

Exhibit No.:  
Issue: MCC Customer Service Requests  
Witness: Mark Trefry  
Sponsoring Party: MCC Telephony of Missouri, Inc.  
Case No.: Case No. TE-2006-0415

**MCC TELEPHONY OF MISSOURI, INC.**

Case No. TE-2006-0415

**FILED<sup>2</sup>**

FEB 07 2007

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

Missouri Public  
Service Commission

OF

MARK TREFRY

December, 2006

mcc Exhibit No. 4  
Date 1-25-07 Case No. TE-2006-0415  
Reporter IV

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of                     )  
MCC Telephony of Missouri, Inc.                     )  
of Compliance with the Requirement                     )  
of 4 CSR 240-32                     )  
Case No. TE-2006-0415

AFFIDAVIT OF MARK TREFRY


STATE OF MINNESOTA    )  
                                      ) ss.  
COUNTY OF WASECA    )

I, Mark Trefry, of lawful age, and being duly sworn, do hereby depose and state:


1. My name is Mark Trefry. I am Vice President of Telephony of Mediacom Communications Corporation, the ultimate parent company of MCC Telephony of Missouri Inc., applicant in the referenced matter.


2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my surrebuttal testimony.

3. I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded are true and correct to the best of my personal knowledge, information and belief.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Trefry

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public, this 20<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2006.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public



1                                    **SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF MARK TREFRY**

2            **Q.     Please state your name and your employment.**

3            A.     My name is Mark Trefry. I am the Vice President of Telephony for Mediacom and in  
4                   that role am aware of the operations of MCC Telephony of Missouri, Inc. (MCC).

5  
6            **Q.     Are you the same Mark Trefry who filed written direct testimony in this**  
7                   **proceeding?**

8            A.     Yes, I am.

9  
10           **Q.     What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?**

11           A.     I will focus my surrebuttal on several answers Mr. Larry Henderson made in his  
12                   rebuttal testimony in which he purports to identify certain discrepancies in MCC's  
13                   quarterly reporting.

14  
15           **Q.     Can you respond to Mr. Henderson's comment on page 14 that MCC is**  
16                   **misreporting the percentage of orders installed within 5 days?**

17           A.     Mr. Henderson points out that MCC has reported that it has not installed any orders  
18                   within five days whereas in fact it has provisioned a small number within that  
19                   interval. Given the system constraints described throughout this proceeding, it is  
20                   likely that those orders were reactivations of service following a suspension and  
21                   would thus not have needed to go through the entire porting or installation procedure.  
22                   However, MCC will file a correction to account for those few instances.

23

Q. Can you please respond to Mr. Henderson's comments on page 15 regarding the apparent discrepancy between your earlier testimony and the information MCC provided in response to Staff's Data Request number 24?

A. This apparent discrepancy is the result of the following calculation issue. My testimony refers to installation intervals measured by business days (or working days). The database statistical analysis was performed on the basis of calendar days, hence the discrepancy. Additionally, a significant number of our customers request a specific install date that is different from and later than the first offered/available date. Commitments met for these installation dates are included in the "commitment met" calculation. MCC installs service on the day agreed to with its customers in 97.5%<sup>1</sup> of instances.

Q. Can you respond to Mr. Henderson's claim, on pages 15-16 that MCC is misreporting its customer trouble report rate?

A. MCC's 437 number for trouble reports in its report for the 2nd Quarter is a monthly average for the quarter as opposed to the total for the quarter. The Quarterly total was in fact 1311. The quarter's total should have been used in the report. The Quarterly total for Out of Service reports is accurate at 963 and is a subset of the total trouble reports (1311) for the quarter.<sup>2</sup> The repair commitment number of 1793 as reported was inclusive of non-phone products and was therefore not an appropriate figure to

---

<sup>1</sup> Change from reported 98.5%. Please see the comment in footnote 2.

<sup>2</sup> The data for repair commitments resides in a separate database from the data for trouble reports. Mr. Henderson's comment has led us to perform additional analysis of the two sets of data. We reviewed the trouble reports that were unique to each database, and this analysis raised the number of trouble reports to 1385.

use.<sup>3</sup> After filtering these non-phone products, the “commitments met” rate is properly stated 97.7%. We will resubmit the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter numbers to reflect these changes.

**Q. Can you respond to Mr. Henderson’s claim that MCC may be inaccurately tracking the average speed of answer for calls its business or repair office?**

**A.** Mr. Henderson inaccurately characterizes the information on MCC’s report. MCC’s report does not indicate that the 26 seconds “is an estimate derived from call center data and a formula.” The 26 seconds is the result of call center monitoring. The “estimate derived from call center data and a formula” is the total number of customer assistance calls for the state since MCC maintains regional rather than state specific call centers.

**Q. Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?**

**A.** Yes.

---

<sup>3</sup> After filtering out items representing non-phone products, the number of phone repair commitments met is 1351 or 97.5% “commitments met” rate.