# APPEARANCES:

JUNE McKINNEY, Florida Public Service

Commission, Division of Legal Services, 2540 Shumard

Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870,

appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

CHARLES J. BECK, Deputy Public

Counsel,Office of Public Counsel, 111 West Madison

Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400,

appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of

Florida.

# ALSO PRESENT:

ANN SHELFER and LEVENT ILERI, FPSC Division of Communications.

1	
1	INDEX
2	
3	WITNESSES
4	NAME PAGE NO.
5	ROY POOLEY
6	Direct Statement 8
7	VALERIE HIKEY-PATTON
8	Direct Statement 12
9	PAUL HOLMES
10	Direct Statement 14
11	DAVID WRIGHT
12	Direct Statement 16
13	GARY EARL
14	Direct Statement 31
15	TYLER WEISMAN
16	Direct Statement 43
17	AARON KAUFMAN
18	Direct Statement 51
19	REX TOI
20	Direct Statement 60
21	MONTE BELOTE
22	Direct Statement 71
23	ED PASCHALL
24	Direct Statement 79
25	
1	

# 1

# PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Hearing convened at 8:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to go ahead and begin our hearing tonight. My name is Julia Johnson. I'm the Chairman of the Florida Public Service Commission. Can you hear me now? I'll speak closer into the microphone. I wanted to welcome you all here this evening.

Counsel, could you please read the notice.

MS. McKINNEY: By notice issued August 27th, 1998, this time and place have been set for public hearing in the Florida Public Service Commission Undocketed Special Project 980000A. The purpose of the hearing is set forth in the Notice.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Again, I'm Julia Johnson. I'm the Chairman of the Florida Public Service Commission. Seated to my far left here is Commissioner Leon Jacobs. To my right is Commissioner Terry Deason, and to my far right is Commissioner Joe Garcia.

If you didn't get an opportunity to receive one of the blue sheets out in front, we'll have someone available that can pass the sheets to you. provides you with a lot of background information about why we're here today and goes into quite a bit

of detail. If you will allow me, I'll go through a brief summary of what's in the materials.

Last year the legislature, in House Bill
4785, determined that the Florida Public Service
Commission should study and report back to the
legislature our conclusions as to the fair and
reasonableness of local residential rates. They gave
us a couple of criteria which are set to guide us.

They asked us to look at the affordability of service, the cost of service, the value of service and also to look at comparable rates in other areas. Quite a bit of that information on the rates in other areas is provided in the blue information that we have for you.

Most importantly, they directed us to hear from you, the citizens across the state of Florida, to determine how you feel about local telecommunications services; how you feel about the level of competition, the need for competition; the value of telecommunications services to you, and any other thing you might want to present to the Commission so we can then forward that information to the legislature. So we're here basically and mainly to hear from you.

Now, if you have questions about the

Commission and any of our regulatory authority, feel free to ask those too. But mainly we want to hear from you, your comments, your suggestions. If you don't feel like providing any oral comments, you can turn to the last sheet in the blue packet and there's a section for you to provide consumer comments. If you want to write those comments and provide them to the staff here, that would be fine. If you prefer to call us, there's a 1-800 number. We also have our Internet address. If you want to file a complaint or a concern over the Internet, or if you'd like to listen to some of the hearings that have already occurred over the last several weeks, you can access those if you have the necessary equipment on your computer through the Internet process.

I wanted to give you a little bit of background. I do need to take appearances of the attorneys here. With that in mind, I'll take the appearances. And then at the appropriate time, those of you that would like to testify, I'll ask you to stand and we'll swear you in. The reason we do that is to make sure your comments can be made a part of the official record upon which we can rely when we make our final report to the legislature. And with that we'll take appearances.

1 MR. BECK: My name is Charlie Beck. with the Office of Public Counsel in Tallahassee and 2 3 appearing on behalf of the Florida citizens. 4 MS. McKINNEY: June McKinney on behalf of 5 Staff. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Are there any other 6 7 preliminary matters other than swearing in the 8 customers that want to testify? 9 With that, if you'd like to testify today, 10 if you could stand and raise your right hand. 11 (Witnesses collectively sworn.) 12 Thank you. You may all be seated. Any 13 other matters? We're also, at the conclusion of the fair 14 15 and reasonable rate study hearing, we're going to also 16 open back up the 407 area code hearing to allow those 17 that weren't able to make it here earlier today to testify on that particular issue too. 18 19 There are two separate dockets. We have the 20 fair and reasonable rate hearings, which I believe 21 most of you are here to testify to that particular 22 topic. But we also have another docket that we had an 23 earlier hearing on today, and if those that would like

to testify as to the area code change or the need for

an area code change, we will allow you to do that

25

also, but we will have to read a separate notice and 2 open that process up separately. Anything else? 3 MS. McKINNEY: No, Chairman. 4 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. With that I 5 think we're ready for the first customer. 6 MR. BECK: The first witness is Mr. Roy 7 Pooley. 8 9 ROY POOLEY was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of 10 11 the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 12 13 DIRECT STATEMENT 14 WITNESS POOLEY: Ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, it's a pleasure to be with you and I thank 15 you for the opportunity. I don't quite know how I got to be first. Yeah, I do. I was pushed into it by my 17

neighbor there.

I'm from Jacksonville, Florida, retired architect. I'm chairman of the State Legislative Committee of AARP, and that's my position and I speak for that group.

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Today we have heard from -- we spent the day on your business. We have heard from Mary Bane. She represented you wonderfully. She's a very effective

and the kind of person that you enjoy talking to and very believable. We also heard from Tom Hunt, who is with the telephone company. So we've heard these two. And tomorrow we have scheduled listening to one of the legislators. So we're trying to do our very best to study and be aware of what's going on. We have people, I suppose, who have sought to speak that probably can speak to you much better than I can as to technical aspects of what we're dealing with.

But things that concern us is, first of all, the hearings before the legislature last April when before the State Committee officers of telephone companies could not answer very simple questions, and that seemed odd. They had no idea what the cost of serving a residential, or business for that matter, customer cost them. There was no indication whatever as to really why they were there asking for -- or being considered for a rate increase.

At that same time a major officer of

BellSouth presented a check for what -- facsimile of a check in the State Attorney's Office for \$123,000 some odd dollars, which represented the current and last payment on a refund of overcharges in the past five years. Prior to that, it was about \$197 million of the same kind, and those payments reduced the bottom

line for BellSouth to 13.11. I believe you're familiar with that.

And I'm also familiar with the fact that your mission has nothing to do with their profits. I think that's a shame, but I understand that is the way it is. Your mission seems to be, or you seem to have been instructed by the legislature, to determine what would be fair and reasonable residential rates, and that implies that they need to be increased. To me it implies that, particularly since they sought a doubling in April. And I just recounted the recovery of overpayments, excess profits, I guess you would call it.

Today among the materials provided us by the telephone company there were some strange looking estimates of the cost of producing and providing residential basic service. Obviously, it amounted to considerably more than the current rates. At the same time, there was an indication of the charges and costs and the result of profits much of what they called the vertical services, the extra services, the superservices, which they said were not part of the cost of basic service; which had nothing to do with the income from residential basis service. And we find that hard to believe. We find that hard to

swallow.

If I don't pay my phone bill and include all of those other services, including long distance all of which have profits for the telephone company, they would have no profit. They would have no income. It would be a loss. I believe a major loss.

It seems to me that the excess charges -- I can't say excess -- we've agreed to them. We're happy with them -- but at least the charges for vertical services, compared to the cost, provided an absolutely obscene level of profit. In some cases as much as 9,000%. I think you have to take that into account when you look at whether or not rates should be raised.

I know that there are a lot of people in this state who need the lowest rates they can have. I know that not many of them avail themselves of that, something like 7- or 8,000 in the entire state; the Lifeline rates. At the same time a great many more are eligible. And I think those people need to be protected. I think there are a lot of people my age, my condition, living virtually on Social Security income who would find \$150 more a year to be a problem. I'm not saying by that it would be a big problem for me. I'm not even saying it would be a big

problem for most people that I know. Most of us, in my church and my social activities, we could stand an extra \$10, \$12, \$15; we can do that. But there doesn't seem to be any reason for it to happen.

And so I would ask you to look at it very hard. I know you will. I hope we can offer some sense of how the public feels about telephone rates, and I very much appreciate the opportunity to speak to you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Pooley.

Any questions?

MR. BECK: Thank you, Mr. Pooley. You're second witness is Valerie Hikey-Patton.

## VALERIE HIKEY-PATTON

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS HIKEY-PATTON: Well, I think that you people get enough money; the telephone company.

Not you. They have -- for the first quarter they made 17%. Have any of you made that much on any of your investments? In fact, our investments are going down. I do think that the elder people have to be

considered. They have very little money and their only contact with the outside world is that telephone. You know that they call their friends, and a lot of them are homebound, and even a couple of dollars they couldn't afford. So that should be a very, very great concern.

The middle class people are next. They all have teenagers, and if any of you have teenagers you know that they use the phone continually. They use it for their social life. We want them to seek to be home. We want them to be where we can see them, know what's going on, what they are doing, and the telephone company -- the telephone is a very important part of their social life. If you expect them to stay home, then not only do they like -- they don't particularly like television, but they like to talk to their friends. And if you raise it, the telephone bill, it takes something away from them. Something else has to go. Because people today are living, many of them, from week to week on their salaries.

So I ask you and I implore you to look carefully, make sure that there isn't any -- I can't say any reason -- if you can show me a reason to raise the telephone rates, then I might feel differently.

But so far no one has shown me any reason. Just I

don't know what the reason is. Can anybody tell me that reason? Maybe the telephone company could tell me? Just to raise the rates because that's the thing to do I don't feel -- and they're making a profit. We all know that. We don't mind that. But I don't think it should be an exorbitant profit. They are doing well and they should have a little concern for their constituents and the rest of the people. Thank you very much.

MR. BECK: Thank you. Paul Holmes.

# PAUL HOLMES

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS HOLMES: Good evening, honorable board members. My name is Paul Holmes. I live in Orlando here and I have been here for 22 years.

I come with mixed emotions. I happen to be financially involved with the Southern Bell people, when previous to when I was still working the telephone people were very kind to the organization in which I worked. They had done all of the printing and done all of the paperwork, done all of our mailing,

put out our news bulletins and everything at no charge to this senior center in which I was involved in.

So I really, really would like to be honest to myself and honest to the telephone people. But at this time we have all been bombarded by other influences that come out of Washington D.C. that so many things have happened that are mind-boggling that we really do not have full capacity to think out what we want to do. And it seems like these increases that are coming on, you have the -- you have the cable TV people are after increases, you have the Food Manufacturers Association of America are after increases. All of your major chain grocery stores are now getting ready to reassess, reset their computers on a price increase. Perhaps the telephone people are just following suit because they want to be in style.

But being a senior citizen, and I'm well up there, I know that there are a lot of people that use that telephone as a necessity in their home to call for a physician or to call their friends, to check on the health of somebody else. And if the increase is allowed, I believe that will actually cut back the phone service that a lot of the elderly people have in this particular area.

And I thank you very much for allowing me to

say what I had to say, and I hope you will respond accordingly. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. BECK: Thank you. Robert Stonerock.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Actually I have a comment on 407.

MR. BECK: We'll hold on. When we start the 407 hearing I'll call you. David Wright.

DAVID WRIGHT

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworm, testified as follows:

# DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS WRIGHT: Good evening, and thank you for allowing us to be here this evening and share some comments with you.

For the record my name is David Wright. I'm the president of Glaze and Radcliffe. We're a local professional consulting engineering firm. I'm a resident and customer in Seminole County of BellSouth. We also have corporate services through Sprint in Orange County.

My purpose tonight is to offer some comments to you from the business perspective. And again, as

some of the speakers have indicated to you already, we are certainly not in favor of rate hikes for the sake of rate hikes, but I have some points I'd like to share with you that you may find useful in your deliberations in terms of how you are looking at the current rate structure and moving towards making that rate structure a bit more fair, equitable and reasonable for all of your ratepayers.

Certainly in the last several years there have been some major technological advances in the telecommunications industry; specifically in the voice, the data and the video communications end of it. And a lot of that technological advancement has been spurred by competitive involvement in the industry and opening up the industry.

We've seen that increased competition having a significant impact not only in the services that are provided, the technologies that are available for all of us to use, but also the value and pricing to a great extent has become much more attractive for us.

A story, if you will, for just a second that I remember from years and years ago when I was a little boy. My grandfather was the vice president of Rochester Telephone up in Rochester, New York. And I used to query him as to why we had one phone in the

house, why that phone was rather large and bulky and why that phone was black. And he said, "Well, we offer any color you want so long as it's black. We offer any phone you want so long as it's this one." I said, "Why do you do that?" He said, "Well, we don't have to do anything differently. Nobody requires us to change. Nobody requires us to make different colors. Nobody requires us to make different phones."

I think you've all seen in the last 20 to 25 years that that has changed dramatically. When competition was allowed to enter the marketplace, things changed.

We have colors. We have different types of phone. You have cell phones. You have the interlinking between voice data and video that's making the industry a lot more viable for us as business customers to take advantage of that technology.

What we're seeing, though, is that in looking at the rate structure there is a business factor subsidization of the basic residential rate structure. And we have a concern about that.

The concern basically says that we're looking at the rate structure in the sense that while the basic fee for the business customer is higher for

us than the fundamental cost, we see the reverse happening for the residential customer. We see that there's a subsidization from the rate structure in terms of them being charged less than the fundamental cost of providing that service.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, that is a relatively simplistic view and I don't want you to think that's as spearhead of my argument. But it's an observation I have in terms of what the telecommunication industry is doing.

They are finding that the feature add-ons are the high profit areas. And if you look at the pricing structure between the cost of that service and what they charge the residential or business customer, they are required to be forced into bundling or packaging services such that the ultimate price they receive, part of it a loss leader for the residential side, profit on the feature side, ultimately gives them the margins they are looking for. But what we're seeing, and I think this is good, is that the market sector in competition doesn't tolerate high profitability too long before companies get into the arena and say, "We can take that piece of the market. We can do it better. We can give better value and we can do it cheaper." And you're going to see more and more of that on the feature side: Call waiting, call

forwarding and things like that where you have major margins to work with. Now, what that will do, though, is going to force the telephone companies on the residential side to have a problem if the basic residential rates are left the way they are.

And, again, I'm not looking at asking you to consider price hikes. What I'm saying tonight is that rate subsidization for residential doesn't seem logical and reasonable anymore. And certainly having the business community support the residential customer doesn't seem reasonable nor logical either, but prefacing my next several comments I think I want to recognize one thing: There is a segment of the residential customer base that I think we have to pay special attention to, even as a business customer, and that's the poor and the needy, and things like your Lifeline rate.

I think as a good corporation, a good corporate citizen, we should also take responsibility as businesses to help make sure the poor and the needy retain the necessity of their telephone service. So while I'm speaking of moving away from rate subsidization, I'm qualifying it by saying that particular portion of your residential market sector I think should always get special attention. Because

without that, they are put in a situation where if a serious incident occurs, they are left without the ability to the communicate.

So I feel as a corporate citizen that has to be retained. The rest of the residential customer base, though, I think has to be relooked at. The way to do that is moving towards a more fair and reasonable rate structure that you've talked about already, Madam Chairman.

I think competition can be your best ally there. We have competition already in the marketplace. I think one of the suggestions I would leave you with is we need to increase that competition. We need to open up that arena more for some of these newer corporations and newer technologies to deal with all of the rate sectors you're looking at.

I think you're going to see that by allowing competition to have a greater role in the marketplace, that some of the concerns that we all have about your rate structure will grow through a market-based readjustment. Now, I'm not suggesting that you consider a radical overnight change. I don't think that would be reasonable either. I think whatever program you look at should be phased. I would

strongly suggest you do that. I would strongly suggest as well that you embed in your program appropriate milestones throughout the course of this change where you have the ability to go back and check to see how well the changes are occurring, to assess the review of those changes, and make sure that those changes are working in concert with the intent of the changes you put forth. And, also, you build into your program corrective actions, such as if rate extremes start to occur in the marketplace, you have the ability to curb those rate extremes so they don't inadvertently affect those people on fixed incomes who don't have the ability to quickly change their economic base to adopt the changing rates in the marketplace. So I would look for you to do things along those lines in whatever rate structuring you do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

You are going to find that no matter what program you put together, it's not going to be a panacea; it won't be perfect. There will be critics and criticism. And you're going to be left with some uncertainty and you're going to be taking a little risk. You're going to be outlining a future system that you can't really tell yet what the future is going to bring. So you all will face some criticism for taking a little risk no matter what you do. But I

think you'll move more towards a rate structure that moves closer to being more fair, more reasonable, more equitable for all of the ratepayers, and ultimately you'll give the ratepayers themselves a better ability to choose the service and service packaging that they want, such that they pick what they want, they pick what they need, and they pay a fair and reasonable price for it; whether it's a residential customer in my case personally, or a business customer in my case as well.

I think what I'd like to leave you with, as you move forward, move towards something that gives the customers the ability to pick and choose what they want and pay a fair and equitable rate for what they select. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Wright?

COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Mr. Wright, one of the premises of this whole discussion is that if we send the right price signal, then the competitors will show up. It's to early to make a conclusion on the evidence, but early indications are that that doesn't always occur. If we see that happening in our experiment, do you have any thoughts or suggestions about how to go about dealing with it? Because you

would agree that if we don't, if the price signals even though correct, do not attract market players, we'll have a ongoing problem. Would you agree with that?

WITNESS WRIGHT: Correct. I think the way I look at -- first of all, let me back up by saying this is not my area of expertise per se. I do a lot of rate work for municipal governments and function as an expert witness in many cases, but that's not for telephone services. It's for water, wastewater, storm water, solid waste, so I have a fundamental understanding of what you all are facing, but certainly not an expert in the specifics of what you're trying to deal with.

In any situation where you're structuring rates, you have to create the motivation for the competition to want to enter the arena. Ultimately that means there has to be profit. There has to be the financial inducement for them to want to be there in a free and open market, or you mandate them to be there out of the functional definition; if it's a necessity, they have to provide that service. You have those two things that you're weighing.

In opening it up for competition to come into the arena to take advantage of this broad

spectrum of availability of service I think you need to create the opportunity for them to have the ability to structure their services so they can get a reasonable rate of return in whatever arena they choose to serve, whether it's a singular arena of basic residential rate service, or whether they choose to go to the features area only, or they decide to bundle or package services in all arenas. If you don't do that, there's probably going to be some reluctance and reticence of getting in there unless you force them in by mandates.

My thought is that you probably aren't going to package it perfectly up front, so you may see some resistance in the players in the market. I would encourage you to have them offer some suggestions as well as how they could work with you to cause that end result to occur, but I would also suggest that you provide some necessary safeguards such that if you aren't seeing a movement in the direction you're hoping for, that you have a backup position that you can quickly implement to protect the ratepayers, especially some of the lower end residential, the poor needy and those on fixed incomes, especially your Lifeline customers.

So I think you're going to have to look at

all of those features. Again, this is not a area I'm well versed in but as a businessman I see certain things here that relate very clearly to some of the other things I normally do, and that's why I felt it was important to share some thoughts with you here tonight.

with me that there is a societal benefit to having as low rates as possible for all of the citizens in general in terms of just basic service so everyone can communicate on the phone. For example, I would use -- I'm sorry -- were you hearing me?

WITNESS WRIGHT: Yes.

that, for example, I guess water regulation, to a general sense many municipalities subsidize their water because there's a public good there that's involved that -- it may not be a profit center for a municipality, but there are certain benefits to providing water as low a cost as possible and many cities take a loss in their water provision because they think there is a benefit to provide water to their citizens as low as possible.

WITNESS WRIGHT: If you're asking me do I agree with that statement? No, sir, I do not agree

with that statement.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: You don't think that municipalities --

WITNESS WRIGHT: Your statement is factually not correct. Let me clarify.

I think fundamentally the argument of structuring a rate system, whether it's the water/wastewater that I work in or whether it's a telephone rate structure, to cause the marketplace to provide the highest value at the lowest possible price is certainly something that I would argue for extensively.

In the municipal arena, though, to argue that they provide the highest value at the lowest possible price is fairly accurate but they don't provide that value at a loss. Most of the municipalities are enterprise funds in water and wastewater, and by definition they are structured to be break-even at the end of the year, with some minor retainage for future investments and capital improvements.

So it's not correct to say that they price below the market or they price below cost. They do not do that. Many of the municipalities are now moving to what they call --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: You certainly don't
price for profitability because we are on the other

side of that. We regulate water also.

WITNESS WRIGHT: I know that.

commissioner Garcia: And clearly it is one of the most, I think, difficult things we do.

Commissioner Jacobs sort of leads on that issue, but it is a very difficult thing because we have to price so that the companies have a fair rate of return. And what we find is that many times when the companies that we regulate are bordered by municipal programs, right, they don't price to lose, but they don't price to profit in comparison. Their water is usually much less expensive than privately owned systems. I mean they have all sorts of advantages.

witness wright: Not to enter into a debate, but having done this for 25 years, both for private corporations, many regulated by you here in Florida, and for municipal corporations, to make that dramatic comparison by saying the private corporations are more expensive but they make profit versus the municipal utilities.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm distilling it.

WITNESS WRIGHT: You are distilling it, I
think to a point where that simplistic analysis would

be an unfair characterization. That's why I'd have to disagree with you on that point.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let me ask you beyond that because I started and I didn't finish the question.

You do believe, though, that there is an inherent need for modern society to have as many phones out there as possible, right?

WITNESS WRIGHT: Again, I'm going to have to answer that question a little differently.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: You can answer it any way you want and you can restate the question.

WITNESS WRIGHT: And I will choose to do that, thanks.

What we see both personally, at my home, and what I see in our business, is that for many people, if not for our entire society, the phone basically can qualify as a necessity.

# COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Correct.

witness wright: I don't think you'll find
many arguments there. And certainly at the low end of
the spectrum those people that are restricted income,
poor and needy not having that available to them would
cause serious consequence to them. I understand that
and I would agree that we, in the corporate

environment, and maybe some of the higher-end residential customers, should not ignore that end of the spectrum with you as you price things. Because 1 think that's unfair for us to close our eyes to both extremes, especially the low end extreme that needs that help.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

To argue that we need a lot more phones, I'm not going to say that because I see the industry moving to a point where telecommunications and the combination of audio and video and data is moving us into a whole new arena. I see the ability to have communication capability as the key to the future in our business and personal lives, whether we're carrying portable phones, whether we're using a computer in front of us where we press a button and the computer speaks back to us and we can connect with anybody else in the world. Our industry is moving in that direction. So I would argue back that communication capability becomes an essential ingredient to life for all of us, whether it's a business life, a personal life, or security and health and welfare. So in the response there, that's where we're moving and I think that's how I look at it.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any other questions?

Thank you, Mr. Wright.

WITNESS WRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity.

MR. BECK: The next witness is Gary Earl.

## GARY EARL

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

#### DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS EARL: Madam Chairman and

Commissioners, my name is as stated, Gary Earl. I'm

the Executive Director of the Jobs and Education

Partnership for a five-county region in this area, as

well as the Local Wages Coalition. I'm responsible

basically for job training programs and pretty much -
a little bit more importantly here tonight I think I'm

responsible for the entity that handles welfare reform

in the area.

To go to my remarks, and I'll keep them extremely brief, I think that as a society we have moved to a point where we're re-examining what should and should not be subsidized. Universal subsidization is probably a bygone concept. And I think as a society we have moved to a point where those who can

ought to pay, and those who can't, by some demonstrable measure, ought to be helped. And I think this goes to some of the remarks that my immediate predecessor made about making sure that we do take care of those who are unfortunate enough to be unable to carry the basic service.

What I would ask -- and for the purposes of my remarks I will assume that the process will work its ways, that you will come to some result in terms of fair and equitable rates, some adjustment that reduces disparity and subsidization from one group to another.

What I would ask, basically on behalf of most of my customers, is that for those who by some demonstrable measure, whether it's whether or not they paid income tax last year, whether or not they are on some form of income subsidization, that you identify some simple way of identifying whether or not a person can afford to keep their basic services. And if they cannot, then subsidize those. But if they can, they should help with the rest of us. And I'll lend my remarks with that.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Earl, are you familiar with the Lifeline or Link Up program?

WITNESS EARL: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: That's offered.

WITNESS EARL: And I -- I know it's there.

I guess what I would say is that if I were in your shoes I think you need to find some universal measure that would decide whether or not a person is capable of paying; something that means something. Perhaps maybe we should look at whether or not people are, like I said, paying income tax or taking advantage of earned income credit. That's one way of looking at whether or not a person is self-sufficient.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: You think that the criteria that we use for Lifeline and Link Up aren't sufficient. We look at their participation in the wages program, food stamps, supplemental Social Security. It is kind of program-based, which in the programs -- I don't know if it's a direct income but I know you have to have a certain income to be in those programs.

WITNESS EARL: Everyone in those programs has a different criterion. We just went through a reorganization where we examined just in the work force development side of the fence 122 different programs funneled through 16 different federal agencies. And the criterion are all over the place.

I would just simply ask that you look at

some simple direct measure of ability and then apply it universally without regard to age, sex, whatever. Just say here's where we draw the line and basic services available at that point. Now, you do get into some complications as to whether or not you provide that basic service, and then also allow additional optional services, call-waiting, whatever at base rates.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: How do you feel about that?

witness EARL: You know, I can't answer that. I have an inherent feeling that everyone should have a right to the basic service. Maybe if you really wanted to make it complicated you'd have some scaled system. But I'm not going to give you that advice.

What I am asking is that as you work through the process you look to a simplistic way of identifying those who need assistance and draw the line somewhere so that we're not subsidizing willy-nilly without justification.

commissioner Jacobs: Mr. Earl, there's an interesting argument that's been raised by several people. It goes something like this: They are willing to pay for the bare-bones basic service.

Their problem is that they think they are paying more. And one person said it this way: They would love to be able to get a dial tone to dial 911 and then go out to someplace and buy a card, an a long distance calling card, and not have to have even the ability from their line to make long distance calls. They are willing to have that kind of service. In exchange, they would want to not pay any of the overhead currently imposed on them in order to make long distance calls and the other auxiliary kinds of services for the phone system? Do you think that's a fair exchange? And how would that measure out in the overall objective of obtaining competition?

witness EARL: Well, you're asking me about something that I had not heard of or considered.

I tend to think, again on behalf of my clientele, that some basic services, the ability to call out in emergencies, the ability to reach your kids when something happens at school or whatever, those kinds of things ought to be something that all of us have access to, whether you assign a basic feed of that and the rest of us pay something more to subsidize it, that's -- I don't know how to answer your question. If they want to carry something else beyond that to have access to disbanded service --

there's no subsidization because they don't want to have these other services or the other options. They are willing to pay for the basic POTS line, basic access line, okay, at some level, but they don't want to have to pay access charges, they don't want to have to pay access charges, they don't want to have to pay SLC charges, they don't want to have to pay all of these other add-ons -- some of which may be even bundled into the present day line charge. But they don't want to have any of that. They want to go out and buy a calling card and whenever they need to call their kids use that card.

WITNESS EARL: For the other services.

and take that off of their line. And their argument is they think that they are paying more than what they really use. We've even heard people come up and I think it's official now -- there's one company that would charge them and impose on them a surcharge if they don't make long distance calls, but simply have the opportunity to make long distance calls.

witness EARL: I can only respond to that by saying that if I were in your shoes I'd sure want to make this as simple as possible for the customer.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let me ask you a sort

of question that I think you would be an expert at.

And if you're not, that's fine. But you alluded to it earlier.

The concept of -- one of the issues that we discussed, and the Chairman may have talked about it is, if you qualify for assistance, and I'm using the word "assistance" in a general way because I think it's difficult for people -- it's difficult enough for people to ask for assistance as is, you know, for pride and for other reasons.

## WITNESS EARL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: To have to demonstrate necessity to Ma Bell has to be even more repugnant to the average citizen. So one of the things we've been talking about, and I guess you can be helpful is, what would be the criteria, or what government program does there exist where we could say -- it's the most general and broadest program, if you were receiving this, then Southern Bell or Sprint or whoever gets an automatic, you know -- your computer or our computer or BellSouth's computer would automatically put them on a Lifeline assistance. Because the great problem we have is the huge amount of nonparticipation that we have in the Lifeline program in certain areas of the state. Nobody knows it's there.

way, that for the large number of people that my agency and its subcontractors work with, the ability to work with those people, and the necessity to work with those people as they take those first steps back towards self-sufficiency doesn't end when the public cash assistance ends. In many cases we need to provide child care subsidies for nine to 12 months afterwards, educational benefits for two years afterwards.

I would look for something out there that is easy to identify, that is relatively universal, that has some defensible basis for how it's calculated, that doesn't peg itself to a given program because we work all today --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Because there's so many different programs.

witness EARL: -- because there are people who are identified as being one program and not another.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Got you.

WITNESS EARL: I would recommend that you look to some of the income tax laws. If they are paying income tax but still making use of earned income tax credit, that is a fairly good measure as to

whether or not a person is self-sufficient, and it's universal, and they do it once a year.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I have a question.

Mr. Earl, given your background, I have, I guess, a
more general philosophical-type question.

When we talk about subsidizing telephone rates for those that need the subsidization, what that implies is that we're charging other people more in the cost so that excess then can be used to subsidize the lower rate that's below cost for those that can't afford. At the same time we're talking about -- when we're in a monopoly and you had one provider and you set the rates and the rate of return and you basically controlled everything and there was not a market and there was no competition, that did not create a lot of problems. We're trying to move this industry to where it's market based. And usually we have competition and it's market based you basically result in prices trending towards cost, and usually with a little bit of profit above cost.

WITNESS EARL: Right.

CHAIRMAN DEASON: I'm trying to analogize
that a little bit with some other programs. Obviously
there's the food stamp program. Food is an essential
thing. Telephone service might not be quite as

essential as food, most people consider it a necessity of life, modern day life, why don't we have telephone stamps? And that's kind of an facetious question but then it's kind of serious, too. What we're asking to do is manipulate the market for telephone service so they could afford it, but we don't do that with food stamps. We don't go to the grocery store and tell the grocery store owner, well, true, a pound of sugar is a dollar a pound, the cost, but we want you to charge \$1.10 to 90% of your customers so that 10% can buy it for 10 cents a pound and get that person involved in that. Why is it that telephone service should be different?

WITNESS EARL: Well, let me answer in sort of a multifaceted way.

When I started I said that I would assume that your process would work its way through, and some things that I was not going to comment on I would assume would work their way through the system and you all would come out with fair and reasonable results.

One of those is the simple recognition that technology is here that allows us to put competition in the system. And there is a certain market control that comes with competition in the marketplace.

The idea of using telephone stamps just out

of the box, having never been asked that, strikes a very dangerous chord with me. Nationally, and even in the state, the quote/unquote "error rate" in food stamp administration pushes 50%. I think we're somewhere in the 40s now after massive efforts to correct problems.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me interrupt you for just --

WITNESS EARL: And what I'm suggesting to
you is that you would be creating a bureaucracy to
monitor the telephone stamps that would far exceed its
costs.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I'm glad you make that point. Who is going to -- you're proposing something simple to have a universal way of identifying. Who is going to administer that and how do we know there's not going to be fraud in that?

witness EARL: I don't think you can ever eliminate all fraud. The minute you write the rules to some game, someone will figure out how to beat you at it. But everybody files income tax and everybody has one piece of paper to show that. However, you can minimally examine something like that, would be my recommendation; whether it's to show a copy of that form, I don't know. That's up to you to decide but I

sure as heck wouldn't create a bureaucracy to do it.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Who should do that?

Should the Public Service Commission do that or should the telephone companies do that? And there's a cost of administering any program. And then if you ask the telephone companies to do that, you're increasing their cost of service, which then, again, I guess, gets passed to all customers.

witness EARL: I would suggest that would be cheaper than creating another agency to watch them. There would certainly be some ability to go in and audit whether or not they did it correctly once in a while by an outside independent firm. I would not create any independent agency to do anything like that. I just wouldn't recommend it. We're, as a society, in the business of getting rid of such organizations.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you. That was a good suggestion I thought, in the concept of a broad brush stroke of how something could apply, and it's something that captures, I think, a lot of the retired, it captures a lot of different people in different niches, but it's sort of a broad brush stroke of a minimum level entry sort of into some type of need. So I appreciate that. Thank you. It hadn't

occurred to me.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Earl.

MR. BECK: Thank you. The next witness is Tyler Weisman.

## TYLER WEISMAN

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT STATEMENT

Chairman, I am both a customer and a stockholder of BellSouth. I'm extremely pleased with the quality of my residential service, as well as the many custom calling services that have been put in place since BellSouth -- since its divestiture from AT&T. With that in mind, I have a few areas of concern that I'd like to be brought before this Commission this evening and see if there can be some resolution.

Number one is extending the toll free dialing area, and this directly relates to rates, I'm sure. I live in the city of Winter Springs.

Residents one mile away from my home, who are also in the city of Winter Springs are served by Sprint, can dial toll free to Apopka, Windemere, Winter Garden and

Lake Buena Vista. I cannot. Orlando is one big metropolitan area stretching from Sanford in the north to Kissimmee in the south, and from Winter Garden in the west to Christmas in the east. An option for toll free dialing should be provided for this entire area. Such an option should be on an unlimited calling plan and should be exclusive of any message unit-type calling plan.

Second concern. I'm currently being prevented from using the terminology "home office" in a directory listing for my second telephone line. I'm allowed to use the term "residence office," but the former term is proper and preferred. For some reason BellSouth believes that the terminology "home office" warrants business rates. This is totally ludicrous and needs to be addressed in regulation.

Third point. BellSouth also refuses to allow call forwarding busy line to be utilized to forward the call to another line at the same location. Instead, they are forcing hunting, an older and more costly technology to be implemented. Hunting is a technology used with analog-type switching systems. This has been obsoleted by the digital switch technology which allows the call forwarding and busy line capabilities. BellSouth hides behind a tariff

violation to justify this action. The tariff needs to 2 be reconsidered and brought in line with today's 3 technologies. And that's my three points. 4 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Mr. Weisman. 5 WITNESS WEISMAN: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I understand you don't 7 live in Sprint's territory. 8 WITNESS WEISMAN: No. 9 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: But you're awareness of the calling scopes over there is what I'm concerned 10 11 with. Are you aware if they are under some kind of 12 special calling or is it just the base --13 WITNESS WEISMAN: That's just the basic 14 local extended toll free area for Sprint compared to 15 BellSouth. 16 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. 17 WITNESS WEISMAN: It's totally -- it's 18 unequal. Something needs to be looked into that. I 19 mean, I called down to Lake Buena Vista, I call out to 20 Apopka, I mean -- I can down to Orlando, it's further 21 to call down to Orlando than call to Apopka and yet I 22 get tolled for calling Apopka. 23 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Do you make a large 24 number of those calls? 25 WITNESS WEISMAN: I make a few a month but

it's still, you know, annoying. It should be in the 2 base rate. 3 COMMISSIONER JACOBS: Okay. Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Shelfer, you're 5 familiar with those calling scopes and issues there but I know they are talking about two different 6 7 companies. Is there a LATA there or what's the issue? 8 MS. SHELFER: I believe I was away. Which 9 areas are we talking about? From Orlando into Apopka? 10 WITNESS WEISMAN: Calling from Winter 11 Springs, 327 exchange. 12 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Did you say Winter Springs, the city. 13 14 WITNESS WEISMAN: City. 15 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Half of the city is 16 served by United and the other half is --17 WITNESS WEISMAN: Both. The city is served 18 by both companies, half and half. But the Sprint customers get far more access than the BellSouth 19 customers do. 20 21 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We may have some 22 information on that. And while she's looking at that 23 issue, the other issue you raised was that they only allow you to use the what you call the old fashioned

hunting. And they said our tariff prevented them from

25

1 doing the call forwarding --2 WITNESS WEISMAN: The call forwarding, busy 3 line, yes, ma'am. 4 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Not the technology but 5 the tariff? 6 WITNESS WEISMAN: The tariff. The 7 technology is there. 8 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: That's something that we'll also have to look into and have Staff get back 10 with you on what the dilemma could be with respect to 11 that issue. 12 The other issue that you raised was the 13 second line, what you have to call it in order to have 14 the residential rate, I guess. And do you have a 15 home -- do you operate a business out of your home? 16 WITNESS WEISMAN: I work full time, and I 17 also have a consulting business in my home. But you 18 know, it's very minor. My income comes from my 19 full-time job. 20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And what you'd like to 21 do --22 WITNESS WEISMAN: Instead of listing it as 23 "residence office," list it as "home office." That's 24 what it would say. It wouldn't be advertising in any

25

specific way.

1 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I know that generally, and I'm sure you're aware of, too, to the extent it 2 3 was a real business that received the phone line, that 4 they do charge the business rate, but --5 WITNESS WEISMAN: Right. No, it's still under my name individually, and all I wanted it to do 6 7 was say "home office." They'll let me put "residence 8 office" but they won't let me put "home office." I 9 think there's something funny about that. 10 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, it does strike me 11 as a little odd. Perhaps we can check into that, too, 12 to better understand what their policies are and why 13 it's set up in that manner. 14 Ms. Shelfer, any indication on Winter 15 Springs and the issues there? 16 MS. SHELFER: Based on the NXX he has he's 17 calling to East Orange, Geneva, Orlando, Sanford and 18 Winter Park. And he's correct, he does not have 19

served out of the Oviedo exchange and he has toll free calling to Apopka.

WITNESS WEISMAN: Windemere, Lake Buena Vista or Winter Garden.

20

21

22

23

25

MS. SHELFER: I vaguely remember a request that involved Oviedo and I don't know if it was through leapfrogging or through a direct filing.

if no further calling was given but -- when we had jurisdiction, either it didn't qualify or we were never requested.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

witness weisman: I mean, I'd be willing to pay a little higher rate on my phone bill to have access to those areas, like they do in South Florida where they give you an extension.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: That's what we used to, before of the 1995 legislation, the Commission did have the authority to look at the calling patterns and make some determination as to extending scopes. We no longer have that authority. When the legislature changed the law in 1995 and started opening up the market, I would assume that they thought that the competitive forces would take care of that issue. the companies -- this may be an odd situation because you're dealing with two different companies, but generally the companies, to the extent that there's no other restriction, you could approach the company. And I know that in the Sprint area, they take in those petitions when customers petition and say they want a larger calling scope, and they apply the rule we used to have in place to make their determinations. Perhaps something is possible through that forum. I don't believe there's anything that we could do at

this time. Ms. Shelfer. 2 MS. SHELFER: No, Chairman, there isn't. 3 believe that BellSouth does offer a LATA-wide program. It's tariffed and there's a charge for it but it's 5 optional, and that may assist you in that area. 6 WITNESS WEISMAN: But it's different from 7 what they have down in South Florida where you could 8 add on just a certain amount surrounding -- this would 9 be an entire LATA-type situation, right? 10 MS. SHELFER: Yes. I don't think you have 11 the option of just adding a few. You would either 12 take some or all. 13 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We'll have a Staff member get with you and see if we can address or assist you 14 15 with the matters you raised. 16 WITNESS WEISMAN: I have a written copy I 17 can provide. 18 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much. 19 WITNESS WEISMAN: Thank you. 20 MR. BECK: The next witness is Aaron 21 Kaufman. 22 23 24 25

AARON KAUFMAN

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

#### DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS KAUFMAN: Hi. Good evening. I'm

Aaron Kaufman. I live in Orlando on the east side.

I'm a BellSouth customer. Some of my comments are
going to be a little disjointed because I wasn't sure
I was going to be here tonight.

I have a general comment on rate cases themselves. As a court reporter, I've sat in on probably three or four times on different utilities. And it's interesting for the public to realize, to know that the utility is always going to give a high request, and the Public Service Commission is always going to give a low one, and they usually end up meeting somewhere in between. So it's just a process of them deciding which is valid and which isn't. So it's not always a cut and dried situation on what the rate is going to be.

My service over all, all the years, has been fine as far as residential service, but I have some complaints. Particularly, recent two years ago, I had another line jack installed; not another line, a jack.

I was charged \$65 for the BellSouth serviceman to come out, drill a hole through a 8-inch concrete block, put the jack on the inside. Where the jack had to be put was right under the telephone box. He was there a whole 15 minutes. And I -- through BellSouth's courtesy, they allowed me to pay for it over three months instead of all at once. I think it's extremely excessive for that kind of service, \$65.

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Secondly, I have had a problem with BellSouth's billing statements for years. Sometimes I'll get a statement that's ten pages of these (indicating) front and back. It takes me a good 30 minutes to read through everything just to make sure that I can understand the charges that are being applied. When you add in -- this is a small one. I didn't have any long distance phone calls this month. And the only thing I did -- and this is another complaint I had, I went from their \$7 a month rate service, which was basically you paid for every call over 30 calls. You got 30 free calls locally, whatever, and every call over that you pay 10 cents a month. As I was planning on making a lot more calls in the next few months, I decided I'll go back to the flat rate line, what I thought was the flat rate line, at \$10 a month, which was supposed to be unlimited

calls locally. Well, on my bill I've gotten charged for adding a service. They gave me a credit, a partial credit for the residential rate line that I had previously. Then they charged me \$8 to go back to the \$10.45 rate. Plus -- so I ended up having to pay \$2.60 to go back to the other rate, which I'm sure all involved was three key strokes in the computer.

And my suggestion to BellSouth is I want a bill like most of the utility companies I have that's at least 8 by 11 so they can itemized down the lines. I'm getting tired of reading -- I go to one page, turn to another, and then I get an explanation on something else and then we go back to this -- you know, I have to keep flipping back and forth to figure out what everything is supposed to be.

And finally, I'm one of those phone users that they don't like. I've never had an extra service on my line in my life, in 25 years of owning a phone. I don't want call forwarding, I don't want call waiting, I don't want ID, I don't want any of that stuff. And our phone bills, since deregulation, have gone from a basic service line of about \$10 to \$12 a month now to 18. And I don't know whether people realize it or not, one-third of your phone bill is taxes now. So even if you didn't have a line -- if

you just had a line and no phone -- and a basic residential line rate now is \$17. That's including the residential line plus taxes. That's without any long distance.

And I understand the Public Service

Commission doesn't have control over, you know, the

FCC charges, and that's where people need to talk to

their Congressman about. You should see this bill

when I got long distance phone calls on it. I can't

make head -- most of the time I end up having to call

them to figure out my bill and that shouldn't have to

happen.

And finally, about the subsidization, I'm referring mostly to business. Business users use the phone a lot more than residential users do and that's why they charged more. They have more lines, they have more services, they use it a lot more, and as a business owner I understand where they are coming from but that's just the way it is. Most car dealers will tell you they make ten times the profit on a Cadillac than they do on a Honda. The more expensive the car, the more overhead, the more profit they charge on it. That's just the way businesses do it.

I don't know what's going to happen -actually, I'm more worried about opening the system up

to the market because of the billing problems we're having now. I don't know how you're going to accomplish it. Good luck.

Like I said, the service has been fine. I'm just -- I think their billing is atrocious, and I think their charge for repairs and residential rates -- I've talked to other people, that's way out of line for that kind of repair. And I have had one repair on my phone in 25 years and no upgrade of service, no upgrade of lines.

So they are getting the benefit of all of the people that have already been in their calling area for years. They are still getting paid. And I understand they are upgrading their technology, but they haven't had to go out and get new customers. That's also a cost of doing business. So they've gotten it good from both ends.

So that's all the comments I have. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I have a quick question. You mentioned the \$65 charge to install a jack. Did you call anyone else to see if someone could do it for less or did you just call BellSouth and just had them do it.

WITNESS KAUFMAN: I called BellSouth because

I didn't want anybody else -- and I don't think -- I'm sure it wasn't a BellSouth employee. They contract it 3 out. I'm not one of those people that call friends 4 over to do stuff like that. 5 No, I didn't. No. I mean it was their equipment I would have to tie into. And I don't want 6 7 to be responsible for something going wrong with that box. I know how easy it is. People tell me how easy it is all the time. But I figure it's their 10 equipment, it's not mine, and don't want to take the 11 chance on it being damaged. 12 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Actually, your inside 13 wire, that does not belong to the telephone company. 14 WITNESS KAUFMAN: No, but the box does on the outside that I have to wire into. 15 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: I thought you said it 17 was just a jack, not an additional line. 18 WITNESS KAUFMAN: It was not an additional 19 line. 20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any other questions? Thank you for your testimony. 21 22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: A quick question. 23 said your bill is ten pages long? 24 WITNESS KAUFMAN: Some months it has been 25 ten pages.

1 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: How long is that one 2 for your first flat --3 WITNESS KAUFMAN: This is the smallest bill I have had in probably five years. This is front and 4 5 back. 6 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: You had no long 7 distance. 8 WITNESS KAUFMAN: No long distance. 9 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: All you had was --10 WITNESS KAUFMAN: One change on a service. 11 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And it's six pages 12 long? 13 WITNESS KAUFMAN: If you don't count the information. 14 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm Southern Bell's 15 16 dream. I have everything on my phone. Would you 17 mind, could I see your bill? Would you mind that? 18 WITNESS KAUFMAN: Sure. 19 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Because I expect mine to look complicated because I do have all of the bells 20 and whistles. 21 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: While he's looking at 22 23 that, sir, one of the things that's happening on both 24 the state and the federal level, I know there are a 25 lot of new federal charges, there's not much we can do about that. But we have been filing in response to a lot of those end user surcharges, as a Commission we have been filing in opposition to them. But as it relates to the billing, the FCC, they are also concerned with the complicated nature of the billing and the way that it's formatted. They have issued a Notice of Inquiry, and they are going to, perhaps in the next several months, start addressing the billing issue to make the bills more user friendly, more understandable. I don't know if they'll go so far as to tell them, you know, that has to be on bigger paper, that kind of thing. But they are looking at some of those issues because it's caused a big problem for consumers, just understanding, like you said, what should be a simple phone bill.

Also, on the state level, we're looking at both the billing practices and some of the advertising practices to determine if there's something else that we need to do to make sure that advertising isn't misleading, that bills aren't confusing. It is something that we are focussing on, and your concern and you statements well-taken.

WITNESS KAUFMAN: My real concern is about the slamming problem. I've heard responses from other people that the phone company's response is, well,

it's your job to prove they slammed you. When you try
to contact some of these slammers and they are out of
state and you have to pay the bill. You could have
\$200 bill and you have to pay it, otherwise the phone
company will cut you off. I've heard of horror
stories there has to be some kind of medium ground
here --

don't have to pay the bill. Obviously, if you call BellSouth they'll tell you have to pay the bill. But you don't have to pay the bill. If you are slammed, you call the Commission, file a complaint with the Commission, and until that's resolved -- and it has to be resolved -- BellSouth cannot collect from you and they have to continue providing you basic service.

WITNESS KAUFKAN: That's good to hear that because I didn't know that. I would have found out about it, I'm sure, eventually, but I'm sure a lot of people don't know that.

GHAIRMAN JOHNSON: You know, you raise a good point there. That's another thing we're looking at too, that requirement, perhaps when we were in more of a monopoly environment, it was easier for us to tell the customer and the company that customer, when there's a dispute you call the company first or you

1	
1	call us and you let the company know, well, we filed
2	something with the PSC so don't turn off my service.
3	Now that we're having so many competitors in the
4	market we're looking at whether or not that makes
5	sense. Because most customers don't know they need to
6	call the Commission and then they can not pay the
7	disputed amount. So we're looking at other ways to
8	make sure that we can provide customers with the
9	assistance they need, particularly since we're dealing
10	with a lot of slamming, cramming, those kind of
11	issues. And we don't want people to feel as if they
12	are held hostage to a phone bill.
13	WITNESS KAUFMAN: I agree. I appreciate
14	that.
15	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank for your phone
16	bill. Thank you for your testimony.
17	MR. BECK: Next witness is Rex Toi.
18	
19	REX TOI
20	was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of
21	the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn,
22	testified as follows:
23	DIRECT STATEMENT
24	WITNESS TOI: I haven't been to one of these
25	sessions before. I got a phone bill that said if I

have any complaints or comments to just come in, so I don't have prepared remarks but I did have something that's been bugging me. Actually it relates --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Toi. Mr. Toi.

WITNESS TOI: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We have a court reporter that's recording everything that you're saying. She's actually typing it in. Could you speak a little slower.

WITNESS TOI: I could do that. I didn't say
anything significant yet.

As I unwind my voice, I'm just going to outline my foundation.

I live in Osceola County. I live five minutes from the boundary between Osceola and Orange County. As everyone knows, I just think of this as a giant Metroplex, like one of the gentlemen said from Sanford to Kissimmee, St. Cloud, you know, the way our highways are done, way the subdivisions are done, building between the different counties, really a continuum, and it just doesn't seem with the toll, the billing system, to have 25-cent tolls, it just doesn't seem to reflect economic reality. The bottom line is either -- preferably you do away with a tolls; include it in the base rate, or -- I'm using Sprint right now

and Sprint doesn't really have this higher amount you can pay monthly to have unlimited 25-cent toll calls. They do not have that. I asked for it. I notice that people I know in Southern Bell, I think they said for \$23 a month they can pretty much call in an extended service area as much as they want for what used to be 25 cents a call.

So I believe there should be some symmetry.

Even if there's different local companies, there
should be some symmetry. So if the other side can do
it, I should do it. And it seems to me that
intuitively if one company can do it, then it should
be feasible for another company to do it, a reasonably
equivalent stature like Southern Bell versus Sprint.
I don't like the notion that Sprint can't do it but
Southern Bell can do something.

I believe that -- I'm just going to think
out loud and there's a conclusion to this. When I get
a 25-cent call -- okay, I'm calling -- say I'm in
St. Cloud, I'm in the north end of St. Cloud,
Narcoossee, I call Orlando, it could be five minutes
away, that's 25 cents. If I'm calling an answering
machine it's 25 cents, if I misdial a number, I made a
mistake it's 25 cents. Whether it's twenty minutes or
two seconds, it's 25 cents. They do add up

substantially. What I think I'm paying for is -- a lot of it is paperwork that is unnecessary. I do not need the phone company to track all of my 25-cent toll calls. I'm not sure if they usually tell me how long the 25-cent toll call lasted. To me, I'm paying for extra paper, extra typing, extra postage, and I'm paying for something I don't need.

Basically it should be a built-in service or like a \$23-a-month extension. And so to me this problem is different than one of allocation. For example, when you talk about subsidies, you're talking about the overall cost and the overall revenues you need. And then you have to divide up issues of dividing up revenue and cost and matching them. To me I'm talking about something which is just lowering the cost, period. I'm saying there's redundancies. You don't need to create paper to track 25-cent toll calls. And it just doesn't reflect economic reality. Southern Bell can do it and so Sprint doesn't.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let me just -- say slow you down because I'm sure our court reporter is a few paragraphs behind you. Speak a little bit slower.

I'll tell you what, we have exactly the opposite reaction from other customers that say to us -- in fact, yesterday we had a gentleman who keeps

a log next to his phone. Every time he makes a

25-cent -- and then compare he compares it against GTE

and if they are off by one call, you know, he calls

them. Some people really like that information

because it helps them control their spending and

realize where it's going. So.

witness toi: Okay. Then probably the best solution -- they really care about that they are making a local call from Apopka to -- or whatever, St. Cloud --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No, I'm talking about the 25-cent call. I don't think BellSouth tracks your --

WITNESS TOI: So do you think there's enough
people who -- well, if they really want to know, why
do they need to have it documented? It's just a
residential service. If they are curious how many
times they called from Kissimmee to Orlando --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I should give you his number. He'd plant a flag in your chest. It's a banner call for him. It's just because he likes to understand what he's got. He likes to know what it is that he did. You're right, it all adds up, ten calls times 25 cents, it's 2.50.

WITNESS TOI: I make about \$100 worth of

calls of the 25-cent variety a month. It just seems too much to pay \$100. It's a lot more than my basic service and all I'm doing is calling people that could be ten minutes away and I'm paying \$100 a month for a 25-cent call. I think that's not a good counter-example of what I do, because it's a residential user. If he really wants to know -- well, yeah, he can keep track. Well, let's see. The thing is if it's unlimited, he doesn't need to keep track. That's the whole point.

# COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Right.

WITNESS TOI: If it's unlimited built into the base, then it doesn't matter if the company made a mistake keeping track of 25-cent calls.

I think the system can do 25-cent -- I don't think there's really a cost to 25-cent calls. You don't need to track them, put them on paper, keep track of the length. I think electronically it seems to me quite simple to just incorporate it and increase the overall base rate. Or I suppose what I think Southern Bell does, they have just like an extended calling area and they pay like \$25 a month extra and they can just -- so you can sort of segment that way. But just the idea of continuing getting 20 pages of my listing of 25-cent toll calls, to me I'm paying for

all of that paper and tracking. That's not right.

And Southern Bell is showing me a \$25-a-month type of thing and Sprint is not.

So at least in the immediate solution I

think Sprint can at least do what Southern Bell does

by -- ultimately it's going to happen anyway to think

of this community as a metroplex from Sanford to

Kissimmee, St. Cloud, Winter Park, Orlando, Longwood,

Maitland. Just make it one base. I don't think

there's that much additional cost to do that, because

it's all just electronic impulses. You don't need to

create paper tracking everything in between.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I have quick question.

Have you asked Sprint if they were willing to provide such a service?

WITNESS TOI: Yes, I did. Got a letter.

They said they couldn't do it. They had it checked out. In fact, I have a letter of the -- I think

Mr. Kelly assigned a special guy to do it, and he says bottom line it just didn't get done. So can't do it.

I have actually wrote the president of Sprint and he's had some tariff manager call me and I talked to him.

residential customer, been contacted by any other local carrier from a competing company that perhaps

would offer such a service?

witness toi: I have not. I'd love to be contacted by a whole bunch of people, but not from the local -- I haven't seen local competition. I would like to have much more local competition. Also local -- unrelated local cable competition. I haven't really seen that. I'm trapped, for example -- it's unrelated, I think it's in your department, telemedia cable service, they have poor service, but I can't find anyone else. They have a monopoly on certain channels and I can't use another company. I can't us Time Warner or anyone else but I guess that's a different hearing.

But, no, I don't hear from any of the competitors that can give me a different pricing plan for my local service.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: But you would like to see a competitor --

WITNESS TOI: I'd like to see competitors definitely. Or in the immediate term just another pricing option so I can call unlimited 25-cent toll calls be priced in and not read about all of my 25-cent toll calls and pay for the paper for that.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: In your response from -- in the response from Sprint, did they indicate

it's just a service they were not willing to provide or they indicated there was some restriction either from this Commission or for some other reason they could not. They said there was a restriction?

restriction. They indicated that it depends on what people prefer, like something like the last, maybe five years ago, they had a balloting, or there's some balloting they do and they ask people whether they want this system or not. And for some reason the responses they got were from people who didn't want to pay extra in order to have non-itemized 25-cent calls. I think they said -- basically they said they had some capacity to ballot and it hasn't been done for several years. And they might have been balloting people from the north coming here on vacation, asking their opinion.

So I said their balloting is flawed. I think and I said that -- and they said it's nothing that's been current anyway. But they said there was some balloting procedure that could be done. But then with some open to competition thing, that they don't even do that anymore. So I don't think they have a gauge of public interest in having one flat basic rate for the metroplex. I don't think they have assessed

it. As far as the actual response, nothing has really stuck in my mind; it was about a year ago. And they didn't say any reason they couldn't do it. It's just that they just didn't offer it at this time. And they do admit that Southern Bell, who I'm calling -- like in West Palm or Orlando, they are doing it for their customers, but I can't get it from Sprint in my own area.

And, yes, I do wish there was much more local competition, or even a listing -- if you can list who I can call. I don't even have to have them call me. I will call them. If you have a public service insert that says these are the local companies that are competing in your area, these are their phone numbers, I will even call them. But I don't even have that information.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Just a clarify, I think when they were referring to balloting, that was a process we required back when there was a proposal to make everybody's phone bill go up. You're not seeking that. You just want the option yourself. You're willing to pay more to get the service.

witness ToI: I'm actually two levels. One is I'm willing to do that, but ultimately I'd like everyone to pay more if electronically there is a

study that says it's really not that much more costly to just make it a giant metroplex basic line. Pretty soon everyone is going to have Orlando and Kissimmee, back and forth, know each other from artificial boundary lines. And I think sooner or later it's going to be just one complex.

So in the short term I just want the option to pay, say, \$25 a month for unlimited 25-cent toll calls. That would be satisfactory. In the long term, I don't think it's awful and that expensive to just build it into the base rate. That's my intuition. I think that's really part of the community and the growth of Orlando, of metroplex, to think of it as one giant community.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Toi.

MR. BECK: Monte Belote.

#### MONTE BELOTE

was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS BELOTE: Good evening,

Commissioners. My name is Monte Belote. I'm actually
not this evening a BellSouth customer, but for the
last 14 years I've run the Florida Consumer Action

Network, a statewide grassroots consumer and
environmental advocacy organization. I retired an few
months ago. But while I was running that nonprofit
for 14 years, I have had the opportunity to be a
customer for Sprint, BellSouth and GTE in our various
offices.

You have a unenviable task before you that the legislature has punted to you: To try and decide what a fair and reasonable rate for basic residential phone service is. But I wanted to start by urging you to take pride in the work that the Florida Public Service Commission has already done.

You have the lowest rates in the southeast and you should crow about it, not wait until at the legislature to try and figure out ways to raise them, but rather to thank Florida's customers for the

aggressive advocacy of the Public Counsel, intervenors like AARP, the Florida Consumer Action Network,
Attorney General and others, your Staff, who have done a wonderful job in their most recent case involving BellSouth, the question of whether or not they should enter long distance markets, and, of course, previous and the current Commissioners themselves.

Because of your foresight, you helped to provide the largest rate reduction in Florida's history for telephone customers. That 1994 settlement ultimately has returned more than a billion dollars into Florida's consumer's pockets. It reduced business rates, it cut long distance access charges, it expanded the 25-cent area ECS calls across the state, and you finally slayed the cash cow: Touch-Tone service. Something that people paid for on their bills a dollar per month per line for decades, but now has been taken off their bill.

My experience, though, that while BellSouth, of the three major companies, is at least reluctant but allowing competitors to come into the market, ultimately, BellSouth is still the monopoly player. It's alive and well and laughing all the way to the bank.

The last thing that we believe Florida's

consumers need is for you to give them more money.

And that's exactly what their proposal in any form
will ultimately do. (Shows poster)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What will they think of next, you might ask? Now we're starting to hear the need for universal service fund. The Public Service Commission has already ruled just a couple of years ago that there is no need for funding a universal service program. Already there is a subsidy of \$3.50 per month per line per customer, the subscriber line charge. Now they want to tax customers supposedly to help rural people. But virtually all BellSouth customers aren't rural unless you count rural hamlets like Miami, Pensacola, Jacksonville or Downtown Orlando. Frankly, if the problem is rural customers, like folks in Christmas, a town -- I don't know if you can even call it a town, as you drive between here and Brevard County, maybe we should give them all cell phones rather than trying to worry about raise rates so you can deal with those rural customers.

Frankly, the whole idea of trying to create a new pot of money for BellSouth's benefit to fund quote/unquote "universal service needs" to me harkens the idea of what BellSouth might really want to do similar to the BellSouth camel: Once it opens up the

flap, sees its head inside, before you know it, it will be right inside the camp with you swattering Florida's consumers. It doesn't make any send.

Frankly, as you know, telephone service is still a declining cost industry. The switches, the computers all become faster and cheaper each year. Heck, frankly, every six months it seems there are new advances in the technological wonders for telecommunications.

In talking with people across the state, and I think you have been seeing this yourselves, frankly, residential customers feel that current rates are already fair and reasonable. However, business interests are also right, I will tell you honestly, but I believe they are being mislead.

Business rates could be significantly lower, but first you have to look at what BellSouth calls fair and reasonable costs. Is it fair and reasonable for customers to pay for shiny skyscrapers on the banks of the St. Johns River in Jacksonville, or could they just work fine in a back office setting rather than downtown?

Is it fair and reasonable for customers to pay for an airport specifically for the BellSouth president, Joe Lacher, who seems to have problems

getting fogged in in Tallahassee at important times.

Is it fair and reasonable for customers to pay for BellSouth's image advertising. It doesn't provide telephone service. For that matter, golf tournaments? Excessive executive compensation? And certainly, is it fair and reasonable for customers to pay for the lawyers and lobbyists who craft crazy plans, like the one filed a few months ago that would have proposed doubling people's residential phone bills?

What I'd like to do to close is to list a few commonsense suggestions, recommendations, if you will, and some of them you've heard.

Recommendation number one would be to keep the price caps that currently exist in Florida law for residential service, but to expand and include any monopoly service or vertical service for which residential customers, or business customers, can't choose. In other words, I can choose to go ahead and have voice mail from any one of a number of carriers. I can't choose to have call waiting from anyone other than the monopoly phone company.

Mandatory enrollment for Lifeline and Link
Up. I know that Commissioner Johnson has been
speaking across the state about the possibilities of

looking specifically at mandatory enrollment of
Lifeline rather than waiting until the companies
decide to deal with the fact that only 3 to 5% of all
of those who are eligible for Lifeline actually take
the service. For that matter, we could develop a
basic telephone line option that would specifically
provide only local service and nothing more.

You have constant debates in Tallahassee before the Public Service Commission about the billing practices of long distance carriers. If you want to try and help a really low income customer, just take the long distance option out of there completely. Hey, maybe they can even strike the subscriber line charge for those customers and just provide that basic necessity: A telephone with no frills.

Phase in access reductions to interstate parity. Something that doesn't make any sense if you're a BellSouth customer because you already have that, thank you to the Public Service Commission and interveners. But if you're a Sprint customer or a GTE customer, et cetera, you're paying two to three times the cost for calls between one city and another within Florida. That's the proverbial situation where a customer in Tampa trying to call to Sarasota at one rate and then find out that they could make actually

half again as many calls, if you would, or as many minutes, by placing the call from Tampa to Los Angeles. It doesn't make any sense. And here's an opportunity to change that.

I certainly would suggest your continued aggressive enforcement of slamming and cramming. You've done a wonderful job and I know the legislature came in and ratified the work that you all have been hard at work to do. And I know that you're also beginning to look at clearer bills, more descriptive telephone bills.

I would suggest that you include in those descriptions the exact calculation of each tax or fee on that bill. Just a short summary is fine. But even a well detailed bill, such as GTE's, comes up with absolute jibberish when you try and realize why one line's taxes are not used for the same calculation for another tax. Unfortunately, the Florida Legislature is ultimately at fault for opening the Pandora's box in 1995.

Normally you try to do good things by first developing competition and then deregulating over time. Unfortunately, the Florida legislature did it exactly backwards.

Now that we are 3.5 years down the road and

there's still no real competition for basic telephone 1 service, I would urge, to begin with, to provide a 3 real wholesale rate, particularly for residential service, similar to the FCC's original recommendations 5 in 1996. That was a 25 to 40% discount; not the 10 to 6 18 or 20% resale rates that ultimately were put before 7 the Public Service Commission. You'd think, especially BellSouth, would understand that since they 8 9 were already getting their costs and a reasonable profit of the 12 to 14%, that that only leaves you 4 10 11 to 6% to play with, with billing and advertising, and 12 administration. Obviously, no one's going to jump 13 into the competition bandwagon. 14 These are all reasonable ideas, or modest 15 proposals, if you will, and I'd be happy to take any 16 questions. And thank you for your patience. 17 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any questions for 18 Mr. Belote. 19 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Monte, what was the other side of that poster? You didn't speak about it. 20 21 WITNESS BELOTE: Oh, it's for tomorrow. 22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Thank you for 23 keeping it interesting. COMMISSIONER JACOBS: I was going to say we 25 now have a reason to show up.

2

4

1 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: To look forward to tomorrow. And the second question is, who does those 2 3 drawings for you, Monte? WITNESS BELOTE: Actually it's a friend of 4 5 one of our staff. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you. 6 7 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you for your 8 comments. Appreciate your suggestions. 9 MR. BECK: The next witness is Ed Paschall 10 11 ED PASCHALL was called as a witness on behalf of the Citizens of 12 13 the State of Florida and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 14 15 DIRECT STATEMENT 16 WITNESS PASCHALL: Madam Chairman, 17 Commissioners, this is the last time I think you're 18 going to be seeing me at one of these meetings because 19 they are a little too far away for the rest of them. I just happened to stumble on to something here the 20 last couple of days -- I say stumbled on, because it 21 22 had been bugging me for a while but I couldn't really

And that was this -- we have been talking a

dig it out to set it up there so that I could really

get a handle on it to think about it.

23

24

long time about the rate that the basic -- that the local residential ratepayers have to pay, and that -- we just mentioned that as a flat fee there and that it was so very low.

But the other thing that finally I was able to separate out and look at was this subscriber line charge. And that has a maximum charge on it of \$3.50. I'm sure all of you know this, but I just want to remind you of it.

But everybody that I know has to pay that thing. In other words, it's practically mandatory on that telephone bill. And that money is on there for the purpose of construction, maintenance and repair of the telephone transmitting capability; in other words, poles, lines, conduits, all of that kind of stuff.

And when that is mandatory charge on there, that it might as well be a part of the phone bill because it is mandatory.

So the basic phone rate for your residential customer is not approximately, what is it, \$10.50 in this state, but it's \$10.50 plus the subscriber line charge. And that money goes directly to the phone company for their use, as far as I know. So that is one thing there that I wanted to mention.

The other thing is that I've heard there's

been a number of businesses complaining about so-called subsidizing residential service. A number of years ago I had to put in for a business line myself. I asked them why in the world is this charge so much higher than the cost for the residential line? The answer I got was because you make more calls on a business line than you do on a residential line. Consider that for a moment, yes, that is probably true, because in these days most of the people, both the husband and the wife in a two-parent household are working. And if it's a one-parent household, that person is working most of the hours of the day, and during that time is when that business phone is really cooking, because the calls are coming and going there for all kinds of activity, calling either customers to let them know that their products are there, vice versa, back and forth like that, or customers calling the business. So that is one of the things that makes a lot of difference in the number of calls between businesses and the consumer. Now, the one thing, also, that's mentioned

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, the one thing, also, that's mentioned in the study that you're doing is the value of that telephone service. And, of course, the value of that telephone service is indispensable in a business because you can't operate without it; not even the

lowest type of business you can think of, except the fellows that drive around in their cars and solicit mowing lawns. They are about the only ones that can operate without a phone, and most of them will give you a card and tell you if you need any help with your yard, give them a call.

The other point there is the business has to call other businesses for parts, supplies, and everything that's involved in it, or vice versa, the other business is calling them for it. So all of this contributes to a great number of calls, and the value of that telephone being in there as opposed to your residential phone.

And the last point that I want to make, and it is an extremely important one, and that's just this: That business can deduct that telephone charge as a deductible legitimate expense. I think

Commissioner Deason, who, I believe, is an accountant by profession, would agree with that point. And that is one of the most important things there because it doesn't make any difference how big their phone bill is, they can deduct that from their business revenue before they have to pay taxes on it, income taxes, things of that nature. By the same token, the residential customer cannot deduct a telephone expense

from his income tax unless he is using it as a business telephone.

Those are the things I wanted to mention to you that I hadn't mentioned before, and I don't know whether you had heard them very much or not, and I wanted to mention them to you. And I thank you for the time. And here again, I know what you're up against.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I want to state it just for you, people who are members of AARP, Ed follows around the state. That's why he's not discussing elderly issues, because you'd say, well, why isn't he talking about us, because he's hit us -- this is the fourth or fifth time we've seen him, so he's just refining his argument.

WITNESS PASCHALL: I'm going to give you tomorrow morning off from me. I won't be there.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. BECK: Chairman Johnson, Mr. Paschall is the last witness signing up for the rate docket.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I'd like to thank all of you who testified in our -- sir, did you have a comment?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you through at

this point?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes. We were just going to conclude this one and then go directly into the 407.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was the first one to talk to you, and I would love to have a few minutes.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Now, you're not going to yell at us or anything because you got steamed up from sitting there, right?

WITNESS POOLEY: Well, I could do that (Laughter) but I don't want to get that steamed up.

I'm old fellow. I have been around along time.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Why don't you state your name again.

WITNESS POOLEY: I'm Roy Pooley,
P-O-O-L-E-Y.

And I remember in 1973, when throughout the state of Florida automobiles were lined up to buy gasoline while there were tankers sitting a half mile or a mile offshore waiting to bring gasoline in. I remember going into a warehouse not so many years ago stored with sugar, and that sugar was not available on the grocery shelves. It was so deep, it was about ten

feet deep, a huge block square warehouse with front-end loaders moving the sugar around, but my wife couldn't buy a pound of Dixie Crystals at the grocery store. That got resolved. That got resolved by increasing the price of sugar. The same kind of thing happened pretty close to the same time, but with coffee. And we're still paying a premium for coffee in this country because of that kind of grasping and maneuvering to increase the price. Now, let me tell you where I'm going.

I want to make sure you're aware that I think we have, in this country, the world's greatest best, most efficient, and probably cheapest telephone service in the world. It's good. It's great. Everyone testifying here today has said they have good service. That doesn't change the efforts of the company to increase their income, and that I understand too.

An example that I think is misguided in terms of analyzing the cost of telephone service and competitive telephone service, is the concept of forward costing; determining what the cost of a business five years from day may be to produce the same facilities that are in place throughout America, through the state of Florida. And, of course, there

are ways for wholesaling and making that less of a 2 There's no reason for it to be a burden. As a matter of fact, there are now movements -- and they 3 are going to increase -- in Jacksonville, for example, 4 5 there's a Media One, the cable service, and they are offering a pretty fine service with all of the 6 7 verticals for about \$7, I believe it is, less than BellSouth does. So that can come. 8 9 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: They're offering it here now in Orlando? 10 11 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: He said Jacksonville. 12 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Jacksonville. You had 13 stated that you were from Jacksonville. forgotten to ask you that, right? You said you were 14 15 from Jacksonville. 16 WITNESS POOLEY: Yes, I did. 17 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Did you come here 18 for --19 WITNESS POOLEY: I came here for a meeting. 20 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Of the AARP. 21 WITNESS POOLEY: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: But you just said that 23 in Jacksonville Media One is providing local service 24 in certain communities today? 25 WITNESS POOLEY: They are advertising it

today.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And are they advertising it city wide?

WITNESS POOLEY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Really?

WITNESS POOLEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I didn't know that.

Did they say --

witness Pooley: Another telephone company has come into Jacksonville and they're advertising today with a wireless service, and it was so important to them that they set up a new headquarters in Jacksonville and they paid millions of dollars to have their name on the new stadium for the World Series -- listen to me, Super Bowl-bound Jaguars. So they are looking to grow and penetrate that market. No other reason for them to spend that kind of money.

What I'm saying is, there is potential competition, and that competition, as it takes hold, will lower rates. It has in the field of long distance.

In my present position I'm spending a lot of time on the telephone, speaking to a lot of places around the country and I'm getting about ten pages with a list of calls with every bill. And what's

amazing to me is how many of those phone calls to Miami, to New York, to Washington D.C., to California have a charge of 15 cents. You can't do that in the state of Florida, I don't think. My Florica calls, of course, cost me a whole lot more than my calls beyond the boarders of the state. So this is something that really doesn't need to be, I think.

I have an argument also, that I think is very valid, about the concept that residential service is subsidized. Ed has spoken about subsidy and he's probably said it better than I can, but there's no question there's a value, a dollar value, under tax reduction for business telephone which doesn't exist in the residential arena. There's no question that all of the income generated by a residential line, while the telephone company is not included in what they are telling us is the cost of service or the income from service. These are things I think we need to look at. I'm sure you will.

I appreciate very much the work you do. And I think you've done a great job through the years. I think you have been handed a very hot potato in this particular deal, and I hope we can help you resolve it. I'm available for a question if you have one.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any additional questions

for Mr. Pooley?

you said that Media One -- and I guess the Chairman confirmed it with me, but I guess I'm going to have to take trip over there -- Media One is now providing residential phone service in the Jacksonville area to anyone who asks for it. It's just that it's a more upgraded system.

witness pooley: That's right. They actually have been providing the service for some little time. They have a fiber-optic system now through most of the city. And for 30 -- I think it's \$37.50, but I could be wrong, you get your basic phone service with a full array of vertical services. That same thing with BellSouth would cost you considerably more; several dollars more.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Does Media One offer a basic line with none of the frills?

WITNESS POOLEY: No, I don't think so. I don't think so.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: They only offer the upper end customer.

WITNESS POOLEY: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: They only offer it to the upper end customer. All the bells and whistles.

WITNESS POOLEY: That's right. But you see, if they make the penetration into that field that they'd like to, BellSouth is going to be suffering pretty badly.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I think that's part of BellSouth's argument, that the high end customer is paying for it but the low end is costing them money.

WITNESS POOLEY: I've just never been able to understand the argument that by increasing my bill that's going to create competition. That's not the way it usually works. Having charges high enough to attract competition is what drives it down. I think that was amply demonstrated in the long distance deal.

I know it's tougher with this particular circumstance, but I think it is coming and it should be encouraged and there should be some means provided for perhaps better discounts for wholesale users.

That kind of thing can work.

In any event, I just ask you to weigh all of the factors that affect the income and cost of doing business.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I just want to mention, because I always do, because I have been impressed by it, that we have had members of AARP in every meeting that we've gone to in this state. In

fact, the meetings where no one else goes, we have had one AARP member as a minimum, an then we have had an AARP member from another district that we just saw come into that meeting and speak. So I think it's been wonderful and you should be proud of the work your organization does because they certainly have kept the --

WITNESS POOLEY: I appreciate the -
COMMISSIONER GARCIA: -- kept with us on
this. (Pause)

witness pooley: Hey, AARP members, stand up and be recognized, will you? (Members stand up)

So we have a few here tonight.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: If we start a fight, I think you can take the phone companies right here.

(Laughter)

WITNESS POOLEY: Just a word of explanation, this is a regular meeting of our committee. Most of these people are members of the State Legislative Committee. Most of these people come from all areas of the state. We had the opportunity, while we're here today, to talk to the principles and to talk to you. We very much appreciate it. And I know you're trying to do the right thing. We intend to try and make the legislature understand that we don't like

what's going on.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I think that's important also, that you realize whether you like or dislike whatever we do -- and I hope you will like the report we submit to the legislature --

WITNESS POOLEY: Hope so.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: -- we will not have the last word on this. It will be up to the legislature and the Governor, and so you'll get one more crack at this.

WITNESS POOLEY: That probably is the most important crack, it's probably the thing we really have to do is make the legislature aware that we are concerned and how deeply we're concerned, and we intend to do that. Hope that helps you.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Pooley.

And let the record reflect that when he asked the members of AARP to stand, that over 90% of the audience did stand in representation of AARP.

Congratulations and thank you for the testimony.

WITNESS POOLEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any other witnesses?

MR. BECK: No.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Seeing none, I'd like to

thank you all again for coming out and testifying before us this evening. Your comments will be made a part of the official record upon which we will rely when we make our final report to the legislature for the 1999 session. Thank you very much. And with that, we will conclude the fair and reasonable rate portion of our hearing, but we will -- one second. (Pause) We're going to have to take a couple minutes break for our court reporter. We'll go back on the record in just a few minutes. (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 8:05 p.m.) 

1 STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON ) 2 3 I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Hearing in Docket 5 No. 980000A-SP was heard by the Florida Public Service Commission at the time and place herein stated; it is further 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed by me; and that this transcript, consisting of 93 pages, constitutes a true 9 transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 10 DATED this 8th day of October, 1998. 11 12 13 14 15 KELLY, CSR, Florida Public Service Commission Chief, Bureau of Reporting 16 17 (850) 413-6732 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25