

Exhibit No.:

Issue(s):

Witness/Type of Exhibit:

Sponsoring Party:

Case No.:

ETC Designation Meisenheimer/ Supplemental Rebuttal Public Counsel TO-2006-0172

FILED

JUL 2 1 2006

Misseuri Public service Commission

SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER

Submitted on Behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel

APPLICATION OF MISSOURI RSA NO. 5 PARTNERSHIP FOR ETC DESIGNATION

CASE NO. TO-2006-0172

May 18, 2006

Exhibit No. Scase No(s). 10-2006-603

Date 6-22-06 Rptr +F

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Missouri RSA)	
No. 5 Partnership for Designation as a)	
Telecommunications Carrier Eligible for Federal)	Case No. TO-2006-0172
Universal Service Support Pursuant to 254 of the)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996)	

AFFIDAVIT OF BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	SS
COUNTY OF COLE)	

Barbara A. Meisenheimer, of lawful age and being first duly sworn, deposes and states:

- 1. My name is Barbara A. Meisenheimer. I am Chief Utility Economist for the Office of the Public Counsel.
- 2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my supplemental rebuttal testimony consisting of pages 1 through 3.
- 3. I hereby swear and affirm that my statements contained in the attached testimony are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Barbara A. Meisenheimer

Subscribed and sworn to me this 18th day of May 2006.

JERENE A. BUCKMAN My Commission Expires August 10, 2009 Cole County Commission #05754036

Joiene A. Buckman Notary Public

My Commission expires August 10, 2009.

1	SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2	OF
3	BARBARA MEISENHEIMER
4	CASE NO. TO-2006-0172
5	APPLICATION OF MISSOURI RSA 5 PARTNERSHIP
6	FOR ETC STATUS
7	
8	Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
9	A. Barbara A. Meisenheimer, Chief Utility Economist, Office of the Public Counsel,
10	P. O. 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
11	Q. Have you testified previously in this case?
12	A. Yes, I filed rebuttal testimony on May, 9, 2006.
13	Q. WHAT INFORMATION DID YOU REVIEW IN PREPARATION OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
14	A. I reviewed the supplemental direct testimony of James Simon and Jonathan
15	Reeves filed on behalf of Missouri RSA No. Partnership (MO5 or Company).
16	Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
17	A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to the Company's supplemental direct
18	testimony.
19	Q. DOES PUBLIC COUNSEL CURRENTLY SUPPORT THE COMPANY'S APPLICATION
20	FOR ETC STATUS?
21	A. No. Based on the information and commitments received to date, as reflected in
22	the Company's Application, direct testimony and supplemental direct testimony,
23	Public Counsel cannot support granting MO5 ETC status. Although the Company
24	has undated its testimony to be more consistent with the Commission's proposed

ETC rule and has submitted additional detailed information consistent with the proposed rule, the supplemental testimony does not address or diminish the following concerns raised in my May 9, 2006, rebuttal testimony:

- The terms and conditions of the Company's Lifefine and Link-Up proposals are not fully described and there is no assurance that the Company's rates and terms of service will not change adverse to the customer's interest once the Company gains PSC approval.
- The supplemental testimony does not address whether the Company will commit to inform prospective Lifeline customers of the price of the lowest cost available handset.
- The supplemental testimony does not correct the misleading comparison of Lifeline rates I identified in Appendix K to the direct testimony of James Simon.
- The supplemental testimony does not demonstrate that the ILEC equivalent plan is equivalent in terms of price or terms of service to the ILECs' basic local services.
 - The supplemental testimony does not identify any equipment change fees, term commitments, early termination fees, or credit check that may be a condition of service for the Lifeline and ILEC equivalent plans.
 - Regarding calling scopes, the supplemental testimony does not address how its services compare to mandatory expanded basic local services such as traditional EAS or Mark Twain's company-wide calling scopes. It is still unclear whether toll and roaming charges will apply to calls to and from traditionally toll free areas.

 Resale is not identified among the methods listed on page 13 of Mr. Simon's supplemental direct testimony as an option for serving currently unserved areas; however, resale is mentioned on page 17. It is still unclear whether the Company is adequately prepared to utilize resale as an option for serving customers in a timely manner.

Q. WITH REGARD TO THE PROPOSED ETC RULES' LIMITS RELATED TO CUSTOMER FUNDED CONSTRUCTION, SHOULD THE COMPANY BE REQUIRED TO COMPLY?

A. It would serve the public interest for MO5 to limit customers' contributions to construction or extensions. That limit should be no more than the amount the relevant ILEC charges. Despite a tariff provision, many incumbents currently do not charge customers for line extensions or other construction necessary to provide service. Instead, the ILEC absorbs those costs, recovering them through normal rates and universal service support. MO5 should commit to do the same.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.