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 Section 254 of the
Telecommunications Act of 1996.)

FILED

NOV 1 0 2003

PREHEARING CONFERENCE Missouri
Public Service Commission

Thursday, October 1, 2003
Governor Office Building
200 Madison Street
Room 305
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

BEFORE:

JUDGE NANCY DIPPELL

Reported by:

JOANN RENEE RICHARDSON
Bredeman & Associates, Inc.
311 Jackson Street
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

1

APPEARANCES:

For Spectra Communications Group/Centurytel:

LARRY W. DORITY
Attorney at Law
Fischer & Dority, P.C.
101 Madison Street, Suite 400
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
tel: (573) 636-6758

For Mid-Missouri Cellular Telephone Co.:

PAUL DeFORD
Attorney at Law
Lathop & Gage
2345 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
tel: (816) 292-2000

For Alma Telephone Co.:

LISA CHASE
Attorney at Law
Andereck, Evans, Milne, Peace & Johnson
700 E. Capitol
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
tel: (573) 634-3422

For Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission:

MARC POSTON
Attorney at Law
Missouri Public Service Commission
200 Madison Street
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
tel: (573) 751-8701

For OPC:

MICHAEL DANDINO
Attorney at Law
Office of Public Counsel
P. O. Box 2800
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

tel: (573) 751-5559

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

APPEARANCES:

For Sprint Missouri, Inc., Sprint Spectrum:

PAUL H. GARDNER
Attorney at Law
Goller, Gardner & Feather
131 E. High Street
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
tel: (573) 635-6187

For Citizens Telephone Company of Higginsville, Mo:

SONDRA B. MORGAN
Attorney at Law
Brydon, Swearengen & England
312 East Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
tel: (573) 635-7166

EXHIBIT INSTRUCTIONS:

No exhibits marked.

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
Hearing convened by Judge Dippell	5
Roll call	5
Discussion on witnesses	. 7
Hearing concluded	. 10
Reporter's Certificate	11

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE DIPPELL: Let's go ahead and go on the record. This is Case No. TO-2003-0531: In the Matter of the Application of Missouri RSA No. 7 Limited Partnership doing business as Mid-Missouri Cellular for Designation as a Telecommunications Company Carrier Eligible for Federal Universal Service Support Pursuant to Section 254 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

My name is Nancy Dippell. I'm the judge assigned to this matter, and I have asked you all to come today for a prehearing conference, and we'd like to begin with entries of appearance. The attorneys have all made written entries, so I'll just ask you to state your name and the party that you're representing. Let's just start over against the wall.

MR. GARDNER: Paul H. Gardner. I'm with Goller, Gardner & Feather, appearing on behalf of Sprint Missouri, Inc., and Sprint Spectrum d/b/a Sprint PCS.

MR. DeFORD: Paul DeFord with Lathop & Gage, appearing on behalf of the applicant, Mid-Missouri Cellular.

MR. POSTON: Marc Poston, appearing for the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission.

MS. MORGAN: Sondra Morgan and Trip England of the law firm Brydon, Swearengen & England, appearing on behalf of Citizens Telephone Company of Higginsville,

23

24

25

Missouri.

MS. CHASE: Lisa Chase with the law firm

Andereck, Evans, Milne, Peace & Johnson, appearing on behalf

of Alma Telephone Company.

MR. DORITY: Larry Dority with Fischer and Dority, P.C., appearing on behalf of Spectra Communications Group, LLC, doing business as Centurytel and Centurytel of Missouri, LLC.

MR. DANDINO: Michael Dandino, appearing on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. It looks like everybody is here. And I did request that you file proposed procedural schedules due next week on the eighth. I expect that since this is a new proceeding before the commission, you all might want to discuss that at some length, how you think this case should go forward, and make suggestions to me so that I can have a little guidance on that. And I'd like to ask if anybody has been involved with this kind of proceeding in another state?

MR. DeFCRD: I'm actually involved in a proceeding in Kansas, but it's not as far along as this one here.

JUDGE DIPPELL: So no help there as far as proceedings in another state. I thought I might \wp e able to learn from other state's mistakes.

1	MR. DeFORD: I will have witnesses that have
2	been in other states.
3	JUDGE DIPPELL: That's my next question, is
4	about the types and numbers of witnesses. I'll start with
5	you, Mr. DeFord.
6	MR. DeFORD: I'll only have two witnesses at
7	least from my direct case. Depending upon what I see in
8	rebuttle, I may have to add a witness and insert a couple.
9	JUDGE DIPPELL: How long would you expect
10	those witnesses to need at the hearing?
11	MR. DeFORD: I would think no longer than a
12	day.
13	JUDGE DIPPELL: I guess you probably wouldn't
14	know because they would be under cross, wouldn't they.
15	What about the intervenors? Do you all have
16	any idea yet as to how many witnesses you might have?
17	MS. MORGAN: We will probably have two
18	witnesses, Your Honor. I'm not sure how long it would take
19	with them. It depends on, of course, what we hear from
20	Mid-Missouri.
21	MR. DORITY: Your Honor, I believe we will
22	have only one to two witnesses and these witnesses will have
23	been like Mr. DeFord's, these witnesses will have been
24	involved in another state's proceedings.
25	JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Dandino?

1	MR. DANDINO: Public counsel will only have
2	one witness and I really couldn't estimate how long it would
3	be. I wouldn't imagine it would be more than half a day,
4	though.
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Chase?
6	MS. CHASE: Alma Telephone Company would
7	likely have two witnesses, possibly one or two. But I
8	anticipate that one would be a shared witness with Ms.
9	Morgan.
10	JUDGE DIPPELL: So I'm hearing maybe
11	somewhere between, like, three days to a week even for a
12	hearing. I would hope it wouldn't have to take that long,
13	but it sounds like quite a few witnesses, depending on what
14	you all get worked out amongst yourselves ahead of time.
15	How quickly do you all anticipate I know
16	the commissioner's calendar is really booked up; but setting
17	that aside and pretending that's not so, how quickly would
18	you all anticipate having a hearing?
19	Mr. DeFord, what is the schedule Mid-Missouri
20	is having?
21	MR. DeFORD: We're prepared to file our
22	direct case within two weeks, so by October 15th we could
23	have our direct case in order.
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: And do the intervenors have
25	any handle on how quickly they might be prepared to respond?

MR. ENGLAND: Your Honor, I'm Trip England. I'll speak on behalf of Citizens. I would imagine that we would need at least 30 days after the testimony, direct testimony is filed, for purposes of rebuttle. Obviously, we'll want to do some discovery. And as you're well aware, the commission rules allow 20 days for data requests, at least responses to data requests, so I expect that we need at least 30.

My personal problem with hearings later this year are the water company rate cases that are sandwiched around the Christmas holidays. We've got seven days of hearings before Christmas and five after the new year, so that's going to prove to be problematic for me for purposes of trying this case. I know the commission itself is going to have quite a few hearings even beyond that, so I think the hearing days may be the real problem.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Well, obviously the rate cases by statute have to be given priority, but I believe the commission in the beginning of this was anxious to move this case along, too, so we'll have to see how that shakes out, and I'll let you all compare your calendars and discuss that without -- you know, we don't need to do that on the record.

I just wanted to get some idea if you had some concept that -- some of you are involved in some of the rate

cases, and there are several rate cases on the calendar. Those tend to -- some of those tend to settle and go away and free up space at later times, so we'll keep our fingers

Are there any other procedural matters that you all would like to address or substantive matters that you would like to address on the record?

(No response.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. I will leave you all to discuss what you think the procedures will look like in this case and what the schedules are going to look like and any issues, if you have any discovery issues that you know are going to be problematic, I encourage you to go ahead and get those taken care of right now and let me know if you need anything else. Mr. England?

MR. ENGLAND: Your Honor, would it be possible to get, perhaps, a calendar of the commission's

Sure. I'll print you up a calendar and bring it back down for you.

Anything else? I will go off the record, then. Thank you.

[WHEREUPON, this hearing is concluded.]

24

20

21

22

23

25

CERTIFICATE

I, Joann Renee Richardson, a Certified Court
Reporter of the firm of Bredeman & Associates, Inc.,
Shorthand Reporters, do hereby certify that I was employed
by the Public Service Commission to record verbatim, by
machine shorthand, the proceedings herein and thereby became
the official reporter for the hearing in this matter; that I
was personally present at said hearing and reported said
proceedings; that the machine shorthand notes so made at the
time and place mentioned on the title page hereof were
transcribed by means of computer-aided transcription, and
the foregoing 11 pages constitute a true, complete and
accurate transcript of my said machine shorthand notes.

Given at my office in the City of Rolla, County of Phelps, State of Missouri, this 5th day of November, 2003.

Joann Renee Richardson, CCR Certified Court Reporter