

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON**

**UM 1648**

**Joint Testimony of Oregon Public Utility Commission Staff,  
AT&T, Cricket Telecommunications, Inc., and  
Oregon Telecommunications Association  
in Support of Second Partial Stipulation**

**In the Matter of  
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON  
Staff Investigation into Eligible Telecommunications  
Carriers' Requirements**

**May 15, 2014**

1           **A.     Qualifications of Kay Marinos.**

2   **Q.     PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND THE PARTY FOR WHOM YOU ARE**  
3   **APPEARING.**

4   A.     My name is Kay Marinos. I am a Manager in and appearing on behalf of the  
5     Telecommunications and Water Division of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon  
6     (Commission). My responsibilities include monitoring compliance of Oregon Eligible  
7     Telecommunications Carriers (ETCs) with federal and state requirements, and managing  
8     the annual certification and initial designation of ETCs in Oregon. My witness  
9     qualifications statement is included as Attachment 1 to this testimony.

10           **B.     Qualifications of Brant Wolf.**

11   **Q.     PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND THE PARTY FOR WHOM YOU ARE**  
12   **APPEARING.**

13   A.     My name is Brant Wolf. I am the Executive Vice President of and appearing on behalf of  
14     the Oregon Telecommunications Association (OTA). Among my other duties, I have  
15     been responsible for providing comments or otherwise participating in numerous OPUC  
16     proceedings. As the advocate for members of the OTA I have also provided testimony  
17     and comments in numerous other legislative and regulatory proceedings related to  
18     telecommunications issues. My witness qualifications statement is included as  
19     Attachment 2 to this testimony.

20           **C.     Qualifications of Sharon Mullin.**

21   **Q.     PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND THE PARTY FOR WHOM YOU ARE**  
22   **APPEARING.**

1 A. My name is Sharon Mullin. I am Director-Regulatory in External Affairs with AT&T  
2 Services, Inc. I am responsible for directing AT&T's regulatory affairs in the states of  
3 Oregon, Washington, Arizona, New Mexico and South Dakota for all AT&T entities.  
4 My witness qualifications statement is included as Attachment 3 to this testimony.

5 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

6 A. The purpose of our testimony is to describe and support the Second Partial Stipulation  
7 (Stipulation) entered into by Staff, AT&T Corp., Teleport Communications America  
8 LLC, AT&T Mobility LLC, Cricket Communications, Inc. (AT&T), Boomerang  
9 Wireless, Inc., CenturyLink companies (Qwest Corporation, United Telephone Company  
10 of the Northwest, CenturyTel of Oregon and CenturyTel of Eastern Oregon), Oregon  
11 Telecommunications Association, United States Cellular Corporation, T-Mobile West  
12 LLC, Warm Springs Telecommunications Company, Frontier Communications  
13 Northwest Inc., and Citizens' Telecommunications Co. of Oregon (Frontier), collectively  
14 referred to as the "Stipulating Parties."

15 **Q. MS. MARINOS, WHICH PORTIONS OF THIS EXHIBIT CONTAIN YOUR**  
16 **TESTIMONY?**

17 A. I am responsible for the testimony in this entire exhibit.

18 **Q. MS. MULLIN AND MR. WOLF, WHICH PORTIONS OF THIS EXHIBIT**  
19 **CONTAIN YOUR TESTIMONY?**

20 A. We are responsible for the testimony in this exhibit, with the exception of the answers  
21 that respond to questions that are specifically directed to Staff in this testimony. The first  
22 answer to the questions directed to Staff begins on page 7, in response to the question,

1 “What objectives did Staff employ to review last year’s experience and determine this  
2 year’s approach to annual reporting?” The second begins on page 9 in response to the  
3 question, “Please explain the elimination of the CETC network plan requirement from  
4 Staff’s perspective.” The third answer begins on page 12 in response to the question, “Is  
5 there any other reason why Staff believes the reporting requirements may need to be  
6 revised for future years?” We are not responsible for the testimony in response to these  
7 three questions.

8 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF THE SECOND PARTIAL**  
9 **STIPULATION.**

10 A. In Order No. 06-292, the Commission adopted requirements for the annual recertification  
11 of eligible telecommunications carriers (ETCs) to receive federal universal fund support  
12 (FUSF). The Commission currently requires Oregon ETCs to file the Oregon-specific  
13 annual reports listed in Appendix A of Order 06-292 by July 15th. In November 2011,  
14 the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) issued Order 11-161 that, in relevant  
15 part, provides new mandatory annual reporting requirements for ETCs receiving federal  
16 high-cost support. The high-cost annual reporting requirements are codified in 47 CFR  
17 54.313. In February 2012, the FCC issued Order 12-11 that includes new annual  
18 reporting requirements for ETCs receiving support from the federal Lifeline program.  
19 The Lifeline reporting requirements are codified in 47 CFR 54.422. In 2013, the FCC  
20 Wireline Competition Bureau created FCC Form 481, Carrier Annual Reporting  
21 (54.313/54.422) Collection Form. Annual reports must be filed using the Form 481 and  
22 are due by July 1 to the FCC with a copy to state commissions.

1 The Form 481 covers many of the same items as the Oregon annual report. In order to  
2 avoid duplication and create an efficient process for the annual review of ETCs, the  
3 Parties first agreed to specific 2013 annual reporting requirements, as reflected in the  
4 Partial Stipulation filed in this docket on June 3, 2013. In this Second Partial Stipulation,  
5 the parties propose a revised set of reporting requirements for 2014.

6 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHETHER THE STIPULATION RESOLVES ALL OF THE**  
7 **ISSUES IN THIS PHASE OF THE PROCEEDING?**

8 A. It may. Phase I of the proceeding addresses the Oregon annual reporting requirements  
9 for ETCs designated by the Commission. This Second Partial Stipulation resolves all of  
10 the issues for this year's annual reporting requirements. However, due to changes that  
11 may become apparent in Phase II of this docket and the possibility of additional changes  
12 by the FCC, the Stipulation allows for review of the annual reporting requirements after  
13 October 1, 2014, which is the current due date for the State's annual certification to the  
14 FCC for ETCs receiving federal high-cost support. The annual reports provide key  
15 information to facilitate the Commission's annual certification of Oregon ETCs to the  
16 FCC. If the review concludes that the 2014 reporting requirements are sufficient and  
17 there appears to be no need for modification, the Parties may file a Motion with the  
18 Commission to modify Order 06-292 to apply to years beyond 2014.

19 **Q. ARE ALL PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING SIGNATORIES TO THE**  
20 **STIPULATION?**

21 A. No. Three parties in this docket, the Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon (CUB), Budget  
22 PrePay, Inc. and YourTel America Inc., are not signatories to the Second Partial

1 Stipulation. None of these parties participated in recent docket activity related to this  
2 stipulation. No party opposes this stipulation.

3 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS DOCKET?**

4 A. At Staff's request, the Commission opened Docket No. UM 1648 (Docket) in February of  
5 2013 to review and consider changes to ETC requirements that were established in Order  
6 No. 06-292, entered in Docket No. UM 1217. The changes are necessitated by  
7 significant modifications made by the FCC to the Federal Universal Service Fund (FUSF)  
8 from which ETCs receive support. The Docket addresses the issues in two phases. Phase  
9 I addresses requirements for ETC annual reporting, while Phase II addresses  
10 requirements for initial ETC designation. Docket activities to date have been limited to  
11 Phase I.

12 **Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE EVENTS THAT TOOK PLACE LAST**  
13 **YEAR IN PHASE I OF THIS DOCKET.**

14 A. On June 3, 2013, Staff, on behalf of all active Parties in the docket, filed a Partial  
15 Stipulation that addressed agreed-upon requirements for ETC annual reporting for 2013.  
16 In addition, Staff filed a motion to amend Order No. 06-292 to reflect the terms of the  
17 Partial Stipulation. The Commission adopted the 2013 Partial Stipulation in Order  
18 No. 13-228 entered June 19, 2013. Subsequently, ETCs were required to file reports  
19 pursuant to the Order by November 15, 2013.

20 **Q. WHY ARE THE PARTIES NOW SUBMITTING ANOTHER STIPULATION**  
21 **REGARDING ANNUAL REPORTING?**

1 A. Due to uncertainties associated with FCC FUSF reporting requirements, one of the terms  
2 of the 2013 Partial Stipulation was to re-visit the annual reporting requirements adopted  
3 for 2013 after reports were filed that year. The re-examination of reporting requirements  
4 was to determine whether the same requirements used in 2013 should be adopted for  
5 subsequent years. The current Stipulation is the product of that review process.

6 **Q. DID LAST YEAR'S REPORTING PROCESS PRESENT ANY CHALLENGES**  
7 **OR PROBLEMS?**

8 A. Yes. Staff described the reporting experience in its Docket No. UM 1652 Public Meeting  
9 memorandum for the December 10, 2013 Public Meeting, recommending ETC annual  
10 certification. As a consequence of changing deadlines for submission of annual report  
11 information to the FCC, there was confusion regarding due dates. On June 10, 2013, the  
12 FCC granted a limited waiver of the reporting requirements in 47 CFR § 54.313 and  
13 54.422 with the exception of 47 CFR § 54.313(h) until the federal Office of Management  
14 and Budget (OMB) approved the new Form 481. The FCC also waived the October 1  
15 deadline for states to certify state designated high-cost ETCs to the FCC. On August 6,  
16 the FCC announced that the OMB had approved the Form 481 and set October 15 as the  
17 deadline for the Form 481 and December 16 as the deadline for state certification of  
18 ETCs. Subsequent temporary shut-down of the federal government resulted in the FCC  
19 moving the October 15 deadline to October 31. The changing dates created confusion for  
20 all involved in the reporting process.

21 **Q. WHAT DOCKET ACTIVITY RELATED TO ANNUAL REPORTING**  
22 **REQUIREMENTS OCCURRED THIS YEAR?**

1 A. A prehearing conference was held on April 4, 2014. The Parties met in a  
2 workshop/settlement conference immediately following the prehearing conference. The  
3 purpose of the meeting was to review the reporting experience of the previous year,  
4 identify any significant changes occurring since then, and determine whether  
5 modification to last year's reporting requirements are needed.

6 **Q. WHAT OBJECTIVES DID STAFF EMPLOY TO REVIEW LAST YEAR'S**  
7 **EXPERIENCE AND DETERMINE THIS YEAR'S APPROACH TO ANNUAL**  
8 **REPORTING?**

9 A. Staff's objectives were similar to those used last year. The first objective was to ensure  
10 that sufficient information is provided to the Commission to recertify Oregon ETCs for  
11 FUSF high-cost funds and to monitor performance of federal USF low-income providers.  
12 The second objective was to minimize reporting burdens on ETCs to the extent possible.  
13 The third objective was to provide a recommendation to the Commission quickly so that  
14 ETCs have sufficient notice prior to the due dates for the reports.

15 **Q. DOES THE STIPULATION CHANGE THE BASIC APPROACH UNDERLYING**  
16 **THE DETERMINATION OF LAST YEAR'S REQUIREMENTS?**

17 A. No, the basic approach is largely the same. However, a few modifications to individual  
18 requirements are needed. The general approach continues to center around the use of the  
19 FCC Form 481 reports in lieu of the Oregon-specific reports required by Order No. 06-  
20 292. Despite some timing difficulties encountered last year, use of the FCC Form 481  
21 reports remains the least burdensome approach. The FCC requires ETCs to submit  
22 information using this form, and also requires that the ETCs submit copies to state



1 commissions. Given that, continuation of the Oregon-specific reports detailed in Order  
2 No. 06-292 would impose an unnecessary burden on ETCs. While Order No. 06-292  
3 requires reporting of some types of information that are not in the Form 481, the  
4 difference is not significant enough to justify the filing of two separate albeit similar  
5 reports.

6 The Stipulation also retains the 2013 requirement that ETCs receiving FUSF high-cost  
7 support file an affidavit from a company officer attesting to the appropriate use of high-  
8 cost support funds. The affidavit places the ultimate responsibility on each ETC for its  
9 use of FUSF support and provides assurances to the Commission that it can reasonably  
10 certify the ETC to the FCC for continued receipt of federal high-cost support.

11 **Q. DO THE PARTIES PROPOSE ANY MODIFICATIONS TO REQUIREMENTS**  
12 **THAT WERE ADOPTED FOR REPORTING LAST YEAR?**

13 A. Yes, the Parties propose a few modifications to last year's reporting requirements. There  
14 are basically three types of changes proposed.

15 **Q. WHAT IS THE FIRST TYPE OF MODIFICATION PROPOSED?**

16 A. The first proposed modification impacts only the competitive ETCs (CETCs) that receive  
17 high-cost support. Currently, this group includes US Cellular, AT&T Mobility, Snake  
18 River PCS, and Comspan Communications. Order 06-292 requires CETCs to file  
19 network improvement plans each year and the CETCs have been doing so since the Order  
20 was issued in 2006. The network plans were intended to demonstrate how the FUSF  
21 support was actually used in the previous year, and how the CETC planned to use the  
22 support in each of the upcoming two years, on a detailed project-by-project basis. Staff

1 considered these network plans as an integral tool in supporting Staff's recommendation  
2 to the Commission to certify these carriers each year for continued funding. As part of  
3 last year's Stipulation, the CETCs agreed to submit network plans to the Commission in  
4 2013, even though the FCC did not require submission of such plans as part of its new  
5 reporting requirements. This year, however, the Parties agree that the filing of CETC  
6 network plans is no longer useful and the requirement should be eliminated.

7 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE ELIMINATION OF THE CETC NETWORK PLAN**  
8 **REQUIREMENT FROM STAFF'S PERSPECTIVE.**

9 A. Information in the network plans submitted last year demonstrates that there is no longer  
10 a need to require submission of such plans. Since 2012, FUSF support to the CETCs has  
11 been subject to a five-year phase-down with all such support to be eliminated on July 1,  
12 2016. Due to the phase-down of support, for the coming July-June period the CETCs  
13 will receive only 40% of the federal high-cost support they received in 2011. Based on  
14 Staff's review of the previously submitted network plans, the 2014 funding has been  
15 reduced to levels that now only support the maintenance of facilities that the CETCs  
16 previously built or installed with earlier support funding. There is no longer sufficient  
17 funding to cover the cost of maintenance of existing facilities built with federal support  
18 and new tower builds or upgrades. In last year's plans the CETCs adequately  
19 documented the use of the declining funds so there is no purpose to be served by  
20 requiring submission of the same information again. However, the CETCs will continue  
21 to submit the same type of affidavit that other ETCs will this year to attest to the  
22 appropriate use of support funds they receive.

1 **Q. DO THE STIPULATING PARTIES SUPPORT ELIMINATION OF THE CETC**  
2 **NETWORK PLAN REQUIREMENT?**

3 A. Yes.

4 **Q. WHAT IS THE SECOND TYPE OF MODIFICATION PROPOSED?**

5 A. The second modification provides clarification of reporting requirements for Lifeline-  
6 only ETCs, which are those ETCs that receive support only for low-income (and not high  
7 cost) purposes. The 2013 Stipulation required the filing of FCC reports pursuant to 47  
8 C.F.R. § 54.422 for Lifeline providers. This FCC rule, unlike some others, distinguishes  
9 reporting requirements based on whether the ETC was designated by the FCC or by a  
10 state commission. There may have been some confusion last year as to exactly which  
11 information the Lifeline-only ETCs were to report to the Commission. The Second  
12 Partial Stipulation clarifies that the Lifeline-only ETCs will report to the Commission the  
13 same information required by 47 CFR § 54.422(b), even though this FCC rule does not  
14 apply to ETCs designated by state commissions. The FCC rule, 47 CFR § 54.422(b)  
15 addresses network outages, customer complaints, compliance with applicable service  
16 quality standards and consumer protection rules, and ability to function in emergency  
17 situations. Requiring reporting of this information is similar to the Commission's  
18 previous reporting requirements in Order No. 06-292 and ensures that Staff is provided  
19 consistent information for all ETCs in the state.

20 **Q. WHAT IS THE THIRD TYPE OF MODIFICATION PROPOSED?**

21 A. The third type of modification relates to the due dates for the reports. The 2013 reporting  
22 requirements gave the ETCs a window of two weeks after the FCC reporting deadlines to

1 file copies of the FCC reports with the Commission. Last year, the additional time  
2 assured all parties were able to meet the reporting requirements despite confusion caused  
3 by the FCC's change to the reporting deadlines. This additional time is not needed this  
4 year. For consistency with the FCC's due dates, the deadlines for submission of copies  
5 of the Form 481, CAF/ICC data and Form 690 to the Commission should be modified to  
6 reflect the same dates as those in FCC rules. Further, because the Form 481 reports will  
7 now be due by July 1, it makes sense to change the due date for the affidavits from July  
8 15 to July 1 to sync up with the timing of the Form 481 reports. If the FCC decides to  
9 change its deadlines for reporting this year after a Commission Order modifying Order  
10 No. 06-292 is issued, then by the terms of the modified order the Commission deadlines  
11 would also be changed to match the revised FCC deadlines.

12 **Q. DO THE PARTIES PROPOSE TO CHANGE DUE DATES FOR UPDATES OR**  
13 **REVISIONS TO REPORTS?**

14 A. No. For any updates or revisions to reports that are filed with the FCC, the ETCs will  
15 continue to have the same amount of time as last year, i.e., within five business days of  
16 filing with the FCC. There appears to be no federal or state administrative rule that  
17 would prohibit this filing timeline for reporting updates or revisions.

18 **Q. WHY ARE THE PARTIES PROPOSING THAT THE STIPULATION**  
19 **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS BE USED ONLY FOR 2014 AND NOT**  
20 **ADOPTED AS REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS WELL?**

21 A. It became evident last year that the FCC requirements and deadlines were subject to  
22 change and flexibility was needed to react to the changes. It would not be prudent to

1 adopt requirements for future years as long as the FCC rules and procedures are still in a  
2 state of flux. The uncertainties surrounding future changes to the FUSF program may  
3 affect the type and frequency of reporting to the FCC, and consequently, to the  
4 Commission.

5 **Q. IS THERE ANOTHER REASON WHY THE COMMISSION SHOULD NOT**  
6 **ADOPT REQUIREMENTS NOW THAT WOULD ALSO APPLY IN**  
7 **SUBSEQUENT YEARS?**

8 A. Yes, there is an issue concerning reporting requirements for non-facilities-based Lifeline-  
9 only ETCs. One of the parties to the Second Partial Stipulation is a non-facilities-based  
10 provider and has an application pending before the Commission at this time to be  
11 designated as a Lifeline-only ETC. This party is concerned about how some reporting  
12 requirements in 47 CFR § 54.422(b) will apply to non-facilities-based providers and  
13 contends that compliance with these reporting requirements may be difficult, if not  
14 impossible. While this is not an issue for this Party this reporting year, as its petition for  
15 Lifeline-only ETC designation is still pending before the Commission, it may be an issue  
16 in the future. This issue is also likely to be addressed relative to initial designation  
17 requirements in Phase II of this docket. Decisions made in Phase II may impact the  
18 appropriate treatment of the same issues relative to reporting. In any event, there is  
19 reason to believe that requirements for reporting by non-facilities-based providers could  
20 be an issue next year.

21 **Q. IS THERE ANY OTHER REASON WHY STAFF BELIEVES THE REPORTING**  
22 **REQUIREMENTS MAY NEED TO BE REVISED FOR FUTURE YEARS?**

1 A. This is the first year that some Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs) will submit  
2 five-year plans, as well as information on broadband services. Staff is uncertain as to  
3 what to expect from these plans or when other ILECs may be required to file such plans.  
4 Unlike the network plan requirements developed by Staff in Docket No. UM 1217, the  
5 new plan requirements were developed by the FCC. Unfortunately, the FCC has  
6 provided no guidance to state commission staff members as to the substance and form of  
7 the plans to date. After seeing these plans for the first time, Staff and the Commission  
8 may wish to gather more information than what will be reported for FCC purposes. But,  
9 under the Second Partial Stipulation, in no event will any ILECs file such reports with the  
10 Commission until such time as they do so with the FCC.

11 **Q. IS THE TIMING OF A COMMISSION ORDER DETERMINING THIS YEAR'S**  
12 **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IMPORTANT?**

13 A. Yes, it is. Without Commission action, the ETCs will be required to submit the reports  
14 established in Order No. 06-292 by July 15. They need to know whether to start  
15 preparing those reports. Action by the Commission will eliminate the need for CETCs to  
16 unnecessarily waste time and effort on developing network plans and for all ETCs to  
17 prepare the other items required by the existing language in Order 06-292.

18 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

19 A. Yes.

WITNESS QUALIFICATION STATEMENT

NAME: Kay Marinos

EMPLOYER: Public Utility Commission of Oregon

TITLE: Manager

ADDRESS: 3930 Fairview Industrial Drive  
Salem, OR 97302

EDUCATION: PhD/ABD and MA in Economics  
University of Hawaii, 1981

BA in Economics  
Hofstra University, 1975

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Manager, Competitive Issues, Public Utility Commission of Oregon, 2007 - Present  
Responsible for managing telecommunications competitive issues, competitive provider certifications, carrier interconnection agreements, wholesale service quality, Eligible Telecommunications Carrier (ETC) designations, federal universal service programs (high-cost and low-income) and ILEC service territory allocations. Staff member of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service.

Senior Telecommunications Analyst, Public Utility Commission of Oregon, 2004 – 2007  
Responsible for federal ETC designations, annual ETC certifications, and federal universal service issues. Developed ETC requirements adopted by the Commission, and served as expert witness in Docket No. UM 1217.

Senior Consultant, Verizon Communications, 2000 – 2003  
Managed special project teams to ensure compliance with regulatory and legal requirements in various aspects of national telecommunications business, including new product development, interconnection, customer proprietary information and billing.

Senior Specialist, Bell Atlantic and NYNEX, 1988- 2000

As subject matter expert, performed wide range of analytic functions to develop and support company’s objectives in federal regulatory proceedings. Major issues included Telecom Act implementation, competitive markets, interconnection, pricing flexibility, price caps, access rates, cost recovery and cost allocation.

Manager, National Exchange Carrier Association (NECA), 1984 - 1988

Managed development of telecom industry forecasts of interstate usage and dedicated access services used to determine nationwide carrier pool rates.

Business Research Analyst, GTE Hawaiian Telephone, 1982 – 1983

Developed revenue and demand forecasts for budgeting and network planning.

Economist and Planner, State of Hawaii, 1978 – 1982

Managed energy conservation and emergency planning projects, lectured in economics at the University of Hawaii, and supervised economic and demographic studies for urban redevelopment in industrial area of Honolulu.



Witness Qualification Statement

Name: Brant Wolf

Education: MBA, George Fox University

BA, Political Science, Oregon State University

Relevant Employment History:

I have been employed as the Executive Vice President of the Oregon Telecommunications Association (OTA) since 2000. During that time I have appeared as a witness, provided comments or participated otherwise in numerous OPUC proceedings.

As the advocate for members of the OTA I have also provided testimony and comments in numerous other legislative and regulatory proceedings related to telecommunications issues.

**WITNESS QUALIFICATION STATEMENT**

NAME: Sharon Mullin

EMPLOYER: AT&T Services Inc.

TITLE: Director

ADDRESS: 2003 Point Bluff  
Austin, Texas 78746

EDUCATION: MBA, Krannert School of Business, Purdue University, 1997.  
B.S. in Education, University of Texas at Austin with Honors, 1974.

**RELEVANT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

AT&T

External Affairs Director

State Regulatory Director with responsibility for advocacy in multiple states on behalf of all AT&T entities. I have more than thirty years of experience in the telecommunications industry. During my tenure I have handled diverse telecommunications issues including access charge issues, competitive issues, and the regulation of telecommunications and wireless carriers as well as the development and interpretation of regulatory policy. I have filed expert testimony in proceedings in a number of states. I am currently responsible for directing AT&T's regulatory affairs in Oregon, Washington, Arizona, New Mexico and South Dakota.

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I certify that on May 15, 2014, I served the foregoing Amended Joint Testimony upon the  
3 parties in this proceeding by electronic mail only as all parties waive paper service.

4 **W**  
CHARLES L BEST  
5 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
1631 NE BROADWAY #538  
6 PORTLAND OR 97232-1425  
charlesbestlaw@q.com

7 **W**  
JULIA REDMAN-CARTER  
8 955 KACENA RD, STE A  
HIWATHA IA 52233  
9 jrcarter@readywireless.com

10 **W**  
**AT&T**  
CYNTHIA MANHEIM  
11 PO BOX 97061  
REDMOND WA 98052  
12 cm9268@att.com

13 **W**  
**AT&T SERVICES INC**  
DAVID COLLIER  
14 AREA MANAGER-REGULATORY  
RELATIONS  
15 645 E PLUMB LNM RN C-142  
PO BOX 11010  
16 RENO NV 89502  
david.collier@att.com

17 **W**  
**AT&T SERVICES, INC.**  
18 SHARON L MULLIN  
DIRECTOR--EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
19 2003 POINT BLUFF  
AUSTIN TX 78746-6236  
20 slmullin@att.com

21 **W**  
**ATER WYNNE LLP**  
ARTHUR A BUTLER  
22 601 UNION STREET, STE 1501  
SEATTLE WA 98101-3981  
23 aab@aterwynne.com

24 **W**  
**BUDGET PREPAY, INC.**  
ROBIN ENKEY  
25 1325 BARKSDALE BLVD  
BOSSIER CITY LA 71111  
26 robine@budgetprepay.com

**W**  
**CENTURYLINK**  
RON L TRULLINGER  
MANAGER - OREGON REGULATORY  
310 SW PARK AVE 11TH FL  
PORTLAND OR 97205  
ron.trullinger@centurylink.com

**W**  
**CENTURYLINK, INC.**  
WILLIAM E HENDRICKS  
ATTORNEY  
902 WASCO ST A0412  
HOOD RIVER OR 97031  
tre.hendricks@centurylink.com

**W**  
**CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON**  
OPUC DOCKETS  
610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400  
PORTLAND OR 97205  
dockets@oregoncub.org

ROBERT JENKS  
610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400  
PORTLAND OR 97205  
bob@oregoncub.org

G. CATRIONA MCCrackEN  
610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400  
PORTLAND OR 97205  
catriona@oregoncub.org

**W**  
**CRICKET COMMUNICATIONS INC**  
JULIE BUECHLER  
5887 COPLEY DR  
SAN DIEGO OR 92111  
jubuechler@cricketcommunications.com

**W**  
**DAVIS WRIGHT TERMAINE LLP**  
ALAN J GALLOWAY  
1300 SW FIFTH AVENUE  
PORTLAND OR 97201-5630  
alangalloway@dwt.com

**W**  
**DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP**  
MARK P TRINCHERO  
1300 SW FIFTH AVE STE 2300  
PORTLAND OR 97201-5682  
marktrinchero@dwt.com

**W**  
**FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS NORTHWEST INC**  
GEORGE BAKER THOMSON  
1800 41ST ST  
EVERETT WA 98201  
george.thomson@ftr.com

RENEE WILLER  
20575 NW VON NEUMANN DR  
SUITE 150  
BEAVERTON OR 97006-6982  
renee.willer@ftr.com

**W**  
**LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD A FINNIGAN**  
RICHARD A FINNIGAN  
2112 BLACK LAKE BLVD SW  
OLYMPIA WA 98512  
rickfinn@localaccess.com

**W**  
**LUKAS, NACE, GUTIERREZ & SACHS**  
TODD B LANTOR  
8300 GREENSBORO DR, #1200  
MCLEAN VA 22102  
tlantor@fcclaw.com

**W**  
**LUKAS, NACE, GUTIERREZ & SACHS, LLP**  
BROOKS HARLOW  
8300 GREENSBORO DRIVE, STE 1200  
MCLEAN VA 22102  
bharlow@fcclaw.com

**W**  
**NEXUS COMMUNICATIONS INC**  
STEVEN FENKER  
3629 CLEVELAND AVE, STE C  
COLUMBUS OH 43223  
sfenker1@earthlink.net

1 **W**  
**OREGON**  
2 **TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSN**  
BRANT WOLF  
3 777 13TH ST SE - STE 120  
SALEM OR 97301-4038  
4 bwolf@ota-telecom.org

5 **W**  
**PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**  
**OF OREGON**  
6 KAY MARINOS  
PO BOX 1088  
7 SALEM OR 97308-1088  
kay.marininos@state.or.us

8 **W**  
**PUC STAFF - DEPARTMENT OF**  
**JUSTICE**  
9 JOHANNA RIEMENSCHNEIDER  
BUSINESS ACTIVITIES SECTION  
10 1162 COURT ST NE  
SALEM OR 97301-4796  
11 johanna.riemenschneider@doj.state  
.or.us

**W**  
**T-MOBILE USA INC**  
TERI OHTA  
12920 SE 38TH ST  
BELLEVUE WA 98006  
teri.ohta@t-mobile.com

**W**  
**UNITED STATES CELLULAR CORP**  
STEPHANIE CASSIOPPI  
8410 WEST BRYN MAWR AVENUE  
CHICAGO IL 60631-3486  
stephanie.cassioppi@uscellular.com

**W**  
**WARM SPRINGS**  
**TELECOMMUNICATIONS**  
MARSHA SPELLMAN  
10425 SW HAWTHORNE LN  
PORTLAND OR 97225  
marsha.spellman@warmspringstelec  
om.com

**W**  
**WARM SPRINGS**  
**TELECOMMUNICATIONS**  
**COMPANY**  
JOSE MATANANE  
PO BOX 910  
WARM SPRINGS OR 97761  
jose.matanane@warmspringsteleco  
m.com



Neoma Lane  
Legal Secretary  
Department of Justice  
Business Activities Section