

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the Matter of:

AN INVESTIGATION OF TOLL AND)
ACCESS CHARGE PRICING AND)
TOLL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS FOR) CASE NO. 8838
TELEPHONE UTILITIES PURSUANT TO)
CHANGES TO BE EFFECTIVE)
JANUARY 1, 1984)

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that Cincinnati Bell, Inc. ("CB") shall file an original and 15 copies of the following information with the Commission on or before October 24, 1983. Each copy of the data requested should be placed in a bound volume with each item tabbed. When a number of sheets are required for an item, each sheet should be appropriately indexed, for example, Item 1(a), Sheet 2 of 6. Include with each response the name of the witness who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided. Careful attention should be given to copied material to insure that it is legible. Where information requested herein has been provided along with the original application, in the format requested herein, reference may be made to the specific location of said information in responding to this information request. When applicable, the information requested herein should be provided for total company operations and Kentucky jurisdictional operations, separately. If

neither the requested information nor a motion for an extension of time is filed by the stated date, the case may be dismissed.

1. Identify intrastate end user revenue requirement as filed in Case No. 8838 on September 30, 1983, and show each end user revenue requirement calculation.

2. Provide end user rate schedules based on the September 30, 1983, and end user revenue requirements.

3. Identify each rate element in the Facilities for Intrastate Access Tariff that mirrors interstate access charges and state the reason for concurrence. Also, identify each rate element that does not mirror interstate access charges, state the reason for non-concurrence, and state the interstate access service rate. Finally, quantify the revenue effect for each element for which CB did not mirror the interstate access charge, (e.g., AT&T premium access and the \$25 surcharge on WATS resellers as specified in FCC's Orders in 78-72).

4. Provide a billing analysis and price-out showing each rate element in the Access Service Tariff and the billing units used to generate access revenues. Also, specifically explain adjustments to the billing analysis.

5. Provide cost documentation for each rate element in the Facilities for Intrastate Access Tariff.

6. In Section 8, Billing and Collection Services, of the Access Services Tariff CB proposes to provide billing service on

the condition that it purchase an interexchange carrier's accounts receivable.

(a) Identify and describe in brief narrative each type of billing and collection service CB proposes to provide.

(b) Identify and quantify any billing system development and/or modification costs incurred by CB, including administrative, managerial, programming, and equipment costs to provide interexchange carrier billing. Also, identify the rate element(s) to which such costs have been allocated.

(c) Estimate the cost benefit effects of CB's proposal to purchase interexchange carrier accounts receivable vs. billing without purchase.

(d) Identify expenses and revenues associated with such type of billing and collection service CB proposes to provide.

(e) Provide a narrative statement describing any conflicts, if any, between CB's billing and collection service proposal and Commission Administrative Regulations; e.g., deposit guidelines and discontinuance of service regulations.

(f) Quantify estimated total interexchange carrier billing for 1984 and the amount of any discount rate that CB proposes to apply to interexchange carrier billing.

(g) Provide a sample 1984 customer bill.

7. Provide a statement of CB's plan for the routing of undesignated interlata and interstate calls to a preferred interchange carrier or among all interexchange carriers.

8. Provide a statement as to CB's plans to notify its customers of interexchange carrier selection options.

9. What specific administrative burdens and expenses would CB experience as a result of a system of access charges that:

- (a) mirror the traffic sensitive portions of the interstate access tariff and
- (b) set a constant markup of the carrier common line portion of the interstate tariff (e.g., 120 percent of the interstate charge)?

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 14 day of October, 1983
at Frankfort, Kentucky.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION



For the Commission

ATTEST:

Secretary