

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition of DIECA Communications,)
Inc. d/b/a Covad Communications Company)
for arbitration to establish interconnection)
agreement with GTE Florida, Inc.)
_____)

DOCKET NO. 990182-TP

DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
MICHELE MENY
ON BEHALF OF
GTE FLORIDA INCORPORATED

MARCH 15, 1999

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

03272 MAR 15 99

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

1 **GTE FLORIDA INCORPORATED**

2 **DIRECT TESTIMONY**

3 **OF**

4 **MICHELE MENY**

5 **DOCKET NO. 990182-TP**

6

7 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

8 A. My name is Michele M. Meny. My business address is 600 Hidden
9 Ridge, Irving, Texas.

10

11 **Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?**

12 A. I am employed by GTE Telephone Operations, as Director-Cost Study
13 Production. I am providing testimony in this proceeding on behalf of
14 GTE Florida Incorporated ("GTE").

15

16 **Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL**
17 **BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE IN THE**
18 **TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY.**

19 A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting from the
20 University of Kentucky in Lexington, Kentucky. My
21 telecommunications industry work experience began with United
22 Telephone Company of the Southeast, where I was a Management
23 Trainee and subsequently an Internal Auditor. In 1987, I was hired by
24 GTE South in Durham, North Carolina as an Internal Auditor. In
25 1989, I transferred to GTE Telephone Operations in Irving, Texas

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

where I held various positions of increasing responsibility in the Regulatory Accounting, Pricing and Tariffs, and Business Development organizations. In October 1997 I assumed my current position.

Q. WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF YOUR CURRENT POSITION?

A. In my current position, I am responsible for all cost study filings in support of regulatory proceedings for GTE in its 28 jurisdictions. I am responsible for cost studies associated with unbundled network elements (TELRICs), products and services (TSLRICs) and universal service.

Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS COMMISSION OR ANY OTHER REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?

A. I have appeared before the state regulatory commissions in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Arkansas, Alabama, and Kentucky.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. I am sponsoring the cost studies GTE previously filed in its consolidated arbitration with AT&T and MCI (Petitions by AT&T Comm. Of the Southern States, Inc., MCI Telecomm. Corp. and MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc., for arbitration of certain

1 terms and conditions of a proposed agreement with GTE Florida Inc.
2 concerning interconnection and resale under the Telecomm. Act of
3 1996, Docket Nos. 960847-TP and 960980-TP), and which GTE may
4 need to rely on in this arbitration.

5
6 **Q. HAS GTE RESUBMITTED THOSE COST STUDIES IN THIS**
7 **ARBITRATION?**

8 A. No. GTE did not believe it was necessary to make this voluminous
9 submission again, as the Commission still has the cost studies GTE
10 filed in the AT&T and MCI arbitration. As such, I am incorporating
11 those studies by reference into this Testimony. If the Commission
12 disagrees with this approach, GTE will submit the same studies again.
13 GTE will also furnish these cost studies to Covad upon request and
14 execution of an appropriate protective agreement.

15
16 **Q. WHY DID YOU SAY THE COMMISSION “MAY” NEED TO RELY**
17 **ON THESE PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED STUDIES.**

18 A. GTE witness Jones will more fully explain this point, but, as I
19 understand it, there will be no need to further address GTE’s cost
20 studies if Covad accepts GTE’s pricing alternative of the unbundled
21 network element (UNE) rates the Commission established in the
22 AT&T and MCI arbitration.

23
24 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

25 A. Yes.