DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2

3

5

6

7

10 11

12

13

14 15 PROCEEDINGS:

BEFORE:

DATE:

TIME:

PLACE:

REPORTED BY:

16

17

18

20

21 22

23

24

25

In the Matter of

DOCKET NO. 970882-TI

Proposed Rule 25-24.845, F.A.C., Customer Relations; Rules Incorporated, and Proposed Amendments to Rules 25-4.003, F.A.C., Definitions, : 25-4.110, F.A.C., Customer Billing; 25-4.118, F.A.C., Interexchange Carrier Selection; and 25-24.490, F.A.C. Customer Relations; Rules Incorporated.



WORESHOP - PENSACOLA

CHAIRMAN JULIA L. JOHNSON COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON

Wednesday, October 8, 1997

Commenced at 6:30 p.m., C.S.T. Concluded at 8:20 p.m., C.S.T

Pensacola City Hall City Council Chambers 180 Governmental Center Pensacola, Florida 32501

H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official Commission Reporter

1								
ı	14 ATTENDANCE:							
2	DIAMA CALDWELL, FPSC Division of Appeals.							
3	CHARLIE BECK, Office of Public Counsel.							
4	CECILIA BRADLEY, Office of the Attorney General.							
5	RICE MOSES, Division of Communications.							
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								

INDEX	
NISCELLANEOUS	
ITEM	PAGE MO.
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	83
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	03
745	
A Section 1	

WITHESSES	
NAME	PAGE NO.
CAROLYN BROWN	
Direct Statement	22
ELLEN BARBER	
Direct Statement	35
ELLA WARREN	
Direct Statement	41
TERRY SWIONTEK	
Direct Statement	48
MARY VAN ARSDEL	
Direct Statement	52
DAVID HOWE	
Direct Statement	61
CHARLES REHWINKEL	
Direct Statement	67
JOEL COHEN	
Direct Statement	68
THELMA BROWN	
Direct Statement	73
MATTIE BELCHER	
Direct Statement	75

ì	4	ŀ		
		ı		
	•	ŀ	۰	

II.

...

__

PROCEEDINGS

(Workshop convened at 6:40 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to go ahead and call this workshop to order.

Counsel, could you read the notice, please?

pursuant to Section 120.54, Florida Statutes, that the Florida Public Service Commission Staff has initiated the development of Rules 25-4.003, 25-4.110, 25-4.118, 25-24.845, and 25-24.490, Florida Administrative Code, to adopt provisions relating to customer preference for local, local toll and toll provider.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. We'll take appearances. Public Counsel?

MR. BECK: Thank you. My name is Charlie

Beck with the Office of Public Counsel in the Claude

Pepper Building in Tallahassee, appearing today on

behalf of the citizens of Florida.

MS. CALDWELL: I'm Diana Caldwell, Florida
Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard,
Tallahassee, Florida.

MR. MOSES: I'm Rick Moses with the Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I'll note that there are

1 | several company representatives, telecommunications company representatives, in the audience, but I understand you're here to answer any questions that might arise.

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Julia I'm the chairperson of the Florida Public Johnson. Service Commission, and seated to my right is Commissioner Terry Deason.

The entire Commission will be hearing the formal rule aspect of this hearing, and we will, as Commissioners, be appearing across the state to mainly hear from you to learn if there are other offenses other than the ones that have been directly reported to us, your thoughts on the telecommunications companies, any activities that have occurred as it relates to what we're investigating, and that is slamming.

The Commission and its Staff, for several months we've been looking at revising our rules, because we've been concerned that though we have rules in place and we have now the statutory authority and the rule authority to impose fines and also to revoke certificates from companies, we're seeing that there is a growing number of slamming complaints.

Back in 1990, we had approximately 30

II

2 |

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

complaints filed. Last year we had close to 3,000 complaints filed. Again, the issue is when someone, a company, changes your long distance carrier without your permission.

Now I'm going to take an opportunity to go through a little background that I thought might be helpful for all of us. Some of it will just be informational. And if during the course of the comments that I make you have additional questions, feel free when you come forward to provide the Commission with your information or testimony. Feel free to ask us or the company members any questions that you might have.

Another point of information, when we do
have the public witnesses come forward, I'll have to
swear you in. That's because the comments that you
make before the Commission today will be a part of our
official record.

We can rely upon those comments when we make our final determination. We can use your questions, your testimony, to ask the company technical witnesses questions and make it a full part of this process as we begin and deliberate on how we should, indeed, develop this rule and how we can provide the best information and the best rule to protect the customers

as fully as possible.

I know you've received some materials outside that basically go over different ways that you can avoid getting slammed. Again, I know the jargon is a little odd, but what it means basically is if you signed up for a certain telephone company, say AT&T, and that is your presubscribed carrier, and a month later you look at your bill and it's company XYZ, and you know that you did not sign up for XYZ, or if you did, it was without your full knowledge, that's slamming. That's someone asserting themselves as your provider when you did not authorize that.

Now, how can you avoid being slammed? One of the things that we get a lot of calls from consumers and they have suggested and they've requested is they don't like telemarketing. They sit down for dinner after a hard day's work and the phone rings, and it's someone who wants to tell them something about telecommunications, or whatever that might be.

One of the things that you can do to avoid receiving information or receiving those solicitations is to sign up with the Department of Agriculture, their no sales solicitation calls. We have forms in the packets out front. It's a service that the

Department of Agriculture offers, and by subscribing to that and paying an initial \$10 fee and then a renewal of \$5, you can assure yourself that companies will not call you; and if they do, there are severe sanctions for calling you once you have become part of that no solicitation list.

So that's just a way to avoid the telemarketers completely. But if you'd like to hear from the telemarketers and you want to rely upon that kind of information, what we're doing -- and we will have a Staff member that will describe to you what the rule will do and what the company must do under this rule to ensure that the authorization that you give to change your service is with your full knowledge and understanding.

A second concern or second item or criteria or one of the things that you might want to do is make sure you read the fine print. Now, what has happened in the past is that customers would receive, say, sweepstakes or some giveaway, and what they would not be aware of is that there was fine print that said certainly you may win this wonderful new car, but in the fine print it would change your telecommunications provider.

A lot of customers are confused by that,

having not only a giveaway on the front page but also changing your service. We consider that to be misleading. And to the extent that that did happen to you and that was something that was done without your authorization, certainly you could call your local company and say you did not intend to make a change, or call the Commission and we will try assist you.

Under our current rules if you are changed, if your service is changed from a provider other than one that you authorize, you will be entitled to have your rates rerated, or you will be able -- the company won't be able to charge you any more than you would have been charged under your authorized provider.

Under the proposal, there's a proposal that you won't be charged at all. Even though you made calls, if your provider is an unauthorized provider and it was not by any fault of your own, then the company under the proposal would have to indeed, eat the cost, even the legitimate costs, because it was an unauthorized change. Now, that will be one of the things that we will be considering, that we will be deliberating, that we will take testimony on.

Again, the third one is to check your telephone bill each month very carefully. And I know that in the past we've dealt with monopolies. You

haven't had that much choice, at least in the local market, and now we will have choice in the local market and even more choice in the long distance market; and it will be very, very important for us all to read our bills carefully to ensure that nothing on there is new that we didn't, indeed, authorize.

And, again, with the telemarketers, if you decide that you don't want to go the no solicitation route and that you do want to receive the calls, one of the things that we're advising is don't accept anything over the phone. Ask for whatever information they provide you to have that followed up in writing. And as it relates to making a change via a telephone call, we're advising customers to just say no and to not entertain that at all until you have something concrete and something in writing upon which you can rely.

I think we had some demonstrative exhibits outside that show some of the issues that we've seen and some of the ways in which people have authorized — or without their knowledge their telephone service has been changed by registering to win a jeep, and they thought they were just entering a lottery to win a jeep, and in fact there was fine print either on the back or very fine print on the end

of the notice that would actually change your telecommunications company, your long distance provider.

so one of the things that we are asking customers to do is to look at those carefully, and when you see an instance where there is some misrepresentation, again, if you could call the Public Service Commission, we are still investigating those. When we find companies that are misleading the customers, then we do have the authority to contact that company and post fines or even revoke their certificate to have service in our state.

If you'd look in your blue handouts, I think it's the fourth or fifth page, we have a list of companies that have been fined, or that we have show cause, and that process is a process by which we ask the company to come in and justify their actions because we believe that they perhaps have engaged in an illegal -- as it relates to the Commission's rules -- a violation of the Commission's rules.

We have had several companies that have either settled and paid monetary fines and/or we have also revoked at least, I believe, one, maybe more than one's company certificate for engaging in such practices.

Again, I have several slides that if questions come up, we can entertain those by slide and then give you more examples, but we're really here to get information from you. If you have instances where you believe that you've had a problem with a company, if you could tell us that, that would give us an opportunity to make sure that we understand the gravity of the problem, and as we're trying to come up with the proper resolution, that we can take all of your concerns and your thoughts in mind.

I had some general information, because I participated in a couple public forums this morning. And one of the questions that occurred was, well, we really have a problem in this county or in this particular area. And I can tell you this year alone we've closed out at least 21 complaints where customers have, indeed, stated that their service was changed without their permission.

We have saved the customers in this area in the last several months about \$1,000 having their rates changed back to their authorized carrier's rates, and we have in surrounding counties, Panama City and surrounding cities, we've had ten complaints in Panama City, Apalachicola. We've not had any in Quincy. We've two -- Marianna we've not had any

formal complaints, but that's not to say that the local exchange companies, your local company, that they have not received complaints.

And one of the things that we want to know about and hear from you from you about is are there other instances; are there other schemes or other activities that cause you concern.

So I wanted to introduce some of the Staff members that are here. In you don't feel comfortable coming forward and providing public testimony, then there are two alternatives. You can meet with one of our Staff members, or on the special report there is a sheet on the back where if you'd just like to fill that out and send it in with your comments, we'd love to hear from you.

Also there's a 1-800 number that's printed on our -- I believe is printed on our -- let me make sure -- yes, it is printed on -- it should be printed on the special report. Yes, on the front page of the special report, 1-800-342-3552. For those of you who would like to talk directly to one of our analysts at the Commission, you can also use that number.

The Staff members that are here to assist you, again, our lead attorney is Diana Caldwell. She introduced herself. Rick Moses is the lead technical

person on this issue. Ann Shelfer is sitting here in the front. Kelly Biegalski is also in the front.

Blanco Bayo is seated here to my far right. Ruthe is reporting this for us tonight and, again, it will be very important as you come forward to present your testimony that you state your name and address for the record, and she will make sure that this is a part of our official record.

and Dick Durbin, you might have seen him earlier today on TV, and if not, he was here to greet you. He's one of our chief analysts that handles the day-to-day complaints that come in regarding slamming and other activities.

I believe that someone from the Attorney

General's Office -- if you would, if you'd just like

to state your name and who you represent for the

record.

MS. BRADLEY: I'm with the Attorney

General's Office here. My name is Cecilia Bradley,

and we appreciate you all coming tonight. We're in

Tallahassee at the Capitol.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Are there any other preliminary matters, counsel?

MB. CALDWELL: No.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Then would it be

appropriate to go ahead and entertain any customer testimony after I swear them in?

MS. CALDWELL: I think what we'd like to do is have Staff just go through some of the rules and explain what we have proposed so far.

MR. MOSES: Thank you. Today most of you already, I'm sure, are aware that you can have competition in many more areas other than just your traditional long distance telephone companies. You can choose a different telephone company now for your local service and your local toll, which is sometimes called intraLATA, as well as your traditional long distance service.

By being required to choose between competing service providers with sometimes very little knowledge of these companies, many unsuspecting consumers are vulnerable to being taken advantage of.

Many consumers have reported having their phone service switched without their authorization. This is also known as slamming. It is the single most common complaint that the Public Service Commission receives.

The Public Service Commission, as Chairman Johnson discussed a while ago, has fined companies; they have revoked the certificates to operate in Florida; negotiated settlements, and have required refunds. But as competition builds, these actions become less sufficient; therefore, the Public Service Commission is proposing rules to see if we can tighten the requirements before your service is switched.

The proposed amendments will do the following for you: It applies to all companies providing local service, local toll service, and long distance service. It requires these companies to be certificated prior to providing service by the Public Service Commission.

It also requires the information to be printed on your bill that in the past has not been there. The information includes the name of the company, the type of service that is going to be provided by that company, and a toll free service number for each provider.

You can see up to three providers on your telephone bill; one for your local service, one, if you so choose a long distance carrier intraLATA or your local toll service, and a long distance company for your other services.

These rules will also require the consumers' authorization, and it will limit the ways in which a preferred company may be changed. The only way a

change may be made is if the company has a signed letter of agency by the consumer that contains sufficient information to verify that the consumer is authorizing the change.

Another way is the company has received a customer-initiated call; in other words, you could dial an 800 number to call the company that you want to be switched to; and that the company has obtained the consumers' consent and has recorded that consent and has recorded the number to be changed.

In other words, when you dial from your house to change your long distance service or your local service, there's what they call an ANI, or automatic number identification, that will be recorded by the company that it automatically pops up your telephone number. And also an independent unaffiliated firm that has verified the customer's request.

Another method is the company has received a consumer's change request and response by mailing an information package which explains the changes, verifies information, and requires a signed statement acknowledging the change.

This is different than what is in the present rules. Right now you're sent a postcard, and

if you fail to return the postcard after 14 days, the company will change your service. That's being reversed. Now you will have to sign that card and confirm the change and send it back to the company before the change will be made.

Another major change is that the company cannot combine the letter of agency with any inducements on the same document. Some of you may have received checks in the mail from various companies offering \$100 or \$60 to switch to their service. By signing the back of that check, there's a statement on the back that says "By signing this, you're authorizing your service to be switched." This type of inducement will be eliminated by the proposed rules.

entries, which Chairman Johnson demonstrated one of them a while ago on the overhead right there. If you're in a flea market or some type of auction or anyplace where they have some of these display boxes -- and you'll see a couple of them out front there -- by signing that entry in the past, you're authorizing your service to be switched. This type of inducement will be eliminated.

The rules also require that the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

solicitations in writing or by telephone, that the inducements may not be misleading or deceptive. They can't have language in here that's talking about some other subject that you're not familiar with.

And, as Chairman Johnson also pointed out, the rules are changing that if you are slammed, an unauthorized change, that you will be credited for the first 90 days. The reason for the 90 days is to limit the exposure to the companies just in case some consumers get wise to the idea and just keep switching around and saying they didn't really change. So that kind of limits the exposure. And usually if you are slammed, you're going to know it within 90 days. That should give you justification, time to notify the companies.

That sums up the rule changes.

Again, those are the proposed rules. The companies will have an opportunity to react to those and to provide us with comments on those rules, and then the Commission will have to vote on whether or not the rules are adequate, whether we need to do more, whether Staff has proposed too much. But those are the kind of issues that we will be considering.

And a lot of that will be -- or the process

will be very much improved by receiving your comments to help us better understand, well, when are the customers confused, how are they confused; are the sweepstakes confusing to the customers. We are hopeful that over the next several weeks as we visit different cities that we'll have an opportunity to have the dialogue and receive the information from the customers as to what customers would like to see and what they would not like to see.

several people that would like to testify today and provide us with information. If you could stand and raise your right hand, at this time I'll swear you in.

(Witnesses collectively sworn.)

appearing tonight. I know you've been waiting a long time, and we'll get right to your testimony. We appreciate your coming, and we know it's an inconvenience.

If any of you would like to speak with either Cecilia Bradley or myself afterwards, we would be glad to speak with you. Also, Earl Poucher -- Earl, would you raise your hand -- from our office would be glad to speak with you if you have any questions.

The first witness is Carolyn Brown. If you would, please state your name and address and phone number and then tell us what your experience has been.

2 ||

CAROLYN BROWN

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITHESS BROWN: Thank you. Hy name is

Carolyn Brown, and I live at 400 Winton Avenue. I'm

representing my mother-in-law who is in the audience.

She lives at 401 Colbert, and she was the one that was
slammed.

The company that we had the problem with is Network Utilization Services, which BellSouth and AT&T I talked with had never heard of them. What happened was we're not really sure of the date, but probably back in March of last year, they seemed to think they changed her then.

However, she did not receive an invoice until September and at that time she received a little yellow flier like this, which looks like just a piece of junk mail, and she had actually tossed it out; but on second thought she got it back out and started reading it, and it said that her AT&T Bill Manager

carvice invoice was overdue.

Well, she got all these invoices and she started paying them. This was in September, and she wasn't concerned about paying them because she had made the long distance calls and she assumed, I guess, they were going to AT&T.

Well, it went on for several months, and then she said her bill was getting larger and larger. So we looked at it, and she was paying about 22 cents a minute, which she had been paying like 10 cents a minute with AT&T.

So she wrote on this invoice "Cancel this long distance service." And they had an 800 number also that she could call. This company was in Boston, Massachusetts. Well, there was never an answer at this 800 number. It was just a recording or nobody was in the office. They would take your name and number and return the call. Well, no one ever did.

So then comes along about January or February, after the holidays, I thought, well, someone needs to get involved, because the bills -- actually, she paid close to \$575 for these long distance services.

So I called, I guess, BellSouth. I didn't know where to start, so I called BellSouth. They said

that the change had been made through something called a mechanized legal form. Now, they didn't tell me what that was, but it had been made, and AT&T was not her long distance carrier, but it was somebody else.

them, so I called the Better Business Bureau in
Pensacola. They had never heard of them, but they
gave me the number in Boston, so I called Boston.
They said there was an address there. They have a
post office box address. So I called information to
try to get a phone number besides an 800 number.
Well, there was no phone number. They had no, like,
you know, a local number to call in Boston.

So I called AT&T to see if they had heard of them, because this little flier said "AT&T Bill Manager Service." Well, AT&T had never heard of them, so I was back on the phone. This was about three hours this day I spent on the phone. I called BellSouth back and she told me I could change that number; I could change her long distance carrier and put a PIC freeze, something called a PIC freeze, on there; therefore, no one had authorization to that account.

So we did that. We changed it back. We went to AT&T at 10 cents a minute. We put a PIC

free e on it.

Utilizations and mailed letters to the Better Business Bureau, copies to -- I even sent to Scarborough Payment Center -- there's an address in Detroit, Michigan for Network Utilizations. So I sent them a letter and wanted to know why; you know, how did they get her name and number. The phone is not in her name. It's in her husband's name; therefore, she should not have been authorized to change anybody -- you know, to make any changes.

Well, I got a response from Network

Utilizations saying that they had -- she had done it

through a phone call, that she had gave her consent

for -- to change this; but she -- I'm sure she didn't.

She keeps a journal every day of what goes on, and she
had no desire to change from AT&T.

so the change was made. And they said that they did this over the phone. And I told them that I had tried to reach them on several different times, and they didn't reply to me. They didn't respond to any of my letters.

The Better Business Bureau in Boston did respond. They said they had several complaints against that company, but the company told them that

she gav. her authorization over the telephone; therefore, there was nothing more they could do-

And I just feel -- you know, she's a 78-year-old lady. She was living -- she had no desire to change her phone. How they got her number -- how could they change that without somebody's written consent?

You know, I called up BellSouth, and one lady -- I accessed that account. I could have told them I was John Doe. I accessed that account. I could make any changes I wanted to.

Another lady that I called with BellSouth, she would not access the account. She said she needed a social security number to access the account. Well, I didn't have my father-in-law's social security number, so I couldn't get in. But there should be some way that these people cannot do this, cannot call them up.

She was hassled for six months, trying to write letters. And needless to say, a lot of the older people throw a lot of that invoice that comes with the phone company -- there's like five or six sheets -- pay their bill, toss the rest of it away; and she did that. We didn't save all those invoices.

But that's been our experience. And as of

now we just wrote another letter in September, and that's kind of where we left it, that it's open and closed. We don't want anything else to do with them. We're back with AT&T. And they haven't billed us anymore, so we haven't heard from them either way.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Ms. Brown.

There may be questions for you.

question. I understand the problem, and I think perhaps some of the controls that we have in our proposed rule may address some of the problems you've encountered. I hope that's the case.

The question I have, though, is did your mother-in-law receive a refund of any sort from Network Utilization Services?

WITNESS BROWN: No, sir.

commissioner DEASON: You may want to speak to a member of our Staff to see -- I don't know if the time frame that has elapsed is such that it would prevent, but it may be possible that those calls could be rerated if it could be shown that the change was not authorized; and perhaps some of the \$575 that you indicated was paid to this company perhaps could be made --

WITNESS BROWN: Well, again --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: -- assuming that

Network Utilizations is even in business now. That's

part of the problem. These companies seem to come and

go, and that's one of the problems. But if you've got

a moment, you may wish to discuss that with one of our

Staff members. They may be able to assist you a

little bit further in that regard.

withess BROWN: Well, we're not squabbling about -- she did make the calls; that's true.

commissioner Deason: But the problem, you indicated, though, that the going rate seemed to be 22 cents and --

WITNESS BROWN: Right.

to paying a lot less with your carrier that you thought was your authorized carrier.

WITNESS BROWN: Right.

those rates perhaps could be refunded to you, here again, assuming that we can locate this company and assuming they're still in business and that sort of thing. But you may want to pursue that with one of our Staff members.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Brown, you said the

1 name of the company was Network Utilization, Inc.?

Services -- no Inc. after it -- in Boston. They had a post office box address is all we came up with. And some of her payments would go to Boston, and then they sent her a note saying "Send these payments to Detroit," to the payment center in Detroit. So some of her checks went to Boston to Network and some of them went to Payment Center in Detroit, Michigan.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And you stated that when you first noticed the problem that you called the local company?

WITNESS BROWN: Right.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And what was their response?

WITNESS BROWN: Well, I started with

BellSouth, not knowing what else to do. So first I

wanted to check who her long distance carrier was, and
they said it was not AT&T, that it had been changed.

And I said, well, who authorized the change. And she
said it was done through a mechanic -- a document
called a mechanized form, which is some type of legal
document, and I never -- I still don't know what that
was.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.

withess brown: But that's the one -- see, one time I called them and I could access that account; the next time I called, I couldn't. And nobody should be able to call there and access anybody's account without a password or code or something.

question. Did you actually speak to anyone, a live person, at Network Utilizations?

WITHESS BROWN: No, sir. We never could get an answer.

charman Johnson: Ms. Brown, Mr. Durbin, the gentleman in the back there with the blue jacket, he'll give you one of his cards. And this is exactly the kind of activity that we can and will -- if you'd like us to investigate, we'll investigate.

WITHESS BROWN: Okay. Good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And we appreciate you letting us know what your problems and experiences have been.

witness brown: Well, thank you. Hopefully something can be done. Thank you.

chairman Johnson: Thank you. Let me ask
you another question. I'm sorry. Mr. Moses kind of
went over the proposed rule. Did you have any

reaction to that, to any of the issues that he stated,
the issues that we were looking into; the refund
methodology, or was there anything that was -- that
you agreed with or disagreed with?

witness Brown: Well, yeah. Well, to the extent of the refund, I think if these people are changed without their consent, they should be entitled to a refund, definitely.

However, it's their word against ours. So, you know, she said they called on the phone. They had the authority to change that account. And I'm sure she didn't, but that's one word against the other. But definitely I think with this happening there should be a refund, or at least the difference. Like if I'm paying 22 -- well, I'm not going to complain because I made my call, and I'd like to pay my 10 cents a minute. At least the difference.

But it's a hassle. It's a hassle for the people to go through. You have no idea what this has put my mother-in-law through.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: One of the issues that
you raised that perhaps we don't always internalize is
not just the 10-cent difference, but the times, the
three or four hours that you have to spend trying to
track down the company. So there is a lot more in

terms of damages than just the actual monetary difference.

witness brown: There is, and that's what happened in our case; not so much the monetary damage, but what we went through and what she went through and still would be going through, I feel, if I did not get involved.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: When you tried to call this company, was it an 800 number, or did you have to pay to make the call?

WITHESS BROWN: The Network?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes.

WITNESS BROWN: No. That's an 800 number.

I could not get any other number than that.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And no one ever responded when you attempted to --

recording that there's nobody in the office, leave your name and number they would return the call. We did that several times, and she had sat by the phone actually eight hours a day waiting for somebody to call, and we never heard. But we couldn't get a number.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: In our proposed rules we're requiring that there be a toll free number

provided on the monthly bill. Perhaps we need to 1 expand that and require that someone answer the call 2 3 when it's made. (Laughter) WITHESS BROWN: That could help. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Ms. Brown. 5 MS. BRADLEY: Did you say that BellSouth 6 7 told that you they verified -- got her consent through a phone call? 8 9 WITNESS BROWN: No. BellSouth said they got it through a mechanized form. Do you know what that 10 is? 11 MS. BRADLEY: I'm not familiar with --12 13 WITHESS BROWN: I don't know either. They got it through a mechanized form. 14 MR. MOSES: The only thing I can possibly 15 think of is there's a series of prompts sometimes they will use similar to a voice mail or fax system where 17 they'll ask you to press "1" if you select --18 WITHESS BROWN: Okay. Now, that did happen 19 to her. You know, a lot of times you call up a number 20 and you listen, press 1, so-and-so, press 2, press 3, 21 and it gets confusing for myself even. When do I press 1? Did I press it too soon? Do I wait until 23

MR. MOSES: But even so, going through that

the whole recording is off? I mean, it is confusing.

process, they're still supposed to, under the current 1 rules, go through third-party verification or --2 3 WITHESS BROWN: Exactly. MR. MOSES: -- it sounds like what they did is sent you that postcard to where if you don't return 5 it within 14 days, you're switched, and that sounds like what happened to you. WITHESS BROWN: Maybe that was the 8 9 mechanized form? MR. MOSES: And that was the part that she 10 wasn't familiar with and just tossed it in the 11 garbage. And that's why we're changing in the 12 proposed rules to make that an affirmative action 13 taken on a consumer before they're switched, where they have to actually return that card instead of not 15 returning it. 16 WITNESS BROWN: With a signature. I think 17 that would be great. 18 MR. MOSES: And if you can give either Dick 19 or Ann some information on that, I'll be glad to help 20 you with this complaint tomorrow. 21 WITHESS BROWN: Okay. Thank you. 22 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Ms. Brown. 23

MR. BECK: Don Barber?

24

DON BARBER

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS BARBER: Good evening. Don Barber,

5499 Pensacola Boulevard. I want to point out a couple things. People in this area have been spoiled

with good service from Southern Bell and BellSouth for

years and years and we've never had -- I've been a

phone user of their service for probably 37 years, and

never -- I can never recall having a complaint or

problem.

We even traced it to who signed -- they falsified my name on the switchover. And, of course,

If you had a problem on the line or long distance, within hours somebody was out there or they would have the problem corrected within that day. And when they busted up BellSouth, the Ma Bell utilities, our service just went to hell, and it's been that way since.

Last year I had occasion to be slammed by AT&T, and I raised Cain and I went to you people and filed a complaint, and I corresponded with scmebody in your Staff and got it resolved, but still there was no penalty to AT&T whatsoever.

you go to them and you couldn't back up and say, well, all right, you're going to have to pay Mr. Barber back this or whatever, you know. So I would suggest a strong, stiff penalty when you can document stuff such as this or a pattern of this type of activity there. It's just -- it's disgusting.

And I've just gave Mr. Durbin a complaint that I had to mail out last week to you people. And BellSouth resolved it. And I got to -- I was treated as a casual customer, casual billing through MCI.

And my wife -- first I got a notice from

BellSouth that my phone bill, the next phone bill, was
going to be quite high. And I usually spend two to

\$400 a month on long distance calls. I spend a lot of
time on long distance. And I got a bill for 600 and
some-odd dollars, and I looked and I recognized all
the numbers. I said, I guess I did spend that.

But then I got to -- my wife said, look at it closer. And I got to looking, and I was paying \$1.59 per minute on some of my calls. I said, wait a minute, something is wrong here.

So I contacted BellSouth, and she explained to me what this casual billing was, and she said, now when you get your bill -- which I just got a couple weeks ago -- she said, let's -- we'll go over it and

see. So I tried -- and here's another thing, too, that needs to be addressed.

When you're trying to call in people like
MCI and it takes five hours and you cannot get anybody
on the phone, then you're put on hold, and there's
your long distance there; five, 10, 15 minutes there.

I got so aggravated with MCI a few months ago. I started, and it was five hours, steady hours, of trying to get somebody on the phone. Finally I had an MCI charge card for when you're out, you know, making long distance calls on the road, and I said, I'm going to try -- I tried an 800 number, and I finally got in to somebody to voice a complaint after five hours there. But this is some of the things you need to address.

And another suggestion is, maybe these companies, have them put up a performance bond. If they're going to operate in Florida, let them put a performance bond up there. When you get a lot of complaints, then you can address them and put some heat on them. If they've got something -- some assets at stake with the state, like a performance bond, then they're going to try and go overboard to give a little better service there.

But is there any questions I can answer?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes, sir, I have a question. The bill that -- I guess it's a recent bill that you received that --

WITNESS BARBER: Yes.

commissioner DEASON: -- had the casual billing on it, and it had calls at \$1.59 a minute -- witness BARBER: Uh-huh. \$1.50 -- it was either \$1.53, \$1.59 a minute.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: What was the explanation you received?

WITNESS BARBER: Casual billing.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: But you recognized the numbers --

but I didn't -- I had a contract with a company that
was -- MCI supplied the long distance at 11.9. Then
all of a sudden I'm going to 1.59. And so the lady
with BellSouth, I faxed her all this, and I had a
letter to Mr. Durbin, and to send to Governor Chiles,
a bunch of people, and to the Attorney General's
Office and then -- but the lady from BellSouth
resolved it all quickly.

I mean, within two hours she called me back and said, I've re-figured these long distance bills and it will show up within four days in your next

bill.

2 COMMISSIONER DEASON: So that problem has
3 been --

withess barber: It's been resolved, yes, sir. But I'm looking forward to the day -- and I'm hoping January, Pebruary, BellSouth will be able to offer long distance service, and it will eliminate a lot of this. They ruined a lot of people, BellSouth, with such good service, and then when we had to put up with this crap, it's very, very disgusting.

chairman Johnson: Mr. Barber, one of your suggestions, then -- because we do -- we do certify the companies that operate, and we try to -- some of them operate without a certificate. But one of your suggestions, then, is on the certification process that perhaps when they sign up to offer service in Florida that we would require some kind of a bond?

WITNESS BARBER: A performance bond, yes.

An insurance company coming into Florida to write insurance in Florida, they have pretty strict requirements. They have to put a bond up. I think it would eliminate a lot of this.

MR. BECK: Mr. Barber, you said AT&T slammed you? Could you briefly explain what happened -- WITHESS BARBER: It was last year. I think

it was sometime in last year. I don't know how I got slammed, but I did. And so I got to looking into it, 2 and through some checking and all, we found out -- the 3 Public Service Commission through their correspondence back and forth to AT&T, we found where my signature 5 was on the paperwork. And we looked at the signature, 7 and it wasn't my signature whatsoever. So they finally tracked it down to who signed it. Somebody 8 had signed my name to it. 9 10

MR. BECK: Who was your carrier before that?
WITNESS BARBER: LDS, I think -- I think.

LD --

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. BECK: That's who you wanted to be served by?

WITHESS BARBER: At that time, I think; yes.

MR. BECK: Mr. Barber, just so you know, one of the things we're looking at at PSC is the amount of fines that they fine companies for activities like that. And last November the Commission fined AT&T \$30,000, but that was for 141 infractions, and that came out to \$213 fine per infraction, and we're going to be urging the Commission to --

witness BARBER: It should -- you should hurt them in their pocketbook. Any other questions?

MS. BRADLEY: You mentioned something

1	about you said it was \$1.59 per minute. Was that
2	in addition to the 11
3	WITHESS BARBER: No, huh-uh.
4	MS. BRADLEY: point whatever? That was
5	just a change
6	WITHESS BARBER: It was a complete different
7	rate, uh-huh. And the lady at BellSouth explained to
8	me it's called casual billing.
9	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any other questions?
10	WITHESS BARBER: Thanks.
11	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much.
12	MR. BECK: Ella Warren.
13	
14	ELLA WARREN
15	appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth,
16	testified as follows:
17	DIRECT STATEMENT
18	WITHESS WARREN: My complaint is with AT&T.
19	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ma, am, could you begin
20	by giving us your name?
21	WITHESS WARREN: Oh, I'm sorry. My name is
22	Ella Warren, 3705 North 12th Avenue, and my telephone
23	was slammed by AT&T in September of '96.
24	I discovered that my phone was slammed when

could not use my calling card. Within five days I knew this, so I was not out a lot of money. I was -- you know, the phone bill was readjusted \$2 and whatever. So that's not the big issue here

I wrote the FCC. I complained through the FCC. They responded back. I filed an informal complaint. I found through their correspondence that in order to file a formal complaint, I would have to pay \$140. I did not go to that extent. Okay.

My problem with the issue is I understand telecommunication and what lengths they go through to get customers and whatever. My biggest problem here is the way they justify their switch to the FCC. They justified their switch through a forged document called a service agreement.

My husband's signature is on here. This was in October 1996. My husband died in May of 1991. They cannot use his name, number one. My telephone bills, the checks that AT&T send me through promotions has Ella Lampkin Warren on them. My telephone bill has Ella Lampkin Warren on them. There is no way that they would come up with James Warren except through listings of some sort.

This disturbed me very much. And they actually justified their switching with this forgery.

Forgery is illegal. If you and I did something like this, we would go to jail. I think there should be

I received letters, I received amounts like you're saying of fines that are assessed to these companies, amounts -- I think a solution to this problem is in all the moneys going to the U.S.

Treasury, the consumer should be able to file complaints and be appropriated funds. I think they should be able to be fined legally and the consumer should be paid.

There is a lot of money on here. I'm looking at anywhere from 30,000 to \$500,000 being given to the U.S. Treasury for the consumer being slammed, the consumer being inconvenienced. Okay. And I think that's one of the solutions there.

But that's my major complaint there is that the companies are being able to do illegal things and get away with it per se.

MR. BECK: Ms. Warren, do you know whether there was ever an investigation to find out how it came that they had forged your deceased husband's signature?

WITNESS WARREN: No.

MR. BECK: Nobody ever told you --

fines.

WITNESS WARREN: No. When I sent this, when I wrote the letter, I wrote the FCC back -- when they sent me the letter with this agreement attached, I wrote them back and told them that this was a forgery, and a few -- maybe a week later I received a card saying that, you know, the complaint, all this, the file has been closed.

So I said to myself, you know, if it's being closed with the informal complaint, then I guess they except me to file a formal complaint. And I was attempting to write Joe Scarborough. I was going to do all those things, and I was like one of the other people said. I just got -- you know, I just threw my hands up and said, I'm tired now, you know.

But I think it's very unfair, very unfair to the consumer to have to just -- not so much that I was out of money. That's not the money. It was all about the time, the time I spent. I had spent, you know, hours writing letters and responding, and then when I get this thing showing me the forgery, it was like, I mean, what do I do? Where do I go from here? I went to the highest.

And I would say, too, as the gentleman said, BellSouth is what I went -- that's where I went when I first learned that I had been slammed. I called

BellSouth and they told me, your long distance service has been changed to AT&T. And I'm like how, when, why? And at that moment they did put a block on -- I'll have to sign -- I would have to sign in order for a carrier to change my long distance service.

And I called then AT&T, and they explained to me that it had been switched and whatever, and I got the name -- got the number, the address rather, of the FCC; and then I began to write them and get responses from them, you know, but no real satisfaction.

And like they were saying, you know, I received all the information where the companies are fined, had been fined, and it does list AT&T with a \$30,000 voluntary payment to the U.S. Treasury. You know, voluntary; you know. I don't know. This is all legal jargon here, and I don't know what that's all about. But even with that, I'm sure that's a small amount of money for them. That's a pat on the hand.

And I think some way the consumer should be not so much satisfied monetarily, not so much that, but I'm thinking as a solution to the stoppage of all these things, I think we should some way be able to fine them or file a lawsuit against them for these things. I really do.

I even called lawyer offices to pursue this, but everybody was like, we don't have anything about slamming, we don't know anything about slamming. You know, it's like everything is downplayed, and I think it's unfair, very unfair to the consumer.

investigate, see Earl Poucher in the back. I'm sure the PSC, the same. If you want us to try to pursue it to find out how it came about, we'd be glad to.

WITHESS WARREN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Warren, one of the things that you suggested was that -- or that you testified to was that during the process you did communicate with the FCC.

WITNESS WARREN: Yes.

chairman Johnson: And this may be a new process, but I understand what they're going to attempt to do now -- because a lot of customers don't know about the Florida Public Service Commission.

They just know about --

WITHESS WARREN: I found out later, yes.

chairman journson: One of the things that

we're -- they are going to implement is when they send

you that informal complaint, send you the name and the

numbers for the Florida Commission with information

that we have a Staff that can investigate the matters that you bring up. Because it is unfortunate that there's a charge when you want to pursue it further with them, and they've even admitted that that's been a deterrent, because once people find out -- you know, they already feel as if they've been perhaps ripped off, and now they have to pay to get the justice --

WITNESS WARREN: Really.

charman Johnson: -- that they think they deserve. But we are trying to work more closely with them, and to the extent that there are issues that Florida consumers have, try to help those consumers through that. Our process is, of course, free of charge. That's what we're here for. And so we're still in the process of trying to improve the system and, hopefully, we can even help you.

I know you feel like it's been a while ago, but I know certainly the circumstances surrounding how you were slammed are pretty offensive. And if there's any other way we can assist, we appreciate that. And, of course, we've taken all your suggestions as to additional remedies to help with this problem. Thank you very much.

WITNESS WARREN: Thank you.

MR. BECK: Terry Swiontek.

--

TEPRY SWIONTEK

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS SWIONTEK: Close enough. 6130
Walton Street, Pensacola, Florida.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Could you spell your last name?

withess swiontex: S-W-I-O-N-T-E-K. I wear two hats. I'm a consumer like everyone else that has phone service in Florida, and I work for BellSouth. I was slammed, and I knew what was happening.

Twice this week alone I've been solicited by long distance vendors to change, and without being too rude to them, I just told them I'm not interested.

But that's a flag to me, because I work for the company, to check my bill next month and make sure something didn't happen.

Every day I deal with large business customers and major accounts in the marketing office. Several of my customers were supposed to be here tonight with their presentation of being slammed themselves where I have to provide them with information as to what happened as well as advice on

1 | what to do.

Myself, my resolution was quite simple. I contacted the company that changed my long distance PIC, and they were apologetic and made sure that the difference in the normal price was taken care of. It was very simple. But for some of my other business customers, Internet providers to a lot of business customers, it's -- it happens more than a regular amount.

They don't know what to do. They call us and ask us for advice, and we refer them to the business office unless it's an assigned account that we handle.

But I'll give you an example. One of our Internet providers here, very large customer, 250 lines, he calls and says, half -- or six or seven of my lines all of a sudden have different long distance PICs, and he has been PIC'd -- the same long distance vendor for several years, and they give him volume discounts and whatever.

He doesn't understand how this can happen.

He didn't solicit anything, and nobody contacted him.

So we at that point, to resolve the situation, ordered

a PIC freeze on 250 numbers. It puts BellSouth at an
inconvenience as well as it costs us time and staff to

fix that situation.

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

25

Another of my customers -- I'm not going to cite customer after customer because I could be here all night doing that -- but myself being slammed -and I think -- I followed the Alabama PSC pretty well on their latest decision that they would fine their slamming PICs companies a \$500 fine for each occasion that they slam unauthorized that's been verified, and that, you know, whatever penalty they do to do that.

It's just something has got to be done. It's like a runaway train. I know myself at the house I hate to answer the phone and hear it's one of these long distance companies offering something that I really don't want done. My account is PIC-free myself, because I knew that was the way to do it 16 because I deal with this every day.

But it's just something has to be done. here as a consumer, not a representative of Southern Bell. But I just deal with this every day, and people just don't realize -- my mother-in-law and my neighbors and everybody talks to me because I'm a BellSouth person about, you know, why do these people do this to you and, you know, they charge ridiculous prices.

Mine was 25 cents a minute when I -- you

know, I never look at my bill. That's the problem is you assume everything is okay, and then someone calls you and then next month you've got somebody else down there. I've had two or three different long distance PICs on my bill that I didn't ask for any of them, and just had them cleaned up and taken care of; but the average consumer never looks. The bill comes from BellSouth.

one of my customers I dealt with today, he's having trouble with I can't mention the name, but another company that he's called them and documented this several times where they won't give their name who he's talking to. I told him to start a log, who he talked to, the time and date and everything else. And now he's incurring late charges for not paying that difference in the bill, so he's not getting satisfaction.

And, again, it's time -- that's up to -- try and interface between him because we're the collecting agents for a lot of long distance carriers.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Any questions? Thank you, sir.

MR. BECK: Mary Van Arsdel.

MARY VAN ARSDEL

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS VAN ARSDEL: Good evening. Mary Van Arsdel, 583 West Roberts Road, Cantonment. I was slammed. I have three telephone lines and had AT&T long distance service and was paying 10 cents a minute, and I was slammed on March the 8th of this year; and in August I received my long distance telephone bill for one of my phone lines, and it was for \$240 in long distance calls.

And I thought, gee, I talk a lot, but I didn't talk that much on the phone in one month, and I looked at the telephone bill and it was for three months. And my fiance is an attorney and, you know, we looked at this bill and thought, well, what in the world is going on here. And I called a long distance carrier that was on the bill, and it was Equalnet (phonetic), and it was U.S. Billing Services. It was U.S. Billing Services. It was

And I called them, and they said, well, we're just a billing service, we have nothing to do with this long distance service. So I looked again and it said "Long Distance Service by Equalnet," and

so I called Equalnet and they said, well, you authorized your switch on March the 8th.

And so then I hung up the phone and I called BellSouth, and I said, what happened, my bill is, you know, for 25 cents a minute, I had it with AT&T. And they said, well, you were slammed. And they gave me some advice. They said to block my telephone number immediately, which I did, and called Equalnet back and said I was slammed and we need to adjust this bill. And they said to fax a copy of my last authorized long distance carrier, fax a copy of my last bill to them.

Well, at that moment I was unsure whether or not I should do that. So I called BellSouth back, and they said it was all right to do that, that they would make the adjustments. And so I did do that. I compiled all the telephone bills and I did fax that, my last carrier, AT&T, to Equalnet; and I still haven't heard from Equalnet as far as any kind of rerating.

BellSouth gave me two months to solve this problem. I did not pay those long distance calls because I immediately knew that I was slammed. So I have two months to do this. So that's my question is, what happens after two months.

My phone service actually -- I need to back

up a little bit. When I did call BellSouth I
explained to them about the slamming. They adjusted
my long distance calls, so I only needed to pay the
regulated charges. So I did pay the regulated
charges, and I got a late notice stating I needed to
pay the entire telephone bill.

Well, I ignored it because I already had permission just to pay the regulated charges. Well, my phone service was cut off and — the first time in my life. I had no idea — you know, I was trying to make phone calls and I kept getting busy signals. I was thinking everybody was talking on the phone today. But — and then I called on my second line which was with AT&T long distance; and I called BellSouth and said, what happened, and they told me that I didn't pay my bill.

And I explained to them that I had called on such-and-such a date and arrangements were made where I didn't have to pay that. And I spoke to Debra Smith the second time, and she was extremely helpful, and she adjusted my bill.

Well, I just got my next bill, and the amount still wasn't -- the long distance calls still weren't the right amount. I mean, I was still responsible for paying more. So I had to call

BellSouth again and have that taken care of.

But BellSouth has been -- I have rave reviews about BellSouth and, you know, I agree with the long distance services. It's great.

But I did file -- I filed a complaint with
the Public Services Commission around, I believe it
was, the first week in September. I've been keeping a
log. When I called them back they didn't have a
complaint issued. So I don't know what happened
there, but I've talked to them several times.

Equalnet did call me and said that they did receive a complaint from the Public Services Commission, and they said they never received any documentation from me. So I refaxed the entire packet to Equalnet, and I'm still waiting. I haven't paid that bill, and I sure don't want my telephone cut off again.

I think -- one of my biggest complaints is
the fact that if -- we did make these telephone calls.
I do not deny that I didn't make these telephone
calls, because they were all familiar telephone
numbers. My complaint is that we would still -- they
would rerate the bill to 10 cents a minute. I mean
that's what they agreed to do. I haven't seen it yet,
but that's what they agreed to do.

Well, why should the consumer have to keep these companies afloat by paying them 10 cents a minute when we did not choose of our own free will to go with that company? So by rerating, we're still supporting their business, and I think it's very unfair to the consumer.

I believe that there needs to be some kind of fine. The time that all of these people in -- all over Florida, all over the United States have put in their time and their efforts, their telephone calls, and I believe that there needs to be some kind of compensation for these people, some kind of fine from these companies, a small -- some sort of small fine. I'm not sure exactly what. And I believe that the telephone bills should not be paid to these companies, that they should not receive our money.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask you a question on that. Are you finished?

WITHESS VAN ARSDEL: Yes, sir.

commissioner DEASON: In our proposed rule -- and granted as Chairman Johnson indicated, it's just a proposal at this point -- but there is a proposal to when slamming occurs, that the consumer not be responsible for any of the charges for up to 90 days. I assume you think that would be an improvement

over the current system of just rerating.

fair, except for the fact that I've not received -let's see. This was March. I still -- that's April,
May, June, July, August, September, October. That's
seven months I haven't paid any long distance phone
charges. So to forgive only 90 days is saying I still
have to pay that company the remaining of the month
that I've made calls.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: When did you first discover that you were slammed?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And the reason it took
so long is because your first bill contained three
months of service?

witness van arsdel: Three months of service, uh-huh.

change our rule, then, from 90 days to three bills, because if they only bill once a quarter, that would be unfair.

withess van arsoll: Sure. And the other point about billing per -- you know, every quarter, is the fact that by the time people get the three-month bill, they don't know that they've been slammed, and,

you know, it's too late.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ma'am, you stated that Equalnet stated that they did receive notice from the PSC.

WITHESS VAN ARSDEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: But you having an issue with the PSC, do we not -- we don't have a record of your complaint, but --

misspelling of my name. It's not a common name, and it could be that maybe they've alphabetized it differently. So I'm going to talk with someone afterwards to see if maybe they spelled it wrong or something. But when I did call back they said that they didn't have a record of my complaint, and so I was very surprised about that.

I did talk to the Public Services Commission and actually had a good conversation with one of your people about slamming and the pros and cons about it, and I did learn a lot from them.

asked about your complaint being filed, because you had asked, well, what's going to happen now because Equalnet, they haven't resolved the issue, and you haven't paid the bill, and you were concerned about

perhaps Bell terminating your service during -
withess van ARSDEL: Right.

chairman Johnson: -- because the bill hadn't been paid during the pendency of that complaint or our investigation. They won't act on that during the pendency. So if you get with our Staff so that we make sure that we have the ongoing dispute recorded and that we're communicating with the company as well as your communications, we can at least -- at least you won't have that fear that any day you might be cut off, although I know you have mentioned that Bell has been very cooperative in working with you on the issue.

WITHESS VAN ARSDEL: Right. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much. Any other questions?

was made. Did they claim that you had done it by phone or by some other -- something in writing, or how did they claim that this was made, and did they provide you with any verification of that?

witness van arsdel: No. I had asked them what kind of authorization that they had to do that. They said that I gave verbal authorization, and I

already knew that they had 10 days to provide me with
that authorization, and I told them that. That's what
I was told by BellSouth, whether or not that's true or
not. But I told -- they said that they would call me
with my verbal authorization giving them permission to
change my long distance service; and they still
haven't done that.

MS. BRADLEY: Did they claim to have that recorded or something?

WITHESS VAN ARSDEL: They said they did.

They said that they did, and they said March the 8th was the date that I said I would change my long distance service to Equalnet.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any other questions?

WITNESS VAN ARSDEL: I do have one more

thing to say. I handle my fiance's finances for his

law practice, and I happened to look at one of his

bills, and he was slammed, too. So I don't know.

They might know we're together. I don't know.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Make sure you register his complaint, too.

WITHESS VAN ARSDEL: He did. He will.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

WITHESS VAN ARSDEL: Thank you.

MR. BECK: David Howe.

1

DAVID HOWE

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

3

DIRECT STATEMENT

5

WITNESS HOWE: David Howe, 925 Langley Avenue, Pensacola.

6 7

8

My complaint involves LCI International. March of this past year I received a notification from them welcoming me to the worldwide firm of LCI. This was the first I had ever heard of the company, much

9 10

less having signed up for their long distance.

12

11

numerous hours on the telephone trying to communicate 13

with people from LCI, the first 20 minutes on hold. I

As Mr. Barber mentioned, I had spent

15

was finally connected with an operator who promptly

16 17

repeatedly by a young man at LCI that they were an

18

honorable company and they do not slam people.

hung up on me. The next hour or so I was told

19 20

what authorization they had to change my long distance

And so I asked for their LOA authorizing --

21

carrier. They supplied that within several days, and

22

as Mr. Barber and Ms. Warren both had, I have a

23

forgery of my name, someone who has never contacted

25

me, obviously, because at the time they had my long distance carrier as AT&T, which I had not had AT&T as a long distance carrier for well over 10 years.

My average bill was \$35, which I haven't had a \$35 telephone bill since I was in college and calling home collect. So it's told me, obviously, that there is rampant problems in the industry, and I think a lot of that comes from the fact that it is a very fast and widely growing field and there's a lot of competition out there.

I did receive a letter from a gentleman who is an independent representative who represents LCI and told me basically he heard I had been slammed and wanted to clear things up and please sign this so that I can clear my name.

Part of the problem, too, with that is LCI is based in Virginia. Their billing and customer service is out of Ohio. The company that is their representative for soliciting long distance carriers is in Detroit, and the gentleman who slammed me lives in Los Angeles. And so it is an extremely difficult time, I know, for the consumer to go about the business of trying to track down and spend the time and effort that's necessary to find where these folks are, how they go about doing things.

Now, the rules changes that have been mentioned roughly parallel what the Federal

Communications Commission's current rules are. One of the things that was mentioned was the fact that I would receive a card, or I should. Current rules apparently say that I should receive a card within 14 days that let me know that I have changed.

I, for one, received nothing from LCI letting me know that my long distance carrier had been changed. I was fortunate in that I found out about the change far quicker than apparently most have. In changing the rules, and speaking with Kate Smith at the PSC Staff who was very helpful to me in helping me go through this maze of conflicting information, the idea that I get from PSC Staff is that if enough people complain, if enough complaints are filed against a certain company, then their certificate of occupancy — certificate of whatever is pulled and they cannot operate in the state of Florida.

In the meantime, they pay fines. It's a slap on the wrist. It's a cost of doing business. I think part of the problem could be cured if the people that are forging my name as well as others' names on documentation -- as Ms. Warren said, we would be in jail for that kind of thing -- I think they need to be prosecuted and handle it like it is, which is a felony, and let these people go to jail. Let them --

instead of writing me a letter and telling me they
heard I had a problem, let them call me from the jail
somewhere while they're doing their time for forging
my name.

and I feel like it's a very small tip of the iceberg, because I don't think this meeting was very well publicized. Most of us are here because we are concerned. I think it's a wide-going problem.

I pulled things off the Internet the other night just to do a little research. There are 17,400 and some odd hits regarding the word "slamming" on the Internet, and so obviously it's a big problem out there that needs to be addressed.

Instead of slapping people on the wrist, let's give them a hefty fine, put them in jail for forging documentation. I think that's the only way we're going to see a stop to this type of behavior.

Thank you.

question. You indicated that there should be some type of criminal prosecution.

WITHESS HOWE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: That's something that is probably going to be discussed during this

rulemaking process, but perhaps on the periphery,
because the Public Service Commission does not have
any type of criminal jurisdiction. It's just not part
of what we were created by the legislature to do.

WITNESS HOWE: I understand.

Attorney General perhaps is interested in that. Part of the problem is, is that there -- as I understand it, is that there is -- currently in the law there's an exemption for regulated utilities being subject to an agency like the Public Service Commission that exempts them from some of the prosecution that normally could take place by the Attorney General folks.

I think that we're going to try to work with the Attorney General to try to see if some changes need to be made in that law so that those exemptions perhaps could be reworked or eliminated so that in flagrant situations that you just indicated, such as forgeries and things of that nature, if it's indicated there needs to be some type of prosecution of that sort, that the avenue would at least be available to pursue that. I assume you would be in favor --

people are working as independent contractors. I have

not spoken with the gentleman from Los Angeles. My
wife has. His summation of the thing is that two
people who were working for him -- it goes farther and
farther afield and it's trying to put a finger on a
snail almost, the slime trail you can't follow -- but
two people working for him who -- he is working for an
independent contractor who is again working for
another independent contractor -- apparently went down
through the telephone book and just copied people's
names and took it upon themselves to forge LOAs so
they could get their things switched.

Like I said, I have not spoken with the gentleman. That's what my wife has told me that she has. But, no, I would be far in favor of that because -- and if regulated utilities do not -- the PSC or the Attorney General does not have that authorization, these people are independent contractors; they are not regulated utilities. They answer to no one basically, and I think they need to answer to someone.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much. Any other questions for Mr. Howe? Thank you.

MR. BECK: Charles Rehwinkel.

CHARLES REHWINKEL

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS REHWINKEL: My name is Charles C.
Rehwinkel, 2770 North Magnolia Avenue, Pensacola,
Florida 32503.

7 8

I was slammed. I had AT&T, and when I found out I was slammed, of course I was very upset. I called BellSouth and I spoke with a lady in West Palm Beach, and she explained to me that someone had — company had requested the change. And I couldn't understand it because I had not authorized it, and I contacted the Public Service Commission, made a complaint.

And I also contacted the carrier that he slammed me, and I was more fortunate than the others because the person did apologize. He credited my account all the charges that were made and, in addition, I got back with AT&T and they sent me a check inducement for switching back to them. I explained to them it was a mistake, but they said, cash your check nevertheless. So mine was a happy experience. It ended up that way anyway.

I was just wondering about something. If

there's a change made, I wonder if an insert couldn't be sent in the first bill showing that you have been changed from X company to Y company on such-and-such a date; if that's correct, don't do anything, but if it's incorrect, sign this and send it in and you'll be 5 changed back. 6 7

But that's about all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any questions? I'd like to thank you, then, for testifying and for that suggestion of the insert in the bill. Thank you very much.

WITHESS REHWINKEL: Thank you.

MR. BECK: Mr. Joel Cohen.

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

8

10

11

12

13

JOEL COHEN

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITNESS COHEN: Madam Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, my name is Joel Cohen, 583 West Roberts Road. I am the fiance. Mary Van Arsdel told you of our experience with Equalnet. And I've got my bill here. I've never even seen this bill Mary takes care of it.

And the first thing that I'd like to say, of

course Mary has given you the factual basis, and I'd like to give you some recommendations on these proposed rules.

The first thing I'd like to say is that this company, Equalnet, has played their card one step further. They're using an independent billing company called U.S. Billing. And it says, for U.S. Billing billing questions call a certain 888 number. And this bill is presented and mailed on the very same paperwork as AT&T. AT&T's logo is right on the other side here.

So it lulls you into that security thinking that you're dealing with AT&T and that this U.S.

Billing is part of AT&T, and that Equalnet is riding on the coattails of AT&T, also, because it all comes on the BellSouth bill. So I don't know how anybody can figure out just who is here and who you're dealing with and who do you call with the problem. You know, do you call BellSouth? Do you call Equalnet? Do you call AT&T, or do you call U.S. Billing, Incorporated?

All these names of companies appear on one document -- on one set of documents that come in one envelope, and they want you to pay the bottom line that I guess somehow they split it up when you send your check in.

And that's the gist of one of my suggestions
for this rule; to require that the provider of
services actually bill the consumer, not through any
third party or not piggybacked with any other service.
And while this might cost them something, we're
talking about the consumers here and their rights and

II

their money, and not to go through a third party or anything else.

So let the provider of services render the bills separately so that when I get my long distance bill, I know what it is and I know who I'm paying and I know how much I'm paying.

By the way, this Equalnet bill is 25 cents a minute, which is substantially higher than the 10 cents a minute that we normally get.

I would also like to urge the Commission to require that the provider who is rendering the long distance services furnish monthly bills and not quarterly bills. Mary received the bill for the house and for -- for the house with a three-month track of bills on there. Not only was it an expensive bill at double the rate, but most consumers are not interested in quarreling about something that happened three months ago. So I would like to suggest that the billing be on a monthly basis or else it be rendered

uncollectible.

Now -- and I wanted -- I had some prepared remarks here, and I'd like to just share them with you, because I was thinking as I was listening to Ms. Brown and Ms. Warren and Don Barber, that, you know, all these people have -- they're citizens who pay their bills, and they didn't ask for this. And this is perpetrated upon them as an intentional act.

This was no accident. Somewhere someone is siting in a boiler room somewhere with a bank of phones, or a bunch of telemarketers are sitting there and intentionally perpetrating this on consumers. And it's a form of dishonesty in business. It's offensive. It's uncalled for. The offending companies make untold amounts of money by this fraud.

And I'd like to encourage the board to require that any such fraud perpetrated not be rewarded by payment of the basic charge that they would have had to pay anyway. But do more than slap them on the hand. Tell them, we're not going to permit this and you're going to have to absorb this call because you did wrong.

That's what happens. That's what happens when you and I do wrong. We cannot profit by it.

Even at 10 cents a minute a lot of these places will

profit. So do more than slap them on the hand.

Your racketeering charges, your deceptive trade practices that are all in Florida statutes, they all have -- or by and large they have some minimum civil penalty per occurrence. And I think, as was suggested here by others, that the consumer who has to spend hours and hours -- that lady spent eight hours, five hours sitting on the phone waiting for somebody to call her back. Another lady testified that she had to wait five hours. Don told you that he waited all day long and finally had to call on a calling card.

You know, time is money, and these people are putting out their time and efforts trying to straighten out a mess that they didn't create. I suggest that there be a civil penalty attached here if you have that jurisdiction. If not, maybe it's a matter for the legislature. But there should be a civil penalty to compensate people like these here who have been fraudulently billed by these companies.

And I think in the way of an additional consideration for your rule proposal here is to allow for a retroactive adjustment, because many times people like Ms. Brown's mother-in-law, you know, she was paying the bills and chucking them in the garbage

can. And God knows how much she's paid in the way of unfair charges. Allow her to get a copy of her bill and allow her to make a claim for retroactive adjustment.

Put some teeth in these rules and tell these people, these companies, a lot of them from out of state, that Florida is not the place to come and cheat the citizens. And once we get past this rulemaking procedure and get it to the legislative level, we could call it racketeering, because that's what it is. It's an organized form of fraud.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Cohen.

Any questions. Thank you for your suggestions.

witness T. BROWN: Excuse me. We're going to have to go because my daughter-in-law has young children at home, but --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am. And if you could come forward because, one, we can't hear you and, two, you need to speak into the microphone.

1

THELMA BROWN

3

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

5

WITNESS T. BROWN: I have a hard time walking, so I can't come forward. But I was going to tell you that I had -- I'm not a professional person. I'm a mother, and I'm a grandmother of 17 children.

9

10

11

12

But my husband had a small business after we retired, and we would get a call from Dun & Bradstreet once in while, and I thought that was some elite something or other that he could belong to. Well, I got a letter from Dun & Bradstreet during all this, and I found out it was a collecting agency. And my husband knew that, but he didn't tell me or anything. I thought he just -- they wanted to get him on the phone list, I guess, or something.

13 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

receipt of this letter and so forth, and we can accept 22 Visa and MasterCard and all that garbage. So I'm glad you didn't get a dun from Dun & Bradstreet. So that's part of the problem.

because I didn't pay one of the bills, because my

going to disconnect my phone in seven days from

husband told me not to, not to pay it; so they were

So I got a dun from Dun & Bradstreet, and

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much. Could you give us your name, ma'am? I know --WITNESS T. BROWN: My name is Thelma Brown, 3 and my daughter-in-law is Carolyn Brown. 4 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thelma Brown. Thank you 5 6 very much. 7 MR. BECK: Mattie Belcher. 8 MATTIE BELCHER 9 appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, 10 11 testified as follows: 12 DIRECT STATEMENT WITNESS BELCHER: Good evening. Mattie 13 Belcher, 6400 Birkhead Drive, Pensacola. 14 First of all, I would like to read a letter 15 that I wrote to the FCC dated January 3rd, 1996. 16 17 "Dear Mr. Quello, I'm Mattie Belcher, a law-abiding citizen of these United States residing in 18 Pensacola, Florida. My reason for writing this letter 19 is to ask you for your advice on a problem that we are 20 21 experiencing here in Pensacola, Florida. A number of us have chosen to become 22 independent representatives for American Communication Network who has contracted with LCI International to

acquire customers from the residential and small

business market.

2

3

8

13

14

At the time of changeover we asked that a freeze be placed on the accounts. Unfortunately, all of us are experiencing switchbacks to other long distance companies, and especially MCI. These switchbacks run for some three to four days and then we are switched back to LCI.

When I called the local BellSouth Company and complained, I was told that I had dialed an access code before dialing each of the numbers. I explained to the receptionist that these were all family phone numbers that I call all the time. Moreover, I told her that I did not even know the access code.

When I asked what the access code was, I was told to call MCI. I called MCI and explained my problem. I was told that I was not a customer of MCI, that I had been disconnected as of November 9, 1995. 18 Again, I was told that I had used an access code to dial each of the numbers listed. Again I explained that I did not know the access code, so how could I have used the access number.

I was then told that if I did not dial the access code, the switchback occurred in the local office here in Pensacola. My switchback occurred on December, 9, 10 and 11, 1995. This has come to be a

20

21

22

widespread matter here -- I'm sorry.

*This has come to be a widespread matter where people are changing to LCI as their long distance carrier.

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Mattie Belcher."

The bill that I had at the time that I wrote the letter was for a total of \$18.14 that MCI had sent me, and I had already -- well, supposedly, to have been switched.

Then for February 7th, I have a bill from MCI for \$31.89. And then for -- let me see. This one is dated February 7, bill period date February 7th, 1996. This one is bill date February 4th, 1996, and it is for \$83.90.

I called BellSouth and I talked with -- and I do not have the names. I'm sorry. I did not write down the names. But I talked with a receptionist, and she promised to correct the one for the \$83.90 within four days, but it was not corrected. So I called again, and -- well, I called MCI, and then MCI got on the phone with the local representative in BellSouth, and they resolved the matter. So I did not pay the \$83.90. But I think it's unfair to us as consumers for these companies to take advantage of us.

1 Now, I had a PIC freeze put on my bill, and according to the rules, no one should have been able to switch my long distance unless I gave them permission. I gave no one permission to change my long distance carrier. 5 So as the previous speakers have said, there 6 should be some kind of stiff penalty -- I work in the 7 school system. If a student forges a teacher's name, 8 they get sent home for three days. And if we're going to do the student like that, why don't we do these 10 companies worse? 11 To me, we're sending two different messages. 12 We're saying, no, students, you can't do this, but here we are grown and we're doing worse. So I think there should be some kind of penalty. And one of the things I feel like that if 16 you -- if a customer has been switched without his or 17 her permission, they shouldn't have to pay the bill. 18 Thank you. 19 MR. BECK: Thank you very much. 20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Bircher -- is it 21 Ms. Bircher? 22 WITNESS BELCHER: Belcher. 23 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Belcher, I know you 24

stated that -- you said the \$83.90, that you did not

1	have to pay that?
2	WITHESS BELCHER: No, I didn't pay it.
3	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: But the other ones the
4	first one was \$18.14?
5	WITHESS BELCHER: Uh-huh. I they gave me
6	credit, the difference between LCI and MCI. I got the
7	difference there.
8	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And you said you wrote
9	that letter to the FCC. Did you get a response back
LO	from them?
11	WITNESS BELCHER: Yes, I did, but I couldn't
12	find my letter.
13	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.
14	WITNESS BELCHER: It was an informal
1.5	complaint. That's what they wrote back and told me.
16	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: How did you know to
L7	contact the FCC? And then I'll give you a background
18	as to why I'm asking that. Because I know that a lot
19	of customers are contacting the FCC, and they aren't
20	aware of the Florida Public Service Commission.
21	WITHESS BELCHER: That was my problem. I
22	knew about the FCC.
23	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Was that in a phone bill,
24	or is there

WITNESS BELCHER: What? The FCC?

1

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

2

WITHESS BELCHER: No. I'm a librarian. You know, I just knew that.

3

5

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Because that is one of the issues that we're trying to address to help particularly Floridians to know that we do have a state regulator that can assist.

7 8

when she got one of the responses from the FCC, is that if she wanted to initiate something formal, it would cost money. And that oftentimes deters customers from pursuing things further. So we're also looking for ways and we ourselves trying to make sure that customers do know that we're there and we're

And as one of the ladies testified earlier

13

11

12

available to try to help resolve some of the issues.

15

But it looks like you were doing a pretty good job in working through this. But we are here to help.

17

Thank you for testifying.

18

WITNESS BELCHER: Thank you.

20

MR. BECK: Chairman Johnson, that completes the people that have signed up.

21

22

CEATRMAN JOHNSON: Are there any customers here that did not sign up but that would like to

23

present any testimony or any comments? Seeing none,

24

Staff are there any conclusion matters?

ws. CALDWELL: I would just like to fill everyone in on the final process or where the Commission will be going from this point.

Rulemaking is governed by Section 120.54,

Florida Statutes. This section prescribes a process
by which the agency may adopt rules, and that's the

process that we're going through right now. This

process includes these workshops, a proposal phase, a

comment and hearing phase, and then the rule adoption.

Workshops are going to be held in addition to the one here in Pensacola. We will be holding them in Tallahassee, Miami, Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach. We have a total of ten sites.

The last public workshop will conclude on November the 20th, 1997 in Jacksonville. From there we plan to propose a rule at the Commission's agenda conference on December the 16th. The end of the comment period after that we except to be approximately January the 23rd of 1998.

A hearing will be held before the full Commission where evidence is presented. Sworn testimony and cross-examination will be made on February 6th of 1998. The Commission will then have another agenda conference to adopt rules on approximately April the 7th, '98, and we hope the

rules to become effective in May of 1998. 1 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. I'd like to 2 thank all of you for coming out today. Again, this is 3 a process that it will be a part of our formal hearing. Your testimony is testimony that we can use 5 when we decide how we craft this rule and, indeed, what we will actually vote out of the Commission. 7 8 Thank you very much. And you have our 1-800 number if there are any other issues. Because not only do we regulate telecommunications, but we 10 regulate electric and gas and then water and 11 12 wastewater. 13 And one other note. Counsel gave you the 14 dates that we will be holding these hearings. They're going to all be broadcast over the Internet. So if 15 you'd like to listen in to some of the other testimony 17 from customers throughout the state, that, too, will be available. 18 19 Thank you for your participation. This hearing is adjourned. 21 (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 8:20 22 p.m.)

PLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

23

24

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON 2 I, H. RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR Official 3 Commission Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Workshop in Docket No. 970882-TI was heard by the Florida Public 5 Service Commission at the time and place herein stated; it is further 6 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this 8 transcript, consisting of 82 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 9 DATED this 13th day of October, 1997. 10 11 12 H. RUTHE POTAMI, BS, CSR, RPR 13 Official Commission Reporter (904) 413-6732 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24