

--BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH--

In the Matter of the Application for Increase in USF Eligibility for Uintah Basin Telecommunications Association and UBET Telecom, Inc.	Docket No. 05-053-01 Bart S. Croxford Exhibit No. DPU 6.0
--	---

PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

BART S. CROXFORD

FOR THE

DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

STATE OF UTAH

SEPTEMBER 9, 2005

CONFIDENTIAL PUBLIC VERSION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

I. QUALIFICATIONS

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD.

A. Bart S. Croxford.

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND WHAT IS YOUR BUSINESS ADDRESS?

A. I am employed by the Utah Department of Commerce, Division of Public Utilities (“Division”). My business address is 160 East 300 South, Fourth Floor, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84111.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR POSITION?

A. Utility Regulatory Analyst.

Q. BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND.

A. I received a Bachelor of Arts in Accounting from the University of Utah in 1976. I am also a certified public accountant. I was employed by Utah Power & Light and PacifiCorp for a total of nineteen years in the accounting and power supply operations departments. I have been with the Division for eight years and have worked mainly in the regulation of telecommunications utilities. I am responsible for auditing companies in preparation for rate cases, making recommendations to the Commission after reviewing contracts, tariffs, applications for competitive

1 entry, etc. Currently, I have been asked to examine issues in conjunction with the
2 application of UBTA-UBET Communications in this docket.

3

4

II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

5

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

6

A. My testimony addresses the revenue requirement relating to UBTA-UBET's
7 revenue accounts. I will be addressing revenue that could have been collected for
8 the implementation of local number portability and recommending normalizing
9 lease payments that were received for offices in North Myton for the test period.

10

11

12

III. ADJUSTMENTS

13

1. LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY (LNP)

14

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ADJUSTMENT FOR LOCAL NUMBER
15 PORTABILITY.**

16

A. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 amended the Communications Act of 1934
17 "to provide for a pro-competitive, de-regulatory national policy framework
18 designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced
19 telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans
20 by opening all telecommunications markets to competition." In particular, section
21 251(b) of the amended 1934 Act imposes specific obligations on all local
22 exchange carriers ("LECs") to open their networks to competition. Congress
23 recognized that the inability of customers to retain their telephone numbers when

1 changing local service providers hampers the development of local competition.
2 To address this concern, Congress added section 251(b)(2) to the 1934 Act, which
3 requires all LECs, both incumbents and new entrants, to provide, to the extent
4 technically feasible, number portability in accordance with requirements by the
5 Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”).

6
7 In its *Third Report and Order*, the FCC concluded that section 251(e)(2) requires
8 the FCC to ensure that all telecommunications carriers bear, in a competitively-
9 neutral manner, the costs of providing long-term portability for interstate and
10 intrastate calls. It concluded that the costs of number portability that carriers must
11 bear on a competitively-neutral basis included the costs that LECs incur to meet
12 the obligation imposed by section 251(b)(2), as well as the costs other
13 telecommunications carriers—such as interexchange carriers and commercial
14 mobile radio service providers—incur for the industry-wide solution to providing
15 local number portability.

16
17 Initially, this did not affect UBTA-UBET because it was protected from
18 competition, pursuant to section 251(f)(1) of the 1996 Act. But when the FCC
19 required wireless number portability to be implemented by May 24, 2004 by all
20 wireless carriers that were not required to implement LNP by the original date of
21 November 24, 2003, it affected UBTA-UBET because its affiliate, UBET
22 Wireless, was required to provide LNP.

23

1 plant investment remaining would be allocated that way. The total adjustment is,
2 therefore, *****.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

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

5 **A.** Yes.

RESUME
BART S. CROXFORD

EDUCATION:

Bachelor of Arts, Accounting: University of Utah, 1976, Magna Cum Laude

CPA STATUS:

Licensed in Utah since 1981

EMPLOYMENT:

July 1997 to present:

Utah Division of Public Utilities
160 East 300 South, 4th Floor
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Position:

Utility Regulatory Analyst

Description:

Primary responsibilities include reviewing and analyzing financial statements, tariffs, contracts, and applications of telecommunications companies and making recommendations to the Commission. Responsibilities also include auditing telecommunications companies in preparation of rate cases.

Jan. 1989 to Nov. 1995:

PacifiCorp/Utah Power & Light Company
825 NE Multnomah
Portland, OR 97032

Position:

Power analyst

Description:

Compiled and analyzed power plant loads and costs for management.

April 1977 to Jan. 1989:

Utah Power & Light Company
1407 W. North Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Position:

Accountant

Description:

Prepared cost analyses and billings involving Company property.
