

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

9

| Intrastate networ | Verizon Florida Inc. to reform k access and basic local ions rates in accordance with Florida Statutes |) Docket No. 030867-TL)) |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Reduce intrastate Interstate parity i | Sprint-Florida, Incorporated to e switched network access rates to n revenue-neutral manner on 364.164(1), Florida Statutes |)) Docket No. 030868-TL)) |
| 364.164, Florida revenue-neutral r intrastate switche | r implementation of Section Statutes, by rebalancing rates in a nanner through decreases in ed access charges with offsetting for basic services, by BellSouth ions, Inc. |) Docket No. 030869-TL)) |
| | gh of LEC Switched Access (Cs, Pursuant to Section ida Statutes |)) Docket No. 030961-TI) |
| | DIRECT TESTIMON | TY ALL ST |
| | OF | en en |
| | JOSEPH DUNBAR | |
| | ON BEHALF OF | ATIONS, INC. |
| Ν | ICI WORLDCOM COMMUNIC | ATIONS, INC. |
| | NOVEMBER 19, 200 | |
| | CONF | IDENTIAL |
| | declas 9/4/05 appe | al |
| | This claim of confidentiality was filed by or on behaff o "telco" for Confidential DN 1691-033 document is in locked storage pending advice on handli To access the material, your name must be on the CASI If undocketed, your division director must obtain writte EXD/Tech permission before you can access it. | The DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE |
| | | 600696 FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK |

1

Q. Please state your name and address.

- A My name is Joseph Dunbar. My business address is Two International
 Drive Rye Brook, NY 10573.
- 4 Q. By whom are you employed and what are your duties?

5 Α. I am employed by MCI. My title is Senior Manager, Regulatory 6 Compliance and Reporting. In this position my team and I work with 7 MCI's business units to keep them abreast of various state regulations that 8 may affect their operations and to work with those units to insure 9 compliance with such state regulations. In addition we are responsible for 10 collecting and assimilating information from MCI's business units and then filing that information with Public Service Commissions across the country. 11 Such reporting may be on a regularly scheduled basis, such as annual 12 13 financial reports or monthly service quality reports or may be on an ad hoc basis for specific issues like flow through compliance. 14

15 Q. Please describe your background and experience.

A. I have been employed by MCI since 1984. Since joining MCI I have held a
 variety of positions within the State Regulatory and Public Policy
 Organization. In addition to my current position I have managed the
 intrastate tariff function and have at various times represented the company
 before Public Service Commissions on a variety of public policy issues.

21 Q. Have you ever testified before this Commission?

| 1 | A. | No, I have never testified on behalf of MCI before this Commission, but I | |
|----|----|---|--|
| 2 | | have testified before other public service commissions, such as New York, | |
| 3 | | Connecticut, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Georgia. | |
| 4 | Q. | What is the purpose of your testimony? | |
| 5 | А. | The primary purpose of my testimony is to respond to the additional issues | |
| 6 | | the Commission established regarding IXC flow-through as listed in the | |
| 7 | | Nov. 10, 2003, procedural Order in this docket. | |
| 8 | Q. | Are you familiar with the access reduction petitions filed by the ILECs? | |
| 9 | A. | Yes, generally. Verizon, Sprint and BellSouth have asked the Commission | |
| 10 | | to allow them to reduce their intrastate access charges and rebalance retail | |
| 11 | | service rates on a revenue neutral basis to recognize those revenue | |
| 12 | | reductions. Their petitions were filed as permitted by statutory changes that | |
| 13 | | became effective upon enactment of law. | |
| 14 | Q. | Has MCI filed testimony addressing the issues regarding the ILEC | |
| 15 | | petitions filed in these dockets? | |
| 16 | А. | Yes, MCI and AT&T are co-sponsoring Dr. John W. Mayo, who has | |
| 17 | | already prefiled testimony in these dockets. | |
| 18 | Q. | If the Commission approves the petitions filed by the ILECs, will that | |
| 19 | | have an affect on MCI? | |
| 20 | А. | Yes. The ILECs filed their petitions pursuant to Section 364.164, Florida | |
| 21 | | Statutes. The Legislature also amended Section 364.163, Florida Statutes, | |
| 22 | | to require intrastate interexchange companies (IXCs), like MCI, to return | |
| 23 | | the benefits of any access reductions to both residential and business | |
| | | | |

customers. If the Commission approves the ILECs' petitions, thereby
 reducing access charges, IXCs, such as MCI, will then be required to flow through the benefits of those reductions to its residential and business
 customers. Also, if the Commission approves the ILECs' petitions,
 Section 364.163 also provides that IXCs may determine specifically how to
 accomplish the flow through.

7 Q. And MCI would implement that flow-through?

8 A. Yes. That is the statutory requirement and we will comply. Initially, MCI 9 expects to change its tariffed rates for some business and residential 10 customers, but MCI has not finalized its plans. Customers may see other 11 benefits as well, such as new programs, and innovative offerings as a result 12 of the access charge reductions.

Q. Does the manner by which benefits are flowed-through have any affect on approval of the ILEC petitions?

A. No. The Commission is required to evaluate the ILEC petitions based on the four criteria set forth in the statute. The manner by which IXCs flowthrough the benefits to their customers is not related to whether the Commission should approve the ILEC petitions. There are no flow-through issues unless the petitions are approved, so except for approval triggering the flow-through, I don't believe there is a relation.

Q. Will approval of the ILEC petitions have an effect on long distance services?

1 Α. Yes. The long distance market place is already highly competitive and I 2 think it will become more so. Carriers now compete on prices, new 3 features, services, and other innovative offerings. Consumers have choices 4 in the long distance market and the flow-through of these reductions will 5 stimulate the development of more promotions, features and innovations. 6 Consumers have choices in the long distance market and can make changes 7 fairly quickly if not satisfied. If a consumer is not happy with a service for 8 whatever reason there are other choices available.

9 Q. If the petitions are approved, will MCI be expanding or changing the 10 services offered to consumers?

11 A. Yes. However, MCI's specific plans are not yet finalized, in part because it 12 must know what specifically is or is not approved and in part because it is 13 premature to predict what specifically is happening in the competitive 14 market at the time the flow-through is to be accomplished and whether 15 MCI's plans are an appropriate competitive response

MCI has been a leader in the long distance market with innovative services. For example, Friends and Family, 1-800-collect, 10-10-NXX, The Neighborhood and similar offerings were MCI innovations and some were copied by its competitors in the market. One reason that these innovative offerings have been available is that access cost reductions have allowed MCI to reprice and repackage services for consumers.

| 1 | Q. | If the ILEC access rate reductions are approved, should the IXCs be |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | required to flow-through the benefits of the reductions, simultaneously |
| 3 | | with the approved ILEC access rate reductions? |
| 4 | A. | Yes. MCI would support the IXCs filing concurrently with the ILEC access |
| 5 | | reduction if we are given at least 60 days to implement the rates changes. |
| 6 | | For instance, if LEC access rates were to change on March 1, 2004, MCI |
| 7 | | would be prepared to implement changes on March 1, 2004 as long as the |
| 8 | | specific changes the LECs were going to implement were known by |
| 9 | | December 31, 2003. |
| 10 | Q. | For each access rate reduction that an IXC receives, how long should |
| 11 | | the associated revenue reduction last? |
| 12 | Α. | The marketplace should and will decide this issue. IXCs are in a dynamic |
| 13 | | market and trying to fit this flow-though effort into a "static box" does not |
| 14 | | make sense and doing so could cause significant harm to a company trying |
| 15 | | to compete. |
| 16 | Q. | How should the IXC flow-through of the benefits from the ILEC access |
| 17 | | rate reductions be allocated between residential and business |
| 18 | | customers? |
| 19 | А. | Consistent with the statute, MCI believes that each IXC should determine |
| 20 | | the best way to accomplish its flow through obligation to both its residential |
| 21 | | and business customers. MCI has traditionally split the savings on a pro rata |
| 22 | | share between its residential/consumer markets switched access base and |
| 23 | | business markets switched access customer base. This results in a split of |

1 approximately 30% residential and 70% business. [CONFIDENTIAL] 2 Then, within those customer bases, MCI has allocated the flow through 3 savings in a manner that reflects the competitive market for that base of 4 customers.

Q. What amount of access savings does MCI expect to see if the ILEC access rate reductions are approved?

A. MCl expects that the first year access savings will amount to approximately
\$25 million dollars. [CONFIDENTIAL] MCI determined this amount by
looking at the specific changes proposed by BellSouth (Typical Network
Methodology), Verizon, and Sprint, and then calculated a composite rate
per minute change in intrastate switched access. MCI then looked at
forecasted minutes for 2004 and multiplied those minutes by the change in
switched access.

Q. Will all residential and business customers experience a reduction in
their long distance bills? If not, which residential and business
customers will and will not experience a reduction in their long distance
bills?

A. MCl believes all consumers in Florida will benefit from these access
 reductions either directly or indirectly. First, if the ILEC petitions are
 approved, pricing changes will occur, making people look at their bills to
 make sure that they have the right long distance plan for their needs.

22 Second, all MCI stand-alone, presubscribed, residential long 23 distance customers paying MCI's in-state access recovery fee will receive a

benefit, because MCI will reduce its in-state connection fee over the next
three years, eliminating it by July 1, 2006. At a minimum MCI will reduce
it by one third each year. MCI will be passing other benefits to some of its
residential customers, but has not determined specifically how it will do so
at this time. MCI is also contemplating offering new products if the ILEC
petitions are approved.
Third, depending on the service and plan, some business customers

8 will see benefits, though not all will because of the nature of the plans.

9 Q. Does MCI support the access reduction petitions?

10 A. Generally, yes. I would refer to the testimony of Dr. John W. Mayo for
11 specific responses. MCI endorses the reductions and believe they will bring
12 benefits to all consumers.

13 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

14 A. Yes, it does.

• • •

i