Exhibit No.:

Issue: Policy Issues

Witness: Jack E. Redfern

Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony

Sponsoring Party: ALLTEL Communications, Inc.

Case No.: TO-2000-667

Date Testimony Prepared: November 6, 2000

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF JACK E. REDFERN

FILED

on behalf of

NOV 8 2000

Missouri Public ALLTEL Communications, Inc. Service Commission

Jefferson City, Missouri November 6, 2000

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Investigation into the Effective Availability for Resale of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's Local Plus Service by Interexchange Companies and Facilities-Based Competitive Local Exchange Companies	) ) Case No. TO-2000-667 )	
AFFIDAVIT OF JACK E. REDFERN		
STATE OF ARKANSAS ) ss. COUNTY OF fulaske )		
Jack E. Redfern, being first duly sworn, on his oath and in his capacity as Staff Manager—State Government Affairs for ALLTEL Communications Service Corporation, that he is authorized to execute on behalf of ALLTEL Communications, Inc., this Rebuttal Testimony, and has knowledge of the matters stated in this Rebuttal Testimony, and that said matters are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.		
Jack E.	Redfern Tack E. Rudform	
Subscribed and sworn to before me th	is 6th day of Yovember, 2000.	
	Jeny J. Clark Notary Public	
My Commission Expires 12-16-2008	BARY G. CLARA BARCOMM LAR JOTARLO AUBLIC &	

1 2		BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STATE OF MISSOURI
3		
4		
5		
6		Matter of the Investigation into the
7 8		rtive Availability for Resale of Southwestern )  Felephone Company's Local Plus Service by ) Case No. TO-2000-667
9		exchange Companies and Facilities-Based )
10		petitive Local Exchange Companies )
11		,
12		
13		
14 15		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
16		OF
17		JACK E. REDFERN
18		
19	0	Diago state your name and hyginess address
20	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
21	A.	My name is Jack E. Redfern. My business address is One Allied Drive, Little
22		Rock, Arkansas 72202-2013.
23		
24	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
25	A.	I am employed by ALLTEL Communications Service Corporation as Staff
26		Manager-State Government Affairs.
27		
28	Q.	Please describe your educational background and experience.
29	A.	I attended Wilmington College in Wilmington, North Carolina, majoring in
30		Accounting. I have been involved in the telecommunications industry for twenty-
31		seven (27) years, serving the past eleven (11) years with ALLTEL
32		Communications Service Corporation, with various responsibilities in the areas of
33		Carrier Services, Separations and Settlements, and currently State Government

Affairs. My previous telephony experience involved Accounting and Commercial Ì Operations with Yell County Telephone Company, in Arkansas, for sixteen (16) 2 3 years. 4 What is the purpose of your testimony? 5 Q. 6 Α. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to the direct testimony of Thomas F. Hughes of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, filed in this proceeding in 7 8 October, 2000. 9 Q. Is Local Plus available to non facilities-based CLECs? 10 11 A. Yes. (Hughes direct testimony – pg. 4, line 11) 12 Is Local Plus available to facilities-based CLECs? 13 Q. No. (Hughes direct testimony - pg. 6, line 10) Although, ACI submitted a A. 14 proposal to Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (SWBT) in discovery 15 suggesting a solution and asking for their concurrence, SWBT to date has not 16 responded despite at least one conference call held on October 27, 2000 at 17 18 SWBT's request. SWBT's responses to ACI's data requests were due on October 31, 2000. If and when SWBT's responses to this discovery are received, ACI 19 reserves the right to file supplemental rebuttal testimony on this issue accordingly. 20 21 Is ALLTEL Communications, Inc. (ACI) a facilities-based CLEC? 22 Q.

23

A.

Yes.

Q. Does this position by SWBT appear to be discriminatory?

1

2

6

12

- A. Yes. It also appears to conflict with the theory or assumption underlying the
  Commission's April 6, 2000 Report and Order issued in Case No. TT-2000-258 that
  facilities-based CLECs should be permitted to resell Local Plus service.
- Q. Why would SWBT need the settlement record described in rebuttal testimony of Marty Detling?
- 9 A. If a Local Plus call terminates to a non-SWBT ILEC, that terminating ILEC is
  10 entitled to terminating access revenue for that call and would need such settlement
  11 record in order to bill SWBT for that terminating access.
- Q. Since ACI is a facilities-based CLEC, leasing unbundled loops from SWBT and using its own facilities to switch local calls, why then would SWBT be liable for terminating access expense on Local Plus calls terminating to other ILECs, rather than ACI bearing that responsibility?
- The issue of this Case is whether or not Local Plus is a service available for resale. ACI intends to pay SWBT their tariffed rate, less applicable avoided cost discount, for Local Plus service. In developing the rate for this service, SWBT factored in, or should have, terminating access expense to non-SWBT terminating ILECs, and, imputed terminating access to Local Plus calls terminating to its own exchanges. To require a facilities-based CLEC to be responsible for terminating access expense would enable SWBT to realize a revenue windfall and would not

allow Local Plus to be offered to a facilities-based CLEC as a competitive service. Consequently, the facilities-based CLEC would be at a competitive disadvantage to solicit SWBT customers who enjoy Local Plus service today. If SWBT did not, in fact, consider terminating access expense in the development of rates for this service, they have the ability to reprice that service. As long as the facilities-based CLEC is not responsible for terminating access expense, the rate established by SWBT, at any level, would be considered a competitive service offering for the facilities-based CLEC.

## Q. Should ACI be able to order Local Plus service for resale at the same time it orders unbundled loops from SWBT?

12 A. If ACI, as a facilities-based CLEC, is allowed to resell Local Plus service, then,
13 based on Mr. Hughes direct testimony (pg. 4, line 1), they will. Mr. Hughes'
14 testimony states: "CLECs may use the standard ordering processes available to all
15 CLECs who wish to resell SWBT retail telecommunications services. CLECs
16 may use a manual process by faxing requests to the Local Service Center, or they
17 may use electronic ordering systems to place orders."

## Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

20 A. Yes, it does.