STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

At a session of the Public Service Commission held at its office in Jefferson City on the 20th day of July, 1993.

AT&T Communications of the Southwest, Inc., Complainant,	)	
v.	)	Case No. TC-93-101
Contel Systems of Missouri, Inc., d/b/a GTE Systems of Missouri, Respondent.	)	

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS

On September 10, 1992, Complainant AT&T Communications of the Southwest, Inc. (AT&T) filed a complaint against Respondent Contel Systems of Missouri, Inc., d/b/a GTE Systems of Missouri, (GTE Systems), alleging that GTE Systems' charges for access service are too high. At the same time AT&T filed complaints against 43 other noncompetitive local exchange telecommunications companies in the state of Missouri. On October 13, 1992 GTE Systems filed its Answer, and on October 21, 1992 the Office of the Public Counsel filed a Motion To Dismiss. On November 16, 1992 AT&T filed Suggestions in Opposition to the Public Counsel's Motion to Dismiss. Applications to intervene were filed by MCI Telecommunications Corporation (MCI) and Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (Southwestern Bell).

In its complaint AT&T alleges that the amount charged by GTE Systems for monopoly exchange access services is substantially higher than the amount charged by Southwestern Bell for the same services; that the charges are on their face excessive and violative of §392.200.1, R.S.Mo. Supp. 1992; and that the monopoly exchange access services provide GTE Systems with excessive levels of

contribution and discourage competition. GTE Systems' access charges were set in 1989 and have not changed since that time. AT&T claims that the minutes of use for GTE Systems' access services and resulting revenues have increased dramatically, while the average cost per minute of providing those services has declined substantially without a corresponding reduction in rates, and thus appears to imply that the current access charges are not cost-based.

Additionally, AT&T posits concern that the alleged inequities in access charges will affect the then-proposed, now ordered Outstate Calling Area Plan, ***Re the establishment of a plan for expanded calling scopes in metropolitan and outstate exchanges***, Case No. TO-92-306 (Mo. P.S.C. Report and Order issued December 23, 1992), the mandatory network modernization project, 17 Mo. Reg. 1045, 4 CSR 240-32.100 ***et seq.***, and any review or revision of the Primary Toll Carrier Plan, ***Re the Missouri interLATA access charge and intraLATA toll pool***, 29 Mo. P.S.C. (N.S.) 249 (1987). In its prayer for relief, AT&T seeks to have the Commission declare GTE Systems' access rates and rate design unlawful, and to reduce GTE Systems' access charges to just and reasonable levels. AT&T suggests that it is uniquely harmed by the allegedly unreasonably high access charges, as it has been designated the carrier of last resort in the state of Missouri, and also is required under state law to charge the same price for intrastate calls of equivalent distance, accomplished through averaging statewide costs, while its competitors can choose not to serve an area with high access charges and thereby exclude the higher rates from calculation of the statewide averages.

GTE Systems filed an Answer in which it sought dismissal of AT&T's complaint. The Office of the Public Counsel filed a Motion to Dismiss on October 21, 1992, which expressed serious reservations about whether the complaint was an appropriate way to deal with AT&T's concerns, given that access charges could not be lowered without a consideration of all relevant factors,

including the effect on other rates. On November 16, 1992, AT&T filed Suggestions in Opposition to the Public Counsel's Motion to Dismiss. After a careful review of the various pleadings of the parties, research, and analysis, the Commission concludes that AT&T's complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted because there is no statutory authority cited which permits a consideration of AT&T's allegations in this manner. The Commission's treatment of this complaint is consistent with its treatment of the other 43 complaints filed by AT&T. In addition, the Commission further determines that the principle of judicial economy dictates that AT&T's complaints be dismissed.

As authority for its complaint, AT&T cites the Commission to three statutory sections, §392.400.6, §392.200.1, and §386.330.2, R.S.Mo. Supp. 1992.[1] None of these sections is apposite to AT&T's complaint. Section 392.200.1 basically requires that charges for services rendered by telecommunications companies must be just and reasonable, and not more than allowed by law, or by order or decision of the Commission. Nothing in this statute, however, authorizes a utility, or any other person or corporation, to complain about the rates charged by another utility. Nor does AT&T allege that GTE Systems has charged rates other than those authorized by the Commission, which rates are presumed to be prima facie lawful. §386.270, R.S.Mo. 1986.

Section 386.330.2 essentially allows complaints to be made regarding any thing or act done by a telecommunications company, and other specified regulated entities, in violation of any provision of law or of the terms and conditions of its franchise or charter or of any order or decision of the Commission. However, there have been no allegations that GTE Systems has been charging access rates in excess of what it has been authorized to do by the Commission, and none of the facts alleged by AT&T in its complaint can be

[1]All references are to R.S.Mo. Supp. 1992 except where otherwise noted.

construed to aver a violation by GTE Systems of any provision of law, or of the terms of its franchise or charter, or of any order or decision of the Commission. Like §386.200.1, §386.330.2 does not authorize a complaint as to the reasonableness of rates.

Neither does §392.400.6 aid AT&T in support of its requested relief. Section 392.400.6 provides: "A telecommunications company may file a complaint as to the reasonableness or lawfulness of any rate or charge for service offered or provided by a noncompetitive or transitionally competitive telecommunications company." While at first blush §392.400.6 does seem to support AT&T's claim, this subsection cannot be read in isolation. It is a maxim of statutory construction that the various sections of a single act should be construed together as a consistent and homogeneous whole. ***State ex rel. Ashcroft v. Union Electric Company,*** 559 S.W.2d 216, 221 (Mo. App. 1977). Scrutiny of a statute cannot be confined to the words quoted in a particular section, but must include the purpose of the act and objectives of the legislation. ***Lebcowitz v. Simms,*** 300 S.W.2d 827, 829 (Mo. App. 1957). This includes reviewing the totality of the enactment and construing it in light of "'what is below the surface of the words and yet fairly a part of them.'" ***State ex rel. Henderson v. Proctor,*** 361 S.W.2d 802, 805 (Mo. banc 1962).

Taken as a whole, §392.400 addresses the enforcement by the Commission of the segregation of noncompetitive services from transitionally competitive or competitive services. Subsection 1, for instance, prohibits the Commission from including expenses which are in any way associated with the provision of transitionally competitive or competitive telecommunications services in setting rates for noncompetitive services. The remaining subsections are designed to aid in the implementation of that prohibition. For example, subsection 2 provides for the establishment of accounting procedures to assist in implementing the prohibition; subsection 3 provides for the establishment of procedures for

determining the cost of service of a telecommunications service, which would naturally aid in the segregation of expenses; subsection 4 provides an exception to the general prohibition, allowing the Commission to consider the revenues generated by a transitionally competitive or competitive telecommunications service in setting rates for noncompetitive services where the revenues exceed the expense of the service plus a reasonable return on investment; subsection 5 prohibits noncompetitive or transitionally competitive telecommunications companies from offering transitionally competitive or competitive telecommunications services below the cost of such services, which again aids in segregation of expenses and discourages the development of subsidies; and subsection 7 provides the Commission with authority to inspect the books and records of noncompetitive or transitionally competitive telecommunications companies in order to implement the provisions of the statute.

A close reading of §392.400 as a whole indicates that the statute assumes the existence of a noncompetitive or transitionally competitive telecommunications company which offers either transitionally competitive or competitive services in addition to noncompetitive services, and is concerned with the interrelationship between rates charged for different services offered by the same company, or, more specifically, with the possibility that the company's noncompetitive services are subsidizing other services. There is no indication anywhere in the statute that the legislature contemplated a situation where one company's telecommunications service is subsidizing the telecommunications service of another company; rather, the focus is on differing services offered by the same company. A company would have a very real interest in challenging the rates of another company where the first company offered a service in competition with the second company and the noncompetitive services were subsidizing the competitive services of the second company; thus, subsection 6 merely provides the mechanism through which the first company is able to

challenge the second company's rates. In sum, within the context of §392.400 as a whole, subsection 6 merely allows one telecommunications company to challenge the reasonableness of the rates charged by another telecommunications company on the ground that the latter company's noncompetitive telecommunications services are subsidizing the latter company's transitionally competitive or competitive services.

This interpretation of §392.400.6 is also bolstered by a reading of the heading given to this section by the revisor of statutes: "Noncompetitive telecommunications services, rates not to cover expenses of competitive services, exception--complaint may be filed by another company, purpose--commission may examine records, purpose." Although the heading was not enacted by the General Assembly and cannot be relied upon to the extent as though it were, "headings and revisor's catchlines may be pertinent in demonstrating how the statute has generally been read and understood." ***Fiandaca v. Niehaus***, 570 S.W.2d 714, 716, n.2 (Mo. App. 1978).

Thus AT&T's claim does not fall within the ambit of §392.400.6, as any subsidy resulting from unreasonably high access charges would flow between companies instead of within a company as contemplated by the statute, and AT&T has not alleged in its complaint that GTE Systems offers services which have been classified as transitionally competitive or competitive.

Although not cited in AT&T's complaint, or in any of the pleadings filed in this case, the question of the possible applicability of §386.390.1 was raised in some of the other 43 AT&T complaint cases, and the Commission deems it appropriate to address the impact of that statute on the present proceeding. Section 386.390.1 clearly states:

> [N]o complaint shall be entertained by the commission, except upon its own motion, as to the reasonableness of any rates or charges of any gas, electrical, water, sewer, or telephone corporation, unless the same be signed by the public counsel or the mayor or the president or chairman of

> the board of aldermen or a majority of the council, commission or other legislative body of any city, town, village or county, within which the alleged violation occurred, or not less than twenty-five consumers or purchasers, or prospective consumers or purchasers, of such gas, electricity, water, sewer, or telephone service.

§386.390.1 R.S.Mo. Supp. 1986.

Section 386.390.1, along with its sister statute §393.260.1, which deals specifically with gas, electric, water, and sewer corporations, are the only statutes specifically authorizing a complaint as to the rates or prices charged by the various utilities regulated by the Public Service Commission, whereas the language of §386.330.2 is more general. It is an oft-cited axiom of statutory construction that where there are two separate statutes pertaining to the same subject matter, the two statutes must be read together, and where the provisions of the more specific statute conflict with the provisions of the more general statute, the provisions of the specific statute must hold sway over the general statute. ***State ex rel. Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company v. Public Service Commission***, 441 S.W.2d 742, 746 (Mo. App. 1969). See also ***City of Raytown v. Danforth***, 560 S.W.2d 846, 848 (Mo. banc 1977). Thus §386.390.1's provisions with respect to complaints regarding rates takes precedence over §386.330.2. AT&T has neither pleaded §386.390.1, nor has it met the preconditions listed therein for filing complaints as to rates; therefore its complaints are required to be dismissed.

A fundamental problem with AT&T's position is the lack of an appropriate forum. It is impractical and perhaps impossible to address AT&T's concerns outside of the context of a rate case. The Office of the Public Counsel, which filed a Motion to Dismiss in some although not all of the 44 AT&T complaint cases, expressed concern that access charges not be lowered without consideration of other relevant factors, including the effect on other rates. AT&T itself admits in its Suggestions in Opposition that the Commission's duty

to consider all relevant factors in setting access rates "may include the analysis of other rates and charges of the Respondent, the cost of capital, increasing or decreasing equipment costs and any other issue the Commission deems relevant." Suggestions in Opposition at 2.

At a minimum AT&T's complaints would almost certainly require audits of the respondent companies and cost of service studies relating to the companies' various rate designs. It is unclear whether AT&T expects to undertake the burden of conducting the audits and cost of service studies itself. Such a burden is likely to be on AT&T, as, for example, it hints in its complaint that the rates charged by the respondent companies are not cost-based. In ***Shephard v. City of Wentzville***, 645 S.W.2d 130, 133 (Mo. App. 1982), the court, in the context of a customer challenge to the reasonableness of water rates charged by a municipal corporation not under the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission, affirmed the denial of a declaratory judgment action, noting that the plaintiff failed to show proof that the rate charged bore no relation to the cost of service as claimed, and thus the plaintiff failed to carry his burden on the issue.

To simultaneously mount what in essence would be 44 full blown rate cases would be judicially uneconomic. Nor does the Commission have sufficient resources to undertake such an endeavor in addition to its normal workload. AT&T is not, however, without a remedy. It may intervene in the rate cases filed by local exchange telecommunications companies and raise its claims as to the reasonableness of the rate design and rates charged by the companies for monopoly exchange access services. Indeed, several of the companies against whom AT&T filed complaints have already initiated rate cases with the Commission, and AT&T has sought and been granted intervention in those cases.

In addition, AT&T may have an opportunity to address the issue of access charges in Case No. TR-89-182, in which AT&T previously participated,

which was remanded to the Commission by the Missouri Court of Appeals for further proceedings in ***State ex rel. GTE North v. Missouri Public Service Commission***, 835 S.W.2d 356 (Mo. App. 1992). The remanded issue involves the question of whether GTE North Incorporated's carrier common line charge portion of access charges for intrastate interLATA traffic should be reduced to achieve parity with the rates charged for intrastate intraLATA traffic. Although that case specifically involved GTE North, GTE North and GTE Systems have become a part of GTE Midwest Incorporated, along with other GTE companies, pursuant to a Report and Order issued on December 8, 1992 in Case No. TM-93-1, therefore the remand in TR-89-182 may have the potential to affect other GTE companies against which AT&T has brought complaints as well.

AT&T's recitation in its complaint of other matters which can affect or be affected by the access rates charged by GTE Systems only underscores the Commission's concern with judicial economy. For example, it is certainly possible that the Outstate Calling Area Plan and mandatory network modernization project, cited by AT&T in its complaint, and FCC Docket No. 91-141 on expanded interconnection with local telephone facilities, not cited by AT&T, may have an effect on the access rates charged by GTE Systems and other local exchange telecommunications companies in Missouri. What effect these matters might have on the amount charged as access rates, either upwards or downwards, cannot be predicted with any certainty, as the occurrence of such an effect depends on future events. The best way to address AT&T's concerns, therefore, is to do so on a case-by-case basis in the context of a general rate case.

Thus, even if AT&T had statutory authority to complain about the reasonableness of GTE Systems' access charges, no adjustment to those charges could be made outside the context of a general rate case, and judicial economy would require the Commission to dismiss the complaint, as the Commission would be unable to grant the relief requested.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That the complaint filed by AT&T Communications of the Southwest, Inc. on September 10, 1992 against Contel Systems of Missouri, Inc., d/b/a GTE Systems of Missouri is hereby dismissed.

2. That the applications to intervene of MCI Telecommunications Corporation and Southwestern Bell Telephone Company are hereby dismissed as moot.

3. That this order shall become effective on August 9, 1993.

BY THE COMMISSION

Brent Stewart

Brent Stewart
Executive Secretary

(S E A L)

Mueller, Chm., McClure, Perkins,
and Crumpton, CC., Concur.
Kincheloe, C., Absent.