Exhibit No.: Issue: 28, 30 and 32 Witness: Amy Hankins Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony Sponsoring Party: Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC Case No.: TO-2009-0037 Date Testimony Prepared: September 30, 2008

)

)

)

)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Petition of Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC for Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement Between CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC And Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC.

Case No. TO-2009-0037

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF AMY HANKINS ON BEHALF OF CHARTER FIBERLINK-MISSOURI, LLC

September 30, 2008

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

)

)

)

)

In the Matter of the Petition of Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC for Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement Between CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC And Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC.

Case No. TO-2009-0037

AFFIDAVIT OF AMY HANKINS

STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss.COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS)

Amy Hankins, being first duly sworn on her oath, states:

1. My name is Amy Hankins. I am presently Director of Telephone Service Delivery for Charter Communications.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my direct 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 personal knowledge, information and belief.

Subscribed and sworn before me this 30° day of September, 2008.

emin SChancellow

Notary Public for Tama S Chancellor Gounty, Missouri My Commission State of Missouri County of Franklin

My Commission Expires 03/21/2010 Commission #06503855

Affidavit for Hankins Direct Testimony (TO-2009-0037) (3).DOC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Purpose and Summary of Testimony	3
III.	Issue 28 : Should CenturyTel be entitled to monitor, and audit Charter's use of OSS Systems which Charter may use to make a service request, or similar request of CenturyTel?	4
IV.	Issue 30 : What information regarding directory close dates is CenturyTel required to provide Charter, and in what manner?	9
V.	Issue 32 : How should the Agreement define each Party's respective directory assistance obligations under Section 251(b)(3)?	12
VI.	Conclusion	15

1		I. INTRODUCTION
2 3	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
4	A.	My name is Amy Hankins. My business address is 12405 Powerscourt Drive, St.
5		Louis, Missouri 63131.
6		
7 8 9	Q.	BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED, WHAT IS YOUR POSITION, AND WHAT ARE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN THAT POSITION?
10	А.	I am employed by Charter Communications, Inc. as Director of Telephone
11		Service Delivery. In that role my responsibilities include running the Charter
12		back office teams which include; Quality Control, Third Party Verification, Local
13		Number Portability, E911, Telephone Help Desk, Switch Provisioning and Day of
14		Install Support. Various aspects of my responsibilities include administration,
15		operations, technical support, outsourcer management, and various escalations. I
16		have held this position for four and a half years and have been deeply involved in
17		Charter's launch and support of telephone services and operations.
18		
19 20 21 22	Q.	WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YOUR EMPLOYER, CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS AND CHARTER FIBERLINK, LLC, THE PETITIONER IN THIS ARBITRATION DOCKET?
23	А.	Charter Communications, Inc. is a major national multi-system cable television
24		operator that provides cable television and broadband internet access services in
25		various parts the United States, including parts of Missouri. The Charter
26		Fiberlink companies of which Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC is one, are
27		wholly-owned subsidiaries of Charter Communications that provide facilities
28		based local exchange services and resold interexchange services to customers

1		using facilities and services obtained from the Charter Communications cable
2		television companies. Charter Fiberlink offers force communication services
3		primarily to residential customers and has recently begun offering such services to
4		small business customers in some of its service areas. For the sake of brevity, I
5		refer to Charter Communications and the Charter Fiberlink companies,
6		specifically including Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC, which provides local
7		exchange services in Missouri, as "Charter" throughout my testimony.
8		
9 10	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND WORK EXPERIENCE.
11 12	A.	I have a B.S. in Communications Management from Missouri State University
13		(formerly Southwest Missouri State University) and fourteen years of telephone
14		operations experience. Before working at Charter, I was a Provisioning
15		Supervisor with Brooks Fibercom, a Provisioning Manager with Everest
16		Connects, and a Business Consultant with GLA International.
17		
18 19	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE ANY STATE REGULATORY COMMISSION?
20 21	A.	I recently filed both written Direct and Rebuttal Testimony in Minnesota
22		Frontier/Charter arbitration proceeding, MPUC Docket No. P-5535, 407, 405/M-
23		08-643. However, because the Parties reached settlement, I was not required to
24		appear.
25		
26		

1 2		II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY
3	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
4	A.	This testimony is offered to explain Charter's position on disputed issues
5		numbered 28, 30 and 32 of this arbitration.
6		
7	Q.	DO YOU OFFER TESTIMONY ON OTHER DISPUTED ISSUES?
8	A.	No. My colleagues and experts from QSI Consulting will be submitting separate
9		testimony on other issues.
10		
11	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.
12	A.	In my testimony I will explain, for Issue 28, the extent to which CenturyTel
13		should be permitted to "monitor" and "audit" Charter's use of CenturyTel's OSS
14		systems. I will then explain, for Issue 30, what obligations CenturyTel should
15		assume with respect to the provision of information concerning directory close
16		dates. Finally, I will offer testimony on Issue 32 that explains how the agreement
17		should establish each party's respective directory assistance obligations, and I will
18		illustrate the need for providing clarity in the agreement as it pertains to these
19		obligations by discussing the various problems that Charter has recently
20		encountered due to the absence of such precise obligations.
21		

2 **ISSUE 28:** III. SHOULD CENTURYTEL BE ENTITLED TO MONITOR, AND AUDIT, 3 CHARTER'S USE OF OSS SYSTEMS WHICH CHARTER MAY USE TO 4 MAKE A SERVICE REQUEST, OR OTHER SIMILAR REQUEST OF 5 **CENTURYTEL?** 6 7 8 **Q**. PLEASE EXPLAIN CHARTER'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE. 9 10 Charter's position is that CenturyTel should only be permitted to "monitor" and A. 11 "audit" Charter's use of the CenturyTel OSS systems if, and only if, CenturyTel 12 first defines what it means to "monitor" and "audit" Charter's use of the OSS. So, 13 let me be clear, Charter does not object, in principle, to CenturyTel's basic right 14 to monitor Charter's use of the system. But CenturyTel has refused to describe, 15 or define, its monitoring and audit activities for the agreement. So Charter simply 16 seeks some reasonable, and explicit, parameters surrounding how CenturyTel 17 would propose to monitor and audit Charter's use of the system. 18 19 PLEASE PROVIDE CHARTER'S PROPOSED LANGUAGE ON THIS 20 **Q**. **ISSUE.** 21 22 Charter's proposed language is as follows: 23 A. 24 25 8.3 Unless sooner terminated or suspended in accordance with the Agreement or this Article (including, but not limited to, Article III, Sections 2.0 26 and 9.0 of the Agreement and Section 11.1 below), **CLEC's access to 27 CenturyTel OSS Information through CenturyTel OSS Services shall terminate 28 upon the expiration or termination of the Agreement. 29 CenturyTel shall have the right (but not the obligation) to ascertain 30 8.3.1 31 whether **CLEC is complying with the requirements of Applicable Law and this Agreement with regard to **CLEC's access to, and use and disclosure of, 32 CenturyTel OSS Information. 33 34 35 8.3.2 Without in any way limiting any other rights CenturyTel may have under the Agreement or Applicable Law, CenturyTel may, upon CLEC's consent, 36 monitor **CLEC's access to and use of CenturyTel OSS Information which is 37 made available by CenturyTel to **CLEC pursuant to this Agreement, to 38

1

ascertain whether **CLEC is complying with the requirements of Applicable 1 2 Law and this Agreement, with regard to **CLEC's access to, and use and disclosure of, such CenturyTel OSS Information. The foregoing right shall 3 include, but not be limited to, the right (but not the obligation) to electronically 4 monitor **CLEC's access to and use of CenturyTel OSS Information which is 5 made available by CenturyTel to **CLEC through CenturyTel OSS Facilities. 6 7 8.3.3 Information obtained by CenturyTel pursuant to this Section 8.0 shall be treated by CenturyTel as Confidential Information of **CLEC pursuant to 8 9 Section 14.0, Article III of the Agreement; provided that, CenturyTel may, upon CLEC's consent, use and disclose information obtained by CenturyTel pursuant 10 11 to this Article to enforce CenturyTel's rights under the Agreement or Applicable 12 Law. 13 PLEASE PROVIDE CENTURYTEL'S LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE. 14 **Q**. 15 16 A. CenturyTel's proposed language is as follows: 17 8.3 Unless sooner terminated or suspended in accordance with the 18 19 Agreement or this Article (including, but not limited to, Article III, Sections 2.0 and 9.0 of the Agreement and Section 11.1 below), **CLEC's access to 20 CenturyTel OSS Information through CenturyTel OSS Services shall terminate 21 22 upon the expiration or termination of the Agreement. 23 8.3.1 CenturyTel shall have the right (but not the obligation) to audit **CLEC 24 to ascertain whether **CLEC is complying with the requirements of Applicable 25 Law and this Agreement with regard to **CLEC's access to, and use and disclosure of, CenturyTel OSS Information. 26 Without in any way limiting any other rights CenturyTel may have under 27 8.3.2 the Agreement or Applicable Law, CenturyTel shall have the right (but not the 28 29 obligation) to monitor **CLEC's access to and use of CenturyTel OSS Information which is made available by CenturyTel to **CLEC pursuant to this 30 31 Agreement, to ascertain whether **CLEC is complying with the requirements of Applicable Law and this Agreement, with regard to **CLEC's access to, and use 32 33 and disclosure of, such CenturyTel OSS Information. The foregoing right shall 34 include, but not be limited to, the right (but not the obligation) to electronically monitor **CLEC's access to and use of CenturyTel OSS Information which is 35 made available by CenturyTel to **CLEC through CenturyTel OSS Facilities. 36 37 8.3.3 Information obtained by CenturyTel pursuant to this Section 8.0 shall be treated by CenturyTel as Confidential Information of **CLEC pursuant to 38 39 Section 14.0, Article III of the Agreement; provided that, CenturyTel shall have the right (but not the obligation) to use and disclose information obtained by 40 CenturyTel pursuant to this Article to enforce CenturyTel's rights under the 41 42 Agreement or Applicable Law. 43 44 45 46

Q. HOW DOES CHARTER'S POSITION DIFFER FROM CENTURYTEL'S 1 2 **POSITION?**

4 A. CenturyTel believes that it should have unfettered, and undefined, rights to audit 5 and monitor Charter's use of the OSS. Although CenturyTel has insisted that it have the right to "monitor" and "audit" Charter's access to this system, it has 6 7 refused to define those actions. Other than a single sentence at the end of Section 8 8.3.2, Article X, CenturyTel has not stated in the contract precisely what it means when it says that it will "monitor" and "audit" Charter's access to this system. 9 10 CenturyTel's refusal to explain, or define, the scope of their monitor and audit activities concerns us. 11

Q. 12

PLEASE EXPLAIN.

A. This dispute is not really about whether CenturyTel should have the right to 14 monitor and audit Charter's use of the OSS. Charter acknowledges that the OSS 15 16 is CenturyTel's system, and that it has the right to ensure that the system is used properly. Indeed, in Sections 7 and 8 of Article X of the agreement, Charter has 17 already agreed to a number of provisions which protect the integrity of 18 19 CenturyTel's OSS, and which ensure that Charter uses the system properly, as intended. 20

21

26

13

3

22 0. SO THE DISPUTE IS NOT ABOUT WHETHER CENTURYTEL CAN AUDIT AND MONITOR CHARTER'S USE OF THE OSS, BUT SIMPLY 23 HOW CENTURYTEL WILL AUDIT AND MONITOR CHARTER'S USE 24 **OF THE OSS?** 25

27 A. Yes, exactly. The dispute is really about *how* CenturyTel will monitor and audit 28 Charter's use of the OSS. As I noted, CenturyTel has refused to explain what

6

1	actions it would take to monitor and audit Charter's use. Without an explanation
2	of what CenturyTel means by "audit" and "monitor," Charter can not reasonably
3	be asked to agree to CenturyTel's language unconditionally.

- 4
- 5 6

7

Q. COULD YOU PLEASE PROVIDE THE CONTEXT FOR THIS DISPUTE. HOW DOES CHARTER USE CENTURYTEL'S OSS?

8 A. Yes. Charter uses the CenturyTel OSS to engage in activities necessary to 9 compete with CenturyTel in those areas where CenturyTel is the incumbent 10 provider. For example, when competing for a subscriber Charter will sometimes pose a customer records search request to CenturyTel through the OSS. The 11 purpose of this request is to obtain basic customer information (name, address, 12 telephone number) so that Charter can provide competing voice service to the 13 Or, Charter may also submit a request to port the subscriber's 14 customer. 15 telephone number from CenturyTel's network to Charter's network. Such a request would usually be submitted through the CenturyTel OSS system. 16

17

18 19

20 21

Q. WHY WOULD IT BE PROBLEMATIC IF CENTURYTEL HAS UNFETTERED, AND UNDEFINED, RIGHTS TO MONITOR CHARTER'S USE OF THE OSS?

A. The potential problem is that CenturyTel might use these unrestricted rights to monitor and audit Charter's use of the OSS for CenturyTel's own competitive advantage. If left undefined, the contractual right to "monitor" Charter's use of the OSS could be construed as involving any number of activities associated with Charter's use of the OSS to obtain information, or make requests, necessary for Charter to offer its competitive services. For example, CenturyTel might believe

1	that its right to "monitor" Charter's use of the OSS gives CenturyTel the right to
2	track every Charter request for number porting, and to use that information to
3	initiate certain marketing programs intended to retain a customer. Obtaining, and
4	using, information derived from Charter's use of the OSS for CenturyTel's own
5	competitive purposes would be wrong.

6

7 8 9

10

Q. SO CHARTER'S CONCERN IS THAT CENTURYTEL COULD USE THESE UNDEFINED "MONITOR" AND "AUDIT" RIGHTS TO GAIN AN UNFAIR COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE?

11 A. Yes, exactly. To the extent that CenturyTel uses its rights to monitor and audit 12 Charter's use of the OSS as a means of gaining a competitive advantage, and 13 potentially Charter's proprietary information, that type of monitoring would be 14 improper. Of course, CenturyTel's activities could also be so invasive that they 15 hamper Charter's ability to conduct business in an efficient manner.

16 17

18

Q. HOW DOES CHARTER'S PROPOSAL ADDRESS THIS CONCERN?

19 A. Charter's proposed language would require that CenturyTel obtain Charter's consent before it initiates any actions to monitor or audit Charter's use of the 20 OSS. That does not guarantee that CenturyTel will not improperly use its "audit 21 and monitor" rights, but at least Charter would be aware of those occasions when 22 CenturyTel is taking such actions. Alternatively, CenturyTel could simply 23 provide additional information to Charter (and the Commission) concerning what 24 actions it takes to monitor and audit Charter's use of the OSS. Specifically, 25 CenturyTel could provide a more detailed explanation of what actions it takes to 26 monitor and audit another provider's use of the CenturyTel OSS. 27

<u>IV.</u> <u>ISSUE 30</u> WHAT INFORMATION REGARDING DIRECTORY CLOSE DATES IS CENTURYTEL REQUIRED TO PROVIDE CHARTER, AND IN WHAT MANNER?

6 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN CHARTER'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE.

A. As the incumbent provider, and the entity with the direct connection to the 8 directory publisher, CenturyTel should assume some basic obligations 9 surrounding the provision of information concerning directory close dates. 10 Specifically, CenturyTel should provide Charter information concerning the 11 publication schedules of the directories published in CenturyTel's service area. 12 Included in that schedule should be the name of the directory, the close date, and 13 where the close date has changed, both the original close date and the new close 14 15 date.

16

18

1

2

3

4 5

7

17 Q. WHAT IS A "CLOSE" DATE?

- 19 A. That is the deadline by which the directory publisher must have all information
- 20 that will be included in the directory that will be published for that area.

21

24

26 27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

Q. PLEASE PROVIDE CHARTER'S PROPOSED LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE.

25 A. Charter's proposed language is as follows:

2.1.2.3 <u>Directory Close Date</u>. CenturyTel shall provide **CLEC with publication schedules, including Directory close dates (and changes to those dates) for the Directories associated with the areas where Charter is providing local service. This publication information shall include the name of the directory, the close date, and, where the close date has changed, both the original close date and the new close date. Century Tel shall provide notification of changes in close dates in a format that specifically identifies the notification as relating to Directory publication. Where Charter has not

forwarded its flat file of listing information for a Directory to Century Tel 1 2 two weeks prior to the date that the listing information is due to the publisher, Century Tel will notify Charter. 3 4 PLEASE PROVIDE CENTURYTEL'S LANGUAGE ON THIS ISSUE. 5 **Q**. 6 7 A. CenturyTel's proposed language is as follows: 8 2.1.2.3 Directory Close Date. **CLEC must submit all listing information 9 intended for publication by the applicable Directory close date. CenturyTel shall 10 provide **CLEC with publication schedules, including Directory close dates for 11 12 the Directories associated with the areas where Charter is providing local service. 13 14 Q. HOW DOES CHARTER'S POSITION DIFFER FROM CENTURYTEL'S **POSITION?** 15 16 17 A. CenturyTel's position is that it should only be required to provide the bare minimum of information related to directories. Specifically, CenturyTel proposes 18 that it should only be required to provide the publication schedule, and close date, 19 for such directories. 20 21 WHY DOES CHARTER BELIEVE THAT THIS IS INADEQUATE? **O**. 22 23 A. CenturyTel's proposal is inadequate because it does not provide sufficient 24 information to Charter. In order to properly manage the process of including its 25 subscribers in the published directories in each service area, Charter seeks specific 26 information concerning the directory publication and close dates for each 27 directory publisher. Specifically, Charter must have the name of the directory, the 28 close date of the directory, and when the close date has changed, both the original 29 and new close dates. This level of detail will ensure that Charter can submit its 30 subscriber information for publication in all of the directories published in 31 CenturyTel's service areas. That is, obviously, a result that benefits all of the 32

parties involved in this process (the publisher, Charter, CenturyTel and of course
 the consumer who wants his or her information in the directory).

3

6

4Q.BUT DOESN'T CHARTER'S PROPOSAL REQUIRE CENTURYTEL TO5TAKE ACTIONS THAT ARE BEYOND ITS BASIC OBLIGATIONS?

A. I don't think so. And, more significantly, Charter's proposal simply requires
CenturyTel to take actions concerning information that CenturyTel has in its
possession. It is not unreasonable to ask CenturyTel to provide these dates,
especially when they have changed, to Charter. As I explained above, doing so
simply facilitates a more efficient process of publishing directories that are
accurate and complete.

13

16

14 Q. WHY SHOULD CENTURYTEL BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE THIS 15 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION?

CenturyTel's position as the incumbent provider, and as the entity that works 17 A. 18 most closely with the publisher in each area, means that it has a long-standing relationship with the publisher. Given this long-standing relationship it is safe to 19 assume that CenturyTel and the publisher have established processes for 20 21 exchanging information, and data, concerning the directory publication process and the inclusion of subscriber listings in that directory. Therefore, given the 22 long-standing relationship, and existing processes, CenturyTel is certainly in the 23 best position to provide to Charter the information concerning directory close 24 25 dates which Charter has requested.

26

ISSUE 32 1 V. 2 HOW SHOULD THE AGREEMENT DEFINE EACH PARTY'S **RESPECTIVE DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE OBLIGATIONS** 3 **UNDER SECTION 251(b)(3)?** 4 5 PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY CHARTER IS PROPOSING ITS LANGUAGE 6 **Q**. **REGARDING DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE OBLIGATIONS.** 7 8 A. Generally speaking, Charter wants to make sure that the contract clearly 9 establishes each party's respective obligations to ensure that each party's 10 11 subscribers can obtain correct basic listing information (i.e. name, phone number, and address) related to the other party's subscribers. In other words, Charter 12 wants to make sure that when CenturyTel subscribers dial the directory assistance 13 number and request the phone number of a Charter subscriber, that phone number 14 (or other relevant information) will be available. 15

16

18

17 Q. DOESN'T THAT HAPPEN ALREADY?

A. Well, it does happen now. But very recently this process was not working the
way it should, and Charter subscriber information was not made available to
CenturyTel subscribers seeking such information.

22

24

23 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

A. Charter has recently experienced very significant problems with certain failures in
 CenturyTel's directory assistance service. Specifically, under a prior
 arrangement, CenturyTel's subscribers were not able to obtain directory listing
 information, i.e. name, address and phone number, for Charter's subscribers.
 What happened was that every time that a CenturyTel subscriber called directory

1	assistance and asked for listing information about a Charter subscriber, the listing
2	information was not provided. Instead, the subscriber was told that such
3	information was not available.

- 4
- 5 6

Q. WHY IS THAT A PROBLEM?

That is a problem because Charter subscribers who believed that their listing 7 A. 8 information was available to the public, were not receiving the benefits of that Although some people specifically request that their listing 9 arrangement. information not be published, most persons expect that their listing information 10 will be published, and available through directory assistance services. These 11 persons rely on that assumption and believe that their family, friends, business 12 13 associates (or whomever) will be able to obtain their listing information through directory assistance services. So when that information is not made available to 14 other persons, it can be problematic for both the subscribers that expect their 15 16 information to be available, as well as to the persons seeking that information.

17

19

18 Q. DO YOU KNOW WHY THAT PROBLEM OCCURRED?

A. Yes. The problem occurred because CenturyTel was using a third party vendor to provide its directory assistance services. That vendor was not performing the necessary database queries to find the Charter subscriber information, and make it available to the requesting party. For a variety of reasons the directory assistance industry now relies upon two different databases to obtain subscriber listing information. In many instances the directory assistance provider will need to query both a local, and a national, directory assistance database to obtain the subscriber listing information. However, CenturyTel's vendor was not doing so. Specifically, that entity only queried the local database, even though Charter's subscriber listing information resides in the national database. As a result, Charter's subscribers' listing information was not made available to persons who called CenturyTel's directory assistance service.

- 7
- 8 9

Q. DID CENTURYTEL TAKE ANY ACTION TO FIX THE PROBLEM?

No. After Charter alerted CenturyTel to this problem CenturyTel did not take any 10 A. action to conclusively address the problem. Instead, CenturyTel took the position 11 that the problem was Charter's problem, and that Charter was responsible for 12 13 dealing with *CenturyTel's* vendor to resolve the problem. CenturyTel refused to direct its third party vendor to query the appropriate database. Instead. 14 CenturyTel directed Charter to contract with that entity directly to address the 15 problem. Eventually, CenturyTel obtained a new vendor to provide its directory 16 assistance services. That vendor currently does query both databases, such that 17 Charter subscriber listing information is currently available to all requesting 18 parties. 19

20

21

Q.

22 23

IF THAT PROBLEM HAS BEEN RESOLVED, WHY DOES THE COMMISSION NEED TO CONSIDER IT NOW, SINCE THIS AGREEMENT WILL GOVERN OBLIGATIONS IN THE FUTURE?

A. It seems that these past problems may inform the Commission of why Charter
 proposes basic language concerning directory assistance obligations of both

1		parties. In other words, if Charter's language is included in this agreement,
2		problems like those which arose in the past will not occur in the future.
3 4 5		VI. CONCLUSION
6	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
7	A.	Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served by facsimile, hand-delivery, or electronic mail, on the 30th day of September, 2008, on the following:

Thomas J. Moorman WOODS & AITKEN LLP 2154 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Suite 200 Washington, DC 20007

Becky Owenson Kilpatrick Manager Government Relations CenturyTel – Missouri 220 Madison Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Paul M. Schudel James A. Overcash WOODS & AITKEN LLP 301 South 13th Street Suite 500 Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Larry W. Dority Fischer & Dority 101 Madison, Suite 400 Jefferson City, MO 65101

General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Office of the Public Counsel P.O. Box 2230 Jefferson City, MO 65102

/s/

Gina Lee