

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MARK A. HANSON

TELECOMMUNICATIONS DIVISION

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

PROPOSED REVISION TO THE COLLOCATION TARIFFS TO ELIMINATE CHARGES
FOR DC POWER ON A PER KILOWATT-HOUR BASIS AND TO IMPLEMENT
CHARGING ON A PER AMP BASIS

ILLINOIS BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 05-0675

March 29, 2006

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2

3 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

4 A. My name is Mark A. Hanson and my business address is 527 East Capitol
5 Avenue, Springfield, Illinois 62701.

6

7 **Q. Are you the same Mark A. Hanson who has previously sponsored**
8 **testimony in this proceeding?**

9 A. Yes.

10

11 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

12 A. I will respond to certain aspects of the rebuttal testimony of Roman Smith of
13 AT&T Illinois in this proceeding.

14

15 **Q. In his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Roman A. Smith of AT&T Illinois offers a**
16 **revised proposal to switch rates for DC power from a kWh basis to a per**
17 **amp basis. What is your reaction to Mr. Smith's modified proposal?**

18 A. I believe Mr. Smith's clarifications that charges will not be assessed on a fused
19 amp basis are very useful.¹ I believe this is consistent with Ms. Stewart's and my
20 recommendations that any charges for DC Power be usage based. As Mr. Smith
21 states, the preponderance of evidence in the case indicates that once equipment
22 is turned on usage tends to relatively constant. This addresses a concern I had

¹ AT&T Illinois Exhibit 5.1 at page 7.

23 with replacing kWh metering with a per amp approach. In light of Mr. Smith's
24 modifications and clarifications on this issue, I believe most of my concerns with
25 AT&T Illinois' proposal are addressed. In my opinion, AT&T Illinois' proposal is
26 an improvement over the present system. This proposal should remedy the
27 AT&T Illinois under-collection of revenues associated with providing DC power
28 services to its CLEC customers, while avoiding, for the most part, creating a
29 situation where AT&T Illinois would over-collect revenues.

30

31 **Q. Do you see any situations where AT&T Illinois may overcollect revenues?**

32 A. Yes. I do not believe AT&T Illinois proposed 5 amp minimum is warranted.
33 DC power charges are intended to insure that AT&T recovers costs for power
34 consumed. That is why Ms. Stewart and I have consistently argued the charges
35 should be usage based. The 5 amp minimum charge is inconsistent with this
36 premise. If one of AT&T Illinois CLEC customers is using less than 5 amps, that
37 is what they should be charged for. Although Mr. Nevels derides such a situation
38 as "not really collocating but warehousing its equipment"², AT&T Illinois is being
39 compensated by the CLEC for its costs of providing the space. AT&T Illinois
40 should not be further compensated for power that is not being consumed.

41

42 **Q. Do you see the need for a cost study to support this modified proposal?**

43 A. It appears the other parties in the proceeding do not believe a cost study is
44 needed at this time. AT&T Illinois always has the remedy to file revised tariff

² AT&T Illinois Exhibit 3.1 at page 25.

45 sheets with a supporting cost study if its costs change significantly. Therefore, I
46 find that it is not necessary to have a cost study for this modified proposal.

47

48 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

49

50 A. Yes, it does.

51

52

53

54