COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTH CENTRAL) STATES, INC.'S PROPOSED SEPARATE RATE) CASE NO. 91-193 SCHEDULES FOR THE AT&T CIID/891 CARD) TARIFF)

ORDER

This matter having arisen upon AT&T Communications of South Central States, Inc.'s ("AT&T") motion to limit the scope of the October 29, 1991 hearing in this proceeding to the reasonableness of AT&T's proposed tariff revision. On October 18, 1991, AmeriCall Systems of Louisville ("AmeriCall") filed a response objecting to AT&T's motion to limit the scope of the proceeding stating that all issues relating to the CIID card should be considered and that AT&T's procedural motion is untimely.

The Commission in response to AT&T's motion finds that its June 20, 1991 Order suspended the proposed tariff filing and ordered AT&T to respond to AmeriCall's motion to suspend which was based on the allegation that the filing was discriminatory. Subsequent to this Order, AmeriCall filed a motion requesting that a procedural schedule be adopted which was granted by the Commission. Although the Commission did not specifically set forth issues which would be addressed in the proceeding, neither did it expand the proceeding beyond the June 20, 1991 Order, which suspended the tariff filing and ordered AT&T to respond to AmeriCall's objections. The Commission, having considered the motion and being otherwise sufficiently advised, HEREBY ORDERS that ATST's motion to limit the scope of the October 29, 1991 hearing to the reasonableness of the proposed tariff revision filing is granted.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 22nd day of October, 1991.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

rman

Commissioner

ATTEST:

Wheel so a how

• •

Executive Director

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTH CENTRAL) STATES, INC.'S PROPOSED SEPARATE RATE) CASE NO. 91-193 SCHEDULES FOR THE AT&T CIID/891 CARD) TARIFF)

ORDER

On September 30, 1991, AmeriCall Systems of Louisville ("AmeriCall") filed a motion to compel AT&T Communications of South Central States ("AT&T") to answer the following information requests: Items 7, 8(b), 8(c), 14, 15, and 19. On October 7, 1991, AT&T responded to AmeriCall's motion to compel by reasserting each of the general and specific objections set forth in its initial response. AT&T also supplemented its response to Items 7 and 8(b). However, AT&T objects to Items 8(c), 14, 15, and 19 on the grounds of relevancy.

Item 8(c) requests a copy of each "Mutual Card Honoring Agreement" utilized by AT&T and every local exchange carrier in Kentucky which accepts the AT&T CIID card for IntraLATA calling. The proposed tariff does not address nor is it related to billing and collection procedures, therefore, it is not relevant to this proceeding. The issue of whether billing and collection procedures of any regulated company are in violation of Commission rules should be appropriately addressed through the filing of a complaint. Item 14 requests a description of the arrangement by which GTE AirFone is permitted to accept AT&T calling cards and a copy of any "Mutual Card Honoring Agreements." For the reason discussed in relation to Item 8(c), this information is not relevant to the proposed tariff.

Item 15 requests information relating to the number of AT&T Universal Cards issued to AT&T customers in Kentucky. Although the Universal Card utilizes the CIID format, which is the subject of the proposed tariff, the two are separate matters. Therefore, the number of Universal Cards which are issued to AT&T customers in Kentucky is not relevant to and beyond the scope of this proceeding.

Item 19 requests information regarding the amount of compensation or value provided to and from AT&T, Universal Bank and Universal Card Services. AT&T responded by stating that the information is not relevant to the proposed tariff because the discount is not funded by AT&T but by the bank issuing the card. As previously discussed in reference to Item 15, the Universal Card and the CIID format, which is the subject of the proposed tariff, are two separate issues; therefore, the information request is beyond the scope of this proceeding.

The Commission, being further sufficiently advised, HEREBY ORDERS that AmeriCall's motion to compel AT&T to respond to Items 8(c), 14, 15, and 19 is denied.

-2-

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 22nd day of October, 1991.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chairman

Commissioner

ATTEST:

Luchen 1. .

Executive Director