

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: MAY 7, 2001

TO: DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (BAYO)

FROM: DIVISION OF COMPETITIVE SERVICES (K. CRAIG, AUDU, MOSES, SALAK) *von*
DIVISION OF APPEALS (BROWN) *mcB (cm)*
DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (ELLIOTT) *JAE*

RE: DOCKET NO. 991222-TP - REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS FOR RELAY SERVICE, BEGINNING IN JUNE 2001, FOR THE HEARING AND SPEECH IMPAIRED, AND OTHER IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE FLORIDA TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCESS SYSTEM ACT OF 1991.

AGENDA: 05/15/01 - REGULAR AGENDA - ISSUE 3 IS PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION - INTERESTED PERSONS MAY PARTICIPATE

CRITICAL DATES: BUDGET APPROVAL IS NEEDED FOR FTRI'S FISCAL YEAR WHICH BEGINS JULY 1, 2001. ALSO NEED TO ALLOW TIME FOR LECS & ALECS TO PROGRAM ANY SURCHARGE BILLING CHANGES EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2001.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: ANTICIPATE THE NEED FOR SIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS AND ASSISTIVE LISTENING DEVICES. PLACE NEAR THE BEGINNING OF THE AGENDA OR AT A TIME CERTAIN TO REDUCE INTERPRETER COSTS.

FILE NAME AND LOCATION: S:\PSC\CMP\WP\991222.RCM

CASE BACKGROUND

The Telecommunications Access System Act of 1991 (TASA) became effective May 24, 1991 and is found in Part II, Chapter 427, Florida Statutes. TASA provides funding for the distribution of specialized telecommunications devices and provision of intrastate relay service through the imposition of a surcharge of up to \$.25

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

05726 MAY-7

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

DATE: May 7, 2001

per access line per month. Accounts with over 25 lines are billed for only 25 lines.

Florida Telecommunications Relay, Inc. (FTRI), a non-profit corporation formed by the local exchange telephone companies, was named by the Commission to serve as the TASA administrator. Currently, FTRI has over 218,000 Floridians in its client data base.

On July 1, 1991, the LECs began collecting an initial \$.05 per access line surcharge pursuant to Order No. 24581; the surcharge was increased to \$.10 per access line on July 1, 1992. The surcharge remained at \$.10 per access line through November 30, 1994. Effective December 1, 1994, the surcharge was increased to \$.12 per access line. Due to expense reductions proposed by FTRI and a cash balance in its surplus fund account, the surcharge was reduced from \$.12 to \$.10 for the fiscal year 1995-1996. Staff was aware that the cash balance would be reduced during the fiscal year and that an increase in the surcharge would be required for the 1996-97 fiscal year. Accordingly, the surcharge was increased back to \$.12 July 1, 1996, and remained at \$.12 for the 1997-98 fiscal year. Because of an increase in FTRI's surplus account the surcharge was reduced to \$.11 for the 1998-99 fiscal year. The surcharge was again reduced for the 1999-2000 fiscal year, to \$.09. Again, to reduce its surplus fund account, the surcharge was further reduced in the 2000-2001 fiscal year, to \$.08. Sprint is now the relay provider -- replacing MCI.

In June 2000, the Commission executed a contract with Sprint to provide the relay service the act requires. The current contract ends June 1, 2003. In its proposal to become Florida's relay provider, Sprint offered Caller ID as an optional feature. On March 27, 2001, the TASA advisory committee held a meeting to discuss the pros and cons of Caller ID for Florida relay. Following a presentation by Sprint which described the functionality of Caller ID for Florida relay, the advisory committee voted unanimously to request that the Commission add this feature to the current relay service contract.

In a letter to staff dated March 27, 2001, Sprint has offered this feature for the Commission's consideration as an addition to Sprint's current Florida relay platform. (Attachment A, pages 12 through 15)

The Commission is vested with jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Sections 427.702(3)(a)(b)(c) and 427.704(1)(d)(8), Florida Statutes.

DOCKET NO. 991222-TP
DATE: May 7, 2001

Issues 1 and 2 concern a proposal to add Caller ID to the services Sprint currently provides under its Relay Contract, and how payment for this contract amendment should be handled.

Issue 3 addresses Florida Telecommunications Relay, Inc.'s proposed budget for the 2001-2002 fiscal year. FTRI proposes to increase the surcharge to \$.12.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Should the Commission approve an amendment to its relay contract with Sprint to add Caller ID as a feature of Florida's relay service?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. The Commission should approve the addition of Caller ID as a feature of Florida's relay service and amend the Sprint contract accordingly. (K. CRAIG, MOSES)

STAFF ANALYSIS: On March 27, 2001, the Florida TASA advisory committee held a meeting to discuss the pros and cons of Sprint's offer to add Caller ID as a feature of Florida's relay service contract. Following Sprint's presentation and demonstration of Caller ID for Florida relay, the advisory committee voted unanimously to request that the Commission add this feature to the relay service contract.

In a letter to staff dated March 27, 2001, Sprint has offered this feature for the Commission's consideration. Also included in the letter to staff was a detailed explanation of Caller ID for Florida relay, as well as an outline of the technical benefits of adding this optional feature to the relay platform. (Attachment A, pages 12 through 15)

Section 427.702(3)(a), Florida Statutes, provides that a telecommunications access system be established to provide access to the telecommunications network for persons who are hearing impaired, speech impaired, or dual sensory impaired. Also, the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC)'s relay service rules require the service to be "functionally equivalent" to conventional voice telecommunications service to the greatest extent possible. Caller ID is a feature that many Florida relay users subscribe to through their local exchange company, but until now have been unable to use. The addition of Caller ID to the relay platform would allow for "functionally equivalent" service for Florida relay customers.

Sprint has stated that there are a few notable differences between Caller ID for TRS and typical Caller ID. Typical Caller ID uses SS7 signaling, while Caller ID for relay does not yet use this technology, as development of a platform using SS7 signaling would have required an additional extended development and deployment time. Sprint believed, based on very high customer demand and the benefits of Caller ID to relay customers, that immediate deployment was necessary, and therefore developed the feature in as short a timeframe as possible. As a result, Caller ID for relay does not

DATE: May 7, 2001

support the delivery and use of the SS7 Caller ID Blocking parameter. Due to variances in TTY (text telephone) devices of relay users, and the fact that the dial tone does not originate on the caller's side, some devices can not recognize the key sequences *67 or *82, which either submit or block Caller ID on a call-by-call basis. Sprint is currently upgrading its relay platform to be SS7 compatible, and over \$2 million has been budgeted in 2001 to develop this technology; Sprint expects deployment of a new platform utilizing SS7 signaling to begin in 2002.

Until the new platform is available, Sprint has indicated that it intends to use a methodology that allows both Line and Per-Call Caller ID Blocking. This methodology will be available to Voice, TTY/ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interexchange), VCO/HCO (Voice Carry Over/Hearing Carry Over), Speech to Speech and foreign language relay users. Sprint expects that this solution should be available in the late second quarter or early third quarter of this year. A detailed description of both the call blocking and line blocking processes that Sprint will use are included in Attachment A, pages 12 through 15.

Another difference between typical Caller ID and Caller ID for relay is that one inbound call into the relay center frequently results in several outbound calls using the same operator; however, Caller ID information would be available only for the first outbound call and not for subsequent outbound calls. This may require more interaction on the part of the relay caller to choose to submit or not to submit Caller ID information for each call, but Sprint believes this extra effort is very small, and should not be an inconvenience to the relay user.

To the extent possible, relay users should be provided access to the same level of service as non-relay users, and should be able to benefit from the conveniences that Caller ID would provide. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission should approve the addition of Caller ID as a feature of Florida's relay service and amend the Sprint contract accordingly.

DATE: May 7, 2001

ISSUE 2: Should the Commission pay Sprint for Caller ID for Florida relay service on a per session minute basis or in a one-time, lump-sum payment?

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Commission, upon electing to add the Caller ID feature to the relay platform, pay Sprint in a one-time, lump-sum payment of \$500,000. This lump-sum payment would cover the provision of Caller ID through the end of the relay service contract with Sprint, currently June 1, 2003. (K. CRAIG, MOSES)

STAFF ANALYSIS: Sprint has offered two pricing options for the Commission's consideration for Caller ID for Florida relay. The first option includes payment for the feature on a per-minute basis, which would be \$0.025/session minute, in addition to Florida's current price. The other option would be a one-time, lump-sum payment of \$500,000, which would cover the provision of this feature throughout the duration of the relay service contract, currently expiring June 1, 2003. As an incentive for the lump-sum payment option, Sprint has stated that should the Commission extend its contract beyond June 1, 2003, there would be no additional charge for this service. Sprint has stated, based on the historical average number of billable minutes for relay service, that the State would save approximately \$40,000 in total payments if the lump-sum payment option is selected.

Additionally, Sprint has stated that it investigated the possibility of billing Florida for Caller ID for relay on a per-call Caller ID usage basis but is unable to offer this option, as it does not have the capability to determine whether the caller or the call recipient subscribe to Caller ID through their local exchange company.

Staff has compiled a table below with the historical billable intrastate session minutes, beginning with the contract initiation date of June 2000, to determine which of the two payment options proposed by Sprint would be most cost-effective for the State.

BILLABLE INTRASTATE SESSION MINUTES FOR RELAY SERVICE	
June 2000	952,467
July 2000	948,879
August 2000	975,507

BILLABLE INTRASTATE SESSION MINUTES FOR RELAY SERVICE	
September 2000	913,044
October 2000	961,188
November 2000	901,701
December 2000	896,278
January 2001	962,514
February 2001	853,325
March 2001	962,642
Total	9,327,545
Monthly average	932,755

Taking the monthly average billable session minutes of 932,755 and multiplying it by the proposed \$0.025/session minute rate would amount to a cost of \$23,318.88 per month. Using an implementation date for Caller ID for relay of June 2001, leaving 24 months left in the current relay contract with Sprint, this would amount to a total amount paid of over \$550,000. As Sprint has stated, and as is further supported by staff's calculations, the one-time, lump-sum payment option is more cost effective for the State. Sprint has indicated that there will be no additional charge if the Commission chooses to exercise its two one-year options to maintain Sprint as the relay provider for fiscal years ending June 2004 and 2005.

Staff contacted James Forstall, Executive Director of Florida Telecommunications Relay, Inc. (FTRI), on May 2, 2001, and confirmed that there is enough money in the FTRI's proposed 2001-02 budget to pay Sprint for the addition of this feature to Florida's relay contract.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission, if it chooses to add the Caller ID feature to the relay platform, pay Sprint in a one-time, lump-sum payment of \$500,000. This lump-sum payment would cover the provision of Caller ID through the end of the relay service contract with Sprint, currently June 1, 2003.

ISSUE 3: Should Florida Telecommunications Relay, Inc.'s proposed budget for the fiscal year 2001-2002 be approved effective July 1, 2001, and the TASA surcharge raised to \$.12 per access line?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. Florida Telecommunications Relay, Inc.'s proposed budget for fiscal year 2001-2002 should be approved as modified (see **Attachment B**) and the surcharge should be raised to \$.12 per access line.

Local exchange telephone companies and alternative local exchange companies should be ordered to assess a \$.12 surcharge beginning July 1, 2001.

As is the case today, the budget shall be grouped into five categories. FTRI may move amounts between these five categories not to exceed 10% of the category from which the funds are being moved; greater movement would require prior Commission authorization.
(AUDU, SALAK)

STAFF ANALYSIS: Although the Commission approved a total budget of \$14,784,298 for fiscal year 2000/2001, FTRI projects its total budget requirement will be \$17,038,007 by June 30, 2001. Staff notes that the variance between the approved and the projected expenses is to be covered by the surplus fund account as is evident by the projected end of fiscal year 2000/2001 balance of \$3,797,342.

This significant increase in FTRI's annual expenses is a result of several factors. Some of these factors include the implementation of Turbo Code, significant increases related to the up-keep of certain equipment, and the additional Regional Distribution Centers (RDCs) and outreach, as indicated in the Operating Expense Categories I, II, and III. At the November 7, 2000, Agenda Conference, the Commission approved staff's recommendation to add TurboCode¹ to Florida's Relay Service. A contract amendment occurred in the first quarter of 2001 at an additional rate of \$.01 per session minute. TurboCode, which is designed to improve quality and enhance the relay system, will potentially decrease total session minutes; however, there is no empirical data to date to ascertain the level of impact.

¹ Turbo Code is a feature that allows for enhanced transmission and the capability to interrupt during transmission. (10/26/00 Staff Recommendation, page 6)

DATE: May 7, 2001

In FTRI's 2001/2002 proposed budget, FTRI projects that by June 30, 2001, its expenses for volume control telephones (VCPH) for hearing impaired persons will have exceeded the Commission previously approved budgeted amount by \$923,171 (\$2,776,885 less \$1,853,714). It appears that FTRI has experienced a higher level of demand for the VCPH. Further, FTRI shows that approximately 15,000 VCPH units will have been modified to the XL-40² by end of the 2000/2001 fiscal year. This spending increase is approximately 50% over the prior approved spending level.

As FTRI has increased its outreach activities, the Regional Distribution Centers (RDCs), which are responsible for distributing FTRI equipment, have experienced increased levels of activity. This is most evident in the RDCs' general and training expenses. In the 2001/2002 proposed budget, FTRI is proposing to add two new RDCs. One RDC will be located in the Pensacola area; clients in this area are currently being served out of the Tallahassee RDC. The other RDC will be located in Jacksonville to handle increasing demands in the Jacksonville area.

FTRI projects a 3% growth in access lines and approximately a 10% growth in its level of activities. FTRI projects that it will need one additional full-time employee (i.e., an Outreach Assistant), bringing its total paid positions to 13. FTRI proposes to significantly increase outreach activities in the coming fiscal year. Staff notes that this increased activity level will include 711. In the last quarter of 2000, the FCC ordered the 711 abbreviated dialing code for relay services which becomes effective in Florida on August 1, 2001. 711 enables a caller to reach a relay provider from wherever the caller is located. FTRI has included 711 in its outreach activities state-wide.

In reviewing FTRI's proposed budget, staff has recommended several modifications. First, staff has modified line item #4 of Attachment B (pages 16 and 17) to reflect two adjustments: 1) a downward adjustment to eliminate a 5.75% tax rate for approximately \$501,632, and 2) an upward adjustment to pay for the proposed addition of Caller ID for \$500,000 as recommended in Issue 2. Second, staff has modified line item #10 due to a mathematical error in the proposed budget. Next, staff has modified line item #21 by increasing Commission approved 2000/2001 expenditures by only 10%, a growth factor FTRI has used to project growth in its activities for the 2001/2002 fiscal year budget. Staff believes

² XL-40 is the modified model of the Ameriphone VCPH that replaces the current Clarity VCPH units.

this downward adjustment is necessary because FTRI has failed to enumerate its target markets, nor provide a detailed breakdown of its proposal that shows a good understanding of its media goals. Also, FTRI has not provided sufficient evidence to show the effectiveness of its outreach program, nor provided an instrument to measure the efficacy of its outreach activities. Attachment B (pages 16 and 17) shows that FTRI is projected to underspend its outreach budget for this fiscal year. It is therefore questionable whether the Commission should approve a proposed budget that is approximately 50% larger than the currently approved amount. Staff believes that FTRI's Outreach Program is still in its infancy. An increase should be based on a demonstration that the Outreach Program is effective. Lastly, staff modified line item #s 28, 33, and 34. These modifications are related and reflect an adjustment to account for the proposed full-time employee. With all of these modifications, staff's proposed 2001/2002 fiscal year budget amounts to \$16,793,085.

To support its budget, FTRI has requested a \$.12 surcharge. On several occasions, the Commission has approved this same level of surcharge in order to enable FTRI to carry out its responsibilities as provided in Chapter 427, Part II, Florida Statutes. While FTRI proposes an increase of \$.04 from the current year's level of \$.08, staff notes that the current surcharge level was made possible because of the level of the surplus fund account. Indeed, the current surcharge was set at this level to enable FTRI to lower its surplus fund account. By June 30, 2001, the surplus fund account would have been reduced to \$3,797,342 (as projected by FTRI) from \$10,238,799. Staff therefore is recommending the higher surcharge level in order to fund FTRI's proposed budget and to prevent the surplus fund account becoming too low.

Based on the foregoing, staff believes that at the proposed surcharge level of \$.12, and given the projected June 30, 2001, surplus fund account balance, FTRI will have a surplus fund account balance that is right at the level of a month's operating expense of approximately \$1,443,709 by June 30, 2002. A surcharge of \$.12 per access line appears sufficient for FTRI to fund its planned programs for the 2001/2002 fiscal year. Thus, staff recommends that the Commission approve staff's proposed FTRI's 2001/2002 fiscal year budget as modified and shown on Attachment B (pages 16 and 17) at a surcharge level of \$.12 per access line.

DOCKET NO. 991222-TP
DATE: May 7, 2001

ISSUE 4: Should this docket be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: No, this docket should not be closed. (BROWN)

STAFF ANALYSIS: This docket should remain open during the contract period with Sprint as the relay provider. This docket is used to monitor relay and contract issues that arise during the contract term.



13221 Woodland Park Road
Herndon, VA 20171
Tel: (703) 904-2492
Fax: (703) 904-2069
Mailstop: VAHRNA0608

March 27, 2001

State of Florida
Public Service Commission
2450 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Attn: Ms. Beth Salak
Assistant Director, Division of Competitive Services

Subject: Sprint's Caller ID for TRS

Dear Ms. Salak:

In Sprint's proposal to become Florida's TRS provider, Caller ID was provided as an optional feature. This feature is now available and has been added to the TRS platforms for several of Sprint's state customers. Sprint would like to take this opportunity to acquaint you with our Caller ID for TRS feature and again to offer this feature for the Public Service Commission's consideration.

I. EXPLANATION OF SPRINT'S CALLER ID FOR TRS

First, it should be stated that Sprint's Caller ID for TRS is not a mirror product of traditional Caller ID. There are several reasons that Caller ID for TRS cannot be identical to standard Caller ID. First, standard Caller ID provides the option of entering a key sequence (*67 or *82) to either submit or block Caller ID information on a call-by-call basis. Due to differences in various TTY devices currently in service, some devices may not recognize the required key sequences for Caller ID. Another key difference is that with relay calls, the dial tone essentially originates at the CA position and not with the relay caller in that it is the relay center that makes the outbound call. Therefore additional programming and input on the part of the relay provider is necessary create a link that transmits the caller's ID information to the called party. Also, due to the nature of relay calls, a single inbound call (into the relay center) may result in several outbound calls. Using standard technology, Caller ID information would be available only for the first outbound call and not for subsequent outbound calls.

Sprint's Caller ID solution takes these differences into account and provides the relay user with a product that is cost effective, convenient, and affords privacy options that exceed those available through standard Caller ID.

Standard Caller ID takes advantage of SS7 signaling. Sprint's Caller ID for TRS does not use SS7 technology. Sprint developed its Caller ID feature on its current relay platform in order to provide it to the TRS user population in as short a timeframe as possible. It was determined that, based on customer demand and the benefits of Caller ID to the majority of the TRS user population, an immediate deployment was mandated. Development of a platform that uses SS7 signaling would have



required an additional extended development and deployment timeline. Even using the existing platform, significant development time was required because TRS platforms are not available as "off the shelf" products due to their limited application.

Sprint is moving towards upgrading its TRS platform to be SS7 compatible. Over \$2 million has been budgeted in 2001 to initiate the development of a completely new TRS platform that utilizes cutting edge technology and SS7 signaling. The deployment of the new platform is anticipated to begin in 2002.

It is anticipated that Sprint's Caller ID solution will result in cost savings to Florida Relay and other Sprint customers. Sprint estimates that its method of providing Caller ID will result in a net savings of session minute call time (outdial time savings) of about seven (7) seconds (ISDN outdial) per local call. The stated savings is compared to a standard – non-Caller ID relay call and is calculated as follows:

Using Sprint's historical TRS average of 1.5 outdials per each inbound call, the outdial time savings of 7 seconds results in a total of 10.5 seconds per relay call (1.5×7). The amount of time that is required to inform the TRS user of the Caller ID status is approximately 3.5 seconds.

Add: 3.5 seconds to transmit Caller ID status

Subtract: 10.5 seconds time savings (7 seconds time savings times 1.5 outdials)

Equals: 7 seconds per inbound call in time savings

Because Sprint's Caller ID for TRS does not use SS7 signaling, it does not support the delivery and use of the SS7 Caller ID Blocking parameter (the ability to enter the codes *67 and *82 to block or unblock Caller ID information from being transmitted). However, Sprint intends to comply with Florida and federal regulations through a methodology that permits both Line and Per-Call Caller ID Blocking. This methodology will be available to Voice, TTY/ASCII, VCO/HCO, Speech to Speech, and foreign language TRS users. The methodology will also permit accommodation of the unique TRS requirements that result from the ability of TRS users to make multiple outbound calls during one inbound call session. This fully compliant solution should be available in the late 2nd quarter or early 3rd quarter of this year.

The processes that Sprint will use to provide Caller ID Blocking follow:

Per Call Blocking:

For every answered inbound call, the Sprint TRS system/operator will transmit/speak a greeting phrase that will be modified to indicate to the calling customer that Caller ID is enabled for the TRS service. The current Florida greeting will be modified to inform the customer that Caller ID is enabled.

TTY/ASCII Callers:

"FL Relay OPR 1234 (UR CALLER ID SENDING) GA"

Voice Callers:

"Florida Relay Operator 1234, May I have the number you are calling please? Your caller ID will transmit. Go ahead"



The caller will then have the opportunity to inform the TRS operator that Caller ID should be blocked for the outbound call that will be placed. (Or, if a Line Block is in place, the user may inform the agent of the need to transmit Caller ID for the specific call.)

The TRS user will have the opportunity to inform the relay operator of a desired change in Caller ID status before each subsequent outbound call. This allows the TRS customer to send or not send Caller ID information for each outbound call. This is a TRS specific requirement that is not met by using SS7 signaling.

Line Blocking:

Both voice and data users may elect to establish a database profile with Sprint TRS that will block the customer's Caller ID from being sent forward with the outbound call. This line block will apply to all outbound calls made by that customer. A customer that has established a Line Block via the TRS database may request that Caller ID be sent forward for any call by indicating this to the relay operator through the Per Call Blocking call processing described earlier. The customer also has the option of requesting the relay operator send or not send Caller ID, in any combination, for each outbound call placed during one call to the TRS service. This functionality supports the unique needs of the TRS user and the call processing requirements of TRS in that one caller may place many calls during one inbound call to relay. (For privacy, if for any reason the TRS database is not available, caller ID will not be transmitted, thereby ensuring that privacy is provided.)

It should be pointed out that SS7 technology in and of itself will not provide the TRS caller with the ability to block and unblock Caller ID information as is provided in Sprint's solution. This is because one inbound relay call frequently results in several outbound calls. In a relay call, the dial tone basically originates with the operator and not with the inbound caller. So while SS7 technology can provide the Caller ID information for the first outbound call, that information is not available for subsequent outbound calls. Sprint's solution is functionally equivalent to standard Caller ID in that each time the caller reaches an operator, the caller has the ability to block or unblock Caller ID including multiple outdials.

In summary, Sprint has committed significant resources to the development of a Caller ID feature that works for the TRS environment. Sprint strives to provide the best TRS product available. It believes that its Caller ID for TRS is compatible with the requirements of the state and federal governments and compliant with the terms of its contract with Florida. While Sprint's solution may require a bit more interaction on the part of the relay caller to choose to submit or not to submit Caller ID information, this is a very small effort and it should not be an inconvenience to the relay user. More so, Sprint believes that this feature is an enhancement for and of significant benefit to the deaf, hard of hearing, and speech-impaired users of TRS.

II. PRICING

Sprint offers the Florida PSC two pricing options for Caller ID for TRS. Sprint will add Caller ID to Florida Relay's TRS platform for a one-time, lump-sum payment of \$500,000. This amount covers the provision of this feature through the end of the current contract (June 1, 2003). If the State would prefer to pay for this feature on a per-minute basis, the price will be \$0.025/session minute in addition to Florida's current price. Of these two pricing options it should be noted that based on the historical average number of billable minutes for Florida Relay, the State stands to save \$40,000 in total payments if it elects the lump-sum option.



Sprint did investigate the possibility of billing Florida for Caller ID on a per-call basis but we are unable to offer this option. Sprint does not have the capability to determine which relay calls take advantage of Caller ID, i.e. the caller or the call recipient subscribe to the service through their LEC. Therefore Sprint has no way of billing this service on a per-use basis.

Lastly, the prices offered for Caller ID for TRS are commercial prices and are offered to the Florida PSC for their consideration on a fixed price basis. As a fixed price, commercial offering, Sprint cannot provide information concerning the establishment of cost or pricing. The prices offered to Florida are commensurate with prices offered to other states Sprint serves as the TRS provider.

If Sprint can be of further assistance to you in providing additional information concerning its approach to Caller ID for TRS or this price proposal, please contact Andrew Brenneman at (703) 904-2382.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Don Rawlings", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Don Rawlings
Senior Contracts Administrator

Cc: Andrew Brenneman, Sr. Government Account Manager

DATE: May 7, 2001

ATTACHMENT B

	PSC Approved Budget 2000/2001	FTRI BEST VIEW ACTUAL 2000/2001 (as of 3/31/01)	FTRI PROPOSED BUDGET 2001/2002	Staff Recommended Budget 2001/2002
OPERATING REVENUE				
1) Surcharges	\$10,082,682	\$10,014,403	\$15,472,252	\$15,472,252
2) Interest Income	285,144	407,147	144,728	144,728
3) Service/Other	0	175,000	0	0
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE	\$10,367,826	\$10,596,550	\$15,616,980	\$15,616,980
OPERATING EXPENSES				
Category I - Relay Services				
4) DPR Provider	\$8,971,537	\$10,238,799	\$9,225,667	\$9,224,035
SUBTOTAL-Category 1	\$8,971,537	\$10,238,799	\$9,225,667	\$9,224,035
Category II - Equipment/Repair				
5) TDD EQ.	\$403,008	\$393,400	\$423,256	\$423,256
6) Large Print TDDs	12,735	11,139	19,332	19,332
7) VCH/HCO-TDD	42,790	41,690	48,871	48,871
8) VCO Telephone	117,147	11,485	38,590	38,590
9) Dual Sensory Equipment	21,740	10,350	35,360	35,360
10) VCP Hearing Impaired	1,853,714	2,776,885	3,062,486	3,048,817
11) VCP Speech Impaired	9,261	10,885	11,760	11,760
12) In-Line Amplifier	4,761	3,808	4,179	4,179
13) ARS Signaling Equip.	393,888	273,942	303,117	303,117
14) VRS Signaling Equip.	74,202	58,307	66,603	66,603
15) TRS Signaling Equip.	2,925	1,440	2,685	2,685
16) Telecomm Equip. Repair	33,820	41,150	54,984	54,984
SUBTOTAL-Category II	\$2,969,991	\$3,634,481	\$4,071,223	\$4,057,554
Category III-Equipment				
17) Freight-Telecomm Equip.	\$45,635	\$30,562	\$37,061	\$37,061
18) Regional Distr. Centers	927,092	1,173,276	1,375,248	1,375,248
19) Workshop Expenses	33,632	79	39,940	39,940
20) Training Expenses	85,793	106,931	117,624	117,624
SUBTOTAL-Category III	\$1,092,152	\$1,310,848	\$1,569,873	\$1,569,873
Category IV-Outreach				
21) Outreach Expense	\$819,100	\$765,085	\$1,414,800	\$901,010
SUBTOTAL- Category IV	\$819,100	\$765,085	\$1,414,800	\$901,010

DOCKET NO. 991222-TP

DATE: May 7, 2001

	PSC Approved Budget 2000/2001	FTRI BEST VIEW ACTUAL 2000/2001 (as of 3/31/01)	FTRI PROPOSED BUDGET 2001/2002	Staff Recommended Budget 2001/2002
Category V - General & Administrative				
22)Advertising	\$1,000	\$2,313	\$2,700	\$2,700
23)Accounting/Audit	12,800	14,775	14,900	14,900
24)Legal	70,400	81,234	82,859	82,859
25)Computer Consultation	9,450	8,784	8,550	8,550
26)Bank Charges	0	1,150	1,560	1,560
27)Dues & Subscriptions	1,800	1,752	2,442	2,442
28)Office Furniture Purchase	2,500	4,926	8,767	7,306
28A)Less: Capitalized Portion	0	0	0	0
29)Office Equipment Purchase	60,300	13,441	39,987	39,987
29A)Less: Capitalized Portion	0	0	0	0
30)Depreciation	0	0	0	0
31)Office Equipment Lease	3,940	3,727	4,238	4,238
32)Insurance-Hlth/Life/Dsblty	124,464	99,753	155,853	155,853
33)Insurance-Other	3,614	3,372	5,223	4,628
34)Office Expense	7,855	7,492	9,412	9,132
35)Postage	14,011	17,827	20,608	20,608
36)Printing	23,986	30,856	5,128	5,128
37)Rent	65,736	65,070	84,353	84,353
38)Retirement	43,660	38,927	48,324	48,324
39)Employee Compensation	386,370	344,486	427,648	427,648
40)Temporary Employment	9,810	7,448	7,820	7,820
41)Taxes-Payroll	29,557	26,353	32,715	32,715
42)Taxes-Unempl Comp	1,000	799	914	914
43)Taxes-Licenses	62	62	62	62
44)Telephone	26,008	34,549	38,949	38,949
45)Travel & Business	20,395	19,354	24,500	24,500
46)Equip. Maint.	5,170	3,892	6,767	6,767
47)Employee Training/Dev.	1,000	1,653	5,040	5,040
48)Meeting Expense	6,430	2,834	3,430	3,430
49) Misc. Expense	200	0	200	200
SUBTOTAL-Category V	\$931,518	\$836,829	\$1,042,949	\$1,041,173
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$14,784,298	\$17,038,007	\$17,324,512	\$16,793,085
REVENUE LESS EXPENSES	\$(4,416,472)	\$(6,441,457)	\$(1,707,532)	\$(1,176,105)