differences may be summarized as follows. Compared to Release 1,
21 Release 2

- 22 - estimates the cost of basic local exchange service,
- 23 - tentatively provides a graphical user interface to facilitate the
- 24 setting of user inputs and running the model,

- 1 - provides an increased set of inputs that can be set by the user,
- 2 - uses a 1995 estimate of households by CBG, rather than 1990
- 3 census data,
- 4 - estimates the number of business, special access, and payphone
- 5 lines per CBG using a database containing employees per CBG,
- 6 - increases the length of distribution cable for the two highest-
- 7 density ranges, and decreases it for the least dense range,
- 8 - specifies cable costs on an as-installed basis, generally leading to
- 9 higher per-foot cable costs,
- 10 - separates structure costs from cable costs, rather than calculating
- 11 them as a multiplier of cable costs,
- 12 - places each serving area interface (the interface point between
- 13 feeder and distribution cable) inside the CBG it serves, rather
- 14 than at the edge of the CBG,
- 15 - refines the treatment of interoffice transport and signaling costs,
- 16 - provides a greater disaggregation of expense factors, for
- 17 instance, by considering underground and buried cable expenses
- 18 separately, and
- 19 - adds the estimated cost of local number portability.

20

21

Section III: Florida-Specific Model Results

22

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE MODEL INPUTS THAT HAVE BEEN USED
23 TO DEVELOP COST ESTIMATES FOR FLORIDA.

24

A. The inputs used to perform the run of the model used to develop costs for use

1 in this proceeding are attached as Exhibit DJW-2. As with all data, MCI is
2 continuing to evaluate the accuracy and validity of these inputs in order to
3 ensure the reliability of the cost information produced by the model.

4

5 Q. WHAT ARE THE RESULTS OF THE MODEL?

6 A. In Exhibit DJW-3, I have included the results of running the Hatfield Model to
7 develop costs for use in this proceeding. In summary, the results of MCI's
8 analysis are as follows:

9

10 **Hatfield Model Unbundled Network Element Summary**

11	Element	Unit Definition	Unit Cost
12	1. Network Interface Device	per line-per month	\$ 0.55
13	2. Loop Distribution	per line-per month	\$ 6.32
14	3. Loop Concentrator	per line-per month	\$ 2.51
15	4. Loop Feeder	per line-per month	\$ 2.30
16	5. End Office Switching		
17	Port	per line-per month	\$ 1.00
18	Usage	per minute	\$ 0.0016
19	6. Signaling Links	per link-per month	\$ 18.14
20	7. Signal Transfer Point	per message	\$ 0.00005
21	8. Signal Control Point	per message	\$ 0.00078
22	9. Common Transport	per minute	\$ 0.00073
23	10. Dedicated Transport	per DSO - per month	\$ 4.17
24	11. Tandem Switching	per minute	\$ 0.0012

1 12. Operator Systems \$ 7,320,597

2

3 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

4 A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Vita of Don J. Wood

914 Stream Valley Trail, Alpharetta, Georgia 30202 ■ (770) 475-9971, FAX (770) 475-9972

EDUCATION

Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.
BBA in Finance, with Distinction.

College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.
MBA, with concentration in Finance and Microeconomics.

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Don J. Wood provides economic and regulatory analysis services in telecommunications and related industries. He has been employed in a management capacity at a major Local Exchange Company and an Interexchange Carrier, and has been directly involved in both the development and implementation of regulatory policy. He has presented testimony before the Regulatory Commissions of twenty-three states and the District of Columbia, state courts, and has prepared comments for filing with the Federal Communications Commission.

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

BellSouth Services, Inc.

Staff Manager responsible for conducting cost of service studies to be filed for regulatory purposes at State Commissions and FCC. Developed new costing methodologies and models for use by other analysts.

MCI Telecommunications Corporation.

Manager of Regulatory Analysis, Southeast Division. Responsible for development and implementation of regulatory policy for nine state division of the company. Duties included testimony before State Commissions, preparation of related pleadings, settlement negotiations, and development of relationships with Commission Staff and key industry personnel. After company reorganization, responsibilities expanded to new 15 state Southern Division.

Manager, Corporate Economic Analysis and Regulatory Affairs. Responsible for national regulatory policy development. Acted as part of a four person internal consulting team, specifically assigned to new/complex issues. Testimony before State Commissions throughout eastern US and comments/lobbying at FCC.

TESTIMONY - STATE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS:

Alabama Public Service Commission

Docket No. 19356, Phase III: Alabama Public Service Commission vs. All Telephone Companies Operating in Alabama, and Docket 21455: AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc., Applicant, Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Provide Limited IntraLATA Telecommunications Service in the State of Alabama.

Docket No. 20895: In Re: Petition for Approval to Introduce Business Line Termination for MCI's 800 Service.

Docket No. 21071: In Re: Petition by South Central Bell for Introduction of Bidirectional Measured Service.

Docket No. 21067: In Re: Petition by South Central Bell to Offer Dial Back-Up Service and 2400 BPS Central Office Data Set for Use with PulseLink Public Packet Switching Network Service.

Docket No. 21378: In Re: Petition by South Central Bell for Approval of Tariff Revisions to Restructure ESSX and Digital ESSX Service.

Docket No. 21865: In Re: Petition by South Central Bell for Approval of Tariff Revisions to Introduce Network Services to be Offered as a Part of Open Network Architecture.

Arkansas Public Service Commission

Docket No. 92-337-R: In the Matter of the Application for a Rule Limiting Collocation for Special Access to Virtual or Physical Collocation at the Option of the Local Exchange Carrier.

State of Connecticut, Department of Utility Control

Docket 91-12-19: DPUC Review of Intrastate Telecommunications Services Open to Competition (Comments).

Docket No. 94-07-02: Development of the Assumptions, Tests, Analysis, and Review to Govern Telecommunications Service Reclassifications in Light of the Eight Criteria Set Forth in Section 6 of Public Act 94-83 (Comments).

Delaware Public Service Commission

Docket No. 93-31T: In the Matter of the Application of The Diamond State Telephone Company for Establishment of Rules and Rates for the Provision of IntelliLinQ-PRI and IntelliLinQ-BRI.

Docket No. 41: In the Matter of the Development of Regulations for the Implementation of the Telecommunications Technology Investment Act.

Florida Public Service Commission

Docket No. 881257-TL: In Re: Proposed Tariff by Southern Bell to Introduce New Features for Digital ESSX Service, and to Provide Structural Changes for both ESSX Service and Digital ESSX Service.

Docket No. 880812-TP: In Re: Investigation into Equal Access Exchange Areas (EAEAs), Toll Monopoly Areas (TMAs), 1+ Restriction to the Local Exchange Companies (LECs), and Elimination of the Access Discount.

Docket No. 890183-TL: In Re: Generic Investigation into the Operations of Alternate Access Vendors.

Docket No. 870347-TI: In Re: Petition of AT&T Communications of the Southern States for Commission Forbearance from Earnings Regulation and Waiver of Rule 25-4.495(1) and 25-24.480 (1) (b), F.A.C., for a trial period.

Docket No. 900708-TL: In Re: Investigation of Methodology to Account for Access Charges in Local Exchange Company (LEC) Toll Pricing.

Docket No. 900633-TL: In Re: Development of Local Exchange Company Cost of Service Study Methodology.

Docket No. 910757-TP: In Re: Investigation into the Regulatory Safeguards Required to Prevent Cross-Subsidization by Telephone Companies.

Docket No. 920260-TL: In Re: Petition of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company for Rate Stabilization, Implementation Orders, and Other Relief.

Docket No. 950985-TP: In Re: Resolution of Petitions to establish 1995 rates, terms, and conditions for interconnection involving local exchange companies and alternative local exchange companies pursuant to Section 364.162, Florida Statutes.

Georgia Public Service Commission

Docket No. 3882-U: In Re: Investigation into Incentive Telephone Regulation in Georgia.

Docket No. 3883-U: In Re: Investigation into the Level and Structure of Intrastate Access Charges.

Docket No. 3921-U: In Re: Compliance and Implementation of Senate Bill 524.

Docket No. 3905-U: In Re: Southern Bell Rule Nisi.

Docket No. 3995-U: In Re: IntraLATA Toll Competition.

Docket No. 4018-U: In Re: Review of Open Network Architecture (ONA) (Comments).

Docket No. 5258-U: In Re: Petition of BellSouth Telecommunications for Consideration and Approval of its "Georgians FIRST" (Price Caps) Proposal.

Docket No. 5825-U: In Re: The Creation of a Universal Access Fund as Required by the Telecommunications Competition and Development Act of 1995.

Iowa Utilities Board

Docket No. RPU-95-10.

Docket No. RPU-95-11.

Kentucky Public Service Commission

Administrative Case No. 10321: In the Matter of the Tariff Filing of South Central Bell Telephone Company to Establish and Offer Pulselink Service.

Administrative Case No. 323: In the Matter of An Inquiry into IntraLATA Toll Competition, An Appropriate Compensation Scheme for Completion of IntraLATA Calls by Interexchange Carriers, and WATS Jurisdictionality.

- Phase IA: Determination of whether intraLATA toll competition is in the

public interest.

- Phase IB: Determination of a method of implementing intraLATA competition.
- Rehearing on issue of Imputation.

Administrative Case No. 90-256, Phase II: In the Matter of A Review of the Rates and Charges and Incentive Regulation Plan of South Central Bell Telephone Company.

Administrative Case No. 336: In the Matter of an Investigation into the Elimination of Switched Access Service Discounts and Adoption of Time of Day Switch Access Service Rates.

Administrative Case No. 91-250: In the Matter of South Central Bell Telephone Company's Proposed Area Calling Service Tariff.

Louisiana Public Service Commission

Docket No. 17970: In Re: Investigation of the Revenue Requirements, Rate Structures, Charges, Services, Rate of Return, and Construction Program of AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc., in its Louisiana Operations.

Docket No. U-17949: In the Matter of an Investigation of the Revenue Requirements, Rate Structures, Charges, Services, Rate of Return, and Construction Program of South Central Bell Telephone Company, Its Louisiana Intrastate Operations, The Appropriate Level of Access Charges, and All Matters Relevant to the Rates and Service Rendered by the Company.

- Subdocket A (SCB Earnings Phase)
- Subdocket B (Generic Competition Phase)

Docket No. 18913-U: In Re: South Central Bell's Request for Approval of Tariff Revisions to Restructure ESSX and Digital ESSX Service.

Docket No. U-18851: In Re: Petition for Elimination of Disparity in Access Tariff Rates.

Public Service Commission of Maryland

Case 8584, Phase II: In the Matter of the Application of MFS Intelenet of Maryland, Inc. for Authority to Provide and Resell Local Exchange and Intrastate Telecommunications Services in Areas Served by C&P Telephone Company of Maryland.

Case 8715: In the Matter of the Inquiry into Alternative Forms of Regulating Telephone Companies.

Mississippi Public Service Commission

Docket No. U-5086: In Re: MCI Telecommunications Corporation's Metered Use Service Option D (Prism I) and Option E (Prism II).

Docket No. U-5112: In Re: MCI Telecommunications Corporation's Metered Use Option H (800 Service).

Docket No. U-5318: In Re: Petition of MCI for Approval of MCI's Provision of Service to a Specific Commercial Banking Customers for Intrastate Interexchange Telecommunications Service.

Docket 89-UN-5453: In Re: Notice and Application of South Central Bell Telephone Company for Adoption and Implementation of a Rate Stabilization Plan for its Mississippi Operations.

Docket No. 90-UA-0280: In Re: Order of the Mississippi Public Service Commission Initiating Hearings Concerning (1) IntraLATA Competition in the Telecommunications Industry and (2) Payment of Compensation by Interexchange Carriers and Resellers to Local Exchange Companies in Addition to Access Charges.

Docket No. 92-UA-0227: In Re: Order Implementing IntraLATA Competition.

New York Public Service Commission

Case No. 28425: Proceeding on Motion of the Commission as to the Impact of the Modification of Final Judgement and the Federal Communications Commission's Docket 78-72 on the Provision of Toll Service in New York State.

North Carolina Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. P-100, Sub 72: In the Matter of the Petition of AT&T to Amend Commission Rules Governing Regulation of Interexchange Carriers (Comments).

Docket No. P-141, Sub 19: In the Matter of the Application of MCI Telecommunications Corporation to Provide InterLATA Facilities-Based Telecommunications Services (Comments).

Docket No. P-55, Sub 1013: In the Matter of Application of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for, and Election of, Price Regulation.

Docket Nos. P-7, Sub 825 and P-10, Sub 479: In the Matter of Petition of Carolina Telephone and Telegraph and Central Telephone Company for Approval of a Price Regulation Plan Pursuant to G.S. 62-133.5.

Docket No. P-19, Sub 277: In the Matter of Application of GTE South Incorporated for and Election of, Price Regulation.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Case No. 93-487-TP-ALT: In the Matter of the Application of The Ohio Bell Telephone Company for Approval of an Alternative Form of Regulation.

Oklahoma Corporation Commission

Cause No. PUD 01448: In the Matter of the Application for an Order Limiting Collocation for Special Access to Virtual or Physical Collocation at the Option of the Local Exchange Carrier.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon

Docket No. UT 119: In the Matter of an Investigation into Tariffs Filed by US West Communications, Inc., United Telephone of the Northwest, Pacific Telecom, Inc., and GTE Northwest, Inc. in Accordance with ORS 759.185(4).

Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. I-00910010: In Re: Generic Investigation into the Current Provision of InterLATA Toll Service.

Docket No. P-00930715: In Re: The Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania's Petition and Plan for Alternative Form of Regulation under Chapter 30.

Docket No. R-00943008: In Re: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Inc. (Investigation of Proposed Promotional Offerings Tariff).

Docket No. M-00940587: In Re: Investigation pursuant to Section 3005 of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa. C. S. §3005, and the Commission's Opinion and Order at Docket No. P-930715, to establish standards and safeguards for competitive services, with particular emphasis in the areas of cost allocations, cost studies, unbundling, and imputation, and to consider generic issues for future rulemaking.

South Carolina Public Service Commission

Docket No. 90-626-C: In Re: Generic Proceeding to Consider Intrastate Incentive Regulation.

Docket No. 90-321-C: In Re: Petition of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company for Revisions to its Access Service Tariff Nos. E2 and E16.

Docket No. 88-472-C: In Re: Petition of AT&T of the Southern States, Inc., Requesting the Commission to Initiate an Investigation Concerning the Level and Structure of Intrastate Carrier Common Line (CCL) Access Charges.

Docket No. 92-163-C: In Re: Position of Certain Participating South Carolina Local Exchange Companies for Approval of an Expanded Area Calling (EAC) Plan.

Docket No. 92-182-C: In Re: Application of MCI Telecommunications Corporation, AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., and Sprint Communications Company, L.P., to Provide IntraLATA Telecommunications Services.

Docket No. 95-720-C: In Re: Application of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company for Approval of an Alternative Regulation Plan.

Tennessee Public Service Commission

Docket No. 90-05953: In Re: Earnings Investigation of South Central Bell Telephone Company.

Docket Nos. 89-11065, 89-11735, 89-12677: AT&T Communications of the South Central States, MCI Telecommunications Corporation, US Sprint Communications

Company -- Application for Limited IntraLATA Telecommunications Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity.

Docket No. 91-07501: South Central Bell Telephone Company's Application to Reflect Changes in its Switched Access Service Tariff to Limit Use of the 700 Access Code.

Public Utility Commission of Texas

Docket No. 12879: Application of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company for Expanded Interconnection for Special Access Services and Switched Transport Services and Unbundling of Special Access DS1 and DS3 Services Pursuant to P. U. C. Subst. R. 23.26.

Virginia State Corporation Commission

Case No. PUC920043: Application of Virginia Metrotel, Inc. for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Provide InterLATA Interexchange Telecommunications Services.

Case No. PUC920029: Ex Parte: In the Matter of Evaluating the Experimental Plan for Alternative Regulation of Virginia Telephone Companies.

Case No. PUC930035: Application of Contel of Virginia, Inc. d/b/a GTE Virginia to implement community calling plans in various GTE Virginia exchanges within the Richmond and Lynchburg LATAs.

Case No. PUC930036: Ex Parte: In the Matter of Investigating Telephone Regulatory Methods Pursuant to Virginia Code § 56-235.5, & Etc.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

Docket Nos. UT-941464, UT-941465, UT-950146, and UT-950265 (Consolidated): Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, Complainant, vs. US West Communications, Inc., Respondent; TCG Seattle and Digital Direct of Seattle, Inc., Complainant, vs. US West Communications, Inc., Respondent; TCG Seattle, Complainant, vs. GTE Northwest Inc., Respondent; Electric Lightwave, Inc., vs. GTE Northwest, Inc., Respondent.

Docket No. UT-950200: In the Matter of the Request of US West Communications, Inc. for an Increase in its Rates and Charges.

Public Service Commission of Wyoming

Docket No. 70000-TR-95-238: In the Matter of the General Rate/Price Case Application of US West Communications, Inc.

Docket No. PSC-96-32: In the Matter of Proposed Rule Regarding Total Service Long Run Incremental Cost (TSLRIC) Studies.

Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia

Formal Case No. 814, Phase IV: In the Matter of the Investigation into the Impact of the AT&T Divestiture and Decisions of the Federal Communications Commission on Bell Atlantic - Washington, D. C. Inc.'s Jurisdictional Rates.

COMMENTS - FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

CC Docket No. 92-91: In the Matter of Open Network Architecture Tariffs of Bell Operating Companies.

CC Docket No. 93-162: Local Exchange Carriers' Rates, Terms, and Conditions for Expanded Interconnection for Special Access.

CC Docket No. 91-141: Common Carrier Bureau Inquiry into Local Exchange Company Term and Volume Discount Plans for Special Access.

CC Docket No. 94-97: Review of Virtual Expanded Interconnection Service Tariffs.

CC Docket No. 94-128: Open Network Architecture Tariffs of US West Communications, Inc.

CC Docket No. 94-97, Phase II: Investigation of Cost Issues, Virtual Expanded Interconnection Service Tariffs.

network investment inputs

	density range						totals	
	0 - 5	5 - 200	200 - 850	650 - 850	850 - 2550	> 2550		
total lines	9,391	344,682		480,863	202,704	1,578,133	3,259,031	5,874,804
business lines	1,314	61,223		93,382	42,586	368,242	1,002,114	1,568,861
residential lines	7,728	267,121		362,562	148,755	1,111,628	1,989,508	3,887,300
special access lines	348	16,207		24,721	11,274	97,483	265,286	415,319
households	6,434	222,450		301,930	123,878	925,727	1,656,797	3,237,216
buried distribution cable	\$ 12,188,180	\$ 122,076,955	\$	73,207,452	\$ 20,518,330	\$ 114,092,458	\$ 13,572,434	\$ 355,655,809
buried distribution placement	\$ 2,345,196	\$ 22,396,030	\$	8,685,400	\$ 3,800,388	\$ 31,408,692	\$ 30,408,372	\$ 99,044,078
NID, terminals, splices	\$ 439,567	\$ 15,454,132	\$	21,142,904	\$ 8,744,085	\$ 66,156,185	\$ 123,976,159	\$ 235,913,031
DLC electronics	\$ 2,711,358	\$ 56,180,706	\$	64,162,483	\$ 26,166,999	\$ 175,028,619	\$ 241,048,950	\$ 666,299,115
total DLC lines	8,742	318,276		382,700		1,047,915		1,460,786
optical "SAI"	\$ 86,800	\$ 1,414,800	\$	1,168,900	\$ 436,800	\$ 3,036,700	\$ 3,794,300	\$ 9,938,300
passive SAI	\$ 2,400	\$ 59,000	\$	141,500	\$ 69,400	\$ 762,200	\$ 2,193,600	\$ 3,228,100
distribution conduit, w/placement	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 96,319,990	\$ 647,698,315	\$ 744,018,305
distribution pole inv	\$ 3,524,850	\$ 33,687,450	\$	13,114,350	\$ 3,835,350	\$ 25,414,200	\$ 59,853,600	\$ 139,429,800
aerial distribution cable	\$ 11,080,164	\$ 110,979,050	\$	66,552,229	\$ 18,653,028	\$ 82,976,333	\$ 160,401,489	\$ 450,842,292
underground distribution cable	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 20,744,083	\$ 74,031,457	\$ 94,775,540
aerial feeder cable	\$ 905,313	\$ 9,464,658	\$	10,248,850	\$ 2,911,179	\$ 8,972,464	\$ 11,196,064	\$ 43,698,529
feeder pole investment	\$ 898,200	\$ 6,999,300	\$	3,685,950	\$ 747,900	\$ 2,337,300	\$ 1,743,750	\$ 16,412,400
end office switching	\$ 2,081,030	\$ 52,296,005	\$	54,511,197	\$ 21,299,580	\$ 162,065,752	\$ 322,657,186	\$ 614,910,750
end office wire center	\$ 450,492	\$ 10,336,263	\$	12,164,635	\$ 4,811,823	\$ 42,470,651	\$ 96,161,416	\$ 168,396,261
local tandem switching	\$ 21,405	\$ 784,447	\$	1,094,928	\$ 462,578	\$ 3,623,649	\$ 7,542,477	\$ 13,629,484
local tandem wire center	\$ 11,656	\$ 427,800	\$	596,819	\$ 251,585	\$ 1,958,688	\$ 4,044,923	\$ 7,291,470
OS tandem switching	\$ 4,926	\$ 178,101	\$	247,917	\$ 104,727	\$ 822,039	\$ 1,715,744	\$ 3,073,454
OS tandem wire center	\$ 3,440	\$ 126,269	\$	176,157	\$ 74,258	\$ 578,125	\$ 1,193,897	\$ 2,152,146
OS trunks	\$ 17,728	\$ 532,835	\$	585,767	\$ 201,126	\$ 1,460,502	\$ 2,272,977	\$ 5,070,935
operator position	\$ 11,349	\$ 416,529	\$	581,096	\$ 244,956	\$ 1,907,086	\$ 3,938,357	\$ 7,089,373
common transport	\$ 50,330	\$ 1,551,055	\$	1,711,315	\$ 588,398	\$ 4,277,257	\$ 6,658,763	\$ 14,837,117
dedicated transport	\$ 186,215	\$ 7,443,431	\$	10,863,923	\$ 4,748,901	\$ 39,741,659	\$ 89,826,149	\$ 152,810,278
local direct trunking	\$ 60,598	\$ 2,228,348	\$	3,116,526	\$ 1,316,574	\$ 10,309,954	\$ 21,207,158	
local tandem trunking	\$ 6,012	\$ 186,803	\$	206,236	\$ 71,110	\$ 511,164	\$ 781,094	
STP	\$ 22,862	\$ 752,287	\$	1,020,378	\$ 427,038	\$ 3,320,781	\$ 6,839,946	\$ 12,383,292
SCP	\$ 20,166	\$ 740,142	\$	1,032,565	\$ 435,270	\$ 3,388,754	\$ 6,898,178	\$ 12,615,075
signaling links	\$ 4,791	\$ 59,066	\$	39,834	\$ 12,338	\$ 90,055	\$ 154,623	\$ 360,708
feeder conduit/manhole, w/placement	\$ 1,215,048	\$ 9,776,810	\$	5,455,816	\$ 6,172,320	\$ 262,495,223	\$ 534,577,364	\$ 819,692,581
underground feeder cable	\$ 128,846	\$ 1,253,794	\$	1,175,309	\$ 1,767,727	\$ 71,779,716	\$ 201,529,160	
buried feeder placement	\$ 1,018,610	\$ 7,740,107	\$	3,829,458	\$ 1,849,321	\$ 2,027,725	\$ 8,409,438	
total public telephone	\$ 3,817	\$ 173,706	\$	268,336	\$ 122,185	\$ 1,098,707	\$ 2,681,956	\$ 4,348,706
total public lines	3	130		198		90	780	3,324
buried feeder cable	\$ 1,645,480	\$ 15,321,342	\$	13,040,939	\$ 4,502,347	\$ 9,791,361	\$ 12,274,181	
NID investment per line	\$ 30.00							
terminal and splice investment per line	\$ 35.00							
average lines/business location	4							
local DEMs, thousands	84,865,532		local call attempts	21,826,509,000				
intrastate DEMs, thousands	9,984,286		call completion factor	0.70				
interstate DEMs, thousands	19,195,718		intraLATA calls completed	663,660,000				
total DEMs, thousands	114,045,535		interLATA intrastate calls comp	580,388,000				
intraLATA tandem fraction	0.20		interLATA interstate calls comp	1,817,766,000				
interLATA tandem fraction	0.20		fraction interoffice str shared w/dr	0.25				
interoffice traffic fraction	0.65		trunk port investment, per port	\$ 100				
total dedicated access trunks	600,341		signaling port investment, per end	\$ 450				
total dedicated transport trunks	998,146		avg D link investment, per link	\$ 220				
total common trunks	54,290		business holding time multiplier	1.00				
state	FL		res holding time multiplier	1.00				
company	BELLSOUTH TELECOMM INC - FL		bus/res local DEMs	1.10				
fraction direct-routed local traffic	0.98		bus/res state DEMs	2.00				
max trunk usage, CCS	27.5		bus/res interstate DEMs	3.00				
average trunk utilization	0.3		total shared feeder/i/o structure	\$ 11,782,225				
local interoffice traffic fraction	0.374		i/o aerial structure fract of total	0.30				
local DEM fraction	0.724							
ISUP msgs/interoffice call	6							
ISUP msg length	25							
TCAP msgs/transaction	2							
TCAP msg length	100							
fraction of calls requiring TCAP	0.10							
average local direct route distance	10							
average intraLATA direct route distance	25							
average direct access route distance	15							
total signaling links	512							
drop investment per line	40							

Inputs

Cost of Capital Inputs		economic life and tax inputs			
Debt fraction	0.45				
Cost of Debt	0.077	0.035	tax rate		0.40
Equity fraction	0.55		economic life -- 50 years maximum		
Cost of Equity	0.119	0.065	loop distribution		20
Overall Cost of Capital		10.01%	loop feeder		20
Weighted equity fraction	0.65		loop concentrator		10
			end office switching		14.3
corporate overhead factor	0.100		wire center		37
other taxes factor	0.050		tandem switching		14.3
operating state and local income tax factor	0.010		OS investment		8
billing/bill inquiry per line per month	\$ 1.22		transport facilities		19
directory listing per line per month	\$ 0.15		STP		14
service order processing fraction of 6623	0.027		SCP		14
forward-looking network operations factor	0.700		links		19
alternative CO switching factor	0.0269		public telephones		9
alternative circuit equipment factor	0.0153		general support		7
EO traffic-sensitive fraction	0.70				
per-line monthly LNP cost	\$ 0.25				
tandem-routed toll fraction	0.20				
tandem-routed local fraction	0.02				
interoffice local fraction	0.65				
State	Florida				
Company	BELLSOUTH TELECOMM INC - FL	Structure fraction assigned to telephone			
Carrier-carrier customer service, per line per year	\$ 1.56	aerial	underground	buried	
NID expense per line per year	\$ 3.00	distribution	0.33	0.33	0.33
DS-0/DS-1 crossover	24	feeder	0.33	0.33	0.33
DS-1/DS-3 crossover	28				
Switch line circuit offset per DLC line	\$ 35.00				
Local call completion fraction	0.70				
Total local calls attempted	21,826,509,000				
Total intraLATA toll calls completed	663,660,000				
Total interLATA calls completed					
	intrastate	580,388,000			
	interstate	1,817,766,000			
Total local calls completed	15,278,556,300				
Total completed local interoffice calls	8,859,426,695				
Total completed local interoffice calls	0.483				

Actuals for 1995 (\$000s)

	Investments	Expenses	calculated Factor	
Plant-Specific Operations Expenses				
TPIS - General Support				
2111 Land	\$ 52,233	\$ -		
2112 Motor Vehicles	\$ 62,253	\$ 1,565	0.025	
2113 Aircraft	\$ -	\$ 1,609		
2114 Special Purpose Vehicles	\$ 4	\$ -		
2115 Garage Work Equipment	\$ 1,825	\$ 149	0.082	
2116 Other Work Equipment	\$ 91,882	\$ 488	0.005	
2121 Buildings	\$ 730,472	\$ 74,156	0.102	Land & Bldg Exp Applied to Bldgs
2122 Furniture	\$ 10,947	\$ 5,891	0.538	
2123 Office Equipment	\$ 33,135	\$ 6,581	0.199	
2124 General Purpose Computers	\$ 390,235	\$ 88,223	0.226	
2110 Total Land & Support Assets	\$ 1,372,986	\$ 178,662	0.130	
TPIS - Central Office Switching				
2211 Analog Electronic Switching	\$ 390,499	\$ 19,552	0.050	
2212 Digital Electronic Switching	\$ 1,272,535	\$ 84,534	0.066	0.0269 NET CO Switch Factor
2210 Total Central Office Switching	\$ 1,663,034	\$ 104,086	0.063	
2220 Operator Systems	\$ 43,571	\$ 3,297	0.076	
TPIS - Central Office Transmission				
2231 Satellite & Earth Station Facilities				
2231 Other Radio Facilities				
2231 Radio Systems				
2232 Circuit Equipment	\$ 2,094,287	\$ 48,614	0.0232	0.0153 alternative factor
2230 Total Central Office Transmission	\$ 2,094,287	\$ 48,614	0.0232	
TPIS - Information Orig/Term				
2311 Station Apparatus	\$ 363	\$ 673		
2321 Customer Premises Wiring	\$ -	\$ -		
2341 Large Private Branch Exchange	\$ 8,780	\$ (43)		
2351 Public Telephone Terminal Equipment	\$ 60,196	\$ 15,627	0.260	
2362 Other Terminal Equipment	\$ 102,454	\$ 79,858	0.778	
2310 Total Information Orig/Term	\$ 171,793	\$ 95,915	0.558	
TPIS - Cable & Wire Facilities				
2411 Poles	\$ 137,698	\$ 7,097	0.052	
2421 Aerial Cable	\$ 730,392	\$ 69,888	0.096	
2422 Underground Cable	\$ 927,419	\$ 20,226	0.022	
2423 Buried Cable	\$ 2,413,728	\$ 168,323	0.070	
2424 Submarine Cable				
2425 Deep Sea Cable				
2426 Intra-building Network Cable				
2431 Aerial Wire				
2441 Conduit Systems	\$ 697,061	\$ 3,960	0.006	
2410 Total Cable & Wire Facilities	\$ 4,906,298	\$ 269,394	0.055	0.0496253
240 Total TPIS (before amortizable assets)	\$ 10,251,969	\$ 699,968	0.068	
Plant Non-Specific Operations Expenses				
	Expenses	Investment	Factor	
6512 Provisioning Expenses	\$ 833	\$ 10,251,969	0.000	
6531 Power Expenses	\$ 12,022	\$ 10,251,969	0.001	4.27% all
6532 Network Administration	\$ 21,166	\$ 10,251,969	0.002	7.52% switching, interoffice
6533 Testing	\$ 73,961	\$ 10,251,969	0.007	26.29% all
6534 Plant Operations Administration	\$ 86,506	\$ 10,251,969	0.008	30.75% all
6535 Engineering	\$ 86,804	\$ 10,251,969	0.008	30.86% all
6540 Access Expense				
6530 Total Network Operations Expenses	\$ 281,292	\$ 10,251,969	0.027	per line network operations total lines (from net. invest. inputs) annual net ops per line
Network Support Factor Calculation				
	Expenses	Cable & Wire Inv	Factor	
2112 Motor Vehicles	\$ 1,565			
2113 Aircraft	\$ 1,609			
2114 Special Purpose Vehicles	\$ -			
2115 Garage Work Equipment	\$ 149			
2116 Other Work Equipment	\$ 488			
Total Network Support	\$ 3,811	\$ 4,906,298	0.000777	
Customer Operations Expenses				
	Expenses	Net Revenues	Factor	
6611 Product Management *	\$ 33,295	\$ 0.4723	\$ 1,788,874	0.01861
6612 Sales *	\$ 74,054	\$ 1.0504	\$ 1,788,874	0.04140
6613 Product Advertising	\$ 34,017	\$ -	\$ 1,788,874	0.01902
6610 Total Marketing Expenses	\$ 141,366			0.07903
6621 Call Completion Service	\$ 17,871		\$ 1,788,874	0.00999
6622 Number Services	\$ 58,783	\$ 0.8338	\$ 1,788,874	0.03286
6623 Customer Services	\$ 288,265	\$ 4.0890	\$ 1,788,874	0.16114
6620 Total Services Expenses	\$ 357,165	\$ 5.61		0.20399
Billing/bill inquiry (per line/month)	\$ 1.22			
Service order processing fraction of 6623	\$ 0.027			
Directory listing (per line/month)	\$ 0.15			
700 Total Customer Operations Expenses	\$ 498,531		\$ 1,788,874	0.27868

Corporate Operations Expenses

	Expenses	Revenues	Factor
6711 Executive	\$ 10,710	\$ 1,788,874	0.005987
6712 Planning	\$ 4,232	\$ 1,788,874	0.002386
6710 Total Executive & Planning	\$ 14,942	\$ 1,788,874	0.008353
6721 Accounting & Finance	\$ 29,733	\$ 1,788,874	0.016621
6722 External Relations	\$ 25,795	\$ 1,788,874	0.014420
6723 Human Resources	\$ 43,048	\$ 1,788,874	0.024064
6724 Information Management	\$ 157,437	\$ 1,788,874	0.088009
6725 Legal	\$ 14,821	\$ 1,788,874	0.008285
6726 Procurement	\$ 8,849	\$ 1,788,874	0.004947
6727 Research & Development	\$ 8,156	\$ 1,788,874	0.004559
6728 Other General & Administrative	\$ 149,299	\$ 1,788,874	0.083480
6720 Total General & Administrative	\$ 437,138	\$ 1,788,874	0.244365
710 Total Corporate Operations Expense	\$ 452,080	\$ 1,788,874	0.10
720 Total Operating Expenses	\$ 1,932,704		
note: does not include dep/amort			

Misc Expenses Calculation

	2122 Furniture	2123 Ofc Eqpt	2124 GP Compr
Investment	\$ 10,947	\$ 33,135	\$ 390,235
Investment/TPIS	0.00107	0.00323	0.03806
Expense	\$ 5,891	\$ 6,581	\$ 88,223
Expense Factor	0.53814	0.19861	0.22808
Model TPIS	\$ 4,739,747	\$ 4,739,747	\$ 4,739,747
Calculated Investment	\$ 5,061	\$ 15,319	\$ 180,416
Calculated Expense	\$ 2,724	\$ 3,043	\$ 40,788
Subtotal (\$s)	\$ 46,553,871		
2351 Pub Tel Eqpt			
Investment	\$ 60,196		
Expense	\$ 15,627	c141,c130	
Expense Factor	0.259602		
Model Investment	\$ 3,733,822,777		
Calculated Expense	\$ 969,307,737		
Subtotal (\$s)	\$		
Total Misc Expense	\$ 46,553,871		

Other Taxes & Uncollectibles Calculation

	Expenses	Net Revenues	Factor
7230 Operating State & Local Income Tax	\$ 36,257	\$ (221,261)	0.0100
7240 Operating Other Taxes	\$ 188,016	\$ (221,261)	0.0500
5300 Uncollectible Revenues	\$ 47,906	\$ 1,788,874	0.0288
retail			0.0201
wholesale			0.0044

Ratio of Net Plant to TPIS

TPIS	\$ 10,251,969
Net Plant	\$ 10,251,969
Ratio	100.00%
Model Investment	\$ 4,739,747
Model % of Net Plant	46%
Model % of TPIS	46%

Network Expense

	0 - 5	5 - 200	200 - 650	650 - 850	850 - 2550	> 2550	Totals
	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	
total wire center	\$ 47,265	\$ 1,105,564	\$ 1,313,399	\$ 521,565	\$ 4,569,064	\$ 10,293,941	\$ 17,850,800
total switching, installed	\$ 48,457	\$ 1,132,998	\$ 1,142,162	\$ 439,939	\$ 3,492,546	\$ 7,553,194	\$ 13,809,297
total interoffice transmission	\$ 5,491	\$ 208,786	\$ 291,905	\$ 123,893	\$ 1,021,797	\$ 2,239,673	\$ 3,891,544
total pole investment	\$ 227,965	\$ 2,097,008	\$ 865,893	\$ 236,222	\$ 1,430,321	\$ 3,174,748	\$ 8,032,158
total buried cable	\$ 964,700	\$ 9,581,566	\$ 6,014,591	\$ 1,744,834	\$ 8,639,124	\$ 1,802,432	\$ 28,747,247
total u/g cable	\$ 2,810	\$ 27,344	\$ 25,632	\$ 38,552	\$ 2,017,843	\$ 6,009,677	\$ 8,121,859
total conduit	\$ 6,728	\$ 54,139	\$ 30,212	\$ 34,179	\$ 1,986,952	\$ 6,546,893	\$ 8,659,104
total aerial cable	\$ 1,146,838	\$ 11,524,729	\$ 7,348,758	\$ 2,063,384	\$ 8,798,176	\$ 16,419,416	\$ 47,301,300
total drop cable	\$ 5,899	\$ 207,408	\$ 283,756	\$ 117,353	\$ 887,874	\$ 1,663,868	\$ 3,166,158
total muxes and digital termin	\$ 65,008	\$ 1,338,315	\$ 1,519,801	\$ 619,156	\$ 4,151,065	\$ 5,734,386	\$ 13,427,731
total common channel signali	\$ 1,286	\$ 41,735	\$ 56,296	\$ 23,528	\$ 182,909	\$ 376,405	\$ 682,159
Totals	\$ 2,522,449	\$ 27,319,593	\$ 18,892,405	\$ 5,962,607	\$ 37,177,672	\$ 61,814,633	\$ 153,689,358

Notes:

- 1) Land & Building Factor applied to wire center investment
- 2) CO Switching Factor applied to common channel signaling
- 3) interoffice transmission factor applied to muxes & digital terminals

Actual 1995 Revenue

		% of total
Interstate Access		
5081 End User	\$ 266,050	8.83%
5082 Switched Access	\$ 436,895	14.51%
5083 Special Access	\$ 92,625	3.08%
Total Inter Access	\$ 795,570	26.42%
State Access Revenue		
5084 End User	\$ -	0.00%
5084 Switched Access	\$ -	0.00%
5084 Special Access	\$ 284,333	9.44%
Total State Access	\$ 284,333	9.44%
Total Access Revenue	\$ 1,079,903	35.86%
Long Distance Network Revenue		
5100 Interstate Message	\$ -	0.00%
5100 Intrastate Message	\$ -	0.00%
5100 Interstate Calling Plan	\$ -	0.00%
5100 Intrastate Calling Plan	\$ -	0.00%
Total LD Msg Revenue	\$ 192,968	6.41%
Unidirectional LD Revenue		
5110 Interstate	\$ -	0.00%
Intrastate	\$ -	0.00%
Total	\$ 44,069	1.46%
LD Private Network Revenue		
5120 Interstate	\$ -	0.00%
Intrastate	\$ -	0.00%
Total	\$ 52,467	1.74%
Other Long Distance Revenue		
5160 Interstate	\$ -	0.00%
Intrastate	\$ -	0.00%
Total	\$ 2,538	0.08%
Total Long Distance Network Rev		
Interstate	\$ -	0.00%
Intrastate	\$ -	0.00%
Total	\$ 292,042	9.70%

Actual Revenue

EXHIBIT _____ (DJW-2)
 Docket No. 960846-TP
 Page 7 of 26

Basic Local Service

5001 Basic Area	\$	1,020,084	33.87%
5002 Optional Extended Area	\$	14,013	0.47%
5003 Cellular Mobile	\$	-	0.00%
5004 Other Mobile Svcs	\$	926	0.03%
Total Basic Local Service	\$	1,035,023	34.37%

Public Telephone Revenue

5010 Local Public Msgs	\$	-	0.00%
Universal Public Phone	\$	-	0.00%
Public Exchange - IX Carrier	\$	-	0.00%
Credit Card Coinless	\$	-	0.00%
Public Exchange - CPE	\$	-	0.00%
Semi-Public Msgs	\$	-	0.00%
Other Public Phone Revenue	\$	-	0.00%
Total Public Phone Revenue	\$	79,251	2.63%

Local Private Line Revenue

5040 Interstate	\$	-	0.00%
Intrastate	\$	-	0.00%
Total Private Line	\$	64,341	2.14%

Customer Premises Revenue

5050 Station Apparatus	\$	-	0.00%
Customer Premises Wiring	\$	-	0.00%
Total Customer Premises	\$	4,923	0.16%

Other Local Exchange Revenue

5060 Central Office Features	\$	-	0.00%
Information Transport	\$	-	0.00%
Directory Assistance	\$	-	0.00%
Intercept Services	\$	-	0.00%
Other Loc Exchg	\$	-	0.00%
Total Other	\$	456,181	15.15%

Total Local Network Service Revenue

Interstate	\$	-	0.00%
Intrastate	\$	1,639,719	54.45%

Total Revenue	\$	3,011,664	100.00%
---------------	----	-----------	---------

Calculation of Investment in General Support Items

Calculated Investment (\$)
 (from sheet '95 Actuals)

2122 Furniture	5,061,078
2123 Office Equipment	15,319,157
2124 General Purpose Comp	180,415,609
\$	200,795,844

Return, Depreciation, & Income Tax

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Total Investment	\$ 200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844
Accumulated Depreciation		28,685,121	57,370,241	86,055,362	114,740,482	143,425,603	172,110,723	200,795,844	229,480,964
Net Plant		172,110,723	143,425,603	114,740,482	86,055,362	57,370,241	28,685,121	0	-28,685,121
Depreciable Life	7								
Rate of Return	0.100								
Return Amount		17,228,283	14,356,903	11,485,522	8,614,142	5,742,761	2,871,381	0	-2,871,381
Income Tax Rate	0.40								
Income Tax Gross-Up		6,317,037	5,264,198	4,211,358	3,158,519	2,105,679	1,052,840	0	-1,052,840
Total Return		52,230,441	48,306,221	44,382,001	40,457,781	36,533,561	32,609,341	28,685,121	0
Discount Rate	0.100								
Present Value		204,133,949							
Present Value Factor		4.867							
Levelized Capital Cost		\$ 41,944,042							

CapCost % of Investment 20.89%

General Support

EXHIBIT _____ (DJW-2)
Docket No. 960846-TP
Page 12 of 26

43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844	\$200,795,844
1,233,460,183	1,262,145,304	1,290,830,424	1,319,515,545	1,348,200,665	1,376,885,786	1,405,570,907	1,434,256,027
-1,032,664,339	-1,061,349,460	-1,090,034,581	-1,118,719,701	-1,147,404,822	-1,176,089,942	-1,204,775,063	-1,233,460,183
-103,369,700	-106,241,081	-109,112,462	-111,983,842	-114,855,223	-117,726,603	-120,597,984	-123,469,364
-37,902,223	-38,955,063	-40,007,903	-41,060,742	-42,113,582	-43,166,421	-44,219,261	-45,272,100
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Expenses by Service

	0 - 6 lines/sq mi	6 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals	
Network-Related Expenses								
Distribution								
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 3,510,627	\$ 37,459,644	\$ 24,533,592	\$ 7,581,101	\$ 50,828,580	\$ 93,714,356	\$ 217,607,900	
Network Expenses	\$ 1,873,468	\$ 19,517,204	\$ 12,483,540	\$ 3,609,618	\$ 19,416,367	\$ 25,898,761	\$ 82,798,956	
Direct expense	\$ 5,384,093	\$ 56,976,848	\$ 37,017,132	\$ 11,170,718	\$ 70,244,948	\$ 119,613,117	\$ 300,406,856	44.27%
Investment	\$ 25,915,528	\$ 276,527,920	\$ 181,107,519	\$ 55,816,212	\$ 375,217,709	\$ 691,801,454	\$ 1,606,386,342	
Support expenses	\$ 1,422,881	\$ 19,433,124	\$ 15,921,665	\$ 5,293,412	\$ 34,433,128	\$ 63,509,358	\$ 140,013,368	
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 6,806,774	\$ 76,409,971	\$ 52,938,797	\$ 16,484,131	\$ 104,678,076	\$ 183,122,475	\$ 440,420,224	
Total, with var overhead	\$ 7,487,451	\$ 84,050,969	\$ 58,232,677	\$ 18,110,544	\$ 115,145,884	\$ 201,434,722	\$ 484,462,246	
Concentrator								
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 482,164	\$ 9,926,219	\$ 11,272,287	\$ 4,592,252	\$ 30,788,245	\$ 42,531,858	\$ 99,592,825	
Network Expenses	\$ 42,864	\$ 882,498	\$ 1,002,858	\$ 408,552	\$ 2,741,022	\$ 3,793,942	\$ 8,871,534	
Direct expense	\$ 525,028	\$ 10,808,716	\$ 12,274,943	\$ 5,000,803	\$ 33,529,267	\$ 46,325,600	\$ 108,464,359	15.98%
Investment	\$ 2,800,558	\$ 57,654,506	\$ 65,472,883	\$ 26,873,199	\$ 178,827,519	\$ 247,036,850	\$ 578,465,515	
Support expenses	\$ 138,732	\$ 3,686,535	\$ 5,279,651	\$ 2,369,706	\$ 16,435,595	\$ 24,586,877	\$ 52,507,096	
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 663,761	\$ 14,495,251	\$ 17,554,594	\$ 7,370,509	\$ 49,964,862	\$ 70,922,477	\$ 160,971,454	
Total, with var overhead	\$ 730,137	\$ 15,944,776	\$ 19,310,053	\$ 8,107,560	\$ 54,961,348	\$ 78,014,725	\$ 177,068,600	
Feeder								
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 475,139	\$ 4,405,888	\$ 3,779,029	\$ 1,605,526	\$ 23,788,945	\$ 54,051,083	\$ 88,085,591	
Network Expenses	\$ 205,514	\$ 1,989,748	\$ 1,887,795	\$ 593,352	\$ 2,232,743	\$ 3,278,946	\$ 10,188,098	
Direct expense	\$ 680,853	\$ 6,395,636	\$ 5,666,824	\$ 2,198,877	\$ 28,001,689	\$ 57,330,010	\$ 98,273,689	14.48%
Investment	\$ 3,507,485	\$ 32,524,365	\$ 27,896,879	\$ 11,852,025	\$ 175,462,883	\$ 399,006,149	\$ 650,249,786	
Support expenses	\$ 179,854	\$ 2,181,363	\$ 2,437,392	\$ 1,041,971	\$ 12,745,678	\$ 30,439,739	\$ 49,025,998	
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 860,507	\$ 8,576,999	\$ 8,104,217	\$ 3,240,848	\$ 38,747,387	\$ 87,769,749	\$ 147,299,687	
Total, with var overhead	\$ 946,558	\$ 9,434,899	\$ 8,914,838	\$ 3,564,933	\$ 42,622,103	\$ 96,546,724	\$ 162,029,656	
End Office Switching								
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 318,964	\$ 7,379,913	\$ 7,636,274	\$ 2,952,265	\$ 24,057,583	\$ 52,697,435	\$ 95,042,434	
Network Expenses	\$ 93,482	\$ 2,156,422	\$ 2,340,968	\$ 913,165	\$ 7,684,489	\$ 17,066,255	\$ 17,066,255	
Direct expense	\$ 412,446	\$ 9,536,335	\$ 9,977,242	\$ 3,865,430	\$ 31,742,072	\$ 69,763,690	\$ 125,297,215	18.46%
Investment	\$ 2,225,539	\$ 51,492,606	\$ 53,281,340	\$ 20,599,137	\$ 167,859,381	\$ 387,691,092	\$ 663,149,094	
Support expenses	\$ 129,702	\$ 3,959,709	\$ 5,220,747	\$ 2,215,154	\$ 18,551,101	\$ 43,242,807	\$ 73,319,220	
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 542,148	\$ 13,496,044	\$ 15,197,989	\$ 6,080,584	\$ 50,293,173	\$ 113,008,497	\$ 198,616,435	
Total, with var overhead	\$ 586,362	\$ 14,845,648	\$ 16,717,788	\$ 6,688,643	\$ 55,322,490	\$ 124,307,147	\$ 218,478,078	
Signaling								
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 7,156	\$ 232,195	\$ 313,202	\$ 130,898	\$ 1,017,619	\$ 2,094,138	\$ 3,795,209	
Network Expenses	\$ 1,395	\$ 43,078	\$ 57,201	\$ 23,808	\$ 184,956	\$ 379,919	\$ 690,356	
Direct expense	\$ 8,552	\$ 275,273	\$ 370,403	\$ 154,707	\$ 1,202,574	\$ 2,474,057	\$ 4,485,566	0.66%
Investment	\$ 47,818	\$ 1,551,496	\$ 2,092,776	\$ 874,646	\$ 6,799,591	\$ 13,992,748	\$ 25,359,075	
Support expenses	\$ 2,689	\$ 114,300	\$ 193,819	\$ 88,658	\$ 702,824	\$ 1,533,537	\$ 2,635,826	
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 11,241	\$ 389,572	\$ 564,223	\$ 243,364	\$ 1,905,398	\$ 4,007,593	\$ 7,121,391	
Total, with var overhead	\$ 12,365	\$ 428,529	\$ 620,645	\$ 267,701	\$ 2,095,938	\$ 4,408,353	\$ 7,833,531	
Dedicated Transport								
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 25,510	\$ 1,019,680	\$ 1,488,255	\$ 650,554	\$ 5,444,231	\$ 12,305,332	\$ 20,933,561	
Network Expenses	\$ 9,241	\$ 369,382	\$ 539,125	\$ 235,666	\$ 1,972,191	\$ 4,457,647	\$ 7,583,252	
Direct expense	\$ 34,751	\$ 1,389,062	\$ 2,027,380	\$ 886,220	\$ 7,416,422	\$ 16,762,979	\$ 28,516,813	4.20%
Investment	\$ 186,215	\$ 7,443,431	\$ 10,863,923	\$ 4,748,901	\$ 39,741,659	\$ 89,826,149	\$ 152,810,278	
Support expenses	\$ 10,928	\$ 576,771	\$ 1,060,858	\$ 507,864	\$ 4,334,399	\$ 10,390,481	\$ 16,881,300	
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 45,679	\$ 1,965,833	\$ 3,088,238	\$ 1,394,084	\$ 11,750,820	\$ 27,153,460	\$ 45,398,113	
Total, with var overhead	\$ 50,247	\$ 2,162,416	\$ 3,397,061	\$ 1,533,493	\$ 12,925,902	\$ 29,868,806	\$ 49,937,925	
Common Transport								

Expenses by Service

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	6 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 6,895	\$ 212,480	\$ 234,434	\$ 80,605	\$ 585,944	\$ 912,187	\$ 2,032,545
Network Expenses	\$ 2,498	\$ 76,972	\$ 84,924	\$ 29,199	\$ 212,260	\$ 330,443	\$ 736,296
Direct expense	\$ 9,392	\$ 289,451	\$ 319,358	\$ 109,804	\$ 798,204	\$ 1,242,830	\$ 2,768,841
Investment	\$ 50,330	\$ 1,551,055	\$ 1,711,315	\$ 588,398	\$ 4,277,257	\$ 6,858,763	\$ 14,837,117
Support expenses	\$ 2,954	\$ 120,187	\$ 167,109	\$ 62,925	\$ 466,496	\$ 770,241	\$ 1,589,912
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 12,346	\$ 409,638	\$ 486,468	\$ 172,730	\$ 1,264,700	\$ 2,012,871	\$ 4,368,753
Total, with var overhead	\$ 13,580	\$ 450,602	\$ 535,114	\$ 190,003	\$ 1,391,170	\$ 2,214,158	\$ 4,794,628
Tandem Switching							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 4,588	\$ 168,229	\$ 234,771	\$ 99,107	\$ 774,685	\$ 1,508,033	\$ 2,889,413
Network Expenses	\$ 1,759	\$ 84,531	\$ 90,041	\$ 37,984	\$ 296,318	\$ 613,525	\$ 1,104,158
Direct expense	\$ 6,347	\$ 232,760	\$ 324,812	\$ 137,091	\$ 1,071,003	\$ 2,221,558	\$ 3,993,571
Investment	\$ 33,061	\$ 1,212,246	\$ 1,691,747	\$ 714,163	\$ 5,582,338	\$ 11,587,400	\$ 20,820,954
Support expenses	\$ 1,996	\$ 96,647	\$ 169,963	\$ 78,563	\$ 625,929	\$ 1,377,026	\$ 2,350,123
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 8,343	\$ 329,407	\$ 494,775	\$ 215,654	\$ 1,696,932	\$ 3,598,583	\$ 6,343,694
Total, with var overhead	\$ 9,177	\$ 362,347	\$ 544,253	\$ 237,219	\$ 1,866,625	\$ 3,958,442	\$ 6,978,064
Operator Systems							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 7,239	\$ 242,388	\$ 307,581	\$ 120,846	\$ 921,764	\$ 1,783,388	\$ 3,363,203
Network Expenses	\$ 2,220	\$ 75,570	\$ 97,582	\$ 38,872	\$ 297,589	\$ 578,166	\$ 1,090,010
Direct expense	\$ 9,459	\$ 317,958	\$ 405,173	\$ 159,718	\$ 1,219,353	\$ 2,341,552	\$ 4,453,213
Investment	\$ 37,443	\$ 1,253,734	\$ 1,590,937	\$ 625,067	\$ 4,767,752	\$ 9,120,975	\$ 17,395,907
Support expenses	\$ 2,499	\$ 108,446	\$ 174,271	\$ 75,685	\$ 597,710	\$ 1,243,262	\$ 2,201,874
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 11,959	\$ 426,405	\$ 579,444	\$ 235,403	\$ 1,817,063	\$ 3,584,814	\$ 6,655,088
Total, with var overhead	\$ 13,154	\$ 469,045	\$ 637,388	\$ 258,944	\$ 1,998,770	\$ 3,943,296	\$ 7,320,597
Public Telephone							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 693	\$ 31,521	\$ 48,693	\$ 22,172	\$ 199,374	\$ 486,673	\$ 789,125
Network Expenses	\$ 991	\$ 45,094	\$ 69,660	\$ 31,719	\$ 285,227	\$ 696,241	\$ 1,128,933
Direct expense	\$ 1,684	\$ 76,615	\$ 118,353	\$ 53,891	\$ 484,800	\$ 1,182,914	\$ 1,918,058
Investment	\$ 3,817	\$ 173,706	\$ 268,336	\$ 122,185	\$ 1,098,707	\$ 2,681,956	\$ 4,348,706
Support expenses	\$ 445	\$ 26,131	\$ 50,906	\$ 25,637	\$ 237,544	\$ 628,076	\$ 968,639
Subtotal, with misc spt	\$ 2,129	\$ 102,747	\$ 189,259	\$ 79,428	\$ 722,145	\$ 1,810,990	\$ 2,886,697
Total, with var overhead	\$ 2,341	\$ 113,021	\$ 186,185	\$ 87,371	\$ 794,359	\$ 1,992,089	\$ 3,175,366
Totals							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 4,838,975	\$ 61,078,156	\$ 49,848,118	\$ 17,815,326	\$ 138,386,969	\$ 262,164,262	\$ 534,131,805
Network Expenses	\$ 2,233,430	\$ 25,220,498	\$ 18,653,504	\$ 5,921,935	\$ 35,323,162	\$ 57,093,846	\$ 144,446,375
Total	\$ 7,072,404	\$ 86,298,654	\$ 68,501,621	\$ 23,737,261	\$ 173,710,131	\$ 319,258,108	\$ 678,578,180
Investment	\$ 34,807,792	\$ 431,385,066	\$ 345,977,655	\$ 122,613,932	\$ 959,634,795	\$ 1,839,403,536	\$ 3,733,822,777
Supporting Network Expenses							
Capital Cost - Genl Support	\$ 359,176	\$ 4,168,130	\$ 3,083,089	\$ 1,105,147	\$ 10,411,923	\$ 22,816,578	\$ 41,944,042
Network Operations	\$ 291,072	\$ 10,683,344	\$ 14,904,224	\$ 6,282,763	\$ 48,913,869	\$ 101,012,928	\$ 182,088,200
Network Support	\$ 11,979	\$ 153,687	\$ 131,299	\$ 47,167	\$ 348,011	\$ 673,427	\$ 1,365,570
Other Taxes	\$ 486,753	\$ 6,300,410	\$ 5,333,168	\$ 1,904,590	\$ 14,092,204	\$ 26,608,348	\$ 54,725,474
Misc Expenses	\$ 719,816	\$ 8,128,358	\$ 6,011,870	\$ 1,908,591	\$ 11,384,363	\$ 18,400,874	\$ 46,553,871
Subtotal	\$ 1,868,796	\$ 29,433,928	\$ 29,483,651	\$ 11,248,257	\$ 85,150,369	\$ 189,512,155	\$ 326,877,157
Carrier-carrier customer svc	\$ 14,650	\$ 537,704	\$ 750,146	\$ 316,218	\$ 2,461,887	\$ 5,084,089	\$ 9,164,694
Interoffice/Switching Net Ops	\$ 23,684	\$ 869,285	\$ 1,212,731	\$ 511,217	\$ 3,980,036	\$ 8,219,246	\$ 14,816,200
Interoffice/Sw Exp	\$ 471,487	\$ 11,722,880	\$ 13,019,196	\$ 5,153,253	\$ 42,230,275	\$ 92,464,915	\$ 165,062,005
Total Network Costs	\$ 8,964,885	\$ 116,601,867	\$ 99,178,003	\$ 35,496,735	\$ 262,840,536	\$ 496,989,509	\$ 1,020,071,536
Other costs							

Expenses by Service

	0 - 5	5 - 200	200 - 650	650 - 850	850 - 2550	> 2550	Totals
	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	lines/sq mi	
Operating taxes and uncollectibles	\$ 486,753	\$ 6,300,410	\$ 5,333,168	\$ 1,904,590	\$ 14,092,204	\$ 26,608,348	\$ 54,725,474
<i>USF calculations</i>							
Capital cost	\$ 4,698,855	\$ 57,271,429	\$ 45,388,253	\$ 16,019,385	\$ 123,724,905	\$ 230,192,379	\$ 477,295,206
Network expenses	\$ 2,189,599	\$ 23,997,803	\$ 17,156,258	\$ 5,311,504	\$ 30,238,402	\$ 45,850,701	\$ 124,742,267
unbundled network expenses	\$ 2,233,430	\$ 25,220,498	\$ 18,653,504	\$ 5,921,935	\$ 35,323,162	\$ 57,093,846	\$ 144,446,375
USF/unbundled expenses	98.0%	95.2%	92.0%	89.7%	85.6%	80.3%	86.4%
USF/unbundled capital cost	97.1%	93.8%	91.1%	89.9%	89.4%	87.8%	89.4%
Capital cost - gen spt	\$ 348,775	\$ 3,908,349	\$ 2,807,248	\$ 993,738	\$ 9,308,782	\$ 20,034,013	\$ 37,400,906
loop	\$ 332,142	\$ 3,538,523	\$ 2,445,356	\$ 850,983	\$ 7,915,776	\$ 16,574,779	\$ 31,657,559
EO switching	\$ 15,783	\$ 341,868	\$ 326,604	\$ 127,843	\$ 1,253,199	\$ 3,134,268	\$ 5,199,568
signaling	\$ 138	\$ 3,782	\$ 4,563	\$ 1,914	\$ 17,878	\$ 41,860	\$ 70,135
transport	\$ 712	\$ 24,176	\$ 30,725	\$ 12,997	\$ 121,929	\$ 283,106	\$ 473,645
Network operations	\$ 308,580	\$ 10,992,555	\$ 14,823,309	\$ 6,093,659	\$ 45,276,846	\$ 87,721,744	\$ 165,216,692
loop	\$ 293,864	\$ 9,952,388	\$ 12,912,384	\$ 5,218,278	\$ 38,501,426	\$ 72,574,999	\$ 139,453,339
EO switching	\$ 13,964	\$ 961,533	\$ 1,724,591	\$ 783,943	\$ 6,095,415	\$ 13,723,835	\$ 23,303,281
signaling	\$ 122	\$ 10,637	\$ 24,093	\$ 11,740	\$ 86,957	\$ 183,290	\$ 316,839
transport	\$ 630	\$ 67,997	\$ 162,241	\$ 79,698	\$ 593,048	\$ 1,239,620	\$ 2,143,233
Network support	\$ 11,979	\$ 153,687	\$ 131,299	\$ 47,167	\$ 348,011	\$ 673,427	\$ 1,365,570
loop	\$ 11,408	\$ 139,144	\$ 114,373	\$ 40,392	\$ 295,933	\$ 557,148	\$ 1,158,397
EO switching	\$ 542	\$ 13,443	\$ 15,276	\$ 6,068	\$ 46,851	\$ 105,356	\$ 187,536
signaling	\$ 5	\$ 149	\$ 213	\$ 91	\$ 668	\$ 1,407	\$ 2,533
transport	\$ 24	\$ 951	\$ 1,437	\$ 617	\$ 4,558	\$ 9,516	\$ 17,104
Misc expenses	\$ 705,690	\$ 7,734,293	\$ 5,529,320	\$ 1,711,854	\$ 9,744,942	\$ 14,777,301	\$ 40,203,400
loop	\$ 672,036	\$ 7,002,438	\$ 4,816,516	\$ 1,485,938	\$ 8,286,667	\$ 12,225,733	\$ 34,489,329
EO switching	\$ 31,935	\$ 676,529	\$ 643,299	\$ 220,228	\$ 1,311,917	\$ 2,311,870	\$ 5,195,777
signaling	\$ 279	\$ 7,484	\$ 8,987	\$ 3,298	\$ 18,716	\$ 30,876	\$ 69,640
transport	\$ 1,441	\$ 47,842	\$ 60,518	\$ 22,389	\$ 127,642	\$ 208,822	\$ 468,654
USF investment ratios							
loop	95.2%	90.5%	87.1%	85.6%	85.0%	82.7%	
EO switching	4.5%	8.7%	11.6%	12.9%	13.5%	15.8%	
signaling	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	
transport	0.2%	0.6%	1.1%	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	
total USF Investment	\$ 33,837,250	\$ 405,032,891	\$ 315,097,623	\$ 110,167,484	\$ 857,885,783	\$ 1,817,058,914	

Distribution

total pole investment	\$	59,952	\$	572,967	\$	223,053	\$	65,233	\$	432,253	\$	1,018,008	\$	2,371,465
total buried cable	\$	727,115	\$	7,404,464	\$	4,632,815	\$	1,238,632	\$	6,834,482	\$	658,018	\$	21,495,526
total u/g cable	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	92,743	\$	305,182	\$	397,924
total conduit	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	176,014	\$	1,183,595	\$	1,359,609
total aerial cable	\$	1,060,212	\$	10,619,098	\$	6,368,090	\$	1,784,826	\$	7,939,641	\$	15,348,113	\$	43,119,980
total drop cable	\$	5,899	\$	207,408	\$	283,756	\$	117,353	\$	887,874	\$	1,663,868	\$	3,166,158
total muxes and digital terminals	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
total NID	\$	20,288	\$	713,268	\$	975,826	\$	403,573	\$	3,053,362	\$	5,721,977	\$	10,888,294
Expense Summary														
Annual Capital Cost	\$	3,510,627	\$	37,459,644	\$	24,533,592	\$	7,561,101	\$	50,828,580	\$	93,714,356	\$	217,607,900
Network Expenses	\$	1,873,466	\$	19,517,204	\$	12,483,540	\$	3,609,618	\$	19,416,367	\$	25,898,761	\$	82,798,956
Total	\$	5,384,093	\$	56,976,848	\$	37,017,132	\$	11,170,718	\$	70,244,948	\$	119,613,117	\$	300,406,856

Concentrator

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Loop Concentrator Investment							
total wire center							\$ -
total switching, installed							\$ -
total interoffice transmission							\$ -
total pole investment							\$ -
total buried cable							\$ -
total w/g cable							\$ -
total conduit							\$ -
total aerial cable							\$ -
total passive SAI	\$ 2,400	\$ 59,000	\$ 141,500	\$ 69,400	\$ 762,200	\$ 2,193,600	\$ 3,228,100
total muxes and digital terminals	\$ 2,798,158	\$ 57,595,506	\$ 65,331,383	\$ 26,603,799	\$ 178,065,319	\$ 244,843,250	\$ 575,237,415
total common channel signaling							
TOTAL	\$ 2,800,558 0.48%	\$ 57,654,506 9.97%	\$ 65,472,883 11.32%	\$ 26,673,199 4.61%	\$ 178,827,519 30.91%	\$ 247,036,850 42.71%	\$ 578,465,515 100.00%

Cost of Capital

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Investment	\$	578,465,515	\$578,465,515	\$578,465,515	\$578,465,515	\$578,465,515	\$578,465,515
Accumulated Depreciation			57,846,551	115,693,103	173,539,654	231,386,206	289,232,757
Net Plant			520,618,963	462,772,412	404,925,860	347,079,309	289,232,757
Depreciable Life		10					
Rate of Return		0.100					
Return Amount			52,113,958	46,323,518	40,533,079	34,742,639	28,952,199
Income Tax Rate		0.40					
Income Tax Gross-Up			19,108,451	16,985,290	14,862,129	12,738,968	10,615,806
Total Return			129,068,961	121,155,360	113,241,759	105,328,158	97,414,557
Discount Rate		0.100					
Present Value			611,691,995				
Present Value Factor			6.142				
Levelized Capital Cost	\$		99,592,825	0.172167264			

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Network Expenses							
total wire center	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total switching, installed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total interoffice transmission	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total pole investment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total buried cable	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total w/g cable	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total conduit	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total aerial cable	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total drop cable							\$ -
total muxes and digital terminals	\$ 42,864	\$ 882,498	\$ 1,002,656	\$ 408,552	\$ 2,741,022	\$ 3,793,942	\$ 8,871,534
total common channel signaling	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Expense Summary							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 482,164	\$ 9,926,219	\$ 11,272,287	\$ 4,592,252	\$ 30,788,245	\$ 42,531,658	\$ 99,592,825
Network Expenses	\$ 42,864	\$ 882,498	\$ 1,002,656	\$ 408,552	\$ 2,741,022	\$ 3,793,942	\$ 8,871,534
Total	\$ 525,028	\$ 10,808,716	\$ 12,274,943	\$ 5,000,803	\$ 33,529,267	\$ 46,325,600	\$ 108,464,359

Feeder

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Feeder Investment							
total wire center							\$ -
total switching, installed							\$ -
total interoffice transmission							\$ -
total pole investment	\$ 102,965	\$ 802,360	\$ 422,536	\$ 85,735	\$ 267,935	\$ 199,894	\$ 1,881,425
total buried cable	\$ 1,981,621	\$ 17,875,577	\$ 14,304,660	\$ 5,112,623	\$ 10,460,510	\$ 15,049,295	\$ 64,784,287
total u/g cable	\$ 128,846	\$ 1,253,794	\$ 1,175,309	\$ 1,767,727	\$ 71,779,716	\$ 201,529,160	\$ 277,634,551
total conduit	\$ 388,740	\$ 3,127,975	\$ 1,745,524	\$ 1,974,761	\$ 83,982,257	\$ 171,031,736	\$ 262,250,994
total aerial cable	\$ 905,313	\$ 9,464,658	\$ 10,248,850	\$ 2,911,179	\$ 8,972,464	\$ 11,196,064	\$ 43,698,529
total drop cable							\$ -
total muxes and digital terminals							\$ -
total ROW							\$ -
network investment frac							
TOTAL	\$ 3,507,485 0.54%	\$ 32,524,365 5.00%	\$ 27,896,879 4.29%	\$ 11,852,025 1.82%	\$ 175,462,883 26.98%	\$ 399,006,149 61.36%	\$ 650,249,786 100.00%

Cost of Capital	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Investment	\$ 650,249,786	\$650,249,786	\$650,249,786	\$650,249,786	\$650,249,786	\$650,249,786	\$650,249,786
Accumulated Depreciation		32,512,489	65,024,979	97,537,468	130,049,957	162,562,447	195,074,936
Net Plant		617,737,297	585,224,808	552,712,318	520,199,829	487,687,340	455,174,850
Depreciable Life	20						
Rate of Return	0.100						
Return Amount		61,835,503	58,581,003	55,326,503	52,072,003	48,817,503	45,563,003
Income Tax Rate	0.40						
Income Tax Gross-Up		22,673,018	21,479,701	20,286,384	19,093,068	17,899,751	16,706,434
Total Return		117,021,011	112,573,194	108,125,377	103,677,560	99,229,743	94,781,926
Discount Rate	0.100						
Present Value		749,410,714					
Present Value Factor		8.508					
Levelized Capital Cost	\$	88,085,591	0.135464237				

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Network Expenses							
total wire center							\$ -
total switching, installed							\$ -
total interoffice transmission							\$ -
total pole investment	\$ 5,307	\$ 41,354	\$ 21,778	\$ 4,419	\$ 13,809	\$ 10,303	\$ 96,969
total buried cable	\$ 111,160	\$ 1,022,333	\$ 871,141	\$ 290,856	\$ 574,431	\$ 419,478	\$ 3,289,400
total u/g cable	\$ 269	\$ 3,108	\$ 4,543	\$ 8,583	\$ 320,912	\$ 830,769	\$ 1,168,185
total conduit	\$ 2,153	\$ 17,321	\$ 9,666	\$ 10,935	\$ 465,055	\$ 947,094	\$ 1,452,224
total aerial cable	\$ 86,625	\$ 905,632	\$ 980,867	\$ 278,558	\$ 858,536	\$ 1,071,302	\$ 4,181,320
total drop cable	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total muxes and digital terminals							\$ -
total common channel signaling							\$ -
Expense Summary							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 475,139	\$ 4,405,888	\$ 3,779,029	\$ 1,605,526	\$ 23,768,945	\$ 54,051,063	\$ 88,085,591
Network Expenses	\$ 205,514	\$ 1,989,748	\$ 1,887,795	\$ 593,352	\$ 2,232,743	\$ 3,278,946	\$ 10,188,098
Total	\$ 680,653	\$ 6,395,636	\$ 5,666,824	\$ 2,198,877	\$ 26,001,689	\$ 57,330,010	\$ 98,273,689

EO Switching

EXHIBIT _____ (DJW-2)

Docket No. 960846-TP

Page 20 of 26

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
End Office Switching Investment							
total wire center	\$ 450,492	\$ 10,336,263	\$ 12,164,635	\$ 4,811,823	\$ 42,470,651	\$ 96,161,416	\$ 166,395,281
total switching, installed	\$ 1,775,047	\$ 41,156,342	\$ 41,116,705	\$ 15,787,313	\$ 125,388,730	\$ 271,529,676	\$ 496,753,813
total interoffice transmission							\$ -
total pole investment							\$ -
total buried cable							\$ -
total u/g cable							\$ -
total conduit							\$ -
total aerial cable							\$ -
total drop cable							\$ -
total muxes and digital terminals							\$ -
total common channel signaling							\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 2,225,539 0.34%	\$ 51,492,606 7.76%	\$ 53,281,340 8.03%	\$ 20,599,137 3.11%	\$ 167,859,381 25.31%	\$ 367,691,092 55.45%	\$ 663,149,094 100.00%

Cost of Capital

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Investment	\$	663,149,094	\$663,149,094	\$663,149,094	\$663,149,094	\$663,149,094	\$663,149,094
Accumulated Depreciation			41,446,818	82,893,637	124,340,455	165,787,274	207,234,092
Net Plant			621,702,276	580,255,458	538,808,639	497,361,821	455,915,002
Depreciable Life		16					
Rate of Return		0.100					
Return Amount			62,232,398	58,083,571	53,934,745	49,785,918	45,637,092
Income Tax Rate		0.40					
Income Tax Gross-Up			22,818,546	21,297,309	19,776,073	18,254,837	16,733,600
Total Return			126,497,762	120,827,699	115,157,636	109,487,573	103,817,510
Discount Rate		0.100					
Present Value			743,141,795				
Present Value Factor			7.819				
Levelized Capital Cost	\$		95,042,434	0.143319858			

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Network Expenses							
total wire center	\$ 45,733	\$ 1,049,316	\$ 1,234,928	\$ 488,486	\$ 4,311,532	\$ 9,762,107	\$ 16,892,103
total switching, installed	\$ 47,749	\$ 1,107,106	\$ 1,106,039	\$ 424,679	\$ 3,372,957	\$ 7,304,148	\$ 13,362,678
total interoffice transmission	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total pole investment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total buried cable	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total u/g cable	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total conduit	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total aerial cable	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total drop cable	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total muxes and digital terminals	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
total common channel signaling	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Expense Summary							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 318,964	\$ 7,379,913	\$ 7,636,274	\$ 2,952,265	\$ 24,057,583	\$ 52,697,435	\$ 95,042,434
Network Expenses	\$ 93,482	\$ 2,156,422	\$ 2,340,968	\$ 913,165	\$ 7,684,489	\$ 17,066,255	\$ 30,254,781
Total	\$ 412,446	\$ 9,536,335	\$ 9,977,242	\$ 3,865,430	\$ 31,742,072	\$ 69,763,690	\$ 125,297,215

Signaling

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Signaling Investment							
total STP	\$ 22,862	\$ 752,287	\$ 1,020,378	\$ 427,038	\$ 3,320,781	\$ 6,839,946	12,383,292
total links	\$ 4,791	\$ 59,066	\$ 39,834	\$ 12,338	\$ 90,055	\$ 154,623	360,708
total SCP	\$ 20,166	\$ 740,142	\$ 1,032,565	\$ 435,270	\$ 3,388,754	\$ 6,998,178	12,615,075
TOTAL	\$ 47,818	\$ 1,551,496	\$ 2,092,776	\$ 874,646	\$ 6,799,591	\$ 13,992,748	25,359,075
	0.19%	6.12%	8.25%	3.45%	26.81%	55.18%	100.00%

Cost of Capital

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Investment	\$ 25,359,075	\$25,359,075	\$25,359,075	\$25,359,075	\$25,359,075	\$25,359,075	\$25,359,075
Accumulated Depreciation		1,811,363	3,622,725	5,434,088	7,245,450	9,056,813	10,868,175
Net Plant		23,547,713	21,736,350	19,924,988	18,113,625	16,302,263	14,490,900
Depreciable Life	14						
Rate of Return	0.100						
Return Amount		2,357,126	2,175,809	1,994,491	1,813,174	1,631,856	1,450,539
Income Tax Rate	0.40						
Income Tax Gross-Up		864,280	797,797	731,313	664,830	598,347	531,864
Total Return		5,032,768	4,784,968	4,537,167	4,289,367	4,041,566	3,793,766
Discount Rate	0.100						
Present Value		27,942,889					
Present Value Factor		7.363					
Levelized Capital Cost	\$	3,795,209	0.149658824				

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Network Expenses							
total STP	\$ 615	\$ 20,237	\$ 27,448	\$ 11,487	\$ 89,329	\$ 183,995	333,111
total links	\$ 238	\$ 2,931	\$ 1,977	\$ 612	\$ 4,469	\$ 7,673	17,900
total SCP	\$ 542	\$ 19,910	\$ 27,776	\$ 11,709	\$ 91,157	\$ 188,251	339,346
Expense Summary							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 7,156	\$ 232,195	\$ 313,202	\$ 130,898	\$ 1,017,619	\$ 2,094,138	3,795,209
Network Expenses	\$ 1,395	\$ 43,078	\$ 57,201	\$ 23,808	\$ 184,956	\$ 379,919	690,356
Total	\$ 8,552	\$ 275,273	\$ 370,403	\$ 154,707	\$ 1,202,574	\$ 2,474,057	4,485,566

Ded Xport

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Dedicated Transport							
total dedicated transmiss	\$ 186,215	\$ 7,443,431	\$ 10,863,923	\$ 4,748,901	\$ 39,741,659	\$ 89,826,149	\$ 152,810,278
TOTAL	\$ 186,215	\$ 7,443,431	\$ 10,863,923	\$ 4,748,901	\$ 39,741,659	\$ 89,826,149	\$ 152,810,278
	0.12%	4.87%	7.11%	3.11%	26.01%	58.78%	100.00%

Cost of Capital

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Investment	\$ 152,810,278	\$152,810,278	\$152,810,278	\$152,810,278	\$152,810,278	\$152,810,278	\$152,810,278
Accumulated Depreciation		8,042,646	16,085,292	24,127,939	32,170,585	40,213,231	48,255,877
Net Plant		144,767,632	136,724,986	128,682,340	120,639,693	112,597,047	104,554,401
Depreciable Life	19						
Rate of Return	0.100						
Return Amount		14,491,240	13,686,171	12,881,102	12,076,033	11,270,964	10,465,896
Income Tax Rate	0.40						
Income Tax Gross-Up		5,313,455	5,018,263	4,723,071	4,427,879	4,132,687	3,837,495
Total Return		27,847,341	26,747,080	25,646,819	24,546,558	23,446,298	22,346,037
Discount Rate	0.100						
Present Value		174,991,643					
Present Value Factor		8.359					
Levelized Capital Cost	\$	20,933,561	0.136990531				

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Network Expenses							
total interoffice transmiss	\$ 9,241	\$ 369,382	\$ 539,125	\$ 235,666	\$ 1,972,191	\$ 4,457,647	\$ 7,583,252
Expense Summary							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 25,510	\$ 1,019,680	\$ 1,488,255	\$ 650,554	\$ 5,444,231	\$ 12,305,332	\$ 20,933,561
Network Expenses	\$ 9,241	\$ 369,382	\$ 539,125	\$ 235,666	\$ 1,972,191	\$ 4,457,647	\$ 7,583,252
Total	\$ 34,751	\$ 1,389,062	\$ 2,027,380	\$ 886,220	\$ 7,416,422	\$ 16,762,979	\$ 28,516,813

Common Xport

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Common Transport							
total common transmissi	\$ 50,330	\$ 1,551,055	\$ 1,711,315	\$ 588,398	\$ 4,277,257	\$ 6,658,763	14,837,117
TOTAL	\$ 50,330	\$ 1,551,055	\$ 1,711,315	\$ 588,398	\$ 4,277,257	\$ 6,658,763	14,837,117
	0.34%	10.45%	11.53%	3.97%	28.83%	44.88%	100.00%

Cost of Capital

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Investment	\$ 14,837,117	\$14,837,117	\$14,837,117	\$14,837,117	\$14,837,117	\$14,837,117	\$14,837,117
Accumulated Depreciation		780,901	1,561,802	2,342,703	3,123,604	3,904,505	4,685,406
Net Plant		14,056,217	13,275,316	12,494,415	11,713,514	10,932,613	10,151,712
Depreciable Life	19						
Rate of Return	0.100						
Return Amount		1,407,027	1,328,859	1,250,691	1,172,523	1,094,355	1,016,186
Income Tax Rate	0.400						
Income Tax Gross-Up		515,910	487,248	458,587	429,925	401,263	372,602
Total Return		2,703,838	2,597,008	2,490,178	2,383,349	2,276,519	2,169,689
Discount Rate	0.100						
Present Value		16,990,817					
Present Value Factor		8.359					
Levelized Capital Cost	\$	2,032,545	0.136990531				

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Network Expenses							
total interoffice transmiss	\$ 2,498	\$ 76,972	\$ 84,924	\$ 29,199	\$ 212,260	\$ 330,443	736,296
Expense Summary							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 6,895	\$ 212,480	\$ 234,434	\$ 80,605	\$ 585,944	\$ 912,187	2,032,545
Network Expenses	\$ 2,498	\$ 76,972	\$ 84,924	\$ 29,199	\$ 212,260	\$ 330,443	736,296
Total	\$ 9,392	\$ 289,451	\$ 319,358	\$ 109,804	\$ 798,204	\$ 1,242,630	2,768,841

Tandem Switching

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Tandem Switching Investment							
total wire center	\$ 11,656	\$ 427,800	\$ 596,819	\$ 251,585	\$ 1,958,688	\$ 4,044,923	7,291,470
total switching	\$ 21,405	\$ 784,447	\$ 1,094,928	\$ 462,578	\$ 3,623,649	\$ 7,542,477	13,529,484
TOTAL	\$ 33,061	\$ 1,212,246	\$ 1,691,747	\$ 714,163	\$ 5,582,338	\$ 11,587,400	20,820,954
	0.16%	5.82%	8.13%	3.43%	26.81%	55.65%	100.00%

Cost of Capital

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Investment	\$ 20,820,954	\$20,820,954	\$20,820,954	\$20,820,954	\$20,820,954	\$20,820,954	\$20,820,954
Accumulated Depreciation		1,156,720	2,313,439	3,470,159	4,626,879	5,783,598	6,940,318
Net Plant		19,664,235	18,507,515	17,350,795	16,194,076	15,037,356	13,880,636
Depreciable Life	18						
Rate of Return	0.100						
Return Amount		1,968,390	1,852,602	1,736,815	1,621,027	1,505,239	1,389,452
Income Tax Rate	0.40						
Income Tax Gross-Up		721,743	679,287	636,832	594,377	551,921	509,466
Total Return		3,846,853	3,688,609	3,530,366	3,372,123	3,213,880	3,055,637
Discount Rate	0.100						
Present Value		23,682,079					
Present Value Factor		8.196					
Levelized Capital Cost	\$	2,889,413	0.138774267				

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Network Expenses							
total wire center	\$ 1,183	\$ 43,429	\$ 60,588	\$ 25,540	\$ 198,842	\$ 410,632	740,215
total switching	\$ 576	\$ 21,102	\$ 29,454	\$ 12,443	\$ 97,476	\$ 202,893	363,943
Expense Summary							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 4,588	\$ 168,229	\$ 234,771	\$ 99,107	\$ 774,685	\$ 1,608,033	2,889,413
Network Expenses	\$ 1,759	\$ 64,531	\$ 90,041	\$ 37,984	\$ 296,318	\$ 613,525	1,104,158
Total	\$ 6,347	\$ 232,760	\$ 324,812	\$ 137,091	\$ 1,071,003	\$ 2,221,558	3,993,571

Operator

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Operator Systems Investment							
total wire center	\$ 3,440	\$ 126,269	\$ 176,157	\$ 74,258	\$ 578,125	\$ 1,193,897	\$ 2,152,146
total switching	\$ 4,926	\$ 178,101	\$ 247,917	\$ 104,727	\$ 822,039	\$ 1,715,744	\$ 3,073,454
total transport	\$ 17,728	\$ 532,835	\$ 585,767	\$ 201,126	\$ 1,460,502	\$ 2,272,977	\$ 5,070,935
total operator positions	\$ 11,349	\$ 416,529	\$ 581,096	\$ 244,956	\$ 1,907,086	\$ 3,938,357	\$ 7,099,373
TOTAL	\$ 37,443	\$ 1,253,734	\$ 1,590,937	\$ 625,067	\$ 4,767,752	\$ 9,120,975	\$ 17,395,907
	0.22%	7.21%	9.15%	3.59%	27.41%	52.43%	100.00%

Cost of Capital

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Investment	\$ 17,395,907	\$17,395,907	\$17,395,907	\$17,395,907	\$17,395,907	\$17,395,907	\$17,395,907
Accumulated Depreciation		2,174,488	4,348,977	6,523,465	8,697,954	10,872,442	13,046,930
Net Plant		15,221,419	13,046,930	10,872,442	8,697,954	6,523,465	4,348,977
Depreciable Life	8						
Rate of Return	0.100						
Return Amount		1,523,664	1,305,998	1,088,331	870,665	652,999	435,333
Income Tax Rate	0.40						
Income Tax Gross-Up		558,677	478,866	399,055	319,244	239,433	159,622
Total Return		4,256,829	3,959,352	3,661,875	3,364,397	3,066,920	2,769,443
Discount Rate	0.100						
Present Value		17,935,910					
Present Value Factor		5.333					
Levelized Capital Cost	\$	3,363,203	0.193333006				

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Network Expenses							
total wire center	\$ 349	\$ 12,819	\$ 17,883	\$ 7,538	\$ 58,690	\$ 121,202	\$ 218,481
total switching	\$ 132	\$ 4,791	\$ 6,669	\$ 2,817	\$ 22,113	\$ 46,154	\$ 82,676
total transport	\$ 880	\$ 26,442	\$ 29,069	\$ 9,981	\$ 72,478	\$ 112,797	\$ 251,647
total operator positions	\$ 859	\$ 31,519	\$ 43,971	\$ 18,536	\$ 144,308	\$ 298,014	\$ 537,207
Expense Summary							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 7,239	\$ 242,388	\$ 307,581	\$ 120,846	\$ 921,764	\$ 1,763,386	\$ 3,363,203
Network Expenses	\$ 2,220	\$ 75,570	\$ 97,592	\$ 38,872	\$ 297,589	\$ 578,166	\$ 1,090,010
Total	\$ 9,459	\$ 317,958	\$ 405,173	\$ 159,718	\$ 1,219,353	\$ 2,341,552	\$ 4,453,213

Public Telephone

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Public Telephone Investment							
total wire center							\$ -
total switching, installed							\$ -
total interoffice transmission							\$ -
total pole investment							\$ -
total buried cable							\$ -
total u/g cable							\$ -
total conduit							\$ -
total aerial cable							\$ -
total drop cable							\$ -
total muxes and digital terminals							\$ -
total common channel signaling							\$ -
public telephone equipm	\$ 3,817	\$ 173,706	\$ 268,336	\$ 122,185	\$ 1,098,707	\$ 2,681,956	\$ 4,348,706
TOTAL	\$ 3,817	\$ 173,706	\$ 268,336	\$ 122,185	\$ 1,098,707	\$ 2,681,956	\$ 4,348,706
	0.09%	3.99%	6.17%	2.81%	25.27%	61.67%	100.00%

Cost of Capital	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
Total Investment	\$ 4,348,706	\$4,348,706	\$4,348,706	\$4,348,706	\$4,348,706	\$4,348,706	\$4,348,706
Accumulated Depreciation		483,190	966,379	1,449,569	1,932,758	2,415,948	2,899,138
Net Plant		3,865,517	3,382,327	2,899,138	2,415,948	1,932,758	1,449,569
Depreciable Life	9						
Rate of Return	0.100						
Return Amount		386,938	338,571	290,204	241,836	193,469	145,102
Income Tax Rate	0.40						
Income Tax Gross-Up		141,877	124,143	106,408	88,673	70,939	53,204
Total Return		1,012,005	945,903	879,801	813,699	747,597	681,495
Discount Rate	0.100						
Present Value		4,542,783					
Present Value Factor		5.757					
Levelized Capital Cost	\$	789,125	0.181461961				

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
Network Expenses							
total public telephone eq	\$ 991	\$ 45,094	\$ 69,660	\$ 31,719	\$ 285,227	\$ 696,241	\$ 1,128,933
total switching, installed							\$ -
total interoffice transmission							\$ -
total pole investment							\$ -
total buried cable							\$ -
total u/g cable							\$ -
total conduit							\$ -
total aerial cable							\$ -
total drop cable							\$ -
total muxes and digital terminals							\$ -
total common channel signaling							\$ -
Expense Summary							
Annual Capital Cost	\$ 693	\$ 31,521	\$ 48,693	\$ 22,172	\$ 199,374	\$ 486,673	\$ 789,125
Network Expenses	\$ 991	\$ 45,094	\$ 69,660	\$ 31,719	\$ 285,227	\$ 696,241	\$ 1,128,933
Total	\$ 1,684	\$ 76,615	\$ 118,353	\$ 53,891	\$ 484,600	\$ 1,182,914	\$ 1,918,058

COST OF NETWORK ELEMENTS

Florida BELL SOUTH TELECOMM INC - FL

A. Loop elements

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	Totals
<i>Loop Distribution (including NID)</i>							
Annual Cost	\$ 7,487,451	\$ 84,050,969	\$ 58,232,677	\$ 18,110,544	\$ 115,145,884	\$ 201,434,722	\$ 484,462,246
Unit Cost/month	\$ 66.44	\$ 20.32	\$ 10.09	\$ 7.45	\$ 6.08	\$ 5.15	\$ 6.87
<i>Loop Concentration</i>							
Annual Cost	\$ 730,137	\$ 15,944,776	\$ 19,310,053	\$ 8,107,560	\$ 54,961,348	\$ 78,014,725	\$ 177,068,600
Unit Cost/month	\$ 6.48	\$ 3.85	\$ 3.35	\$ 3.33	\$ 2.90	\$ 1.99	\$ 2.51
<i>Loop Feeder</i>							
Annual Cost	\$ 946,558	\$ 9,434,699	\$ 8,914,638	\$ 3,564,933	\$ 42,622,103	\$ 96,548,724	\$ 162,029,656
Unit Cost/month	\$ 8.40	\$ 2.28	\$ 1.54	\$ 1.47	\$ 2.25	\$ 2.47	\$ 2.30
<i>Total Loop</i>							
Annual Cost	\$ 9,164,146	\$ 109,430,444	\$ 86,457,368	\$ 29,783,036	\$ 212,729,335	\$ 375,996,171	\$ 823,560,501
Unit Cost/month	\$ 81.32	\$ 26.46	\$ 14.98	\$ 12.24	\$ 11.23	\$ 9.61	\$ 11.68
<i>Total lines</i>							
	9,391	344,682	480,863	202,704	1,578,133	3,259,031	5,874,804
<i>Total lines served by DLC</i>	8,742	318,276	382,700	157,493	1,047,915	1,460,786	3,375,912

	Annual Cost	Units	Unit Cost
End office switching	\$ 218,478,078		
1. Port	\$ 65,543,423	5,459,485 switched lines	\$ 1.00 per line/month
2. Usage	\$ 152,934,655	93,536,345,969 minutes	\$ 0.0016 per minute
Signaling network elements	\$ 7,833,531		
1. Links	\$ 111,424	512 links	\$ 18.14 per link per month
2. STP	\$ 3,825,254	72,345,209,941 TCAP+ISUP messages	\$ 0.00005 per signaling message
3. SCP	\$ 3,896,853	4,977,664,600 TCAP messages	\$ 0.00078 per signaling message
Transport network elements			
1. Dedicated	\$ 49,937,925	998,146 trunks	\$ 4.17 per DS-0 equivalent/month
Switched	\$ 29,159,228	582,827	\$ 0.00042 per minute
Special	\$ 20,778,696	415,319	
2. Common	\$ 4,794,628	6,689,374,354 minutes	\$ 0.00073 per minute per leg (orig or term)
3. Tandem switch	\$ 8,978,064	5,730,057,671 minutes	\$ 0.0012 per minute
Operator systems	\$ 7,320,597		
Total	\$ 1,118,903,324		
Total cost of switched network elements	\$ 15.87	per line/month	

Intrastate Toll DEMs	9,984,285,626				
Interstate Toll DEMs	19,185,717,860				
		10,044	trk-min/mo		
Common Transport MOU				interLATA ded trunks	206,741
Local	853,373,676		w/o OS usage	end office trk port inv	95,881,301
Interstate Toll	1,998,857,105				
Interstate Toll	3,839,143,572				
	6,689,374,354				
Intrastate IntraLATA Calls	863,660,000		53.35% SOCCC message counts		
Intrastate InterLATA Calls	580,389,000		46.65%		
	1,244,048,000				
Calculation of EO Usage			trunk port usage		118,834,508,832
Local DEMs, incl OS	84,865,531,848				
Intraoffice Local DEMs	41,018,378,531		74.4% of total DEMs		
Intraoffice Local Actual Min	20,509,189,266			Dedicated Transport MOU	
Interoffice Local Actual Min	43,847,153,317		per end	Local, w/o OS	20,907,655,068
Intrastate Toll Actual Min	9,984,285,526			IntraLATA Toll	2,130,519,379
Interstate Toll Actual Min	19,185,717,860			InterLATA Toll	24,918,964,628
	93,538,345,969				47,957,139,075
Tandem Switch MOU				Dedicated Trunk-SW	397,877

Cost detail

Loops percent	0.16%	5.87%	8.19%	3.45%	26.86%	55.47%	100.00%
Loops	9,388	344,552	480,665	202,614	1,577,353	3,256,908	5,871,480

	Interconnected at		
	end office	tandem	wtd average
Local interconnection	\$ 0.0017	\$ 0.0036	n/a
IXC switched access	\$ 0.0021	\$ 0.0040	\$ 0.0025
per 800 attempt (TCAP)	\$ 0.0017		
	\$ 0.0003		
ISUP cost/transaction	\$ 0.0003		
ISUP cost/completion	\$ 0.0005		
IXC switched access MOU/comp	9.95		
ISUP cost/min	\$ 0.0000		
D link per month	\$ 5.67		
DS-1 per month	\$ 100		
DS-3 per month	\$ 2,802		

	0 - 5 lines/sq mi	5 - 200 lines/sq mi	200 - 650 lines/sq mi	650 - 850 lines/sq mi	850 - 2550 lines/sq mi	> 2550 lines/sq mi	wtd average
NID cost per month	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.53	\$ 0.55

trunk port costs	
per trunk port (DS-0)	\$ 3.67
per trunk port minute	\$ 0.00058
total EO usage per minute	\$ 0.00164
trk port/min	\$ 0.00058
other	\$ 0.00106