

NERA
Economic Consulting

National Economic Research Associates, Inc.
200 Clarendon Street, 35th Floor
Boston, MA 02116
617 621 2615 Fax 617 621 0336
www.nera.com

William E. Taylor

Senior Vice President
National Economic Research Associates, Inc.
200 Clarendon Street, 35th Floor
Boston, MA 02116
617 621 2615 Fax 617 621 0336

Dr. Taylor received a B.A. *magna cum laude* in Economics from Harvard College, an M.A. in Statistics and a Ph.D. in Economics from the University of California at Berkeley. He has taught economics, statistics, and econometrics at Cornell and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and was a post doctoral Research Fellow at the Center for Operations Research and Econometrics at the University of Louvain, Belgium.

At NERA, Dr. Taylor is a Senior Vice President, heads the Cambridge office and is Director of the Telecommunications Practice. He has worked primarily in the field of telecommunications economics on problems of state and federal regulatory reform, competition policy, terms and conditions for competitive parity in local competition, quantitative analysis of state and federal price cap and incentive regulation proposals, and antitrust problems in telecommunications markets. He has testified on telecommunications economics before numerous state regulatory authorities, the Federal Communications Commission, the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, the New Zealand Commerce Commission, the Comisión Federal de Telecomunicaciones de México, federal and state congressional committees and courts. Recently, he was chosen by the Mexican Federal Telecommunications Commission and Telmex to arbitrate the last two renewals of the Telmex price cap plan in Mexico. Other recent work includes studies of the competitive effects of major mergers among telecommunications firms and analyses of vertical integration and interconnection of telecommunications networks. He has appeared as a telecommunications commentator on PBS Radio and on The News Hour with Jim Lehrer.

He has published extensively in the areas of telecommunications policy related to access and in theoretical and applied econometrics. His articles have appeared in numerous telecommunications industry publications as well as *Econometrica*, the *American Economic Review*, the *International Economic Review*, the *Journal of Econometrics*, *Econometric Reviews*, the *Antitrust Law Journal*, *The Review of Industrial Organization*, and *The Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*. He has served as a referee for these journals (and others) and the National Science Foundation and has served as an Associate Editor of the *Journal of Econometrics*.

Education

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
Ph.D., Economics, 1974

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
M.A., Statistics, 1970

HARVARD COLLEGE
B.A., Economics, 1968
(Magna Cum Laude)

Professional Experience

1988- NATIONAL ECONOMIC RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC. (NERA)
Senior Vice President, Office Head, Telecommunications Practice Director.

1983-1988 BELL COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH, INC. (Bellcore)
Division Manager, Economic Analysis, formerly Central Services Organization, formerly American Telephone and Telegraph Company: theoretical and quantitative work on problems raised by the Bell System divestiture and the implementation of access charges, including design and implementation of demand response forecasting for interstate access demand, quantification of potential bypass liability, design of optimal nonlinear price schedules for access charges and theoretical and quantitative analysis of price cap regulation of access charges.

1975-1983 BELL TELEPHONE LABORATORIES
Member, Technical Staff, Economics Research Center: basic research on theoretical and applied econometrics, focusing on small sample theory, panel data and simultaneous equations systems.

Fall 1977 MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Visiting Associate Professor, Department of Economics: taught graduate courses in econometrics.

1974-1975 CENTER FOR OPERATIONS RESEARCH AND ECONOMETRICS
Université Catholique de Louvain, Belgium.
Post Doctoral Research Associate: basic research on finite sample econometric theory and on cost function estimation.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

1972-1975 Assistant Professor, Department of Economics. (On leave 1974-1975.) taught graduate and undergraduate courses on econometrics, microeconomic theory and economic principles.

Miscellaneous

1985-1995 Associate Editor, *Journal of Econometrics*, North-Holland Publishing Company.

1990- Board of Directors, National Economic Research Associates, Inc.

1995- Board of Trustees, Treasurer, Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Publications

“Smoothness Priors and Stochastic Prior Restrictions in Distributed Lag Estimation,” *International Economic Review*, 15 (1974), pp. 803-804.

“Prior Information on the Coefficients When the Disturbance Covariance Matrix is Unknown,” *Econometrica*, 44 (1976), pp. 725-739.

“Small Sample Properties of a Class of Two Stage Aitken Estimators,” *Econometrica*, 45 (1977), pp. 497-508.

“The Heteroscedastic Linear Model: Exact Finite Sample Results,” *Econometrica*, 46 (1978), pp. 663-676.

“Small Sample Considerations in Estimation from Panel Data,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 13 (1980) pp. 203-223.

“Comparing Specification Tests and Classical Tests,” Bell Laboratories Economics Discussion Paper, 1980 (with J.A. Hausman).

“Panel Data and Unobservable Individual Effects,” *Econometrica*, 49 (1981), pp. 1377-1398 (with J.A. Hausman).

“On the Efficiency of the Cochrane-Orcutt Estimator,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 17 (1981), pp. 67-82.

“A Generalized Specification Test,” *Economics Letters*, 8 (1981), pp. 239-245 (with J.A. Hausman).

“Identification in Linear Simultaneous Equations Models with Covariance Restrictions: An Instrumental Variables Interpretation,” *Econometrica*, 51 (1983), pp. 1527-1549 (with J.A. Hausman).

“On the Relevance of Finite Sample Distribution Theory,” *Econometric Reviews*, 2 (1983), pp. 1-84.

“Universal Service and the Access Charge Debate: Comment,” in P.C. Mann and H.M. Trebing (editors) *Changing Patterns in Regulation, Markets, and Technology: The Effect on Public Utility Pricing*. The Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University, 1984.

“Recovery of Local Telephone Plant Costs under the St. Louis Plan,” in P.C. Mann and H.M. Trebing (editors) *Impact of Deregulation and Market Forces on Public Utilities*. The Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University, 1985.

“Access Charges and Bypass: Some Approximate Magnitudes,” in W.R. Cooke (editor) *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Telecommunications Policy Research Conference*, 1985.

“Federal and State Issues in Non-Traffic Sensitive Cost Recovery,” in *Proceedings from the Telecommunications Deregulation Forum*, Karl Eller Center, College of Business and Public Administration, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, 1986.

“Panel Data” in N.L. Johnson and S. Kotz (editors), *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1986.

“An Analysis of Tapered Access Charges for End Users,” in P.C. Mann and H.M. Trebing (editors) *New Regulatory and Management Strategies in a Changing Market Environment*. The Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University, 1987 (with D.P. Heyman, J.M. Lazorchak, and D.S. Sibley).

“Efficient Estimation and Identification of Simultaneous Equation Models with Covariance Restrictions,” *Econometrica*, 55 (1987), pp. 849-874 (with J.A. Hausman and W.K. Newey).

“Alternative NTS Recovery Mechanisms and Geographic Averaging of Toll Rates,” in *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Rate Symposium: Pricing Electric, Gas, and Telecommunications Services*. The Institute for the Study of Regulation, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1987.

“Price Cap Regulation: Contrasting Approaches Taken at the Federal and State Level,” in W. Bolter (editor), *Federal/State Price-of-Service Regulation: Why, What and How?*, Proceedings of the George Washington University Policy Symposium, December, 1987.

“Local Exchange Pricing: Is There Any Hope?,” in J. Alleman (editor), *Perspectives on the Telephone Industry: The Challenge of the Future*, Ballinger Publishing Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1989.

“Generic Costing and Pricing Problems in the New Network: How Should Costs be Defined and Assessed,” in P.C. Mann and H.M. Trebing (editors) *New Regulatory Concepts, Issues, and Controversies*. The Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University, 1989.

“Telephone Penetration and Universal Service in the 1980s,” in B. Cole (editor), *Divestiture Five Years Later*, Columbia University Press, New York, New York, 1989 (with L.J. Perl).

“Regulating Competition for IntraLATA Services,” in *Telecommunications in a Competitive Environment*, Proceedings of the Third Biennial NERA Telecommunications Conference, 1989, pp. 35-50.

“Costing Principles for Competitive Assessment,” in *Telecommunications Costing in a Dynamic Environment*, Bellcore-Bell Canada Conference Proceedings, 1989 (with T.J. Tardiff).

“Optional Tariffs for Access in the FCC's Price Cap Proposal,” in M. Einhorn (ed.), *Price Caps and Incentive Regulation in the Telecommunications Industry*, Kluwer, 1991 (with D.P. Heyman and D.S. Sibley).

“Alternative Measures of Cross-Subsidization,” prepared for the Florida Workshop on Appropriate Methodologies for the Detection of Cross--Subsidies, June 8, 1991.

“Predation and Multiproduct Firms: An Economic Appraisal of the Sievers-Albery Results,” *Antitrust Law Journal*, 30 (1992), pp. 785-795.

“Lessons for the Energy Industries from Deregulation in Telecommunications,” *Proceedings of the 46th Annual Meeting of the Federal Energy Bar Association*, May, 1992.

“Efficient Price of Telecommunications Services: The State of the Debate,” *Review of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 8, pp. 21-37, 1993.

“Status and Results of Regulatory Reform in the U.S. Telecommunications Industry,” in C.G. Stalon, *Regulatory Responses to Continuously Changing Industry Structures*, The Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University, 1992.

“Post-Divestiture Long-Distance Competition in the United States,” *American Economic Review*, Vol. 83, No. 2, May 1993 (with Lester D. Taylor). Reprinted in E. Bailey, J. Hower, and J. Pack, *The Political Economy of Privatization and Deregulation*, (London: Edward Elgar), 1994.

“Comment on ‘Pricing of Inputs Sold to Competitors,’ by W.J. Baumol and J.G. Sidak,” *Yale Journal on Regulation*, Vol. 11, Issue 1, 1994, pp. 225-240 (with Alfred E. Kahn).

“Comments on Economic Efficiency and Incentive Regulation,” Chapter 7 in S. Globerman, W. Stanbury and T. Wilson, *The Future of Telecommunications Policy in Canada*, Toronto: Institute for Policy Analysis, University of Toronto, April 1995.

“Revising Price Caps: The Next Generation of Incentive Regulation Plans,” Chapter 2 in M.A. Crew (ed.) *Pricing and Regulatory Innovations under Increasing Competition*, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, May 1996 (with T. Tardiff).

“An Analysis of the State of Competition in Long-Distance Telephone Markets,” *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, May, 1997, pp. 227-256 (with J.D. Zona).

“An Analysis of the Welfare Effects of Long Distance Market Entry by an Integrated Access and Long Distance Provider”, *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, March, 1998, pp. 183-196 (with Richard Schmalensee, J.D. Zona and Paul Hinton).

“Market Power and Mergers in Telecommunications,” *Proceedings of the Institute of Public Utilities; 30th Annual Conference: Competition in Crisis: Where are Network Industries Heading?*, The Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University, 1999.

“The Baby and the Bathwater: Utility Competition, But at What Price?,” *Public Utilities Fortnightly*, Vol. 137, No.21, November 15, 1999, pp. 48-56 (with Anne S. Babineau and Matthew M. Weissman).

“Aligning Price Regulation with Telecommunications Competition,” *Review of Network Economics*, December, 2003, pp. 338-354 (with Timothy Tardiff).

Testimony

1. Alabama

1. Alabama Public Service Commission (Docket No. 25677), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., direct testimony regarding economic aspects of avoided costs of services supplied for resale. Filed November 26, 1996.
2. Alabama Public Service Commission, on behalf of BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., (Docket No. 25835): direct testimony regarding the probable economic benefits to consumers in Alabama from entry by BellSouth into the interLATA long distance market. Filed June 18, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed August 8, 1997.
3. Alabama Public Service Commission, on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., (Docket No. 26029): rebuttal testimony of intervenor testimonies in BellSouth's cost and unbundled network element pricing docket in Alabama. Filed September 12, 1997.
4. Alabama Public Service Commission (Docket No. 25980), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications: rebuttal testimony regarding revenue benchmarks and other matters in universal service funding. Filed February 13, 1998.
5. Alabama Public Service Commission (Docket No. 27091), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, rebuttal testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic, filed October 14, 1999.
6. Alabama Public Service Commission (Docket No. 25835), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., economic aspects of service quality penalty plans. Rebuttal testimony filed June 19, 2001.
7. Alabama Public Service Commission (Docket Nos. 15957 and 27989), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: economic support for promotional offerings. Direct testimony filed August 3, 2001, rebuttal testimony filed August 13, 2001. Additional rebuttal testimony filed August 17, 2001.
8. Alabama Public Service Commission (Docket No. 25835), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., economic aspects of structural separations. Surrebuttal testimony filed July 24, 2001.

2. Alaska

9. Alaskan Public Utilities Commission, (Docket Nos. U-98-140/141/142 and U-98-173/174), testimony regarding the economic effects on competition of the acquisitions of Telephone Utilities of Alaska, Telephone Utilities of the Northland, Inc., and PTI Communications of Alaska by ALEC Acquisition Sub Corporation and of Anchorage Telephone Utility and ATU Long Distance, Inc. by Alaska Communications Systems, Inc. Filed February 2, 1999. Rebuttal testimony filed March 24, 1999.

3. Arizona

10. Arizona State Air Pollution Control Hearing Board (Docket No. A-90-02) on behalf of Arizona Public Service Company. A statistical study of SO₂ emissions entitled, "Analysis of Cholla Unit 2 SO₂ Compliance Test Data," (October 24, 1990) and an Affidavit (December 7, 1990).
11. Arizona Corporation Commission (Docket Nos. T-02432B-00-0026, T-01051B-00-0026), on

behalf of US WEST Communications, Inc., direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic. Filed March 27, 2000.

12. Arizona Corporation Commission (Docket No. T-01051B-99-0497), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., rebuttal testimony regarding economic issues arising in the proposed merger between U S WEST and Qwest. Filed April 3, 2000.
13. Arizona Corporation Commission (Docket No. T-01051B-99-105), on behalf of Qwest Corporation., rebuttal testimony regarding rate design. Filed August 21, 2000.
14. Arizona Corporation Commission (Docket Nos. T-03654A-00-0882,T-01051B-00-0882), on behalf of Qwest Corporation, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for internet-bound traffic. Filed January 8, 2001.
15. Arizona Corporation Commission (Docket No. T-00000A-00-0194, Phase 2), on behalf of Qwest Corporation., direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic. Filed March 15, 2001.

4. Arkansas

16. Arkansas Public Service Commission (Docket No. 83-042-U) on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company: economic analysis of non-traffic sensitive cost recovery proposals. Filed October 7, 1985.

5. California

17. California Public Utilities Commission (Case 88-04-029) on behalf of Pacific Bell: commission payment practices, cross-subsidization of pay telephones, and compensation payments to competitive pay telephone suppliers. Filed July 11, 1988.
18. California Public Utilities Commission (Phase II of Case 90-07-037) on behalf of Pacific Bell: economic analysis of the effects of FAS 106, (accrual accounting for post-retirement benefits other than pensions) under state price cap regulation, (with Timothy J. Tardiff). Filed August 30, 1991. Supplemental testimony filed January 21, 1992.
19. California Public Utilities Commission, (Docket No. I.87-11-033), on behalf of Pacific Bell, "The New Regulatory Framework 1990-1992: An Economic Review," (with T.J. Tardiff). Filed May 1, 1992.
20. California Public Utilities Commission, (Docket No. I.87-11-033), on behalf of Pacific Bell, "Pacific Bell's Performance Under the New Regulatory Framework: An Economic Evaluation of the First Three Years," (with T.J. Tardiff). Filed April 8, 1993, reply testimony filed May 7, 1993.
21. California Public Utilities Commission, (Investigation No. I.95-05-047), on behalf of Pacific Bell, "Incentive Regulation and Competition: Issues for the 1995 Incentive Regulation Review," (with R.L. Schmalensee and T.J. Tardiff). Filed September 8, 1995, reply testimony filed September 18, 1995.
22. California Public Utilities Commission, (U 1015 C) on behalf of Roseville Telephone Company, testimony regarding productivity measures in Roseville's proposed new regulatory framework. Filed May 15, 1995. Rebuttal testimony filed January 12, 1996.

23. California Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of Pacific Bell: Comments on the economic principles for updating Pacific Bell's price cap plan. Filed February 2, 1998.
24. California Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of Pacific Bell: reply comments regarding proposed changes to the price cap plan, filed June 19, 1998.
25. California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of California American Water Company, RWE AG, Thames Water Aqua Holding GmbH, Thames Water Plc and Apollo Acquisition Company, economic support regarding the merger between American Water Company and Thames Water, direct testimony filed May 17, 2002, rebuttal testimony filed July 15, 2002.
26. California Public Utilities Commission (Case No. 95-04-043/I.95-04-044) on behalf of Verizon California, Inc, forecast of incremental hot cut demand, filed November 7, 2003.
27. California Public Utilities Commission (Case No. 95-04-043/I.95-04-044) on behalf of Verizon California, Inc, rebuttal testimony regarding geographic market definition for unbundled network elements. Filed January 16, 2004.
28. Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Alameda, *Zill et. al. v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.*, Declaration in support of opposition to motion for class certification, on behalf of Sprint. Filed January 14, 2005.

6. Colorado

29. Colorado Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 97A-540T), on behalf of U S WEST: testimony concerning the economic effects of a proposed price regulation plan. Direct testimony filed January 30, 1998. Rebuttal testimony filed May 14, 1998.
30. Colorado Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 99A-001T), on behalf of US WEST, regarding US WEST's interconnection arbitration with AirTouch Paging in Colorado. Rebuttal testimony filed March 15, 1999.
31. Colorado Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 99A-407T), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., rebuttal testimony regarding the effects of the proposed Qwest-US West merger on economic welfare, filed December 7, 1999.
32. Colorado Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 00B-011T), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic. Filed March 28, 2000.
33. Colorado Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 00B-103T), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., rebuttal testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic in arbitration with ICG. Filed June 19, 2000.
34. Colorado Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 00B-601T), on behalf of Qwest. Rebuttal testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for internet-bound traffic in arbitration with Level 3. Filed January 16, 2001.
35. Colorado Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 04A-411T), on behalf of Qwest. Direct testimony regarding reclassification of services as deregulated. Filed July 21, 2004. Revision filed October 1, 2004. Rebuttal filed March 25, 2005.

7. Connecticut

36. State of Connecticut, Department of Public Utility Control, (DPUC Docket No. 95-03-01) on behalf of Southern New England Telephone Company, testimony concerning productivity

- growth targets in a proposed state price cap regulation plan. Filed June 19, 1995.
37. State of Connecticut, Department of Public Utility Control, (DPUC Docket No. 95-06-17) on behalf of Southern New England Telephone Company: testimony concerning economic principles of costing and cost recovery. Filed July 23, 1996.
 38. Connecticut Department of Public Utilities (DPUC Docket No. 96-09-22), on behalf of the Southern New England Telephone Company. Rebuttal testimony regarding alternative models of cost. Filed January 24, 1997.
 39. Connecticut Department of Public Utilities (DPUC Docket No. 96-11-03), on behalf of the Woodbury Telephone Company, statement regarding the effects of resale and the provision of unbundled network elements on a rural telephone company. Filed February 11, 1997.
 40. State of Connecticut, Department of Public Utility Control (Docket Nos. 95-03-01,95-06-17 and 96-09-22), on behalf of Southern New England Telephone Company: direct testimony discussing economic principles the DPUC should use in evaluating SNET's joint and common overhead and network support expenses. Filed August 29, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed December 17, 1998.
 41. State of Connecticut, Department of Public Utility Control (Docket No. 96-04-07) on behalf of Southern New England Telephone Company: direct testimony regarding economic principles guiding access charge reform. Filed October 16, 1997.
 42. State of Connecticut, Department of Public Utility Control (Docket No. 98-02-33), on behalf of Southern New England Telephone Company: direct testimony regarding reclassification of custom calling services as emerging competitive. Filed February 27, 1998.
 43. Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, on behalf of SBC Communications Inc. and Southern New England Telecommunications Corporation: direct testimony regarding the SBC-SNET merger, filed June 1, 1998.
 44. Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (Docket No. 95-06-17RE02), on behalf of The Southern New England Telephone Company, rebuttal testimony regarding local competition and reseller market. Filed June 8, 1999.
 45. Connecticut Department of Public Utilities (Docket No. 99-03-17), on behalf of The Southern New England Telephone Company, rebuttal testimony regarding market power and termination liabilities in contracts. Filed June 18, 1999.
 46. Connecticut Department of Public Utilities (Docket No. 00-07-17), on behalf of The Southern New England Telephone Company, testimony regarding local competition and pricing. Filed November 21, 2000.
 47. State of Connecticut, Department of Public Utility Control, (Docket No. 03-09-01PH01) on behalf of SBC SNET, direct testimony concerning geographic market definition for unbundled network elements. Filed December 2, 2003. Rebuttal testimony filed January 9, 2004.

8. Delaware

48. Delaware Public Service Commission (Docket No. 86-20, Phase II) on behalf of The Diamond State Telephone Company: appropriate costing and pricing methods for a regulated firm facing competition. Filed March 31, 1989. Rebuttal testimony filed November 17, 1989.
49. Delaware Public Service Commission (Docket No. 89-24T) on behalf of The Diamond State

- Telephone Company: rebuttal testimony describing the appropriate costing and pricing methods for the provision of contract Centrex services by a local exchange carrier. Filed August 17, 1990.
50. Delaware Public Utilities Commission, (Docket No. 33), on behalf of Diamond State Telephone Company, "Incentive Regulation of Telecommunications Utilities in Delaware," filed June 22, 1992.
 51. Delaware Public Utilities Commission, (Docket No. 33), on behalf of Diamond State Telephone Company, analysis of productivity growth and a proposed incentive regulation plan: "Reply Comments," June 1, 1993, "Supplementary Statement," June 7, 1993, "Second Supplementary Statement," June 14, 1993.
 52. Delaware Public Utilities Commission, (Docket No. 42), on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Delaware, rebuttal testimony concerning the historical effects of equal access competition in interstate toll markets and the likely future effects of competition under 1+ presubscription in Delaware. Filed October 21, 1994.
 53. Delaware Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Delaware, direct testimony regarding costs and pricing of interconnection and network elements. Filed December 16, 1996. Rebuttal testimony (proprietary) filed February 11, 1997.
 54. Delaware Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Delaware: statement regarding costs and benefits from Bell Atlantic entry into interLATA telecommunications markets. Filed February 26, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed April 28, 1997.
 55. Delaware Public Service Commission (PSC Docket No. 00-205), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Delaware, direct testimony responding to the Petition for Arbitration of Focal Communications Group. Filed April 25, 2000.

9. District of Columbia

56. Affidavit to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on behalf of Bell Atlantic Corporation in *United States of America v. Western Electric Company, Inc. and American Telephone and Telegraph Company*, re relief from the interLATA restrictions of the MFJ in connection with the pending merger with Tele-Communications, Inc. and Liberty Media Corporation. Filed January 14, 1994, (with A.E. Kahn).
57. Affidavit to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on behalf of Southwestern Bell in *United States of America v. Western Electric Company, Inc. and American Telephone and Telegraph Company*, regarding provision of telecommunications and information services across LATA boundaries outside the regions in which its local exchange operations are located. Filed May 13, 1994, (with A.E. Kahn).
58. District of Columbia, Public Service Commission (Case No. 962), on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Washington, D.C., direct testimony regarding costing and pricing of interconnection and network elements. Filed January 17, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed May 2, 1997.
59. Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia (Case No. 962), on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Washington, D.C., direct testimony regarding costing and pricing of interconnection and network elements. Filed July 16, 2001. Rebuttal testimony filed January 11, 2002.
60. United States District Court for the District of Columbia, (MDL No. 1285, Misc. No 99-0197

- (TFH)), Declaration regarding statistical issues in measuring damages from price fixing in the vitamin industry, filed October 31, 2002. Reply Declaration filed January 15, 2003.
61. Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia on behalf of Verizon District of Columbia, Direct testimony regarding forecasts of incremental hot cut demand, filed December 15, 2003.
 62. Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia on behalf of Verizon DC, (Formal Case No. 1005), Declaration regarding reclassification of directory assistance services as competitive. Filed December 17, 2004.
10. Florida
63. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 820537-TP) on behalf of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company: economic analysis of premium intraLATA access charges. Filed July 22, 1983.
 64. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 820400-TP) on behalf of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company: economic principles underlying a proposed method for calculating marginal costs for private line services. Filed June 25, 1986.
 65. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 880069-TL) on behalf of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company: economic incentives for firms under the proposed Florida Rate Stabilization Plan. Filed June 10, 1988.
 66. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 900633-TL) on behalf of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company: alternative measures of cross-subsidization. May 9, 1991.
 67. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 920260-TL) on behalf of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company: economic analysis of a proposed price cap regulation plan. December 18, 1992.
 68. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 920385-TL) on behalf of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company: the economic relationship between depreciation rates, investment, and infrastructure development. September 3, 1992.
 69. Florida Public Service Commission on behalf of BellSouth, "Local Telecommunications Competition: An Evaluation of a Proposal by the Communications Staff of the Florida Public Service Commission," filed November 21, 1997 (with A. Banerjee).
 70. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 980000-SP) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: "Costing and Pricing Principles for Determining Fair and Reasonable Rates Under Competition," economic principles for pricing local exchange services, filed September 24, 1998.
 71. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 980000-SP) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: "Determining Fair and Reasonable Rates Under Competition: Response to Major Themes at the FPSC Workshop," economic principles for pricing local exchange services, filed November 13, 1998.
 72. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 980696-TP) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: rebuttal testimony regarding measurements of cost for sizing a universal service fund, filed September 2, 1998.

73. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 990750-TP), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, rebuttal testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic, filed September 13, 1999.
 74. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 000075-TP) on behalf BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: rebuttal testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic, filed January 10, 2001.
 75. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No.0000121-TP) on behalf BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: direct testimony regarding properties of a service quality performance assurance plan. Filed March 1, 2001. Rebuttal filed March 21, 2001.
 76. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 000075-TP) on behalf BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., rebuttal testimony regarding efficient intercarrier compensation, filed April 12, 2001.
 77. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 960786-TL) on behalf BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: surrebuttal testimony regarding the state of local competition in Florida, filed August 20, 2001.
 78. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket Nos. 020119-TP and 020578-TP) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., regarding competitive promotional offerings. Direct testimony filed October 23, 2002, rebuttal filed November 25, 2002.
 79. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 020507-TP) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., regarding bundling of basic and non-basic services. Rebuttal testimony filed December 23, 2002.
 80. U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida (Case No. 99-1706), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Confidential Reply Affidavit (“Economic Assessment of Damages”). Filed April 25, 2003.
 81. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 030869-TL), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., regarding rate rebalancing in the Florida Statutes. Direct testimony filed August 27, 2003.
 82. Florida Public Service Commission, (Docket No. 030851-TP) on behalf of Verizon Florida, Direct Testimony regarding forecasts of incremental hot cut demand, filed December 4, 2003.
 83. Florida Public Service Commission, (Docket No. 030851-TP) on behalf of Verizon Florida, Rebuttal Testimony regarding geographic market definition for unbundled network elements, filed January 7, 2004.
 84. Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 040353-TP), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., regarding predatory pricing, promotional offerings and discrimination. Affidavit filed August 16, 2004.
11. Georgia
85. Georgia Public Service Commission (Docket No. 3882-U) on behalf of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company: analysis of incentive regulation plans. Filed September 29, 1989.
 86. Georgia Public Service Commission (Docket No. 6863-U) on behalf of BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., direct testimony concerning benefits from BellSouth participation in long distance service markets. Filed January 3, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed February 24, 1997.

87. Georgia Public Service Commission (Docket No. 10767-U), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, rebuttal testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic, filed October 25, 1999.
88. Georgia Public Service Commission (Docket No. 10854-U), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic, filed November 15, 1999, rebuttal testimony filed November 22, 1999.
89. Georgia Public Service Commission (Docket No. 7892-U), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, rebuttal testimony regarding implementation of service quality standards, filed June 27, 2000.
90. CPR Institute for Dispute Resolution Arbitral Tribunal, Rebuttal Affidavit in Arbitrations III and IV between BellSouth Telecommunications and Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems. Filed November 5, 2001.
91. Georgia Public Service Commission (Docket No. 11901-U) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., regarding the provision of DSL service to competitors' voice customers. Rebuttal testimony filed November 8, 2002.
92. CPR Institute for Dispute Resolution Arbitral Tribunal, Rebuttal Affidavit in Arbitration V between BellSouth Telecommunications and Supra Telecommunications & Information Systems. Filed November 21, 2003.
93. Georgia Public Service Commission, (Docket No. 19393-U) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., regarding the provision of standalone DSL service. Direct testimony filed November 19, 2004, rebuttal testimony filed January 10, 2005.

12. Idaho

94. Idaho Public Utilities Commission (Case No. GST-T-99-1), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic, November 22, 1999, rebuttal testimony filed December 2, 1999.

13. Illinois

95. Illinois Commerce Commission (Docket No. 88-0412) on behalf of Illinois Bell Telephone Company: analysis of pricing issues for public telephone service. Filed August 3, 1990. Surrebuttal testimony filed December 9, 1991.
96. United States Bankruptcy Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division Telesphere Liquidating Trust vs. Francesco Galesi, Adv. Proc. Nos. 95 A 1051 & 99 A 131: expert opinion regarding the condition of alternative operator service provider and 900 service markets. Report filed August 23, 2002.
97. Illinois Commerce Commission (Docket No. 03-0595) on behalf of SBC Illinois. Direct testimony concerning geographic market definition for unbundled network elements. Filed December 2, 2003.
98. Circuit Court, Third Judicial Circuit, Madison County, Illinois, *Jessica Hall, et. al. v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.*, Affidavit in opposition to motion for class certification, on behalf of Sprint. Filed February 5, 2005.

14. Iowa

99. Iowa Utilities Board, on behalf Qwest Communications Intl, Inc., rebuttal testimony regarding public interest effects of the proposed merger, filed December 23, 1999
100. Iowa Utilities Board, on behalf of Qwest Corporation, (Docket No. INU-04-01), Counterstatement regarding reclassification of services as competitive. Filed August 2, 2004.

15. Kentucky

101. Kentucky Public Service Commission on behalf of South Central Bell Telephone Company, testimony concerning telecommunications productivity growth and price cap plans, April 18, 1995.
102. Kentucky Public Service Commission (Administrative Case No. 96-608) on behalf of BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., testimony regarding the economic effects of BellSouth entry into interLATA services. Filed April 14, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed April 28, 1997, supplemental rebuttal testimony filed August 15, 1997.
103. Kentucky Public Service Commission (Docket No. 98-292), on behalf of Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company, direct testimony regarding proposed price regulation plan containing earnings sharing requirements. Filed April 5, 1999.
104. Kentucky Public Service Commission (Docket No. 99-218), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic, filed October 21, 1999. Rebuttal testimony filed November 19, 1999.
105. Kentucky Public Service Commission (Docket No. 99-296), on behalf of GTE & Bell Atlantic, direct testimony on the effects of the Bell Atlantic-GTE merger on competition in Kentucky and on the benchmarking abilities of regulators. Filed July 9, 1999, rebuttal testimony filed August 20, 1999.
106. Kentucky Public Service Commission (Docket No. 2001-105), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: local competition in Kentucky and BellSouth's performance measurements plan to support its application for interLATA authority. Rebuttal testimony filed July 30, 2001. Surrebuttal testimony filed September 10, 2001.

16. Louisiana

107. Louisiana Public Service Commission (Docket No. U-17949, Subdocket E) on behalf of South Central Bell Telephone Company, rebuttal testimony concerning productivity growth accounting and other aspects of a price regulation plan, July 24, 1995.
108. Louisiana Public Service Commission (Docket No. U-17949, Subdocket E) on behalf of South Central Bell Telephone Company, supplemental and rebuttal testimony concerning economic issues in depreciation accounting in the presence of competition and price cap regulation, November 17, 1995. Surrebuttal testimony, December 13, 1995, Further Surrebuttal testimony, January 12, 1996.
109. Louisiana Public Service Commission (Docket No. U-20883) on behalf of South Central Bell Telephone Company, "Price Regulation and Local Competition in Louisiana," affidavit evaluating a framework for local competition and price regulation in Louisiana, November 21, 1995.

110. Louisiana Public Service Commission (Docket No. U-20883, Subdocket A) on behalf of South Central Bell Telephone Company, rebuttal testimony concerning methods for measuring the cost of providing universal service, August 16, 1995.
111. Louisiana Public Service Commission (Docket No. U-U-22020) on behalf of South Central Bell Telephone Company, testimony concerning economic principles determining wholesale prices for resold services. Filed August 30 1996. Rebuttal testimony filed September 13, 1996.
112. Louisiana Public Service Commission, on behalf of BellSouth Long Distance, Inc. (Docket No. U-22252), direct testimony regarding the probable economic benefits to consumers in Louisiana from entry by BellSouth into the interLATA long distance market. Filed March 14, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed May 2, 1997. Supplemental testimony filed May 27, 1997.
113. Louisiana Public Service Commission (Docket No. U-24206), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic. Filed September 3, 1999, rebuttal filed September 17, 1999.
114. Louisiana Public Service Commission (Docket No. U-22632) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, rebuttal testimony concerning payphone access services, July 17, 2000.
115. Louisiana Public Service Commission (Docket No. U-22252, Subdocket E), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, economic properties of service quality penalty plans. Reply affidavit filed June 25, 2001.
116. United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana, Civil Action No. 02-0481: *Dwayne P. Smith, Trustee v. Lucent Technologies, Inc.*, on behalf of Lucent Technologies, Inc., damage calculation from alleged equipment failure. Expert Report filed June 16, 2003.
117. United States District Court, Eastern District, Louisiana, *Baroni, et. al, v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.*, Statement regarding consolidation of directory assistance facilities, filed January 3, 2005.

17. Maine

118. State of Maine Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 89-397) on behalf of New England Telephone & Telegraph Company: theoretical and historical analysis of incentive regulation in telecommunications, entitled "Incentive Regulation in Telecommunications," filed June 15, 1990.
119. State of Maine Public Utilities Commission (Docket Nos. 94-123/94-254) on behalf of New England Telephone & Telegraph Company: analysis of appropriate parameters for a price regulation plan. Filed December 13, 1994. Rebuttal testimony filed January 13, 1995.
120. Maine Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 96-388) on behalf of NYNEX, testimony regarding the economic effects of the proposed merger between Bell Atlantic and NYNEX, Direct Testimony filed September 6, 1996. Rebuttal Testimony filed October 30, 1996.
121. Maine Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 97-505) on behalf of NYNEX: direct testimony regarding economic principles for setting prices and estimating costs for interconnection. Filed April 21, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed October 21, 1997.
122. Maine Public Utilities Commission on behalf of NYNEX: affidavit regarding competitive effects of NYNEX entry into interLATA markets. Filed May 27, 1997 (with Kenneth Gordon, Richard Schmalensee and Harold Ware).

123. Maine Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 99-851) on behalf of Verizon: direct testimony regarding the review of Maine's alternative regulation plan. Filed January 8, 2001. Rebuttal filed February 12, 2001.
124. Maine Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 99-851), on behalf of Verizon- Maine, affidavit regarding economics of price cap regulation. Filed April 29, 2003.

18. Maryland

125. Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8462) on behalf of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Maryland: competition and the appropriate regulatory treatment of Yellow Pages. Filed October 2, 1992.
126. Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8584) on behalf of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Maryland: appropriate pricing and regulatory treatment of interconnection to permit competition for local service. Filed November 19, 1993, (with A.E. Kahn). Rebuttal testimony filed January 10, 1994, surrebuttal testimony filed January 24, 1994.
127. Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8584, Phase II) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Maryland: geographically deaveraged incremental and embedded costs of service. Filed December 15, 1994. Additional direct testimony concerning efficient rate structures for interconnection pricing filed May 5, 1995. Rebuttal testimony filed June 30, 1995.
128. Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8659) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Maryland: appropriate pricing of interconnection among competing local exchange carriers. Filed November 9, 1994.
129. *FreBon International Corp. vs. BA Corp. Civil Action*, No. 94-324 (GK): Defendants' Amended Expert Disclosure Statement, regarding markets for teleconferencing services. Filed under seal February 15, 1996.
130. Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8715), on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Maryland: rebuttal testimony on the economic criteria for the reclassification of telecommunications services. Filed March 14, 1996, surrebuttal testimony filed April 1, 1996.
131. Maryland Public Service Commission, on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Maryland, (Case No. 8731-II), statement regarding costing and pricing of interconnection and unbundled network elements. Filed January 10, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed April 4, 1997.
132. Maryland Public Service Commission, on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Maryland: statement regarding consumer benefits from Bell Atlantic's provision of interLATA service, filed March 14, 1997.
133. Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8786), on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Maryland: rebuttal testimony regarding economic principles underlying costs and prices for non-recurring services and access to operations support systems. Filed November 16, 1998.
134. Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8745), direct testimony on behalf of Verizon Maryland Inc. regarding efficient pricing of carrier access charges. Filed March 23, 2001. Rebuttal filed May 21, 2001. Surrebuttal filed June 11, 2001.
135. Before the Public Service Commission of Maryland (Case No. 8879), direct testimony on behalf of Verizon Maryland Inc. regarding costing principles for network elements. Filed May 25, 2001. Rebuttal testimony filed September 5, 2001. Surrebuttal filed October 15, 2001.

136. Circuit Court For Prince George's County, Maryland. Case No: CAL 99-21004, Jacqueline Dotson, et al. v. Bell Atlantic – Maryland, Inc. and Maryland Public Service Commission, affidavit on behalf of Bell Atlantic Maryland regarding late payment fees. Filed October 14, 2002.
137. Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8927), on behalf of Verizon Maryland, rebuttal testimony regarding complaint by CloseCall America alleging anti-competitive tying of Verizon's residential and small business local service with voice messaging and high-speed Internet access, filed September 24, 2002. Supplemental rebuttal testimony filed March 3, 2003. Surrebuttal testimony filed April 11, 2003.
138. Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 8988) on behalf of Verizon Maryland, forecasts of the demand for incremental hot cuts, January 9, 2004.

19. Massachusetts

139. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (Docket No. D.P.U. 94-50), on behalf of NYNEX: analysis of appropriate parameters for a price regulation plan. Filed April 14, 1994. Rebuttal testimony filed October 26, 1994.
140. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (Docket No. D.P.U. 94-185) on behalf of NYNEX: economic analysis of terms and conditions for efficient local competition. Filed May 19, 1995. Rebuttal testimony filed August 23, 1995.
141. Affidavit to the Superior Court Department of the Trial Court (Civil Action No. 95-6363F), on behalf of New England Telephone and Telegraph Company, d/b/a NYNEX: in opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification. Filed July 1996.
142. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (Docket Nos. D.P.U. 96-73/74, 96-75, 96-80/81, 96-83, 96-94) on behalf of NYNEX: economic analysis of costs avoided from resale of local exchange services. Testimony filed September 27, 1996. Rebuttal Testimony filed October 16, 1996.
143. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (Docket Nos. D.P.U. 96-73/74, 96-75, 96-80/81, 96-83, 96-94) on behalf of NYNEX: Arbitration of interconnection agreements under the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Filed October 11, 1996. Rebuttal Testimony filed October 30, 1996.
144. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (Docket No. DTE 98-15), on behalf of Bell Atlantic – MA: direct testimony regarding the method used to determine wholesale (avoided cost) discount that applies to resold retail services. Filed January 16, 1998.
145. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities (Docket No. D.P.U./D.T.E. 94-185-C) on behalf of Bell Atlantic: economic analysis of the usefulness of a regulatory price floor for wholesale services. Affidavit filed February 6, 1998. Reply Affidavit filed February 19, 1998.
146. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy (D.P.U. 96-3/74, 96-75, 96-80/81, 96-83, & 96-94), on behalf of Bell Atlantic – Massachusetts: rebuttal testimony discussing the types of costs for OSSs, filed April 29, 1998.
147. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy (Docket No. 85-15, Phase III, Part 1), on behalf of Bell Atlantic – Massachusetts: rebuttal testimony discussing appropriate forward-looking technology for costing network elements, filed August 31, 1998.

148. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy (Docket No. 98-15, Phase II), on behalf of Bell Atlantic – Massachusetts: rebuttal testimony concerning the avoided costs of resold services, filed September 8, 1998.
149. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy (Docket No. 98-67), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Massachusetts: direct testimony regarding regulatory rules/economic principles pertaining to exogenous adjustment factors in Bell Atlantic's price cap formula, filed September 25, 1998.
150. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy (Docket No. 98-85), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Massachusetts: direct testimony regarding efficiency changes from intraLATA presubscription, filed October 20, 1998.
151. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy (Docket No. D.T.E. 97-116-B), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Massachusetts, affidavit regarding consequences for economic efficiency of different intercarrier compensation rules for ISP-bound traffic. Filed March 29, 1999.
152. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications & Energy (Docket No. 94-185-E), on behalf of Bell Atlantic, rebuttal testimony re: inclusion of overhead costs in the calculation of price floors for BA-MA services. Filed July 26, 1999.
153. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy (Docket DTE –1-20), on behalf of Verizon New England Inc., D/B/A/ Verizon Massachusetts, direct testimony regarding cost concepts and pricing principals for UNEs, filed May 4, 2001. Rebuttal testimony filed December 17, 2001.
154. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy, testimony on behalf of Verizon New England Inc. d/b/a/ Verizon Massachusetts, regarding benefits of alternative regulation in Massachusetts since adoption of price cap plan.. Filed April 12, 2001. Rebuttal testimony filed September 21, 2001. Reply filed November 14, 2001.
155. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and energy (Docket No. 03-60) on behalf of Verizon Massachusetts, forecast of incremental hot cut demand, filed November 12, 2003.
156. Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy (Docket No. 03-60) on behalf of Verizon Massachusetts, Reply Panel Testimony regarding geographic market definition. Filed February 25, 2004, Rebuttal Panel Testimony regarding hot cuts. Filed February 25, 2004.

20. Michigan

157. Testimony before the Michigan Circuit Court (Case No. 87-709234-CE and 87-709232-CE) on behalf of Combustion Engineering, Inc., in *Her Majesty the Queen, et al., v. Greater Detroit Resource Recovery Authority, et al.*, re statistical analysis of air pollution data to determine emissions limits for the Detroit municipal waste-to-energy facility, February, 1992.
158. Michigan Public Service Commission (Case No. U-11756), on behalf of Ameritech Michigan: direct testimony regarding efficient prices for services supplied to independent phone payers, filed October 9, 1998.
159. Michigan Public Service Commission (Case No. U-13796), on behalf of SBC Michigan: direct testimony regarding geographic markets for local exchange services, filed December 19, 2003. Reply testimony filed February 10, 2004. Response testimony filed March 5, 2004.

160. Michigan Public Service Commission (Case No. U-14323), on behalf of SBC Michigan: direct testimony regarding deregulation of business local exchange services, filed October 26, 2004.
161. Michigan Public Service Commission (Case No. U-14324), on behalf of SBC Michigan: direct testimony regarding deregulation of residential local exchange services, filed October 26, 2004.
162. Michigan Public Service Commission (Case No. U-14323), on behalf of SBC Michigan: direct supplemental testimony regarding deregulation of business local exchange services, filed February 10, 2005.
163. Michigan Public Service Commission (Case No. U-14324), on behalf of SBC Michigan: direct testimony regarding deregulation of residential local exchange services, filed February 10, 2005. Rebuttal filed March 25, 2005.

21. Minnesota

164. Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. P3009, 3052, 5096, 421, 3017/PA-99-1192), on behalf of US WEST Communications, Inc., rebuttal affidavit regarding the effects of the proposed Qwest-US West merger on economic welfare. Filed January 14, 2000.
165. Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. P3009, 3052, 5096, 421, 3017/PA-99-1192), direct testimony regarding the effects of the proposed Qwest-US West merger on economic welfare. Filed March 29, 2000.
166. Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (PUC Docket No. P-421/C1-01-1372, OAH Docket No. 7-2500-14487-2) on behalf of Qwest Corporation, economic aspects of separate affiliate requirements, affidavit filed December 28, 2001, Surrebuttal Affidavit filed January 16, 2002.

22. Mississippi

167. Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 95-UA-313) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a South Central Bell Telephone Company, rebuttal testimony addressing cost issues, as they pertain to price regulation raised in the direct testimony by intervenors. Filed October 13, 1995.
168. Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 95-UA-358) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a South Central Bell Telephone Company, testimony regarding universal service fund issues. Filed January 17, 1996. Rebuttal testimony filed February 28, 1996.
169. Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 97-AD-0321), on behalf of BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., direct testimony regarding the likely economic benefits to consumers in Mississippi from entry by BellSouth into the interLATA long distance market. Filed July 1, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed September 29, 1997.
170. Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 97-AD-544), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications: rebuttal testimony regarding economic issues of costing and pricing unbundled network elements. Filed March 13, 1998.
171. Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 98-AD-035), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications: direct testimony regarding universal service funding and price benchmark issues. Filed February 23, 1998, rebuttal testimony filed March 6, 1998.

172. Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 99-AD-421), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic, filed October 20, 1999. Rebuttal testimony filed November 12, 1999.
173. Mississippi Public Service Commission (Docket No. 97-AD-321), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: local competition in Mississippi and BellSouth's performance measurements plan to support its application for interLATA authority. Rebuttal testimony filed August 2, 2001.

23. Montana

174. Montana Public Service Commission (Docket No. 90.8.46) on behalf of US West Communications: theoretical and historical analysis of incentive regulation plans in telecommunications. Filed October 4, 1990.
175. Montana Public Service Commission (Docket No. 90.12.86) on behalf of US West Communications: economic analysis of a proposed incentive regulation plan. Filed November 4, 1991. Additional testimony filed January 15, 1992.
176. Montana Public Service Commission (Docket No. D99.8.200), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., rebuttal testimony regarding the effects of the proposed Qwest-US West merger on economic welfare. Filed February 22, 2000.
177. Montana Department of Public Service Regulation (Docket No. D2000.6.89), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., direct testimony regarding efficient intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic. Filed July 24, 2000. Rebuttal testimony filed February 7, 2001.
178. Montana Department of Public Service Regulation (Docket No. D2000.8.124), on behalf of Qwest Corporation., direct testimony in arbitration with TouchAmerica regarding efficient intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic. Filed October 20, 2000. Rebuttal testimony filed December 20, 2000.
179. Montana Public Service Commission (Docket No. D2002.12.153) on behalf of Qwest Long Distance Corp.: rebuttal testimony regarding alleged anticompetitive practices in long distance services. Filed July 18, 2003.

24. Nebraska

180. Nebraska Public Service Commission, on behalf of US WEST, (Application No. C-1628), economic analysis of local exchange and exchange access pricing, direct testimony filed October 20, 1998; reply testimony filed November 20, 1998.
181. Nebraska Public Service Commission, *In the Matter of the Petition of Sprint Communications Company L.P. for Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms, Conditions, and Related Arrangements with U S WEST Communications, Inc. N/K/A Qwest Corporation*, (Docket No. C-2328), Direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic filed September 25, 2000. Rebuttal testimony filed October 4, 2000.

25. Nevada

182. United States District Court, District of Nevada (Case No. CV-S-99-1796-KJD(RJJ) on behalf of

Broadwing Communications Services, Inc., affidavit regarding damages from alleged misuse of trade secret information. Filed December 28, 2000.

26. New Hampshire

183. New Hampshire Public Service Commission (Docket 89-010) on behalf of New England Telephone & Telegraph Company: appropriate level and structure of productivity adjustments in a proposed price regulation plan. Filed March 3, 1989.
184. New Hampshire Public Service Commission, (Docket DE 90-002), on behalf of New England Telephone & Telegraph Company: the appropriate relationship between carrier access and toll prices. Filed May 1, 1992. Reply testimony filed July 10, 1992. Rebuttal testimony filed August 21, 1992.
185. Science, Technology and Energy Committee of the New Hampshire House of Representatives on behalf of New England Telephone Company, "An Economic Perspective on New Hampshire Senate Bill 77," an analysis of resale of intraLATA toll services. April 6, 1993
186. New Hampshire Public Service Commission, (Docket DE 96-252) on behalf of NYNEX: economic analysis of costs avoided from resale of local exchange services. Filed October 1, 1996.
187. New Hampshire Public Service Commission (Docket DE 96-220) on behalf of NYNEX, testimony regarding the economic effects of the proposed merger between Bell Atlantic and NYNEX. Filed October 10, 1996.
188. New Hampshire Public Service Commission, (Docket DE 96-252) on behalf of NYNEX: Arbitration of interconnection agreements under the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Filed October 23, 1996.
189. New Hampshire Public Service Commission (Docket No. 97-171, Phase II), on behalf of Bell Atlantic – New Hampshire: direct testimony discussing the basic economic principles regarding costs and prices of interconnection and unbundled network elements, filed March 13, 1998. Rebuttal filed April 17, 1998.
190. New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 99-018), on behalf of Bell Atlantic, direct testimony regarding the use of Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost (TELRIC) methodology as the basis for prices in special contracts. Filed April 7, 1999. Rebuttal testimony filed April 23, 1999.
191. New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. DT 02-111) on behalf of Verizon – New Hampshire, rebuttal testimony regarding private line pricing. Filed May 2, 2003.
192. New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. DT 02-165) on behalf of Verizon – New Hampshire, rebuttal testimony regarding Yellow Pages revenue imputation. Filed June 4, 2003. Surrebuttal filed November 10, 2003.

27. New Jersey

193. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TX90050349) on behalf of New Jersey Bell Telephone Company: theoretical and empirical analysis of the Board's intraLATA compensation policy. Filed December 6, 1990.

194. New Jersey Board of Regulatory Commissioners, (Docket No. TX93060259), Affidavit analyzing statistical evidence regarding the effect of intraLATA competition on telephone prices. Filed October 1, 1993.
195. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket Nos. TX90050349, TE92111047, TE93060211) on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey: economic impacts of intraLATA toll competition and regulatory changes required to accommodate competition. Filed April 7, 1994. Rebuttal testimony filed April 25, 1994. Summary Affidavit and Technical Affidavit filed April 19, 1994.
196. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TX94090388) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey: economic analysis of issues regarding proposed presubscription for intraLATA toll traffic in New Jersey. Amended direct testimony filed April 17, 1995. Rebuttal Testimony filed May 31, 1995.
197. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey: "Economic Competition in Local Exchange Markets," position paper on the economics of local exchange competition filed in connection with arbitration proceedings, August 9, 1996 (with Kenneth Gordon and Alfred E. Kahn).
198. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TX95120631) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey, incremental costs of residential basic exchange service. Filed August 15, 1996. Rebuttal testimony filed August 30, 1996.
199. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TO96070519) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey: evaluation of proxy models of the incremental cost of unbundled network elements, testimony filed September 18, 1996.
200. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TX95120631) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey: economic analysis of the avoided costs from resale of local exchange services. Rebuttal testimony filed September 27, 1996.
201. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. T096080621: MCI/Bell Atlantic Arbitration) on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey. Rebuttal testimony concerning the pricing of unbundled network elements, November 7, 1996.
202. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey (Docket No. T097030166) economic analysis of costs and benefits from Bell Atlantic provision of interLATA services, statement filed March 3, 1997, reply affidavit filed May 15, 1997.
203. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TX95120631) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey: economic analysis of proposed universal service funds. Direct testimony filed September 24, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed October 18, 1997.
204. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (BPU Docket No. TO97100808, OAL Docket No. PUCOT 11326-97N) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey: economic analysis of imputation rules for long distance services. Direct testimony filed July 8, 1998, rebuttal testimony filed September 18, 1998.
205. The New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (OAL DOCKET Nos. PUCOT 11269-97N, PUCOT 11357-97N, PUCOT 01186-94N AND PUCOT 09917-98N) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey: economic issues regarding alleged subsidization of payphone services. Rebuttal testimony filed March 8, 1999; surrebuttal testimony filed June 21, 1999.
206. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TO 00031063), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, direct testimony regarding the measurement of economic costs of ISP-bound traffic

- and economic issues concerning intercarrier compensation for such traffic. Filed April 28, 2000. Rebuttal testimony filed May 5, 2000.
207. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TO 99120934), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, direct testimony regarding reclassification of services as competitive. Filed May 18, 2000.
 208. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TO00060356), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, affidavit regarding the measurement of economic costs for unbundled network elements. Filed July 28, 2000.
 209. The New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TO01020095), on behalf of Verizon-New Jersey, panel testimony regarding parameters in an incentive regulation plan. Filed February 15, 2001. Rebuttal filed June 15, 2001. Supplemental rebuttal filed September 25, 2001.
 210. The New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TO01020095), on behalf of Verizon-New Jersey, panel testimony regarding measurement of cross-subsidies. Filed February 15, 2001. Rebuttal filed June 15, 2001.
 211. The New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TO01020095), on behalf of Verizon-New Jersey, panel testimony regarding reclassification of business services as competitive. Filed February 15, 2001. Rebuttal filed June 15, 2001.
 212. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. TT97120889), on behalf of Verizon – New Jersey, updated rebuttal testimony (with Michael Falkiewicz) regarding reclassification of directory assistance services as competitive, filed February 13, 2003.
 213. New Jersey Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Verizon New Jersey, Direct Testimony regarding forecasts of incremental hot cut demand, filed December 10, 2003.
 214. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (Docket No. T003090705), on behalf of Verizon New Jersey. Rebuttal testimony regarding geographic market definition in applying the FCC's switching triggers. Filed February 26, 2004.
 215. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities on behalf of Verizon New Jersey, Rebuttal Panel Testimony regarding forecasts of incremental hot cut demand, filed February 27, 2004.

28. New Mexico

216. New Mexico Public Regulation Commission (Case No. 3131), On behalf of U S WEST Communications, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic, filed October 14, 1999. Rebuttal testimony filed October 18, 1999.
217. New Mexico Public Regulation Commission (Utility Case No. 3147), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., direct testimony regarding efficient pricing and policies towards investment and new service implementation, filed December 6, 1999, rebuttal testimony filed December 28, 1999.
218. New Mexico Public Regulation Commission, on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., direct testimony regarding pricing flexible and alternatives to rate of return regulation, filed December 10, 1999.
219. New Mexico Public Regulation Commission (Case No. 3008), On behalf of U S WEST Communications, rebuttal testimony regarding local exchange rate levels and structure, filed May 19, 2000.

220. New Mexico Public Regulation Commission (Case No. 3225), on behalf of Qwest Corporation, direct testimony regarding the subsidy in existing telephone rates. Filed August 18, 2000.
221. New Mexico Public Regulation Commission (Case No. 3300), on behalf of Valor Telecommunications of New Mexico, LLC, rebuttal testimony regarding the subsidy in existing telephone rates. Filed October 19, 2000.

29. New York

222. New York State Public Service Commission (Case 28961 - Fifth Stage) on behalf of New York Telephone Company: appropriate level and structure of productivity adjustments in a proposed price regulation plan. Filed September 15, 1989.
223. Testimony before the United States District Court, Eastern District of New York on behalf of Jancyn Manufacturing Corp., in *Jancyn Manufacturing Corp. v. The County of Suffolk*. Commercial damages. Depositions: September 19, 1991, November 22, 1993; Testimony and Cross-Examination: January 11, 1994.
224. New York Public Service Commission (Case No. 28425) on behalf of New York Telephone Company, "Costs and Benefits of IntraLATA Presubscription," (with T.J. Tardiff). Filed May 1, 1992.
225. New York State Public Service Commission (Case 92-C-0665, Proceeding on Motion of the Commission to Investigate Performance-Based Incentive Regulatory Plans for New York Telephone Company) on behalf of New York Telephone Company: appropriate level and structure of productivity adjustments and competitive pricing safeguards in a proposed incentive regulation plan. Filed as part of panel testimony, October 3, 1994.
226. New York Public Service Commission (Case 94-C-0017) on behalf of New York Telephone Company, testimony regarding competition and market power in intrastate toll markets. Filed August 1, 1995.
227. New York Public Service Commission (Case Nos. 95-C-0657, 94-C-0095, 91-C-1174) on behalf of New York Telephone Company, costing principles for resold services. Filed May 31, 1996. Costing and pricing principles for unbundled network elements. Filed June 4, 1996. Rebuttal testimony filed July 15, 1996.
228. New York Public Service Commission (Case Nos. 93-C-0451 and 91-C-1249) on behalf of New York Telephone Company, statistical issues in the calculation of damages in the provision of Mass Announcement Services: Rebuttal testimony filed July 23, 1996.
229. New York Public Service Commission (Case 96-C-0603) on behalf of NYNEX and Bell Atlantic, *Initial Panel Testimony*, regarding the economic effects of the proposed merger between Bell Atlantic and NYNEX. Filed November 25, 1996. *Reply Panel Testimony* filed December 12, 1996.
230. Affidavit to the U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, on behalf of Multi Communication Media Inc., *Multi Communications Media Inc., v. AT&T and Trevor Fischbach*, (96 Civ. 2679 (MBM)) regarding the application of the filed tariff doctrine to contract tariffs in telecommunications. Filed December 27, 1996.
231. New York Public Service Commission on behalf of New York Telephone Company, "Competitive Effects of Allowing NYNEX To Provide InterLATA Services Originating In New

- York State,” public interest analysis of NYNEX’s proposed entry into in-region long distance service. Filed February 18, 1997 (with Harold Ware and Richard Schmalensee).
232. State of New York Public Service Commission (Case 94-C-0095 and 28425), on behalf of NYNEX, *Initial Panel Testimony*: direct testimony regarding InterLATA Access Charge Reform. Filed May 8, 1997. *Rebuttal Panel Testimony* filed July 8, 1997.
 233. State of New York Public Service Commission (Cases 95-C-0657, 94-C-0095, 91-C-1174 and 96-C-0036), on behalf of Bell Atlantic, *Panel Testimony of Bell Atlantic – New York on Costs and Rates for Miscellaneous Phase 3 Services*: panel testimony regarding statistical sampling issues in cost studies for non-recurring charges. Filed March 18, 1998. Rebuttal filed June 3, 1998.
 234. New York Public Service Commission, (Case 98-C-1357), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New York, Panel Testimony on costs for wholesale services, Panel Testimony filed February 7, 2000. Panel Rebuttal Testimony filed October 19, 2000.
 235. New York Public Service Commission, (Case 00-C-1945), on behalf of Verizon-New York, Panel Testimony on price regulation, filed May 15, 2001.
 236. New York Public Service Commission, (Case 00-C-1945), on behalf of Verizon-New York, Panel Testimony on the New York competitive marketplace, filed May 15, 2001.
 237. American Arbitration Association, New York, MCI WorldCom Communications Inc. v. Electronic Data Systems, Corporation, Expert Report on prices and incentives in a disputed contract filed June 25, 2001. Supplemental Expert Report filed July 13, 2001.
 238. New York Public Service Commission (Case 01-C-0767), on behalf of Verizon-New York, panel testimony regarding incremental costs and pricing of mobile interconnection services. Filed October 31, 2001.
 239. New York Public Service Commission, (Case 00-C-1945), economic issues in renewing the New York incentive regulation plan, (panel testimony), filed February 11, 2002.
 240. American Arbitration Association, on behalf of Verizon – New York, direct testimony regarding events in telecommunications markets affecting employment. February 2003.
 241. American Arbitration Association (Case No: 50-T-180-00458-02), *Global Crossing USA, Inc. v. Softbank Corp.*, on behalf of Softbank Corp., damage calculations regarding undersea optical fiber capacity. Direct and Supplemental direct testimonies filed July 2003.
 242. New York Public Service Commission, (Case 02-C-1425), on behalf of Verizon New York, forecasts of incremental hot cut demand (panel testimony), filed October 24, 2003.

30. North Carolina

243. North Carolina Utilities Commission (Docket No. P-7, Sub 825; P-10, Sub 479) on behalf of Carolina Telephone and Telegraph Company and Central Telephone Company, direct and rebuttal testimony regarding price cap regulation for small telephone companies, February 9, 1996.
244. North Carolina Utilities Commission (Docket No. P-55, Sub1022) on behalf of BellSouth Long Distance, Inc.: direct testimony regarding the likely economic benefits to consumers in North Carolina from entry by BellSouth into the interLATA long distance market. Filed August 5, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed September 15, 1997.

245. North Carolina Utilities Commission (Docket No. P-100, SUB 133d), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications: direct testimony on the proper economic basis for determining costs and prices of interconnection, unbundled network elements, and operating support systems. Filed December 15, 1997. Rebuttal filed March 9, 1998.
246. North Carolina Utilities Commission (Docket No. P-100, SUB 133g), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications: direct testimony on appropriate economic principles for sizing the state universal service fund. Filed February 16, 1998. Rebuttal filed April 13, 1998.
247. North Carolina Utilities Commission, *In re: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DELTA COM Communications, Inc., with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, (Docket No. P-500, Sub 10), testimony regarding economic interconnection issues, filed July 9, 1999.
248. North Carolina Utilities Commission, *In the Matter of Bell South Telecommunications, Inc., Complainant vs. US LEC of North Carolina, Respondent*, (Docket No. P-561, Sub 10), rebuttal testimony regarding economic efficiency and reciprocal compensation. Filed July 30, 1999.
249. North Carolina Utilities Commission (Docket No. P-100, SUB 133k), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications: rebuttal testimony regarding properties of a service quality performance assurance plan. Filed May 21, 2001.
250. North Carolina Utilities Commission (Docket No. P-55, SUB 1022), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications: rebuttal testimony regarding status of local competition in North Carolina. Filed October 8, 2001.

31. North Dakota

251. North Dakota Public Service Commission, on behalf of US WEST Communications, rebuttal testimony in support of US WEST's filing for a residential basic local service rate increase, filed May 30, 2000.

32. Ohio

252. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (Case No. 94-1695-TP-ACE) on behalf of Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company: economic analysis of terms and conditions for efficient local competition. Filed May 24, 1995.
253. Ohio Public Utility Commission (Case No. 96-899-TP-ALT) on behalf of Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company: direct testimony regarding CBT's proposed rate rebalancing and price regulation plan. Filed February 19, 1997.
254. Ohio Public Utility Commission (Case No. 97-152-TP-ARB), on behalf of Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company: direct testimony regarding the application of MCI Telecommunications Corporation Petition for Arbitration Pursuant to Section 252 (b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Filed April 2, 1997.
255. Ohio Public Utility Commission (Docket No. 98-1398-TP-AMT), on behalf of Bell Atlantic and GTE, rebuttal testimony concerning economic effects of the proposed merger of Bell Atlantic and GTE. Filed June 16, 1999, substitute rebuttal testimony filed October 12, 1999.

33. Oregon

256. Oregon Public Utility Commission (ARB 154) on behalf of US WEST Communications, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for ISP-bound traffic, November 1, 1999, rebuttal testimony filed November 5, 1999.

34. Pennsylvania

257. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, (Docket No. P-009350715), on behalf of Bell Atlantic: a study of inflation offsets in a proposed price regulation plan. Filed October 1, 1993. Rebuttal testimony filed January 18, 1994.
258. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, (Docket No. I-940034) on behalf of Bell Atlantic: issues regarding proposed presubscription for intraLATA toll traffic. Filed as part of panel testimony, December 8, 1994. Reply testimony filed February 23, 1995. Surrebuttal testimony filed March 16, 1995.
259. *US WATS v. AT&T*: Retained by counsel for US WATS, a reseller of AT&T long distance services, plaintiff in an antitrust suit alleging monopolization and conspiracy in business long distance markets. Antitrust liability and damages. Confidential Report, August 22, 1995. Depositions September 30, October 1, October 12, December 3, 1995. Testimony October 18-20, 25-27, 30, 1995. Rebuttal testimony December 4, December 11, 1995.
260. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket Nos. A-310203F0002, A-310213F0002, A-310236F0002 and A-310258F0002), on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Pennsylvania: rebuttal testimony to evaluate costing and pricing principles and cost models. Filed March 21, 1996.
261. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. P-00961024), on behalf of Commonwealth Telephone Company: economic appraisal of a price cap regulation proposal, Direct testimony filed April 15, 1996. Rebuttal testimony filed July 19, 1996.
262. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-00963550), on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Pennsylvania: economic consequences of rate rebalancing, Direct testimony filed April 26, 1996. Rebuttal testimony filed July 5, 1996.
263. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-963550 C0006), on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Pennsylvania: economic consequences of rate rebalancing, Direct testimony filed August 30, 1996.
264. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. A-310258F0002 - Interconnection Arbitration, Eastern Telelogic Corporation/Bell Atlantic) on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, direct and rebuttal testimony on economic costs of interconnection and unbundled network elements, September 23, 1996.
265. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, statement regarding costs and benefits from Bell Atlantic entry into interLATA telecommunications markets. Filed February 10, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed March 21, 1997.
266. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. I-00960066), on behalf of Bell Atlantic: direct testimony providing an economic framework for the intrastate carrier switched access rates charged by Bell Atlantic. Filed June 30, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed July 29, 1997. Surrebuttal testimony filed August 27, 1997.
267. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. I-00940035), on behalf of Bell Atlantic:

- direct testimony regarding the relationship between access charge reform and universal service funding. Filed October 22, 1997.
268. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. P-00971307), on behalf of Bell Atlantic: direct testimony concerning the classification of Bell Atlantic's business services in Pennsylvania as competitive and the calculation of an imputation price floor for those services. Filed February 11, 1998. Rebuttal filed February 18, 1998.
 269. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. P-00981410), on behalf of The United Telephone Company of Pennsylvania: direct testimony regarding role of productivity offset in a price cap plan, filed October 16, 1998. Rebuttal testimony filed February 4, 1999.
 270. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania: A report entitled "Promises Fulfilled; Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania's Infrastructure Development." Filed January 15, 1999 (with Charles J. Zarkadas, Agustin J. Ros, and Jaime C. d'Almeida).
 271. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket Nos. A-310200F0002, A-311350F0002, A-310222F0002, A-310291F0003), on behalf of Bell Atlantic Corporation and GTE Corporation, rebuttal testimony regarding economic issues raised in the proposed merger of Bell Atlantic and GTE. Filed April 22, 1999.
 272. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. A-310630F0002), on behalf of Bell Atlantic, direct testimony regarding the measurement of economic costs of ISP-bound traffic and economic issues concerning intercarrier compensation for such traffic. Filed April 14, 2000. Rebuttal testimony filed April 21, 2000.
 273. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, (Docket No. M-00001435) on behalf of Verizon-Pennsylvania, Inc.: affidavit regarding the public interest benefits of Verizon entry into interLATA services. Filed January 8, 2001.
 274. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. P-00981449), on behalf of Verizon North, testimony regarding parameters in a Chapter 30 price cap plan. Filed October 31, 2000. Rebuttal testimony filed February 20, 2001.
 275. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, (Docket No. P-00032020), on behalf of Commonwealth Telephone Company. Affidavit regarding exogenous events in price cap plans. Filed February 3, 2003.
 276. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, (Docket No. P-00930715F0002), on behalf of Verizon – Pennsylvania. Rebuttal testimony regarding broadband development and productivity growth in the context of a price cap plan. Filed February 4, 2003.
 277. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on behalf of Verizon-PA Inc. and Verizon North Inc., surrebuttal testimony (proprietary) to support Verizon-PA rate rebalancing plan. Filed August 4, 2003.
 278. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. P-00951005) on behalf of the Frontier Companies, testimony regarding a price regulation plan. November 7, 2003.
 279. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. I-00030099) on behalf of Verizon Pennsylvania, rebuttal testimony regarding geographic market definition for unbundled network elements. January 20, 2004.
 280. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. M-0031754) on behalf of Verizon Pennsylvania, declaration regarding forecasts of incremental hot cuts. Filed January 28, 2004.

35. Rhode Island

281. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 1997) on behalf of New England Telephone & Telegraph Company, "Rhode Island Price Regulation Plan," analysis of proposed price regulation plan and evidence of the effects of incentive regulation on prices and infrastructure development. Filed September 30, 1991.
282. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission on behalf of NYNEX (Docket No. 2252), testimony addressing the economic conditions under which competition in the local exchange and intraLATA markets will bring benefits to customers. Direct testimony, November 17, 1995.
283. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 2370), on behalf of New England Telephone and Telegraph Company, D/B/A NYNEX: economic review and revision of the Rhode Island price cap plan. Direct testimony, February 23, 1996. Rebuttal testimony filed June 25, 1996.
284. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of Bell Atlantic – Rhode Island: direct testimony discussing basic economic principles regarding costs and prices of interconnection and unbundled network elements. Filed November 25, 1997.
285. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 2681), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Rhode Island: rebuttal testimony regarding costs for OSSs, filed September 18, 1998.
286. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 2681), on behalf of Bell Atlantic: rebuttal testimony regarding entry into the local services telecommunications market. Filed January 15, 1999.
287. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 2681), on behalf of Bell Atlantic Rhode Island, direct testimony regarding incremental costs and switched access rates. Filed October 22, 1999.
288. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 2681), on behalf of Verizon Rhode Island, direct testimony regarding incremental costs and switched access rates. Filed May 1, 2002.
289. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 3179), on behalf of Verizon Rhode Island, direct testimony regarding alternative regulation. Filed July 1, 2002. Rebuttal Testimony filed October 22, 2003.
290. Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Verizon Rhode Island, Direct Testimony regarding forecasts of incremental hot cut demand, filed December 8, 2003.

36. South Carolina

291. South Carolina Public Service Commission, on behalf of BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., (Docket No. 97-101-C) : direct testimony regarding the probable economic benefits to consumers in South Carolina from entry by BellSouth into the interLATA long distance market. Filed April 1, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed June 30, 1997.
292. South Carolina Public Service Commission (Docket No. 97-374-C), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: rebuttal testimony concerning general economic principles for the pricing and costing of interconnection and unbundled network elements. Filed November 25, 1997.
293. South Carolina Public Service Commission (Docket No. 97-124-C), on behalf of BellSouth

- Telecommunications, Inc.: rebuttal testimony concerning economic principles for pricing interconnection services supplied to payphone providers. Filed December 7, 1998.
294. South Carolina Public Service Commission, *In re: Petition for Arbitration of ITC^DELTA COM Communications, Inc., with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, (Docket No. 1999-259-C), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, testimony regarding economic interconnection issues. Filed August 25, 1999.
 295. South Carolina Public Service Commission (Docket No. 2001-209-C), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: economic aspects of BellSouth's application to provide long distance services in South Carolina. Rebuttal testimony filed July 16, 2001.
 296. South Carolina Public Service Commission (Docket No. 2001-209-C), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.. Direct testimony regarding statistical issues in performance penalty plans, filed March 5, 2003.
 297. Public Service Commission of South Carolina, Docket Nos. 2002-367-C and 2002-408-C on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.. Economic interpretation of "abuse of market position" and "inflation-based index" in legislation. Direct testimony filed July 23, 2003, Responsive testimony filed July 30, 2003.

37. Tennessee

298. Tennessee Public Service Commission (*In re: The Promulgation of Agency Statements of General Applicability to Telephone Companies That Prescribe New Policies and Procedures for Their Regulation*) on behalf of South Central Bell Telephone Company: theoretical analysis and appraisal of the proposed Tennessee Regulatory Reform Plan. Filed February 20, 1991.
299. Tennessee Public Service Commission (Docket No. 95-02499) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a BellSouth Telephone Company, testimony addressing the definition and measurement of the cost of supplying universal service. (Direct testimony filed October 20, 1995. Rebuttal testimony filed October 25, 1995). Additional testimony regarding economic principles underlying the creation of a competitively-neutral universal service fund: direct testimony filed October 30, 1995. Rebuttal testimony filed November 3, 1995.
300. Tennessee Public Service Commission (*In re: The Avoidable Costs of Providing Bundled Services for Resale by Local Exchange Telephone Companies*) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (Docket No. 96-00067): economic costing and pricing principles for resold and unbundled services. May 24, 1996. Refiled with the Tennessee Regulatory Authority (Docket No. 96-00067), August 23, 1996.
301. Tennessee Regulatory Authority (*In re: The Avoidable Costs of Providing Bundled Services for Resale by Local Exchange Telephone Companies*) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (Docket No. 96-01331): economic costing and pricing principles for resold and unbundled services. Filed September 10, 1996. Rebuttal testimony filed September 20, 1996.
302. Tennessee Regulatory Authority (*In re: Petition to Convene a Contested Case Proceeding to Establish "Permanent Prices" for Interconnection and Unbundled Network Elements*) on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (Docket No. 97-01262): rebuttal testimony regarding costing principles on which to base prices of unbundled network elements. Filed October 17,

1997.

303. Tennessee Regulatory Authority (Docket No. 97-00888), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.: direct testimony regarding appropriate economic principles for sizing the state universal service fund, Filed April 3, 1998. Rebuttal filed April 9, 1998.
304. Tennessee Regulatory Authority (Docket No. 99-00377), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic in Arbitration with ICG Telecom Group, filed October 15, 1999. Rebuttal testimony filed October 25, 1999.
305. Tennessee Regulatory Authority (Docket No. 99-00430), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic in Arbitration with ITC-DeltaCom, filed October 15, 1999. Rebuttal testimony filed October 25, 1999.
306. Tennessee Regulatory Authority, (Docket No. 97-00409), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, rebuttal testimony regarding efficient pricing for pay telephone services. Filed October 6, 2000.
307. Tennessee Regulatory Authority, (Docket No. 01-00193), on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications: rebuttal testimony regarding performance measurements and self-effectuating penalties. Filed August 10, 2001.

38. Texas

308. *Darren B. Swain, Inc. d/b/a U.S. Communications v. AT&T Corp.*, United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, Civil Action 394CV-1088D: Retained by counsel for U.S. Communications, a reseller of AT&T long distance services, plaintiff in an antitrust suit alleging monopolization in inbound business long distance markets. Antitrust liability and damages. Confidential Report, November 17, 1995.
309. Public Utility Commission of Texas (Docket No. 8585) on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company: analysis of Texas intrastate switched access charges and bypass of switched access. Filed December 18, 1989.
310. Texas Public Utility Commission (Docket No. 21982), on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, direct testimony regarding CLEC's rate for transport and termination of ISP-bound traffic. Filed March 13, 2000. Rebuttal testimony filed March 31, 2000.
311. Texas Public Utility Commission (Docket No. 28607), on behalf of SBC Texas. Direct testimony regarding geographic market definition for local telephone service. Filed February 9, 2004. Rebuttal testimony filed March 19, 2004.

39. Utah

312. Utah Public Service Commission (Docket No. 99-049-41), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., rebuttal testimony regarding the effects of the proposed Qwest-US West merger on economic welfare. Filed February 28, 2000.
313. Utah Public Service Commission (Docket No. 00-999-05), on behalf of Qwest Corporation, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic. Filed February

2, 2001. Rebuttal testimony filed March 9, 2001.

314. Utah Public Service Commission on behalf of Qwest Corporation, direct testimony regarding productivity offsets in a price cap plan. Filed October 5, 2001. Rebuttal testimony filed November 22, 2001.

40. Vermont

315. Vermont Public Service Board, Petition for Price Regulation Plan of New England Telephone on behalf of New England Telephone Company, Dockets 5700/5702: analysis of appropriate parameters for a price regulation plan. Filed September 30, 1993. Rebuttal testimony filed July 5, 1994.
316. Vermont Public Service Board, (Open Network Architecture Docket No. 5713) on behalf of New England Telephone Company, economic principles for local competition, interconnection and unbundling, direct testimony filed June 7, 1995. Rebuttal testimony filed July 12, 1995.
317. Vermont Public Service Board (Docket No. 5713), on behalf of Bell Atlantic – Vermont, direct testimony regarding economic principles for setting prices and estimating costs for interconnection. Filed July 31, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed January 9, 1998. Surrebuttal testimony filed February 26, 1998. Supplemental rebuttal testimony filed March 4, 1998.
318. Vermont Public Service Board (Docket No. 5900) on behalf of NYNEX, testimony regarding the economic effects of the proposed merger between Bell Atlantic and NYNEX. Filed September 6, 1996.
319. Vermont Public Service Board (Docket no. 6000), on behalf of Bell Atlantic: direct testimony examining the likely benefits from adopting a price regulation plan. Filed January 19, 1998.
320. Vermont Public Service Board (Docket No. 6077), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Vermont: rebuttal testimony regarding application of imputation standard, filed November 4, 1998.
321. Vermont Public Service Board (Docket No. 6167), on behalf of Bell Atlantic, rebuttal testimony regarding reduction of access charges & pricing of new services. Filed May 20, 1999. Supplemental testimony filed May 27, 1999.

41. Virginia

322. Affidavit to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia (Alexandria Division) on behalf of United States Telephone Association, *United States Telephone Association, et al., v. Federal Communications Commission, et al.*, (Civil Action No. 95-533-A) regarding the Section 214 process for local exchange companies providing cable television services. Filed October 30, 1995, (with A.E. Kahn).
323. State Corporation Commission of Virginia (Case No. PUC 950067) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Virginia, Inc., rebuttal testimony concerning economic standards for the classification of services as competitive for regulatory purposes, January 11, 1996.
324. State Corporation Commission of Virginia, on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Virginia, (Case No. PUC960), direct testimony regarding costing and pricing of interconnection and unbundled network elements. Filed December 20, 1996. Rebuttal testimony filed June 10, 1997 (Case No. PUC970005).

325. State Corporation Commission of Virginia *In re: Joint Petition of Bell Atlantic Corporation and GTE Corporation for approval of agreement and plan of merger*, economic effects of the proposed merger of Bell Atlantic and GTE. File May 28, 1999, rebuttal testimony filed October 8, 1999.
326. Virginia State Corporation Commission, (Case No. PUC000079) on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Virginia, direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic in arbitration with Focal Communications Group. Filed April 25, 2000.
327. Virginia State Corporation Commission, (Case No. PUC 000003) on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Virginia, direct testimony regarding efficient pricing of carrier access charges. Filed May 30, 2000.
328. State Corporation Commission of Virginia (Case No. PUC-2003-00091) on behalf of Verizon - Virginia, Inc.. Affidavit concerning pricing of carrier access charges. Filed March 31, 2004.
329. State Corporation Commission of Virginia (Case No. PUC-2004-) on behalf of Verizon - Virginia, Inc.. Affidavit concerning alternative regulation of telecommunications services. Filed July 9, 2004. Reply Affidavit filed October 29, 2004.

42. Washington

330. Washington Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. UT-990300), on behalf of US WEST, regarding US WEST's interconnection arbitration with AirTouch Paging in Washington. Direct testimony filed February 24, 1999; rebuttal testimony filed March 8, 1999.
331. Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Docket No. UT-991358), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., rebuttal testimony regarding the effects of the proposed Qwest-US West merger on economic welfare. Filed February 22, 2000.
332. Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Docket No. UT-003006), on behalf of US West Communications, Inc., direct testimony regarding intercarrier compensation for internet-bound traffic. Filed April 26, 2000. Rebuttal testimony filed May 10, 2000.
333. Washington Transportation and Utilities Commission, *In the Matter of the Petition of Qwest Corporation for Competitive Classification of Business Services in Specified Wire Centers*, Docket No. UT-000883. Rebuttal testimony regarding economic criteria for classification of services as competitive. Filed October 6, 2000.
334. Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Docket No. UT-02-11-20), on behalf of Qwest, rebuttal testimony regarding economic aspects of the sale of Qwest Dex (Yellow Pages). Filed April 17, 2003.

43. West Virginia

335. Public Service Commission of West Virginia (Case No. 94-1103-T-GI) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - West Virginia: economic analysis of issues regarding proposed presubscription for intraLATA toll traffic in West Virginia, March 24, 1995.
336. Public Service Commission of West Virginia (Case Nos. 96-1516-T-PC, 96-1561-T-PC, 96-1009-T-PC, and 96-1533-T-T) on behalf of Bell Atlantic - West Virginia: direct testimony regarding costing and pricing of interconnection and unbundled network elements. Filed

February 13, 1997. Rebuttal testimony filed February 20, 1997.

337. Public Service Commission of West Virginia on behalf of Bell Atlantic - West Virginia: economic analysis of issues regarding Bell Atlantic's entry into the interLATA long distance market. Filed March 31, 1997.

44. Wisconsin

338. Wisconsin Public Service Commission, (Docket No. 6720-TI-173) on behalf of SBC Wisconsin, economic analysis of competition for small business customers. Filed October 31, 2003.
339. Wisconsin Public Service Commission, (Docket No. 05-TI-908) on behalf of SBC Wisconsin, geographic market analysis for local exchange service. Filed February 9, 2004.
340. Wisconsin Public Service Commission, (Docket No. 6720-TI-196) on behalf of SBC Wisconsin, pricing flexibility for residential local exchange service. Direct testimony filed February 15, 2005. Rebuttal filed June 2, 2005.

45. Wyoming

341. Wyoming Public Service Commission (Docket No. 70000-TR-99), on behalf of US West Communications, direct testimony evaluating proposed prices of non-competitive US West services with regards to cost, pricing, competition, & regulation. Filed April 26, 1999.
342. Wyoming Public Service Commission (Docket Nos. 74142-TA-99-16, 70000-TA-99-503, 74037-TA-99-8, 70034-TA-99-4, 74089-TA-99-9, 74029-TA-99-43, 74337-TA-99-2, Record No. 5134), on behalf of US West Communications, rebuttal testimony regarding economic issues arising in the proposed merger between U S WEST and Qwest. Filed April 4, 2000.

Canada

343. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (Docket No. 1990-73) on behalf of Bell Canada: "The Effect of Competition on U.S. Telecommunications Performance," (with L.J. Perl). Filed November 30, 1990.
344. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (Docket No. 92-78) on behalf of Alberta General Telephone: "Lessons for the Canadian Regulatory Structure from the U.S. Experience with Incentive Regulation," and "Performance Under Alternative Forms of Regulation in the U.S. Telecommunications Industry," (with T.J. Tardiff). Filed April 13, 1993.
345. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (Application of Teleglobe Canada for Review of the Regulatory Framework of Teleglobe Canada Inc.): on behalf of Teleglobe Canada, Inc., structure of a price regulation plan for the franchised supplier of overseas telecommunications services in Canada. Filed December 21, 1994.
346. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, Response to Interrogatory SRCI(CRTC) 1Nov94-906, "Economies of Scope in Telecommunications," on behalf of Stentor. Filed January 31, 1995.
347. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, Implementation of Regulatory Framework and Related Issues, Telecom Public Notices CRTC 94-52, 94-56 and 94-58, "Economic Welfare Benefits from Rate Rebalancing," on behalf of Stentor. Filed February

- 20, 1995.
348. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, "Imputation Test to be Applied to Competitive Local Exchange Services," position paper on imputation for local exchange services filed in response to Telecom Public Notice CRTC 95-36 on behalf of Stentor on August 18, 1995.
 349. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, in response to CRTC Telecom Public Notice CRTC 96-8, "Economic Aspects of Canadian Price Cap Regulation," on behalf of the Stentor companies. Filed June 10, 1996.
 350. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, in response to CRTC Telecom Public Notice CRTC 96-8, "Economic Aspects of Price Cap Regulation for MTS NetCom Inc.," on behalf of MTS Net Com, Inc. Filed June 10, 1996.
 351. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, in response to CRTC Telecom Public Notice CRTC 2000-108, "MTS Communications Inc., Recovery of 2000 and 2001 Income Tax Expense" on behalf of MTS Communications, Inc. Oral panel testimony, January 11, 2001.
 352. Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (Public Notice CRTC 2001-37) on behalf of Aliant Telecom Inc., Bell Canada, MTS Communications Inc., and Saskatchewan Telecommunications: "Price Cap Review and Related Issues," filed May 31, 2001. Rebuttal evidence filed September 20, 2001.

Federal Communications Commission

1988

353. Federal Communications Commission (Docket No. 87-313) on behalf of Bell Communications Research, Inc.: empirical analysis of price cap regulation of interstate access service, entitled "The Impact of Federal Price Cap Regulation on Interstate Toll Customers." Filed March 17, 1988.
354. Federal Communications Commission (Docket No. 87-313) on behalf of Bell Communications Research, Inc.: "The Impact of the FCC Proposed Price Cap Plan on Interstate Consumers," Filed August 18, 1988. Rebuttal analysis filed November 18, 1988.

1989

355. Federal Communications Commission (Docket No. 87-313) on behalf of Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company, "Incentive Regulation and Estimates of Productivity," (with J. Rohlfs), June 9, 1989.
356. Federal Communications Commission (Docket No. 87-313) on behalf of the United States Telephone Association: "Analysis of AT&T's Comparison of Interstate Access Charges Under Incentive Regulation and Rate of Return Regulation." Filed as Reply Comments regarding the FCC's Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket 87-313, August 3, 1989.
357. Federal Communications Commission (Docket No. 87-313) on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, "Taxes and Incentive Regulation," filed as Exhibit 3 to the Reply Comments of Southwestern Bell regarding the FCC's Report and Order and Second Further

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket 87-313, August 3, 1989.

1990

358. Federal Communications Commission (Docket 87-313) on behalf of the United States Telephone Association: "Local Exchange Carrier Productivity Offsets for the FCC Price Cap Plan," May 3, 1990.
359. Federal Communications Commission (Docket 87-313) on behalf of the United States Telephone Association: "Productivity Offsets for LEC Interstate Access," June 8, 1990.
360. Federal Communications Commission (Docket 87-313) on behalf of the United States Telephone Association: "Interstate Access Productivity Offsets for Mid-Size Telephone Companies," June 8, 1990.
361. Federal Communications Commission (Docket 87-313) on behalf of the United States Telephone Association: analysis of total factor productivity calculations, entitled "Productivity Measurements in the Price Cap Docket," December 21, 1990.

1991

362. Federal Communications Commission (Docket 87-313) on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, "The Treatment of New Services under Price Cap Regulation," (with Alfred E. Kahn), June 12, 1991.
363. Federal Communications Commission (Docket 91-141, Expanded Interconnection with Local Telephone Company Facilities) on behalf of Bell Atlantic, "Effects of Competitive Entry in the U.S. Interstate Toll Markets." August 6, 1991.
364. Federal Communications Commission (Docket 91-141, Expanded Interconnection with Local Telephone Company Facilities) on behalf of Southwestern Bell, "Economic Effects of the FCC's Tentative Proposal for Interstate Access Transport Services." Filed September 20, 1991.

1992

365. Federal Communications Commission, (Pacific Bell Tariff F.C.C. No. 128, Transmittal No. 1579) on behalf of Pacific Bell, "The Treatment of FAS 106 Accounting Changes Under FCC Price Cap Regulation," (with T.J. Tardiff). Filed April 15, 1992. Reply comments filed July 31, 1992.
366. Federal Communications Commission, (CC Docket 92-141, In the Matter of 1992 Annual Access Tariff Filings) on behalf of Bell Atlantic, "Effects of Competitive Entry in the U.S. Interstate Toll Markets: An Update," filed July 10, 1992.
367. Federal Communications Commission (ET Docket 92-100) on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, "Assigning PCS Spectrum: An Economic Analysis of Eligibility Requirements and Licensing Mechanisms," (with Richard Schmalensee). Filed November 9, 1992.

1993

368. Federal Communications Commission (Petition for Declaratory Ruling and Related Waivers to Establish a New Regulatory Model for the Ameritech Region) on behalf of Ameritech: "Price Cap Regulation and Enhanced Competition for Interstate Access Services," filed April 16, 1993, Reply Comments, July 12, 1993.
369. Federal Communications Commission (Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to

Adopt Regulations for Automatic Vehicle Monitoring Systems) PR Docket No. 93-61 on behalf of PacTel Teletrac, "The Economics of Co-Channel Separation for Wideband Pulse Ranging Location Monitoring Systems," (with R. Schmalensee). Filed June 29, 1993.

370. Federal Communications Commission (In the Matter of Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Competitive Common Carrier Services and Facilities Authorization Therefor) on behalf of four Regional Bell Holding Companies, Affidavit "Interstate Long Distance Competition and AT&T's Motion for Reclassification as a Nondominant Carrier," filed November 12, 1993, (with A.E. Kahn).

1994

371. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket 94-1) on behalf of the United States Telephone Association: "Economic Performance of the LEC Price Cap Plan," filed as Attachment 5 to the United States Telephone Association Comments, May 9, 1994, "Economic Performance of the LEC Price Cap Plan: Reply Comments," filed as Attachment 4 to the United States Telephone Association Reply Comments, June 29, 1994.
372. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket 94-1) on behalf of the United States Telephone Association: "Comments on the USTA Pricing Flexibility Proposal," filed as Attachment 4 to the United States Telephone Association Comments, May 9, 1994, "Reply Comments: Market Analysis and Pricing Flexibility for Interstate Access Services," filed as Attachment 3 to the United States Telephone Association Reply Comments, June 29, 1994 (with Richard Schmalensee).
373. Federal Communications Commission (File Nos. W-P-C 6912 and 6966) on behalf of Bell Atlantic Corporation, affidavit supporting Section 214 applications to provide video dialtone services, August 5, 1994.
374. Federal Communications Commission (File Nos. W-P-C 6982 and 6983) on behalf of NYNEX: affidavit supporting Section 214 applications to provide video dialtone services in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, September 21, 1994.

1995

375. Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic Corporation, affidavit examining cost support for Asymmetric Digital Subscriber Loop (ADSL) video dialtone market trial. Filed February 21, 1995.
376. Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic Corporation, affidavit examining cost support for Bell Atlantic's video dialtone tariff. Filed March 6, 1995.
377. Federal Communications Commission on behalf of the United States Telephone Association, study entitled "Competition in the Interstate Long-Distance Markets: Recent Evidence from AT&T Price Changes," *ex parte* filing in CC Docket No. 94-1, March 16, 1995.
378. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 79-252) on behalf of Bell Atlantic, BellSouth, SBC, and Pacific Telesis, "An Analysis of the State of Competition in Long-Distance Telephone Markets," study attached to *ex parte* comments examining the competitiveness of interstate long-distance telephone markets, (with J. Douglas Zona), April 1995.
379. Federal Communications Commission (File Nos. W-P-C 7074) on behalf of Southern New England Telephone Company, affidavit supporting Section 214 applications to provide video dialtone services, July 6, 1995.

380. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 95-145) on behalf of Bell Atlantic Corporation, affidavit examining economic issues raised in the investigation of Bell Atlantic's video dialtone tariff. Filed October 26, 1995. Supplemental Affidavit filed December 21, 1995.
381. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 94-1) on behalf of the United States Telephone Association, "Economic Evaluation of Selected Issues from the Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the LEC Price Cap Performance Review," Attachment C to the United States Telephone Association "Comments," filed December 18, 1995 (with T. Tardiff and C. Zarkadas). Reply Comments filed March 1, 1996.

1996

382. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 95-185) on behalf of NYNEX, "Affidavit Concerning Interconnection Between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers," filed March 4, 1996.
383. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-45) on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, "Comments on Universal Service," (with Kenneth Gordon) , analysis of proposed rules to implement the universal service requirements of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, filed April 12, 1996.
384. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-46), on behalf of Bell Atlantic, BellSouth, GTE, Lincoln, Pacific Bell and SBC Communications, Inc., ex parte affidavit on costing principles and cross-subsidization in broadband, joint-use networks, April 26, 1996.
385. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-98) videotaped presentation on economic costs for interconnection, FCC Economic Open Forum, May 20, 1996.
386. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-112), on behalf of the Southern New England Telephone Company: cost allocation between telephony and broadband services, Affidavit filed May 31, 1996.
387. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-112), on behalf of Bell Atlantic: reply comments concerning cost allocations between telephony and broadband services, Affidavit filed June 12, 1996.
388. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-46), on behalf of Bell Atlantic, BellSouth, GTE, Lincoln, Pacific and SBC, Declaration concerning the use of efficient component pricing in open video systems. Filed July 5, 1996.
389. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-98), on behalf of the United States Telephone Association, Affidavit concerning technical qualities of the Staff Industry Demand and Supply Simulation Model. Filed July 8, 1996; *ex parte* letters filed July 22, 1996 and July 23, 1996.
390. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-45), on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, comments concerning the use of proxy cost models for measuring the cost of universal service. Filed August 9, 1996 (with Aniruddha Banerjee).
391. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-149), on behalf of Bell Atlantic, Affidavit concerning safeguards for in-region supply of interexchange services by local exchange carriers. Filed August 15, 1996.
392. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-45), on behalf of the United States Telephone Association, "Not the Real McCoy: A Compendium of Problems with the Hatfield

Model.” Filed October 15, 1996

393. Federal Communications Commission (Tracking No. 96-0221) on behalf of NYNEX and Bell Atlantic, affidavit concerning the competitive effects of the proposed NYNEX-Bell Atlantic merger. Filed October 23, 1996 (with Richard Schmalensee).
394. Affidavit to the Federal Communications Commission, on behalf of SBC Communications, Inc., (Docket No. 96-149), regarding Commission’s proposed rules and their impact on joint marketing. Filed November 14, 1996 (with Paul B. Vasington).

1997

395. Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, on behalf of the United States Telephone Association, *Remarks on Proxy Cost Models*, CC Docket No. 96-45 (videotape filed in docket). Filed January 14, 1997.
396. Federal Communications Commission, on behalf of Bell Atlantic: “An Analysis of Conceptual Issues Regarding Proxy Cost Models”, a response to FCC Staff Report on issues regarding Proxy Cost Models. Filed February 13, 1997.
397. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-262 et. al.), statement on behalf of United States Telephone Association, “Economic Aspects of Access Reform.” Filed on January 29, 1997 (with Richard Schmalensee). Rebuttal filed on February 14, 1997.
398. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket 96-262 et al.), on behalf of USTA: a report entitled, “An Analysis of the Welfare Effects of Long Distance Market Entry by an Integrated Access and Long Distance Provider”, *ex parte* filed March 7, 1997 (with Richard Schmalensee, Doug Zona and Paul Hinton).
399. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket 96-262 et al.), on behalf of the United States Telephone Association: a report entitled, “An Update of the FCC Short-Term Productivity Study (1985-1995)”, *ex parte* filed March 1997.
400. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 96-149), on behalf of Bell Atlantic, BellSouth, NYNEX, Pacific Bell and SBC: affidavit concerning economic issues raised by the BOC supply of interLATA services to an affiliate. Filed April 17, 1997.
401. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket Nos. 93-193, Phase 1, Part 2, 94-65), on behalf of Bell Atlantic: affidavit concerning allocation of earnings sharing and refunds in the local exchange carrier price cap plan. Filed May 19, 1997.
402. Federal Communications Commission (File No. SCL-97-003), on behalf of ATU Long Distance: affidavit concerning the economic effects of classifying a proposed undersea cable between Alaska and the lower 48 states as a private carrier. Filed December 8, 1997.
403. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 80-286), on behalf of Bell Atlantic: affidavit concerning proposed reforms of jurisdictional separations. Filed December 10, 1997.

1998

404. Federal Communications Commission (*ex parte* CC Docket No. 96-262 et. al.), “The Need for Carrier Access Pricing Flexibility in Light of Recent Marketplace Developments: A Primer,” research paper prepared on behalf of United States Telephone Association. Filed on January 21, 1998 (with Richard Schmalensee).
405. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter of Applications of WorldCom, Inc. and MCI Communications Corporation for Transfer of Control of MCI Communications*

- Corporation to WorldCom, Inc.* (CC Docket No. 97-211), affidavit on behalf of GTE Corporation analyzing the likely economic effects of the proposed acquisition of MCI by WorldCom, (with R. Schmalensee), March 13, 1998, reply affidavit filed May 26, 1998.
406. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter of Customer Impact of New Access Charges* (CC Docket Nos. 96-262 and 96-45), affidavit on behalf of the United States Telephone Association analyzing long distance price reductions stemming from recent access charge reductions. Filed March 18, 1998.
407. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter of MCI Telecommunications Corp. Petition for Prescription of Tariffs Implementing Access Charge Reform* (CCB/CPD 98-12), affidavit on behalf of Bell Atlantic analyzing economic issues in MCI's petition for changes in the level and structure of interstate access charges. Filed March 18, 1998.
408. Federal Communications Commission, Merger of SBC Communications Inc. and Ameritech Corporation, comments on behalf of SBC and Ameritech analyzing the likely effects of the proposed merger on competition. (with R. Schmalensee) Filed July 21, 1998, reply affidavit filed November 11, 1998.
409. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter of United States Telephone Association Petition for Rulemaking—1998 Biennial Regulatory Review*, “Economic Standards for the Biennial Review of Interstate Telecommunications Regulation,” economic rationale for regulatory simplification, Attachment to the Petition for Rulemaking of the United States Telephone Association, filed September 30, 1998 (with Robert W. Hahn).
410. Federal Communications Commission, (CC Docket No. 96-262), “Assessment of AT&T’s Study of Access Charge Pass-Through,” study of long distance pricing, filed *ex parte* on behalf of the United States Telephone Association, October 22, 1998 (with P.S. Brandon)
411. Federal Communications Commission, (CC Docket No. 96-262), “AT&T, MCI, and Sprint Failed to Pass Through the 1998 Interstate Access Charge Reductions to Consumers,” study of long distance pricing, filed *ex parte* on behalf of the United States Telephone Association, October 16, 1998 (with P.S. Brandon)
412. Federal Communications Commission, (CC Docket No. 98-137), Affidavit on behalf of the United States Telephone Association, Review of Depreciation Requirements for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, November 23, 1998. (with A. Banerjee).
413. Federal Communications Commission, (CC Docket Nos. 96-262, 94-1, 97-250 and RM 9210), “Access Reform Again: Market-Based Regulation, Pricing Flexibility and the Universal Service Fund,” Attachment A to the Comments of the United States Telephone Association, filed October 26, 1998; “Productivity and Pricing Flexibility: Reply Comments,” Attachment A to the Reply Comments of the United States Telephone Association, filed November 9, 1998.

1999

414. Federal Communications Commission (Docket No. 99-24), affidavit on behalf of Bell Atlantic: economic requirements for regulatory forbearance for special access services. Filed January 20, 1999 (with Karl McDermott). Reply affidavit responding to claims that Bell Atlantic retains market power in the provision of special access filed April 8, 1999.
415. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter of Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region,*

InterLATA Service in the State of New York (CC Docket No. 99-295), Declaration on behalf of Bell Atlantic analyzing public interest issues in connection with Bell Atlantic long distance entry in New York. Filed September 29, 1999.

416. Federal Communications Commission (Docket No. 96-262), on behalf of United States Telephone Association, comments regarding rate structures for the local switching service category of the traffic-sensitive basket and common line basket, filed October 29, 1999. Reply comments filed November 29, 1999.
417. Federal Communications Commission (Docket No. 99-68), "An Economic and Policy Analysis of Efficient Intercarrier Compensation Mechanisms for Internet-Bound Traffic," on behalf of U S WEST Communications, ex parte analysis of intercarrier compensation plans for ISP-bound traffic, November 12, 1999 (with A. Banerjee and A. Ros). Reply Comments: "Efficient Inter-Carrier Compensation for Internet-Bound Traffic," (with A. Banerjee), October 23, 2000.

2000

418. Federal Communications Commission (Docket Nos. 94-1, 96-26), comments on behalf of the United States Telecom Association regarding the proposed rescription of the productivity offset in the FCC's price cap plan, January 7, 2000. Reply comments filed January 24, 2000, Ex parte presentation filed May 5, 2000.
419. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter of Reciprocal Compensation for CMRS Providers* (CC Docket Nos. 96-98, 95-185, WT Docket No. 97-207), "Reciprocal Compensation for CMRS Providers," on behalf of United States Telecom Association, reply comments regarding interconnection with CMRS providers, June 13, 2000 (with Charles Jackson).
420. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter the Remand of the Commission's Reciprocal Compensation Declaratory Ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit* (CC Docket Nos. 96-98, 99-68), on behalf of Verizon, declaration regarding intercarrier compensation for Internet-bound traffic, filed July 21, 2000. Reply declaration filed August 4, 2000.
421. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter of Application by Verizon New England Inc., et. al. for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Massachusetts*, on behalf of Verizon New England, Appendix A, declaration regarding competition in Massachusetts and the public interest benefits of interLATA entry, September 19, 2000, Reply Declaration filed November 3, 2000. Supplemental Reply Declaration filed February 28, 2001.

2001

422. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter of Application by Verizon New England Inc., et. al. for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Connecticut*, on behalf of Verizon New England, Appendix A, declaration regarding competition in Connecticut and the public interest benefits of interLATA entry, May 24, 2001.
423. Federal Communications Commission, *In the Matter of Application by Verizon Pennsylvania Inc., et. al. for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Pennsylvania*, on behalf of Verizon Pennsylvania, Appendix A, declaration regarding competition in Pennsylvania and the public interest benefits of interLATA entry, June 21, 2001.
424. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 01-92), on behalf of BellSouth Corporation: Reply Declaration (with Aniruddha Banerjee) on a unified regime of inter-carrier

compensation (calling party's network pays or bill and keep?). Filed November 5, 2001.

425. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket No. 01-277), on behalf of BellSouth Corporation: Reply Affidavit on BellSouth's application for interLATA authority in Georgia and Louisiana. Filed November 13, 2001.

2002

426. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket Nos. 99-273, 92-105, 92-237), on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, Qwest Communications International, Inc., SBC Communications, Inc., and Verizon Telephone Companies: Affidavit: "Competition and Regulation for Directory Assistance Services" (with Harold Ware) regarding incremental costs and benefits from 411 presubscription. Filed April 1, 2002.
427. Federal Communications Commission (CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, 98-47), on behalf of BellSouth Corporation: Reply Declaration (with Aniruddha Banerjee, Charles Zarkadas and Agustin Ros) regarding unbundling obligations of local exchange carriers. Filed July 17, 2002.
428. Federal Communications Commission (RM No. 10593) on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, Qwest Corporation, SBC Communications, Inc., and Verizon, regarding pricing flexibility for interstate special access services (with A.E. Kahn), filed December 2, 2002.

2003

429. Federal Communications Commission (WC Docket No. 03-173) on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, , comments regarding economic costs of unbundled network elements, filed December 16, 2003 (with A. Banerjee and H. Ware).

2004

430. Federal Communications Commission (WC Docket No. 03-173) on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, , reply comments regarding economic costs of unbundled network elements, filed January 30, 2004 (with A. Banerjee and H. Ware).
431. Federal Communications Commission (WCB Docket No. 02-112, CC Docket No. 00-175) on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, SBC and Verizon. Ex Parte Statement regarding imputation standards for in-region long distance service. Filed August 10, 2004. Ex parte October 6, 2004. (with T. Tardiff and H. Ware).
432. Federal Communications Commission (WCB Docket No. 04-313, CC Docket No. 01-338) on behalf of Verizon. Declaration regarding pricing history for special access services. Filed October 4, 2004. Reply Declaration filed October 19, 2004. Ex Parte Declaration, filed November 15, 2004.
433. Federal Communications Commission (WCB Docket No. 04-313, CC Docket No. 01-338) on behalf of Verizon. Declaration regarding incremental hot cuts and workforce requirements. Filed October 4, 2004.

2005

434. Federal Communications Commission (WC Docket No. 03-266) on behalf of the United States Telecom Association. "Analysis of the QSI Study." Declaration regarding revenue effects from proposed changes in VoIP interconnection prices. Filed March 4, 2005.
435. Federal Communications Commission (WC Docket No. 05-25, RM No. 10593) on behalf of

Verizon. Declaration analyzing special access pricing flexibility. Filed June 9, 2005.

Mexico

436. Mexican Secretariat of Communications and Transport on behalf of Southwestern Bell International Holdings Corporation, affidavit on interconnection regulation (with T.J. Tardiff). Filed October 18, 1995.
437. Comisión Federal de Telecomunicaciones de México (“Cofetel”), “Economic Parameter Values in the Telmex Price Cap Plan,” arbitrator’s report on behalf of COFETEL and Telmex regarding the renewal of the price cap plan for Telmex, February 15, 1999.
438. Comisión Federal de Telecomunicaciones de México, on behalf of the Commission, “Telmex’s 2003-2006 Price Cap Tariff Proposal,” expert report regarding the renewal of the price cap plan for Telmex, (with A. Ros, G. Martinez and A. Banerjee), filed December 13, 2002.

New Zealand

439. Commerce Commission of New Zealand on behalf of New Zealand Telecom, “Review of CostQuest Associates’ Benchmarking Survey” En banc hearings May 13-17, 2002.
440. Commerce Commission of New Zealand on behalf of New Zealand Telecom, “The Wholesale Discount” En banc hearings February 10, 2003

United States Department of Justice

441. Affidavit to the U.S. Department of Justice on behalf of NYNEX in *United States of America v. Western Electric Company, Inc. and American Telephone and Telegraph Company*, regarding provision of telecommunications services across LATA boundaries for traffic originating or terminating in New York State. Filed August 25, 1994.
442. Affidavit to the U.S. Department of Justice on behalf of SBC Communications Inc. in *United States of America v. Western Electric Company, Inc. and American Telephone and Telegraph Company*, regarding Telefonos de Mexico’s (Telmex’s) provision of interexchange telecommunications services within the United States. Filed May 22, 1995.
443. Affidavit to the U.S. Department of Justice on behalf of SBC Communications Inc. in *United States of America v. Western Electric Company, Inc. and American Telephone and Telegraph Company*, regarding provision of interexchange telecommunications services to customers with independent access to interexchange carriers. Filed May 30, 1995.

United States Senate

444. Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, *Statement* and oral testimony regarding long distance competition and Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Filed March 25, 1998.