

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC INVESTIGATION OF THE)	CASE NO.
PROPOSED POLE ATTACHMENT TARIFFS OF)	2022-00108
INCUMBENT LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIERS)	

ORDER

This matter was initiated to investigate proposed amendments to the pole attachment tariffs of BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T Kentucky (AT&T Kentucky), Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company, LLC d/b/a Altafiber (Altafiber), Windstream Kentucky East, LLC, (Windstream Kentucky East) and Windstream Kentucky West, LLC (Windstream Kentucky West) (collectively, Windstream Kentucky), filed pursuant to 807 KAR 5:015. On June 9, 2022, Kentucky Broadband and Cable Association (KBCA) filed testimony pursuant to the procedural schedule, including the testimony of Patricia Kravtin, discussing how the Commission should allocate the cost of make-ready to replace non-red tagged poles. On June 28, 2022, AT&T Kentucky filed a motion to strike the testimony of Ms. Kravtin based on the argument that the positions that she advocates in her testimony were fully litigated and rejected by the Commission “in the rule making proceeding” when it promulgated 807 KAR 5:015. AT&T Kentucky points to its agreement with the same argument made in motions to strike testimony of Ms. Kravtin by Kentucky Power Company (Kentucky Power) and Louisville Gas and

Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company in companion Case No. 2022-00105.¹
KBCA filed its response in opposition to AT&T Kentucky’s motion on July 5, 2022.

Having reviewed the motion and being otherwise sufficiently advised, the Commission finds that AT&T Kentucky’s motion is denied.

AT&T Kentucky’s argument that the Commission fully litigated the issues raised in Ms. Kravtin’s testimony in the “rule making proceeding” is not based on the language of the regulation, but rather, is based on language in the Statement of Consideration filed in response to comments that:

Section 4(6)(b)4, with which KBCA now takes issue, then indicates that the replacement costs for non-red tagged poles that must be replaced to accommodate a new attachment will be charged in accordance with each utility’s tariff or an applicable special contract . . . [t]he amendment proposed by KBCA could result in . . . rates that are not fair, just and reasonable. When reviewing utility rates and charges to determine if they are fair, just and reasonable and otherwise comply with statutory requirements imposed by KRS Chapter 278, the Commission generally attempts to ensure that costs are assigned to the party responsible for causing the utility to incur the cost. If a utility must replace a pole that does not need to be replaced with a larger pole or a pole of a different type to accommodate a new attachment, then the cost to replace that pole is caused by the new attacher.²

AT&T Kentucky’s motion states that in her testimony, Ms. Kravtin incorrectly asserts that “the Commission’s regulations do not address the cost allocation treatment of non-red-tagged poles,” and that “[u]tilities have taken advantage of the gap in the

¹ Case No. 2022-00105, *Electronic Investigation of the Proposed Pole Attachment Tariffs of Investor Owned Electric Utilities*.

² AT&T Kentucky’s Motion to Strike at 2.

Commission's regulations related to the replacement of non-red tagged poles"³
AT&T Kentucky asserts that Ms. Kravtin ignores the Commission's previous remarks in its Statement of Consideration Relating to 807 KAR 5:015 during the rulemaking which demonstrates the falsity of such an assertion. AT&T Kentucky argues that the Commission's remarks in its Statement of Reconsideration⁴ clearly demonstrates that the Commission not only considered KCBA and Ms. Kravtin's specific argument concerning non-red-tagged poles during the rule making proceeding, it squarely addressed the issue in its reasoning and detailed analysis for rejecting the KCBA proposal.

AT&T Kentucky's reading of the aforementioned sentence in the Statement of Reconsideration ignores the context and is inconsistent with the plain language of the regulation. Section 4(6)(b)2 and Section 4(6)(b)3 of 807 KAR 5:015, as initially proposed and as ultimately adopted, state specifically how the cost of red tagged poles, as defined in the regulation, would be allocated.⁵ Section 4(6)(b)4, as initially proposed and ultimately adopted, then states that:

The make ready cost, if any, for a pole that is not a red tagged pole to be replaced with a new utility pole to accommodate the new attacher's attachment shall be charged in accordance with the utility's tariff or a special contract regarding pole attachments between the utility and the new attacher.⁶

³ AT&T Kentucky's Motion to Strike at 2, referencing Direct Testimony of Patricia D. Kravtin dated June 9, 2022 at 6-10; Case No. 2022-00105, *Electronic Investigation of the Proposed Pole Attachment Tariffs of Investor Owned Electric Utilities*.

⁴ AT&T Kentucky's Motion to Strike at 2-3, referencing Commission's Statement of Consideration Relating to 807 KAR 5:015, p. 47-48.

⁵ 807 KAR 5:015, Section 4(6)(b); see also Amendments after Comments and Statement of Consideration for 807 KAR 5:015 at 13-14 (filed Sept. 15, 2021) (showing no amendments to Section 4(6)(b)).

⁶ 807 KAR 5:015, Section 4(6)(b); see also Amendments after Comments and Statement of Consideration for 807 KAR 5:015 at 13-14 (filed Sept. 15, 2021) (showing no amendments to Section 4(6)(b)).

The regulation also states that “[t]he tariff may include terms, subject to approval by the commission, that are fair, just and reasonable and consistent with the requirements of this administrative regulation and KRS Chapter 278.”⁷ AT&T Kentucky further incorrectly argues that the Commission concluded in its Statement of Reconsideration that “simply requiring the new attacher to pay the full cost of the new pole . . . would likely result in the fewest disputes and delays, because the cost would be easily identifiable.”⁸

AT&T Kentucky omits the portion of the Commission’s statement that clarifies:

There will also potentially be disputes regarding the cost of a new pole of the same height/type of the pole replaced and the cost of the pole necessary to accommodate the new attachment. In fact, ***while it is not being proposed here***, simply requiring the new attacher to pay the full cost of a new pole necessary to accommodate a new attacher would likely result in the fewest disputes and delays, because the cost would be easily identifiable.⁹ (Emphasis added.)

The plain language of the regulation, which controls,¹⁰ clearly indicates that the pole owners would be permitted to propose tariff provisions governing the cost allocation for non-red tagged poles but that those provisions would be subject to review by the Commission to determine whether they are fair, just and reasonable and otherwise

⁷ 807 KAR 5:015, Section 3(4).

⁸ AT&T Kentucky’s Motion to Strike at 3, referencing Commission’s Statement of Consideration Relating to 807 KAR 5:015 at 48.

⁹ Commission’s Statement of Consideration Relating to 807 KAR 5:015 at 48.

¹⁰ See *Stephenson v. Woodward*, 182 S.W.3d 162, 169-70 (Ky. 2005) (quoting *Gateway Construction Company v. Wallbaum*, 356 S.W.2d 247, 249 (Ky. 1962)) (“The most logical and effective manner by which to determine the intent of the legislature is simply to analyze the plain meaning of the statutory language: ‘[r]esort must be had first to the words, which are decisive if they are clear.’”); see also *Marksberry v. Chandler*, 126 S.W.3d 747, 753 (Ky. App. 2003) (stating that the same rules of construction or interpretation that apply to statutes also apply to administrative regulations).

comply with KRS Chapter 278 like any other rate or service standard included in a utility tariff.

KBCA's response to AT&T Kentucky's motion to strike Kravtin's testimony states that the Commission did not fully address the allocation of non-red tagged pole costs and intended to address the allocation through the review of tariff filings.¹¹ The Commission finds that this position is also supported by the Statement of Consideration, which notes that other utility customers might benefit from non-red tagged pole replacements,¹² consistent with Ms. Kravtin's argument in support of her cost allocation methodology,¹³ and portions of the next paragraph explain how other customers might benefit.¹⁴ The Statement of Consideration also explicitly explains that the regulation is written to allow the allocation non-red tagged pole replacement costs to be addressed through tariff filings on a utility specific basis, stating:

Section 4(6)(b)4, with which KBCA now takes issue, then indicates that the replacement costs for non-red tagged poles that must be replaced to accommodate a new attachment will be charged in accordance with each utility's tariff or an applicable special contract.

...

The regulation, as written, allows for the cost of replacement poles install to accommodate a new attachers equipment to be addressed through each utilities tariff, which is the same manner in which the Commission allocates most utility costs among various classes of utility customers. As argued by Chris Perry on behalf of KAEC, addressing the cost of replacement poles that are necessary to accommodate a new

¹¹ KBCA's Response in Opposition to AT&T's Motion to Strike (filed July 5, 2022).

¹² Amendments after Comments and Statement of Consideration for 807 KAR 5:015 at 47.

¹³ See Direct Testimony of Patricia D. Kravtin (filed June 9, 2022) at 7–8.

¹⁴ Amendments after Comments and Statement of Consideration for 807 KAR 5:015 at 47.

attacher in that manner is the best way to allocate such costs at this time, because it will allow the Commission to address the issue in a more nuanced manner based on evidence regarding specific utilities, including information regarding the age of each utility's poles and the level of specificity with which they track depreciation expense for utility poles.¹⁵

Given those statements, the sentences referred to by AT&T Kentucky could not reasonably be said to have fully litigated or resolved the issue,¹⁶ and certainly could not be read to contradict the plain language of the regulation. Thus, AT&T Kentucky failed to support the premise for its motion to strike, and therefore, the Commission finds that AT&T Kentucky's motion to strike should be denied.

However, even if AT&T Kentucky had established that the Commission fully addressed the allocation non-red tagged pole replacement, it would not justify AT&T Kentucky's motion to strike. AT&T Kentucky's position is essentially that the evidence presented by KBCA is irrelevant, because the issue was previously addressed by the Commission. While the Commission has granted motions to strike when a party files evidence after the record is closed pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, Section 11(4),¹⁷ the Commission has rejected motions to strike based on the claim that evidence is irrelevant based, in part, on the premise that the Commission "is the final arbiter of the relevancy of information in the record and will afford the evidence whatever weight to which it is

¹⁵ Amendments after Comments and Statement of Consideration for 807 KAR 5:015 at 46–47 (footnote omitted).

¹⁶ In fact, even the sentence referred to by Kentucky Power read in isolation could not really be read as resolving the issue, because there could be more than one cause requiring a pole replacement.

¹⁷ See Case No. 2013-00237, *Application of Water Service Corporation of Kentucky for an Adjustment of Rates* (Ky. PSC July 11, 2014), Order; Case No. 2012-00470, *Application of Jessamine South Elkhorn Water District for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct and Finance a Waterworks Improvements Project Pursuant to KRS 278.020 and 278.300* (Ky. PSC Jan. 3, 2014), Order.

entitled.”¹⁸ Narrowing the evidence available for the Commission’s consideration unnecessarily constrains its ability to uphold its statutory obligations. Thus, again, the Commission finds that AT&T Kentucky’s motion to strike should be denied.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that AT&T Kentucky’s motion to strike is denied.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

¹⁸ See Case No. 2015-00283, *Application of Windstream Communications, Inc. for a Declaratory Order Affirming that the Interconnection Regimes under KRS 278.530 and 47 U.S.C. § 251 are Technology Neutral* (Ky. PSC Aug. 6, 2018), Order.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION



Chairman

Vice Chairman

Commissioner



ATTEST:



Executive Director

*Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company LL dba
Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company LLC dba
221 E Fourth Street, Room 103-1080
Cincinnati, OH 45201-2301

*Kevin Mann
Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company
221 E 4th Street, Room 103-1170
Cincinnati, OH 45202

*Suzanne Pagana
Inteserra Consulting Group
151 Southhall Lane Suite 450
Maitland, FLORIDA 32751

*Cheryl Winn
Waters Law Group, PLLC
12802 Townepark Way, Suite 200
Louisville, KENTUCKY 40243

*Katie M Glass
Stites & Harbison
421 West Main Street
P. O. Box 634
Frankfort, KENTUCKY 40602-0634

*Windstream Kentucky East, LLC
Windstream Kentucky East, LLC
4001 N Rodney Parham Road
Little Rock, AR 72212

*Douglas E Hart
Frost & Jacobs
2500 Pnc Center
201 E. Fifth Street
Cincinnati, OHIO 45202

*Leigh Fox
Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company
201 E. Fourth Street
P. O. Box 2301
Cincinnati, OH 45201-2301

*Sharon Thomas
Inteserra Consulting Group
151 Southhall Lane Suite 450
Maitland, FLORIDA 32751

*Eduardo Arellano
BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC dba AT&T
405 N Broadway
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

*BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC db
BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC dba AT&T
Meidinger Tower
462 S 4th Street, Suite 2400
Louisville, KY 40202

*M. Todd Osterloh
Sturgill, Turner, Barker & Moloney, PLLC
333 West Vine Street
Suite 1400
Lexington, KENTUCKY 40507

*Hannah Wigger
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1
Washington, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 20006

*Paul Werner
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1
Washington, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 20006

*James W Gardner
Sturgill, Turner, Barker & Moloney, PLLC
333 West Vine Street
Suite 1400
Lexington, KENTUCKY 40507

*Honorable Robert C Moore
Attorney At Law
Stites & Harbison
421 West Main Street
P. O. Box 634
Frankfort, KENTUCKY 40602-0634

*John Tyler
BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC dba AT&T
405 N Broadway
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

*Rebecca C. Price
Sturgill, Turner, Barker & Moloney
155 East Main Street
Lexington, KENTUCKY 40507