

PAUL S. DEFORD (816) 460-5827 EMAIL: PDeFord@LathropGage.com

SUITE 2800 2345 GRAND BOULEVARD KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64108-2612 (816) 292-2000, FAX (816) 292-2001

January 16, 2004

Mr. Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary/Chief Regulatory Judge Missouri Public Service Commission **PO Box 360** Jefferson City, MO 65102

Re: Case No. TO-2003-0531

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Enclosed are copies of Amended Surrebuttal Testimony in the above case for Kevin Dawson, David L. Jones and Michael K. Kurtis.

The original surrebuttal testimonies were electronically filed on January 14, but were improperly formatted. Therefore, we are filing Amended Surrebuttal Testimonies which conform with the formatting requirements of 4 CSR 240-2.130(6).

We have served copies of these amended testimonies upon all counsel of record.

Very truly yours,

LATHROP & GAGE L.C.

By: Paul linn Paul S. DeFord

PSD/dl Enclosures

CC 1261082v1

Change Your Expectations.

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

1		AMENDED SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY		
2		OF		
3		DAVID L. JONES		
4	A	PPLICATION 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	А.	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	А.	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	А.	Yes, I have.		
26				

Q. How will you refer to the three rebuttal testimonies in your instant surrebuttal
 testimony?

A. I will refer to them as: (a) the McKinnie Rebuttal (on behalf of Commission
Staff); (b) the Schoonmaker Rebuttal (on behalf of Alma and Citizens); and (c) the Martinez
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 status to MMC would serve the public interest. Moreover, all of the rebuttal witnesses assert that granting ETC status to wireless carriers like MMC could jeopardize the USF.

Q. Why do you believe that designating MMC an ETC in the area proposed in itsapplication will serve the public interest?

12 Α. 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.

20 Q. Ca

Can you provide more specific information?

A. Some time between August 1993 and January 1995, MMTC received a request for basic exchange telephone service from Jeff and Michelle Nebergal. The Nebergals' home was located in a remote area not then served by MMTC. MMTC estimated that it would cost tens of thousands of dollars to run the single phone line out to that remote location using wireline technology. Accordingly, MMTC sought Staff concurrence that MMTC could meet its carrier of 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 providing that service would merely be the difference between the price of the wireless service and the cost of basic LEC service as opposed to the cost of constructing the requisite landline circuit. Staff accompanied me to the Nebergals' home and agreed that the public interest would best be served by allowing the use of wireless facilities to meet MMTC's carrier of last resort obligations in this instance.

7

Q. Was there any written record of this matter?

8 A. To the best of my recollection, I believe that, sometime between August 1993 and 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.

3

14 Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?

15	А.	Yes, it does.
16		

17 18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

)

)

)

)

)

)

))

In the Matter of the Application of Missouri RSA No. 7 Limited Partnership d/b/a Mid-Missouri Cellular For Designation as a Telecommunications Company Carrier Eligible for Federal Universal Service Support pursuant to § 254 of) the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Case No. TO-2003-0531

AFFIDAVIT OF DAVID L. JONES

CITY OF PARIS)	
)	SS.
DISTRICT OF LAMAR)	

David L. Jones, of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the foregoing Amended Surrebuttal Testimony in question and answer form, consisting of 3 pages to be presented in the above case; that the answers in the foregoing Amended Surrebuttal Testimony were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

> /s/ David L. Jones David L. Jones Director, Mid-Missouri Cellular, Inc.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of January 2004.

/s/ Notary Public