DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

BEFORE THE 1 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 3 In the Matter of DOCKET NO. 970882-TI 4 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. 11 PROCEEDINGS: RULE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP 12 TALLAHASSEE 13 CHAIRMAN JULIA L. JOHNSON BEFORE: 14 COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON 15 COMMISSIONER JOE GARCIA Monday, October 20, 1997 DATE: 16 17 TIME: Commenced at 6:40 p.m. 18 Concluded at 8:37 p.m. 19 Betty Easley Conference Center PLACE: 20 Hearing Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way 21 Tallahassee, Florida 22 JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR REPORTED BY: 23 Chief, Bureau of Reporting Official Commission Reporter 24

25

1	IN "TTENDANCE:
2	DIAMA CALDWELL, FPSC Division of Appeals.
3	JACK SHREVE and CHARLIE BECK, Office of
4	Public Counsel.
5	MICHAEL GROSS, Office of the Attorney General.
6	RICK MOSES, FPSC Division of Communications.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	INDEX	
2	MISCELLAMEOUS	
3	ITEM	PAGE NO.
4	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	85
5	VITMESSES	
6		
7	MAKE	PAGE NO.
8	DONALD R. FROST	
°	Direct Statement	12
9	Examination By Mr. Gross	26
10	EUGENE DANAHER	
11	Direct Statement	28
12	MICHAEL KENNEDY	
13	Direct Statement	38
14	EMILY KENNEDY	
15	Direct Statement	45
16	MARGARET GORDY	
17	Direct Statement	50
18	JAMES C. WILSON, JR.	
19	Direct Statement	58
20	ROBERT C. FLINT	
21	Direct Statement	65
22	BENJAMIN OCHSHORN	
23	Direct Statement	70
24	CHRIS SANDS	
25	Direct Statement	78

PROCEEDINGS

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

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to call the hearing to order.

MS. CALDWELL: Yes. Pursuant to the notices, under Section 120.54, Florida Statutes, the Florida Public Service Commission will hold a rule development workshop at this time and place to consider amendments to rules relating to customer preference for local toll and toll provider.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We'll take appearances.

Public Counsel.

Office of Public Counsel, representing the Citizens of the State of Florida, Claude Pepper Building,
Tallahassee, Florida.

MR. GROSS: Michael Gross, Assistant
Attorney General, on behalf of the Florida Attorney
General's office.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I understand that there are members of the industry that are in the audience that will not be making formal appearances but are here to listen and to participate through listening to the process.

I did want to make one announcement, that
the proceeding tonight is being transmitted via the
Internet through the PSC's home page. I apologize for
our starting a little late, but we were having a few
technical problems and wanted to make sure that the
system was set up so that customers and interested
persons across the state could participate or at least
listen in to the testimony that's being presented
tonight via the Internet.

My name is Julia Johnson. I'm the Chairperson for the Florida Public Service Commission, and I'll be chairing this proceeding this evening. To my right is Commissioner Terry Deason, and to my left is Commissioner Joe Garcia.

We're here tonight to really hear from you;
Your suggestions, your concerns and your complaints as
it relates to slamming.

As many of you are aware, slamming is when a company changes your service in an unauthorized manner when you do not, indeed, want your service changed, but through no fault or authorization of your own your service is somehow changed.

It has been a major problem for the Commission, and we have rules that are designed to address the slamming problem. Certainly, despite our

rules, the problem continues to persist and we are now in the process of revising our rules and are looking at more stringent actions to take to see if we can help alleviate this problem. Public Counsel and the Attorney General, they are involved in this case and they will be providing testimony, suggestions. They, too, want to hear from you and they, too, are interested in us crafting our rules in such a way that we can provide the maximum protection to you.

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

Outside, if you had the opportunity or if you haven't, we still have our materials set up outside. But there are a couple of suggestions that we have and some information on what we've done thus far to date in terms of fining companies, in terms of helping customers get monies back when their service has been changed without their permission. And, indeed, we also have -- because one of the things we often hear from customers is that they don't like those calls that they get from telemarketers when they are at home, coming from work, sitting down for dinner, so we have some brochures and some materials that relate to how you can stop telemarketers from calling, and that's part of the Department of Agriculture's no solicitation program. And there are other suggestions and ideas of how we can better

guard against this problem. But our main issue tonight is to hear from you and to hear your issues and your concerns as to how we can better address this slamming problem.

Now, at the appropriate time I'd like for you to all stand, and we'll do it as a group, and I'll swear you in before you testify.

The reason we do that is so that your testimony can be a part of the official record that we can use and rely upon when we make our final determination.

For those of you who would not like to testify orally here tonight but would like to provide us with some comments, we have on our special report that was also available at the front table a customer comment section. So if you'd just like to fill that out and provide your comments to us in writing, we'll also accept those.

Additionally, we've established through our web site a process whereby you can file any complaint that you might have as it relates to slamming, and if you have access to a computer, through that process.

We, here at the Commission, are committed to hearing your suggestions, responding to those and assisting in any way possible. so with that, I have a Staff member here who will provide you with a summary of the rules that are currently being proposed. I know that at our last hearing we got a lot of comments on our proposed rules and even ways in which we can improve upon those. So I'd like to allow Staff the opportunity to present to you briefly the proposed rules.

with the Staff of the Commission. Today consumers can choose a different telephone company to provide their local telephone service, their local toll service, which is sometimes intraLATA service, both of which at one time could only be provided by the local telephone company. However, that has changed and there is competition for these services, and also your long distance service.

By being required to choose between competing service providers, sometimes with very little knowledge, many unsuspecting consumers are vulnerable to being taken advantage of. Many consumers have reported having their phone service switched without their authorization. This practice is called slamming, and it is the single most common complaint received by the Public Service Commission over the last several years.

The Public Service Commission has fined companies, revoked operating certificates, negotiated settlements and required refunds. But as competition builds these actions become less efficient, and the Public Service Commission is proposing to amend its rules to make companies more accountable.

Their proposed amendments will do the following for you: First, they apply to all companies providing local telephone service, local toll service or long distance service. It requires these companies to be certificated by this Commission prior to operating. It requires information to be printed on the bill. That information includes the name of the company, the type of service provided, and a toll free service number for each provider. You may see up to three providers on your bills now where you usually have been used to seeing two, one for your local service and one for long distance service. The third one is going to be added, and that's going to be your intraLATA.

The rules will also require the consumer's authorization and limit the ways in which a preferred company may be changed. The change may only be made if the company has a signed letter of agency that contains sufficient information to verify that the

consumer is authorizing the change. The company has received a consumer-initiated call, has obtained the consumer's consent and has recorded the consent and has recorded the number to be changed. Or an independent, unaffiliated firm has verified the consumer's request or that the company has received a consumer's change request and responds by mailing an information package, which explains the changes, verifies the information and requires a signed statement acknowledging the change. That differs from the current rule; whereas, you may receive a postcard in the mail, and if you fail to send that back within 14 days your service gets change. This is just the opposite. It requires a positive motion on your part before it will get changed.

Furthermore, a company may not combine the letter of agency with any inducement on the same document. Some of you may have received AT&T checks, inducements. By signing on the back it says that your service will be changed. They may be offering you \$60, \$100. Some companies are offering sky mileage and things of that nature. That will no longer be allowed under the proposed rules.

When a copy is solicited in writing or by telephone the inducement may not be misleading or

deceptive in any manner.

If a person is slammed, charges for the change and all charges billed on behalf of the unauthorized provider for the first 90 days must be credited to the consumer. So if you've been slammed and you've used the telephone up to 90 days, you're not going to be out anything as long as you notify the companies.

Upon notification by the consumer, the consumer must be switched back to his or her original provider or the provider of his or her choice. And that concludes the summary of the rules.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Again, if you have any questions, when you come forward, we will -- either Staff or the Commissioners or any of the individuals present here with the Staff will provide you with any answers to your questions.

So with that, if you're here to testify, if you could stand and raise your right hand.

Thank you. You may be seated.

(Witnesses sworn collectively.)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Public Counsel, you can call your first witness.

MR. SEREVE: Thank you. Mr. Donald Frost. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Sir, if you could state your name and address before you begin to provide comments, that will be helpful and help us have a complete record. Thank you.

DOMALD R. PROST, SR.

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITHESS FROST: My name is Donald Russell

Prost, Sr., 101 Orsen Drive, DeFuniak Springs, Walton

County, Florida. I first would like to thank the

Commission for calling this meeting. I wish to

especially say thank you to Mr. Kenya Tompkins who

handled my first complaint. I would like to thank

Earl Poucher for the information and directions of how

to get here from DeFuniak Springs to this hearing.

And my concern, I believe this hearing is long overdue. Because my incident was in 1995. It caused me a lot of inconvenience -- recovering from health problems, a major heart surgery, and a lot of denials by MCI, after 31 phone calls to them and being constantly switched from person to person to person, out in Denver, out in St. Louis, New York, you name the state. I was switched. Constantly refusing to identify themselves -- there's nothing more

aggravating to any individual when he calls with a complaint to any business is when the clerks, supervisors and the directors of those companies refuse to identify themselves -- including refusing to give me the name of the president of MCI and his address. That is totally wrong.

When my service was switched I would not have known it if I hadn't have read my phone bill from Centel completely. I called Centel and asked them why it said that my long distance carrier was MCI when I had had WorldCom for nearly 20 years? And they said they didn't know.

I called MCI. MCI said, "Well, we have a letter of authorization." I said, "I would like a copy of that letter of authorization. I would like to send it to the state of Florida's Attorney General's office, and I would like it sent to our Public Commission -- Service Commission." The young lady out in Oklahoma City said, "Yes, we have that copy and we will send it to you." I waited a few days; no letter. I thought it was reasonable after seven days to call back. When I called back she said, "We sent it to our public relations office. I said, "Fine. Will you switch me to public relations?" They switched me to public relations in Missouri. I asked public

relations in Missouri did they have a copy of the letter I had requested. "No, sir, we have not received it." I said, "Do you have the name and address of the individual that said I switched?" They said, no. They could not give that to me.

The individual that caused all of this problem for me lived in Sampson, Alabama, and her last night was Fink, and I think Sara was her first name. I asked them if she was an employee of the company. "We cannot identify that for you." And I says, "Why can't you? She switched my service. She's the one that sent you the paperwork. I have a right to know it." And this went on and on and on from 9:27 to well past 11:07.

misleading it was unbelievable. They tried to put the blame on Centel. That Centel made the error. And I had said to the woman at that time, a Mrs. Susan Delafield (phonetic), "If your personnel told me that the letter of authorization was sent to your division by Susan Fink of Sampson, Alabama, then how could you blame Centel?" I gave a copy of that letter to Centel, because I felt that they needed to see how they were being blamed for certain things.

I wanted my long distance service back,

because I could not make any long distance service calls. Because of the problems, they didn't switch it right. They didn't put the proper codes in. I finally got hold of WorldCom. WorldCom very graciously gave me the codes to give to Centel to put me back into the proper service. The code that Centel was using at that time was not putting me in my proper service.

Going through the health problems that I was going through, my family in Connecticut and Massachusetts were unable to contact me which gave them a problem. Was I back in for heart surgery? Was I back in for something else? No contact, no way to get ahold of me. And that makes it unfair to any customer.

I do have few suggestions that I'd like to give to the Commission. Number one, all telephone companies, local companies have a contract that you sign on the date requesting service, and on that form the name of your long distance carrier. That no long distance carrier, none, be permitted to switch a service for 30 days to which they must send the local service department a copy of your signed request, no verbals. Failure to do so, long distance companies should pay a fine of \$500 and a penalty of \$500 to the

customer that was switched without his or her authorization.

A lot of phone companies are now taking the position that somebody else did it. You wait for authorization of return. I have now been waiting six months for a credit that was issued in June that I have not received.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you what's the worst one: 900 numbers. I just got hit with \$485 worth of 900 number charges on my phone. I thanked AT&T for what they did for me. Because I am on Social Security. They removed the charges. But I also was informed that at any time the 900 company can take me to court to collect that money, even though I did not make the calls.

There's got to be a rule set up by the Commission to forbid the charges being charged to a person's phone without his or her authorization.

Because folks on Social Security -- ladies and gentlemen, we're not going to be able to afford these \$500, \$600 phone bills. We just cannot afford to be hit that way.

Most long distance companies do not give you the name of a service rep. Local companies, long

1 distance companies, the customer should have the name of that representative that would handle his or her problems. It's very important. You can feel comfortable talking to the same person all the time and not be run around and around and around.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think the Commission should also set a rule that anytime a customer requests the name of a supervisor, a director of a division of operations, or the name and address of the president of those companies, they should be furnished to us with no hesitation. Because that is important for us to write letters and we can't do it without that information. And I thank you all for this opportunity to be able to talk.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Mr. Frost, there may be some questions for you.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Frost, I wanted to ask you, these problems that you had, did you contact the Commission at any point or was it Mr. Poucher who directed you to the Commission later on?

WITNESS FROST: No, I had contacted.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Frost, it might be easier if you press the button until the light is not on and then remove your hand. When the light is off, you're on and you can let go.

withes FROST: I contacted Kenya Tompkins on 9-27. Very nice gentlemen. I understood he was a part-time worker for the Commission, so there was only certain times of the day that I could talk to him. I contacted Mr. Poucher this morning so I would know how to drive from DeFuniak Springs to here. This is my first time I have ever been in the city of Tallahassee.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Welcome.

withess FROST: I'm thankful he gave me the road instructions of how to get here.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Frost, you mentioned that you're due a credit and a credit should have been issued. I guess you have been waiting about six months for a credit. Who owes you that particular credit or that money?

Sprint. These were charges on my phone. I had two credits coming. To give you an example, I received my bill yesterday — correction, Saturday. And their charge, they put it in my bill that I have \$10.25 credit, and then they don't deduct it from my bill, but I'm charged a 50 cent late charge.

I talked to both parties concerning transferring this. This was another illegal

me on a Voice Mailbox. From what I understand, they have no lines that they can authorize -- operate in the Panhandle. But I'm being billed \$10 and something a month for something I didn't ask for and something I don't need. I can go to the phone company and get it for a lot less than that.

But it's taken Sprint all of these months to get that corrected. And all of the time they just keep adding charges.

favor? Before you leave, speak with Bev DeMello who is right there, and she'll get your information, and we'll open a file and make sure you get that resolved because I think they'll be a little bit more responsive if you can get the Commission involved.

WITHESS FROST: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let me ask you about the 900 charges. How did those appear on your bill?

withess frost: I had let a young person -we rented out a room to him. He worked late nights.

I'm an individual who happens to be in bed usually by

9:30 at the latest. These calls were made at
midnight, one, two o'clock in the morning.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And the company just

1 || gave you credit for it because it was --

WITHESS FROST: No, the company didn't; AT&T did.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Because they were charged to your bill through AT&T?

WITHESS FROST: Without any authorization.
COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

WITHESS FROST: Now, you're talking about automatic sales calls coming in.

us of \$10 for the initial and \$5 per year thereafter. I don't believe that's correct. I don't think it's right. We should not be charged for something like that. When I had a private line unlisted, nonpublished, my telephone number was given to sales companies. That's not right. And then to take around and charge us for not putting our names in the phone books. Those aren't right. Our contract today with the phone companies is not customer-friendly. They are out for the bottom line profit and 900 numbers should be banned across this whole country. That is the highest racketeering there is by use of the phone companies, and it should be banned state by state until it is done away with.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Frost.

Any other questions?

questions. Mr. Frost, you indicated there was a time when you were unable to receive long distance calls.

witness FROST: When I called about my number being switched, they said they would get me switched back. It was cut off, so I was a week without service.

understanding that during that week you could not receive long distance.

WITHESS FROST: I could not receive long distance calls from out of the state because I had no long distance service.

you -- did they try to call you and could not complete the call?

withess frost: My brother in Connecticut,
my sister in Massachusetts could not contact me. They
didn't know what had happened. They figured I was
back in for another heart operation. And finally I
got through. But they were told both by the telephone
companies in Connecticut and Massachusetts that I did
not have a long distance service.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Commissioner Garcia

has asked you to meet with our Staff about some other matters. I'm going to request that you have them or I directly request Staff to investigate that. That seems to be a very unusual situation for calls not to be able to be completed. It was my understanding that if the individual has a working local number that he should be able to receive long distance calls from person's originating those, unless they are collect calls, that may be a problem. But if they are dialed direct, I've never heard of that situation being encountered with a slamming problem. If you have some information on it generically, if you could share it with us, I'd appreciate it.

MR. MOSES: Well, your understanding is correct. You can have no access to toll services and still receive a long distance call because it's the originating number that has the toll service that is reaching you, and it may be a different carrier than the one you're presubscribed to, which is normal. Evidently -- was it a collect call, sir?

MR. GROSS: No. Let me explain to you.

WorldCom probably has four, maybe five codes. These codes are set up to give you to the service that you are in. If somebody puts the wrong code in like they did on my phone, then I have no

service. Because they have switched me to something that becomes deadlocked. That's why when I contacted WorldCom and asked for their supervisor of maintenance, he looked up into the computer and found out that the wrong codes had been entered for my particular service. The WorldCom has more than one service throughout the areas. And when he gave it to me, I contacted Centel's night supervisor of maintenance. He went in to their computer network, put the code in that was begin to me. It brought me back up to service. I was putting on a service line by code that didn't service DeFuniak Springs/Walton county and that area. It served itself and that's why I had no service.

information from you on that, because that should not have happened technically. Because whether or not you have service on the same carrier, it does not matter. I could call you from my house. I may have AT&T, MCI or what. It doesn't matter what carrier you have, I should be able to complete a call to you by my carrier. If anyone makes a long distance call to you it's carried by the call -- excuse me -- carried by the carrier of their choice, not the one you were presubscribed to. So let me get some more information

from you before you leave.

most unusual situation, and that's why I'm going to ask Staff to look into it a little bit further.

And the other question I have pertains to your suggestion that there be a \$500 fine paid to the state and then another \$500 fine paid to the victim?

WITHESS FROST: That's correct.

suggestion was made at the hearing that we had in Pensacola not too long ago, and I'm going to ask our legal Staff to look into the rule question of whether we have the legal authority to impose a fine that is paid to the customer. I know we have the authority to impose a fine that is paid to the state, but perhaps it's entirely different matter to have a fine paid to a customer. Since we are getting these suggestions and since we've — this is the second hearing we've had, and we've had this same suggestion in both hearings. I anticipate we'll receive similar suggestions throughout the state. I think we need to investigate the legality of that possibility.

withess FROST: The other thing that also needs to be done is not to allow any phone company to go to malls, parades, fairs, carnivals and have people sign paperwork not realizing that was an authorization slip for service. They don't explain it to you.

Ladies and gentlemen, this happened to me down in Homestead, Florida, right after the hurricane.

Believe me we needed phone service. We needed it bad. And this was supposed to have been a little temporary deal where we could go to a phone outside the area and give them a code, we'd get a free phone call. It never happened. It was a switching of service.

proposed rule addresses that very specific situation.

And we're hopeful that with the language that is being proposed, if it is finally adopted, that, hopefully, we will, if not prevent, curtail such activities because we're very concerned about that type of activity as well.

withes FROST: There have been things that the phone companies have done that I assume that you are all aware of. During the hurricane or shortly after the hurricane, if it had not been for the phone companies that brought in these field-type phones and gave us a temporary service, relatives of ours across the country would not have known who was still alive in Homestead. We do -- we're very thankful for that. But there is greed in the phone company services. And

their bottom line is to build a profit, not take care of the customer. Build the profit. And that has got to come to a halt. They've got to take care of the customer. Without the customer there is no phone company.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much,

Mr. Frost, for your testimony and for your

suggestions. Again, there is a Staff person that is

waiting there for you to help you with some of your

still existing concerns and complaints. Thank you

again for your testimony.

WITHESS FROST: I thank you for my time.

MR. GROSS: Excuse me, Madam Chairperson, I
have a question for Mr. Frost.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Certainly, Mr. Gross.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. GROSS:

Q Mr. Frost, you had mentioned that there was an unauthorized billing for a mailbox -- a Voice Mailbox service from a Texas company. Do you recall the name of that company?

A Trans -- offhand, I'm going to say it was
Transmittal Service Company. I can call your office
if you would like me to. I have the file on all of my
problems in the latter six months. I left those at

1	the house because those concerned a local matter and
2	not a slamming matter. I didn't bring those with me.
3	Q I'd appreciate that, if you could follow up
4	on that.
5	I also have a another question about one of
6	your suggestions that there be a 30-day freeze
7	documented in writing at the time a person obtains
8	local telephone service, that there would be a freeze
9	on the long distance service. Did I understand you
10	correctly?
11	A When a party signs up for his phone service,
12	any switching of service, any long distance service,
13	the contract must be mailed back and it must be a hold
14	of 30 days so that the customer can verify with the
15	local company, yes, this is true.
16	Q Okay. I understand.
17	A I'm sorry.
18	Q I misunderstood you. I apologize. I now
19	thank you for the clarification.
20	WITNESS FROST: Your welcome.
21	MR. GROSS: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any further questions for
23	Mr. Frost?
24	MR. SHREVE: Thank you, Mr. Frost.
25	WITHESS PROST: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOENSON: Mr. Danaher.

2

1

EUGENE DANAHER

3

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

5

DIRECT STATEMENT

6

WITHESS DANAHER: My name is Eugene Danaher, Route 3 box 249, Tallahassee 32308.

7

Before I get into my -- meat of my

8

discussion, I'd like to make two housekeeping

suggestions for changes. And they sounded

10

suggestions if I may.

First, we heard from counsel some specific

11

interesting, but I had a hard time keeping notes. It

13

would seem to me it would be very germane to make

15

those suggestions, even though they are in a

16

preliminary state, available to everybody in here so

17

that we know what the current status of thinking is.

18

I think that would be very customer friendly.

what is being proposed, if that's possible.

19

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Danaher, a summary of that is attached to the --

20

WITHESS DAMAHER: I'd like to get the exact words that this gentlemen spoke over here so I know

23

22

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Very well. Certainly.

24

25 WITHESS DAMAHER: Could we have those before

we leave?

MS. CALDWELL: I think he read them directly off of the sheet.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I'm sorry.

following the green sheet. As I was following along, he pretty much read it word for word or very closely, anyway.

MS. CALDWELL: Mr. Danaher, we also have copies of the proposed rules back here, and I think Mr. Durbin is bringing you a copy right now.

WITHESS DANAHER: Fine. Thank you. I appreciate that. Do these encompass what you said?

MR. MOSES: Yes, sir, they do.

WITHESS DANAHER: Oh, very good. I didn't see those.

MR. MOSES: The only thing I really changed in the wording from the sheet that you have got is that I just interjected the word "intraLATA" where it says local toll. The word "intraLATA" is also used in the rules, so that's where you'll see it.

The second comment is -- and I want to compliment the Chair for explaining why this meeting didn't start on time. I think it was a very legitimate concern.

I've attended a lot of meetings at the city, county, state, PSC, civic center authority. Rarely does a public meeting start on time. I just attended a city Commission meeting last Wednesday, it was 22 minutes late, they took a five-minute recess and spent 17 minutes on the recess.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'll have you know the Chairman is very punctual.

WITHESS DANAHER: Very good. I would like to compliment her for --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Certain of the Commissioners are running late every once in a while, but the Chairman is on time.

WITHESS DAMAHER: All right.

may remember, I think some of you were on the dias when I was here. Susan Clark, I believe, was the chairperson. Two or three years ago I was so concerned about this matter that I came before the Commission without any proper -- or prior approval and Ms. Clark slipped me on the agenda, and I pontificated on my concerns about slamming. And I said, "I think it's something that is out of control, and if we don't do something it's going to get worse." And I think everybody was very courteous and listened to me but

with all due candor, I think that's what has happened.

Really not too much has been done both nationally and within the state and this problem has gotten worse. The Wall Street Journal has done a marvelous job of documenting what's going on, and they said in 1995 we had virtually no problems with slamming but that was before we went into massive deregulation. And by 1995 with hundreds of tiny wholesalers scrambling to sign up phone customers, slamming became the most frequent large grievance at the FCC. Then it went on and on locally as here.

And one of the things, and I think it ties in with this previous gentleman's comments, is that in this article that I have out of the Wall Street

Journal, the thing that appalls me is the arrogance of these slammers in saying that the consumers are at fault. Shannon McManners (ph) of EqualNet Investor's relation staff, said consumers may be at fault. In a written statement she said the FCC's scorecard highlights a growing concern among many companies in the reselling industry. The lack of understanding among consumers as to the difference between long distance sellers, resellers, such as EqualNet, and bigger, more well known carriers.

The FCC properly took her to task for that.

But I don't think the customers are at fault.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

25

I have tracked since I appeared before you, and even before I was tracking, the total number of complaints that you get on electrical operations or complaints and the number of complaints that are related to slamming. And I think it's a very interesting trend. In 1991 you got 294 slamming complaints which was 33% of the total complaints, electrical -- or telephone complaints received that year. In '92 you had 318 which was 40%. Not the trend? '93, I couldn't find the data, it was there but I apparently set it aside. '94 we had 1,049 slamming complaints in the state of Florida with your Commission; 57%. In 1995 we had 2,316; 70%. Last year we had 2,393. And I haven't been able to get the total number of complaints, but I respectfully suggest it's probably closer to 75 or 78% of the total number of complaints. So the trend is inexorably going up. I think part of that may be because the total complaints are going down. But the slamming complaints in relation to the total number of complaints in the state of Florida is going up.

So I think it's obvious to anybody that this is a situation that's out of control. And I only think we're seeing the tip of the iceberg here.

I have two neighbors. I told them I was coming down here, and they said, "Well, gosh, I have been slammed." And I said, "Well, did you file a complaint?" "No." I think, you know, if you really knew how many complaints there were out there, I think you would be -- your mind would be boggled. This is just the tip of the iceberg.

I'd like to talk a little bit about this special report you have passed out. I'm baffled by it. You list the top ten slamming offenders. Phone Calls, Incorporated. This is for the 31-month period ending in July, 1997, 476. So then I look down below, "Fine, Settlements, Agreements for Slamming," and I see we're going to assign \$860,000 penalty, but it's only proposed. So this thing has been going on for months and we haven't even got a fine in place. We're just talking about it. Heartline Communications, 290 complaints. We fined them \$50,000. They have been fined, I presumed. AT&T, 280 complaints. They have

I guess the point I'm making is that it seems to me that we're a little slow in assessing fines. You have an abundance of evidence here, apparently, in your own documentation. And I don't understand the disparity between Phone Calls,

Incorporated's proposed fine of \$860,000 and Heartline Communications', a modest, meager \$50,000. Now, what did Phone Calls do that was so bad, or what did Heartline Communication do that's so good that there should be such a tremendous disparity? It seems to me there ought to be some correlation between the number of offenses and the fines that are assessed. And those fines should be assessed in a timely manner.

2

3

7

9

10

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

My last comment is -- and I want to commend you for taking these public hearings. I know it takes a lot of time for all of you, but I think it's excellent. But I have an observation to make. I looked at the schedule here, and this is the second hearing and you're going to have your last hearing in Jacksonville on 11-20-97. But the thing that baffles me is that you're not going to really move into doing anything about it -- if I can get my notes here, wherever it is. Apparently I've set them aside. Oh, here it is. The last hearing is on 11-20. Then you're going to have a formal hearing on February the 6th, 1998. Then the Staff is scheduled to make a recommendation to the Commission on March 26th, 1998, and then the Commission is scheduled to vote on this matter on April the 17th, 1998, five months after the last hearing. I don't think this is -- impresses me

as a citizen that you're really giving this a fast-track approach. Five months? This is glacier speed. It seems to me you could short track this considerably.

Wou're getting these excellent comments from me and everybody else, for whatever they are worth.

Certainly, you can be developing drafts of your proposed rulemaking as you go along. Why do we have to give the Staff such luxurious time periods to come up with final decisions? I don't think this is a situation that should be handled in a "business as usual." This is an important, serious public concern. It's customer unfriendly, as this previous gentleman pointed out. I sympathize with the problems he's had, far in excess of any I have had. But to take five months after the last hearing before you people sit up there and vote on something. I'm not impressed.

I thank you for the time to speak with you.

I'll take any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Danaher.

Questions for Mr. Danaher?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Perhaps it would be useful for Staff to address the time schedule involved in this proceeding, because I know that there are a number of steps that we have to go through to

effectuate rulemaking consistent with procedures and law. And maybe you could educate us a little bit on that process.

MB. CALDWELL: That's correct, Chairman. We are following the newly passed 1996 Florida

Administrative Procedures Act on the rulemaking. It's chapter 120.54, Florida Statutes, and it requires us to hold these rule development workshops when they have been requested. So we have to go through that process.

We plan to -- the Commission first has to propose a rule, then we have to give a certain amount of time for comments. Then once those comments are received, we then have a public hearing. We're then having a rule hearing, which is February the 6th.

Parties, through our process, rulemaking process, are then given the opportunity to file briefs.

and finally make the changes to the rules, based upon the record that's been made during this process. We also have to work within the constraints of the time that the Commissioners can meet. They generally meet every other Tuesday of the month. And Staff has to file its recommendation ten days prior to when they meet.

Staff, in fact, has very little time in between to be doing all of the analysis that we need to do to make sure that we have a rule that is going to be the most effective. And we're hoping to file the -- take the rules on April 7th to the agenda conference and, hopefully, they will become effective approximately 20 days after that. So we're going as fast as we can within the constraints of the law that has been put upon agencies with the new APA act.

Janet Reno announced today that she's fining Microsoft a million dollars a day for failure to comply with their consent agreement. She seems to move with some speed. I appreciate it's a different situation. I just respectfully suggest as a citizen sitting here this sounds to me like a lot of bureaucratic gobbledygook. And it seems to me you people could do a little more effort under the Chair's direction -- I don't want you to violate any laws -- and just try to get the job done a little quicker.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Danaher.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you, Mr. Danaher.

Mr. Michael Kennedy.

MICHAEL KENNEDY

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITHESS M. RENNEY: Michael Kennedy. I'm the president of North Bay Electronics in Panama City, Florida, and the address is 3309, Frankfort Avenue, Panama City, Florida, 32405.

hearings. From what I've heard of the proposed changes, I think it will take care of the problems I have had. I got slammed a couple of times at my business. The first time was relatively uneventful in early 1995, where a reseller had called in and told one of our girls they were going to get a discount on the phone service. And inadvertently she gave them our numbers that were with AT&T. And our phone got switched. It was relatively easy to get them switched back. And I think I'm a little bit nervous here.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: That's fine.

WITHESS M. KENNEY: Let me take a breath here for a second.

The second incident was -- took a little longer to resolve. And it was -- it involved AT&T and this Discount Network Services, which you've listed in

1 your slamming activity report here. That second incident took about a year and three months to finally get resolved. We had originally had a contract with ATET for long distance services for about a three-year period. And within about six months of that contract expiring, we switched three of the four lines we had at the facility. We left the main line with AT&T, because our contract required that. And within several weeks we were converted back to this Discount Network Services. We did not know how that took place, and we never did get to the bottom of how that change took place.

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On pursuing who Discount Network Services was, we learned that they were within AT&T. The number to contact them was the same number that appeared on our original AT&T contract. AT&T claims that they are just a network reseller, but to contact them you call the main AT&T number.

When we got switched our phone rates went double. We were several months getting that resolved back to what we had been paying in getting our phone line switched back to go with the carrier we preferred to be using. When our contract expired with AT&T, we terminated our service and went with our preferred carrier. We subsequently received a bill with no

backup, said they just reviewed our record and we owed them another \$500-and-something, and that if we didn't pay within a reasonable period of time they would turn it over to a collection agency. And we received a notice from a collection agency within two weeks. We contacted both the AT&T and the collection agencies and told them we didn't have any backup as to what this was for, and wanted an explanation. And all we got was continuing letters from the collection agency. We had to finally contact the FCC in order to get it resolved and it eventually was resolved.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let me ask you about the FCC here. How good were they in terms of dealing with you? Because I've always heard complaints at the FCC, which is one --

I first called our local telephone company here and asked them what to do, and they were the ones who told me. I wrote them letters and they responded they would look into the matter. And other than taking some time, every time I did send them a letter things got resolved. So other than the normal time frames it takes to resolve something, it was a positive experience.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Sorry for interrupting

you, Mr. Kennedy.

withess M. KHMMEY: That's fine. I don't want to take up a whole bunch more of your time. I brought copies of the letter that went back and forth to AT&T, to the FCC, and just for your view, I believe, again, what you're doing is going to resolve the kind of problem I had.

one other comment I might have is that AT&T in their response to the FCC just claimed that this Discount Network Services was just a reseller and wasn't something that they were participating in. But to contact Discount Network Services all you have to do is call AT&T. So I don't know. I'm sure they've legally separated the entities but somehow there's a relationship. And that's all the testimony I really have.

commissioner GARCIA: If I'm not mistaken, in our rule presently the company can't bill for someone who is not certificated in the state, correct?

MR. MOSES: No, sir. In the rule right now it requires them to put the language in their tariff that they must have a certificate prior to operating in Florida.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I thought we had worked on that, that a company cannot bill for -- for

example, AT&T could not bill for Network Services unless Network Services was certificated in the state.

MR. MOSES: Well, AT&T has changed their procedure to where they are not going to bill in AT&T's name; that they would drop their name off of it.

WITHESS M. REMMEY: I have an actual bill from AT&T that combines the two.

something we should look at. I thought that that had been adopted at some point, but I definitely think in order to be providing long distance service in the state from a major IXC that they should — that IXC should have some type of certificate filed. In other words, there should be proof by AT&T that X Company operating in the state of Florida has a certificate to operate in the state of Florida so that we have some way to get to these people and so that AT&T can't avoid responsibility.

And forgive me, if AT&T is in the room. It isn't about AT&T. It's simply about the larger carriers. But many times you have smaller companies working through larger companies who aren't certificated in the state. And I know we have many occasions we've tried to contact these companies and

we haven't been able to.

I'm sorry Mr. Kennedy.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Kennedy, you have stated that one of the unauthorized switches led to doubling of your rate.

WITHESS M. KENNEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Did you receive a refund?

WITHESS M. KENNEY: Yes. We settled for the

rate we would have been paying with our preferred

carrier.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. And you also stated when you were experiencing some of these problems that you called your local company and they referred you to the FCC. Did they also refer you to the Public Service Commission?

WITNESS KENNEDY: No, they didn't. I wasn't aware that we could contact you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. One of the things that we heard in our hearings that we held in Pensacola was that generally the individuals were referred to the FCC. And relating to what Commissioner Garcia said, oftentimes if you file with the FCC, you start with an informal process. But if your complaint isn't resolved through that, you have to go through a formal process and that costs \$125.

1	Did you have to pay that amount?
2	WITHESS M. RENNEY: No, we didn't.
3	Everything got resolved just with our documentation.
4	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Any other
5	questions for Mr. Kennedy?
6	WITHESS M. KENNEY: Is there someone who
7	would like the copies of these?
8	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, we'll have a and
9	Public Counsel may want to have those papers, also.
10	Again, if you look at our Special Report there's a
11	1-800 number in here, and also you'll be able to file
12	your complaints to the PSC via the Internet and our
13	home page. So we're trying to make the Commission
14	more accessible and inform people that we are here and
15	these are exactly the kind of issues that we should
16	and would like to continue to try to help you with.
17	WITHESS M. REMMEY: I think you're going to
18	be able to clear it up some.
19	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.
20	WITHESS M. KENNEY: Thank you.
21	MR. SHREVE: Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
22	Emily Kennedy.
23	
24	

1

EMILY KEENEDY

2

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

3 4

DIRECT STATEMENT

5

6

I'm Emily Kennedy. My WITHESS E. KENNEDY: address is the Herb Shop, 302B West 23rd Street, Panama City, Florida.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

In looking at my September phone bill, I realized I had been slammed. The name on my bill is Vista Group Communications. There was no telephone number on my bill for them and I called AT&T. They suggested that I call -- I'm sorry, I called BellSouth, and they suggested I call USBI. USBI gave me the telephone number for Vista Group. I called on several occasions and could never receive an answer. And they also gave me the address. It's Vista Group Communications, 821 West Point Parkway, West Lake, Ohio 44145.

Basically, they said that they switched with authorization. I said, "What day?" And it was actually March 1st, and that was on a Saturday. My only regret is that I did not catch this until now. My secretary usually pays my bills for me.

But a Saturday -- on a Saturday I have a part-time employee, and so she does not recall this.

But my point is that I certainly did not give authorization. And if they got any kind of authorization, it was from a part-time employee and 3 that's it. I wrote them a letter, and so I do expect to hear from them when I don't pay that portion of the 5 bill. I just paid for my services. 6 7 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I would suggest, again, that you speak with one of our customer service 8 people and open -- go ahead and file a complaint with 9 us to make sure that you -- that the company doesn't 10 have a problem with you not paying that portion of the 11 bill. Because if you have a formal complaint with us, 12 they are not going to collect that portion. 13 WITHESS E. KENNEDY: Okay. Thanks very 14 15 much. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Kennedy, you stated 16 that they said there was authorization given, but have 17 they provided you with any documentation? 18 WITHESS E. KENNEDY: No, no documentation. 19 And my employee does not recall authorizing anything. 20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And how many months have 21 you been with this new carrier? 22 WITHESS E. KENNEDY: I'm really embarrassed 23

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: That's understandable.

to say that I did not realize this until September.

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

WITHESS B. KENNEDY: Because my bill had doubled, and I started really looking at every phone call and then I realized in small print "Vista Group Communications" on my bill.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: One of the things -- when you meet with Staff, one of the things that we would like to do is to look at the date of that switch to make a determination as to, you know, perhaps -particularly, given the fact that it looks as if this was -- that they did not have proper authorization, even if they thought they had some sort of authorization -- and that way we could, at least under the current rules, rerate and make them at least refund you the difference in what you would have been charged. Under the new proposed rule, certainly -and that is a proposed rule, we've not voted on that yet but it will be a requirement that you not be charged at all for the unauthorized switch and the services that were rendered under that unauthorized switch.

But if you could, meet with our Staff and they'll try to help you with this problem. Thanks for testifying.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: It was a good suggestion by Ms. Kennedy about the company should be

required to put a phone number when it bills through the LEC so that persons have — so that they can directly reach the company. Because I know it's very difficult for them. As a general rule, the LEC has very little information on who this customer is, and usually they've already paid off that bill by the time the customer receives it. So maybe to some degree our rule can contemplate demanding that on the billing statement that the number is required.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me clarify one thing. The Chairman indicated the proposed rule, that when there is a slamming there would be no charge. I think there's a 90-day limitation on that.

But the other thing is you indicated that it went for some time without your knowledge and that —
I can understand that happening. We had a suggestion by a customer in Pensacola that there be a requirement that when there is a change in the long distance carrier that there be some type of special notice put in the billing, printed on red paper or something that really catches the customer's eyes. Do you think that would have been helpful in your situation?

WITHESS E. KENNEDY: Oh, absolutely.

Absolutely.

1	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Commissioner
2	Deason, for raising that point. Another point raised
3	on that same issue, a lady testified that she received
4	her bills perhaps quarterly, and so that she wouldn't
5	get a bill, you know, every three or four months. So
6	that whether or not there are two issues, one
7	whether the person should be charged at all, and how
8	should that time period be defined? Your testimony is
9	helpful because customers, often they don't notice
10	right away, and it is difficult when you have a lot of
11	bills, particularly when you're a business and someone
12	else is taking care of those matters for you. But
13	we're glad that you're here and our Staff will be here
14	to assist you and see what we can do to remedy this
15	situation.
16	WITHESS E. KEMMEDY: Thank you. I certainly
17	do appreciate your proposal.
18	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.
19	MR. SEREVE: Thank you.
20	Margaret Gordy.
21	
22	
23	
24	

MARGARET GORDY

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITHESS GORDY: My name is Margaret Gordy.

I live at 130 Oak Street, Tallahassee. And this is
the first time I've ever done this in all these years,
so if I'm nervous, forgive me.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: That's fine.

the 2nd, when I read my telephone bill, the April 25 bill. I was checking it for my long distance calls and for some reason I checked it a little more carefully than I ordinarily do. And down in the fine print I noticed that charges and credits, I had one plus change interstate charged to USLD, \$2.40. And that entry was made again, \$2.40. Well, I thought what on earth could that be?

So I called Sprint. And a very polite young lady said that someone had called and changed my long distance carrier. I said, "Well, they can't do that without my authority." She said, "Yes, they can." And they did. So I said -- and she was very nice, and she said that I could get it changed back but it would cost me \$5. I said no way would I pay for \$5 to have

that changed back. I didn't authorize it in the first place. And so she was very nice and said well she could take care of it, which she did.

sent the note to me, I said, "Well, I'm not satisfied with this. I'm going to call the Public Service Commission." Which I did. And I talked with a very nice representative there, and gave her the information. And she was going to file a complaint, which she did, against this USLD, which I had never heard of it.

Within a few days I received a letter from USLD and, of course, they, in their letter, said that Britain Communications was the person who had instigated the change. Well, I didn't understand that, either. But the letter was addressed to a member of the Public Service Commission from USLD.

So in a few days I received a certified letter from Britain Communications. And it's a long letter. And the last page of it was this signed authorization for this change. And this is what baffles me -- if I can find this letter -- how someone who has a form, the register for long distance service, BCI Corporation; "fill out completely" was what it said. It is not dated. The person's name is

printed. It gives the person's name. My phone number, his address -- I won't give you that address here -- and his signature. My question here is how did this person get this form? From whom? And was he compensated for it?

You have a copy of this complete file in your office. The number is file number -- well, I can't give you the file number. But it does -- oh, here it is, 1735061.

I was supposed to have been credited for I believe it was \$16 and something, but they said they would reimburse me within 30 days. Well, when I received my next bill I decided I would just deduct it from the bill myself. Well, that was not such a good idea because even though -- when I talked to sprint they said it was all right. But the next month they had charged me a service -- a late charge or whatever for not having paid that, and I was very irritated about that.

But, anyway, they finally did get it all straight, they say. But on my very last bill that -- the current one, I'm not sure that I have been properly credited, with the way that the bill was worded and everything. And you just sort of give up after a while over such a small amount. So I paid the

bill and, hopefully, it's taken care of.

aware of during all of this terrible ordeal that
lasted from May the 2nd until just this last month.

And I guess I'm not finished yet, because I did get a
copy of it — the whole file to the Securities

Exchange Commission because I had heard indirectly
that they were looking into the problem also, so I
sent that. They acknowledged the file and said they
would be back in touch, but I haven't heard from them
further.

Early on in this problem I was talking with some relatives on a Saturday evening, and I was telling them about the problem. And my great-nephew was in the room and his father said, "Well, get Robert to tell you all about it. He's been slammed." He said, "What you need is a PIC freeze form." I said, "Well, I never heard of such a thing." You have to request it. And I wonder why is not the public made aware that such a form exists so that we cannot have all of this hassle?

I have spent hours and hours and hours on the phone trying to get this resolved. And when you get past 35 years old these things are a little bit more difficult than you would imagine. And there are

many people who at my age don't pay that much 1 2 attention to their bill. And I really don't know why I noticed it that day, but something just caused me to 3 check it more carefully. Anyway, that's my story, and I hope 5 something can come out of it where we won't be slammed 6 7 anymore. And does anybody ever check, like this 8 person who signed this form, does anybody ever check 9 and see where or how we got the form and is anything 10 done about his part in the business, too? 11 Thank you for your time. 12 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Ms. Gordy. 13 There may be some questions. 14 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Ms. Gordy. 15 WITNESS GORDY: Yes. 16 COMMISSIONER DEASON: May I ask a question, 17 18 please? The form that was sent to you by certified mail, that indicated your telephone number but it was 19 20 someone else's name, address and signature; is that 21 correct? WITHESS GORDY: Absolutely. 22 COMMISSIONER DEASON: That sounds like that 23 was a fraudulent activity, would you agree with that? 24

25

WITHESS GORDY: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely,

1	the person's name, someone I have never heard of, and
2	address do you want the address?
3	COMMISSIONER DEASON: No, ma'am. As long as
4	it's in our files here at the Commission.
5	WITHESS GORDY: It's in our file. It's in
6	your file.
7	COUNTSSIONER DEASON: Okay. When there's
8	fraudulent activities, it's something that certainly
9	concerns the Commission and it concerns, obviously,
10	the Attorney General's office. They are very much
11	interested in this and it's something they are taking
12	a look at.
13	WITHESS GORDY: Well, now, the Office of the
14	Attorney General does not have a copy of this file.
15	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Gross may want to
16	he perhaps can get that from our files or he may
17	want to get it directly from you, but he can address
18	that.
19	WITHESS GORDY: Okay.
20	COMMISSIONER DEASON: All right. Thank you,
21	ma'am.
22	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Gordy, you had raised
23	one issue, and I think it's a very important issue and
24	that was about the PIC freeze form.
25	WITHESS GORDY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And making sure that 1 consumers are aware of that. That's one thing -- the lady sitting back there. Bev DeMello, she is -- heads 3 up our Consumer Affairs Division, and we are doing 5 more consumer outreach. I know one thing we're hearing from customers is before they didn't have the 7 choice and confusion, but now they do have that, they do need all of the help and the assistance they can get. So we're going to do our best to try to reach 9 out more and provide information to customers to help them make choices, even if it's just giving them our 11 1-800 number so that they can call us, and that we can 12 13 provide the needed assistance. But thank you very, very much for your testimony. 14

WITHESS GORDY: Thank you.

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask our Staff a question. Is there a requirement or a verification of a telephone number to make sure it's consistent with a name and address before a change is made in long distance service?

MR. MOSES: Not to my knowledge, normally whenever the companies input them into their computer, that every once in a while they hit a key punch error or something like that and put in the wrong number, but usually there's a match up with the name on the

account.

commissioner DEASON: I guess my concern is, is there anything in our rules which would prohibit or, hopefully, would have someone catch an inconsistency between a telephone number and person's name that has signed a letter of authorization?

had initiated the call to the company, say, to the local exchange company, there would be no further verification. However, if there's another company acting on her behalf, then there are verification procedures they have to follow in the rules. One of them is third-party independent verification, and there are other methods also.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Well, then, perhaps that was a rule violation that occurred here in this situation?

MR. MOSES: It's a possibility it's rule violation or there's a possibility it was a mistake when the person was putting the number down. There's a lot of variables.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Obviously, we have this complaint on file, and we're going to look into those possibilities. Thank you, ma'am.

WITHESS GORDY: Do you ever follow up so ---

I actually would like to know what happened; if anybody was penalized or anything?

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Yes, ma'am, we'll provide that information. I'm getting some heads in the back that are shaking yes.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you.

Mr. Wilson.

JAMES C. WILSON, JR.

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITHESS WILSON: My name is James C. Wilson, Jr. I live at 14C East 6th Court, Greenville, Florida 32331, 805-997-8591.

My slamming occurred last year. My bill from Centel indicated long distance service -- this is for the 16th of May of 1996 -- indicated long distance carrier as Sprint. On the 16th of June Centel's statement indicated long distance service of AT&T Custom Service. This statement had Sprint charges on it, and I paid those Sprint charges at that time. There were no AT&T Custom Service's charges at that time. On the 16th of July I got a statement, and it said long distance carrier is AT&T Custom Services. This statement had 0+ Dialing, Incorporated, charges

of \$146.49. The next month's statement on the 16th of August indicated the long distance carrier as Sprint, and this statement had some more 0+ Dialing charges, additional charges of \$19.58. There was a total charges of \$166.07 from 0+ Dialing.

In July I contacted Centel to see what was going on. Centel said it had been switched, but they would change it back, which they did. And it was reflected on the next statement as a change. However, they really didn't know anything about how it was changed or why or by whom.

number of 0+ Dialing someplace in Texas. I contacted 0+ Dialing. They were acting as a collection agency for another organization in Virginia. They would not give me the address, telephone number or anything of the organization in Arlington, which was -- and incidentally, all of this was provided to Ms. DeMello. I believe that's the lady that was here a while ago. I sent her a letter on the 22nd of July, and delineated all of this, these actions up to that time.

They -- 0+ Dialing referred me to or gave me the name of the company as Long Distance Service Company in Arlington, Virginia. I could not reach them. I had no course to go to, to talk to anybody in that organization. I asked 0+ Dialing to provide me with a copy of the authorization for the change. They said they would; It might take a couple of weeks. I waited and did not get any response whatsoever.

Eventually, after a couple of months, Centel was in a position of harassing me and billing me every month. And actually at one time, in November, I got a service interruption notice.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Wilson, this was after you had spoken with Ms. DeMello and you opened a file here?

WITHESS WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And Centel was still harassing you about the bill?

WITHESS WILSON: Well, in November that

letter to her was written in July, the 22nd of July,
and I got the service interruption notice in November,
the 12th of November. And I called him and talked to
him about it, and they said there would not be any
interruption of service. However, the point is that
the local provider is put in the position of being a
collector for all of these other garbage outfits, you
know, regardless of who it is. Even the billing
procedure constitutes a harassment. And in addition
to that, they were charging me interest for the

payment that had not been made.

Eventually, I got to Centel and initiated a letter on the 16th of September which formally told Centel -- and this is their form -- told them not to ever make any changes, which, in effect, says I have a protected long distance carrier provision. I got that recorded with Centel. That gives them the authority to not do anything. Tells them not to do anything. I went to the State Attorney's Office in Monticello and talked to Francisco Venus, I believe that's his name, and asked him opinions about what I should do and so forth. I asked him about not making payment, and I was concerned about credit rating and a few things like this. He said not to make the payments.

I eventually got to 0+ Dialing, a person down there, and they started negotiating a settlement. And they started at 30% of the bill, 40% of the bill, 50% of the bill and I think that I finally -- they got down to 65% of the bill and I agreed to pay that, mistake or not. But I went back to the State Attorney's Office then to make sure that if I did pay this it would not constitute an acknowledgement of a valid change in the service. And he said it would not.

So I went ahead with the payment and sent it

to them. However, 0+ Dialing did not advise Centel, and for the next four months Centel continued to bill me. First of all, it was the full amount and then it was a reduced amount. But they never got any documentation from 0+ Dialing that there had been a settlement or an agreement.

Finally, I told Centel that they better go
to 0+ Dialing, get the thing resolved, and if
necessary, let them turn it over to a collection
agency and I'd fight that. Well, that was the end of
it. I never heard anymore. They dropped it from the
bill. It was all cleared up. And, in effect, I went
back to sleep, you know.

Now, in November I did get a response from the Public Service Commission, one Nancy Pruitt. This was in response to my letter that I had sent in July.

And they said, in effect, that they were looking into it, and that they were going to try to change some rules and things of that nature.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: But that was the only help you got from the Florida Public Service Commission, a letter from Nancy Pruitt?

WITHESS WILSON: Yes. That's all I've ever heard.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Well, I need

you to get with Ms. DeMello and discuss your case at length with her, because I think we dropped the ball there. If you contacted us in July and were sitting alone negotiating with this company without some type of help from us I think we dropped the ball there. So I'd like you to sit down with Ms. DeMello and make sure our procedures were followed on because you should not have been having an argument with Centel all along, and you shouldn't have been getting an interest charged on having that bill. So if you could, I'd really appreciate that.

WITHESS WILSON: I'll do that. Be glad to.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Sir, did you ever
receive a copy of the so-called letter of
authorization?

withess wilsow: Absolutely not. I have never received anything from them. They haven't got guts enough to send it here.

Essentially, that's my story. But I'd like to talk to you about concerns. First of all, it's a little bit distasteful to me to have a local telephone provider being a bill collector for the subsidiaries. I think that basically is wrong. It needs to be looked at.

Multiple tiering, the first indication that

I had were that the charges were being -- long distance was changed to AT&T Service, Incorporated. And then whether they peddled this authorization to an 3 outfit in Arlington, Virginia, and that outfit in 5 Virginia insulates themselves from any customer by having a collection agency, 0+ Dialing in Texas handle 7 it and then turn it to Centel for collection. Multiple tiering; it's an absolutely poor procedure. It's something that should not be allowed. If I deal with ATET, I expect to deal with them, not through two 10 or three other tierings of companies. 11

The selling or leasing of these rights should not be allowed. If a company assumes responsibility for a long distance service, they should not be allowed to peddle it. It's not a mortgage that you're going to sell from one mortgage house to another mortgage house.

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Recently we have seen and heard a lot about deregulation of the electric industry. And I am very apprehensive about the same things happening with the deregulation of the electric industry. We have seen people out there, or companies or conglomerates, buying rights to the power grid today. And they're going to turn right around and peddle it to somebody alse. And the blooming rates are going to go up for

the majority of this country. And the Public Service Commission, I think, is obligated to look and take 2 lessons, learn from what has happened in the telephone 3 business. 5 Thank you. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Any other 6 7 questions? MR. SHREVE: Thank you, sir. 8 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Wilson, we'll have a 9 Staff person there to meet you. Thank you, sir. 10 MR. SEREVE: Mr. Robert Flint. 11 12 ROBERT C. FLINT 13 appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows: 16 DIRECT STATEMENT 17 WITHESS FLIMT: Greetings. Name is Robert Flint. I live at 3424 Old St. Augustine Road, 18 19 Tallahassee, Florida. In around June my wife said that there was a 20 21 phone call asking why we had switched phone services. And I said, "Well, it must have been a mistake because 22 we have not switched." We use WilTel, which is 23

Lifeline Network, and they donate part of their fee to

charitable enterprises, and I had planned to stay with

24

25

them.

2

3

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

However, I got a July phone bill from Sprint-Centel which included \$156.78. In the fine print it said, "You're long distance carrier is AT&T." I said, "No, it isn't." So I called them up. Sprint-Centel said they would switch them back, which they did. And I said, "Well, you know, I don't like paying this. I'll be happy to pay it if you can tell me that AT&T is going to pay the phone company that I contracted with." And they said, "Well, you have to pay it or they -- I said, "What happens if I don't pay it?" They say they'll shut off the phone. So I paid 12 it with protest. And I filed a complaint with Bob Crawford, the Department of Agriculture.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let me ask you before you get too far. You filed a complaint with the Secretary Crawford's department. They actually opened a file with you, and they did the complaint or did they refer you to the PSC?

WITHESS FLIMT: They apparently referred me to you because this was a June letter from the Department of Agriculture, Bob Crawford, and I got a letter from the PSC, a Douglas Martin, on July 7th. And nothing else until I got the notice of this hearing from the PSC.

After I did file that complaint, I did get a phone call from AT&T who said that they didn't know how it happened, et cetera, and apologized and said they'd try to clear it up. Well, they sent me a \$5 certificate. Well, that didn't cover the \$156.78.

you move on from there. The \$150 was much more expensive than you were normally used to paying for or you simply wanted to be able to credit to the charities that Lifeline network typically --

withess FLIMT: My request was that I'd be happy to -- well, I did pay it under protest which was a mistake when I thought about it, and since they are not going to send that money from AT&T to the people they contracted with --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Right.

withess FLIET: -- then I said I wouldn't pay it. And I didn't, on the last bill, and so I'm now dunned again for -- I just left that 156.78 out of the last bill. And it's on the current bill that I got.

And then, postmarked August 11th from a Chantilly, Virginia, I get a letter from MCI welcoming me to their long distance service. And I think this is ridiculous. However, the current bill did not show

that they had switched or slammed me again, so I'm still on the one that I asked for. The gentlemen over there, I thought I heard him say that you go up to 90 days if you had been slammed, you don't have to pay that. How do you work that?

that if you were slammed and you were billed for services, then the unauthorized carrier would not be able to collect that from you. That's the total charge, not just rerated.

understand that's a proposed rule; you can't put that into effect through self-help.

WITHESS FLIMT: Well, I'm going to continue to withhold that amount.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Can I ask you a favor?

WITHESS FLINT: I'm going to write AT&T and

say, "If you want to pay that money to the network I

contracted with, that's fine."

commissioner GARCIA: Just in case, I'd appreciate it if you could meet with our Staff so that you don't get yourself into a worse tangle with your local company. If you could talk to our Staff before you leave so you can open a file with us so they can help you. I know you've already contacted them, but

I'd like you to contact them directly and make sure that we've got a record of this. If you open a file with us, your local phone company will not bill you for the amount that is in dispute, and you don't have to pay them. Okay?

WITHESS FLIMT: Well, they didn't -COMMISSIONER GARCIA: At least not until the
dispute is resolved.

withess FLINT: They didn't shut off the phone, but after I paid -- didn't pay the \$156.74, or whatever, the only balance was \$10.74 that I sent in for this last bill. But --

MR. MOSES: Just to clarify what the current rules would require is they would require the unauthorized carrier to rerate your service to the same rates as your previous carrier. So if you were with WilTel, ATST would be required to rerate your calls so you wouldn't be charged any more than what you were charged before. That's the current rules.

withess FLIMT: I don't find that acceptable. What I would find acceptable is if AT&T would send the money that I've paid or that they received, that they send that to the carrier with which I contracted for the service.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask, is there

an AT&T representative in the audience? I guess there's not. They don't think these hearings are important. All right.

WITHESS FLIMT: Who do you wish me to make contact with?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, sir. The gentlemen in the blue. Thank you, sir.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Ochshorn.

BENJAMIN OCHSHORN

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

Florida Legal Services, and I'm just here to help out, if I can, a bit. I'm starting to do consumer law now and this is in the form of a public comment. I'm leaving the heavy lifting to Public Counsel and the Attorney General. They get to do the work in this case.

I'd like to commend the Commission for, you know, the attention you're giving to this issue. What I'm learning about it is that it seems kind of like the Wild West. I mean, in our latest local phone

bills, you know, usually we throw out the stuff that comes with it, but Sprint says that they did a survey of their consumers in Florida who have switched local toll carriers, and they discovered that 39% of them had no idea their service had been switched. Maybe the percentage is a whole lot different for other kinds of toll carriers. I kind of doubt it.

Last week the US Senate Committee that oversees communications held a hearing on slamming and FCC Commissioner Susan Ness testified and started off her testimony by noting that the Chairman of the Commission who called the hearing had had his service slammed.

I guess I look at this kind of like from a lawyer's point of view, and the law in this area which you can -- the responsibility for it is largely on the Pederal Communications Commission and the phone companies rather than the PSC. It is really deficient compared with how fraudulent activities are handled generally under Florida law. And we think that's a big reason why there's the prevalence of slamming that there is.

There was a district court case that I noted in a written comment that I sent in about a month ago -- it's in the record -- that I invite you to

read, from the Southern District of Florida, which held that basically local governments can take whatever consumer protection measures they feel are necessary to protect consumers of even long distance service. And that the Federal Communications Commission's jurisdiction in this matter is limited to setting effective rates and charges, but that's because the FCC regulates here, that doesn't limit what a local government can do as far as consumer protection. And we think that your proposed rule is in line with this decision, and, in fact, goes beyond what the FCC offers to do, and we want to commend you on that.

we'd like to share with you a little bit of knowledge that we do have about other kinds of consumer laws that we think would be helpful here.

one is that consumer protection laws

generally provide that in order to enter into a

contract you have to follow certain consumer

protection rules. And if you don't follow them, then

the contract is unenforceable, and, at least,

voidable. That means, for example, that if somebody

has been slammed, that they can't have their phone

service disconnected if they bring that up, and, in

fact, their service has been slammed.

apply to activities regulated by the Public Service Commission, provides that for the activities under that Act, unless a contract is entered into pursuant to those requirements, then the contract is void and unenforceable. And we think that that's one thing that you need to consider here. We'd submit to you that that makes slamming a whole different issue for the companies that are doing it. It changes it from a public relations issue to an issue that has to do with entering into valid agreements, which is something the companies like to do, and so that's why it's there.

The common law also treats it this way. If you enter into a contract under false pretenses, under deception, the contract is voidable and unenforceable. If a contract is entered into that's an illegal contract in some way because some part of it is prohibited by law, then absent some declaration by the state agency or state legislature, the contract is considered void.

In the case of slamming, where you have that the service continues and the person can be charged an amount equal to what they paid prior to that and all of that, you have a situation where a contract that's illegal, basically in violation of the rule, is still a valid contract. And it just really retards efforts at reducing the problem.

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

A second comment, issue, in consumer protection laws that I found is that there be some reliable consumer verification of changes; in this case changes in telecommunications service. There needs to be some definite way that people can know that their service has been changed. This is also common in many other kinds of consumer protection laws. In a case like this, with communication service, we'd agree with what has been said publically by the Public Counsel and Attorney General, that some kind of written verification should be required. We applaud you that it's one of your options. But you also list several other options that don't require written verification. And we question whether people will really know that their service has been changed. And that's really the key thing. At least it doesn't appear that you should give particularly great deference to have the approach that the Federal Communications Commission has given to this issue. They haven't, obviously, done enough, and I suggest you just do what you think would be best.

And a final issue is that people do get some disclosure of the terms of their service at a

reasonably early point so that they can make some informed decision about having their service transferred. And our particular concern has to do with termination provisions. Especially because there's been discussions among some telecommunications carriers of treating different customers differently based on their credit rating or some other criteria unrelated to whether they paid the bill or not. So that kind of thing we think you should look at.

Finally, we'd suggest that outside of this hearing that you consider promulgating some general rules similar to the state's deceptive and unfair trade practices rule that would allow the Commission at least to act when it sees fraudulent activities occur.

I'm not your counsel, but I think you have legal authority to do that. If some of the phone companies want to claim that you don't have jurisdiction to pass such a rule, then my suggestion is let them; but I kind of doubt that they would, at least publicly.

We think this is important because there's going to be all kinds of deceptive activities that go on in this area and in most other businesses in Florida which are regulated. There's very few

unregulated businesses in Florida. There's a combination of agency regulatory oversight of the companies, plus the Attorney General can always come in under the Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, and we ask that you give yourself similar power.

all got this -- something called a "Sprint Internet
Passport," and it says that if you want to get on the
Internet it says, quote, "All it takes is a free
Sprint Internet passport CD ROM." There's no mention
of any charges. The only indication that you might
have to pay anything is that there's something at the
end that says call whatever to get your first month of
Internet access free, which suggests that in future
months you might have to pay. Would this be a
deceptive advertisement under the state UDEP law? I
think so. And it's just one of many kinds of things
that go on that you probably want to have the power to
be able to address.

What you may want to do -- I realize this is going to be a formal hearing for a while, but if you decide you want to do more, you may just make that a finding that you do want to do more and refine your rule in a less formal process, more like how other agencies pass rules. If you have had the hearings and

gotten the public testimony, there may not be a need to treat it this way. And it might be a way to (a), shorten the time frame if you're going to add more things to the rule, and also provide a very different process for taking input from all sides. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Any
questions? Thank you very much for your testimony.

Is that a written -- do you have a written account of
your testimony?

WITHESS OCHSHORN: Yes. I think it's in the record. It's dated September 17th, and as a result of that, we have been getting some things from here.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you very much.

WITHESS OCHSEORN: Okay.

commissioner GARCIA: I just wanted to let you know that we -- one of the reasons that this rule has taken so long to get out of here is that our Staff tried time and again to work with the companies to come up with something that was agreeable to all of the parties and, unfortunately, we never even got near there.

WITHRES OCHSEORN: You're not going to be able to do it. I'll just tell you the companies have been fighting in courts for years that the consumer

protection laws don't apply to them. I encourage you to read the Lip Con (ph) decision. You just need to go forward.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you.

WITHESS OCHSHORM: Okay.

MR. SHREVE: Thank you.

Chris Sands.

CHRIS SANDS

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

DIRECT STATEMENT

WITHESS SANDS: Good evening. My name is Chris Sands, and I'm a student at FSU. My address is 982 West Brevard Street, Apartment 818, here in Tallahassee 32304.

I was slammed by MCI back in February. My first contact with MCI was I received my "Welcome to MCI-1" package in the mail, and I immediately called them and told them I had never switched my phone service. I had just recently switched to Sprint. They had called and they had spoken to one of my roommates. They received my name and my roommates' names from Florida State University without any authorization.

They spoke with one of my roommates and he was confused by what he was told. He was told simply he would be receiving phone cards in the mail. And he said "Oh, okay, that's fine." And so NCI took it upon themselves to change my long distance. So I called them immediately. Told them I had not changed the service, did not want their service; wanted them to switch it back, and was not going to pay them anything. I received a bill from them, which to me seemed vary curious, because usually I received only a bill from Centel, regardless of who my long distance carrier is, which I immediately again called them and told them I wasn't going to pay them anything, told them I didn't have a contract with them, and threw the bill in tha trash.

The next notification I received from them was this -- the original bill was for approximately \$20, I think \$19.50. I received this notice of my mandatory lawful notification from a collection service in California for \$47.50. I went through a long battle for several months with Centel, and to their credit they were very accommodating.

I called them every month when I received a bill and said, "I'm not paying these charges. Take them off the bill." I had them change my phone

service back. They told me about the PIC freeze form.

I filled out a PIC freeze form. So I took as much action as I could.

I wrote back to the collection agency and I wrote to several people in the MCI organization and told them, sent them copies of the letter to the collection agency. And my arguments were these: I was never billed for the amount that they had sent to the collection agency. I have never contracted with MCI in the first place. The charges that they were billing me for were already billed through my local telephone bill through Centel. Also, that MCI is required to reschedule the fees, which they never did.

At the time I was under a three-month agreement with Sprint, during which time I would not be charged for any calls within the state of Florida, and they were trying to charge me their rates. Also, MCI made no attempt at all to deal with me. They never called me, they never contacted me to negotiate or even to address the fact that I supposedly owed them money.

I later called the collection agency to see if they had received my letter. They said the person who was working on the case was no longer working there, but the account balance was zero. And I was

ready to forget it all.

and I causally mentioned it to Dick Durbin, and he suggested -- he works for the Public Service Commission -- he suggested I file a complaint. At that point it had just been an annoyance. I hadn't really been -- put out any money. I think I might have paid \$5 total, and \$50 to a phone company is not a lot of money. And I think they probably decided it wasn't worth trying to pursue it.

But later that same week I got another call from MCI. And they didn't asked who lived there, they just said, "Are you someone who is authorized to change this phone service?" And I said -- actually, I just hung up on them. I was too angry to say anything polite. But I received a similar call from AT&T. and I said to the woman, "If you would like to speak with me, you can call and ask for me by name. But if you're just going trolling for people to change their phone service, I have nothing to say to you," and I hung up on her.

And I did eventually receive a letter from MCI. They claimed that they had legally changed my phone service; that they had obtained verification from my roommate and they name him here. They said they had verified his identity and they listed a birth

date, which I assume is his birth date. It's certainly not mine. And they list my Social Security number. All of this information is readily available from the information that PSU supplies to its corporate partners. So I don't know what research they did.

My issue is one -- and I looked over the proposed information here, the proposed law, I guess. I don't see a definition for what is a customer? And my roommate is not the customer when my name is on the phone bill, and when my credit history is affected by whether the phone bill is paid or not. So I think there needs to be some clarification. I'm not sure if it's somewhere else in there.

Also the verification process -- again, I guess I got lost in the legalese -- I would like to see a verification process where the verifier is held accountable. The fact that they say they went to a third party to verify this information and the information is inaccurate means that I shouldn't be held accountable for this; the verifier should. So this \$47.50, they can bill the person who supposedly verified my identity and leave me alone.

That's pretty much all I have to say. Any questions?

1	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any questions of
2	Mr. Sands?
3	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I just wanted to thank
4	you, Mr. Sands. And Mr. Durbin is right, you should
5	go ahead and file that so that we can look into that.
6	WITHESS SANDS: I have.
7	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Great. Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much for
9	your testimony.
10	Are there any other witnesses?
11	MR. BECK: Commissioner, Mr. Sands was the
12	last speaker to sign up ahead of time.
13	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Are there any
14	other witnesses in the audience that would like to
15	testify that did not sign up to testify tonight?
16	(No response)
17	Seeing none, I'd like to thank you all for
18	coming out and participating in our process. And
19	remember that your comments and your statements will
20	be made a part of our official record, and we can rely
21	upon that when we make our final decision.
22	Staff, could you go over the schedule as to
23	when we will be making our decision?
24	MS. CALDWELL: Yes. Rulemaking is governed,
25	as I said earlier, by Section 120.54, Plorida

1	Statutes. This section describes the process by which
2	an agency may adopt rules. Part of that process
3	includes these workshops, a proposal phase, comments
4	and a hearing phase and adoption of the rules.
5	Workshops will be held in additional cities including
6	on November the 20th of this year in Jacksonville.
7	Other noteworthy events in the rulemaking are on
8	December 16th of 1997, the rules will be proposed by
9	the Commission at their agenda conference. On January
10	23rd, 1998, interested persons must file their
11	comments. On February 6th, 1998, the full Commission
12	will hold a rule hearing taking evidence and sworn
13	testimony and witnesses may be cross examined. On
14	April the 7th, final rules will be adopted at the
15	Commission agenda conference, and the rules will
16	become effective sometime in May of 1998.
17	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you very much. Are
18	there any other concluding matters? Seeing none, this
19	hearing is adjourned. Thank you very much.
20	(Thereupon, the workshop concluded at
21	8:37 p.m.)
22	
23	
24	
-	

1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	COUNTY OF LEON)
3	I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting Official Commission Reporter,
4	
5	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Rule Development Workshop in Docket No. 970882-TI was heard by the Florida Public Service Commission at the time and
6	place herein stated; it is further
7	CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been
8	transcribed under my direct supervision; and that thi transcript, consisting of 84 pages, constitutes a
9	true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
10	DATED this 24th day of October, 1997.
11	0 1.0
12	Jes July
13	Chief, Bureau of Reporting
14	(904) 413-6732
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	