1	H op the	BEFORE THE		
2	FLORIDA	A PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
3	In the Matter o	· <del>- ·</del>		
4		DOCKET NO.	UNDOCKETED	
5	INITIATION OF F AMEND RULE 25-4	.0665, FLORIDA		
6	ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE, AND TO	REPEAL RULE		
7		DA ADMINISTRATIVE DR DISCONTINUANCE		
8		OMPANY/		
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15	PROCEEDINGS:	STAFF WORKSHOP		
16	TAKEN AT THE INSTANCE OF:	The Staff of the Florida Public Service Commission		
17	DATE:	Wednesday, January 18, 1012		
18	TIME:	Commenced at 1:30 p.m.		
19		Concluded at 1:56 p.m.		
20	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Cen Room 140	ter	
21		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida		
22	DEDODTED BV.	·		
23	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732		
24		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE	
25			00436 JAN 23 º	

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION CLERK

PROCEEDINGS

MS. GERVASI: Okay. I think we will go ahead and get started, so I will call this staff workshop to order. This time and place has been noticed for an undocketed staff rule development workshop on the initiation of rulemaking to amend Rule 25-4.0665, Florida Administrative Code, Lifeline service, and to repeal Rule 25-4.113 consistent with the 2011 changes made to Chapter 364 of the Florida Statutes.

I'm Rosanne Gervasi with the Commission's legal staff, and with me are Bob Casey and Bill McNulty of the technical staff. And we want to thank you all for being here today, and we appreciate your input in this rule development process. There are extra copies of the agenda and the rule, if anybody needs them, on the table here.

And then before we go into our brief overview of the rule where we'll walk you through what our changes are, I would like to remind everyone that the meeting is being reported by our court reporter, so when you do give your comments, please state and spell your name first for the court reporter, and speak clearly into your microphone for us.

Is there anybody on the telephone? We have the lines open so people may call in, but for now --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. GERVASI: Oh, there is. Okay. Very good. What we will do is after we take the commentary of those who are present in the room, we'll then turn it over to folks who are on the telephone to give your comments at that time.

Finally, if you do plan to give us suggested changes to the draft rule language, it is very helpful if you would refer us to the specific paragraph and line numbers of the draft rule and to provide us with the specific alternative language that you would suggest that we consider. And with that, I will it turn it over to Bob Casey for a brief overview of the changes to the rule.

MR. CASEY: Good afternoon. I'd like to go section-by-section starting with Section 20, and what I will do is briefly go over what we're trying to do, and then ask for comments, if you have any comments.

Section 20, the old Section 20 is being eliminated which required quarterly reports by all the ETCs. Now, the reason we are doing that is because of information being available from USAC. We can go to USAC's website and pull down a lot of that information, and we didn't think it was necessary anymore to have the ETCs give this on a quarterly basis.

I know you are going to have hurt feelings.

(Laugher.) And what we are doing is we are also adding something, which is the sentence that was in the Rule 25-4.113 about the discontinuance of Lifeline. Once we get this sentence in this new rule, we can repeal the total Rule 25-4.113. And, of course, the sentence says, "The company may not discontinue a customer's Lifeline local service if the charges, taxes, and fees applicable to dial tone, local usage, dual tone multifrequency dialing, emergency services, such as 911, and relay services are paid.

Now, does anyone have any comments on Section 20?

MR. FOLLENSBEE: Bob, this is Greg Follensbee with AT&T, F-O-L-L-E-N-S-B-E-E. I just want to confirm what you said on it. That AT&T was having to file a quarterly report, I think, for another reason dealing with a settlement, and I just want to make sure that what you said, that we don't have to file quarterly. When you said all the companies, that would include what AT&T previously had to file.

MR. CASEY: What we are actually doing is crossing out -- you can see what is crossed out here. What quarterly reports are you -- are you speaking of the Lifeline Community Service Fund?

1 MR. FOLLENSBEE: Yes, sir. And the fund no longer exists, so that would be part of it, as well. 2 3 MR. CASEY: It no longer exists at all? MR. FOLLENSBEE: Yes. We have exhausted the fund. 5 6 MR. CASEY: Okay. Well, if you have 7 exhausted the fund, there is no use sending a letter saying we have zero. 8 9 MR. FOLLENSBEE: Correct. MR. CASEY: Could you send us a letter to 10 that effect? 11 12 MR. FOLLENSBEE: Yes, sir. 13 MR. CASEY: Okay. And then we can respond 14 saying, yes, we agree you don't have to do any more 15 quarterly reports on the Community Service Fund. 16 MR. FOLLENSBEE: Thank you. 17 MR. O'ROARK: De O'Roark with Verizon. Two or three comments on Section 20. Obviously, no 18 19 objection to the language that is being deleted. 20 On the sentence that you are adding, there could be a concern if this were read as providing the 21 22 only basis on which a Lifeline customer's local service 23 could be discontinued. One suggestion that we have that I think will make it clear and would capture what 24 25 we think your intent is, is to add after the words

"local service" add "for nonpayment." Because what we think you are trying to get at is the circumstances under which a Lifeline customer's service can be discontinued for nonpayment.

There can be other valid reasons for discontinuing service. I mean, if you go to Rule 25-4.113, the rule that you are proposing to repeal, you have got a laundry list of reasons why service could be discontinued. For example, fraudulent or illegal use. And I'm sure that staff is not intending to rule out those sorts of reasons for discontinuing service.

And one thing that we would add, one approach that -- and I think we may suggest this in our comments -- in addition to adding the words "for nonpayment," it might be to pick up some of the language that you had in 113, and add it back here to make clear some of the reasons that you can discontinue a Lifeline customer's service. And we can provide that for you.

When we do that, one thing that we think it would be helpful to include is making it clear that, you know, as we move forward in the industry, as you know there's lots of changes, lots of changes in technology and the kinds of facilities that we are

using. As you know, Verizon is more and more providing service over fiber. We'd like to make it clear that if we are changing the technology used to serve a customer or the facilities used, that if a customer is not willing to allow us to make those changes and we are making those changes throughout the neighborhood, that could be a reason for discontinuing service.

For example, let's say that a neighborhood where we have got some fiber facilities and some copper and we make the decision, look, we are going to serve everybody on fiber, which is an upgrade and a good thing. We wouldn't want to have to retain copper to serve, say, a Lifeline customer who's not willing for us to make that network upgrade for their residence.

Or, likewise, if you had a Lifeline customer in an apartment complex, but the MDU owner is not willing to allow us to provide the fiber to provide service to that complex, that might be a reason why service might need to be discontinued. We can discuss that in a little more detail in our comments, but I think some of that might be helpful, some of that fleshing out might be helpful for guidance as we go forward.

MR. CASEY: We'll welcome any of those comments. If you could, just put them in there. Our intent is to push out the post-workshop comments until

after the Lifeline order is issued to give you an opportunity to look through that order and include any comments that you have on that, also, for any rule changes we may make here.

MR. O'ROARK: Terrific. Thank you.

MR. CASEY: Because some of the things may change. You know, what we are proposing here may change because of that order.

MR. O'ROARK: That makes good sense.

MR. HATCH: Quick question, Bob.

MR. CASEY: Sure.

MR. HATCH: This is Tracy Hatch with AT&T. With respect to when the FCC order come out, whatever it is going to say, nobody knows yet, but are you planning a subsequent workshop for that, or are you just going to plan on including whatever our comments are on top of this and taking that into conjunction?

MR. CASEY: I would anticipate that we would probably have to do another workshop. I haven't talked to our management yet, but I would anticipate we would have to have another workshop for that. What I would be looking for in post-workshop comments is anything that came out in the Lifeline order which affects our proposed language here.

MR. HATCH: And then take that up subsequent?

MR. CASEY: Yes. Any other comments?

MS. GERVASI: Anybody on the phone have comments to Paragraph 20? Okay.

MR. CASEY: Okay. We can go on to Paragraph 21. This has to do with Lifeline outreach and advertising. And what we're doing here in A and B is adding what is basically already required through an FCC order, FCC Order 0487.

(21) reads, "An eligible telecommunications carrier shall advertise the availability of Lifeline and Link-Up services in media of general distribution throughout its service areas. The outreach materials must target consumer groups that may be in need of Lifeline, such as seniors, young adults, consumers who live in remote areas, wireless users, non-English speaking populations, the disabled community, users of telecommunications relay service, and the unemployed."

Now, Subsection B says, "Eligible telecommunications carriers must develop outreach materials and methods designed to reach households that do not currently have telephone service. The outreach materials must be placed in locations where low-income individuals are likely to visit, such as shelters, soup kitchens, public assistance agencies, and public transportation. Multi-media outreach approaches such

as newspaper advertisement, articles in consumer newsletters, press releases, radio commercials, and radio and television public service announcements are also acceptable."

MR. FOLLENSBEE: This is Greg Follensbee.

Just a couple of questions, and then we may have further comments after others speak. Going to the last sentence when you say are also acceptable, does that mean in lieu of the others that are mentioned in (b) above? In other words, rather than putting outreach materials in specific locations, we simply can do outreach through public media, or is it intended that it would be required of us to do both?

MR. CASEY: I would have to -- could you put that in your comments and ask that question?

MR. FOLLENSBEE: Absolutely.

MR. CASEY: We'll give you an answer.

MR. FOLLENSBEE: Okay.

MR. CASEY: I'd rather get together with the group before I answer that.

MR. HATCH: This is Tracy Hatch again with AT&T. Just sort of a quick thought that I understand that all of your Lifeline stuff that you are doing is, in part, coming out of your delegated federal authority

to start with. It strikes me as a little bit
overreaching, perhaps, to start building substantive
rules on a federal rule as your source authority that
doesn't already exist in your state statutory
authority. And as you recall when we addressed Chapter
364 last year, a lot of the specific statutory
authority for the Commission to require companies to go
out and do outreach and make publications and do that
advertising and that sort of thing, that went away.

There is a provision that was put into 364.110, which is the Lifeline provision, that allows the Commission to conduct outreach, but I'm not sure that you can extend that piece to require us to now start conducting outreach. And so that is just a question in my mind that this substantive proposal of you go do these things as to how you are proposing us to require us to do that.

MR. CASEY: Well, if you're expecting a legal opinion from me, I don't have esquire after my name.

MR. HATCH: No, but I was just simply giving you a heads-up.

MS. GERVASI: It's certainly something that we would like to consider. And are you planning to file post-workshop comments, Tracy?

MR. HATCH: I hadn't considered that. In

part we are waiting to see what happens with the FCC's rules, too. It may all go away. It may change substantially. I mean, that's part of the reason why I wanted to understand whether there will be a subsequent workshop to really flesh all this out and figure out where we are.

MS. GERVASI: Okay. I mean, I don't have an answer either, but it is certainly something to think about.

MR. HATCH: Yes.

MR. O'ROARK: De O'Roark, again, with Verizon. We had the same concern that Tracy expressed about the statutory authority for this rule and, I think, for the others that we are about to cover. And we will be filing post-workshop comments and will address that in some more detail then.

MS. GERVASI: Thank you.

MR. CASEY: Any other comments? Anyone on the phone like to comment?

Okay. Let's go ahead and move on to

Section 22. (22) states that, "Eligible

telecommunications carriers that resell Lifeline and/or

Link-Up services to non-eligible telecommunications

carriers are required to obtain a certification from

each reseller that it is complying with all the

Commission and Federal Communications Commission

Lifeline/Link-Up requirements. The eligible

telecommunications carriers shall file a copy of this

certification with the Division of the Commission Clerk

by October 1 of each year. Comments?

MR. FOLLENSBEE: This is Greg Follensbee.

Yes, we do have a couple of comments on this. We are familiar somewhat with the certification program from the standpoint, for instance, that annually we'll get a certification from companies that they are sales tax exempt. And so absent that, we will assess them sales tax until we receive that certificate saying, no, don't charge me sales tax, I'll be liable directly with the Department of Revenue for those.

Under that same vein, we are wondering why it wouldn't be better for the companies that are wanting to do this to get a certificate from you. Because the question that is raised in AT&T's mind is if they certify they are compliant with the FCC Link-Up requirements, which to me might also require the rules, what if they aren't? There's nothing we can do, because we've just simply got a piece of paper saying they are. It would seem like if you are wanting them to be required to comply with those, you would want them to register and certify with you they are.

Now, I will tell that you that this is one area I hear the FCC will be addressing in their rules. I just don't know how. But that is the one thing we are concerned with is trying to get these certificates, and the question becomes then until we do, do we reject their orders? Do we stop taking orders for them where today when an order comes in, they say the customer is Lifeline eligible, we'll process it, we'll make sure we have the documentation we need, and then we will give the reseller the credit. And we don't know then if they are passing that credit on to the end users. But if you are now requiring us to get a certificate that they are compliant and we don't get one, now we're in a process of having to reject their orders.

And so I think there is some more thought that needs to be done on this on process, because that will increase our cost of operations to know when will we have to reject an order, what kind of reject code do we have to put in, does it impact our SQM SEEMs, because suddenly we are having to reject an order. So I think there is a little bit more behind this for AT&T than the simple -- what you think would be a simple requirement on our behalf to make sure these companies are compliant with whatever they are doing and telling customers I can sell you Lifeline service.

MR. CASEY: Now, this requirement is something you should be doing already. ETCs should be doing already. And, basically, all we are asking for is, well, when you get this certification, we'd like a copy of it. Because we don't know who the carriers are out there that are selling Lifeline, the non-ETCs.

MR. FOLLENSBEE: Right. And I'm hoping the FCC may shut the done door on that, so we can kind of get to it, but we are just going to live with whatever the rules changes are.

MR. CASEY: Right. This might be a moot point, as you said.

MR. FOLLENSBEE: It is. But the point being that if they don't get the certificate, we really today don't have a process to stop processing the order. And we also don't know if they are compliant or not, because a certificate doesn't mean any kind of compliance. It's just simply somebody gave you a piece of paper saying, oh, yeah, I'm following some guidelines.

MR. CASEY: Right. And if we get complaints saying this carrier is supplying Lifeline, and they're only given a \$10 credit or something, and then we would ask you, well, do you have a certificate saying that they have complied with all the rules and regulations,

and then we would go off that carrier. We're not going to go after you. All we want is a copy of that certificate saying that they have been following Lifeline and Link-Up.

MR. FOLLENSBEE: And that's why we think that it shortcuts us as the middle person. Let them come to you and certify it; we'll get it from you saying they have filed it.

MR. CASEY: We don't know who they are. See, you know who is selling Lifeline because you are giving the discount to them.

MR. FOLLENSBEE: Any company could, is the point. Any company could, that isn't an ETC themselves, could be doing it.

MR. CASEY: Right. But we don't know which companies are.

MR. FOLLENSBEE: We don't either until they place the order.

MR. CASEY: Right. But you know --

MR. FOLLENSBEE: So it is a chicken and egg.

I don't disagree, but I'm just saying we're probably
going to have some more comments on this. Because now
that you are putting in a rule that we have to do this,
it puts it at a higher level than probably we have been
processing in the past. We probably have been

1	processing some orders with the certificate not yet
2	received. Again, it gets to be is this really what we
3	need to be doing in the future with all of this going
4	on with Lifeline and all the issues that the FCC and
5	you all have addressed over the last 18 months.
6	MR. CASEY: The whole world of Lifeline may
7	change in a few weeks.
8	MR. FOLLENSBEE: Yes, sir, it just might.
9	MR. CASEY: And please include those in your
10	comments.
11	MR. FOLLENSBEE: We're give you more comments
12	on some of the issues we have with this particular
13	part.
14	MR. CASEY: Okay. I appreciate it.
15	MR. FOLLENSBEE: But we'll wait until the FCC
16	rule comes out to see if it has changed that whole
17	world.
18	MR. CASEY: That makes sense.
19	MR. FOLLENSBEE: Thank you.
20	MR. CASEY: De, did you have some comments?
21	MR. O'ROARK: No further comments from
22	Verizon.
23	MR. CASEY: Okay. Anyone else? Anyone on
24	the telephone like to comment on Section 22?
25	Okay. Let's go ahead with the last section

here. This is Section 23, and it reads, "Each eligible telecommunications carrier shall retain its eligibility documentation as a designated eligible telecommunications carrier, as well as for its customers receiving Lifeline discounts for a period of three years."

Now, I open the floor for comments.
Susan.

MS. BERLIN: Hi, it's Susan Berlin with

Sprint. B-E-R-L-I-N. It's really just a question.

Would you consider digital copies of documents that

were retained for the requisite period of time

sufficient? If the originals are not retained, but

electronic copies are retained for this amount of time

and even longer, is that sufficient?

MR. CASEY: That's something I would like to take up again with the group, and if you would include that in your comments, I would appreciate it.

MS. BERLIN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CASEY: I don't think that would be a problem, but before I say okay I'd like to get with the group, the Lifeline group.

Any other comments? How about on the telephone, any comments on Section 23?

Well, this is going pretty fast. I will turn

it over to the attorney now. Rosanne.

MS. GERVASI: I think the only other course of business at this point is to set a date for the post-hearing comments. Do we know when the FCC order is going to be issued?

MR. CASEY: They are going to meet on

January 31st, and its anybody guess when the order will

be released, but we can push the date out. Any

suggestions, 30 or 60 days, or --

MR. FOLLENSBEE: Well, I was going to ask you a question on that point to understand process. This is Greg Follensbee, excuse me. If we get the rules out from the FCC, there might be other things you want to add to your rule. So the question becomes does it make sense to give you comments on what you have proposed if you might have to propose a whole brand new set of other rules? So the question is are you going to do a two-part process? Do this rule once and come back in four months and do it again, or are you intending to do it all at once?

The only reason I'm asking is it just depends on when comments would then be due. Because, in other words, we could give you comments knowing that we would discuss them at the next workshop, knowing that you may be proposing three more pages of rules, you may be not,

it's just an unknown.

MR. CASEY: Right. We're looking at it in sort of a two-part. Let's take care of this now.

Let's get that one section repealed, the other rule repealed by putting that sentence in this, and then we will work on, you know, the new rules, if there's going to be new rules.

MR. FOLLENSBEE: Then if you're looking for advice, I would think we could have something to you in 45 days, which would be roughly 30 days after the FCC votes. If you want to go 60 just in case there's a concern the order won't be out that much sooner, that's fine with us. I mean, I think we would need a minimum probably of about 30 days after the vote, which could be two weeks or three weeks after the actual written rules are out.

MR. CASEY: Let me ask Rosanne. Rosanne, could we word it such as 30 days after the issuance of the order, the FCC order?

MS. GERVASI: Sure.

MR. CASEY: Because what happens if they issue it three or four weeks after Agenda? I don't want to be tied down, have you tied down. Would that be okay?

MR. HATCH: Anything after the end of the

1 session would be very helpful. MR. CASEY: I don't keep track of those 2 dates. 3 4 MS. GERVASI: So 30 days after the issuance of the FCC order. Does that sound good? And when you 5 file those comments, if you would please file them in 6 7 the Clerk's office with a cover letter saying to please 8 put these comments in the undocketed file. The Clerk's Office has a big massive undocketed file, and we'll know to look for them there, and this way it is more 10 easily accessible to all of the staff. 11 12 And with that, if nobody has any other comments or questions, we can go ahead and adjourn the 13 14 workshop. 15 Thank you all for being here and for your participation. 16 17 Thank you very much. MR. CASEY: 18 (The Workshop concluded at 1:56 p.m.) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	STATE OF FLORIDA )		
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER		
3	COUNTY OF LEON )		
4	T TAME ENLIDOR DDD Chief Heaving Describes		
5	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard		
6	at the time and place herein stated.		
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that		
8	the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a		
9	true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.		
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties,		
11	nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I		
12	financially interested in the action.		
13	DATED THIS 23rd day of January, 2012.		
14			
15	Jane Janet		
16	JAME FAUROT, RPR Official FASC Hearings Reporter		
17	(850) 413-6732		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			