

**STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

MIDCONTINENT COMMUNICATIONS,
A SOUTH DAKOTA PARTNERSHIP,
COMPLAINANT

VS.

NORTH DAKOTA TELEPHONE COMPANY,
RESPONDENT

)
)
)
)
) Case No. PU-05-451
)
)
)
)
)

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

I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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. Since I received my Masters, I have taken additional graduate-level courses in statistics and econometrics. I also have attended numerous courses and seminars specific to the telecommunications industry, including both the NARUC Annual and NARUC Advanced Regulatory Studies Programs.

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

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

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

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

Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU FILING THIS TESTIMONY?

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

II. PURPOSE OF THE TESTIMONY

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

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

Q. WHAT ARE THE MAJOR CONCLUSIONS OF THE TESTIMONY?

A. The major conclusions are as follows:

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

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

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

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.

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

III. LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

⁴ Amended Order at 7.

IV. CALCULATING AND APPLYING THE WHOLESALE DISCOUNT

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

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

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

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

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

A. Yes. The Commission can approve an interim wholesale discount rate between 17 and 25 percent.⁵ At paragraph 910 of the *Local Competition Order*, the FCC identifies the 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

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

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

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

A. *Avoided Retail Costs*

Q. SHOULD WHOLESALE RATES INCLUDE ILEC RETAILING COSTS?

A. No. Retail competition will provide consumer benefits only if ILECs are not allowed to 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:

There has been considerable debate on the record in this proceeding and 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*).

“avoided” cost standard or an “avoidable” cost standard. We find that “the portion [of the retail rate] . . . attributable to costs that will be avoided” includes all of the costs that the LEC incurs in maintaining a retail, as opposed to a wholesale, business. In other words, the avoided costs are those that an incumbent LEC would no longer incur if it were to cease retail operations and instead provide all of its services through resellers. Thus, we reject the arguments of incumbent LECs and others who maintain that the LEC must actually experience a reduction in its operating expenses for a cost to be considered “avoided” for purposes of section 252(d)(3). We do not believe that Congress intended to allow incumbent LECs to sustain artificially high wholesale prices by declining to reduce their expenditures to the degree that certain costs are readily avoidable. We therefore interpret the 1996 Act as requiring states to make an objective assessment of what costs are reasonably avoidable when a LEC sells its services wholesale. We note that Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, New York, and Ohio commissions have all interpreted the 1996 Act in this manner. (*Local Competition Order*, Paragraph 911).

If avoided costs are estimated correctly, and then subtracted from retail prices, efficient resellers should be able to succeed in the retail market.

Q. CERTAIN COURT DECISIONS HAVE DISAGREED WITH THE FCC’S STANDARDS FOR SETTING RESALE DISCOUNTS. CAN YOU DESCRIBE HOW THOSE DECISIONS SHOULD AFFECT THIS COMMISSION’S ANALYSIS?

A. The U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Third and Eighth Circuits both have concluded that it is inappropriate to assume that an ILEC actually will avoid all costs that could potentially be avoided. At the same time, it is inappropriate to let the ILEC decide which costs it will avoid and which ones it won’t, because every ILEC would then set the discount rate at zero percent. In the end, the Commission has to apply a common-sense test to determine which costs will be avoided and which ones will not. For instance, it’s clear

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

B. Services Available for Resale

Q. WHICH SERVICES SHOULD BE OFFERED AT THE WHOLESALE DISCOUNT PRICE?

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

Ancillary services must also be made available for resale. This includes custom calling services, CLASS features, and all Centrex features.⁸ While some of these features may not be regulated, depending on the state jurisdiction or the jurisdictional nature of the 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.

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

Q. DOES THE FCC PROHIBIT SERVICE-SPECIFIC DISCOUNTS?

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

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

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

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

A. Yes. Many state commissions have already addressed the need for identifying services available for resale and the need for unrestricted resale. Several of the initial decisions 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.

D. Calculating Avoided Costs and the Avoided Cost Discount

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

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

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

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

Account 6611: Product management and sales - This account includes costs incurred in performing administrative activities related to marketing products and services. This includes competitive analysis, product and service identification and specification, test market planning, demand forecasting, product life cycle analysis, pricing analysis, and identification and establishment of distribution channels. This account also includes the costs of selling products and services – this includes determination of individual customer needs, development and presentation of customer proposals, sales order preparation and handling, and preparation of sales 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.

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).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q. DOES DSL SERVICE RAISE ANY SPECIAL ISSUES?

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

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

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 NDTC 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 MCI Metro 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 on 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. 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. 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.



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 MCImetro and GTE; Direct Testimony on Behalf of MCI.

November 5, 1996; Docket No. ARB 9; Interconnection Contract Negotiations Between MCImetro 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; MCImetro 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; MCImetro 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 on 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 IXCs 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.