

REVISED VERIFIED STATEMENT  
OF  
RUSSELL W. MURRAY

TELECOMMUNICATIONS DIVISION  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 01-0338

JUNE 18, 2001

OFFICIAL FILE

ILL. C. C. DOCKET NO. 01-0338  
Staff Docket No. 2.0  
Date 6-22-01 Reporter CB

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

2  
3 A. My name is Russell W. Murray and my business address is 527 East Capitol  
4 Avenue, Springfield, Illinois 62794-9280.

5  
6 **Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

7  
8 A. I am employed by the Illinois Commerce Commission as an Utility Analyst in the  
9 Telecommunications Division.

10  
11 **Q. Please describe your professional background.**

12  
13 A. I am retired from GTE/Verizon after 30 years of service. I began my career with  
14 GTE of Illinois in 1970 as a Central Office Equipment Installer in Belvidere,  
15 Illinois. As an Equipment Installer I installed Electrical Mechanical switching  
16 equipment, Special Service Equipment and Transmission Equipment in GTE  
17 Central Offices in Northern Illinois. In 1976 I became a Switching Technician in  
18 New Milford, Illinois. In that capacity I conducted routine maintenance and repair  
19 of Electrical Mechanical and the newer #2EAX electronic switches, as well as  
20 maintenance and repair of various PABX switching equipment. I also worked on  
21 customer related trouble. In 1984 I transferred from Belvidere, Illinois to  
22 Bloomington, Illinois to work in the Switching Services Operations Center  
23 (SSOC). There I provided technical support to the local Switching Technicians

1 who worked on the #2EAX and GTD5 electronic switches. I also assisted the  
2 local technicians performing the software upgrades called System Version  
3 Releases (SVRs). The SSOC not only provided first line support but also was  
4 the alarm monitoring center as well as call out center for Illinois during off hours.  
5 SSOC personnel, of which I was one, were on call seven days per week, twenty  
6 four hours per day. In 1987 I become an Instructor for GTE North, located in  
7 Bloomington, Illinois. In that capacity, I instructed Management and Craft  
8 personnel on various technical and operational characteristics of the GTD5  
9 electronic switch. In 1990 I returned to the Technical Support group. Again, I  
10 was responsible for providing technical support not only to the Local Technicians  
11 but also to the group's own Support Technicians. I also provided technical  
12 support and undertook Test Engineering functions for the GTE's Equipment  
13 Installation group. In addition, I was responsible for undertaking office  
14 conversions on several 5ESS switches throughout Illinois. I helped develop and  
15 train the Local Technicians on ADSL Testing in GTE North and provided  
16 technical support for the ATM network. Further, I have worked on Local Number  
17 Portability (LNP) and helped to develop the Fiber Restoration Procedures for  
18 GTE North.

19  
20 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?**

21 A. My testimony will explain Staff's position on the following items: TDS 101,  
22 TDS102, TDS 196 and TDS 197.

23

1 **Issue TDS-101**

2 **Q. When should Ameritech notify a CLEC prior to a major construction**  
3 **project?**

4 A. In his direct testimony, TDS Metrocom's Witness Cliff Lawson refers to the  
5 Ameritech Interconnector's Collocation Handbook section 4.0.12 for support for  
6 his position on notification prior to a major project. "Ameritech will notify the  
7 collocator prior the scheduled start dates of all construction activities (including  
8 power additions or modifications) in the general area of the collocator's  
9 dedicated space with potential to disrupt the collocator's services. Ameritech will  
10 proved such notification to the collocator at least twenty (20) business days  
11 where feasible before the scheduled start date of such construction activity."  
12 TDS Metrocom Direct Testimony Witness Mr. Cliff Lawson page 28 through 29  
13 starting at line 17. Whereas, Ameritech's Witness Theresa Bates indicates in  
14 her direct testimony that the Collocator's Handbook should not overrule the  
15 Interconnection Agreement. Ameritech Direct Testimony Witness Ms. Theresa  
16 Bates page 35 starting at line 14.  
17 While Staff agrees that the CLEC Collocator's Handbook should not necessarily  
18 overrule the Interconnection Agreement, it should be used as a guideline for  
19 notification of major work projects. If Ameritech insists that a CLEC should follow  
20 the Handbook, then it follows that Ameritech should also have to live by these  
21 rules. Staff agrees that twenty (20) business days notification (unless it is an  
22 emergency) is an acceptable time frame for major construction projects.

23

1 **Issue TDS-102**

2 **Q. How much notice should Ameritech be required to give prior to scheduled**  
3 **AC or DC power work?**

4 A. For the reasons set forth above, Staff believes that twenty (20) business days  
5 (unless there is an emergency) is also an acceptable time frame for scheduled  
6 AC and DC power work.

7

8 **Issue TDS-196**

9

10 **Q. Do you believe that Ameritech should do Acceptance Testing?**

11 A. Yes. In Docket 00-0592 Final Order Issue 56 Cooperative Testing-Loops,  
12 Analyses and Conclusion-sets forth "[t]he remaining issue is the schedule for  
13 implementation of cooperative acceptance testing. In its Reply Brief on  
14 Exceptions, AI agrees to perform acceptance testing on 90% of xDSL-capable  
15 loops and ISDN loops within 90 days of this Order. Further, AI indicates that it  
16 began cooperative maintenance testing on xDSL-capable loops on December  
17 1,2000 and issued an Accessible letter for such testing on xDSL-capable loops  
18 within 90 days of this Order. We find AI's proposals for implementation to be  
19 reasonable". Docket 00-0592 Final Order page 98. In further support for the  
20 need for acceptance testing, Ameritech's Witness Michael Silver states in his  
21 testimony "In order to resolve this problem, effective June 23, 2001, CLEC's will  
22 use the ALBR field populated with "Y" and the words Acceptance testing  
23 requested in the Remarks". Ameritech Direct Testimony Witness Michael Silver  
24 page 24 line 4.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

**Q. Have you received a copy of Ameritech's Acceptance Testing Method of Procedures for Acceptance Testing?**

A. Yes. I received it on Wednesday, June 13, 2001 via e-mail.

**Q. Have you had an opportunity to review the Acceptance Testing Method of Procedures for Acceptance Testing?**

A. Yes.

**Q. What conclusions have you reached since reviewing this document?**

A. This document has been listed as proprietary material so I will try to explain its contents without divulging any proprietary data. Ameritech has developed a set of procedures for performing Acceptance Testing for Unbundled xDSL UNEs. This program is scheduled to be rolled out on June 25, 2001. The accompanying flow chart and procedures are quite extensive. Both the flow chart and the written procedures: (1) provide phone numbers for the Ameritech Local Operations Center/LOC;(2) describe the tests that are to be performed by the technician; (3) detail how the technician is to close out the work order or trouble ticket, as well as indicates who the technician is to refer the work order or trouble ticket to if there is a problem. The written procedures incorporate both Ameritech and SBC practices as well as detail the expected time allotment for clearing out the work order/trouble ticket. Staff realizes that these procedures as well as training the technicians will take

1 time for Ameritech to set up, however, Staff feels that this is an acceptable  
2 “framework” for Ameritech Acceptance Testing.  
3 TDS Metrocom’s supports language stating that “all loops shall be tested to  
4 verify absence of load coils, excessive bridge taps, foreign voltage, grounds or  
5 other elements that make the loop unsuitable” TDS Metrocom Lawson’s Direct  
6 Testimony page 30. The information provided by Ameritech in the response to  
7 Staff’s data request RWM 6.1 does indicate that the tests in question by TDS  
8 Metrocom are included in their written procedures. Staff agrees that these tests  
9 are important to ensure that the loop meets its defined electrical characteristics  
10 before delivering the loop to TDS Metrocom. Therefore, at this point in time,  
11 Staff feels that Ameritech is making good faith efforts to perform the required  
12 and requested test in a reasonable amount of time.  
13 Furthermore, Staff will continue to monitor the Acceptance Testing in conjunction  
14 with Docket 00-0592. In that docket Ameritech has certain rules they are to  
15 comply with, which includes providing a monthly Acceptance Testing Issues  
16 report to Staff, therefore, Staff recommends that this process should be given an  
17 opportunity to develop on is own.

18  
19  
20 **Issue TDS-197**

21  
22 **Q. TDS Metrocom Issue 197 deals with Ameritech’s obligation to perform**  
23 **acceptance testing. In the instance where the CLEC cannot provide a**  
24 **“live” representative within ten minutes so that Ameritech can perform its**

1       **Acceptance Testing, should Ameritech be relieved of its obligation to**  
2       **perform acceptance testing, hence, forcing the CLEC to assume**  
3       **acceptance of the loop?-**

4       A.   This is a very complex issue. The question becomes: "how long should a  
5       technician have to wait for someone to either initially answer the phone or  
6       answer the phone after being placed on hold?" Staff recommends that this issue  
7       be addressed in the six-month review of the SBC/Ameritech Wholesale  
8       Performance Plan, which is currently underway.

9

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

11      A.   Yes.