LAW OFFICES

BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE P.O. BOX 456 JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65 I 02-0456 TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166 FACSIMILE (573) 634-7431 E-MAIL: WREBSE@AOL.COM

CHARLES E. SMARR DEAN L. COOPER MARK G. ANDERSON TIMOTHY T. STEWART GREGORY C. MITCHELL RACHEL M. CRAIG BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY DALE T, SMITH

OF COUNSEL RICHARD T. CIOTTONE

January 20, 2000

Mr. Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

M Contrav

Re:

DAVID V.G. BRYDON

GARY W. DUFFY

PAUL A. BOUDREAU

SONDRA B. MORGAN

JAMES C. SWEARENGEN

WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III

JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON

Case No. TC-2000-401

o. TC-2000-401
SWBT v. Seneca and Goodman Telephone Companies Missouri Public Commission

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Enclosed for filing please find an original and fourteen (14) copies of the Answer to Complaint filed on behalf of Seneca and Goodman Telephone Companies in above-referenced case.

Please see that this filing is brought to the attention of the appropriate Commission personnel. A copy of the attached will be provided to parties of record. I thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Brian T. McCartney

BTM/da Enclosure

Parties of Record

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company,)	
Complainant,)	Case No. TC-2000-401
v.)	_
Seneca and Goodman Telephone Companies,)))	FILED
Respondents.)	JAN 2 0 2000
		Missouri Public

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

Missouri Public S**ervice Commiss**ion

COMES NOW Seneca Telephone Company ("Seneca") and Goodman Telephone Company ("Goodman") (referred to collectively as "the Companies"), pursuant to 4 CSR 240-2.070(8), and for their Answer¹ to Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's ("SWBT") complaint state as follows:

- 1. Seneca and Goodman admit the allegations contained in paragraph 1, except that the Companies deny that SWBT is authorized to originate intraLATA interexchange toll traffic, such as the 800 MaxiMizer traffic which is purportedly the subject of SWBT's complaint, in Seneca and Goodman's exchanges following the Commission's termination of the Primary Toll Carrier ("PTC") Plan in Case No. TO-99-254.
 - 2. Admitted.
 - 3. Admitted.
 - 4. Seneca and Goodman deny the allegations contained in paragraph 4 because they

1

¹ The filing of this Answer in no way concedes SWBT's right to bring the complaint, and SWBT's right to bring such a complaint is directly challenged in the Companies' Motion to Dismiss filed concurrently herewith.

are based on an inaccurate and misleading interpretation of this Commission's PTC Plan Report and Order in Case No. TO-99-254. Specifically, the Companies deny that the PTC Order allowed SWBT to continue to originate intraLATA toll traffic on a Feature Group C ("FGC") basis in Seneca and Goodman's exchanges. The Companies incorporate by reference the arguments contained in their Motion to Dismiss filed concurrently with this complaint.

- 5. Seneca and Goodman are without sufficient information to form a specific response to the allegation contained in paragraph 5 at this time.
- 6. Seneca and Goodman are without sufficient information to form a specific response to the allegation contained in paragraph 6 at this time.
 - 7. Admitted.
 - 8. Admitted.
 - 9. Admitted.
- 10. Seneca and Goodman admit that representatives from large and small LECs have met to discuss the implications of the PTC Plan's termination. During one of these meetings, a representative of one of the former SCs raised the issue of SWBT's 800 traffic that originates in the former SCs' exchanges. Thus, Seneca and Goodman deny SWBT's claim that SWBT raised this issue. Seneca and Goodman also deny that these industry meetings have provided SWBT with any authority or any reason to believe that SWBT has authority to originate intraLATA toll traffic from Seneca and Goodman's exchanges.
 - 11. Denied. (See the Companies' Motion to Dismiss)
 - 12. Denied. (See the Companies' Motion to Dismiss)
 - 13. Denied.. (See the Companies' Motion to Dismiss)

WHEREFORE, on the basis of the foregoing, Seneca and Goodman respectfully request that SWBT's complaint be dismissed on the grounds that: (1) Seneca and Goodman are not in violation of the Commission's PTC *Order* in Case No. TO-99-254, and accordingly, (2) SWBT has failed to state facts upon which relief can be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

W.R. England, III

Mo. Bar #23975

Brian T. McCartney

Mo. Bar #47788

BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND P.C.

312 East Capitol Avenue

Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0456

(573) 635-7166

Attorneys for:

Seneca and Goodman Telephone Companies

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was mailed or hand-delivered, this _______ day of January, 2000, to:

Mike Dandino Office of Public Counsel P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102 Dan Joyce Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Paul Lane/Leo Bub/Anthony Conroy Southwestern Bell Telephone Company One Bell Center, Room 3518 St. Louis, MO 63101

W.R. England, III/Brian T. McCartney