

Office of the Public Counsel

Harry S Truman Building - Ste. 250 P.O. Box 7800

Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Telephone: 573-751-4857

Facsimile: 573-751-5562

Relay Missouri

1-800-735-2966 TDD

1-800-735-2466 Voice

February 17, 1999

Mr. Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary Missouri Public Service Commission 301 W. High Street, Room 530 Jefferson City, MO 65102

FILED

FEB 1 7 1999

Missouri Public Service Commission

RE: TO-99-227

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission is an original and 14 copies of:

PUBLIC COUNSEL'S COMMENTS ON THE EFFECT OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

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

Very truly yours

Michael F. Dandino Senior Public Counsel

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STATE OF MISSOURI

N	FER:
Sen	
0/6	ssouri Public Commission

Application of Southwestern Bell)
Telephone Company to Provide Notice)
of Intent to File an Application for)
Authorization to Provide In-Region)
InterLATA Services Originating in)
Missouri Pursuant to Section 271 of the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Case No. TO-99-227

PUBLIC COUNSEL'S COMMENTS ON THE EFFECT OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

comments to the Public Service Commission on the recent decision of the U. S. Supreme Court in AT&T Corp. et al v. Iowa Utilities Board, et al, No. 97-826 (January 25, 1999). This is the first Supreme Court decision construing the Federal Telecommunications Act, reversing most of the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals decision and reaffirming Congress' intent that the FCC has general juridiction to implement local service competition. The decision effectively reinstates the FCC rulemaking related to implementing the Act.

For purposes of the Section 271 application, the most significant impact of the decision relates to unbundled network elements (UNEs). The Court held that the FCC rule improperly fails to take into account on a rational basis which elements must be made available, taking into account the objectives of the Act and giving substance to the "ecessary" and "impair" requirements in the Act. The FCC's expansive rule creating an underlying duty to make all elements available was vacated as not providing a reasonable

interpretation of the Act. The remand of this Rule 319 essential creates no rule for UNEs. Without a rule, how can SWBT comply with the second checklist item?

The decision also restored the FCC's authority over intralata dialing parity. This is also a checklist item and the compliance with the FCC rule is now the standard.

Public Counsel suggests that this decision affects the legal landscape under which

this Commission must view compliance with the Act. It is difficult to fully brief the import of this decision in so short a period of time and to adequately view the filed testimony in light of the decision. That is the task before the parties and the Commission. With this decision, the ground rules are different than they were when SWBT filed its Section 271 application notice and the accompanying testimony and when the parties filed testimony supporting their comments and positions. It is difficult to determine whether SWBT complies with portions of the Act when (1) no one knew how the Court would decide the case (2) no one could have addressed how the decision relates to the present facts. Therefore, Public Counsel suggests that in the interests of providing parties with a full and fair opportunity to present relevant facts to the Commission and the Commission's interest in creating a full and complete record for its review and for the FCC to consider SWBT's application, the Commission should allow parties to file supplemental testimony to address how the law is applied to the existing facts and address how it affects SWBT's application. The Commission can then consider this additional evidence and cross-examine the witnesses with the benefit of this supplemental testimony. This does not require continuation of the hearing, but may cause it to extend beyond the current time frame.

Respectfully submitted,

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL

Michael F. Dandino (24590)

Senior Public Counsel

P.O. Box 7800

Jefferson City, MO 65102

(573) 751-4857

(573) 751-5559

email: mdandino@mail.state.mo.us

I hereby certify that the foregoing was mailed or hand delivered this / Z day of _ _____, 1999 to the attached service list:

STATE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION JEFFERSON CITY February 10, 1999

CASE NO: TO-99-227

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

Paul G. Lane/Leo J. Bub Anthony K. Conroy/Katherine C. Swaller Southwestern Bell Telephone Company One Bell Center, Room 3520 St. Louis, MO 63101

Richard S. Brownlee, HI/Patricia D. Perkins Hendren and Andrae, L.L.C. 221 Bolivard Street, P.O. Box 1069 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Stephen F. Morris
MCI Telecommunications Corporation
701 Brazos, Suite 600
Austin, TX 78701

James M. Fischer
James M. Fischer P.C.
101 West McCarty Street, Suite 215
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Karl Zobrist/Christine Egbarts
Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin LLP
2300 Main Street, Suite 1100
Kansas City, MO 64108

Mark W. Comley Newman, Comley & Ruth P.C. 601 Monroe Street, Suite 301 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Jeremiah W. Nixon/Mark E. Long Ronald Molteni Attorney General-State of Missouri 221 West High Street, PO Box 899 Jefferson City, MO 65102 Office of the Public Counsel P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Paul S. DeFord Lathrop & Gage 2345 Grand Boulevard, Suite 2500 Kansas City, MO 64108

Carl J. Lumley/Leland B. Curtis Curtis, Oetting, Heinz, Garrett & Soule 130 s. Bemiston, Suite 200 Clayton, MO 63105

Kenneth A. Schifman

Sprint Communications Company L.P.
8140 Ward Parkway, 5E

Kansas City, MO 64114

Mary Ann Young William D. Steinmeier, P.C. 2031 Tower Drive Jefferson City, MO 65110

Charles Brent Stewart Stewart & Keevil, L.L.C. 1001 Cherry Street, Suite 302 Columbia, MO 65201

Michael Ferry
Gateway Legal Services
4232 Forest Park Ave., Suite 1800
St. Louis, MO 63108