

**REDACTED**

**ATTACHMENT B**

**BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.  
FPSC Docket No. 020507-TL  
Request for Confidential Classification  
Page 1 of 1  
9/9/03**

**REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL CLASSIFICATION OF BELLSOUTH'S POST-  
HEARING BRIEF AS FILED AUGUST 19, 2003,  
IN FLORIDA DOCKET NO. 020507-TL**

**TWO REDACTED COPIES**

**DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
08500 SEP-9 3  
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK**

**PUBLIC VERSION**

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In re: Complaint of the Florida )  
Competitive Carriers Association ) Docket No. 020507-TL  
Against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. )  
And Request for Expedited Relief ) Filed: August 19, 2003

**BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S POST-HEARING BRIEF**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth") respectfully submits its Post-Hearing Brief in this case, which involves the efforts of certain competitive local exchange telecommunications companies ("CLECs")<sup>1</sup> to expand prior panel decisions and force BellSouth to provide its retail wireline broadband service, BellSouth FastAccess® DSL ("FastAccess®"), to any voice customers served by the CLECs. The CLECs have also rejected the method by which BellSouth is currently complying with prior arbitration rulings pending the appeals of such orders, which is a standalone offering. Instead, the CLECs seek to force BellSouth to change the processes and procedures that are in place and working today by compelling BellSouth to provide FastAccess® over UNE loops or UNE-P loops, which would require new processes and procedures.

Without belaboring BellSouth's fundamental jurisdictional disagreement with prior decisions concerning FastAccess®, no one can deny the rationale for the first of these orders centered on "*possible* barriers to competition in the local telecommunications voice market that *could* result from BellSouth's practice . . ." Order No. PSC-02-0765-FOF-TP, p. 8 ("FDN

---

<sup>1</sup> The CLEC parties in this case are Access Integrated Networks, Inc. ("AIN"); AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. ("AT&T"); ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. ("DeltaCom"); MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. and MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC (both entities referred to as "MCI") (all companies collectively referred to as "CLECs" or "the CLEC parties").

1 from taking service from the carrier they prefer." Complaint, ¶¶ 7, 14. At the hearing, however,  
2 the consumers were conspicuously absent. No consumer came forward to testify as a public  
3 witness. No consumer presented written comments as an interested party at the hearing. No  
4 CLEC sponsored actual customer testimony, either formally, in affidavit form, or even in  
5 anecdotal form. No consumer claimed that he or she was actually reluctant to change providers  
6 or was prevented from obtaining voice service from the carrier of his or her choice. The  
7 Commission should not be swayed into believing that it is acting in furtherance of consumer  
8 choice or welfare when the reality is that the CLEC parties are in business to advance their own  
9 agendas and not those of the general Florida populace.

10 The record evidence indicates that competition is thriving in Florida. 149 operational  
11 CLECs currently serve 1.3 million access lines, which is 20.0% of the total lines in Florida.  
12 (Exh. 7). This Commission has documented CLEC increases in market share, as well as the  
13 heavy CLEC presence in BellSouth territory in its 2002 Annual Report on Competition. (See  
14 Annual Report on Competition, published by the Florida Public Service Commission's Office of  
15 Market Monitoring and Strategic Analysis, December 2002). Such market share increases have  
16 continued over time, unaffected whatsoever by BellSouth's FastAccess® policy.

17 Not only is competition alive and well in Florida, the CLEC parties in this case have  
18 experienced extraordinary growth. For example, AIN has grown its lines from 4,368 in 2001 to  
19 11,894 in 2002 to 12,147 lines in mid 2003. (Exh. 1). AIN failed to provide this Commission  
20 with any evidence of customers that refused to migrate voice service because of BellSouth's  
21 FastAccess policy. (*Id.*) Similarly, AT&T has grown its total lines from in 1999, to  
22 in 2000, to in 2001 to 175,667 in 2002. (Exh. 1). AT&T also failed to provide

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE  
DOCUMENT

1 any evidence of customers that refused to migrate voice service to it because of BellSouth's  
2 FastAccess policy. (*Id.*).

3 Likewise, DeltaCom has grown its lines from in 2001 to lines in 2003.  
4 (Exh. 1). DeltaCom provided an unsupported estimate of alleged lost sales due to BellSouth's  
5 policy; however, DeltaCom did not support any witness testimony in this proceeding. Without  
6 evidence of the methodology underlying DeltaCom's estimate, or the ability to cross-examine a  
7 witness about the validity of the estimate, DeltaCom's claims cannot withstand scrutiny. Thus,  
8 DeltaCom also failed to provide actual evidence of customers that refused to migrate voice  
9 service to DeltaCom because of BellSouth's FastAccess policy.

10 Finally, CLEC MCI has also experienced line growth. (Exh. 1). Initially, MCI's analog  
11 line numbers were up and down, however, most recently MCI has grown exponentially. MCI's  
12 line data reveals it went from lines in 1999 to in 2000, to in 2001. (*Id.*)  
13 Thereafter, MCI reached lines in 2002, and subsequently achieved lines by mid-  
14 2003. (*Id.*) MCI also failed to provide evidence establishing the number of customers that  
15 actually refused to establish voice service with MCI due to BellSouth's FastAccess policy.<sup>2</sup>

16 The line growth experienced by the CLEC parties illustrates why the relief requested in  
17 this proceeding is - at best - unjustified, and more accurately - completely frivolous. The CLEC  
18 parties have grown lines during the time BellSouth's alleged anticompetitive policy has been in  
19 place. Despite this proceeding having been initiated over a year ago, the CLEC parties are  
20 requesting extraordinary relief that requires BellSouth alone to incur costs, change its processes,

---

<sup>2</sup> MCI's reliance on rejected local service requests as a surrogate proves nothing. BellSouth reviewed a sample of MCI's account records, and found that one in five customers decided to migrate to a voice provider other than BellSouth, which indicates that customers are not "reluctant" to change voice carriers as the CLEC witnesses claim. (Exh. 7). Moreover, MCI's conclusions concerning the rejected LSRs are misleading. MCI initially testified that 260 customers established voice service with MCI after an initial reject was received; at hearing Ms. Lichtenberg conceded the number was 317. (Tr. at 180).

1 were already available in the marketplace. (Id.) Consequently, BellSouth began investing the  
2 resources necessary to support its DSL product offerings. (Id.)

3 To date, BellSouth has invested more than \$393 million in Florida to support its DSL  
4 offerings. (Tr. at 523). That investment includes the cost of upgrading BellSouth's backhaul  
5 network and deploying DSL capability in 191 BellSouth central offices and 3,945 BellSouth  
6 remote terminals. (Tr. at 530). In deploying DSL, BellSouth took a careful approach. Demand  
7 for high-speed Internet access was analyzed at the neighborhood level. Through this process of  
8 targeted deployment, BellSouth selected what it believed were the best locations to place central  
9 office and remote terminal Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexers ("DSLAMs"). (Id.)  
10 This efficient use of capital has been critical to the competitive nature of BellSouth's DSL  
11 service and has allowed BellSouth to deploy DSL service throughout Florida. (Id.) This is  
12 significant because BellSouth's strategy involved only investing in areas where BellSouth  
13 believed it could successfully market DSL service as a complement to its existing voice service  
14 and thereby realize a favorable return on its investment. (Tr. at 524). BellSouth would not have  
15 made as substantial an investment in broadband technology if it knew that it would be required to  
16 offer its services to CLEC end users. (Tr. at 533).

17 Since 1998, BellSouth has grown its FastAccess® customer base in Florida. As of June  
18 30, 2003, BellSouth had FastAccess® customers. Over time BellSouth has also  
19 experienced customer disconnections and churn relating to FastAccess®. For example, 235,022  
20 Florida customers have disconnected FastAccess® service while retaining BellSouth voice  
21 service since August 1999. (Exh. 7). Such disconnections reflect customer churn; in the  
22 broadband market average customer churn rates range from three to five percent per month. (Tr.