

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Petition of Competitive Carriers for )  
 Commission action to support local ) DOCKET NO. 981834-TP  
 competition in BellSouth )  
 Telecommunications, Inc.'s service )  
 territory. )

---

Petition of ACI Corp.d/b/a )  
 Accelerated Connections, Inc. ) DOCKET NO. 990321-TP  
 for generic investigation to )  
 ensure that BellSouth )  
 Telecommunications, Inc., )  
 Sprint-Florida, Incorporated, and )  
 GTE Florida Incorporated comply )  
 with obligation to provide )  
 alternative local exchange carriers )  
 with flexible, timely, and cost- )  
 efficient physical collocation. ) FILED: October 28, 1999

---

**SUPRA TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
 & INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC.'S  
 DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DAVID NILSON**

AFA \_\_\_\_\_  
 APP \_\_\_\_\_  
 CAF \_\_\_\_\_  
 CMU *Summers*  
 CTR \_\_\_\_\_  
 EAG \_\_\_\_\_  
 LEG *2*  
 MAS *37 ag*  
 OPC \_\_\_\_\_  
 PAI \_\_\_\_\_  
 SEC *1*  
 WAW \_\_\_\_\_  
 OTH \_\_\_\_\_

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
 13263 OCT 28 1999  
 FFLS-TELECOMS-REPORTING

1 SUPRA TELECOMMUNICATIONS & INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC.

2 DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DAVID A. NILSON

3 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

4 DOCKET NOS. 981834-TP AND 990321-TP

5 OCTOBER 28, 1999

6

7

8 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS

9

10 A. My name is David A. Nilson. My address is 2620 SW 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Miami,  
11 Florida 33133.

12

13 Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

14

15 A. I am the Chief Technology Officer of Supra Telecommunications and Information  
16 Systems, Inc. ("Supra").

17

18 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR BACKGROUND AND WORK EXPERIENCE.

19

20 A. I have been an electrical engineer for the past 25 years, with the last 21 years spent  
21 in management level positions in engineering and quality control departments. In  
22 1976, after spending two years working in the microwave industry producing next  
23 generation switching equipment for end customers such as AT&T Long Lines and  
24 ITT, I was part of a three-man design team that produced the world's first microwave  
25 integrated circuit. This job involved extensive work with various government

DOCUMENT NO. TP-DATE

13263 OCT 28 89

FPSC-REG. DIV. / REPORTING

1 agencies. At that time, our design was considered the “holy grail” of the microwave  
2 industry and was placed in production for AT&T within 30 days of its creation. This  
3 job also involved communications equipment design work with various government  
4 entities covered by United States Department of Defense security restrictions. I spent  
5 several years in quality control management, monitoring and trouble-shooting  
6 manufacturing process deviations, and serving as liaison and auditor to our regulatory  
7 dealings with the government. I spent 14 years in the aviation industry designing  
8 communications systems, both airborne and land-based, for various airlines and  
9 airframe manufacturers worldwide. This included custom designed hardware  
10 originally designed for the Pan American Airlines call centers, and the HF long range  
11 communications system controllers used on Air Force One and Two and other  
12 government aircraft. In this job I was also responsible for validation design testing  
13 and FAA system conformance testing. Since 1992, I have been performing network  
14 and system design consulting for various industry and government agencies, including  
15 the Argonne National Laboratories. I am the principal architect of Supra’s ATM  
16 backbone network and our central office design.

17

18 Q. HAVE YOU EVER PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS COMMISSION?

19

20 A. Yes. I testified in Docket No. 980800-TP.

21

22 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

23 A. The purpose of my testimony is to address the issues identified in this proceeding.

24

1 **ISSUE 1: WHEN SHOULD AN ILEC BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO A**  
2 **COMPLETE AND CORRECT APPLICATION FOR COLLOCATION AND WHAT**  
3 **INFORMATION SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THAT RESPONSE?**

4

5 Q. IN WHAT TIME FRAME DO YOU BELIEVE AN ILEC SHOULD BE  
6 REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO A COMPLETE AND CORRECT APPLICATION  
7 FOR COLLOCATION?

8

9 A. Although the FCC did not establish specific provisioning intervals in Order 99-48,  
10 CC Docket No. 99-147, it did state that it views ten days as a reasonable time period  
11 within which to inform a new entrant whether its collocation application is accepted or  
12 denied. The FCC further stated that even with a timely response a new entrant cannot  
13 compete effectively unless they have timely access to provisioned collocation space.  
14 (FCC Order 99-48 at 55) The Texas PUC already requires Southwestern Bell  
15 Telephone Company to provide ALECs with information on space availability within  
16 ten days of a collocation request. (at ¶54) In addition, GTE and Ameritech state that  
17 they respond to physical collocation requests within ten days. (at ¶55) Supra believes  
18 this is reasonable and urges the Commission to require ILECS to respond to physical  
19 collocation requests within ten calendar days by advising the requesting carrier  
20 whether space is available or not.

21

22 Q. WHAT INFORMATION SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE ILEC'S  
23 RESPONSE?

24

1 A. The ILEC should be required to state whether or not space is available to meet the  
2 conditions of the request. This would provide the ALEC an opportunity to consider  
3 modifying its application, if necessary. However, the ALEC should immediately be  
4 permitted to do a “walk-through” of the central office to evaluate the feasibility of  
5 modifying its request for space.

6

7 In Florida, Sprint schedules an engineering review meeting to determine whether they  
8 properly understand the application sufficiently to provide an accurate quotation.  
9 Sprint prefers to hold this meeting at the CO in question, if not possible. Supra  
10 believes this is reasonable and urges the Commission to require ILECs to hold  
11 ALEC/ILEC equipment vendor site visit and engineering meetings at this time to  
12 eliminate delays requiring clarification.

13

14

15 **ISSUE 2: IF THE INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE ILEC’S INITIAL**  
16 **RESPONSE IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO COMPLETE A FIRM ORDER, WHEN**  
17 **SHOULD THE ILEC PROVIDE SUCH INFORMATION OR SHOULD AN**  
18 **ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE BE IMPLEMENTED?**

19

20 **Q. IF THE INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE ILEC RESPONSE IS NOT SUFFICIENT**  
21 **TO COMPLETE A FIRM ORDER, WHEN SHOULD THE ILEC PROVIDE SUCH**  
22 **INFORMATION OR SHOULD AN ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE BE IMPLEMENTED?**

23

24 A. If the ten-day time frame for a response is adopted by the Commission, all  
25 additional information necessary to submit a firm order should be provided by the

1 ILEC within twenty calendar days of the ALEC's application. This information  
2 should also include the cost estimates. This cost information is crucial to a ALEC in  
3 determining whether or not to file a firm order commitment. The ALEC must know  
4 the total cost of space preparation prior to placing a firm order commitment. With  
5 collocation application acceptance from the ILEC, a sufficiently detailed cost  
6 breakdown must be supplied to allow the ALEC to validate a) their business model  
7 and b) that the ILEC is indeed provisioning the infrastructure asked for by the ALEC,  
8 and no more. Instead of a single line item for Power, the ILEC should detail  
9 separately the cost for cabling, racking, rectifiers, AC modifications, and labor, instead  
10 of a single price for space enclosure, costs for HVAC, lighting modification, AC  
11 electrical costs, architectural and other engineering planning, and general construction  
12 costs. Racking and cabling costs should be broken down showing the lengths of newly  
13 constructed runs separately from lengths of existing runs. Prorated costs should  
14 always be shown separately from non-prorated costs and should show the ALEC's  
15 portion of the whole in case there is reason to recover costs from future collocators and  
16 to demonstrate that the first collocator is being forced to pay all the costs of  
17 collocation infrastructure.

18

19

20 **ISSUE 4: WHAT OBLIGATIONS, IF ANY, DOES AN ILEC HAVE TO**  
21 **INTERCONNECT WITH ALEC PHYSICAL COLLOCATION EQUIPMENT**  
22 **LOCATED "OFF-PREMISES"?**

23

1 Q. WHAT OBLIGATIONS, IF ANY, DOES AN ILEC HAVE TO  
2 INTERCONNECT WITH ALEC PHYSICAL COLLOCATION EQUIPMENT  
3 LOCATED "OFF-PREMISES"?

4  
5

6 A. ILECs are clearly obligated, under the Act, to interconnect at any technically  
7 feasible point within the carrier's network. This provision is made to accomplish  
8 interconnection and use of unbundled network elements in lieu of providing sufficient  
9 space for collocation within the CO properly. Therefore, the ILEC should be required  
10 to provide anything that is a technically feasible interconnection or use of facilities  
11 within the CO off premises. The alternative is also available to the ILEC, to create  
12 more space as if the demand was from within its own organization.

13  
14

15 **ISSUE 6: WHAT ARE THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE AND**  
16 **IMPLEMENTATION INTERVALS FOR ALEC REQUESTS FOR CHANGES**  
17 **TO EXISTING COLLOCATION SPACE?**

18

19 Q. IN WHAT TIME FRAME SHOULD ILECS BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO  
20 A ALEC'S REQUEST TO CHANGE AN EXISTING COLLOCATION SPACE?

21

22 A. I believe that a ten-day, or less, response time interval is appropriate. Since the  
23 Commission has already determined that physical collocation should be performed  
24 within ninety days, a modification to an existing collocation space should take even  
25 less time, certainly not more.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**ISSUE 7: WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITES OF THE ILEC AND COLLOCATORS WHEN:**

**A. A COLLOCATOR SHARES SPACE WITH, OR SUBLEASES SPACE TO, ANOTHER COLLOCATOR;**

Q. WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITES OF THE ILEC AND COLLOCATORS WHEN A COLLOCATOR SHARES SPACE WITH, OR SUBLEASES SPACE TO, ANOTHER COLLOCATOR?

A. The ILEC must provision space and honor service requests to all collocators equally. The ILEC should not be allowed to require ALECs to identify the nature of the business relationship between the collocators or the specific equipment belonging to a given collocator.

**B. A COLLOCATOR CROSS-CONNECTS WITH ANOTHER COLLOCATOR.**

Q. WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITES OF THE ILEC AND COLLOCATORS WHEN A COLLOCATOR CROSS-CONNECTS WITH ANOTHER COLLOCATOR?

1 A. The ILEC must provide shared cable racking, cable routing, and other engineering  
2 services. The collocators must provide accurate information regarding the physical  
3 characteristics of the copper/fiber transmission path, including size and weight, and  
4 must comply with ILEC technical specifications on the manufacture of that  
5 transmission path. The ILEC must document the minimum level of technical training  
6 required to perform work in the CO. This must be no more stringent than the ILEC's  
7 own requirements for its workers. The collocators must mutually agree on the type of  
8 cross-connect, division of labor, technical aspects of interconnection, and pricing.

9

10

11 **ISSUE 8: WHAT IS THE APPROPRIATE PROVISIONING INTERVAL FOR**  
12 **CAGELESS PHYSICAL COLLOCATION?**

13

14 Q. Should the provisioning interval for cageless physical collocation mirror that of  
15 virtual collocation?

16

17 A. Yes. The provisioning of cageless collocation is the same as provisioning for  
18 virtual collocation. The equipment for both cageless and virtual collocation is placed  
19 in existing lineups. The Commission has already determined that virtual collocation  
20 should be provisioned within sixty days; therefore, it is reasonable to assume that since  
21 cageless and virtual collocation are provisioned in the same manner, the intervals  
22 should also be the same.

23

24 In Florida, Sprint has already told Supra that cageless collocation uses the same rate  
25 structures, provisioning intervals, and policies as virtual collocation. The only

1 difference in their eyes is that the ALEC can maintain their own equipment in cageless  
2 collocation. All other issues remain the same. This passes the test for technical  
3 feasibility.

4

5 **ISSUE 9: WHAT IS THE APPROPRIATE DEMARCATION POINT**  
6 **BETWEEN ILEC AND ALEC FACILITIES WHEN THE ALEC'S**  
7 **EQUIPMENT IS CONNECTED DIRECTLY TO THE ILEC'S NETWORK**  
8 **WITHOUT AN INTERMEDIATE POINT OF INTERCONNECTION?**

9

10 Q. HOW SHOULD THE DEMARCATION POINT BETWEEN AN ILEC'S AND  
11 AN ALEC'S EQUIPMENT BE DETERMINED?

12

13 A. As a minimum, for equivalent circuit types, there should be difference between the  
14 demarcation point the ILEC uses in connecting its switching and transmission  
15 equipment to the network and what the ALEC uses. At the ALEC's option, the ALEC  
16 may provision an alternate demarcation point within its collocation space. Further, the  
17 ILEC must not require the ALEC to purchase equipment or cross-connects solely from  
18 the ILEC.

19

20

21 **ISSUE 10: WHAT ARE REASONABLE PARAMETERS FOR RESERVING**  
22 **SPACE FOR FUTURE LEC AND ALEC USE?**

23

24 Q. WHAT PARAMETERS SHOULD APPLY TO ILECS AND ALECS FOR  
25 RESERVING SPACE FOR FUTURE USE?

1

2 A. Historically, an ILEC's space reservation was based on growth forecasting in a  
3 monopoly environment. ILECs now must take into consideration a decrease in  
4 demand due to local competition. Therefore, I believe the parameters should apply  
5 equally to both ILECs and ALECs. The FCC's rule §51.323(f)(4) states that an ILEC  
6 cannot retain space on terms more favorably than those that apply to ALECs seeking  
7 to reserve collocation space for their own future use. No ILEC may reserve space  
8 farther in advance than it allows an ALEC to reserve space.

9

10

11 **ISSUE 12: WHAT TYPES OF EQUIPMENT ARE THE ILECS OBLIGATED**  
12 **TO ALLOW IN A PHYSICAL COLLOCATION ARRANGEMENT?**

13

14 Q. Did the FCC address what equipment the ILECs are obligated to allow in a  
15 physical collocation arrangement?

16

17 A. Yes, the FCC clearly states that ILECS are required to permit collocation of all  
18 equipment that is necessary for interconnection or access to unbundled network  
19 elements, regardless of whether such equipment includes a switching functionality,  
20 provides enhanced services capabilities, or offers other functionalities, provided that  
21 the collocater is providing basic telephony service from the same arrangement. The  
22 FCC further states that an ILEC may not refuse to permit collocation of any equipment  
23 that is "used or useful" for either interconnection or access to unbundled network  
24 elements, regardless of other functionalities inherent in such equipment. It is also  
25 required that before an ILEC denies an ALEC's equipment, the ILEC must first prove

1 to the state commission that the equipment will not be actually used for the purpose of  
2 obtaining interconnection or access to unbundled network elements. The FCC permits  
3 equipment, such as DSLAMS, routers, ATM multiplexers, and remote switching  
4 modules. In addition, ILECs cannot place limitations of use of all features, functions,  
5 and capabilities of collocated equipment. This would also include switching and  
6 routing features and functions that may be inherent in this equipment. (FCC Order 99-  
7 48 at ¶28)

8

9

10 **ISSUE 13: IF SPACE IS AVAILABLE, SHOULD THE ILEC BE REQUIRED**  
11 **TO PROVIDE PRICE QUOTES TO AN ALEC PRIOR TO RECEIVING A**  
12 **FIRM ORDER FOR SPACE IN A CENTRAL OFFICE (CO)?**

13

14 Q. SHOULD AN ILEC BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE PRICE QUOTES TO AN  
15 ALEC PRIOR TO RECEIVING A FIRM ORDER FOR SPACE IN A CENTRAL  
16 OFFICE (CO)?

17

18 A. The ALEC should be given the option of requesting a price quote on the  
19 application. The Commission should also require the ILECS, if requested by the  
20 ALEC, to provide three independent estimates. This is consistent with the  
21 Commission's decision in Order No. PSC-98-0604-FOF-TP, Docket Nos. 960757-TP,  
22 960833-TP, and 960846-TP (at page 145).

23

1 **A. IF AN ILEC SHOULD PROVIDE PRICE QUOTES TO AN ALEC PRIOR**  
2 **TO RECEIVING A FIRM ORDER FROM THAT ALEC, WHEN SHOULD**  
3 **THE QUOTE BE PROVIDED?**

4

5 Q. WHEN SHOULD AN ILEC PROVIDE PRICE QUOTES?

6

7 A. An ILEC should provide price quotes to ALECs within 30 calendar days of the  
8 initial application. Since it is at the point that the ILEC provides the ALEC with a cost  
9 quotation, this is a reasonable time frame for the ILEC to provide the detailed cost  
10 information that the quotation is based upon.

11

12 **B. IF AN ILEC SHOULD PROVIDE PRICE QUOTES TO AN ALEC PRIOR**  
13 **TO RECEIVING A FIRM ORDER FROM THAT ALEC, SHOULD THE**  
14 **QUOTE PROVIDE DETAILED COSTS?**

15

16 Q. SHOULD ILECS BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE DETAILED PRICE QUOTES?

17

18 A. The ALEC should have the option of requesting a detailed price quote. This would  
19 allow the ALEC an opportunity to check the quote(s) rather than just accepting the  
20 price estimates on its face. The detailed estimate should be itemized sufficiently for  
21 the ALEC to determine what elements were considered in the determination of the  
22 costs and to detect potential misunderstandings by the ILEC of the ALEC's design.

23

24

1 **ISSUE 14: SHOULD AN ALEC HAVE THE OPTION TO PARTICIPATE IN**  
2 **THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ILEC'S PRICE QUOTE, AND IF SO, WHAT**  
3 **TIME FRAMES SHOULD APPLY?**

4

5 Q. SHOULD AN ALEC HAVE THE OPTION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE  
6 DEVELOPMENT OF THE ILEC'S PRICE QUOTE, AND IF SO, WHAT TIME  
7 FRAMES SHOULD APPLY?

8

9 A. The ALEC should have the option to participate in the development of the price  
10 quote. If the ALEC can hire an ILEC-certified contractor to do the work, the ALEC  
11 should be allowed to choice to subcontract the work themselves, relieving the ILEC of  
12 that portion of the job that the ILEC would subcontract to a certified contractor. The  
13 same time frame should apply, as discussed in Issue 13(A), which is twenty calendar  
14 days.

15

16

17 **ISSUE 15: SHOULD AN ALEC BE PERMITTED TO HIRE AN ILEC**  
18 **CERTIFIED CONTRATOR TO PERFORM SPACE PREPARATION,**  
19 **RACKING AND CABLING, AND POWER WORK?**

20

21 Q. SHOULD AN ALEC BE PERMITTED TO HIRE AN ILEC CERTIFIED  
22 CONTRATOR TO PERFORM SPACE PREPARATION, RACKING AND  
23 CABLING, AND POWER WORK?

24

25

1 A. Rule 51.323(j) states:

2 An incumbent LEC shall permit a collocating telecommunications  
3 carrier to subcontract the construction of physical collocation  
4 arrangements with contractors approved by the incumbent LEC,  
5 provided, however, that the incumbent LEC shall not unreasonably  
6 withhold approval of contractors. Approval by an incumbent LEC  
7 shall be based on the same criteria it uses in approving contractors  
8 for its own purposes. (CFR 47)

9 Therefore, an ALEC should be allowed to hire contractors to perform space  
10 preparation, racking and cabling, and power. I also contend that ILECs should not  
11 assess a nonrecurring charge for power. As the Commission correctly concluded,  
12 "...Power plant expansions are more appropriately recovered in recurring charges  
13 because they will benefit both BellSouth and future collocators. Therefore, power  
14 plant investment shall not be included in any space preparation charge assessed to a  
15 collocator. (Order NO. PSC-98-0604-FOF-TP, page 155).

16

17

18 **ISSUE 16: FOR WHAT REASONS, IF ANY, SHOULD THE PROVISIONING**  
19 **INTERVALS BE EXTENDED WITHOUT THE NEED FOR AN AGREEMENT**  
20 **BY THE APPLICANT ALEC OR FILING BY THE ILEC OF A REQUEST**  
21 **FOR EXTENSION OF TIME?**

22

23 Q. SHOULD THE PROVISIONING INTERVALS FOR COLLOCATION BE  
24 EXTENDED WITHOUT THE NEED FOR AN AGREEMENT BY THE

1 APPLICANT ALEC OR FILING BY THE ILEC OF A REQUEST FOR  
2 EXTENSION OF TIME?

3

4 A. Other than acts of God, I cannot foresee a reason that would warrant an extension  
5 of time. However, if the ILEC has a situation where it cannot meet the required  
6 interval for provisioning, it should file an emergency petition with the Commission  
7 requesting an extension of time. This petition should detail the circumstance(s) that is  
8 causing the delay. Because time is an important factor for ALECs, the extension  
9 should only be granted for extreme emergency situations which are clearly out of the  
10 ILEC's control.

11

12

13 **ISSUE 17: HOW SHOULD THE COSTS OF SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS,**  
14 **SITE PREPARATION, COLLOCATION SPACE REPORTS, AND OTHER**  
15 **COSTS NECESSARY TO THE PROVISIONING OF COLLOCATION SPACE,**  
16 **BE ALLOCATED BETWEEN MULTIPLE CARRIERS?**

17

18 Q. HOW SHOULD THE COSTS OF SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS, SITE  
19 PREPARATION, COLLOCATION SPACE, BE ALLOCATED BETWEEN  
20 MULTIPLE CARRIERS?

21

22 A. The FCC states that ILECS must allocate space preparation, security measures, and  
23 other collocation charges on a pro-rated basis so the first collocater in a particular  
24 incumbent premises will not be responsible for the entire cost of site preparation. The  
25 FCC further states that if an incumbent LEC implements cageless collocation

1 arrangements in a particular central office that requires air conditioning and power  
2 upgrades, the incumbent may not require the first collocating party to pay the entire  
3 cost of site preparation. The Order also requires the incumbent to develop a system of  
4 partitioning the cost by combining, for example, the amount of conditioned space  
5 actually occupied by the new entrant with the overall space conditioning expenses.  
6 The Order also indicates that it is up to the state commissions to determine the proper  
7 pricing methodology. (Order No. 99-48, ¶51)

8

9 The Commission has already determined that the ALEC may be required to pay for  
10 maintenance of, and the access devices to a security device, that is already installed.  
11 The Commission declined to require ALECs to fund the installation of new security  
12 devices (card readers). (Order No. PSC-98-0604-FOF-TP, page 158)

13

14 As I stated earlier in my testimony, the Commission has already determined that the  
15 expansions in power plant are more appropriately recovered in recurring charges  
16 because both BellSouth and future collocators will benefit from the upgrade. The  
17 Commission concluded that power plant investment will not be included in any space  
18 preparation charge assessed to a collocator. (Order No. PSC-98-0604-FOF-TP, page  
19 155)

20

21 Supra filed a grievance with the FCC on September 20, 1999, against BellSouth for its  
22 collocation practices and procedures. Supra is seeking mediation and possible  
23 acceptance to the FCC's Accelerate Docket process. In response to Supra's filing, the  
24 FCC requested BellSouth to provide a breakdown of the collocation cost estimates  
25 provided to Supra. BellSouth did not provide a detailed breakdown but rather a cost

1 summary. As illustrated in Exhibit DAN-1, which is the cost breakdown BellSouth  
2 provided to the FCC, BellSouth is requiring Supra to absorb the entire cost of power  
3 infrastructure upgrades and “space enclosure” in all four central offices. BellSouth is  
4 requiring Supra to absorb the entire costs of racking and cabling in one office, and the  
5 majority in the other three (these four central offices were part of the collocation  
6 waiver dockets). These prorated percentages are not in proportion to either the  
7 number of collocators, or the ratio of floor space Supra is occupying versus all other  
8 collocators, whether collocating at the same time or in total! BellSouth clearly states  
9 in its footnotes to this exhibit, “There are no prorated costs as Supra is the only  
10 collocator that will utilize this area of the ... central office.” However, in three of the  
11 offices, there are 5, 6, and 7 collocators applying for collocation in that office at the  
12 same time. Requiring Supra to pay the entire cost for collocating in these offices is a  
13 direct contradiction of the FCC order which states that the first collocator in a  
14 particular incumbent premises will not be responsible for the entire cost of site  
15 preparation. In fact, BellSouth is currently assessing a non-recurring charge for  
16 power. This is also contrary to the Commission’s decision that power cannot be  
17 recovered through a nonrecurring charge. (Order No. PSC-98-0604-FOF-TP, page  
18 155).

19

20 I believe the costs for collocation should be allocated based on the amount of space  
21 occupied by the ALEC and a portion should be shared by all ILECs since they also  
22 benefit from the upgrades, and profit from the ALEC’s business expansion. As  
23 required by the FCC, the first collocator should not bear the cost for the entire cost of  
24 site preparation. The Commission should determine the proper pricing methodology  
25 so the ILECs cannot impose unreasonable and unnecessary costs on any ALEC.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

As stated in the FCC Order, the Commission may also want to consider adopting the approach taken by Bell Atlantic, which permits smaller competing providers the opportunity to pay collocation costs on an installment basis. This would be a proactive approach the Commission could take in advancing competition in Florida.

**ISSUE 18: IF INSUFFICIENT SPACE IS AVAILABLE TO SATISFY THE COLLOCATION REQUEST, SHOULD THE ILEC BE REQUIRED TO ADVISE THE ALEC AS TO WHAT SPACE IS AVAILABLE?**

Q. IF INSUFFICIENT SPACE IS AVAILABLE TO SATISFY THE COLLOCATION REQUEST, SHOULD THE ILEC BE REQUIRED TO ADVISE THE ALEC AS TO WHAT SPACE IS AVAILABLE?

A. Yes. If the total amount of space requested is not available, the ILEC should let the ALEC know how much space is available. If the ILEC responds that there is insufficient space, the Commission should require the ILEC to follow the procedures for demonstrating space depletion—filing a petition of waiver as identified in Order No. PSC-99-1744-PAA-TP, Docket No. 981834-TP. In any event, the Commission should take action to determine if the ILEC has accurately assessed the availability of space. This would ensure that ILEC equipment or a subsidiary’s equipment, such as video equipment used to provide entertainment offerings (movies by phone), was not taking up valuable space that should be used for collocation of competitive telecommunications equipment. As soon as an ILEC responds to an application for

1 collocation stating that there is insufficient space, then a walk-through of the central  
2 office should be performed by Commission staff, the denied carrier, and the ILEC. A  
3 determination must be made concerning space that the ILEC is reserving for future  
4 use, and what type of equipment has been collocated for subsidiaries.

5

6

7 **ISSUE 19: IF AN ILEC HAS BEEN GRANTED A WAIVER FROM THE**  
8 **PHYSICAL COLLOCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR A PARTICULAR CO,**  
9 **AND THE ILEC LATER MAKES MODIFICATIONS THAT CREATE SPACE**  
10 **THAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR COLLOCATION, WHEN SHOULD**  
11 **THE ILEC BE REQUIRED TO INFORM THE COMMISSION AND ANY**  
12 **REQUESTING ALECS OF THE AVAILABILITY OF SPACE IN THAT**  
13 **OFFICE?**

14

15 Q. IF AN ILEC HAS BEEN GRANTED A WAIVER FROM THE PHYSICAL  
16 COLLOCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR A PARTICULAR CO, AND THE ILEC  
17 LATER MAKES MODIFICATIONS THAT CREATE SPACE THAT WOULD BE  
18 APPROPRIATE FOR COLLOCATION, WHEN SHOULD THE ILEC BE  
19 REQUIRED TO INFORM THE COMMISSION AND ANY REQUESTING ALECS  
20 OF THE AVAILABILITY OF SPACE IN THAT OFFICE?

21

22 A. The ILEC should notify the Commission and any requesting carriers of the  
23 availability of space in the central office.

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Since all of the recognized Class 5 switch vendors are also power vendors, it only makes sense that an ALEC would subcontract power to their switch vendor, achieving greater economy of scale in the price negotiations, finance collocation costs along with switch costs instead of having to pay all collocation costs up front prior to taking possession of the space, and having control of the permitting process. BellSouth has actually assigned Supra a Dade County permit expeditor. The person who lives and works in the State of Kentucky and can do little to help Supra, compared to what a certified Miami contractor can do to expedite permits.

Once again, BellSouth seeks to obfuscate the issue of permitting multi-tenant dwellings as a means of denying collocation. Based on previous dockets, Supra has met with the Chief Fire inspector of Miami, the Fire Marshal of the City of Miami, and other surrounding communities. According to the City of Miami, it is not an issue of mulitenancy at all. These local authorities told Supra, "We do not require office buildings to construct fire-rated walls between tenants, and in the central office it would just complicate egress from the building and that is all we are concerned with." They further went on to say that if the BellSouth central office was properly constructed with no shortcuts, there would be no requirements for fire-rated walls.

The appropriate section covering this issue is Section 26-3.6 of the 1994 version of the Life Safety Code Handbook relating to Corridors. There are three exemptions to the corridor requirement.

Exception 1. Where exits are available from an open floor area.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A. If space become available in a central office because a waiver is denied or modifications are made, the ILEC should offer the available space to the first carrier that requested space. However, to determine the first carrier, the ILEC should be required to maintain a list of all carriers who have requested space in the order they were received.

## Exhibit 1

Page 1 of 4  
Docket No. 981834-TP

## Port Orange

Below is the detail initial estimate of the costs associated with the Supra inquiry at the BellSouth central office in Port Orange. Supra has requested space for 14 bays of equipment, this equals 406 SF of floor space {116 (equipment foot print) x 3.5 (aisle recovery)}.

Note: As detailed engineering is performed other facility modifications may need to be performed.

Cost Estimate for Supra Collocation at Daytona Port Orange	Total Project Cost	Supra Cost
<b>General Construction</b> \$250 of construction costs. This includes the cost for rekeying one door to provide collocator access. <b>Total General Construction Costs</b>	\$250	\$250*
<b>HVAC Costs</b> \$12,000 for 3 ducts (one main duct and two branch ducts to provide air at both ends of the long area dedicated to Supra) \$3,350 for 2 relief dampers. Due to installation of a new duct path from the mechanical room(s) which penetrate existing fire rated walls \$1,000 for rebalancing the system \$15,000 for controls \$7,838 general conditions, overhead & profit, taxes, supervision <b>Total HVAC Costs</b>	\$39,188	\$39,188*
<b>Electrical Costs</b> \$25,000 for a new electrical panel \$600 for new lights and outlets. \$1,015 for the EWFD system. \$6,641 general conditions, overhead & profit, taxes, supervision <b>Total Electrical Costs</b>	\$33,256	\$33,256*
<b>Security System Costs</b> \$0 for the installation of new card readers <b>Total Security System Costs</b>	\$0	\$0
<b>Architectural/Engineering/Project Management Fees</b> \$11,285 A&E fees, based on estimated construction costs \$ 1,800 Project Management <b>Total Architectural/Engineering/Project Management Fees</b>	\$13,085	\$13,085*
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$89,779</b>	<b>\$85,779</b>

\* There are no prorated costs as Supra is the only collocator that will utilize this area of the Port Orange central office.

## Exhibit 1

Page 2 of 4

Docket No. 981834-TP

**Palm Beach**

Below is the detail initial estimate of the costs associated with the Supra inquiry at the BellSouth central office in Palm Beach. Supra has requested space for 26 bays of equipment, this equals about 358 SF of floor space (102 (equipment foot print) x 3.5 (aisle recovery)).

At Palm Beach, there is an area available for Supra and two other collocators. This area is roughly equal to 500 sq. ft. Supra occupies 358 square feet of this area (equipment footprints + circulation area).

Note: As detailed engineering is performed other facility modifications may need to be performed.

Cost Estimate for Supra Collocation at West Palm Beach Gardens	Total Project Cost	Supra Cost
<b>General Construction</b> \$10,000 for card access system installation \$ 250 for rekeying several doors to permit collocator access \$ 3,000 general conditions, supervision, overhead and profit, taxes <b>Total General Construction Costs</b>	\$13,250	\$12,333
<b>HVAC Costs</b> \$8,000 for 1 main duct and 3 branch ducts to feed the four rows of equipment installations \$1,000 for HVAC rebalancing \$5,000 for HVAC controls \$3,500 general conditions, supervision, overhead & profit, taxes. <b>Total HVAC Costs</b>	\$17,500	\$16,289
<b>Electrical Costs</b> \$25,000 for a new electrical panel \$1,250 for the Early Warning Fire Detection system modification \$6,563 general conditions, overhead & profit, taxes, supervision <b>Total Electrical Costs</b>	\$32,813	\$30,547
<b>Security System Costs</b> \$ 0 for the installation of new card readers <b>Total Security System Costs</b>	\$0	\$0
<b>Architectural/Engineering/Project Management Fees</b> \$ 9,422 of A/E fees, based on the estimated construction costs \$ 2,019 of Project Management costs <b>Total Architectural/Engineering/Project Management Fees</b>	\$11,441	\$10,64
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$75,004</b>	<b>\$69,81</b>

**Exhibit 1**

**Palmetto**

Below is the detail initial estimate of the costs associated with the Supra inquiry at the BellSouth Palmetto central office. Supra has requested space for 26 bays of equipment, this equals about 358 sq. ft. of floor space (102 (equipment foot print) x 3.5 (aisle recovery)).

Note: As detailed engineering is performed other modifications may need to be performed.

Cost Estimate for Supra Collocation at Miami Palmetto	Total Project Cost	Supra Cost
<b>General Construction</b> \$ 0 of construction costs <b>Total General Construction Costs</b>	\$0	\$0
<b>HVAC Costs</b> \$ 8,000 for 2 branch ducts to feed the four rows of equipment installation \$ 2,000 for HVAC rebalancing \$ 2,500 for general conditions, supervision, overhead and profit, taxes <b>Total HVAC Costs</b>	\$12,500	\$12,500*
<b>Electrical Costs</b> \$1,050 for extra light fixtures and outlets for the area \$ 263 for general conditions, supervision, overhead and profit, taxes <b>Total Electrical Costs</b>	\$1,313	\$1,313*
<b>Security System Costs</b> \$ 25,875 for the installation of new card access system <b>Total Security System Costs</b>	\$25,875	\$3,234
<b>Architectural/Engineering/Project Management Fees</b> \$ 4,248 of A/E fees, based on the estimated construction costs \$ 1,000 of Project Management Costs <b>Total Architectural/Engineering/Project Management Fees</b>	\$5,248	\$5,248*
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$44,936</b>	<b>\$22,295</b>

\* There are no prorated costs as Supra is the only collocator that will utilize this area of the Palmetto central office.

## Exhibit 1

Page 4 of 4  
Rocket No. 981834-TP**Golden Glades**

Below is the detail initial estimate of the costs associated with the Supra inquiry at the BellSouth Golden Glades central office. Supra has requested space for 28 bays of equipment, this equals about 371 SF of floor space (106 (equipment foot print) x 3.5 (aisle recovery))

Note: As detailed engineering is performed other physical facility modifications may need to be performed.

Cost Estimate for Supra Collocation at Miami Golden Glades	Total Project Cost	Supra Cost
<b>General Construction</b> \$ 316 for the demolition of a suspended ceiling \$ 400 for the removal of a door frame and door \$ 300 for the demolition of existing light fixtures \$8,372 for the demolition of interior partitions \$ 400 for the general rekeying of doors \$2,190 for the installation of a dust partition \$3,791 general conditions, supervision, overhead and profit, taxes. \$ 638 asbestos abatement <b>Total General Construction Costs</b>	\$16,407	\$16,407*
<b>HVAC Costs</b> \$20,050 for 2 main duct and 3 branch ducts to feed the four rows of equipment installations \$ 2,000 for HVAC rebalancing \$ 450 general conditions, supervision, overhead & profit, taxes. <b>Total HVAC Costs</b>	\$22,500	\$22,500*
<b>Electrical Costs</b> \$1,400 for extra light fixtures and outlets for the area \$ 350 general conditions, overhead & profit, taxes, supervision <b>Total Electrical Costs</b>	\$1,750	\$1,750*
<b>Security System Costs</b> \$ 25,875 for the installation of new card readers <b>Total Security System Costs</b>	\$25,875	\$3,234
<b>Architectural/Engineering/Project Management Fees</b> \$13,345 of A/E fees, based on estimated construction costs \$ 2,105 of Project Management costs <b>Total Architectural/Engineering/Project Management Fees</b>	\$15,450	\$15,450*
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$81,982</b>	<b>\$59,341</b>

\* There are no prorated costs as Supra is the only collocator that will utilize this area of the Golden Glades central office.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of Direct Testimony of David Nilson on behalf of Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc. in Docket Nos. 981834-TP and 990321-TP has been furnished by U.S. Mail to the following parties of record this 28<sup>th</sup> day of October, 1999:

Ms. Nancy B. White  
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.  
150 West Flagler St., Suite 1910  
Miami, FL 33130

Ms. Carolyn Marek  
Time Warner Telecom  
233 Bramerton Court  
Franklin, TN 37069

Ms. Elise Kiley  
Blumenfeld & Cohen  
1625 Massachusetts Ave. NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20036

Ms. Angela Green, General Counsel  
Florida Public Telecom Association  
125 S. Gadsen St., #200  
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1525

Mr. Micheal A. Gross  
Florida Cable Telecom Assoc., Inc.  
310 N. Monroe St.  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Ms. Vicki Kaufman  
Florida Competitive Carriers Assoc.  
c/o McWhirter Law Firm  
117 S. Gadsen St.  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Ms. Kimberly Caswell  
GTE Florida Incorporated  
P.O. Box 110, FLTC0007  
Tampa, FL 33601-0110

Mr. James Falvey  
e.spire Communications, Inc.  
133 National Business Parkway  
Suite 200  
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Mr. Rick Melson  
Hopping Law Firm  
P.O. Box 6526  
Tallahassee, FL 32314

Mr. Christopher V. Goodpaster  
Covad Communications Company  
9600 Great Hills Trail, Suite 150 W  
Austin, TX 78759

Mr. Peter M. Dunbar  
Pennington Law Firm  
P.O. Box 10095  
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Mr. Terry Monroe  
CompTel  
1900 M Street, NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036

Mr. F.B. (Ben) Poag  
Sprint-Florida  
P.O. Box 2214 (MCFLTHO0107)  
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214

Ms. Donna McNulty  
WorldCom Technologies, Inc.  
325 John Knox Road, Suite 105  
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Mr. Charlie Pelligrini  
Wiggins Law Firm  
P.O. Drawer 1657  
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Mr. Andrew Isar  
Telecommunications Resellers Assoc.  
3220 Uddenberg Lane, Suite 4  
Gig Harbor, WA 98335

Mr. Kenneth Hoffman  
TCG South Florida  
c/o Rutledge Law Firm  
P.O. Box 551  
Tallahassee, FL 32302-0551

Ms. Susan Huther  
MGC Communications, Inc.  
3301 North Buffalo Drive  
Las Vegas, NV 89129

Mr. Floyd Self  
Messer Law Firm  
P.O. Box 1876  
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Ms. Laura L. Gallagher, P.A.  
Media One Telecommunications, Inc.  
c/o Laura L. Gallagher  
101 E. College Ave, Suite 302  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Ms. Donna Canzano McNulty  
MCImetro Access Transmission  
Services LLC  
325 John Knox Road, Suite 105  
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Ms. Anita L. Fourcard  
Lockheed Martin IMS  
Communication Industry Services  
1200 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Mr. Scott Sappersteinn  
Intermedia Communications, Inc.  
3625 Queen Palm Drive  
Tampa, FL 33619-1309

Mr. Tracy Hatch  
AT&T Communications  
101 North Monroe Street, Suite 700  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Ms. Beth Keating  
Legal Division  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Ms. Betty Willis  
ALLTEL  
One Allied Drive  
Little Rock, AR 72203-2177

*Mark Buechele/ATS*  
Mark Buechele  
General Counsel  
Supra Telecom  
2620 SW 27<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Miami, FL 33133  
(305) 476-4206