

1

I.INTRODUCTION

2

3 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

4 A. My name is John J. Boshier. My business address is 600 Hidden Ridge Drive, Irving,
5 Texas 75038.

6

7 **Q. HAVE YOU FILED PHASE A DIRECT AND RESPONSIVE DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS**
8 **DOCKET?**

9 A. Yes, I have.

10

11 **ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU PRESENTING TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

12 I am presenting testimony on behalf of Verizon Northwest Inc., which was formerly known as GTE Northwest
13 Incorporated. The company recently changed its name after the closure of the merger between its parent
14 company, GTE Corporation, and Bell Atlantic Corporation. The merged company name is Verizon
15 Communications.

16

17 **IN YOUR TESTIMONY HOW DO YOU USE THE TERMS "VERIZON NW" AND "GTE"?**

18 My fellow witnesses and I use "Verizon NW" to refer to Verizon Northwest Inc., the company that is a party to this
19 proceeding and on whose behalf we are testifying. I use "GTE" to refer to the former GTE companies,
20 which are now part of the Verizon Communications companies along with the former Bell Atlantic
21 companies. This will make clear that we are talking about cost studies and inputs that have been developed
22 by and for the GTE telephone operating companies and about those companies' operations, practices and
23 procedures.

24

25 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR PHASE A REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

1 A. The purpose of my phase A rebuttal testimony is to respond to statements made by: 1) Worldcom Inc.
2 witness Roy Lathrop regarding ILEC facilitation of line sharing between CLECs and 2) Covad and
3 Rhythms Links witness John Klick concerning ILEC placement of splitters without the input of CLECs.
4 In addition, I am providing a revision to my phase A direct testimony.

5

6

II.CLEC-TO-CLEC LINE SHARING

7

8 **MR. LATHROP RECOMMENDS THE COMMISSION REQUIRE ILECS TO FACILITATE LINE**
9 **SHARING BETWEEN CLECS. DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS RECOMMENDATION?**

10 A. No. As I noted in my phase A responsive direct testimony in response to similar comments made by
11 AT&T witness Joseph Gillan, the FCC Line Sharing Order clearly excludes the obligation of the ILEC to
12 provide line sharing to CLECs that purchase a combination of network elements (“UNE-P”). I also noted
13 in my phase A responsive direct testimony that there are operational and technical issues associated with
14 offering line sharing in conjunction with UNE-P.

15

16

III.ILEC PLACEMENT OF SPLITTERS

17

18 **MR. KCLICK STATES THAT ILECS MAKE DECISIONS WITHOUT INPUT FROM CLECS**
19 **REGARDING THE PLACEMENT OF SPLITTERS. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO THIS**
20 **STATEMENT?**

21 Nothing in the FCC Line Sharing Order suggests or directs that the CLEC may dictate the
22 location of an ILEC-owned splitter. Rather, ILECs must be allowed to manage the use
23 of their own facilities to ensure that they are used efficiently and in a safe manner.
24 Verizon NW must be allowed to make that determination regarding its own space.

25

1 The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit recently considered a FCC rule
2 that required ILECs to give competitors the option of collocating equipment in any
3 unused space within the ILEC’s premises, to the extent technically feasible. In vacating
4 the FCC’s rule, the Court stated:

5 ““The FCC offers no good reason to explain why a competitor, as
6 opposed to the LEC, should choose where to establish collocation on
7 the LEC’s property; nor is there any good explanation of why LECs
8 are forbidden from requiring competitors to use separate entrances to
9 access their own equipment; nor is there any reasonable justification
10 for the rule prohibiting LECs from requiring competitors to use
11 separate or isolated rooms or floors. It is one thing to say that LECs
12 are forbidden from imposing unreasonable minimum space
13 requirements on competitors; it is quite another thing, however, to say
14 that competitors, over the objection of LEC property owners, are free
15 to pick and choose preferred space on the LECs’ premises, subject to
16 only technical feasibility. There is nothing in § 251(c)(6) that
17 endorses this approach.”¹

18

19 **IV. REVISIONS TO PHASE A DIRECT TESTIMONY**

20

21 **DO YOU HAVE ANY CORRECTIONS TO YOUR PHASE A DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

22 Yes. In response to the question “What is the third network configuration?” found on page 10
23 of my phase A direct testimony, I indicated that the CLEC-owned splitter option
24 (Configuration #3) is only available until August 31, 2000 ,and during that period the
25 CLECs should place their own splitters in Verizon NW’s office using one of the first two

¹GTE Services Corporation et al. v. Federal Communications Commission et al., 205 F. 3d 416, 426 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (emphasis added).

1 splitter configuration options proposed by Verizon NW. Since the filing of my phase A
2 direct testimony, the August 31, 2000, date has been changed to December 15, 2000, to
3 allow CLECs additional time to acquire their own splitters.

4

5 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR PHASE A REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

6 A. Yes.

7

BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE CONTINUED)
COSTING AND PRICING OF UNBUNDLED)
NETWORK ELEMENTS, TRANSPORT,) DOCKET NO. UT- 003013
TERMINATION, AND RESALE) PHASE A

PHASE A REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

JOHN J. BOSHER

GROUP MANAGER-WHOLESALE MARKETS

ON BEHALF OF

VERIZON NORTHWEST INC.

Formerly Known as GTE Northwest Incorporated

SUBJECT: LINE-SHARING POLICY AND TERMS & CONDITIONS

AUGUST 4, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	CLEC-TO-CLEC LINE SHARING	2
III.	ilec placement of splitters	3
IV.	REVISION TO PHASE A DIRECT TESTIMONY	4