

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

In re: Implementation of requirements arising)
from Federal Communications Commission) Docket No. 030851-TP
triennial UNE review: Local Circuit Switching)
for Mass Market Customers.)

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DON J. WOOD

**ON BEHALF OF
AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES, LLC**

DECEMBER 4, 2003

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
12428 DEC-4 8
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1 **I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

2 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

3 A. My name is Don J. Wood. I am a principal in the firm of Wood & Wood, an
4 economic and financial consulting firm. My business address is 30000 Mill Creek
5 Avenue, Suite 395, Alpharetta, Georgia 30022. I provide economic and regulatory
6 analysis of the telecommunications, cable, and related convergence industries with an
7 emphasis on economic policy, competitive market development, and cost-of-service
8 issues.

9 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE.**

10 A. I received a BBA in Finance with distinction from Emory University and an MBA
11 with concentrations in Finance and Microeconomics from the College of William and
12 Mary. My telecommunications experience includes employment at both a Regional
13 Bell Operating Company ("RBOC") and an Interexchange Carrier ("IXC").

14 Specifically, I was employed in the local exchange industry by BellSouth
15 Services, Inc. in its Pricing and Economics, Service Cost Division. My
16 responsibilities included performing cost analyses of new and existing services,
17 preparing documentation for filings with state regulatory commissions and the
18 Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), developing methodology and
19 computer models for use by other analysts, and performing special assembly cost
20 studies.

21 I was employed in the interexchange industry by MCI Telecommunications
22 Corporation, as Manager of Regulatory Analysis for the Southern Division. In this
23 capacity I was responsible for the development and implementation of regulatory

1 policy for operations in the southern U. S. I then served as a Manager in MCI's
2 Economic Analysis and Regulatory Affairs Organization, where I participated in the
3 development of regulatory policy for national issues.

4 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TESTIMONY BEFORE STATE**
5 **REGULATORS?**

6 A. Yes. I have testified on telecommunications issues before the regulatory commissions
7 of thirty-five states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. I have also presented
8 testimony regarding telecommunications issues in state, federal, and overseas courts,
9 before alternative dispute resolution tribunals, and at the FCC. A listing of my
10 previous testimony is attached as Exhibit DJW-1.

11 I have testified before this Commission on issues related to cost of service and
12 competitive market entry on several occasions, most recently in Docket No. 030137-
13 TP.

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

15 A. I have been asked by AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC ("AT&T")
16 to describe the framework for the type of economic impairment analysis discussed by
17 the FCC in the Triennial Review Order ("TRO"). Specifically, I am addressing the
18 FCC's guidelines for an analysis of "economic impairment" for local circuit
19 switching used to provide competitive service to mass market customers. My
20 testimony responds to several of the sub-elements of the Commission's Issue 5.

21
22 **II. USES AND LIMITATIONS OF AN ECONOMIC IMPAIRMENT ANALYSIS**

23 **Q. IS THIS COMMISSION REQUIRED TO CONDUCT AN ECONOMIC**
24 **IMPAIRMENT ANALYSIS?**

1 A. Not necessarily. In the Triennial Review Order, the FCC stated: “[w]e find on a
2 national level that requesting carriers are impaired without access to unbundled local
3 switching when serving mass market customers.” TRO ¶ 419; *see also* ¶¶ 422, 424,
4 459, 476, 479 and 493. Impairment exists unless and until specific, concrete evidence
5 to the contrary is identified.

6 ILECs seeking to set aside that finding of impairment may rely on the
7 “triggers” set forth in the TRO. *See* TRO ¶ 501. If the ILEC cannot establish that
8 CLECs are self-provisioning switches to serve the mass market, the ILEC may
9 attempt other means of demonstrating that there is no impairment. In that instance,
10 the Commission, if it wants to consider a finding of “no impairment,” must conduct a
11 granular analysis that includes an assessment of both operational and economic
12 impairment. *See* TRO ¶¶ 511-520.

13 **Q. CAN THIS COMMISSION MAKE A FINDING OF “NO IMPAIRMENT”**
14 **BASED ONLY ON AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS?**

15 A. No. According to the FCC, a determination of whether lack of access to an
16 unbundled network element will “impair” a CLEC’s ability to enter the market
17 requires an analysis of “whether lack of access to an incumbent LEC network element
18 poses a barrier or barriers to entry, including operational and economic barriers, that
19 are likely to make entry into a market uneconomic.” TRO ¶ 56. This Commission
20 must analyze operational and economic factors “in concert.” Clearly, if a CLEC is
21 impaired because of operational barriers in a given market, no economic analysis will
22 change that fact. Conversely, a lack of operational barriers cannot offset the
23 existence of an economic barrier. A finding of impairment must be reached if either

1 operational *or* economic barriers are found to exist. My testimony addresses only
2 economic impairment.

3 **Q. IS IT LIKELY THAT AN “ECONOMIC IMPAIRMENT” ANALYSIS WILL**
4 **ESTABLISH THAT ECONOMIC IMPAIRMENT DOES NOT EXIST?**

5 A. No. Since 1996, CLECs have engaged in a wide variety of entry strategies. Many of
6 these strategies have been based on an analysis of the same market-specific costs and
7 potential revenues that the FCC contemplates in its analysis. The investors who
8 funded - or elected not to fund - these entry strategies likewise considered these same
9 factors.

10 Since 1996, I have worked with CLECs in most aspects of their market entry
11 plans and have assisted investors (and potential investors) with their analyses of
12 CLEC business plans. In my experience, the individuals who undertook these
13 analyses for both carriers and investors were qualified to undertake the effort and to
14 generate meaningful results. Yet the market realities (as revealed in the results of the
15 triggers analysis) make it abundantly clear that CLECs either (1) could not
16 economically justify the deployment of their own local switching equipment to serve
17 mass market customers, and so decided not to make the investment, or (2) decided (in
18 what in hindsight proved to be a bad decision) to make this investment, were
19 unsuccessful, and are no longer attempting to use this entry vehicle as a means of
20 serving mass market customers. This real-world experience of CLECs and investors
21 over the last seven years reveals that CLEC deployment of their own local circuit
22 switching equipment to serve mass market customers is not economically viable.
23 Some previously elusive formula for making it economically viable is not likely to
24 materialize in the midst of a contested state proceeding. It is even more unlikely that

1 this elusive formula will finally reveal itself in the results of a BellSouth “business
2 case” model.

3 **Q. ARE YOU SUGGESTING THAT THERE IS NO BENEFIT TO**
4 **CONDUCTING AN “ECONOMIC IMPAIRMENT” ANALYSIS?**

5 A. No. As I will describe in more detail later in my testimony, the FCC found the
6 “economic impairment” analyses that it reviewed are highly sensitive to the
7 underlying inputs and assumptions. A properly developed model, therefore, could be
8 used to gain insight into which factors make the most significant contribution to the
9 existing impairment and how changes in these factors (in terms of changes due to
10 market response over time or changes induced through changes in regulatory
11 requirements) impact the overall equation. The results of such an analysis would
12 indicate whether a specific regulatory action has the potential, on a prospective basis,
13 to reduce impairment for some markets in some circumstances.

14
15 **III. THE FCC’S ECONOMIC IMPAIRMENT GUIDANCE**

16 **Q. WHAT GUIDANCE DID THE FCC PROVIDE TO STATE COMMISSIONS**
17 **FOR CONDUCTING AN ECONOMIC IMPAIRMENT ANALYSIS?**

18 A. In section VI.D.6.a.(i)(b) of the TRO, the FCC discusses the economic factors that
19 may be relevant to states’ determinations. The FCC focused principally on the
20 primary cost disadvantage faced by CLECs, “the cost of backhauling the voice circuit
21 to their switch from the customer’s end office.” The costs of backhaul “include the
22 costs of collocating in the customer’s serving wire center, installing equipment in the
23 wire center in order to digitize, aggregate, and transmit the voice traffic, and paying
24 the incumbent to transport the traffic to the competitor’s switch” *Id.* at ¶480.

1 As shown in the testimony of Mr. Turner, this cost disadvantage is significant.
2 Indeed, in my view, it is sufficient in and of itself to create economic impairment for
3 CLECs.

4 **Q. DID THE FCC REVIEW INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CLECS AND**
5 **ILECS REGARDING OTHER ECONOMIC FACTORS?**

6 A. Yes. In its review, the FCC considered studies conducted by both ILECs and CLECs.
7 CLEC studies focused on the cost disadvantage created by the need to backhaul the
8 traffic to the CLEC switch, while ILEC studies focused on the “revenue
9 opportunities” available. Compare TRO ¶ 481 and ¶ 482. The FCC ultimately
10 determined that none of the studies was sufficient to “form a basis for making a
11 national finding of no impairment, or a finding of impairment on the basis of non-hot
12 cut factors alone.” *Id.* at ¶ 485. The FCC did conclude, however, that it was
13 “persuaded that other economic factors, in addition to the economic and operational
14 barriers associated with the current hot cut process that we have already identified,
15 may make entry uneconomic without access to the incumbent’s switch.” TRO ¶ 484.
16 Accordingly, the FCC found that the studies before it “strongly support the need for a
17 more granular analysis of impairment ... Such an analysis would require complete
18 information about UNE rates, retail rates, other revenue opportunities, wire center
19 sizes, equipment costs, and other overhead and marketing costs.” TRO ¶ 485.

20 **Q. WHAT COSTS OTHER THAN THE BACKHAUL COSTS ARE RELEVANT**
21 **TO AN ANALYSIS OF “ECONOMIC IMPAIRMENT”?**

22 A. The FCC identified several additional types of costs. They included: the cost of
23 purchasing and installing a switch; the recurring and non-recurring charges paid to the
24 incumbent LEC for loops, collocations, transport, hot cuts, OSS, signaling, and other
25 services and equipment necessary to access the loop; the cost of collocation and

1 equipment necessary to serve local exchange customers in a wire center, taking into
2 consideration an entrant's likely market share, the scale economies inherent to serving
3 a wire center, and the line density of the wire center; the cost of backhauling the local
4 traffic to the competitor's switch; other costs associated with transferring the
5 customer's service over to the competitor; the impact of churn on the cost of customer
6 acquisitions; the cost of maintenance, operations, and other administrative activities;
7 and the competitors' capital costs. TRO ¶ 520.

8 The FCC also noted that an economic impairment analysis should take into
9 account the impact of scale economies and line densities on the costs incurred by
10 ILECs and CLECs. TRO ¶ 520. Because many of the costs of providing local
11 telecommunications services are fixed at some level, ILECs begin their efforts to
12 compete with a unit cost advantage that CLECs cannot overcome without capturing
13 sufficient market share. Even if it is theoretically possible for a CLEC to reduce its
14 costs over time by achieving a significant market share, it cannot do so immediately.
15 This time dimension is extremely important. The CLEC must make an investment
16 that represents a significant fixed cost before serving any customers at all, and then
17 must hope that it will achieve a threshold market share that makes the investment
18 economically viable.

19 **Q. CAN A COST DISPARITY ALONE CREATE IMPAIRMENT?**

20 A. Yes, depending on which of the categories of cost creates the cost disadvantage. A
21 disparity in the level of the costs that both the ILEC and CLEC must incur (assuming
22 the CLEC can achieve the same scale economies as the ILEC) may not create
23 impairment because an efficiently operating CLEC could overcome this cost disparity

1 – over time – if it could achieve the necessary scale of operations. In direct contrast,
2 any costs that a CLEC must incur that the ILEC, as the incumbent monopoly
3 provider, avoids do create impairment. The necessity of recovering backhaul-related
4 costs and the inability of a CLEC to achieve the same scale economies as the ILEC in
5 a given market both fall into this category. As I will explain below, no CLEC can
6 “grow out of” this kind of cost disadvantage, and the resulting impairment cannot be
7 overcome, and the resulting impairment cannot be eliminated merely by a broadening
8 of the analysis to consider revenue opportunities.

9 **Q. WHAT REVENUES ARE RELEVANT TO AN ANALYSIS OF “ECONOMIC**
10 **IMPAIRMENT”?**

11 A. After reviewing the studies presented by both ILECs and CLECs, the FCC found that
12 revenue assumptions have a “significant impact” on the results. TRO ¶ 485. In its
13 analysis, the FCC noted that “[t]he revenue estimates, which depend on customers’
14 predicted expenditures on local voice service, were particularly controversial, and
15 appear to have had a significant impact on the results.” *Id.* The potential revenues
16 include the basic retail price charged to the customer, the sale of vertical features,
17 universal service payments, access charges, subscriber line charges, and, if any, toll
18 revenues” TRO ¶ 519.

19 The FCC’s focus on “predicted” or “potential” revenues is an important
20 consideration. A CLEC that elects to invest in its own local switching facilities to
21 serve mass market customers must recover the cost of those facilities over time from
22 the revenues received from these customers. Prior to making such a substantial
23 investment, a prudent CLEC will consider not only current revenue levels but also
24 likely changes in those levels over time.

1 Some revenue changes may be predicted from current market trends. For example, it
2 would clearly not be prudent for a CLEC to base its investment decision on an
3 expectation of higher toll revenues in the future. Other revenue changes can be
4 predicted by considering the operation of competitive market forces. Successful entry
5 by a CLEC, particularly a CLEC that manages to increase its market share over time,
6 will certainly inspire a competitive pricing response by the ILEC. As the FCC
7 correctly noted, a market that is currently characterized by high rates and low costs is
8 most likely to support self-provisioning of a switch by a CLEC to serve mass market
9 customers. TRO ¶ 484 and n. 1499. It is important to recognize, however – and a
10 prudent CLEC considering an investment of the scale of a circuit switch would
11 certainly do so – that high prices and low costs do *not* represent a relationship that is
12 likely to be maintained in an effectively competitive market. By definition,
13 effectively competitive markets do not have such relationships. It is essential,
14 therefore, for a CLEC to consider the potential revenues it would receive – and how
15 the level of those potential revenues can be expected to change over time –when
16 deciding whether to use its own local circuit switching equipment to serve mass
17 market customers. Such a consideration is fully consistent with the FCC’s conclusion
18 that when “judging whether entry is economic,” states must consider how
19 “competitive risks affect the likelihood of entry.” TRO ¶ 517.

20 **Q. YOU STATED PREVIOUSLY THAT THE CLECS’ COST DISADVANTAGE**
21 **CREATED BY THE NEED TO BACKHAUL TRAFFIC FROM THE LOOP**
22 **AGGREGATION POINT TO ITS SWITCH IS SUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH**
23 **ECONOMIC IMPAIRMENT. WHY CAN’T OTHER REVENUES OFFSET**
24 **THIS COST DISADVANTAGE?**

25 A. The potential for “offsetting revenues” is effectively eliminated by an undisputed
26 fact: mass market revenue opportunities are the same for both ILECs and CLECs. If

1 revenue opportunities are the same and CLECs have higher costs as a result of need
2 to backhaul all of their customers' loops and/or from the inability to fully realize the
3 ILEC's economies of scale, ILECs will always be able to underprice the CLECs if
4 they choose to do so. This is a point that cannot be ignored: an efficient CLEC that
5 experiences a cost disadvantage cannot compete on price over time, and therefore
6 cannot prudently invest in assets whose costs can only be recovered over an extended
7 period of time.

8 Even if it could be shown a CLEC could use self-deployed local circuit
9 switching to serve mass market customers in a given area at current retail prices, it
10 could not rationally make the investment if it were also aware that it could be priced
11 out of the market before recovering its investment.

12 In contrast, access to local circuit switching as a UNE, particularly because of
13 its extremely important function of providing the CLEC access to voice grade local
14 loops at the place where they are aggregated, puts ILECs and CLECs on a reasonably
15 equal footing (the ILEC doesn't get an artificial competitive advantage as the first in,
16 former monopoly provider). ILECs and CLECs can then compete based on the costs
17 that they do control.

18 **Q. DOES THE REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ENJOYED BY THE ILEC**
19 **IMPACT THIS EQUATION?**

20 **A.** Yes. The ability of an ILEC to easily make price changes underscores the temporary
21 nature of any market that is currently characterized by high prices and low costs. An
22 ability to decrease the price charged to all mass market customers means that the
23 ILEC can underprice a CLEC that has invested in its own local circuit switching
24 facilities. An ability to target the price reduction only to those mass market

1 customers that have been or are likely to be lost (through a so-called win-back
2 offering, for example) puts the ILEC in an even better position: it can underprice the
3 CLEC where necessary to recapture and retain customers, and can do so without
4 incurring the cost of offering the price reduction to all customers in the area.

5 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

6 **A. Yes.**

Vita of Don J. Wood

4625 Alexander Drive, Suite 125, Alpharetta, Georgia 30022

Voice 770.475.9971, Facsimile 770.475.9972

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Don J. Wood is a principal in the firm of Wood & Wood. He provides economic and regulatory analysis services in telecommunications, cable, IP, and related convergence industries, specializing in economic policy related to the development of competitive markets and cost of service issues. In addition, Mr. Wood advises industry associations on regulatory and economic policy, and assists investors in their evaluation of investment opportunities in the telecommunications industry. The scope of his work has included landline and wireless voice communications, data services, and emerging technologies.

As a consultant, Mr. Wood has assisted his clients in responding to the challenges and business opportunities of the industry both before and subsequent to the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Prior to his work as a consultant, Mr. Wood was employed in a management capacity at a major Local Exchange Company and an Interexchange Carrier. In each capacity he has been directly involved in both the development and implementation of regulatory policy and business strategy.

As a part of his regulatory practice, Mr. Wood has presented testimony before the administrative regulatory bodies of thirty-five states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and has prepared comments and testimony for filing with the Federal Communications Commission. The subject matter of his testimony has ranged from broad policy issues to detailed cost analysis.

Mr. Wood has also presented testimony in state, federal, and overseas courts regarding business plans and strategies, competition policy, and cost of service issues. He has presented studies of the damages incurred by plaintiffs and has provided rebuttal testimony to damage calculations performed by others. Mr. Wood has also testified in alternative dispute resolution proceedings conducted pursuant to both AAA and CPR rules.

Mr. Wood is certified as a Commercial Mediator in the state of Georgia.

PREVIOUS INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT

Klick, Kent & Allen/FTI Consulting, Inc.

Regional Director.

GDS Associates, Inc.

Senior Project Manager.

MCI Telecommunications Corporation

Manager of Regulatory Analysis, Southeast Division.

Manager, Corporate Economic Analysis and Regulatory Affairs.

BellSouth Services, Inc.

Staff Manager.

EDUCATION

Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.

BBA in Finance, with Distinction.

College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.

MBA, with concentrations in Finance and Microeconomics.

TESTIMONY - STATE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS:

Alabama Public Service Commission

Docket No. 19356, Phase III: Alabama Public Service Commission vs. All Telephone Companies Operating in Alabama, and Docket 21455: AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc., Applicant, Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Provide Limited IntraLATA Telecommunications Service in the State of Alabama.

Docket No. 20895: In Re: Petition for Approval to Introduce Business Line Termination for MCI's 800 Service.

Docket No. 21071: In Re: Petition by South Central Bell for Introduction of Bidirectional Measured Service.

Docket No. 21067: In Re: Petition by South Central Bell to Offer Dial Back-Up Service and 2400 BPS Central Office Data Set for Use with PulseLink Public Packet Switching Network Service.

Docket No. 21378: In Re: Petition by South Central Bell for Approval of Tariff Revisions to Restructure ESSX and Digital ESSX Service.

Docket No. 21865: In Re: Petition by South Central Bell for Approval of Tariff Revisions to Introduce Network Services to be Offered as a Part of Open Network Architecture.

Docket No. 25703: In Re: In the Matter of the Interconnection Agreement Between AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252.

Docket No. 25704: In Re: Petition by AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of a Proposed Agreement with GTE South Incorporated and CONTEL of the South, Inc. Concerning Interconnection and Resale under the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 25835: In Re: Petition for Approval of a Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions Pursuant to §252(f) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Notification of Intention to File a §271 Petition for In-Region InterLATA Authority with the Federal Communications Commission Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 26029: In Re: Generic Proceeding - Consideration of TELRIC Studies.

Docket No. 25980: Implementation of the Universal Support Requirements of Section 254 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 27091: Petition for Arbitration by ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 27821: Generic Proceeding to Establish Prices for Interconnection Services and Unbundled Network Elements.

Docket Nos. 27989 and 15957: BellSouth "Full Circle" Promotion and Generic Proceeding Considering the Promulgation of Telephone Rules Governing Promotions.

Docket No. 28841: In Re: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

The Regulatory Commission of Alaska

Case No. U-02-039: In the Matter of Request by Alaska Digitel, LLC for Designation as a Carrier Eligible To Receive Federal Universal Service Support Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Arkansas Public Service Commission

Docket No. 92-337-R: In the Matter of the Application for a Rule Limiting Collocation for Special Access to Virtual or Physical Collocation at the Option of the Local Exchange Carrier.

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California

Rulemaking 00-02-005: Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion into Reciprocal Compensation for Telephone Traffic Transmitted to Internet Service Provider Modems.

Application Nos. 01-02-024, 01-02-035, 02-02-031, 02-02-032, 02-02-034, 02-03-002: Applications for the Commission to Reexamine the Recurring Costs and Prices of Unbundled Network element Costs Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 11 of D.99-11-050.

Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado

Docket No. 96A-345T: In the Matter of the Interconnection Contract Negotiations Between AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc., and US West Communications, Inc., Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252. Docket No. 96A-366T: In the Matter of the Petition of MCIMetro Access Transmission Services, Inc., for Arbitration Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with US West Communications, Inc. (consolidated).

Docket No. 96S-257T: In Re: The Investigation and Suspension of Tariff Sheets Filed by US West Communications, Inc., with Advice Letter No. 2608 Regarding Proposed Rate Changes.

Docket No. 98F-146T: Colorado Payphone Association, Complainant, v. US West Communications, Inc., Respondent.

Docket No. 02A-276T: In the Matter of the Application of Wiggins Telephone Association for Approval of its Disaggregation Plan

Docket No. 02A-444T: In the Matter of NECC's Application to Redefine the Service Area of Eastern Slope Rural Telephone Association, Inc., Great Plains Communications, Inc., Plains Coop Telephone Association, Inc., and Sunflower Telephone Co., Inc.

State of Connecticut, Department of Utility Control

Docket 91-12-19: DPUC Review of Intrastate Telecommunications Services Open to Competition (Comments).

Docket No. 94-07-02: Development of the Assumptions, Tests, Analysis, and Review to Govern Telecommunications Service Reclassifications in Light of the Eight Criteria Set Forth in Section 6 of Public Act 94-83 (Comments).

Delaware Public Service Commission

Docket No. 93-31T: In the Matter of the Application of The Diamond State Telephone Company for Establishment of Rules and Rates for the Provision of IntelliLinQ-PRI and IntelliLinQ-BRI.

Docket No. 41: In the Matter of the Development of Regulations for the Implementation of the Telecommunications Technology Investment Act.

Docket No. 96-324: In the Matter of the Application of Bell Atlantic-Delaware, Inc. for Approval of its Statement of Terms and Conditions Under Section 252(f) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Phase II).

Docket No. 02-001: In the Matter of the Inquiry into Verizon Delaware Inc.'s Compliance with the Conditions Set Forth in 47 U.S.C. § 271(c).

Florida Public Service Commission

Docket No. 881257-TL: In Re: Proposed Tariff by Southern Bell to Introduce New Features for Digital ESSX Service, and to Provide Structural Changes for both ESSX Service and Digital ESSX Service.

Docket No. 880812-TP: In Re: Investigation into Equal Access Exchange Areas (EAEAs), Toll Monopoly Areas (TMAs), 1+ Restriction to the Local Exchange Companies (LECs), and Elimination of the Access Discount.

Docket No. 890183-TL: In Re: Generic Investigation into the Operations of Alternate Access Vendors.

Docket No. 870347-TI: In Re: Petition of AT&T Communications of the Southern States for Commission Forbearance from Earnings Regulation and Waiver of Rule 25-4.495(1) and 25-24.480 (1) (b), F.A.C., for a trial period.

Docket No. 900708-TL: In Re: Investigation of Methodology to Account for Access Charges in Local Exchange Company (LEC) Toll Pricing.

Docket No. 900633-TL: In Re: Development of Local Exchange Company Cost of Service Study Methodology.

Docket No. 910757-TP: In Re: Investigation into the Regulatory Safeguards Required to Prevent Cross-Subsidization by Telephone Companies.

Docket No. 920260-TL: In Re: Petition of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company for Rate Stabilization, Implementation Orders, and Other Relief.

Docket No. 950985-TP: In Re: Resolution of Petitions to establish 1995 rates, terms, and conditions for interconnection involving local exchange companies and alternative local exchange companies pursuant to Section 364.162, Florida Statutes.

Docket No. 960846-TP: In Re: Petition by MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of a proposed agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Concerning Interconnection and Resale Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Docket No. 960833-TP: In Re: Petition by AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of a Proposed Agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Concerning Interconnection and Resale Under the

Telecommunications Act of 1996 (consolidated).

Docket No. 960847-TP and 960980-TP: In Re: Petition by AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., MCI Telecommunications Corporation, MCI Metro Access Transmission Service, Inc., for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of a Proposed Agreement with GTE Florida Incorporated Inc. Concerning Interconnection and Resale Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (consolidated).

Docket No. 961230-TP: In Re: Petition by MCI Telecommunications Corporation for Arbitration with United Telephone Company of Florida and Central Telephone Company of Florida Concerning Interconnection Rates, Terms, and Conditions, Pursuant to the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 960786-TL: In Re: Consideration of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Entry Into InterLATA Services Pursuant to Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket Nos. 960833-TP, 960846-TP, 960757-TP, and 971140-TP: Investigation to develop permanent rates for certain unbundled network elements.

Docket No. 980696-TP: In Re: Determination of the cost of basic local telecommunications service, pursuant to Section 364.025 Florida Statutes.

Docket No. 990750-TP: Petition by ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc., d/b/a/ ITC^DeltaCom, for arbitration of certain unresolved issues in interconnection negotiations between ITC^DeltaCom and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

Docket No. 991605-TP: Petition of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for Arbitration of the Interconnection Agreement Between Time Warner Telecom of Florida, L.P., pursuant to Section 252 (b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 030137-TP: In re: Petition for Arbitration of Unresolved Issues in Negotiation of Interconnection Agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. by ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. d/b/a ITC^DeltaCom.

Georgia Public Service Commission

Docket No. 3882-U: In Re: Investigation into Incentive Telephone Regulation in Georgia.

Docket No. 3883-U: In Re: Investigation into the Level and Structure of Intrastate Access Charges.

Docket No. 3921-U: In Re: Compliance and Implementation of Senate Bill 524.

Docket No. 3905-U: In Re: Southern Bell Rule Nisi.

Docket No. 3995-U: In Re: IntraLATA Toll Competition.

Docket No. 4018-U: In Re: Review of Open Network Architecture (ONA) (Comments).

Docket No. 5258-U: In Re: Petition of BellSouth Telecommunications for Consideration and Approval of its "Georgians FIRST" (Price Caps) Proposal.

Docket No. 5825-U: In Re: The Creation of a Universal Access Fund as Required by the Telecommunications Competition and Development Act of 1995.

Docket No. 6801-U: In Re: Interconnection Negotiations Between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., Pursuant to Sections 251-252 and 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 6865-U: In Re: Petition by MCI for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Concerning Interconnection and Resale Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 7253-U: In Re: BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions Under Section 252 (f) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 7061-U: In Re: Review of Cost Studies and Methodologies for Interconnection and Unbundling of BellSouth Telecommunications Services.

Docket No. 10692-U: In Re: Generic Proceeding to Establish Long-Term Pricing Policies for Unbundled Network Elements.

Docket No. 10854-U: In Re: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 16583-U: In Re: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Public Utilities Commission of Hawaii

Docket No. 7702: In the Matter of Instituting a Proceeding on Communications, Including an Investigation of the Communications Infrastructure of the State of Hawaii.

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission

Cause No. 42303: In the Matter of the Complaint of the Indiana Payphone Association for a Commission Determination of Just and Reasonable Rates and Charges and Compliance with Federal Regulations.

Cause No. 41052-ETC-43: In the Matter of the Designation of Eligible Telecommunications Carriers by the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Related FCC Orders. In Particular, the Application of NPCR, Inc. d/b/a Nextel Partners to be Designated.

Iowa Utilities Board

Docket No. RPU-95-10.

Docket No. RPU-95-11.

State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas

Docket No. 00-GIMT-1054-GIT: In the Matter of a General Investigation to Determine Whether Reciprocal Compensation Should Be Paid for Traffic to an Internet Service Provider.

Kentucky Public Service Commission

Administrative Case No. 10321: In the Matter of the Tariff Filing of South Central Bell Telephone Company to Establish and Offer Pulselink Service.

Administrative Case No. 323: In the Matter of An Inquiry into IntraLATA Toll Competition, An Appropriate Compensation Scheme for Completion of IntraLATA Calls by Interexchange Carriers, and WATS Jurisdictionality.

- Phase IA: Determination of whether intraLATA toll competition is in the public interest.
- Phase IB: Determination of a method of implementing intraLATA competition.
- Rehearing on issue of Imputation.

Administrative Case No. 90-256, Phase II: In the Matter of A Review of the Rates and Charges and Incentive Regulation Plan of South Central Bell Telephone Company.

Administrative Case No. 336: In the Matter of an Investigation into the Elimination of Switched Access Service Discounts and Adoption of Time of Day Switch Access Service Rates.

Administrative Case No. 91-250: In the Matter of South Central Bell Telephone Company's Proposed Area Calling Service Tariff.

Administrative Case No. 96-431: In Re: Petition by MCI for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of a Proposed Agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Concerning Interconnection and Resale Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Administrative Case No. 96-478: In Re: The Petition by AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of a Proposed Agreement with GTE South Incorporated Concerning Interconnection and Resale Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Administrative Case No. 96-482: In Re: The Interconnection Agreement Negotiations Between AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252.

Administrative Case No. 360: In the Matter of: An Inquiry into Universal Service and Funding Issues.

Administrative Case No. 96-608: In the Matter of: Investigation Concerning the Provision of InterLATA Services by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Administrative Case No. 382: An Inquiry into the Development of Deaveraged Rates for Unbundled Network Elements.

Louisiana Public Service Commission

Docket No. 17970: In Re: Investigation of the Revenue Requirements, Rate Structures, Charges, Services, Rate of Return, and Construction Program of AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc., in its Louisiana Operations.

Docket No. U-17949: In the Matter of an Investigation of the Revenue Requirements, Rate Structures, Charges, Services, Rate of Return, and Construction Program of South Central Bell Telephone Company, Its Louisiana Intrastate Operations, The Appropriate Level of Access Charges, and All Matters Relevant to the Rates and Service Rendered by the Company.

Subdocket A (SCB Earnings Phase)

Subdocket B (Generic Competition Phase)

Docket No. 18913-U: In Re: South Central Bell's Request for Approval of Tariff Revisions to Restructure ESSX and Digital ESSX Service.

Docket No. U-18851: In Re: Petition for Elimination of Disparity in Access Tariff Rates.

Docket No. U-22022: In Re: Review and Consideration of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s TSLRIC and LRIC Cost Studies Submitted Pursuant to Sections 901(C) and 1001(E) of the Regulations for Competition in the Local Telecommunications Market as Adopted by General Order Dated March 15, 1996 in Order to Determine the Cost of Interconnection Services and Unbundled Network Components to Establish Reasonable, Non-Discriminatory, Cost Based Tariffed Rates and Docket No. U-22093: In Re: Review and Consideration of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Tariff Filing of April 1, 1996, Filed Pursuant to Section 901 and 1001 of the Regulations for Competition in the Local Telecommunications Market Which Tariff Introduces Interconnection and Unbundled Services and Establishes the Rates, Terms and Conditions for Such Service Offerings (consolidated).

Docket No. U-22145: In the Matter of Interconnection Agreement Negotiations Between AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252.

Docket No. U-22252: In Re: Consideration and Review of BST's Preapplication Compliance with Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, including but not limited to the fourteen requirements set forth in Section 271 (c) (2) (b) in order to verify compliance with section 271 and provide a recommendation to the FCC regarding BST's application to provide interLATA services originating in-region.

Docket No. U-20883 Subdocket A: In Re: Submission of the Louisiana Public Service Commission's Forward Looking Cost Study to the FCC for Purposes of Calculating Federal Universal Service Support.

Docket No. U-24206: In Re: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. U-22632: In Re: BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Filing of New Cost Studies for Providing Access Line Service for Customer Provided Public Telephones and Smartline Service for Public Telephone Access.

Docket No. Docket No. U-24714-A: In Re: Final Deaveraging of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. UNE Rates Pursuant to FCC 96-45 Ninth Report and Order and Order on Eighteenth Order on Reconsideration Released November 2, 1999.

Public Service Commission of Maryland

Case 8584, Phase II: In the Matter of the Application of MFS Intelenet of Maryland, Inc. for Authority to Provide and Resell Local Exchange and Intrastate Telecommunications Services in Areas Served by C&P Telephone Company of Maryland.

Case 8715: In the Matter of the Inquiry into Alternative Forms of Regulating Telephone Companies.

Case 8731: In the Matter of the Petitions for Approval of Agreements and Arbitration of Unresolved Issues Arising Under Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy

D.P.U./D.T.E. 97088/97-18 (Phase II): Investigation by the Department of Telecommunications & Energy on its own motion regarding (1) implementation of section 276 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 relative to public interest payphones, (2) Entry and Exit Barriers for the Payphone Marketplace, (3) New England Telephone and Telegraph Company d/b/a NYNEX's Public Access Smart-Pay Service, and (4) the rate policy for operator service providers.

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

PUC Docket No. PT6153/AM-02-686, OAH Docket No. 3-2500-14980-2: In the Matter of Petition of Midwest Wireless Communications, LLC for Designation as an Eligible Communications carrier under 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2).

PUC Docket No. PT-6182, 6181/M-02-1503: In the Matter of RCC Minnesota, Inc. and Wireless Alliance, LLC for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier under 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2).

Mississippi Public Service Commission

Docket No. U-5086: In Re: MCI Telecommunications Corporation's Metered Use Service Option D (Prism I) and Option E (Prism II).

Docket No. U-5112: In Re: MCI Telecommunications Corporation's Metered Use Option H (800 Service).

Docket No. U-5318: In Re: Petition of MCI for Approval of MCI's Provision of Service to a Specific Commercial Banking Customers for Intrastate Interexchange Telecommunications Service.

Docket 89-UN-5453: In Re: Notice and Application of South Central Bell Telephone Company for Adoption and Implementation of a Rate Stabilization Plan for its Mississippi Operations.

Docket No. 90-UA-0280: In Re: Order of the Mississippi Public Service Commission Initiating Hearings Concerning (1) IntraLATA Competition in the Telecommunications Industry and (2) Payment of Compensation by Interexchange Carriers and Resellers to Local Exchange Companies in Addition to Access Charges.

Docket No. 92-UA-0227: In Re: Order Implementing IntraLATA Competition.

Docket No. 96-AD-0559: In Re: In the Matter of the Interconnection Agreement Negotiations Between AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252.

Docket No. 98-AD-035: Universal Service.

Docket No. 97-AD-544: In Re: Generic Proceeding to Establish Permanent Prices for BellSouth Interconnection and Unbundled Network Elements.

Public Service Commission of the State of Montana

Docket No. D2000.8.124: In the Matter of Touch America, Inc.'s Petition for Arbitration Pursuant to

Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 of the Terms and Conditions of Interconnection with Qwest Corporation, f/k/a US West Communications, Inc.

Docket No. D2000.6.89: In the Matter of Qwest Corporation's Application to Establish Rates for Interconnection, Unbundled Network Elements, Transport and Termination, and Resale Services.

Nebraska Public Service Commission

Docket No. C-1385: In the Matter of a Petition for Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement Between AT&T Communications of the Midwest, Inc., and US West Communications, Inc.

New York Public Service Commission

Case No. 28425: Proceeding on Motion of the Commission as to the Impact of the Modification of Final Judgement and the Federal Communications Commission's Docket 78-72 on the Provision of Toll Service in New York State.

North Carolina Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. P-100, Sub 72: In the Matter of the Petition of AT&T to Amend Commission Rules Governing Regulation of Interexchange Carriers (Comments).

Docket No. P-141, Sub 19: In the Matter of the Application of MCI Telecommunications Corporation to Provide InterLATA Facilities-Based Telecommunications Services (Comments).

Docket No. P-55, Sub 1013: In the Matter of Application of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. for, and Election of, Price Regulation.

Docket Nos. P-7, Sub 825 and P-10, Sub 479: In the Matter of Petition of Carolina Telephone and Telegraph and Central Telephone Company for Approval of a Price Regulation Plan Pursuant to G.S. 62-133.5.

Docket No. P-19, Sub 277: In the Matter of Application of GTE South Incorporated for and Election of, Price Regulation.

Docket No. P-141, Sub 29: In the Matter of: Petition of MCI Telecommunications Corporation for Arbitration of Interconnection with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Petition of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. for Arbitration of Interconnection with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (consolidated).

Docket No. P-141, Sub 30: In the Matter of: Petition of MCI Telecommunications Corporation for Arbitration of Interconnection with General Telephone Company of North Carolina, Inc., Petition of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. for Arbitration of Interconnection with General Telephone Company of North Carolina, Inc. (consolidated).

Docket No. P-100, Sub 133b: Re: In the Matter of Establishment of Universal Support Mechanisms Pursuant to Section 254 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. P-100, Sub 133d: Re: Proceeding to Determine Permanent Pricing for Unbundled Network Elements.

Docket No. P-100, Sub 84b: Re: In the Matter of Petition of North Carolina Payphone Association for Review of Local Exchange Company Tariffs for Basic Payphone Services (Comments).

Docket No. P-561, Sub 10: BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Complainant, v. US LEC of North Carolina, LLC, and Metacomm, LLC, Respondents.

Docket No. P-472, Sub 15: In the Matter of the Interconnection Agreement Between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and Time Warner Telecom of North Carolina, L.P. Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket Nos. P-7, Sub 995; P-10, Sub 633: ALEC., Inc. v. Carolina Telephone and Telegraph Company and Central Telephone Company.

Docket No. P-500, Sub 18: In the Matter of: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Case No. 93-487-TP-ALT: In the Matter of the Application of The Ohio Bell Telephone Company for Approval of an Alternative Form of Regulation.

Oklahoma Corporation Commission

Cause No. PUD 01448: In the Matter of the Application for an Order Limiting Collocation for Special Access to Virtual or Physical Collocation at the Option of the Local Exchange Carrier.

Cause No. PUD 200300195: Application of United States Cellular Corporation for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Cause No. PUD 200300239: Application of Dobson Cellular Systems, Inc. for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon

Docket No. UT 119: In the Matter of an Investigation into Tariffs Filed by US West Communications, Inc., United Telephone of the Northwest, Pacific Telecom, Inc., and GTE Northwest, Inc. in Accordance with ORS 759.185(4).

Docket No. ARB 3: In the Matter of the Petition of AT&T Communications of the Pacific Northwest, Inc., for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms, and Conditions Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Docket No. ARB 6: In the Matter of the Petition of MCIMetro Access Transmission Services, Inc. for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms, and Conditions Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (consolidated).

Docket No. ARB 9: In the Matter of the Petition of an Interconnection Agreement Between MCIMetro Access Transportation Services, Inc. and GTE Northwest Incorporated, Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252.

Docket No. UT-125: In the Matter of the Application of US West Communications, Inc. for an Increase in Revenues.

Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. I-00910010: In Re: Generic Investigation into the Current Provision of InterLATA Toll Service.

Docket No. P-00930715: In Re: The Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania's Petition and Plan for Alternative Form of Regulation under Chapter 30.

Docket No. R-00943008: In Re: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Inc. (Investigation of Proposed Promotional Offerings Tariff).

Docket No. M-00940587: In Re: Investigation pursuant to Section 3005 of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa. C. S. §3005, and the Commission's Opinion and Order at Docket No. P-930715, to establish standards and safeguards for competitive services, with particular emphasis in the areas of cost allocations, cost studies, unbundling, and imputation, and to consider generic issues for future rulemaking.

South Carolina Public Service Commission

Docket No. 90-626-C: In Re: Generic Proceeding to Consider Intrastate Incentive Regulation.

Docket No. 90-321-C: In Re: Petition of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company for Revisions to its Access Service Tariff Nos. E2 and E16.

Docket No. 88-472-C: In Re: Petition of AT&T of the Southern States, Inc., Requesting the Commission to Initiate an Investigation Concerning the Level and Structure of Intrastate Carrier Common Line (CCL) Access Charges.

Docket No. 92-163-C: In Re: Position of Certain Participating South Carolina Local Exchange Companies for Approval of an Expanded Area Calling (EAC) Plan.

Docket No. 92-182-C: In Re: Application of MCI Telecommunications Corporation, AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., and Sprint Communications Company, L.P., to Provide IntraLATA Telecommunications Services.

Docket No. 95-720-C: In Re: Application of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company for Approval of an Alternative Regulation Plan.

Docket No. 96-358-C: In Re: Interconnection Agreement Negotiations Between AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252.

Docket No. 96-375-C: In Re: Interconnection Agreement Negotiations Between AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. and GTE South Incorporated Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252.

Docket No. 97-101-C: In Re: Entry of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. into the InterLATA Toll Market.

Docket No. 97-374-C: In Re: Proceeding to Review BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Cost for Unbundled Network Elements.

Docket No. 97-239-C: Intrastate Universal Service Fund.

Docket No. 97-124-C: BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Revisions to its General Subscriber Services Tariff and Access Service Tariff to Comply with the FCC's Implementation of the Pay Telephone

Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 1999-268-C: Petition of Myrtle Beach Telephone, LLC, for Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with Horry Telephone Cooperative, Inc.

Docket No. 1999-259-C: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 2001-65-C: Generic Proceeding to Establish Prices for BellSouth's Interconnection Services, Unbundled Network Elements and Other Related Elements and Services.

Tennessee Public Service Commission

Docket No. 90-05953: In Re: Earnings Investigation of South Central Bell Telephone Company.

Docket Nos. 89-11065, 89-11735, 89-12677: AT&T Communications of the South Central States, MCI Telecommunications Corporation, US Sprint Communications Company -- Application for Limited IntraLATA Telecommunications Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity.

Docket No. 91-07501: South Central Bell Telephone Company's Application to Reflect Changes in its Switched Access Service Tariff to Limit Use of the 700 Access Code.

Tennessee Regulatory Authority

Docket No. 96-01152: In Re: Petition by AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc. for Arbitration under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Docket No. 96-01271: In Re: Petition by MCI Telecommunications Corporation for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of a Proposed Agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Concerning Interconnection and Resale Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (consolidated).

Docket No. 96-01262: In Re: Interconnection Agreement Negotiations Between AT&T of the South Central States, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252.

Docket No. 97-01262: Proceeding to Establish Permanent Prices for Interconnection and Unbundled Network Elements.

Docket No. 97-00888: Universal Service Generic Contested Case.

Docket No. 99-00430: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 97-00409: In Re: All Telephone Companies Tariff Filings Regarding Reclassification of Pay Telephone Service as Required by Federal Communications Commission Docket No. 96-128.

Docket No. 03-00119: In Re: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DeltaCom Communications, Inc. with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

Public Utility Commission of Texas

Docket No. 12879: Application of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company for Expanded Interconnection

for Special Access Services and Switched Transport Services and Unbundling of Special Access DS1 and DS3 Services Pursuant to P. U. C. Subst. R. 23.26.

Docket No. 18082: Complaint of Time Warner Communications against Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.

Docket No. 21982: Proceeding to Examine Reciprocal Compensation Pursuant to Section 252 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Docket No. 23396: Joint Petition of CoServ, LLC d/b/a CoServ Communications and Multitechnology Services, LP d/b/a CoServ Broadband Services for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms, Conditions, and Related Arrangements with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.

Docket No. 24015: Consolidated Complaints and Requests of Post-Interconnection Dispute Resolution Regarding Inter-Carrier Compensation for FX-Type Traffic Against Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.

PUC Docket No. 27709: Application of NPCR, Inc., dba Nextel Partners for Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Designation (ETC).

State of Vermont Public Service Board

Docket No. 6533: Application of Verizon New England Inc. d/b/a Verizon Vermont for a Favorable Recommendation to Offer InterLATA Services Under 47 U.S.C. 271.

Virginia State Corporation Commission

Case No. PUC920043: Application of Virginia Metrotel, Inc. for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Provide InterLATA Interexchange Telecommunications Services.

Case No. PUC920029: Ex Parte: In the Matter of Evaluating the Experimental Plan for Alternative Regulation of Virginia Telephone Companies.

Case No. PUC930035: Application of Contel of Virginia, Inc. d/b/a GTE Virginia to implement community calling plans in various GTE Virginia exchanges within the Richmond and Lynchburg LATAs.

Case No. PUC930036: Ex Parte: In the Matter of Investigating Telephone Regulatory Methods Pursuant to Virginia Code § 56-235.5, & Etc.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

Docket Nos. UT-941464, UT-941465, UT-950146, and UT-950265 (Consolidated): Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, Complainant, vs. US West Communications, Inc., Respondent; TCG Seattle and Digital Direct of Seattle, Inc., Complainant, vs. US West Communications, Inc., Respondent; TCG Seattle, Complainant, vs. GTE Northwest Inc., Respondent; Electric Lightwave, Inc., vs. GTE Northwest, Inc., Respondent.

Docket No. UT-950200: In the Matter of the Request of US West Communications, Inc. for an Increase in its Rates and Charges.

Docket No. UT-000883: In the Matter of the Petition of U S West Communications, Inc. for Competitive

Classification.

Public Service Commission of West Virginia

Case No. 02-1453-T-PC: Highland Cellular, Inc. Petition for consent and approval to be designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier in the areas served by Citizens Telecommunications Company of West Virginia.

Public Service Commission of Wyoming

Docket No. 70000-TR-95-238: In the Matter of the General Rate/Price Case Application of US West Communications, Inc. (Phase I).

Docket No. PSC-96-32: In the Matter of Proposed Rule Regarding Total Service Long Run Incremental Cost (TSLRIC) Studies.

Docket No. 70000-TR-98-420: In the Matter of the Application of US West Communications, Inc. for authority to implement price ceilings in conjunction with its proposed Wyoming Price Regulation Plan for essential and noncompetitive telecommunications services (Phase III).

Docket No. 70000-TR-99-480: In the Matter of the Application of US West Communications, Inc. for authority to implement price ceilings in conjunction with its proposed Wyoming Price Regulation Plan for essential and noncompetitive telecommunications services (Phase IV).

Docket No. 70000-TR-00-556: In the Matter of the Filing by US West Communications, Inc. for Authority to File its TSLRIC 2000 Annual Input Filing and Docket No. 70000-TR-00-570: In the Matter of the Application of US West Communications, Inc. for Authority to File its 2000 Annual TSLRIC Study Filing.

Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia

Formal Case No. 814, Phase IV: In the Matter of the Investigation into the Impact of the AT&T Divestiture and Decisions of the Federal Communications Commission on Bell Atlantic - Washington, D. C. Inc.'s Jurisdictional Rates.

Puerto Rico Telecommunications Regulatory Board

Case No. 98-Q-0001: In Re: Payphone Tariffs.

Docket No.: JRT-2001-AR-0002: In the Matter of Interconnection Rates, Terms and Conditions between WorldNet Telecommunications, Inc. and Puerto Rico Telephone Company.

COMMENTS/DECLARATIONS - FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

CC Docket No. 92-91: In the Matter of Open Network Architecture Tariffs of Bell Operating Companies.

CC Docket No. 93-162: Local Exchange Carriers' Rates, Terms, and Conditions for Expanded Interconnection for Special Access.

CC Docket No. 91-141: Common Carrier Bureau Inquiry into Local Exchange Company Term and Volume Discount Plans for Special Access.

CC Docket No. 94-97: Review of Virtual Expanded Interconnection Service Tariffs.

CC Docket No. 94-128: Open Network Architecture Tariffs of US West Communications, Inc.

CC Docket No. 94-97, Phase II: Investigation of Cost Issues, Virtual Expanded Interconnection Service Tariffs.

CC Docket No. 96-98: In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996

CC Docket No. 97-231: Application by BellSouth to Provide In-Region InterLATA Services

CC Docket No. 98-121: Application by BellSouth to Provide In-Region InterLATA Services

CCB/CPD No. 99-27: In the Matter of Petition of North Carolina Payphone Association for Expedited Review of, and/or Declaratory Ruling Concerning, Local Exchange Company Tariffs for Basic Payphone Services.

CC Docket No. 96-128: In the Matter of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CCB/CPD No. 99-31: Oklahoma Independent Telephone Companies Petition for Declaratory Ruling (consolidated).

CCB/CPD No. 00-1: In the Matter of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission Order Directing Filings.

CC Docket No. 99-68: In the Matter of Inter-Carrier Compensation for ISP-Bound Traffic

File No. EB-01-MD-020: In the Matter of Sprint Communications Company, L.P., Complainant v. Time Warner Telecom, Inc. Defendant.

Request by the American Public Communications Council that the Commission Issue a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to Update the Dial-Around Compensation Rate

File Nos. EB-02-MD-018-030: In the Matter of Communications Vending Corp. of Arizona, et. al., Complainants, v. Citizens Communications Co. f/k/a Citizens Utilities Co. and Citizens Telecommunications Co., et. al., Defendants.

CC Docket No. 96-45: In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Cellular South License, Inc., RCC Holdings, Inc., Petitions for designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Alabama.

CC Docket No. 96-45: In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Declaration in Support of the Comments to the Federal-State Joint Board of the Rural Cellular Association and the Alliance of Rural CMRS Carriers.

REPRESENTATIVE TESTIMONY – STATE, FEDERAL, AND OVERSEAS COURTS

Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania

Shared Communications Services of 1800-80 JFK Boulevard, Inc., Plaintiff, v. Bell Atlantic Properties, Inc., Defendant.

Texas State Office of Administrative Hearings

Office of Customer Protection (OCP) Investigation of Axces, Inc. for Continuing Violations of PUC Substantive Rule §26.130, Selection of Telecommunications Utilities, Pursuant to Procedural Rules 22.246 Administrative Penalties.

Superior Court for the State of Alaska, First Judicial District

Richard R. Watson, David K. Brown and Ketchikan Internet Services, a partnership of Richard R. Watson and David K. Brown, plaintiffs, v. Karl Amylon and the City of Ketchikan, Defendants.

United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Columbia Division

Brian Wesley Jeffcoat, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. Time Warner Entertainment - Advance/Newhouse Partnership, Defendant.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division

Multitechnology Services, L. P. d/b/a CoServ Broadband Services, Plaintiffs, v. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Defendant.

Multitechnology Services, L. P. d/b/a CoServ Broadband Services, Plaintiffs, v. Verizon Southwest f/k/a GTE Southwest Incorporated.

High Court of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, Court of First Instance

Commercial List No. 229 of 1999: Cable and Wireless HKT International Limited, Plaintiff v. New World Telephone Limited, Defendant.

REPRESENTATIVE TESTIMONY – PRIVATE COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION TRIBUNALS

American Arbitration Association

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Claimant vs. Time Warner Telecom, Respondent.

CPR Institute for Dispute Resolution

Supra Telecommunications and Information Systems, Inc., Claimant vs. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Respondent.