

# EXHIBIT

Exhibit No.:  
Issue(s): ETC Designation  
Witness/Type of Exhibit: Meisenheimer/  
Supplemental Rebuttal  
Sponsoring Party: Public Counsel  
Case No.: TO-2006-0172

FILED

JUL 21 2006

Missouri 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. 8  
Case No(s) TO-2006-0172  
Date 6-22-06 Rptr KF





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

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

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

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

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

14          **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

15          A. Yes, it does.