

ORIGINAL

HOPPING GREEN SAMS & SMITH
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

123 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 6526
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32314

(850) 222-7500

FAX (850) 224-8551

FAX (850) 425-3415

www.hgss.com

Writer's Direct Dial No.
(850) 425-2313

August 28, 2000

JAMES S. ALVES
BRIAN H. BIBEAU
RICHARD S. BRIGHTMAN
KEVIN B. COVINGTON
PETER C. CUNNINGHAM
RALPH A. DEMEO
WILLIAM H. GREEN
WADE L. HOPPING
GARY K. HUNTER, JR.
JONATHAN T. JOHNSON
LEIGH H. KELLETT
ROBERT A. MANNING
FRANK E. MATTHEWS
RICHARD D. MELSON
ANGELA R. MORRISON
SHANNON L. NOVEY
ERIC T. OLSEN

GARY V. PERKO
MICHAEL P. PETROVICH
DAVID L. POWELL
JOHN K. POWELL
WILLIAM D. PRESTON
CAROLYN S. RAEPPEL
DOUGLAS S. ROBERTS
D. KENT SAFRIET
GARY P. SAMS
TIMOTHY G. SCHOENWALDER
ROBERT P. SMITH
DAN R. STENGLE
CHERYL G. STUART
W. STEVE SYKES
OF COUNSEL
ELIZABETH C. BOWMAN

BY HAND DELIVERY

Blanca Bayó
Director, Records and Reporting
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re: UNE Cost Proceeding -- Docket No. 990649-TP

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Bluestar Networks, Inc., DIECA Communications, Inc. d/b/a Covad Communications Company, and Rhythms Links Inc. (collectively the "Data ALECs") are the original and fifteen copies of the following:

- (1) Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray (redacted)
- (2) Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Joseph P. Riolo

A Notice of Intent to Seek Confidential Classification, together with highlighted copies of the un-redacted testimony of Ms. Murray, is being submitted by separate letter. This notice relates to certain information contained in the above testimony which was obtained from documents of BellSouth that were provided to the Data ALECs pursuant to Protective Agreements.

By copy of this letter, these documents have been provided to the parties on the attached service list, including electronic service to the parties on the staff's e-mail list for this docket. If you have any questions, please call.

APP _____
 CAF _____
 CMP _____
 COM _____
 CTR _____
 ECR _____
 LEG _____
 OPC _____
 PAI _____
 RGO _____
 SEC _____
 SER _____
 OTH _____

_____ RDM/mee
 _____ Enclosures
 _____ cc: Parties of Record

Very truly yours,

RECEIVED
Richard D. Melson

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing was furnished to the following parties by U.S. Mail, hand delivery (*) this 28th day of August, 2000.

*Beth Keating
Staff Counsel
Florida Public Service
Commission
Division of Legal Services
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

*BellSouth Telecommunications,
Inc.
Nancy B. White
c/o Nancy H. Sims
150 S. Monroe Street,
Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556

Joseph A. McGlothlin
Vicki Gordon Kaufman
McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin,
Davidson, Decker, Kaufman,
Arnold, & Steen, P.A.
117 South Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Floyd Self/Norman Horton, Jr.
Messer, Caparello & Self
P.O. Drawer 1876
215 S. Monroe Street Suite 701
Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876

Marsha Rule
AT&T Communications
101 N. Monroe Street
Suite 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Susan Hither
Rick Heater
M.C. Communications, Inc.
3301 Worth Buffalo Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129

James C. Falvey, Esq.
e.spire Communications, Inc.
133 National Business Parkway
Suite 200
Annapolis Junction, MA 20701

Jeremy Marcus
Kristen Smith
Blumenfeld & Cohen
1625 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20036

Terry Monroe
Vice President, State Affairs
Competitive Telecomm. Assoc.
1900 M. Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

Kimberly Caswell
Verizon Select Services, Inc.
One Tampa City Center
201 North Franklin Street
Tampa, FL 33601-0110

Carolyn Marek
Vice President of Regulatory
Affairs
Southeast Region
Time Warner Communications
233 Bramerton Court
Franklin, TN 37069

Mark Buechele
Supra Telecom Koger Center
Ellis Building, Suite 1311
Executive Center Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Donna Canzano McNulty, Esq.
MCI WorldCom
325 John Knox Road Suite 105
Tallahassee, Fl 32303

Michael A. Gross
VP Reg. Affairs & Reg. Counsel
Florida Cable Telecomm. Assoc.
310 North Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

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

Karen M. Camechis
Pennington, Moore, Wilkinson &
Dunbar
P.O. Box 10095
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Scott A. Sapperstein
Sr. Policy Counsel
Intermedia Communications
3625 Queen Palm Dr.
Tampa, FL 33619

Cathy Boone
Covad Communications, Co.
10 Glen Lake Parkway
Suite 650
Atlanta, GA 30328

Charles J. Rehwinkel
Sprint
P.O. Box 2214
Tallahassee, FL 32316

Bettye Willis
ALLTEL Communications
Services, Inc.
One Allied Drive
Little Rock, AR 72203-2177

J. Jeffrey Wahlen
Ausley & McMullen
P.O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Florida Digital Network, Inc.
390 N. Orange Ave., Suite 2000
Orlando, FL 32801

KMC Telecom, Inc.
John McLaughlin
Suite 170
3025 Breckinridge Blvd.
Duluth, Ga 30096

MCI WorldCom, Inc.
Mr. Brian Sulmonetti
Concourse Corporate Center
Six
Six Concourse Parkway
Suite 3200
Atlanta, GA 30328

Office of Public Counsel
Stephen C. Reilly
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 W. Madison Street, Rm.
812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400
Holland Law Firm

Bruce May
P.O. Drawer 810
Tallahassee, FL 32302

John Fons
Ausley & McMullen
P.O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Norton Cutler
General Counsel
Five Corporate Centre
801 Crescent Centre Drive
Suite 600
Franklin, TN 37067

George S. Ford
Chief Economist
Z-Tel Communications, Inc.
601 South Harbor Island Blvd.
Tampa, FL 33602

Genevieve Morelli
Eric D. Jenkins
Kelley Dry & Warren, LLP
1200 19th Street, NW,
Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Rodney L. Joyce
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, L.L.P.
600 14th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005-2004

Hope G. Colantonio
Cleartel Communications, Inc.
1255 22nd Street N.W.
6th Floor
Washington, DC 20037

John Spilman
Broadslate Networks of
Florida, Inc.
675 Peter Jefferson Parkway
Suite 310
Charlottesville, VA 22911

Network Access Solutions
Corporation
100 Carpenter Drive, Suite 206
Sterling, VA 20164

Sprint Communications Company
Limited Partnership
3100 Cumberland Circle
Mailstop GAATLN0802
Atlanta, GA 30339

Patrick K. Wiggins, Esq.
Charles J. Pellegrini
Wiggins Law Firm
P.O. Drawer 1657
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Brent E. McMahan
Vice President-Regulatory and
Government Affairs
Network Telephone Corporation
815 South Palafox Street
Pensacola, FL 32501

Jim Lamoureux, Esq.
AT&T Communications of the
Southern States, Inc.
1200 Peachtree Street.
Suite 8068
Atlanta, GA 30309



Attorney

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC
SERVICE COMMISSION
DOCKET NO. 990649-TP

ORIGINAL

SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
TERRY L. MURRAY
ON BEHALF OF
BLUESTAR NETWORKS INC.,
COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY AND
RHYTHMS LINKS INC.

REDACTED VERSION

DATED: August 28, 2000

APP _____
CAL _____
3
CFR _____
COR _____
LEG _____
OPC _____
PAI _____
RGO _____
SEC _____
SER _____
OTH _____

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
10607 - AUG 28 8
005573
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>PAGE</i>
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1
A. BST'S REVISIONS HAVE NOT BROUGHT ITS STUDIES INTO LINE WITH FORWARD- LOOKING ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES.	2
B. NOTHING IN BST'S REVISED FILING FUNDAMENTALLY CHANGES MY EARLIER RECOMMENDATIONS TO THIS COMMISSION.	3
II. BST'S REVISED RECURRING COST STUDIES SUFFER FROM THE SAME DEFECTS AS ITS ORIGINAL FILING.....	4
III. BST'S REVISED NONRECURRING CHARGES ARE NOT FORWARD- LOOKING.	8
A. THE COMMISSION SHOULD REJECT BST'S PROPOSED NONRECURRING CHARGES FOR DSL-CAPABLE LOOPS.	11
B. BST'S REVISED NONRECURRING COSTS FOR VOICE-GRADE LOOPS FAIL TO REFLECT FORWARD-LOOKING ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES OR EFFICIENT ENGINEERING PRACTICES.	15
C. BST'S PROPOSED NONRECURRING COSTS FOR UDCs AND ISDN- CAPABLE LOOPS DO NOT REFLECT FORWARD-LOOKING ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES OR EFFICIENT PRACTICES.	20
D. BST CONTINUES TO VASTLY OVERSTATE THE FORWARD-LOOKING COST OF PROVIDING "CONDITIONED" LOOPS.	22
E. BST'S REVISED NONRECURRING CHARGES FOR ACCESS TO LOOP MAKEUP INFORMATION ARE MORE REASONABLE, BUT STILL INFLATED.	29

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

2 **Q. Please state your name, title and business address.**

3 A. My name is Terry L. Murray. I am President of the consulting firm Murray &
4 Cratty, LLC. My business address is 227 Palm Drive, Piedmont, California
5 94610.

6 **Q. Have you previously filed testimony in this proceeding?**

7 A. Yes. I filed testimony on both June 1, 2000, and July 31, 2000, in the current
8 phase of this proceeding. Exhibit _____ (TLM-1) attached to my June 1st
9 direct testimony describes my qualifications and relevant experience.

10 **Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental rebuttal testimony?**

11 A. BlueStar Networks, Inc. ("BlueStar"), DIECA Communications, Inc. d/b/a
12 Covad Communications Company ("Covad") and Rhythms Links Inc.
13 ("Rhythms") have asked me to review and respond to the revised direct
14 testimony and cost study presentations made by BellSouth
15 Telecommunications, Inc. ("BST") on August 16 and 18, 2000. My review
16 has focused on any issue raised in BST's revised testimony and cost studies
17 that would have a unique or disproportionate effect on providers of broadband
18 services that use digital subscriber line technology (commonly referred to as
19 DSL-based services).

1 **A. BST's Revisions Have Not Brought Its Studies into Line with**
2 **Forward-Looking Economic Principles.**

3 **Q. Please summarize the conclusions you present in your testimony.**

4 A. After reviewing BST's revised cost studies, I conclude that BST's studies are
5 still far from complying with forward-looking economic principles. Virtually
6 all of the criticisms that I presented in my July 31st testimony continue to
7 apply. Indeed, BST's revised studies contain additional sources of concern.

8 BST's revised cost study and supporting testimony makes one
9 significant improvement. It begins to recognize that BST must provide
10 competitors with mechanized access to loop makeup information at a cost far
11 below the cost for manual provision of this information. BST refuses,
12 however, to carry that assumption through to its logical conclusion. BST
13 continues to assume that it must make inappropriate, irrelevant distinctions
14 among DSL-capable loops. Instead, it should simply provide the data that
15 allow competitors to know the characteristics of the loops that are available
16 and to determine the suitability of any given loop.

17 In addition, BST's nonrecurring studies still contain the assumption of
18 significant manual order intervention. After a competitor has selected a DSL-
19 capable loop, BST wants to charge over \$200 for a special series of manual
20 installation activities, even though the selected loop has physical costs
21 identical to a voice loop. The study also violates forward-looking principles
22 by insisting on charging for loop "conditioning" even though BST's own

1 design standards used to develop the cost for the recurring loop charges do not
2 permit the installation of the load coils and excessive bridged taps that would
3 necessitate loop “conditioning.” Worse yet, BST is attempting to levy a
4 “conditioning” additive charge on every DSL-capable loop under 18,000 feet
5 that would over-recover its already inflated “conditioning” costs, thereby
6 causing competitors to subsidize BST’s retail xDSL offerings.

7 **B. Nothing in BST’s Revised Filing Fundamentally Changes My**
8 **Earlier Recommendations to This Commission.**

9 **Q. Has your review of BST’s revised cost studies caused you to change any**
10 **of the recommendations that you made to this Commission in your July**
11 **31st testimony?**

12 **A.** No. If anything, BST’s revised filing has shown that my criticisms of BST’s
13 original filing, and those of Mr. Riolo, were well founded. For example,
14 BST’s study revisions have begun to acknowledge that the FCC has required
15 BST to provide nondiscriminatory access to its loop makeup information.
16 BST’s attempts to correct its double counting of manual loop qualification
17 costs validates my claim that BST’s original nonrecurring cost analyses were
18 in error. In addition, BST’s revised estimates of the cost to provide
19 mechanized access to loop makeup data have borne out my earlier contention
20 that BST’s original estimates of computer investment were excessive.

21 The basic tenets I presented in my earlier testimony still hold. BST’s
22 recurring and nonrecurring charges must be based on forward-looking,

1 efficient costs that reflect a consistent network design. The prices that BST
2 has proposed in this revised filing do not conform to that principle. Instead,
3 BST's revisions to consider mechanized access to loop makeup information
4 constitute an admission that its studies as originally presented were so short-
5 term that they had become outdated in the few months since BST's original
6 filing. That admission, in turn, confirms that BST's basic approach to
7 nonrecurring cost modeling is not forward-looking.

8 Furthermore, BST's revisions seem to be riddled with errors and
9 unsupported assumptions. Therefore, I urge the Commission to adopt the
10 recommendations that Mr. Riolo and I presented in our July 31st testimonies.

11 **II. BST'S REVISED RECURRING COST STUDIES SUFFER FROM THE**
12 **SAME DEFECTS AS ITS ORIGINAL FILING.**

13 **Q. Do the criticisms you made of BST's original recurring cost study**
14 **continue to apply to its revised recurring cost studies?**

15 A. Yes. Nothing that BST has presented in its revised cost studies ameliorates
16 any of the concerns I presented in my July 31st testimony regarding BST's
17 recurring cost analysis. BST has wrongly continued to use several networks
18 to estimate recurring costs for different elements, rather than a single
19 consistent network design. In addition, the revised studies continue to
20 estimate ISDN costs incorrectly and to rely on flawed "in-plant factors" that
21 overstate the costs of installing loop plant.

1 **Q. Has BST modified its proposed DSL-capable loop elements?**

2 A. Yes. As I discuss in more detail below, in its revised cost study, BST has
3 developed two options for provisioning each type of DSL-capable loop (other
4 than ISDN/IDSL-capable loops): one that includes manual loop makeup and
5 one that does not. Furthermore, it appears from BST's revised descriptions of
6 loop makeup that BST intends to provide a competitor with information to
7 make a determination for itself whether the facility is qualified for a service
8 [see BST revised cost study, at Section 6, page 67], rather than BST
9 performing loop qualification for the competitor.

10 **Q. How do these modifications affect BST's recurring cost studies for DSL-**
11 **capable loops?**

12 A. At first glance, it may not appear that these modifications should affect BST's
13 recurring cost studies for DSL-capable loops at all, since the changes were
14 made specifically to nonrecurring cost elements. However, further scrutiny
15 reveals that BST should have revised its recurring cost elements for DSL-
16 capable loops in concert with these modifications.

17 BST has proposed several types of DSL-capable loops in this
18 proceeding (ADSL, HDSL, Unbundled Copper Loop – Short, and Unbundled
19 Copper Loop – Long, not including ISDN). Mr. Riolo and I have both
20 testified that the distinctions among DSL-capable loops that BST proposes are
21 inappropriate. The distinction among DSL-capable loops is surely an artifact
22 of BST's former assumption that it would need to “qualify” a loop, *i.e.*,
23 determine that the loop meets certain technical specifications. When BST

1 makes loop makeup data available directly to competitors, as indicated in the
2 revised cost studies, competitors will make their own judgments regarding
3 which loop to choose and what services they can provide over it. Thus, the
4 BST-imposed distinctions among loop types become irrelevant.

5 BST should instead offer a single type of two-wire DSL-capable loop
6 (as well as a single four-wire DSL-capable loop). The prices for the two
7 DSL-capable loops (two-wire and four-wire) should be based on the
8 Commission-adopted prices for a comparable voice grade loop.

9 **Q. In its revised cost study filing, BST has proposed an additional loop**
10 **element, the “Universal Digital Channel.” Do you have any comments**
11 **on this element?**

12 A. It is difficult to comment on the new “Universal Digital Channel” (“UDC”)
13 because BST has provided no description of this element at all. Ms. Caldwell
14 has indicated that:

15 The costs for the UDC are identical to an ISDN loop, but the
16 methods and procedures (“M&Ps”) associated with the
17 provisioning process are different. Thus, BellSouth needed an
18 additional element to reflect these different M&Ps.

19 [Caldwell Revised Direct, at 4.]

20 BST has provided no further indication of how the M&Ps for the two
21 elements might differ, nor information on any way in which a UDC differs
22 from an ISDN loop. However, I understand that UDC may be used to provide
23 IDSL services.

1 **Q. How should recurring costs be set for the UDC element?**

2 A. Because it appears that there are no cost differences between the ISDN and
3 UDC elements, as Ms. Caldwell indicates, my July 31st critique [at 32-40] of
4 BST's proposed ISDN rates would apply equally to UDCs. In particular,
5 UDC recurring rates should be the same as the recurring rates for Service
6 Level 1 ("SL-1") analog loops, plus an increment to account for the higher
7 cost of an ISDN card as compared to a plain old telephone service ("POTS")
8 card. [See also Riolo Direct and Rebuttal at 53 and 62-63.] The increment
9 should reflect the cost of the card, weighted by the percentage of loops that
10 BST would provision over fiber feeder in its forward-looking network.
11 Furthermore, Mr. Riolo explains in his concurrently filed testimony that, just
12 as with ISDN loops, it is not necessary to "design" UDCs. In fact, Mr. James
13 R. McCracken, one of BST's subject matter experts for the Special Services
14 Installation & Maintenance ("SSI&M") work group, admitted that BST does
15 not "design" ISDN loops in Georgia, for example. [Deposition of James R.
16 McCracken, July 28, 2000, Tr. at 31.]

17 **Q. Is BST's proposed recurring charge for UDCs (and ISDN-capable loops)**
18 **reasonable?**

19 A. No. BST has proposed a recurring rate of \$30.01 per month, which is almost
20 \$12 per month, or 66%, more than its proposed rate for an SL-1 loop. This
21 excessive increment over analog prices is driven by BST's inappropriate
22 assumptions regarding the demand for ISDN services. As I explained in my
23 July 31st testimony [at 37-39], BST based its estimate of ISDN costs (and thus

1 UDC costs) on its *current retail* ISDN customers and locations. This
2 approach generates nonsensical results, with widely skewed prices. (In some
3 wire centers, BST's proposed UDC/ISDN prices are significantly lower than
4 its voice-grade prices and in others, UDC/ISDN prices are several times
5 higher than those for the basic SL-1 loop.) Competitors are free to buy any
6 loop as an ISDN-capable loop. Thus, BST should have modeled the cost of
7 ISDN-capable loops based on the characteristics of all loops.

8 In contrast, I estimated that the ISDN/UDC adder would be *****BST**
9 **PROPRIETARY END PROPRIETARY***** per month based on the
10 incremental investment needed for ISDN cards on loops over fiber feeder.
11 [See Murray Direct and Rebuttal at 39-40.] BST's proposed increment is
12 more than nine times as high.

13 Even if the Commission were to accept BST's incorrect contention
14 that UDCs and ISDN-capable loops need to be "designed," the correct price
15 would be *****BST PROPRIETARY END PROPRIETARY***** per
16 month over the SL-1 price. This is the average incremental cost for the ISDN
17 line card plus the \$2.31 per month recurring cost that BST calculated for the
18 incremental effort to design loops. BST's proposed increment is more than
19 three times as high.

20 **III. BST'S REVISED NONRECURRING CHARGES ARE NOT**
21 **FORWARD-LOOKING.**

22 **Q. Can the Commission rely on BST's revised nonrecurring studies?**

1 A. No. It seems that BST's quality control on this filing was limited. The filing
2 appears to be riddled with errors, several of which I discuss below, and
3 unsupported assumptions. For example, BST has increased its dispatch
4 percentage for connecting analog Service Level 1 ("SL-1") loops from 20% to
5 38%, but has neither provided any supporting documentation for the change,
6 nor even bothered to explain the basis for the change at all. This one entirely
7 unjustified change is responsible for an increase in the SL-1 analog
8 nonrecurring charge of 37%.

9 **Q. Do the criticisms you made of BST's original nonrecurring cost study**
10 **continue to apply to its revised nonrecurring cost studies?**

11 A. Yes, for the most part. BST's revisions to the nonrecurring charges for DSL-
12 capable loops to remove loop qualification charges begins to address one of
13 the concerns I presented in my July 31st testimony. However, BST's proposed
14 nonrecurring charges for those elements remain unreasonably high, well
15 above forward-looking economic costs. The balance of my criticisms
16 regarding BST's nonrecurring cost studies continue to apply. Indeed, BST's
17 revised studies contain additional sources of concern.

18 **Q. Please summarize your criticisms of BST's nonrecurring cost studies.**

19 A. The Commission should reject BST's revised nonrecurring cost analysis for
20 several reasons, including the following:

- 21 • BST's nonrecurring studies still generally fail to reflect a network that
22 is consistent with its recurring cost analysis.

- 1 • BST's studies continue to improperly include fieldwork and other
2 activities that BST should have reflected, and probably did already
3 include, in its recurring cost study.
- 4 • BST's studies incorrectly presume that the company will manually
5 perform a number of basic order processing activities. In particular,
6 BST's assumed "fallout" rates are unsupported and unaccountably
7 high. This was already true in its original studies; BST's revised
8 studies have increased the excessive manual processing assumed in its
9 original studies.

10 **Q. What changes has BST made to its nonrecurring studies in its August**
11 **16th filing?**

12 A. BST has changed virtually every nonrecurring charge it is proposing.
13 Nonrecurring charges for loop elements, in particular for elements related to
14 DSL-capable loops, have been changed substantially. Two sets of
15 modifications appear to drive the cost changes of concern to BlueStar, Covad
16 and Rhythms. First, BST has modified its provisioning process for DSL-
17 capable loops. Second, BST has modified some of the assumptions and task
18 times underlying the nonrecurring costs for loop elements. I will address
19 several of the affected nonrecurring charges below.

20 **Q. Has BST provided any explanation or justification for the changes in**
21 **assumptions and task times underlying the nonrecurring costs for loop**
22 **elements?**

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 A. Very little. For example, Ms. Caldwell states that
2 during the revisions to the xDSL nonrecurring costs, BellSouth
3 reviewed all of the nonrecurring inputs for all types of loops to
4 ensure consistency of work time estimates and the correctness
5 of the underlying assumptions. Several inputs were modified
6 as part of this process.

7 [Caldwell Revised Direct, at 3.]

8 This appears to be the sole explanation that BST provides for changes
9 in task times that affect each of its nonrecurring charges for loop elements.
10 Ms. Caldwell does not even indicate whether BST's review was limited to an
11 effort to "ensure consistency" among the nonrecurring costs reported in this
12 filing, or to maintain consistency with some other outside data. Certainly BST
13 has provided nothing to indicate the basis for resolving conflicts. BST did not
14 even make any effort to identify the specific changes in its study. Worse yet,
15 BST substantially redesigned the format of its studies so that it is extremely
16 tedious to search for those changes.

17 **A. The Commission Should Reject BST's Proposed Nonrecurring**
18 **Charges for DSL-Capable Loops.**

19 **Q. How has BST changed its provisioning process for DSL-capable loops?**

20 A. As I discussed in my July 31st testimony [at 56-58], BST's original cost study
21 inappropriately bundled manual loop qualification costs into the costs to
22 provision each type of DSL-capable loop (other than ISDN). In its revised

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 cost study, BST has developed two options for provisioning DSL-capable
2 loops: one that includes manual loop makeup research and one that does not.
3 BST has classified these elements as “with loop makeup” and “without loop
4 makeup.”

5 **Q. Why has BST made this change?**

6 A. BST witness Caldwell cites the FCC’s requirement for nondiscriminatory
7 access to its loop makeup information, which the FCC propounded in its *Third*
8 *Report and Order and Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* in CC
9 Docket 96-98 (hereafter “*UNE Remand Order*”), adopted September 15, 1999
10 (roughly half a year before BST had to file its original study). [See Caldwell
11 Revised Direct at 2-3.]

12 **Q. Does the addition of a DSL-capable loop provisioning option that**
13 **excludes manual loop makeup eliminate the concerns that you addressed**
14 **in your earlier testimony?**

15 A. Only in part. Again, I must stress that nonrecurring provisioning charges for
16 DSL-capable loops should not differ from nonrecurring provisioning changes
17 for a basic analog loop. As Mr. Riolo explained in his July 31st testimony [at
18 8-12], no engineering difference exists between analog loops and those loops
19 used to provide DSL services. The removal of the duplicative and
20 unnecessary loop qualification charges is certainly a step in the right direction.
21 Unfortunately, BST has not managed to remove loop makeup costs
22 completely from its “without loop makeup” elements. Nor has BST done

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 anything to eliminate the many other sources of inflated costs in its proposed
2 nonrecurring charges for DSL-capable loops, which Mr. Riolo and I addressed
3 in our July 31st testimonies. For example, BST's proposed nonrecurring
4 charge for an ADSL loop "without loop makeup" is still almost two and a half
5 times its proposed charge for a voice-grade loop.

6 Moreover, while this change helps bring the "without loop makeup"
7 path of BST's new bifurcated nonrecurring charges for DSL-capable loops a
8 step closer to forward-looking cost, it does just the opposite to the "with loop
9 makeup" elements. Indeed, the new "with loop makeup" nonrecurring
10 charges are well over \$300, a level that is certain to discourage competition.
11 Therefore, to the extent that the Commission contemplates allowing BST to
12 implement its proposed rate structure, it is doubly important that the
13 Commission evaluate each line in BST's analysis and give full weight to each
14 issue that parties have raised in this proceeding.

15 **Q. Why do you say that BST has not managed to remove loop makeup costs**
16 **completely from its "without loop makeup" elements?**

17 A. In the "without loop makeup" elements, BST has included time for such tasks
18 as "OSPE Investigation," "Pull LMU," and "LFACS input of LMU" for some
19 percentage of the time. These items appear to insert loop makeup tasks into
20 the supposedly "without loop makeup" cost results. [BST revised cost study,
21 Fl-xdsl.xls.]

1 **Q. Have you found any other errors in BST’s nonrecurring cost studies for**
2 **DSL-capable loops?**

3 A. Yes. BST’s proposed “Disconnect Only” charges inexplicably differ between
4 the “with loop makeup” and “without loop makeup” elements. Upon further
5 investigation, I discovered that BST has inappropriately included nearly an
6 hour for work on “Service Inquiry” activities in the “Disconnect Only”
7 charges. For example, BST has included 18 minutes for the task: “Upon
8 completion of job, informs CLEC site is ready for provisioning.” I cannot
9 imagine how it could be correct to include this task, which clearly relates to
10 provisioning a loop rather than to disconnecting a line that has been in service,
11 in a disconnect charge. (Indeed, I contend that it is inappropriate to include
12 any such manual work even in the connect charge.) [See BST revised cost
13 study, Fl-xdsl.xls.]

14 In addition, BST has included time in the “Disconnect Only” charge
15 for tasks such as “Assigns loop facility,” “Design circuit and generates DLR
16 and WORD document for CLEC and Field,” and “CO Field wire circuit at
17 collocation site.” Such tasks clearly do not belong in a disconnect study.

18 That BST’s study still includes tasks that are obviously irrelevant,
19 even to a non-engineer, is an indication that the overall quality of BST’s
20 analysis is low. The Commission should reject all of BST’s proposed
21 “Disconnect Only” rate elements and adopt the more reasonable proposal that
22 Mr. Riolo presented in his July 31st testimony [at 37].

23 **Q. What nonrecurring charges should apply for DSL-capable loops?**

1 A. The Commission should reject BST's proposed nonrecurring charges for
2 DSL-capable loops entirely. Nonrecurring charges for DSL-capable loops
3 should not differ significantly from the charges for voice-grade loops.
4 Because BST's proposed charges for voice-grade loops are themselves
5 inflated, as I explain below, the Commission should correct BST's
6 nonrecurring charges for installing all loop types to reflect the tasks and task
7 times identified in Mr. Riolo's July 31st testimony [at 36-42].

8 **B. BST's Revised Nonrecurring Costs for Voice-Grade Loops Fail to**
9 **Reflect Forward-Looking Economic Principles or Efficient**
10 **Engineering Practices.**

11 **Q. Does BST's revised nonrecurring cost study for voice-grade loops**
12 **comply with forward-looking economic cost principles?**

13 A. No. BST's original nonrecurring cost estimate for voice-grade loops was
14 already well above efficient, forward-looking costs. BST's revised filing
15 advocates a nonrecurring charge for voice-grade loops that is even higher and
16 thus further from complying with forward-looking economic cost principles.

17 **Q. What revisions has BST made to its nonrecurring study for SL-1 voice-**
18 **grade loops?**

19 A. BST's proposed nonrecurring charge for SL-1 voice-grade loops increased to
20 \$83.20, almost 37% above its original proposal. The primary cause seems to
21 be a change in BST's assumption regarding the percentage of time an outside

1 plant dispatch would be necessary. In addition, BST has added several new
2 tasks to attempt to account for the provision of services over fiber-fed loops,
3 as well as further increasing its already overstated fallout rate assumptions, all
4 without a hint of explanation.

5 **Q. How have BST's assumptions regarding the percentage of time an**
6 **outside plant dispatch would be necessary to install voice-grade loops**
7 **changed?**

8 A. BST has unaccountably increased its assumed dispatch rate for SL-1 loops
9 from 20% to 38%, which is an increase of 90% in the assumed number of
10 dispatches.

11 **Q. Should the Commission accept BST's revised dispatch rate?**

12 A. No. The Commission should reject BST's increased dispatch rate assumption
13 because it is entirely unsupported and unreasonably high. More important, it
14 is inappropriate to include *any* such fieldwork in the nonrecurring costs.

15 **Q. Why is it inappropriate to include these fieldwork costs in a forward-**
16 **looking nonrecurring cost study?**

17 A. As I explained in my earlier testimony [at 55-56], BST's *recurring* cost study
18 should have reflected the fieldwork to connect a loop (and probably did).
19 Thus, competitors are already paying recurring charges for a fully *connected*
20 loop, and should not have to pay to dispatch a technician to the field to
21 connect that loop. A forward-looking recurring cost analysis includes all of
22 the investment and expense necessary to establish a complete connection from

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 its central office main frame to the end user. It would be inappropriate to
2 establish an nonrecurring charge that also includes fieldwork costs for
3 installing the loop.

4 **Q. Even if it were appropriate to include fieldwork in the loop nonrecurring**
5 **charge, would BST's assumption of a 38% dispatch rate to install a SL-1**
6 **voice-grade loop be acceptable?**

7 A. No. Even if the Commission were to accept the idea that some fieldwork
8 costs should be included in the nonrecurring charge, it should reject BST's
9 assumed dispatch rate. Mr. Riolo explains in his testimony that BST's
10 dispatch assumption is unreasonably high.

11 **Q. Has BST provided any justification for its increase in dispatch rate**
12 **assumptions for voice-grade loops?**

13 A. None whatsoever. Ms. Caldwell's testimony merely notes that the voice-
14 grade loop nonrecurring costs "increased mainly as a result of an increase in
15 the dispatch rate," [Caldwell Revised Direct, at 6] with no word of
16 justification. (BST has also increased its assumed dispatch rate for SL-2 loops
17 from 20% to 100% with no explanation or justification.) Nor can I find
18 anything in BST's revised cost study documentation concerning this change.
19 Because BST contends that it has provided parties with "all work papers, cost
20 models, and supporting documentation" as required by the Stipulation of
21 Certain Issues and Schedule of Events (filed December 7, 1999, in this

1 docket), I can only assume that BST has no documentation or support for
2 these changes.

3 **Q. Has BST correctly accounted for the provision of loops over Digital**
4 **Loop Carrier/fiber-feeder in its nonrecurring cost study revisions?**

5 A. No. Apparently recognizing the fact that it had failed to consider the
6 provision of unbundled loops over fiber feeder in its original study, BST has
7 added three new work steps into its analysis that are concerned with obtaining
8 and placing plug-ins in the Digital Loop Carrier (“DLC”) system. Again, the
9 inclusion of these work steps in nonrecurring costs is fundamentally improper,
10 because the placement of the necessary electronics is already part of the BST
11 recurring cost calculation. Moreover, BST’s notion that it should add costs
12 for DLC plug-in cards but not reflect the provisioning savings obtainable from
13 current generation DLC systems, such as remote configuration of loops which
14 reduces the requirement for dispatch — the opposite of BST’s other change —
15 is further proof that the BST analysis is not forward-looking.

16 **Q. Have you found any other problems with BST’s estimate of its**
17 **nonrecurring costs for voice-grade loops?**

18 A. Yes. Some of the new study inputs simply do not make sense absent further
19 explanation. For example, in the new “Network Plug-In Administration”
20 tasks that it shows on the “Inputs_Engineering” sheet of its “FL-2W”
21 spreadsheet, BST includes the tasks “Planner orders plug-in when not in
22 stock” and “Clerical functions in connection with handling of plug-in order.”

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 Because the time for clerical functions is explicitly tied to handling plug-in
2 orders, it would seem that the occurrence of that task should match the
3 occurrence of the time that the Planners place such orders. That is
4 inexplicably not the case in the new BST study. In fact, it almost appears as if
5 the occurrence calculation is set as if the tasks are mutually exclusive. Given
6 the limited information that BST has provided, it is not possible even to
7 understand what relationship is supposed to exist between these tasks or how
8 either is triggered.

9 In addition, BST's estimates of the "Disconnect Only" charges for
10 voice-grade loops suffer from some of the same problems as its estimate of
11 the "Disconnect Only" charges for DSL-capable loops. Specifically, the
12 "Disconnect Only" charge includes tasks that clearly do not belong in a
13 disconnect study. [See BST revised cost study, FL-2W.xls.]

14 **Q. How did the fallout rate assumptions change in BST's new analysis?**

15 A. Without support, BST has increased the fallout rate assigned to the Address
16 and Facility Inventory Group ("AFIG") from 5% to 30%. [BST revised cost
17 study, FL-2W.xls.] As I showed in my July 31st testimony [at 58-60], BST's
18 fallout rate assumption across all tasks was already over 50%. With this
19 additional increase, BST's study now assumes that three out of four orders
20 will have some sort of fallout. This low level of efficiency is entirely
21 unacceptable in a forward-looking cost study. Furthermore, BST's own
22 outside plant engineering expert, Mr. Michael K. Zitzmann, has agreed that

1 “most of the time the SL-1 requests flow-through without manual
2 intervention.” [Deposition of Michael K. Zitzmann, July 20, 2000, Tr. at 39.]

3 **Q. What should the Commission adopt as the forward-looking nonrecurring**
4 **charge for voice-grade loops?**

5 A. The Commission cannot rely on BST’s nonrecurring cost study because it
6 contains numerous errors and unsupported assumptions. The Commission
7 should adopt the nonrecurring charges presented in Mr. Riolo’s July 31st
8 testimony [at 36-37].

9 **C. BST’s Proposed Nonrecurring Costs for UDCs and ISDN-**
10 **Capable Loops Do Not Reflect Forward-Looking Economic**
11 **Principles or Efficient Practices**

12 **Q. Does BST’s proposed nonrecurring cost study for the UDC and ISDN**
13 **elements comply with forward-looking economic cost principles?**

14 A. No. At \$238.33, BST’s proposed nonrecurring charge for UDC/ISDN-
15 capable loops is almost three times its already inflated nonrecurring charge for
16 voice-grade loops. BST’s original nonrecurring cost estimate for ISDN-
17 capable loops was already well above efficient, forward-looking costs, as Mr.
18 Riolo discussed in his July 31st testimony [at 37-42]. BST’s revised filing
19 advocates a nonrecurring charge for UDCs and ISDN-capable loops that is
20 even higher and thus further from complying with forward-looking economic
21 cost principles.

1 **Q. Does BST’s proposed UDC/ISDN nonrecurring cost study suffer from**
2 **some of the same problems as you identified in BST’s revised study for**
3 **voice-grade loops?**

4 A. Yes. For example, BST has added the same inappropriate work steps
5 concerned with obtaining and placing plug-ins in the DLC system that I
6 discussed for voice-grade loops, while still failing to reflect the provisioning
7 savings obtainable from current generation DLC systems, such as remote
8 configuration of loops. In addition, those new study inputs have the same
9 perplexing occurrence factors that I discussed above. [See BST revised cost
10 study, FL_DIG.xls.]

11 **Q. What fallout rate assumptions did BST assume in its revised ISDN**
12 **analysis?**

13 A. BST has assumed a fallout rate of 67% for the Service Advocacy Center
14 (“SAC”) work group. This assumption, along with reported fallout rates of
15 30% for the AFIG and 15% for the Circuit Provisioning Group (“CPG”) and
16 the other fallout assumptions that are buried within BST’s calculations, means
17 that *virtually every order* will experience process breakdowns somewhere in
18 the provisioning process. Such high failure rates are plainly out of line for an
19 efficient, forward-looking process. Once again, BST has provided no support
20 or justification of these fallout rates. For example, Mr. Zitzmann, BST’s
21 subject matter expert for the SAC, did not even know what the fallout rate
22 assumption was for ISDN. [See Deposition of Michael K. Zitzmann, July 20,
23 2000, Tr. at 42.] The Commission should order BST to remove those costs

1 from its nonrecurring cost analysis if the Commission makes any use of those
2 (fundamentally incorrect) studies.

3 **Q. What should the Commission adopt as the forward-looking nonrecurring**
4 **charge for UDCs and ISDN-capable loops?**

5 A. The Commission should adopt nonrecurring charges for UDCs and ISDN-
6 capable loops based on the efficient engineering practices that Mr. Riolo
7 presented in his July 31st testimony [at 37-42].

8 **D. BST Continues to Vastly Overstate the Forward-Looking Cost of**
9 **Providing “Conditioned” Loops.**

10 **Q. How has BST revised its “Loop Conditioning” (or “Unbundled Loop**
11 **Modification”) elements?**

12 A. In addition to lowering slightly its proposed nonrecurring charges for each of
13 its former loop “conditioning” elements, BST has proposed two additional
14 “conditioning” elements: “2W/4W Copper Distribution Load Coil/Equipment
15 Removal” (A.17.5) and “2W/4W Copper Distribution Bridged Tap Removal”
16 (A.17.6).

17 **Q. Please explain why BST’s revised estimates for loop “conditioning” have**
18 **decreased slightly.**

19 A. For the most part, BST’s tasks and task times for “conditioning” activities
20 remain unchanged from its original cost study filing. However, BST has
21 made some adjustments to the manual “Service Inquiry” activities included in

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 the Unbundled Loop Modification elements. In particular, BST has
2 apparently assumed that it would achieve some efficiencies in these manual
3 tasks when loop modification is ordered at the same time as the loop itself,
4 and when load coil removal is ordered at the same time as bridged tap
5 removal. BST has assumed, for example, that load coil removal and bridged
6 tap removal will be ordered simultaneously one third of the time. In addition,
7 it appears that BST has assumed that loop “conditioning” will be ordered
8 separately from the loop itself 20% of the time. [See BST revised cost study,
9 at Section 6, page 36.]

10 **Q. Do BST’s revised “conditioning” charges, with these adjustments to the**
11 **“Service Inquiry” manual activities, represent forward-looking costs?**

12 A. No. Although BST’s acknowledgement of the savings in manual labor that
13 would be achieved for orders that are placed at the same time is a slight
14 improvement over its original proposals, BST’s revised rates are far from
15 forward-looking. As I explained at length in my July 31st testimony [at 77-
16 88], nonrecurring “conditioning” charges would not be consistent with
17 forward-looking economic costs at all. However, if the Commission were to
18 decide to allow such charges, they should at the very least be based on
19 efficient practices. Therefore, it is inappropriate to include these manual
20 “Service Inquiry” activities, even at the lower level that BST now proposes.

21 **Q. Why is it inappropriate to include manual “Service Inquiry” activities in**
22 **the costs for loop “conditioning”?**

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 A. My original understanding of the manual “Service Inquiry” activities was that
2 they related entirely to the manual loop qualification process that BST
3 inappropriately bundled into the cost to provision DSL-capable loops, as well
4 as the loop qualification and “conditioning” elements. BST has now correctly
5 removed most of the manual “Service Inquiry” activities from provisioning of
6 a DSL-capable loop “without loop makeup.” (It follows that, to the extent
7 that these manual activities *are* related to manual loop qualification, they
8 should obviously be removed from the “conditioning” costs as well. It makes
9 no sense for BST to replicate manually a process that the competitor ordering
10 the loop has already accomplished electronically.)

11 What is clear, however, is that the “Service Inquiry” activities that
12 BST has included here represent *manual* ordering processes that are in no way
13 forward-looking. BST’s revised cost study indicates that “[t]he ordering
14 procedures for loop conditioning are to be handled *manually* through the
15 Service Inquiry process.” [BST revised cost study, at Section 6, page 36,
16 emphasis added.] A forward-looking, long-run cost study should not assume
17 substantial manual order intervention, given the current advanced state of
18 automation in the local exchange network and related Operations Support
19 Systems (“OSS”). In fact, Ms. Nancy Pauline Murphy, BST’s subject matter
20 expert for the Local Carrier Service Center (“LSCS”), conceded that BST can
21 accept mechanized orders [Deposition of Nancy Pauline Murphy, July
22 28,2000,Tr. at 26-27], and further admitted that, if orders were automated,

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 they would completely bypass her group [Tr. at 42-43]. These manual tasks
2 have no place in a forward-looking environment.

3 **Q. Is inclusion of manual “Service Inquiry” activities the only problem with**
4 **BST’s proposed “conditioning” charges?**

5 A. No. BST’s revised “conditioning” charges have the same problems that Mr.
6 Riolo and I identified in our July testimonies. Namely, BST inflates its
7 “conditioning” costs by understating the number of loops that should be
8 “conditioned” whenever a technician is dispatched and by overstating the time
9 it would take to accomplish the “conditioning” tasks.

10 In addition, BST includes time such tasks as “OSPC sets up manhole”
11 in its estimate of the costs of removing load coils from an *aerial/buried*
12 application. [BST revised cost study, FL-ULM.xls.]

13 **Q. Has BST’s revised its “Unbundled Loop Modification Additive”?**

14 A. BST has revised its “Unbundled Loop Modification Additive” downward
15 substantially from \$120.98 per loop to \$57.99. However, even given this
16 sizeable decline, this proposed charge would still potentially over-compensate
17 even BST’s inflated estimate of its “conditioning” costs. The over-recovery
18 of “conditioning” costs through this charge means that competitors would in
19 effect be subsidizing BST’s retail xDSL offerings.

20 **Q. How does the “Additive” charge subsidize BST’s retail xDSL offerings?**

21 A. If BST is allowed to impose this inappropriate nonrecurring charge,
22 competitors will pay to condition loops that BST will use.

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 For example, assume that BST removes load coils from ten pairs at
2 once as a result of an order from a competitor. The competitor pays the load
3 coil removal fee as well as the “Additive” for each pair ordered: $\$65.40 +$
4 $\$57.99 = \125.39 or 19% of BST’s supposed cost to “condition” those ten
5 pairs. Suppose that, as BST itself assumes, the competitor typically orders
6 two pairs. Then the competitor would pay $2 \times \$125.39 = \250.78 or 38% of
7 BST’s supposed cost to “condition” the ten pairs. BST has assumed that it
8 will use four of the remaining pairs and that the final four pairs may or may
9 not be ordered by a competitor at a later date. BST’s further assumes that
10 about 40% of DSL-capable loops will need to be conditioned. Thus, three
11 loops are ordered that do not need to be conditioned for every two that do.
12 Given BST’s methodology these three loops each pay the “Additive”: $\$57.99$
13 $\times 3 = \$173.97$ or 27% of BST’s supposed cost to “condition” the original ten
14 pairs. (Thus far, for the two “conditioned” loops a competitor ordered, plus
15 the three loops that did not require “conditioning,” BST has recovered 64% of
16 its supposed cost, leaving $\$229.25$ of the original cost.)

17 Now, further suppose that at some point the final four pairs do get
18 ordered by competitors. Then the competitor(s) would have to pay the
19 “Additive”: $4 \times \$57.33 = \229.32 or 35% of BST supposed cost to
20 “condition” the original ten pairs. Recall that BST plans to use four of the
21 original ten pairs and therefore has claimed that it will absorb the cost of
22 “conditioning” them. In this scenario, however, competitors have now paid a
23 total of $\$250.78 + \$173.97 + \$229.32 = \654.07 or **100%** of BST’s costs,

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 leaving *no* costs for BST to absorb. BST pays nothing for its four
2 “conditioned” pairs, because the competitors have paid the entire cost for
3 “conditioning” ten lines including the four that BST presumes it will use for
4 its own retail service, giving BST a “free ride.” Furthermore, BST may also
5 collect the “Additive” on other DSL-capable loops that never required
6 “conditioning,” which creates further potential for over-recovery.

7 Even if the last four pairs are never ordered, BST still over-recovers its
8 supposed “conditioning” costs. The cost BST claims it will absorb for the
9 four pairs it presumes it will use would be: $4 \times \$65.40 = \261.60 or 40% of
10 BST’s supposed cost to “condition” the original ten pairs. Thus, BST
11 recovers $\$250.78 + \$173.97 + \$261.60 = \686.35 or 105% of its original \$654
12 total cost. Even in this conservative scenario, competitors subsidize BST use
13 of those four loops.

14 Moreover, if BST is incorrect in its assumption that about 40% of
15 DSL-capable loops will require “conditioning,” there is even greater potential
16 for over-recovery. Keep in mind that the “Additive” applies only to loops
17 *under* 18,000 feet, which do not need and should not have load coils at all.
18 BST is suggesting that 40% of its loops do not meet engineering standards
19 adopted twenty years ago. If the actual percentage of loops that need to be
20 “conditioned” is much lower than BST’s assumption (which it should be if
21 BST has been modernizing its plant) BST’s calculation will over-recover costs
22 further. Suppose, for example, that in actual fact only 10% of loops require
23 conditioning. Then for every two pairs that need “conditioning,” eighteen

1 pairs do not. In this case, BST would recover from competitors \$1294.60
2 (\$250.78 + (18 x \$57.99)) or almost *twice* its already inflated costs! In
3 addition to which, BST would have paid nothing for the four “conditioned”
4 pairs it will use.

5 **Q. Do the nonrecurring charges that BST has proposed for the two**
6 **additional distribution “conditioning” elements comply with forward-**
7 **looking economic principles?**

8 A. No. BST has inflated the cost for these elements by assuming that distribution
9 “conditioning” jobs would be performed on only one pair at a time. This
10 greatly understates the number of loops that should be “conditioned”
11 whenever a technician is dispatched. Mr. Riolo explains in his concurrently
12 filed testimony that a one-at-a-time approach is extremely inefficient. In fact,
13 BST itself has assumed that most “conditioning” jobs (*i.e.*, bridged tap
14 removal and load coil removal on loops under 18,000 feet) would be
15 undertaken on ten pairs at a time. This strange dichotomy leads to the
16 perplexing situation in which conditioning a *portion* of the loop is far more
17 expensive than conditioning the loop as a whole. In addition, as with the other
18 “conditioning” elements, BST appears to have overstated the time it would
19 take to accomplish the “conditioning” tasks. Mr. Riolo explained this
20 problem in his July 31st testimony [at 81-97]. Mr. Riolo provides more
21 reasonable task time estimates corresponding to BST’s new elements in his
22 concurrently filed testimony.

1 **E. BST's Revised Nonrecurring Charges for Access to Loop Makeup**
2 **Information Are More Reasonable, But Still Inflated.**

3 **Q. How has BST revised its "Loop Qualification" elements?**

4 A. BST has revised its former "Loop Qualification" elements (J.3.1 and J.3.3) in
5 several ways. First, BST has renamed these elements as "Loop Makeup"
6 ("LMU"). Second, BST has clarified that its proposed "Mechanized LMU"
7 element is not related to its Loop Qualification System (also known as
8 "Loopy"), which BST uses to determine whether a customer location qualifies
9 for BellSouth's retail ADSL offering based on BellSouth's technical
10 parameters. Third, the former element "Service Inquiry w/ Loop Makeup"
11 (J.3.3) has been restructured into two elements: "Manual Loop Makeup w/o
12 Facility Reservation Number" (element J.3.3), which does not include the
13 reservation of a loop facility, and "Manual Loop Makeup w/ Facility
14 Reservation Number" (element J.3.4), which does include the reservation of a
15 loop facility. [See BST revised cost study, at Section 6, page 67.]

16 **Q. Do you have comments regarding these revisions to the Loop Makeup**
17 **elements?**

18 A. Yes. First, I believe that BST's clarification regarding mechanized loop
19 makeup is an important one. Both Mr. Riolo and I explained in our July 31st
20 testimonies that it is essential that competitors have access to detailed loop
21 makeup information so that they can make their own *independent* judgment
22 regarding the suitability of a loop. As I have already explained, BST has

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 finally acknowledged that the FCC has required such access and has at least
2 taken some steps to remove the manual loop makeup process from DSL-
3 capable loop provisioning. In its revised description of loop makeup
4 elements, BST explains that it intends loop makeup to provide “sufficient
5 information on the loop make-up of a facility at a particular service location
6 so that the CLEC can make a determination for itself whether the facility is
7 qualified for the service that it wishes to provision over that facility.” [BST
8 revised cost study, at Section 6, page 67.] Assuming that BST’s definition of
9 “sufficient information” is correct, this is just what competitors require.

10 However, I have an additional concern regarding reservation of loop
11 facilities that is raised by BST’s description of its manual loop makeup
12 elements, as well as its description of its new DSL-capable loop provisioning
13 elements.

14 **Q. What concern do you have regarding reservation of loop facilities?**

15 A. Obviously, access to detailed loop makeup information about a particular loop
16 is of little use if a competitor cannot subsequently purchase that precise loop.
17 Nor would it be acceptable for the loop facilities to change after the loop had
18 been provisioned (if, for example, BST were to do a line and station transfer
19 for reasons of its own), because the new facilities might no longer support the
20 services that a competitor had promised its customer. Therefore, it is critical
21 that competitors have the ability to reserve specific loop facilities.

22 BST is now offering manual loop makeup with and without loop
23 reservation; BST’s DSL-capable loop provisioning options “with loop

1 makeup” also include reservation of loop facilities. However, the DSL-
2 capable loop provisioning options “without loop makeup” do not appear to
3 include loop facility reservation. [See BST revised cost study, at Section 6,
4 page 25.] Moreover, BST’s description of its mechanized loop makeup option
5 does not mention facility reservation. [See BST revised cost study, at Section
6 6, pages 67-68.]

7 Thus, it is not clear that a competitor using mechanized loop makeup
8 would have the option to reserve loop facilities. It may be that BST does
9 contemplate that loop reservation would be accomplished through the
10 mechanized loop makeup process. For example, BST has stated:

11 A loop without a loop make-up is ordered when either a
12 manual or *mechanized loop make-up with reservation* is
13 ordered prior to ordering the loop.

14 [BST revised cost study, at Section 6, page 25, emphasis added] However,
15 that is not clear, and it needs to be. Mechanized access to loop makeup
16 information must also enable the competitor to reserve the selected loop
17 facilities.

18 **Q. What charges is BST now proposing for access to loop makeup**
19 **information?**

20 A. BST has proposed the following charges for access to loop makeup
21 information:

- 22 • a per-use charge of \$0.69 for mechanized access to loop makeup
23 information;

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

- 1 • a nonrecurring charge of \$132.82 for manual loop makeup without
2 facility reservation; and
- 3 • a nonrecurring charge of \$138.61 for manual loop qualification with
4 facility reservation.

5 **Q. Is BST's revised per-use charge for mechanized access to loop makeup**
6 **data reasonable?**

7 A. No. As I explained in my July 31st testimony [at 101-105], the investment that
8 BST seeks to recover through this per-use charge for access to loop makeup
9 information is for an OSS electronic interface. The Florida Commission has
10 already correctly determined that incumbents should bear their own cost of
11 developing and implementing such OSS interfaces, as competitors do. [See
12 Order No. PSC-96-1579-FOF-TP, at 87.]

13 Furthermore, although BST's revised estimate of the cost to provide
14 mechanized access to loop makeup represents a sizeable decrease from its
15 original estimate, I believe that BST's proposed charge continues to be
16 inflated. Indeed, BST's revision has served to support my contention that
17 BST's original estimates of the computer investment needed to make
18 mechanized loop makeup possible were quite excessive.

19 **Q. How do BST's revised estimates show that its original estimates of**
20 **computer investment were excessive?**

21 A. BST's revised proposal of \$0.69 per use is 36% below its original proposal of
22 \$1.08 per use. This drop results from adjustments to BST's estimate of the

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 computer investment that will be necessary to provide such mechanized
2 access. Inspection of BST's current estimate of computer investment bears
3 out my contention that its earlier estimate was vastly inflated. For example,
4 BST's estimate for midrange computer hardware investment is now only
5 about 10% of its former estimate. Examples of the adjustments BST has made
6 include:

7 ***** BST PROPRIETARY**

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

END

19

PROPRIETARY ***

20 **Q. Why does BST's proposed per-use charge continue to be excessive even**
21 **with these adjustments?**

22 A. BST's revised estimate is certainly more reasonable than its first effort. But,
23 even if one accepted the idea that competitors should be partially responsible

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 for investment in BST's OSS investment, this estimate still seems to be
2 inflated. For example, BST's estimate still includes a *** BST
3 PROPRIETARY END PROPRIETARY *** investment in
4 computer equipment, third party software and right to use fees, and program
5 development fees, and *** BST PROPRIETARY END
6 PROPRIETARY *** in consulting services and third party software support
7 expenses for 2000-2002. [BST revised cost study, FLLQDB.XLS, Input,
8 WP1 and WP3 sheets.] The Commission should reject such apparently
9 unreasonable inputs until BST has supplied substantive support for those
10 inputs and parties have had an opportunity to comment on that support.

11 **Q. What is an appropriate price for access to loop makeup information,**
12 **based on the cost of forward-looking, efficient electronic access to that**
13 **information?**

14 A. As I explained in my July 31st testimony [at 99-100], the best estimate of the
15 efficient, long-run cost for the electronic provision of loop makeup
16 information, which new entrants can in turn use to perform their own loop
17 qualification assessment, is \$0. I recommend that the Commission adopt a
18 price of \$0 for mechanized loop makeup.

19 **Q. BST has proposed charges for manual loop makeup. When should**
20 **manual charges apply?**

21 A. Although the FCC required direct access to loop makeup information some
22 time ago (September 15, 1999), BST has only recently begun steps to provide

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Murray

1 such mechanized access. Moreover, Mr. Riolo explained in his July 31st
2 testimony [at 45-46] that BST should have most, if not all, of the information
3 available electronically. Therefore, if a competitor is prepared to use the BST
4 electronic interface, the mechanized charge should apply — regardless of
5 whether BST must actually provide manual research to obtain the necessary
6 data. Otherwise, BST will no longer have an incentive to make mechanized
7 access available in a timely fashion. A manual loop makeup charge should
8 *only* apply if a competitor *opts* not to develop its own capacity to use an
9 available mechanized system, after BST has made electronic access
10 commercially available.

11 BST's manual loop makeup process continues to include inefficient
12 and unnecessary tasks. Thus, the Commission should adjust the cost of this
13 optional manual loop makeup element to match the price for an efficient
14 process, as presented in my July 31st testimony [at 104].

15 **Q. Does that conclude your testimony at this time?**

16 A. Yes, it does.