

STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

At a session of the Public Service
Commission held at its office
in Jefferson City on the 1st
day of May, 1990.

In the matter of the administration of community)
optional service (COS) program and the consideration)
of the intercompany compensation plan, expedited) CASE NO. TO-90-232
treatment of COS-related rate increases and attendant)
issues.)

ORDER CONCERNING THE REQUEST OF MISSOURI TELEPHONE COMPANY FOR AN
EXTENSION IN IMPLEMENTING TWO-WAY COS IN ITS MORRISVILLE EXCHANGE

On April 2, 1990, Missouri Telephone Company (MOTEL) filed a request for an extension of time in which to provide two-way community optional service (COS) between its Morrisville exchange and the Springfield exchange of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (SWB). In support of its request MOTEL states that, if SWB is allowed to provision two-way COS on this route by using remote call forwarding (RCF) as they plan to do, the scope of COS provided to MOTEL's customers in the Morrisville exchange will be greatly expanded beyond the scope authorized by the Commission in its Report and Order issued December 29, 1989, in Case No. TO-87-131. In re the investigation of experimental extended measured service (EMS), Case No. TO-87-131 (December 29, 1989, clarified January 23, 1990).

MOTEL states that if this expanded calling scope is allowed to exist, MOTEL will be detrimentally affected because it will be unable to collect additional compensation for this expanded calling scope. MOTEL requests that the Commission delay implementation of two-way COS between these exchanges until the Commission has considered limiting such unauthorized expanded COS calling or, if the Commission decides to permit such expanded calling, until the Commission has authorized local exchange carriers (LECs) to collect additional compensation for completing such expanded calling.

By pleading filed April 11, 1990, Contel of Missouri, Inc., Contel System of Missouri, Inc., and Contel of Eastern Missouri (CONTEL) filed their response to this request for an extension made by MOTEL. CONTEL states that it has no objection to MOTEL's request but fears that an action taken by the Commission in response to MOTEL's request could affect CONTEL's planned implementation on May 9, 1990, of two-way COS on the nearby route from its Ozark exchange to SWB's Springfield exchange. CONTEL requests that the Commission take no action in responding to MOTEL's request that could affect CONTEL's planned implementation and, in addition, CONTEL requests that the Commission make no substantive determination on the provision of two-way COS via RCF until the issue of the relative merits of providing two-way COS by RCF or billing adjustments is thoroughly studied.

On April 24, 1990, MOTEL filed a reply to the comments of CONTEL in which MOTEL expressed its willingness to withdraw its request for a delay in the implementation of two-way COS on the Morrisville/Springfield route. In lieu of delaying implementation MOTEL requests the following tripartite relief:

1. That the Commission schedule a hearing to address the reports of the local exchange companies (LECs) to be filed September 4, 1990 concerning the billing adjustment approach to provisioning two-way COS;
2. That the Commission direct the LECs to devise a means whereby all COS calls will be rated as toll which come from the Morrisville exchange and go to the remote call forwarding (RCF) number in Springfield of two-way COS customers in other exchanges; and
3. That the Commission direct the LECs to consider possible means of tracking toll calls originating outside the Springfield area and terminating to RCF numbers in Springfield of COS customers in other exchanges.

Since MOTEL has withdrawn its request for an extension the Commission need not rule on that request. The Commission will set a hearing to address the billing adjustment alternative to RCF as a means of providing two-way COS. Parties wishing

to respond to MOTEL's second and third requests will be directed to do so as set forth below.


It is, therefore,

ORDERED: 1. That a hearing is set hereby for the purposes set forth herein to commence at 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, September 25, 1990, at the Commission's hearing room in the Truman State Office Building, 301 West High Street, Jefferson City, Missouri.

ORDERED: 2. That parties wishing to respond to suggestions 2 and 3 of Missouri Telephone Company set forth above are directed hereby to do so on or before May 31, 1990.

ORDERED: 3. That this order shall become effective on the date hereof.

BY THE COMMISSION



Harvey G. Hubbs
Secretary

(S E A L)

Steinmeier, Chm., Mueller, Rauch, McClure
and Letsch-Roderique, CC., Concur.