BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of	DOCKET NO. UT-991930
MOUNT ST. HELENS TOURS, INC.	
For Designation of a Telecommunications Common Carrier to Serve an Unserved Community, or Portion Thereof.)))
In the Matter of the Petition of)
BARBARA BRADY) DOCKET NO. UT-991931
For an Exchange Area Boundary Change.))
In the Matter of Designation of a	,)
Telecommunications Common Carrier to Serve)
WILDERNESS LAKE COMMUNITY, or Portion) DOCKET NO. UT-993000
Thereof, on the Commission's Own Motion)
U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.)
GTE NORTHWEST INCORPORATED))
)
)
)

RESPONSE TESTIMONY OF

THERESA A. JENSEN

June 12, 2000

I.IDENTIFICATION OF WITNESS

2	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND CURRENT
3		POSITION.
4	A.	My name is Theresa A. Jensen and my business address is 1600 7 th Ave, Room 3206,
5		Seattle, Washington 98191. I am employed by U S WEST Communications, Inc.
6		("U S WEST") as a Director of Washington Regulatory Affairs in the Public Policy
7		organization.
8	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES.
9	A.	As a Director of Washington Regulatory Affairs, I am responsible for advocacy of
10		U S WEST Communications, Inc. issues before the Washington Utilities and
11		Transportation Commission ("Commission").
12	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR BACKGROUND AND WORK EXPERIENCE.
13	A.	I have been employed by U S WEST or its predecessors since 1972 and in my current
14		assignment since 1991. I began my career in telecommunications in 1972 as a
15		directory assistance operator. I also worked as a customer service representative for
16		about six years. I then spent several years in Marketing holding various job
17		responsibilities, including, market administrator, account executive, sales manager,
18		instructor, market manager, data systems manager and product manager. From 1987
19		until 1991 I worked in Strategic Planning and was responsible for developing and

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Docket No. UT-991930, et al. Response Testimony of Theresa A. Jensen June 12, 2000 Page 2

1 implementing U S WEST's Open Network Architecture Plan. In my current 2 assignment, I am responsible for regulatory issues, including, rulemakings, service quality, product and service offerings, depreciation, petitions for competitive 3 4 classifications and the Washington financial results of operation. 5 Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS COMMISSION? **6** A. Yes. I have testified as a company policy witness in a number of proceedings before 7 this Commission. 8 **PURPOSE** 9 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY? 10 A. The purpose of my testimony is to state that U S Cellular is the designated eligible 11 telecommunications carrier ("ETC") in the Castle Rock and Toledo exchanges and **12** therefore is the common carrier designated as an ETC that is the closest in proximity to 13 the Mount St. Helens Tours, Inc. area. 14 Q. WHAT IS AN ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER (ETC)? 15 A. An ETC is a common carrier that is eligible to receive state and/or federal universal 16 service funds. An ETC has certain duties and responsibilities to fulfill as a condition to **17** receiving this public funding, including an obligation to provide universal service

throughout the area in which the carrier was designated, 47 U.S.C. §214(e)(1).

1	Q.	WHEN DID U S CELLULAR RECEIVE THE ETC DESIGNATION FOR THE CASTLE ROCK
2		EXCHANGE?
3	A.	In 1997, in Docket No. UT-970345, the Commission designated U S Cellular as the Castle Rock ETC.
4	Q.	DID U S WEST REQUEST OR RECEIVE ETC DESIGNATION FOR THE CASTLE ROCK
5		EXCHANGE?
6		No. U S WEST did not request ETC designation for the Castle Rock Exchange nor has the Commission
7		designated U S WEST as an ETC in the Castle Rock Exchange.
8	Q.	WHAT RELEVANCE DOES THE ETC DESIGNATION OF US CELLULAR IN THE
9		CASTLE ROCK EXCHANGE HAVE TO THIS CASE?
10		A determination now that this same ETC should not be held to the same standards as a wireline carrier in
11		the designation of a non-voluntary ETC is contrary to good public policy and the Federal
12		Telecommunications Act Designation of an ETC, albeit voluntary or involuntary, requires the carrier to
13		meet the requirements of Section 54.201(d). The Commission should not discriminate in favor of wireline
14		service in designating an involuntary ETC. Any decisions made in designating an involuntary ETC must
15		be competitively and technologically neutral.
16	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO MR. SHIRLEY'S SUGGESTION THAT US CELLULAR DOES
17		NOT PROVIDE "RELIABLE BASIC TELEPHONE SERVICE" IN THE AREA AROUND MOUNT
18		ST. HELENS TOURS, INC. AT COMPARABLE RATES?
19	A.	When U S Cellular requested ETC designation it agreed to comply with Federal law. At page 12 of Mr.
20		Shirley's testimony, he discusses the principles articulated in the Communications Act at Section 254(b)(1).
21		Specifically Mr. Shirley focuses on the principle that quality services should be available at just, reasonable
22		and affordable rates.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Docket No. UT-991930, et al. Response Testimony of Theresa A. Jensen June 12, 2000 Page 4

1		When U S Cellular filed its December 1999 amended petition in Docket No. UT-970345, it stated the
2		following:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		"Amending the designation of USCC to incorporate the additional exchanges is in the public interest because it supports the efforts of wireless carriers to serve rural areas and provide competitive, lower-cost telecommunications alternatives to rural customers. This supports federal universal service policies as most recently articulated in the FCC's Ninth Report and Order and Eighteenth Order on Reconsideration issued November 2, 1999 in CC Docket No. 96-45. That Order recognized that wireless carriers are both contributors and potential recipients of federal universal service funds. This Order also stated that wireless carriers should receive federal universal service support if they meet the criteria for ETC status under the 1996 Act."
12		Clearly, U S Cellular considers itself able to offer reliable basic service at just, reasonable and affordable
13		rates.
14		
15	HAVE	OTHER STATE COMMISSIONS ALSO APPROVED CELLULAR OR WIRELESS PROVIDERS
16		AS ETCS?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	WHEN U S CELLULAR REQUESTED ETC DESIGNATION FOR THE CASTLE ROCK
19		EXCHANGE, HOW DID U S CELLULAR IDENTIFY THE AREA IT CURRENTLY SERVED?
20	A.	U S Cellular defined the area for which it provided cellular service as either an Metropolitian Statistical
21		Area ("MSA") or a Rural Service Area ("RSA"). I believe the Castle Rock Exchange is in Washington
22		RSA #6 for which US Cellular is the licensed cellular service provider. Toledo clearly is in this
23		same RSA. RSA boundaries typically differ from wireline exchange boundaries.
24	Q.	DOES THE U S CELLULAR COVERAGE AREA INCLUDE THE MOUNT ST. HELENS
25		TOURS, INC. AREA?
26	A.	Yes.

1 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.

2 A. U S Cellular is the Commission designated ETC for the Castle Rock exchange which is

located closest to Mount St. Helens Tours, Inc. U S Cellular's serving area, which is an

RSA, includes the Mount St. Helens Tours, Inc. area. The RSA license under which U

S Cellular operates, is the same license and RSA the Mount St. Helens Tours, Inc area

is in. And finally, U S Cellular currently serves customers located in the Mount St.

7 Helens Tours, Inc. area.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

3

4

5

6

Based on the above facts, I can only conclude that Mr. Shirley raises issues that need not

be decided when he suggests that the Commission needs to address the supposed

requirement in 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(3) concerning comparability of rates and services in

deciding what carriers to order to serve because the undisputed evidence is that an ETC

has already been designated for the closest exchange that exists to the area and is serving

the area. Nor has Mr. Shirley provided evidence that U S Cellular rates are unjust,

unreasonable and unaffordable.

16 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

17 A. Yes.