LAW OFFICES

MESSER, VICKERS, CAPARELLO, MADSEN & LEWIS

A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

SUITE 1040, BAYPORT PLAZA
6200 COURTNEY CAMPBELL CAUSEWAY
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33607
TELEPHONE (813) 281-8711

TELECOPIER (813) 282-0050

SUITE 701, FIRST FLORIDA BANK BUILDING 215 SOUTH MONROE STREET POST OFFICE BOX 1876 TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32302-1876

> TELEPHONE (904) 222-0720 TELECOPIER (904) 224-4359

SUITE 900
2000 PALM BEACH LAKES BOULEVARD
WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA 33409
TELEPHONE (407) 640-0820
TELECOPIER (407) 640-8202

REPLY TO Tallahassee

May 31, 1991

Mr. Steve Tribble, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 101 East Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850 OMSHAL FILE COPY HAND DELIVERED

Re: FPSC Docket 910060-TP

Dear Mr. Tribble:

Enclosed for filing are an original and fifteen copies of Sprint Gateways' Comments and Request for Hearing. Please date stamp the extra copy of this letter enclosed to indicate this filing and return the copy to me.

Thank you for your assistance in the processing of this filing, and please call if there are any questions or further requirements.

	tnere	are any questions or further re	equirements.	
ACK AFA APP CAF CMU	Lackn FRS:	sb	Sincerely Floyd R. Self For the Firm	
EAG .	- Enclo	sures		
LEG .	(cc:	Craig Dingwall, Esq.	RECEIVED & FILED	
OPC RCH	1			
SEC	1		FPSC BURLAU OF NECORDS	
	4		ALCORDS -	
WAS			DOCUMENT	1,
OTH	-		200:12	

05507 MAY 31 KG

and State of the FORTH

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re:	Amendment of Rule 4.110),)
F.A.C.,	Pertaining to Customer)
Billing)
Billing		

Docket No. 910060-TP

Filed: May 31, 1991

SPRINT GATEWAYS' COMMENTS AND REQUEST FOR HEARING

US Telecom, Inc., d/b/a Sprint Gateways ("Gateways"), pursuant to Order No. 24477, issued May 6, 1991 and Florida Statutes sections 120.54 and 120.57, respectfully submits the following comments and request for hearing in response to the Florida Public Service Commission's ("Commission's") Notice of Rulemaking ("Notice") dated May 6, 1991 in the above-captioned matter.

The complete name and address of the Petitioner is:

US Telecom, Inc., d/b/a Sprint Gateways c/o Craig Dingwall, Esq. 2002 Edmund Halley Drive Reston, VA 22091

2. All notices, pleadings, orders, and other materials in this docket should be directed to the following, on behalf of the Petitioner:

US Telecom, Inc., d/b/a Sprint Gateways c/o Craig Dingwall, Esq. 2002 Edmund Halley Drive Reston, VA 22091 Floyd R. Self, Esq.
Messer, Vickers, Caparello,
Madsen & Lewis, P.A.
P. O. Box 1876
Tallahassee, FL 32302

I. Introduction

- 3. The Notice includes proposed rules which, if implemented, would require that charges for 900/976 calls be listed on telephone bills separately from long distance or local charges, and that they be identified as "900 or 976 nonregulated charges." The proposed rules also require notice to customers on their telephone bills that service will not be discontinued because of nonpayment of 900/976 service charges.
- 4. While Gateways understands the Commission's interest in providing notice to customers of the Commission's current policies with respect to 900/976 calls, the proposed rules require significant software modification by local exchange companies ("LECs") and interexchange carriers ("IXCs") in order to provide the desired customer notice.
- 5. From the customer's perspective, the proposed 900/976 segregation requirement could cause confusion and further complicate an already complex billing process. In addition, the proposed requirement that nonpayment of 900 or 976 service charges will not result in discontinuance of service will invite 900/976 customers to not pay their legitimate bills leading to further complications in the billing process. Referencing all services to which local service disconnect does not apply would provide customers with a more complete and accurate description of the Commission's billing policies without singling out any particular services.
- A hearing would afford a more complete record to address customers',
 carriers', other parties' and the Commission's interests in this matter. Pursuant to the

Notice, Gateways respectfully requests a hearing in this docket at the time and place specified in the Notice.

II. Discussion

- A. Charges for 900/976 Calls Should Not Be Segregated From Other Charges On the Billi
- 7. Proposed Rule 25-4.110(1)(a) would require 900/976 charges to be segregated from charges for regular long distance service or local charges by appearing under a separate heading. There is no rational basis for segregating 900/976 charges from other charges. Current regulations require the clear identification of 900/976 charges on customer bills. See e.g., Order No. 24456, January 24, 1990. There has been no showing that segregating 900/976 charges will provide any new or additional benefits to consumers, or that the procedure can be implemented by LECs in the near future absent significant costs which would no doubt be passed on to LEC billing and collection ("B&C") customers (i.e., IXCs), and ultimately to the consumer. Indeed, this requirement could complicate bills and thereby result in customer confusion. Gateways opposes the proposed segregation of charges for 900/976 and other non-regulated services from all other telecommunications services charges. Clearly more information is necessary to properly evaluate the costs and benefits of this proposed rule. A hearing would provide a more complete record with which to analyze this important issue.

- B. The Proposed Customer Notice That Nonpayment of 900/976 Service Charges Will Not Result In Discontinuance of Service Should Apply To All Non-Regulated Services
- 8. Proposed Rule 25-4.110(1)(a)1, if adopted, would require each page of the bill containing 900 or 976 service charges to include a statement that nonpayment of 900 or 976 service charges will not result in discontinuance of service. Aside from billing cost and implementation issues associated with this proposed rule, the proposed requirement would invite customers to not pay legitimate 900/976 charges. Disconnect of local service for nonpayment of charges adds considerable value to LEC B&C services. Removing the local disconnect threat could diminish the value of the LEC B&C services by threatening the ability to collect for legitimate 900/976 charges. Referencing all services to which local service disconnect does not apply (by asterisk, highlighting, or other means), together with a corresponding notice or bill insert with the required notice, would provide a more complete and accurate description of the Commission's billing policies without singling out any particular services. Again, a hearing would provide a more complete record with which to analyze the various options, costs, and implementation considerations.

Conclusion

9. For the foregoing reasons, Gateways respectfully requests a hearing to address proposed Rule 25-4.110. If Gateways' request for a hearing is granted, Gateways' respectfully reserves the right to address the above issues as well as any other issues which arise from the proposed rules or are posed by other parties.

Respectfully submitted this 31st day of May, 1991.

Craig Dingwall, Esq.
US Telecom, Inc., d/b/a
Sprint Gateways
2002 Edmund Halley Drive
Reston, VA 22091

MESSER, VICKERS, CAPARELLO, MADSEN, & LEWIS, P.A. 215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 701 Post Office Box 1876 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876 (904) 222-0720

FLOYD R. S

:sb\910060.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of Sprint Gateways' Comments and Request for Hearing in Docket No. 910060-TP has been served by U.S. Mail and/or Hand Delivery (*) on May 31, 1991 to the following parties of record:

Tracy Hatch, Esq.*
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service Commission
101 E. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Ms. Ann Shelfer*
Division of Communications
Florida Public Service Commission
101 E. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

The Honorable Robert A. Butterworth Attorney General State of Florida Department of Legal Affairs The Capitol Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050

Jack Shreve, Esquire
Office of Public Counsel
111 West Madison Street
Room 112
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Harris R. Anthony, Esq. c/o Marshall M. Criser, III 150 S. Monroe Street, Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Joseph A. McGlothin, Esq. Vicki G. Kaufman, Esq. Lawson, McWhirter, Grandoff & Reeves 522 E. Park Avenue, Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301 Mr. Joseph Gillan Fla. Interexchange Carriers Ass'n Post Office Box 547276 Orlando. FL 32854-7276

Kenric E. Port, Esq.
Michael J. Henry, Esq.
MCI Telecommunications Corp.
MCI Center
Three Ravinia Drive
Atlanta, GA 30346-2102

Richard D. Melson, Esq. Hopping Boyd Green & Sams P.O. Box 6526 Tallahassee, FL 32314

Jerry Johns, Esq.
Alan Berg, Esq.
United Telephone Company
of Florida
P. O. Box 5000
Altamonte Springs, FL 32716-5000

Patrick K. Wiggins, Esq. Ranson & Wiggins P. O. Drawer 1657 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Michael Tye, Esq.
AT&T Communications, Inc.
106 East College Avenue
Suite 1410
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Thomas Parker, Esq. GTE Florida Inc. P. O. Box 110, MC7 Tampa, FL 3360ì

David Erwin, Esq. Mason, Erwin & Horton 1311-A Paul Russell Road Suite 101 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Lee Willis, Esq.
Ausley, McMullen, McGehee,
Carothers & Proctor
P. O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Andrew D. Lipman, Esq. Jean L. Kiddoo, Esq. Robert G. Berger, Esq. Seidier & Berlin 3000 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20007

Nycom Information Services Attn: Jodi DelVecchio 5 High Ridge Park Stanford, CT 06905

D. Bruce May, Esq. Holland & Knight P. O. Drawer 810 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Craig Dingwall, Esq.
US Telecom, Inc.
d/b/a Sprint Gateways
2002 Edmund Halley Drive
Reston, VA 22091
Mailstop: VARESC106H

Albert J. Angel, Esq. 3500 Magellan Circle #717 Aventura, FL 33180

BY:

DATE: TO:	6/13/41. Appeals
The attached is sent to you for:	
	nformation
	r Handling sary action
Advice	on Handling
Respo	nse
Remarks:	5998-91
	——————————————————————————————————————