ORIGINAL

Decision No. <u>68087</u>

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA;

Application of THE PACIFIC TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY for authority to file and make effective (1) rates for extended business 1-party line message rate service and withdraw the offering of extended business 2-party line flat rate service, (2) rates for extended message rate joint user service in connection with individual, party or answering line service, and (3) revised rates for extended business message rate foreign exchange service and joint user service in connection therewith, in the Danville, Dumbarton and San Rafael exchanges.

Application No. 46735 (Filed June 17, 1964)

## OPINION AND ORDER

Applicant seeks authority to (1) replace business 2-party line flat rate service with business 1-party line message rate service, and (2) introduce extended message rate joint user service in its Danville, Dumbarton, and San Rafael exchanges, said exchanges being within the San Francisco-East Bay Extended Area. Applicant's proposal respecting message rate service in these three exchanges would make such type of service available throughout the extended area.

Introduction of the proposed service would involve the following business rate changes:

Exchange	2-Party Flat Rate (Present)	I-Party Message Rate* (Proposco)	Joint User Message Rate (Proposed)
Danville Main District Area Valley District Area Dumbarton	\$7.10 7.75	\$5.00 (75) 5.00 (75)	\$1.50 1.50
Main District Area Oliver District Area Greenleaf District Area San Rafael	6.60	5.00 (75)	1.50
	6.60	5.00 (75)	1.50
	7.85	5.00 (75)	1.50
Base Rate Area	7.85	5.00 (75)	1.50
Special Rate Area	8.55	6.00 (75)	1.50
* Messages over 75,	at 4.25 cen	ats per message	rate.

The proposed 1-party message rate service would require revision of business foreign exchange service rates. The proposal is to increase business individual line and PBX-trunk line foreign exchange services by 25 cents per month. Joint user service, in connection with these two services, would be increased 50 cents per month. As of March 1964, approximately 105 foreign exchange services would be affected.

Present 2-party business subscribers will have the option of converting to 1-party flat rate or to 1-party message rate service. Because of the low usage normally characteristic of 2-party business service, it is to be expected that nearly all 2-party subscribers will convert to the message rate service. Applicant estimates that expected conversions will result in an annual revenue decrease of \$68,500.

The Commission has considered this matter and finds that public hearing thereon is not necessary. Further, the proposed service should improve telephone service; the rates proposed are justified and present business rates, insofar as they differ from those to be authorized herein, will become unjust and unreasonable upon establishment of extended 1-party line message rate service. The Commission concludes that the application herein should be granted.

## IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Applicant is authorized to file with this Commission, after the effective date of this order and in conformity with the provisions of General Order No. 96-A, the rates for extended business 1-party line message rate service and for joint user service set forth on Exhibit A attached to the application and, on not less than five days' notice to the public and to this

Commission, to make said rates effective for service rendered in the Danville, Dumbarton, and San Rafael exchanges on such date as said service is established in each of said exchanges.

- 2. Coincident with the establishment of the aforesaid service, applicant is authorized to withdraw the offering of extended business 2-party line flat rate service in the aforesaid exchanges and to cancel and withdraw the rates applicable thereto.
- 3. The authorization herein granted will expire if not exercised prior to February 1, 1965.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty days after the date hereof.

		Dated	at	San Fr	anc	isco ,	California,	this	200
day	of		nctos	RER	>	1964.			

Commissioners

Commissioner William M. Bennett, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.