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## PROCEEDINGS

Mr. McNulty: Okay. I guess we can get started.
This is a workshop for Undocketed Special Project $980000 \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{SP}$. I would like to call the workshop to order. My name is Bill McNulty. I'm with research and regulatory review staff, Division of Research and Regulatory Review with the Florida Public Service Commission. And at this time I think it would be appropriate to have staff introduce themselves, and then we'll ask the various interested persons to do the same.

MR. COX: Will Cox, with the legal division.
MS. WATTS: Clintina Watts, legal division.
MS. MARSH: Anne Marsh, division of
communications.
MR. YU: Yiwen Yu, research division.
MS. DANIEL: Patti Daniel, research. You guys want to introduce yourselves?

MR. POAG: Ben Poag with Sprint.
MR. FONS: John Fons with the Ausley law firm representing Sprint-Florida, Inc.

MR. McNULTY: If you could please come to a microphone.

MR. POAG: Ben Poag with Sprint.
MR. FONS: John Fons with the Ausley law firm, representing Sprint-Florida, Inc.

MS. WHITE: Nancy White and Nancy Sims, Mary Rose Sirianni for BellSouth.

MR. SCOBIE: Mike Scobie and Kirk McNew with GTE .

MR. ERWIN: Dave Erwin representing ITS Telecommunications Systems.

MR. PASCHALL: Ed Paschall, AARP.
MR. BECK: Charlie Beck and Earl Poucher, Office of the Public Counsel.

MR. McNuLTY: Okay. The title of this docket is: "The determination of the amount of support necessary to provide residential basic local telecommunications service to low-income customers in Florida." This workshop is not to be confused with another acheduled Lifeline-related workshop scheduled for October 20th. Anne Marsh has some information on this.

MS. MARSH: On October 20th we' 11 be having another workshop on Lifeline, and as Bill indicated, it's not part of this project. The chairman has asked me to investigate certain issues that have been raised. Part of it has been in customer testimony in Study 2 , but it has come up in other arenas as well. One of the primary issues we'll be discussing will be automatic enrollment in Lifeline. I would really like to hear from both companies and the agencies involved as to the pros and cons of
automatic enrollment and suggestions for how to go about it if we did adopt something like that, or assuming whoever could adopt a program like that would do so.

As an alternative to automatic enrollment, we would also like to explore the possibility of having a standardized form for Lifeline. Some of the agencies have expressed a desire to have a form that they could help their clients fill out. An additional issue is whether or not Lifeline subscribers should be permitted to subscribe to ancillary services at their own expense, which is what they do now. If there is a restriction placed on the services so that they could not sign up for ancillary services, a determination would need to be made as to what they would be allowed to purchase.

We certainly wouldn't be deciding all of that at this workshop. It's just to get some input and some thought. The outcome of the workshop will be that I'll be making a presentation to the commissioners at internal affairs, basically a briefing. What will happen after that on the subject I don't know, but that is where will be going. So that will be October 20th, and I think I have it scheduled for the small hearing room at 9:30. There will be a dial-in number, and that is in the notice, and the notice has gone out.

MS. WHITE: Excuse me. Nancy White for BellSouth

Telecommunications. Can I ask a couple of questions on that?

MS. MARSH: Sure.
MS. WHITE: Just clarification.
MS. MARSH: Okay. Sure.
MS. WHITE: By automatic enrollment, do you mean that like when they sign up for one of the social services they would be automatically enrolled?

MS. MARSH: Yes.
MS. WHITE: Is that what you mean?
MS. MARSH: Yes.
MS. WHITE: And then the issues that you are going to take on discussion, you just want .- if people have comments, to be prepared to make comments on those types of issues at the October 20th workshop?

MS. MARSH: Yes, and anything related to those topics that you can think of, you know, we can sit down and discuss it so that I can brief the commissioners on the topic.

MR. BECK: Anne, Charlie Beck with the Public Counsel's office. Commissioner Garcia has mentioned numerous times at the public hearinos about the issue of Lifeline customers taking ancillary services. What evidence is available about the extent to which Lifeline customers do that?
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MS. MARSH: I have gotten a data request recently. Let me see, looks to be about 60 t.

MR. BECK: Okay. You have that, and it's breaking down which services are taken?

MS. MARSH: No, I don't. I just asked for a total.

MR. BECK: Just some ancillary service.
MS. MARSH: I have asked them just for whatever ancillary services customers take. I didn't ask for it to be broken down.

MR. BECK: Okay. So what you have is simply either yes or no?

MS. MARSH: Yeah, basically.
MR. BECK: Okay.
MS. MARSH: There are a few -- I think maybe one company responded to just a couple of services as an example, but basically I just have a percentage number and that's all.

MR. BECK: Thank you.
MR. McNULTY: Okay. The notice on today' $B$ workshop went out on September 14 th to all interested persons and to state and federal agencies that are qualifying agencies for Lifeline or qualifying .. that implement or administer qualifying programs for Lifeline service.

The purpose of the workshop, as stated in the notice, is to allow interested persons to respond to the method staff is using to determine the number of Lifeline qualified low-income customers in Florida. Everyone should have an agenda and a copy of the staff's draft report on this subject. There is one located -- there are additional copies located at the front table here.

The first thing we would like to do before getting into our methodology is to go through some of the corrections, review some of the corrections to staff's draft report; and these corrections are not grammatical in nature, they are substantive. We will handle grammatical another time with the final review. We didn't feel as though that was important to do at this juncture.

So if you do have a copy, if you wouldn't mind following along on page 8 , at the -- towards the bottom of the page at the end of the, I guess what we call the second paragraph, the statement: "However, staff did make a best-guess assumption." That sentence needs to be eliminated, deleted and replaced with the paragraph on the following page, page 9. So that is correction one to be made.

The second correction is on page 10 in the middle of the page. The sentence that starts with, "For example, DCF maintains Medicaid program participation data," the
term "DCF" should be deleted and replaced with A-H-C-A, for Agency for Health Care Administration.

The third correction is on page 13 in table two on the bottom right cell of that table, we have the number 34 thousand 282,676. That number needs to be replaced with thirty -- excuse me, I meant to say 34 million 282,676 . That number is to be replaced with $34,283,676$.

That same error appears at the bottom of the page in the text, the second to the last line. That would .And the fourth correction.

Correction 5 appears on page 15 in table 3, the header for the second to the last column is "Projected Based section 8." It should be "Project Base Section 8," so please drop the e-d on that word.

The sixth correction is also on page 15 but in the bottom of the page under the LIHEAP section. The Florida LIHEAP administrator's name is Robert Lakin, not Lane, so that the name is spelled L-a-k-i-n.

The seventh correction 18 on page 16 in the middle of the page under the header "Estimation of future number of Lifeline eligible customers and Lifeline support," three lines below that where it says, "Agency for Health Care Administration --" or it says AHCA, and DFC. That should be DCF, not DFC.

The eighth correction is a few lines down, the
reference to Agency for Health Care Administration or AHCA is incorrect. Where it says, "According to AHCA," it should have said, "Office of economic and demographic research," in parens, EDR.

The ninth correction is at the top of page 17 , Robert Lakin's name is, again, misspelled, L-a-k-i-n.

And another correction, or tenth correction is the bottom of page 17, the sentence that starts with, "As depicted in table 4," the "AHCA" appearing in that sentence should be replaced with "EDR."

I believe I have one more correction to tell you about, and that is on -- take you back to page 5. At the bottom of the page it cites an order number, PSC-98-0328-FPF-TP, to include Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. "Temporary Assistance to Needy Families" is to be deleted and replaced with "Public housing in Section 8 and LIHEAP." And LIHEAP is spelled L-I-H-E-A-P.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you give that again to us?

MR. McNULTY: Yes, the final sentence --
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just give us (inaudible).
MR. McNULTY: The new language is "Public Housing and Section 8 and LIHEAP."

MR. POAG: Eliminate your footnote?
MR. McNULTY: Excuse me?

MR. POAG: It eliminates your footnote?
MR. McNULTY: Yes, it does.
MR. ERWIN: Would you repeat the first correction that you gave?

MR. McNULTY: Yes. The first correction is on page 8. The last sentence of the first complete paragraph starts with the word "however." That sentence is to be deleted and replaced with the paragraph on page 9.

Are there any questions on the corrections that have been discussed this morning?
(NO RESPONSE)
MR. POAG: Deleting that footnote three is going to change your footnotes all the way through?

MR. McNULTY: Yes, it will.
MR. POAG: Yeah, and then I was just noticing back on page 15 , is that you've got a 45 by the footnote at the bottom, and it's not clear to me how you jumped to 45 in your footnote references here.

MR. McNULTY: That will be corrected. That's one of those grammatical issues.

MR. POAG: You followed then on with 46 on the subsequent page.

MR. McNULTY: Right.
MR. POAG: So you just need to fix those numbers,
MR. McNULTY: Very good. Thank you for bringing
that to our attention.
Okay. What we would like to do now is to present an overview of staff's methodology and findings, and following this we will solicit comments and questions, and then we will proceed to Number III on today's agenda.

The first point I would like to make about the Lifeline service program is that it's a federal program and that households qualify for receiving Lifeline assistance by participating in certain federal assistance programs, and those federal arsistance programs include Medicaid, Food Stamps, SSI, or Supplemental Security Income, Public Housing Assistance and Section 8 programs and LIHEAP.

In Florida eligibility guidelines have been modified somewhat this year. We have changed what was previously Aid to Families with Dependent Children to be modified now to Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, and we made other changes to include Public Housing and Section 8 and LIHEAP.

The agencies that are basically in a position to help us determine the number of customers eligible to receive Lifeline assistance because they administer the programs include the Florida Department of Children and Families which administers Medicaid, Food Stamps and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, or TANF. The second such agency is the Agency for Health Care

Administration which administers SSI. The third agency $2 s$ the Federal Department of Housing and Urban development, which it administers Public Housing Assistance and Section 8. And finally, the fourth agency is the Department of Community Affairs which administers Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP.

In developing a methodology for determining the number of Lifeline qualifying customers in Florida, staff knew that the primary obstacle would be more complicated than simply asking the agencies to provide us the number of households participating in each of the programs and then summing up these numbers. We anticipated that there would be a large proportion of these households which would be participating in more than one program thus simply summing the participants of each program would lead to a serious case of double counting of households; however, during the course of developing our methodology, several other issues became evident. The main issues we addressed include, first, the time frame for estimating low-income support requirements called for by the legislation. It's not clear to us whether the current or projected levels of support is required. Not being certain of that, we determined to attempt to provide both current and projected levels.

The second issue that we faced was the fact that there are differences in the ways agencies maintain and
format their data. AHCA, or Agency for Health Care Administration, for instance, maintains their data in terms of case loads while others maintain their data in terms of households. Some can run computer matches on addresses, others can perform matches based on Social Security numbers. We had those kinds of concerns. We also found that different types of data formats were utilized by the different agencies, which presented an obstacle in merging data sets, so compatibility would be a key concern there.

Our third issue was that agencies were prevented from sharing their data in many instances due to confidentiality requirements of client information. Staff's initial attempt to collect the data was contounded by the fact that the agencies could not share their client-specific data, including names, Social Security numbers and addresses.

And then a final issue that came to the fore was that there was limited availability of the agencies. resources and personnel. They are many times concerned with their own internal demands, as you can well imagine, and so this created an extra burden on them, and their availability was sometimes a limiting factor.

So now what I would like to do is give a brief overview of our methodology, and we'll look at both the current and projected Lifeline qualifying households within
these methodologies. I'11 start with what was our methodology for determining the current number of households.

First, we asked the agencies to determine certain data for us and report it to us. We asked DCF to identify and eliminate multiple occurrences of current recipient households within Medicaid, Food Stamps and TANF data sets. And then DCF also eliminated from this data set all SSI recipient households. They reported that number to staff.

Secondly, AHCA identified and summed the total number of current SSI households, and they reported that number to staff.

Thirdly, HUD performed computer matching of households on Public Housing and Section 8 current program participancs but then eliminated those households which also participated in TANF or SSI, and they reported that number to staff.

Fourthly, DCA submitted the total annual number of LIHEAP participants for 1997 in Florida to staff. They did this rather than run electronic matching of households on the most current monthly client data for two reasons: First, DCA maintains annual rather than monthly data on the number of households participating in LIHEAP, so 1997 data is the most current, Secondly, DCA was unable to perform
electronic matching of LIHEAP households and the other programs households since LIHEAP data is distributed in 32 field offices, and only some of those field offices store their data in an electronic data set.

And then finally, staff summed the quantities of the participating households reported from the DCF, AHCA and HUD. To this amount staff added 501 of the reported number of LIHEAP households. Staff made the assumption that 50 of LIHEAP households were not participating in any of the other five programs. The resulting amount became staff's estimate of the current number of customers eligible to receive Lifeline service in Florida.

All right. The second part, of course, then is to develop projections of Lifeline eligible customers, and we determined we would attempt to do this for 1999 and 2000 The staff solicited the following program growth data and client participation unit changes from the agencies and from the Florida Office of Economic and Demographic Research, or EDF.

First, DCF and EDF determined the growth rates for Medicaid programs and Food Stamps.

Secondly, HUD gave specific annual increases expected in its Public Housing and Section 8 programs.

Thirdly, DCA indicated that growth and LIHEAP participation was very dependent upon federal funding. DCA
defaulted to the current participation level as their proxy of future participation levels until such time as better funding data is available.

So finally, staff applied these growth rates and annual increases to the current estimates of Lifeline eligible customers for each of the programs as previously discussed in order to project the number of households eligible to receive Lifeline assistance in Florida in 1999 and 2000. Now Yiwen Yu will present the findings of this study.

MR. YU: I'm going to use this overhead to show you how we calculated the numbers that you have in a copy of the draft report, and as Bill said, we tried to come up with two different numbers: One is the current number; the other is the projected numbers for the next two years.

The biggest problem with, you know, calculating these numbers is that, you know, how to avoid double counting or multiple occurrences or duplication, whatever you want to call it. We used this sort of a van (phonetics) diagram type of picture to show you the potential overlapping relationships among the six qualifying programs. As I said, if you turn the picture upside down it looks like a bug; but this picture shows you that these are the -- you know, you could have also potential overlaps across the six different programs.

In Florida, the biggest one is the Medicaid, but within Medicaid, as you can tell, there were two programs: One is SSI; the other is TANF. And TANF is called the wages in Florida. And then these two programs are a hundred percent included in Medicaid program.

In Florida, SSI is administered by the Agency for Health Care Administration. The rest of Medicaid, we call it the non-SSI Medicaid, is administered by the Department of Children and Families.

The Food Stamp, and you can tell also the Food Stamp has a big overlap with the Medicaid and the other programs, and the Food Stamp is also administered by the DCF. And there are two other relatively smaller programs: Public Housing, Section 8 and the LIHEAP. And Section 8 is administered by HUD, and LIHEAP is DCA.

And from this, the Agency for Health Care Administration, they provided us the number for SSI, as Bill already said. The number is 306 thousand. And for the non-SSI Medicaid, the number is 321 thousand, so add them up. The sum of the two give us a total number of Medicaid eligible, total number of Medfcaid households, recipient households. The number is 627 thousand.

And then the second one would show us the numbers. There are the numbers. So here 627 is the Medicaid number, and that is a very good number. We use
that as a base and the fund, the unduplicative part of other programs, and they add up to the number. For instance, for Food Stamps the total number is 417 thousand, and after all the duplications of the all the others, found households receiving like Medicaid. All those subtracted from this number, the left over is only 50,500 .

For Public Housing -- By the way, these two numbers, Food Stamps and the total Medicald, they are updated to the August of this year. For Public Housing the total number of households is 151. The time is July of this year, and that is from HUD. And then we asked them to help us identify and eliminate all those duplications, and they could only do that for SSI and the TANF. In other words, they identify all those HUD recipient households who also receive assistance from SSI and the TANF, and we subtract that part from the total number. We come up with 103 thousand.

And the LIHEAP, they give us a total number of households, recipients, and then the number is 70 thousand, but that is a yearly number. Here the time is a little bit different, a yearly number. That is last year. That is the only number we could get from them. And then this number has -- you know, we have a little problem with, you know, asking them to help us to find and eliminate any duplications, and we could not do any of those, you know,
eliminating duplications or anything.
So in order to come up with a number, we just take the assumption that $50 \%$ of this 70 thousand receiving only LIHEAP assistance, and that would give us 35 thousand. And I know this assumption might be a problem, but compare this size of LIHEAP program to the others, this is a relatively small program, so the potential error might be emall.

So, and then you sum up the last column to come up with a total number, and that number tells us how many households are eligible for Lifeline programs in Florida at, you know, current number; and this is the current number. The next one we tried to calculate the forecast number, you know, projected for next two years. And, also, the problem is how do you avoid the duplications. And, you know, for the future years, we don't have those addresses for the future recipients, not yet, so the computer cannot do the address match runs yet, so we take the current number as the base. We try to find the growth rate and apply the growth rates to each of these programs and come up with the projected number.

For the Medicaid program, we get the growth rates from the Social Service Estimated Conference, which is also the Economic and Demographic Research, that office. For next year the growth rate is 5.6t, and for year 2000 is
2.54; and we applied these numbers for the next two years and come up with the Medicaid eligible households.

For Food Stamps, Department of Children and Families, they provide the projected number; and as you can see, that projected the growth rate as negative. The number is getting smaller and smaller. For the next year, the growth rate is negative .17, and for the year 2000 is negative 1.1.

And the next program is Public Housing. The project -- the forecast information we got from HUD is, they said just add up one thousand each year to the current number, and they believe that is a reasonable number to use; and that's the only forecast information we got from HUD. So we add one thousand to their current number for the next two years.

And again, LIHEAP they couldn't provide a number for the next two years, the projected number, except to say that over the years the budget has no big changes; and then so if the budget does not change, the number of recipient households are not going to change a lot. So we just assumed that it's not going to change for the next two years. And that .- again, that's the only information we have. That might be a problem, but this is the only information we have. And again, that relatively the program is small compared to the others.

So we just do these additions, and they come up with the number of households eligible for Lifeline services in Florida for the next two years. And again, our task was to try to come up with the number of eligible households, and that's what we have done. And now we are open to the questions and the comments relating to these numbers. Thank you.

MS. SIMS: Do you have a figure for total households in the State of Florida, I mean total households in the State of Florida?

MS. DANIEL: Nancy, I'm Patti Daniel. We rely on the Florida Statistical Abstract for that information. I believe it's about five million households in Florida.

MS. SIMS: Okay. Do you have . . do you know what the requirements are in order to participate in LIHEAP?

MS. DANIEL: We have that data. We don't profess to be experts at it, so I do have that data.

MS. SIMS: Can we get a copy of that?
MS. DANIEL: Uh-huh.
MS. SIMS: And also, what is required to, you know, have Public Housing or Section 8?

MS. DANIEL: We have that data, and I might let Yiwen speak to that. We had quite a bit of difficulty getting a bottom line. You cannot go to a Florida statute and find what the eligibility requirements are. I believe
there is probably a lot of discretion within the agencies, and it's very difficult. It's not only based on income, it's based on, you know, number of people in the household. Sometimes theac benefits go to children. Sometimes they go to the family. There are just a wide variety of issues. MS. SIMS: Yeah, I was mainly looking at .MS. DANIEL: I can give you a best guess. MS. SIMS: -- just those two. MS. DANIEL: Okay. Which were the two again? MS. SIMS: Well, the LIHEAP and the Public Housing and Section 8.

MS. DANIEL: Okay.
MS. SIMS: Are you all open to anything that we have gleamed from other states? Because we were speaking with some of our regulatory counterparts in Louisiana, and they've been dealing with Universal Service and Lifeline and so forth. And I don't have anything in writing. I mean you are going to have to take -- this was a phone conversation, but it was regarding the LIHEAP and the Public Housing. And basically, they had a conversation with one of the -- a casual conversation with one of the representatives that works on these agencies, and they said that in Louisiana, which of course is probably a high participation state as far as Lifeline eligibility, that 998 of those that participate in Public Housing and LIHEAP
also participate in the other programs, in one of the other programs. So that puts it a little bit -- if that carries any weight.

Now I thought maybe we would try to talk to some of our other states too and see if they have gotten any information. I don't know if other states keep better records or, you know, have any better information, but I think that we are going to go to our other states and see if there is anything else that could help you in estimating on these two areas.

MS. DANIEL: We would welcome something more concrete than we currently have. I think for LIHEAP we're, as you can see from Yiwen's discussion, we are particularly at a loss.

MS. SIMS: Yeah. Okay.
MR. McNULTY: Anything along those lines. It would be good to have some of the background as to how they came up with that estimate. We ran into the problem here as LIHEAP is administered in Florida where some of the field offices maintain the data in electronic format and yet others don't. We basically ran into the problem of not being able to get the whole data set, obviously, so that we considered the possibilities of doing a statistical inference based upon one or two field offices, but then we ran into some confidentiality issues as well; so we would
be very interested to find out how that was implemented in those states. It would help us support any estimate that we would use.

MS. SIMS: I guess you can appreciate now our predicament in trying to determine whether somebody is actually eligible when we go to these agencies to verify our list. It gets to be pretty hectic.

MR. McNULTY: Yes, we have a lot of appreciation for that.

MR. YU: For the Lifeline program, we also looked at the eligibility requirements also, and the same thing for the Public Housing, Section 8; but, you know, you look at income requirements. There are other, some other things that you need to pay attention to. For instance, those programs serve recipients on first-come, first-serve basis. So, you know, to be poor is to be, you know, meeting the income level, is the first one; but it doesn't necessarily mean that your income is, you know, is meeting the requirements and then you will get the assistince. It also depends on the funding. If the funding is not sufficient, you will be put on the waiting list. So that would make it maybe differences across the states.

MS. DANIEL: And which programs is that applicable?

MR. YU: Two programs: LIHEAP and the Public

Housing and the Section 8. Thanks.
MS. SIMS: I'll see if we can find anything else about Louisiana as well as some of the other states. I don't know if we' 11 be very successful, but we' 11 try.

MR. McNULTY: We also are attempting to get an update from the Florida LIHEAP administrator on what the prognosis is for funding, federal funding for the program, since that is something that is a determinant for LIHEAP participant - LIHEAP participation.

MR. YU: Also, for the LIHEAP, in terms of data collecting, and there are field offices which, you know, operate and run these programs. They don't $\cdots$ many of them are not computer automated yet, so that created a potential problem in collecting the most updated data.

MR. FONS: This is John Fons. I have a question for Charlie Beck, Charlie, does NASUCA keep any statistics on Lifeline?

MR. BECK: I could ask. I don't know offhand.
MR. FONS: Okay. You haven't checked on that?
MR. BECK: No, I haven't.
MR. FONS: Okay.
MS. DANIEL: Who? I'm sorry. Who?
MR. FONS: NASUCA which is the National
Association of State Public Counsels. Close?
MR. BECK: Close.

MR. FONS: What?
MR. BECK: State Utility Consumer Advocates.
MR. FONS: State Utility Consumer Advocates, national association chereof.

MR. McNULTY: Other comments on the --
MR. POUCHER: Earl Poucher of Public Counsel's office. I'd like to ask a question. Is there any data or evidence that would provide information on Medicaid recipients as to whether or not they live in households with other telephone service? And I'm thinking of mother-in-laws who receive Medicaid living in a house with existing telephone service. They probably would not be a candidate for Lifeline, but does anybody know how many mother-in-laws live in houses with telephones?

MR. McNULTY: Most of this counting we really relied very heavily upon the agencies for. In this case, of course, it was the Department of Children and Families. And we understand that they keep their case load data and are able to determine by address the number of individuals who are participating in their various programs.

MR. POUCHER: Yeah, I see You've done a good job, or they've done a good job of liminating duplications where two people in the same household have Medicaid. I think that's -- based on the way the report reads, it's been taken care of; but I'm concerned about the number of
people who are Medicaid recipients who live in houses with other people, other families that are not recipients that are not duplicates but people who are wage earners and are not public welfare recipients and have the basic telephone service for the household.

A Medicaid recipient, just because they receive Medicaid, is not going to be a candidate for telephone service unless they live in their own house separately; so I would be concerned -- I don't think you can ever put your arms around that number, but I would put a big disclaimer around the 34 -million-dollar number and the 815 thousand participants beca:se of the fact that there are many people who receive Medicaid who live in houses with other people who have the telephone service in that house, and I .- I don't think you can find out what that number is, but it deserves to be mentioned as one of the reasons why it's very unlikely that you'll have a hundred percent participation ever or anything approaching that.

The second disclaimer I would recommend that you deal with is Lifeline eligible customers who have existing bad debts with the telephone companies. Presently, those customers who have bad debts, even though they are eligible for Lifeline, will not be eligible for telephone service until they pay their bad debt; and if they are Lifeline eligible, why it's unlikely that they are going to be able
to do that. So somewhere you've got to take into consideration the fact that there are a lot of customers out there who have bad debts with the telephone companies, and they are not going to get telephone service, even Lifeline telephone service, unless there is a change of rules.

MR. McNULTY: So in both of those instances you would say that the, either the estimate or the projections that we came up with were overstated?

MR. POUCHER: Yes, very definitely. And as a matter of personal information, every Lifeline eligible customer that I've tried to help to get telephone service has a bad debt with the telephone company and did not get their telephone service.

MR. McNULTY: Thank you. Are there any other comments on this portion of the agendar
(NO RESPONSE)
MR. McNULTY: Okay. I think that then we could go to Number III. Yes, comments?
(NO RESPONSE)
MR. McNULTY: This is asking basically for other issues related to determining the amount of support. If there are any issues at this time, any interested persons are welcome to openly discuss it.

MR. McCABE: I just have some questions regarding
what it is --
MR. McNULTY: Could you identify yourself?
MR. McCABE: Tom McCabe with TDS Telecom, Quincy.
I was interested in terms of what you envision providing to the legislature. Would it be this report here with, you know, some modifications as were discussed, or will you be making a series of recommendations in terms of whether Universal Service -- Lifeline should be funded through a universal service program, how that program should be funded and things of that nature? I mean I think that, you know, based on the number of subscribers today, I don't think that we would need to start out trying to fund 35 million dollars; and I'm curious in terms of whether you will be presenting recommendations in terms of, yes, there is a need for Lifeline support. Yes, it should be funded through a universal service fund, and at this time we would project that the funding should be based on $X$-number of dollars today with updates periodically, maybe on a yearly basis, in terms of actual subscribership and things of that nature because everyone is going to be paying into this fund; and my company, obviously, based on what I would anticipate, number of customers I would have, it's very important to us. Yet at the same time, we will be paying into the fund, and we don't want to be in a situation of paying 35 million dollars -- part of 35 million dollars
into the state coffers that are going to sit there unused until you get a hundred percent subscribership.

MR. MCNULTY: Tom, basically the research and regulatory review, Division of Research and Regulatory Review conducted this study and is forwarding its results to the Division of Communications, and if there are any policy issues to be addressed, it would be addressed by the Division. We are in the process of working together with them to get this report to the legislature, but that's the extent of what our study has been doing. And we have basically put together this report with the assistance of the Division of Communications for factual basis only. We haven't really provided any policy recommendation, per se, and perhaps the Division of Communications might have something to say on the issues that you've presented.

MS. MARSH: As far as I know, for now, this is what is going to be inserted into the report. I don't think a lot of other people in communications have seen it besides me, and some policy issues may come up later on, so it's possible there could be some things added to it. We haven't really sat down and discussed this particular report because it just has gotten to us just the same as it has to you. The statute asked for the amount of support, and this is basically .- I view it as kind of a maximum number. Obviously the participation at Lifeline is a whole
lot less. In fact, it's even lower now than it was in '97. So obviously you don't need a 34- or 36-million-dollar funding, but whether we'll make any recommendations on that or not, I don't know at this time.

MR. McNULTY: It sounds like the other workshop will maybe get into some of those issues.

MS. MARSH: No.
MR. McNULTY: No? Okay. All right. Excuse me. MS. MARSH: At least we don't plan to. MR. McNULTY: Okay. MS. MARSH: Although, if somebody has something they want to bring up, you know, I'd certainly be glad to entertain it.

MR. McNULTY: Okay. Other issues that we can address today?

MR. PASCHALL: Ed Paschall with AARP. I raise a question here in conjunction with what Mr. Poucher with public counsel mentioned a little bit ago about the fact that he had tried to help quite a number of people get Lifeline assistance and were unable to do so because they had a bad debt with a telephone company already, and while they were qualified for it otherwise, as far as the requirements were concerned, the telephone company would not give it to them because of their bad debt with them, Would there be any way that we could get a number from the
combined telephone companies as to how many people they have like that with bad debts? Because if it's only maybe a bad debt for a month or something like that, maybe there would be some way that could be resolved so that they could be included into this program.

MR. McNULTY: That's an excellent question, and I think that we can definitely investigate that.

MS. SIMS: Let me -- This is Nancy Sims with BellSouth. Let me explain to you what we have been doing for, it's been well over a year now, I think. We instituted what we call a toll credit limit program, and what we do is if a customer -- of course, before we cut a customer off, we will try to work with the custoner to work out a payment schedule, and they will agree to go on a -to get a toll block on their line and work out a payment schedule, and we will not cut them off.

If they have been disconnecter for non-pay and we have not yet -- they have not yet been turned over to a collection agency, because we have certain contracts with collection agencies that we are -- We are in the process of renegotiating those so that we can override some of those. But if they've been disconnected and they have a bad debt, in fact, most of -- a lot of the ones we have tried to contact and send letters to and say, we have a plan now whereby if you will agree to put a toll block on
your line and agree to some type of a payment schedule, we will turn your service back on. And I think we've been pretty successful with that, but we can certainly give you a report. I don't know that we can tell you which ones that have bad debts sould have been eligible for Lifeline. You know, I don't know, that our records can tell that, but we can certainly give you reports on, $;$ ul know, what has happened with bad debt as far as before we put the toll credit limit on and after we put the toll credit limit program in.

MR. PASCHALL: I think that would be very useful there, and if the other telephone companies would consider doing the same thing, I think that would be very helpful in the total analysis of what you can do to get more of those people back into the loop, if you want to call it such, because that's the main purpose of the whole thing in the first place, is to get them back in there, if they are out. And the other point of it is that, just as she said, if they would agree to toll blocking or just tell them pure and simple that if they want to get back in, that we would do that, but they would have to agree to that toll blocking. Would the other companies .- I think if the other companies would do that, I think we would come up with some very useful figures that may provide some additional support to those people to get some of their
debts -- I'm not saying we should pay a two or three-hundred-dollar bill for some of them that they are not trying to pay themselves, but to help some of them get back in the loop who may be making a strong effort in that area. I think it might be certainly well worthwhile.

MR. McNULTY: Are there other telephone companies here today that could maybe give their perspective on their ability to quantify the number of customers with bad debt who don't have the opportunity?

MR. POAG: We operate, I think, pretty much the same as BellSouth has described, and I don't know that we would be able to quantify the number that were Lifeline eligible. Possibly you could find out which ones were Lifeline that were disconnected, but I'm not sure how much of a process that is and how long it would take to do it. It would definitely be some sort of a tianual process though, I believe.

MR. MCCABE: For Quincy we basically operate the same way BellSouth does, and again, we would not have any idea whether we had people that had been disconnected that would be eligible for Lifeline. I don't know how we would go about finding that information out. I don't think that that's something that should be - that burden should be placed upon us to find out who is eligible for Lifeline.

MR. MCNULTY: But it would be possible to find
out the total number of people who have been basically withheld from service due to bad debt considerations?

MR. McCABE: We could provide you probably with information of people that we have disconnected. One of the difficulties though is, you know, a lot of times we may have somebody who has been permanently disconnected that, you know, we don't even know whether they still exist in the area. I mean we have a lot of bad debt customers that no longer are in our territory.

MR. McNULTY: Okay. Does GTE have any comments on this?

MR. SCOBIE: We do the same basic thing Bell does, and I would agree with Tom --

MR. McNULTY: You have to come to -.
MR. SCOBIE: GTE does the same basic thing, I guess, as BellSouth and Sprint as far as dealing with customers that go out non-pay or with bad debt. I am pretty sure we could not quantify those that would be eligible for Lifeline service. As far as total calculation of the total customers that have gone out non-pay, there may be some way to calculate that, but I'm not sure at this time until we go back and check.

MR. McNULTY: Thank you for that response.
Okay. Are there any other comments at today's workshop?
(NO RESPONSE)
MR. McNULTY: Okay. Seeing none, this workshop
is adjourned.
(WHEREUPON, THE WORKSHOP WAS ADJOURNED)
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