FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
 Capital Circle Office Center - 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

## MEMORANDUM

JANUARY 9, 1997

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

| FROM: | DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS (ISLER) D |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (CULPEPPER) |
|  | DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS (PRUITT) NP |

RE: DOCKET NO. 961a79-TI - PHONE CALLS, INC. - INITIATION OF SHOW CAUSE PROCEEDINGS FOR VIOLATIONS OF RULES 25-4.043, FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, RESPONSE TO COMMISSION STAFF INQUIRIES, 25-4.118, FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, INTEREXCHANGE CARRIER SELECTION, AND 25-24.472, FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, IMPROPER USE OF A CERTIFICATE

AGENDA: JANUARY 21, 1997 - REGULAR AGENDA - PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION - INTERESTED PERSONS MAY PARTICIPATE

CRITICAL DATES: NONE
SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: S:\PSC\CMU\WP\961479TI.XCM

## CASE BACKGROUND

- By Order No. PSC-96-0637-FOF-TI issued May 10, 1996, the Commission approved the assignment of Certificate No. 3543 from Long Distance Services, Inc., to Phone Calls, Inc., a switchless reseller, effective June L, 1996. Long Distance Services was originally ceztificated April 19, 1994.
- The Division of Consumer Affairs has received a total of 430 slamming complaints against Phones Calls, Inc.
- In the past year, the company stopped responding to Commission staff inquiries.

As such, staff believes the following recommendaiions are appropriate.
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## pracusgxon or Issugs

ISSUE 1: Should Phone Calls, Inc. be ordered to show cause why it should not be fined up to $\$ 25,000$ per day pursuant to Section 364.285, Florida Statutes, or have its Certificate No. 3543 cancelled for violations of Rule 25-4.043, Florida Administrative Code, Response to Commission Staff Inquiries, Rule 25-4.118, Florida Administrative Code, Interexchange Carrier Selection, and Rule 25-24.472, Florida Administrative Code, Improper Use of a Certificate?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes.
STAFF ANALYSIS: Rule 25-24.480 (1) (a), Florida Administrative Code, incorporates Rule 25-4.043, Florida Administrative Code, and states that "The necessary replies to inquiries propounded by the Commission's staff concerning service or other complaints received by the Commission shall be furnished in writing within fifteen (15) days from the date of the Commission inquiry."

The Divisions oi Communications and Consumer Affairs (CAF) have made numerous attempts to get Phone Calls, Inc. to adequately respond to staff inquiries without success.

For example, CAF staff mailed the company a certified letter on July 25, 1996. The U.S. Postal Service returned the signed receipt showing the letter was delivered on July 31, 1996. In the letter, staff requested a response to a complaint that was originally taken from a consumer on March 22, 1996. In addition, staff contacted the company by telephone and faxes in an attempt to ger a response. As of November 5, 1996, the company has not responded. (Attachment A, Page 9)

Each time CAF staff receives a consumer complaint, it is entered into the computerized complaint tracking system. A typed form is printed detailirg the complaint which is then mailed or faxed to the company. Staff asks that the company send a report outlining what its records show happened on each individual case. Initially, Phone Calls, Inc. provided inadequate responses to the complaints (Attachment B, Pages 10 - 11). Specifically, the company would fax a cover sheet apologizing for the delay in responding, explaining it believed the problem was resolved, and advising the letter of authosization (LOA) would be faxed at a later date. The second page of the fax listed the consumer's telephone number, name, work phone number, a batch number, and date. However, there was no explanation as to what the batch number meant or the significance of the date. Also, the company never followed up on its promise to fax a copy of the LOA at a
later date or to describe what steps it had taken to resolve the complaint.

More recently, mail addressed to Phone Calls, Inc., has been returned by the post Office and stamped "Moved, Left No Address." (Attachment C)

Rule 25-4.118, Florida Administrative Code, states, in pertinent part:
(I) The primary interexchange company (PIC) of a customer shall not be changed without the customer's authorization.
(3) (a) The ballot or letter submitted to the interexchange company requesting a PIC change shall include, but not be limited to, the following information (each shall be separately stated) :

1. Customer name, phone/account number and address;
2. Company and the service to which the customer wishes to subscribe;
3. Statement that the person requesting the change is authorized to request the PIC change; and
4. Customer signature.
(3) (b) Every written document by means of which a customer can request a PIC change shall clearly identify the certificated telecommunications company to which the service is being changed, whether or not that company uses the facilities of another carrier. The page of the document containing the customer's signature shall contain a statement that the customer's signature or endorsement on the document will result in a change of the customer's long distance service provider, and explain that only one long distance service provider may be designated for the telephone number listed; that the customer's selection will apply only to that number, and that the customer's local exchange company may charge a fee to switch service providers. Such statement shall be clearly legibla and printed in type at least as large


#### Abstract

as any other text on the page. If any such document is not used solely for the purpose of requesting a PIC change, then the document as a whole must not be misleading or deceptive. For purposes of this rule, the terms "misleading or deceptive" mean that, because of the style, format or content of the document, it would not be readily apparent to the person signing the document that the purpose of the signature was to authorize a PIC change, or it would be unclear to the customer who the new long distance service provider would be; that the customer's selection would apply only to the number listed and there could only be one long distance service provider for that number; or that the customer's local exchange company might charge a fee to switch service providers. If any part of the document is written in a language other than English, then the document must contain all relevant information in the same language.


Phone Calls, Inc., formerly known as Long Distance Service, Inc., received its only 1994 complaint in the Division of Consumer Affairs on November 3, 1994, about six months after the company first became certificated. In all of 1995, staff received 22 complaints. From January 1 to November 30, 1996, Consumer Affairs staff received 407 complaints, all of which dealt with unauthorized carrier changes (slamming).

Staff obtained a copy of two different LOAs from displays in the Tallahassee area that Phone Calls, Inc. used. Attachment D, Page 13, is a copy of the cardboard display where the signed LOAs are dropped into a connected box. The LOAs (Attachment D, Page 14) are stacked in front of the display. Attachment E, Pages $15-16$, shows a similar display and LOA. In large letters, along with a picture of a vehicle, it is implied that by registering, you could win the vehicle or $\$ 20,000$ cash. Both displays indicate that as a bonus, customers could "save up to $30 \%$ on long distance calling card calls"; and, in much smaller print type "receive high-quality 1+ service!" The displays, which are in a much larger print than the LOA, do not state that the main purpose of the "registration" is to change a cuotomer's long distance carriex. In fact, a specific long distance carrier is not mentioned on the display or the LOA. Also, in a smaller type than most of the other size print are the words "This is not a contest or sweepstakes." Staff would like to point out that blank LOAs were stacked up against the box.
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The only way a consumer could see the phrase "This is not a contest or sweepstakes" would be to remove the stack of LOAs, Staff belleves that both LOAs are in violation of Rule 25-4.118, Florida Administrative Code.

One of staff's greatest concerns deals with altered LOAs. For example, Ms. Lois Zahler informed staff that she filled out a form at a home show in Miami for a chance to win an automobile. (Attachment F, Pages 17-19) Ms. Zahler advised that the form she signed stated at the top "I wish to know more about 800 dialing services," and at the bottom, the form stated "We may notify you at the home phone number above or by mail."

Attachment $F$, Page 19 , is the copy of the signed LOA the company sent Ms. Zahler, and she in turn, sent us. Ms. Zahler noted the "crooked paste up" job as further proof that the form had been altered.

A second example, Attachment G, Pages 20 and 21, is from Ms. Barbara M. Ruskin, who noted that she is 60 years old, yet the altered form states her age is 23. Staff notes that the printed material inside the outlined box is misaligned, which appears to substantiate the customer's claim that the form was altered.

Attachment $H$, Pages 22 and 23 , is an example of an altered LOA signed by Ms. Jo Helen Eluik. Ms. Eluik stated that the top and bottom of the form were added after she had signed the form.

In addition to the slamming complaints, several consumers advised staff that they were billed a monthly recurring charge of $\$ 5.97$ for "discount calling cards." These customers advised that not only did they not request a calling card, they never received the calling card, yet were billed for them. Attachment I, Pages 24 - 25, is an example of this concern.

Staff is also concerned that Phone Calls, Inc. is apparently sharing its certificate with an uncertificated carrier. Staff notes that the company could possibly be using a name other than what is on its certificate and failed to notify this Commission. To illustraze, on August 2, 1996, staff notified Sprint that a complaint had been received from Mr. James M. Dawson, that his long distance carrier had been switched without authorization (Attachment $J$, Pages $26-28$ ). Sprint responded on August 7, that Charity Long Distance had authorized the switch. Staff asked Sprint for Charity Long Distance's Certificate number since the Master Commission Directory did not show a certificated carrier by that name. Sprint advised the Certificate number was
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3543, which is Phone Calls, Inc.'s certificate number. Based on this information, it appears that Phone Calls, Inc. is misusing its certificate.

In conclusion, staff believes there is sufficient cause to initiate show cause proceedings against Phone Calls, Inc based on the number of complaints staff has received from consumers and because the company is not responding to Commission staff inquiries. Staff notes that since the Division of Consumer Affairs began tracking slamming complaints in 1983, no long distance carrier has had this volume of complaints in an 11 month period (407). In the event the company is fined, the monies should be forwarded to the Office of the Comptroller for deposit in the State General Revenue Fund pursuant to Section 364.285 (1), Florida Statutes. Fines levied in past orders for similar violations range from $\$ 2,000$ to $\$ 100,000$.

ISSUE 2: Should Phone Calls, Inc. be ordered to rerate all long distance calls resulting from unauthorized PIC changes and switch the customers back to their preferred carrier at no cost to the customers?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes.
STAFF ANALYSIS: Rule 25-4.118 (5), Florida Administrative Code, states:

Charges for unauthorized PIC changes and higher usage rates, if any, over the rates of the preferred company shall be credited to the customer by the IXC responsible for the error within 45 days of notification. Upon notice from the customer of an unauthorized PIC change, the LEC shall change the customer back to the prior IXC, or another of the customer's choice. The change must be made within 24 hours excepting Saturday, Sunday and holidays, in which case the change shall be made by the end of the next business day. In the case where the customer disputes the ballot or letter, the IXC appearing on the ballot/letter will be responsible for any charges incurred to change the PIC of the cus"omer.

The Commission has received over 400 complaints against Phone Calls, Inc. concerning customers having their long distance carriers changed without proper authorization. In addition, Phone Calls, Inc. has stopped responding to staff inquiries.

In some cases, the company has credited customers accounts, but in many cases, customers have advised staff that no credits were issued. Since Phone Calls, Inc. is no longer responding at all to inquiries, staff does not know how many of the 430 consumers who filed complaints received a rerating and were switched back to their preferred carrier without charge.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission order Phone Calls, Inc. to rerate all long distance calls resulting from unauthorized PIC changes anc switch the customers back to their preferred carrier at no cost to the customers.

ISgue 3: Should this docket be closed?
RECOMMENDATION: No, this docket should remain open pending resolution of the show cause process. Phone Calls, Inc., must respond, in writing, to the allegations set forth in the show cause order within 20 days of the issuance of the order. The company's response must contain specific allegations of facts and law. The company's response must contain specific allegations of facts and law. In the event the company is fined, the monies should be forwarded to the office of the Comptroller for deposit in the State General Revenue Fund pursuant to Section 364.285 (1), Florida Statutes.

STAFF ANALYSIS: If the Commission approves the staff recommendation on Issue 1, an order to show cause will be issued. Phone Calls, Inc., must respond, in writing, to the allegations set forth in the show cause order within 20 days of the issuance of the order. The company's response must contain specific allegations of facts and law. In the event the company is fined, the monies should be forwarded to the office of the Comptroller for deposit in the State General Revenue Fund pursuant to Section 364.285 (1), Florida Statutes.


```
FACGSIMILEETTRANSN|ISNSINON
```

TO:
FROM: Dan H. Flefcher, PHONE CALLS INC. SUBJ: Sign-up Authorization Information

We apologize for the delay in responding to the complaints indicated on the attached page. We believe that we have resolved the problems which have contributed to said delay.

Attached is the info. Which you requested for the phone numbers indicated thereon; a copy of the Letters of agency themselves will be faxed to you as soon as we retrieve then from file storage.

Sincerely,


Attachment
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## OFFICIAL L.O.A. REGISTRATION FORM

| SIGNATURE (REQUIRED) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRINTNAME |  |  |
| ADDRESS |  |  |
| criv |  |  |
| HOME PHONE (REQUIRED) |  |  |
| WORK PHONE (REQUIRED) |  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |  |




## OFFICIAL REGISTRATION FORM AND L.O.A. <br> $\qquad$

DATE
SIGNATURE (REQUIRED)
ABE $\qquad$
PRINTNAME
ADDRESS $\qquad$ STATE $\qquad$ ZIP
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## BARBARA M. RUSKIN

1310 Gulf Boulevard
Indian Rocks Beach, Florida 33785

## USBI <br> 9311 San Pedro, Suite 400 <br> San Antonio, Texas 78216-4476

## 8/9/96

## To Whom It May Concern;

Enclosed is the copy you sent to me of a form that you claim authorized you to become my long distance telephone carrier. This obviously is only a small part of your advertisement. Whatever it advertised and represented itself to be was definitely NOT a solicitation to change phone companies. That part of your scheme was hidden in the fine print. Kindly send me the entire ad. Until you do, : have no intention of honoring your bill.

You might also want to investigate who it ...as ... , .... . . umpntr, that took the liberty of filling in my age. This form was tampered with after you received it. I am 60 years old.

When I have had a chance to review your ad with the proper authorities, I will then pay you a fair portion of your exorbitant charges that we will deem reasonable. If you prefer not to prolong this dispute, you can re-bill me now at rates comparable to AT\&T.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I await your prompt reply.
Yours truly,

Barbara Ruskin
C. f. f oc - 20 -
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Florida Public Service Commission
Division of Consumer Affairs 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399r0850


Dear Sir:
On my October. 1995 BellSouth bill I had a calling card charge from Integrecel Inc. I do not have a calling card for this company. I have always used AT\&T. I called the 800 number and after many attempts to speak with a service representative I finally got through and explained the situation. The representative said she would send me a copy of the contract. and it would take about 1 month. I did not sign a contract, have never received a copy of the contract, and have never heard of Integretal. When I received no satisfaction from Integretel in getting the charges removed. I called BellSouth and spoke to a representative who informed me there was nothing they could do. that I would have to contact the long distance carrier personally. I then asked to speak to a supervisor, who informed me of the same thing. The next day. I called the 202 number in Washington, D.C. and got a voice recording. On that recording I asked that these charges be removed from my bill, as I did not authorize this company as my long distance carrier. I was also given an address to write for my refund: That address is:

Attention Refund
1718 M Street N.W. \#143
Washington. D.C. 20136
Shave not received a refund, do not intend to pay this charge. and would like the late charge. even though it is a small amount. and the $\$ 6.29$ removed from ny bill.

I have written on the bill every month that I did not authorize the calling card. have never made a calling card call from Integretel. and at the time this transaction was supposed to have transpired. I was in Maryland on vacation.

Any help you can give me would be greatly appreciated. I know this is a small amount, but if they can add $\$ 6.29$ to my account without authorization. what's to stop them from adding six thousand?

Thank you for any assistance you can give me to resolve this problem.
Sincerely,


## Barbara Kalb

(Mrs, Matt Kalb)

## CC. BellSouth

Better Business Bureau
Integretel. Inc.
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```
Address 8000 S.W. 62ND COURT
```

| city/zip MIAMI $\quad 33143$ | county DADE |
| :--- | :--- |

Account Number $\qquad$

Company Contact $\qquad$
company SPRINT (SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPA

```
attn. THORNHILL DAVID 135059
```

Consumer's
Telephone : (305)-662-1387

Can Be $\qquad$

Note $\qquad$

Limited Reponse N

Customer's PIC was switched to Sprint without his authorization. Please provide proof of authorization.
8/7/96 Report received.

8/8/96 FAX TO SPRINT: YOUR REPORT INDICATES THAT YOU ACCEPTED A PIC CHANGE I ORDER FROM CHARITY LONG DISTANCE. THERE IS NO IXC CERTIFICATED UNDER THE NAME N CHARITY LONG DISTANCE IN FLORIDA. PLEASE PROVIDE A FOLLOW-UP REPORT ON WHY YOU I ACCEPTED A PIC CHANGE ORDER FROM A NON-CERTIFICATED COMPANY.

8/30/96 FAX TO SPRINT: PLEASE RESPOND TO THE AUGUST 8, 1996, FAX.
9/6/96 Received call from Sprint advising that the customer was slammed by Phone Calls, Inc. Closed with letter. Filed against PCI.

Request No. 135059 I

```
By JRD I Ime 9:47 AM Date08/02/96
To CO Time FAX
```

$\qquad$

``` Date08/02/96
Iype S Form Phone
```

Category GI-07

Infraction $\qquad$
Closed by JRD Date 09/06/9
Reply Received $I$

## CONSUMER REQUEST

## FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD

 TALLAHASSEE, FL. 32399-0850 904-413-6100PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM WITH REPORT OF ACTION T

Richard Durbin
DUE: 08/19/96


August 7, 1996

Mr. James M. Dawson 8000 S.W. 62nd Court Miami, FL 33143

Re: FL PSC Case \#1350591
Dear Mr. Dawson:
On August 2, 1996, Sprint received an inquiry submitted on your behalf by the Florida Public Service Commission.

According to the information received, you state that your long distance service was switched to Sprint without your authorization. You are requesting that we provide you with information as to who authorized the switch.

I understand your concern with being switched from your preferred long distance carrier without your knowledge or consent. I know how upsetting this can be, and I apologize for any inconvenience this matter has caused you.

Our records indicate that your long distance service was switched to Sprint's network on July 10, 1996, at the request of Charity Long Distance (CLD), a switchless reseller. Our records also show that your telephone number, (305) 662-1387, was cancaled from CLD's customer database on August 5, 1996.

As a reseller, CLD purchases bulk amounts of long distance service and sells it at its own rates. The customer's cells are routed over our network; however, the reseller operates separately from Sprint and is responsible for its own billing, collections and cuslomer service. Since you were a customer of CLD and not Sprint, please call them at (800) 839-7011. If you would like to request a copy of the Letter of Authorization, please vrite the following address:

Charity Long Distance
P.O. Box 9169

Arlington, VA 22219

Mr. Dawson
Page 2

To confirm that your service has been switched to your preferred long distance carrier, please dial the following toll-free test number: 1 (700) 555-4141. A recorded message will specify the long distance carrier assigned to the telephone number from which you are dialing. This iest number may be kept for future reference and can be used at any time to verify your long distance carrier.

Again, I apologize for any inconvenience this matter has caused you. If I may be of further assistance, please call me at (800) 347-8988.

Sincerely,


Jack D. Clift
Regulatory Analyst
JDC:113809
c: Florida Public Service Ccmmission Attention: Richard Durbin via facsimile (904) 413-6362


[^0]:    * Taxes and Rates Applied - See Back of Page

