

**STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

)
MIDCONTINENT COMMUNICATIONS,)
A SOUTH DAKOTA PARTNERSHIP,)
COMPLAINANT)
) Case No. PU-05-451
VS.)
)
NORTH DAKOTA TELEPHONE COMPANY,)
RESPONDENT)
)

Direct Testimony of Timothy J Gates

On Behalf Of

Midcontinent Communications

July 5, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	PURPOSE OF THE TESTIMONY	3
III.	LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS	4
IV.	CALCULATING AND APPLYING THE WHOLESALE DISCOUNT	6
A.	Avoided Retail Costs	8
B.	Services Available for Resale	10
C.	Quality and Conditions for Resold Services.....	12
D.	Calculating Avoided Costs and the Avoided Cost Discount	13

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD.**

3 A. My name is Timothy J Gates. My business address is QSI Consulting, 819 Huntington
4 Drive, Highlands Ranch, Colorado 80126.

5 **Q. WHAT IS QSI CONSULTING, INC. AND WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITH**
6 **THE FIRM?**

7 A. QSI Consulting, Inc. ("QSI") is a consulting firm specializing in regulated industries,
8 econometric analysis and computer aided modeling. I currently serve as Senior Vice
9 President and Partner.

10 **Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A SYNOPSIS OF YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND**
11 **AND RELEVANT WORK EXPERIENCE.**

12 A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree from Oregon State University and a Master of
13 Management degree in Finance and Quantitative Methods from Willamette University's
14 Atkinson Graduate School of Management. Since I received my Masters, I have taken
15 additional graduate-level courses in statistics and econometrics. I also have attended
16 numerous courses and seminars specific to the telecommunications industry, including
17 both the NARUC Annual and NARUC Advanced Regulatory Studies Programs.

18 Prior to joining QSI, I was a Senior Executive Staff Member at MCI. I was
19 employed by MCI and/or MCI/WorldCom for 15 years in various public policy positions.
20 While at MCI I managed various functions, including tariffing, economic and financial
21 analysis, competitive analysis, witness training and MCI's use of external consultants.

23 Prior to joining MCI, I was employed as a Telephone Rate Analyst in the Engineering
24 Division at the Texas Public Utility Commission and earlier as an Economic Analyst at
25 the Oregon Public Utility Commission. I also worked at the Bonneville Power
26 Administration (United States Department of Energy) as a Financial Analyst doing total
27 electric use forecasts while I attended graduate school. Prior to doing my graduate work,
28 I worked for ten years as a reforestation forester in the Pacific Northwest for
29 multinational and government organizations. Exhibit TJG-1, attached hereto to this
30 testimony, is a summary of my work experience and education.

31 **Q. HAVE YOU EVER TESTIFIED BEFORE THE NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
32 SERVICE COMMISSION ("COMMISSION")?**

33 A. Yes. I have testified in North Dakota in the following dockets: PU-2320-90-183, PU-
34 2065-02-465, PU-2342-01-296 and the earlier phase of this proceeding. I have testified
35 more than 200 times in 44 states and I have filed comments with the FCC on various
36 public policy issues ranging from costing, pricing, local entry and universal service to
37 strategic planning, merger and network issues. As noted above, a list of proceedings in
38 which I have filed testimony or provided comments is attached hereto as Exhibit TJG-1.

39 **Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU FILING THIS TESTIMONY?**

40 A. This testimony was prepared on behalf of the Midcontinent Communications
41 ("Midcontinent").

42

43 **II. PURPOSE OF THE TESTIMONY**

44 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

45 A. Pursuant to the prehearing order in this proceeding issued June 27, 2006, this testimony
46 addresses the calculation of an interim wholesale discount rate.¹ This testimony will
47 address the rules and guidelines associated with the calculation of a wholesale discount
48 rate in the context of arbitrations under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by
49 the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Specifically, this testimony will address the
50 accounting requirements for the establishment of a wholesale discount rate for North
51 Dakota Telephone Company's (NDTC) retail rates in the Devils Lake exchange.

52 **Q. WHAT ARE THE MAJOR CONCLUSIONS OF THE TESTIMONY?**

53 A. The major conclusions are as follows:

54 A properly conducted avoided cost study must reflect the jurisdictional allocation
55 of expenses pursuant to the FCC rules.

56 If the Commission cannot establish a rate based on the July 5, 2006 filing by
57 NDTC, then the Commission can order a discount rate from within the FCC's
58 range of interim discounts. Those discounts range from at least 17 percent to no
59 more than 25 percent below the ILEC's existing retail rates.

60 At a minimum, the interim discount rate should be no lower than the Commission
61 approved Qwest wholesale discount rate which is 16.15 percent.²

62

63

64

65

66

¹ See also, the Commission's Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order, filed June 7, 2006, at 6. (Amended Order)

² Exhibit A to *Qwest's Statements of Generally Available Terms and Conditions for Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements, Ancillary Services and Resale of Telecommunications Services in North Dakota*, Section 6.

67 If an interim rate is approved, the rate should be subject to true-up once the
68 Commission approves a final NDTC-specific wholesale discount rate.
69

70 **III. LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS**

71 **Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE GOALS OF THE TELECOM ACT AND,**
72 **SPECIFICALLY, THE RESALE REQUIREMENTS OF THE ACT.**

73 **A.** The FCC and state commissions have recognized that the various subsections of section
74 251 impose escalating obligations on carriers depending upon their classifications (*i.e.*,
75 telecommunications carrier, LEC, or ILEC). These classifications are based upon their
76 market power and economic position (e.g. monopoly) and attendant public obligations
77 (e.g., common carrier obligations). Section 251(a) of the Act requires all
78 telecommunications carriers to “interconnect directly or indirectly with the facilities and
79 equipment of other telecommunications carriers.”³ Section 251(b) imposes additional
80 duties on local exchange carriers (LECs), such as dialing parity and number portability
81 and section 251(c) imposes further obligations and specific interconnection duties on
82 ILECs, including the duty to “offer for resale at wholesale rates any telecommunications
83 service that the carrier provides at retail to subscribers who are not telecommunications
84 carriers.” (Section 251(c)(4))

85 **Q. PLEASE CITE THE SECTIONS OF THE ACT THAT REQUIRE ILECS TO**
86 **OFFER RESOLD SERVICES AT WHOLESALE RATES.**

³ 47 USC § 251(a)(1).

88 A. The Act imposes a duty upon ILECs to offer services for resale at wholesale rates.

89 Specifically, Section 251(c)(4) requires ILECs:

90 (A) to offer for resale at wholesale rates any telecommunications
91 service that the carrier provides at retail to subscribers who are not
92 telecommunications carriers; and
93
94 (B) not to prohibit, and not to impose unreasonable or discriminatory
95 conditions or limitations on, the resale of such telecommunications
96 services, except that a state commission may, consistent with
97 regulations prescribed by the Commission under this section,
98 prohibit a reseller that obtains at wholesale rates a
99 telecommunications service that is available at retail only to a
100 category of subscribers from offering such service to a different
101 category of subscribers.

102 NDTC is a rural carrier and would not normally be subject to this obligation. However,
103 this Commission has lifted the rural exemption as it applies to the wholesale resale
104 requirements in NDTC's Devils Lake exchange. In addition, this Commission has
105 required NDTC to provide support for an interim wholesale rate for the Devils Lake
106 exchange under an interconnection agreement no later than July 5, 2006. Further, NDTC
107 shall begin providing to Midcontinent retail services at wholesale prices for resale in the
108 Devils Lake exchange under an interconnection agreement no later than July 26, 2006.⁴

⁴ Amended Order at 7.

110

111 **IV. CALCULATING AND APPLYING THE WHOLESALE**
DISCOUNT

112

113 **Q. WHAT GUIDANCE DOES THE ACT PROVIDE WITH RESPECT TO**
114 **DETERMINING THE WHOLESALE PRICES FOR RESOLD SERVICE?**

115 A. The Act provides very specific guidance on the determination of wholesale prices for
116 telecommunications services. Section 252(d)(3) states that:

117 For the purposes of Section 251(c)(4), a state commission shall determine
118 wholesale rates on the basis of retail rates charged to subscribers for the
119 telecommunications service requested, excluding the portion thereof
120 attributable to any marketing, billing, collection, and other costs that will
121 be avoided by the local exchange carrier.

122 Using the FCC's rules for the avoided cost calculation, the Commission may review and
123 approve a company-specific wholesale discount rate. The discount reflects the retail
124 related costs that are considered avoided or avoidable by the incumbent LEC (ILEC).

125 **Q. IF THE COMMISSION FINDS THE NDTC STUDY DOES NOT COMPORT**
126 **WITH THE FCC RULES OR THAT THE DATA AND/OR ASSUMPTIONS ARE**
127 **FLAWED, CAN THE COMMISSION REQUIRE A SPECIFIC INTERIM**
128 **WHOLESALE DISCOUNT RATE?**

129 A. Yes. The Commission can approve an interim wholesale discount rate between 17 and 25
130 percent.⁵ At paragraph 910 of the *Local Competition Order*, the FCC identifies the
131 conditions under which a state commission may use an interim wholesale rate:

⁵ See 47 C.F.R. § 51.611.

A default wholesale discount rate shall be used if: (1) an avoided cost study that satisfies the criteria we set forth below does not exist; (2) a state commission has not completed its review of such an avoided cost study; or (3) a rate established by a state commission before release of this Order is based on a study that does not comply with the criteria described in the following section.

Q. **WOULD IT BE REASONABLE TO USE QWEST'S APPROVED WHOLESALE DISCOUNT RATE INSTEAD OF SELECTING A DISCOUNT FROM THE FCC'S WHOLESALE DISCOUNT RANGE?**

A. As an interim rate, I would not oppose the use of Qwest's rate. But the Commission should recognize that Qwest's discount rate is likely to be much lower than NDTC's rate since Qwest has significant economies of scale and scope because of its size that NDTC could not achieve. In other words, because Qwest is much larger than NDTC, it is likely to be more efficient than NDTC and have fewer costs that it can avoid when it provides service on a wholesale basis. As such, although you could use the Qwest discount rate, it is likely to be far too low for NDTC and a significant true-up may be required once the final wholesale rate is approved.

Q. HAS THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION ("FCC") PROVIDED AN OPINION ON THE NEED FOR RESALE DURING THE TRANSITION TO COMPETITION FOR LOCAL SERVICES?

A. Yes. The *Local Competition Order* discusses the need for resale.

Resale will be an important entry strategy for many new entrants, especially in the short term when they are building their own facilities. Further, in some areas and for some new entrants, we expect that the resale option will remain an important entry strategy over the longer term. Resale will also be an important entry strategy for small businesses that

160
161
162
163
164
165
166 may lack capital to compete in the local exchange market by purchasing
167 unbundled elements or by building their own networks. In light of the
168 strategic importance of resale to the development of competition, we
169 conclude that it is especially important to promulgate national rules for use
170 by state commissions in setting wholesale rates.⁶ (Paragraph 907).

171 The *Local Competition Order* establishes "... a minimum set of criteria for avoided cost
172 studies used to determine wholesale discount rates." (Paragraph 909) Sections 605
173 through 611 of Part 51 of the FCC Rules set forth the FCC's methodology. These Rules
174 are attached as Appendix I to this testimony.

175 Beyond the minimum criteria, the FCC allows states "... broad latitude in selecting
176 costing methodologies that comport with their own ratemaking practices for retail
177 services." (Paragraph 910) As noted above, however, states are allowed to select interim
178 "default" rates from within a range prescribed by the FCC if an avoided cost study is not
179 available or is found to be flawed in some respect. (See FCC Rules Section 51.611.)

180 **A. *Avoided Retail Costs***

181 **Q. *SHOULD WHOLESALE RATES INCLUDE ILEC RETAILING COSTS?***

182 A. No. Retail competition will provide consumer benefits only if ILECs are not allowed to
183 charge excessive wholesale service prices. In any market, resellers or retailers require a
margin between the retail price and the wholesale price sufficient to allow recovery of
their expenses, including a reasonable profit. The FCC points out that:

184 There has been considerable debate on the record in this proceeding and
185 before the state commissions on whether section 252(d)(3) embodies an

⁶ Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, *First Report and Order*, 11 FCC Rcd 15499 (1996) (*Local Competition Order*).

184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065

214 that marketing and sales costs are avoided because that's the essence of retail (as opposed
215 to wholesale) operations. It also is important to recognize that the courts have not
216 disagreed with the categories of costs identified by the FCC in its orders. Consequently,
217 any cost study must account for all of those categories of avoided costs.

218 ***B. Services Available for Resale***

219
220 **Q. WHICH SERVICES SHOULD BE OFFERED AT THE WHOLESALE**
221 **DISCOUNT PRICE?**

222 A. All of the telecommunications services offered to end-users must be made available to
223 resellers at the wholesale discount. This includes optional calling plans, grandfathered
224 services, promotions and contract services. This also includes government and state
225 agency contracts as well as any "umbrella" contract that allows other entities to
226 participate and obtain the benefits of a master contract. All ILEC retail services are at
227 least partial substitutes for one another.⁷ Therefore, absent this requirement, ILECs will
228 be able to discriminate against resellers by making offers to customers that their retail
229 competitors are unable to match.

230 Ancillary services must also be made available for resale. This includes custom
231 calling services, CLASS features, and all Centrex features.⁸ While some of these features
232 may not be regulated, depending on the state jurisdiction or the jurisdictional nature of the
233 service, they are all telecommunications services. If some features are not discounted, the

⁷ The FCC Rules permit states to restrict "cross-class" selling. See Section 51.613(a)(1).

⁸ These services are marketed by different names in different telephone company service areas.

234 ILECs' resale competitors effectively will be denied the opportunity to market to a
235 significant group of customers because the lack of a discount on these features will
236 reduce reseller margins to inadequate levels.

237 **Q. DOES THE FCC PROHIBIT SERVICE-SPECIFIC DISCOUNTS?**

238 A. No. The FCC Rules do not rule out service-specific discounts, but requiring the ILEC to
239 provide such detailed information on a service-by-service basis would be an
240 administrative burden for the ILECs and the responsible federal and state regulatory
241 agencies. Moreover, the result would be highly debatable service-by-service discount
242 levels.

243 **Q. SERVICES FREQUENTLY CONTAIN MANY RATE ELEMENTS. DO YOU
244 RECOMMEND USING THE UNIFORM DISCOUNT FOR ALL RATE
245 ELEMENTS OF A PARTICULAR SERVICE?**

246 A. Yes. The discount should apply to each rate element. Any other basis provides
247 opportunities for abuse. For example, applying the discount on revenue per minute for a
248 service may penalize resellers whose sales by rate element are weighted differently than
249 those of the ILEC or other resellers.

250 **Q. HAVE ANY STATE COMMISSIONS ADDRESSED THE RESALE AND
251 WHOLESALE PRICING ISSUES?**

252 A. Yes. Many state commissions have already addressed the need for identifying services
253 available for resale and the need for unrestricted resale. Several of the initial decisions
254 were described in the FCC's *Local Competition Order*. (See Paragraphs. 898-906.)

The FCC's Rules also require promotions to be offered at a discount in certain circumstances. (See Section 51.613(a)(2).) Granting exceptions to the requirement that all services be made available at wholesale discounts may lead to abuse. States should be alert to this possibility and be prepared to take corrective action against ILECs that abuse the exceptions.

C. *Quality and Conditions for Resold Services*

Q. PLEASE DISCUSS SERVICE QUALITY AND THE NEED FOR WHOLESALE-RESELLER INTERFACES.

A. The FCC has ruled that ILECs must provide resale services to competitors under the same terms and conditions it enjoys itself. For instance, 51.603 states as follows:

51.603 Resale obligation of all local exchange carriers.

(a) A LEC shall make its telecommunications services available for resale to requesting telecommunications carriers on terms and conditions that are reasonable and non-discriminatory.

(b) A LEC must provide services to requesting telecommunications carriers for resale that are equal in quality, subject to the same conditions, and provided within the same provisioning time intervals that the LEC provides these services to others, including end users.

It is unknown at this time whether there will be any "service related" problems once Midcontinent begins to resell NDTC's services. While this hearing is limited to the pricing issues, the Commission should be aware that service provisioning issues may also become an issue once Midcontinent begins to offer services in Devils Lake.

281 **D. Calculating Avoided Costs and the Avoided Cost Discount**

282 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE FCC'S CRITERIA FOR SETTING WHOLESALE**
283 **PRICES.**

285 A. The FCC's *Local Competition Order* establishes minimum criteria for the avoided cost
286 methodology. Essentially, the costs in certain FCC Part 32 Uniform System of Accounts
287 (USOA) accounts are identified as directly avoided while costs in other accounts are
288 treated as indirectly avoided.⁹ The avoided indirect costs are calculated by determining
289 the ratio of directly avoided costs to total costs and then applying that proportion to the
290 accounts containing indirectly avoided costs. The ILEC should use account data from the
291 most recent year for the calculation of the discount. The data are immediately verifiable.

292 **Q. WHICH USOA ACCOUNTS INCLUDE COSTS THAT ARE DIRECTLY**
293 **AVOIDED?**

294 A. The following specific accounts from the USOA are *directly* avoided (see Code of
295 Federal Regulations, Title 47, Telecommunication, Part 32):

296 **Account 6611:** Product management and sales - This account includes
297 costs incurred in performing administrative activities related to marketing
298 products and services. This includes competitive analysis, product and
299 service identification and specification, test market planning, demand
300 forecasting, product life cycle analysis, pricing analysis, and identification
301 and establishment of distribution channels. This account also includes the
302 costs of selling products and services – this includes determination of
303 individual customer needs, development and presentation of customer
304 proposals, sales order preparation and handling, and preparation of sales
305 records. This account is one of the ILECs' marketing costs, which are

⁹ The FCC rules indicate that all costs that can be reasonably avoided should be identified. As described above, it is Midcontinent's position that the Commission should identify costs that are expected to be avoided.

306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343

expressly listed as avoided by the 1996 Act. Product management is a function specifically tied to determining the market demand for retail sales, which the ILEC will offer in competition with the purchaser of wholesale services. Purchasers of wholesale service from the ILECs should not be required to subsidize the ILECs' costs of competing with them.¹⁰

Account 6613: Product advertising - This account includes costs incurred in developing and implementing promotional strategies to stimulate the purchase of products and services, but excludes non-product-related advertising, such as corporate image, stock and bond issue and employment advertisement, which are included in the appropriate functional accounts. This is another of the Marketing expenses specifically excluded by the 1996 Act. As in the case of Sales and Product Management costs, Product Advertising is a function that is required to make retail sales, and is therefore avoided if the ILEC sells a wholesale service.

Account 6621: Call completion services - This account includes costs incurred in helping customers place and complete calls, except directory assistance. This includes handling and recording, intercept, quoting rates, time and charges; and all other activities involved in the manual handling of calls. These expenses are incurred to serve the retail customers of the ILEC. Competing ILECs will either provide this service themselves or contract for it separately with the ILEC or some other service provider. In either case, the costs recorded in this account should not be bundled into the wholesale rate.

Account 6622: Number services - This account includes costs incurred in providing customer number and classified listings. This includes preparing or purchasing, compiling, and disseminating those listings through directory assistance or other means. As with Account 6621, a purchaser of the ILECs' wholesale services will either purchase this separately from the ILEC or some other provider, or provide this service itself. In either case, the costs recorded in this account should not be bundled into the wholesale rate.

Account 6623: Customer services -

¹⁰ In the *Local Competition Order* the FCC referred to Accounts 6611 (product management) and 6612 (sales) as presumed to be avoided direct costs. Since that order was released, however, Account 6612 has been merged into the new Account 6611(product management and sales).

344 (a) This account includes costs incurred in establishing and
345 servicing customer accounts. This includes:

346 (1) Initiating customer service orders and records;
347 (2) Maintaining and billing customer accounts;
348 (3) Collecting and investigating customer accounts,
349 including collecting revenues, reporting receipts,
350 administering collection treatment, and handling
351 contacts with customers regarding adjustments of
352 bills;
353 (4) Collecting and reporting pay station receipts; and
354 (5) Instructing customers in the use of products and
355 services.

356 b) This account also includes amounts paid by interexchange
357 carriers or other exchange carriers to another exchange
358 carrier for billing and collection services.

360 **Q. WHICH USOA ACCOUNTS INCLUDE COSTS THAT ARE INDIRECTLY
361 AVOIDED IN THE WHOLESALE-RESELLER ARRANGEMENT?**

363 A. Within the USOA there are a number of expense accounts that are either common costs
364 or general overhead. By definition overhead costs, such as marketing, support all other
365 functions, including those that are avoided. For example, the Human Resources
366 department incurs expenditures in the staffing of the marketing department. As
367 marketing expenses are avoided, so are the expenses incurred in supporting marketing.
368 Therefore, the portion of these expense items equal to the proportion of direct avoided
369 costs to total expense is excluded as an avoided cost.

370 The following USOA accounts include common costs or general overhead which
371 support marketing and customer service operations:

372 6120 - General Support (6121 Land and Building Expense; 6122 Furniture and
373 Artworks Expense; 6123 Office Equipment Expense; and 6124 General Purpose
374 Computers Expense)

375 6720 – General and Administrative

5300 – Uncollectible Revenues

Expenses in these accounts are, at least, partially avoidable.

Q. WILL THE ILECS INCUR ANY ADDITIONAL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE RESALE SERVICES?

- A. While the ILECs will avoid substantial costs when they provide wholesale services, they will incur a small amount of incremental expenses to service the accounts of the resellers. However, these costs will be quite small. ILECs are already set-up to perform the wholesaling function because they provide wholesale-like functions to interexchange carriers and Enhanced Service Providers. The incremental cost of providing these services to resellers of wholesale local exchange service should be minimal. The FCC addresses this issue by treating only 90 percent of the costs in certain of the directly avoided cost categories as avoided for purposes of setting default discounts. Specifically, the FCC determined that 90 percent of accounts 6610 (Marketing), and 6623 (Customer Service) would be avoided, while 100 percent of accounts 6621 (Call Completion) and 6622 (Number Services) would be avoided.¹¹

Q. HOW IS THE AVOIDED COST DISCOUNT DETERMINED ONCE AVOIDED OR REASONABLY AVOIDABLE COSTS ARE IDENTIFIED?

A. Total avoided retail costs are divided by total revenue subject to resale for the incumbent LEC. This requires identifying services that are subject to resale under the FCC's rules. As noted previously, 47 U.S.C. Section 251(c)(4)(A) requires an incumbent LEC to offer

¹¹ *Local Competition Order* at paragraph 928.

398 any carrier any telecommunications service that it offers on a retail basis to subscribers
399 that are not telecommunications carriers for resale at wholesale rates. This requirement
400 excludes services such as switched and special access, billing and collection and other
401 miscellaneous service that are not sold to retail customers. The resulting percentage is
402 applied to retail rates charged by the incumbent LEC to determine the wholesale price to
403 be paid by the CLEC for resold services.

404 **Q. ARE THERE ANY SPECIAL ISSUES THAT ARISE WHEN A CARRIER**
405 **OFFERS TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND NON-TELECOMMUNICATIONS**
406 **SERVICES?**

407 A. Yes. It is important to make sure that the carrier does not allocate marketing and other
408 direct costs that really are attributable to its telecommunications services to non-
409 telecommunications services like voice mail. If this kind of error is made, the resale
410 discount will be too low.

411 **Q. DOES DSL SERVICE RAISE ANY SPECIAL ISSUES?**

412 A. Yes. If NDTC is continuing to treat DSL as a telecommunications service under the
413 FCC's new broadband rules, then DSL-related costs must be included in the cost study,
414 and NDTC's DSL service would be subject to wholesale resale. This is particularly
415 important if NDTC shares resources between DSL and its traditional telephone services.

416 **Q. IF THERE IS A DISPUTE OVER THE ACCURACY OF THE NDTC AVOIDED**
417 **COST MODEL, WHAT AREAS OF THE MODEL WILL BE IN DISPUTE?**

418 A. Hopefully the model will be done according to FCC rules and the avoided cost

419 calculations will be reasonable. In the past, however, the dispute with ILECs in general
420 has been over the percent of costs in any particular account that is avoided or ought to be
421 avoided. These percentages impact the resulting wholesale discount. I would hope and
422 expect that directly avoided costs would not be controversial, but NDTA and
423 Midcontinent may have a disagreement on the percentage of avoided costs for the
424 indirectly avoided cost categories.

425 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

426 A. Yes, it does.

427



**Qualifications of Timothy J Gates
Exhibit ____ (TJG-1)**

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.

A. Prior to my current position with QSI Consulting, I was a Senior Executive Staff Member in MCI WorldCom's ("MCIW") National Public Policy Group. In this position, I was responsible for providing public policy expertise in key cases across the country and for managing external consultants for MCIW's state public policy organization. In certain situations, I also provided testimony in regulatory and legislative proceedings.

Prior to my position with MCIW in Denver, I was an Executive Staff Member II at MCI Telecommunications ("MCI") World Headquarters in Washington D.C.. In that position I managed economists, external consultants, and provided training and policy support for regional regulatory staffs. Prior to that position I was a Senior Manager in MCI's Regulatory Analysis Department, which provided support in state regulatory and legislative matters to the various operating regions of MCI. In that position I was given responsibility for assigning resources from our group for state regulatory proceedings throughout the United States. At the same time, I prepared and presented testimony on various telecommunications issues before state regulatory and legislative bodies. I was also responsible for managing federal tariff reviews and presenting MCI's position on regulatory matters to the Federal Communications Commission. Prior to my assignment in the Regulatory Analysis Department, I was the Senior Manager of Economic Analysis and Regulatory Policy in the Legal, Regulatory and Legislative Affairs Department for the Midwest Division of MCI. In that position I developed and promoted regulatory policy within what was then a five-state operating division of MCI. I promoted MCI policy positions through negotiations, testimony and participation in industry forums.

Prior to my positions in the Midwest, I was employed as Manager of Tariffs and Economic Analysis with MCI's West Division in Denver, Colorado. In that position I was responsible for managing the development and application of MCI's tariffs in the fifteen MCI West states. I was also responsible for managing regulatory dockets and for providing economic and financial expertise in the areas of discovery and issue analysis. Prior to joining the West Division, I was a Financial Analyst III and then a Senior Staff Specialist with MCI's Southwest Division in Austin, Texas. In those positions, I was responsible for the management of regulatory dockets and liaison with outside counsel. I was also responsible for discovery, issue analysis, and for the development of working relationships with consumer and business groups. Just prior to joining MCI, I was employed by the Texas Public Utility Commission as a Telephone Rate Analyst in the Engineering Division responsible for examining



telecommunications cost studies and rate structures.

I was employed as an Economic Analyst with the Public Utility Commissioner of Oregon from July, 1983 to December, 1984. In that position, I examined and analyzed cost studies and rate structures in telecommunications rate cases and investigations. I also testified in rate cases and in private and public hearings regarding telecommunications services. Before joining the Oregon Commissioner's Staff, I was employed by the Bonneville Power Administration (United States Department of Energy) as a Financial Analyst, where I made total regional electric use forecasts and automated the Average System Cost Review Methodology. Prior to joining the Bonneville Power Administration, I held numerous positions of increasing responsibility in areas of forest management for both public and private forestry concerns.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS.

A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree from Oregon State University and a Master of Management degree in Finance and Quantitative Methods from Willamette University's Atkinson Graduate School of Management. I have also attended numerous courses and seminars specific to the telecommunications industry, including the NARUC Annual and Advanced Regulatory Studies Program.

Q. WHAT ARE YOUR CURRENT RESPONSIBILITIES?

A. Effective April 1, 2000, I joined QSI Consulting as Senior Vice President and Partner. In this position I provide analysis and testimony for QSI's many clients. The deliverables include written and oral testimony, analysis of rates, cost studies and policy positions, position papers, presentations on industry issues and training.

Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE JURISDICTIONS IN WHICH YOU HAVE TESTIFIED.

A. I have filed testimony or comments on telecommunications issues in the following 44 states: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming and Puerto Rico. I have also filed comments with the FCC and made presentations to the Department of Justice.



I have testified or presented formal comments in the following proceedings and forums:

Alabama:

October 18, 2000; Docket No. 27867; Adelphia Business Solutions Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

January 31, 2001; Docket No. 27867; Adelphia Business Solutions Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

Arkansas:

September 7, 2004; Docket No. 04-0999-U; In the Matter of Level 3 Petition for Arbitration with Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. D/B/A SBC Arkansas; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

Arizona:

September 23, 1987; Arizona Corporation Commission Workshop on Special Access Services; Comments on Behalf of MCI.

August 21, 1996; Affidavit in Opposition to USWC Motion for Partial Summary Judgment; No. CV 95-14284, No. CV-96-03355, No. CV-96-03356, (consolidated); On Behalf of MCI.

October 24, 1997; Comments to the Universal Service Fund Working Group; Docket No. R-0000-97-137; On Behalf of MCI.

May 8, 1998; Comments to the Universal Service Fund Working Group; Docket No. R-0000-97-137; On Behalf of MCI.

November 9, 1998; Docket No. T-03175A-97-0251; Application of MCImetro Access Transmission Services, Inc. to Expand Its CCN to Provide IntraLATA Services and to Determine that Its IntraLATA Services are Competitive; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI WorldCom, Inc.

September 20, 1999; Docket No. T-00000B-97-238; USWC OSS Workshop; Comments on Behalf of MCI WorldCom, Inc.

January 8, 2001; Docket Nos. T-03654A-00-0882, T-01051B-00-0882; Petition of Level 3 Communications, LLC, for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.



February 20, 2001; Superior Court of Arizona; Count of Maricopa; ESI Ergonomic Solutions, LLC, Plaintiff, vs. United Artists Theatre Circuit; No. CV 99-20649; Affidavit on Behalf of United Artists Theatre Circuit.

September 2, 2001; Docket No. T-00000A-00-0194 Phase II – A; Investigation into Qwest's Compliance with Wholesale Pricing Requirements for Unbundled Network Elements and Resale Discounts; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc.

January 9, 2004; Docket No. T-00000A-03-0369; In the Matter of ILEC Unbundling Obligations as a Result of the Federal Triennial Review Order; Direct Testimony on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc. (MCI).

November 18, 2004; Docket No. T-01051B-0454; In the Matter of Qwest Corporation's Amended Renewed Price Regulation Plan; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Time Warner Telecom, Inc.

July 15, 2005; Docket No. T-03654-05-0350, T-01051B-05-0350; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation, Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

August 15, 2005; Docket No. T-03654-05-0350, T-01051B-05-0350; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation, Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

Arkansas:

September 7, 2004; Docket No. 04-099-U; In the Matter of Level 3 Petition for Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252(b) with Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. D/B/A SBC Arkansas; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC.

California:

August 30, 1996; Application No. 96-08-068; MCI Petition for Arbitration with Pacific Bell; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 10, 1996; Application No. 96-09-012; MCI Petition for Arbitration with GTE California, Inc.; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.



June 5, 2000; Docket No. A0004037; Petition of Level 3 Communications for Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement with Pacific Bell Telephone Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC.

June 1, 2004; Docket No. A.04-06-004; Petition of Level 3 Communications for Arbitration with SBC; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3 Communications LLC.

Colorado:

December 1, 1986; Investigation and Suspension Docket No. 1720; Rate Case of Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

October 26, 1988; Investigation and Suspension Docket No. 1766; Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Company's Local Calling Access Plan; Direct Testimony of Behalf of MCI.

September 6, 1996; MCImetro Petition for Arbitration with U S WEST Communications, Inc.; Docket No. 96A-366T (consolidated); Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 17, 1996; MCImetro Petition for Arbitration with U S WEST Communications, Inc.; Docket No. 96A-366T (consolidated); Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 26, 1996; Application of U S WEST Communications, Inc. To Modify Its Rate and Service Regulation Plan; Docket No. Docket No. 90A-665T (consolidated); Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

October 7, 1996; Application of U S WEST Communications, Inc. To Modify Its Rate and Service Regulation Plan; Docket No. Docket No. 90A-665T (consolidated); Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

July 18, 1997; Complaint of MCI to Reduce USWC Access Charges to Economic Cost; Docket Nos. 97K-237T, 97F-175T (consolidated) and 97F-212T (consolidated); Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

August 15, 1997; Complaint of MCI to Reduce USWC Access Charges to Economic Cost; Docket Nos. 97K-237T, 97F-175T (consolidated) and 97F-212T (consolidated); Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.



March 10, 1998; Application of WorldCom, Inc. for Approval to Transfer Control of MCI to WorldCom, Inc.; Docket No. 97A-494T; Supplemental Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

March 26, 1998; Application of WorldCom, Inc. for Approval to Transfer Control of MCI to WorldCom, Inc.; Docket No. 97A-494T; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

May 8, 1998; Application of WorldCom, Inc. for Approval to Transfer Control of MCI to WorldCom, Inc.; Docket No. 97A-494T; Affidavit in Response to GTE.

November 4, 1998; Proposed Amendments to the Rules Prescribing IntraLATA Equal Access; Docket No. 98R-426T; Comments to the Commission on Behalf of MCI WorldCom and AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc.

May 13, 1999; Proposed Amendments to the Rules on Local Calling Area Standards; Docket No. 99R-128T; Oral Comments before the Commissioners on Behalf of MCIW.

January 4, 2001; Petition of Level 3 Communications, LLC for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Docket No. 00B-601T; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

January 16, 2001; Petition of Level 3 Communications, LLC for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Docket No. 00B-601T; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

January 29, 2001; Qwest Corporation, Inc., Plaintiff, v. IP Telephony, Inc., Defendant. District Court, City and County of Denver, State of Colorado; Case No. 99CV8252; Direct Testimony on Behalf of IP Telephony.

June 27, 2001; US WEST Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions; Docket No. 991-577T; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Covad Communications Company, Rhythms Links, Inc., and New Edge Networks, Inc.

January 26, 2004; Regarding the Unbundling Obligations of ILECs Pursuant to the Triennial Review Order; Docket No. 03I-478T; Direct Testimony on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc. (MCI).

February 18, 2005; Regarding Application of Qwest for Reclassification and Deregulation of Certain Products and Services; Docket No. 04A-411T; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Time Warner Telecom.

July 11, 2005; Petition of Level 3 Communications, LLC for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Docket No. 05B-210T; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.



December 19, 2005; Petition of Level 3 Communications, LLC for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Docket No. 05B-210T; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

Connecticut:

November 2, 2004; Petition of Level 3 Communications, LLC for Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252(b) with Southern New England Telephone Company d/b/a/ SBC Connecticut; Level 3/SNET Arbitration; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC.

Delaware:

February 12, 1993; Diamond State Telephone Company's Application for a Rate Increase; Docket No. 92-47; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

Florida:

July 1, 1994; Investigation into IntralATA Presubscription; Docket No. 930330-TP; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

October 5, 2000; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with BellSouth; Docket No. 000907-TP; Direct Testimony On Behalf of Level 3.

October 13, 2000; Petition of BellSouth for Arbitration with US LEC of Florida Inc.; Docket No. 000084-TP; Direct Testimony On Behalf of US LEC.

October 27, 2000; Petition of BellSouth for Arbitration with US LEC of Florida Inc.; Docket No. 000084-TP; Rebuttal Testimony On Behalf of US LEC.

November 1, 2000; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with BellSouth; Docket No. 000907-TP; Rebuttal Testimony On Behalf of Level 3.

June 11, 2004; Petition of KMC Telecom for Arbitration with Sprint Communications; Docket No. 031047-TP; Direct Testimony on Behalf of KMC Telecom III, L.L.C, KMC Telecom V, Inc., and KMC Data, L.L.C.

July 9, 2004; Petition of KMC Telecom for Arbitration with Sprint Communications; Docket No. 031047-TP; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of KMC Telecom III, L.L.C, KMC Telecom V, Inc., and KMC Data, L.L.C.



December 19, 2005; Petition and complaint for suspension and cancellation of Transit Traffic Service Tariff No. FL2004-284 filed by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., by AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC.; Docket Nos. 050119-TP/050125-TP; Direct Testimony on Behalf of CompSouth.

January 30, 2005; Petition and complaint for suspension and cancellation of Transit Traffic Service Tariff No. FL2004-284 filed by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., by AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC.; Docket Nos. 050119-TP/050125-TP; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of CompSouth.

Georgia:

December 6, 2000; Docket No. 12645-U; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with BellSouth; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

December 20, 2000; Docket No. 12645-U; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with BellSouth; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

Idaho:

November 20, 1987; Case No. U-1150-1; Petition of MCI for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

March 17, 1988; Case No. U-1500-177; Investigation of the Universal Local Access Service Tariff; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

April 26, 1988; Case No. U-1500-177; Investigation of the Universal Local Access Service Tariff; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 25, 2002; Case No. GNR-T-02-16; Petition of Potlatch, CenturyTel, the Idaho Telephone Association for Declaratory Order Prohibiting the Use of "Virtual" NXX Calling; Comments/Presentation on Behalf of Level 3, AT&T, WorldCom, and Time Warner Telecom.

August 12, 2005; Case No. QWE-T-05-11; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

September 16, 2005; Case No. QWE-T-05-11; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.



Illinois:

January 16, 1989; Docket No. 83-0142; Appropriate Methodology for Intrastate Access Charges; Rebuttal Testimony Regarding Toll Access Denial on Behalf of MCI.

February 16, 1989; Docket No. 83-0142; Appropriate Methodology for Intrastate Access Charges; Testimony Regarding ICTC's Access Charge Proposal on Behalf of MCI.

May 3, 1989; Docket No. 89-0033; Illinois Bell Telephone Company's Rate Restructuring; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

July 14, 1989; Docket No. 89-0033; Illinois Bell Telephone Company's Rate Restructuring; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 22, 1989; Docket No. 88-0091; IntraMSA Dialing Arrangements; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

February 9, 1990; Docket No. 88-0091; IntraMSA Dialing Arrangements; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 19, 1990; Docket No. 83-0142; Industry presentation to the Commission re Docket No. 83-0142 and issues for next generic access docket; Comments re the Imputation Trial and Unitary Pricing/Building Blocks on Behalf of MCI.

July 29, 1991; Case No. 90-0425; Presentation to the Industry Regarding MCI's Position on Imputation.

November 18, 1993; Docket No. 93-0044; Complaint of MCI and LDDS re Illinois Bell Additional Aggregated Discount and Growth Incentive Discount Services; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI and LDDS.

January 10, 1994; Docket No. 93-0044; Complaint of MCI and LDDS re Illinois Bell Additional Aggregated Discount and Growth Incentive Discount Services; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI and LDDS.

May 30, 2000; Docket No. 00-0332; Level 3 Petition for Arbitration to Establish and Interconnection Agreement with Illinois Bell Telephone Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.



July 11, 2000; Docket No. 00-0332; Level 3 Petition for Arbitration to Establish and Interconnection Agreement with Illinois Bell Telephone Company; Supplemental Verified Statement on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

June 22, 2004; Docket No. 04-0428; Level 3 Petition for Arbitration to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with Illinois Bell Telephone Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

September 3, 2004; Docket No. 04-0428; Level 3 Petition for Arbitration to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with Illinois Bell Telephone Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

Indiana:

October 28, 1988; Cause No. 38561; Deregulation of Customer Specific Offerings of Indiana Telephone Companies; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

December 16, 1988; Cause No. 38561; Deregulation of Customer Specific Offerings of Indiana Telephone Companies; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI Regarding GTE.

April 14, 1989; Cause No. 38561; Deregulation of Customer Specific Offerings of Indiana Telephone Companies; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI Regarding Staff Reports.

June 21, 1989; Cause No. 37905; Intrastate Access Tariffs -- Parity with Federal Rates; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

June 29, 1989; Cause No. 38560; Reseller Complaint Regarding 1+ IntraLATA Calling; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

October 25, 1990; Cause No. 39032; MCI Request for IntraLATA Authority; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

April 4, 1991; Rebuttal Testimony in Cause No. 39032 re MCI's Request for IntraLATA Authority on Behalf of MCI.

September 2, 2004; Cause No. 42663-INT-01; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with SBC Indiana; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC.

October 5, 2004; Cause No. 42663-INT-01; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with SBC Indiana; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC.



Iowa:
September 1, 1988; Docket No. RPU 88_6; IntraLATA Competition in Iowa; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 20, 1988; Docket No. RPU_88_1; Regarding the Access Charges of Northwestern Bell Telephone Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 25, 1991; Docket No. RPU-91-4; Investigation of the Earnings of U S WEST Communications, Inc.; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

October 3, 1991; Docket No. NOI-90-1; Presentation on Imputation of Access Charges and the Other Costs of Providing Toll Services; On Behalf of MCI.

November 5, 1991; Docket No. RPU-91-4; Investigation of the Earnings of U S WEST Communications, Inc.; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

December 23, 1991; Docket No. RPU-91-4; Investigation of the Earnings of US WEST Communications; Inc.; Supplemental Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

January 10, 1992; Docket No. RPU-91-4; Investigation of the Earnings of U S WEST Communications, Inc.; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

January 20, 1992; Docket No. RPU-91-4; Investigation of the Earnings of U S WEST Communications, Inc.; Surrebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

June 8, 1999; Docket NOI-99-1; Universal Service Workshop; Participated on numerous panels during two day workshop; Comments on Behalf of MCIW.

October 27, 1999; Docket NOI-99-1; Universal Service Workshop; Responded to questions posed by the Staff of the Board during one day workshop; Comments on Behalf of MCIW and AT&T.

November 14, 2003; Docket Nos. INU-03-4, WRU-03-61; In Re: Qwest Corporation; Sworn Statement of Position on Behalf of MCI.

December 15, 2003; Docket Nos. INU-03-4, WRU-03-61; In Re: Qwest Corporation; Sworn Counter Statement of Position on Behalf of MCI.

July 20, 2005; Docket No. ARB-05-4; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.



August 12, 2005; Docket No. ARB-05-4; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

August 24, 2005; Docket No. ARB-05-4; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest; Surrebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

Kansas:

June 10, 1992; Docket No. 181,097-U; General Investigation into IntraLATA Competition within the State of Kansas; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 16, 1992; Docket No. 181,097-U; General Investigation into IntraLATA Competition within the State of Kansas; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

August 31, 2004; Docket No. 04-L3CT-1046-ARB; In the Matter of Arbitration Between Level 3 Communications LLC and SBC Communications; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC.

Kentucky:

May 20, 1993; Administrative Case No. 323, Phase I; An Inquiry into IntraLATA Toll Competition, an Appropriate Compensation Scheme for Completion of IntraLATA Calls by Interexchange Carriers, and WATS Jurisdictionality; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

December 21, 2000; Case No. 2000-404; Petition of Level 3 Communications, LLC for Arbitration with BellSouth; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

January 12, 2001; Case No. 2000-477; Petition of Adelphia Business Solutions for Arbitration with BellSouth; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

Louisiana:

December 28, 2000; Docket No. U-25301; Petition of Adelphia Business Solutions for Arbitration with BellSouth; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

January 5, 2001; Docket No. U-25301; Petition of Adelphia Business Solutions for Arbitration with BellSouth; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.



Maryland:

November 12, 1993; Case No. 8585; Competitive Safeguards Required re C&P's Centrex Extend Service; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

January 14, 1994; Case No. 8585; Competitive Safeguards Required re C&P's Centrex Extend Service; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

May 19, 1994; Case No. 8585; Re Bell Atlantic Maryland, Inc.'s Transmittal No. 878; Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

June 2, 1994; Case No. 8585; Competitive Safeguards Required re C&P's Centrex Extend Service; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 5, 2001; Case No. 8879; Rates for Unbundled Network Elements Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Staff of the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

October 15, 2001; Case No. 8879; Rates for Unbundled Network Elements Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Staff of the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

Massachusetts:

April 22, 1993; D.P.U. 93-45; New England Telephone Implementation of Interchangeable NPAs; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

May 10, 1993; D.P.U. 93-45; New England Telephone Implementation of Interchangeable NPAs; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

Michigan:

September 29, 1988; Case Nos. U_9004, U_9006, U_9007 (Consolidated); Industry Framework for IntraLATA Toll Competition; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 30, 1988; Case Nos. U_9004, U_9006, U_9007 (Consolidated); Industry Framework for IntraLATA Toll Competition; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

June 30, 1989; Case No. U-8987; Michigan Bell Telephone Company Incentive Regulation Plan; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.



July 31, 1992; Case No. U-10138; MCI v Michigan Bell and GTE re IntraLATA Equal Access; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 17, 1992; Case No. U-10138; MCI v Michigan Bell and GTE re IntraLATA Equal Access; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

July 22, 1993; Case No. U-10138 (Reopener); MCI v Michigan Bell and GTE re IntraLATA Equal Access; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

February 16, 2000; Case No. U-12321; AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. Complainant v. GTE North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a GTE Systems of Michigan; Direct Testimony on Behalf of AT&T. (Adopted Testimony of Michael Starkey)

May 11, 2000; Case No. U-12321; AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. Complainant v. GTE North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a GTE Systems of Michigan; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of AT&T.

June 8, 2000; Case No. U-12460; Petition of Level 3 Communications for Arbitration to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with Ameritech Michigan; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

September 27, 2000; Case No. U-12528; In the Matter of the Implementation of the Local Calling Area Provisions of the MTA; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Focal Communications, Inc.

June 1, 2004; Case No. U-14152; Petition of Level 3 Communications LLC for Arbitration with SBC Michigan; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC.

Minnesota:

January 30, 1987; Docket No. P_421/CI_86_88; Summary Investigation into Alternative Methods for Recovery of Non-traffic Sensitive Costs; Comments to the Commission on Behalf of MCI.

September 7, 1993; Docket No. P-999/CI-85-582, P-999/CI-87-697 and P-999/CI-87-695, In the Matter of an Investigation into IntraLATA Equal Access and Presubscription; Comments of MCI on the Report of the Equal Access and Presubscription Study Committee on Behalf of MCI.

September 20, 1996; Petition for Arbitration with U S WEST Communications, Inc.; Docket No. P-442, 421/M-96-855; P-5321, 421/M-96-909; and P-3167, 421/M-96-729 (consolidated); Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.



September 30, 1996; Petition for Arbitration with U S WEST Communications, Inc.; Docket No. P-442, 421/M-96-855; P-5321, 421/M-96-909; and P-3167, 421/M-96-729 (consolidated); Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 14-16, 1999; USWC OSS Workshop; Comments on Behalf of MCI WorldCom, Inc. re OSS Issues.

September 28, 1999; Docket No. P-999/R-97-609; Universal Service Group; Comments on Behalf of MCI WorldCom, Inc. and AT&T Communications.

April 18, 2002; Commission Investigation of Qwest's Pricing of Certain Unbundled Network Elements; Docket Nos. P-442, 421, 3012/M-01-1916; P-421/C1-01-1375; OAH Docket No. 12-2500-14490; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of McLeod USA Telecommunications Services, Inc., Eschelon Telecom of Minnesota, Inc., US Link, Inc., Northstar Access, LLC, Otter Tail Telecomm LLC, VAL-Ed Joint Venture, LLP, dba 702 Communications.

January 23, 2004; In the Matter of the Commission Investigation into ILEC Unbundling Obligations as a Result of the Federal Triennial Review Order; Docket No.: P-999/CI-03-961; Direct Testimony on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc. (MCI).

Mississippi:

February 2, 2001; Docket No. 2000-AD-846; Petition of Adelphia Business Solutions for Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

February 16, 2001; Docket No. 2000-AD-846; Petition of Adelphia Business Solutions for Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

Montana:

May 1, 1987; Docket No. 86.12.67; Rate Case of AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc.; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 12, 1988; Docket No. 88.1.2; Rate Case of Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

May 12, 1998; Docket No. D97.10.191; Application of WorldCom, Inc. for Approval to Transfer Control of MCI Communications Corporation to WorldCom, Inc.; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.



June 1, 1998; Docket No. D97.10.191; Application of WorldCom, Inc. for Approval to Transfer Control of MCI Communications Corporation to WorldCom, Inc.; Amended Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

Nebraska:

November 6, 1986; Application No. C_627; Nebraska Telephone Association Access Charge Proceeding; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

March 31, 1988; Application No. C_749; Application of United Telephone Long Distance Company of the Midwest for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

New Hampshire:

April 30, 1993; Docket DE 93-003; Investigation into New England Telephone's Proposal to Implement Seven Digit Dialing for Intrastate Toll Calls; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

January 12, 2001; Docket No. DT 00-223; Investigation Into Whether Certain Calls are Local; Direct Testimony on Behalf of BayRing Communications.

April 5, 2002; Docket No. DT 00-223; Investigation Into Whether Certain Calls are Local; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of BayRing Communications.

New Jersey:

September 15, 1993; Docket No. TX93060259; Notice of Pre-Proposal re IntraLATA Competition; Comments in Response to the Board of Regulatory Commissioners on Behalf of MCI.

October 1, 1993; Docket No. TX93060259; Notice of Pre-Proposal re IntraLATA Competition; Reply Comments in Response to the Board of Regulatory Commissioners on Behalf of MCI.

April 7, 1994; Docket Nos. TX90050349, TE92111047, and TE93060211; Petitions of MCI, Sprint and AT&T for Authorization of IntraLATA Competition and Elimination of Compensation; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

April 25, 1994; Docket Nos. TX90050349, TE92111047, and TE93060211; Petitions of MCI, Sprint and AT&T for Authorization of IntraLATA Competition and Elimination of Compensation; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.



New Mexico:

September 28, 1987; Docket No. 87_61_TC; Application of MCI for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

August 30, 1996; Docket No. 95-572-TC; Petition of AT&T for IntraLATA Equal Access; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 16, 2002; Utility Case No. 3495, Phase B; Consideration of Costing and Pricing Rules for OSS, Collocation, Shared Transport, Nonrecurring Charges, Spot Frames, Combination of Network Elements and Switching; Direct Testimony on Behalf of the Staff of the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission.

February 9, 2004; Case Nos. 03-00403-UT and 03-00404-UT; Triennial Review Proceedings (Batch Hot Cut and Local Circuit Switching); Testimony on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc. (MCI).

May 11, 2004; Case No. 00108-UT; Regarding Unfiled Agreements between Qwest Corporation and Competitive Local Exchange Carriers; Testimony on Behalf of Time Warner Telecom

September 14, 2005; Case No. 05-00211-UT; In the Matter of a Notice of Inquiry to Develop a Rule to Implement House Bill 776, Relating to Access Charge Reform, Oral Comments on Behalf of MCI.

December 5, 2005; Case No. 05-00094-UT; In the Matter of the Implementation and Enforcement of Qwest Corporations' Amended Alternative Form of Regulation; Direct Testimony on Behalf of the New Mexico Attorney General.

December 15, 2005; Case No. 05-00484-UT; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC's Petition for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

February 24, 2006; Case No. 05-00466-UT; In the Matter of the Development of an Alternative Form of Regulation for Qwest Corporation; Direct Testimony on Behalf of the New Mexico Attorney General.

March 31, 2006; Case No. 05-00466-UT; In the Matter of the Development of an Alternative Form of Regulation for Qwest Corporation; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of the New Mexico Attorney General.



New York:

April 30, 1992; Case 28425; Comments of MCI Telecommunications Corporation on IntraLATA Presubscription.

June 8, 1992; Case 28425; Reply Comments of MCI Telecommunications Corporation on IntraLATA Presubscription.

North Carolina:

August 4, 2000; Docket No. P779 SUB4; Petition of Level (3) Communications, LLC for Arbitration with Bell South; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

September 18, 2000; Docket No. P779 SUB4; Petition of Level (3) Communications, LLC for Arbitration with Bell South; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

October 18, 2000; Docket No. P-886, SUB 1; Petition of Adelphia Business Solutions of North Carolina, LP for Arbitration with BellSouth; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

December 8, 2000; Docket No. P-886, SUB 1; Petition of Adelphia Business Solutions of North Carolina, LP for Arbitration with BellSouth; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

North Dakota:

June 24, 1991; Case No. PU-2320-90-183 (Implementation of SB 2320 -- Subsidy Investigation); Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

October 24, 1991; Case No. PU-2320-90-183 (Implementation of SB 2320 -- Subsidy Investigation); Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

December 4, 2002; Case No. PU-2065-02-465; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with SRT Communications Cooperative; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.



May 2, 2003; Case No. PU-2342-01-296; Qwest Corporation Price Investigation; Direct Testimony on Behalf of the CLEC Coalition (US Link, Inc., VAL-ED Joint Venture LLP d/b/a 702 Communications, McLeodUSA Telecommunications, Inc. and IdeaOne Telecom Group, LLC).

December 21, 2005; Case No. PU-05-451; Midcontinent Communications v. North Dakota Telephone Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Midcontinent.

January 16, 2006; Case No. PU-05-451; Midcontinent Communications v. North Dakota Telephone Company; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Midcontinent.

Ohio:

February 26, 2004; Case No. 04-35-TP-COI; In the Matter of the Implementation of the FCC's Triennial Review Regarding Local Circuit Switching in the Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company's Mass Market; Direct Testimony on Behalf of AT&T.

Oklahoma:

April 2, 1992; Cause No. 28713; Application of MCI for Additional CCN Authority to Provide IntraLATA Services; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

June 22, 1992; Cause No. 28713; Application of MCI for Additional CCN Authority to Provide IntraLATA Services; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

Oregon:

October 27, 1983; Docket No. UT 9; Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company Business Measured Service; Direct Testimony on Behalf of the Public Utility Commissioner of Oregon.

April 23, 1984; Docket No. UT 17; Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company Business Measured Service; Direct Testimony on Behalf of the Public Utility Commissioner of Oregon.

May 7, 1984; Docket No. UT 17; Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company Business Measured Service; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of the Public Utility Commissioner of Oregon.

October 31, 1986; Docket No. AR 154; Administrative Rules Relating to the Universal Service Protection Plan; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 6, 1996; Docket ARB3/ARB6; Petition of MCI for Arbitration with U S WEST Communications, Inc.; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.



October 11, 1996; Docket No. ARB 9; Interconnection Contract Negotiations Between MCI metro and GTE; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 5, 1996; Docket No. ARB 9; Interconnection Contract Negotiations Between MCI metro and GTE; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 6, 2002; Docket No. UM 1058; Investigation into the Use of Virtual NPA/NXX Calling Patterns; Comments/Presentation on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

August 12, 2005; Docket No. ARB 665; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

September 6, 2005; Docket No. ARB 665; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

Pennsylvania:

December 9, 1994; Docket No. I-00940034; Investigation Into IntraLATA Interconnection Arrangements (Presubscription); Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 5, 2002; Docket No. C-20028114; Level 3 Communications, LLC v. Marianna & Scenery Hill Telephone Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

Puerto Rico:

January 19, 2006; Case Nos. JRT-2005-Q-0121, JRT-2005-Q-0128, JRT-2003-Q-0297, JRT-2004-Q-0068; TELEFÓNICA LARGA DISTANCIA DE PUERTO RICO, INC., WORLDNET TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC., SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, LP, and AT&T OF PUERTO RICO, INC., v. PUERTO RICO TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC., Direct Testimony on Behalf of Centennial Puerto Rico License Corporation

Rhode Island:

April 30, 1993; Docket No. 2089; Dialing Pattern Proposal Made by the New England Telephone Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.



South Carolina:

October 2000; Docket No. 2000-0446-C; US LEC of South Carolina Inc. Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications; Direct Testimony on Behalf of US LEC.

November 22, 2000; Docket No. 2000-516-C; Adelphia Business Solutions of South Carolina, Inc. Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

December 14, 2000; Docket No. 2000-516-C; Adelphia Business Solutions of South Carolina, Inc. Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

South Dakota:

November 11, 1987; Docket No. F_3652_12; Application of Northwestern Bell Telephone Company to Introduce Its Contract Toll Plan; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

May 27, 2003; Docket No. TC03-057; Application of Qwest to Reclassify Local Exchange Services as Fully Competitive; Direct Testimony on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc., Black Hills FiberCom and Midcontinent Communications.

Tennessee:

January 31, 2001; Petition of Adelphia Business Solutions for Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

February 7, 2001; Petition of Adelphia Business Solutions for Arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Adelphia.

Texas:

June 5, 2000; PUC Docket No. 22441; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

June 12, 2000; PUC Docket No. 22441; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.



October 10, 2002; PUC Docket No. 26431; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with CenturyTel of Lake Dallas, Inc. and CenturyTel of San Marcos, Inc.; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

October 16, 2002; PUC Docket No. 26431; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with CenturyTel of Lake Dallas, Inc. and CenturyTel of San Marcos, Inc.; Reply Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

July 19, 2004; PUC Docket No. 28821; Arbitration of Non-costing Issues for Successor Interconnection Agreement to the Texas 271 Agreement; Direct Testimony on Behalf of KMC Telecom III, L.L.C, KMC Telecom V, Inc. (d/b/a KMC Network Services, Inc.), and KMC Data, L.L.C.

August 23, 2004; PUC Docket No. 28821; Arbitration of Non-costing Issues for Successor Interconnection Agreement to the Texas 271 Agreement; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of KMC Telecom III, L.L.C, KMC Telecom V, Inc. (d/b/a KMC Network Services, Inc.), and KMC Data, L.L.C.

Utah:

November 16, 1987; Case No. 87_049_05; Petition of the Mountain State Telephone and Telegraph Company for Exemption from Regulation of Various Transport Services; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

July 7, 1988; Case No. 83_999_11; Investigation of Access Charges for Intrastate InterLATA and IntraLATA Telephone Services; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 8, 1996; Docket No. 96-095-01; MCI metro Petition for Arbitration with USWC Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 22, 1996; Docket No. 96-095-01; MCI metro Petition for Arbitration with USWC Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 3, 1997; Docket No. 97-049-08; USWC Rate Case; Surrebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 29, 1997; Docket No. 97-049-08; USWC Rate Case; Revised Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

February 2, 2001; Docket No. 00-999-05; In the Matter of the Investigation of Inter-Carrier Compensation for Exchanged ESP Traffic; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLP.



January 13, 2004; Docket No. 03-999-04; In the Matter of a Proceeding to Address Actions Necessary to Respond to the FCC's Triennial Review Order; Direct Testimony on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc. (MCI).

Washington:

September 27, 1988; Docket No. U-88-2052-P; Petition of Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company for Classification of Services as Competitive; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

October 11, 1996; Docket No. UT-96-0338; Petition of MCImetro for Arbitration with GTE Northwest, Inc., Pursuant to 47 U.S.C.252; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 20, 1996; Docket No. UT-96-0338; Petition of MCImetro for Arbitration with GTE Northwest, Inc., Pursuant to 47 U.S.C.252; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

January 13, 1998; Docket No. UT-97-0325; Rulemaking Workshop re Access Charge Reform and the Cost of Universal Service; Comments and Presentation on Behalf of MCI.

December 21, 2001; Docket No. UT-003013, Part D; Continued Costing and Pricing of Unbundled Network Elements, Transport, and Termination; Direct Testimony on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc.

October 18, 2002; Docket No. UT-023043; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with CenturyTel of Washington, Inc.; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

November 1, 2002; Docket No. UT-023043; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with CenturyTel of Washington, Inc.; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

January 31, 2003; Docket No. UT-021569; Developing an Interpretive or Policy Statement relating to the Use of Virtual NPA/NXX Calling Patterns; Comments on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc. and KMC Telecom.

May 1, 2003; Docket No. UT-021569; Developing an Interpretive or Policy Statement relating to the Use of Virtual NPA/NXX Calling Patterns; Workshop Participation on Behalf of MCI, KMC Telecom, and Level (3) Communications, LLC.



August 13, 2003; Docket No. UT-030614; In the Matter of the Petition of Qwest Corporation for Competitive Classification of Basic Exchange Telecommunications Services; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI, Inc.

August 29, 2003; UT-030614; In the Matter of the Petition of Qwest Corporation for Competitive Classification of Basic Exchange Telecommunications Services; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI, Inc.

September 13, 2004; Docket No. UT-033011; In the Matter of Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, Petitioners, v. Advanced Telecom Group, Inc., et al, Respondents; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Time Warner Telecom of Washington, LLC.

West Virginia:

October 11, 1994; Case No. 94-0725-T-PC; Bell Atlantic - West Virginia Incentive Regulation Plan; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

June 18, 1998; Case No. 97-1338-T-PC; Petition of WorldCom, Inc. for Approval to Transfer Control of MCI Communications Corporation to WorldCom, Inc.; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

Wisconsin:

October 31, 1988; Docket No. 05_TR_102; Investigation of Intrastate Access Costs, Settlements, and IntraLATA Access Charges; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 14, 1988; Docket No. 05_TR_102; Investigation of Intrastate Access Costs, Settlements, and IntraLATA Access Charges; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

December 12, 1988; Docket No. 05_TI_116; In the Matter of Provision of Operator Services; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

March 6, 1989; Docket No. 6720_TI_102; Review of Financial Data Filed by Wisconsin Bell, Inc.; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

May 1, 1989; Docket No. 05_NC_100; Amendment of MCI's CCN for Authority to Provide IntraLATA Dedicated Access Services; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

May 11, 1989; Docket No. 6720_TR_103; Investigation Into the Financial Data and Regulation of Wisconsin Bell, Inc.; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.



July 5, 1989; Docket No. 05-TI-112; Disconnection of Local and Toll Services for Nonpayment -- Part A; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

July 5, 1989; Docket No. 05-TI-112; Examination of Industry Wide Billing and Collection Practices -- Part B; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

July 12, 1989; Docket No. 05-TI-112; Rebuttal Testimony in Parts A and B on Behalf of MCI.

October 9, 1989; Docket No. 6720-TI-102; Review of the WBI Rate Moratorium; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 17, 1989; Docket No. 6720-TI-102; Review of the WBI Rate Moratorium; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

December 1, 1989; Docket No. 05-TR-102; Investigation of Intrastate Access Costs, Settlements, and IntraLATA Access Charges; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

April 16, 1990; Docket No. 6720-TR-104; Wisconsin Bell Rate Case; Direct Testimony of Behalf of MCI.

October 1, 1990; Docket No. 2180-TR-102; GTE Rate Case and Request for Alternative Regulatory Plan; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

October 15, 1990; Docket No. 2180-TR-102; GTE Rate Case and Request for Alternative Regulatory Plan; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 15, 1990; Docket No. 05-TR-103; Investigation of Intrastate Access Costs and Intrastate Access Charges; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

April 3, 1992; Docket No. 05-NC-102; Petition of MCI for IntraLATA 10XXX 1+ Authority; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 30, 2002; Docket No. 05-MA-130; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with CenturyTel; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

October 9, 2002; Docket No. 05-MA-130; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with CenturyTel; Reply Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.

September 1, 2004; Docket No. 05-MA-135; Petition of Level 3 for Arbitration with Wisconsin Bell, Inc. d/b/a/ SBC Wisconsin; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level (3) Communications, LLC.



Wyoming:

June 17, 1987; Docket No. 9746 Sub 1; Application of MCI for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

May 19, 1997; Docket No. 72000-TC-97-99; In the Matter of Compliance with Federal Regulations of Payphones; Oral Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

September 8, 2005; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Direct Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

November 18, 2005; In the Matter of Level 3 Communications, LLC Petition for Arbitration with Qwest Corporation; Rebuttal Testimony on Behalf of Level 3.

Comments Submitted to the Federal Communications Commission and/or the Department of Justice

March 6, 1991; Ameritech Transmittal No. 518; Petition to Suspend and Investigate on Behalf of MCI re Proposed Rates for OPTINET 64 Kbps Service.

April 17, 1991; Ameritech Transmittal No. 526; Petition to Suspend and Investigate on Behalf of MCI re Proposed Flexible ANI Service.

August 30, 1991; Ameritech Transmittal No. 555; Petition to Suspend and Investigate on Behalf of MCI re Ameritech Directory Search Service.

September 30, 1991; Ameritech Transmittal No. 562; Petition to Suspend and Investigate on Behalf of MCI re Proposed Rates and Possible MFJ Violations Associated with Ameritech's OPTINET Reconfiguration Service (AORS).

October 15, 1991; CC Docket No. 91-215; Opposition to Direct Cases of Ameritech and United (Ameritech Transmittal No. 518; United Transmittal No. 273) on Behalf of MCI re the introduction of 64 Kbps Special Access Service.

November 27, 1991; Ameritech Transmittal No. 578; Petition to Suspend and Investigate on Behalf of MCI re Ameritech Directory Search Service.

September 4, 1992; Ameritech Transmittal No. 650; Petition to Suspend and Investigate on Behalf of MCI re Ameritech 64 Clear Channel Capability Service.

February 16, 1995; Presentation to FCC Staff on the Status of Intrastate Competition on Behalf of MCI.



November 9, 1999; Comments to FCC Staff of Common Carrier Bureau on the Status of OSS Testing in Arizona on Behalf of MCI WorldCom, Inc.

November 9, 1999; Comments to the Department of Justice (Task Force on Telecommunications) on the Status of OSS Testing in Arizona and the USWC Collaborative on Behalf of MCI WorldCom, Inc.

Presentations Before Legislative Bodies:

April 8, 1987; Minnesota; Senate File 677; Proposed Deregulation Legislation; Comments before the House Committee on Telecommunications.

October 30, 1989; Michigan; Presentation Before the Michigan House and Senate Staff Working Group on Telecommunications; "A First Look at Nebraska, Incentive Rates and Price Caps," Comments on Behalf of MCI.

May 16, 1990; Wisconsin; Comments Before the Wisconsin Assembly Utilities Committee Regarding the Wisconsin Bell Plan for Flexible Regulation, on Behalf of MCI.

March 20, 1991; Michigan; Presentation to the Michigan Senate Technology and Energy Committee re SB 124 on behalf of MCI.

May 15, 1991; Michigan; Presentation to the Michigan Senate Technology and Energy Commission and the House Public Utilities Committee re MCI's Building Blocks Proposal and SB 124/HB 4343.

March 8, 2000; Illinois; Presentation to the Environment & Energy Senate Committee re Emerging Technologies and Their Impact on Public Policy, on Behalf of MCI WorldCom, Inc.

February 19, 2004; Presentation to the Iowa Senate Committee Regarding House Study Bill 622/Senate Study Bill 3035; Comments on Behalf of MCI.

November 30, 2004; A Report to the Wyoming Legislature: The Wyoming Universal Service Fund – Basis and Qualification for Funding.

Presentations Before Industry Groups -- Seminars:

May 17, 1989; Wisconsin Public Utility Institute -- Telecommunications Utilities and Regulation; May 15-18, 1989; Panel Presentation -- Interexchange Service Pricing Practices Under Price Cap Regulation; Comments on Behalf of MCI.



July 24, 1989; National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners -- Summer Committee Meeting, San Francisco, California. Panel Presentation -- Specific IntraLATA Market Concerns of Interexchange Carriers; Comments on Behalf of MCI.

May 16, 1990; Wisconsin Public Utility Institute -- Telecommunications Utilities and Regulation; May 14-18, 1990; Presentation on Alternative Forms of Regulation.

October 29, 1990; Illinois Telecommunications Sunset Review Forum; Two Panel Presentations: Discussion of the Illinois Commerce Commission's Decision in Docket No. 88-0091 for the Technology Working Group; and, Discussion of the Treatment of Competitive Services for the Rate of Return Regulation Working Group; Comments on Behalf of MCI.

May 16, 1991; Wisconsin Public Utility Institute -- Telecommunications Utilities and Regulation Course; May 13-16, 1991; Participated in IntraLATA Toll Competition Debate on Behalf of MCI.

November 19, 1991; TeleStrategies Conference -- "Local Exchange Competition: The \$70 Billion Opportunity." Presentation as part of a panel on "IntraLATA 1+ Presubscription" on Behalf of MCI.

July 9, 1992; North Dakota Association of Telephone Cooperatives Summer Conference, July 8-10, 1992. Panel presentations on "Equal Access in North Dakota: Implementation of PSC Mandate" and "Open Network Access in North Dakota" on Behalf of MCI.

December 2-3, 1992; TeleStrategies Conference -- "IntraLATA Toll Competition - - A Multi-Billion Dollar Market Opportunity." Presentations on the interexchange carriers' position on intraLATA dialing parity and presubscription and on technical considerations on behalf of MCI.

March 14-17, 1993; NARUC Introductory Regulatory Training Program; Panel Presentation on Competition in Telecommunications on Behalf of MCI.

May 13-14, 1993; TeleStrategies Conference -- "IntraLATA Toll Competition -- Gaining the Competitive Edge"; Presentation on Carriers and IntraLATA Toll Competition on Behalf of MCI.

May 23-26, 1994; The 12th Annual National Telecommunications Forecasting Conference; Represented IXC's in Special Town Meeting Segment Regarding the Convergence of CATV and Telecommunications and other Local Competition Issues.



March 14-15, 1995; "The LEC-IXC Conference"; Sponsored by Telecommunications Reports and Telco Competition Report; Panel on Redefining the IntraLATA Service Market -- Toll Competition, Extended Area Calling and Local Resale.

August 28-30, 1995; "Phone+ Supershow '95"; Playing Fair: An Update on IntraLATA Equal Access; Panel Presentation.

August 29, 1995; "TDS Annual Regulatory Meeting"; Panel Presentation on Local Competition Issues.

December 13-14, 1995; "NECA/Century Access Conference"; Panel Presentation on Local Exchange Competition.

October 23, 1997; "Interpreting the FCC Rules of 1997"; The Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Southern California; Panel Presentation on Universal Service and Access Reform.

February 5-6, 2002; "Litigating Telecommunications Cost Cases and Other Sources of Enlightenment"; Educational Seminar for State Commission and Attorney General Employees on Litigating TELRIC Cases; Denver, Colorado.

February 19-20, 2003; Seminar for the New York State Department of Public Service entitled "Emerging Technologies and Convergence in the Telecommunications Network". Presented with Ken Wilson of Boulder Telecommunications Consultants, LLC.

July 25, 2003; National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Summer Committee Meetings; Participated in Panel regarding "Wireless Substitution of Wireline – Policy Implications."

December 8-9, 2005, CLE International 8th Annual Conference, "Telecommunications Law", "VoIP and Brand X – Legal and Regulatory Developments."

Appendix I -- FCC Resale Rules (47 C.F.R. Part 51)

Sec. 51.605 Additional obligations of incumbent local exchange carriers.

(a) An incumbent LEC shall offer to any requesting telecommunications carrier any telecommunications service that the incumbent LEC offers on a retail basis to subscribers that are not telecommunications carriers for resale at wholesale rates that are, at the election of the state commission--

- (1) Consistent with the avoided cost methodology described in Sec. Sec. 51.607 and 51.609; or
- (2) Interim wholesale rates, pursuant to Sec. 51.611.

(b) For purposes of this subpart, exchange access services, as defined in section 3 of the Act, shall not be considered to be telecommunications services that incumbent LECs must make available for resale at wholesale rates to requesting telecommunications carriers.

(c) For purposes of this subpart, advanced telecommunications services sold to Internet Service Providers as an input component to the Internet Service Providers' retail Internet service offering shall not be considered to be telecommunications services offered on a retail basis that incumbent LECs must make available for resale at wholesale rates to requesting telecommunications carriers.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraph (b) of this section, advanced telecommunications services that are classified as exchange access services are subject to the obligations of paragraph (a) of this section if such services are sold on a retail basis to residential and business end-users that are not telecommunications carriers.

(e) Except as provided in Sec. 51.613, an incumbent LEC shall not impose restrictions on the resale by a requesting carrier of telecommunications services offered by the incumbent LEC.

Sec. 51.607 Wholesale pricing standard.

The wholesale rate that an incumbent LEC may charge for a telecommunications service provided for resale to other telecommunications carriers shall equal the rate for the telecommunications service, less avoided retail costs, as described in section 51.609. For purposes of this subpart, exchange access services, as defined in section 3 of the Act, shall not be considered to be telecommunications services that incumbent LECs must make available for resale at wholesale rates to requesting telecommunications carriers.

Sec. 51.609 Determination of avoided retail costs.

(a) Except as provided in Sec. 51.611, the amount of avoided retail costs shall be determined on the basis of a cost study that complies with the requirements of this section.

(b) Avoided retail costs shall be those costs that reasonably can be avoided when an incumbent LEC provides a telecommunications service for resale at wholesale rates to a requesting carrier.

(c) For incumbent LECs that are designated as Class A companies under Sec. 32.11 of this chapter, except as provided in paragraph (d) of this section, avoided retail costs shall:

(1) Include as direct costs, the costs recorded in USOA accounts 6611 (product management and sales), 6613 (product advertising), 6621 (call completion services), 6622, (number services), and 6623 (customer services) (Sec. Sec. 32.6611, 32.6613, 32.6621, 32.6622, and 32.6623 of this chapter);

(2) Include, as indirect costs, a portion of the costs recorded in USOA accounts 6121-6124 (general support expenses), 6720 (corporate operations expenses), and uncollectible telecommunications revenue included in 5300 (uncollectible revenue) (Secs. 32.6121 through 32.6124, 32.6720 and 32.5300 of this chapter); and

(3) Not include plant-specific expenses and plant non-specific expenses, other than general support expenses (Sec. Sec. 32.6112-6114, 32.6211-6565 of this chapter).

(d) Costs included in accounts 6611, 6613 and 6621-6623 described in paragraph (c) of this section (Sec. Sec. 32.6611, 32.6613, and 32.6621-6623 of this chapter) may be included in wholesale rates only to the extent that the incumbent LEC proves to a state commission that specific costs in these accounts will be incurred and are not avoidable with respect to services sold at wholesale, or that specific costs in these accounts are not included in the retail prices of resold services. Costs included in accounts 6112-6114 and 6211-6565 described in paragraph (c) of this section (Sec. Sec. 32.6112-32.6114, 32.6211-32.6565 of this chapter) may be treated as avoided retail costs, and excluded from wholesale rates, only to the extent that a party proves to a state commission that specific costs in these accounts can reasonably be avoided when an incumbent LEC provides a telecommunications service for resale to a requesting carrier.

(e) For incumbent LECs that are designated as Class B companies under Sec. 32.11 of this chapter and that record information in summary accounts instead of specific USOA accounts, the entire relevant summary accounts may be used in lieu of the specific USOA accounts listed in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

Sec. 51.611 Interim wholesale rates.

(a) If a state commission cannot, based on the information available to it, establish a wholesale rate using the methodology prescribed in Sec. 51.609, then the state commission may elect to establish an interim wholesale rate as described in paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) The state commission may establish interim wholesale rates that are at least 17 percent, and no more than 25 percent, below the incumbent LEC's existing retail rates, and shall articulate the basis for selecting a particular discount rate. The same discount percentage rate shall be used to establish interim wholesale rates for each telecommunications service.

(c) A state commission that establishes interim wholesale rates shall, within a reasonable period of time thereafter, establish wholesale rates on the basis of an avoided retail cost study that complies with Sec. 51.609.