

showing set forth in Section 1.773(a)(1)(iv) of the Rules.¹¹³ The petitioners did not address the Section 1.773(a)(1)(iv) requirements. We have reviewed LECs' transmittals and all associated pleadings. We conclude that there is insufficient reason to reject or investigate these rates at this time.¹¹⁴

J. Elimination of Feature Groups by Bell Atlantic, BellSouth and NYNEX

70. Sprint argues that Bell Atlantic, BellSouth and NYNEX have revised their access tariffs to eliminate bundled feature groups. Sprint asserts that, the Commission's April 14, 1993 order on reconsideration in the ONA proceeding mandated continued availability of bundled feature groups.¹¹⁵ Accordingly, Sprint contends, these LECs should revise their proposed tariffs to reinstate all terms and conditions relating to the provision and use of bundled feature group arrangements.

71. As Sprint observes, the Commission has reinstated feature groups by its April 14 order. Subsequently, the carriers have complied with that Order. Accordingly, we dismiss this aspect of Sprint's petition as moot.

III. TIER 2 CARRIERS

A. Increases in Local Switching Rates for Certain Tier 2 Local Exchange Carriers

72. AT&T argues that the Traffic Sensitive rates filed by 23 LECS pursuant to Section 61.39 or Section 61.38 of the Commission's Rules¹¹⁶ are excessive, resulting in aggregate rate increases of

¹¹³ 47 C.F.R. § 1.773(a)(1)(iv); see also LEC Price Cap Order 5 FCC Rcd at 6822 (para 293).

¹¹⁴ We note, however, that we are already inquiring into whether we should promulgate guidelines requiring cost justification of any subset of LEC volume and term discounts. Expanded Interconnection with Local Telephone Company Facilities, CC Docket No. 91-141, Amendment of the Part 69 Allocation of General Support Facility Costs, CC Docket No. 92-222, Report and Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 7 FCC Rcd 7369 (1992). These rates will be subject to the outcome of that inquiry.

¹¹⁵ Sprint Petition at 6, citing Amendments of Part 69 of the Commission's rules Relating to the Creation of Access Charge Subelements for Open Network Architecture, CC Docket No. 89-79, Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration, FCC 93-190, released Apr. 14, 1993.

¹¹⁶ 47 C.F.R. §§ 61.38 and 61.39.

\$4,747,965.¹¹⁷ AT&T contends that each of these LECs has filed local switching rate increases for 1993 that are more than 10 percent greater than their 1992 rates, with certain increases as high as 134.32 percent (Merchants and Farmers) and 139.13 percent (Bloomindale). The average rate increase for these LECs, according to AT&T, is 38.91 percent, and the weighted average rate increase is 22.93 percent. AT&T argues that these rates appear on their face to be excessive when compared with overall industry trends.¹¹⁸

73. The LECs filing pursuant to Section 61.39 respond that Section 1.773 of the Commission's Rules¹¹⁹ deems the rates prima facie lawful and not subject to suspension unless the petition shows that the cost and demand studies were not provided to an interested party upon reasonable request.¹²⁰ Elkhart further argues that suspension of the small company access tariffs would be contrary to the Commission's goal of rate neutrality. Elkhart contends that revisions suggested by AT&T would be based on a combination of historical and prospective data. Elkhart argues that since the principle of rate neutrality is based in the calculation of rates using historical data, the results would violate that principle.¹²¹

74. We have reviewed the LEC transmittals that were petitioned by AT&T and all associated pleadings. We conclude that the filings are not patently unlawful so as to warrant rejection. We also conclude that no question has been presented that warrants investigation at this time.

B. Citizens Increase of Rates Due to Operating Expenses

75. Citizens Utilities Telephone of Arizona filed rates based on prospective cost data pursuant to Section 61.38 of the

¹¹⁷ AT&T Petition at App. H; listing the following LECs: Ayershire, Bay Springs, Bloomindale, Bourbeuse, Coastal Utilities, C-R Telephone, East Ascension, El Paso, Elkhart, Fidelity, Granite State, Gridley, Hargray, Leaf River, Merchants and Farmer, Millington, Northwest, Odin, Pineland, Sierra, Southeast, United Telephone Association, and Warwick Valley.

¹¹⁸ AT&T notes that it has requested and reviewed the cost support for these rates and concluded that the cost support does not demonstrate any justification for the rate increases.

¹¹⁹ 47 C.F.R. § 1.773(a)(1)(iii).

¹²⁰ See e.g., Coastal Utilities, et al. Reply at 2; GVNW Reply at 1-2; Elkhart et al. Reply at 1-2.

¹²¹ Elkhart Reply at 7.

Commission's rules.¹²² AT&T argues that Citizens appears to have projected growth rates for total company operating expenses which far exceed Citizens' historical trends. Specifically, AT&T contends that Citizens has projected growth in certain expense categories from historical to the prospective period at rates between 10 and 55 percent. These growth rates, AT&T contends, are significantly higher than Citizens' projected overall 6.45 percent growth in central office equipment investment during the same period. Finally, AT&T asserts that nothing in Citizens' workpapers offers a satisfactory explanation or justification for these increases. AT&T asks that the Commission enter a one day suspension and investigate Citizens' rates.¹²³

76. Citizens replies that AT&T provides no evidence that its expenses are unwarranted or that they do not serve the public interest. Citizens further argues that AT&T provides no evidence that current expenses are excessive, that the historical average is appropriate today, or that the historical ratio of expenses to investment is relevant for ratemaking purposes.¹²⁴

77. We have reviewed Citizen's transmittal and all associated pleadings.¹²⁵ We conclude that no question has been presented that warrants investigation at this time.

C. Demand Forecast of Anchorage for 800 Query Service

78. Anchorage filed rates based on prospective cost data pursuant to Section 61.38 of the Commission's rules.¹²⁶ AT&T argues that Anchorage has shown a test period demand amount of 19,299,100 queries for 800 query service. AT&T asserts that this amount appears to be incorrect and that Anchorage has understated its demand by using historical 1992 demand instead of forecasting demand. AT&T also argues that Anchorage has forecasted its total traffic sensitive minutes to increase at an annualized rate of 7.85 percent throughout the test period. AT&T contends that a proper calculation will result in a reduction of Anchorage's access charges for 800 query service of approximately \$55,000.¹²⁷

122 47 C.F.R. § 61.38.

123 AT&T Petition at App. I.

124 Citizens Reply at 2.

125 See also Letter to the Secretary Supplementing Citizens' 1993 Annual Access Filing, June 7, 1993.

126 47 C.F.R. § 61.38.

127 AT&T Petition at App. J.

79. Anchorage agrees with AT&T that its projected demand for 800 query service should be increased by using a projected annualized growth rate of 7.85 percent. However, Anchorage also argues that its revenue requirement must also be increased to reflect additional costs from serving the higher demand.¹²⁸

80. We conclude that AT&T has raised sufficient question as to the correctness of Anchorage's cost support to warrant investigation. We therefore suspend Anchorage's tariff for one day and incorporate the 800 services portion of Anchorage's transmittal into the Commission's current investigation in CC Docket No. 93-129.¹²⁹ We also impose an accounting order upon Anchorage.

D. Anchorage Traffic Sensitive Rates

81. GCI addresses several issues concerning Anchorage's traffic sensitive rates and asks that the Commission suspend and investigate the transmittal. First GCI contests Anchorage's directory assistance service charge. GCI argues that, when compared to Anchorage's revenue requirement filed with NECA for the NECA 1992 directory assistance rate, Anchorage's 1993 revenue requirement is 43 percent higher.¹³⁰ Concerning its directory assistance rates, Anchorage states that it will amend its rate to reflect errors alleged by GCI.¹³¹

82. Second, GCI states that Anchorage's cost study for this tariff includes tandem switching costs. GCI argues that Anchorage has never reflected tandem switching costs in its prior cost studies and includes no allocation to local service. GCI asks that Anchorage explain the investment, associated traffic studies underlying the allocation factors, and provide network diagrams to assist in an analysis of this new investment.¹³² Anchorage asserts that its tandem equipment investment allocation factor is intended to reflect a portion of the switch it needs to terminate GCI's Feature Group B traffic and that this is the first time such allocation has been appropriate.¹³³

¹²⁸ Anchorage Reply at 5.

¹²⁹ Bell Operating Companies' Tariff for the 800 Service Management System and 800 Data Base Access Tariffs, 8 FCC Rcd 3242 (Com. Car. Bur., Apr. 28, 1993).

¹³⁰ GCI Petition at 3-4.

¹³¹ Anchorage Reply at 2.

¹³² GCI Petition at 4-5.

¹³³ Anchorage Reply at 3.

83. GCI next argues that it is impossible to determine whether Anchorage's claimed investment in fiber optic and circuit equipment has been properly assigned.¹³⁴ Anchorage contends that all fiber optic costs are covered through a lease arrangement with Alascom, Inc. pursuant to an Alaska Public Utilities Commission order.¹³⁵

84. GCI also argues that Anchorage's 800 database query charge improperly included local switching and local transport costs.¹³⁶ Anchorage asserts that its 800 database query rate is developed in accordance with Commission orders and rules.¹³⁷

85. Lastly, GCI asserts that Anchorage offers 19.2 Kbps and 64 Kbps high capacity services which it has not included in its tariff.¹³⁸ Anchorage states that the 19.2 and 64 Kbps services received by GCI are multiplexed from Anchorage's tariffed 1.544 Mbps, either by GCI or by its customers.¹³⁹

86. We have reviewed Anchorage Transmittal No. 64, GCI's petition and related pleadings. We conclude that, except for the 800 service issue addressed in the previous section, no question has been presented that warrants investigation at this time.

E. ALLTEL Minutes of Use Forecast

87. ALLTEL filed prospective cost data pursuant to Section 61.38 of the Commission's rules.¹⁴⁰ AT&T states that ALLTEL has reduced its traffic sensitive minutes of use forecast from its baseline due to the anticipated closing of Chanute Air Force Base. AT&T argues that ALLTEL has not provided evidence that traffic will decline by the full 14.7 percent as projected. AT&T contends that it is more likely that air force base operations will be phased out gradually over time. AT&T further asserts that it is possible that the traffic will actually increase due to activities associated with the base's closing.¹⁴¹

134 GCI Petition at 5.

135 Anchorage Reply at 3-4.

136 GCI Petition at 5-6.

137 Anchorage Reply at 5-6.

138 GCI Petition at 6.

139 Anchorage Reply at 6.

140 47 C.F.R. § 61.38.

141 AT&T Petition at App. K.

88. ALLTEL responds that AT&T's arguments are speculative and are undermined by facts filed with its tariff. ALLTEL argues that it received confirmation from the Air Force that the final closing of the base will take place on September 30, 1993, concluding the phase-out of operations which began in January of 1993. ALLTEL contends that it did not reflect the phase-down in minutes of use until after the September 30th closing date. Finally ALLTEL argues that its forecast of demand impact is, therefore, conservative.¹⁴²

89. We have reviewed ALLTEL's transmittal and all related pleadings. We conclude that there is nothing patently unlawful so as to warrant rejection, and that no question has been presented that warrants investigation at this time.

F. Roseville Cash Working Capital

90. Roseville filed rates based on prospective cost data pursuant to Section 61.38 of the Commission's rules.¹⁴³ AT&T asserts that Roseville overstated its cash working capital (CWC) requirement by approximately \$1.2 million.¹⁴⁴ Roseville's requirement amounts to 76 net days of working capital according to AT&T. AT&T asserts that the average number of days of 10 LECs similarly situated to Roseville is 20 days, ranging from 17 days to 39 days. AT&T therefore requests that the Commission direct Roseville to justify its use of an extraordinary number of days or to use no more than the average number of days of the comparable-sized LECs as a reasonable surrogate.¹⁴⁵

91. Roseville responds that AT&T's computation is based on incorrect assumptions and that a corrected AT&T analysis yields 59 days of working capital requirement. Roseville states that its results are based on a study and are thus, more accurate than calculations using standard assumptions as permitted by the Commission's rules. Roseville further asserts that AT&T failed to demonstrate that Roseville's transmittal is prima facie unlawful and that the petition fails to raise significant questions of lawfulness.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² ALLTEL Reply at 2-4.

¹⁴³ 47 C.F.R. § 61.38.

¹⁴⁴ CWC is the amount of investor-supplied funds used to pay operating expenses that are incurred in providing service prior to the receipt of revenues. CWC is generally computed by determining the revenue lag.

¹⁴⁵ AT&T Petition at App. L.

¹⁴⁶ Roseville Reply at 2-6.

92. Pursuant to Section 204(a) of the Communications Act and Section 0.291 of the Commission's rules, we conclude that an investigation of the proposed tariff changes concerning Roseville's calculations related to its cash working capital is warranted. Therefore, we are suspending rates for one day, imposing an accounting order, and initiating an investigation. We designate issues for investigation in Section VI of this Order.

G. NECA's Traffic Sensitive Rate Calculations

93. AT&T and MCI filed petitions against the National Exchange Carrier Association's (NECA's) Traffic Sensitive rates. AT&T argues that the NECA rates appear to overstate the average schedule settlement projections for the test period.¹⁴⁷ AT&T asserts that there is a \$62.7 million discrepancy between the forecasted average schedule settlement amounts for the tariff year and NECA's December 31, 1992 average schedule filing.¹⁴⁸ AT&T further contends that NECA has not included overall Traffic Sensitive rate reductions to account for overearnings in 1992, and alleges that NECA has overstated the amount of its "earnings erosion."¹⁴⁹

94. MCI asserts that NECA has provided insufficient information to determine whether NECA used proper DEM factors. MCI argues that this may result in unwarranted Traffic Sensitive rate increases.¹⁵⁰ Both MCI and AT&T seek suspension and investigation of NECA's Traffic Sensitive rates.

95. NECA argues that it has correctly forecasted its average schedule company settlements. NECA contends that AT&T's analysis incorrectly applies an annual growth rate to baseline data and fails to include the impact of several average schedule formulas that are based on demand units other than minutes. NECA further argues that in its annual filing, prior year cost of service and test-period average schedule settlement projections use historical trends to estimate both anticipated changes to pooling data and the impact of the proposed schedule revisions. AT&T has, NECA

¹⁴⁷ AT&T Petition at 30-31.

¹⁴⁸ Id. at 31.

¹⁴⁹ "Earnings erosion" occurs as a result of NECA permitting carriers to true-up their settlement amounts with the pool for up to two years. Since these costs tend to rise, earnings are diminished or eroded over time. Id. at 33 and App. D-2; MCI Petition at 30-32.

¹⁵⁰ MCI Petition at 30-32.

contends, based its analysis on the projection of a single month's data to the test period.¹⁵¹

96. Concerning "earnings erosion" in the development of Traffic Sensitive rates, NECA contends that AT&T's and MCI's arguments fail to consider the impact of three important factors: (1) that NECA voluntarily reduced its current test-period Traffic Sensitive rates on February 1, 1993; (2) that the pool composition for the test period is significantly different from the 1992 pool composition; and (3) that the parties rely on preliminary data. NECA states that while it has made substantial improvement in reducing earnings erosion to the level displayed for 1991, and is continuing to do so, further progress will be difficult to accomplish due to the volatility in small company cost trends, combined with implementation of infrastructure enhancements.¹⁵²

97. Finally, NECA responds to MCI's contention that a large part of the annualized Traffic Sensitive revenue requirement is attributed to the DEM transition. NECA contends that the growth rate of its Traffic Sensitive switched access revenue requirement due to the DEM transition is reasonable and consistent with industry trends. NECA argues that the annual growth in its Traffic Sensitive switched access pool revenue requirement is less than the projected growth attributable to NECA companies' DEM.¹⁵³

98. We have examined the issues raised in the petitions regarding NECA's Traffic Sensitive rates and calculation, as well as the filing and supporting documentation. We conclude that an investigation is not warranted at this time.

IV. UNIVERSAL SERVICE FUND AND LIFELINE

99. On May 17, 1993, NECA filed tariff revisions to decrease its Universal Service Fund (USF) charge from \$.4604 to \$.4561, and to increase the Lifeline Assistance (LA) charge from \$.0777 to \$.0809.¹⁵⁴ The tariff is scheduled to become effective on July 1, 1993. Petitions to suspend and investigate NECA Transmittal No. 556 were filed by MCI and Sprint on June 1, 1993.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ NECA Reply at 4-5.

¹⁵² Id. at 7-10.

¹⁵³ Id. at 10-12.

¹⁵⁴ National Exchange Carrier Association, Tariff F.C.C. No. 5, Transmittal No. 556, filed May 17, 1993.

¹⁵⁵ Sprint asks that the NECA filing be suspended for one day and that the transmittal be incorporated into the Commission's current investigation of NECA USF/LA tariff provisions in CC Docket 93-123.

100. Sprint argues that the rates are based on revenue requirement estimates which are excessive and insufficiently documented.¹⁵⁶ Sprint asserts that NECA has failed to provide adequate justification for the increases in USF/LA revenue requirements: the difference between prior projections and actual assistance provided, or fund resizing; the "quarterly update and other adjustments;" and the estimated increase in administrative expenses.¹⁵⁷ MCI argues that the level of increase in the USF revenue requirement is unwarranted because the phase in of the USF is complete.¹⁵⁸

101. NECA responds that neither MCI nor Sprint has raised sufficient questions of lawfulness to warrant investigation of Transmittal 556. NECA asserts that its resizing adjustments of USF and of LA are consistent with Commission rules. NECA also contends that it calculated its expenses in a reasonable manner and consistent with the Commission's rules.¹⁵⁹

102. We conclude that sufficient question as to NECA's justification for its USF/LA rate changes have been raised to warrant investigation. We also find that these issues are sufficiently similar to those in our current investigation of NECA's USF/LA rate changes, that administrative convenience permits adding this transmittal to that investigation. We therefore suspend NECA's Transmittal 556 for one day and incorporate that transmittal into the Commission's current investigation of NECA USF/LA provision in CC Docket No. 93-123.¹⁶⁰ The accounting order imposed in CC Docket No. 93-123 also applies to this transmittal.

V. GENERAL SUPPORT FACILITIES (GSF) COSTS

103. On May 19, 1993, the Commission released an Order adopting rule modifications to correct the misallocation of GSF investment and related expenses among the Part 69 cost categories

¹⁵⁶ Sprint Petition at 1.

¹⁵⁷ Id. at 1-3.

¹⁵⁸ Id.

¹⁵⁹ NECA Reply (Tr. 556) at 3-7.

¹⁶⁰ National Exchange Carrier Association, Revisions to Tariff F.C.C. NO. 5, Universal Service Fund and Lifeline Assistance Rates, Order, 8 FCC Rcd 922 (Com. Car. Bur. 1993); Order Designating Issues for Investigation, 8 FCC Rcd 2930 (Com. Car. Bur. 1993).

for LECs.¹⁶¹ The Order directed LECs to file compliance tariffs, on not less than 14-days' notice, to be effective July 1, 1993.

104. These tariffs were filed June 17, 1993. Petitions, if any, will be due virtually at the same time this Order is released. Therefore, because of the limited time within which to conduct a necessary review of issues concerning the GSF filings and in an abundance of caution, we conclude that an investigation is warranted to determine whether these filings comply with the Commission's GSF Order. Accordingly, in this Order we suspend those tariffs filed pursuant to the GSF Order for one day and impose an accounting order. The issues are designated in Section VI of this Order.¹⁶²

VI. ISSUES DESIGNATED FOR INVESTIGATION

105. We hereby designate the following issues for investigation:

1. Have the LECs borne their burden of demonstrating that implementing SFAS-106 results in an exogenous cost change for the TBO amounts under the Commission's price cap rules?

We direct the LECs to provide evidence of and describe the ranges of data on the age of the workforce, the ages at which employees will retire, and the length of service of retirees, presented by their actuaries and used by the companies to compute OPEB amounts claimed in the annual access transmittals.

We direct the LECs to provide pertinent sections of their employee handbooks, contracts with unions, and other items that include statements to the employees concerning the company's ability to modify its post-employment benefits package.

2. How should price cap LECs reflect amounts from prior year sharing or low-end adjustments in computing their rates of return for the current year's sharing and low-end adjustments to price cap indices?

¹⁶¹ Amendment of the Part 69 Allocation of General Support Facility Costs, CC Docket No. 92-222, FCC 93-238, released May 19, 1993 (GSF Order).

¹⁶² The analysis of price cap indices in Appendix C does not reflect the GSF reallocations. An analysis reflecting the GSF reallocation is available in hard copy or computer disk from the Commission's commercial contractor, International Transcription Services, Room 246, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

3. Does US West's filing, claiming a change in a DEM allocator as exogenous, comply with Section 61.45(d)?

4. Should Bell Atlantic be permitted to exclude end user charge revenues from the common line basket for the purposes of computing sharing obligations?

5. Have Bell Atlantic and SNET correctly calculated the "g" factor? Parties addressing this issue should discuss whether the fact that revenues in the PCI calculation are viewed over an entire year requires that other factors in the PCI formula be treated consistently. Responsive parties should also address whether an average line count should apply to both the base year, and the base year minus one.

6. Have the LECs properly reallocated GSF costs in accordance with the GSF Order?

7. To what category or categories should the LIDB per query charges be assigned?

8. Has Roseville met its burden of justifying its cash working capital requirement and underlying study in support of its annual access rates?

106. This investigation will be conducted as a notice and comment proceeding pursuant to Section 1.411 of the Commissions Rules.¹⁶³ CC Docket No. 93 - 193 has been assigned for this purpose. The carriers listed in Appendix B to this Order are designated as parties. These parties shall file their direct cases no later than July 27, 1993. The direct cases must present the parties' positions with respect to the issues described in this Order. Pleadings responding to the direct cases may be filed no later than August 10, 1993, and must be captioned "Opposition to Direct Case" or "Comments on Direct Case." Parties may each file a "rebuttal" to oppositions or comments no later than August 24, 1993.

107. An original and seven copies of all pleadings must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission. In addition, one copy must be delivered to the Commission's commercial copying firm, ITS, Room 246, 1919 M St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554. Members of the general public who wish to express their views in an informal manner regarding the issues in this investigation may do so by submitting one copy of their comments to the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554. Such comments must specify the docket number of this investigation.

¹⁶³ 47 C.F.R. § 1.411.

108. All relevant and timely pleadings will be considered by the Commission. In reaching a decision, the Commission will take into account information and ideas not contained in pleadings, provided that such information or a writing containing the nature and source of such information is placed in the public file, and provided that the fact of reliance on such information is noted in the Order.

109. Ex parte contacts (i.e., written or oral communications which address the procedural or substantive merits of the proceeding and which are directed to any member, officer, or employee of the Commission who may reasonably be expected to be involved in the decisional process in this proceeding) are permitted in this proceeding until a public notice of scheduled Commission consideration of a final Order is released and after the final Order itself is issued. Written ex parte contacts must be filed on the day submitted with the Secretary and Commission employees receiving each presentation. For other requirements, see generally Section 1.1200 et seq. of the Commissions rules.¹⁶⁴

110. The investigation established in this Order has been analyzed with respect to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 and found to contain no new or modified form, information collection, or recordkeeping, labeling, disclosure or other record retention requirements as contemplated under the statute.¹⁶⁵

VII. ORDERING CLAUSES

111. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. § 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the rates specified in Sections II.A., II.B.1., II.B.4., II.C., II.F., II.G., III.C., III.F., IV, and V, supra, ARE SUSPENDED for one day from the current effective date and an investigation of those rates is instituted. The local exchange carriers affected SHALL FILE a supplement reflecting this suspension no later than June 29, 1993, to be effective July 1, 1993.

112. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i), 4(j), and 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), 204(a), the local exchange carriers listed in Appendix B SHALL RESPOND to the issues designated in Section VI, supra, no later than July 27, 1993. Interested parties may file pleadings responding to the direct case no later than August 10, 1993, and the local exchange carriers may file a rebuttal no later than August 24, 1993.

¹⁶⁴ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.1200 et seq.

¹⁶⁵ See 44 U.S.C. § 3502(4) (A).

113. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the local exchange carriers that filed 1993 annual access rates specified in Sections II.A., II.B.1., II.B.4., II.C., II.F., II.G., III.C., III.F., IV, and V, supra, SHALL KEEP ACCURATE ACCOUNT of all amounts received that are associated with the rates that are the subject of this investigation.

114. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to Section 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. § 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the tariff revisions filed by the Anchorage Telephone Utility, and any other local exchange carrier that included new or changed 800 service rates in its 1993 annual access filings, are subject to the investigation of 800 service rates instituted in CC Docket No. 93-129. Anchorage Telephone Utility SHALL FILE a supplement reflecting this suspension no later than June 29, 1993, to be effective July 1, 1993.

115. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the Anchorage Telephone Utility, and any other local exchange carrier that included new or changed 800 service rates in its 1993 annual access filings, SHALL KEEP ACCURATE ACCOUNT of all amounts received that are associated with the rates that are the subject to the investigation in CC Docket No. 93-129.

116. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to Section 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. § 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the tariff revisions filed by the National Exchange Carrier Association, Transmittal No. 556, are subject to the investigation Universal Service Fund and Lifeline Assistance rates instituted in CC Docket No. 93-123. The National Exchange Carrier Association SHALL FILE a supplement reflecting this suspension no later than June 29, 1993, to be effective July 1, 1993.

117. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the National Exchange Carrier Association SHALL KEEP ACCURATE ACCOUNT of all amounts received that are associated with the rates that are the subject to the investigation in CC Docket No. 93-123.

118. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i) and 204(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 204(a), and Section 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 0.291, the local exchange carriers, as listed in Appendix B, that filed 1993 annual access rates SHALL KEEP ACCURATE ACCOUNT of all

amounts received that are associated with the rates that are the subject of this investigation.

119. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petitions to suspend and investigate or to reject the Annual 1993 Access Tariff filings ARE GRANTED to the extent indicated herein and otherwise ARE DENIED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Kathleen B. Levitz

Kathleen B. Levitz
Acting Chief
Common Carrier Bureau

APPENDIX A
Petitions

The following parties filed petitions against the 1993 Annual Access Tariff Filings. The names in parentheses are used for these parties throughout the Order.

Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users Committee (Ad Hoc)
American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T)
General Communication, Inc. (GCI)
MCI Telecommunications Corporation (MCI)
Metropolitan Fiber Systems, Inc. (MFS)
Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership (Sprint)
Williams Telecommunication Group, Inc. (Wiltel)

Replies

The following parties filed replies to the petitions:

ALLTEL Telephone System (ALLTEL)
Anchorage Telephone Utility (Anchorage)
Bay Springs Telephone Company, Inc. (Bay Springs)^{††}
Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies (Bell Atlantic)
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth)
Centel Telephone Companies (Centel)
Chicamauga Telephone Corporation (Chicamauga)
Chillicothe Telephone Company (Chillicothe)
Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company (Cincinnati Bell)
Citizens Telephone Companies (Citizens)
Coastal Utilities, Inc. (Coastal)[†]
Elkhart Telephone Company (Elkhart)^{††}
GTE Telephone Operating Companies and GTE System Telephone Companies (GTE)
GVNW, Inc./Management (GVNW)
Hargray Telephone Company, Inc.[†]
Lincoln Telephone Company (Lincoln)
Millington Telephone Company, Inc.[†]
National Exchange Carrier Association (NECA)
NYNEX Telephone Companies (NYNEX)
Pacific Bell (Pacific)
Pineland Telephone Cooperative, Inc.[†]
Rochester Telephone Corporation (Rochester)
Roseville Telephone Company (Roseville)
Southeast Telephone Company of Wisconsin, Inc.[†]
Southern New England Telephone Company (SNET)
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (Southwestern)
United Telephone Association, Inc.^{††}
US West Communications, Inc. (US West)

[†] Filed replies jointly (Coastal et. al.)

^{††} Filed replies jointly (Elkhart et. al.)

APPENDIX B

List of Parties to Investigation

Ameritech Operating Companies
Anchorage Telephone Utility
Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
Centel Telephone Companies
GTE Telephone Operating Companies
GTE System Telephone Companies
Lincoln Telephone Company
Nevada Bell
NYNEX Telephone Companies
Pacific Bell
Rochester Telephone Corporation
Roseville Telephone Company
Southern New England Telephone Company
United Telephone System
US West Communications, Inc.

APPENDIX C

Analysis of Price Cap Indexes

These charts show the indexes in the April 2, 1993 filings. Charts that show revisions, including the effects of re-allocating General Support Facility costs, are available in hardcopy or computer format from the Commission's commercial contractor, International Transcription Service, 1919 M Street, N.W., or the Common Carrier Bureau, Tariff Division.

Plan: Encls: AMTR

1983 Tr II Review Plan

#	GENERAL	LEC	FOC	Delta	Flag	#	SPECIAL	LEC	FOC	Delta	Flag
1	GNPR	0.00016				46	VO, ME, TG				
2	X for GL, TS and SP	0.00000				47	Proposed SB	102.95	102.95	0.000	
3	X for IX	0.00000				48	SB: Upper Limit	103.15	103.15	0.000	
4	EXCESSIVE CHANGES (000's)					49	SB: Lower Limit	97.95	97.95	0.000	
5	SAF	26.501				50	LEC SB Out Bounds?				
6	DEMS	(65,757)				51	FOC SB Out Bounds?				
7	LTS/TMS	(604,073)				52	Audio & Video				
8	ISW	(6267)				53	Proposed SB	98.75	98.75	0.000	
9	MDA	(65,189)				54	SB: Upper Limit	101.60	101.60	0.000	
10	EDT	31,204				55	SB: Lower Limit	91.95	91.95	0.000	
11	ITC	5269				56	LEC SB Out Bounds?				
12	PERSONAL SHAWNA/LOW END ADJ	\$18,400				57	FOC SB Out Bounds?				
13	PERSON SHAWNA/LOW END ADJ	(1,204)				58	H-Dep				
14	SHAWNA/LOW END ADJ	(114,313)				59	DB1				
15	OT/SH	34,889				60	Prop Sub-Index				
16	TOTAL OF INDIVIDUALS	(627,981)				61	Sub-Index Up Lim				
17	TOTAL EXCESSIVE	(627,981)				62	Sub-Index Lower Lim	84.85	84.85	0.000	
18	COMMON LINE					63	LEC Sub-Ind Out?	83.15	83.15	0.000	
19	Term Prem CCL Rate	0.00007	0.00007	-0.00000		64	FOC Sub-Ind Out?	80.85	80.85	0.000	
20	Orig Prem CCL Rate	0.00007	0.00007	-0.00000		65	DB5				
21	Proposed FCI	83.05	83.05	-0.000		66	Prop Sub-Index				
22	LOCAL SERVICES					67	Sub-Index Up Lim	86.42	86.42	0.000	
23	Local Subsidy					68	Sub-Index Lower Lim	80.78	80.78	0.000	
24	Proposed SB	88.31	88.31	0.000		69	LEC Sub-Ind Out?	82.13	82.13	0.000	
25	SB: Upper Limit	100.2975	100.2975	0.000		70	FOC Sub-Ind Out?				
26	SB: Lower Limit	88.94	88.94	0.000		71	Total Midday				
27	LEC SB Out Bounds?					72	Proposed SB				
28	FOC SB Out Bounds?					73	SB: Upper Limit	86.77	86.77	0.000	
29	Local Transport					74	SB: Lower Limit	91.14	91.14	0.000	
30	Proposed SB	90.28	90.28	0.000		75	LEC SB Out?	82.46	82.46	0.000	
31	SB: Upper Limit	95.89	95.89	0.000		76	Webboard				
32	SB: Lower Limit	88.48	88.48	0.000		77	Proposed SB				
33	LEC SB Out Bounds?					78	SB: Upper Limit				
34	FOC SB Out Bounds?					79	SB: Lower Limit	0.00	NONE	0.000	
35	Information					80	LEC SB Out Bounds?	0.00	NONE	0.000	
36	Proposed SB	91.45	91.45	0.000		81	FOC SB Out Bounds?	0.00	NONE	0.000	
37	SB: Upper Limit	95.51	95.51	0.000		82	Total Special Access				
38	SB: Lower Limit	88.41	88.41	0.000		83	Special AP				
39	LEC SB Out Bounds?					84	Special FCI				
40	FOC SB Out Bounds?					85	LEC AR Above FCI?	93.58	93.58	0.000	LOW
41	600 Data Base					86	FOC AR Above FCI?	98.79	98.79	0.000	LOW
42	Proposed SB	100.00	100.00	0.000		87	INTERCHANGE				
43	SB: Upper Limit	104.44	104.44	0.000		88	Interchange AP				
44	SB: Lower Limit	94.48	94.48	0.000		89	Interchange FCI	82.51	82.51	0.000	LOW
45	LEC SB Out Bounds?					90	LEC AR Above FCI?	98.29	98.29	0.000	LOW
46	FOC SB Out Bounds?					91	FOC AR Above FCI?				
47	Total Traffic Sensitive					92					
48	TS AP	93.13	93.13	0.000		93					
49	TS FCI	94.98	94.98	0.000		94					
50	LEC AR Above FCI?					95					
51	FOC AR Above FCI?					96					

Filing Entity: BSTR

1993 Tariff Review Plan

#	GENERAL	LEC	FCC	Delta	Flag
1	GNPPI	0.03018			
2	X for CL, TS and SP	0.03000			
3	X for DX	0.03000			
EXOGENOUS CHANGES (000's)					
4	SPP	(87,809)			
5	DEM	(84,089)			
6	LTS/TTS	351,724			
7	ISW	(142)			
8	RDA	90			
9	EDT	24,825			
10	ITC	24,888			
11	REMOVAL SHARINGLOW END ADJ	324,088			
12	REVISION SHARINGLOW END ADJ	38,700			
13	SHARINGLOW END ADJ	(11,889)			
14	OTHER	\$2,136			
15	TOTAL OF INDIVIDUALS	\$73,113			
16	TOTAL EXOGENOUS	\$73,113			
COMMON LINE					
17	Term Prem CCL Rate	0.01385	0.01385	-0.00000	*
18	Orig Prem CCL Rate	0.01000	0.01000	0.00000	*
19	0	0			
20	Proposed PCI	94.81	94.61	-0.000	*
TRAFFIC SENSITIVE					
21	Local Switching				
22	Proposed SBI	107.88	107.80	-0.000	*
23	SBI: Upper Limit	108.0281	108.0280	0.000	*
24	SBI: Lower Limit	87.74	87.74	0.000	*
25	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
26	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
27	Local Transport				
28	Proposed SBI	80.61	80.61	-0.000	*
29	SBI: Upper Limit	89.08	89.08	0.000	*
30	SBI: Lower Limit	80.61	80.61	0.000	*
31	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
32	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
33	Information				
34	Proposed SBI	108.93	108.93	-0.000	*
35	SBI: Upper Limit	110.18	110.19	0.000	*
36	SBI: Lower Limit	98.88	98.88	0.000	*
37	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
38	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
39	800 Data Base				
40	Proposed SBI	93.22	93.22	0.000	*
41	SBI: Upper Limit	98.11	98.11	0.000	*
42	SBI: Lower Limit	88.77	88.77	0.000	*
43	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
44	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
45	Total Traffic Sensitive	93.61	93.61	-0.000	*
46	TS API	93.64	93.64	0.000	*
47	TS PCI				*
48	LEC API Above PCI?				*
49	FCC API Above PCI?				*
SPECIAL					
VG, MT, TG					
50	Proposed SBI	103.45	103.45	-0.000	*
51	SBI: Upper Limit	110.43	110.43	-0.000	*
52	SBI: Lower Limit	98.91	98.91	-0.000	*
53	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
54	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
Audio & Video					
55	Proposed SBI	108.04	108.04	0.000	*
56	SBI: Upper Limit	112.32	112.32	-0.000	*
57	SBI: Lower Limit	101.82	101.82	-0.000	*
58	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
59	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
HiCap					
60	Proposed SBI	92.71	92.71	0.000	*
61	SBI: Upper Limit	98.48	98.48	-0.000	*
62	SBI: Lower Limit	88.11	88.11	-0.000	*
63	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
64	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
DB3					
65	Proposed SBI	98.35	98.35	0.000	*
66	SBI: Upper Limit	102.14	102.14	-0.000	*
67	SBI: Lower Limit	92.41	92.41	-0.000	*
68	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
69	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
Total HiCap					
70	Proposed SBI	92.18	92.18	0.000	*
71	SBI: Upper Limit	97.83	97.83	-0.000	*
72	SBI: Lower Limit	88.51	88.51	-0.000	*
73	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
74	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
Wideband					
75	Proposed SBI	0.00	NONE	0.000	*
76	SBI: Upper Limit	0.00	NONE	0.000	*
77	SBI: Lower Limit	0.00	NONE	0.000	*
78	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				*
79	FCC SBI Out Boundary?				*
Total Special Access					
80	Special API	97.08	97.08	-0.000	*
81	Special PCI	98.78	98.78	-0.000	*
82	LEC API Above PCI?				LOW
83	FCC API Above PCI?				LOW
INTERCHANGE					
84	Interchange API	96.43	96.43	0.000	*
85	Interchange PCI	98.52	98.52	0.000	*
86	LEC API Above PCI?				LOW
87	FCC API Above PCI?				LOW

1993 Tariff Review Plan

#	LEC	FCC	Data	Flag	#	LEC	FCC	Data	Flag
GENERAL					SPECIAL				
1					46				
2	0.03018				47	102.46	102.46	0.000	*
3	0.03300				48	107.07	107.07	-0.000	*
	0.03000				49	96.66	96.66	-0.000	*
EXOGENOUS CHANGES (000's)					50				*
4	\$72				51				*
5	(\$3,403)				52	98.11	98.11	0.000	*
6	(\$5,991)				53	102.52	102.52	-0.000	*
7	\$0				54	92.76	92.76	-0.000	*
8	\$0				55				*
9	\$598				Audio & Video				
10	\$2,450				56				*
11	\$0				57	98.11	98.11	0.000	*
12	\$0				58	102.52	102.52	-0.000	*
13	(\$3,941)				59	92.76	92.76	-0.000	*
14	\$0				60				*
15	(\$9,617)				HICap				
16	(\$9,617)				61				*
COMMON LINE					62				*
17	0.00410	0.00413	-0.00003	*	63	90.17	90.17	0.000	*
18	0.00410	0.00413	-0.00003	*	64	95.58	95.58	-0.000	*
19	0.07000				65	86.48	86.48	-0.000	*
20	83.54	83.54	0.000	*	66				*
TRAFFIC SENSITIVE					67				*
21					68	98.64	98.64	-0.000	*
22	102.88	102.88	-0.000	*	69	95.98	95.98	-0.000	*
23	106.7190	106.7190	0.000	*	70	86.84	86.84	-0.000	*
24	98.56	98.56	0.000	*	71				*
25				*	72	0.00	NONE	0.000	*
26				*	73	0.00	NONE	0.000	*
27	82.75	82.75	-0.000	*	74	0.00	NONE	0.000	*
28	88.78	88.77	0.000	*	75				*
29	80.32	80.32	-0.000	*	76				*
30				*	77	95.37	95.37	-0.000	*
31				*	78	96.38	96.38	-0.000	*
32	98.03	98.03	-0.000	*	79				*
33	98.03	98.03	-0.000	*	INTEREXCHANGE				
34	88.69	88.69	-0.000	*	80	98.72	98.72	0.000	*
35				*	81	99.39	99.39	-0.000	*
36				*	82				*
37	91.42	91.42	0.000	*	83				*
38	94.93	94.93	-0.000	*	INTEREXCHANGE				
39	85.89	85.89	-0.000	*	80	98.72	98.72	0.000	*
40				*	81	99.39	99.39	-0.000	*
41				*	82				*
42	93.55	93.55	-0.000	*	83				*
43	93.60	93.60	-0.000	*	INTEREXCHANGE				
44				*	80	98.72	98.72	0.000	*
45				*	81	99.39	99.39	-0.000	*
				*	82				*
				*	83				*

#	LEG	FOG	Data	Flag	#	LEG	FOG	Data	Flag
GENERAL					SPECIAL				
1	GRPPN	0.00304			46	VA, INT, TG			
2	X for CL, TS and SP	0.04300			47	Proposed SBI	90.46	90.46	0.000
3	X for EX	0.04000			48	SBI: Upper Limit	90.46	90.46	0.000
EXOGENOUS CHANGES (000'g)					49	SBI: Lower Limit	81.87	81.87	0.000
4	SFT	(\$1,329)			50	LEC SBI Out Boundary?			
5	DEM	(\$174)			51	Audio & Video			
6	LTR/TMS	\$633			52	Proposed SBI	102.84	102.84	-0.000
7	RAW	\$0			53	SBI: Upper Limit	102.83	102.83	0.000
8	RDA	\$0			54	SBI: Lower Limit	82.13	82.13	0.000
9	EDT	\$3			55	LEC SBI Out Boundary?			
10	ITC	\$182			56	FOC SBI Out Boundary?			
11	REMOVAL SHAWNAWLOW END ADJ	\$289			57	HICAP			
12	REMOVAL SHAWNAWLOW END ADJ	(\$291)			58	DB1			
13	SHAWNAWLOW END ADJ	(\$1,889)			59	Prop Sub--Index	106.87	106.87	0.000
14	OTHER	\$0			60	Sub--Index Up Lim	110.19	116.19	0.000
15	TOTAL OF INDIVIDUALS	(\$2,219)			61	Sub--Index Low Lim	82.70	82.70	0.000
16	TOTAL EXOGENOUS	(\$2,235)			62	LEC Sub--Ind Out?			
COMMON LINE					63	FOC Sub--Ind Out?			
17	Terms From CCL Rate	0.00020	0.00020	0.00000	64	Total HICAP			
18	Orig From CCL Rate	0.00090	0.00090	0.00000	65	Proposed SBI	101.86	101.86	0.000
19	Proposed PCI	0.02300	0.02300	0.00000	66	SBI: Upper Limit	102.89	102.89	0.000
TRAFFIC SENSITIVE					67	SBI: Lower Limit	92.33	92.33	0.000
21	Local Substack	91.93	91.93	0.000	68	LEC SBI Out?			
22	Proposed SBI	92.31	92.31	0.000	69	FOC SBI Out?			
23	SBI: Upper Limit	92.31	92.31	0.000	70	Wavelength			
24	SBI: Lower Limit	82.45	82.45	0.000	71	Proposed SBI	0.00	NONE	0.000
25	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				72	SBI: Upper Limit		NONE	0.000
26	FOC SBI Out Boundary?				73	SBI: Lower Limit		NONE	0.000
27	Local Transport	85.80	85.80	0.000	74	LEC SBI Out Boundary?			
28	Proposed SBI	82.31	82.31	0.000	75	FOC SBI Out Boundary?			
29	SBI: Upper Limit	82.31	82.31	0.000	76	Total Special Access			
30	SBI: Lower Limit	82.51	82.51	-0.000	77	Special APN	92.42	92.42	0.000
31	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				78	Special PCI	92.42	92.42	0.000
32	FOC SBI Out Boundary?				79	LEC APN Above PCI?			
33	Information	95.82	95.82	0.000	80	FOC APN Above PCI?			
34	Proposed SBI	92.42	92.42	0.000	81	Interchange APN	90.94	90.94	-0.000
35	SBI: Upper Limit	92.42	92.42	0.000	82	Interchange PCI	90.94	90.94	0.000
36	SBI: Lower Limit	87.23	87.23	-0.000	83	LEC APN Above PCI?			
37	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				84	FOC APN Above PCI?			
38	FOC SBI Out Boundary?				85	Interchange APN	90.94	90.94	-0.000
39	800 Data Base	92.14	92.14	0.000	86	Interchange PCI	90.94	90.94	0.000
40	Proposed SBI	92.16	92.16	0.000	87	LEC APN Above PCI?			
41	SBI: Upper Limit	92.16	92.16	0.000	88	FOC APN Above PCI?			
42	SBI: Lower Limit	82.71	82.71	-0.000	89	Interchange APN	90.94	90.94	-0.000
43	LEC SBI Out Boundary?				90	Interchange PCI	90.94	90.94	0.000
44	FOC SBI Out Boundary?				91	LEC APN Above PCI?			
45	Total Traffic Sensitive	90.36	90.36	0.000	92	FOC APN Above PCI?			
46	TS APN	90.36	90.36	0.000	93	Interchange APN	90.94	90.94	-0.000
47	TS PCI	90.36	90.36	0.000	94	Interchange PCI	90.94	90.94	0.000
48	LEC APN Above PCI?				95	LEC APN Above PCI?			
49	FOC APN Above PCI?				96	FOC APN Above PCI?			

1993 Tariff Review Plan

#	LEC	FCC	Delta	Flag	#	LEC	FCC	Delta	Flag
GENERAL					SPECIAL				
1	GNPPI	0.03018			46	Proposed SBI	113.82	113.82	0.000 *
2	X for CL, TS and SP	0.03300			47	SBI: Upper Limit	114.24	114.24	0.000 *
3	X for IX	0.0300			48	SBI: Lower Limit	103.36	103.36	0.000 *
EXOGENOUS CHANGES (000's)					49	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*
4	SPF	(\$1,718)			50	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*
5	DEM	(\$3,739)			Audio & Video				
6	LTS/TRS	(\$7,482)			51	Proposed SBI	112.55	112.55	0.000 *
7	ISW	(\$981)			52	SBI: Upper Limit	114.28	114.28	-0.000 *
8	RDA	\$0			53	SBI: Lower Limit	103.40	103.40	0.000 *
9	EDT	\$3,867			54	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*
10	ITC	\$3,832			55	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*
11	REMOVAL SHARING/LOW END ADJ	\$0			HiCap				
12	REVISION SHARING/LOW END ADJ	\$0			DS1				
13	SHARING/LOW END ADJ	\$0			56	Prop Sub-Index	93.88	93.88	-0.000 *
14	OTHER	\$32,644			57	Sub-Index Up Lim	100.93	100.93	0.000 *
15	TOTAL OF INDIVIDUALS	\$28,846			58	Sub-Index Low Lim	91.31	91.31	0.000 *
16	TOTAL EXOGENOUS	\$58,304			59	LEC Sub-Ind Out?			*
COMMON LINE					60	FCC Sub-Ind Out?			*
17	Term From CCL Rate	0.00758	0.00758	-0.00000 *	DS3				
18	Orig From COL Rate	0.00758	0.00758	-0.00000 *	61	Prop Sub-Index	94.28	94.28	0.000 *
19	g	0.02906			62	Sub-Index Up Lim	101.91	101.91	-0.000 *
20	Proposed PCI	87.03	87.03	-0.000 *	63	Sub-Index Low Lim	92.20	92.20	0.000 *
TRAFFIC SENSITIVE					64	LEC Sub-Ind Out?			*
21	Local Switching				65	FCC Sub-Ind Out?			*
22	Proposed SBI	108.67	108.67	0.000 *	Total HiCap				
23	SBI: Upper Limit	108.8953	108.8952	0.000 *	66	Proposed SBI	95.54	95.54	-0.000 *
24	SBI: Lower Limit	98.34	98.34	-0.000 *	67	SBI: Upper Limit	101.41	101.41	0.000 *
25	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*	68	SBI: Lower Limit	91.75	91.75	-0.000 *
26	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*	69	LEC SBI Out?			*
Local Transport					70	FCC SBI Out?			*
27	Proposed SBI	89.62	89.62	-0.000 *	Wideband				
28	SBI: Upper Limit	97.04	97.04	0.000 *	71	Proposed SBI	0.00	NONE	0.000 *
29	SBI: Lower Limit	87.80	87.80	-0.000 *	72	SBI: Upper Limit	0.00	NONE	0.000 *
30	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*	73	SBI: Lower Limit	0.00	NONE	0.000 *
31	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*	74	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*
Information					75	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*
32	Proposed SBI	98.06	98.06	0.000 *	Total Special Access				
33	SBI: Upper Limit	108.32	108.32	0.000 *	76	Special API	101.44	101.44	0.000 *
34	SBI: Lower Limit	98.01	98.01	0.000 *	77	Special PCI	101.44	101.44	0.000 *
35	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*	78	LEC API Above PCI?			*
36	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*	79	FCC API Above PCI?			*
800 Data Base					INTEREXCHANGE				
37	Proposed SBI	100.00	100.00	0.000 *	80	Interexchange API	107.97	107.97	-0.000 *
38	SBI: Upper Limit	108.42	108.42	0.000 *	81	Interexchange PCI	108.03	108.03	0.000 *
39	SBI: Lower Limit	98.10	98.10	0.000 *	82	LEC API Above PCI?			*
40	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*	83	FCC API Above PCI?			*
41	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*					
Total Traffic Sensitive									
42	TS API	97.95	97.95	0.000 *					
43	TS PCI	97.95	97.95	0.000 *					
44	LEC API Above PCI?			*					
45	FCC API Above PCI?			*					

1993 Tariff Review Plan

#	LEC	FCC	Delta	Flag	#	LEC	FCC	Delta	Flag	
GENERAL					SPECIAL					
1	GNPPI	0.02834			46	VG, MT, TG Proposed SBI	98.62	98.62	-0.000 *	
2	X for CL, TS and SP	0.04300			47	SBI: Upper Limit	107.18	107.18	0.000 *	
3	X for IX	0.0400			48	SBI: Lower Limit	98.97	98.97	0.000 *	
EXOGENOUS CHANGES (000's)					49	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*	
4	SPF	(\$22,094)			50	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*	
5	DEM	(\$753)			Audio & Video					
6	LTS/TRS	(\$1,502)			51	Proposed SBI	93.44	93.44	0.000 *	
7	ISW	\$0			52	SBI: Upper Limit	98.54	98.54	0.000 *	
8	RDA	\$0			53	SBI: Lower Limit	88.16	88.16	0.000 *	
9	EDT	(\$2,221)			54	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*	
10	ITC	\$1,800			55	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*	
11	REMOVAL SHARING/LOW END ADJ	\$0			HiCap					
12	REVISION SHARING/LOW END ADJ	(\$5,624)			DS1					
13	SHARING/LOW END ADJ	\$0			56	Prop Sub-Index	94.38	94.38	0.000 *	
14	OTHER	\$46,791			57	Sub-Index Up Lim	101.85	101.85	0.000 *	
15	TOTAL OF INDIVIDUALS	\$16,188			58	Sub-Index Low Lim	92.24	92.24	0.000 *	
16	TOTAL EXOGENOUS	\$16,188			59	LEC Sub-Ind Out?			*	
COMMON LINE					60	FCC Sub-Ind Out?			*	
17	Term Prem CCL Rate	0.00415	0.00465	-0.00049	LOW	DS3				
18	Orig Prem CCL Rate	0.00415	0.00465	-0.00049	LOW	61	Prop Sub-Index	100.39	100.39	-0.000 *
19	g	0.04429				62	Sub-Index Up Lim	107.32	107.32	0.000 *
20	Proposed PCI	76.40	76.40	-0.000	*	63	Sub-Index Low Lim	97.10	97.10	0.000 *
TRAFFIC SENSITIVE					64	LEC Sub-Ind Out?			*	
21	Local Switching				65	FCC Sub-Ind Out?			*	
22	Proposed SBI	102.80	102.80	-0.000	*	Total HiCap				
23	SBI: Upper Limit	110.2140	110.2138	0.000	*	66	Proposed SBI	98.16	98.16	-0.000 *
24	SBI: Lower Limit	98.72	98.72	0.000	*	67	SBI: Upper Limit	104.91	104.91	0.000 *
25	LEC SBI Out Bounds?				*	68	SBI: Lower Limit	94.82	94.82	0.000 *
26	FCC SBI Out Bounds?				*	69	LEC SBI Out?			*
Local Transport					70	FCC SBI Out?			*	
27	Proposed SBI	89.15	89.15	0.000	*	Wideband				
28	SBI: Upper Limit	95.14	95.14	-0.000	*	71	Proposed SBI	0.00	NONE	0.000 *
29	SBI: Lower Limit	86.08	86.08	-0.000	*	72	SBI: Upper Limit	0.00	NONE	0.000 *
30	LEC SBI Out Bounds?				*	73	SBI: Lower Limit	0.00	NONE	0.000 *
31	FCC SBI Out Bounds?				*	74	LEC SBI Out Bounds?			*
Information					75	FCC SBI Out Bounds?			*	
32	Proposed SBI	79.89	79.89	0.000	*	Total Special Access				
33	SBI: Upper Limit	85.80	85.80	-0.000	*	76	Special API	97.05	97.05	0.000 *
34	SBI: Lower Limit	77.63	77.63	0.000	*	77	Special PCI	98.17	98.17	0.000 *
35	LEC SBI Out Bounds?				*	78	LEC API Above PCI?			LOW
36	FCC SBI Out Bounds?				*	79	FCC API Above PCI?			LOW
800 Data Base					INTEREXCHANGE					
37	Proposed SBI	100.00	100.00	0.000	*	80	Interexchange API	93.11	93.11	0.002 *
38	SBI: Upper Limit	105.47	105.47	0.000	*	81	Interexchange PCI	93.70	93.70	0.000 *
39	SBI: Lower Limit	95.42	95.42	-0.000	*	82	LEC API Above PCI?			*
40	LEC SBI Out Bounds?				*	83	FCC API Above PCI?			*
41	FCC SBI Out Bounds?				*					
Total Traffic Sensitive										
42	TS API	93.96	93.96	0.000	*					
43	TS PCI	96.10	96.10	0.000	*					
44	LEC API Above PCI?				LOW					
45	FCC API Above PCI?				LOW					