1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITIES COMMISSION
7	)
8	) In the Matter of the Petition for Arbitration )
9	of an Interconnection Agreement Between ) AMERICAN TELEPHONE TECHNOLOGY, )
10	INC. and GTE NORTHWEST ) DOCKET NO. UT-990390 INCORPORATED Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. )
11	Section 252
12	
13	,
14	
15	REBUTTAL
16	TESTIMONY OF
17	R. KIRK LEE
18	ON BEHALF OF
19	GTE NORTHWEST INCORPORATED
20	October 19, 1999
21	
22	

1	
2	Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
3	My name is R. Kirk Lee. My business address is 600 Hidden Ridge, Irving, Texas
4	75038.
5	DID YOU SUBMIT DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET ON BEHALF OF GTE
6	NORTHWEST INCORPORATED ("GTE")?
7	Yes.
8	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.
9	The purpose of my testimony is to rebut the testimony of David A. Kunde, submitted
10	on behalf of American Telephone Technology, Inc. ("ATTI").
11	Q. PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FIRST ISSUE RAISED BY MR. KUNDE,
12	RELATING TO MINOR CHANGES TO THE COLLOCATION USAGE?
13	A. Mr. Kunde misrepresents GTE's position claiming that GTE would charge for
14	minor augments by ATTI to ATTI equipment and that GTE's process would
15	delay ATTI. GTE requires submission of a fee and an application only where a
16	work activity is required by GTE. GTE would not charge for ATTI augments
17	performed by ATTI which do not require GTE to perform a service or function.
18	Minor augments, which would require a fee, might include, but not be limited to,
19	adding light fixtures, AC outlets, requests for CLEC to CLEC cross connects and
20	DS0, DS1 and DS3 facility terminations. To achieve such minor augments, an
21	order will have to be submitted and minor charges will apply to cover GTE's
22	costs.

Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_)

- 1 DOES GTE CHARGE MINOR AUGMENT FEES TO OTHER COLLOCATORS? 2 Yes. GTE follows the practice I have described above with all of its collocators. 3 ATTI is not the only CLEC requesting collocation. GTE evenly applies standards 4 designed to address the requests of all parties collocating in a GTE central 5 office. 6 PLEASE RESPOND TO THE SECOND ISSUE RAISED BY MR. KUNDE, 7 RELATING TO REASONABLE BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION 8 **REQUIREMENTS?** 9 GTE has the right to impose security requirements upon ATTI as stringent as those 10 imposed on GTE's employees under paragraph 47 of the FCC's Order No. 99-11 48 in cc Docket No. 98-147. What GTE requires of ATTI is no different that 12 what GTE requires of itself and other parties requesting collocation. What U.S. 13 WEST may require is irrelevant because GTE can impose different security 14 requirements, premised upon its employment practices. ATTI protests, claiming 15 that what GTE wants would implicate undefined "substantial human resources 16 issues." To grant ATTI's request would derail explicit GTE human resource 17 practices. The FCC has clearly allowed central office owners, like GTE, to 18 decide what is necessary for security background checks... 19 ARE ATTI'S CONCERNS ABOUT GTE'S ALLOCATION OF SHARED 20 **COLLOCATION COSTS WARRANTED?** 21
- 22

No. ATTI's position ignores the fact that it is the ATTI request that drives the cost

2

which GTE will be forced to incur to accommodate ATTI's request. Contrary to 2 Mr. Kunde's testimony, (p. 4, I. 20), ATTI does have control of the costs GTE 3 may require it to bear because ATTI controls the timing. Submission of a 4 collocation request will trigger the need to incur the cost. The example used by 5 Mr. Kunde, if anything, demonstrates the reasonableness of GTE's approach. 6 GTE would only be forced to upgrade its power plant to accommodate ATTI's 7 request for 20 amps of power if GTE's existing power plant was not capable of 8 handling it because it was at capacity. Sound engineering design principles 9 would require an upgrade of an appropriate increment which would 10 accommodate future needs. ATTI will be asked to bear a proportionate share 11 of the costs of such an upgrade, as will GTE. There is little relationship between 12 the cost of the upgrade and the amount of space used, and amount of power 13 consumed. If ATTI's views were accepted, GTE and its ratepayers would have 14 to bear costs which were initiated at ATTI's request. 15

MR. KUNDE SUGGESTS THAT GTE WILL TIME UPGRADE DECISIONS SO

16 17

1

## THAT COLLOCATORS WILL PAY FOR THEM. IS THIS TRUE?

No. There is no evidence whatsoever that GTE would manipulate its plant upgrade
 schedule to "foist its costs upon collocated parties," as Mr. Kunde suggests. (p.
 4, I. 18) GTE does not possess a crystal ball to know when collocators will
 submit requests requiring major upgrades. GTE's engineers develop GTE driven schedules for plant upgrades which get altered when collocators make

1	
2	requests which require GTE to direct resources from planned projects to
3	accommodate major augmentations caused by collocators.
4	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
5	A. Yes.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	