

Tracy Hatch Attorney

Suite 700 101 N. Monroe St. Tallahassee, FL 32301 904 425-6364 FAX: 904 425-6361

September 23, 1996

Mrs. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Docket No. 950737-TP

Dear Mrs. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing in the above referenced dockets are an original and fifteen (15) copies of AT&T's Direct Testimony of Mike Guedel.

Copies of the foregoing are being served on all parties of record in accordance with the attached Certificate of Service.

Yours truly,

Tracy Hatch

ACK ____ AFA _ APP Attachments CAF Parties of Record cc: CTR EAG LEG LIN 070 RCH RECEIVED & FILED SEC WAS EPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS OTH

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MIKE GUEDEL 1 ON BEHALF OF AT&T COMMUNICATIONS 2 OF THE SOUTHERN STATES INC. 3 4 BEFORE THE 5 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 6 DOCKET NO. 950737-TP 7 FILED: SEPTEMBER 23, 1996 8 9 10 11 WILL YOU PLEASE IDENTIFY YOURSELF? 12 Q. 13 A. My name is Mike Guedel and my business address 14 is AT&T, 1200 Peachtree Street, NE, Atlanta, 15 Georgia, 30309. I am employed by AT&T as 16 Manager-Access Management. 17 18 19 PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND 20 Q. WORK EXPERIENCES. 21 22 I received a Master of Business Administration Α. 23 with a concentration in Finance from Kennesaw 24 State College, Marietta, GA in 1994. I 25

1

•

DOCUMENT MUMBER-DATE

received a Bachelor of Science degree in 1 Business Administration from Miami University, 2 Oxford, Ohio. Over the past years, I have 3 attended numerous industry schools and seminars 4 covering a variety of technical and regulatory 5 issues. I joined the Rates and Economics 6 Department of South Central Bell in February of 7 1980. My initial assignments included cost 8 9 analysis of terminal equipment and special assembly offerings. In 1982, I began working 10 on access charge design and development. From 11 May of 1983 through September of 1983, as part 12 of an AT&T task force, I developed local 13 transport rates for the initial NECA interstate 14 filing. Post divestiture, I remained with 15 South Central Bell with specific responsibility 16 17 for cost analysis, design, and development relating to switched access services and 18 intraLATA toll. In June of 1985, I joined 19 AT&T, assuming responsibility for cost analysis 20 of network services including access charge 21 impacts for the five South Central States 22 (Alabama, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, and 23 Tennessee). 24

25

1 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR CURRENT RESPONSIBILITIES.

2

My current responsibilities include directing Α. 3 analytical support activities necessary for 4 AT&T's provision of intrastate communications 5 service in Florida and other southern states. 6 This includes detailed analysis of access 7 charges and other Local Exchange Company (LEC) 8 filings to assess their impact on AT&T and its 9 customers. In this capacity, I have 10 represented AT&T through formal testimony 11 before the Florida Public Service Commission, 12 as well as regulatory commissions in the states 13 of Georgia, Kentucky, and South Carolina. 14 15 16 WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY? Q. 17 18 The purpose of my testimony is to: 1) 19 Α. demonstrate that the cost recovery method 20 adopted by the Florida Public Service 21 Commission (FPSC) with respect to interim local 22 number portability is not consistent with the 23 Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Act), and 2) 24

25 recommend an alternative method of cost

1 recovery that is consistent with the federal statute and the Federal Communications 2 Commission's (FCC) regulations. 3 4 5 6 7 Q. IS ORDER NO. PSC-95-1604-FOF-TP INCONSISTENT 8 WITH THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION'S ORDER AND FURTHER NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING 9 10 IN THE MATTER OF TELEPHONE NUMBER PORTABILITY IN CC DOCKET NO. 95-116 WITH RESPECT TO COST 11 **RECOVERY?** 12

13

.

In Order No. PSC-95-1604-FOF-TP, the FPSC 14 Α. Yes. prescribed a method of cost recovery that 15 entitled the incumbent Local Exchange Companies 16 (ILECs) to charge new entrants a rate equal to 17 or greater than the incumbents incremental cost 18 19 of providing the portability service. This method now appears to be inconsistent with the 20 ACT and contrary to the FCC's First Report and 21 Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking 22 23 released July 2, 1996 in CC Docket No. 95-116 (``FCC Order''). 24

:	1	
:	2	Specifically, the FCC states at paragraph 138
:	3	of the FCC Order:
	4	
9	5	requiring the new entrants to bear all
	5	of the costs, measured on the basis of
	7	incremental costs of currently available
٤	3	number portability methods, would not
2	Ð	comply with the statutory requirements of
10)	section 251(e)(2). Imposing the full
11	L	incremental cost of number portability
12	2	solely on new entrants would contravene
13	3	the statutory mandate that all carriers
14	Ł	share the cost of number portability.
15	5	
16	5	
17	Q.	DID THE FCC OFFER ANY GUIDANCE IN THE FCC ORDER
18	}	REGARDING APPROPRIATE COST RECOVERY METHODS?
19)	
20) A.	Yes. The FCC concluded that an appropriate
21		charge should be ``competitively neutral.''
22	!	Further the FCC established two criteria for
23	ł	establishing competitive neutrality. Paragraph
24		132 of the FCC Order provides:
25	i	

.

· · · ·

.

· ·

First, a ``competitively neutral'' cost 1 recovery mechanism should not give one 2 3 service provider an appreciable, incremental cost advantage over another 4 5 service provider, when competing for a specific subscriber. ... We thus interpret 6 our first criteria as meaning that the 7 incremental payment made by a new entrant 8 for winning a customer that ports his 9 number cannot put the new entrant at an 10 appreciable cost disadvantage relative to 11 any other carrier that could serve that 12 13 customer. 14 At paragraph 135 of the FCC Order, the FCC 15 states: 16 17 The second criterion for a ``competitively 18 neutral'' cost recovery mechanism is that 19 20 it should not have a disparate effect on the ability of competing service providers 21 to earn normal returns on their 22 investment. 23 24

1		Within the scope of these guidelines, the FCC
2		suggested several mechanisms that it believed
3		to be consistent with the ACT. The suggested
4		mechanisms included: 1) a distribution of costs
5		based upon total working telephone numbers in
6		an area, 2) a distribution of costs based upon
7		total revenues minus carrier to carrier
8		revenues, and 3) ``a mechanism that requires
9		each carrier to pay for its own costs of
10		currently available number portability
11		measures.''
12		
13		
14	Q.	WHAT COST RECOVERY METHOD SHOULD THE FLORIDA
14 15	Q.	WHAT COST RECOVERY METHOD SHOULD THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADOPT?
	Q.	
15	Q. A.	
15 16		PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADOPT?
15 16 17		PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADOPT? The Commission should adopt a mechanism which
15 16 17 18		PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADOPT? The Commission should adopt a mechanism which requires each carrier to pay for its own costs
15 16 17 18 19		PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADOPT? The Commission should adopt a mechanism which requires each carrier to pay for its own costs of providing interim local number portability.
15 16 17 18 19 20		PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADOPT? The Commission should adopt a mechanism which requires each carrier to pay for its own costs of providing interim local number portability. In other words, the service should be provided
15 16 17 18 19 20 21		PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADOPT? The Commission should adopt a mechanism which requires each carrier to pay for its own costs of providing interim local number portability. In other words, the service should be provided as requested (of either the incumbent or the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADOPT? The Commission should adopt a mechanism which requires each carrier to pay for its own costs of providing interim local number portability. In other words, the service should be provided as requested (of either the incumbent or the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADOPT? The Commission should adopt a mechanism which requires each carrier to pay for its own costs of providing interim local number portability. In other words, the service should be provided as requested (of either the incumbent or the new entrant) at no charge.

•

First, the prescription effects interim number portability - an arrangement that will become obsolete in Florida within the next 12 to 18 months.

6 Second, the capability of providing interim 7 number portability currently exists in the 8 switching equipment of both the incumbent LECs 9 and the new entrants. No additional investment 10 should be required.

11

5

Third, it is not likely that a significant 12 amount of revenue would be effected. 13 Interim 14 portability has been available in Florida since the beginning of this year and to my knowledge 15 no customers have been ported to date. 16 It is likely that demand for this service will grow 17 slowly as new entrants struggle to finds ways 18 to enter the incumbents' territories. 19

20

21 These realities do not seem to justify the 22 creation of a complex recovery mechanism.

- 23
- 24

IF THE COMMISSION DECIDES TO IMPLEMENT A 1 Q. MECHANISM THAT REQUIRES DOLLAR PAYMENTS, WHAT 2 MECHANISM SHOULD IT ADOPT? 3 4 If the Commission elects to adopt a mechanism 5 Α. that requires dollar payments (and it should б only consider such a system if it finds the 7 representation of interim number portability 8 stated in the above response to be in error), 9 then it should adopt the mechanism that has 10 been approved by the NY DPS in the New York 11 metropolitan area. The formula as filed in the 12 NYNEX tariff is: 13 14 15 total ported minutes * (switching + transport costs) 16 total working telephone numbers provided by NYNEX 17 18 The charge per working telephone number times 19

20 the number of ported telephone numbers used by 21 the new entrant would equal the charge per new 22 entrant. The new entrant would charge the 23 incumbent the same rate for similarly ported 24 numbers.

25

This mechanism will allow each LEC to recover 1 an appropriate portion of the costs that it 2 incurs in providing interim number portability, 3 but it can only be justified if the anticipated 4 dollars changing hands exceed the additional 5 costs of developing and maintaining the 6 mechanism. 7 8 9 DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY? Q. 10 11

12 A. Yes.

. .

.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

DOCKET NO. 950737-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U. S. Mail or hand-delivery to the following parties of record this 232 day of Leptenne, 1996:

Martha McMillin, Esq. MCI Telecommunications Corp. Suite 700 780 Johnson Ferry Road Atlanta, GA 30346

Tony Key Sprint Communications Co. 3100 Cumberland Circle, N0802 Atlanta, GA 30339

C. Everett Boyd, Jr., Esq. Ervin, Varn, Jacobs, Odom P. O. Drawer 1170 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Peter Dunbar, Esq. Pennington Culpepper, P.A. P. O. Box 10095 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Lee Willis, Esq. Jeffry Wahlen, Esq. Macfarlane Ausley P. O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Floyd R. Self, Esq. Messer, Vickers, Caparello P. O. Box 1876 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876 Richard D. Melson, Esq. Hopping Green Sams & Smith P. O. Box 6526 Tallahassee, FL 32314

Vicki Gordon Kaufman, Esq. McWhirter, Grandoff & Reeves 117 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Anthony Gillman, Esq. GTE Florida Incorporated P. O. Box 110, FLTC0007 Tampa, FL 33601-0110

Laura Wilson, Esq. FL Cable Telecommunications 310 North Monroe Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

William Higgins, Esq. Cellular One 250 S. Australian Avenue West Palm Beach, FL 33401

David Erwin, Esq. Young, van Assenderp, Varnadoe P. O. Box 1833 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1833 Robert Beatty, Esq. c/o Nancy Sims BellSouth Telecommunications 150 S. Monroe St., Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556

Douglas Metcalf Communications Consultants P. O. Box 1148 Winter Park, FL 32790-1148

Monica Barone, Esq. Division of Legal Services Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Richard M. Rindler, Esq. Swidler & Berlin, Chartered 3000 K. Street, N. W., Suite 300 Washington, DC 20007

Patrick K. Wiggins, Esq. Wiggins & Villacorta, P.A. P. O. Drawer 1657 Tallahassee, FL 32302 Angela B. Green, Esq. FL Public Telecommunications 125 S. Gadsden St., Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Charles J. Beck, Esq. Office of the Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison St., Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Timothy Devine MFS Communications Co., Inc. Six Concourse Pkwy, Suite 2100 Atlanta, GA 30328

Jill Butler Digital Media Partners/Time Warner Communications 2773 Red Maple Ridge Tallahassee, FL 32301

Sue E. Weiske, Esq. Senior Counsel Time Warner Communications 160 Inverness Drive West Englewood, CO 80112

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

DOCKET NO. 950737-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U. S. Mail or hand-delivery to the following parties of record this 232 day of Leptune, 1996:

Martha McMillin, Esq. MCI Telecommunications Corp. Suite 700 780 Johnson Ferry Road Atlanta, GA 30346

Tony Key Sprint Communications Co. 3100 Cumberland Circle, N0802 Atlanta, GA 30339

C. Everett Boyd, Jr., Esq. Ervin, Varn, Jacobs, Odom P. O. Drawer 1170 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Peter Dunbar, Esq. Pennington Culpepper, P.A. P. O. Box 10095 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Lee Willis, Esq. Jeffry Wahlen, Esq. Macfarlane Ausley P. O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Floyd R. Self, Esq. Messer, Vickers, Caparello P. O. Box 1876 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876 Richard D. Melson, Esq. Hopping Green Sams & Smith P. O. Box 6526 Tallahassee, FL 32314

Vicki Gordon Kaufman, Esq. McWhirter, Grandoff & Reeves 117 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Anthony Gillman, Esq. GTE Florida Incorporated P. O. Box 110, FLTC0007 Tampa, FL 33601-0110

Laura Wilson, Esq. FL Cable Telecommunications 310 North Monroe Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

William Higgins, Esq. Cellular One 250 S. Australian Avenue West Palm Beach, FL 33401

David Erwin, Esq. Young, van Assenderp, Varnadoe P. O. Box 1833 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1833

DU10159-94

Robert Beatty, Esq. c/o Nancy Sims BellSouth Telecommunications 150 S. Monroe St., Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556

1

Douglas Metcalf Communications Consultants P. O. Box 1148 Winter Park, FL 32790-1148

Monica Barone, Esq. Division of Legal Services Florida Public Service Commission Six Concourse Pkwy, Suite 2100 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Richard M. Rindler, Esq. Swidler & Berlin, Chartered 3000 K. Street, N. W., Suite 300 Washington, DC 20007

Patrick K. Wiggins, Esq. Wiggins & Villacorta, P.A. P. O. Drawer 1657 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Angela B. Green, Esq. FL Public Telecommunications 125 S. Gadsden St., Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Charles J. Beck, Esq. Office of the Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison St., Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Timothy Devine MFS Communications Co., Inc. Atlanta, GA 30328

Jill Butler Digital Media Partners/Time Warner Communications 2773 Red Maple Ridge Tallahassee, FL 32301

Sue E. Weiske, Esq. Senior Counsel Time Warner Communications 160 Inverness Drive West Englewood, CO 80112