

Mark L. Stacy

Contact Information

229 Stetson Drive
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82009

t (307)638-6091
f (307)638-6073

mstacy@qsiconsulting.com

Current Position

QSI Consulting
Director, Telecom Policy – Senior Consultant

Professional Experience

Stacy & Stacy Consulting, LLC
President

Kenetech Windpower
Manager, Project and Business Development

Wyoming Public Service Commission
Senior Economist

Laramie County Community College
Adjunct Professor

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines
Industry Economist

Stacy Drilling Company
Vice President

Education

B.S., Geology; M.S. Public Utility and Regulatory Economics; University of Wyoming

Professional Activities

Former member National Association of Regulatory Commissioners (NARUC) Subcommittee on Renewable Resources.

Testimony Profile and Experience

Before the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy
Docket No. D.T.E. 01-20

Re: The investigation by the Department on its own motion into the appropriate pricing, based upon Total Element Long-Run Incremental Costs, for Unbundled Network Elements and combinations of Unbundled Network Elements, and the appropriate avoided cost discount for Verizon New England d/b/a Verizon Massachusetts' Resale services.

On behalf of Allegiance Telecom of Massachusetts, Inc. Covad Communications Company, El Paso Networks, LLC and Network Plus.

Before Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado

Docket No. 99S-110T

Re: The investigation and suspension of the tariff sheets filed by U S WEST Communications, Inc., with advice letter No 2756.

On behalf of MCI WorldCom Inc.

Before the Florida Public Service Commission

Docket No. 990649-TP

On behalf of Broadslate Networks, Cleartel Communications, Florida Digital Network, Network Telephone.

Before the State of Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control

Docket No. 00-03-19

DPUC review of the Southern New England Telephone Company's studies of unbundled network elements non-recurring costs.

On behalf of DSL Net Communications and Rhythms Links, Inc.

Before the North Carolina Utilities Commission

Docket No. P-779, Sub 4

For arbitration with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

On behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC.

Before the Indiana Regulatory Commission

Cause Nos. 40785-S1, 40894, 41058

In the matter of the investigation on the Commission's own motion into any and all matters relating to access charge reform and universal service reform, including but not limited to, high cost or universal service funding mechanisms relative to telephone and telecommunications services within the state of Indiana pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2-51, 58, 59, 69; 8-1-2.6 ET SEQ. And other related statutes, as well as the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. Sec. 151 ET SEQ)

In the matter of petition of Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Inc. D/B/A Ameritech Indiana, for the Commission to Decline to exercise in whole or in part its jurisdiction over, and to utilize alternative regulatory procedures for, Ameritech Indiana's provision of retail and carrier access services pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2.6 ET SEQ.

Petition of Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana, Inc., the American Association of Retired Persons, Inc., United Senior Action of Indiana, Inc., and ten individual ratepayers of Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Inc., D/B/A Ameritech Indiana for an investigation pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2-54 and ¶ 13 of the Settlement Agreement in Cause 39705, and for the Commission to decline to

UT-033044

EXHIBIT MLS-1

Page 2 of 6

exercise in whole or in part its jurisdiction over, and to utilize alternative regulatory procedures for, Ameritech Indiana's provision of basic local service pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2.6-1 ET SEQ.
On behalf of Time Warner Telecom.

Before the State of New Jersey Board of Public Utilities

Docket No. TO00060356

In the matter of the review of Unbundled Network Elements, rates terms and conditions of Verizon - New Jersey.

On behalf of WorldCom.

Before the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma

CAUSE NO. PUD 200000192

Applicant: Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Relief sought: Approval of nonrecurring rates for conditioning unbundled digital subscriber line ("DSL") capable loops.

On behalf of @Link Networks, Inc., Blue Star Communications, Inc., Mpower Communications, Vectris Telecom and DSLnet Communications, LLC

Before the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin

CASE NO. 6720-TI-161

In the Matter of the Investigation into Ameritech Wisconsin's Unbundled Network Elements.

On behalf of AT&T Communications of Wisconsin TCG Milwaukee (D/B/A AT&T Local Services), MCI WorldCom, Inc., McLEODUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc., Rhythms Links, Inc., TDS Metrocom, Time Warner Telecom.

Before the State of New York Public Service Commission

Case No. 98-C-1357

Proceeding on the motion of the Commission to examine New York Telephone Company's rates for unbundled network elements.

On behalf of CoreComm New York, Inc., CTSI, Inc., Mpower Communications, Inc., Network Plus, Inc., NorthPoint Communications, Inc., RCN Telecom Services, Inc., and Vitti Networks, Inc.

Before Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Case No. 96-922-TP-UNC

In the matter of the review of Ameritech Ohio's economic costs for interconnection, unbundled network elements, and reciprocal compensation for transport and termination of local telecommunications traffic.

On behalf of @Link Networks, Inc., AT&T Communications of Ohio, Inc., Allegiance Telecom of Ohio, Inc, Blue Star Communications, Inc., CoreComm Newco, Inc., CTSI, Inc., DIECA Communications, Inc., D/B/A, Covad Communications Company, DSLnet Communications, LLC, ICF Telecom Group, Inc., IP Communications IN., McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc., New Edge Network, Inc., NEXTLINK Ohio, Inc., Rhythms Links, Inc., and Vectris Telecom Inc.

Before the Public Service Commission of Wyoming

Docket No. 70000-TR-96-312

In the matter of the application of U S WEST Communications, Inc. for authority to submit a price plan for extended area service for their customers in Wyoming.

On behalf of AT&T Communications of the Mountain States

Before the Public Service Commission of Wyoming

Docket No. 72000-TF-96-95 and 720-TF-96-319

In the Matter of the interconnection contract negotiations between AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, inc. and U S WEST Communications, Inc., Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252

On behalf of AT&T Communications of the Mountain States

Before the Public Service Commission of Wyoming

Docket No. 70000-TR-96-323

In the Matter of the application of U S WEST Communications, Inc., for authority to implement phase II of its proposed Wyoming price regulation plan for essential and noncompetitive telecommunications services.

On behalf of AT&T Communications of the Mountain States

Before the Public Service Commission of Wyoming

Docket No: 72000-TT-96-301

In the Matter of the application of U S WEST Communications, Inc., for authority to introduce integrated services digital network (ISDN) as a new competitive service in Wyoming.

On behalf of AT&T Communications of the Mountain States

Before the Public Service Commission for the State of Colorado

Docket No. 97A-540T

In the Matter of the application of U S WEST Communications, Inc., for specific forms of price regulation.

On behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation.

Before the Public Service Commission for the State of Colorado

Docket No. 99S-110T

In the Matter of the investigation and suspension of tariff sheets filed by U S WEST Communications, Inc., with advice letter No. 2756

On behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation.

Before the Nebraska Public Service Commission

Application No. C-1628

In the Matter of the application of the Nebraska Public Service Commission, on its own motion to conduct an investigation into intrastate access charge reform

On behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation.

Before the Public Service Commission of Wyoming

Mark L. Stacy

Docket Nos. 72000-TI-97-107 and 72000-TI-97-352

In the Matter of the Petition of AT&T for the Commission to initiate an investigation of U S WEST Communications Compliance with Sections 271 (c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

On behalf of AT&T Communications of the Mountain States.

Before the Public Service Commission of Wyoming

Docket Nos. 72000-TI-97-107 and 72000-TI-97-352

In the Matter of the Application of Qwest Corporation regarding relief under Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, Wyoming's participation in a multi-state Section 271 process, and approval of its Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions.

On behalf of the Wyoming Public Service Commission (Advisor to the Commission)

Before the Public Service Commission of Wyoming

Docket No. 20003-EP-01-59

In the Matter of Cheyenne Light, Fuel and Power for an Order authorizing it to revise its Electric Cost Adjustment and Extended Cost Deferral Plan.

On behalf of The City of Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Before the Public Utilities Commission of South Dakota

Docket No. TC01-165

In the Matter of the analysis into Qwest Corporation's compliance with Section 271 (c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

On behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of South Dakota.

Before the Public Utilities Commission of South Dakota

Docket No. TC01-098

In the Matter of the determination of prices (UNES) IN QWEST CORPORATION'S STATEMENT OF GENERALLY AVAILABLE TERMS (SGAT)..

On behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of South Dakota.

Before the Public Utilities Commission of South Dakota

Docket No. TC01-165

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF QWEST CORPORATION TO RECLASSIFY LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES AS FULLY COMPETITIVE.

On behalf of WorldCom, Inc., Black Hills FiberCom, LLC, and Midcontinent Communications.

Before the Public Utilities Commission of North Dakota

Docket No. PU-2342-01-296

In the matter of Qwest Corporation Interconnection/Wholesale Price Investigation.

On behalf of The North Dakota CLEC Coalition.

Before the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

Docket No. UT-030614

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF QWEST CORPORATION FOR COMPETITIVE CLASSIFICATION OF BASIC EXCHANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

On behalf of MCI.

Before the State of Iowa Department of Commerce Utilities Board

Docket No. INU-03-4

IN RE: QWEST CORPORATION PETITION TO THE BOARD TO DETERMINE THAT ITS EXISTING RETAIL LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES IN 37 OF ITS 124 EXCHANGES ARE SUBJECT TO EFFECTIVE COMPETITION.

On behalf of MCI.

Selected Reports, Publications and Presentations

The Federal Communications Commissions Implementation of the Universal Service Provisions of the 1996 Telecommunications Act

April, 2000

"CONDITIONING" OUTSIDE PLANT FACILITIES FOR PROVISIONING ADVANCED SERVICES

December, 2000

Microsoft
Windows 2000
Server Documentation

Windows 2000 Home Page |

Contents Index Search Glossary ? Using This Site

Contents

- Welcome
- Getting Started with Windows 2000
- Active Directory
- Active Directory Connector
- Security
- Users and Computers
- Files and Printers
- Connections
- Networking
- Network Interoperability
- Client Services
- IntelliMirror
- Storing Data
- Disaster Protection
- Monitoring and Diagnostics Tools
- Internet Tools and Services
- Automating Administrative Tasks
- Application and Programming Tools
- Troubleshooting and Additional Resources

Attaining fast speeds with a 56 Kbps modem

A modem connection must fulfill three requirements to support a 56 kilobits per second (Kbps) (also called V.90) connection.

1. The host server must use a digital connection to the network. Your Internet service provider can tell you if they support 56 Kbps service.
2. Both ends of the connection must support the same protocol, the V.90 standard or either of its predecessors, K56flex, or 3COM/USR X2. For example, if your Internet service provider has a V.90 device, your modem must support the V.90 protocol.
3. There can only be one analog connection between your modem and the host computer. The phone line in most homes is an analog line.

If a connection does not meet these requirements, a modem falls back to the fastest protocol that works for the connection. For example, a 56 Kbps V.90 modem falls back to the 33.6 Kbps V.34 protocol if it cannot make a V.90 connection. Even if your connection fulfills these requirements, other factors may reduce either the transmission speed or the number of times that you successfully obtain the highest speed connection. For example, old lines or lines that are subject to interference may reduce transmission speeds. Maximum throughput speeds of 26 Kbps are not unusual in these cases.

Devices to improve the quality of your telephone service may also hamper 56 Kbps V.90 modem connections. Load coils found on long wire lengths to improve voice quality do not usually prevent V.90 connections, but can reduce the speed. Digital pads, which balance the volume of voice calls, usually do not prevent V.90 connections, but they can reduce the speed. Analog pads prevent V.90 connections, because they convert the digital data to analog to balance the volume and then back to digital. This inserts an additional analog section in the line.

In practice, the 56 Kbps speed supported by the V.90 and other protocols is unattainable. U.S. government regulations to safeguard public phone systems right now limit transmission speeds to 53 Kbps. Phone-line noise and other limitations of phone systems usually keep average transmissions in the 40 to 50 Kbps range.

For more information, see [The V.90 modulation protocol](#), [Data transfer speed](#), [Improving modem throughput speeds](#), [Optimizing data transfer speed](#), and [Protocols and standards](#)

Last updated: February 28, 2000
©2000 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved. Terms of Use.

UT-033044