WITNESS OUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUND

_	WIINDS COMMITTENIS IND DIGITAL
2	
3 Q •	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, JOB TITLE AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
4 A.	My name is Karen A. Baird. My job title is Director,
5	Markets-Regulatory Strategy for U S WEST Communications
6	(U S WEST ¹). My business address is 421 SW Oak, Portland, OR 97204.
7	
8 Q •	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE.
9 A .	I received a BS in business administration from
10	Portland State University in 1980 and a masters in
11	business administration from the University of Oregon
12	in July 1994. I have been employed by U S WEST since
13	1981 (then Pacific Northwest Bell). I have held a
14	variety of positions in U S WEST, including sales,
15	product management, regulatory affairs, strategic
16	development, issues management, and E911 service and
17	technical design.
18	ccomitour debign.
19 Q .	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE ANY STATE
20	REGULATORY COMMISSION?
21 A .	Yes. I have testified before the Commissions of South Dakota, Colorado,
22	Oregon, Utah, Nebraska and New Mexico.
	Oregon, Otan, reoraska and rew Mexico.
23	
24	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY
25	
26 Q .	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS
27	PROCEEDING?
28 A.	The purpose of my testimony is to describe U S WEST's
29	proposed withdrawal and grandfathering of Centrex Plus
30	and to explain why the filing should be approved by
31	the Commission.
32 Q •	
33	CENTREX PLUS SERVICE OR ANY OTHER TARIFFED OR PRICE
34	LISTED SERVICE?
35 A.	No.
36	
37	WHAT IS CENTREX PLUS?
38	
39 Q •	WHAT IS CENTREX PLUS?
40 A.	Centrex Plus is a central office-based switching
41	service offered by U S WEST that includes a standard
42	feature package of optional calling features such as

call hold, call transfer and three-way calling.

In my testimony, all references to U S WEST Communications, Inc., and U S WEST refer exclusively to the U S WEST Communications, Inc., and have no connection to the U S WEST Media Group, Inc., or its subsidiaries.

2 Centrex Plus is a central office-based switching alternative to Private Branch Exchange Switches or, as they are commonly called, PBXs. Centrex Plus is, and PBXs are, designed for and marketed to medium and large business and government end-user customers.

7

WHY U S WEST PROPOSED TO GRANDFATHER CENTREX PLUS

9 10

8

- 11 Q. COULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CENTREX PLUS FILING 12 U S WEST MADE ON FEBRUARY 5, 1996?
- 13 A. Yes. In Tariff Transmittal 2740T U S WEST requested 14 the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 15 approve the "discontinuance" of Centrex Plus to new 16 customers" and the "grandfathering" of existing 17 customers until April 29, 2005.

18

- 19 Q. WITH THE APPROVAL OF TARIFF TRANSMITTAL 2740T, WOULD
 20 CENTREX PLUS BE THE ONLY GRANDFATHERED CENTREX SERVICE
 21 IN THE TARIFF?
- No. U S WEST grandfathered, i.e., is no longer offering to new customers, a number of Centrex-related services such as Centrex Group Use Service (grandfathered June 10, 1977), Centrex (grandfathered March 30, 1981), Centraflex System 3 (grandfathered August 28, 1986), and Centron service (grandfathered May 5, 1995).

29

- 30 Q. WHY HAS U S WEST INTRODUCED AND SUBSEQUENTLY OBSOLETED SO MANY CENTREX TYPE PRODUCTS?
- 32A. Since the mid 1970s, when PBXs began to match or exceed 33 the capabilities of the original Centrex product on a 34 price competitive basis, U S WEST has generally 35 modified the product and grandfathered the pre-existing 36 versions.
- Pre-existing versions were grandfathered to eliminate pricing anomalies.

39

- 40 Q. WHY DID U S WEST REQUEST THE DISCONTINUANCE AND GRANDFATHERING OF CENTREX SERVICE IN THE TARIFF?
- To address price arbitrage that will occur in the new telecommunications environment with the Centrex Plus service.

- 46 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PRICE ARBITRAGE CONCERNS OF U S WEST.
- 48 A. Centrex Plus, as it is currently priced and structured, 49 has significant and inappropriate advantages when 50 compared with existing basic business service and

feature prices. With the rapidly changing marketplace 1 2 and regulatory environment resulting from the Washington Supreme Court decision in 1994, various 3 4 proceedings initiated at the Commission which have encouraged local service competition and by the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, these advantages create 6 uneconomic arbitrage (or resale) opportunities that 7 U S WEST must address as the local telecommunications market is opened for competitive entry. 9

10

11 Q. WHY SHOULD THIS COMMISSION BE CONCERNED ABOUT 12 UNECONOMIC ARBITRAGE (OR RESALE) OPPORTUNITIES?

13 A. If the Commission were to continue to allow Centrex to be resold in Washington, a Centrex reseller could 14 15 exploit the significant price differential between Centrex station lines and U S WEST basic exchange 16 business service. If this were to occur, revenue that 17 contributes substantially to the recovery of joint and 18 common cost is significantly reduced, forcing the rates 19 20 of all services to increase.

21

22 For example, historically, local exchange business lines, features and toll have been priced at a rate that allows a contribution to support lower residential rates. Thus, if a significant loss of business exchange lines, features, toll, and of switched access associated with interLATA toll traffic were to result from Centrex resale, this contribution would be greatly reduced.

30

31 Q. CAN YOU DEMONSTRATE HOW A CENTREX RESELLER COULD EXPLOIT THE PRICE DIFFERENTIAL?

Yes. Confidential Exhibit A demonstrates the average revenue per line a business exchange line generates in Washington. This revenue estimate is based on the rate for a business line, the average revenue per line for central office features like hunting and call waiting, the average amount of intraLATA toll, and switched access service associated with outgoing interLATA toll.

40

41 Also, in Exhibit A, U S WEST projects the average revenue 42 generated from a resold Centrex line. This much lower 43 revenue estimate represents not only the price 44 difference between the rate for a business line, and a 45 Centrex station line, but the fact that Centrex 46 resellers aggregate their customers' intraLATA and 47 interLATA traffic to bypass U S WEST's toll and 48 switched access services.

49

50 Q. CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHAT YOU MEAN WHEN YOU STATE THAT CENTREX
51 RESELLERS AGGREGATE THEIR CUSTOMERS' INTRALATA AND

INTERLATA TOLL TRAFFIC TO BYPASS 2 U S WEST'S TOLL AND SWITCHED ACCESS SERVICE? Yes, existing Centrex Plus resellers use Centrex Plus combine long distance traffic from unaffiliated to 5 end users, then use dedicated toll trunks to haul that traffic from the Centrex Plus system to an 6 7 interexchange carrier selected by the Centrex Plus reseller. This allows the reseller to offer a 1+ alternative to U S WEST's intraLATA long distance 9 service. 10 11 12 IS THE CURRENT BUSINESS PRACTICES OF CENTREX RESELLERS WHO 13 AGGREGATE TOLL TRAFFIC INCONSISTENT WITH THE NEW FEDERAL 14 TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT? 15 A. Yes, it could be. One of the substantive protections afforded by the new federal telecommunications law is that RBOCs do not have to implement intraLATA 17 presubscription until the RBOC has been authorized to 18 provide interLATA long distance service or February 8, 19 20 1999 whichever is earlier. Section 271(e)(2)(B) of the new federal telecommunications law provides: 21 22 23 Except for single-LATA States and States that have issued an order by December 19, 1995, requiring a Bell operating company to implement intraLATA toll 25 dialing parity, a state may not require a Bell 26 27 operating company to implement intraLATA toll 28 dialing parity in that state before a Bell operating company has been granted authority under 29 this section to provide interLATA services 30 originating in that State or before 3 years after 31 32 the date of enactment of the Telecommunications 33 Act of 1996, whichever is earlier. 34 35 The new federal telecommunications law also precludes AT&T and MCI Metro from joint marketing resold Centrex Plus 37 with their interLATA long distance services. Thus, AT&T and MCI Metro could not resale 271(e)(1). 38 39 Centrex Plus in a manner similar to other Centrex Plus resellers currently operating in Washington. 40 41 HAVE OTHER STATES ADDRESSED THIS CONCERN? 43 A. Yes, the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, in recently looking at the resale issue, released an order finding that such a practice 44 undermined the Act: 45 47 We agree with Pacific that Centrex should be resold only as a business system to single businesses and not as 48 49 a network infrastructure, toll aggregation tool

that undermines the federal law on presubscription

timing. . . . The balance set by the law would be upset if [resellers] could give their customers presubscription through Centrex sale. It would be inappropriate to use resale of Centrex as a tool to aggregate toll from unrelated end users. . . . We shall consider imposing appropriate use and user restrictions limiting Centrex . . . to resale as business systems in place of premise based equipment (i.e., PBX)².

10

- 11 Q. IS THE WITHDRAWAL AND GRANDFATHERING OF CENTREX PLUS
 12 INCONSISTENT WITH THE NEW TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF
 13 1996?
- 14A. No. I am not aware of any provision in the 15 Telecommunications Act of 1996 that would require 16 U S WEST to continue to offer Centrex Plus to new 17 customers.

18

- 19 Q. ARE THERE ANY AUTHORIZED CENTREX RESELLERS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON TODAY?
- 21 A. Yes.

22

- 23 Q. ARE ALL OF THE INTERVENORS IN THIS CASE CURRENTLY US WEST CENTREX CUSTOMERS IN WASHINGTON?
- 25 A. No.

26

- 27 Q. WHAT EFFECT COULD THE GRANDFATHERING OF CENTREX PLUS
 28 SERVICE HAVE ON COMPANIES WHO CURRENTLY ARE NOT
 29 SUBSCRIBING TO THE SERVICE?
- Their concerns appear to be tied to a desire, at some unspecified time in the future, to resell U S WEST Centrex service, and the ability to increase their profits by exploiting the price difference between Centrex service and U S WEST business basic exchange services.

- 37 Q. HOW WILL ALTERNATIVE LOCAL EXCHANGE COMPANIES COMPETE IF
 38 THEY ARE UNABLE TO RESALE U S WEST CENTREX SERVICE IN THE
 39 FUTURE?
- 40 A. Alternative local exchange companies will have a large 41 array of retail services (at wholesale rates), and 42 unbundled interconnection elements, to use in meeting
- the needs of their customers. These resale
- opportunities will be in addition to any of their own facilities or equipment these providers might choose to

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion into Competition for Local Exchange Service, Docket No. R.95-04-043, 044 at pp. 24-25 (See Schedule B)

and Commission Decision released March 13, 1996, Decision No. 96-03-020 at pg. 25.

install in Washington.

2

ALTERNATIVE SERVICES FOR EXISTING CUSTOMERS

3 4

5 Q. DO U S WEST'S RETAIL CENTREX CUSTOMERS HAVE COMPETITIVE ALTERNATIVES TO CENTREX?

7A. Yes. U S WEST's retail Centrex customers have several alternatives to select from. The two most obvious include new local exchange providers who have placed their own central office switch in service and are offering a Centrex service, and PBX providers who are anxious to meet the needs of Washington business customers for telephone switching systems.

14

15 PBXs can provide functional equivalents or substitutes for 16 all of the features available with Centrex service. In 17 particular, many PBXs have management control 18 capabilities not currently available on the U S WEST 19 Centrex service.

20

21 Q. DID THIS COMMISSION FIND THAT CENTREX SERVICE IS IN FACT A COMPETITIVE SERVICE OFFERING IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON?

Yes, in Cause No. U-86-86 the Commission determined 24 A. that Centrex-type services, specifically, intercom 25 26 dialing and optional feature package elements, were 27 competitive. This issue was investigated again in 1992 and in November, 1993, the Commission issued the Fourth 28 Supplemental Order in Docket No.UT-911488, et al. At 29 page 20 of that order, the Commission found that the 30 31 Centrex-type services share of the Washington business 32 customer market was between ten and fifteen percent and that U S WEST had no captive customer base for Centrex-33 type services. This means that in 1993, 85-90% of the 34 35 Washington business customer market utilized non-36 Centrex-type service.

37

38 Q. DO OTHER NEW LOCAL EXCHANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS 39 PROVIDERS IN WASHINGTON OFFER CENTREX SERVICE?

- 40 A. Yes, at least three alternative local exchange 41 providers currently offer their own Centrex-type 42 service to their business customers and are not 43 currently resellers of
- 44 U S WEST Centrex Plus service. In fact, most recently, MCI
 45 Metro extended a promotion directed at existing U S
 46 WEST Centrex customers (see Exhibit B). As local
 47 exchange carriers, under the Telecommunications Act of
 48 1996, each of these carriers will have the obligation

to provide for resale their Centrex-type
telecommunication services. It is clear that existing,
and potential resellers of Centrex-type services, will
have choices other than the U S WEST Centrex Plus
product.

6

7Q. ARE THERE A LARGE NUMBER OF ALTERNATIVE PROVIDERS FOR PBX SERVICES IN WASHINGTON?

Yes. Local providers of PBXs include companies like 9 **A.** GTE, Communications World of Seattle, and Executone. 10 In addition, large nationally known companies, such as 11 AT&T also provide PBX services in Washington. These 12 13 providers market to all areas of Washington. In fact, PBX systems can be utilized in all U S WEST exchanges, 14 15 while U S WEST Centrex service is not available in all 16 exchanges.

17

18 Q. HOW MANY CENTREX PLUS CUSTOMERS DOES U S WEST CURRENTLY 19 HAVE IN WASHINGTON?

20 A. U S WEST has 143 rate stabilized Centrex Plus customers in Washington as of June, 1996.

22

23 Q. HOW MANY BUSINESS CUSTOMERS DOES U S WEST CURRENTLY SERVE IN WASHINGTON?

U S WEST served 178,804 business customers in Washington in May, 1994.

27

28 Q. ARE THERE OTHER CENTREX CUSTOMERS AFFECTED BY THIS FILING?

30 A. Yes. As of June, 1996, there are 51 rate stabilized
Custom Centron customers, 19 rate stabilized Centraflex
customers, 32 rate stabilized Centron customers, and
one rate stabilized Centrex Standby line customer
affected by this filing.

35

36 Q. HOW ARE THESE CUSTOMERS AFFECTED BY THIS FILING?

Their Centrex services were grandfathered in the past as previously discussed in my testimony. At the time the services were grandfathered, these customers were advised that when their current Centrex service contract expired, they would be required to convert their service to Centrex Plus or to an alternative service.

44

45 Q. HOW DOES U S WEST'S PROPOSAL MODIFY THIS "GRANDFATHER" 46 TARIFF PROVISION?

47 A. U S WEST'S proposal enables these customers to have the 48 same terms and conditions with the obsolescence of 49 their service as those specified for Centrex Plus 50 service customers.

PROVISIONS FOR EXISTING CUSTOMERS

1 2

- 3Q. WHY WAS THE DATE APRIL 29, 2005, CHOSEN AS THE DATE TO TERMINATE CENTREX PLUS?
- 5A. U S WEST wished to honor the terms of its existing contracts. The customer contract of longest duration in the Washington expires on March 1, 2002; the customer contract of longest duration in the U S WEST region expires on April 29, 2005. U S WEST chose to apply April 29, 2005 for all existing Centrex Plus customers across the U S WEST region, in order to allow them a comfortable transition period.

13

- 14 Q. WHY HAS U S WEST INCLUDED PROVISIONS IN THIS FILING TO CONTINUE CENTREX SERVICE FOR EXISTING CUSTOMERS?
- 16 A. U S WEST indicated its intention to continue to provide
 17 Centrex Plus to "current Centrex Plus customers" up to
 18 April 29, 2005, under certain conditions because these
 19 customers will need at least two years, if not longer,
 20 to complete the process necessary to select a new
 21 service, and to have such a new service installed.

22

- 23 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE "CURRENT 'CENTREX PLUS' CUSTOMERS" AS
 24 YOU HAVE USED THE PHRASE.
- 25 A. I use the phrase "current Centrex Plus customers" to mean:

27

281. Those Centrex Plus customers of record as of February 5, 1996;

30

31 2. Those customers to whom U S WEST had presented a written 32 offer, documented proposal, or Request for Proposal 33 (RFP) response on or before February 5, 1996, which 34 terminates on or before May 5, 1996; or

35

363. Those customers who have signed a contract, or for whom a service order was issued, on or before February 5, 1996, and whose service had not yet been installed.

39

- 40 Q. WHAT ARE THE CONDITIONS TO WHICH "CURRENT CENTREX PLUS CUSTOMERS" ARE SUBJECT AS DESCRIBED IN U S WEST'S FEBRUARY 5, 1996, GRANDFATHERING?
- The following key conditions are proposed to be applicable to U S WEST's "current Centrex Plus customers":

46

Waiver of Termination Liability Charges. Centrex Plus customers are allowed to convert to other U S WEST services such as PBX trunks, 1FB and ISDN without a Centrex Plus termination liability charge or non-recurring charges to convert to another U S WEST

service.

1 2

32. Common Blocks. Centrex Plus customers may not add
additional common blocks beyond those on record or
identified in an authorized U S WEST proposal as of
February 5, 1996. Centrex Plus customers may vacate
and move locations which may require a common block to
be changed. However, no additional common blocks may
be added as a result of the move.

10

Additional Locations. Centrex Plus customers may add up 113. to 20 additional locations annually for each of their 12 13 common blocks. The only exception is that a Centrex Plus customer may initially add more than 20 locations 14 15 to its pre-existing Centrex Plus system if the Centrex 16 Plus customer has acquired another system. This exception also applies to realignments between 17 government entities. Following the initial acquisition 18 or government realignment, any additional growth is 19 20 limited to 20 new locations annually per common block.

21

Station Lines. Centrex Plus customers may move, add or 224. change station lines and optional features at existing 23 24 locations until the customer converts to another service, their Centrex Plus service contract expires or 25 until April 29, 2005. Centrex Plus customers with 1 to 26 27 100 station lines may add up to 100% of their current station lines annually for each common block. 28 Plus customers with 101 or more station lines may add 29 30 up to 100% of their current station lines every two years for each common block. In neither instance are 31 station lines compounded for purposes of calculating 32 33 future growth.

34

Assignments. Existing Centrex Plus systems may be assigned subject to the assignee being bound by the terms set forth above.

38

39 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THESE CONDITIONS?

40 A. As I stated earlier, Centrex Plus is designed to
41 provide central office-based switching to medium and
42 large business and government end-user customers.
43 These conditions were designed to allow the majority of
44 these customers the flexibility to continue doing
45 business in their typical growth and utilization
46 patterns until such time as they select and install a
47 new telephone switching service.

48 49

50 Q. WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THE GRANDFATHERING TERMS ON EXISTING CENTREX PLUS RATE STABILITY CONTRACTS?

Rate Stability Contracts are fixed price contracts for 1 A. Centrex Plus or other services. The rates set forth in Centrex Plus Rate Stability Contracts will continue in effect, but the conditions I described are proposed to apply to existing Centrex Plus Rate Stability Contracts. 6 7 RECOMMENDATIONS 8 9 10 Q. WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND? For the reasons stated above, I believe it is in the 11 A. 12 best interest of U S WEST, and its Washington 13 customers, that the Commission approve discontinuance of Centrex Plus and the terms and conditions of 14 grandfathering requested for the tariffed Centrex Plus 15 service. 16 17 18 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

19 A. Yes it does. Thank you.