ORIGINAL



Tracy Hatch Senior Attorney Law and Government Affairs Southern Region Suite 700 101 N. Monroe Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 850-425-6360

June 30, 2003

BY HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Blanca Bayó, Director
The Commission Clerk and Administrative Services
Room 110, Easley Building
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re:

Docket Nos. 981834-TP and 990321-TP

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing an original and fifteen copies of the Prehearing Statement of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC, TCG South Florida, Inc. and DIECA Communication, Inc. d/b/a Covad Communications Company ("Joint CLECs") in the above-referenced docket.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter by stamping the extra copy of this letter "filed" and returning to the runner making this filing. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Tracy W. Hatch

5ec - 1

TWH/las Enclosure

cc:

Parties of Record

RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

BOCCHEM: Manage - 1711

J5825 JUN 30 8

FPSC-OULTHOUGHON CLERK

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NOS. 981834 & 990321

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished via

U.S. Mail this 30th day of June, 2003, to the following parties of record:

Adam Teitzman	Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP
Staff Counsel	Rodney L. Joyce
Florida Public Service Commission	600 14 th Street N.W., Suite 800
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard	Washington, DC 20005-2004
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850	Phone: (202) 639-5602
	Fax: (202) 783-4211
Ausley Law Firm	BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
Jeffry Wahlen	Nancy B. White
P.O. Box 391	c/o Ms. Nancy H. Sims
Tallahassee, FL 32302	150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400
Phone: 850-224-9115	Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556
Fax: 222-7560	Phone: (850) 224-7798
	Fax: 222-8640
Florida Digital Network, Inc.	
Matthew Feil, Esq.	Hopping Law Firm
390 North Orange Ave., Suite 2000	Richard Melson
Orlando, FL 32801	P.O. Box 6526
Phone: (407) 835-0460	Tallahassee, FL 32314
Fax: (407) 835-0309	Phone: 850-222-7500
Email: mfeil@floridadigital.net	Fax: 224-8551
Florida Cable Telecom. Assoc., Inc.	Florida Competitive Carriers Assoc.
Michael A. Gross	c/o McWhirter Law Firm
246 E. 6th Avenue, Suite 100	Vicki Kaufman
Tallahassee, FL 32303	117 S. Gadsden St.
Phone: 850-681-1990	Tallahassee, FL 32301
Fax: 681-9676	Phone: 850-222-2525
Email: mgross@fcta.com	Fax: 222-5606
ITC^DeltaCom	KMC Telecom, Inc.
Ms. Nanette S. Edwards	Mr. John D. McLaughlin, Jr.
4092 S. Memorial Parkway	1755 North Brown Road
Huntsville, AL 35802-4343	Lawrenceville, GA 30043-8119
Email: NEdwards@itcdeltacom.com	Phone: (678) 985-6262
	Fax: (678) 985-6213
	Email: <u>imclau@kmctelecom.com</u>
Sprint-Florida, Inc.	MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc.
F.B. (Ben) Poag	Ms. Donna C. McNulty
PO BOX 2214, MC FLTLHO0107	1203 Governors Square Blvd., Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214	Tallahassee, FL 32301-2960
Phone: 850-599-1027 •	Phone: (850) 219-1008
Fax: 407-814-5700	Fax: 219-1018
	Email: donna.mcnulty@wcom.com
Network Telephone Corporation	Pennington Law Firm

Brent E. McMahan	Peter Dunbar/ Marc Dunbar
815 South Palafox Street	P.O. Box 10095
Pensacola, FL 32501-5937	Tallahassee, FL 32302
Phone: (850) 432-4855	Phone: 850-222-3533
Fax: (850) 437-0724	Fax: 222-2126
Sprint Communications Company Limited	Supra Telecommunications & Information
Partnership	Systems, Inc.
Susan S.Masterton	Paul Turner
P.O. Box 2214	2620 S.W. 27th Avenue
MC: FLTLHO0107	Miami, FL 33133
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214	Phone: 305-531-5286
Phone: (850) 847-0244	Fax: 305-476-4282
Fax: 878-0777	
Email: susan.masterton@mail.sprint.com	
Covad Communications	Verizon Florida Inc.
William H. Weber / Gene Watkins	Mr. Richard Chapkis
19 th Floor	201 N. Franklin Street, MCFLTC0007
1230 Peachtree Street N.E.	Tampa, FL 33601
Atlanta, GA 30309	Phone: (813) 483-2606
Phone: (404) 942-3494	Fax: (813) 204-8870
Fax: (404) 942-3495	
Beth Keating, Esq.	MediaOne Florida Telecom., Inc.
Division of Legal Services	c/o Laura L. Gallagher, P.A.
Florida Public Service Commission	101 E. College Ave., Suite 302
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard	Tallahassee, FL 32301
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0870	
BellSouth Telecom., Inc.	Messer Law Firm
Patrick W. Turner/R. Douglas Lackey	Floyd Self/Norman Horton
675 W. Peachtree St., Suite 4300	PO BOX 1876
Atlanta, GA 30375	Tallahassee, FL 32302
Verizon Florida Inc.	
Ms. Michelle A. Robinson	
c/o Mr. David Christian	
106 East College Avenue, Suite 810	
Tallahassee, FL 32301-7704	
Phone: (813) 483-2526	
Fax: (813) 223-4888	
Email: Michelle.Robinson@verizon.com	

Tracy W. Hatch

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition of Competitive Carriers for Commission action to support local competition in BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s service territory.

DOCKET NO. 981834-TP

In re: Petition of ACI Corp. d/b/a
Accelerated Connections, Inc. for generic
investigation to ensure that BellSouth
Telecommunications, Inc., Sprint-Florida,
Incorporated, and GTE Florida
Incorporated comply with obligation to
provide alternative local exchange carriers
with flexible, timely, and cost-efficient
physical collocation.

DOCKET NO. 990321-TP

FILED: June 30, 2003

PREHEARING STATEMENT (ISSUES NOS. 1-8) OF AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES, LLC; TCG SOUTH FLORIDA, INC; AND DIECA COMMUNICATIONS, INC., d/b/a COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC; TCG South Florida, Inc.; and Dieca Communications, Inc. d/b/a Covad Communications Company, (hereinafter "Joint CLECs") pursuant to Order No. PSC-02-1513-PCO-TP issued on November 4, 2002, submit the following Prehearing Statement in the above-captioned docket.

(A)/(B) Witnesses, Subject Matter Issue(s), and Exhibit(s)

The Joint CLECs intend to sponsor the testimony of the following witnesses:

U5825 JUN 30 8

FPSC-COMPLISSION CLERK

Witnesses:
1. Jeff King (AT&T)

Testimony Filed (Direct and Surrebuttal)

<u>Issues:</u> 1-8

King Exhibits:

N/A

(C) Joint CLEC's Basic Position

Collocation of CLEC facilities in ILEC central offices is an essential prerequisite to facilities-based entry into the local market. It is absolutely critical that collocation be provided on a timely, efficient and economic basis. The Commission should adopt the practices, terms and conditions described below by the Joint CLECs regarding the recurring and non-recurring charges for collocation space, cancellation of collocation space, space reservation and reclamation, transfer of collocation space, copper entrance facilities, and the provision of electric power to collocation space. The Joint CLEC's positions are the most appropriate in fulfilling the Commission's mandate to foster competition in the local exchange market.

(D)(E) and (F) Questions of Fact, Law and Policy

ISSUE 1A: When should an ALEC be required to remit payment for non-recurring charges for collocation space?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>IOINT CLEC POSITION:</u> There are generally 3 categories of non-recurring charges associated with collocation space: (1) Application Fee, (2) Space Preparation – Firm Order Processing and (3) Other.

- (1) The non-recurring Application Fee should be billed within a 30-day billing cycle of the date which the ILEC notifies the CLEC of space availability.
- (2) The non-recurring charge for processing the firm order for collocation space preparation is billed

within a 30-day billing cycle of the date which the ILEC confirms the CLEC's Firm Order for collocation.

(3) The non-recurring charges for Other (e.g., Cable Installation, Cross-Connects, etc) are billed within a 30-day billing cycle of the date that the CLEC has accepted the requested collocation UNE (i.e., the date the CLEC has tested and interconnected its facilities to the ILEC).

ISSUE 1B: When should billing of monthly recurring charges begin?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>IOINT CLEC POSITION:</u> Once the CLEC accepts the collocation space (i.e., cage acceptance) from the ILEC, the ILEC should bill the CLEC within a thirty (30) day billing cycle for the floor space. The remaining monthly recurring charges should be billed within a thirty (30) day billing cycle after the CLEC installs its equipment, tests and interconnects its equipment to the ILEC interoffice facilities and is provided power.

ISSUE 1C: What cancellation charges should apply if an ALEC cancels its request for collocation space?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>IOINT CLEC POSITION</u>: There should not be a cancellation charge (i.e., a separate fee for cancellation) imposed on the CLEC when collocation space is cancelled. If the CLEC cancels its request for collocation space within 20 days after the application has been submitted to the ILEC, the application fees should be fully refundable to the CLEC. If a collocation request is cancelled before the preparation of the space is complete, the CLEC should be entitled to a return of the portion of the amounts already paid attributable to the work that will not be done as a result of the cancellation. To the extent that the collocation is not complete, the ILEC still will recoup its costs for the work performed as well as the benefit of the preparation of the space already accomplished.

ISSUE 2A: Should a CLEC be required to justify its space reservation needs to the ILEC when an ILEC is forced to consider a building addition to accommodate future space requirements?

WITNESS: Jeff King

JOINT CLEC POSITION: If an ILEC desires to reclaim unused space from a CLEC, the ILEC should be required to notify the CLEC in possession of the space in writing, sufficient to enable the CLEC to make a reasonable judgment as to the necessity for the reclamation. The CLEC should be allowed the opportunity to verify the ILEC's need through a site survey or other reasonable means. After the ILEC has demonstrated an immediate need for space reclamation, a CLEC should then be required to show that it has need of the space within a reasonable amount of time.

ISSUE 2B: Under what conditions should an ILEC be allowed to reclaim unused collocation space?

WITNESS: Jeff King

JOINT CLEC POSITION: The condition that would allow an ILEC to reclaim unused collocation space is when the ILEC has determined that their central office floor space is completely exhausted, has demonstrated an immediate need for the deployment of equipment necessary to provide service for its local customers, and the CLEC has no demonstrated need for the space.

ISSUE 2C: What obligations, if any, should be placed on the CLEC that contracted for the space?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>JOINT CLEC POSITION</u>: 1) If the CLEC has future plans for their collocation space and provides written notification as such to the ILEC, then the ILEC has no authority to reclaim their collocation space. 2) If the CLEC has no future plans for the designated collocation space and provides written documentation to the ILEC as such, then the ILEC should be allowed to reclaim the unused collocation space.

ISSUE 2D: What obligations, if any, should be placed on the ILEC?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>JOINT CLEC POSITION</u>: The ILEC must send formal written notification to the CLEC requesting reclamation of space. If the CLEC has no future plans for the collocation space, the ILEC can reclaim the space. Once the collocation space has been reclaimed, the ILEC must stop all monthly recurring billing charges to the CLEC and send formal notification to the CLEC of the stopped bill date.

ISSUE 3: Should a CLEC have the option to transfer accepted collocation space to another CLEC? If so, what are the responsibilities of the ILEC and CLECs?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>JOINT CLEC POSITION</u>: Yes. If a CLEC has accepted collocation space from an ILEC, and at that time, its requirements for collocation have changed, the CLEC should be allowed to transfer over this space to another CLEC that has expressed an interest. The contracted CLEC should submit an application for a collocation records change to the ILEC for said collocation space. The collocation provisioning intervals should not apply as the space has already been completed. Therefore, the CLEC should be granted immediate access to the designated collocation space.

ISSUE 4: Should the ILEC be required to provide copper entrance facilities within the context of a collocation inside the central office?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>IOINT CLEC POSITION</u>: Yes. Copper technology, including copper entrance facilities, is still an integral part of the telecommunications industry. The ILECs still use copper technology within their networks to provide both basic and advanced services such as the ongoing deployment of DSL technology. A CLEC should be allowed the same opportunity to use copper plant within the context of a collocation inside the central office.

ISSUE 5: Should an ILEC be required to offer, at a minimum, power in standardized increments? If so, what should the standardized power increments be?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>IOINT CLEC POSITION</u>: Power, as defined for purpose of charges "per amp", should be offered in one (1) amp increments. ILECs should be required to provision power in fuse size increments of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, 120, 150, 180, 200, 225 amps, and above as available from the market. Fuse sizes of 70 amps or greater should be provisioned from the ILEC power distribution board if requested by the CLEC.

ISSUE 6A: Should an ILEC's per ampere (amp) rate for the provisioning of DC power to a CLEC's collocation space apply to amps used or fused capacity?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>IOINT CLEC POSITION</u>: The ILEC's "per ampere" power rate should be based on the CLEC's actual usage.

ISSUE 6B: If power is charged on a per-amp-used basis or on a fused capacity basis, how should the charge be calculated and applied?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>IOINT CLEC POSITION</u>: Following cost-causation pricing principles and since the ILEC incurs its expense from its power supplier based on actual usage then the ILEC (as a secondary supplier of power) should charge its customers (i.e., CLECs) based on the actual amperage used by the CLEC's installed equipment." Any deviation, or attempt to charge on a "per fused" basis, introduces opportunities for significant over recovery of the ILEC's true cost.

There are two ways recommended, in priority order, to capture actual CLEC power usage: (1) metering and (2) using the List 1 Drain of installed equipment as provided by the equipment vendors adjusted downward appropriately to prevent over-recovery in the range of 50-67%.

The Joint CLECs believe the Commission should order the use of the adjusted List 1 Drain specifications as a suitable proxy for actual usage when determining collocation power charges if meters or measuring facilities are unavailable or not economically feasible at the PDB or BDFB, such as with virtual collocation.

ISSUE 6C: When should an ILEC be allowed to begin billing a CLEC for power?

WITNESS: Jeff King

<u>IOINT CLEC POSITION</u>: As also discussed in Issue 1B, a CLEC should be billed for power once power is being provided and used by the CLEC. Once equipment has been installed and activated by the CLEC the ILEC (or certified 3rd party representative) will perform a collocation site survey and record the metered power. Unless future augments occur to a collocation site metering surveys could occur quarterly.

ISSUE 7: Should a CLEC have the option of an AC power feed to its collocation space?

WITNESS: Jeff King

JOINT CLEC POSITION: Yes, a CLEC should have the option of an AC power feed to its collocation space. This is essential to enable CLECs to place AC powered equipment in their collocation space. In addition, CLECs can also convert AC power to DC power if needed. Such conversion may also be more economical for a CLEC than purchasing DC power from the ILEC.

ISSUE 8: What are the responsibilities of the ILEC, if any, when a CLEC requests collocation space at a remote terminal where space is not available or space is nearing exhaustion?

WITNESS: Jeff King

JOINT CLEC POSITION: The ILEC should be responsible for notifying the CLEC community via its form of communications such as website postings or Carrier Notification Letters, of the remote terminal sites that are exhausted. For these sites pre-determined to be exhausted, the ILEC owes to the CLEC community, a plan of action as to when new construction of a remote terminal will be completed. If the ILEC has other plans in which to relieve the exhausted conditions of the remote terminal, again, the ILEC needs to provide notification to the CLEC's of those plans with time lines and dates of anticipated completion.

(G) Stipulated Issues

No issues have been stipulated at this time.

(H) Pending Motions

The Joint CLECs do not have any pending motions at this time.

(I) Other Requirements

There are no requirements, of which the Joint CLECs are aware or that cannot be complied with.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30th day of June, 2003.

TRACY W. HATCH, ESQ.

101 N. Monroe Street

Suite 700

Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876

(850) 425-6360

Attorney for AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC

Charles E. (Gene) Watkins

Senior Counsel, Covad Communications Co.

1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.

19th Floor

Atlanta, Georgia 30309

(404) 942-3492