Exhibit No.:

Issue: Application for Designation as an Eligible

Telecommunications Carrier

Witness: David L. Jones

Type of Exhibit: Amended Surrebuttal Testimony

Sponsoring Party: Missouri RSA No. 7 Limited Partnership

d/b/a Mid-Missouri Cellular

Case No.: TO-2003-0531

Date Testimony Prepared: January 14, 2004

MISSOURI RSA No. 7 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

d/b/a

MID-MISSOURI CELLULAR

AMENDED SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

DAVID L. JONES

CASE No. TO-2003-0531

Exhibit No	
Case No(s).70-2003-0531	
Date 1-28-14 Rptr 777	

1		AMENDED SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY		
2		OF		
3		DAVID L. JONES		
4	APPLICATION OF MISSOURI RSA No. 7 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP			
5		d/b/a MID-MISSOURI CELLULAR		
6		CASE NO. TO-2003-0531		
7				
8	Q.	Please state your name and current business address.		
9	A.	David L. Jones		
10		Air Direct, LLC		
11		3850 FM 2648		
12		Powderly, Texas 75473		
13	Q.	What is your current position with Mid-Missouri Cellular ("MMC")?		
14	A.	I am a member of the Board of Directors of Mid-Missouri Cellular, Inc., the		
15	general partner of Missouri RSA No. 7 Limited Partnership d/b/a Mid-Missouri Cellular.			
16	Q.	During the period from August of 1993 through and including January of 1995, in		
17	what capacity were you employed by MMC?			
18	A.	I was President of MMC. During that period, I was also Executive Vice President		
19	of Mid-Missouri Telephone Company.			
20	Q.	Have you reviewed the Rebuttal Testimony of: Adam McKinnie on behalf of the		
21	Telecommunications Department Staff ("Staff") of the Missouri Public Service Commission			
22	Robert C. S	Schoonmaker on behalf of Alma Telephone Company and Citizens Telephone		
23	Company; a	nd Arthur P. Martinez on behalf of Spectra Communications Group, LLC d/b/a		
24				
25	A.	Yes, I have.		
26				

- 1 Q. How will you refer to the three rebuttal testimonies in your instant surrebuttal
- 2 testimony?
- A. I will refer to them as: (a) the McKinnie Rebuttal (on behalf of Commission
- 4 Staff); (b) the Schoonmaker Rebuttal (on behalf of Alma and Citizens); and (c) the Martinez
- 5 Rebuttal (on behalf of CenturyTel).
- 6 Q. What general conclusions were reached by the rebuttal witnesses?
- A. Mr. McKinnie implies that there is no basis for finding that the grant of ETC
- 8 status to MMC would serve the public interest. Moreover, all of the rebuttal witnesses assert that
- 9 granting ETC status to wireless carriers like MMC could jeopardize the USF.
- 10 Q. Why do you believe that designating MMC an ETC in the area proposed in its
- 11 application will serve the public interest?
- 12 A. Based on my experience with both MMC and its wireline affiliate, Mid-Missouri
- 13 Telephone Company ("MMTC"), I believe that wireless carriers are able to assist ILECs in
- 14 fulfilling their commitments as carriers of last resort at substantially reduced costs and in a much
- 15 shorter time interval than otherwise would be incurred and required by the ILEC. This view
- 16 reflects an incident in which the Staff allowed MMTC to use MMC's wireless service to provide
- 17 basic exchange service in an isolated portion of an MMTC exchange. For MMTC to extend its
- 18 wireline plant to this location would have been an extremely costly and time consuming
- 19 undertaking.
- Q. Can you provide more specific information?
- A. Some time between August 1993 and January 1995, MMTC received a request
- 22 for basic exchange telephone service from Jeff and Michelle Nebergal. The Nebergals' home
- 23 was located in a remote area not then served by MMTC. MMTC estimated that it would cost
- 24 tens of thousands of dollars to run the single phone line out to that remote location using wireline
- 25 technology. Accordingly, MMTC sought Staff concurrence that MMTC could meet its carrier of
- 26 last resort obligations by purchasing fixed wireless service from MMC and reselling that service

to the Nebergals at MMTC's rate for standard LEC service. By doing so, MMTC's cost basis for 1 2 providing that service would merely be the difference between the price of the wireless service 3 and the cost of basic LEC service as opposed to the cost of constructing the requisite landline 4 circuit. Staff accompanied me to the Nebergals' home and agreed that the public interest would 5 best be served by allowing the use of wireless facilities to meet MMTC's carrier of last resort 6 obligations in this instance. 7 Q. Was there any written record of this matter? 8 To the best of my recollection, I believe that, sometime between August 1993 and A. 9 January 1995, the Staff, by or at the direction of Ms. Linda Gardner, former Manager of the 10 Commission's telecommunications department, issued a letter to MMTC authorizing use of 11 MMC wireless service in response to the Nebergal request. MMC issued a data request to the 12 Staff for a copy of this correspondence. Unfortunately, as of the date of this testimony, both 13 Staff's and my efforts to locate the correspondence have been unsuccessful. 14 Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony? 15 A. Yes, it does. 16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Applicat Missouri RSA No. 7 Limited d/b/a Mid-Missouri Cellular For Designation as a Telecon Company Carrier Eligible for Universal Service Support pot the Telecommunications Act	d Partnership mmunications or Federal ursuant to § 254 of))) Case No. TO-2003-0531))			
AFFIDAVIT OF DAVID L. JONES					
CITY OF PARIS)				
DISTRICT OF LAMAR) ss.)				
preparation of the foregoing consisting of 3 pages to be Amended Surrebuttal Testing	g Amended Surrebute presented in the a	oath states: that he has participated in the attal Testimony in question and answer form, above case; that the answers in the foregoing him; that he has knowledge of the matters set rue and correct to the best of his knowledge and			
Subscribed and sworn to befo	ore me this day	/s/			
		Notary Public			