FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

11/9/2004

# ORIGINAL

Matilda S	anders	
From:	Smith, Debbie N. [Debbie.N.Smith@BellSouth.com]	
Sent:	Tuesday, November 09, 2004 3:19 PM	
To:	Filings@psc.state.fl.us	
Ce	Fatool, Vicki, Slaughter, Brenda; Nancy Sims, Holland, Robyn P; Edenfield, Kip Micheale, Linda Hobbs	Bixler,
Subject	Florida Docket No. 040301-TP	
Importance	e: Fligh	
BellSou	ecretary for E. Earl Edenfield, Jr. th Telecommunications, Inc.	
Tallaha: (404) 33	uth Monroe, Rm. 400 ssee, FL 32301-1558 35-0772	
debbies	n.smfb@bellsouth.com	
	No. 040301-TP: In Re: Petition of Supra Telecommunications and Information Sy ration with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.	stems, Inc.
	uth Telecommunications, Inc. aff of E. Earl Edenfield, Jr.	
D. 8 page	s total in PDE format	
E. Prehea	aring Statement of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.	
BellSouth Te	n (sent on behalf of E. Earl Edenfield, Jr.) lecommunications, Inc. Legal Department	
675 W. Peac Atlanta, GA		
Phone: (404	) 335-0772	
5	마스프랑스 현실 등 경험 등 경험 경험 경험 전체 보고 있다. 그 그 전 전 시간	
<< Prehearing	g Statement of BST>>	
****	(그 영화 경류 개념 등학 기능 등 기능	
— The informat	sion transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed ar	id may contain
confidential,	proprietary, and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination of	or other use of
	action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the interfyou received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from	
117		
7		ENT NUMBER
•		



E. EARL EDENFIELD, JR Senior Attorney

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 150 South Monroe Street Room 400 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (404) 335-0763

November 9, 2004

Mrs. Blanca S. Bayó
Division of the Commission Clerk and
Administrative Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No.: 040301-TP
Petition of Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc. for Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed is the Prehearing Statement of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., which we ask that you file in the captioned docket.

Copies have been served to the parties shown on the attached Certificate of Service.

Sincerely,

Kip Edenfield, Jr. by Rolling

Enclosure

cc: All Parties of Record Marshall M. Criser III Nancy B. White R. Douglas Lackey

12062 NOV-9 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Docket No. 040301-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via

Electronic Mail and U,S. Mail this 9th day of November, 2004 to the following:

Jason Rojas
Jeremy Susac
Staff Counsels
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Tel No. (850) 413-6179 or 6236
Fax No. (850) 413-6250
irojas@psc.state.fl.us
Jsusac@psc.state.fl.us

Ann H. Shelfer
Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems, Inc.
Koger Center – Ellis Building
1311 Executive Center Drive
Suite 220
Tallahassee, FL 32301-5067
Tel. No. (850) 402-0510
Fax. No. (850) 402-0522
ashelfer@stis.com

Brian Chaiken (+)
Supra Telecommuncations & Information Systems, Inc. 2620 S. W. 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue Miami, FL 33133
Tel. No. (305) 476-4248
Fax. No. (305) 443-1078
bchaiken@stis.com

# To receive discovery related material only

John Duffey
Division of Competitive
Markets & Enforcement
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Tel No. (850) 413-6828
iduffey@psc.state.fl.us

E. Earl Edenfield. Jr.

## ORIGINAL

#### BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Petition of Supra	)
Telecommunications and Information )	)
Systems, Inc. for arbitration )	Docket No.: 040301-TP
With BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. )	)
)	
	Filed: November 9, 2004

#### PREHEARING STATEMENT OF BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth"), in compliance with the Revised Order Establishing Procedure (Order No. PSC-04-0959-PCO-TP) issued on October 1, 2004, hereby submits its Prehearing Statement for Docket No. 040301-TP.

#### A. Witnesses

BellSouth proposes to call the following witness to offer testimony on the issues in this docket:

Witness	<u>Issue(s)</u>
D. Daonne Caldwell (Direct and Rebuttal)	1, 2, 3, 4
Kenneth L. Ainsworth (Direct and Rebuttal)	1, 2, 3, 4

BellSouth reserves the right to call additional witnesses, witnesses to respond to Commission inquiries not addressed in direct and rebuttal testimony and witnesses to address issues not presently designated that may be designated by the Prehearing Officer at the prehearing conference to be held on November 19, 2004. BellSouth has listed the witnesses for whom BellSouth believes testimony will be filed, but reserves the right to supplement that list if necessary.

#### B. Exhibits

Kenneth L. Ainsworth (Direct):

KLA-1

Provisioning Process Flow Chart

D. Daonne Caldwell (Rebuttal)

DDC-1

Dispatch/Non-Dispatch Cost Analysis

BellSouth reserves the right to file exhibits to any testimony that may be filed under the circumstances identified in Section "A" above. BellSouth also reserves the right to introduce exhibits for cross-examination, impeachment, or any other purpose authorized by the applicable Florida Rules of Evidence and Rules of this Commission.

#### C. Statement of Basic Position

Each of the individually numbered issues in this docket represent a specific dispute regarding the Interconnection Agreement between BellSouth and Supra and the prices for certain network elements Supra seeks to purchase from BellSouth. As to each of these issues, BellSouth's positions are the more consistent with the 1996 Act, the pertinent rulings of the FCC and the rules of this Commission. Therefore, the Commission should sustain each of BellSouth's positions.

#### D. BellSouth's Position on the Issues

Issue 1:

Under the parties' existing interconnection agreement, what nonrecurring rate, if any, applies for a hot-cut from UNE-P to UNE-L, where the lines being converted are served by copper or UDLC, for (a) SL1 loops and (b) SL2 loops?

<u>Position</u>: The Commission has already set non-recurring rates that apply to conversions from UNE-P to UNE-L, retail to UNE-L, and resale to UNE-L. Those rates were set in the Commission's UNE docket and the Covad Arbitration docket. Each of the three rates that

2

comprise the charges for conversions (OSS charge; SL-1 or SL-2 loop rate; collocation cross-connect charge) are found in the Interconnection Agreement between BellSouth and Supra and are applicable when Supra converts a line to a UNE-L, irrespective of the underlying type of facility used (i.e., copper, UDLC or IDLC). Supra either participated, or could have requested to participate, in the dockets in which the rates were set. Therefore, Supra is simply trying (improperly) to collaterally attack lawful rates of the Commission that have been incorporated into the parties' Interconnection Agreement.

<u>Issue 2</u>: Under the parties' existing interconnection agreement, what nonrecurring rate, if any, applies for a hot-cut from UNE-P to UNE-L, where the lines being converted are not served by copper or UDLC, for (a) SL1 loops and (b) SL2 loops?

Position: The Commission has already set non-recurring rates that apply to conversions from UNE-P to UNE-L, retail to UNE-L, and resale to UNE-L. Those rates were set in the Commission's UNE docket and the Covad Arbitration docket. Each of the three rates that comprise the charges for conversions (OSS charge; SL-1 or SL-2 loop rate; collocation cross-connect charge) are found in the Interconnection Agreement between BellSouth and Supra and are applicable when Supra converts a line to a UNE-L, irrespective of the underlying type of facility used (i.e., copper, UDLC or IDLC). Supra either participated, or could have requested to participate, in the dockets in which the rates were set. Therefore, Supra is simply trying (improperly) to collaterally attack lawful rates of the Commission that have been incorporated into the parties' Interconnection Agreement.

Issue 3: Should a new nonrecurring rate be created that applies for a hot-cut from UNE-P to UNE-L, where the lines being converted are served by copper or UDLC, for (a) SL1 loops and (b) SL2 loops? If so, what should such nonrecurring rates be?

Position: No. The current rates that comprise the components of a conversion (OSS charge; SL-1 or SL-2 loop rate; collocation cross-connect charge) have all been set in the context of generic dockets wherein all CLECs were given the opportunity to participate. Specifically, the OSS charge and the SL-1 / SL-2 loop rates were set in the Commission's Generic UNE Docket and the collocation cross-connect charge was recently set in the Commission's Generic Collocation Docket, which modified the previous rate set by the Commission in the Covad Arbitration. Of particular importance, is the fact that the SL-1 / SL-2 loop rates were established using a blended rate of probabilities of whether a dispatch would be required. This blended rate insures that conversions are affordable for all CLECs, irrespective of the underlying facilities (i.e., copper, UDLC or IDLC) used to serve the end-user customer. Supra's suggestion that the conversion rate be bifurcated into dispatch (IDLC) and non-dispatch (copper and UDLC) will result in a rate structure that will be a disincentive for CLECs to compete for customers that are served via any facility that will require a dispatch to convert, as such a conversion will be significantly higher than the current rate. Such a distinction will harm competition in Florida, not stimulate it; thus, the Commission should not modify the current rates.

Issue 4: Should a new nonrecurring rate be created that applies for a hot-cut from UNE-P to UNE-L, where the lines being converted are not served by copper or UDLC, for (a) SL1 loops and (b) SL2 loops? If so, what should such nonrecurring rates be?

<u>Position</u>: No. The current rates that comprise the components of a conversion (OSS charge; SL-1 or SL-2 loop rate; collocation cross-connect charge) have all been set in the context of generic dockets wherein all CLECs were given the opportunity to participate. Specifically, the OSS charge and the SL-1 / SL-2 loop rates were set in the Commission's Generic UNE Docket and the collocation cross-connect charge was recently set in the Commission's Generic

Collocation Docket, which modified the previous rate set by the Commission in the Covad Arbitration. Of particular importance, is the fact that the SL-1 / SL-2 loop rates were established using a blended rate of probabilities of whether a dispatch would be required. This blended rate insures that conversions are affordable for all CLECs, irrespective of the underlying facilities (*i.e.*, copper, UDLC or IDLC) used to serve the end-user customer. Supra's suggestion that the conversion rate be bifurcated into dispatch (IDLC) and non-dispatch (copper and UDLC) will result in a rate structure that will be a disincentive for CLECs to compete for customers that are served via any facility that will require a dispatch to convert, as such a conversion will be significantly higher than the current rate. Such a distinction will harm competition in Florida, not stimulate it; thus, the Commission should not modify the current rates.

#### E. Stipulations

None.

#### F. Pending Motions and Requests for Confidentiality

BellSouth's Request for Specified Confidential Classification dated October 6, 2004.

BellSouth's Request for Specified Confidential Classification dated October 28, 2004.

BellSouth's Request for Specified Confidential Classification to be filed November 10, 2004.

Respectfully submitted this 9th day of November, 2004.

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

NANCY B. WHITE

JAMES MEZA III c/o Nancy H. Sims

150 So. Monroe Street, Suite 400

Tallahassee, FL 32301

(305) 347-5855,

R. DOUGLAS LACKEY

E. EARL EDENFIELD, JR.

Suite 4300

675 W. Peachtree St., NE

Atlanta, GA 30375

(404) 335-0763

556207