COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

AN INQUIRY INTO UNIVERSAL)ADMINISTRATIVESERVICE AND FUNDING ISSUES)CASE NO. 360

INDEX

PAGE

INTRODUCTION	1
UNIVERSAL SERVICE COST MODEL SELECTION	5
FCC Criteria Compliance	6
Costing Universal Service on a Wirecenter Basis	14
DEFINITION OF BASIC LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE	14
DESIGNATED SERVING AREAS	15
INPUTS TO MODEL	19
REVENUE BENCHMARKS	24
FUND SIZE	26
FUND ASSESSMENTS	27
Assessment to Customers	27
Billing All Telecommunications Carriers	28
Universal Service Network Access Rate Elements	29
Commission Decision	30
ELIMINATION OF WINDFALLS	30

PAGE

PRIMARY ACCESS LINE SUPPORT	35
ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS	36
ADDITIONAL LOW-INCOME SUPPORT	37
SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, AND HEALTH CARE	38
FUND ADMINISTRATION	38
CONCLUSION	38
ORDERING PARAGRAPHS	39

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

AN INQUIRY INTO UNIVERSAL SERVICE AND FUNDING ISSUES

) ADMINISTRATIVE) CASE NO. 360

<u>ORDER</u>

INTRODUCTION

The Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996) (the "Act" or the "1996 Act"), specifically provides for states to adopt mechanisms that preserve and advance universal service.¹ Such mechanisms must be "specific, predictable, and sufficient" and must not "burden federal universal support mechanisms."² The decisions reached herein comply with those principles as well as those enumerated elsewhere in the 1996 Act. The first principle of the Universal Service Fund ("USF") created herein is to ensure that quality service is provided at just, reasonable, and affordable rates.³ Ensuring that quality service is available to all Kentuckians at reasonable rates has been a primary goal of this Commission since its inception. That goal has been achieved in the past, in part, by means of a complex system of implicit subsidies. Prices for certain services such as toll, access, and vertical services were set above their economic costs, and prices for basic residential service, especially in rural areas, generally were set below their economic costs. However,

- ² Id.
- ³ 47 U.S.C. § 254(b).

¹ 47 U.S.C. § 254(f).

complex costing methods and allocations have made it difficult in the past to determine the economic cost of the services. The purpose of this proceeding is to determine the amount of implicit high cost subsidy on a forward-looking basis and create an explicit mechanism to fulfill the necessary functions of those subsidies.

The Act, at Section 254(e), requires, among other things, that universal service support be explicit. The Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") order on universal service explains why implicit subsidies should be replaced by an explicit mechanism:

This system [of implicit subsidies] is not sustainable in its current form in a competitive environment. In a competitive market, a carrier that attempts to charge rates significantly above cost to a class of customers will lose many of those customers to a competitor. This incentive to entry by competitors in the lowest cost, highest profit market segments means that today's pillars of implicit subsidies -----high access charges, high prices for business services, and the averaging of rates over broad geographic areas --- will be under attack. New competitors can target service to more profitable customers without having to build into their rates the types of cross-subsidies that have been required of existing carriers who serve all customers.⁴

The FCC has also found that "the states acting pursuant to sections 254(f) and 253 of the Communications Act, must in the first instance be responsible for identifying implicit universal service support. We believe that, as competition develops, states may be compelled by market place forces to convert implicit support to explicit, sustainable

4

In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45, Report and Order (May 8, 1997) ("FCC Order") at paragraph 17.

mechanisms consistent with section 254(f)."⁵ This Commission concurs with the FCC's reasoning and with its approach, and determines, based upon findings to be discussed in this Order, that the state portion of the high cost subsidy is approximately \$98 million annually. Because these subsidies have been necessary to preserve affordable rates in Kentucky, the Commission concludes that for the time being this amount, in addition to low-income support discussed herein, is required in the intrastate USF. This Order discusses these findings and related issues.

The evolution of the telecommunications industry has given rise to numerous Commission proceedings in recent years. In response to burgeoning competition and technological advances, the Commission has reduced regulatory requirements and exempted certain telephone services from regulation pursuant to enabling legislation, KRS 278.512.⁶ In 1995, the Commission initiated a proceeding, the predecessor to this one, to investigate the viability of local competition, to expand universal service goals,

⁵ FCC Order at paragraph 202.

See, generally, Administrative Case No. 273, An Inquiry Into Inter- and IntraLATA Intrastate Competition in Toll and Related Services Markets in Kentucky; Administrative Case No. 323, An Inquiry Into IntraLATA Toll Competition, and Appropriate Competition Scheme for Completion of IntraLATA Calls By Interexchange Carriers, and WATS Jurisdictionality; Administrative Case No. 340, An Investigation Into Diversified Operations of Local Exchange Telephone Companies; Administrative Case No. 344, Inquiry Into the Provision and Regulation of Cellular Mobile Telephone Service in Kentucky; Administrative Case No. 359, Exemptions for Interexchange Carriers, Long-Distance Resellers, Operator Service Providers and Customer-Owned, Coin-Operated Telephones; Administrative Case No. 370, Exemptions for Providers of Local Exchange Service Other Than Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers.

and to address the feasibility of reducing the non-traffic sensitive ("NTS") revenue requirement.⁷ During the pendency of that docket, the Congress enacted the 1996 Act.⁸

In the September 26, 1996 Order in Administrative Case No. 355, the Commission established preliminary issues and initial parameters for universal service. The Commission found that an intrastate USF should be established to comply with minimum federal standards, and that it should support a single residential access line for Kentucky subscribers, promote facilities-based competition, support low-income assistance, and cover its administrative costs. The Commission determined that all telecommunications service providers regulated by the Commission would contribute toward universal service, except for payphone providers, and that the assessment upon each carrier would be based on the percentage of gross intrastate revenues net of payments to other carriers.

At that time, the Commission contemplated that universal service funding would be initiated on a flash-cut transition basis. Thus, NTS rate elements would be removed from access charges and intrastate toll rates once the fund was initiated.⁹ However, based on the evidence received in this proceeding, the Commission's initial findings have been significantly altered.

⁷ Administrative Case No. 355, An Inquiry Into Local Competition, Universal Service, and the Non-Traffic Sensitive Access Rate.

⁸ The 1996 Act became law February 8, 1996.

⁹ Administrative Case No. 355, Order dated September 26, 1996 at 27 and 28.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE COST MODEL SELECTION

The Commission first evaluated the Hatfield Model Version 2.2.2 in interconnection arbitration proceedings held pursuant to Section 252 of the Act.¹⁰ Subsequently, the model has evolved into the current HAI Model, Release 5.0a ("HAI Model").¹¹ The Commission has also seen the Benchmark Cost Proxy Model evolve through four stages, culminating in the BCPM 3.1 ("BCPM"). Both models continue to evolve as the FCC and the states refine their critiques and suggestions and the model builders attempt to satisfy their clients' needs.

The Commission must choose a universal service cost model by May 26, 1998 to satisfy FCC requirements. As this deadline has approached, the FCC has continued to request further comments on principle inputs.¹² Accordingly, this Order will satisfy federal requirements imposed upon the states, as well as implement the Commission's desire to establish a USF in Kentucky.

¹⁰ It should be noted that each of the arbitration proceedings before the Commission established unbundled network element ("UNE") pricing based on total element long run incremental costs ("TELRIC"), as submitted by the incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs").

¹¹ The HAI Model, formerly known as the Hatfield Model, was developed by HAI Consulting, Inc. at the request of AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. and MCI Communications Corporation.

¹² Common Carrier Bureau Requests Further Comment on Selected Issues Regarding the Forward-Looking Economic Cost Mechanism for Universal Service Support, DA 98-848, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 97-160 (May 4, 1998).

FCC Criteria Compliance

The FCC has provided general guidance for the construction of universal service cost models,¹³ supplying ten criteria which must be satisfied.¹⁴ Both HAI Model and BCPM Model supporters claim that their model satisfies these criteria. Indeed, the criteria are sufficiently general in nature that both models do appear to satisfy all requirements. Both models successfully construct and estimate the cost of a local network. However, there are some fundamental differences in their respective modeling approaches. In modeling wirecenters with lower population densities, the HAI Model approach focuses on designing a least-cost network built to serve large numbers of people over a wide geographic area and to provide access to comparable levels of service between urban and rural customers. The BCPM modeling approach focuses more on providing identical levels of service between urban and rural customers in a least-cost manner. Compared to the HAI Model, the BCPM tends to design smaller distribution and serving areas and places more of them within a wirecenter to serve a given number of people. Fewer but larger distribution and serving areas means that the HAI Model tends to install fewer remote terminals, serving area interfaces, and other types of plant than does the BCPM Model. Given these fundamentally different approaches to designing the local network, it is to be expected that the BCPM supporters would claim that the HAI Model underbuilds the network and will not work properly. By the same token, HAI Model supporters claim that the BCPM Model

¹⁴ <u>Id.</u> at paragraph 250.

-6-

¹³ <u>See, generally</u>, FCC Order at paragraphs 223-272.

overdesigns and overbuilds the network far beyond what is reasonable and necessary to satisfy FCC requirements.¹⁵

The Integrated Cost Model ("ICM") being developed by GTE South Incorporated ("GTE") could potentially be used to estimate the cost of local service for universal service purposes. However, the ICM has not been introduced into this case. GTE has indicated its willingness temporarily to accept and support the BCPM model, but states it wishes to substitute the ICM at the appropriate time.¹⁶

GTE and Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company ("CBT") believe that each ILEC should have the freedom to choose its own universal service cost model and that all model inputs should be company specific.¹⁷ Rather than taking a statewide view of what constitutes a least-cost, forward-looking technology network, GTE argues that the Commission must focus on each ILEC individually as the standard to judge what is a "least-cost" network utilizing a specific forward-looking technological design. GTE contends that a least-cost network utilizing specific, forward-looking technology will not necessarily be the same, for example, between adjacent GTE and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth") wirecenters.

¹⁷ Id. and CBT March 1998 Brief at 1 and 2.

¹⁵ It is interesting to note that in the parties' efforts to discredit each other's positions, much discussion sometimes focused on user-definable default input values, the use of which neither party was actually advocating.

¹⁶ GTE March 27, 1998 Brief at 16.

It is commonly accepted that the universal service model designs a hypothetical least-cost local network utilizing forward-looking technology and encompassing certain actual local network characteristics. Such a hypothetical network would be designed and operated by an efficient firm operating in a competitive environment. The Georgetown Consulting Group ("GCG") on behalf of BellSouth argues that the Commission should take a statewide approach and utilize input data which most closely represents what a competitively efficient firm would experience.¹⁸ The Commission agrees and finds that a statewide perspective should be taken in the design of the Kentucky universal service mechanism. There is no evidence in the record to suggest that a hypothetical, efficient firm would either change its network design or alter its resource procurement practices simply because it operates in wirecenters formerly monopolized by different ILECs. An input value obtained from GTE data could be used as the representative data input into the universal service cost model for use in a BellSouth wirecenter, or vice versa.

Accepting GTE's reasoning regarding the need for a company-specific model and inputs would impose unnecessary restrictions upon the hypothetical firm in the model. Moreover, acceptance of GTE's position could also serve to insulate the ILEC from the cost pressures that otherwise would be imposed on it by a competing firm. Accordingly, to the extent that GTE advocates placing a binding rule upon the Commission for choosing both a universal service model and model inputs, its argument is rejected.

The Commission notes that GTE has argued that "[t]he universal service fund must be sufficient to replace all of GTE's existing implicit subsidies, which are based on

18

Transcript of Evidence ("TE"), Vol. VI dated November 14, 1997 at 60 and 61.

GTE's actual costs."¹⁹ It argues that it is entitled to a continuation of the opportunity to recover its prudently incurred investments plus a reasonable profit.²⁰ However, the FCC has concluded that embedded costs are not appropriate for determining universal service support, specifically rejecting the argument that "only a universal service mechanism that calculates support based on a carrier's embedded cost will provide sufficient support."²¹ The Commission concurs, and rejects GTE's contention that, if it is not assured of recovering its embedded costs, its property will have been taken without due process of law. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia has rejected a similar argument made by GTE in its appeal of a local interconnection agreement. See GTE South Inc. v. Morrison, et al., C.A. No. 3:97CV493 (E.D.Va., May 19, 1998). That court found, citing Williamson Co. Regional Planning v. Hamilton Bank, 473 U.S. 172 (1985), that GTE's unconstitutional takings claim was not ripe because GTE had not sought just compensation through existing statutory mechanisms. Precisely the same circumstance exists here. GTE cannot claim that it has been deprived of just compensation when it has not applied for rate review pursuant to KRS 278.190. GTE may appear at any time before this Commission for a thorough review of its rates, so that an appropriate determination of its needs can be made.

The Commission must determine which model and input values best estimate the universal service costs. Inserting comparable input values into both the HAI Model and

¹⁹ GTE March 27, 1998 Brief at 11.

²⁰ <u>Id.</u> at 11-12.

²¹ The FCC states, "[t]he term 'embedded cost' refers to a carrier's historic loop or switching costs. FCC Order at paragraphs 227 and 228.

the BCPM Model yields universal service cost estimates within established zones of reasonableness when the same benchmarks are used. However, in the Commission's opinion, the HAI Model reflects more appropriate network costs. Moreover, the HAI Model more accurately locates customers and is more open to public review. Therefore, the Commission adopts the HAI Model to establish the Kentucky USF and determines that the HAI Model complies with the FCC's criteria as discussed below.²²

CRITERION 1

The technology assumed in the cost study or model must be the least-cost, mostefficient, and reasonable technology for providing the supported services that is currently being deployed. A model, however, must include the ILECs' wire centers as the center of the loop network and the outside plant should terminate at the ILECs' current wire centers. The loop design incorporated into a forward-looking economic cost study or model should not impede the provision of advanced services. For example, load coils should not be used because they impede the provision of advanced services. Wire center line counts should equal actual incumbent LEC wire center line counts, and the study's or model's average loop length should reflect the incumbent carrier's actual average loop length.

The Commission determined that the nature of the design of the HAI Model aligns itself with current technology which is least-cost, most efficient and reasonable. The HAI Model engineers the complete network including the loop. It measures the cost of switching and interoffice facilities, and explicitly engineers the signaling network necessary to provide local exchange service. The HAI Model is designed to receive line count information, by type of service and by wirecenter, for the entire state. The HAI

²² The Commission acknowledges that universal service models will continue to evolve while the FCC continues to investigate crucial aspects of model design and the model developers continue their work. Therefore, the Commission may, in the future, reconsider its decision of the model to be used.

Model uses the Local Exchange Routing Guide maintained by Bellcore to determine wirecenter location.

The HAI Model engineers longer loop length and in turn uses less Digital Loop Carrier ("DLC"). The current technology allows for advanced services to be provided over longer loop length. Although the HAI Model does not contain actual wirecenter line counts, the Commission intends to use current line count data.

The HAI Model produces a reasonable and accurate estimate of the average loop length for all loops in the study area. The customer location and loop methodology used to determine the loop lengths are explained in detail in the HAI Model documentation. The Commission has no reasonable way of determining the actual average loop length of all its loops in Kentucky for all classes of service. Thus, a comparison of actual average loop length to a cost proxy model loop length is not feasible. To determine the actual average loop length would require a review of each loop in this state, or at least a very comprehensive sample of loops for all classes of service. Moreover, the Commission believes that the loop lengths reflected in the HAI Model engineer an appropriate loop length for modeling purposes.

CRITERION 2

Any network function or element, such as loop, switching, transport, or signaling necessary to produce supported services must have an associated cost.

Each network function or element in the HAI Model has an associated cost.

CRITERION 3

Only long-run forward-looking economic cost may be included. The long-run period used must be a period long enough that all costs may be treated as variable and avoidable. The costs must not be the embedded cost of the facilities, functions, or elements. The study or model, however, must be based upon an examination of the current cost of purchasing facilities and equipment, such as switches and digital loop carriers (rather than list prices).

The HAI model was developed to estimate the costs incurred by an efficient carrier building a network using current technology and costs. The consulting group designing the model used long-run forward-looking costs. The model correctly applies a long-run assumption by treating the ILECs' embedded cost structure, except for the location of wirecenters, as variable and avoidable. The Commission believes that the HAI Model meets the requirements of this criterion.

CRITERION 4

The rate of return must be either the authorized federal rate of return on interstate services, currently 11.25 percent, or the state's prescribed rate of return for intrastate services.

The parties participating in this proceeding have not been before the Commission for a rate of return proceeding in several years. Therefore, the current prescribed state rates of return are out of date and irrelevant to this proceeding. The Commission will use a prescribed rate of return of 10.3 percent. This rate of return reflects current and forward-looking conditions of the market.

CRITERION 5

Economic lives and future net salvage percentages used in calculating depreciation expense should be within the FCC-authorized range and use currently authorized depreciation lives.

The HAI Model allows the user to define the depreciation and future net salvage

values. The Commission has chosen values within the FCC-authorized range as shown

in the Appendices attached hereto.

CRITERION 6

The cost study or model must estimate the cost of providing service for all businesses and households within a geographic region. This includes the provision of multi-line business services, special access, private lines, and multiple residential lines. Such inclusion of multi-line business services and multiple residential lines will permit the cost study or model to reflect the economies of scale associated with the provision of these services.

The HAI Model estimates the cost of providing service for all types of access lines

within a geographic region. It then allows the user to specify which lines are to be

supported by the USF.

CRITERION 7

A reasonable allocation of joint and common costs should be assigned to the cost of supported services.

The HAI Model assigns a reasonable allocation of joint and common costs to

supported services.

CRITERION 8

The cost study or model and all underlying data, formulae, computations, and software associated with the model should be available to all interested parties for review and comment. All underlying data should be verifiable, engineering assumptions reasonable, and outputs plausible.

The HAI Model is open and based on publicly available information, even though

some preprocessing occurs. The output spreadsheets are contained in the Appendices

attached hereto.

CRITERION 9

The cost study or model should include the capability to examine and modify the critical assumptions and engineering principles. These assumptions and principles include, but are not limited to, the cost of capital, depreciation rates, fill factors, input costs, overhead adjustments, retail costs, structure sharing percentages, fiber-copper cross-over points, and terrain factors.

The HAI Model has the capability to examine and modify critical assumptions and

engineering principles. The input values are contained in Appendices attached hereto.

CRITERION 10

The cost study or model should deaverage support calculations to the wire center serving area level at least, and, if feasible, to even smaller areas such as a Census Block Group, Census Block, or grid cell in order to target universal service support efficiently.

The HAI Model deaverages support calculations to the wirecenter serving area level and to smaller areas, thereby meeting this criterion.

Costing Universal Service on a Wirecenter Basis

The Commission has heard testimony from all parties to this case, and the majority of the parties believe the wirecenter level is appropriate for costing universal service. The Commission finds it is appropriate at this time to calculate universal service cost at the wirecenter level.

DEFINITION OF BASIC LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE

The Commission has, on a preliminary basis, defined basic local exchange service for universal service purposes to include dialtone, access to touchtone, access to locally provided emergency service (911 and E911), operator services, interexchange services, directory assistance, and a white-page directory and listing for residential customers.²³ No party has opposed the inclusion of a white-page directory and listing. Accordingly, the Commission affirms its decision to include this addition to the FCC's list of services to be supported.

The Commission has also found that the assessments for telecommunications relay service and telecommunication devices for the deaf should be tied to customers'

23

Administrative Case No. 355, Order dated September 26, 1996 at 29 and 30.

access lines.²⁴ Thus, when a CLEC serves a residential or business customer instead of the ILEC, the assessment will be collected by the CLEC and paid to the TRS and TDD fund.

The Commission has also previously found that touchtone service is a mandatory requirement for basic local exchange service; however, existing customers who do not subscribe to touchtone are "grandfathered," and touchtone service will continue to be optional for these customers while they remain at their current respective addresses.²⁵

DESIGNATED SERVING AREAS

The FCC's discussion of service areas concludes "[t]hat service areas should be sufficiently small to ensure accurate targeting of high cost support and to encourage entry by competitors."²⁶ The FCC urges states not to designate existing ILEC study areas as service areas, as designating unreasonably large service areas might violate the 1966 Act.²⁷ However, the FCC does encourage state commissions, in order to promote competition, "[t]o consider designating service areas that require ILECs to serve areas that they have not traditionally served."²⁸ The FCC also states that it recognizes "[t]hat a service area cannot be tailored to the natural facilities-based service area of each entrant, but notes that ILECs, like other carriers, may use resold wholesale service

- ²⁶ FCC Order at paragraph 184.
- ²⁷ <u>Id.</u> at paragraph 185.
- ²⁸ Id.

-15-

²⁴ <u>Id.</u> at 30.

²⁵ <u>Id.</u> at 31.

or unbundled network elements to provide service in the portions of a service area where they have not constructed facilities."²⁹

In regard to support areas, the FCC states that "it would be consistent with the Act for the Commission to base the actual level of universal service support that carriers receive on the cost of providing service within sub-units of a state-defined service area, such as a wire center or a census block group."³⁰ As discussed previously, actual universal service cost support in Kentucky will be based on costs disaggregated at the wirecenter level. An eligible telecommunications carrier ("ETC") that provides supported services using landline technology and that seeks USF support for providing one or more of the designated services within any given wirecenter must offer its services to all customers within each wirecenter for which it seeks USF support.

In regard to wireless providers, the FCC has cautioned that "[i]f a state adopts a service area that is simply structured to fit the contours of an incumbent's facilities, a new entrant, especially a CMRS-based provider, might find it difficult to conform its signal or service area to the precise contours of the incumbent's area."³¹ CMRS-based providers' service areas do not, of course, always conform to wirecenter boundaries. It is sufficient if these carriers conform to this requirement only to the extent that their FCC authorized licenses and franchised territories allow. However, they must still meet all of the necessary criteria within their operating service territories to achieve ETC status.

²⁹ <u>Id.</u>

³⁰ <u>Id.</u> at paragraph 192.

³¹ FCC Order at paragraph 185.

The Commission is also aware that the rural carriers are not required to participate at this time in universal service cost deliberations. The Commission notes, however, that all carriers must comply with 807 KAR 5:061, Section 8, and provide service without construction charges to any person requesting service within 750 feet of an existing customer of that carrier. The extension of a service area to encompass all access lines within a wirecenter applies to CLECs seeking universal service support.

Though the Commission currently chooses the wirecenter as the designated serving area, it may wish to consider other alternatives in the future. Accordingly, the Commission seeks comments on whether universal service would be better served if each county were a designated service area. There are counties in Kentucky whose residents are served by a different telecommunications carrier than that serving their county seat. These customers may incur toll charges to call the county seat or other parts of the county. This situation has generated numerous complaints and calls for action by county authorities and other elected officials. This situation has also generated problems concerning customers' ability to call the appropriate emergency authorities on a 911 or E911 basis. In this case, customers residing near the county boundary, who are served by a carrier other than that serving the county seat, may get the neighboring county's emergency authorities upon dialing 911 or E911. The emergency authorities in the neighboring counties often must forward messages to each other or have some other arrangement in place. However, when neighboring counties have difficulties cooperating with each other, delays in connecting Kentucky citizens with the proper emergency authorities can have devastating consequences.

-17-

One of the primary requirements of the 1996 Act for ETC status is access to 911 or E911 services. The comments should address whether access to 911 or E911 services should mean access to those emergency authorities and services that have been designated for the citizen seeking to use the service. In other words, the comments should address whether every citizen must have equal access to the emergency authorities and services within his own respective county.

Comments should also address general issues concerning whether the minimum service area for USF purposes should be designated as the county boundary,³² including (1) whether county serving areas would encourage the companies to enter into interconnection agreements with each other and foster local competition across the state; (2) whether competition between ILECs for each other's customers would help alleviate the county-wide calling problems; and (3) whether facilities-based competition may help to solve the 911/E911 problem through facilitating switch upgrades and other necessary actions.

Though rural carriers are not now participating in the USF, the Commission invites the rural companies to work with CBT, BellSouth, and GTE in commenting on solutions to 911/E911 and county-wide calling problems that may continue for any counties within their respective operating territories.

³² This issue may also be a key factor in determining "affordability." The FCC in its Order at paragraph 114, discusses non-rate factors affecting "affordability" in considering [calling area], an examination that would focus solely on the number of subscribers to whom one has access for local service in a local calling area would be insufficient. [A] determination that the calling area reflects the pertinent "community of interest," allowing subscribers to call hospitals, schools, and other essential services without incurring a toll charge is appropriate."

INPUTS TO MODEL

The Commission has selected inputs for the HAI Model based on the criterion that the model should estimate the costs of a forward-looking, least-cost network. The cost model should not duplicate the existing network or the costs of the existing providers. The goal of the use of a cost model in this proceeding is to make existing subsidies in the network charges explicit to the end-users. Therefore, the inputs selected in this proceeding will be used for all service areas.

The Commission finds that some of the inputs that are used in the default version of the HAI Model are reasonable and accurate. Others variables will be changed to reflect the conditions in Kentucky and are discussed below.

The Commission has determined that the appropriate costs of debt and equity for use in the forward-looking cost model are 7 percent and 12.5 percent, respectively. The FCC's list of criteria allows the states to select cost of capital that is either equal to the FCC's current 11.25 percent or a cost of capital that is prescribed at the state level. Based on the Commission's analysis, the current and future conditions will not allow for 11.25 percent cost of capital. The FCC's prescribed cost of capital has remained unchanged for many years and was developed prior to the advent of local competitive pressures. Also, trends in interest rates are forecasted to remain flat over the next several years. The Commission has determined that a forward-looking capital structure of 40 percent debt and 60 percent equity is reasonable.

The Commission has used the input of 65 percent for Distribution Fill for all density zones. The Commission believes that default values in the HAI Model overstate

-19-

the amount of fill that would be observed in the current and future of telecommunications.

The Commission has selected 150 feet for the value for Drop Distance. The default values in the HAI Model are not representative of conditions in Kentucky. GCG found the average aerial and buried drops to be 325 and 250 feet, respectively. However, the Commission finds these lengths appear to be overstated. Therefore, the Commission selects 150 feet for all density zones.

The Aerial Drop and Buried Drop placement cost selected are \$45.90 and \$.59, respectively. This is an average cost selected by the GCG for all density zones. The Commission finds these costs to be reasonable.

The Buried Drop sharing fraction selected is 85 percent for all density zones. The default value for the HAI Model is 50 percent for all density zones. The default value, which represents two entities sharing a common trench, cannot reasonably be expected in current and future networks. On the other hand, the GCG's recommendation that no sharing be considered is unreasonable.

The Buried Cable Jacketing Multiplier represents the additional cost of buried distribution cable compared to the cost of underground and aerial distribution cable. The default value of the HAI Model is 1.04. The GCG selected 1.044 based on its analysis of buried and aerial distribution cost specific to Kentucky. The Commission will use 1.044 for the Buried Cable Jacketing Multiplier.

The Commission adopts the prices recommended by the GCG for the Network Interface Device ("NID"). The cost of the NID for residential and business case shall be

-20-

\$7.57; the cost of the basic labor for the residential and business case NID shall be \$32.30; and the cost of the protection block per pair for the residential and business case shall be \$8.08. Terminal and splicing costs will be set at zero; they are included in the calculation of the costs named above.

The Commission adopts the recommendation by the GCG for Digital Loop Carrier. The GCG analysis used Kentucky-specific data. Although GCG recommended the use of two types in its forward-looking analysis, the Commission's output does not incorporate the Litespan system, since the integration of both in a single run is not possible in this release.

The values developed by the GCG for Distribution Cable Investment per foot pricing were developed using Kentucky-specific data and upon reviewing the data and its relationship to other similar inputs. The Commission finds GCG's recommendation on this issue to be reasonable and will use the values it recommends.

The maximum distance of the copper loop is set at 18,000 feet for default. At the hearing the parties disagreed as to whether the model contained the proper electronics to support such distances. There was also conflicting testimony as to whether the loop would perform properly at these distances. The Commission has chosen 15,000 feet as the maximum distance of the copper loop. It is the Commission's belief that today's technology allows the market place to install copper loop at distances beyond the traditional 12,000 feet presently prescribed by engineering standards. Although this determination represents a compromise, it is our expectation that forward-looking technology will permit the longer length.

-21-

The Commission adopted the serving area interface ("SAI") outdoor investment inputs recommended by the GCG. GCG argues that the default values in the HAI Model are not representative of conditions that exist in Kentucky and questions the genesis of the default values. The Commission agrees and will use the values suggested by the GCG.

The copper feeder fill and fiber feeder strand fill values are .727 and .945, respectively, for all density zones. These values are based on the GCG recommendations. They are based on currently used system values in Kentucky. The Commission agrees that these values are representative of forward-looking system design.

The Commission will use the values selected by the GCG for fiber feeder investment per foot and copper feeder investment per foot. These values are based on actual cost paid by BellSouth for fiber and copper in Kentucky. The default values lacked necessary supporting documentation, and the Commission will use the GCG values based on verifiable studies.

The GCG recommended values for all categories of copper manholes and fiber pullboxes is zero on the basis that distribution costs are not segregated. In the development of costs for copper and fiber investment, GCG included manhole and pullbox costs. Because the Commission chooses GCG's corresponding values, it is appropriate to also use its recommended values for cooper manholes and fiber pullboxes.

-22-

The Forward Looking Network Operations Factor is used to adjust expenses that will occur in the future. The factor recommended by AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. and MCI Communications Corporation is 50 percent. The Commission, however, adopts 70 percent. It is unreasonable to expect the ILECs to shed 50 percent of this expense even in a forward-looking competitive market. On the other hand, it is equally unreasonable to assume that the ILECs will be able to compete without dramatically transferring expenses.

The sharing factors for aerial distribution will be set at 48 percent, buried distribution at 85 percent, and underground distribution at 85 percent. It is the Commission's opinion that the future telecommunications landscape will not allow for sharing in excess of these amounts.

The Commission has selected depreciation factors that fall within the ranges approved by the FCC, but notes that, although the factors selected are reasonable for the purposes of initializing a USF, certain factors may not reflect truly forward-looking competitive rates.

GCG recommended that the cost of underground and buried excavation and restoration be modified on a Kentucky-specific basis. In its analysis, the Commission notes that on a weighted average basis, the GCG's recommendation is lower than the default but increases the universal service cost. However, when GCG inputs are allocated to all input fields, the universal service cost tracks appropriately. Thus, GCG's recommended trench costs are adopted.

-23-

All inputs selected by the Commission are contained in the Appendices attached hereto.

REVENUE BENCHMARKS

A revenue benchmark, according to the FCC, should be used to calculate federal universal service support, and "[t]he revenue benchmark should take account not only of the retail price currently charged for local service, but also of other revenues the carrier receives as a result of providing service, including vertical service revenue, and interstate and intrastate access revenues."³³ The FCC has provided a detailed discussion of revenue benchmarks.³⁴ Generally, the ILECs do not support the use of revenue benchmarks as proposed by the FCC. BellSouth, GTE, and CBT do not support the use of a revenue benchmark that includes revenues from non-supported services, i.e., toll, vertical and discretionary services. They argue these services currently provide implicit support for universal service. However, including revenues from services in the revenue benchmark will serve to include implicit support levels in an explicit support mechanism. These implicit support levels cannot be sustained in a competitive environment. Therefore, only the costs and revenues generated from supported services should be calculated.³⁵ GTE specifically argues that the implicit

³³ FCC Order at paragraph 200.

³⁴ <u>Id.</u> at paragraphs 257-267.

³⁵ <u>See, generally</u>, GTE March 28, 1998 Brief at 5-7, and BellSouth March 27, 1998 Brief at 43-45, and CBT March, 1998 Brief at 2. In addition BellSouth and GTE argue that preserving the implicit subsidy levels in access, vertical and discretionary service rates is contrary to the 1996 Act, Section 254(e).

subsidies inherent in toll, access, and vertical services should be removed and made explicit.³⁶

The Commission agrees with the FCC in principle and adopts the use of a revenue benchmark for determining universal service support. The Commission also agrees that other revenues, in addition to local service retail revenues, should be included in the revenue benchmark calculation. The benchmark should include all revenues that a new entrant may expect to obtain from market entry. The USF will serve its function, supporting carriers serving in high-cost areas, by contributing only monies equal to costs in excess of revenue benchmarks.

However, the Commission finds that a revenue benchmark reflecting state-specific revenues is preferable to a national average revenue benchmark, provided that components included for cost and revenue calculations are matched. The ILECs provided the Commission with summary pages of their respective billing analysis for each wirecenter with inadequate support. The Commission is aware that selection of the proper revenue benchmark is equally important to selecting the proper cost model and inputs. With insufficient backup data to verify the ILECs' work results, the Commission will not adopt the results as filed. Therefore, the Commission will require the ILECs to submit detailed billing analyses for the Commission to verify and calculate a revenue benchmark. The Commission will schedule an informal conference with BellSouth, GTE and CBT to discuss revenue benchmark construction methodology.

36

Id. at 6. See BellSouth March 27, 1998 Brief at 45.

-25-

While ILECs and other eligible carriers change service prices, introduce new services, and gain or lose customers, the revenue benchmark can change. In order to assure that the proper amount of USF subsidy is being remunerated to eligible carriers, guarterly monitoring revenue reports should be submitted to the USF administrator.

FUND SIZE

Once a universal service cost model has been selected and populated with the appropriate inputs, and the level of customer aggregation has been determined, then the cost of providing the supported services can be calculated. These costs are then compared to the relevant revenue benchmark to determine how much money is required to be collected. CBT calculated its USF needs to be \$28 million;³⁷ GTE calculated its USF needs to be \$28 million;³⁷ GTE calculated its USF needs to be \$145.3 million;³⁸ and BellSouth calculated its USF needs to be \$209.4 million.³⁹

Based on the Commission's findings, the state high-cost fund size is \$98 million.

The Commission calculates the intrastate high cost USF for CBT to be \$7 million, for

³⁸ GTE March 27, 1998 Brief at 14. This amount is calculated based on BCPM using GTE's calculated wirecenter specific revenue benchmark for the state portion and the \$31 residential and \$51 business revenue benchmarks for the federal portion. This results in a federal high cost fund requirement of \$23.8 million and a state high cost fund requirement of \$121.5 million.

³⁹ BellSouth March 1998 Brief at 2. This amount is calculated based on the BCPM using BellSouth's calculated wirecenter specific revenue benchmark for the state portion and the \$31 residential and \$51 business revenue benchmarks for the federal portion. This results in a federal high cost fund requirement of \$30.5 million and a state high cost fund requirement of \$178.9 million.

³⁷ CBT March, 1998 Brief at 3. CBT calculated total residential high-cost support by using an internally generated cost model to determine the cost of a residential line and used a wirecenter specific benchmark.

GTE to be \$36 million, and for BellSouth to be \$55 million. This includes all inputs previously described. The benchmarks of \$31 for residential lines and \$51 for business lines were used in the calculation. The fund provides support for primary residential lines and single business lines.

FUND ASSESSMENTS

There are four broad avenues to collect USF monies: (1) impose a subscriber line charge ("SLC") on a flat-rate basis; (2) impose a SLC on a percentage of service billed; (3) assess all telecommunications providers based on retail revenues; or (4) create explicit universal service usage sensitive network access rate elements.

The USF cost model estimates that the cost of providing basic local service for selected wirecenters is less than the revenue generated for those wirecenters. In some cases, there are substantial differences between costs and revenues. Since passage of the 1996 Act, it has been a central tenet of national policy to avoid permitting basic local residential rates to increase as a result of introducing competition into the local telephone market.⁴⁰ Meanwhile, many long-distance carriers have passed on to their customers monthly charges which account for the FCC-imposed primary interexchange carrier charge ("PICC") to fund the federal universal service fund.

Assessment to Customers

The Commission may assess customers a subscriber line charge. The assessment may be either flat-rated or based upon a percentage of intrastate revenues.

⁴⁰ The FCC has declared that "we must maintain rate for basic residential service at affordable levels. We believe that the rates for this service are generally at affordable levels today." FCC Order at 2.

A flat-rated SLC imposes a relatively greater burden on customers that is not commensurate with their actual use of network functions and services. These customers may include low-income subscribers. Assessing customers a SLC based on a percentage of their intrastate bill means that those customers who use network functions and services will pay relatively more in universal service support. A percentage SLC creates a more reasonable system by assessing heavy users a share of the cost based on proportionate use. It would be levied much like a sales tax as a line item on customers' bills.

Billing All Telecommunications Carriers

A third option to collect monies into the USF is to place an assessment on all telecommunications providers operating in Kentucky, including wireless carriers, based on revenues.⁴¹ This option was the Commission's initial choice in Administrative Case No. 355.⁴² There are distinct possibilities that such direct assessments would and should be passed directly onto consumers in the form of lump sum monthly charges.⁴³ It is unreasonable to assume that telecommunications provider shareholders should absorb USF assessments. It is reasonable to assume and expect that USF assessments will be passed onto consumers. To the extent that USF assessments are passed on to consumers in the form of lump sum monthly fees, then consumers are left with another, albeit indirectly assessed, SLC.

⁴³ IXCs are passing the FCC's PICC charges directly to their customers.

⁴¹ See Bluegrass Cellular Corporation, March 1998 Brief at 1.

⁴² Administrative Case No. 355, Order dated September 26, 1996 at 36.

If the Commission creates its own SLC as part of recovering universal service costs, then the combination of these two forms of universal service assessment would mean that most, if not all, of the universal service costs could be recovered as lump sum monthly surcharges. This may perpetuate or exacerbate the cross-subsidies existing between urban and rural customers.

Universal Service Network Access Rate Elements

The final method of assessing universal service costs to telecommunications providers and, eventually to consumers, is to create universal service charges as explicit usage sensitive network access rate elements. Minutes of use ("MOU") have been growing quickly, much more quickly than additional line growth. Growth in MOU represents consumers placing greater value on available network services and using these services with ever greater frequency and duration. To the extent that implicit subsidies embedded in network charges are eliminated and are not replaced with explicit subsidies, consumers who derive value from actual network usage, over and above simply having access to network services, will pay rates that cover cost. However, these customers will not be contributing any additional amounts toward maintaining or expanding the local network, as was the case under the prior method of subsidization. Since it is the local network which makes all telecommunications services possible, it is arguable that those who derive value from actual network usage should be required to contribute more toward network support than those who do not use the network as heavily.

-29-

Also, eliminating implicit subsidies from network charges without replacing them with an explicit subsidy will mean that some users of the local network, who are currently contributing toward local network maintenance and upgrade, i.e., those who make out-ofregion, out-of-state toll calls, and wireless calls terminating on the local network, will cease their contributions. These users of the local network should continue their contributions after the creation and implementation of the USF.

Commission Decision

The Commission finds that it is appropriate to collect universal service funds through a combination of an assessment to customers based on the percentage of services billed (i.e. a percentage SLC) and usage sensitive network access rate elements. Both methods should be designed to collect half of the total assessment. That is, the total assessment of the percentage SLC and of network access rate elements for high-cost support should be \$49 million each. This method should reasonably apportion the expense. Final details of the assessment collection will be addressed in this proceeding in the coming months.

ELIMINATION OF WINDFALLS

BellSouth argues that, "[c]oncurrent with the establishment of the USF, each nonrural LEC receiving universal service support . . . should reduce rates of services which currently provide implicit support in an amount equal to the difference between funds received from the Fund [USF] and payments into the Fund," and recommends that each

-30-

non-rural LEC submit a plan reducing rates that currently contain implicit support to the Commission after the Commission has addressed all universal service issues.⁴⁴

The Commission agrees there should be a reduction in the implicit support provided by non-supported services. The reduction in implicit support inherent in nonsupported services should equal the net contribution received from the USF. As discussed above, telecommunications carrier revenues will not be assessed for universal service support. Therefore, service rates containing implicit universal service support will be reduced by the full amount of universal service high cost support received from the USF.

Under traditional regulatory rules and prior to the 1996 Act, specific implicit urban to rural and business to residential subsidies were established through traditional rate cases. This amounted to setting residential and business rates for the various rate groups in Kentucky.⁴⁵ The USF is intended to help eliminate these implicit subsidies and replace them, as needed, with explicit subsidies. It is clear that the FCC is concerned

⁴⁴ BellSouth March 27, 1998 Brief at 48. GTE also argues that implicit universal service support provided by non-supported services should be removed and made explicit. GTE March 28, 1998 Brief at 6.

⁴⁵ During this period, when the Commission established the implicit business to residential and implicit urban to rural subsidies for basic local service, the Commission also established a subsidy, a non-traffic sensitive ("NTS") rate element embedded in access charges. Thus, there is also a toll to local subsidy.

that neither ILECs nor customers be over-burdened or over-compensated as a result of implementing a USF.⁴⁶

Windfall revenue gains could arise when the state USF is implemented and ETCs are receiving explicit universal service subsidies for every verified rural, insular and high cost customer if implicit subsidies have not been adjusted accordingly.

Using the HAI Model, the traditional implicit business to residential and urban to rural subsidies can be identified on a wirecenter basis. If there were vigorous facilitiesbased competition in these areas, market forces could be expected to eliminate implicit subsidies. However, at this point, the extent of facilities-based competition is unclear. At the time when the state USF is implemented, the implicit subsidies must be eliminated to the extent that there are windfall revenue gains to ILECs. The Commission realizes that eliminating part or all of the implicit subsidy embedded in urban business rates and urban residential rates will affect those customers most likely to see local competition

⁴⁶ The FCC states "[f]ailure to include all revenues [for revenue benchmark calculations] received by the carrier could result in substantial overpayment to the carrier." FCC Order at paragraph 200. "We believe that, as competition develops, states may be compelled by marketplace forces to convert [state-determined intrastate] implicit support to explicit, sustainable mechanism consistent with Section 254(f) [of the Act]." FCC Order at paragraph 202. "Our determinations of forward-looking economic cost for the purpose of determining federal universal service support for rural, insular, and high cost care must be coordinated with these [similar on-going] state proceedings. Failure to do so would risk under funding universal service or overcompensating carriers in some areas." FCC Order at paragraph 205.

in the near future.⁴⁷ Were it not for the immediate need to eliminate any windfall revenues resulting from changing subsidy mechanisms, the Commission would allow market forces to dictate the rate of change in local exchange rate levels. The Commission shall schedule an informal conference with CBT, BellSouth, and GTE to address these issues and to ensure a seamless transition to the new support mechanism.

As in the case of ILECs, CLECs should not unduly profit by receiving universal service support. It is clear that the FCC's intent is neither to erect barriers of entry into any specific geographic local market,⁴⁸ nor to create an artificial incentive for entry.⁴⁹ The FCC Order discusses the need for states to coordinate UNE cost estimations and proceedings with universal service cost proceedings.⁵⁰ The FCC states, "[t]his would reduce duplication and diminish arbitrage opportunities that might arise from inconsistencies between the methodologies for setting unbundled network elements and determining universal service support levels" and "[w]e wish to avoid situations in which, because of different methodologies ... a carrier could receive support for the provision

⁴⁷ This action is fully consistent with the 1996 Act, Section 254, in that the Commission is working to make implicit universal service support as explicit as possible. This position is also taken by the FCC where it concluded that it has the authority to "[c]raft a phased-in plan that relies in part on prescriptive and in part on competition to eliminate subsidies in the prices for various products sold in the market for telecommunications services." FCC Order at paragraph 246.

⁴⁸ FCC Order at paragraph 165.

⁴⁹ <u>Id.</u> at paragraph 164, including footnote 417, and paragraphs 287-288, including footnote 746.

⁵⁰ <u>Id.</u> at paragraph 251.

of universal service that differs from the rate it pays to acquire access to the unbundled network elements needed to provide universal service."⁵¹ Actions that the Commission is taking in this Order necessitate revisiting UNE cost estimates determined in prior cases upon the expiration of the interconnection agreements specifying UNE prices.⁵² The FCC acknowledges that there may be "difficulties inherent in using state cost studies designed for pricing [UNEs] for universal service purposes."⁵³ The Commission is aware of these concerns and intends to work diligently to minimize the creation of uneconomic barriers to local market entry, as well as to ensure that all eligible service providers receive the correct amount of universal service support.⁵⁴

The elimination of windfall revenues is not synonymous with rate restructuring <u>per</u> <u>se</u>. Section 254(e) of the 1996 Act provides that "[a] carrier that receives such support shall use that support only for the provision, maintenance, and upgrading of facilities and services for which the support is intended."⁵⁵

⁵² At the very least, UNE cost estimates should be recalculated on a geographically deaveraged basis. The FCC at Section VII(B)(3)(c) of the Interconnection order discusses geographic deaveraging and at paragraph 765, "concludes that three zones are presumptively sufficient to reflect geographic cost differences in setting rates for interconnection and unbundled elements"

⁵¹ FCC Order at paragraphs 232-251. Although footnote 669 sets out a specific illustration of how a CLEC could arbitrage UNE prices and universal service support, the actual situation would not occur. The FCC has prohibited eligible CLECs from receiving universal service support in excess of the cost to obtain UNEs. See FCC Order at paragraph 287.

⁵³ FCC Order at paragraph 251, footnote 670.

⁵⁴ Carriers providing service solely through resale are not eligible carriers. Id. at paragraph 290.

⁵⁵ 47 U.S.C. § 254(e).

In order that carriers do not receive a "windfall gain," they must remove the amount they receive from the USF from their rates. Thus, the subsidy that has been collected on an implicit basis will now be collected explicitly from the fund. Rate reductions to offset the explicit subsidies will be determined over the next few months. Elimination of NTS is a priority and will be considered along with the elimination of other implicit subsidies. Proposals for such reductions will be discussed at the informal conference scheduled herein.

PRIMARY ACCESS LINE SUPPORT

In Administrative Case No. 355, the Commission determined on a preliminary basis that USF support should be calculated on the number of single (first line only) residential lines served in rural areas.⁵⁶ Evidence presented in this case necessitates changing this determination. No longer will universal support be based on rural residential access lines only.

The Commission believes that focusing on providing access to the public switched network and the available services should be the primary goal of the USF.⁵⁷ In situations where there are two or more access lines being utilized at the same residence that are being paid for by separate entities, one might contend that only one line per residence should receive a USF subsidy. Universal service is defined in terms of having access

⁵⁶ Administrative Case No. 355, Order dated September 26, 1996 at 38.

⁵⁷ Section 254(b) of the Act establishes the principle that "consumers . . . should have access to telecommunications and information services" Also see the FCC Order at paragraph 66, "[u]niversal service must encompass the ability to use the network, including the ability to place calls at affordable rates. We find that both access to and use of the public switched network at rates that are "just, reasonable and affordable, are necessary to promote the principles embodied in Section 254(b)(1)." The Commission also agrees with the Joint Board recommended decisions, as discussed in the FCC Order at paragraphs 94-96.

to the network and available network services, and not in the technical terms of which person is actually responsible for paying for the one or more access lines utilized in the same place of residence.

The Commission finds that during the initial period of implementing and operating the USF, it is appropriate to support only single connection residences and businesses. The Commission understands that this may present additional enforcement or tracking problems for ETCs.

ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS

The FCC addresses the issues of carriers eligible for USF support.⁵⁶ The Commission agrees with this discussion and concurs in the findings. Also, all existing ILECs have been designated as ETCs.⁵⁹ The Commission again addresses the issue here as a point of clarification concerning wireless carriers. The FCC makes it clear that a wireless carrier can be designated as an ETC that is eligible to receive universal service support as long as it satisfies all the criteria under Section 214(e)(1) of the Act.⁶⁰ At such time when this Commission finds that any of the state wireless carriers satisfy all the necessary ETC criteria, that carrier will be designated as an ETC and will begin receiving universal service support according to FCC guidelines.

⁵⁸ <u>See, generally</u>, FCC Order at paragraphs 127-198.

⁵⁹ Administrative Case No. 360, Order dated November 26, 1997 at 3. The FCC Order at paragraph 178 discusses the eligibility of resellers and concludes that "pure" resellers using no facilities of their own are not eligible to receive USF support.

⁶⁰ FCC Order at paragraph 145 at 83. Also, in paragraph 146, the FCC goes on to say that a wireless carrier need not be the customer's primary carrier to receive support.

ADDITIONAL LOW-INCOME SUPPORT

The Commission has previously ruled that the state would not provide any additional funding for low-income programs.⁶¹ Federal support will be provided to low-income subscribers eligible for Medicaid, food stamps, supplemental security income, federal public housing assistance, and low-income home energy assistance programs.⁶² The FCC had given the states the option to supplement the Lifeline support provided by the federal program. The federal program would then in turn provide 50 percent of the state's contribution per line, up to \$1.75. That is, the state could provide an additional \$3.50 per line and the federal program would provide an additional \$1.75.

The Commission has decided that the USF will fund additional support for the Lifeline program with an additional \$3.50 per line to be eligible to receive an additional \$1.75 from the federal program. The Commission has estimated that this will create an additional \$3 million revenue requirement for the USF. The Metro Human Needs Alliance ("MHNA") argues that the Commission should fund low-income subscribers to the maximum extent.⁶³ MHNA also asserts that persons whose income is below 200 percent of the federal poverty guideline should receive benefits.⁶⁴ The Commission disagrees. Such a guideline would inject too much subjectivity into the process and would create administrative difficulty in fund administration.

- ⁶³ MHNA March 1998 Brief at 1.
- ⁶⁴ Id.

-37-

⁶¹ Administrative Case No. 360, Order dated November 26, 1997.

⁶² FCC Order at paragraph 374.

SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, AND HEALTH CARE

The Commission has previously adopted the federal discount matrix established by the FCC for schools and libraries.⁶⁵ The Commission affirms that decision in this Order. No information has been provided to the Commission that establishes a need for additional support. Moreover, no quantifiable need for telemedicine support has been established. However, the Commission will continue to monitor these issues.

FUND ADMINISTRATION

Parties requested that the USF be administered by a neutral third-party rather than by a support recipient. Accordingly, the Commission has selected a governmental agency for the fund administration. This will reduce the administration costs well below what would be incurred through use of a for-profit administrator. The Commission will enter into an interagency agreement with the Finance and Administration Cabinet for the administration of the USF. Moreover, the Commission will actively assist in the USF administration process and may consult with the National Exchange Carrier Association in regard to establishing the USF.

CONCLUSION

The decisions announced in this Order form a beginning for USF implementation in Kentucky. Over the next few months, the Commission will consider proposals by BellSouth, GTE, and CBT for rate reductions equal to the net amount to be received by each of them from the USF. These and other issues must be resolved in order to begin the USF on January 1, 1999.

-38-

⁶⁵

Administrative Case No. 360, Order dated June 17, 1997.

The Commission, having considered the evidence, and having been otherwise sufficiently advised, HEREBY ORDERS that:

1. A statewide perspective shall be taken in the design of the Kentucky universal service mechanism and universal service costs shall be calculated at the wirecenter level.

2. The HAI Model shall be used to establish the Kentucky USF.

3. The inputs contained in the Appendices attached to this Order shall be used in calculating universal service support.

4. The federal benchmark shall be used to calculate universal service support until a state-specific benchmark can be established.

5. The high cost support fund size for Kentucky is \$98 million.

6. Universal service support shall be collected through a combination of an assessment to customers based upon a percentage of services billed and usage sensitive network access rate elements. Each method shall be designed to collect half of the total assessment.

7. BellSouth, GTE, and CBT shall reduce rates for non-supported services by the amount of the high cost support they receive from the USF. These rate reductions to offset the explicit subsidies shall be determined in this proceeding over the next few months.

8. Universal service support shall be provided only for single connection residences and businesses.

-39-

9. Additional low-income support shall be provided to low-income subscribers as specified herein, with an estimated increase of \$3 million annually to the USF.

10. The Finance and Administration Cabinet shall administer the USF through an interagency agreement with the Commission.

11. Within 90 days of the date of this Order, any party may comment on the use of county boundaries as an alternative to the wirecenter designated serving area as specified herein.

12. GTE, BellSouth, and CBT shall each file a billing analysis for all services, and other relevant information necessary to calculate a revenue benchmark, no later than June 23, 1998.

13. ILECs and carriers shall file information relevant to develop the initial USF assessment by no later than June 23, 1998.

14. ETCs shall submit quarterly reports regarding revenue benchmark calculation to the USF administrator beginning April 1, 1999.

15. An informal conference is hereby scheduled for June 30, 1998 at 9:00 a.m., Eastern Daylight Time, in Hearing Room 1 of the Commission's offices at 730 Schenkel Lane, Frankfort, Kentucky to discuss the reduction of explicit subsidies, revenue benchwork construction methodology, and information necessary to develop the initial USF assessment.

-40-

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 22nd day of May, 1998.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1/elm Chairman

Vice Chairman

Commissioner

ATTEST:

Executive Director

APPENDICES

APPENDICES TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION IN ADMINISTRATIVE CASE NO. 360 DATED MAY 22, 1998.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Universal Service Worksheets	Appendix A
BellSouth Worksheets	Appendix B
Cincinnati Bell Worksheets	Appendix C
Contel of Kentucky Worksheets	Appendix D
GTE South - Kentucky Worksheets	Appendix E
Inputs Worksheet	Appendix F
Variances From Default Worksheet	Appendix G

Universal Service Wirecenter Summary Sheet

	Line	Type								@75%
	Prim	ary residence	Secondary	Single line	Multline				@25% Federal	Federal
Company		lines	residence lines	business lines	business lines	Public lines	All swit	ched lines	allocation	allocation
Cincinnati Bell - KY	\$	9,722,131	•	\$ 30,434	' \$	، ب	\$	9,752,565 \$	2,438,141	\$ 7,314,424
Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE Kentucky	\$	20,898,688	•	\$ 63,760	•	ب	\$	20,962,448 \$	5,240,612	\$ 15,721,836
GTE South Inc - Kentucky	ŝ	27,010,488	۰ ج	\$ 155,522	، ج	، ب	\$	27,166,010 \$	6,791,503	\$ 20,374,508
BellSouth - KY	\$	72,688,003	•	\$ 438,459	•	، ج	\$	73,126,462 \$	18,281,616	\$ 54,844,847
Tota	Fotals \$	130,319,309	\$	\$ 688,175	۰ ج	- \$	\$ 1	131,007,485 \$	32,751,871 \$	\$ 98,255,614

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Universal Service Density Zone Summary Sheet

Соправу	Total Switched Lines	Primary residence lines	Secondary residence lines	Single line business lines	Multitute business lines	Public lines
Cincinnati Bell - Ky	184,255	126,318	161'11	3,328	40,307	3,110
Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE - Ky	92,325	68,440	5,929	335		449
GTE South Inc - Ky	406,412	271,812	119 22	17,114		
BellSouth - Ky	1,113,872	757,481	65,254	31,229	248,977	10,931
Totals	1,796,864	1,224,051	105,018	53,006	397,500	17,287

FEDERAL FUND ANALYSIS Amoni Support for line types:						
Company	Primary residence lines	Secondary residence lines	Secondary-residence lines Single line business lines	Multine business lines	Public lines	Support cost if all lines supported
Cincinnati Bell - Ky	\$ 8,507,331	\$ 787,477	39,445	\$ 308,139	\$ 24,773	\$ 9,667,164
Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE - Ky	\$ 22,838,636	\$ 2.096,043	\$ 105,666	\$ 958,442	\$ 21,295	\$ 26,027,081
GTE South Inc - Ky	\$ 30,258,078	\$ 2,521,555	\$ 306,886	\$ 1,172,101	\$ 37,901	34,286,521
BellSouth - Ky	\$ 78,562,088	\$ 6,577,699	\$ 425,520	\$ 2,412,648	\$ 110,719	\$ 88,088,674
Totals	\$ 140,166,133	\$ 11,962,773	\$77,516	4,652,330	\$ 200,687	\$ 158,079,440
		And a start of the				
	of runique leanan not	UQUESTING TOTAL AND	Cumpued 12 % SIER MOCERDIN.			
Cincinnati Bell - Ky	\$ 8,546,776	\$ 2,136,694	\$ 6,410,082			
Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE - Ky	\$ 22,944,301	\$ 5,736,075	\$ 17,208,226			
GTE South Inc - Ky	\$ 30,564,964	\$ 7,641,241	\$ 22,923,723			
BellSouth - Ky	\$ 78,987,608	\$ 19,746,902	\$ 59,240,706			
Totals	\$ 141,043,650	\$ 35,260,912	105,782,737			

STATE FUND ANALYSIS						
Company	Primary residence lines	Secondary residence lines Surgle line business lines	Suge line busines lines 1 21	Multine business lines	Public Ines S	Support cost if all lines supported
Cincinnati Bell - Ky	\$ 8,507,331	\$ 787,477	39,445	\$ 308,139	\$ 24,773	\$ 9,667,164
Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE - Ky	5 Z2,636,636	\$ 2,096,043	105,566	\$ 959,442	•	\$ 26,027,061
GTE South Inc - Ky	5 30,256,078	\$ 2,521,555	306,886	1,172,101	\$ 37,901	34.296.521
BellSouth - Ky	\$ 78,562,088	\$ 6,577,639	\$ 425,520	\$ 2,412,648	\$ 110,719	\$ 88.088,674
Totals	\$ 140,166,133	\$ 11,962,773	\$ 877,516	\$ 4,852,330	\$ 200,667	\$ 158,079,440
	Total annual support.	Total annual support (@75% State allocation	@Implied 25% Federal allocation			
Cincinnati Bell - Ky	\$ 8,546,776	\$ 6,410,082	\$ 2,136,694			
Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE - Ky	\$ Z2,944,301	\$ 17,208,226	5,736,075			
GTE South Inc - Ky	5 30,564,964	\$ 22,923,723	\$ 7,641,241			
BellSouth - Ky	\$ 78,987,608	\$ 59,240,706	\$ 19,746,902			
Totals	\$ 141,043,650	\$ 105,782,737	\$ 35,260,912			
				•		

	Total Anual Sup	out for Primity Resident	ce Lines at Pre-Selected Monthly	deachmarks			
Company	20:00	30.00	540.00	0009St 12 2000	00:09	570.00	S80.00
Cincinnati Bell - Ky	\$ 18,173,743 \$	166'110'6	\$,808,009	3,311,593	\$ 815,177		
Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE - Ky	\$ 30,916,091 \$	23,522,332	\$ 17,100,566	\$ 10,968,351	\$ 4,836,136	965,282	\$ 832,577
GTE South Inc - Ky	\$ 44,435,735 \$	176,792,16	\$ 20,899,042	\$ 10,500,114	\$ 1,945,219	1,718,427	1,491,634
tellSouth - Ky	\$ 120,093,675 \$	61,472,190	\$ 52,371,169	\$ 23,270,148	3,333,411	2,860,964	2,388,516
Totals	\$ 213,619,264 \$	145,370,514	\$ 96,178,827	\$ 48,050,257	\$ 10,930,004	5,564,742	\$ 4,712,807

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Kentucky

•

											BellSouth-Ky	Å,
Loop elements	lhe	0-5 lines/sq mi	5-100 lines/sq mi	100-200 lines/sq mi	200-650 linea/sq mi	650-850 lines/sq mi	850-2550 lines/sq mi	2650-5000 lines/sq mi	5000-10000 lines/sq mi	>10000 lines/sq mi	Totais	ļ
NID Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	\$	45,126 \$ 0.82	2,890,083 \$ 0.77	530,641 \$ 0.69	1,357,429 \$	418,960 \$ 0.69	2,602,767 0.66	855	\$ 555,102 \$ 0.52	188,372 0.50	\$ 10,261,406 0.68	-406 0.68
Loop Distribution (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	s	2,564,070 \$ 46.78	92,401,982 \$ 25.48	9,138,895 \$ 13.95	19,949,798 \$ 11.91	4,055,553 \$ 9.43	19,873,392 \$ 7.26	8,034,466 5.55	\$ 2,134,486 \$ 4.19	352,210 4.42	\$ 158,504,852 14.13	14.852 14.13
Loop Distribution (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	~	ده ۱۱	1,047,746 \$ 7.91	891,312 \$ 7.87	1,807,908 \$ 7.03	1,197,222 \$ 6.86	7,370,205 \$ 6.18	6,425,481 5.75	\$ 1,521,027 \$ 2.68	716,097 2.44	\$ 20,976,999 5.45	,999 5.45
Loop Distribution (ail) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	\$	2,564,070 \$ 46.78	93,449,728 \$ 24.86	10,030,208 \$ 13.05	21,757,706 \$ 11.26	5,252,775 \$ 8.69	27,243,597 \$ 6.94	14,459,947 5.64	\$ 3,655,513 \$ 3.39	1,068,307 2.86	\$ 179,481,851 11.92	11,851 11.92
Loop Concentration (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	\$	2,050,261 \$ 37.41	53,699,490 \$ 14.81	3,990,490 \$ 6.09	8,521,326 \$ 5.09	2,184,859 \$ 5.08	13,430,703 \$ 4.91	6,864,224 4.74	\$ 2,530,417 \$ 4.97	425,700 5.34	\$ 93,697,472 8.36	472
Loop Concentration (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costfmonth	~	<i>پ</i> ه	37,447 \$ 0.28	29,743 \$ 0.26	65,650 \$ 0.26	40,271 \$ 0.23	275,966 \$ 0.23	251,038 0.22	\$ 116,547 \$ 0.21	55,504 0.19	\$ 872, 0	872,167 0.23
Loop Concentration (all) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	\$	2,050,261 \$ 37.41	53,736,937 \$ 14.29	4,020,233 \$ 5.23	8,586,976 \$ 4.44	2,225,130 \$ 3.68	13,706,669 \$ 3.49	7,115,262 2.77	\$ 2,646,965 \$ 2.46	481,204 1.29	\$ 94,569,639 6.28	,639 6.28
Loop Feeder (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	<i>v</i>	2,169,335 \$ 39.58	40,523,942 \$ 11.17	1,873,665 \$ 2.86	2,991,378 \$ 1.79	665,526 \$ 1.55	3,358,268 \$ 1.23	1,535,529 1.06	\$ 635,085 \$ 1.25	84,520 1.06	\$ 53,837,249 4.80	249
Loop Feeder (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	\$	s	546,130 \$ 4.12	374,596 \$ 3.31	896,794 \$ 3.49	520,555 \$ 2.98	3.374,116 \$ 2.83	3,023,539 2.71	\$ 1,224,983 \$ 2.16	699,018 2.38	\$ 10,659,731 2.77	2.77
Loop Feeder (all) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	\$	2,169,335 \$ 39.58	41,070,073 \$ 10.92	2,248,261 \$ 2.93	3,888,172 \$ 2.01	1,186,081 \$ 1.96	6,732,384 \$ 1.71	4,559,068 1.78	\$ 1,860,068 \$ 1.73	783,538 2.10	\$ 64,496,980 4.28	,980 4.28
Total Loop (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	~	6,828,792 \$ 124.59	189,413,604 \$ 52.23	15,455,449 \$ 23.59	32,639,309 \$ 19.49	7,203,939 \$ 16.75	38,475,129 \$ 14.07	17,378,526 12.00	\$ 5,562,508 \$ 10.92	902,708 11.32	\$ 313,859,964 27.99	19,964 27.99
Totai Loop (non-DLC) Arnual Cost Unit Cost/month	\$	•	1,733,218 \$ 13.08	1,373,894 \$ 12.13	2,950,974 \$ 11,48	1,879,007 \$ 10.76	11,810,288 \$ 9.91	10,428,675 9.33	\$ 3,155,140 \$ 5.56	1,618,713 5.52	\$ 34,949,911 9.08	,911 9.08
Total Loop (ail) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	\$	6,828,792 \$ 124.59	191,146,822 \$ 50.85	16,829,343 \$ 21.90	35,590,283 \$ 18.42	9,082,946 \$ 15.02	50,285,417 \$ 12.80	27,807,202 10.84	\$ 8,717,648 \$ 8.10	2,521,421 6.76	\$ 348,809,874 23.16	39,874 23.16
Total lines Total lines served by DLC		4,568 4,568	313,274 302,229	64,029 54,588	161,016 139,591	50,383 35,837	327,303 227,959	213,791 120,678	89,739 42,440	31,086 6,647	1,255,189 934,535	,189 ,535

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

•--

•

		Annual Cost	Units			Unit Cost		
End office switching Line Port Non-Line Port	"	57,830,297 17,349,089 40,481,208	1,113,872 22,775,402,453	switched lines actual minutes		1.30	per line/month per actual minute (for rate per DEM, see "Cost detair" sheet)	Cost detail sheet)
Signaling network elements Links STP SCP	69	2,206,986 342,832 1,160,264 703,889	554 links 22,795,579,838 TCAP+ISUP n 5,246,220,000 TCAP queries	links TCAP+ISUP msgs TCAP queries	~~ ~	51.53 0.00005 0.00013	per link per month per signaling message per query	
Transport network elements Dedicated		10 010 CT	C1012			000		
Switched Switched Special	.	12,616,007 1,991,523 10,826,544	16/,312 25,995 141,317	trunks trunks trunks	<i></i>	0.00064	per US-0 equivalent per month per minute	
Transmission Terminal		8,267,728	167,312	trunks	~ ~ ~	4.12 0.00041 0.00105	per DS-0 equivalent per month per minute total per minute	
Transport \$	\$	3,026,885 1,277,096	2,004,963,632 2,004,963,632	minutes minutes	~ ~ ~	0.00177	per minute per leg (orig or term) per minute	
Direct Transport \$	**	6,471,072 2,907,189	6,057,369,155 6,057,369,155	minutes minutes	~ ~~~	0.00105 0.00155	cotal per minute per minute per minute total per minute	
Tandem switch	\$	1,577,524	1,695,839,562	minutes	ŝ	0.0003	0.0003 per minute	
Operator systems	\$	6,807,939						
Public Telephones	\$	3,111,748						
Totai (w/ Public)	47	455,112,406						
Total cost of switched network elements (w/o Public)	s	29.55 p	29.55 per line/month					

.

COST SUMMARY

Kentucky

-
5
X.
÷.
5
ō
Ñ.
÷.
¢.
<u> </u>

			1	2	1+2	ę	1+2+3	
Network Element	Investment 4	% of total invesment	Amrual Capital Cost	Network Expenses	Direct Expense	Support Expense	Support Expense ((with misc support)	Total (with carrier-to- carrier)
NID	\$ 44,980,028	2.7%	\$ 6,915,244 \$	827,532 \$	7,742,776	\$ 2,410,784	\$ 10,153,560	\$ 10,217,329
Distribution (DLC)	596,483,414	35.5%	91,594,255	28,258,234	119,852,489	37,317,169	157,169,658	157,824,012
Distribution (non-DLC)	79,475,876	4.7%	12,190,075	3,610,535	15,800,609	4,919,664	20,720,273	20,886,894
Distribution (all)	675,959,289	40.2%	103,784,330	31,868,768	135,653,098	42,236,833	177,889,931	178,710,907
Concentrator (DLC)	334,128,032	19.9%	64,929,969	5,902,954	70,832,923	22,054,479	92,887,402	93,295,005
Concentrator (non-DLC)	3,844,900	0.2%	591,116	65,553	656,669	204,460	861,129	868,421
Concentrator (all)	337,972,932	20.1%	65,521,086	5,968,507	71,489,592	22,258,939	93,748,531	94,163,426
Feeder (DLC)	217,776,944	13.0%	32,134,761	8,611,270	40,746,031	12,686,649	53,432,680	53,605,998
Feeder (non-DLC)	44,910,915	2.7%	6,769,727	1,257,224	8,026,951	2,499,265	10,526,216	10,613,943
Feeder (all)	262,687,859	15.6%	38,904,489	9,868,493	48,772,982	15,185,914	63,958,896	64,219,940
End Office Switching	194,670,121	11.6%	30,766,306	10,864,582	41,630,888	10,225,449	51,856,337	57,581,893
Signaling	7,574,777	0.5%	1,182,289	413,219	1,595,508	383,876	1,979,384	2,197,506
Dedicated Transport	53,182,082	3.2%	7,847,726	1,732,540	9,580,266	1,933,752	11,514,019	12,763,009
Dedicated Transport Transmission	27,990,967	1.7%	5,500,587	495,440	5,996,027	1,420,118	7,416,146	8,232,215
Direct Transport	27,272,320	1.6%	4,024,510	886,225	4,910,735	906,205	5,816,940	6,443,277
Direct Transport Transmission	10,120,469	0.6%	1,988,803	179,132 .	2,167,935	443,202	2,611,138	2,894,702
Common Transport	12,814,949	0.8%	1,891,116	415,605	2,306,721	414,738	2,721,458	3,013,884
Common Transport Transmission	4,482,965	0.3%	880,961	79,348	960,309	187,186	1,147,495	1,271,611
Tandem Switching	5,127,563	0.3%	771,772	358,279	1,130,050	284,197	1,414,248	1,570,748
Operator Systems	7,362,151	0.4%	1,338,274	3,691,680	5,029,954	1,073,409	6,103,363	6,778,696
Public Telephone	8,307,564	0.5%	1,793,411	471,159	2,264,570	534,162	2,798,732	3,111,748
							Total Network Cost	
Total	\$ 1,680,506,036	100%	\$ 273.110.904 \$	68.120.509 \$	341.231.413	\$ 99,898,764	\$ 441.130.177	\$ 453 170 889

* Post sharing

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Adm. Case No. 360 May 22, 1998

USOA Detail Breakdown of HAI Model Costs

Kentucky BellSouth-KY

Cost \$(000)

702 204 33 31 0 33 939

6,372 245 344

6,432 13,393 8,552

EXPENSE DESCRIPTION	Plant Specific Expenses		MOTOR VEHICLES	AIRCRAFT	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	GARAGE WORK EQUIPMENT	OTHER WORK EQUIPMENT	NETWORK SUPPORT	LAND & BUILDINGS	FURNITURE	OFFICE EQUIPMENT		GENERAL PURPOSE COMPUTERS LAND & SUPPORT ASSETS	DIGITAL ELECTRONIC SWITCHING	OPERATOR SYSTEMS	CIRCUIT EQUIPMENT	PUBLIC TEL TERMINAL EQUIPMENT	POLES	AFPIAL CARLE		UNDERGROUND CABLE		BURIED CABLE		INTRABUILDING NETWORK CABLE	CONDUIT SYSTEMS	TOTAL CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES	Total Plant Specific Expenses	Plant Nonspecific Operations	TOTAL NETWORK OPERATIONS SUPPORT DEPRECIATION TPIS	CUS LUMEK SERVICES Total Plant Nonspecific Operations	TOTAL CORPORATE OPERATIONS	TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES
NSOA			6112	6113	6114	6115	6116	6110	6121	6122	6123		6124 6120	6212	6220	6232	6351	6411	6421		6422		6423		6426	6441	6410			6561	6700		
Cost	(000) \$	5.055	11,496			356	8,218		69,927	717	2,350		16,094 114,213	165,411	3,461	360,194	8,308	55,806	135 934	58.405	30,444	76,838	555,241	160,671		27,234	1,100,573	1,752,160	. GSF investment is	he "Summary" sheet.			
INVESTMENT DESCRIPTION	Telecommunications Plant in Service	LAND	MOTOR VEHICLES	AIRCRAFT	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	GARAGE WORK EQUIPMENT	OTHER WORK EQUIPMENT		BUILDINGS	FURNITURE	OFFICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	COMPANY COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	GENERAL PURPOSE COMPUTERS TOTAL LAND & SUPPORT ASSETS	DIGITAL ELECTRONIC SWITCHING	OPERATOR SYSTEMS	CIRCUIT EQUIPMENT	PUBLIC TEL TERMINAL EQUIPMENT	POLES	AERIAL CABLE - METALLIC	AERIAL CABLE - NonMETALLIC	UNDERGROUND CABLE - METALLIC	UNDERGROUND CABLE - NonMETALLIC	BURIED CABLE - METALLIC	BURIED CABLE - NonMETALLIC	INTRABUILDING NETWORK CABLE - MET. INTRABUILDING NETWORK CABLE - Nonmet	CONDUIT SYSTEMS	TOTAL CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES	Total TPIS (before amortizable assets)*	This calculation of total plant includes GSF investment. GSF investment is	not included in the total investment that is reported in the "Summary" sheet			
NSOA		2111	2112		2114	2115	2116			2122		~.	2124 2110	2212	2220	2232	2351		2421.1		2422.1				2426.1 2426.2		2410	•	•	-			

6,388

471

3,453

1,914 10,331

1,415 32,310 99 46,069

79,266

30,539 112,427 2,121 **145,087**

42,378

13,295 266,731

280,025

TOTAL EXPENSES & OPERATING TAXES

7240 OPERATING OTHER TAXES

Hai Model Release 5.0a Kentucky PSC

B	ო
Appendix	Worksheet

Network Element Disaggregations	Expense Disaggregations:	Terminal, Drop, and NID Aerial portion Buried portion	OS Triks + Signating links Circuit Eqpt, portion Pole portion	Underground-run portion Buried-run portion Conduit portion	SA/ Aerial portion	Underground portion Buried portion				
Network Elemen		119,069,369 22,491,691 96,577,678	3,302,736 550,456 107,812	1,027,207 1,104,643 253,532	20,923,900 688,808	4,010,435 2,325,797	9,330,763 646,325 9,921,750			
	Investment Disaggregations:	Terminal, Drop, and NID Aerial-m portion Buried-m portion	OS Trks + Signating links Circuit Eqpt. portion Pole portion	Underground-run portion Buried-run portion Conduit portion	SA/ Aerial-m portion	Aerial-nm portion Underground-m portion	uraergruung-mponun Buried-mm portion Buried-mm portion			
tions	Dep Exp	1,251	30 208 30	1,507 46 184	2,682	10,338	346 38,821	1,071 2,643	7,755 2,688 1,425	3,536 30,281 6,815 - - 499
Depreciation Calculations	DepFact	0.10884	0.08333 0.06176	0.02156 0.06461 0.07835	0.1289/ 0.16667	0.06250	0.10000 0.10778	0.12897 0.04736	0.05705 0.04602 0.04682	0.04602 0.05454 0.05385 0.04521 0.04521 0.01831
Depreci	DepLife	9.20	12.00 16.20	46.39 15.49 12.78	6.00	16.00	10.00 9.30	7.78 21.12	17.54 21.74 21.37	21.74 18.35 18.58 18.58 18.58 22.12 54.63
NSOA		2112 2113 2113	2115 2116	2121 2122 2123.1	2124 2124 2110	2212	2220 2232	2351 2411	2421.1 2421.2 2422.1	2422.2 2423.1 2423.2 2426.1 2426.2 2441

3,873,108 1,053,552 2,819,556 135,765 22,627 4,669 18,006 22,128 67,169 1,166 356,739 80,119 96,441 180,179

112,427

Total Depreciation

	% of Lo % of P \us/Res L	op Assi ort Assi ocal DE	igne(Igne(M us	% of Loop Assigned for USF: % of Port Assigned for USF: Bus/Res local DEM usage ratio:		100% 100% 110%			Entry of	\$0.00 I	ndicate	s that	t Line 1	ype is	Not to b	e Sup	Entry of \$0.00 Indicates that Line Type is Not to be Supported				ă.	Kentucky BellSouth-KY	₹Ę
			Mont	Monthly Support Benchmark:	8 T	lenchmar	 ¥		\$31.00		\$0.00		\$51.00	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00						
		88 (9) 8 8 8 8		nin (f. Star General General				Annual	val	Annual	len Ien		Annual		Annual			То То	Total annual				
	Ava m	onthly	6	@ Residence		@ Business		suppor ro	upport ror nrimary	support for secondary	nt tor darv	Su Su	support for single line		support for multiline		Annual support for	ns S	support for specified line	@25% Eadori		@7E% Ctato	
Cli	cost p	cost per line) Ng	usage per line	6404	usage per line	e re		sidence lines residence lines	esidenc	the second se		Jess line	isnq se	business lines business lines		public lines	\$	types	allocation		allocation	
ALLNKYMA	Ś	56.59	∽	56.58		57.16	9 9		521,014	\$	°	\$	382	2 \$		\$ 0	0	ß	521,396 \$	5 130,349	49 \$	391,047	Ę
AURRKYMA	69	105.87	ŝ	105.87	•••	108.21			268,786 \$	¢	0	ф		\$ 0		\$ 0	0	s	268,786 \$	67,196	96 \$	201,589	689
BDFRKYMA	ω.	86.94	ω	86.94	•••	87.73			830,626	\$	0	ŝ		\$ 0		\$ 0	0	в	830,626	\$ 207,657	57 \$	622,970	970
BGDDKYMA	67 6	109.21 70.60	ю 6	109.21		110.43			420,371	69 4	0 0	نه و		ه ه 0 0		с , с	0	69 (420,371	5 105,093	8 33 8	315,278	278
BLSPKYMA	A 40	110.11	ه ه	110.03	A 44	80.39 110.95	ი თ თ.თ		513,112 9	А (4)	00	м м	9,3/2 16.296	ын ма ма		0 0 0	00	69 (A	559,709 \$	5 139,927 5 132,352	27 \$	419,782 397 056	782 756
BNLYKYMA		65.33	ŝ	65.30	\$	68.19		Ŧ	107,935	• •	0	• ••		• • • •		• •	00	• ••	107,935	5 26,984	4 8 9 8	80.952	22
BNTNKYMA	÷	40.45	φ	40.39	÷	40.89	ფ ი	ŝ	523,858	\$	0	ŝ		\$ 0		\$ 0	0	\$	523,858	5 130,964	8	392,893	393
BRGNKYMA	6 9 (55.65	ŝ	55.59	\$	56.52	5 8	ลี	266,624	\$	0	ŝ	1,024	4 \$		\$ 0	0	69	267,647	5 66,912	12 \$	200,736	736
BRMNKYMA	6 9 (63.68	φ e	63.68	ю (64.44	4 · \$ (4	407,830	\$	0	\$		\$ 0		\$ 0	0	ŝ	407,830	\$ 101,957	57 \$	305,872	372
BKIWKYES	<i>₽</i>	33.52 E4 E4	÷	33.41	ю (33.81	- 0	ŇČ	240,645	69 f	0 0	<i>ю</i> (000	69 6 1 O		е С с	0	69 (240,645	60,161	61 5	180,484	84
	₽ 4	24.01	₽ 4	24.40	A U	24.80 24.36	o a	ת	5 0 790'018	A U) (A 4	3,321	* •		9 4 0 4		ю (913,389	5 228,347	47	685,042	¥ 4
BWLGKYRV	э с у	78.76	у бу	78.72) (A	79.59	ა თ	ň	544.237	, 64	00	а (4	0 7.199	ი ი ი		,	5 0	₽ ₩	0 3 551 435 9	0 8 137 859	က မ သဂ္ဂ	0 413 576	0
BYVLKYMA	\$	67.61	\$	67.51	\$	68.20	• \$ 0	ർ	844,007	Ф	0	6	11,647	\$ ~		9 9 9	0	69	855,653	213.913	3 ti 8 s	641.740	40
CADZKYMA	69	59.33	в	59.26	ф	59.78	8 8	10	,075,406	¢	0	θ	10,162	2 \$		\$ 0	0	\$	1,085,568	\$ 271,392	92 \$	814,176	92
CHPLKYMA	6 9 (79.33	\$	79.29	6	80.29	ა თ	2	270,167	ŝ	0	\$	2,688	8 8		\$ 0	0	÷	272,854 \$	68,214	14 \$	204,641	7
CLAYKYMA	6	68.77 00.05	ю (68.76	69 (69.61	с. С. с.	4	434,454	ω.	0	φ,	392	\$ 0		у (0	69 (434,846	\$ 108,712	12 \$	326,135	35
	A V	07.60 60.67	A 4	69.1/ 60.53	n u	69./9 70.30	ອງ ຢ ວາດ	5 Q	610,122 \$	••	0 0	6 9 6	7,165	69 6 10 P		ю «	0 0	ω.	617,287 \$	5 154,322	22 8	462,966	990
CLTNKYES	э с я	71.67	у м	71.57	у Ю	72.26	ი ი ი ი	ΰ	695,462 1	, ⊷	00	о и	11.659	р (я	-			∌ ∉	200,819 \$	00/02/02	5 g	230,115	6 1 P
CMBGKYMA	÷	76.87	\$	76.82	\$	77.53	. ფ ო	4	427,843 \$	÷	0	ŝ	1,560	*	-	• • • •	00	• • •	429,403	107.351	51 S	322.052	52
CNCYKYMA	ŝ	36.47	ŝ	36.41	θ	36.88	8 8	ž	195,227	¢	0	ŝ	-	\$ 0		\$ 0	0	\$	195,227	\$ 48,807	07 \$	146,421	51
CNTNKYMA	6 7 6	63.74	φ.	63.63	φ (64.49	ም (ត រ	288,538	φ.	0	\$	5,251	,		\$ \$	0	\$	293,789 \$	73,447	47 \$	220,342	42
CUTUKYMA	6 4	100.04	A 4	100.47	A 4		л е рс	กัน	331,125 \$	A 4) (A (4,288	÷ € ∞ •		9 e	0 0	63 (342,013 \$	85,503	8	256,510	10
CRBNKYMA	, 0	32.86	÷ €	32 79	,	33.73	9 6 9	ń N	224 141 5	₽	> c	∧ √		4 ⊂	-	л и С с	50	A U	249,404 #	137,351 350,33	9 4 5 7	412,053	53
CRBOKYMA	ŝ	79.16	Ф	79.12	• (79.93		i X	708,771	- 6A	0	• •	7,820	• •	_	• •	• •	e e	716.591 \$	179.148	3 6 9 6	537.444	3 4
CRLSKYMA	Ś	62.53	ф	62.47	ф	63.02	\$ 2	ສ	882,811 \$	₽	0	ŝ	9,001	- \$	-	ري 0	0	\$	891,813 \$	222,953	23 23	668,860	90
CRTNKYMA	Ф	33.80	ى	33.71	ŝ	34.19		~	80,375 \$	æ	0	Ф	-	\$ 0	1	\$ 0	0	Ś	80,375 \$	20,094	94 \$	60,282	82
CYDNKYMA	с я (67.26	φ.	67.21	ଚ	67.90		ហ័	559,959 \$	÷	0	ŝ	4,330	\$ 0	-	\$ 0	0	ŝ	564,289 \$	141,072	72 \$	423,217	11
CYNIKYMA 2011 12:010	9 9 (53.08	ю (53.03	ю	53.56		ίΩ Γ	514,545 \$	6	0	ŝ	4,278	ም - ወ	-	ہ د	0	69	1,518,823 \$	379,706	90 \$	1,139,118	18
	6 9 6	24.11	<i>ю</i> (23.98	ю	24.39		č		6A 4	0 0	φ.	-	6 6		69 (0	0	\$	0		0 0		0
	A 6	01.28 20.02	A (82.11	л (82.92		ъ I	608,975 \$.	0	6	1,773	69 € 10 €	-	6 0	0	6 Э -	610,748 \$	152,687	•••	458,061	61
	A	10.33	A	/0.33	A	20.17	ሳ ን	õ	080,097	A	0	iA	-	÷≁	-	₩ 0	0	ю	686,697 \$	171,674	74 \$	515,023	23
	Ç																						

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

*----

																				VVOLKSITEEL 4	
DWSPKYES	÷	44.35	ю	44.29	~		<u>بم</u>	394,553 \$		ه	0	Ф	8 0	•	ዓ	394,553	ф		ŝ	295,915	
EDVLKYMA	ŝ	58.99	ф	58.95	رب د			875,575 \$		ۍ ه	2,310	Ф	\$ 0	0	ዓ	877,885	ф	219,471		658,414	
EKTNKYMA	θ	62.06	\$	61.97	۳ ۳		"	724,250 \$		\$ 0	9,636	\$	\$ 0	0	ф	733,886	ŝ			550,414	
ELCYKYES	÷	59.82	Ф	59.80				725,396 \$		\$ 0	975	ŝ	\$ 0	0	ф	726,371	Ś	181,593		544,778	
EMNNKYES	ŝ	63.83	ŝ	63.78	v		****	,091,559 \$			10,043	Ф	\$ 0	0		1,101,602	ŝ	275,400	ŝ	826,201	
EMNNKYPL	ŝ	103.39	ŝ	103.39	4			614,476 \$			0	ŝ	\$ 0	0		614,476	ŝ	153,619	ŝ	460,857	
ENSRKYMA	ŝ	49.93	ŝ	49.89	«) «)			354,225 \$			0	ŝ	\$ 0	0	ω	354,225	69	88,556	ŝ	265,668	
ERTNKYMA	с э -	38.78	\$	38.74	(·)		ω	69,981 \$		\$ 0	0	\$	\$ 0	0	ŝ	69,981	ω	17,495	ŝ	52,486	
FDCKKYES	ŝ	60.85	Ф	60.82			۵،	880,777 \$		••	1,788	Ф	€ 0	0	⇔	882,565	в	220,641	ŝ	661,924	
FDVLKYMA	φ.	117.23	сэ -	117.23	7		<u>بم</u>	909,233 \$			1,670	Ф	\$ 0	0	Ф	910,903	ф	227,726		683,178	
FEBRKYMA	ω.	56.45	ŝ	56.41	47	56.96	<u>بم</u>	637,577 \$		¢	1,290	Ф	\$ 0	0	ф	638,866	ŝ	159,717		479,150	
FKLNKYMA	φ,	32.75	ഗ	32.64	(°)	33.06	<u>ل</u> م	107,077 \$			0	Ф	\$ 0	0	ф	107,077	ф	26,769	ŝ	80,308	
FLTNKYMA	ŝ	44.11	\$	44.04	7	44.52	<u>م</u>	593,981 \$		\$ 0	0	Ф	\$ 0	0	G	593,981	Ś	148,495	ŝ	445,486	
FNVLKYMA	ŝ	92.98	ŝ	92.95		93.85	40	410,269 \$			5,102	ŝ	\$ 0	0	€	415,371	ŝ	103,843	ŝ	311,528	
FORDKYMA	θ	77.27	ф	77.12	~	78.37	40	223,881 \$			5,912	Ф	\$ 0	0	ω	229,793	ŝ	57,448	Ф	172,345	
FRDNKYMA	Ф	107.64	\$	107.64	5	109.10	40	359,830 \$			389	ŝ	\$ 0	0	θ	360,220	ŝ	90,055	\$	270,165	
FRFTKYES	ŝ	21.22	ŝ	21.10	•••	21.54	<u>م</u>	\$ 0			0	¢	\$ 0	0	ω	0	Ś	0	÷	0	
FRFTKYMA	\$	23.51	\$	23.40	~	23.77	40				0	\$	≎ ≎	0	θ	0	Ś	0	÷	0	
GBVLKYMA	\$	51.58	ŝ	51.57	4,	52.39	<u>بم</u>	337,389 \$			101	€9	≎ ≎	0	ω	337,490	ф	84,372	\$	253,117	
GHNTKYMA	\$	99.04	\$	99.04	5	100.65 \$	<u>ب</u>	370,408 \$		\$ 0	517	\$	\$ 0	0	θ	370,926	ω	92,731	ŝ	278,194	
GNVLKYMA	\$	43.05	¢	42.98	v	43.46	"	710,869 \$			0	Ф	\$ 0	0	θ	710,869	ω	177,717	\$	533,152	
GRACKYMA	¢	118.70	ŝ			119.55 \$		601,650 \$		69 0	14,689	ф	\$ 0	0	⇔	616,339	ŝ	154,085	ŝ	462,254	
GRTWKYMA	φ	23.62	ŝ	•••	(N)	23.88		\$ 0		\$ 0	0	ф	\$≉ 0	0	G	0	ŝ	0	ŝ	0	
GTHRKYMA	\$	69.17	ŝ			69.78	-	••			6,784	Ф		0	÷	358,320	ŝ	89,580	\$	268,740	
	\$	46.28	ŝ			46.83		•••			0	\$		0	ŝ	213,535	ŝ	53,384	\$	160,151	
	сэ ,	69.51	ŝ			70.19	6	••			1,747	ŝ		0	÷	399,982	ŝ	66'66	\$	299,987	
	и на на	81.03	\$ \$		ው ·	81.74					2,851	в		0	θ	307,989	θ	76,997	ŝ	230,992	
	63 (64.14	69			64.69		•••			8,796	ф		0	ф	533,805	ŝ	133,451	\$	400,353	
	6	31.46	с я (31.77					0	в		0	ŝ	21,996	ŝ	5,499	ŝ	16,497	
_	69 (23.63	с я (23.90					0	в		0	ى	0	Ś		ŝ	0	
	69 (24.15	с я (24.42	<u>.</u>	•••			0	ŝ	е С	0		0	θ		ŝ	0	
	ю. •	73.06	1 9			73.74	-	•••	-		1,038	\$		0	\$	1,013,225	θ		ŝ	759,918	
_	ю.	56.81	₩.	56.73 \$					-	နား ဝေ	5,102 2	6 6	9 (0 (0	÷	621,727	\$		θ.	466,295	
	A (43.05	,					618,732 \$	-			ю,		0	ŝ	618,732	ф		\$	464,049	
đ	نه و	81.83 20.20	1 27 (82.57 \$	•	967,165 \$	_		212	6 6		0	с э	967,377	φ,		\$	725,533	
	~	69.68 27.25	л (,032,708 \$	-		0	ю.		0	с	,032,708	ŝ			774,531	
	<u>ب</u>	65.69	<u>ب</u>					154,656 \$	-		2,587	ю		0	θ	157,243	ŝ			117,932	
	φ.	69.83	\$				****	,673,469 \$	•		10,408	\$		0	\$,683,878	ω		۔ ج	,262,908	
	θ.	45.52	Ś						-		0	\$		0	θ	242,287	ŝ		ŝ	181,715	
_	\$	89.21	Ф						-	\$ 0	2,421	s		0	ŝ	225,365	ŝ		ŝ	169,024	
	\$	56.39	\$						•	\$ 0	2,160	Ś		0	ф	431,425	ŝ	107,856		323,569	
	¢	194.03	ŝ		•			307,977 \$	•	\$ 0	13,080	÷		0	ŝ	321,057	ŝ		Ġ	240,793	
	ŝ	34.46	ŝ	34.37	ო	82		206,311 \$	•	\$ 0	0	Ф		0	s	206,311	ŝ	51,578	ь	154,733	
LOUSKYES	\$	38.22	ŝ	38.14	e	38.79 \$		164,725 \$	•	\$	0	\$		ò	ŝ	164,725	ŝ		Ġ	123,544	
	Ċ																				
Nentucky PSC	5																	Adm. Ca	Case No.	No. 360	
HAI Model Release 5.0a	eleas	e 5.0a	_							2								Ma	May 22,	2, 1998	
																			•		

																		-	Vorl	Appendix B Worksheet 4	
LRBGKYMA	⇔	38.04	ŝ	37.97	ŝ	38.42	\$					0	ŝ	0		485,836		121,459	ى	364,377	
LSVLKY26	↔	16.20	ŝ	16.10	ŝ	16.49	ф					0	\$		<u>نم</u>	0		0	φ	0	
LSVLKYAN	ф	18.28	ŝ	18.15	ŝ	18.50	ŝ					0	\$		"	0	\$	0	φ	0	
LSVLKYAP	θ	11.18	ю	10.91	\$	11.28	Ś					0	ŝ			0	ŝ	0	ŝ	0	
LSVLKYBE	€	17.08	Ф	16.99	ŝ	17.35	ŝ					0	ŝ		"	0	¢	0	÷	0	
LSVLKYBR	ŝ	16.79	ср	16.67	ŝ	17.05	φ	0			\$	0	S		"	0	Ś	0	θ	0	
LSVLKYCW	फ (27.44	s	27.34	ω	27.76	÷					0	÷			0	ŝ	0	÷	0	
LSVLKYFC	6	23.30	6 (23.24	ω	23.64	φ,					0	θ		<u>ب</u>	0	\$	0	ŝ	0	
LSVLKYHA	69	27.69	φ,	27.62	ŝ	28.05	ŝ					0	€9		-	0	\$	0	θ	0	
LSVLKYJT	ŝ	20.45	ŝ	20.32	ŝ	20.70	ŝ				\$ 0	0	Ф		-	0	ŝ	0	⇔	0	
LSVLKYOA	69 (17.50	so (17.40	÷	17.76	s					0	÷		40	0	÷	0	ŝ	0	
LSVLKYSH	ю	17.66	с я (17.57	ŝ	17.94	ŝ	0			\$ 0	0	Ф		-	0	\$	0	ŝ	0	
LSVLKYSL	φ,	16.67	и о	16.55	ŝ	16.91	v					0	θ		40	0	\$	0	÷	0	
LSVLKYSM	نه (15.86	ю (15.75	69 (16.12	6					0	Ф		-	0	ф	0	ω	0	
LSVLKYTS	به	15.49	6	15.36	ю,	15.76	ю,					0	S		6	0	ф	0	φ	0	
LSVLKYVS	ю (20.29	ω	20.22	ŝ	20.62	v				\$ 0	0	€		40	0	ф	0	ŝ	0	
LSVLKYWE	6	17.10	ю	16.97	φ.	17.33	ŝ					0	ŝ			0		0	ю	0	
LVMRKYMA	ω,	56.63	ю,	56.59	ŝ	57.37	\$	•••		1,659		0	↔			268,377		67,094	÷	201,282	
MACEKYMA	ю	50.19	ŝ	50.16	ŝ	50.95	\$					0	ŝ			226,655		56,664	÷	169,991	
MARNKYMA	Ω	61.45	ŝ	61.40	ф	61.89	\$			11,480		0	Ś		-	,125,002		281,251	φ	843,752	
MARTKYMA	ω.	56.70	ŝ	56.70	\$	57.69	Ф	412,597 \$				0	Ф		-	412,597		103,149	ŝ	309,447	
MCDNKYMA	6	97.55	69	97.55	ю,	98.64	Ś	69,896		49		0	⇔			770,392		192,598	ŝ	577,794	
MCWLKYMA	ю (63.27	ю	63.27	ю (64.10	ю (0	€		5 436,	8	\$	109,162	ф	327,485	
MUBUKYMA	, ,	28./9	Э (28.69	<u>ب</u>	29.17	\$					0	ся ·		~	0	\$	0	φ	0	
MUVIKYMA	ю е		6 3 (22.69	ю.	23.11	ю (0	ŝ			0		0	ω	0	
MGFUKYMA	÷۹		<i></i>	49.49	<i>i</i> 9 (49.98	ю. Ю	522,509 \$				0	с э (522,509	\$	130,627	÷	391,882	
	æ (ю	60.26 20.20	ю (60.74 20.74	 13- (12,680		0	с у (÷	718	(1	280,430	φ	841,289	
	₽ 4		A 6	/2.83	<i>.</i> с	/3./8	<i>э</i> (222		2,328		0 0	\$			267,853		66,963	ю	200,890	
	6 4	00.03	A 4	80.U3 05 26	A 6	82.3U	A 6			Ċ		0 0	6 9 6			503,643	ю (25,911	ю (377,733	
	.		, ,	00.00	A 6	00.40 0 4 0 0	A 6			λο		0 0	÷ •			269,138		67,284	ю,	201,853	
MITELICY MA	, 6		₽ €	0/.07	A 6	20.12	^ •					0	6 9 (0		0	ω	0	
MTCTKVAA	∂ 4	20.221	A 6	12771	A 6	124.00	^ 6			1,8,1 0		0 0	ю. •		592	592,104	е А	148,026	ю (444,078	
MYFDKYMA	,		÷ €	24.5	• ¥	76.40	9 U	& /nc'zcz			A 4	> c	A 4		797	3		63,077	ب	189,230	
MYVLKYMA	•		• •	24 95	• 4	25.44	,						÷		~ ~	>	~	,	A 6	. .	
NEBOKYMA	• •9		• •	96.95	• •	97.83	• •			164	σ	о с	• •			0 584 563	Ŧ	U 146 141	, 4	0	
NEONKYES	69		Ф	63.82	ŝ	65.14	\$				0	• •	• •			381.039		95,260	•	285 779	
NRVLKYMA	ŝ	50.31	\$	50.25	ы	50.79	69					0	. Ю			344,943		86.236	• •	258,708	
NWHNKYMA	\$		\$	69.91	s S	70.64	Ś		• • •	6,167		0	. 69	0		670	-	81,668	• •9	545,003	
OKGVKYES	θ	27.48	÷	27.40	ŝ	27.86	ŝ	\$ 0				0	Ф			0		0	Ś	0	
OWBOKYMA	÷		\$	18.60	ŝ	18.97		\$ 0	\$ 0		\$	0	69		• •	0	· 69	0	ŝ	0	
OWTNKYMA	ŝ		Ş	79.32	\$	79.95	ŝ			15,024		0	69		1,429,006	900		357,251	-	,071,75	
PARSKYMA	θ		ŝ	33.26	÷	33.68	\$					0	\$		-	52,723		38,181	ω	114,542	
РОСНКУІР	÷	56.02	ŝ	55.90	\$	57.16	ŝ	142,360 \$		1,312		0	ŝ		-	672		35,918	ŝ	107,754	
Kentucky PSC	SC																ΔC	Adm C.	Case No	No 360	
HAI Model Delesse E Os		50 Z 02							c								2				
	רטוסמ	00 0.00							o									Σ	May ⊿	22, 1998	

																	>	F S	Worksheet 4	
PDCHKYLO	θ	27.80 \$	27.73	Ф		<u>ب</u>	0	<u>م</u>	0			0	в		0	⇔	0	ω	0	
PDCHKYMA	θ		17.97	⇔			0	<u>م</u>	0			0	ŝ		0	•••	0	ω	0	
PDCHKYRL	ŝ	34.80 \$	34.75	ŝ	35.27		202,402	"	0			0	Ф		202,402		50,600	ŝ	151,801	
PIVLKYMA	θ		64.00	\$		-	,831,519	64	0	4,787		0	в	\$ 0	1,836,306		459,077	د ۲	1,377,230	
PKVLKYMA	ŝ		32.50	ŝ		\$		"	0		\$ 0	0	в	\$	131,967		32,992	ŝ	98,975	
PKVLKYMT	ŝ		75.53	φ			•••	\$	0	8,355		0	в		551,786		137,946	φ	413,839	
PLRGKYMA	Ś		68.32	ŝ				ŝ	0	5,351	51 \$	0	ŝ		377,051		94,263	G	282,788	
PMBRKYMA	÷		90.36	ŝ			452,842	4	0	12,093		0	ŝ		464,934		116,234	÷	348,701	
PNTHKYMA	÷		73.96	ŝ		Ģ	225,706	4	0	5,183		0	÷		230,890		57,722	÷	173,167	
PNVLKYMA	θ		32.62	ى			85,205	<i>ب</i> م	0		\$ 0	0	¢		85,205	Ś	21,301	θ	63,903	
PRBGKYES	ŝ	38.09 \$	37.97	ŝ		G	339,834	G	0		\$ 0	0	Ś	≎ 0	339,834	Ś	84,959	ŝ	254,876	
PRTNKYES	Ś		46.94	ŝ	47.44	ŝ	832,998	G	\$ 0			0	ŝ		832,998	ŝ	208,250	ф	624,749	
PRVDKYMA	÷		40.53	ŝ	41.14	ŝ	199,328	<i>(</i> A	0			0	÷		199,328	Ś	49,832	φ	149,496	
PRVLKYMA	θ		63.62	ŝ	64.34	<u>بم</u>	378,846	<i>6</i>		5,591	91 \$	0	ŝ	≎ ≎	384,437	\$	96,109	φ	288,327	
PTRYKYMA	S		126.57	ŝ	128.32	<u>بم</u>	379,570	ф	\$ 0		\$ 0	0	в		379,570		94,892	ŝ	284,677	
RBRDKYMA	ŝ		88.26	ŝ	89.60	<u>بم</u>	410,187	ю	\$ 0	7,756		0	ŝ		417,943		104,486	Ś	313,457	
RCMDKYMA	ŝ		24.63	ŝ	25.02	<u>بم</u>	0	ю			\$ 0	0	¢		0	•••	0	ŝ	0	
RLVLKYMA	ŝ	36.98 \$	36.87	÷	37.29	<u>ب</u> م	365,286	6	9 0		\$ 0	0	ŝ		365,286		91,321	÷	273,964	
RSTRKYES	в	18.87 \$	18.68	ŝ	19.10	<i>ن</i> م	0	69			\$ 0	0	ŝ		0	Ś	0	ŝ	0	
SCRMKYMA	φ	66.18 \$	60.09	ŝ	66.92	<u>بم</u>	253,130	69		3,384		0	ŝ		256,513		64,128	ŝ	192,385	
SDVLKYMA	ŝ	105.53 \$	105.47	ŝ	106.38	<u>ہ</u>	659,541			~		0	\$		671,147		167,787	ŝ	503,360	
SEBRKYMA	ŝ		66.26	₩	67.23	ب م	302,458	6	0			0	ŝ		302,523		75,631	ŝ	226,892	
SHGVKYMA	ω	113.97 \$	113.93	ŝ	114.92	<u>لم</u>	574,882	6	\$ 0	7,989		0	÷	\$ 0	582,871	Ø	145,718	ŝ	437,153	
SHVLKYMA	θ		26.33	ŝ	26.74	íA	0	<i>ن</i> م			\$ 0	0	ŝ		0		0	÷	0	
SLGHKYMA	ŝ		118.71	ŝ	119.85	<u>ب</u>	679,994	6				0	θ		680,455		170,114	ŝ	510,342	
SLPHKYMA	Ś		61.55	ь	62.20	۵.	226,376	6			38 \$	0	ω	\$ 0	227,514		56,879	\$	170,636	
SLVSKYMA	ŝ		88.21	ŝ	90.10	<u>به</u>	523,388	6	\$ 0	9,473		0	ŝ		532,862		133,215	÷	399,646	
SNTNKYMA	ŝ	-	47.38	ŝ	47.85	<i>ب</i> م	618,825	6				0	ŝ	0	618,825	•••	154,706	ω	464,119	
SPFDKYMA	÷	45.18 \$	45.07	ŝ	45.64	<i>ن</i> م	333,103	6	\$ 0			0	ŝ		333,103	\$	83,276	ŝ	249,827	
SRGHKYMA	ŝ		86.51	ŝ	87.68	<u>بم</u>	278,745	Ь		1,401		0	ŝ		280,147		70,037	÷	210,110	
SSVLKYMA	÷	46.57 \$	46.48	ь	47.26	رم ا	233,489	64				0	÷		233,489	\$	58,372	÷	175,117	
STCHKYMA	θ		89.19	ŝ	30.60	<u>ب</u>		69				0	\$		191,199		47,800	ю	143,399	
STFRKYMA	θ		49.49	ф				G				0	⇔		821,305		205,326	\$	615,979	
STGRKYMA	ω	60.50 \$	60.41	ŝ				ф				0	ŝ		361,034		90,258	ŝ	270,775	
STNLKYMA	θ		67.12	\$		ь	•••	ф		Ń		0	θ		227,347		56,837	\$	170,510	
STONKYMA	θ		51.10	ŝ				Ø				0	в		545,950	÷	136,488	θ	409,463	
STRGKYMA	ь		54.16	\$		<i>(</i> 0	608,420			1,978		0	÷		610,398		152,600	ŝ	457,799	
SWSNKYMA	÷		50.40	ŝ				G				0	в		465,521		116,380	÷	349,141	
TRENKYMA	ω		90.57	ŝ				6				0	\$		253,228		63,307	ŝ	189,921	
TYVLKYMA	φ	66.24 \$	66.21	ŝ		ዓ		s	\$ 0			0	ŝ		878,472		219,618	ŝ	658,854	
UTICKYMA	φ		82.62	ŝ				<u>لم</u>				0	ŝ		491,663	\$	122,916	ŝ	368,747	
VIRGKYMA	φ	55.97 \$	55.96	ф				~				0	ф		893,896		223,474	ŝ	670,422	
WACOKYMA	ŝ	58.87 \$	58.82	¢				<u>م</u>		ຕ໌		0	ф		373,283	\$	93,321	÷	279,962	
WDDYKYMA	Ф	92.86 \$	92.85	ŝ	93.78		486,419	-		732		0	ф		487,152		121,788	ŝ	365,364	
Kentucky PSC	SC																Adm. Case No.	ase	No. 360	
HAI Model Belease 5 0a	Delea	co 5 0a							7								M	Nav 22	22 100R	
	רוומ	00.000							t								ž	a <u>y</u>		

•

Appendix B

895,452 415,444 1,036,901 293,595 229,982 119,839 383,888 164,635 430,104 450,415 0 \$ \$ Ś Ф Ф **~~~** 298,484 138,481 345,634 97,865 76,661 54,878 143,368 150,138 39,946 127,963 0 **~~~~** 1,193,936 553,925 1,382,534 391,461 306,642 219,513 573,472 600,553 159,785 511,850 0 **~~~~** 00000000000 **~~~~** 1,591 4,481 3,749 283 4,760 0 5,691 0000 *** 00000000000 **~~~~** 213,822 573,472 600,553 159,785 511,850 549,445 1,378,785 391,178 301,882 0 1,192,345 **~~~~** 52.54 66.44 53.33 52.78 52.78 77.29 26.89 92.21 92.21 43.02 63.96 **~~~** 52.08 65.73 52.01 76.26 90.79 90.79 65.78 65.78 65.78 65.78 52.15 65.77 52.94 52.94 55.04 76.35 26.60 90.86 65.78 65.78 65.78 65.78 65.78 ~~~~~ **WNCHKYMA** WNCHKYPV WLBGKYMA WLCKKYES WRFDKYMA WSBGKYMA WSPNKYMA WHBGKYMA WHVLKYMA WLVLKYMA WYLDKYES

Line Type Primary residence lines	Support Grand Totals \$72,688,003	@25% Federal allocation \$18,172,001	·
Secondary residence lines	\$ 0	80	0\$
Single line business lines	\$438,459	\$109,615	
Multline business lines	\$0	\$0	
Public lines	\$0	\$0	
All switched lines	\$73,126,462	\$18,281,616	

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Reiease 5.0a

COST OF NETWORK ELEMENTS

Kentucky Cincinnati Bell-Ky

												Cinci	nnat	Cincinnati Bell-Ky
Loop elements	0-5 lines/sq mi		5-100 lines/sq mi	100-200 lines/sq mi	200-650 lines/sq mi	650-850 Ihnes/sq mi		850-2550 lines/sq mi	2550-5000 lines/sq mi	6000-10000 lines/sq mi	>1 lines	>10000 lines/sq ml	-	Totals
NID Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	. ,	\$	240,934 \$ 0.79	\$ 74,306 0.73	\$ 282,316 0.67	5 \$ 111,673 7 0.73	\$ 573 573	471,290 \$ 0.71	287,102 \$ 0.72	\$ 131,089 0.67	\$ 6	22,175 0.63	s	1,620,884 0.71
Loop Distribution (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costfmonth	· · ·	~	8,656,100 28.40	\$ 1,871,307 18.40	\$ 5,226,705 13.86	5 \$ 1,008,651 3 7.46	351 \$.46	4,439,579 \$ 7.72	1,620,406 7.41	\$ 6 43,121 6.14	s - 4	69,913 4.18	S	23,535,781 12.83
Loop Distribution (non-DLC) Annual Cast Unit Cost/month	· ·	\$		н, 9	\$ 391,027 9.10	7 \$ 110,998 0 6.11	398 \$ 11	585,122 \$ 6.29	1,056,926 5.79	\$ 401,381 4.38	* 0 \$	60,628 3.29	\$	2,606,082 5.83
Loop Distribution (all) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	· ·	\$	8,656,100 28.40	\$ 1,871,307 18.40	\$ 5.617,732 13.38	2 \$ 1,119,649 3 7.30	549 \$ 30	5,024,701 \$ 7.52	2,677,332 6.67	\$ 1,044,501 5.32	8	130,540 3.72	\$	26,141,863 11.46
Loop Concentration (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	47	s	3,962,299 13.00	\$ 568,097 5.59	\$ 1,925,187 5.11	\$ 740	-860 \$ 5.48	2,878,993 \$ 5.01	1,117,821 5.11	\$ 558,876 5.34	6 5 5	77,086 4.61	~	11,829,218 6,45
Loop Concentration (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmorth	· ·	*		, ,	\$ 12,153 0.28	s,	7,148 \$ 0.39	27,800 \$ 0.30	52,175 0.29	\$ 28,199 0.31	o ←	5,034 0.27	ŝ	132,509 0.30
Loop Concentration (all) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	· ·	¢	3,962,299 13.00	\$ 568,097 5.59	\$ 1,937,340 4.61	0 \$ 748,008 1 4.88	80 88 88	2,906,793 \$ 4.35	1,169,996 2.91	\$ 587,074 2.99	4 0) 49	82,120 2.34	s	11,961,727 5.24
Loop Feeder (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costhmonth		5	3,233,330 10.61	\$ 218,353 2.15	\$ 650,692 1.73	2 \$ 183,243 3 1.36	243 \$.36	695,556 \$ 1.21	238,099 1.09	\$ 163,307 1.56	\$ 9	22,993 1.38	\$	5,405,573 2.95
Loop Feeder (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	۰ ، ب	•	• •	۰ ، ب	\$ 150,874 3.51	4 \$ 81,691	591 \$.49	285,391 \$ 3.07	514,523 2.82	\$ 291,899 3.19	4 9 000	33,827 1.84	Ś	1,358,204 3.04
Loop Feeder (aii) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	, , 	\$	3,233,330 10,61	\$ 218,353 2.15	\$ 801,566 1.91	5 \$ 264,933	333 \$ 73	980,947 \$ 1.47	752,622 1.87	\$ 455,206 2.32	9 CP	56,820 1.62	\$	6,763,777 2.97
Total Loop (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	, , 0	~	16,092,662 : 52.81	\$ 2,732,063 26.87	\$ 8,056,999 21.37	9 \$ 2,031,189 7 15.03	89 \$ 03 \$	8,419,817 \$ 14.64	3,132,815 14.32	\$ 1,435,210 13.71	*	180,538 10.81	~	42,080,293 22.94
Total Loop (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	4 I	\$, . 49	\$ 582,955 13.56	5 5 213,074 5 11.72	374 \$.72	963,915 \$ 10.36	1,754,238 9.61	\$ 782,661 8.54	4 - 4	111,116 6.03	\$	4,407,959 9.86
Total Loop (all) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth		ω.	16,092,662 52.81	\$ 2,732,063 26.87	\$ 8,638,954 20.57	4 \$ 2,244,263 7 14,63	ର ଜୁନ୍ଦ ଜୁନ	9,383,732 \$ 14.04	4,887,052 12.17	\$ 2,217,871 11.30	1 \$	291,655 8.30	~	46,488,252 20.38
Total lines Total lines served by DLC			25,395 25,395	8,474 8,474	34,999 31,416	9 12,780 5 11,265	780 365	55,685 47,934	33,452 18,233	15,363 8,726	۳ ۵	2,927		190,076 152,837

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

	¥ 	Annual Cost	Units			Unit Cost	
End office switching Line Port Non-Line Port	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	17,658,833 5,297,650 12,361,183	184,255 3,571,782,270	switched lines actual minutes	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	2.40 0.00346	per line/month per actual minute (for rate per DEM, see 'Cost detail' sheet)
Signaling network elements Links STP SCP	•	505,123 63,266 289,311 152,546	33 993,386,935 173,276,000	33 links 993,386,935 TCAP+ISUP msgs 173,276,000 TCAP queries	~~	158.66 0.00029 0.00088	per link per month per signaling message per query
Transport network elements Dedicated							
Sw+Sp Transport Switched	\$	4,040,039 1,697,001	10,037 4,216	trunks trunks	~ ~	33.54 0.00334	per DS-0 equivalent per month per minute
Transmission Terminal		728,794	10,037	trunks	~ ~ ~ ~	6.05 0.00060 0.00394	per DS-0 equivalent per month per minuts total car minute
Common Transport \$ Transmission Terminal	<u></u>	994,227 156,357	272,515,825 272,515,825	minutes minutes		0.00455 0.00072 0.00526	
Direct Transport \$ Transmission Terminal		2,978,694 490,975	965,202,134 965,202,134	minutes minutes	~~~~	0.00309 0.00051 0.00359	
Tandem switch	~	243,807	247,770,375	minutes	ŝ	0.00098	0.00098 per minute
Operator systems	\$	1,026,785					
Public Telephones	\$	1,238,209					
Total (w/ Public)	\$	76,550,096					
Total cost of switched network elements (w/o Public)	<u>ه</u>	32.17 pr	32.17 per line/month				

.

COST SUMMARY

	Bell-Ky
Kentucky	Cincinnati

					1	2	1+2	ę	1+2+3	
Network Element		nvestment*	% of total invesment	.	Annual Capital Cost	Network Expenses	Direct Expense	Support Expense	Subtotal (with misc/support)	Iotal (with carner-to- carrier)
QIN	ŝ	7,189,089	2.7%	ŝ	1,105,374 \$	137,227 \$	1,242,601 \$	368,384	\$ 1,610,986	\$ 1,618,927
Distribution (DLC)		79,027,124	29.8%		12,135,986	5,926,921	18,062,907	5,354,968	23,417,875	23,507,363
Distribution (non-DLC)		8,906,631	3.4%		1,364,817	631,209	1,996,026	591,746	2,587,772	2,602,935
Distribution (all)		87,933,755	33.1%		13,500,803	6,558,130	20,058,933	5,946,715	26,005,648	26,110,298
Concentrator (DLC)		42,491,999	16.0%		8,242,355	833,198	9,075,553	2,690,558	11,766,111	11,814,935
		498,400	0.2%		76,633	24,840	101,473	30,083	131,556	132,349
Concentrator (all)		42,990,399	16.2%		8,318,988	858,038	9,177,026	2,720,641	11,897,667	11,947,284
Feeder (DLC)		20,232,487	7.6%		2,986,365	1,164,787	4,151,152	1,230,660	5,381,812	5,399,046
Feeder (non-DLC)		5,077,229	1.9%		764,073	276,082	1,040,155	308,367	1,348,522	1,356,564
Feeder (all)		25,309,716	9.5%		3,750,439	1,440,869	5,191,307	1,539,026	6,730,334	6,755,610
End Office Switching		61,785,565	23.3%		9,792,232	3,319,425	13,111,657	2,788,929	15,900,586	17,637,511
Signaling		1,769,352	0.7%		279,019	906'906	375,924	78,965	454,889	504,513
Dedicated Transport		14,620,281	5.5%		2,157,493	885,983	3,043,476	597,298	3,640,773	4,035,160
Dedicated Transport Transmission		2,539,769	1.0%		499,097	44,954	544,051	112,379	656,430	727,914
Direct Transport		10,834,570	4.1%		1,598,928	655,705	2,254,633	430,421	2,685,054	2,975,098
Direct Transport Transmission		1,719,275	0.6%		337,860	30,431	368,291	74,055	442,346	490,382
Common Transport		3,629,431	1.4%		535,637	219,465	.755,103	141,289	896,392	993,026
Common Transport Transmission		549,559	0.2%		107,995	9,727	117,723	23,178	140,900	156,168
Tandem Switching		810,722	0.3%		121,749	59,060	180,809	38,708	219,517	243,513
Operator Systems		1,275,538	0.5%		227,575	555,698	783,273	141,335	924,608	1,025,545
Public Telephone		2,363,595	0.9%		510,246	428,909	939,155	176,612	1,115,767	1,238,209
								1	Total Network Cost	
Total	φ	265,320,616	100%	Ф	42,843,434 \$	15,300,528 \$	58,143,962 \$	15,177,935	\$ 73,321,897	\$ 76,459,161
							I			

* Post sharing

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Adm. Case No. 360 May 22, 1998

۲

<u>USOA Detail Breakdown of HAI Model Costs</u>

Cost \$(000)

INVESTMENT DESCRIPTION

NSOA

Kentucky **Cincinnati Bell-KY**

USOA	EXPENSE DESCRIPTION	Cost
	Plant Snartfir Evrances	(000) 1
6112	MOTOR VEHICLES	20
6113	AIRCRAFT	0
6114	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	0
6115	GARAGE WORK EQUIPMENT	0
9119	UTHER WORK EQUIPMENT	ន
0110	NEI WURK SUFFURI	152
6121	LAND & BUILDINGS	1,114
6122	FURNITURE	1 8
6123	OFFICE EQUIPMENT	8
6124	GENERAL PURPOSE COMPLITERS	575
6120	LAND & SUPPORT ASSETS	1,840
6212	DIGITAL ELECTRONIC SWITCHING	3,022
6220	OPERATOR SYSTEMS	809
6232	CIRCUIT EQUIPMENT	801
		ŝ
6351	PUBLIC TEL TERMINAL EQUIPMENT	429
6411 6421	POLES AERIAL CABLE	516 2,116
6422	UNDERGROUND CABLE	606
6423	BURIED CABLE	6,488
6426	INTRABUILDING NETWORK CABLE	
6441	CONDUIT SYSTEMS	62
6410	TOTAL CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES	10,090
	Total Plant Specific Expenses	16,837
	Plant Nonspecific Operations	
1939	TOTAL NETWORK OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,837
6623	CUSTOMER SERVICES	5/6'/L
	Total Plant Nonspecific Operations	22,131
	TOTAL CORPORATE OPERATIONS	7,162
	TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	46,130
7240	OPERATING OTHER TAXES	2,240
	TOTAL EXPENSES & OPERATING TAXES	48,370

F	Telecommunications Plant in Service	(000) t
2111 L	LAND MOTOR VEHICLES	755 1,639
• • •	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES GARAGE WORK EQUIPMENT	62
2116 0	other work equipment	944
_	BUILDINGS	12,285
		1,422
- ~	OFFICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT COMPANY COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	1,/14
2124 0	GENERAL PURPOSE COMPUTERS TOTAL LAND & SUPPORT ASSETS	4,442 23,281
2212 C	DIGITAL ELECTRONIC SWITCHING	58,445
2220	OPERATOR SYSTEMS	517
2232 C	CIRCUIT EQUIPMENT	44,910
2351 P	PUBLIC TEL TERMINAL EQUIPMENT	2,364
_	POLES	6,334
-	AERIAL CABLE - METALLIC	19,177
	AERIAL CABLE - NonMETALLIC	6,971
_		4,047
2423.1 B	UNUERGRUUND CABLE - NONMETALLIC BURIED CABLE - METALLIC	17,752 71 700
	BURIED CABLE - NonMETALLIC	21,533
2426.1 II 2426.2 II	INTRABUILDING NETWORK CABLE - MET. INTRABUILDING NETWORK CABLE - NOMMET.	
2441 C	CONDUIT SYSTEMS	5,687
2410 7	TOTAL CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES	153,202
-	Total TPIS (before amortizable assets)*	282,718
+ c +	This calculation of total plant includes GSF investment. GSF investment is not included in the total investment that is reported in the "Summany" sheet	GSF investment is "Summary" sheet.

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Adm. Case No. 360 May 22, 1998

	Investment Disaggregations.	Terminal, Drop, and NID	Aerial-m portion	Buried-m portion		OS Trks + Signaling links	Circuit Eqpt. portion	Pole portion	Aerial-nm portion	Underground-nm portion	Buried-nm portion	Conduit portion		SAI	Aerial-m portion	Aerial-rum portion	Underground-m portion	Underground-nm portion	Buried-m portion	Buried-nm portion												
tions	Dep Exp		178			7	2 8			265	92	134 134	,	740			3,653		52		4,840	305	300	1,094	321	190	817	3,910	913	•	•	104 40
Depreciation Calculations	DepFact		0.10884			0.08333	0.06176			0.02156	0.06461	0.07835	0.12897	0.16667			0.06250		0.10000		0.10778	0.12897	0.04736	0.05705	0.04602	0.04682	0.04602	0.05454	0.04242	0.05385	0.04521	0.01831
Depreci	DepLife		9.20			12.00	16.20			46.39	15.49	12.78	7.78	6.00			16.00		10.00		9.30	7.78	21.12	17.54	21.74	21.37	21.74	18.35	23.58	18.58	22.12	54.63
NSOA		2111	2112	2113	2114	2115	2116			2121	2122	2123.1	2123.2	2124	2110		2212		2220		2232	2351	2411	2421.1	2421.2	2422.1	2422.2	2423.1	2423.2	2426.1	2426.2	2441

Total Depreciation 17,973

Network Element Disaggregations

.

		LANGING LINGUNG CHARMIN	
Terminal, Drop, and NID	18,506,986	Terminal, Drop, and NID	859,585
Aerial-m portion	3,792,996	Aerial portion	242,521
Buried-m portion	14,713,990	Buried portion	617,064
OC Trie + Cinestine linke	706 970	AC The + Cinneline linke	CC0 1/2
	ers'ner		
Circuit Eqpt. portion	132,713	Circuit Eqpt. portion	8,470
Pole portion	21,518	Pole portion	1,846
Aerial-nm portion	62,334	Aerial-nm portion	5,565
Underground-nm portion	256,706	Underground-nm portion	13,485
Buried-nm portion	262,009	Buried-nm portion	20,758
Conduit portion	60,999	Conduit portion	698
541	3 024 400	541	150 587
Aerial-m mortion	106.447	Aerial mortion	20,001
Aerial are portion	401 677	I indemice and notion	20,03
	200.044	Divide notion	
	725,024		120
	100,000		
Buried-m portion	95,735		
Distant and Lots	4 485 444		

Underground-tim portion	13,400
Buried-nm portion	20,758
Conduit portion	698
SAI	150,587
Aerial portion	29,811
Underground portion	58,583
Buried portion	62,193

Cincinnati Bell-KY Cincinnati Bell-KY Grow State	791,185	1,022,507	492,846	290,288	0	900,840	0	0	594,191	691,946	0	525.417	344.922	1.282.745	377,537
	\$	\$ ()	. ୧୨ ୦	\$	\$ 0	. ୧୫ ୦	\$ 0	\$ 0	بې بې	• • •	. ୧୨ ୦	• • •	Ф	• 6 9	\$
Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir Cir	263,728	340,836	164,282	96,763		300,280		J	198,064	230,649		175,139	114.974	427,582	125,846
	ŝ	Ś	Ś	Ś	ŝ	69	\$	θ	ŝ	ŝ	ф	63	ŝ	6	ф
Total annual support for specified line types	1,054,913	1,363,342	657,128	387,051	0	1,201,120	0	0	792,254	922,595	0	700,556	459,896	1,710,327	503,382
	\$	÷	θ	€	Ś	ŝ	Ś	÷	θ	¢	Ś	Ś	ŝ	÷	ى
Supported S0.00 Annual support for public lines	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	\$ 0	о ••	÷ •	ۍ ه	۰ ه	\$ 0	\$ 0	ۍ ه	\$ 0	\$ 0	е С	е С	8 0	\$ 0	е С
Is Not to be \$0.00 Annual support for multiline		-	-	•	•	•	-	•	-	•	•	•	Ū		Ū
s B B	\$ 0	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
that Line Ty \$51.00 Annual support for single line usiness lines	0	0	0	2,301	0	14,247	0	0	577	0	0	4,563	0	7,271	1,476
a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	\$	G	↔	€	S	Ś	θ	€	θ	θ	θ	÷	Ф	θ	\$
Entry of \$0.00 Indicates that Line Type is Not to be Supported \$31.00 \$0.00 \$51.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 Annual Annual Annual Annual Annual Annual for the support for supp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jo S	თ ო	2	ŝ	0	。 。	ლ ო	0	0	~	ŝ	0	4	Ś	~	~
lệ bị Đa	1,054,913	1,363,342	657,128	384,750		1,186,873			791,677	922,595		695,994	459,896	1,703,057	501,907
2	со	69	\$	የን	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
100% 100% 110% Benchmark @ Business age per lin	45.24	98.62	41.14	61.21	22.10	70.03	22.55	25.53	30 .06	39.80	23.93	58.36	43.86	58.77	67.96
	↔	\$	↔	\$	\$	с э	\$	69	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
p Assigned for USF. 100% rt Assigned for USF. 100% cal DEM usage ratio: 110% Monthly Support Benchmark: inthly @ Residence @ Business r line usage per line usage per line	44.33	96.57	40.27	59.48	21.45	68.99	21.93	24.82	97.26	39.02	23.24	56.96	42.91	57.92	66.64
R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R	€ 7	\$ }	\$	\$	\$	ф	\$	\$	ن ه	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
% of Loop Assigned for USF: 100% % of Port Assigned for USF: 100% Bus/Res local DEM usage ratio: 110% Monthly Support Benchmark: Avg monthly @ Residence @ Business cost per line usage per line usage per line resi	44.48	96.58	40.45	59.71	21.61	69.16	22.16	24.97	97.30	39.13	23.45	57.14	43.12	58.04	66.75
% % [§]	\$	\$	θ	\$	Ś	÷	Ф	θ	\$	θ	ŝ	\$	θ	θ	ŝ
And the set of the set	ALXNKYAL	BTLRKYBR	BURLKYBN	CRTDKYCT	CVTNKYCN	FLMOKYFM	FLRNKYFL	FTTHKYFT	GLCOKYGC	INDPKYIN	LKPKKYLP	UNINKYAC	WLTNKYWL	WLTWKYWT	WRSWKYWR

Line Type	Support Grand Totals	@25% Federal allocation	@75% State allocation
Primary residence lines	\$9,722,131	\$2,430,533	\$7,291,598
Secondary residence lines	\$0	\$0	
Single line business lines	\$30,434	\$7,609	\$22,826
Multline business lines	\$0	\$0	•
Public lines	\$0	\$0	
All switched lines	\$9,752,565	\$2,438,141	\$7,314,424

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

COST OF NETWORK ELEMENTS

•

Kentucky Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE Ky

Loop elements	E	0-5 lines/sq ml	5	5-100 lines/sq ml	100-200 lines/sq mi		200-650 lines/sq mi		650-850 lines/sq mi	850-2550 lines/sq mi		2550-5000 lines/sq ml		6000-10000 lines/sq mi	-	- 10000 >10000 lines/sq mi	2	volues of ry include of Lry v10000 Totals lines/sq mi Totals
NID Annual Cost Unit Costmorth	~	14,171 0.78		570,004 \$ 0.77		8 19	84,639 0.61	8	90	8	8		•	• •	~		~	840,264 0.70
Loop Distribution (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth		802,156 44.50	~	19,314,984 \$ 26.08		1,423,312 \$ 14.49	1,361,315	5 Ci	60,299 7.68	\$ 688,999 9.98	\$ 866 9 86		~		~		*	23,651,066 22.46
Loop Distribution (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	<u>~</u>	5,030 32.88	ŝ	16,732 \$ 9.91		•••	190,463 9.93	5 2 \$	21,297 \$ 5.08	\$ 585,473 5.11	473 \$ 5.11		\$, ,	\$	* 1		818,995 5.86
Loop Distribution (all) Amual Cost Unit Cost/month	v >	807,186 44.40	\$	19,331,716 \$ 26.04		1,423,312 \$ 14.49	1,551,779 11.21	8 E	81,595 6.78	\$ 1,274,472 6.94	472 \$ 6.94		*	· ·	ŝ	• •	~	24,470,060 20.52
Loop Concentration (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	~_~	733,362 40.68	~	12,803,049 \$ 17.29		569,867 \$ 5.80	534,081 4.48	58 58	50,624 6.45	\$ 318,981 4.62	,981 \$ 4.62		~		~		w	15,009,964 14.25
Loop Concentration (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	••	260 1.70	\$	975 \$ 0.58		9 1	4,110 0.21	9 E	1,591 0.38	50 \$	20,446 \$ 0.18		~	• •	**		*	27,382 0.20
Loop Concentration (all) Amual Cost Unit Cost/month	\$	733,622 40.36	\$	12,804,024 \$ 17.25		569,867 \$ 5.80	538,192 3.89	\$ \$	52,215 4.34	330	339,427 \$ 1.85		\$	• •	**		<u>~</u>	15,037,347 12.61
Loop Feeder (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	s	688,959 38,22	s	9,352,723 \$ 12.63		405,427 \$ 4.13	235,652 1.98	82	13,060	184	184,182 \$ 2.67		~		~		~	10,880,004
Loop Feeder (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	••	7,299 47.72	ŝ	9,049 \$ 5.36		••	71,309 3.72	5 S	20,977 5.00	\$ 356,504 3.11	504 \$ 3.11		\$		\$		به	465,138 3.33
Loop Feeder (all) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	69	696,259 38.30	5	9,361,771 \$ 12.61		405,427 \$ 4.13	306,961 2.22	5	34,037 2.83	\$ 540, 2	540,686 \$ 2.95		\$	••	49	• •	\$	11,345,142 9.51
Total Loop (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	~	2,238,530 124.18	5	42,039,464 \$ 56.76		2,469,933 \$ 25.14	2,203,965 18.48	\$ 8	127,819 16.29	\$ 1,227,600 17.79	600 \$ 7.79		S		~		~	50,307,310 47.77
Total Loop (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	\$	12,709 83.08	49	28,052 \$ 16.62		••	277,606 14.48	6 8 \$	45,915 1 10,95	\$ 1,021,222 8.92	222 \$ 8.92		\$	• •	69	• •	~~	1,385,503 9.92
Total Loop (all) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	- 44	2,251,238 123.84	'n	42,067,516 \$ 56.67		2,469,933 \$ 25.14	2,481,571	5 5 8	173,733 14,43	\$ 2,248,822 12.25	822 \$ 2.25		ŝ		~	• •	<i>w</i>	51,692,813 43.34
Total lines Total lines served by DLC		1,515 1,502		61,862 61,722		8,187 8,187	11,535 9,937	22	1,003 654	άų	15,295 5,752							99,397 87,754

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

]	Annual Cost	Units		- 0	Unit Cost	
End office switching Line Port Non-Line Port	~	5,601,238 1,680,371 3,920,866	92,325 1,325,119,687	switched lines actual minutes	\$ \$	1.52 0.00296	per linermonth per actual minute (for rate per DEM, see "Cost detail" sheet)
Signaling network elements Links STP SCP	*	458,964 256,309 132,691 69,964	81 1,138,092,401 260,801,000	81 links 138.092,401 TCAP+ISUP msgs 266,801,000 TCAP queries	~~~	264.09 0.00012 0.00027	per link per month per signaling message per query
Transport network elements Dedicated							
.ds+ws	\$	5,290,002	6'488	trunks	\$	46.41	46.41 per DS-0 equivalent per month
Special		1,351,088 3,938,914	2,426 7,073		\$	0.00462	0.00462 per minute
Transmission Terminal	_	1,256,501	8,499	trunks	~ v	11.02	per DS-0 equivalent per month
Common					~	0.00572	total per minute
Transport	~	1 A40 108	153 285 MM	minitae		001000	soo minima and to find and the second
Transmission Terminal		368,527	153,285,004		, , ,	0.00218	per runure per reg (ong or term) per minute
Direct					~	0.01307	total per minute
Transport \$	~	2,657,546	305.796.264	minutes	•	0 00869	nar minista
Transmission Terminal		545,000	305,796,264		~~~~	0.01047	per minute total per minute
Tandem switch	\$	123,345	130,967,687	minutes	•	0.00094	0.00094 per minute
Operator systems	\$	720,248					
Public Telephones	~	165,489					
Total (w/ Public)	\$	70,719,782					
Total cost of switched network elements (w/o Public)	\$	55.96 per	55.96 per line/month				

•

COST SUMMARY

Kentucky Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE Ky

			+	2	1+2	ç	1+2+3	
Network Element.	Investment *	% of total invesment	Annual Capital Cost	Network Expenses	Direct Expense	Support Expense	Subtotal (with misc support)	Vith carrier-to- carrier.
DIN	\$ 3,794,719	1.3%	\$ 584,120	\$ 72,817 \$	656,937 \$	178,720	\$ 835,657	\$ 838,213
Distribution (DLC)	103,794,160	35.3%	15,938,108	2,566,015	18,504,123	5,034,047	23,538,170	23,593,323
Distribution (non-DLC)	3,549,980	1.2%	545,844	92,013	637,857	173,529	811,386	816,995
Distribution (all)	107,344,140	36.5%	16,483,953	2,658,028	19,141,981	5,207,576	24,349,557	24,410,318
Concentrator (DLC)	55,335,929	18.8%	10,770,941	974,637	11,745,578	3,195,385	14,940,962	14,973,319
Concentrator (non-DLC)	125,700	%0.0	19,349	1,976	21,325	5,801	27,126	27,315
Concentrator (all)	55,461,629	18.9%	10,790,290	976,612	11,766,902	3,201,186	14,968,088	15,000,634
Feeder (DLC)	49,809,057	17.0%	7,348,186	1,166,480	8,514,666	2,316,415	10,831,081	10,853,441
Feeder (non-DLC)	2,103,579	0.7%	317,842	44,381	362,223	98,543	460,765	464,002
Feeder (all)	51,912,635	17.7%	7,666,027	1,210,861	8,876,888	2,414,958	11,291,846	11,317,444
End Office Switching	19,280,255	6.6%	3,013,826	1,125,990	4,139,816	906,905	5,046,721	5,587,563
Signaling	1,756,382	0.6%	273,717	69,859	343,576	70,134	413,710	457,843
Dedicated Transport	23,823,721	8.1%	3,516,055	458,845	3,974,900	794,131	4,769,030	5,277,087
Dedicated Transport Transmission	4,346,212	1.5%	854,087	76,928	931,015	201,191	1,132,206	1,253,433
Direct Transport	12,061,286	4.1%	1,780,203	231,750	2,011,953	384,526	2,396,479	2,651,058
Direct Transport Transmission	1,913,418	0.7%	376,011	33,867	409,879	81,468	491,347	543,670
Common Transport	8,363,956	2.8%	1,234,508	160,630	1,395,138	264,288	1,659,426	1,835,616
Common Transport Transmission	1,296,693	0.4%	254,817	22,951	277,769	54,504	332,273	367,628
Tandem Switching	406,229	0.1%	61,005	29,696	90,701	20,414	111,115	123,044
Operator Systems	1,750,751	0.6%	273,354	288,263	561,618	87,469	649,086	718,489
Public Telephone	340,974	0.1%	73,608	53,638	127,246	22,083	149,330	165,489
						1	Total Network Cost	
Total	293,853,001	100%	\$ 47,235,581	\$ 7,470,736 \$	54,706,318 \$	13,889,553	\$ 68,595,871	\$ 70,547,528

* Post sharing

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Adm. Case No. 360 May 22, 1998

•

USOA Detail Breakdown of HAI Model Costs

Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE Ky

Cost \$(000)	550 1,893 107 1,570	8,870 397 1,861 1,861 982 16,230	15,459 213 60,871	341	12,493 17,244 16,244 941 941 23,331 841,367 48,199 48,199 5,891 5,891	304,987 GSF investment is a "Summary" sheet.
USOA INVESTMENT DESCRIPTION Telecommunications Plant in Service	2111 LAND 2112 MOTOR VEHICLES 2113 AIRCRAFT 2114 SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES 2115 GARAGE WORK EQUIPMENT 2116 OTHER WORK EQUIPMENT	2121 BUILDINGS 2122 FURNITURE 2123.1 OFFICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT 2123.2 COMPANY COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT 2124 GENERAL PURPOSE COMPUTERS 2110 TOTAL LAND & SUPPORT ASSETS	2212 DIGITAL ELECTRONIC SWITCHING 2220 OPERATOR SYSTEMS 2232 CIRCUIT EQUIPMENT	-	2411 POLES 2421.1 AERAL CABLE - METALLIC 2421.2 AERAL CABLE - NOMMETALLIC 2422.1 UNDERGROUND CABLE - METALLIC 2422.1 UNDERGROUND CABLE - NOMMETALLIC 2423.1 BURIED CABLE - NOMMETALLIC 2423.1 INTRABULDING NETWORK CABLE - NOMMET. 2426.1 INTRABULDING NETWORK CABLE - NOMMET. 2421.1 OTTAL CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES 2410.1074L CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES	I otal I 1/15 (before amortizable assets) [*] 304,987 * This calculation of total plant includes GSF investment. GSF investment is not included in the total investment that is reported in the "Summary" sheet

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Kentucky	Cost	(000)	141 66 0 29 235	808 31 31	1,833 2,833 799	238 1.082	5	256 1,221	344 3 (158	1	13 4,892	10,133	2,552 18,795 168 21,516	6,627
	EXPENSE DESCRIPTION	Plant Specific Expenses	MOTOR VEHICLES AIRCRAFT SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES GARAGE WORK EQUIPMENT OTHER WORK EQUIPMENT NETWORK SUPPORT	LAND & BUILDINGS FURNITURE OFFICE EQUIPMENT	GENERAL PURPOSE COMPUTERS LAND & SUPPORT ASSETS DIGITAL ELECTRONIC SWITCHING	OPERATOR SYSTEMS CIRCUIT EQUIPMENT	PUBLIC TEL TERMINAL EQUIPMENT	POLES AERIAL CABLE	UNDERGROUND CABLE BURIED CABLE	INTRABUILDING NETWORK CABLE	CONDUIT SYSTEMS TOTAL CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES	Total Plant Specific Expenses	Plant Nonspecific Operations TOTAL NETWORK OPERATIONS SUPPORT DEPRECUATION TPIS CUSTOMER SERVICES Total Plant Nonspecific Operations	TOTAL CORPORATE OPERATIONS
	NSOA		6112 6113 6114 6115 6116 6110	6121 6122 6123	6124 6120 6212	6220 6232	6351	6411 6421	6422 6423	6426	6441 6410		6561 6623	

Adm. Case No.360 May 22, 1998

2,068 **40,343**

TOTAL EXPENSES & OPERATING TAXES

38,276

TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES

7240 OPERATING OTHER TAXES

Appendix D Worksheet 3

	2426.1 2426.2 2441	2423.1 2423.2	2422.1 2422.2	2421.2	2411 2421 1	2351	2232	2220	2212	2123.2 2124 2110	2123.1	2121	2113 2114 2115 2116	2111		USOA
Total De	18.58 22.12 54.63	18.35 23.58	21.37 21.74	21.74	21.12 17.54	7.78	9.30	10.00	16.00	7.78 6.00	12.78	46.39	12.00 16.20	9.20	DepLife	Deprec
Total Depreciation	0.05385 0.04521 0.01831	0.05454 0.04242	0.04682 0.04602	0.04602	0.04736	0.12897	0.10778	0.10000	0.06250	0.12897 0.16667	0.07835	0.02156	0.08333 0.06176	0.10884	DepFact	Depreciation Calculations
18,795	108	4,765 2,045	1,074	755	984 984	4	6,561	21	966	- 164	145 12		9 97	206	Dep Exp	ations

Investment Disaggregations:		Expense Disaggregations:	
Terminal, Drop, and NID	10,368,626	Terminal, Drop, and NID	262,978
Aerial-m portion	1,680,910	Aerial portion	66,475
Buried-m portion	8,687,716	Buried portion	196,503
OS Trks + Signaling links	2,426,454	OS Trks + Signaling links	70, 189
Circuit Eqpt. portion	404,409	Circuit Eqpt. portion	11,698
Pole portion	70,260	Pole portion	2,155
Aerial-nm portion	186,549	Aerial-nm portion	10,215
Underground-nm portion	795,373	Underground-nm portion	18,798
Buried-nm portion	787,312	Buried-nm portion	26,720
Conduit portion	182,552	Conduit portion	603
SAI	2,551,200	SAI	40,098
Aerial-m portion	22,160	Aerial portion	10,226
Aerial-nm portion	628,491	Underground portion	4,941
Underground-m portion	48,709	Buried portion	24,931
Underground-nm portion	265,638		
Buried-m portion	23,427		

.

265,638 23,427 1,562,775	48,709	628,491	22,160	2,551,200	182,552	787,312	795,373	100,049
	Buried portion	Underground portion	Aerial portion	SAI	Conduit portion	Buried-nm portion	Underground-nm portion	Aenal-nm poruon
	24,931	4,941	10,226	40,098	603	26,720	18,798	10,215

N

_	
5	~
5	б
F	ŏ
j_	Φ
F	2
5	dix
۲	2
	U

Worksheet 4

May 22, 1998	Z															5.0a	lease	el Re	HAI Model Release 5.0a
ase No. 360	Adm. Case No.																0	PSC	Kentucky PSC
\$ 228,215	76,072	287 \$	304,287	÷	0	0	\$	\$ 764	0	24 \$	303,524	4	91.74	N	89.72	90.01 \$	g	(0	PRCYKYXA
•••	99,762	1	399,047	\$	•	0	ŝ	\$	0	\$ 7	399,047	0 ()	101.39	N 40	-	98.52 \$	g		ONEDKYXA
\$ 269,335	89,778	113 \$	359,113	€	•	0	ۍ ه	\$	0	τω \$	359,113	60	97.79	СТ 201	96.25	96.25 \$	•••	÷	MYLCKYXA
\$ 792,311	264,104		1,056,414	÷	• •	0		\$ 911	0	ນ ເຊ	; 1,055,503	~~	61.51	N	60.92	60.93 \$	6		MTVRKYXA
\$ 505,759	168,586	345 \$	674,345	\$	0	0	\$	\$ 685	0	8 8	673,660	5	115.36	4	113.74	113.75 \$	11:	"	MTOLKYXA
\$ 1,229,021	409,674	•	1,638,695	\$	•	0		\$ 5,045	0	50	\$ 1,633,650	0	56.90	~	56.41	56.50	5		MNCHKYXA
\$ 70,574	23,525		94,	\$	•	0	\$	\$ 4,625	0	73 ₽	\$ 89,473	5	208.35	0	i 197.40	201.56	20	-	MMCVKYXA
\$ 161,033	53,678	711 \$	214,711	\$	0	0	0 \$	\$	0		\$ 214,711	4	\$ 111.94	ω ω	109.13	109.13	§ 10		MLBNKYXA
\$ 210,779	70,260	039 \$	281,039	\$	• •	0	69	\$ 2,092	0	47 \$	\$ 278,947	0	94.00	4	92.54	92.59	9		LWGMKYXA
\$ 265,035	88,345	380 \$	353,380	÷.	0	0	ся С	↔	0	8	353,380	N	i 114.02	<u>~</u>	\$ 110.91	110.91	5 11		LVTNKYXA
0	0	0 \$		\$	0	0	ۍ ه	÷	0	0		~	5 27.17	~	26.81	26.96	2		LONDKYXA
\$ 297,004	99,001		396,005	. Ө	0	0	\$	\$	0	05 4	396,005		47.11	4	46.54	46.54	5 4		JNKNKYXA
\$ 275,976	91,992	-	367,968	с ,	•	0	\$	\$ 3,102	0	50	364,866	9 	88.79	8	86.98	87.13	8		JHVLKYXA
\$ 323,545	107,848	-	431,393	.	0	0	ŝ	G	0	93 49	431,393	9 	38.99	თ 	38.56	38.68	به بي		IRVNKYXA
\$ 243,493	81,164	657 \$	324,657	. Ө	0	0	\$	€9	0	57	324,657		124.41	4	5 121.74	121.74	\$ 12	4	GMTWKYXA
\$ 243,657	81,219	875 \$	324,875	۔ ج	0	0	с ,	€9	0	75	324,875	ເກ 	\$ 100.05	4	98.64	98.64	6		FRNLKYXA
\$ 405,969	135.323	292 \$	541,292	. ө	0	0	م	↔	0	8 8 4	541,292	8	96.88	œ	95.88	95.88	õ		FLLCKYXA
\$ 634,992	211,664	656 \$	846,656	- Ө	O	0	6	\$ 2,736	0	20	843,920	7	§ 98.77	N M	§ 97.02	97.04	S.		FBSHKYXA
\$ 409.666	136.555	221 \$	546.221	. Ө	0	0	\$	\$ 547	0	74 44	545,674	N 	56.62	б	56.06	56.13	ŭ.		EVRSKYXA
\$ 553,166	184,389	555 \$	737,555	۔ ج	↔	0	ŝ	\$ 915	0	39	5 736,639	о 	62.15	تن د	61.33	61.37	9		EBRNKYXA
\$ 536,860	178,953	813 \$	715,813	ся -	6 9 ·	0		\$ 3,241	0	72 \$	6 712,572	7	61.07	~	60.47	60.53	0		EBNKKYXA
\$ 173.600	57.867	466 \$	231,466	с. С.	6	0	с я -	69	0	8	5 231,466	сл 	\$ 103.95	Ň	101.42	101.42			DOVRKYXA
\$ 892.154	297.385	538 \$	1,189,538	. ө	•	0	s S	\$ 11,799	0	39 4	§ 1,177,739	ເມ 	\$ 83.03	نت 	82.43	82.51			CYVLKYXA
\$ 165 436	55.145	582 s	220.582			0	6 6	6 9 ·	0	80 10	220,582	4	39.84	Ö	39.40	39.50		-	CMLDKYXA
\$ 167 240	55.747	386 €	222.986			0	6 (€9 4	0	8	222,986	o '	156.90	ō	152.90	152.90			CLMBKYXA
S 213 307	71 102	409 \$	284 409	Э		0 0	69 4	s ·	0	00 : 20 :	284,409	-	40.77	б 	40.26	40.26			CLCTKYXA
\$ 579 939	193 313	555 e	773 252	- · ·		0 0	60 (69 (\$	0	22 i	5 765.664	0n (60.15	ω	59.63	59.72			CKSNKYXA
\$ 337 011	70 004	D17 0 0	310 015	 A		5 0) }	<i>9</i>	5 0	5	316.015	ლი . 	49.03	0	48.50	48.64			BWVLKYXA
\$ 217 269	00,244	170 4 4 4	44,914	 A 4	~ ~	5 0	5 C	چه د ر		50 - 50 -	463 158		82.71	თ. 	6 81.16	81.16			BRWLKYXA
\$ 382,/14	127,571		510,285	9 4	•		5 C 9 U	າ ປ ວວວ ດ			344 644	• 0 	502.40	50	ר הע הייר היי	57.90	ле лс		
\$ 633,534	211,178	.712 \$	844,712	. U . 49		00	• •	\$ 11,140	, o	2 2 2	5 833,573	(۱	80.11	ĥở	90 05 00 05	00 05 V			
\$ 984,591	328,197	788 \$	1,312,788	\$	~ \$	0	କ କ	- (,	0	8	5 1,312,788	4	50.54	0	50.10	50.18	بريا د		BBVLKYXA
\$ 154,222	51,407	630 \$; 205,630	÷	0 0	0	ۍ ه	S	0	30	\$ 205,630	دى 	83.73	ω 	6 81.83	81.83	. 00	-	ARTNKYXA
\$ 79,490	26,497	\$ 286	105,987	\$	\$	0	\$	\$	0	87 \$	§ 105,987	0	§ 42.40	9	\$ 41.79		4		AGSTKYXA
allocation	allocation		types		public lines	business lines	44	business lines	residence lines		residence lines		usage per line	· • •	usage per line		cost per line		cli :
@75% State	Federal	line	specified line	S	support for	multiline	a Tu	single line	secondary	anto s anto s anto s	primary	°,	@ Business	6. C 6	@ Residence		Avg monthly		
	@ 25%	for	support for		Annual	support for		support for	support for	Ă	support for	÷.							
		Iual	Total annual	4		Annual	and and and a set a state of a	Annual	Annual		Annual								
		(a (a										Cen				Y.			
				3 1.	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$51.00	\$0.00	8	\$31.00	Λ,	Monthly Support Benchmark:	S Z	onthly Sup	s S			
					to be Supported	Not to be S	YDe is	s that Line 1	Entry of \$0.00 Indicates that Line Type is Not	2 9	Ē	a çe	110%	.	Bus/Res local DEM usage ratio:	al DEM	IRes loc	Bus	27. 7 2. 42 1. 42 1. 42 1. 44 1. 441
Contel of Ky Inc dba GTE Ky	of Ky In	S.											100%	T .	% of Port Assigned for USF:	Assig	% of Por		
Kentucky				A									100%	Ξ	% of Loop Assigned for USE	Assig	of Loop	%	

Adm. Case No. 360 May 22, 1998

HAI Model Release 5.0a Kentucky PSC

WHLLKYXA WASHKYXA UNTWKYXA SOVLKYXA SMLDKYXA SMGVKYXA SCHLKYXA Primary residence lines Secondary residence lines Single line business lines *** Line Type 70.97 65.27 36.09 65.38 58.66 66.44 90.79 **Grand Totals** ••••• \$20,898,688 Support \$63,760 \$0 \$0 58.63 90.78 70.72 65.26 55.20 8 ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ €) allocation \$5,224,672 Federal @25% \$15,940 \$0 \$0 \$0 66.28 36.38 66.01 59.42 67.13 91.72 71.61 * * * * * * * * \$15,674,016 @75% State allocation \$0 \$47,820 359,231 266,843 53,269 548,196 821,559 521,023 750,742 ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ •••••• 1,530 1,032 1,711 3,245 720 0 0 **~~~~** **~~~~** 0000000 ⇔ G ••••• 752,453 551,441 822,591 359,951 522,553 53,269 266,843 ω \$ €) ÷ ŝ \$ 188,113 137,860 205,648 89,988 66,711 13,317 130,638 ω ω 60 69 \$ ÷ 200,133 39,951 564,339 413,580 269,963 616,943 391,915

Worksheet 4

Appendix D

Multline business lines

All switched lines

\$20,962,448

\$5,240,612

\$15,721,836

\$ \$

Public lines

N

	Adm.
May 2	Case
2, 19	No.
866	360

x	
<u>e</u>	
₹	

COST OF NETWORK ELEMENTS

	Total Loop (all) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth \$	Total Loop (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	Total Loop (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	Loop Feeder (all) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	Loop Feeder (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	Loop Feeder (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	Loop Concentration (all) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	Loop Concentration (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	Loop Concentration (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	Loop Distribution (all) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	Loop Distribution (non-DLC) Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	Loop Distribution (DLC) Annual Cost Unit Costmonth	NID Annual Cost Unit Cost/month	Loop elements
2,138	3,526,871 \$ 137.45	· ·	3,526,871 \$ 137.45	1,157,152 \$ 45.10	· ·	1,157,152 \$ 45.10	1,130,565 \$ 44.06	· ·	1,130,565 \$ 44.06	1,217,801 \$ 47.46	· ·	1,217,801 \$ 47.45	21,354 \$ 0.83	0-5 lines/sq ml
113,723	69,964,150 \$	416,129 \$	69,548,021 \$	15,325,999 \$	103,625 \$	15,222,374 \$	21,380,733 \$	7,962 \$	21,372,772 \$	32,227,451 \$	279,119 \$	31,948,332 \$	1,029,967 \$	5-100
	51.27	12.35	52.25	11.23	3.08	11.44	15.67	0.24	16.06	23,62	8.29	24.00	0.75	lines/sq ml
25,660	6,412,289 \$	905,580 \$	5,506,709 \$	1,021,880 \$	348,032 \$	673,848 \$	1,456,154 \$	20,072 \$	1,436,082 \$	3,715,641 \$	477,175 \$	3,238,466 \$	218,614 \$	100-200
18.582	20.82	10.66	24.69	3.32	4.10	3.02	4.73	0.24	6.44	12.07	5.62	14.52	0.71	lines/sq ml
64,270	12,617,871 \$	1,990,341 \$	10,627,529 \$	1,728,393 \$	619,901 \$	1,108,492 \$	3,159,731 \$	48,606 \$	3,111,125 \$	7,207,397 \$	1,182,811 \$	6,024,586 \$	522,350 \$	200-650
47,164	16.36	9.70	18.78	2.24	3.02	1.96	4.10	0.24	5.50	9.35	5.76	10.64	0.68	lines/sq ml
32,608	5,214,921 \$	1,125,613 \$	4,089,308 \$	577,887 \$	302,300 \$	275,567 \$	1,277,800 \$	23,607 \$	1,254,193 \$	3,117,972 \$	728,912 \$	2,389,060 \$	241,262 \$	650-850
23,039	13.33	9.80	14.79	1.48	2.63	1.00	3.27	0.21	4.54	7.97	6.35	8.64	0.62	lines/sq mi
77,377	11,441,446 \$	3,605,522 \$	7,835,924 \$	1,951,327 \$	1,089,577 \$	861,750 \$	2,954,034 \$	96,013 \$	2,858,021 \$	5,900,056 \$	2,156,843 \$	3,743,213 \$	636,029 \$	850-2550
45,370	12.32	9,39	14.39	2.10	2.84	1.58	3.18	0.25	5.25	6.35	5.62	6.88	0,68	lines/sq ml
101,817	12,650,199 \$	4,650,462 \$	7,999,737 \$	2,285,209 \$	1,535,512 \$	749,697 \$	3,458,651 \$	128,084 \$	3,330,567 \$	6,126,549 \$	2,651,274 \$	3,475,276 \$	779,789 \$	2550-5000
57 999	10.35	8.84	11.49	1.87	2.92	1.08	2.83	0.24	4.79	5.01	5.04	4.99	0.64	lines/sq mi
20,311	2,356,783 \$	1,227,120 \$	1,129,663 \$	584,494 \$	461,658 \$	122,837 \$	506,780 \$	31,724 \$	475,056 \$	1,119,897 \$	644,586 \$	475,311 \$	145,611 \$	5000-10000
7.875	9.67	8.22	11.95	2.40	3.09	1.30	2.08	0.21	5.03	4.59	4.32	5.03	0.60	lines/sq ml
12,607 -	728,084 4.81	728,084 4.81		248,108 1.64	248,108 1.64	• •	27,830 0.18	27,830 0.18		388,016 2.56	388,016 2.56		64,129 0.42	>10000 lines/sq mi
450,511	\$ 124,912,614	\$ 14,648,852	\$ 110,263,762	\$ 24,880,450	\$ 4,708,713	\$ 20,171,737	\$ 35,352,278	\$ 363,897	\$ 34,968,381	\$ 61,020,780	\$ 8,508,735	\$ 52,512,044	\$ 3,659,106	900
313.085	23.11	8.88	29.35	4.60	2.86	5.37	6.54	0.23	9.31	11.29	5.16	13.98	0.68	A mi Totals

Unit 1.38 per linatmonth 0.002248 per actual minute (for rate per DEM, see "Cost detail" sheet) 75.90 per link per month 0.000206 per signaling message 0.000207 per query 8.79 per DS-0 equivalent per month 0.00027 per minute 0.000287 per minute 0.00027 per minute 0.00027 per minute 0.000282 per minute 0.00047 per minute 0.000333 per minute 0.00034 total per minute 0.00035 total per minute 0.00035 per minute 0.000547 per minute		1076,680		2 666 820	1,026,875 550,425,838 minutes \$ 0.00187 per minute			1,571,713,776 minutes \$ 0.00147		\$ 0.00315	minutes \$ 0.00082	642,292,238 minutes \$ 0.00233					44,098 trunks	9,138 trunks \$ 0.00087	53,236 trunks \$ 8.79			\$ 0.00020	6,892,702,467 TCAP+ISUP msgs \$ 0.00006	184 links \$ 75.90	895,929	\$ 0.00248 per actual minute	406,412 switched lines \$ 1.38	22.484.166	Annual Cost Units Cost
--	--	----------	--	-----------	---	--	--	----------------------------------	--	------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	--	--	--	--	---------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	--	--	------------	---	--------------------	---------	------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------	------------------------

Adm. Case No. 360 May 22, 1998

HAI Model Release 5.0a Kentucky PSC

* Post sharing

			7	2	1+2	ω	1+2+3	
Network Element	Invesiment T	% of total invesment	Annual Capitali Cost	Network Expenses	Direct Expense	Support	Subtotal (with misc support)	Total (with carrier-to- carrier)
NID	\$ 16,116,393	2.5%	\$ 2,477,201 \$	299,102 \$	2,776,303 \$	850,820	\$ 3,627,123	\$ 3,650,173
Distribution (DLC)	223,718,501	34.4%	34,350,416	5,584,418	39,934,835	12,238,346	52,173,181	52,383,839
_Distribution (non-DLC)	36,057,195	5.5%	5,529,258	914,599	6,443,858	1,974,771	8,418,629	8,487,962
Distribution (all)	259,775,696	39.9%	39,879,674	6,499,018	46,378,692	14,213,117	60,591,809	60,871,801
Concentrator (DLC)	125,402,610	19.3%	24,383,485	2,207,594	26,591,079	8,149,046	34,740,125	34,883,008
<u>Concentrator (non-DLC)</u>	1,715,400	0.3%	263,669	26,961	290,630	89,066	379,696	382,960
Concentrator (all)	127,118,010	19.5%	24,647,153	2,234,556	26,881,709	8,238,112	35,119,822	35,265,968
Feeder (DLC)	90,611,148	13.9%	13,368,722	1,985,667	15,354,389	4,705,474	20,059,863	20,122,489
Feeder (non-DLC)	20,927,161	3.2%	3,157,652	407,842	3,565,495	1,092,674	4,658,169	4,697,217
Feeder (all)	111,538,308	17.1%	16,526,374	2,393,510	18,919,884	5,798,148	24,718,032	24,819,706
End Office Switching	70,705,667	10.9%	11,208,299	3,968,426	15,176,726	5,027,905	20,204,631	22,429,272
Signaling	2,911,901	0.4%	452,153	157,423	609,577	195,740	805,317	893,742
Dedicated Transport	23,686,417	3.6%	3,495,210	458,770	3,953,980	1,098,742	5,052,722	5,600,626
Dedicated Transport Transmission	9,566,770	1.5%	1,879,994	169,332	2,049,326	639,600	2,688,926	2,983,451
Direct Transport	9,992,845	1.5%	1,474,671	193,056	1,667,727	413,346	2,081,073	2,304,653
Direct Transport Transmission	2,795,900	0.4%	549,430	49,487	598,918	160,776	759,694	841,837
Common Transport	5,567,855	0.9%	821,684	107,479	929,162	225,063	1,154,225	1,278,008
Common Transport Transmission	1,508,237	0.2%	296,388	26,696	323,084	84,071	407,155	451,068
Tandem Switching	3,074,084	0.5%	459,773	229,261	689,034	233,540	922,574	1,024,368
Operator Systems	4,369,992	0.7%	718,294	1,268,766	1,987,060	407,989	2,395,050	2,660,310
Public Telephone	2,125,985	0.3%	458,951	334,435	793,386	175,024	968,411	1,076,680
							Total Network Cost	
Total	\$ 650 854 059	100% \$	\$ 105,345,253 \$	18.389.316 \$	123 734 560 \$	37 761 003 0	\$ 161.496.562 \$	\$ 166 151 661

COST SUMMARY

Kentucky GTE South Inc - Ky

Appendix E Worksheet 2

Plant Specific Expenses MOTOR VEHICLES AIRCRAFT SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES GARAGE WORK EQUIPMENT OTHER WORK EQUIPMENT NETWORK SUPPORT LAND & BUILDINGS FURNTURE OFFICE EQUIPMENT GENERAL PURPOSE COMPUTERS	Cost \$1000) 310 145 518 2,197 2,197 134 289 289 289
Specific Expenses	¥(000) 31(145 578 2,197 134 289 289
R VEHICLES AFT 24. PURPOSE VEHICLES 25. WORK EQUIPMENT 14. WORK EQUIPMENT 26. SUPPORT 19. EQUIPMENT 19. EQUIPMENT	310 310 145 578 314 578 310 310 310 310 310 310 310 310 310 310
R VEHICLES AFT 24. PURPOSE VEHICLES 25. WORK EQUIPMENT 1. WORK EQUIPMENT 2007 JUNES 11. REULDINGS 11. REULDINGS 12. EQUIPMENT 12. EQUIPMENT	310 145 2,197 134 289 289
AFT AFT AFT AFT AFT AFT AFT AFT AFT AFT	1455 2,197 1345 1344 289
AL PURPOSE VEHICLES SE WORK EQUIPMENT (WORK EQUIPMENT DRK SUPPORT LAUPORT EQUIPMENT E EQUIPMENT	145 518 2,197 134 289 289
E WORK EQUIPMENT WORK EQUIPMENT DRK SUPPORT ABUILDINGS E EQUIPMENT E EQUIPMENT	د ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج ج
A WORK EQUIPMENT DRK SUPPORT A BUILDINGS TURE E EQUIPMENT E EQUIPMENT	4,033 6,553
DRK SUPPORT E BUILDINGS E EQUIPMENT E EQUIPMENT E EQUIPMENT SUPPORT COMPUTERS	2,197 2,197 4,033 6,653
A BUILDINGS TURE E EQUIPMENT ALL PURPOSE COMPUTERS	2,197 134 4,033
E EQUIPMENT	2,197 134 289 6,653
E EQUIPMENT AL PURPOSE COMPUTERS	4,033
AL PURPOSE COMPUTERS	4,033
AL PURPOSE COMPUTERS	4,033
	0,002
	o, 107
IUR SYSTEMS	1,084
T EQUIPMENT	2,365
TEL TERMINAL EQUIPMENT	334
CABLE	2,773
	ł
GRUUND CABLE	531
CABLE	6,321
UILDING NETWORK CABLE	
IT SYSTEMS CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES	25 10,108
ant Specific Expenses	24,249
Inspecific Operations	11.237
IATION TPIS AER SERVICES Int Nonspecific Operations	42,552 761 54,550
ORPORATE OPERATIONS	15,542
PERATING EXPENSES	94,341
ING OTHER TAXES	4,803
XPENSES & OPERATING TAXES	99,143
	DIGITAL ELECTRONIC SWITCHING OPERATOR SYSTEMS CIRCUIT EQUIPMENT PUBLIC TEL TERMINAL EQUIPMENT POLES AERIAL CABLE UNDERGROUND CABLE BURIED CABLE INTRABUILDING NETWORK CABLE CONDUIT SYSTEMS TOTAL CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES TOTAL CABLE & WIRE FACILITIES TOTAL AETWORK OPERATIONS SUPPORT DEPRECIATION TPIS CUSTOMER SERVICES TOTAL Nonspecific Operations TOTAL NONSPECIFIC OPERATIONS TOTAL CORPORATE OPERATIONS TOTAL CORPORATE OPERATIONS OPERATING OTHER TAXES TOTAL EXPENSES & OPERATING TAXES

,

HAI Model Release 5.ua

Adm. Case No. 360 May 22,1998

Appendix E Worksheet 3

~

ndix E heet 3	Worksheet 3	Annendiv E
------------------	-------------	------------

.

.

	2426.1 2426.2 2441	2423.2	2422.2	2422.1	2421.1	2411	2351	2232	2220	2212	2110	2123.2	2123.1	2122	2121	2116	2115	2113		-		USOA
Total De	18.58 54.63	23.58	21.74	21.37	01 74	21.12	7.78	9.30	10.00	16.00		6.00	12.78	15.49	46.39	16.20	12.00		9.20		Deplife	Deprec
Total Depreciation	0.05385 0.04521 0.01831	0.04242	0.04602	0.04682	0.00700	0.04736	0.12897	0.10778	0.10000	0.06250		0,16667	0.07835	0.06461	0.02156	0.06176	0.08333		0.10884		DepFact	Depreciation Calculations
42,552	· · 205	2,888	1,390	629	1 135	1,064	274	14,383	169	3,852		360 '	321	8	522	213	20		454		Dep Exp	ations

OS Trks + Signaling links Circuit Eqpt, portion Pole portion Aerial-rm portion Underground-rm portion Buried-rm portion Conduit portion £ Investment Disaggregations: Underground-m portion Underground-nm portion Buried-m portion Buried-nm portion Terminal, Drop, and NID Aerial-m portion Buried-m portion Aerial-nm portion Aerial-m portion 42,935,858 8,055,941 34,879,916 Network Element Disaggregations 7,783,500 302,249 1,496,081 903,109 1,079,546 283,420 3,719,094 1,449,069 241,511 46,564 113,522 452,344 484,039 111,089 OS Trks + Signaling links Circuit Eqpt. portion Pole portion Terminal, Drop, and NID Aerial portion Buried portion SAI Expense Disaggregations: Aerial-nm portion Underground-nm portion Buried-nm portion Conduit portion Underground portion Buried portion Aerial portion 1,074,900 291,118 783,783 122,335 28,265 31,162 62,908 41,917 6,986 1,420 6,181 10,630 16,335 365

ш	ম
×	et
ö	ð
Ć	2
Ð	S
0	<u>×</u>

Appe Work:

	j.	ne fiuit	pport	Monthly Support Benchmark:		\$31.00	Eiruy of \$0.00 indicates that Line 19 pe is not to be supported [31.00] . \$0.00] . \$		\$51.00	6 IS NOT 10 00	oddne a	\$0.00					
1						Annal	Annual		Annual	Annual			Total annual	innual			
Avg monthly cost per line	S	@ Residence usade ber line	8 <u>8</u>	© Residence © Business Buside Der Ime usade Der Ime residentes	S a	support for primary sidence lines	upport for support for primary secondary dence lines residence lines	241.61	suppor tor single line business lines	support ror multiine business lines		Annual support for public lines	support for specified lin types	0	Eederal Becation	67 1	@75% State allocation
58.07	€	57	57.99 \$	5 58.48	φ.	889,178	0	24	11,238	\$	÷	0	5 8	416 \$	225,104	ω	675,312
17.71	₩	17	17.59 \$	\$ 17.98	8 8	0	\$	\$	0	\$	\$ 0	0	ŝ	\$ 0	0	₩	0
29.34	↔	29					0 \$	\$	0	Ş	\$ 0	0	÷	\$ 0	0	64	0
45.36		45	•••		5		\$	\$	0	ج	\$ 0	0	i Si Si	521,372 \$	130,343	\$	391,029
128.66		128		-			0 (5 (نه و	762	ω.	<u>به</u> و	0 0		303,447 \$	75,862	\$	227,585
49.84 53.24	99 U	49	49.69 \$ 63.05 \$	5 50.32 5 50.32	99 6 19 7	258,608	о с ж	<i>₽</i>	0 270	× •	~ •	0 0	51 C 54 6	258,608 \$	64,652 oc 013	1 3 6	193,956 750,040
	4 17.00 76.04 \$	94			, ↔ , ►	1109.667	• •	⇒ v	9,019 23 715	÷.	• •		• •	133 383 \$	210,00 283 346	• v	850,040
		43			- 49 - 40	619,219) O) O	÷ ₩	0	, сл	, , ,	00	- ບ - ທ	619.219 \$	154.805	, 4	464.414
		31	•••		. ന	96,915	\$	\$	0	• ••	\$	0	69	96,915 \$	24,229	63	72,686
-	34.18 \$	8 8	34.07	\$ 34.51	6	89,417	\$	\$	0	\$	\$ 0	0	\$	89,417 \$	22,354	\$	67,063
4	104.44 \$	104	104.44 \$	\$ 106.54	4	606,790	\$	\$	0	\$	\$ 0	0	\$ 9	606,790 \$	151,697	ŝ	455,092
~	23.15 \$	23		\$ 23.39	€9 0	•	°	ŝ	0	\$	\$ 0	0	\$	\$ 0	•	₩	0
4	49.41 \$	49			() ()	607,237	\$	\$	0	\$	\$ 0	0	¢	607,237 \$	151,809	\$	455,428
1		18			4	•	\$	\$	•	ŝ	\$	0	\$	\$ 0	•	\$	0
•	48.23 \$	48			57 57	632,395	\$	\$	0	\$	\$	0	\$ 9	632,395 \$	158,099	\$	474,297
51	62.70 \$	62		\$ 63.13	ი. ფ.	1,186,908	о (•	\$ \$	14,605	: ም	ю (0	\$ •	201,513 \$	300,378	\$	901,135
2.1	94.73 \$	46 S	94.73	5 35.71	99 4 57 1	5/9,226	9 G	69 (0 0	ул е	ю е о с	0 0	00 (0 10 10 10 10	579,226 \$	144,806	1 2 (434,419
	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5 C	44.67	47.01 9	**	1,042,603		A (A 6	л е 5 с	.	- -	042,503 \$	200,002	/ •	726,181
. c	33.43 \$	138	33.03 1 138.68 5	\$ 139.72	= 5 * 4	000 571	• •	• •		⊳ 6	• • ⊃ ⊂		- 0 9 44	\$ 202 525	232,301	, 4	92,010 696 907
- T	95.45 \$	- -	95.40	\$ 96.20	, ea ⊧ o	880.476	0 O	69 (6)	11.042	• •	- 0 - 0	0	• • •	891.518 \$	222.880	• •	668.639
3	36.01 \$	35	35.92	\$ 36.39	9 0	392,336	0 \$	\$	0	Ś	\$ 0	0	(1) (1)	392,336 \$	98,084	\$	294,252
3		46	46.87	\$ 47.35	55	; 796,068	0 \$	\$	0	Ś	\$ 0	0	\$	796,068 \$	199,017	\$	597,051
2		82	82.18	\$ 82.75	5	3 2,303,878	\$	\$	6,766	Ŷ	\$ 0	0	\$ 2,3	,310,644 \$	577,661	г	,732,983
		40		\$ 43.52	52	3 407,616	\$	\$	0	\$	\$ 0	0	\$ \$	407,616 \$	101,904	\$	305,712
1		105		***	5	594,322	°		931	ŝ	\$ 0	0	47 49	595,252 \$	148,813	\$	446,439
3		ы С		\$ 30.90	¢,	0	0 \$	••	0	\$	\$ 0	0	ŝ	0	•	69	0
1	96.23 \$	8	96.23	\$ 98.00	¢,	5 294,188	\$	\$	0	۶	\$ 0	0	\$	294,188 \$	13,547	\$	220,641
1			37.76	\$ 39.93	₹ 23	5 2,678	\$	ф	0	\$	\$ 0	0	ŝ	2,678 \$	699	\$	2,008
1					0 8		\$	•••	0	s	\$ 0	0	6 9	0	0	69	0
					s S			•••	0	\$	\$ 0	0	ω	0	0	Ś	0
<u> </u>				\$ 17.99	₹ 6	•		•••	0	ŝ	\$ 0	0	Ś	0	0	ŝ	0
j.			15.00	\$ 15.39	5	0	0 \$		0	ŝ	\$ 0	0	ŝ	0	0	Ś	0
22.03	•																

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

 The second s	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Distribution Input	
Distribution Cable Fill - 0	0.65
Distribution Cable Fill - 5	0.65
Distribution Cable Fill - 100	0.65
Distribution Cable Fill - 200	0.65
Distribution Cable Fill - 650	0.65
Distribution Cable Fill - 850	0.65
Distribution Cable Fill - 2550	0.65
Distribution Cable Fill - 5000	0.65
Distribution Cable Fill - 10000	0.65
Buried Fraction - 0	0.75
Buried Fraction - 5	0.75
Buried Fraction - 100	0.75
Buried Fraction - 200	0.70
Buried Fraction - 650	0.70
Buried Fraction - 850	0.70
Buried Fraction - 2550	0.65
Buried Fraction - 5000	0.35
Buried Fraction - 10000	0.05
Aerial Cable Fraction - 0	0.25
Aerial Cable Fraction - 5	0.25
Aerial Cable Fraction - 100	0.25
Aerial Cable Fraction - 200	0.30
Aerial Cable Fraction - 650	0.30
Aerial Cable Fraction - 850	0.30
Aerial Cable Fraction - 2550	0.30
Aerial Cable Fraction - 5000	0.60
Aerial Cable Fraction - 10000	0.85
Pole Spacing, feet - 0	250
Pole Spacing, feet - 5	250
Pole Spacing, feet - 100	200
Pole Spacing, feet - 200	200
Pole Spacing, feet - 650	175
Pole Spacing, feet - 850	175
Pole Spacing, feet - 2550	150
Pole Spacing, feet - 5000	150
Pole Spacing, feet - 10000	150

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Drop Distance, feet - 0	150
Drop Distance, feet - 5	150
Drop Distance, feet - 100	150
Drop Distance, feet - 200	150
Drop Distance, feet - 650	150
Drop Distance, feet - 850	150
Drop Distance, feet - 2550	150
Drop Distance, feet - 5000	150
Drop Distance, feet - 10000	150
Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 0	45.90
Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 5	45.90
Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 100	45.90
Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 200	45.90
Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 650	45.90
Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 850	45.90
Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 2550	45.90
Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 5000	45.90
Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 10000	45.90
Buried Drop Placement (total) - 0	0.59
Buried Drop Placement (total) - 5	0.59
Buried Drop Placement (total) - 100	0.59
Buried Drop Placement (total) - 200	0.59
Buried Drop Placement (total) - 650	0.59
Buried Drop Placement (total) - 850	0.59
Buried Drop Placement (total) - 2550	0.59
Buried Drop Placement (total) - 5000	0.59
Buried Drop Placement (total) - 10000	0.59
Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 0	0.85
Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 5	0.85
Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 100	0.85
Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 200	0.85
Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 650	0.85
Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 850	0.85
Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 2550	0.85
Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 5000	0.85
Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 10000	0.85
Buried Drop Fraction - 0	0.75
Buried Drop Fraction - 5	0.75
Buried Drop Fraction - 100	0.75
Buried Drop Fraction - 200	0.70
Buried Drop Fraction - 650	0.70
Buried Drop Fraction - 850	0.70
Buried Drop Fraction - 2550	0.70
Buried Drop Fraction - 5000	0.40
Buried Drop Fraction - 10000	0.15

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Pole Investment	201.00
Pole Labor	216.00
Buried Cable Jacketing Multiplier	1.04
Conduit Investment per foot	0.60
Spare Tubes per route	1.00
Regional Labor Adjustment Factor (see Labor Inputs)	1.00
Residential NID case, no protector	7.57
Residential NID basic labor	32.30
spare	-
Residential Protection Block, per pair	8.08
Business NID case, no protector	7.57
Business NID basic labor	32.30
Business Protection Block, per pair	8.08
Average Lines per business location	4.00
Terminal and Splice per line, buried	-
Terminal and Splice per line, aerial	-
Drop cable investment per foot buried	0.14
Drop cable buried pairs	3.00
Drop cable investment per foot aerial	0.078
Drop cable aerial pairs	2.00
DS-0 fraction	1.00
DS-1 fraction	-
DS-0 pair equivalent	1.00
DS-1 pair equivalent	2.00
DS-3 pair equivalent	56.00
Indoor NID case	5.00
Buried fraction available for shift - 0	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 5	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 100	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 200	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 650	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 850	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 2550	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 5000	-
Buried fraction available for shift - 10000	-
Wireless Investment Cap Enabled	FALSE
Wireless Point to Point Inv cap - distribution, per line	7,500.00
Wireless Common inv, broadcast	112,500.00
Wireless per line inv, broadcast	500.00
Maximum broadcast lines for common inv	30.00

	Ky PSC
	Scenario Value
High Density DLC Site and Power	
High Density DLC Maximum Lines/Increment	672.00
High Density DLC RT Fill Factor	0.86
High Density DLC Basic Common Eqpt Invest + initial lines	112,659.00
High Density DLC POTS Channel Unit Investment	71.65
High Density DLC POTS Lines per CU	2.00
High Density DLC Coin Channel Unit Investment	435.85
High Density DLC Coin Lines per CU	1.00
High Density DLC 303/LD crossover, lines	576.00
High Density DLC Fibers per RT	4.00
High Density DLC Optical Patch Panel	606.83
High Density DLC Copper Feeder Max Distance, ft	9,000.00
High Density DLC Common Eqpt Invest per additional 672 lines	37,008.00
High Density DLC Maximum Number of additional line modules/RT	2.00
Low Density DLC Site and Power	
Low Density DLC Maximum Lines/Increment	192.00
Low Density DLC RT Fill Factor	0.86
Low Density DLC Basic Common Eqpt Invest + initial lines	62,052.00
Low Density DLC POTS Channel Unit Investment	85.98
Low Density DLC POTS Lines per CU	2.00
Low Density DLC Coin Channel Unit Investment	423.91
Low Density DLC Coin Lines per CU	1.00
Low Density DLC Fibers per RT	4.00
Low Density DLC Optical Patch Panel	606.83
Low Density DLC Common Eqpt Invest per additional 96 lines	17,518.00
Low Density DLC Maximum Number of additional line modules/RT	9.00
Distribution Cable Size 1	2,400
Distribution Cable Size 2	1,800
Distribution Cable Size 3	1,200
Distribution Cable Size 4	900
Distribution Cable Size 5	600
Distribution Cable Size 6	400
Distribution Cable Size 7	200
Distribution Cable Size 8	100
Distribution Cable Size 9	50
Distribution Cable Size 10	25
Distribution Cable Size 11	12
Distribution Cable Size 12	6

	Ky PSC Scenario
	Value
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 1	and the second
	43.58
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 2 Distribution Cable Investment per foot 3	32.52
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 3 Distribution Cable Investment per foot 4	21.83
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 4 Distribution Cable Investment per foot 5	16.31
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 6	11.05
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 7	7.35
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 8	4.29
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 9	2.51
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 10	1.74
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 11	1.23 1.00
Distribution Cable Investment per foot 12	0.89
Distribution Riser Cable Size 1	2,400
Distribution Riser Cable Size 2	1,800
Distribution Riser Cable Size 3	1,800
Distribution Riser Cable Size 4	900
Distribution Riser Cable Size 5	900 600
Distribution Riser Cable Size 6	400
Distribution Riser Cable Size 7	200
Distribution Riser Cable Size 8	100
Distribution Riser Cable Size 9	50
Distribution Riser Cable Size 10	25
Distribution Riser Cable Size 11	25 12
Distribution Riser Cable Size 12	6
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 1	25.00
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 2	20.00
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 3	15.00
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 4	12.50
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 5	10.00
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 6	7.50
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 7	5.30
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 8	3.15
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 9	2.05
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 10	1.50
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 11	0.95
Distribution Riser Cable Investment per foot 12	0.80
Distance Multiplier for difficult terrain	1.00
Rock Depth Threshold, inches	24.00
Hard Rock Placement Multiplier	3.50
Soft Rock Placement Multiplier	2.00
Sidewalk/Street Fraction	0.20
Local RT - Maximum Total Distance	15,000

	Ky PSC Scenari	. 3
	Value	
SAI Cable Size 1	7,2	200
SAI Cable Size 2	· ·	400
SAI Cable Size 3		600
SAI Cable Size 4	2,4	400
SAI Cable Size 5	1,8	B00
SAI Cable Size 6	1,2	200
SAI Cable Size 7	Ş	900
SAI Cable Size 8	6	600
SAI Cable Size 9	4	400
SAI Cable Size 10	2	200
SAI Cable Size 11	1	100
SAI Cable Size 12	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-
SAI Indoor Investment 1	9,656	.00
SAI Indoor Investment 2	7,392	.00
SAI Indoor Investment 3	4,928	.00
SAI Indoor Investment 4	3,352	.00
SAI Indoor Investment 5	2,464	.00
SAI Indoor Investment 6	1,776.	.00
SAI Indoor Investment 7	1,232	.00
SAI Indoor Investment 8	888.	
SAI Indoor Investment 9	592.	
SAI Indoor Investment 10	296.	
SAI Indoor Investment 11	148.	
SAI Indoor Investment 12		.00
SAI Outdoor Investment 1	22,700.	
SAI Outdoor Investment 2	18,900	
SAI Outdoor Investment 3	15,100.	
SAI Outdoor Investment 4	11,800.	
SAI Outdoor Investment 5	10,100.	
SAI Outdoor Investment 6	7,300.	
SAI Outdoor Investment 7	5,900.	
SAI Outdoor Investment 8	4,500.	
SAI Outdoor Investment 9	3,100.	
SAI Outdoor Investment 10	1,800.	
SAI Outdoor Investment 11	1,200.	.00
SAI Outdoor Investment 12		-

.

Appendix F

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

ø

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Repeater Investment, installed	527.00
Integrated COT, installed	420.00
Remote Multiplexer Common Equip Inv, installed	8,200.00
Channel Unit Investment, per subscriber	125.00
COT investment per RT, installed	1,170.00
Remote Terminal fill factor	0.90
Maximum T1s per cable	8.00
T1 repeater spacing, dB	32.00
Aerial T1 attenuation, dB/kft	6.30
Buried T1 attenuation, dB/kft	5.00
Feeder steering enable	FALSE
Main feeder route/air multiplier	1
Rectangular cluster switch	FALSE

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Feeder Input	
Copper Feeder Fill - 0	0.73
Copper Feeder Fill - 5	0.73
Copper Feeder Fill - 100	0.73
Copper Feeder Fill - 200	0.73
Copper Feeder Fill - 650	0.73
Copper Feeder Fill - 850	0.73
Copper Feeder Fill - 2550	0.73
Copper Feeder Fill - 5000	0.73
Copper Feeder Fill - 10000	0.73
Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 0	0.95
Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 5	0.95
Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 100	0.95
Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 200	0.95
Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 650	0.95
Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 850	0.95
Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 2550	0.95
Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 5000	0.95
Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 10000	0.95
Copper Aerial Fraction - 0	0.50
Copper Aerial Fraction - 5	0.50
Copper Aerial Fraction - 100	0.50
Copper Aerial Fraction - 200	0.40
Copper Aerial Fraction - 650	0.30
Copper Aerial Fraction - 850	0.20
Copper Aerial Fraction - 2550	0.15
Copper Aerial Fraction - 5000	0.10
Copper Aerial Fraction - 10000	0.05
Copper Buried Fraction - 0	0.45
Copper Buried Fraction - 5	0.45
Copper Buried Fraction - 100	0.45
Copper Buried Fraction - 200	0.40
Copper Buried Fraction - 650	0.30
Copper Buried Fraction - 850	0.20
Copper Buried Fraction - 2550	0.10
Copper Buried Fraction - 5000	0.05
Copper Buried Fraction - 10000	0.05

		Ky PSC Scenario Value
Copper Manhole Spacing, feet - 0		800
Copper Manhole Spacing, feet - 5		800
Copper Manhole Spacing, feet - 100		800
Copper Manhole Spacing, feet - 200		800
Copper Manhole Spacing, feet - 650		600
Copper Manhole Spacing, feet - 850		600
Copper Manhole Spacing, feet - 2550		600
Copper Manhole Spacing, feet - 5000		400
Copper Manhole Spacing, feet - 10000		400
Fiber Aerial Fraction - 0		0.35
Fiber Aerial Fraction - 5		0.35
Fiber Aerial Fraction - 100		0.35
Fiber Aerial Fraction - 200		0.30
Fiber Aerial Fraction - 650		0.30
Fiber Aerial Fraction - 850		0.30
Fiber Aerial Fraction - 2550		0.20
Fiber Aerial Fraction - 5000		0.10
Fiber Aerial Fraction - 10000		0.05
Fiber Buried Fraction - 0		0.60
Fiber Buried Fraction - 5		× 0.60
Fiber Buried Fraction - 100		0.60
Fiber Buried Fraction - 200		0.60
Fiber Buried Fraction - 650		0.30
Fiber Buried Fraction - 850		0.20
Fiber Buried Fraction - 2550		0.10
Fiber Buried Fraction - 5000		0.05
Fiber Buried Fraction - 10000		0.05
Fiber Pullbox Spacing. feet - 0		2,000
Fiber Pullbox Spacing. feet - 5		2,000
Fiber Pullbox Spacing. feet - 100		2,000
Fiber Pullbox Spacing. feet - 200		2,000
Fiber Pullbox Spacing. feet - 650		2,000
Fiber Pullbox Spacing. feet - 850		2,000
Fiber Pullbox Spacing. feet - 2550		2,000
Fiber Pullbox Spacing. feet - 5000		2,000
Fiber Pullbox Spacing. feet - 10000		2,000
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 216		7.73
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 144		6.63
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 96		4.52
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 72		3.91
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 60		3.58
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 48		3.30
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 36		3.02
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 24		2.80
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 18		2.59
Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 12		2.43
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 4200		76.27
Kentucky PSC		Adm. Case No. 360
HAI Model Release 5.0a	9	May 22, 1998

	Ky PSC Scenario
	Value
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 3600	65.37
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 3000	54.48
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 2400	43.58
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 1800	32.52
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 1200	21.83
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 900	16.31
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 600	11.05
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 400	7.35
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 200	4.29
Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 100	2.51
Buried Copper Cable Sheath Multiplier	1.04
Buried Fiber Sheath Addition per foot	0.20
Pole Materials	201.00
Pole Labor	216.00
Conduit Material Investment per foot	2.74
Inner Duct Investment per foot	0.30
Spare Tubes per section	-
Regional Labor Adjustment Factor (see Labor Inputs)	1.00
Pole Spacing, feet - 0	250
Pole Spacing, feet - 5	250
Pole Spacing, feet - 100	200
Pole Spacing, feet - 200	200
Pole Spacing, feet - 650	175
Pole Spacing, feet - 850	175
Pole Spacing, feet - 2550	150
Pole Spacing, feet - 5000	150
Pole Spacing, feet - 10000	150
Buried fraction available for shift - 0	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 5	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 100	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 200	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 650	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 850	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 2550	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 5000	0.75
Buried fraction available for shift - 10000	0.75
Fiber investment/strand - foot	0.0690
Copper investment/pair - foot	0.0180

	Ky PSC Scenario
	Value
Copper Manhole Materials - 0	Airen
	-
Copper Manhole Materials - 5 Copper Manhole Materials - 100	-
Copper Manhole Materials - 100 Copper Manhole Materials - 200	-
••	-
Copper Manhole Materials - 650 Copper Manhole Materials - 850	-
	-
Copper Manhole Materials - 2550	-
Copper Manhole Materials - 5000	-
Copper Manhole Materials - 10000	
Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 0	-
Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 5	-
Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 100	-
Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 200	-
Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 650	-
Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 850	-
Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 2550	-
Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 5000	-
Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 10000	
Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 0	-
Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 5	-
Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 100	-
Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 200	-
Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 650	-
Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 850	-
Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 2550	-
Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 5000	-
Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 10000	
Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 0	-
Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 5	-
Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 100	-
Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 200	-
Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 650	-
Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 850	-
Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 2550	-
Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 5000	-
Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 10000	-
Fiber Pullbox Materials - 0	-
Fiber Pullbox Materials - 5	-
Fiber Pullbox Materials - 100	-
Fiber Pullbox Materials - 200	-
Fiber Pullbox Materials - 650	-
Fiber Pullbox Materials - 850	-
Fiber Pullbox Materials - 2550	-
Fiber Pullbox Materials - 5000	-
Fiber Pullbox Materials - 10000	

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Fiber Pullbox Installation - 0	-
Fiber Pullbox Installation - 5	-
Fiber Pullbox Installation - 100	-
Fiber Pullbox Installation - 200	-
Fiber Pullbox Installation - 650	-
Fiber Pullbox Installation - 850	-
Fiber Pullbox Installation - 2550	-
Fiber Pullbox Installation - 5000	-
Fiber Pullbox Installation - 10000	-
Dewatering factor manhole excavation (additive)	0.20
Water table depth for dewatering, ft	5.00

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Switching Input	
Constant EO Switching Investment Term, small ICO	416.11
Constant EO Switching Investment Term, BOC and large ICO	266.04
Switch Capacity Real-Time (BHCA) - 1	10,000
Switch Capacity Real-Time (BHCA) - 2	50,000
Switch Capacity Real-Time (BHCA) - 3	200,000
Switch Capacity Real-Time (BHCA) - 4	600,000
Switch Capacity Traffic (BHCCS) - 1	30,000
Switch Capacity Traffic (BHCCS) - 2	150,000
Switch Capacity Traffic (BHCCS) - 3	600,000
Switch Capacity Traffic (BHCCS) - 4	1,800,000
Initial Switch Maximum Equipped Line Size	80,000
Switch Port Administrative Fill	0.94
Switch Maximim Processor Occupancy	0.90
Processor Feature Loading Multiplier - normal	1.20
Processor Feature Loading Multiplier - heavy business	2.00
Processor Feature Loading Multiplier - business penetration threshold	0.30
MDF/Protector Investment per line	23.38
Analog Line Circuit Offset for DLC lines, per line	5.00
Switch Installation Multiplier	1.10
Operator Traffic Fraction	0.01
Total Interoffice Traffic Fraction	0.60
Maximum Trunk Occupancy, CCS	27.50
Trunk Port, per end	62.73
Entrance Facility Distance, miles	0.50
Direct-routed Fraction of Local Interoffice	0.98
POPs per Tandem Location	5.00
Tandem-routed Fraction of Total IntraLATA Traffic	0.33
Tandem-routed Fraction of Total InterLATA Traffic	0.33
Local Business/Residence DEMs	1.10
Intrastate Business/Residence DEMs	2.00
Interstate Business/Residence DEMs	3.00
BH Fraction of Daily Usage	0.09
Annual to Daily Usage Reduction Factor	310.00
Residential Holding Time Multiplier	1.00
Business Holding Time Multiplier	1.00
Residential Call Attempts per BH	1.30
Business Call Attempts per BH	3.50

	Ky PSC Scenario
	Value
ICO STP Investment, per line (equipment)	5.50
ICO Local Tandem Investment, per line	1.90
ICO OS Tandem Investment, per line	0.80
ICO SCP Investment per line (equipment)	2.50
ICO SCP - STP per line (wirecenter)	0.40
ICO Local Tandem Investment, per line (wirecenter)	2.50
ICO OS Tandem Investment, per line (wirecenter)	1.00
ICO Tandem A Links and C Links per line (wirecenter) Real-time Limit, BHCA	0.30
Port Limit, trunks	750,000
Common Equipment Investment	100,000 1,000,000
Maximum Port Fill	0.90
Maximum Real-time Occupancy	0.90
Common Equipment Intercept Factor	0.50
STP Link Capacity	1,024
STP Maximum Link Fill	0.80
Maximum STP Investment, per pair	5,000,000
Minimum STP Investment, per pair	224,000
Link Termination, both ends	725
Signaling Link Bit Rate	56,000
Link Occupancy	0.40
C Link Cross Section	16.00
ISUP Messages per Interoffice BHCA	6.00
ISUP Message Length, bytes	25.00
TCAP Messages per transaction	2.00
TCAP Message length, bytes Fraction of BHCA requiring TCAP	100.00 0.50
SCP Investment/Transaction/Second	2,444
Operator Investment per position	6,400
Operator Maximum Utilization, per position, CCS	32
Operator Intervention Factor	2
Public Telephone Investment, per station	760
Lot Size, Multiplier of Switch Room Size	2
Tandem/EO Wire Center Common Factor	0.40
Power Investment 1	17,000
Power Investment 2	24,000
Power Investment 3	56,000
Power Investment 4	164,000
Power Investment 5	275,000
Switch Room Size, sq ft 1	500
Switch Room Size, sq ft 2 Switch Room Size, sq ft 3	1,000
Switch Room Size, sq ft 4	2,000 5,000
Switch Room Size, sq ft 5	10,000
	10,000

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Construction Investment, sq ft 1	75.00
Construction Investment, sq ft 2	85.00
Construction Investment, sq ft 3	100.00
Construction Investment, sq ft 4	125.00
Construction Investment, sq ft 5	150.00
Land Investment, sq ft 1	5
Land Investment, sq ft 2	8
Land Investment, sq ft 3	10
Land Investment, sq ft 4	15
Land Investment, sq ft 5	20
OC-48 ADM, installed, 48 DS-3s	133,563
OC-48 ADM, installed, 12 DS-3s	80,825
OC-3/DS-1 Terminal Multiplexer, installed, 84 DS-1s	34,705
Investment per 7 DS-1s	1,060
Number of Fibers	24
Pigtrails, per strand	44
Optical Distribution Panel	4,314
EF&I, per hour	-
EF&I hours	-
Regional Labor Adjustment Factor (see Labor Inputs)	1
Channel Bank Investment, per 24 lines	3,664
Fraction of SA Lines Requiring Multiplexing	-
Regenerator, installed	15,000
Regenerator spacing, miles	40
DCS installed, per DS-3	9,381
Transmission Terminal Fill (DS-0 level)	0.80
Fiber Investment, fiber cable	2.80
Fiber, number of strands per ADM	4.00
Fiber Investment, buried fraction	0.60
Fiber Investment, buried placement	1.77
Fiber Investment, buried sheath addition	-
Fiber Investment, conduit	2.74
Fiber, spare tubes per route	-
Fiber Investment, conduit placement	12.53
Fiber, pullbox spacing	2,000.00
Fiber Investment, pullbox investsment	-
Fiber, aerial fraction	0.20
Fiber, pole spacing, feet	150.00
Fiber Investment, pole material	201.00
Fiber Investment, pole labor (basic)	216.00

Fraction Poles and Buried/Underground Placement Common with Feeder0.75Fraction of Aerial Structure Assigned to Telephone0.48Fraction of Buried Structure Assigned to Telephone0.85Fraction of Underground Structure Assigned to Telephone0.85Multiplicative EO Switching Investment Term-14.92Threshold value for off-ring wire centers, total lines0.0Remote-host fraction of interoffice traffic remote0.0Maximum nodes per ring11Use host - remote assignmentsFALSIRing transiting traffic factor0.0Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.138.00Equivalent tarcility investment, per DS-01138.00Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 1500Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500BOC standalone fixed inv - 217500
Fraction of Buried Structure Assigned to Telephone0.85Fraction of Underground Structure Assigned to Telephone0.85Multiplicative EO Switching Investment Term-14.92Threshold value for off-ring wire centers, total lines-14.92Remote-host fraction of interoffice traffic remote0.Host-remote fraction of interoffice traffic host0.00Maximum nodes per ring11Use host - remote assignmentsFALSIRing transiting traffic factor0.Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.00Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.61Switch line size - 1500Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Fraction of Underground Structure Assigned to Telephone0.85Multiplicative EO Switching Investment Term-14.92Threshold value for off-ring wire centers, total lines-14.92Remote-host fraction of interoffice traffic remote0.Host-remote fraction of interoffice traffice host0.00Maximum nodes per ring11Use host - remote assignmentsFALSIRing transiting traffic factor0.Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.00Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 1500Switch line size - 35000Switch line size - 410000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Multiplicative EO Switching Investment Term14.92Threshold value for off-ring wire centers, total lines
Threshold value for off-ring wire centers, total linesRemote-host fraction of interoffice traffic remote0.Host-remote fraction of interoffice traffice host0.0Maximum nodes per ring11Use host - remote assignmentsFALSIRing transiting traffic factor0.Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.0Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 164Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Remote-host fraction of interoffice traffic remote0.Host-remote fraction of interoffice traffice host0.0Maximum nodes per ring11Use host - remote assignmentsFALSIRing transiting traffic factor0.Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.0Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 164Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Host-remote fraction of interoffice traffice host0.0Maximum nodes per ring11Use host - remote assignmentsFALSIRing transiting traffic factor0.Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.0Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 164Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Maximum nodes per ring11Use host - remote assignmentsFALSIRing transiting traffic factor0.Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.0Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 10Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Use host - remote assignmentsFALSIRing transiting traffic factor0.Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.0Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 164Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Ring transiting traffic factor0.1Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.0Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 164Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Intertandem fraction of tandem trunks (additive)0.Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.0Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 164Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Equivalent facility investment, per DS-0138.0Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 164Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Equivalent terminal investment, per DS-0111.6Switch line size - 164Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Switch line size - 1Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Switch line size - 264Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Switch line size - 3500Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
Switch line size - 41000BOC standalone fixed inv - 117500
BOC standalone fixed inv - 1 17500
BOC standalone fixed inv - 2 17500
BOC standalone fixed inv - 3 17500
BOC standalone fixed inv - 4 47500
BOC host fixed inv - 1 18375
BOC host fixed inv - 2 18375
BOC host fixed inv - 3 18375
BOC host fixed inv - 4 49875
BOC remote fixed inv - 1 1000
BOC remote fixed inv - 2 5500
BOC remote fixed inv - 3 7000
BOC remote fixed inv - 4 22500
BOC standalone per line inv - 1 7
BOC standalone per line inv - 2 7
BOC standalone per line inv - 3 7
BOC standalone per line inv - 4 7
BOC host per line inv - 1 7
BOC host per line inv - 2 7
BOC host per line inv - 3 7
BOC host per line inv - 4 7
BOC remote per line inv - 1 8
BOC remote per line inv - 2 8
BOC remote per line inv - 3 8
BOC remote per line inv - 4 7

	Ky PSC Scenario
	Value
ICO standalone fixed inv - 1	300001
ICO standalone fixed inv - 2	300001
ICO standalone fixed inv - 3	300001
ICO standalone fixed inv - 4	814289
ICO host fixed inv - 1	315001
ICO host fixed inv - 2	315001
ICO host fixed inv - 3	315001
ICO host fixed inv - 4	855003
ICO remote fixed inv - 1	17143
ICO remote fixed inv - 2	94286
ICO remote fixed inv - 3	120000
ICO remote fixed inv - 4	385716
ICO standalone per line inv - 1	129
ICO standalone per line inv - 2	129
ICO standalone per line inv - 3	129
ICO standalone per line inv - 4	124
ICO host per line inv - 1	129
ICO host per line inv - 2	129
ICO host per line inv - 3	129
ICO host per line inv - 4	124
ICO remote per line inv - 1	146
ICO remote per line inv - 2	141
ICO remote per line inv - 3	146
ICO remote per line inv - 4	120

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Expense Input	
Cost of Debt	0.070
Debt Fraction	0.400
Cost of Equity	0.125
Average Trunk Utilization	0.300
Tax Rate	0.404
Corporate Overhead Factor	0.104
Other Taxes Factor	0.033
Billing/Bill Inquiry per line per month	1.220
Directory Listing per line per month	-
Forward-looking Network Operations Factor	0.700
Alternative CO Switching Factor	0.052
Alternative Circuit Equipment Factor	0.018
EO Traffic Sensitive Fraction	0.700
Monthly LNP cost, per line	0.250
Carrier to Carrier Customer Service, per line per year	1.69
NID Expense per line per year	1.00
DS-0/DS-1 Terminal Factor	12.4
DS-1/DS-3 Terminal Factor	9.9
Average Lines per Business Location	4
Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 0	0.48
Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 5	0.48
Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 100	0.48
Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 200	0.48
Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 650	0.48
Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 850	0.48
Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 2550	0.48
Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 5000	0.48
Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 10000	0.48
Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 0	0.85
Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 5	0.85
Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 100	0.85
Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 200	0.85
Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 650	0.85
Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 850	0.85
Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 2550	0.85
Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 5000	0.85
Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 10000	0.85

	Ky PSC Scenario
	Value
Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 0	0.85
Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 5	0.85
Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 100	0.85
Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 200	0.85
Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 650	0.85
Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 850	0.85
Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 2550	0.85
Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 5000	0.85
Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 10000	0.85
Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 0	0.48
Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 5	0.48
Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 100	0.48
Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 200	0.48
Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 650	0.48
Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 850	0.48
Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 2550	0.48
Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 5000	0.48
Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 10000	0.48
Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 0	0.85
Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 5	0.85
Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 100	0.85
Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 200	0.85
Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 650	0.85
Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 850	0.85
Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 2550	0.85
Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 5000	0.85
Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 10000	0.85
Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 0	0.85
Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 5	0.85
Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 100	0.85
Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 200	0.85
Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 650	0.85
Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 850	0.85
Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 2550	0.85
Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 5000	0.85
Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 10000	0.85

	Ky PSC Scenari Value
an and the state of the second sec	Value
Motor Vehicles - Economic Life	8.
Garage Work Equipment - Economic Life	12.
Other Work Equipment - Economic Life	16.
Buildings - Economic Life	45.
Furniture - Economic Life	14.
Office Support Equipment - Economic Life	11.
Company Comm. Equipment - Economic Life	7.
General Purpose Computer - Economic Life	6.
Digital Electronic Switching - Economic Life	16.
Operator Systems - Economic Life	10.
Digital Circuit Equipment - Economic Life	9.
Public Telephone Terminal Equipment - Economic Life	7.
Poles - Economic Life	34.
Aerial Cable - metallic - Economic Life	20.
Aerial Cable - non metallic - Economic Life	25.
Underground Cable - metallic - Economic Life	25.
Underground Cable - non metallic - Economic Life	25.
Buried - metallic - Economic Life	20.0
Buried - non metallic - Economic Life	25.0
ntrabuilding Cable - metallic - Economic Life	21.
ntrabuilding Cable - non metallic - Economic Life	25.
Conduit Systems - Economic Life	59.
Motor Vehicles - Net Salvage %	0.12
Garage Work Equipment - Net Salvage %	0.00
Other Work Equipment - Net Salvage %	0.00
Buildings - Net Salvage %	0.03
Furniture - Net Salvage %	0.09
Office Support Equipment - Net Salvage %	0.10
Company Comm. Equipment - Net Salvage %	0.10
General Purpose Computer - Net Salvage %	0.00
Digital Electronic Switching - Net Salvage %	0.00
Dperator Systems - Net Salvage %	0.00
Digital Circuit Equipment - Net Salvage %	0.00
Public Telephone Terminal Equipment - Net Salvage %	0.10
Poles - Net Salvage %	-0.61
verial Cable - metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.14
erial Cable - non metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.15
Inderground Cable - metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.17
Inderground Cable - non metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.15
Buried - metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.09
Buried - non metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.06
ntrabuilding Cable - metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.13
ntrabuilding Cable - non metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.13
Conduit Systems - Net Salvage %	-0.08

	Ky PSC Scenario
	Value
Furniture - Capital Costs - % assigned per line	0.0000
Furniture - Expenses - % assigned per line	0.0000
Office Equipment - Capital Costs - % assigned per line	0.0000
Office Equipment - Expenses - % assigned per line	0.0000
General Purpose Computer - Capital Costs - % assigned per line	0.0000
General Purpose Computer - Expenses - % assigned per line	0.0000
Motor Vehicles - Capital Costs - % assigned per line	0.0000
Motor Vehicles - Expenses - % assigned per line	0.0000
Buildings - Capital Costs - % assigned per line	0.0000
Buildings - Expenses - % assigned per line	0.0000
Garage Work Eqpt Capital Costs - % assigned per line	0.0000
Garage Work Eqpt Expenses - % assigned per line	0.0000
Other Work Eqpt Capital Costs - % assigned per line	0.0000
Other Work Eqpt Expenses - % assigned per line	0.0000
Network Operations - % assigned per line	0.0000
Other Taxes - % assigned per line	0.0000
Variable Overhead - % assigned per line	0.0000

٠

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Underground	n na
Excavation/Restoration	
Trench Per Ft - 0	1.29
Trench Per Ft - 5	1.29
Trench Per Ft - 100	1.29
Trench Per Ft - 200	1.29
Trench Per Ft - 650	1.35
Trench Per Ft - 850	1.46
Trench Per Ft - 2550	1.46
Trench Per Ft - 5000	4.07
Trench Per Ft -10000	4.07
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 0	0.45
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 5	0.45
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 100	0.45
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 200	0.45
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 650	0.45
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 850	0.45
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 2550	0.55
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 5000	0.67
Backhoe Trench Fraction -10000	0.72
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 0	2.04
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 5	2.04
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 100	2.04
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 200	2.04
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 650	2.04
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 850	2.04
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 2550	2.04
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 5000	13.58
Backhoe Trench Per Ft -10000	20.37
Hand Trench Fraction - 0	0.01
Hand Trench Fraction - 5	0.01
Hand Trench Fraction - 100	0.01
Hand Trench Fraction - 200	0.03
Hand Trench Fraction - 650	0.03
Hand Trench Fraction - 850	0.05
Hand Trench Fraction - 2550	0.10
Hand Trench Fraction - 5000	0.10
Hand Trench Fraction -10000	0.12

	Scenario Value
Hand Trench Per Ft - 0	3.40
Hand Trench Per Ft - 5	3.40
Hand Trench Per Ft - 100	3.40
Hand Trench Per Ft - 200	3.40
Hand Trench Per Ft - 650	3.40
Hand Trench Per Ft - 850	3.40
Hand Trench Per Ft - 2550	3.40
Hand Trench Per Ft - 5000	6.79
Hand Trench Per Ft -10000	12.22
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 0	0.55
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 5	0.55
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 100	0.55
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 200	0.65
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 650	0.70
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 850	0.75
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 2550	0.75 0.80
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 5000 Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction -10000	0.80
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 0	4.07
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 5	4.07
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 100	4.07
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 200	4.07
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 650	4.07
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 850	4.07
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 2550	4.07
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 5000	12.22
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft -10000	20.37
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 0	0.10
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 5	0.10
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 100	0.10
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 200	0.10
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 650	0.10
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 850	0.10
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 2550	0.15
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 5000	0.15
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction -10000	0.16
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 0	6.11
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 5 Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 100	6.11 6.11
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 100 Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 200	6.11
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 650	6.11
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 850	6.11
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 2550	6.11
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 5000	14.26
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft -10000	24.44
	6 7.17

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

	Ky PSC Scenario
	Value
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 0	0.01
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 5	0.01
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 100	0.01
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 200	0.01
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 650	0.03
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 850	0.04
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 2550	0.08
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 5000	0.04
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction -10000	0.00
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 0	0.68
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 5	0.68
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 100	0.68
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 200	0.68
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 650	0.68
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 850	0.68
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 2550	0.68
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 5000	0.68
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft -10000	0.68
Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 0	3.40
Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 5	3.40
Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 100	3.40
Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 200	3.40
Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 650	3.40
Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 850	6.11
Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 2550	8.83
Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 5000	11.54
Pavement Stabilization Per Ft -10000	13.58
Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 0	0.68
Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 5	0.68
Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 100	0.68
Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 200	0.68
Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 650	0.68
Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 850	2.72
Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 2550	7.47
Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 5000	8.15
Dirt Stabilization Per Ft -10000	10.86
Simple Backfill - 0	0.10
Simple Backfill - 5	0.10
Simple Backfill - 100	0.10
Simple Backfill - 200	0.10
Simple Backfill - 650	0.10
Simple Backfill - 850	0.10
Simple Backfill - 2550	0.10
Simple Backfill - 5000	0.10
Simple Backfill -10000	0.10

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

	Ky PSC Scenario
an Carlon and All Brillion and Station and Stationary Stationary and All Stationary Stationary and All Stationary All Stationary St	Value
Buried	
Excavation/Restoration	
Plow Fraction - 0	0.60
Plow Fraction - 5	0.60
Plow Fraction - 100	0.60
Plow Fraction - 200	0.50
Plow Fraction - 650	0.35
Plow Fraction - 850	0.20
Plow Fraction - 2550	0.00
Plow Fraction - 5000	0.00
Plow Fraction -10000	0.00
Plow Per Ft - 0	0.65
Plow Per Ft - 5	0.65
Plow Per Ft - 100	0.65
Plow Per Ft - 200	0.65
Plow Per Ft - 650	0.65
Plow Per Ft - 850	0.98
Plow Per Ft - 2550	0.98
Plow Per Ft - 5000	0.98
Plow Per Ft -10000	0.98
Trench Per Ft - 0	1.55
Trench Per Ft - 5	1.55
Trench Per Ft - 100	1.55
Trench Per Ft - 200	1.55
Trench Per Ft - 650	1.59
Trench Per Ft - 850	1.75
Trench Per Ft - 2550	1.75
Trench Per Ft - 5000	4.90
Trench Per Ft -10000	12.24
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 0	0.10
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 5	0.10
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 100	0.10
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 200	0.10
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 650	0.10
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 850	0.10
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 2550	0.10
Backhoe Trench Fraction - 5000	0.10
Backhoe Trench Fraction -10000	0.25

		Ky PSC Scenario Value
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 0		2.45
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 5		2.45
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 100		2.45
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 200		2.45
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 650		2.45
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 850		
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 2550		2.45
Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 5000		2.45
		16.32
Backhoe Trench Per Ft -10000	······································	24.48
Hand Trench Fraction - 0		0.00
Hand Trench Fraction - 5		0.00
Hand Trench Fraction - 100		0.00
Hand Trench Fraction - 200		0.01
Hand Trench Fraction - 650		0.02
Hand Trench Fraction - 850		0.04
Hand Trench Fraction - 2550		0.05
Hand Trench Fraction - 5000		0.06
Hand Trench Fraction -10000		0.10
Hand Trench Per Ft - 0		4.08
Hand Trench Per Ft - 5		4.08
Hand Trench Per Ft - 100		4.08
Hand Trench Per Ft - 200		4.08
Hand Trench Per Ft - 650		4.08
Hand Trench Per Ft - 850		4.08
Hand Trench Per Ft - 2550		4.08
Hand Trench Per Ft - 5000		8.16
Hand Trench Per Ft -10000		14.69
Bore Cable Fraction - 0		0.00
Bore Cable Fraction - 5		0.00
Bore Cable Fraction - 100		0.00
Bore Cable Fraction - 200		0.00
Bore Cable Fraction - 650		0.00
Bore Cable Fraction - 850		0.03
Bore Cable Fraction - 2550		0.04
Bore Cable Fraction - 5000		0.05
Bore Cable Fraction -10000		0.05
Bore Cable Per Ft - 0		8.98
Bore Cable Per Ft - 5		8.98
Bore Cable Per Ft - 100		8.98
Bore Cable Per Ft - 200		8.98
Bore Cable Per Ft - 650		8.98
Bore Cable Per Ft - 850		8.98
Bore Cable Per Ft - 2550		8.98
Bore Cable Per Ft - 5000		8.98
Bore Cable Per Ft -10000		14.69
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	14.03

	Ky PSC
	Scenario
	Value
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Fraction - 0	0.02
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Fraction - 5	0.02
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Fraction - 100	0.02
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Fraction - 200	0.02
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Fraction - 650	0.02
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Fraction - 850	0.04
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Fraction - 2550	0.05
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Fraction - 5000	0.06
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Fraction -10000	0.06
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 0	4.90
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 5	4.90
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 100	4.90
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 200	4.90
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 650	4.90
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 850	4.90
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 2550	4.90
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 5000	4.90
Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft -10000	19.58
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 0	0.03
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 5	0.03
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 100	0.03
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 200	0.03
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 650	0.03
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 850	0.05
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 2550	0.08
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction - 5000	0.18
Cut/Restore Asphalt Fraction -10000	0.60
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 0	4.90
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 5	4.90
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 100	4.90
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 200	4.90
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 650	4.90
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 850	4.90
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 2550	4.90
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 5000	14.69
Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft -10000	24.48
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 0	0.01
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 5	0.01
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 100	0.01
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 200	0.01
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 650	0.01
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 850	0.03
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 2550	0.05
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction - 5000	0.08
Cut/Restore Concrete Fraction -10000	0.20

	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 0	7.34
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 5	7.34
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 100	7.34
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 200	7.34
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 650	7.34
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 850	
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 2550	7.34
	7.34
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 5000	17.14
Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft -10000	29.38
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 0	0.02
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 5	0.02
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 100	0.02
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 200	0.02
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 650	0.02
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 850	0.35
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 2550	0.35
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction - 5000	0.11
Cut/Restore Sod Fraction -10000	0.05
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 0	0.82
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 5	0.82
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 100	0.82
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 200	0.82
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 650	0.82
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 850	0.82
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 2550	0.82
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 5000	0.82
Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft -10000	0.82
Restoration Not Required - 0	0.62
Restoration Not Required - 5	0.62
Restoration Not Required - 100	0.62
Restoration Not Required - 200	0.52
Restoration Not Required - 650	0.37
Restoration Not Required - 850	0.27
Restoration Not Required - 2550	0.09
Restoration Not Required - 5000	0.11
Restoration Not Required -10000	0.11
Simple Backfill - 0	0.12
Simple Backfill - 5	0.12
Simple Backfill - 100	0.12
Simple Backfill - 200	0.12
Simple Backfill - 650	0.12
Simple Backfill - 850	0.12
Simple Backfill - 2550	0.12
Simple Backfill - 5000	0.12
Simple Backfill -10000	0.12
	0.12

			Ky P Scena Valt	irio
Surface Texture Table	and a start of the second		fraction Effect CBG	of
BY	Bouldery		1	1
BY-COS	Bouldery Coarse S	Sand	1	1
BY-FSL	Bouldery & Fine S		1	1
BY-L	Bouldery & Loam		1	1
BY-LS	Bouldery & Sandy	Loam	1	1
BY-SICL	Bouldery & Silty C		1	1
BY-SL	Bouldery & Sandy	-	1	1
BYV	Very Bouldery		1.1	1
BYV-FSL	Very Bouldery & F	ine Sandy Loam	1.1	1
BYV-L	Very bouldery & L	-	1.1	1
BYV-LS	Very Bouldery & L	-	1.1	1
BYV-SIL	Very Bouldery & S	-	1.1	1
BYV-SL	Very Bouldery & S		1.1	1
XYE	Extremely Boulder	•	1.3	1
BYX-FSL	•	y & Fine Sandy Loam	1.3	1
BYX-L	Extremely Boulder		1.3	1
BYX-SIL	Extremely Boulder	• •	1.3	1
BYX-SL	Extremely Boulder	•	1.3	1
C	Clay		1	1
СВ	Cobbly		1	1
CB-C	Cobbly & Clay		1	1
CB-CL	Cobbly & Clay Loa	am	1	1
CB-COSL	Cobbly & Coarse		1	1
CB-FS	Cobbly & Fine Sar	•	1.1	1
CB-FSL	Cobbly & Fine Sar		1.1	1
CB-L	Cobbly & Loamy	•	1	1
CB-LCOS	Cobbly & Loamy o	oarseSand	1	1
CB-LS	Cobbly & Loamy S		1	1
CB-S	Cobbly & Sand		1.1	1
CB-SCL	Cobbly & Sandy C	lay Loam	1	1
B-SICL	Cobbly & Silty Cla	-	1	1
CB-SIL	Cobbly & Silt Loar	n	1	1
CB-SL	Cobbly & Sandy L	oam	1.1	1
CBA	Angular Cobbly		1	1
CBA-FSL	Angular Cobbly &	Fine Sandy Loam	1.1	1
CB∨	Very Cobbly		1.2	1
CBV-C	Very Cobbly & Cla	ıy	1.2	1
CBV-CL	Very Cobbly & Cla	iy Loam	1.2	1
CBV-FSL	Very Cobbly & Fin	e Sandy Loam	1.2	1
BV-L	Very Cobbly & Loa	amy	1.2	1
CBV-LFS	Very Cobbly & Fin	e Loamy Sand	1.2	1
CBV-LS	Very Cobbly & Loa	amy Sand	1.2	1
CBV-MUCK	Very Cobbly & Mu	ck	1.2	1
CBV-SCL	Very Cobbly & Sa	ndy Clay Loam	1.2	1
CBV-SIL	Very Cobbly & Silt		1.2	1
Kentucky PSC			Adm. Case N	0.36
•	0.0	20		
HAI Model Release 5	.Ud	29	May 22	, 199

		Scenar Value	
CBV-SL	Very Cobbly & Sandy Loam	1.2	1
CBV-VFS	Very Cobbly & Very Fine Sand	1.2	1
CBX	Extremely Cobbly	1.2	1
CBX-CL	Extremely Cobbly & Clay	1.2	1
CBX-L	Extremely Cobbly Loam	1.2	1
CBX-SIL	Extremely Cobbly & Silt	1.2	1
CBX-SL	Extremely Cobbly &Sandy Loam	1.2	1
CBX-VFSL	Extremely Cobbly Very Fine Sandy Loam	1.3	1
CE	Coprogenous Earth	1	1
CIND	Cinders	1	1
CL	Clay Loam	1	1
CM	Cemented	1.3	1
CN	Channery	1	1
CN-CL	Channery & Clay Loam	.1	1
CN-FSL	Channery & Fine Sandy Loam	1.1	1
CN-L	Channery & Loam	1	1
CN-SICL	Channery & Silty Clay Loam	1	1
CN-SIL	Channery & Silty Loam	1	1
CN-SL	Channery & Sandy Loam	1	1
CNV	Very Channery	1	1
CNV-CL	Very Channery & Clay	1	1
CNV-L	Very Channery & Loam	1	1
CNV-SCL	Channery & Sandy Clay Loam	1	1
CNV-SIL	Very Channery & Silty Loam	1	1
CNV-SL	Very Channery & Sandy Loam	1	1
CNX	Extremely Channery	1	1
CNX-SL	Extremely Channery & Sandy Loam	1	1
COS	Coarse Sand	1	1
COSL	Coarse Sandy Loam	1	1
CR	Cherty	1.2	1
CR-L	Cherty & Loam	1.2	1
CR-SICL	Cherty & Silty Clay Loam	1.2	1
CR-SIL	Cherty & Silty Loam	1.2	1
CR-SL	Cherty & Sandy Loam	1.2	1
CRC	Coarse Cherty	1.2	1
CRV	Very Cherty	1.2	1
CRV-L	Very Cherty & Loam	1.2	1
CRV-SIL	Very Cherty & Silty Loam	1.2	1
CRX	Extremely Cherty	1.3	1
CRX-SIL	Extremely Cherty & Silty Loam	1.3	1
DE	Diatomaceous Earth	1	1
FB	Fibric Material	1	1
FINE	Fine	1	1
FL	Flaggy	1	1
FL-FSL	Flaggy & Fine Sandy Loam	1.1	1
FL-L	Flaggy & Loam	1	1
FL-SIC	Flaggy & Silty Clay	1	1
Kentucky PSC		Adm. Case No	36
•	0- 00		
HAI Model Release 5.	0a 30	May 22,	199

.

o

	 I and the second se	Ky PSC
		Scenario Value
	nam - leve - ever existence e lever a constantino particle an article international and the second statement of	a di do
FL-SICL	Flaggy & Silty Clay Loam	1 1
FL-SIL	Flaggy & Silty Loam	1 1
FL-SL	Flaggy & Sandy Loam	1 1
FLV	Very Flaggy	1.1 1
FLV-COSL	Very Flaggy & Coarse Sandy Loam	1.1 1
FLV-L	Very Flaggy & Loam	1.1 1
FLV-SICL	Very Flaggy & Silty Clay Loam	1.1 1
FLV-SL	Very Flaggy & Sandy Loam	1.1 1
FLX	Extremely Flaggy	1.1 1
FLX-L	Extremely Flaggy & Loamy	1.1 1
FRAG	Fragmental Material	1 1
FS	Fine Sand	1.1 1
FSL	Fine Sandy Loam	1.1 1
G	Gravel	1 1
GR	Gravelly	1 1
GR-C	Gravel & Clay	1 1
GR-CL	Gravel & Clay Loam	1 1
GR-COS	Gravel & Coarse Sand	1 1
GR-COSL	Gravel & Coarse Sandy Loam	1 1
GR-FS	Gravel & Fine Sand	1 1
GR-FSL	Gravel & Fine Sandy Loam	
GR-L	Gravel & Loam	
GR-LCOS	Gravel & Loamy Coarse Sand	
GR-LFS	Gravel & Loamy Fine Sand	1.1 1
GR-LS	Gravel & Loamy Sand	1 1
GR-MUCK	Gravel & Muck	1 1
GR-S	Gravel & Sand	1 1
GR-SCL	Gravel & Sandy Clay Loam	1 1
GR-SIC	Gravel & Silty Clay	1 1
GR-SICL	Gravel & Silty Clay Loam	1 1
GR-SIL	Gravel & Silty Loam	1 1
GR-SL	Gravel & Sandy Loam	1 1
GR-VFSL	Gravel & Very Fine Sandy Loam	1.1 1
GRC	Coarse Gravelly	1 1
GRF	Fine Gravel	1 1
GRF-SIL	Fine Gravel Silty Loam	1 1
GRV	Very Gravelly	1 1
GRV-CL	Very gravelly & Clay Loam	1 1
GRV-COS	Very Gravelly & coarse Sand	1 1
GRV-COSL	Very Gravelly & coarse Sandy Loam	1 1
GRV-FSL	Very Gravelly & Fine Sandy Loam	1 1
GRV-L	Very Gravelly & Loam	1 1
GRV-LCOS	Very Gravelly & Loamy Coarse Sand	1 1
GRV-LS	Very Gravelly & Loamy Sand	1 1
GRV-S	Very Gravelly & Sand	1 1
GRV-SCL	Very Gravelly & Sandy Clay Loam	1 1
GRV-SICL	Very Gravelly & Silty Clay Loam	1 1
	tory crutony a only only bound	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Kentucky PSC		Adm. Case No. 360
HAI Model Release 5.0)a 31	May 22, 1998
		may 22, 1000

		Ky P Scen	i Anna 1
		Vali	
GRV-SIL	Very Gravelly & Silt	1	1
SRV-SL	Very Gravelly & Sandy Loam	1	1
GRV-VFS	Very Gravelly & Very Fine Sand	1	1
SRV-VFSL	Very Gravelly & Very Fine Sandy Loam	1	
GRX	Extremely Gravelly	1.1	1
GRX-CL	Extremely Gravelly & Coarse Loam	1.1	1
GRX-COS	Extremely Gravelly & Coarse Sand	1.1	1
GRX-COSL	Extremely Gravelly & Coarse Sandy Loam	1.1	1
GRX-FSL	Extremely Gravelly & Fine Sand Loam	1.1	1
GRX-L	Extremely Gravelly & Loam	1.1	1
GRX-LCOS	Extremely Gravelly & Loamy Coarse	1.1	1
GRX-LCOS	Extremely Gravelly & Loamy Sand	1.1	1
GRX-LS		1.1	
	Extremely Gravelly & Sand		
GRX-SIL	Extremely Gravelly & Silty Loam	1.1	1
GRX-SL	Extremely Gravelly & Sandy Loam	1.1	1
SYP	Gypsiferous Material	1.2	1
IM	Hemic Material	1	1
CE	Ice or Frozen Soil	1.5	1
ND	Indurated	1.2	1
	Loam	1	1
.COS	Loamy Coarse Sand	1	1
FS	Loamy Fine Sand	1.1	1
.S	Loamy Sand	1	1
VFS	Loamy Very Fine Sand	1	1
/ARL	Marl	1	1
IEDIUM	Medium Coarse	1	1
ΛK	Mucky	1	1
/K-C	Mucky Clay	1	1
/K-CL	Mucky Clay Loam	1	1
/K-FS	Muck & Fine Sand	1	1
/K-FSL	Muck & Fine Sandy Loam	1	- 1
/K-L	Mucky Loam	1	1
/K-LFS	Mucky Loamy Fine Sand	1	-
/K-LS	Mucky Loamy Sand	1	4
	Mucky Loany Sand Muck & Sand	1	1
NK-S		4	
/K-SI	Mucky & Silty	1	
MK-SICL	Mucky & Silty Clay Loam	1	
/K-SIL	Mucky Silt	1	1
/K-SL	Mucky & Sandy Loam	· 1	1
NK-VFSL	Mucky & Very Fine Sandy Loam	1	1
/IPT	Mucky Peat	1	1
NUCK	Muck	1	1
PEAT	Peat	1	1
νŢ	Peaty	1	1
RB	Rubbly	1.5	1
RB-FSL	Rubbly Fine Sandy Loam	1.5	1
6	Sand	1	1
Contuctor DSC		Adm Case M	ر مر ما
Centucky PSC	Adm. Case N	U. 30	
Al Model Release	5.0a 32	May 22	

•

		Ky PSC
The second se		Scenario Value
SC	Sandy Clay	1 1
SCL	Sandy Clay Loam	1 1
SG	Sandy Clay Loan Sand & Gravel	
SH SH	Shaly	
SH-CL	•	
	Shaly & Clay	
SH-L	Shale & Loam	1 1
SH-SICL	Shaly & Silty Clay Loam	1 1
SH-SIL	Shaly & Silt Loam	1 1
SHV	Very Shaly	1.5 1
SHV-CL	Very Shaly & Clay Loam	1.5 1
SHX	Extremely Shaly	2 1
SI	Silt	1 1
SIC	Silty Clay	1 1
SICL	Silty Clay Loam	1 1
SIL	Silt Loam	1 1
SL	Sandy Loam	1 1
SP	Sapric Material	1 1
SR	Stratified	1 1
ST	Stony	1 1
ST-C	Stony & Clay	1 1
ST-CL	Stony & Clay Loam	1 1
ST-COSL	Stony & Coarse Sandy Loam	1 1
ST-FSL	Stony & Fine Sandy Loam	1.1 1
ST-L	Stony & Loamy	1 1
ST-LCOS	Stony & Loamy Coarse Sand	1 1
ST-LFS	Stony & Loamy Fine Sand	1.1 1
	Stony & Loamy Sand	1.1 1
ST-LS	• •	
ST-SIC	Stony & Silty Clay	
ST-SICL	Stony & Silty Clay Loam	1 1
ST-SIL	Stony & Silt Loam	1 1
ST-SL	Stony & Sandy Loam	1 1
ST-VFSL	Stony & Sandy Very Fine Silty Loam	1.1 1
STV	Very Stony	1.2 1
STV-C	Very Stony & Clay	1.2 1
STV-CL	Very Stony & Clay Loam	1.2 1
STV-FSL	Very Stony & Fine Sandy Loam	1.2 1
STV-L	Very Stony & Loamy	. 1.2 1
STV-LFS	Very Stony & Loamy Fine Sand	1.2 1
STV-LS	Very Stony & Loamy Sand	1.2 1
STV-MPT	Very Stony & Mucky Peat	1.2 1
STV-MUCK	Very Stony & Muck	1.2 1
STV-SICL	Very Stony & Silty Clay Loam	1.2 1
STV-SIL	Very Stony & Silty Loam	1.2 1
STV-SL	Very Stony & Sandy Loam	1.2 1
STV-VFSL	Very Stony & Very Fine Sandy Loam	1.2 1
STX	Extremely Stony	1.2 1
STX-C	Extremely Stony & Clay	
	Extremely Storry & Clay	,
Kentucky PSC	Adm. Case No. 36	
Al Model Release 5.0	a 33	May 22, 199
	u 00	iviay 22, 193

			PSC inario
		N.	alue
STX-CL	Extremely Stony & Clay Loam	1.3	1
STX-COS	Extremely Stony & Coarse Sand	1.3	1
STX-COSL	Extremely Stony & Coarse Sand Loam	1.3	1
STX-FSL	Extremely Stony & Fine Sandy Loam	1.3	1
STX-L	Extremely Stony & Loamy	1.3	1
STX-LCOS	Extremely Stony & Loamy Coarse Sand	1.3	1
STX-LS	Extremely Stony & Loamy Sand	1.3	1
STX-MUCK	Extremely Stony & Muck	1.3	1
STX-SIC	Extremely Stony & Silty Clay	1.3	1
STX-SICL	Extremely Stony & Silty Clay Loam	1.3	1
STX-SIL	Extremely Stony & Silty Loam	1.3	1
STX-SL	Extremely Stony & Sandy Loam	1.3	1
STX-VFSL	Extremely Stony & Very Fine Sandy Loam	1.3	1
SY	Slaty	3	1
SY-L	Slaty & Loam	3	1
SY-SIL	Slaty & Silty Loam	3	1
SYV	Very Slaty	3.5	1
SYX	Extremely Slaty	4	1
UNK	Unknown	1	1
UWB	Unweathered Bedrock	2	1
VAR	Variable	1	1
VFS	Very Fine Sand	1	1
VFSL	Very Fine Sandy loam	1	1
WB	Weathered Bedrock	3	1

.

	ky PSG
	Scenario Value
Labor Adjustment Factors	
Regional Labor Adjustment Factor	1
Contractor excavation and restoration	0.125
Telco construction copper	0.164
Telco construction fiber	0.364
Telco drop/NID installation and maintenance	0.571
Contractor pole setting	0.518

NOTE: This sheet diplays all user adjustable inputs which vary from HM 5.0a default settings

Workfile Name:	C:\HM50\WORKFILES\HMWKKY2651829999.XLS
Distribution Module Name:	C:\HM50\MODULES\R50a_distribution.xls
Feeder Module Name:	C:\HM50\MODULES\R50a_feeder.xls
Switching Module Name:	C:\HM50\MODULES\R50a_switching_io.xls
Expense Module Name:	C:\HM50\MODULES\R50a_expense_wirecenter.xls

		Ky PSC Scenario
Module/Table	Scenario Input	Value
Distribution	Distribution Cable Fill - 0	0.65
Distribution	Distribution Cable Fill - 5	0.65
Distribution	Distribution Cable Fill - 100	0.65
Distribution	Distribution Cable Fill - 200	0.65
Distribution	Distribution Cable Fill - 850	0.65
Distribution	Distribution Cable Fill - 2550	0.65
Distribution	Distribution Cable Fill - 5000	0.65
Distribution	Distribution Cable Fill - 10000	0.65
Distribution	Drop Distance, feet - 100	150
Distribution	Drop Distance, feet - 200	150
Distribution	Drop Distance, feet - 650	150
Distribution	Drop Distance, feet - 850	150
Distribution	Drop Distance, feet - 2550	150
Distribution	Drop Distance, feet - 5000	150
Distribution	Drop Distance, feet - 10000	150
Distribution	Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 0	45.9
Distribution	Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 5	45.9
Distribution	Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 100	45.9
Distribution	Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 200	45.9
Distribution	Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 650	45.9
Distribution	Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 850	45.9
Distribution	Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 2550	45.9
Distribution	Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 5000	45.9
Distribution	Aerial Drop Placement (total) - 10000	45.9
Distribution	Buried Drop Placement (total) - 0	0.59
Distribution	Buried Drop Placement (total) - 5	0.59
Distribution	Buried Drop Placement (total) - 100	0.59
Distribution	Buried Drop Placement (total) - 200	0.59
Distribution	Buried Drop Placement (total) - 650	0.59
Distribution	Buried Drop Placement (total) - 850	0.59
Distribution	Buried Drop Placement (total) - 2550	0.59
Distribution	Buried Drop Placement (total) - 5000	0.59
Distribution	Buried Drop Placement (total) - 10000	0.59
Distribution	Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 0	0.85
Distribution	Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 5	0.85
Distribution	Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 100	0.85
Distribution	Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 200	0.85
Distribution	Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 650	0.85
Distribution	Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 850	0.85
Distribution	Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 2550	0.85
Distribution	Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 5000	0.85
Distribution	Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 10000	0.85
Distribution	Buried Cable Jacketing Multiplier	1.044

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Module/Table	Scenario Input	Value
Distribution	Residential NID case, no protector	7.5
Distribution	Residential NID basic labor	32.
Distribution	Residential Protection Block, per pair	8.0
Distribution	Business NID case, no protector	7.5
Distribution	Business NID basic labor	32.
	Business Protection Block, per pair	8.0
Distribution	Terminal and Splice per line, buried	
	Terminal and Splice per line, aerial	
Distribution	Drop cable investment per foot buried	0.13
Distribution	Drop cable investment per foot aerial	0.07
Distribution	High Density DLC Site and Power	
Distribution	High Density DLC RT Fill Factor	0.85
Distribution	High Density DLC Basic Common Eqpt Invest + initial lines	11265
Distribution	High Density DLC POTS Channel Unit Investment	71.6
Distribution	High Density DLC POTS Lines per CU	
Distribution	High Density DLC Coin Channel Unit Investment	435.8
Distribution	High Density DLC Coin Lines per CU	
Distribution	High Density DLC 303/LD crossover, lines	57
Distribution	High Density DLC Optical Patch Panel	606.8
Distribution	High Density DLC Common Eqpt Invest per additional 672 lines	3700
Distribution	Low Density DLC Site and Power	
Distribution	Low Density DLC Maximum Lines/Increment	19
Distribution	Low Density DLC RT Fill Factor	0.85
Distribution	Low Density DLC Basic Common Eqpt Invest + initial lines	6205
Distribution	Low Density DLC POTS Channel Unit Investment	85.9
Distribution	Low Density DLC POTS Lines per CU	
Distribution	Low Density DLC Coin Channel Unit Investment	423.9
Distribution	Low Density DLC Coin Lines per CU	
Distribution	Low Density DLC Optical Patch Panel	606.8
Distribution	Low Density DLC Common Eqpt Invest per additional 96 lines	1751
Distribution	Low Density DLC Maximum Number of additional line modules/RT	
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 1	43.5
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 2	32.5
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 3	21.8
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 4	16.3
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 5	11.0
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 6	7.3
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 7	4.2
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 8	2.5
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 9	1.7
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 10	1.2
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 11	
Distribution	Distribution Cable Investment per foot 12	0.8
Distribution	Local RT - Maximum Total Distance	1500
Distribution	SAI Cable Size 12	
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 1	2270
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 2	1890
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 3	1510
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 4	1180
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 5	1010
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 6	730
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 7	590

Module/Table	SAI Outdoor Investment 8	450
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 9	310
	SAI Outdoor Investment 10	180
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 10	120
Distribution		120
Distribution	SAI Outdoor Investment 12	0.70
eeder	Copper Feeder Fill - 0	0.72
eeder	Copper Feeder Fill - 5	0.72
eeder	Copper Feeder Fill - 100	0.72
eeder	Copper Feeder Fill - 200	0.72
eeder	Copper Feeder Fill - 650	0.72
eeder	Copper Feeder Fill - 850	0.72
eeder	Copper Feeder Fill - 2550	• 0.72
eeder	Copper Feeder Fill - 5000	0.72
eeder	Copper Feeder Fill - 10000	0.72
eeder	Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 0	0.94
eeder	Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 5	0.94
eeder	Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 100	0.94
eeder	Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 200	0.94
eeder	Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 650	0.94
eeder	Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 850	0.94
eeder	Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 2550	0.94
eeder	Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 5000	0.94
eeder	Fiber Feeder Strand Fill - 10000	0.94
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 216	7.3
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 144	6.6
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 96	4.5
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 72	3.9
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 60	3.5
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 48	3
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 36	3.0
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 24	2
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 18	2.5
eeder	Fiber Feeder Investment per foot - 12	2.4
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 4200	76.2
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 3600	65.3
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 3000	54.4
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 2400	43.5
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 1800	32.5
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 1200	21.8
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 900	16.3
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 600	11.0
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 400	7.3
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 200	4.2
eeder	Copper Feeder Investment per foot - 100	2.5
eeder	Buried Copper Cable Sheath Multiplier	1.04
eeder	Conduit Material Investment per foot	2.7
eeder		۷.,
	Spare Tubes per section Fiber investment/strand - foot	
eeder		0.0
eeder	Copper investment/pair - foot	0.0
eeder	Copper Manhole Materials - 0	
eeder	Copper Manhole Materials - 5	

		Ky PSC Scenario
Module/Table	Scenario Input	Value
Feeder	Copper Manhole Materials - 200	· 0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Materials - 650	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Materials - 850	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Materials - 2550	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Materials - 5000	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Materials - 10000	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 0	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 5	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 100	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 200	Ō
Feeder	Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 650	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 850	Ō
Feeder	Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 2550	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 5000	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Frame and Cover - 10000	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 0	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 5	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 100	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 200	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 650	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 850	0 0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 2550	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 2000	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Site Delivery - 10000	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 0	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 5	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 100	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 200	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 650	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 850	ů 0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 2550	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 5000	0
Feeder	Copper Manhole Excavate and Backfill - 10000	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Materials - 0	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Materials - 5	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Materials - 100	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Materials - 200	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Materials - 650	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Materials - 850	
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Materials - 2550	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Materials - 5000	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Materials - 10000	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Installation - 0	0
		0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Installation - 5 Fiber Pullbox Installation - 100	0
Feeder Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Installation - 200	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Installation - 200	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Installation - 650	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Installation - 650 Fiber Pullbox Installation - 2550	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Installation - 2000	0
Feeder	Fiber Pullbox Installation - 5000	0
Switching	Constant EO Switching Investment Term, BOC and large ICO	0 266 04
owneeling	Constant CO Switching investment renn, DOC and large ICO	266.04

Module/Table	ScenarioInput	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Switching	Switch Port Administrative Fill	0.94
Switching	MDF/Protector Investment per line	23.38
Switching	Switch Installation Multiplier	1.101
Switching	Operator Traffic Fraction	0.005
Switching	Total Interoffice Traffic Fraction	0.5983
Switching	Trunk Port, per end	62.73
Switching	Tandem-routed Fraction of Total IntraLATA Traffic	0.33
Switching	Tandem-routed Fraction of Total InterLATA Traffic	0.33
Switching	Local Call Attempts	4661683
Switching	Call Completion Factor	0.7
Switching	IntraLATA Calls Completed	142226
Switching	InterLATA intrastate Calls Completed	109764
Switching	InterLATA interstate Calls Completed	332547
Switching	Local DEMs, thousands	23168965
Switching	Intrastate DEMs, thousands	2078034
Switching	Interstate DEMs, thousands	3297000
Switching	BH Fraction of Daily Usage	0.087
Switching	Annual to Daily Usage Reduction Factor	310
Switching	STP Link Capacity	1024
Switching	Minimum STP Investment, per pair	224000
Switching	Link Termination, both ends	725
-	C Link Cross Section	16
Switching Switching	Fraction of BHCA requiring TCAP	0.5
Switching	SCP Investment/Transaction/Second	2444
Switching	Operator Intervention Factor	2444
Switching	Power Investment 1	17000
Switching	Power Investment 2	24000
Switching		
Switching	Power Investment 3	56000
Switching	Power Investment 4	164000 275000
Switching	Power Investment 5	
Switching	OC-48 ADM, installed, 48 DS-3s	133563
Switching	OC-48 ADM, installed, 12 DS-3s	80825
Switching	OC-3/DS-1 Terminal Multiplexer, installed, 84 DS-1s	34705
Switching	Investment per 7 DS-1s	1060
Switching	Pigtrails, per strand	44.36
Switching	Optical Distribution Panel	4314
Switching	EF&I, per hour	C
Switching	EF&I hours	(
Switching	Channel Bank Investment, per 24 lines	3664
Switching	DCS installed, per DS-3	9381
Switching	Transmission Terminal Fill (DS-0 level)	8.0
Switching	Fiber Investment, fiber cable	2.8
Switching	Fiber Investment, buried sheath addition	(
Switching	Fiber Investment, conduit	2.74
Switching	Fiber, spare tubes per route	C
Switching	Fiber Investment, conduit placement	12.53
Switching	Fiber Investment, pullbox investsment	. (
Switching	Fraction of Aerial Structure Assigned to Telephone	0.48
Switching	Fraction of Buried Structure Assigned to Telephone	0.85
Switching	Fraction of Underground Structure Assigned to Telephone	0.85
Expense	Cost of Debt	0.07
Expense	Debt Fraction	0.4

Module/Table	Scenario Input	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Expense	Cost of Equity	0.125
Expense	Tax Rate	0.4036
Expense	Other Taxes Factor	0.0328
Expense	Forward-looking Network Operations Factor	0.7
Expense	Alternative CO Switching Factor	0.0517
Expense	Alternative Circuit Equipment Factor	0.0177
Expense	Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 0	0.48
Expense	Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 5	0.48
Expense	Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 100	0.48
Expense	Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 200	0.48
Expense	Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 650	0.48
Expense	Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 850	0.48
Expense	Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 2550	0.48
Expense	Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 5000	0.48
Expense	Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 10000	0.48
Expense	Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 0	0.85
Expense	Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 5	0.85
Expense	Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 100	0.85
Expense	Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 200	0.85
Expense	Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 200	
	-	0.85
Expense	Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 850	0.85
Expense	Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 2550	0.85
Expense	Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 5000	0.85
Expense	Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 10000	0.85
Expense	Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 0	0.85
Expense	Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 5	0.85
Expense	Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 100	0.85
Expense	Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 200	0.85
Expense	Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 650	0.85
Expense	Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 850	0.85
Expense	Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 2550	0.85
Expense	Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 5000	0.85
Expense	Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 10000	0.85
Expense	Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 0	0.48
Expense	Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 5	0.48
Expense	Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 100	0.48
Expense	Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 200	0.48
Expense	Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 650	0.48
Expense	Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 850	0.48
Expense	Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 2550	0.48
Expense	Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 5000	0.48
Expense	Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 10000	0.48
Expense	Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 0	0.85
Expense	Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 5	0.85
Expense	 Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 100 	0.85
Expense	Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 200	0.85
Expense	Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 650	0.85
Expense	Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 850	0.85
Expense	Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 2550	0.85
Expense	Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 5000	0.85
Expense	Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 10000	0.85
Expense	Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 0	0.85

		Ky PSC Scenario
Module/Table	Scenario Input	Value
Expense	Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 5	0.85
Expense	Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 100	0.85
Expense	Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 200	0.85
Expense	Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 650	0.85
Expense	Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 850	0.85
Expense	Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 2550	0.85
Expense	Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 5000	0.85
Expense	Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 10000	0.85
Expense	Motor Vehicles - Economic Life	8.1
Expense	Garage Work Equipment - Economic Life	12
Expense	Other Work Equipment - Economic Life	16.2
Expense	Buildings - Economic Life	45
Expense	Furniture - Economic Life	14.1
Expense	Office Support Equipment - Economic Life	11.5
Expense	Company Comm. Equipment - Economic Life	7
Expense	General Purpose Computer - Economic Life	6
Expense	Digital Electronic Switching - Economic Life	16
Expense	Operator Systems - Economic Life	10
Expense	Digital Circuit Equipment - Economic Life	9.3
Expense	Public Telephone Terminal Equipment - Economic Life	9.3 7
Expense	Poles - Economic Life	34
Expense	Aerial Cable - metallic - Economic Life	20
	Aerial Cable - non metallic - Economic Life	20
Expense Expense	Underground Cable - non metallic - Economic Life	25
Expense	Buried - metallic - Economic Life	20
Expense	Buried - non metallic - Economic Life	20
Expense	Intrabuilding Cable - metallic - Economic Life	23
Expense	Intrabuilding Cable - non metallic - Economic Life	21
-	-	59
Expense Expense	Conduit Systems - Economic Life Motor Vehicles - Net Salvage %	
-	=	0.12
Expense	Garage Work Equipment - Net Salvage %	0
Expense	Other Work Equipment - Net Salvage %	0
Expense	Buildings - Net Salvage %	0.03
Expense	Furniture - Net Salvage %	0.09
Expense	Office Support Equipment - Net Salvage %	0.1
Expense	Company Comm. Equipment - Net Salvage %	0.1
Expense	General Purpose Computer - Net Salvage %	0
Expense	Digital Electronic Switching - Net Salvage %	0
Expense	Operator Systems - Net Salvage %	0
Expense	Digital Circuit Equipment - Net Salvage %	0
Expense	Public Telephone Terminal Equipment - Net Salvage %	0.1
Expense	Poles - Net Salvage %	-0.61
Expense	Aerial Cable - metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.14
Expense	Aerial Cable - non metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.15
Expense	Underground Cable - metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.17
Expense	Underground Cable - non metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.15
Expense	Buried - metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.09
Expense	Buried - non metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.06
Expense	Intrabuilding Cable - metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.13
Expense	Intrabuilding Cable - non metallic - Net Salvage %	-0.13
Expense	Conduit Systems - Net Salvage %	-0.08
UG Excavation/Restoration	Trench Per Ft - 0	1.29

Appendix G

Module/Table	Scenario Input Value	
JG Excavation/Restoration	Trench Per Ft - 5	1.2
JG Excavation/Restoration	Trench Per Ft - 100	1.2
JG Excavation/Restoration	Trench Per Ft - 200	1.2
IG Excavation/Restoration	Trench Per Ft - 650	1.3
JG Excavation/Restoration	Trench Per Ft - 850	1.4
JG Excavation/Restoration	Trench Per Ft - 2550	1.4
JG Excavation/Restoration	Trench Per Ft - 5000	4.(
JG Excavation/Restoration	Trench Per Ft -10000	4.(
JG Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 0	2.
JG Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 5	2.
IG Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 100	2.
IG Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 200	2.
G Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 650	2.
G Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 850	2.
G Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 2550	2.
G Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 5000	13.
G Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft -10000	20.
G Excavation/Restoration	Hand Trench Per Ft - 0	
G Excavation/Restoration	Hand Trench Per Ft - 5	
G Excavation/Restoration	Hand Trench Per Ft - 100	
G Excavation/Restoration	Hand Trench Per Ft - 200	
G Excavation/Restoration	Hand Trench Per Ft - 650	
G Excavation/Restoration	Hand Trench Per Ft - 850	
G Excavation/Restoration	Hand Trench Per Ft - 2550	
G Excavation/Restoration	Hand Trench Per Ft - 5000	6
G Excavation/Restoration	Hand Trench Per Ft -10000	12
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 0	4
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 5	4
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 100	4
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 200	4
	•	4
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 650	4
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 850	4
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 2550	
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 5000	12
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft -10000	20
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 0	6
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 5	6
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 100	6
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 200	6
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 650	6
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 850	6
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 2550	6
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 5000	14
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft -10000	24
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 0	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 5	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 100	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 200	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 650	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 850	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 2550	0
IG Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 5000	0.

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Appendix G

Module/Table	Scenario Input	Value
JG Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft -10000	0.6
JG Excavation/Restoration	Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 0	3.
JG Excavation/Restoration	Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 5	3.
JG Excavation/Restoration	Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 100	3.
JG Excavation/Restoration	Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 200	3.
JG Excavation/Restoration	Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 650	3.
JG Excavation/Restoration	Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 850	6.1
JG Excavation/Restoration	Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 2550	8.8
JG Excavation/Restoration	Pavement Stabilization Per Ft - 5000	11.5
JG Excavation/Restoration	Pavement Stabilization Per Ft -10000	13.5
JG Excavation/Restoration	Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 0	0.6
JG Excavation/Restoration	Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 5	0.6
JG Excavation/Restoration	Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 100	0.6
JG Excavation/Restoration	Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 200	0.6
IG Excavation/Restoration	Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 650	0.6
G Excavation/Restoration	Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 850	2.7
IG Excavation/Restoration	Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 2550	7.4
G Excavation/Restoration	Dirt Stabilization Per Ft - 5000	8.1
G Excavation/Restoration	Dirt Stabilization Per Ft -10000	10.8
G Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 0	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 5	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 100	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 200	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 650	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 850	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 2550	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 5000	0
G Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill -10000	0
uried Excavation/Restoration	•	0.6
uried Excavation/Restoration		0.9
uried Excavation/Restoration		0.3
uried Excavation/Restoration		0.9
uried Excavation/Restoration		0.9
uried Excavation/Restoration		1.5
uried Excavation/Restoration		
uried Excavation/Restoration		1.5
uried Excavation/Restoration		1.5 1.5
uried Excavation/Restoration		
uried Excavation/Restoration		1.5
uried Excavation/Restoration		1.7
uried Excavation/Restoration		1.7
uried Excavation/Restoration		4.
		12.2
uried Excavation/Restoration		2.4
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 850	2.4

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Appendix G

Module/Table	Ky PSC Scen Scenario Input Value	
	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 2550	2.4
	Backhoe Trench Per Ft - 5000	16.3
	Backhoe Trench Per Ft -10000	24.4
Buried Excavation/Restoration		4.0
uried Excavation/Restoration		4.0
uried Excavation/Restoration		4.0
uried Excavation/Restoration		4.0
uried Excavation/Restoration		4.0
uried Excavation/Restoration		4.0
uried Excavation/Restoration		4.0
uried Excavation/Restoration		8.1
uried Excavation/Restoration		14.6
uried Excavation/Restoration		8.9
uried Excavation/Restoration		8.9
uried Excavation/Restoration	Bore Cable Per Ft - 100	8.9
uried Excavation/Restoration		8.9
uried Excavation/Restoration	Bore Cable Per Ft - 650	8.9
uried Excavation/Restoration	Bore Cable Per Ft - 850	8.9
uried Excavation/Restoration		8.9
uried Excavation/Restoration	Bore Cable Per Ft - 5000	8.9
uried Excavation/Restoration	Bore Cable Per Ft -10000	14.6
uried Excavation/Restoration	Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 0	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 5	4.
uried Excavation/Restoration	Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 100	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 200	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 650	4.
uried Excavation/Restoration	Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per.Ft - 850	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 2550	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft - 5000	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Push Pipe/Pull Cable Per Ft -10000	19.5
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 0	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 5	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 100	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 200	4.
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 650	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 850	4
	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 2550	4
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft - 5000	14.6
•	Cut/Restore Asphalt Per Ft -10000	24.4
	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 0	7.3
	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 5	7.3
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 100	7.3
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 200	7.3
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 650	7.3
uried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 850	7.3
	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 2550	7.3
	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft - 5000	17.1
	Cut/Restore Concrete Per Ft -10000	29.3
uried Excavation/Restoration		0.8
uried Excavation/Restoration		0.8
	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 100	0.8
	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 200	0.8

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a

Module/Table	ScenarioInput	Ky PSC Scenario Value
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 650	0.82
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 850	0.82
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 2550	0.82
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft - 5000	0.82
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Cut/Restore Sod Per Ft -10000	0.82
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 0	0.12
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 5	0.12
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 100	0.12
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 200	0.12
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 650	0.12
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 850	0.12
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 2550	0.12
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill - 5000	0.12
Buried Excavation/Restoration	Simple Backfill -10000	0.12

•

Appendix E Worksheet 4

Kentucky South Inc - Ky				@/5% State allocation	675.312	0	0	391,029	227,585	193,956	258,040	850,037	464,414	72,686	67,063	455,092	0	455.428	0	474,297	901,135	434,419	781,952	92,010	696,902	668,639	294,252	597,051	1,732,983	305,712	446,439	0	220,641	2,008	0	0	0	0	0
Sou		n Ag) 	9) _e	မာ	\$	69	ŝ	Ś	θ	θ	θ	ω	θ	\$	Ś	ŝ	\$	Ś	ŝ	\$	\$	\$	69	Ś	θ	θ	ŝ	Ф	в	θ	ю	ω	Ś	ω	Ś	Ś	Ю	• •
GTE			@25% 	receral allocation	225,104	0	0	130,343	75,862	64,652	86,013	283,346	154,805	24,229	22,354	151,697	0	151,809	0	158,099	300,378	144,806	260,651	30,670	232,301	222,880	98,084	199,017	577,661	101,904	148,813	0	73,547	699	0	0	0	0	0
Link protocol Markator (* 1997) California California California				an 2004 an 2004	φ	\$	\$	69	θ	θ	θ	ŝ	÷	ŝ	θ	\$	Ś	Ś	Ś	ω	θ	€9	Ś	ŝ	θ	θ	↔	\$	\$	θ	ŝ	\$	θ	ω	θ	θ	Ś	Ю	\$
		Total annual	support for	specified line types	900,416	0	0	521,372	303,447	258,608	344,054	1,133,383	619,219	96,915	89,417	606,790	0	607,237	0	632,395	1,201,513	579,226	1,042,603	122,680	929,202	891,518	392,336	796,068	2,310,644	407,616	595,252	0	294,188	2,678	0	0	0	0	0
	1 1 1	۴	ธ	d.	Ś	Ś	\$	↔	ω	ω	Ś	Ś	ŝ	€	↔	θ	Ś	\$	Ś	ŝ	↔	↔	\$	ŝ	€	θ	\$	Ф	Ś	θ	Ś	Ś	ω	€	θ	Ś	Ś	69	• •
poorted	\$0.00		Annual	support lor public lines		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
e Su	0		5. 		8	\$ 0	• •	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	е С	\$ 0	ۍ ه	8 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	8	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 7	\$ 0	မ ဂ	69 0	ନ ୦	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 9	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0	\$ 0	~ \$P
is Not to b	\$0.00	Annual	support for	usiness line		•	•	-	•	-	•	Ū	•	•	Ū		•	J	U	U		Ŭ	•	U	0	0		0	U	J	U	U	0	U	0	0	0	0	U
8				ğ	8	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 8	\$ 0	6 Ф	5 \$	ۍ ه	8 0	\$	\$ 0	\$ 0	е С	\$ 0	\$ 0	ŝ	¢≯ ⊙	\$ 0	\$ 0	8 0	୍ୟ ୧୫	69 (0 (0 0	\$ \$	0 8	\$)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$	ŝ	ŝ	\$	\$
that Line 1	\$51.00	Annal	support for	usiness line	11,238				762		9,679	23,715							J	<u> </u>	14,605	•	U	U		11,042		U	6,766	U	931	U	U	U	0	0	0	0	0
ates	0			es b	6	ۍ ه	\$ 0	8 0	\$ 0	ۍ ه	9 О	ۍ ۹	ۍ ه	ۍ ه	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	8 0	8 0	୫ ଚ	\$ 6	ۍ ه	8 0	69 10	69 0	69 (69 (69 0	ଚ ଚ	↔ 0	\$ 0	ۍ ۹	\$	\$	ନ ୦	\$ 0	\$	\$	\$
Entry of \$0.00 Indicates that Line Type Is Not to be Supported	\$0.00	Annual	support for	dence lines residence lines business lines business lines	\$	\$	\$	6	69	€	- Ф	↔	•	- Ф	- -	6	69	- -	- 	- 9	- 6	Ф Ф	Ф	G	- 	6	6		С Ф	۰ ۵	Ф	۵ ۵	С Ф	ې ۵	\$	с 9	9	٠ ۶	6
و ح	8		1	les n	28	0	0	22	85	8	4	24	5	ŝ	5	8	0	37	0	35	8	g	8	õ	8	9	ģ	80	82	ģ	2	0	ģ			0	0	0	0
	\$31.00	Annual	support for	sidence lir	-			521,372				•	Φ		89,417	606,790		607,237		632,395	1,186,908	579,226	1,042,603	122,680	929,202	880,476	392,336		2,303,878	407,616	594,322		294,188	2,678					
	। २		5 	de res	8							\$		с С		4	s S	ເ	4	\$ 9	ფ დ	~	\$	↔ —	(N)	69 1 0 1	ຍ າ ດາເ	ው ጉ	പ പ	8	ф С	↔ 0	↔ 0	с) С			ക റ	ფ თ	\$ 5
100% 100% 110%	Monthly Support Benchmark:		© Bieineee	usage per line	58.48	17.98			-					32.33	34.51	106.54	23.39	49.83	18.54	48.61	63.13	95.71	49.87	35.51	-		36.39	47.35	82.75	43.52	107.25	30.90	98.00	39.93	15.70	15.99	17.99	15.39	22.35
<u>і</u> : і: ;;	tod	*		VCs		•••				•••	ም ዓ		ക	8	\$ ~	4	8	ფ ი	е С	ფ ფ	ъ С	ფ ი	\$	ອ ອີ			99 (N 1		•••									\$ 0	\$
% of Loop Assigned for USF: % of Port Assigned for USE: Bus/Res local DEM usage ratio:	nthly Sup		@ Recidence	usage per line	57.99	17.59	29.23	45.32	128.64	49.69	63.05	76.89	43.36	31.92	34.07	104.44	23.02	49.33	18.10	48.13	62.65	94.73	49.37	35.03	138.68	95.40 55.50	35.92	40.87	82.18	43.06	105.50	30.43	96.23	37.76	15.34	15.60	17.58	15.00	21.94
ssigr ssign DEM	Ŷ				\$				•••													\$ 9	\$ }		69 (m	99 (0	<i></i>	A (69 (•••	ფ 	\$
f Loop As of Port As as local D	i den en e		Ava monthly	cost per line	58.07	17.71	29.34	45.36	128.66	49.84	63.21	76.94	43.47	32.05	34.18	104.44	23.15	49.41	18.29	48.23	62.70	94.73	49.43	35.15	138.68	95.45 25.61	36.01	40.97	82.19	43.15	105.51	30.58	96.23	38.57	15.53	15.70	17.64	15.14	22.03
% o % us/Re			AV	8	ω	θ	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	ω,	÷	69	ŝ	S	θ	θ	θ	Ś	Ø	↔	₩	θ	S	φ,	9 (<i>А</i> (<i>•</i> •	A (9	9	φ,	ŝ	ŝ	θ	S	θ	↔	ŝ	Ś
				5	ALBYKYXA	ASLDKYXA	BEREKYXA	BRSDKYXA	BRVLKYXA	BSVLKYXA	BIVLKYXA	CECLKYXA	CLMAKYXA	CMVLKYXA	CTBGKYXA	EWNGKYXA	EZTWKYXA	FMBGKYXA	GLSGKYXA	GNBGKYXB	GNUPKYXA	GRSNKYXA	GYSNKYXA	HGVLKYXA				LENNATAA	LBKIKYXA	LNCSKYXA	LRTTKYXA	LTFDKYXA	LTWDKYXA	LXTNKYUK	LXTNKYXA	LXTNKYXB	LXTNKYXC	LXTNKYXD	LXTNKYXE

HAI Model Release 5.0a Kentucky PSC

Adm. Case No. 360 May 22, 1998

Appendix E Worksheet 4

	0		64.844	68.013	1.259.111	559,135	271.681	0	868.876	419,686	335,441	0	685.589	487.536	603.307	298.587	0	391.111	526,805	223.478	528.728	1 023 496		0
2	Ś	6	• •9	• •9	• • •	6	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	\$	Ś	ŝ	\$	•	• •	• •	6	\$	6	6	•	•	\$
•	0	0	21.615	22.671	419.704	186.378	90,560	0	289,625	139,895	111,814	0	228,530	162.512	201.102	99.529	0	130.370	175.602	74.493	176.243	341 165		0
	б	6	6	\$	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	\$	ŝ	ω	θ	θ	ŝ	ŝ	6	- 69	ю	6	6	ŝ	6	6	• •	ŝ
	0	0	86.459	90.685	1.678,815	745,513		0	1,158,501	559,582	447,254	0	914,119	650,047	804.409	398,116	0	521,481	702,406	297,971	704.971	1.364.661		0
	ŝ	ŝ	6	6	ŝ	\$	\$	ŝ	θ	φ	ŝ	Ś	Ś	G	\$	ŝ	6	ŝ	ŝ	Ś	ŝ	ю	6	ŝ
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	\$	÷	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	÷	Ś	в	Ś	Ś	в	Ś	Ś	Ś	ŝ	6	ŝ	\$	\$	ŝ	÷	69	6	• • •
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	69	ю	ю	\$	\$	G	Ś	Ś	÷	Ф	÷	÷	Ġ	G	ŝ	6	6	ŝ	G	G	G	G	· •>	Б
	0	0	0	0	13,588		2,121	0	0	2,160	2,393	0	0	0	1,937	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.584	0	0
					÷.										2							ო		
	G	€	÷	θ	G	G	в	Ś	↔	¢	G	θ	Ф	Ф	Ø	ω	G	G	в	ω	Ś	θ	\$	\$
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	÷	ŝ	\$	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	Ф	\$	\$	ŝ	\$	ŝ	\$	Ь	69	69	ŝ	\$	\$	ŝ
	0	0	20	35	27	13	2	0				0	_		•	91	0					076		0
			86,459	90,685	1,665,23	745,5	360,1;		1,158,501	557,421	444,861		914,119	650,047	782,472	398,1		521,48	702,406	297,97	704,97	1,330,07		
	63	\$	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	\$	69	ŝ	69	\$	θ	ŝ	⇔	θ	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	Ś	ŝ	ŝ	49	Ś	69	\$
	20.31	20.29	41.07	33.14	58.54	41.28	85.07	23.02	60.76	61.31	99.88	21.91	46.86	123.27	68.71	89.69	21.67	50.46	97.76	41.29	77.80	87.62	28.46	27.76
	ŝ	ω	63	÷	Ф	φ	€	ф	ω	θ	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	θ	Ś	θ	ω	ŝ	ŝ	θ	↔	\$	ŝ	\$
	19.91	19.87	40.34	32.69	58.05	40.85	83.53	22.62	60.17	60.62	98.93	21.47	46.41	120.32	68.12	88.16	21.28	49.82	96.79	40.81	76.06	87.06	28.04	27.21
	-	~			-			ь	~	~	~													
	ол О																							⇔
	19.9	20.08	40.46	32.8(58.1	40.9	83.57	22.73	60.17	60.6	<u>98.9</u> {	21.55	46.51	120.32	68.20	88.18	21.42	49.87	96.75	40.92	76.06	87.12	28.17	27.30
	ዏ	θ	ω	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	Ś	ŝ	ŝ	ୢୄୢ	ŝ	ю	w	ŝ	ŝ	↔	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	ω	÷	69
	LXTNKYXF	LXTNKYXG	MDWYKYXA	MEDSKYXA	MNTIKYXA	MRHDKYXA	NANCKYXA	NCVLKYXA	OLHLKYXA	OWNLKYXA	PNLCKYXE	RSSLKYXB	SCVLKYXA	SHBGKYXA	SHDNKYXA	SLLCKYXA	SMRTKYXA	SSHRKYXA	TLBOKYXA	TMVLKYXA	VICCKYXA	VNBGKYXA	VRSLKYXA	WLMRKYXA

Line Type Primary residence lines Secondary residence lines Single line business lines Muttline business lines	Support Grand Totals \$27,010,488 \$155,522 \$0	Federal allocation \$6,752,622 \$38,881 \$0 \$0	@75% State allocation \$20,257,866 \$16,642 \$0 \$0
Public lines	\$0	\$0	
All switched lines	\$27,166,010	\$6,791,503	\$20,374,508

2

Kentucky PSC HAI Model Release 5.0a