

"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 SO<sub>2</sub> emissions entitled, "Analysis of Cholla Unit 2 SO<sub>2</sub> 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. Supplemental declaration filed November 16, 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 pf 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. Missouri**

174. Circuit Court of St. Charles County, Missouri, *The Official Plan Committee of Omniplex Communications Group, Inc. v. Lucent Technologies, Inc.* Analysis of effects of alleged equipment failure. Expert Report filed June 24, 2005.

### **24. Montana**

175. 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.
176. 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.
177. 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.
178. 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.
179. 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.

180. 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.

## 25. Nebraska

181. 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.
182. 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.

## 26. Nevada

183. 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.

## 27. New Hampshire

184. 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.
185. 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.
186. 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
187. 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.
188. 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.

189. 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.
190. 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.
191. 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.
192. 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.
193. 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.

## **28. New Jersey**

194. 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.
195. 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.
196. 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.
197. 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.
198. 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).

199. 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.
200. 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.
201. 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.
202. 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.
203. 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.
204. 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.
205. 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.
206. 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.
207. 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.
208. 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.
209. 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.

210. 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.
211. 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.
212. 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.
213. 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.
214. New Jersey Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Verizon New Jersey, Direct Testimony regarding forecasts of incremental hot cut demand, filed December 10, 2003.
215. 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.
216. 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.
217. New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (BPU Docket No. TM0530189) on behalf of Verizon Communications, Inc., economic effects of the proposed Verizon MCI merger. Direct testimony filed July 8, 2005. Rebuttal testimony filed August 19, 2005.

**29. New Mexico**

218. 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.
219. 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.
220. 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.

221. 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.
222. 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.
223. 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.

**30. New York**

224. 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.
225. 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.
226. 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.
227. 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.
228. 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.
229. 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.
230. 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.

231. 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.
232. 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.
233. 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).
234. 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.
235. 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.
236. 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.
237. New York Public Service Commission, (Case 00-C-1945), on behalf of Verizon-New York, Panel Testimony on price regulation, filed May 15, 2001.
238. 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.
239. 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.
240. 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.
241. 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.