ORIGINAL



HECEIVED-FPSC

5000115 PM 4:38

Charles J. Rehwinkel Senior Attorney

VP Law/External Relations P.O. Box 2214 Tallathassee, FL 32316-2214 Voice 850 847 0244 Fax 850 878 0777 charles.j.rehwinkel@mail.sprint.com

REGORDS AND REPORTING

October 15, 1999

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RE: Docket 990649-TP

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing in the above docket on behalf of Sprint are the original and fifteen (15) copies of the Surrebuttal Testimony of Kent W. Dickerson.

Please acknowledge receipt and filing of the above by stamping the duplicate copy of this letter and returning the same to this writer.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Charles J. Rehwinkel

CJR/bs Enclosures

cc: All parties of record

AFA
APP
CAF
CMU
CTR
EAG
LEG
MAS
OFC
PAI
SEC
WAW
OTH

RECEIVED & FIRED

PSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

12613 OCT 15 #

FPSC-RESPECTABLE REPORT HE

ORIGINAL

SPRINT
DOCKET NO.: 990649-TP
FILED: October 15 1900

	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
	O.E.
	OF
	KENT W. DICKERSON
Q.	Please state your name, business address, employer and
	current position?
A.	My name is Kent W. Dickerson. My business address is 4210
	Shawnee Mission Parkway, Fairway, Kansas 66205. I am
	employed as Director - Cost Support for Sprint/United
	Management Company.
Q.	Are you the same Kent W. Dickerson who previously filed
	direct and rebuttal testimony in this docket?
A.	Yes.
Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?
A.	My surrebuttal testimony responds to portions of the
	rebuttal testimony of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s
	witness, D. Daonne Caldwell.
	A. Q.

12613 OCT 15 #

1 Q. Beginning on page 16 of her rebuttal testimony, BellSouth
2 witness, Ms. Caldwell attempts to rebut Sprint's proposal
3 that the cost of unbundled switching varies and therefore
4 must be deaveraged. Do you agree?

5

20

21

22

23

24

25

6 No I do not. Ms. Caldwell suggests three facts as rebuttal Α. 7 arguments to Sprint's deaveraged switching costs. The first 8 appears at lines 10 through 17 on page 16 of her rebuttal 9 testimony, where Ms. Caldwell states that several of the cost drivers affecting loop costs do not affect switching 10 11 costs, e.g., weather, terrain, distance and local market 12 conditions. While I agree with this statement, it is 13 misleading and incorrect to relate this portion of my 14 testimony to the issue of deaveraged switching costs. 15 Nowhere in my testimony have I stated or implied that these 16 loop cost related issues result in switching differences. Rather, starting at line 23 of page 8 of my 17 direct testimony, I separately addressed the significant 18 19 factors influencing switching cost variances where I state,

Due primarily to differences in the number of customers served and the nature (interoffice or intraoffice), volume, time of day and duration of calls made by those customers, this analysis shows a significant degree of variation in the local switching cost per MOU.

Second, on page 16 lines 21-23, Ms. Caldwell offers the following,

... the distribution between traffic sensitive
 (\$/Minute of Use) and non-traffic sensitive
 (port) costs differs depending on the vendor.

This statement (which I agree with) does not negate the fact that either a Lucent or a Nortel switch will exhibit significant cost variances when the factors I have identified above are correctly reflected in the switch cost study.

Finally, on page 17, beginning on line 4, Ms. Caldwell argues the fact that the switching network enables calls to originate on one switch and terminate on another switch is somehow justification for computing the cost of all switches on an overall average basis. While it is easy to agree that switches are deployed to enable the origination and termination of calls throughout the network, this does not support a conclusion that the cost of all switches must be computed on an average basis. Ms. Caldwell's discussion fails to mention the fact that it is easily demonstrated that the number and duration of interoffice and intraoffice calls varies widely between switches. Use of the same Switching Cost Information Systems (SCIS) model advocated by Ms. Caldwell, along with a proper recognition of switch

specific SCIS model inputs, will result in significant ı 2 deaveraged cost results as demonstrated in Exhibits KWD - 4 3 and KWD - 5 of my direct testimony. Ms. Caldwell's characterization of this reality as a *mathematical 4 5 exercise" does not diminish the fact that it is a correct 6 and relevant mathematical exercise and is required in order to comply with the FCC UNE deaveraging rule. Additionally, 7 8 it bears repeating that GTE's testimony concedes that ... 9 "switching costs do vary based upon size and traffic 10 volumes ... (which appear to vary between wire centers from 11 \$0.003 to \$0.006 per minute of use)"(Trimble Direct, page 9, Lines 23-25). BellSouth stands alone among the ILECs in 12 13 maintaining that significant deaveraged switch cost variances do not exist. 14

15

16 Q. On page 17 of her rebuttal testimony, Ms. Caldwell
17 maintains that since BellSouth's transport rate structure
18 includes a per mile component, no further deaveraging is
19 necessary. Is this true?

20

21 A. No it is not. Exhibits KWD - 7 and KWD - 8 of my direct
22 testimony demonstrate that the termination component of
23 unbundled transport is by far the largest cost component of
24 unbundled transport. These Exhibits further demonstrate
25 that transport costs are far more sensitive to differing

capacity utilization of terminals and fiber than to changes in route distances. For example, Exhibit KWD - 7 shows the cost of a DS1 decreasing from \$52.16 to \$46.58 when terminal and fiber utilization is increased from 60% to 70% and mileage is held constant. This utilization change equates to an 11% decrease in total DS-1 transport cost. Conversely, Exhibit KWD - 8 demonstrates that increasing mileage from 30 miles to 40 miles and holding the capacity utilization of terminals and fiber constant only increases the cost from \$48.09 to \$50.17, or 4%. Thus, utilization is shown to have nearly three times greater impact on the cost of unbundled transport than does route mileage distance.

I agree with BellSouth on the need for deaveraged transport prices to reflect the cost impact of differing transport route distances. However, the transport cost Exhibits provided in my direct testimony clearly demonstrate an even greater need to fully address and include the impact of varying terminal and fiber utilizations in the deaveraged cost and price determination for the unbundled transport network element. BellSouth's transport deaveraging proposal ignores this much more material deaveraged cost determinate and would not comply with FCC rules for deaveraged UNE prices.

1 Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?

2

3 A. Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 990649-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by U.S. Mail or hand-delivery this 15th day of October, 1999 to the following:

Angela Green, General Counsel Florida Public Telecommunications Association 125 S. Gadsden Street, #200 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1525

Steven C. Reilly Charles J. Beck Office of the Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street, Rm. 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

Michael A. Gross
V.P. Regulatory Affairs
& Regulatory Counsel
FCTA Inc.
310 North Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. Tracy Hatch Rhonda Merritt 101 North Monroe Street Suite 700 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1549

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Ms. Nancy B. White c/o Nancy H. Sims 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1556 Messer Law Firm (2) Norman Horton, Jr. Post Office Box 1876 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Pennington Law Firm Peter M. Dunbar Post Office Box 10095 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Rutledge Law Firm Kenneth Hoffman, Esq. Post Office Box 551 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

D. Bruce May, Jr. Holland & Knight LLP Post Office Drawer 810 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Kimberly Caswell GTE Florida Incorporated Post Office Box 110, FLTC0007 Tampa, Florida 33601

Donna McNulty MCI WorldCom 325 John Knox Road Sulte 105 Tallahassee, Florida 32303

David V. Dimlich, Esq. Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems 2620 SW 27th Avenue Miamí, Florida 33133 MediaOne Florida Telecommunications, Inc. Laura L. Gallagher 101 E. College Ave., Suite 302 Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Patrick Wiggins, Esq. Charles Pellegrini, Esq. Post Office Drawer 1657 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Time Warner AxS of Florida, L.P. Carolyn Marek 233 Bramerton Court Franklin, TN 37069

Covad Communications Company Christopher V. Goodpaster % Convad Communications Company 2330 Central Expressway Santa Clara, CA 95050

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

NorthPoint Communications, Inc. Glenn Harris, Esq. 222 Sutter Street, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108

McWhirter Law Firm
Joseph McGlothlin/Vicki Kaufman
117 S. Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Swidler & Berlin Eric Branfman/Morton Posner 3000 K St. NW, #300 Washington, D.C. 20007-5116

Jill N. Butler
State Regulatory Director
Cox Communications
4585 Village Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23502

Charles J. Beck
Office of the Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street,
Room 812
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

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

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

Blumemfeld & Cohen Elise Kiely/Jeffrey Blumemfeld 1625 Massachusetts Ave NW Washington, DC 20036

Charles J. Rehwinkel