

BEFORE THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

DOCKET NO. 110013-TP

REQUEST FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS
FOR RELAY SERVICE, BEGINNING IN JUNE
2012, FOR THE DEAF, HARD OF HEARING,
DEAF/BLIND, OR SPEECH IMPAIRED, AND
OTHER IMPLEMENTATION MATTERS IN
COMPLIANCE WITH THE FLORIDA
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCESS SYSTEM
ACT OF 1991.

_____ /

PROCEEDINGS: COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA
ITEM NO. 2

COMMISSIONERS
PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM
COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR
COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ
COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS
COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN

DATE: Tuesday, September 20, 2011

PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center
Room 148
4075 Esplanade Way
Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY: JANE FAUROT, RPR
Official FPSC Reporter
(850) 413-6732

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
06893 SEP 23 =
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** And that does bring
3 us to Item 2. I will call upon our staff here in
4 just a moment. I would note that this item is
5 limited to Commissioners and staff for a discussion
6 today, and that we do have an interpreter with us
7 here to my left who will be helping us with this
8 item.

9 So with that, I'll look to our staff to
10 bring this item up before us.

11 **MR. KENNEDY:** Good morning, Commissioners.
12 Ray Kennedy with staff.

13 Item 2 is the staff recommendation for
14 Docket Number 110013-TP, request for submission of
15 proposals for relay service for the deaf,
16 hard-of-hearing, deaf/blind, or speech-impaired.
17 The current contract with Sprint is scheduled to
18 expire on May the 31st of next year, so we issued a
19 request for proposal on April the 29th. Three
20 companies bid; AT&T, Hamilton, and Sprint. We are
21 here today to recommend Hamilton be selected as the
22 provider; that is based on the evaluation criteria
23 and the scoring set out in the RFP. Hamilton is the
24 highest scorer, and staff must follow the RFP
25 instructions for the recommendation.

1 We are here to answer any questions.

2 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Thank you.

3 Commissioners? Commissioner Brown.

4 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I guess, first of
5 all, I understand that Hamilton took exception to
6 the liquidation provision, and in doing so made
7 adjustments with their price. That being said, did
8 any of the other bidders take exception with a
9 correlated price adjustment to any of the provisions
10 in the RFP?

11 **MR. KENNEDY:** AT&T offered in their price
12 proposal to establish a relay center, but it was not
13 an exception, it was an addition to at a higher
14 cost. As far as the pricing, no, there are no other
15 exceptions that I'm aware of on the pricing.

16 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Okay. And if I may
17 ask a few more questions.

18 Does staff feel that the breakdown of the
19 35 percent price per minute for TRS versus the
20 5 percent for captioned telephone is an accurate
21 split, with the knowledge that the number of minutes
22 of captioned phone has changed over the years?

23 **MR. KENNEDY:** Strictly from a mathematical
24 standpoint, I would have to say no, because I have
25 to do -- what I did was a cost analysis based on

1 looking backwards and going forward using the same
2 average number of minutes per month. And the point
3 in fact that it could have changed the results of
4 the recommendation, if that had been a factor in the
5 RFP with a different number.

6 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** So that currently
7 they are not realistic, the weight that is in the
8 RFP, the 35.5 is not a realistic number, is that
9 what you are saying?

10 **MR. KENNEDY:** I'm not so sure I would go
11 as far as to say that, because the traditional relay
12 services from a standpoint of criticality to deliver
13 those services is much more difficult. And that was
14 the concept behind that split of the percentages,
15 frankly not realizing that it may have created a
16 problem as far as total costs to the citizens of the
17 state of Florida. Based on billable minutes, the
18 split would not be accurate.

19 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** What would be a more
20 accurate number?

21 **MR. KENNEDY:** Probably --

22 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** The split. Pardon
23 me.

24 **MR. KENNEDY:** 25/15 or possibly 20/20.
25 Probably 25/15 if you take the total number of

1 minutes and average them per month.

2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Commissioner Balbis.

4 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Madam
5 Chair.

6 And I just have a few questions for Mr.
7 Kennedy. You know, one of the things that -- really
8 one of the only things that this Commission is
9 charged with in this situation is following Chapter
10 427 of the statutes, which states that we must
11 select the bidder that's most advantageous to the
12 state.

13 And when I look at that, I mean, I look at
14 a couple of things: One, what is the cost to
15 provide the service; two, what is the quality of
16 that service; and then take into account any other
17 factors. And I agree with Commissioner Brown's line
18 of questioning as far as the split of the two
19 services that are provided. But I think maybe a
20 more accurate way is look at the number of the types
21 of calls or types of services we have received in
22 the past, and then applying those price points to
23 those costs.

24 And I understand, Mr. Kennedy, that you
25 have gone through an exercise of estimating or

1 projecting what we are going to have and
2 recalculating what the total costs for the service
3 would be, is that correct?

4 **MR. KENNEDY:** I have done that, and that's
5 based on using the current monthly averages for the
6 current year, 2011. Yes, sir, I have done that.

7 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** And what was the
8 result? Who was the lowest cost provider of service
9 going through that exercise?

10 **MR. KENNEDY:** Going through that
11 exercise -- and I have this, if you would like me to
12 hand it out.

13 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Yes, please.

14 **MR. KENNEDY:** I would like to put a caveat
15 on that. That is based on what we know today, and
16 certainly I can't predict the future as far as if
17 the number of minutes that we average per month
18 today would be the same going forward. I'm
19 making -- it's a hypothetical assumption, if that
20 were to occur. So based on that analysis, the
21 lowest cost to the state of Florida would be Sprint,
22 and they would be lower -- for a one-year contract
23 period, they would be approximately \$462,000 lower
24 than Hamilton, and approximately \$130,000 lower than
25 AT&T -- (simultaneous conversation).

1 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay. Which, again,
2 is different than the scoring that was applied using
3 the 5 percent and 35 percent.

4 **MR. KENNEDY:** That's correct. So I did
5 not use this analysis in making the recommendation.
6 Just strictly following the RFP guidelines, I had no
7 choice in the matter.

8 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Right.

9 Well, one of my concerns is that, again,
10 us trying to figure out what is most advantageous to
11 the state, I think price is very important, and I'm
12 struggling to find what is the best way to estimate
13 what the cost to the state would be, but I'm
14 uncomfortable with what may be perceived as changing
15 the method midstream. And I don't think that's
16 fair, but, again, we are trying to find out what is
17 the lowest cost, what is the most advantageous.
18 Another point I'd like to make is that there was one
19 bidder that did provide two price points, is that
20 correct?

21 **MR. KENNEDY:** That's correct, AT&T.

22 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** And they provided
23 one with and without a Florida call center.

24 **MR. KENNEDY:** That's correct.

25 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** And in going through

1 the RFP, I did note that you listed for them a
2 bidder to provide information as far as a call
3 center, a Florida call center, but there was no
4 points assigned to that.

5 **MR. KENNEDY:** That's correct. I -- that's
6 correct.

7 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** I think me
8 personally, I think that's something that we need to
9 take into account, you know, and, of course, we need
10 to define what that would be if we take it into
11 account. But, again, I don't think it is fair if
12 bidders were not instructed to provide two price
13 points to suddenly look at that for another -- an
14 individual bidder, again, in fairness, and in order
15 for us to determine what's most advantageous to the
16 state.

17 The other concern I had is -- and, Mr.
18 Kennedy, you and I had a long discussion during our
19 briefing about this, so I apologize for you hearing
20 it again, but I think it's good for the public and
21 the other Commissioners, is the total technical
22 points that were assigned. And you and I had
23 discussed, based on your experience, whether or not
24 the three bidders were equally qualified. And we
25 had a long discussion as to the subjective nature of

1 the assignment of those points. And when you look
2 at a 60 percent weighing criteria for something that
3 is subjective, which you agree you want to have
4 qualified bidders, but, you know, how do you assess
5 who's more qualified than the other. And that's
6 something that I wanted to bring to the Commission
7 as one of the concerns I had is here we have very
8 tight scores, we have very comparable rates, and we
9 have 60 percent of the technical points -- or the
10 scoring based on a subjective analysis, if you will.

11 So, again, you know, my concern is that we
12 may not have an accurate estimation or estimate on
13 the true cost to the state. I'm uncomfortable with
14 switching analysis midstream. And then we had one
15 bidder that provided what I think is an important
16 option, is whether or not to have a Florida call
17 center or not for us to address. So I guess to
18 summarize, I'm not really comfortable with the
19 process here. Thank you.

20 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Thank you.

21 Commissioner Brisé.

22 **COMMISSIONER BRISÉ:** Thank you, Madam
23 Chair.

24 My question goes a step beyond what
25 Commissioner Balbis has teed up and what

1 Commissioner Brown teed up before that. I, too, am
2 uncomfortable with the process, and, in essence, the
3 whole RFP. So it has put us in a very interesting
4 position at this point, and I want to hear from
5 staff as to what options do we have with respect to
6 the RFP itself? Because I, too, concur that I
7 wouldn't want to change the rules midstream, so what
8 options do we have at this point with respect to
9 this RFP?

10 **MS. MILLER:** Commissioner, one of the
11 options that a state agency has is to reject all
12 bids. And we certainly don't take that lightly; a
13 lot of work went into the bids. But in a case where
14 there is a plausible reason to reject all bids, and
15 where you are not showing favoritism to one of the
16 vendors, that may be done.

17 If that option is considered, then what
18 would happen would be there would be a right to
19 protest it. We would issue a notice, and vendors
20 would have 72 hours to protest it, and then ten days
21 to file a formal protest. And if there's a disputed
22 issue of material fact, it would go to the
23 Department of Administrative Hearings, DOAH. And
24 they have to schedule a hearing within thirty days,
25 and then it comes back to you as a recommended

1 order.

2 The reason I mentioned all those steps is
3 because when we did a timeline, that would put us
4 into -- it looked like January, worst-case scenario.
5 If all of the steps took as long as the statute
6 allows, then we would be back in January with the
7 recommended order, it's called, and then -- so that
8 would be if that was protested. And then we would
9 come to you with a new request for proposals. And
10 then at that time you could look at -- give it close
11 scrutiny as to what other changes that you might
12 want to see in an RFP.

13 So that is a key option, and the case law
14 has been quite favorable to state agencies who
15 reject all bids. The standard is that the person
16 contesting it has to show that the Commission's
17 action would be illegal, arbitrary, dishonest, or
18 fraudulent. So it is a tougher standard for a
19 protest than if you chose to go with a different
20 bidder.

21 **COMMISSIONER BRISÉ:** A follow-up question.
22 With respect to the provision of the service, if we
23 decided to go the route of rejecting all bidders and
24 starting the process again, there would not be any
25 interruption of service for of any of our -- anyone

1 who is receiving the service at this point?

2 **MS. MILLER:** The contract is good until
3 the end of May 2012.

4 **COMMISSIONER BRISÉ:** So it's fair to
5 assume that even if we went that route, we would
6 have sufficient time to address the issue without
7 putting those who receive this vital service in any
8 gap without service.

9 **MS. MILLER:** If we did have a protest, and
10 if it did take that long, we would have to do a much
11 more condensed process that next time around. And
12 we believe we could do it, but, you know, there is
13 that issue. We believe that we would be within the
14 timeline, and we also believe that rejecting all
15 bids would be a difficult matter for a vendor to
16 protest and win on. So we think that we would have
17 enough time, but we do have that issue, as well.

18 **COMMISSIONER BRISÉ:** Thank you.

19 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Commissioner Brown --
20 and for the record we will note that Chairman Graham
21 has just joined us.

22 Commissioner Brown, before I call upon
23 you, it is my understanding from our staff that per
24 the arrangement that we have with our translator,
25 that we have to take a short break at certain

1 increments, and I think we are about at that point.
2 So let me ask the staff, are we at that time point?

3 **MS. SALAK:** Yes, we are.

4 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Okay. And how long
5 of a break do we need?

6 **MS. SALAK:** Five minutes.

7 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Five minutes. Okay.
8 Thank you.

9 Then, Commissioners, in order to
10 facilitate having the interpreter/translator, and so
11 that she will join us again for future meetings, we
12 are going to take a five-minute break. And when we
13 come back, Commissioner Brown, we will start with
14 your question and comment.

15 (Recess.)

16 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Okay. We are back on
17 the record after a short break.

18 And, Commissioner Brown, I believe you had
19 a question.

20 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I don't have any
21 other questions. I have more of a comment. If
22 somebody else has -- if a Commissioner has a
23 question, I'll defer to them and reserve my comment.

24 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Anybody have
25 questions before -- I see no questions.

1 Commissioner Brown.

2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

3 We have obviously heard issues with the
4 RFP here. There are doubts raised by the cost
5 estimates that I do not believe are in the public
6 interest. Using the criteria in the RFP that was
7 established, the result we get would not give the
8 state the most advantageous contract in accordance
9 with the statutes. Therefore, I believe it is
10 appropriate to deny the staff recommendation and
11 reject all bidders and thereby directing staff to
12 issue a new RFP.

13 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Is that a motion?

14 COMMISSIONER BROWN: It was. Thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Is there a second?

16 COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: I will second that.

17 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Commissioner Brisé
18 has a second.

19 Discussion?

20 Well, then, let me. I am in support of
21 the motion, per the discussion that we have had, but
22 I am also wondering if before we take a vote on that
23 and move forward with this item, if there is
24 direction that we want to give to our staff as to
25 how to proceed with that next round of the RFP

1 process. There has been discussion about how to
2 best account or analyze cost information and data;
3 there has been some discussion about sort of those
4 potential other factors that may come into play, a
5 call center within the state or not, and I am
6 wondering if, before we move on, we want to take
7 advantage of this opportunity, while the item is
8 before us, to give some additional direction to our
9 staff on any of those points or others.

10 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** I appreciate you
11 bringing that up, Commissioner Edgar.

12 Staff, we had a discussion about the
13 various things that we would alter in hindsight, and
14 if you could go through some of those for the rest
15 of the Commission.

16 **MR. KENNEDY:** Okay. Just that AT&T with
17 the call center, it wasn't evaluated, so we would
18 make that an evaluation item, if, indeed, you would
19 like to see that in the bid. And have a price point
20 with it and without it, and all bidders give the
21 same, respond the same way.

22 Another area is in the -- it's a minor
23 thing, but it created some controversy, is the
24 subcontractors -- all use the same subcontractor.
25 AT&T was not able to provide reference checks,

1 information for the subcontractor. And what I found
2 out was that, in essence, nobody could because the
3 prime contractors were all the other agencies would
4 respond to. So if I didn't have them, we would
5 leave things like that out. We would like to look
6 at the -- there were concerns from the industry
7 about the penalties for failing to meet a call time,
8 the standard or whatever, and we had the statutory
9 maximum. We might want to refine those.

10 Cindy, help me with this one.

11 **MS. MILLER:** Also, we had issues raised
12 about there is a 24-hour cure period, if there's a
13 breach. And so we wanted to look at that a little
14 more, whether changing that to make it a little
15 longer might help even on the price proposals. One
16 of the things I wanted to mention is none of the
17 bidders came forward to the agenda last time when we
18 had the request for proposals before you and it was
19 open for their comment. And so next round, if there
20 is one, I would hope that they would speak to you on
21 any issues that they have so that, you know, we
22 would hear about those. So the 24-hour cure period,
23 and then one other thing, we had a provision in
24 there about perhaps allowing them to take some
25 exceptions. And we would like to look at that

1 language and try to tighten it up more.

2 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Thank you. And she
3 covered the areas that I was concerned with as well.

4 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Commissioner Graham.

5 **CHAIRMAN GRAHAM:** Thank you.

6 Is there anything that you can put in
7 there as far as changing the language that would
8 make it clearer, or clear up the fact that once the
9 RFP is done, it is still the sole discretion of this
10 board to go with whichever way the RFP shakes out.
11 And I don't know if you can say that the RFP is just
12 a guideline, but the fact of the matter is -- and I
13 guess there's more specifics to the state law, I can
14 see the attorneys all looking at each other right
15 now, but the fact of the matter is, you know,
16 whichever is best for the citizens of the state of
17 Florida. And it's my understanding that that
18 determination is made by the five of us up here.
19 Now, how do you clearly specify that in the RFP?

20 **MS. CIBULA:** Samantha Cibula of Commission
21 staff. I know it's difficult, but we just need to
22 try the best we can to put the provisions in the
23 RFP, and that would be the advice I would give you.

24 **CHAIRMAN GRAHAM:** Is it possible, rather
25 than putting forth an RFP to put off -- was it an

1 RFQ? And basically have them come to you with what
2 they think the plan is and what they can provide,
3 and then we can evaluate what the companies all
4 think the best plan is and what they can provide?

5 **MS. CIBULA:** 120, which is applicable to
6 us, says we have to do RFPs, so I think we have to
7 stick to that process.

8 **MS. MILLER:** Actually, if I can embellish
9 that a little bit. In Chapter 427.704, the statute
10 does especially set out that we'll have a request
11 for proposal, and it lists eight -- well, it lists
12 several factors to consider in it. So also it
13 requires the Commission to establish a request for
14 proposals review group, which is what we did here.
15 So it pretty well sets out a process similar to what
16 we followed, and is what we tried to follow.

17 **CHAIRMAN GRAHAM:** I guess what I'm trying
18 to do or trying to figure out is if somebody -- and
19 let's just say AT&T, if somebody comes back with an
20 idea of, you know, we can do this, this, and this,
21 what you asked for, and we can provide 40 jobs. You
22 know, that wasn't something that was specifically
23 quantified when you added everything up, but it was
24 something added. What I'm not trying to do is limit
25 that.

1 If somebody comes up and says, okay, we
2 can do the things you are asking for, but we can
3 also do A, B, and C. I mean, I don't want to
4 discourage that. And how do you go about allowing
5 that to play more specific in the RFP?

6 **MS. CIBULA:** That is something that we can
7 probably put additional points in the RFP for. And
8 I know it's hard to think of maybe every single
9 scenario of what we want to consider in the RFP, but
10 I think we just need to do the best we can to try to
11 think of what criteria we are going to use. Because
12 the underlying purposes of the bid process is to
13 make sure that it is fair to all participants. And,
14 in my opinion, to make sure it is fair to all
15 participants, we need to make sure we have some
16 criteria that we are going to base the decision on,
17 and that's what the RFP is. And I guess the
18 fairness issue comes in is if you deviate from that
19 criteria, and that's why it's difficult to post
20 our -- you know, once the RFP has been issued, and
21 then the word process to change the criteria at that
22 point. So that's why I'm recommending that we just
23 need to do our best to try to come up with what we
24 think are the criteria we're looking for in the
25 initial RFP that we issue.

1 **CHAIRMAN GRAHAM:** Well, I guess one last
2 question. What if the criteria ranges from zero to
3 100. What if you put 30 points set aside for the
4 discretion of the Commission?

5 **MS. CIBULA:** I think there might be still
6 some basis of what that criteria, extra stuff that
7 we are looking for might be -- might still need to
8 be defined a little bit.

9 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Commissioner Brisé.

10 **COMMISSIONER BRISÉ:** Thank you.

11 I think there is a provision that looks at
12 benefit to the state, and so, therefore, there is a
13 little bit of latitude there. And I think if we go
14 back, as I think we're going to do, to take a second
15 look at this whole RFP, if we include enough
16 baseline items in there so, therefore, if the
17 bidders come in within a range of reasonableness to
18 each other, then there will be the latitude
19 necessary to identify the things that go above and
20 beyond what is found.

21 I think one of the issues for me was that
22 whole issue of the 35/5 mix with the caption and the
23 CapTel and so forth. So I think that if we address
24 that issue, that is a significant part of the RFP
25 that will sort of change some of the scores and sort

1 of balance the playing field a little bit more,
2 which by doing that will provide the Commission a
3 little bit more latitude to address some other
4 factors that whoever the bidders are may come in
5 with some things that may be beneficial to the
6 state. And as a result of being beneficial to the
7 state, then we can exercise our discretion that way.

8 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Commissioner Balbis.

9 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Thank you, Madam
10 Chair.

11 And to Chairman Graham's comment, one
12 recommendation for staff that I can make is maybe we
13 can add a similar statement that's listed in the
14 footnote on Page 4, which I think is pretty clear
15 that as with all Commission decisions, the
16 Commission is not bound by staff's recommendations,
17 et cetera, et cetera. And I think that would cover
18 it, for at least the bidders to know that we take
19 staff's recommendation and then the other factors
20 set forth in 427 to make our decision. And
21 hopefully that will would get the desired outcome or
22 information to the bidders.

23 But since we are listing changes, I would
24 look to staff as far as the issue with penalties and
25 the cure period, et cetera. I mean, obviously

1 you're experienced in overseeing these companies and
2 the work they do. If you feel that it will allow
3 the price to come down without reducing the quality
4 of service, that is something that certainly I would
5 support, and I assume that the other Commissioners
6 would, as well. So I would look for staff's
7 recommendation on those changes to the RFP.

8 One of the thoughts that I had was, okay,
9 let's require that every bidder provide the two
10 price points; one with a call center and one without
11 a call center, so it's an equal playing field. But
12 if we do that, I want to make sure that we very
13 clearly define what a call center is. The last
14 thing that we want to have is someone to hang a
15 shingle on a building and call it a call center, and
16 the intended effect would be, one, to have good
17 quality of service and also have these other
18 benefits to the state of Florida. So we need to be
19 very clear as to what a call center is, if that's
20 what the Commission wants to do and require the two
21 price points.

22 I would also like to provide the bidders
23 this information. Not the cost information, but the
24 number of minutes for each type of call. I think
25 that's important, especially for those that have not

1 done work for the state to provide these services,
2 to know these are the volumes and this is the volume
3 of calls that are provided. So I think this should
4 be included in the RFP and used as a basis to
5 determine what the lowest cost would be, because I
6 think it's a little more accurate than just a 5
7 percent, 35 percent weighting on each one.

8 So, again, if the Commission agrees, I
9 would like to see those changes to the RFP. And I
10 think with that and the discretion that we already
11 have with 427 where we take in all the other
12 factors, I'm not concerned that we would be limiting
13 our ability to look at other factors, including
14 price to determine what is most advantageous to the
15 state. Those are the changes I would recommend.

16 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Thank you.

17 Commissioners, we have before us a motion to deny
18 the staff recommendation on Issue 1. In the
19 alternative, to reject all bids, to initiate an RFP
20 per the statutory requirements reflecting the
21 discussion that we have had today. And, of course,
22 the docket would remain open under Issue 2.

23 Is there any further discussion?

24 Commissioner Graham.

25 **CHAIRMAN GRAHAM:** I guess this is just for

1 my understanding. Does the staff come back before
2 us with an RFP? Is that in the form of an Internal
3 Affairs?

4 **MS. MILLER:** No, that would be at agenda,
5 and that would come before you, and it is also wide
6 open for people to speak about any issues they have,
7 or additions, or changes, or whatever.

8 **CHAIRMAN GRAHAM:** Okay. That's all I
9 need.

10 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Commissioners, any
11 further discussion, questions, or comments? Seeing
12 none. All in favor of the motion say aye.

13 (Vote taken.)

14 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Show it adopted.
15 Thank you.

16 **MS. SALAK:** Commissioner, may I just make
17 a statement that this is Mr. Kennedy's last agenda
18 with us before he retires on the 30th, and for one,
19 I will sorely miss him. I use his abilities to the
20 utmost, and he's a good cheer, he is always
21 reminding me.

22 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Ms. Salak, thank you
23 for bringing that to our attention.

24 Mr. Kennedy, thank you for your service.
25 Come back and see us.

1 MR. KENNEDY: I will.

2 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And we wish you well.

3 MR. KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF LEON)

: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.

IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

DATED THIS 23rd day of September, 2011.



JANE FAUROT, RPR
Official FPSC Hearings Reporter
(850) 413-6732

FOR YEAR 2011

06893-11

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1					Hamilton			
2	Month	TRS Min.	Cost/Min	Total Cost	CapTel Min.	Cost	Total Cost	Grand Total Cost
3	January	230,595	\$0.79	\$182,170.05	209,578	\$1.81	\$378,288.29	
4	February	209,798	\$0.79	\$165,740.42	175,496	\$1.81	\$316,770.28	
5	March	225,243	\$0.79	\$177,941.97	194,290	\$1.81	\$350,693.45	
6	April	201,722	\$0.79	\$159,360.38	185,850	\$1.81	\$335,459.25	
7	May	197,966	\$0.79	\$156,393.14	178,892	\$1.81	\$322,900.06	
8	June	203,147	\$0.79	\$160,486.13	181,585	\$1.81	\$327,760.93	
9	July	211,598	\$0.79	\$167,162.42	171,787	\$1.81	\$310,075.54	
10				\$1,169,254.51			\$2,341,947.79	\$3,511,202.30
11								
12								
13					Sprint			
14	Month	TRS Min.	Cost/Min	Total Cost	CapTel Min.	Cost	Total Cost	Grand Total Cost
15	January	230,595	\$0.84	\$193,699.80	209,578	\$1.54	\$322,750.12	
16	February	209,798	\$0.84	\$176,230.32	175,496	\$1.54	\$270,263.84	
17	March	225,243	\$0.84	\$189,204.12	194,290	\$1.54	\$299,206.60	
18	April	201,722	\$0.84	\$169,446.48	185,850	\$1.54	\$286,209.00	
19	May	197,966	\$0.84	\$166,291.44	178,892	\$1.54	\$275,493.68	
20	June	203,147	\$0.84	\$170,643.48	181,585	\$1.54	\$279,640.90	
21	July	211,598	\$0.84	\$177,742.32	171,787	\$1.54	\$264,551.98	
22				\$1,243,257.96			\$1,998,116.12	\$3,241,374.08
23								
24								
25					AT&T			
26	Month	TRS Min.	Cost/Min	Total Cost	CapTel Min.	Cost	Total Cost	Grand Total Cost
27	January	230,595	\$0.90	\$207,535.50	209,578	\$1.53	\$320,654.34	
28	February	209,798	\$0.90	\$188,818.20	175,496	\$1.53	\$268,508.88	
29	March	225,243	\$0.90	\$202,718.70	194,290	\$1.53	\$297,263.70	
30	April	201,722	\$0.90	\$181,549.80	185,850	\$1.53	\$284,350.50	
31	May	197,966	\$0.90	\$178,169.40	178,892	\$1.53	\$273,704.76	
32	June	203,147	\$0.90	\$182,832.30	181,585	\$1.53	\$277,825.05	
33	July	211,598	\$0.90	\$190,438.20	171,787	\$1.53	\$262,834.11	
34				\$1,332,062.10			\$1,985,141.34	\$3,317,203.44
35								
36								
37		Avg cost per month		Avg cost per year		Hamilton vs Sprint & AT&T	Sprint vs Hamilton & AT&T	AT&T vs Hamilton & Sprint
38	Hamilton	\$501,600.33		\$6,019,203.94		N/A	-\$462,562.66	-\$332,569.47
39	Sprint	\$463,053.44		\$5,556,641.28		\$462,562.66	N/A	\$129,993.19
40	AT&T	\$473,886.21		\$5,686,634.47		\$332,569.47	-\$129,993.19	N/A

Parties/Staff Handout
Internal Affairs/Agenda
on 9/20/11
Item No. 2