

Exhibit No.:  
Issue: Policy  
Witness: Arthur P. Martinez  
Sponsoring Party: CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC  
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal  
Case No.: TE-2006-0053  
Date Testimony Prepared: April 7, 2006

**CENTURYTEL OF MISSOURI, LLC**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY  
OF  
ARTHUR P. MARTINEZ**

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

MAY 16 2006

Missouri Public  
Service Commission

**CASE NO. TE-2006-0053**

---

EXHIBIT NO. 5  
Date 4-17-06 Case No. TE-2006-0053  
Reporter PF

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

In the Matter of the Request of Southwestern )  
Bell Telephone, L.P., d/b/a AT&T Missouri, )  
for a Waiver of Certain Requirements of )  
4 CSR 240-29.040(4). )


**Case No. TE-2006-0053**

**AFFIDAVIT OF ARTHUR P. MARTINEZ**


**STATE OF MISSOURI** )  
 ) ss  
**COUNTY OF COLE** )

I, Arthur P. Martinez, of lawful age and being duly sworn, state:

1. I am presently Director of Government Relations for CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC and Spectra Communications Group, LLC d/b/a CenturyTel.
2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Rebuttal 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 knowledge and belief.


  
Arthur P. Martinez

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2006.

  
Mary Siemons – Notary Public

My commission expires

July 8, 2008



1                                   **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

2   **OF**

3                                   **ARTHUR P. MARTINEZ**

4                                   **CASE NO. TE-2006-0053**

5

6   **Identification of Witness**

7   **Q.    Please state your name and business address.**

8   A.    My name is Arthur P. Martinez. My business address is 220 Madison  
9          Street, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.

10   **I.**

11   **BACKGROUND**

12   **Q.    Please state your current job title and identify on whose behalf you**  
13          **are testifying in this proceeding.**

14   A.    I am the Director of Government Relations for CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC  
15          and Spectra Communications Group, LLC d/b/a CenturyTel. The  
16          Commission's Order Adding Parties and Directing Filing entered in this  
17          matter on September 12, 2005, made CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC a party  
18          to this case and I am testifying on its behalf. However, my testimony is  
19          applicable to Spectra Communications Group, LLC d/b/a CenturyTel as  
20          well, and I will collectively refer to both companies as "CenturyTel" unless  
21          distinguishing between the two is necessary for context.

22   **Q.    Please describe your primary responsibilities as Director of**  
23          **Government Relations for CenturyTel.**

1 A. As CenturyTel's Director of Government Relations I oversee both  
2 regulatory and legislative affairs in the State of Missouri.

3 **Q. Please describe your educational background and**  
4 **business/regulatory experience.**

5 A. I graduated from New Mexico State University with a Bachelor of Business  
6 Administration with a major in Managerial Finance, and a Masters of Arts  
7 Degree in Economics with an emphasis in Regulatory Economics. I  
8 began my telecommunications career in 1993 as a staff member with the  
9 Telecommunications Division of the New Mexico State Corporation  
10 Commission ("NMSCC").<sup>1</sup> After leaving the NMSCC, I worked for two  
11 independent rural telephone companies in positions ranging from  
12 Operations Manager to that of General Manager; my duties at both  
13 companies included regulatory and legislative affairs. I have been  
14 employed by CenturyTel for four years, working first in Colorado and now  
15 in Missouri. I previously have testified in a number of regulatory  
16 proceedings before this Commission.

17 **II.**

18 **PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

19 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

20 A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to portions of the direct  
21 testimony presented in this proceeding addressing what has been

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1999 the New Mexico State Corporation Commission was combined with the New Mexico Public Utilities Commission to form the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission.

1 identified as the issue in the first phase of this case: "Does Commission  
2 Rule 4 CSR 240-29.040(4) require the originating tandem carrier to  
3 include the Calling Party Number (CPN) as part of the Category 11-01-XX  
4 billing record that it provides for wireless-originated calls that transit the  
5 LEC-to-LEC network and terminate to other LECs?"

6 **Q. Is the direct testimony of the witnesses addressing the requirements**  
7 **of the subject rule uniform in interpretation?**

8 A. Absolutely not. The Commission Staff and Southwestern Bell Telephone,  
9 L.P., d/b/a AT&T Missouri ("AT&T Missouri") Witnesses conclude that the  
10 rule does not contain such a requirement, while the Small Telephone  
11 Company Group and Missouri Independent Telephone Group Witness  
12 advocates that such a requirement exists.

13 **Q. Is CenturyTel referenced in the prefiled Direct Testimony?**

14 A. Yes. In Mr. Read's testimony on behalf of AT&T Missouri, he states that  
15 CPN is not provided in the billing records associated with wireless-  
16 originated traffic in any of the AT&T states. He goes on to state: "I  
17 understand from recent workshops in Missouri that Sprint Missouri (which  
18 soon will be known as Embarq) and CenturyTel also currently follow this  
19 process."

20 I want to clarify for the Commission that CPN is not provided in the  
21 CenturyTel billing records associated with wireless originated traffic.  
22 CenturyTel follows the same practice as AT&T Missouri by placing the  
23 BTN in the calling number field.

1   **Q.    Has CenturyTel participated in the workshops in Missouri, as**  
2       **referenced in Mr. Read's statement?**

3    A.    Yes, and I have personally participated on its behalf.  As I noted in a  
4       previous answer, in its September 12, 2005 Order the Commission found  
5       that Sprint Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Sprint and CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC  
6       were necessary parties to this case and, therefore, made them parties and  
7       directed them to file pleadings explaining why they are or are not affected  
8       by the subject rule.  CenturyTel's response in September 2005 specifically  
9       referenced the continuing staff/industry workshops.

10           CenturyTel has participated in an initial industry workshop,  
11           facilitated by the Commission Staff, addressing issues  
12           related to the current waiver granted to Southwestern Bell  
13           Telephone, L.P. d/b/a SBC Missouri in Case No. TX-2003-  
14           0301, and will be participating in a follow-up workshop now  
15           scheduled for November 1, 2005.  Accordingly, the extent to  
16           which CenturyTel may be directly affected by the subject rule  
17           is still under review.  CenturyTel anticipates that the issues  
18           under discussion may be clarified at the November 1, 2005  
19           meeting.

20  
21       As evidenced by this very proceeding, there is still uncertainty as to  
22       whether the subject rule/identified issue has a direct impact on  
23       CenturyTel.

24           I also would note that the Rule's provisions allow carriers to  
25       mutually agree to exchange other types of billing records.<sup>2</sup>  CenturyTel  
26       has not been approached by either Peace Valley Telephone Company or  
27       Alltel Missouri, Inc., the only two independent incumbent local exchange

---

<sup>2</sup> 4 CSR 240-29.040(4)(B).

1 companies subtending CenturyTel's network, regarding any changes to  
2 the billing records historically utilized.

3 Q. **Does this conclude your testimony?**

4 A. Yes it does.

5