

Leo J. Bub
Senior Counsel

Southwestern Bell Telephone
One Bell Center
Room 3518
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
Phone 314 235-2508
Fax 314 247-0014



January 26, 2000

The Honorable Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge
Missouri Public Service Commission
301 West High Street, Floor 5A
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

FILED²

JAN 26 2000

Missouri Public
Service Commission

Re: Case No. TC-2000-402

Dear Judge Roberts:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission in the above-referenced case is an original and 14 copies of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's Response to Chariton Valley's Motion to Dismiss.

Thank you for bringing this matter to the attention of the Commission.

Very truly yours,

Leo J. Bub /tm

Leo J. Bub

Enclosure

cc: Attorneys of Record

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

FILED²
JAN 26 2000

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's)
Complaint Against Chariton Valley)
Telephone Corporation and Request for an)
Order Prohibiting Chariton Valley from)
Cutting Off Southwestern Bell's 800)
MaxiMizer Traffic.)

Case No. TC-2000-402

Missouri Public
Service Commission

**SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY'S
RESPONSE TO CHARITON VALLEY'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company opposes Chariton Valley Telephone Company's Motion to Dismiss Complaint and respectfully states:

1. Chariton Valley claims that the Complaint fails to state facts upon which relief can be granted claiming that the Commission's discussions of Feature Group C/Feature Group D (FGC/FGD) in its June 10, 1999 Report and Order in TO-99-254, et al. (the PTC Plan case) focused only on "traffic terminating to SCs" like Chariton Valley. Since the MaxiMizer 800 traffic which Chariton Valley cut off originates from Chariton Valley customers (and terminates to Southwestern Bell customers who, on a reverse billing bases, pay the toll charges on those calls), Chariton Valley claims that the language in the Commission's Order does not prohibit them from cutting off this traffic.

2. Contrary to Chariton Valley's assertions, the Report and Order is not that narrow. As Chariton Valley is aware, it and a few other small LECs advocated the complete conversion of the LEC-to-LEC network from FGC based signaling to FGD based signaling. Based on its review of the evidence, the Commission declined to do so. After setting out five separate bases for its decision, the Commission stated:

Finally, there is little concrete evidence about the cost of converting the LEC-to-LEC network to FGD, but what evidence there is certainly suggests that the cost will be great. The Commission will not order the industry to embark on a massive

2

project to convert to another standard at an unknown cost, to achieve uncertain benefits and possibly cause tangible harm to customers trying to place call. (Report and Order, pp. 11-12).¹

Chariton Valley's unilaterally cutting off calls from its exchanges to Southwestern Bell MaxiMizer 800 customers and attempting to force the conversion of this traffic to FGD violates this section of the Commission's Report and Order. By making its portion of the LEC-to-LEC network unavailable to Southwestern Bell, Chariton Valley has implemented actions the Commission refused it permission to undertake.

3. In addition to having jurisdiction to entertain this Complaint as a violation of a Commission Order, the Commission also has jurisdiction to hear this Complaint under Section 392.240(3) RSMo (1994) which states:

Whenever the commission, after hearing had upon its own motion or upon complaint, shall find that a physical connection can reasonably be made between the lines of two or more telecommunications companies whose facilities can be made to form a continuous link of communication by the construction and maintenance of suitable connections for the transfer of messages or conversations, and that public convenience and necessity will be subserved thereby . . . the commission may, by its order, require that such connection be made . . . and the telecommunications be transmitted over such connection under such rules and regulations as the commission may establish and prescribe through lines and joint rates, tolls and charges to be made and to be used, observed and enforced in the future. . . .

Here, there is no question that the connection that existed between Chariton Valley's exchanges and Southwestern Bell for the carriage of calls to Southwestern Bell MaxiMizer 800 customers was fully operational until Chariton Valley unilaterally disconnected the circuit. This connection had been carrying MaxiMizer 800 calls and served the public convenience and necessity. Under

¹ The pages for the Report and Order are from the hard copy decision published by the Commission. Southwestern Bell's previous reference to pages 7 and 8 (which were also used by Chariton Valley) were from the version of the decision published on the Commission's website at <http://www.ecodov.state.mo.us\psc4\orders4\06109254.htm>.

this statute, Chariton Valley should be required to reconnect and maintain the connection.

4. Chariton Valley also asserts that it cannot continue to allow calls to Southwestern Bell MaxiMizer 800 customers to originate in its exchanges on a "no CIC" basis that existed under the PTC Plan because "Mid-Mo will not be able to distinguish one carrier's traffic from another's for the purpose of assessing its access charges." (Chariton Valley Motion to Dismiss, pp. 4-5).

5. Chariton Valley is mistaken in its assertion. By the very nature of 800 service, the carrier whose customer dialed the 800 call (here Chariton Valley) will know the identity of the carrier responsible for paying originating access charges on the call. When an 800 call is made, the carrier on the originating side sends an electronic query to the regional 800 database to determine the identity of the 800 service provider and to translate that 800 number into a POTS number (plain old telephone number). When Southwestern Bell is the 800 service provider, the 800 database query response will inform Chariton Valley that it is a LEC-carried call and, through the POTS number, direct Chariton Valley to route the call to Southwestern Bell for completion. On these types of LEC-carried calls, the POTS number identifies who the 800 carrier Chariton Valley has been using that POTS destination number inside the Category 11 0101-25 record it creates that forms the basis for its billing of originating access to Southwestern Bell.

There has been no change to this established 800 service procedure as a result of the termination of the PTC Plan and Chariton Valley continues to perform these database queries on 800 calls and receives the same information from the 800 database. And in any event, Chariton Valley's raising this issue simply demonstrates the existence of disputed facts. It does not

constitute any ground for dismissal based on a failure to state facts upon which relief can be granted

WHEREFORE, Southwestern Bell respectfully requests the Commission to deny Chariton Valley's Motion to Dismiss.

Respectfully submitted,

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

BY Leo J. Bub /m
PAUL G. LANE #27011
LEO J. BUB #34326
ANTHONY K. CONROY #35199
MIMI B. MACDONALD #37606
Attorneys for Southwestern Bell Telephone Company
One Bell Center, Room 3518
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
314-235-2508 (Telephone)
314-247-0014 (Facsimile)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this document were served on the following parties by hand delivery or facsimile on January 26, 2000.

Leo J. Bub / TM
Leo J. Bub

DAN JOYCE
MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION
301 W. HIGH STREET, SUITE 530
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101

MICHAEL F. DANDINO
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL
301 W. HIGH STREET, SUITE 250
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101

CRAIG S. JOHNSON
ANDERECK, EVANS, MILNE, PEACE,
BAUMHOER
301 E. MCCARTY STREET
P.O. BOX 1438
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102