Exhibit No.:

Issues:

314 & 816 Area Codes

Witness:

Walt Cecil

Sponsoring Party:

MO PSC

Type of Exhibit:

Surrebuttal Testimony

Case No.:

TO-2000-374

FILED<sup>2</sup>

JUL 1 2 2000

# Missouri Public Missouri Missouri

## SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISION

**OF** 

**WALT CECIL** 

**CASE NO. TO-2000-374** 

Jefferson City, Missouri July 12, 2000

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY		
2		OF		
3		WALT CECIL		
4		IN		
5	!	CASE NO. TO-2000-374		
6				
7	Q.	Please state your name and give your business address.		
8	A.	My name is Walt Cecil. My business address is Truman State Office Building,		
9		Room 530, 301 W. High St., P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360.		
10				
11	Q.	Are you the same Walt Cecil who filed direct and rebuttal testimony in this		
12		case?		
13	A.	Yes, I am.		
14				
15	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony today?		
16	A.	The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the rebuttal testimony of		
17		Ms. Barbara Meisenheimer from the Office of the Public Counsel (OPC).		
18				
19	Q. What portion of Ms. Meisenheimer's rebuttal testimony do you wish to			
20		address?		
21	A.	I wish to address Ms. Meisenheimer's comments in which she urges the		
22		Commission to proceed with number pooling trials as soon as possible.		
23				

#### Q. Do you agree with Ms. Meisenheimer?

- A. No, I have some concerns with her position. Although number pooling should enhance number conservation efforts, the potential benefit that a state commission may expect from an attempted pooling trial may be significantly minimized given the pending federal action on number pooling. Considerable amounts of time and resources will need to be expended by the State to implement such a trial in advance of the federal directive. I am concerned that such efforts will not allow number pooling to be implemented sufficiently ahead of any federal efforts to make the benefits worth the costs. Additionally, I am concerned about the State's ability to establish a trial that will be consistent with the federal plan.
- Q. Do you think that Missouri could implement number pooling significantly in advance of a federal directive to implement number pooling?
- A. The answer to this question depends upon when the FCC announces the selection of a national pooling administrator which may be in September 2000, and on whether or not the FCC grants the Commission's petition for delegated authority to conduct such a trial. If authority is granted and if the FCC does choose a pooling administrator around September, it is difficult for me to see how any state commission could initiate a state sponsored number pooling trial which would commence significantly before the federal plan. Any state pooling trial plan would have to address many technical and cost recovery issues. It is possible that the resolution of some of those issues may take several months. Such an effort may be questionable if ultimately a state initiated pooling trial is

implemented only a few months in advance of the federal rollout.

Q. Why are you concerned about the consistency between state and federal pooling decisions.

- A. The state sponsored pooling trials must conform to the federal mandate when the federal pooling effort commences. There are many issues that have not been decided by the FCC so the states cannot determine with certainty how to proceed with their own trials. Some of the issues that I am concerned with are which data base software management system to use and how to recover costs. The FCC has not yet determined which costs are eligible for recovery so the issue of over- or under-recovery is a real one.
- Q. Are there any other factors the Commission should consider before making a decision about proceeding with a number pooling trial?
- A. Number pooling may be costly to implement. The pooling administrator will need to be compensated for its efforts in evaluating and verifying forecasts and requests for NXXs, maintaining the pool of NXXs, and when required, initiating reclamation procedures.

The Commission may find it difficult to impose a satisfactory cost recovery mechanism. Likely choices for cost recovery would include increasing switched access rates and a special line item on the end user's bill. If the cost of pooling is substantial, it is likely that the State's cost recovery mechanism would have to

#### Case No.TO-2000-374 Walt Cecil

1		remain in effect even after the deployment of the federal pooling program to
2		recover all of the costs involved in the State's pooling trial.
3		
4	Q.	In summary, what is your recommendation regarding number pooling?
5	Α.	Given Missouri's circumstances, number pooling would be appropriate only if
6		deployed with a NPA relief plan. Otherwise, the benefits of a stand-alone state
7		sponsored number pooling trial may not be worth the cost of such a trial.
8		
9	Q.	Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony at this time?
10	A.	Yes, it does.
	D .	

### BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In The Matter Of The N Numbering Plan Administra Of The Missouri Telec Industry, Petition For App Relief Plan For The 314 Codes.	tor, On Behalf ommunications roval Of NPA	) Case No. TO-2000-374
	AFFIDAVIT	OF WALT CECIL
STATE OF MISSOURI	)	
COUNTY OF COLE	) ss )	
•		him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth ue to the best of his knowledge and belief.  Walt Cecil
Subscribed and sworn to be	fore me this <u>12</u> '	day of July, 2000.
		Notary Public
My commission expires	October 14	4, 2003
		NILA S HAGEMEYER NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF MISSON

NILA S HAGEMEYER NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF MISSOURI COLE COUNTY MY COMMISSION EXP. OCT. 14,2000