ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVIC COMMISSION

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

WAYNE ELLISON

ON BEHALF OF

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES, INC.

Docket No. 960833-TP/960846-TP//960757-TP/971140-TP/960916-TP

Filed: December 9, 1997



| Ţ | | REDUTTAL TESTIMONT OF |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | WAYNE ELLISON |
| 3 | | ON BEHALF OF |
| 4 | | AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES, INC. |
| 5 | | DOCKET NOs: 960833-TP/960846-TP/960757-TP/971140-TP/960916-TP |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | Q. | PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND TITLE. |
| 8 | A. | My name is Wayne Ellison. My business address is 1200 Peachtree Street N.E., Atlanta, |
| 9 | | Georgia 30309. I am employed by AT&T as a District Manager in the Law and |
| 10 | | Government Affairs organization. |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | Q. | ARE YOU THE SAME WAYNE ELLISON THAT FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY |
| 13 | | IN THIS PROCEEDING? |
| 14 | A. | Yes. |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | Q. | WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY? |
| 17 | A. | The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to: |
| 18 | | 1. Critique BellSouth's cost studies. I will demonstrate that the cost studies |
| 19 | | submitted by BellSouth in this proceeding contain methodological and data |
| 20 | | flaws. These flaws often lead to greatly overstated BellSouth costs, rendering |
| 21 | | BellSouth's studies unfit for use in establishing rates. These flaws include (1) |
| 22 | | overstated return on investment, depreciation, shared, and common costs, (2) |
| 23 | | excess spare facility requirements, (3) failure to reflect most efficient |
| 24 | | provisioning practices, and (4) overstated vendor costs. As a result, most |

| 1 | | BellSouth cost studies do not reflect BellSouth's forward-looking economic |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | costs. |
| 3 | | 2. Critique BellSouth's proposed rates. I will demonstrate that BellSouth's |
| 4 | | proposed rates are sometimes based on inappropriate embedded cost |
| 5 | | methodologies, in other cases based on inflated cost results, and in other cases |
| 6 | | structured in a discriminatory manner, rendering each such rate proposal |
| 7 | | unacceptable. |
| 8 | | 3. Present and describe AT&T's complete rate proposal, based on our review of |
| 9 | | BellSouth's studies and studies sponsored by AT&T/MCI witnesses. The rates |
| 0 | | proposed by AT&T are designed to fully compensate BellSouth for use of |
| 11 | • | BellSouth's various capabilities, while concurrently promoting the greatest |
| 12 | | possible development of price and service competition to the maximum number |
| 13 | | of Florida consumers. |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | Q. | HAVE YOU REVIEWED THE BELLSOUTH COST STUDIES SUBMITTED IN |
| 16 | | THIS PROCEEDING? |
| 17 | A. | Yes. |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | Q. | BASED ON YOUR REVIEW, DID YOU IDENTIFY PROBLEMS COMMON TO |
| 20 | | ALL OF BELLSOUTH'S STUDIES? |
| 21 | A. | Yes. All of BellSouth's recurring cost studies incorporate incorrect return on investment, |
| 22 | | depreciation, shared, and common cost factors. All of the company's non-recurring cost |
| 23 | | studies incorporate incorrect shared and common cost factors. For these reasons alone |
| 24 | | every study provided by BellSouth requires modification. Recommended changes to |
| 25 | | BellSouth's depreciation and return factors are included in the testimonies of AT&T |

| 1 | | witnesses Majoros and Cornell, respectively. AT&T witness Lerma provides | | | | | |
|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | | recommended changes to BellSouth's shared and common factors. | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Q. | DID YOU ALSO IDENTIFY PROBLEMS SPECIFIC TO INDIVIDUAL | | | | | |
| 5 | | BELLSOUTH STUDIES? | | | | | |
| 6 | A. | Yes. In addition to the common problems noted above, there are additional problems | | | | | |
| 7 | | specific to BellSouth's loop studies (ADSL loops, HDSL loops, 2-wire distribution, 4- | | | | | |
| 8 | | wire distribution), BellSouth's local switching study (4-wire port and features), | | | | | |
| 9 | | BellSouth's NID studies, each BellSouth non-recurring study, BellSouth's physical | | | | | |
| 10 | | collocation study, and BellSouth's virtual collocation study. | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Q. | WHAT ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS DID YOU IDENTIFY WITH BELLSOUTH'S | | | | | |
| 13 | | LOOP SUBMISSIONS? | | | | | |
| 14 | A. | BellSouth's loop cost submissions, including the cost studies for two and four wire loop | | | | | |
| 15 | | distribution, ADSL loops, and HDSL loops, have a number of additional problems. First, | | | | | |
| 16 | | the study procedure used by BellSouth to determine the costs of each element is simply | | | | | |
| 17 | | incapable of producing accurate results. Second, each study is based on a "hypothetical" | | | | | |
| 18 | | loop derived from a loop sample that excludes the characteristics of BellSouth's lowest | | | | | |
| 19 | | cost loops. Third, each study reflects excessive spare facility costs because BellSouth | | | | | |
| 20 | | used incorrect utilization factors. Fourth, each study incorporates overstated unit cost | | | | | |
| 21 | | factors and drop wire costs. Each of these shortcomings increase BellSouth's cost | | | | | |
| 22 | | estimates. | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | |
| 24 | Q. | WHY IS THE BELLSOUTH LOOP STUDY PROCEDURE INCAPABLE OF | | | | | |

PRODUCING ACCURATE RESULTS?

BellSouth's loop study procedure is fatally flawed—for all voice grade loop cost calculations—because the design of the loop cost model is defective. BellSouth's loop cost model estimates average loop cost by, (1) applying various estimated unit cost and utilization ratios to, (2) a "hypothetical" loop derived from sampled characteristics of a small number of loops, (3) modified to reflect BellSouth's view of forward-looking design. Opportunity for significant error occurs at each step of the process.

A.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

The BellSouth loop cost model first relies on a small sample of loops to characterize the "hypothetical" physical characteristics of a typical Florida loop. The various loop characteristics sampled by BellSouth include loop length, cable sheath mix, structure mix, amount of bridged tap, and feeder/distribution interface location. Each of the characteristics sampled by BellSouth have a wide range of values from loop to loop that cannot be accurately captured in the small sample analyzed by BellSouth. Moreover, ASDL and HDSL loop costs are not even calculated from BellSouth's small sample, but from a "sample-of-the-sample".

Next, BellSouth attempts to reflect the forward-looking plant characteristics of Florida loops by altering the characteristics of its small sample. However, as explained by Mr. Wells, the process used by BellSouth's analysts reflect neither good engineering practice nor attributes of a forward-looking design.

Finally, BellSouth computes costs for the "redesigned" sample loops by applying estimated unit cost and utilization factors developed outside the sampling process. The BellSouth loop study methodology at this point forces the Company to rely on

| 1 | | unsubstantiated "expert" opinions and inappropriate historical data to estimate forward- |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | looking cable material costs, conduit costs, pole line costs, engineering costs, installation |
| 3 | | costs, and cable utilization. BellSouth and the parties in this proceeding do not have a |
| 4 | | means of evaluating the reasonableness of these estimates using BellSouth's current |
| 5 | | methodology. |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | In summary, at each step of the BellSouth loop costing process BellSouth introduces |
| 8 | | insupportable estimates of loop characteristics and costs that produce wholly unreliable |
| 9 | | results. |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | Q. | YOU STATE THAT BELLSOUTH'S LOOP STUDY ALSO RELIES ON A |
| 12 | | SAMPLE EXCLUDING BELLSOUTH'S LOWEST COST LOOPS. PLEASE |
| 13 | | EXPLAIN. |
| 14 | A. | The loop sample used to by BellSouth to calculate loop costs is drawn from a universe |
| 15 | | that incorrectly excludes ESSX loops, business trunks, and other business offerings. |
| 16 | | Excluding these loops inappropriately increases BellSouth's estimate of loop costs |
| 17 | | because the excluded loops have lower costs than the mix of loops reflected in |
| 18 | | BellSouth's cost study results. |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | Q. | DID BELLSOUTH USE OTHER INCORRECT INPUTS IN ITS LOOP COST |
| 21 | | STUDIES? |
| 22 | A. | Yes. Mr. Wells describes various other incorrect inputs, including incorrect unit costs, |
| 23 | | overstated drop wire investments, and incorrect feeder and distribution fill factors. |
| 24 | | |
| 16 | | |

1 Q. HOW ARE FEEDER AND DISTRIBUTION FILL FACTORS USED IN 2 BELLSOUTH'S LOOP STUDIES?

The feeder and distribution cable fill factors are designed to recover BellSouth's investments in spare feeder and distribution plant facilities. BellSouth accounts for such costs in its studies by first calculating the direct investment required to provide the loop, and then dividing the calculated direct investment by a "fill" factor. For distribution cable BellSouth uses a factor of 38.8%. The Company divides each dollar of direct investment by this factor to obtain an investment "including spare" of \$2.57. The resulting investment used to compute costs, therefore, includes a spare equipment requirement equal to 157% of the actual investment required to provide service, which is unreasonable.

Α.

Q. IS USE OF A FILL FACTOR INHERENTLY UNREASONABLE?

A. No. Reasonable fill factors are appropriate in order to recover BellSouth's administrative spare and lumpy investment requirements. However, the fill factor BellSouth uses is not derived from a reasonable calculation of these requirements, but from inappropriate historical data reflecting not only spare requirements for current capacity but spare placed by BellSouth to meet future service demands. This type factor is inappropriate.

A.

Q. WHY IS IT INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE COMPANY TO USE FACTORS REFLECTING EXISTING PLANT FILL IN ITS COST STUDIES?

BellSouth's fill factors supposedly measure existing total spare, regardless of whether such spare is required to serve existing customers. In some cases it may be reasonable for BellSouth to have excessive spare levels because it may be more efficient to build excess capacity now (for example, to avoid the costs of future retrenching when new

demand for that capacity materializes). Whether or not that is true in any given case will depend on whether the cost savings associated with a single installation are greater than the carrying costs for the excess capacity. But, in any event, <u>much of BellSouth's spare capacity would not exist if it were not for anticipated future demand.</u> The costs associated with that spare should therefore be the responsibility of the future demand that it services.

Said another way, this is not a question about whether such spare exists, but a question of matching spare facility costs with the offerings that cause such costs to be incurred. AT&T's proposal allows BellSouth to collect growth spare costs once--from the new customers that spare plant is placed to serve. BellSouth's methodology allows the Company to collect its costs twice-- from both new and existing customers.

Q. HOW DO THE COST STUDY DEFICIENCIES YOU DESCRIBE SPECIFICALLY IMPACT BELLSOUTH'S COST ESTIMATES FOR LOOP DISTRIBUTION AND ADSL/HDSL LOOPS?

A. Each of the deficiencies I have described directly impact BellSouth's cost estimates for ADSL/HDSL loops and loop distribution. BellSouth's estimated costs for each of these elements includes cost components for depreciation, cost of money, shared costs, and common costs. BellSouth's cost estimate for each includes costs of a customer drop.

And BellSouth's cost estimate for each includes the Company's estimate of spare facility requirements. Finally, the cost of each element is based on the composition of a "hypothetical" loop that excludes the characteristics of BellSouth's lowest cost loops.

| 1 | Q. | HAVE YOU QUANTIFIED THE IMPACT OF EACH INCORRECT INPUT ON |
|---|----|---|
| 2 | | BELLSOUTH'S SUB-LOOP AND ADSL/HDSL COST RESULTS? |

A. Partially. Rebuttal Exhibit WE-1 includes corrected BellSouth cost results incorporating most of the adjustments I have described. However, Rebuttal Exhibit WE-1 does not adjust for the incorrect loop sample used by BellSouth, because the data to make this correction is not available. The specific adjustments included on Rebuttal Exhibit WE-1, for loops as well as all other elements, are identified on Rebuttal Exhibit WE-2.

9 Q. SHOULD THE COMMISSION REJECT THE BELLSOUTH LOOP MODEL 10 FOR USE IN DETERMINING NETWORK ELEMENT PRICES?

11 A. Yes. The Commission should reject the BellSouth loop model because it is simply
12 incapable of producing reliable cost results, either on a statewide average basis or at the
13 geographically deaveraged cost level required for network element pricing.

A.

Q. HOW SHOULD THE COMMISSION ESTABLISH LOOP AND SUB-LOOP RECURRING RATES IN THIS PROCEEDING?

The Commission should adopt the rate proposals for distribution facilities, ADSL loops, and HDSL loops contained in my Rebuttal Exhibit WE-1, which reflects AT&T's complete price proposal in this proceeding. My recommendations for loops and loop distribution are obtained from Hatfield Model results presented by Mr. Wood and, for 4-wire HDSL loops, cost ratios presented by BellSouth. The rates I propose have been developed by aggregating Hatfield wire center results by identified rate group. The ADSL/HDSL results are based only on copper loops. I also recommend in Rebuttal Exhibit WE-1 that loop prices be deaveraged to reflect weighted average loop costs for each of six wire center groups. Although wire center deaveraging does not capture all

variables associated with loop costs, it does generally capture differences due to the greatest variable, population density. BellSouth should also have the capability to bill deaveraged prices at the wire center group level.

Α.

Q. HAVE YOU BASED YOUR PRICE RECOMMENDATIONS ON TELRIC RESULTS OR TSLRIC RESULTS?

I have based my recommendations on forward-looking costs economic costs, which include all directly attributable costs of the element (sometimes based on corrected BellSouth "TELRIC" studies) plus a reasonable allocation of forward-looking common costs. I believe this standard most closely meets the prior direction for network element pricing established by the Commission. BellSouth's so-called TSLRIC studies do not meet the Commission's requirements because they do not fully reflect directly attributable costs. BellSouth's "TSLRIC" studies therefore provide the Commission little direction regarding appropriate rates.

Α.

Q. WHY SHOULD THE COMMISSION GEOGRAPHICALLY DEAVERAGE LOOP AND LOOP DISTRIBUTION PRICES?

State average loop prices advantage BellSouth in the competitive marketplace by providing the Company an artificial cost advantage in the more densely populated areas of the state. Averaged rates will thereby prevent the type of widespread competition envisioned by the Commission and the Act, which is antithetical to the Commission's goal of encouraging the type of widespread competition that benefits all consumers.

| 1 | | The importance of geographically de-averaged prices for establishing competitive local | | | | |
|----|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | | markets has been specifically recognized by the FCC. In its Ameritech order (FCC 97- | | | | |
| 3 | | 298, released August 19, 1997, paragraph 292) the FCC noted: | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | Establishing prices based on TELRIC is a necessary, but | | | | |
| 6 | | not sufficient, condition for checklist compliance. In | | | | |
| 7 | | order for us to conclude that sections 271(c)(2)(B)(i) and | | | | |
| 8 | | (ii) are met, rates based on TELRIC principles for | | | | |
| 9 | | interconnection and unbundled network elements must | | | | |
| 10 | | also be geographically deaveraged to account for the | | | | |
| 11 | | different costs of building and maintaining networks in | | | | |
| 12 | | different geographic areas of varying population density. | | | | |
| 13 | | Deaveraged rates more closely reflect the actual costs of | | | | |
| 14 | | providing interconnection and unbundled elements. | | | | |
| 15 | | Deaveraging should, therefore, lead to increased | | | | |
| 16 | | competition and ensure that competitors make efficient | | | | |
| 17 | | entry decisions about whether they will use unbundled | | | | |
| 18 | | network elements or build facilities. | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | |
| 20 | Q. | HAVE YOU PROVIDED AN ALTERNATIVE RATE PROPOSAL FOR | | | | |
| 21 | | STATEWIDE AVERAGED RATES IN THE EVENT THE COMMISSION DOES | | | | |
| 22 | | NOT ADOPT GEOGRAPHICALLY DEAVERAGED RATES? | | | | |
| 23 | A. | Yes. Rebuttal Exhibit WE-1 also includes rates suitable for uniform statewide | | | | |
| 24 | | application in the event deaveraged rates are rejected. However, I strongly urge the | | | | |
| 25 | | Commission to implement geographically deaveraged loop rates | | | | |

LOCAL SWITCHING

| ~ |
|---|
| |
| |
| |

- Q. WHAT ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS DID YOU IDENTIFY WITH RESPECT TO
 BELLSOUTH'S LOCAL SWITCHING SUBMISSION?
- A. AT&T determined that BellSouth's local switching cost estimate for the 4-wire port and features is inflated by overstated and improperly assigned investments. Investment related problems are addressed in the testimony of AT&T witness Catherine Petzinger.

A.

9 Q. ARE THERE OTHER PROBLEMS WITH BELLSOUTH'S LOCAL SWITCH 10 PORT PROPOSAL?

Yes. Because BellSouth bases its recommendation on flawed cost studies, the Company proposes port charges that are too high and feature charges that are inappropriate. In addition, BellSouth sums its calculated costs for 24 features to derive a price for the 4-wire port, including features, of \$17.36 per month. Extending BellSouth's logic, a port with all features--which BellSouth is required to provide--would cost approximately \$275.00 per month, given that the typical digital switch has approximately 1000 features. Of course, \$275.00 for a port is unreasonable, and BellSouth's proposal is simply unsound. First, even BellSouth acknowledges that the average consumer uses only a very small proportion of the actual features available in a switch. A cost-based rate would therefore reflect customer use of only a small number of features -- not the total cost of all features available -- and even BellSouth's flawed methodology would produce total feature costs less than 45 cents per month.

This lower estimate of costs is supported by a September 29, 1995 BellSouth filing with the Kentucky Public Service Commission, where BellSouth claimed its average monthly costs for vertical features provided with an additional residential line were \$0.69. BellSouth's estimated vertical feature costs of \$6.20 in this proceeding are therefore unreasonable by any measure, and approximately 800% higher than cost estimates presented by the Company in Kentucky.

6 Q. WHAT ACTION SHOULD THE COMMISSION TAKE WITH RESPECT TO 7 PRICES FOR LOCAL SWITCHING?

8 A. The Commission should adopt the AT&T proposal contained in Rebuttal Exhibit WE-1,
9 which is based on corrected BellSouth cost results and the analysis of witness Catherine
10 Petzinger.

A.

12 Q. DOES AT&T RECOMMEND SEPARATE OR ADDITIONAL CHARGES FOR 13 FEATURES, FUNCTIONS, AND OTHER CAPABILITIES OF THE LOCAL 14 SWITCH?

No. As explained by AT&T witness Catherine Petzinger, separate and additional charges for features and functions are not appropriate. In addition, Ms. Petzinger describes the significant barriers to competition that would occur if BellSouth were allowed to implement even minimal separate feature charges, which would require new entrants to follow a request process each time a new feature were desired. The Commission simply cannot allow BellSouth to erect such barriers to competition by establishing separate charges for each feature, function, or capability, which would remain regardless of the actual level of BellSouth charges. The FCC recognized as much in formulating its network element rules, stating at Paragraph 423 of the FCC's First Report and Order, CC Docket No. 96-98, released August 8, 1996:

| 1 | We also disagree with the proposal to define local |
|----|--|
| 2 | switching as a point of access plus basic switching |
| 3 | functionality, but that would exclude vertical switching |
| 4 | features. As a legal matter, this definition is inconsistent |
| 5 | with the 1996 Act's definition of "network element," |
| 6 | which includes all the "features, functionality's, and |
| 7 | capabilities provided by means of such facility or |
| 8 | equipment. In addition, this definition would not fulfill |
| 9 | the pro-competitive objectives of the 1996 Act as |
| 10 | effectively as the per-line definition we adopt. A |
| 11 | competitor that obtains basic and vertical switching |
| 12 | features at cost-based rates will have maximum |
| 13 | flexibility to distinguish its offerings from those of the |
| 14 | incumbent LEC by developing a variety of service |
| 15 | packages and pricing plans. Moreover, an up front |
| 16 | purchase of all local switching features may speed entry |
| 17 | by simplifying practical issues such as the pricing of |
| 18 | individual switching features. |

The FCC's position was recently upheld by the decision of the 8th Circuit Court.

21

20

ARE THERE ADDITIONAL REASONS FOR NOT ADOPTING SEPARATE Q. 22 **CHARGES FOR 4-WIRE PORT FEATURES AND FUNCTIONS?** 23

Yes. Adopting separate charges for features and functions would also conflict with the 24 Α. 25 policy of this Commission. In its arbitration order the Commission determined that local switching included all features and functions. The Commission thereupon established monthly and usage rates to recover such costs. Specifically, the Commission adopted a monthly rate of \$2.00 and a per minute rate of \$0.0175 for the first minute and \$0.005 for each additional minute for the 2-wire port. The 4-wire port being priced in this proceeding is identical to the 2-wire port already priced; i.e., the 4-wire port is simply a 2-wire port bundled with signaling and terminating equipment. It follows then that adding transmission equipment to the 2-wire port should not cause the entire pricing structure for the underlying switch function to change. Instead, the price increment for the bundled offering should reflect only the cost of the added transmission equipment.

NON-RECURRING COSTS

A.

Q. WHAT ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS DID AT&T IDENTIFY WITH BELLSOUTH'S NONRECURRING COST SUBMISSIONS?

Additional problems with BellSouth's non-recurring cost studies are addressed by witnesses Lynott and Hyde. These witnesses point out BellSouth's failure to reflect forward-looking economic costs in the Company's non-recurring cost studies. The Commission should reject BellSouth's studies, and require that rates reflect efficient provisioning methods, as described and quantified in the testimony of Mr. Lynott, and reflected in AT&T's rate recommendations contained in Rebuttal Exhibit WE-1. Non-recurring charges, if not properly structured and priced, will present insurmountable barriers to competition. The Commission must not allow BellSouth to foreclose viable competition through excessive non-recurring rates that could otherwise result through efficient recurring rates for network elements.

Q. SHOULD THE COMMISSION ADOPT BELLSOUTH'S PROPOSAL FOR OSS INTERFACE CHARGES?

No, absolutely not. The Commission correctly determined in the arbitration proceedings that "each party shall bear its own cost of developing and implementing electronic interface systems, because those systems benefit all carriers". There is no reason to revisit the Commission's decision in the current proceeding. BellSouth should be required to develop its transactional non-recurring costs assuming the existence of efficient electronic interface arrangements, and the Company should be required to provide efficient access as the Commission has directed. To the extent BellSouth desires to tariff "manual" order charges, it should be allowed to do so only for customers who request a manual order process. Customers who are required to place manual orders because they have no other choice (i.e., because electronic capability is not available or fully functional) should not be required to pay "manual" order charges.

A.

A.

Q. SHOULD BELLSOUTH'S PROPOSED OSS INTERFACE CHARGES BE REJECTED FOR ANY OTHER REASON?

Yes. In addition to being inappropriate, BellSouth's claimed costs are undocumented.

No proposal for billing to new entrants should be considered simply because BellSouth claims costs of a certain level, or asserts that such costs are necessary and prudent. The burden of proof for any claimed cost should be on BellSouth, and BellSouth has not even attempted in this proceeding to meet that burden.

The Commission should also reject BellSouth's proposed method of recovering costs.

As the Commission has previously determined, investments in electronic gateway systems will benefit all carriers. Yet, BellSouth has taken the position in this proceeding

| 1 | | that BellSouth's electronic interface costs (which may or may not be prudent) should be |
|----|------|---|
| 2 | | recovered directly and solely from competing carriers in the form of special non- |
| 3 | | recurring charges. This constitutes another attempt by BellSouth to use its monopoly |
| 4 | | power to favor itself over potential entrants. In this regard, even if BellSouth accurately |
| 5 | | identified its prudent costs, the Company would establish one more barrier to entry that |
| 6 | | will suppress competition by making its competitors pay more of those costs per unit of |
| 7 | | demand. |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | Q. | DID AT&T IDENTIFY ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS WITH BELLSOUTH'S COST |
| 10 | | SUBMISSIONS FOR THE NID? |
| 11 | A. | Yes. Mr. Wells describes the additional problems we identified with the BellSouth NID |
| 12 | | studies. Corrected BellSouth cost results incorporating Mr. Well's suggestions are |
| 13 | | reflected on Rebuttal Exhibit WE-1. |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | Q. | WHAT ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS WERE IDENTIFIED WITH RESPECT TO |
| 16 | | BELLSOUTH'S PHYSICAL AND VIRTUAL COLLOCATION COST |
| 17 | | SUBMISSIONS? |
| 18 | A. | Problems with BellSouth's collocation studies are outlined in the testimonies of Mr. |
| 19 | | Bissell and Mr. Hyde. |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | EMBI | EDDED COST RECOVERY |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | Q. | SHOULD THE COMMISSION SERIOUSLY CONSIDER BELLSOUTH'S |
| 24 | | REQUEST TO RECOVER EMBEDDED COSTS IN THE COMPANY'SLOOP |
| 25 | | AND LOCAL SWITCHING RATES? |

No. The recovery of embedded costs in rates charged new entrants would greatly harm competition and the Florida consumer. Competitors would be harmed because they would be placed at a disadvantage to BellSouth in offering cost-based prices. Consumer's would be harmed because they would pay higher than necessary rates to both BellSouth and its competitors. Only BellSouth shareholders and managers would benefit from including embedded costs, because BellSouth would be permitted under its proposal to recover non-existent or inefficient costs. These are not the outcomes contemplated by the Act.

A.

A.

10 Q. THEN YOU DO NOT AGREE WITH MR. VARNER THAT THE ACT 11 CONTEMPLATES THAT PRICES RECOVER EMBEDDED COSTS?

No. The Act contemplates that network element rates will be established at levels to promote efficient competition that benefits consumers, i.e., at forward-looking economic costs. Contrary to Mr. Varner's claims, the Act actually forbids consideration of BellSouth's embedded costs by requiring that interconnection and network element prices be "based on the cost (determined without reference to a rate-of-return or other rate-based proceeding) of providing the interconnection or network element". Considering BellSouth's "embedded" costs would require a rate-based proceeding.

Q. HAS BELLSOUTH PROVIDED ANY DOCUMENTATION OF ITS SO-CALLED EMBEDDED COSTS IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. No. BellSouth has produced volumes of documentation for its TSLRIC/TELRIC cost models, but has not provided documentation for its claimed "embedded" costs.

Evidently, even BellSouth does not take its "embedded" cost recommendation seriously.

Importantly, this Commission should not take the "embedded" cost recommendation

| 1 | | seriously, or allow the proposal to divert this Commission from critically examining |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | BellSouth's forward-looking costs. |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | Q. | HAS IT BEEN BELLSOUTH'S POLICY TO ADVOCATE PRICES BASED ON |
| 5 | | EMBEDDED COSTS IN THE PAST? |
| 6 | A. | No. BellSouth has, in the past, advocated the use of long-run incremental costs |
| 7 | | ("LRIC") to define both the price at which BellSouth is fully compensated and the cos |
| 8 | | that BellSouth believes should be the basis for interconnection prices. BellSouth has also |
| 9 | | argued vigorously before state regulators for the ability to establish various service |
| 10 | | prices, particularly prices for competitive services, at or below incremental cost |
| 11 | | BellSouth witness Frank Kolb outlined the Company's position regarding incrementa |
| 12 | | cost-based pricing in testimony before the Georgia Public Service Commission in Docke |
| 13 | | No. 5258-U, stating that "[L]ong run incremental cost is the proper standard in |
| 14 | | computing a price floor and is a basis for testing for a subsidy". Mr. Kolb went on to |
| 15 | | state "as long as revenue is above total long run incremental cost (volume and non- |
| 16 | | volume sensitive components), a service is compensatory and is not subsidized |
| 17 | | Consequently, there is a need for only one standard to test prices for subsidy, and that |
| 18 | | standard is long run incremental cost." |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | BellSouth specifically addressed the use of LRIC for interconnection pricing in a March |
| | | |

22

24

1995 filing with the European Commission. There, BellSouth Europe summarized the Company's position as follows:

23

Interconnection charges will have a major impact on the potential success of infrastructure liberalization.

| 1 | | Interconnection charges should reflect cost causation and, as such, |
|-----|-------|---|
| 2 | | should be based on long run incremental costs (LRIC). |
| 3 | | • Interconnection charges should motivate incumbent efficiency. |
| 4 | | • Rather than handicapping incumbents, past monopoly-bred |
| 5 | | inefficiencies often greatly advantage these incumbents when |
| 6 | | competition with new entrants requiring interconnection begins. |
| 7 | | • Incumbents bring enormous structural advantages to competitive |
| 8 | | situations. |
| 9 | | • To develop effective competition, interconnection charges must be |
| 10 | | adjusted to motivate incumbent efficiency and counterbalance the |
| l 1 | | incumbent's considerable structural advantages. |
| 12 | | • Effective competition is largely dependent upon equal access to |
| 13 | | infrastructure by competing parties. This is most easily |
| 14 | | accomplished by organizationally separating the incumbent's |
| 15 | | infrastructure and service provision units. Where equal access does |
| 16 | | not exist, interconnection charges should be adjusted to achieve the |
| 17 | | same competitive effect (e.g., the AT&T ENFIA discount to MCI). |
| 18 | (empl | hasis added) |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | Q. | HAS IT ALSO BEEN BELLSOUTH'S POSITION THAT EMBEDDED COSTS |
| 21 | | ARE ACTUALLY INAPPROPRIATE FOR PRICING? |
| 22 | A. | Yes. BellSouth witness Frank Kolb further stated, at page 7 of his testimony in Georgia |
| 23 | | Docket No. 5258-U: |
| 24 | | FDC methodology is inappropriate for making business |
| 25 | | decisions in a competitive market for two major reasons. |

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

First, FDC does not reflect the true economic costs associated with the decision to provide a service for the following reasons:

- FDC does not reflect the current or prospective value of the capital investment used to provide the service.
- 2. FDC is misleading because ongoing costs (maintenance, administration and other operating expenses) are not fixed at their past levels, nor are the methods of production unchanging, as FDC methodology implies.

Second, the assignment of common and shared costs to a product is completely arbitrary. For example, there is no way to logically assign the cost of corporate headquarters to any particular product or service. If this assignment is arbitrarily made, and the resulting price is forced to exceed what would otherwise be a market price, then sales of the product decline. As a result total revenues decline, and the cost of corporate headquarters must be recovered from all other products and services. It is clear that such a result is unacceptable. In effect, the pricing philosophy which tests the market price against the direct incremental cost of a service will produce contributions consistent with market conditions, arbitrarily assigning costs to products and services will not. Said another way, the incremental cost/pricing

| 1 | | concept lets the market determine the extent to which |
|----|-------|--|
| 2 | | common and shared costs are covered by individual |
| 3 | | services. Indeed, this strategy will result in the most |
| 4 | | efficient prices and will provide the maximum |
| 5 | | contribution to universal service. It is imperative that we |
| 6 | | recognize that allocation of common costs to all services |
| 7 | | does not guarantee recovery of those common costs. |
| 8 | (emph | asis added) |
| 9 | | Although Mr. Varner has attempted to disassociate BellSouth from this statement |
| 10 | | in other proceedings by claiming that FDC and embedded costs are not necessarily |
| 11 | | the same, it is apparent from Mr. Kolb's statements (see underlined items) that he |
| 12 | | was talking about embedded FDC. |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | Q. | WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BELLSOUTH'S PRIOR STATEMENTS |
| 15 | | REGARDING EMBEDDED COSTS TO THIS PROCEEDING? |
| 16 | A. | Importantly, BellSouth has acknowledged in these prior statements that neither costs nor |
| 17 | | the methods of production that produce those costs are fixed at past levels. AT&T |
| 18 | | agrees. For example, an article in the June 17, 1997 Atlanta Journal/Constitution |
| 19 | | describes the significant year over year reductions that are occurring in BellSouth's work |
| 20 | | force, stating that "[j]ust this year, the company work force has been trimmed by about |
| 21 | | 5,200 jobs." Thus, whatever BellSouth calculates its prior "actual" expenses to be, that |
| 22 | | expense no longer exists, and "actual" expenses today will not exist in the future. |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | To therefore allow BellSouth to charge rates to reflect these prior "embedded" amounts |

would simply allow BellSouth to establish an artificially high price floor for competitor

prices, which the Company could use to engage in inefficient and/or anti-competitive pricing. For example, BellSouth could use this cost advantage as an offset to inefficient future operations costs, which would result in higher rates for all consumers. BellSouth could also drive additional costs from its business, in which case BellSouth could flow the extra profits to shareholders or use them to engage in anti-competitive pricing. In either case allowing BellSouth to create artificially high price floors through overcharges to its competitors results in higher rates for all Florida consumers.

A.

Q. CONTRARY TO PAST BELLSOUTH POLICY MR. VARNER NOW CITES VARIOUS REASONS WHY PRICES SHOULD NOT BE SET EQUAL TO ECONOMIC COSTS. CAN YOU COMMENT?

Yes. Mr. Varner, at one point in his direct testimony, attempts to justify BellSouth's "new" position by stating that pricing cannot be narrowed to an exact numerical exercise. However, Mr. Varner then contradicts his own testimony by recommending that the Commission adopt BellSouth's embedded rate proposals, indeed obtained through an "exact numerical exercise."

Mr. Varner also states that pricing based on economic costs is not appropriate because prices must be "functional" in the marketplace, sighting the existence of tariffs at rates that are "based on costs" but apparently different than the results of BellSouth's cost studies. Mr. Varner fails to explain how rates that are different than BellSouth's cost studies can be based on costs. Mr. Varner also fails to explain why it is necessary to resolve such conflicts by adopting the tariff rate instead of changing the tariff rate to reflect BellSouth's current estimate of costs.

| 1 | Q. | MR. VARNER ALSO SUGGESTS THAT PRICING AT ECONOMIC COST |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | WOULD DISCOURAGE BELLSOUTH FROM MAKING PRUDENT |
| 3 | | INVESTMENTS. DO YOU AGREE? |
| 4 | A. | No. I find it implausible that BellSouth would purposely choose to make imprudent |
| 5 | | investments in a competitive marketplace, for whatever reason. Mr. Varner attempts to |
| 6 | | support this implausible conclusion by misrepresenting the outcome of suitable forward- |
| 7 | | looking cost procedures, stating that BellSouth cannot recover its shared costs using |
| 8 | | TELRIC-based prices. In fact, shared costs are included in TELRIC cost calculations. |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | Q. | DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY? |
| 11 | A. | Yes. |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

Exhibit

Docket Nos.: 960833-TP/960847-TP/971140-TP/960757-TP/960916-TP

Wayne Ellison Rebuttal Exhibit WE-2

Adjustments to BST studies Page 1 of 7

| AT&T REVISED INPUTS TO TELRIC CALCUL | | | LOCATION WHERE VALUE WAS CHANGED | | T&TA |
|--------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--|------|---------|
| COST OF CAPITAL | BST | <u>AT&T</u> | MODEL | CELL | WITNESS |
| ASSUMPTIONS: | 0.4405 | 0.0043 | | F14 | CORNELL |
| Cost of Money | 0.1125 | 0.0943 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Cost of Money BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Debt Interest Rate | F8 | CORNELL |
| Debt Interest Rate | 0.0800 | 0.0706 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required inputs, Debt interest Rate | FO | CORNECL |
| DEPRECIATION-Account Lives | | | | | |
| BUILDINGS | 45.0 | 48.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 124 | MAJOROS |
| LAND | 98.0 | 98.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 125 | MAJOROS |
| OPERATOR SYSTEMS | 10.0 | 14.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 127 | MAJOROS |
| ANALOG ELEC. SWITCH | 4.2 | 4.2 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 129 | MAJOROS |
| DIGITAL ELEC. SWITCH | 10.0 | 17.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 130 | MAJOROS |
| DIGTL CIRC-DDS | 7.1 | 10.5 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 132 | MAJOROS |
| DIGTL CIRC-PAIR GAIN | 9.3 | 10.5 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 133 | MAJOROS |
| DIGTL CIRC-OTHER | 9.3 | 10.5 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 134 | MAJOROS |
| GEN PURPOSE COMP. OTHER | 5.0 | 7.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 136 | MAJOROS |
| G P COMP, DATA CONT & WRKSTA | 5.0 | 7.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 137 | MAJOROS |
| POLES | 34.0 | 35.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 139 | MAJOROS |
| AERIAL CA - METAL - BLDG ENTER | 14.0 | 18.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 140 | MAJOROS |
| AERIAL CA - METAL | 14.0 | 18.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 141 | MAJOROS |
| AERIAL CA - FIBER - BLDG ENTER | 20.0 | 25.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 142 | MAJOROS |
| AERIAL CA - FIBER | 20.0 | 25.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 143 | MAJOROS |
| BURIED CA - METAL | 14.0 | 18.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 144 | MAJOROS |
| BURIED CA - FIBER | 20.0 | 25.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 145 | MAJOROS |
| UNDERGROUND CA - METAL | 12.0 | 25.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 146 | MAJOROS |
| UNDERGROUND CA - FIBER | 20.0 | 25.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 147 | MAJOROS |
| SUBMARINE CA - METAL | 14.0 | 18.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 148 | MAJOROS |
| SUBMARINE CA - FIBER | 14.0 | 18.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 149 | MAJOROS |
| INTA BLDG NTWK CA - METAL | 21.0 | 20.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 150 | MAJOROS |
| INTA BLDG NTWK CA - FIBER | 21.0 | 20.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 151 | MAJOROS |
| CONDUIT SYSTEMS | 59.0 | 55.0 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Life (Years) | 153 | MAJOROS |

Exhibit_

Docket Nos.: 960833-TP/960847-TP/971140-TP/960757-TP/960916-TP

Wayne Ellison Rebuttal Exhibit WE-2
Adjustments to BST studies

Page 2 of 7

| DEPRECIATIONNet Salvage | BST | <u>T</u> &TA | LOCATION WHERE VALUE WAS CHANGED | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|--------------|---|------|---------|
| | | | MODEL | CELL | |
| BUILDINGS | 0.0300 | 0.04 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K24 | MAJOROS |
| LAND | 1.0000 | 1.00 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K25 | MAJOROS |
| OPERATOR SYSTEMS | 0.0000 | 0.00 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K27 | MAJOROS |
| ANALOG ELEC. SWITCH | 0.0000 | 0.00 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K29 | MAJOROS |
| DIGITAL ELEC. SWITCH | 0.0000 | 0.00 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K30 | MAJOROS |
| DIGTL CIRC-DDS | 0.0000 | 0.00 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K32 | MAJOROS |
| DIGTL CIRC-PAIR GAIN | 0.0000 | 0.00 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K33 | MAJOROS |
| DIGTL CIRC-OTHER | 0.0000 | 0.00 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K34 | MAJOROS |
| GEN PURPOSE COMP, OTHER | 0.0000 | 0.00 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K36 | MAJOROS |
| G P COMP, DATA CONT & WRKSTA | 0.0000 | 0.00 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K37 | MAJOROS |
| POLES | -0.6100 | -0.75 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Regulred Inputs, Net Salvage | K39 | MAJOROS |
| AERIAL CA - METAL - BLDG ENTER | -0.1400 | -0.11 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K40 | MAJOROS |
| AERIAL CA - METAL | -0.1400 | -0.11 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K41 | MAJOROS |
| AERIAL CA - FIBER - BLDG ENTER | -0.1500 | -0.11 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K42 | MAJOROS |
| AERIAL CA - FIBER | -0.1500 | -0.11 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K43 | MAJOROS |
| BURIED CA - METAL | -0.0900 | -0.06 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K44 | MAJOROS |
| BURIED CA - FIBER | -0.0600 | -0.08 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K45 | MAJOROS |
| UNDERGROUND CA - METAL | -0.1700 | -0.07 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K46 | MAJOROS |
| UNDERGROUND CA - FIBER | -0.1500 | -0.06 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K47 | MAJOROS |
| SUBMARINE CA - METAL | -0.0500 | -0.05 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K48 | MAJOROS |
| SUBMARINE CA - FIBER | -0.0500 | -0.05 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K49 | MAJOROS |
| INTA BLDG NTWK CA - METAL | -0.1300 | -0.12 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K50 | MAJOROS |
| INTA BLDG NTWK CA - FIBER | -0.1300 | -0.12 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K51 | MAJOROS |
| CONDUIT SYSTEMS | -0.0800 | -0.07 | BellSouth Capital Cost Calculator, Required Inputs, Net Salvage | K53 | MAJOROS |
| | | | | | MAJOROS |

CAPITAL COST FACTORS WHICH CANNOT BE CHANGED INSIDE CAPITAL COST CALCULATOR

| | BST | T&TA | | LOCATION WHERE VALUE WAS CHANGED | | |
|-----------------|-------|-------|----------------------|----------------------------------|------|-------------------|
| | | | PATH | FILE | CELL | CORNELL & MAJOROS |
| MOTOR VEHICLES | 23.33 | 22.38 | Bistric.fl\Shrdcomn\ | S&cmod.xiw | L279 | CORNELL & MAJOROS |
| SPC PURPOSE VEH | 24.61 | 22.75 | Bistric.fi\Shrdcomn\ | S&cmod.xlw | L281 | CORNELL & MAJOROS |
| GARAGE WORK EQ | 18.86 | 16.90 | Bistric.fl\Shrdcomn\ | S&cmod.xlw | L282 | CORNELL & MAJOROS |
| OTHER WORK EQUI | 17.07 | 15.43 | Bistric.ff\Shrdcomn\ | S&cmod.xlw | L283 | CORNELL & MAJOROS |
| FURNITURE | 18.08 | 18.17 | Bistric.fl\Shrdcomn\ | S&cmod.xlw | L285 | CORNELL & MAJOROS |
| OFC SUPPORT EQU | 19.59 | 18.44 | Bistric.fl\Shrdcomn\ | S&crnod.xlw | L286 | CORNELL & MAJOROS |
| CORP COMM EQUIP | 25.26 | 23.39 | Bistric.fl\Shrdcomn\ | S&cmod.xlw | L287 | CORNELL & MAJOROS |
| COMPUTERS | 30.50 | 26.76 | Blstric.fl\Shrdcomn\ | S&cmod.xlw | L288 | CORNELL & MAJOROS |

Exhibit_

Docket Nos.: 960833-TP/960847-TP/971140-TP/960757-TP/960916-TP

Wayne Elitison Rebuttat Exhibit WE-2

Adjustments to BST studies

Page 3 of 7

AT&T REVISED INPUTS TO TELRIC CALCULATIONS - FLORIDA PLANT SPECIFIC ANNUAL COST FACTORS

| | BST | T&TA | LOCATION WHERE VALUE WAS CHANGED |
|---------------|--------|--------|---|
| PLANT ACCOUNT | | | |
| 10C | 0.0053 | 0.005 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 377C | 0.0400 | 0.0356 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 377CP | 0.0376 | 0.0335 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 157C | 0.0281 | 0.0257 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 257C | 0.0169 | 0.0154 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 357C | 0.0227 | 0.0207 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 1C | 0.0179 | 0.0160 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 1CP | 0.0053 | 0.0160 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 12C | 0.0558 | 0.0508 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 22C | 0.0558 | 0.0508 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 812C | 0.0029 | 0.0026 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 822C | 0.0029 | 0.0026 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 5C | 0.0196 | 0.0179 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 85C | 0.0032 | 0.0029 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 45C | 0.0061 | 0.0315 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 845C | 0.0039 | 0.0035 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 6C | 0.0061 | 0.0056 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 86C | 0.0012 | 0.0056 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 52C | 0.0023 | 0.0020 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 852C | 0.0023 | 0.0069 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 4C | 0.0033 | 0.0030 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 4CP | 0.0034 | 0.0030 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 530C | 0.0614 | 0.0732 | Telric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |
| 630C | 0.0614 | 0.0732 | Teiric Calculator, Factors, Annual Cost Factors tab |

Exhibit

Docket Nos.: 960833-TP/960847-TP/971140-TP/960757-TP/960916-TP

Wayne Ellison Rebuttal Exhibit WE-2 Adjustments to BST studies

Page 4 of 7

AT&T REVISED INPUTS TO TELRIC CALCULATIONS - FLORIDA

| SHARED COST FA | CTORS | | LOCA' | TION WHERE VA | LUE WAS CHANGED | |
|----------------|----------|--------|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| ACCOUNT | BST | AT&T | PATH | FILE | WORKSHEET | CELL |
| 2121 | 0.15496 | 0.1290 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H192 |
| 2211 | 0.344941 | 0.3263 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H211 |
| 2212 | 0.203937 | 0.1505 | Bistric.ff\Teiric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H212 |
| 2220 | 0.203937 | 0.1848 | Bistric.f/\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H214 |
| 2231 | 0.197756 | 0.2244 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H215 |
| 2232 | 0.244021 | 0.1802 | Blatric.ff\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H216 |
| 2232 | 0.211104 | 0.1802 | Blatric.fi\Telric\Shrdoomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H217 |
| 2232 | 0.211104 | 0.1802 | Blatric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H218 |
| 2232 | 0.245529 | 0.2271 | Bistric.fi\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H219 |
| 2232 | 0.2455 | 0.2271 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H220 |
| 2342 | 0.2810 | 0.2865 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H221 |
| 2362 | 0.268097 | 0.2339 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H222 |
| 2411 | 0.146416 | 0.1422 | Bistric.fi\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H224 |
| 2421 | 0.173911 | 0.1422 | Blatric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | \$&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H225 |
| 2421 | 0.159331 | 0.1324 | Bistric.fl\Teirlc\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H226 |
| 2422 | 0.182244 | 0.1331 | Bistric.fl\Teiric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H227 |
| 2422 | 0.159331 | 0.1332 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H228 |
| 2423 | 0.175525 | 0.1429 | Bistric.fi\Teiric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H229 |
| 2423 | 0.161364 | 0.1343 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xtw | Summary-Shared Factor | H230 |
| 2424 | 0.176816 | 0.1437 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H231 |
| 2424 | 0.176816 | 0.1437 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H232 |
| 2426 | 0.158511 | 0.1381 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H233 |
| 2426 | 0.158511 | 0.1381 | Blatric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H234 |
| 2441 | 0.155374 | 0.1284 | Bistric.fi\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Summary-Shared Factor | H235 |
| SHARED LABOR F | ACTORS | | LOCAT | TON WHERE VA | LUE WAS CHANGED | |
| | BST | T&TA | PATH | FILE | WORKSHEET | CELLS |
| | various | 0 | Bistric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Shared Labor Factors | E3 through E43 |
| COMMON COST FA | ACTOR | | LOCAT | TION WHERE VA | LUE WAS CHANGED | |
| | BST | AT&T | PATH | FILE | WORKSHEET | CELL |
| | 5.39% | 4.70% | Blstric.fl\Telric\Shrdcomn\FL\ | S&cmod.xlw | Common Cost Factor | Ð14 |

Exhibit_

Docket Nos.: 960833-TP/960847-TP/971140-TP/960757-TP/960916-TP

Wayne Ellison Rebuttal Exhibit WE-2

Adjustments to BST studies

Page 5 of 7

AT&T REVISED INPUTS TO TELRIC CALCULATIONS - FLORIDA Changes to Recurring Additives
Switch Feature Right to Use Fee

| | BST | AT&T | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | Recurring | Recurring | | | |
| | Volume | Volume | LOCATION WHERE VAL | UE WAS CHANGED | |
| Cost | Insensitive | insensitive | | | |
| Element # | \$ Amount | \$ Amount | MODEL | VIEW | TAB |
| B.2.1-B2.37 | VARIES | \$0.0000 | Telric Calculator | Investments | Recurring Additives |
| B2.37 | | | | | _ |

Changes to Vertical Feature Investments

| Cost Element # B.2.1 - | Investment \$ | Investment \$ | MODEL | VIEW | TAB | |
|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|
| B.2.40 | various | 0 | Teiric Calculator | Investments | Investments | |
| SWITCHING | G INVESTMENT | BST | <u>AT&T</u> | PATH | <u>FILE</u> | TABLE CELL |
| MDF and N | TS | \$ 57.37 | \$47.03 | Bistuc,ff\Teiric | 4wa.xis | nvestments E15 |

Docket Nos.: 960833-TP/960847-TP/971140-TP/960757-TP/960916-TP
Wayne Elilson Rebuttal Exhibit WE-2
Adjustments to BST studies

Page 6 of 7

AT&T REVISED INPUTS TO TELRIC CALCULATIONS - FLORIDA

| | | | LOCATION | WHERE VALU | E WAS CHANGED |) |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|------|
| DROP WIRE/NID INPUTS | BST | <u>T&TA</u> | PATH | FILE | WORKSHEET | CELL |
| DROP MAT. (BURIED, 2-PR., RES) | | \$ 9.08 100 FT@\$0.0908 | Bistric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | | |
| DROP MAT. (AERIAL, 2-PR., RES&BUS) | \$ 16.45 | \$ 6.58 100 FT@\$0.0658 | Blstric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | Inputs | J14 |
| DROP MAT. (BURIED, 5-PR., BUS) | \$ 27.08 | \$ 13.54 100 FT@\$0.1354 | Bistric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | Inputs | J15 |
| CONTRACTOR LABOR (0-500FT) BURIED | \$ 73.57 | \$ 73.57 | Bistric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | Inputs | J21 |
| TELCO LABOR-TRAVEL | 0.3667 hours | 0.2500 hours | Bistric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | Inputs | J22 |
| TELCO LABOR -INSTALL NID | 0.75 hours | 0.4167 hours | Bistric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | Inputs | J23 |
| TELCO LABOR-AERIAL INSTALL&TERM D | 0.9167 hours | 0.6667 hours | Bistric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | Inputs | J24 |
| TELCO LABOR-BURIED INSTALL&TERM D | 0.6667 hours | 0.3333 hours | Bistric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | Inputs | J25 |
| %INVESTMENT AERIAL | 32% | 35% | Bistric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | Inputs | J29 |
| %INVESTMENT BURIED | 68% | 65% | Bistric.FL\Loop | Drop.xls | inputs | J30 |

ASSUMPTIONS/NOTES:

- BST: MATERIAL PRICES FOR DROP, NID, AND EXEMPT ARE FROM BST APPARATUS EQUIPMENT AND TOOLS PRODUCT CATALOG, DECEMBER 1996
- AT&T: MATERIAL PRICES FOR NID, AND EXEMPT ARE FROM BST APPARATUS EQUIPMENT AND TOOLS PRODUCT CATALOG, DROP FROM COPPER CABLE TABLE.
- BST: TRAVEL TIME REPRESENTS AN AVERAGE SITUATION CONSIDERING DISPATCH POINT TO FIRST CUSTOMER, CUSTOMER TO CUSTOMER, AND BACK TO DISPATCH
- AT&T: TRAVEL TIME REPRESENTS A CREW INSTALLING DROPS THROUGHOUT A NEIGHBORHOOD.
- BST: DROP WIRE MATERIAL IS BASED ON A ESTIMATE OF AVERAGE DISTANCE OF 300FT BURIED AND 250 FT AERIAL
- AT&T: DROP WIRE MATERIAL IS BASED ON A ESTIMATE OF AVERAGE DISTANCE OF 100FT BURIED AND 100 FT AERIAL
- BST: RESIDENCE AND BUSINESS INSTALLATION INFORMATION IS THE SAME
- AT&T: PERCENTAGES OF AERIAL AND BURIED DROPS BASED ON THE FRC OF THE LAST CABLE SEGMENT BEFORE THE TERMINAL IN THE LOOP SAMPLE, THEN MODIFIED.

Exhibit

Docket Nos.: 960833-TP/960847-TP/971140-TP/960757-TP/960916-TP

Wayne Ellison Rebuttal Exhibit WE-2

Adjustments to BST studies

Page 7 of 7

AT&T REVISED INPUT TO TELRIC CALCULATIONS - FLORIDA OTHER CHANGES:

| OTHER CHANGES: | | | LOCA | ATION WHERE VAL | UE WAS CHANGED | T&TA |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| UTILIZATION-COPPER FEEDER UTILIZATION-DISTRIBUTION | <u>B\$T</u> 65.7% 38.8% | AT&T 80.0% 62.5% | PATH Bistric.FL\Loop Bistric.FL\Loop | FiLE(s) loop.mdb loop.mdb | TABLE/WORKSHEET Uill Util | WITNESS Wells Wells |
| CONDUIT LOADING FACTOR | 0.911 | 0.25 | | | | Wells |

NON-RECURRING WORK TIMES:

See Rubuttal Testimony of John Lynott

| _ | | BCDE F | G | Н | | J | K | | T - 4 | |
|----|------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|-------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | 8ST Rate Element | Element or Capability | BST TSLRIC uncorrected | BST TSLRIC w/ revised depr., cost of money, shared & common factors, invest. & hours | BST TELRIC (TSLRIC plus shared & common and other methodology changes) uncorrected | BST TELRIC W/ revised depr., cost of money, shared & common factors, invest. & hours | Hatfield, NRC or Collocation Model result | BST proposed rate | AT&T proposed rate | Note |
| 4 | | Network Interface Device (NID) | , L | | | | | 1 | | |
| 1 | A.2.6 | Per 2-Wire, ISDN, ADSL, HDSL loop, monthly | \$1.18 | \$0.53 | \$1.42 | \$0.62 | | | · | |
| | A.2.6 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | - 40.02 | · · | \$1.42 | \$0.62 | |
| 1 | A.2.6 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$5.60 | \$5.72 | (4) |
| | A.2.6 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$34.46 | \$34.46 | \$46.99 | \$36.08 | | \$2.92 | \$2.64 | (4) |
| 4 | A.2.6 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$10.68 | \$10.68 | \$14.57 | \$11.19 | | \$46.99 | \$36.08 | T |
| 4 | | 2-Wire/4-Wire ALEC NID | | | | | | \$14.57 | \$11,19 | |
| Ц. | A.2.12 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | DO Study provided | | | | | _1 |
| | A.2.12 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$116.98 | \$50.42 | |
| 1 | A.2.12 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$118.61 | \$48.16 | no study provided | | | \$72.78 | \$28.29 | 1 (1) |
| 2] | A.2.12 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$65.84 | | \$158.37 | \$50.42 | | \$158.37 | See Note 2 | (1) (2) |
| រា | · | Cross Connect Between NIDs, 2-Wire or 4-Wire | 403,64 | \$27.02 | \$84.43 | \$28.29 | | \$84.43 | See Note 2 | |
| 1 | A.2.13 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | | | | | | | | (1) (2) |
| 1 | A.2.13 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$10.23 | \$1.78 | |
| ₫. | A.2.13 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | no study provided | , | no study provided | | ~ <u>~</u> | \$10.23 | \$1.78 | (1) |
| 1 | A.2.13 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$7.23 | \$1.70 | \$10.23 | \$1.78 | | \$10.23 | | (1) |
| ┪╴ | | THAC - Additioned Manifest Order - Installation | \$7.23 | \$1.70 | \$10.23 | \$1,78 | | \$10.23 | \$1.78 | (1) |
| ı | | Sub-Loop Unbundled Elements | | | | | | 910.23 | \$1.78 | (1) |
| 1 | A.2.2 | Distribution, per 2-wire VG loop, including NID, statewide average | | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| 1 | · ^: | Wire Center Group 1, < 2000 loops | \$7.96 | \$4.45 | \$10.10 | \$5.78 | \$6.98 | \$12.36 | —————————————————————————————————————— | ┷ |
| 1 | | Wire Center Group 2, 2000 < 4000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$19.13 | no proposal | \$6.98 | |
| † | | Wine Center Group 2, 2000 < 4000 toops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$14.85 | | \$19.13 | <u> </u> |
| ╂ | | Wire Center Group 3, 4000 < 8,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$11,11 | no proposal | \$14.85 | |
| ╀ | | Wire Center Group 4, 8,000 < 20,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$10.99 | no proposal | \$11.11 | |
| | | Wire Center Group 5, 20,000 < 40,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$7.42 | no proposal | \$10.99 | |
| +- | | Wire Center Group 6, > 40,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$6.65 | no proposal | \$7.42 | |
| | A.2.2 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | \$6.65 | |
| ╀ | None | NRC - First Electronic Order - Migration | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$16.04 | \$397.93 | \$16.04 | 1 |
| 1_ | None | NRC - First Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided | · | no study provided | ··-· | | no proposal | \$16.22 | † - |
| ١ | A.2.2 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$15.29 | \$0.00 | \$15.29 | |
| 1 | None | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Migration | no study provided | | | | \$16.04 | \$296.11 | \$16.04 | |
| | None | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | \$16.22 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|] | A.2.2 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$309.96 | \$48,44 | no study provided | | \$15.29 | \$0.00 | \$15,29 | |
| Г | A.2.2 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$216.64 | | \$439.32 | \$50.72 | | \$439.32 | See Note 2 | (1)(2) |
| T | A.2.11 | Distribution, per 4-Wire VG analog loop, including NID | \$10.81 | \$8.26 | \$307.75 | \$8.65 | | \$307.75 | See Note 2 | |
| 1 | | Wire Center Group 1, < 2000 loops | | \$5.96 | \$13.55 | \$7.55 | \$13.60 | \$16.58 | \$13,60 | (1) (2) |
| 1 | | Wire Center Group 2, 2000 < 4000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$37.89 | no proposal | \$37.89 | |
| - | | Wire Center Group 3, 4000 < 8,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | | |
| - | | Wire Center Group 4, 8,000 < 20,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | \$29.35 | |
| ╅ | | | no study provided | | no study provided | | | | \$21.88 | |
| H | | Wire Center Group 5, 20,000 < 40,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | \$21.61 | |
| H | 4 2 44 | Wire Center Group 6, > 40,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | \$14.48 | |
| - | A.2.11 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$43.87 | no proposal | \$12.95 | |
| | None | NRC - First Electronic Order - Migration | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$456.51 | \$43.87 | |
| L | None | NRC - First Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$53.51 r | no proposei | \$53.51 | |
| L | A.2.11 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$31.60 | \$0.00 | \$31.60 | |
| | None | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Migration | no study provided | | | | \$43.87 | \$355.18 | \$43.87 | |
| ١. | None | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided | | no study provided no study provided | | | o proposal | \$53.51 | |
| | A.2.11 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$350.75 | \$65.20 | | | \$31.60 | \$0.00 | \$31.60 | |
| 1 | A.2.11 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$257.89 | \$14.85 | \$497.75 | \$68.26 | I | \$497.75 | See Note 2 | (1) (2) |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 7207.00 | #14.00 | \$366.83 | \$15.54 | | \$366.83 | See Note 2 | 11/4/ |

| | | | | H | | | K | <u> </u> | M | |
|---|----------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|------------|----------------|
| | | | | | BST | İ | İ | | | |
| | | | i | BST TSLRIC | TELRIC | | | • | | |
| | | | | | (TSLRIC plus | BST TELRIC | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | 1 | w/ revised depr., | shared & common | w/ revised depr., | | | 1 | i |
| | BST | | 207 | cost of money, | and other | cost of money, | Hatfield, NRC | | | |
| | Rate | | BST | shared & common | methodology | shared & common | or Collocation | BST | AT&T | |
| | Element | Element or Capability | TSLRIC | factors, invest. & | changes) | factors, invest. & | Model | proposed | proposed | |
| | | Element of Capability | uncorrected | hours | uncorrected | hours | result | rate | rate | |
| | | Loop, including NID | | ì | | | | , | 186 | $-\vdash$ |
| | A 6.1 | 2- Wire Asymmetrical Digital Subscriber Line (ADSL), statewide average | \$15,33 | \$8.24 | | | | İ | | - { |
| | | Wire Center Group 1, < 2000 loops | no study provided | ₩0.24 | \$18.62 | \$10.24 | \$9.16 | \$22.79 | \$9.16 | ···- |
| | | Wire Center Group 2, 2000 < 4000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$32.42 | no proposal | \$32.42 | |
| | _ | Wire Center Group 3, 4000 < 8,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$23.23 | no proposal | \$23,23 | 1 |
| | | Wire Center Group 4, 8,000 < 20,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$15.74 | no proposal | \$15.74 | } - |
| | | Wire Center Group 5, 20,000 < 40,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$13.81 | no proposal | \$13.81 | |
| | ~ | Wire Center Group 6, > 40,000 loops | | | no study provided | | \$9.43 | no proposal | \$9.43 | -+ |
| | A.6.1 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$8.42 | no proposal | \$8.42 | - $+$ $-$ |
| | None | NRC - First Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$621.78 | \$13.00 | |
| | A.6.1 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | | | no study provided | | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | |
| | None | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$522.77 | \$8.83 | +- |
| | A.6.1 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | no study provided \$466.31 | | no study provided | | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | |
| | A.6.1 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$375.14 | \$12.42 | \$663 ,17 | \$13.00 | | \$663.17 | See Note 2 | |
| | A.7,1 | 2-Wire High Bit Rate Digital Subscriber Line (HDSL), statewide average | | \$8,43 | \$534.42 | \$8.83 | | \$534.42 | See Note 2 | |
| | | Wire Center Group 1, < 2000 loops | \$11.52 | \$6.49 | \$14.20 | \$8.18 | \$6.90 | \$17.38 | \$6.90 | |
| | · | Wire Center Group 2, 2000 < 4000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$24.42 | no proposal | \$24.42 | |
| | | Wire Center Group 3, 4000 < 8,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$17.50 | no proposal | | |
| | | Wire Center Group 4, 8,000 < 20,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$11.86 | no proposal | \$17.50 | |
| | | Wire Center Group 5, 20,000 < 40,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$10.41 | no proposal | \$11.86 | |
| | | Wife Center Cours 5 - 40 0001 | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$7.11 | no proposal | \$10,41 | |
| | A.7.1 | Wire Center Group 6, > 40,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | \$6.34 | | \$7,11 | . 1 |
| | None | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | \$6.34 | _1 |
| _ | A.7.1 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$621.78 | \$13.00 | |
| _ | None | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | ~ | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | |
| | ** *** | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$522.77 | \$8.83 | |
| | A.7,1 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$466.31 | \$12.42 | \$663,17 | \$13.00 | · | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | |
| | A.7.1 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$375.14 | \$8.43 | \$534,42 | | <u>-</u> | \$663.17 | See Note 2 | (|
| | A.8.1 | 4-Wire High Bit Rate Digital Subscriber Line (HDSL), statewide average | \$17.86 | \$9.77 | \$21.66 | \$8.83 | | \$534.42 | See Note 2 | (1 |
| | | Wire Center Group 1, < 2000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | \$12.05 | \$13.45 | \$26.51 | \$13.45 | 1 |
| | | Wire Center Group 2, 2000 < 4000 loops | no study provided | | | | | no proposal | \$47.57 | + |
| | | Wire Center Group 3, 4000 < 8,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | \$34.09 | + |
| | | Wire Center Group 4, 8,000 < 20,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$23.10 | no proposal | \$23.10 | + |
| | | Wire Center Group 5, 20,000 < 40,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | \$20.27 | † |
| | | Wire Center Group 6, > 40,000 loops | no study provided | | no study provided | | | no proposal | \$13.84 | +- |
| | A.B.1 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$12.35 | no proposal | \$12.35 | + |
| | None | NRC - First Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$647.99 | \$27,21 | , |
| | A.8.1 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | | | no study provided | | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | (|
| | None | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Disconnect | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$549.46 | \$19.25 | |
| | A.8.1 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | no study provided \$484.93 | | no study provided | | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | |
| | A.8.1 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | | \$25.98 | \$689.23 | \$27.21 | | \$689.23 | See Note 2 | (4) |
| | | | \$394.20 | \$18.38 | \$561.11 | \$19.25 | | \$561.11 | See Note 2 | (1) |
| | | Local Switching, Monthly | | 1 | | | | | 300 HULE 2 | (1) |
| | B.1.2 B.1.2 | 4-Wire Voice Grade | \$8.68 | \$7.15 | \$10.11 | \$8.46 | | | | 1 |
| | | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | ·· | no study provided | 40.40 | | \$11.16 | \$8.46 | (1) |
| | B.1.2 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$29.24 | \$1.09 | (1 |
| | B.1.2 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$51.02 | \$1.04 | \$69.24 | 24.00 | | \$28.48 | \$0.64 | (1 |
| | B.1.2 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$29.63 | \$0.61 | \$40.08 | \$1.09 | | \$69.24 | See Note 2 | (1) |
| | | | | 40.01 | \$40.00 | \$0.64 | | \$40.08 | See Note 2 | (1) |
| | | Local Switching, Features | | | | | 1" | | | |

| | BQDE F | G | H | i | J | K | Ļ | M | N N |
|---------|--|--------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------|
| BST | | BST TSLRIC | BST TSLRIC w/ revised depr., cost of money, shared & common factors, invest. & | BST TELRIC (TSLRIC plus shared & common and other methodology changes) | BST TELRIC w/ ravised depr. cost of money, shared & common factors, invest. & | Hatfield, NRC or Collocation Model | BST proposed | AT&T proposed | |
| Rate | | 1 | hours | uncorrected | hours | result | rate | rate | Notes |
| Element | Element or Capability | uncorrected | \$0.00 | \$1.37 | \$0.00 | 1000 | \$1,37 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.1 | Three- way calling | \$1.16 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | ··i | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.1 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$0.1072 | \$0.00 | | \$0.1072 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.2 | Customer Changeable Speed Calling | \$0.0934 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.2 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 \$0.0349 | \$0.00 | \$0.0382 | \$0.00 | ···· | \$0.0382 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.3 | Call Waiting | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.3 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$0.0611 | \$0.00 | \$0.0680 | \$0.00 | | \$0,0680 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.4 | Remote Activation of Call Forwarding | | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.4 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$0.0102 | \$0.00 | t | \$0.0102 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.5 | Cancel Call Waiting | \$0.0068 | \$0.00 | \$1,55 | \$0.00 | - | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.5 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 \$0.8967 | \$0.00 | \$1.06 | \$0.00 | t | \$1.06 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.6 | Automatic Caliback | | \$0.00 | \$1,55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.6 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 \$0.3060 | \$0.00 | \$0.3570 | \$0.00 | <u> </u> | \$0.3570 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.7 | Automatic Recall | | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | · | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.7 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$0,2362 | \$0.00 | · | \$0,2362 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| 8.2.8 | Calling Number Delivery | \$0.2037 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| 8.2.8 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$0,2593 | \$0.00 | | \$0.2593 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.9 | Calling Number Delivery Blocking | \$0.2444 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.9 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$0.1541 | \$0.00 | † · - · | \$0.1541 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.10 | Customer Originated Trace | \$0,1320 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.10 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$0.1768 | \$0.00 | + - | \$0,1768 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.11 | Selective Call Rejection | \$0.1502 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.11 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | | \$0.0823 | \$0.00 | ļ | \$0.0623 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| 8.2.12 | Selective Call Forwarding | \$0.0552 | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.12 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 \$0.3742 | \$0.00 | · - · · · · · · · · | \$0.3742 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.13 | Selective Call Acceptance | \$0.3185 | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | ···· | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.13 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 \$0.1396 | \$0.00 | | \$0.1396 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.15 | Multiline Hunt Service (Rotary) | \$0.1208 | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.15 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0551 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.16 | Call Forwarding Variable | \$0.0492 | \$0.00 | \$0.0551 | \$0.00 | | \$1,55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.16 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0312 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.17 | Call Forwarding Busy Line | \$0.0290 | \$0.00 | \$0.0312 | \$0.00 | - | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| 8.2.17 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | | | \$0,0375 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.18 | Call Forwarding Don't Answer All Calls | \$0.0343 | \$0.00 | \$0.0375 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.18 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.53 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.19 | Remote Call Forwarding | \$1.34 | \$0.00 | \$1,53 | \$0.00 | · | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.19 | | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | <u> </u> | | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.20 | Call Transfer | \$0.1244 | \$0.00 | \$0,1438 | \$0.00 | | \$0.1438 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.20 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | ļ | \$1.55 | | (3) |
| B.2.21 | Call Hold | \$0.0272 | \$0.00 | \$0.0303 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0303 | \$0.00 | |
| 8.2.21 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1,55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| 8.2.22 | Toll Restricted Service | \$0.0406 | \$0.00 | \$0.0449 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0449 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.22 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| | | \$0.0296 | \$0.00 | \$0,0346 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0346 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.23 | | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.23 | | \$1.03 | \$0.00 | \$1.21 | \$0.00 | | \$1.21 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| 8.2.24 | | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | 1 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.24 | | \$0.4512 | \$0.00 | \$0.5320 | \$0.00 | | \$0.5320 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.25 | | \$1,19 | \$0.00 | \$1.50 | \$0.00 | | \$1.50 | \$0.00 | (3) |
| B.2.25 | NRC- Electronic Order | | | | | | \$0,1001 | \$0.00 | (3) |

| | a CDE F | G | H | | J | K | | | |
|-------------|--|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| | | | | BST TELRIC | | | | <u> </u> | |
| | | | BST TSLRIC | (TSLRIC plus | BST TELRIC | | | 1 | |
| | | | w/ revised depr., | shared & common | w/ revised depr., | | İ | | |
| DOT | | | cost of money, | and other | cost of money, | Hatfield, NRC | | | |
| BST | | BST | shared & common | methodology | shared & common | | BST | | |
| Rate | | TSLRIC | factors, invest. & | changes) | factors, invest, & | Model | | AT&T | |
| Element | Element or Capability | uncorrected | hours | uncorrected | hours | | proposed | proposed | |
| B.2.26 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.19 | \$0.00 | \$1.50 | \$0.00 | result | rate | rate | N |
| B.2.27 | ISDN Bridged Call Exclusion | \$0.0012 | \$0.00 | \$0.0014 | \$0.00 | | \$1.50 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.27 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.19 | \$0.00 | \$1.50 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0014 | \$0.00 | |
| 8.2.28 | Call by Call Access | \$37,19 | \$0.00 | \$43.86 | \$0.00 | | \$1.50 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.28 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$26.62 | \$0.00 | \$34.06 | | | \$43.86 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.29 | Privacy Release | \$0.0054 | \$0.00 | \$0,0060 | \$0.00 | | \$34.06 | \$0.00 | |
| 8.2.29 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | | \$0.0060 | \$0.00 | _ : |
| B.2.30 | Multi Appearance Directory Number Calls | \$0,1505 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.30 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$0.1771 | \$0.00 | | \$0.1771 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.31 | Make Set Busy | \$0.0030 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.31 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.030 | \$0.00 | \$0.0031 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0031 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.32 | Teen Service (Res. Dist. Alerting Service) | \$0.1421 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | |
| 8.2.32 | NRC- Electronic Order | | \$0.00 | \$0.1543 | \$0.00 | | \$0.1543 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.33 | Code Restriction and Diversion | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.33 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$0.0416 | \$0.00 | \$0.0461 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0461 | \$0.00 | 4 |
| B.2.34 | Call Park | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.34 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$0.0421 | \$0.00 | \$0.0467 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0467 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.35 | Automatic Line | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | 1 |
| B.2.35 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$0.0937 | \$0.00 | \$0.1010 | \$0.00 | | \$0.1010 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.36 | ISDN Message Waiting Indication-Lamp | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | - | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.36 | | \$0.0114 | \$0.00 | \$0.0134 | \$0.00 | | \$0.0134 | | 1 0 |
| | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.19 | \$0.00 | \$1.50 | \$0.00 | | \$1.50 | \$0.00 | |
| B.2.37 | ISDN Feature Function Buttons | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | (|
| B.2.37 | NRC- Electronic Order | \$1.22 | \$0.00 | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | | | \$0.00 | (; |
| | Exchange Port with All Available Features Included | | | | | | \$1.55 | \$0.00 | (3 |
| None | 4-Wire Analog | \$14.0157 | <u>-</u> | | | | 247.00 | · | |
| None | NRC First- Electronic Order | \$50.96 | | | | | \$17.38 | \$8.46 | (3 |
| None | NRC Additional- Electronic Order | \$50.36 | * | - | | | \$66.44 | \$1.09 | (3 |
| None | NRC First- Manual Order | \$80.30 | | | | | \$65.63 | \$0.64 | (3 |
| None | NRC Additional- Manual Order | \$58.91 | | | | | \$106.44 | See Note 2 | (3 |
| | | | | | | | \$77.28 | See Note 2 | (3 |
| | Operator Services and Directory Assistance | | | | | | | | 1 - " |
| | DA Transport | | | | | | | | |
| G.6.1 | DS1 Local Channel, per Month | \$40.47 | \$34.60 | \$46.63 | | | | | † · · · · · |
| G 6.1 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | ₩J-1,0U | | \$40.44 | | \$46.63 | \$40.44 | |
| G.6.1 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$552.61 | \$48.82 | (1) |
| G.6.1 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$455.02 | 0.40.00 | no study provided | T | | \$477.88 | \$41.28 | (1) |
| G.6.1 | NRC - Additional Manuel Order - Installation | | \$46.63 | \$638.37 | \$48.82 | | \$638.37 | See Note 2 | |
| | DS1 Interoffice Transport | \$338.57 | \$39.43 | \$477.88 | \$41.28 | | \$477.88 | See Note 2 | (1) (|
| G.6.3 | Fixed | | | T | | | - | 200 HUG Z | (1) (|
| G.6.2 | Per Mile | \$93.51 | \$81.06 | \$107.04 | \$94.20 | | \$107.04 | \$94.20 | L |
| G.6.3 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | \$0.5456 | \$0.3882 | \$0.6322 | 80.4577 | | \$0.6322 | \$0.4577 | |
| G.6.3 | | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$11.20 | \$225.46 | | |
| G.6.3 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | \$170.53 | \$11.20 | (1) |
| | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$194,48 | \$17.45 | \$261.84 | \$18.27 | | \$261.84 | \$11.20 | (1) |
| G 6.3 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$155.24 | \$0.21 | \$206.91 | \$0.22 | — - - | | See Note 2 | (1) (2 |
| | DA Trpt., NRC per trunk or signaling connection | | | | | | \$206.91 | See Note 2 | (1) (2 |
| G.6.8 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | | | |
| G.6.8 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | | o proposal | \$150.62 | |
| G.6.B | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$327.56 | \$143.86 | \$416.43 | 8450.00 | | o proposal | \$16.41 | |
| G.6.8 | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$8.39 | \$15.68 | | \$150,62 | | \$416.43 | See Note 2 | (1) (2 |
| | | | 212 05 | \$11.26 | \$16.41 | .1 | \$11.26 | See Note 2 | 11/2 |

Docket Nos.: 960833-TP/960847-TP/971140-TP

Wayne Ellison Rebuttel Exhibit WE-1

AT&T Price Proposal Page 5 of 8

| 1 | | BCDE F | G | H | | J | К | L | M | 1 |
|---|------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|---|---|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| | BST Rate Element | Element or Capability | 8ST TSLRIC uncorrected | BST TSLRIC w/ revised depr., cost of money, shared & common factors, invest. & hours | BST TELRIC (TSLRIC plus shared & common and other methodology changes) uncorrected | BST TELRIC w/ revised depr., cost of money, shared & common factors, invest. & hours | Hatfield, NRC or Collocation Model result | BST proposed rate | AT&T proposed rate | No |
| _ | | Unbundled Transport and Local Interoffice Transport | | | | | İ | | | |
| ŀ | D.42 | Interoffice transport - dedicated - DS1 facility termination | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | ļ |
| | D.4.2 | NRC - First Electronic Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | · | \$11,20 | \$225.46 | | |
| l | D.4.2 | NRC - Additional Electronic Order - Installation NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | no study provided | | no study provided | | \$11.20 | \$170.53 | \$11.20 \$11.20 | 4 . |
| | D.4.2 | NRC - First Manual Order - Installation | \$194.48 | \$17.45 | \$261.84 | \$18.27 | | \$261.84 | | ļ |
| | <u>U.4.2</u> | NRC - Additional Manual Order - Installation | \$155.24 | \$0.21 | \$206.91 | \$0.22 | | \$206,91 | See Note 2 | (1 |
| | | Physical Collocation (BellSouth Proposal) | | | | 40.22 | | 4200.91 | See Note 2 | (1) |
| ٠ | H.1.1 | Application Fee | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | H.1.2 | Space Preparation Fee | \$5,187.00 | \$5,101.00 | \$7,203 | \$5,340.00 | | \$7,203 | See AT&T proposal | ļ~ |
| | H.1.3 | Space Construction Fee- first 100 square ft. | ICB | ICB | ICB | ICB | | ICB | See AT&T proposal | ļ – |
| _ | H.1.4 | Per additional 50 square feet | \$141.24 | \$119.68 | \$149.34 | \$125.30 | | \$149.34 | See AT&T proposal | |
| - | H.1.5 | Cable Installation Fee, per cable | \$16,38 | \$13.88 | \$17.32 | \$14.53 | | \$17.32 | See AT&T proposal | ļ |
| _ | H.1.6 | Floor Space - Per square foot, Zone A | \$1,825.00 | \$1,825.00 | \$2,431 | \$1,911.00 | | \$2,431 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.6 | Floor Space - Per square foot, Zone 8 | \$4.25 | \$3.60 | \$4.49 | \$3.77 | | \$4.49 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.8 | Power, per ampere | \$4.25 | \$3.60 | \$4.49 | \$3.77 | | \$4.49 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.7 | Cable Support Structure, per entrance cable | \$6.79 | \$5.93 | \$7.64 | \$6.67 | | \$7.64 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | | POT bay, Recurring | \$21.66 | \$18.78 | \$24.79 | \$21.82 | | \$24.79 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.13 | 2 wire | | | | | | | See Vigit biobosts | |
| | H.1.14 | 4 wire | \$0.0996 | \$0.0864 | \$0.1141 | \$0.1004 | | \$0.1141 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.15 | DS1 | \$0.1993 | \$0.1727 | \$0.2281 | \$0.2008 | | \$0.2281 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.16 | DS3 | \$0.8226 | \$0.7131 | \$0.9416 | \$0.8287 | | \$0.9416 | See AT&T proposal | |
| _ | | Cross-Connects- Recurring | \$5.08 | \$4.41 | \$5.82 | \$5.12 | | \$5.82 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.I.9 | 2 wire | | | | | | | 340 ATAT Propusar | |
| | H.1.10 | 4 wire | \$0.3333 | \$0.2890 | \$0.3815 | \$0.3358 | | \$0.3815 | See AT&T proposal | |
| _ | H.1.11 | D\$1 | \$0.6666 | \$0.5779 | \$0.7631 | \$0.6716 | | \$0.7631 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.12 | DS3 | \$2.45 | \$2.13 | \$2.81 | \$2.47 | | \$2.81 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | | Cross-Connects - Non-Recurring - First Order | \$44.87 | \$38.90 | \$51.37 | \$45.21 | | \$51.37 | See AT&T proposal | |
| - | H.1.9 | 2 wire | | | | | · · - - - | | 366 VIGI hinborni | |
| | H.1.10 | 4 wire | \$36.97 | \$7.17 | \$48.17 | \$7.51 | | \$44.02 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.11 | DS1 | \$36.87 | \$9.89 | \$48.04 | \$10.35 | - | \$43.90 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.12 | DS3 | \$53.17 | \$9.78 | \$70.54 | \$10.24 | | \$66.46 | See AT&T proposal | |
| - | | Cross-Connects - Non-Recurring - Additional Order | \$57.34 | \$9.78 | \$76.41 | \$10.24 | | \$72.33 | See AT&T proposal | |
| - | H,1.9 | 2 wire | | | | | | T. 2.00 | Oge viai bioboesi | |
| | H.1.10 | 4 wire | \$34.96 | \$7.16 | \$45.40 | \$7.50 | | \$41.25 | See ATRT orong | |
| | H.1,11 | DS1 | \$34.87 | \$9.88 | \$45.28 | \$10.34 | | \$41.14 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.12 | DS3 | \$38.41 | \$9.77 | \$50.03 | \$10.23 | | \$45.95 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | | Security escort | \$42.20 | \$9.77 | \$55.44 | \$10.23 | | \$51.36 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.17 | Basic- First Half Hour | | | | | | 401.50 | See Ala I proposal | |
| | H.1.18 | Overtime- First Half Hour | \$33.60 | \$31.54 | \$43.95 | \$33.02 | | \$43.95 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.19 | Premium- First Half Hour | \$42.06 | \$40.30 | \$55.86 | \$42.19 | | \$55.86 | See AT&T proposal | |
| - | H.1.17 | Basic-Additional | \$50.53 | \$48.41 | \$67.77 | \$50,69 | | \$67.77 | See AT&T proposal | |
| - | H.1.18 | Overtime-Additional | \$20.71 | \$19.31 | \$26.10 | \$20.21 | | \$26.10 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.1.19 | Premium-Additional | \$25.96 | \$24.19 | \$33.15 | \$25.33 | | \$33.15 | | |
| - | | [] I reconstruction as | \$31.21 | \$29.09 | \$40.21 | \$30.46 | | \$40.21 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | F | Physical Collocation (AT&T Proposal) | | | | | | ¥10.21 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | | Cage Construction | | · | | | | | | |
| Ī | | Planning- NRC per request | | | | | | | 7.50 | |
| - | | | | | | | \$3,325.43 | | \$3,325.43 | |

| Т | | BCDE F | G | н | | J | 1 | | | |
|----------|------------|--|---------------|--|---|----------------------|---------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 1 | | | | | | | K | <u> </u> | M | |
| | | | İ | | BST | i | | | | |
| 1 | | | 1 | | TELRIC | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | | 1 | BST TSLRIC | (TSLRIC plus | BST TELRIC | | 1 | | 1 |
| 1 | | | | w/ revised depr | | | | | | İ |
| 1 | | | | | shared & common | w/ revised depr. | | 1 | | 1 |
| 1 | BST | | | cost of money, | and other | cost of money, | Hatfletd, NRC | | | - 1 |
| 1 | Rate | | BST | shared & common | methodology | shared & common | an Callerati | ' | 1 | - 1 |
| 1 | Element | | TSLRIC | factors, invest. & | | area on a contillion | | BST | T&TA | - 1 |
| _ | Ligitionic | Element or Capability | uncorrected | | changes) | factors, invest. & | Model | proposed | d proposed | |
| | | Planning- Monthly charge per request | 3.001160.60 | hours | uncorrected | hours | result | rate | p. opcadu | i |
| 9 | | Grounding- per month | | ļ | | | \$15.13 | 1810 | rate | No |
| 1 | | Cage Preparation- per month per 100 Sq. Ft. Cage | | 1 | | | | 1 | \$15.13 | |
| 3 | | Land Out of the month of the second of the s | | | † · - · · · · - · - · - · · - · | | \$4.05 | | \$4.05 | |
| | | Land & Bidgsper month - per 100 sq. ft. Cage | | | | ļ <u>.</u> | \$103.52 | | \$103.52 | |
| 1 | | Cable Racking- per month | | | <u></u> | | \$526,51 | † | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | \$526.51 | |
| 3— | | Entrance Fiber | 1 | | | · ——— | \$20.66 | L | \$20.66 | |
| | | Non-recurring cable installation | · | | | | i | | | |
| 1 | | Monthly-per cable | | | | | A | | | |
| 3 | | 1.1 | | T | | ···— | \$1,081.43 | | \$1,081.43 | |
| 1 | | Power Delivery | | The second second second | | | \$2.46 | | | _ |
| | | Per 40 amp feed, with 2 battery returns, non-recurring | | } | | | | | \$2.46 | |
| 1 | | Day 100 and 4 and 2 Dattery returns, non-recurring | | 1 | | | · | | | |
| | | Per 100 amp feed, with 2 battery returns, non-recurring | | | | _ | \$160.37 | - | | |
| | | Per 200 amp feed, with 2 battery returns, non-recurring | | | | | \$209.18 | i— · · · — · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | \$160.37 | |
| ŀ | | | | | | | | L | \$209.18 | |
| ! | | Power Consumption | | | | | \$272.63 | <u> </u> | \$272.63 | - |
| L | | DC Plant, per amp | | ļ., i | | | | | | |
| | | AC usage, per DC amp | — <u></u> | | | | | | | ! |
| | | | _ | | | | \$3.97 | | \$3.97 | |
| | | Voice Grade Circuits | | | | | \$2.03 | · | \$2.03 | - |
| | | Connection to MDF, per 100 ckts., nonrecurring | | | l | | | | 32.03 | |
| | | Connection to Mor , per 100 ckts., nonrecurring | | T | ·· ——— | | | | l . | 1 |
| | | Connection to MDF, per 100 ckts., per month | · | | | | \$879.58 | | \$879,58 | + |
| | | DS-1 Circuits | | | T | | \$4.98 | | | |
| _ | | Too or once the second | 1 | i [| | | | | \$4.98 | |
| | | Connection to DCS, per 28 circuits, nonrecurring | | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | Uonnection to DCS per 28 circuits, per month | ·· | · | 1 | | \$1,335.66 | | + | |
| | | Connection to DSX, per 28 circuits, nonrecurring | · | | | | | | \$1,335.66 | |
| | | Comment to box, per 20 circuits, nonrecurring | | T | · | | \$226.51 | | \$226.51 | - |
| | | Connection to DSX, per 28 circuits, per month | | | | | \$1,335.66 | | \$1,335.66 | ļ <u>.</u> |
| | | DS-3 Circuits | - | | | | \$11,17 | | | 1 |
| | | | | 1 | | | V(1.17 | | \$11,17 | |
| | — | Connection to DCS, per circuit, nonrecurring | | | | | 1 | | | |
| | | Connection to DCS, per circuit, per month | · | | | | \$341.31 | | | |
| | | Connection to DSX, per circuit, nonrecurring | -· | | | | | | \$341.31 | |
| | *** * * * | Connection to DOX, per circuit, nonrecurring | | | | | \$56.80 | | \$56.80 | |
| | | Connection to DSX, per circuit, per month | | t | | | \$341.31 | | | |
| | | Optical Circuits | | | | | \$9.80 | ·· | \$341.31 | |
| | | Connection to FDF, per cable, nonrecurring | | - 1 | | | 70.00 | | \$9.80 | |
| | | Connection to FDF, per cable, per month | | | | | | | | |
| | | Security Access | | | | | \$2,464.06 | | \$2,464.06 | |
| | | | | | | | \$6.43 | | | |
| | | Access Cards, per request | | | | | | | \$6.43 | |
| | | Entrance Fiber | | | | | 807.40 | | L | |
| | | Structure Charge (per foot of innerduct per month) | | | | <u>-</u> - | \$87.16 | | \$87.16 | |
| | | The charles (has innered bet wouth) | | | | | | | | |
| | | Method O-Mark 17 and 18 | | — — ——- | | | \$0.0156 | | ****** | |
| | | Virtual Collocation (BellSouth Proposal) | | | | | | | \$0.0156 | |
| | H.2.1 | Application Fee | | | | | | | | |
| | H.2.2 | Cable Indiana | \$2,669.00 | \$2,636.00 | | | | | | |
| | | Cable Installation Fee, per cable | | | \$3,724 | \$2,760.00 | | \$2 848 20 | 0. 4500 | |
| | H.2.3 | Floor Space - Per square foot | \$1,825.00 | \$1,825.00 | \$2,431 | \$1,911.00 | | \$2,848.30 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.2.4 | Power, per ampere | \$4.25 | \$3.60 | \$4.49 | | | \$2,750.00 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.2.5 | Cable Company | \$6.79 | \$5.93 | | \$3.77 | | \$3.20 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | 11.2.3 | Cable Support Structure | \$18.95 | | \$7.64 | \$6.67 | | \$3.48 | Con Aller proposal | |
| | | Cross-Connects - Recurring | 910,93 | \$16.43 | \$21.70 | \$19.09 | | | See AT&T proposal | |
| i | H.2.6 | 2 wire | | · | | 7.0.00 | | \$13.35 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | H.2.7 | ·+-+ | \$0.0935 | \$0,0811 | | | | | | |
| | | 4 wire | \$0.1870 | | \$0.1070 | \$0.0942 | | \$0.1070 | Can ATAT | |
| | H.2.8 | OS1 | | \$0.1621 | \$0.2141 | \$0.1884 | | | See AT&T proposal | |
| | | | \$1.01 | \$0.88 | \$1.16 | \$1.02 | | \$0.2141 | See AT&T proposal | |
| | | - | | | | | | \$7.50 | See AT&T proposal | |

ſ

| | | EGDE F | G | н | <u> </u> | J | K | | T 14 | 7 7 |
|---|---------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|
| ŀ | | | | | BST | | | | | <u> </u> |
| | | | | İ | TELRIC | | ļ , | | Ī | |
| ı | | | | BST TSLRIC | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | (TSLRIC plus | BST TELRIC | | | Į. | 1 |
| I | | | | w/ revised depr., | shared & common | w/ revised depr. | | | | |
| 1 | BST | | | cost of money. | and other | cost of money, | Hatfield, NRC | | | |
| | | | BST | shared & common | methodology | | | | | |
| | Rate | | TSLRIC | | | shared & common | or Collocation | BST | AT&T | j |
| | Element | Element or Capability | _ | factors, invest. & | changes) | factors, invest, & . | Model | proposed | 1 | i |
| 4 - | H.2.9 | | uncorrected | hours | uncorrected | hours | | | proposed | ! |
| 1 — | <u>F1,2.9</u> | DS3 | \$12.92 | \$11.20 | \$14.78 | | result | rate | rate | No |
| 5 | | Cross-Connects - Non-Recurring - First Order | | <u> </u> | 314.70 | \$13.01 | | \$56.25 | See AT&T proposal | |
| 6 | H.2.6 | 2 wire | | | | j | | | | |
| 7 | H.2.7 | 4 wire | \$36.97 | \$7.17 | \$48.17 | \$7.51 | | \$48.17 | 1 0 | |
| | H.2.8 | | \$36.87 | \$9.89 | \$48.04 | \$10.35 | | | See AT&T proposal | |
| 먹_ | | D\$1 | \$53,17 | \$9.78 | \$70.54 | | | \$48.04 | See AT&T proposal | 1 |
| 9 | H.2.9 | D\$3 | \$36.97 | | | \$10.24 | | \$155.00 | See AT&T proposal | + |
| 7 · | | Cross-Connects - Non-Recurring - Additional Order | \$30.97 | \$7.17 | \$48.17 | \$7.51 | | \$151.90 | | ╄ |
| 1 | use | O'CONTROL - NOT TROUBLE O'CONT | | | | | | 4 101.80 | See AT&T proposal | <u>L</u> |
| 4 5 6 7 7 7 8 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 | H.2.6 | 2 wire | \$34.96 | \$7.16 | \$45.40 | | | | | 1 |
| 4 | H.2.7 | 4 wire | \$34.87 | | | \$7.50 | | \$45.40 | See AT&T proposal | 1 |
| 4 | H.2.8 | DS1 | | \$9.88 | \$45.28 | \$10.34 | | \$45.28 | See AT&T proposal | 1 |
| | H.2.9 | DS3 | \$38.41 | \$9.77 | \$50.03 | \$10.23 | | | | _ |
| 4 | 17.2.8 | • 1 1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | \$42.20 | \$9.77 | \$55.44 | | | \$14.00 | See AT&T proposal | 1 |
| L | | Security escort | | | 400.44 | \$10.23 | | \$11.83 | See AT&T proposal | - |
| il I | H.2.10 | Basic- First Half Hour | | I | | 1 | | | PYPE | † |
| 1 | H.2.11 | Overtime- First Half Hour | \$33.60 | \$31.54 | \$43.95 | \$33.02 | | 941.00 | A | L |
| . | | | \$42.06 | \$40.30 | \$55.86 | \$42.19 | | \$41.00 | See AT&T proposal | |
| 1_ | H.2.12 | Premium- First Half Hour | \$50.53 | \$48.41 | | | | \$48.00 | See AT&T proposal | |
| 4 | H.2.10 | Basic-Additional | | + · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | \$67.77 | \$50.69 | | \$55.00 | See AT&T proposal | |
| 1 | H.2.11 | Overtime-Additional | \$20.71 | \$19.31 | \$26.10 | \$20.21 | | \$25.00 | One Vigit Nobossi | |
| ł | | | \$25.96 | \$24.19 | \$33.15 | \$25.33 | · | | See AT&T proposal | 1 |
| | H.2.12 | Premlum-Additional | \$31.21 | \$29.09 | | | | \$30.00 | See AT&T proposal | |
| ı | | | | \$28.08 | \$40.21 | \$30.46 | T | \$35.00 | See AT&T proposal | |
| 1 | | Virtual Collocation (AT&T Proposal) | | i i | | | | | Goe Vite : Bigboset | |
| T | | Planning | | | | Ī | | | | |
| | | | | T | | | | ! | l | |
| ļ | | per initial request, or subsequent request for cabling plus equipment | | ‡· ·- ··- ·· | | | | | | |
| | | Per subsequent request for cabling only | | ··· -··— | I | | \$4,220.74 | | \$4,220.74 | |
| 1 | | Land and Buildings, space to support each quarter rack used, per month | | <u> </u> | | | \$1,279.01 | | | |
| - - | | Beloweet and school ga, space to support each quarter reck used, per month | | | | | | | \$1,279.01 | |
| — | | Relay rack space, per quarter rack used | | | | | \$8.62 | | \$8.62 | |
| L | | Entrance Fiber | | | | | \$2.03 | | \$2.03 | |
| | | Cable Installation, nonrecurring charge | | | | - T | | | | |
| | | per cable, per month | | 1 | | | \$987.39 | | | |
| | | per capie, per mioner | | | | | | —— | \$987.39 | |
| | | Power Delivery, per month | | | ~ - | | \$12.10 | İ | \$12.10 | |
| | | Power Consumption | | | <u></u> | | \$0.06 | | \$0.06 | |
| | | DC plant, per amp, per month | | | | | | | 40.00 | |
| | | | | | | | F2.00 | | | |
| | | AC usage, per DC amp, per month | | | | | \$3.92 | | \$3.92 | |
| | | Voice Grade Circuits | | | | | \$2.03 | - | \$2.03 | |
| | | Cable and Horizontal Terminal Strips, per 100 circuits, nonrecurring charge | | | | | | | | |
| | | Connection to MOS and 400 states and 100 circuits, nonrecurring charge | | | | | \$879.58 | + | | |
| | | Connection to MDF, per 100 circuits, per month | | | | | | | \$879.58 | |
| | | DS-1 Circuits | | | | · | \$4.98 | | \$4.98 | |
| | | Connection to DCS, per 28 circuits, nonrecurring charge | | <u>-</u> | | | | | | |
| | | Connection to DCC | | | | | \$1,335.66 | | | |
| | | Connection to DCS, per 28 circuits, per month | | | | | | | \$1,335.66 | |
| | | Connection to DSX, per 28 circuits, nonrecurring charge | | | | | \$226.51 | | \$226.51 | |
| | | Connection to DSX, per 28 circuits, per month | | | | | \$1,335.66 | | \$1,335,66 | |
| | | DS-3 Circuits | | | | - | \$11.17 | | | |
| | | | | | | | A11.11 | | \$11.17 | |
| | | Connection to DCS, per circuit, nonrecurring charge | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | |
| | | Connection to DCS, per circuit per month | | | | | \$341.31 | | \$341.31 | |
| | | Connection to DSX, per circuit, nonrecurring charge | | | 1 | | \$56.80 | | | |
| | | Connection to DSX, per circuit, nonsecurring charge | | | | | | | \$56.80 | |
| | | Contraction to USA, per circuit, per month | | | | — <u> </u> | \$341.31 | | \$341.31 | |
| | | Optical Circuits | | | -, | | \$9.80 | | \$9.80 | |
| | | Connection to FDF, per 12-fiber breakout cable, nonrecurring charge | | | | | | | | |
| | | Connection to FDF, per cable, per month | l | | | | \$2,139.65 | | | |
| | | Virtual-to-Virtual Connection | Ī | | | | | | \$2,139.85 | |
| | | VERWING-VICTUAL CORRECTION | | | | | \$6.43 | T ' | \$6.43 | |

| A | A BICDE F | Ġ | Н | _ 1 | J | K | L | u | N |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| BST Rate 1 Elemen | te . | BST TSLRIC uncorrected | BST TSLRIC wi revised depr., cost of money, shared & common factors, invest. & hours | BST TELRIC (TSLRIC plus shared & common and other methodology changes) uncorrected | BST TELRIC w/ revised depr., cost of money, shared & common factors, invest. & hours | Hatfield, NRC or Collocation Model result | 8ST proposed rate | AT&T proposed rate | Notes |
| 332 333 334 | Cable Racking for Fiber, per cable, per month | | | | 1 | \$0.19 | | \$0.19 | 1 |
| 333 | Cable Racking for DS1 or DS3, per cable, per month | | | | 1 | \$0.15 | | \$0.15 | T |
| 334 | Connection for DS1, per 28 circuits, nonrecurring charge | | | | | \$526.17 | | \$526.17 | * † |
| 335 | Connection for DS3, per circuit, nonrecurring charge | | | | | \$134.46 | | \$134,46 | |
| 33 6 337 | Equipment Maintenance and Security Escort | | | | | | | | T |
| | Staffed Central Office, during attended hours, per quarter hour | | | | | \$10.49 | | \$10.49 | |
| 338 339 | Staffed Central Office, during unattended hours | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 339 | Initial Charge (for four hours) | | | | | \$167.88 | | \$167.88 | 1 |
| 340 | Subsequent Charge, per quarter hour | | | | | \$10.49 | | \$10.49 | 1 |
| 340 341 342 | Unstaffed Central Office | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 342 | Normal Business Day, per quarter hour | | | | | \$10.49 | | \$10.49 | T |
| 343 | Non-normal Business Day | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 344 | Initial Charge (for four hours) | | | | | \$167.88 | | \$167.88 | 1 |
| 340 | Subsequent Charge, per quarter hour | | | | | \$10.49 | | \$10.49 | I |
| 340 | Entrance Fiber Structure Tariff | | | | | | | | |
| 240 | Structure Charge, per foot of innerduct, per month | | | | | \$0.0156 | | \$0.0156 | |
| 240 | NOTES | | <u></u> | | | | | | |
| 344 345 346 347 349 350 351 352 353 353 | (· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | |
| 350 | (1) Adjusted BST NRC reflects costs of an electronic order and include | | | | | | | | |
| 351 | (2) For manual orders requested by new entrants, apply manual order | ncrement from BST Exhibit P-4 | Use TSLRIC or corre | cted TELRIC increme | nt. For example, for | a 2-wire loop, | | | |
| 302 | the increment would be \$30,36 first and \$8.55 additional. Not appli | cable if manual order is not req | wested. | | | | | | |
| 354 | (3) Switch port includes all features and functions. | | | | | | | | |
| 304 | (4) Represents the difference between the adjusted BST manual cost a | nd the BST manual increment t | teken from Exhibit P-4. | | | | | | i |