Released From Confidential Status

Case Numbers: 96-1310-TP-COI

Date: 04/20/2009

Confidential Document originally filed August 04, 2003 in this proceeding released to the public.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Commission's Investigation into the Implementation of Section 276 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 Regarding Pay Telephone Services)) Case No. 96-1310-TP-COI)				
DIRECT	restimony (2003 AUG -	WECEIATH-	
	OF C	7	₽ H	DOCKETING	
MICHAE	L STARKEY	_	1:1	II SMIT	

On behalf of

Payphone Association of Ohio

August 4, 2003

CONFIDENTIAL VERSION

Data which SBC Ohio has identified as "Confidential" is highlighted in the following manner **__**. This information is reducted from the PUBLIC VERSION.

CONFIDENTIAL



amount of regulatory intervention is required to produce reasonable rates. Hence, overhead costs determined for UNEs, even without considering the flaws inherent in both the *Physical Collocation Tariff Order* and *ONA Tariff Order* methodologies, remains the most economically rational approach to setting a ceiling for overhead loadings assessed for payphone services.

890

891

892

885

886

887

888

889

Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE OVERHEAD LOADING APPROVED BY THE PUCO SPECIFIC TO SBC OHIO'S UNE RATES IN CASE NO. 96-922-TP-UNC.

893

A.

Q.

loading value, after having made the revisions required by the PUCO and running its

Though the PUCO's Ameritech TELRIC Order does not identify a specific overhead

895

894

overhead cost model consistent with the Order, SBC Ohio arrived at an overhead loading

896

897

equal to approximately **32%** of direct costs. Said another way, the PUCO allowed SBC to recover its direct costs plus an additional **32%** associated with overhead

898

costs not directly assignable to any given element or service.24

899

900

901

D. PAO PROPOSED ACCESS LINE RATES

902 903

ABLE TO CALCULATE PAYPHONE ACCESS LINE RATES IT BELIEVES

904

BEST MEET WITH THE FCC'S NEW SERVICES TEST, AND AS SUCH,

CONSISTENT WITH YOUR DISCUSSION ABOVE, HAS THE PAO BEEN

905

SHOULD BE ADOPTED AS PERMANENT RATES BY THE PUCO IN THIS

906 PROCEEDING?

²⁴ See Ameritech TELRIC Order pages 35-57 for a discussion of SBC Ohio's proposed shared and common cost model and the revisions required by the PUCO thereto.



** TABLE INCLUDES CONFIDENTIAL DATA **

PAO PROPOSED ACCESS LINE RATES

		Ac	cess Areas		
Row	Description	8	C	D	Source
1	Total Annual LRSIC costs	\$7.66	\$9.81	\$11.99	June 2000 Cost Study, Dr. Curria Exhibit 2, pg. 1 of
2	PUCO Approved UNE Ovrhd.	1.32	1.32	1.32	PUCO Ameritach TELRIC Order
3	Total Direct + Ovrhd. Costs	\$10.11	\$12.95	\$15.83	Row 1 * Row 2
4	SBC Ohio Current EUCL	(\$5.39)	(\$5,39)	(\$5.39)	SBC Ohio Terliff F.C.C. No. 2, Page 79
5	New Services Test Compliant Intrastate Access Line Rate	\$4.72	\$7.66	\$10.44	Row 3 + Row 4

E. USAGE RATES

Q. HOW DID THE PUCO ESTABLISH INTERIM RATES ASSOCIATED WITH LOCAL USAGE SERVICES?

A. In its Interim Rate Order, the PUCO relied upon SBC Ohio's TELRIC-based Unbundled Local Switching ("ULS") rate as a proxy for retail usage costs (\$0.003226 per minute or fraction thereof). Likewise, in an effort to maintain SBC Ohio's existing local usage rate structure (a "per message" rate structure), the PUCO created an interim per message rate based upon an assumption that a message would, on average, last approximately 4.9 minutes.

Q. DOES DR. CURRIE'S JUNE 2000 LRSIC STUDY DISCUSSED ABOVE INCLUDE LRSIC COSTS SPECIFIC TO PAYPHONE USAGE?

A. Unfortunately, it does not nor has SBC Ohio, to my knowledge, produced any such usage cost study in this proceeding to date.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Commission's Investigation into the Implementation of Section 276 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 Regarding Pay Telephone Services)) Case No. 96-1310-TP-COI)	i,	2003 AUG - 4	RECEIVED-00
DIRECT	TESTIMONY	0	PH 4:47	PIG SKILBYCOU
	OF			

ATTACHMENT 2

MICHAEL STARKEY

This attachment includes confidential information and is available only in the Confidential Version of the testimony.

CONFIDENTIAL

RECEIVED - PRODUCTING DIV OD JUN - 2 PR 4: 46

PUCO

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Commission's Investigation into the Implementation of Section 276 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 Regarding Pay Telephone Services

Case No. 96-1310-TP-COI

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DR. KENT A. CURRIE AMERITECH OHIO EXHIBIT ___

Respectfully submitted,

AMERITECH OHIO

Jon F. Kelly, Esq. 150 E. Gay St., Room 4-C Columbus, Ohio 43215 (614) 223-7928 (telephone) (614) 223 5955(fax)

٠.

Michael T. Mulcahy, Esq. 45 Erieview Plaza, Suite 1400 Cleveland, Ohio 44114 216/822-3437 (telephone) 216/822-0240 (fax) William A. Adama, Esq.
Dane Stinson, Esq.
ARTER & HADDEN LLP
One Columbus
13 West Broad Street, Suite 2100
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 221-3155 (telephone)
(614) 221-0479 (fax)

PUCO Case No. 96-1310-TP-COI Page 1 of 6

I DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DR. KENT A CURRIE Z 3 Qualifications 4 5 Q. Please state your name and business address. 6 A. My name is Kent A. Currie. My business address is 45 Erinview Plaza, Room 1545, 7 Cleveland, Ohio 44114. 8 Q. 9 By whom are you employed and in what capacity? 10 A. I am employed by SBC as Associate Director, Cost Analysis and Regulatory. 11 What are your current responsibilities in that position? 12 -Q, 13 I took on my current responsibilities in the new SEC cost organization at the end of A 14 January 2000. In this role I am primarily responsible for cost study methods for switching 15 services. Consequently, my responsibilities are similar to my previous position at 16 Ameritech, where I was responsible for developing and maintaining the methodological 17 framework for economic cost studies for Ameritach's telecommunications services. These cost methods are used in many studies such as Long-Run Service Incremental Cost 18 ("LRSIC") studies, Total Service Long-Run Incremental Cost ("TSLRIC") studies, Total 19 Element Long-Run Incremental Cost ("TELRIC") studies, universal service cost studies 20 including Forward-Looking Economic Cost ("PLEC") studies and avoided cost studies. 21 In order to monitor the application of these methods, I direct, supervise, and prepare 22 studies using these methods. In addition, my responsibilities have included the internal and 23

PUCO Case No. 96-1310-TP-COI Page 2 of 6

external dissemination of Ameritech's policy regarding studies using these methods and 2 related issues. 3 Q. Please describe your educational background. 5 A, I received a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Iowa in 1973. In addition, I have a Master of Science degree in economics from the University of Iowa, and a Bachelor of б Science degree in mathematics from Bradley University. I specialize in microeconomic 7 theory and industrial organization, concentrating in public utility economics. After 9 completing my graduate studies, I held full-time teaching and research appointments at 10 two engineering universities. 11 12 Q. Please briefly describe your telecommunications work experience. 13 A. I began my telecommunications career in 1980 at Ohio Bell. I have performed, contributed to, and supervised many cost analyses dealing with the complete range of 14 services officed by Ameritech. My responsibilities have included the development and 15 16 monitoring of cost methods used in service cost studies at Ohio Bell. Since the divestiture 17 of the Bell System, I have participated in the coordination and development of these 18 responsibilities across Ameritech. 19 Have you previously testified before any regulatory commission? 20 Q. A. I have testified on cost and other economic issues in regulatory proceedings before the Illinois Commerce Commission in Docket No. 00-0027, the Indiana Utility Regulatory

Commission in Cause Nos. 39705 and 40785-S1, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

PUCO Case No. 96-1310-TP-COI Page 3 of 6

in Case Nos. 95-1057-TP-UNC, 96-1027-TP-CSS, 96-922-TP-UNC, 96-888-TP-ARB, 96-752-TP-ARB, 96-694-TP-ARB, 93-487-TP-ALT, 90-471-TP-ATA, 90-467-TP-ATA, 84-1435-TP-AIR, and 83-300-TP-AIR, and the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin in Dockets 05-TI-160 and 6655-NC-101.

1

2 Purpose of Testimony

- 3 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
- 4 A. The purpose of my testimony is to demonstrate that Ameritech Ohio is complying with the
- 5 FCC's requirements described in its Report and Order¹, and its Order on Reconsideration².

6

7 New Services Test

- 8 Q. Please explain why New Services Tests were completed for Ameritech Ohio's services
- 9 provided to payphone providers.
- 10 A. The FCC, in its Report and Order at paragraph 146, concluded that New Services Tests
- 11 were necessary in order to ensure that certain central office coin services are priced
- 12 reasonably,

13

14 Q. For what services did the FCC require New Services Tests?

¹ Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, FCC 96-388, Report and Order, CC Docket No. 96-128, released September 20, 1996.

² Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telephone Reclassification, CC Docket No. 96-128, released November 2, 1996.

PUCO Case No. 95-1310-TP-COI Page 4 of 6

ĵ	A.	This issue is discussed in more detail by Mr. Caldwell. As he explains, in its April 4 1997
2		Order ³ , the FCC stated that ",the requirement to file tariffs only applies to payphone-
3		specific, network-based, unbundled features and functions provided to others or taken by
4		a LBC's operations we do not include in this federal tariffing requirement features and
5		functions that are generally available to all local exchange quatomers and are only
ó		incidental to payphone service." The four payphone-specific services in Ohio are
7		1. COCOT Line,
8		2. COCOT Coin Line,
9		3. Answer Supervision, and
10		4. Restricted Coin Access (RCA).
11		According to the Commission's Entry dated April 27, 2000, only the first two services, the
12		COCOT line and the COCOT Coin line, are at issue in this case.
13		
14	Q.	Please describe the basis of the New Services Test calculations.
15	A.	The New Services Tests Ameritech Oblo conducted were based on the following
ló		information
17		1. the definition of the test described in 47 CFR 61.49;
18		 the requirement set forth in the FCC's Report and Order and the Order on Reconsideration that payphone services must be cont-based;
19 20		 the PUCO's approved Long Run Service Incremental Cost (LRSIC) methodology; and
!1 !2 !3		4. established Ameritech Ohio practices for FCC New Services Test filings.

³ Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the

PUCO Case No. 96-1310-TP-COI Page 5 of 6

|--|

- 2 Q. Please describe the process involved in calculating the New Services Tests in more detail.
- 3 A. The New Services Tests were calculated using the Long Run Service Incremental Cost
- 4 (LRSIC) methodology, as approved by the Commission in Case No. 93-487-TP-ALT.
- 5 Because these services abready existed, the LRSIC studies that supported the original tariff
- 6 fillings for these services were updated using the then most recent cost inputs consistent
- 7 with Ameritech Ohio's approved LRSIC methodology. Using the parameters described in
- 8 47 CFR 61.49 and established Ameritech Ohlo practices for filing FCC New Services
- 9 Tests, these LRSIC results were then put into the standard FCC format. This format
- includes a projection of costs for a representative 12-month period and estimates of the
- 11 revenues for the same representative 12-month period. These New Services Tests were
- provided to the PUCO on May 16, 1997, as part of a submission certifying that American
- Ohio had met all FCC requirements to be eligible for per-call payphone compensation.

14

- 15 Q. What were the results of the New Services Tests?
- 16 A. The New Services Tests are attached as Attachmen: 1. These tests demonstrate that the
- 17 revenues for Ameritech Obio's payphone services exceed their LRSICs, which
- 18 demonstrates that these services are not being subsidized. The tests also determine how
- 19 much contribution these services generate. Mr. Caldwell explains why the contribution
- 20 level is reasonable.

21

22

Conclusion

PUCO Case No. 96-1310-TP-COI Page 6 of 6

- 1 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 2 A. Yes,

CONFIDENTIAL

Attachgnen, 1 Page 1

Payphone Services - Ohio

Attached are the "new services test" for the following payphone services/features:

COCOT Access Line

COCOT Coin Line

Answer Supervision

Remricted Coin Access

PECUEIVEC PROPERTINONIA

OR THE -5 LIN 19 PARTY OF THE PA

CONFIDENTIAL Page 2

EXHIBIT 1 Page 1 of 1

AMERITECH OHO

AVNUAL REVENUE SUMMARY

RATE ELEMENT	PROPOSED FIRST YEAR DEMAND	MONTHLY FE		PROPOSED FIRST YEAR REVENUES
	<u> </u>		<u>[8]</u>	CHAPPIN
COCOT Coin Une				
- Rate Zone B	8,781		26.20	\$ 2,984,790
- Rate Zone C	17,880	•	30.20	\$ 8,479,712
- Rate Zone D	18,050	\$	30.20	\$ 8,544,509
	TOTAL ANNUAL	REVEN	ŲĘS	\$ 18,989,011 5
COCOT Line		•	21.66	
- Fisie Zone B	1,383	•	21.00	3 343,400
- Fisite Zone C	2,973		23.00	\$ 820,554
- Rate Zene D	2,469	*	23.00	\$ 888,975
	TOTAL ASSEMAL	REVEN		3 1,265,994

AMERITECH OHIO

CONFIDENTIAL Page 3

Page t of t

ANNUAL DIRECT COST BUMMARY

rate elêment	PROPOSEI) FIRST YEAR DEMAND	MC	MATED NTHLY COST		TIMATED RST YEAR COST
			[0]	_0	(A'B'13]
COCOT Coin Line					
- Rate Zone S	0,731	5	10.87		1,142,846
- Rate Zone C	17,830	3	14,13	5	5,030,732
- Rete Zone D	14,039	\$	18.22	-	3,515,570
	TOTAL ANNUAL	COSTE			7,445,156
COCOT Use - Rate Zone B	1,313		7.66	•	127,052 3
- Rate Zone C	7,363 2,973	•	7.00 9.81	•	350,014
- Rate Zone D	2.419	Š	11,99	•	358,000
		•	1 1/22		
	TOTAL ANNUAL	COSTE		8	135,163

CONFIDENTIAL Page 4

EXHIBIT 3

Page 1 of 2

AMERITECH

Chho

COCOT COIN LINE

·	RAT	E ZONE B	RAT	E ZONE C	RAT	e zone d
ESTIMATED INVESTMENTS: Recoverable Material Cost Installation Cost	\$	244.61 147.22	•	347.65 160.12		179.71 213.27
TOTAL		391.83	*	\$94.20	<u>\$</u>	592.93
ESTIMATED RECURRING COSTS: Depreciation Cost of Money Income Tax Maintenance Other Recurring Expense Ad Valorem Tax	\$	38.88 28.05 12.86 12.80 18.84 7.82	3	84,00 34,27 18,42 18,60 18,64 9,74	•	62.43 42.69 18.67 26.46 18.84 11.34
TOTAL ANNUAL COST	*	114.37	\$	152.29	\$	177.46
SUB-TOTAL MONTHLY COST: Monthly Gross Revenue Tax	*	9.83 1.34	*	12.00 1.43	•	14.79
TOTAL MONTHLY COST:	3	10,17		14,13	3	(4.19)
SUB-TOTAL MONTHLY PROPOSED RATE	\$	24.20		30.30	\$	36,36
MONTHLY PROPOSED RATE:	٠	28.20		24,29	\$	30.30
Monthly Rule to Monthly Cout Raile:		2,8942		2.1300		1.0016
pintpart breakout		30%		40%		40%
Mulded Rate to Cost Ratio				242		

CONFIDENTIAL: Solely for use by employees of Ameritach Companies who have a need to know. Not to be disclosed to or used by any other persons without prior subbrization.

CONFIDENTIAL Page 5
Page 5
EXHIBIT 3
Page 2 of 2

AMERITECH

Chio

COCOT LINE

	RATI	E ZONE B	RAT	E ZONE C	RAT	E ZONE D
ESTIMATED INVESTMENTS: Recoverable Meterial Cost Installation Cost	\$	188.06 127.97	\$	229.81 134.18	.	264.33 187.79
TOTAL	3	296,63	<u>\$</u>	343.76	•	453.12
ESTIMATED RECURRING COSTS: Depreciation Cost of Money Income Tax Maintenance Other Recurring Expense All Valorem Tax	\$	25.40 21.77 9.38 8.68 9.99	*	36.73 36.69 11.40 12.67 9.60 8.96	\$	43,64 39,46 14,41 21,58 9,00 7,8,00
TOTAL ANNUAL COST	\$	70.91	•	104.41	*	134,76
SUB-TOTAL MONTHLY COST: Monthly Greek Revenue Tax	4	6.68 1.00	\$	8.72 1.80	•	19.90 1.99
TOTAL MONTHLY COST:		7.64	3	9.81		11.50
BUE-TOTAL MONTHLY PROPOSED RATE	1	21,60	*	23.00	\$	21.60
MONTHLY PROPOSED RATE:	<u>.</u>	21.00	1	33.40	.\$	23.80
Monthly Rain to Monthly Cost Rulls:		1.7427		2.34(3		1,9124
percent breakout		20%		49%		30%
Melded Rute to Cost Ratio				2.27		

CONFIDENTIAL: Solely for use by employees of Ameritech Companies who have a need to know. Not to be garabsed to or used by any other persons without prior authorization.

CONFIDENTIAL Page 6
EXHABIT 1
Page 1 of 1

•

AMERITECH

OHIO

ANNUAL REVENUE SUMMARY

	PROPOSED FIRST YEAR CEMAND	FIRST YEAR MONTHLY		PROPOSED PIRST YEAR REVENUES C=[A*B*12]		
rate element	<u>w</u>					
Answer Supervision	621	\$	1.60	\$	11,923	
	TOTAL ANNUA	L REVE	NUES		11.923	

CONFIDENTIAL Page 7
Page 7
Page 1 of 1

AMERITECH

Ohlo

Answer Supervision

	Unit Costs	
ESTIMATED INVESTMENTS: Recoverable Material Cost Installation Cost	\$ 12.66 2.74	
TOTAL	\$ 16.36	
ESTIMATED RECURRING COSTS:		
Depreciation Cost of Money Income Tax Maintenance Other Recurring Expense Ad Valorum Tax	\$ 2.13 1.06 0.45 0.90 	f.
TOTAL ANNUAL COST	\$ 4.84	
MONTHLY COST:	1 1.46	
Monthly Annuity of NRC SUB-TOTAL MONTHLY COST	\$ 0.19 \$ 0.00	٠
Monthly Gross Revenue Tax	0.00	
TOTAL MONTHLY COST:	1 4.07	
MONTHLY PROPOSED MATE:	.1 1.00	
Monthly Rule to Monthly Cost Ruse:	2,3000	

CONFIDENTIAL Page 8
EXHIBIT 3
Page 1 of 1

Anachment I

AMERITECH

Qhlo

ANSWER SUPERVISION

Per Line	NON-	,4PW	TOTAL
	RECURRING	(1.50%	ANALITY
	EXPENSES	:IVRS	EXPENSES
	(A)	(B)	C= (A+B)
	404	0.03241	0.10

1.4

E=D of Page 2 Estimated First Year Nonrecurring Ravenue

F=D+E Total RCA Revenue

\$ 1,060.00

\$ 1,578.00

950	VSSP		₹		
		LUN	FIUENIIAL	Altac	ement 1 Page 9
		Restricted Coin A	rcess	Exhib	R 1
				Page	1 of 2
		Annual Revenue Summary			
				o	hio
		RATE ELEMENT			
		- RCA per line			
	[A]	Levelzed First Year Domand			4
	[2]	Proposed Menthly Rate		•	44.51
	[P]	LIANGER MANINIS LEIA		-	10.75
C=1	A'B'IZI	Estimated First Year Revenue		*	E18.00
- •		•			110-00
D-T	atal of C	Estimated First Year Recurring (Revenue	Ŧ	618.00

CONFIDENTIAL Page 10

Restricted Coin Access

Page 2 of 2

Annual Revenue Summary

Ohio

RATE ELEMENT - RCA per line

A Estimated First Year Domand

Proposed Nonrecurring Charges [8]

\$ 212,00

C=[A*B] Estimated First Year Charges

\$ 1,060.00

D=Total of C Estimated First Year Monrecurring Revenue

\$ 1,000.00 *

CONFIDENTIAL Page 11

	Restricted Coin Access	Exhibit 2 Page 1 of 2	
		Ohlo	
	- RCA per line		
[A]	Precessing Cost Per Order	\$ 0.26	
[8]	Total Monthly RCA Orders		
C=[A*B]	Total Monthly Expense packate Grove Récepte Tax where applicable)	\$ 7.45	
	Proposed Monthly Rate	\$ 10.75	
	Price to Cast Ratio	1,3694	

	Restricted Coin Access		Exhibit 2 Page 2 of 2	
			Ohio	
	- RCA per line			
[A]	Provision of Line Class Code in Central Office	\$	134.12	
[B]	Labor Cost for Programming into AC\$10 System		12.59	
[0]	Training/M4-P/Bitting Expenses		10.79	
D#(A+8+C)	Total Nonrequering Expenses (Includes Gram Ramips Tax seture applicable)	<u>.</u>	167,50	
	Proposed Nonrecurring Charge	\$	212,00	

- , ,

CONFIDENTIAL

Attachment 1 Page 13

	Restricted Coin Access		Exhibit 2 Page 2 of 2	
		Ohio		
	- RCA per line			
(A)	Provision of Une Class Code in Central Office	\$	134,12	
	Labor Cost for Programming into ACS18 System		12,59	
ପ	Training/ME.P/Billing Expireses		10.79	
D=[A+B+C]	Total Nonrecurring Expenses (Indutes Gross Peosists Texadors scalcula)	<u>\$</u>	157,50	
	Proposed Honrecurring Charge	\$	212,00	