	FILED JUL 15, 2016 DOCUMENT NO. 05083-	16	000001
1	FPSC - COMMISSION C		000001
1	FLORIDA E	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
2			
3	In the Matter of:		
4		DOCKET NO. 140029-TP	
5	REQUEST FOR SUBMISS		
6	PROPOSALS FOR RELAY BEGINNING IN JUNE 2 DEAF, HARD OF HEARI	2015, FOR THE	
7	DEAF/BLIND, OR SPEE AND OTHER IMPLEMENT	ECH IMPAIRED,	
8	IN COMPLIANCE WITH TELECOMMUNICATIONS	THE FLORIDA	
9	ACT OF 1991.	ACCESS SISTEM	
10		/	
11			
12			
13	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEM NO. 2	
14	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN JULIE I. BROWN	
15		COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM	
16		COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER JIMMY PATRONIS	
17	DATE:	July 7, 2016	
18	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center	
19	FLACE.	Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way	
20		Tallahassee, Florida	
21	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR	
22		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734	
23			
24			
25			
	FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	

000002

PROCEEDINGS

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

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right. Circling back to Item 2.

Good morning. Now you're here. Mr. Williams, welcome.

MR. WILLIAMS: Telecom takeover, yes. CHAIRMAN BROWN: That's right, telecom takeover.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Chairman Brown, Commissioners. Curtis Williams on behalf of staff.

Item 2 addresses Florida Telecommunications Relay, Incorporated's 2016/2017 proposed budget and two new appointments to the Telecommunications Access System Act Advisory Committee.

In Issue 1, staff presents three recommendation options for the budget. Staff recommends that FTRI's budget expenses be reduced by approximately 600,000, which is Option 1. Staff also recommends that the surcharge be reduced to 11 cents beginning September 1st, 2016. Staff further recommends that, if necessary, FTRI be allowed to use a surplus account if there is a revenue shortfall in fiscal year 2016/2017.

In Issue 2, staff recommends that the Commission approve the appointments of Mr. Tom D'Angelo and Mr. Tim Wata to the TASA Advisory Committee.

Mr. D'Angelo and Mr. Wata both have extensive relay experience and were nominated for appointment to the TASA Committee by the Florida Association of the Deaf.

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

Late yesterday afternoon, we want to point out, and early this morning staff received a total of six letters in support of FTRI's proposed budget, which have been included in the docket file and shared with your staff and relevant staff on this docket.

FTRI is here to address the Commission and to answer any questions. The staff is also available to answer questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Great. And before we turn to FTRI, I wanted to thank staff for their additional due diligence on this particular item, and for FTRI allowing the delay to have staff provide a more thorough recommendation for us to consider. And with that, Mr. Forstall, you have the floor, sir.

MR. FORSTALL: Good morning. I'm James Forstall, the executive director of FTRI. With me are Brett Bascom, FTRI business manager; Stan Greer, FTRI board president; and Robert Telfer, FTRI legal counsel.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding FTRI's fiscal year 2016/17 budget and staff's recommendation. On March 7th, FTRI submitted a board-approved budget, which is Option 3 in staff's

recommendation.

On April 13th, FTRI presented its budget during the TASA Advisory Committee meeting, at which time the Advisory Committee verbally endorsed the FTRI-approved budget as submitted. On April 22nd, the FPSC staff recommended the approval of FTRI's board-approved budget.

On June 23rd, the Florida Public Service Commission staff issued a revised recommendation, which includes three separate options, one of them being the original FTRI board-approved option, No. 3; with Option 2, the actual 2015/16 expenses level updated by staff; and Option 1, a substitute budget prepared by staff.

Option 1, we believe, goes far beyond oversight and interferes with FTRI's administration of TASA, and for this reason we oppose Option 1. We do recognize that Option No. 1 raises some issues which should be reviewed, and we intend to do so. However, the FTRI board convened after receiving staff's recommendation and maintains that Option No. 3 should be approved as submitted.

I would like to address a few specifics of the staff recommendation, but first I'd like to provide some general comments.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

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

Last year, our former counsel, Doc Horton, provided the Commission with some general background and history of TASA, which is now 25 years old, Chapter 427 and FTRI, which we thought was helpful for last year's discussion, and we -- and which we would like to reemphasize some points here today.

TASA Chapter 427 requires the administrator to be a not-for-profit corporation organized under Chapter 17, which is the Florida not-for-profit statute. FTRI is organized specifically under this provision for the sole purpose of administrating TASA. FTRI, as the administrator, has no other business. It is governed by a board, and, again, its sole purpose is to administer TASA, which was adopted in 1991 by the legislature.

The budget before you, which was Option No. 3 in the staff recommendation, was prepared by FTRI based on its experience and establishes the funding it believes is necessary to maintain the effectiveness and the quality of the system as intended by the legislature. It was approved by the FTRI board which continues to endorse it. We do urge its approval.

In reviewing the Commission's role in this process, the staff recommendation notes that Section 427.704(1) provides that it shall establish, implement, promote, and oversee the administration of the system.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Section 427.704 further outlines the powers and duties of the Commission. Importantly, it provides the Commission the authority to determine the amount of surcharge based on the funding necessary to accomplish the purpose of TASA and provide services on an ongoing basis.

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

The Commission also has the authority to suspend the surcharge for a period of time, if it deems it's appropriate. The legislature provided the Commission with the flexibility to set a surcharge between zero and 25 cents to ensure the necessary funds. FTRI has interpreted this statutory section and the PSC's role to set a surcharge that is at least sufficient to maintain the quality of the program.

Under TASA, specifically Section 427.705, it is the responsibility of FTRI, as the administrator, to deal with the day-to-day operation. This includes purchasing, distributing equipment, training, outreach, advertising, et cetera. FTRI continues to take the view that under TASA, the Commission's role is one of oversight and not management of FTRI's operation and a determination of a surcharge that sufficiently maintains the quality of the program.

Under TASA, FTRI is charged with these day-to-day operations and numerous responsibilities. As

we stated last year, FTRI believes the reason that the legislature provided the Commission with the flexibility to change the surcharge was to ensure that the program is adequately funded. We believe this flexibility is particularly important now when we are confronted with declining access lines.

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

At this time, I would like to address some concerns for consideration. FTRI's outreach specialist resigned her position, and FTRI is looking to hire an outreach management -- manager as a replacement. Option 3 provides it with the best option to accomplish this.

Regarding staff's recommended Option No. 1, we're concerned that the reduction to outreach, which is vital to FTRI's ability to inform the general public about the equipment distribution program and the Florida Relay service, limits FTRI's capability to fulfill the mission and spirit of TASA.

FTRI's tracking mechanism clearly shows that specific outreach activities are effective with recruiting clients to the program. Option 1 would limit our capability to purchase and distribute equipment, provide training and services sufficiently, as directed under Florida Statutes, Chapter 427.705.

Another concern had to do with the information

presented in Table 2 found on page 8. It is FTRI's view that this table does not provide a comprehensive picture of the services FTRI provides. We would like to provide the Commissioners a table for what we believe to be a full picture of cost per service/activity. This chart does reflect a downward trend of cost per service activity until the past year and this year's year-end estimate. This could be attributed to the fact that several RDCs have ceased the FTRI program in their area.

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

During fiscal year 2015/16, the three RDCs, regional distribution centers, that ceased the FTRI program could have potentially contributed over 2,000 additional FTRI service and activity.

We do thank you for the opportunity to share these comments, and we're available to answer any questions the Commissioners may have.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Forstall.

Staff, would you like to respond to any of the comments that were made before we bring it back to the bench?

MS. SALAK: Certainly. I would rather go -- I want to go to the specifics, if you don't mind. I believe that the amount that's under Option 1 for outreach is plenty to inform the consumers of Florida. I think that it will take some tough decisions on

Mr. Forstall's part that he has laid out, and he needs to prioritize the outreach that he has planned. If he wants to do the full newspaper for the state, he still has plenty of money -- he has the sufficient funds to do that under Option 1. That would mean cutting back another program. So he has to decide what he believes is the most effective outreach. But I do believe that there is sufficient monies to reach many consumers.

As far as training and services, we took into consideration that we have reduced outreach, and so outreach should have an impact on how many -- I mean, it may have an impact on how many people you reach. We believe that there is a correlation between equipment distribution and outreach. As such, it's not dollar for dollar, so we've reduced what they requested by a third. We, in turn, reduced equipment and the training and services by 10 percent in recognition of the reduction in outreach.

I believe these -- I would turn to you, Pam, Ms. Page, there we go, to discuss anything that she wants to discuss about the TASA.

MS. PAGE: Under TASA, the Commission oversees the Florida Telecommunications Relay System. The statute that we must comply with is Title IV of the Americans with Disabilities Act. We are only required

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

to provide service that is functionally equivalent to that which is available to hearing persons. We believe that what we are providing here is compliant with Title IV of the ADA and that there is no specific requirement in the ADA or in the FCC regulations that we provide specific types of service such as cellular or wireless.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Commissioners?

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

I'll start off with a question for Mr. Forstall. Looking at Table 2 in the staff recommendation, which is on page 8, you referenced the table or the numbers in your comments. It shows your budget operating expenditures per new client to have really increased in your budget proposal even with the declining new customers, which is a departure from what FTRI has been doing over the last few years, since at least I've been on the Commission. So I'm just trying to understand your business philosophy to increase operating costs in a declining marketplace.

MR. FORSTALL: Our budget is based on the fact of our experience and the distribution of services, and we don't believe that the market has declined for those that would be eligible for the program. The decline that you may be referencing to is a decline in the relay

minutes --

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

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Uh-huh.

MR. FORSTALL: -- which really have no correlation to the actual client that received the equipment and -- or have an opportunity to obtain access to the telephone system. And so we believe also with the shorter number too that that does not reflect -- as I said earlier, that's not a reflective total picture of what we believe. And I do have a chart available for the Commissioners for review, should you be interested in looking at it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Yes.

I'll restate, though, a decline in minutes, yet an increase in operating costs. Thanks.

MR. FORSTALL: The increase in the operating costs, specifically in general administrative, is due to the cost of doing business. We have -- or we are experiencing an increase in the associated costs with employees' compensation, benefits, et cetera. And we also -- other services also are experiencing an increase in the administrative service. And the -- with regards to outreach, we do believe that continuing to insert newspaper ads do make a positive impact with the number of people that are being referred to the program. Again, we continue to hear over and over again that

people have not heard about the program and are hearing about it for the first time.

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

In addition, as mentioned with Option No. 1, the reduction to outreach that the -- we could maintain newspaper advertisements; however, we may have to make a reduction with the actual contract with regard to the regional distribution centers doing outreach, which really plays another major role in recruiting clients as well.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: So looking at this handout that you just passed to the Commissioners, it notes that three RDCs ceased providing services during the fiscal year 2015 and 2016. Is that a result because there was not a need?

MR. FORSTALL: No. Actually two of the centers ceased -- dissolved due to financial difficulty with the individual centers. And keep in mind, they are contracted with FTRI. We do not have any oversight or input as to how they operate the program. We do provide them with a procedures manual specifically to the FTRI program. But almost all regional distribution centers provide other services and activities to the community. The FTRI program is just one part of it. And due to the fact that the other services were being -- budgets were being cut, they had to close their office. And so,

therefore, the FTRI program did cease in those areas; however, we are actively looking to find a replacement in those particular areas.

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

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I'm going to restate my first question, and my first question was it looks like FTRI has been trying to hold the line with the budget with the reduction in relay minutes and customers that -- new customers. I don't understand why there's such a big jump in outreach, given the current climate for landlines, and I don't understand the jump in the administrative costs, including salaries, advertising, consultation, computer expenses, travel business, additional training that wasn't there. Why are there so many increases when minutes are declining, customers are declining?

MR. FORSTALL: Okay. And, yes, you're correct that the minutes for the relay are declining. We do have a section of the population that we serve who are the hard of hearing, who rely on amplified telephones, that do not use the relay service. And so when you have that particular population, who are the majority of the people we serve today, is people who are becoming older in life, losing their hearing as they become older or are being challenged with being able to communicate daily on the telephone, and that's the population that

we're focused on with the outreach and marketing and providing additional services to. Now, granted, we would love to be able to provide services, and we do, by the way, we do provide services to the deaf community that relies on the relay services. Unfortunately, we do not have equipment. More and more deaf individuals are migrating to newer technology such as the video relay phone.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Uh-huh.

MR. FORSTALL: Text messaging or -- exactly. So, therefore, we're not able to supply that equipment to work with them. And so that's why we're seeing the shift from the deaf community to the hard of hearing. It has been that way for a few years, and we have -- we would welcome the opportunity to be able to distribute that type of equipment that would allow the deaf community to communicate.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Will that be possible?

MR. FORSTALL: Not under the current statute. But we know other states are doing it all across the country. Florida, unfortunately, is one of the states that has not made the change to -- with technology. It's there and, you know, we would love to be able to, be able to provide that service.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: So that would take a

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

legislative fix?

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

MR. FORSTALL: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: What is your biggest area of concern with the proposal, either Option 1 or Option 2, the reduction, what area?

MR. FORSTALL: We still, of course, stand firm on Option 3. Option 1 and 2 does limit us to the ability to -- first of all, as I said earlier, I wanted to be able to replace the outreach specialist with the outreach manager. And at the time we developed the budget, we had an outreach specialist on staff. So moving to the outreach manager would require an increase in that particular line item.

We would -- what we see happening is should we run out of funding in any line item, the option would be to come back to the Commissioners to request additional funding.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And that's always an option.

MR. FORSTALL: Yes. We do recognize that, although based -- the budget we submitted is just based on our experience and what we believe will take place, if the projection is approved to operate the FTRI program.

> CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you. MS. SALAK: Oh, I'm sorry. Could I just add

one other thing? He is correct. He can come back and ask for a budget increase later. He can do that. And the other thing that we added to the recommendation was that for categories 2 through 5, that they could shift 10 percent of the amount without coming here for approval. We did have some exclusions in there. But they still have that option also. If, say, they don't have enough equipment, they can shift it from -- well, I hate to say it -- outreach or from other items in their budget.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Salak. And, you know, I originally liked Option 2 because it gave FTRI a little more flexibility --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MS. SALAK: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: -- to kind of meet its needs. But then having my briefing with you all and going over Option 1, it appears that you really adjusted where the costs should be most appropriately made when you went with Option 1. Is your recommendation, is your preference Option 1 or Option 2?

MS. SALAK: There are certain items in Option 1 that I feel strongly about, but certainly you can start with Option 2 and make a few of those adjustments. For example, I think temporary employment, I think that is double counting in the budget. I mean,

that's like a \$9,400 adjustment. I think that the -- as far as the employee benefits, it's a lot of adjustments we made to employee benefits. And I think that for some of their people on the low end of the salary range, that would be difficult for them to absorb. Well, there's the retirement adjustment, there's the short-term liability, long-term liability, which doesn't come out of their paycheck, but they would have to choose whether they were going to buy those or not. The retirement would actually have them paying for part of it. So I think there was a lot that could impact some of the lower paid employees, so that is always a concern.

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

I think that the outreach is fine the way we recommended it. There's a difference between \$74,000 basically between Option 1 and Option 2 for outreach.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Uh-huh.

MS. SALAK: And it does not -- they were -wanted additional in their budget to do the newspapers basically targeted at people 64 and older, 65 and older in specific areas. And that would not give them the additional ability to do that statewide, but it still -our recommendation would still allow them to continue that, if they wanted to. If they wanted to do that as their primary outreach, they could still do it under Option 1 or 2.

000018 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Now getting back to the 1 Category 2, which is the equipment and repair --2 3 MS. SALAK: Yes. 4 CHAIRMAN BROWN: -- you reduced that in Option 2 --5 MS. SALAK: Yes. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BROWN: -- a little bit less than Option 1. Is that because -- is that a correlation with 8 9 the outreach, is that --10 MS. SALAK: That would be part of it. 11 Option 2 is strictly going back to their actuals as we 12 got more information and we updated the actuals. And so 13 if you wanted to go back and just give them the actuals 14 for last year, that would be Option 2. 15 We totally took a different approach to Option 16 1, where we just went through line by line and said, all 17 right, is -- based on last year and calculation of last 18 year, based on what we see, you know, how they projected 19 it, what is in there? It was just -- that's how we did 20 that. It was a line-by-line evaluation by evaluation. 21 Then when we reduced the outreach, again, I'll say that 22 we think there's a correlation between outreach and 23 placement of equipment. 24 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Uh-huh. 25 MS. SALAK: I mean, or the -- not dollar for

dollar, but there -- we believe that that should be a correlation and so that's why we reduced it, and judgmentally 10 percent. That was our judgment call based on what we've seen and knowing that not -- some outreach is more effective than other outreach and just recognizing that. So that's how we -- and we did that to the RDC Category 2 about the training. And the distribution, the same 10 percent was used for that.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you for your thorough explanation. I appreciate it.

MS. SALAK: Yes, ma'am.

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

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I'm very excited about the ability to reduce the surcharge finally. I think that it's something that's been longstanding a need.

Commissioners, curious about your thoughts too on some of these issues. I don't see any lights.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Madam Chair. If I can to staff, I'm -- of course, we've discussed it and I've gone back over it a couple of times and -well, more than a couple of times -- and with my staff as well, and I'm still kind of weighing back and forth the differences and potential impacts between Option 1 and Option 2.

Recognizing that Option 1 recommends a

decrease in the surcharge from 12 cents to 11 cents, Option 2 does not make that recommendation but does discuss that that is a potential. Could you talk -- or somebody on staff -- a little bit more about option -the differences between Option 1 and Option 2, but also looking at Option 2 more specifically, if, indeed, we had some interest in incorporating the 12-cent to 11-cent change?

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

MS. SALAK: Uh-huh. I believe in any of the three options you can incorporate the 11 cents. It's just a matter of how much you are willing to pull out of the surplus account.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: From the reserve.

MS. SALAK: The reserve, yes. Better terminology definitely. But that is money, as you probably know already, but it's money that was set aside by the Commission years ago because of some services that the FCC plans to send to the states. Now -- and I have always been a supporter of keeping the surplus intact; however, the FCC recently has been saying that they will give states transition time.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Uh-huh.

MS. SALAK: For us, to pick up any of those services, I believe that we would need a legislative change, if that's what they chose to do. The people

000021

that make policy would have to look at it and decide what they wanted.

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

So that was a stopgap measure historically for getting us through to the next legislative session so we could ask the question. Again, since we've got a couple -- if they're going to build in time at the FCC, I think that you could use the surplus and that would be the way that you would reduce it to 11 cents. And, you know, these numbers are -- it's close in Option 2. We're still into the 12s, but it's very -- you know, it's like \$60,000. So that's not a lot, given that we're banking on whether landlines decline or not. So you never know when -- you know, it's not a for sure thing that they'll have all that revenue. So, yes, you can go to 11, but you just have to understand that it would come from the surplus, and that is true for 1, 2, and 3 just how much you wanted --

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

MS. SALAK: Did you have any -- did that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: You did.

Follow-up?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So, again, could you walk me through what reductions to the budget request would

be between Option 2 and Option 3, recognizing Option 3 is the budget that was submitted, between Option 2 and Option 3 versus Option 1 and Option 3? And I hope that's clear.

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

MS. SALAK: Yes. There are a lot of -- there are a lot of changes just due to what we believe was actual. So that's going to be reflected. But let me go to what I believe are the major differences between 1 and 3 versus 2 and 3. How about we do that.

We specifically made a change to line 12 --I'm on page 25 -- line 12, which was the hard of hearing equipment that Mr. Forstall was discussing. Again, this was because of the outreach that we made that adjustment. And the Option 2 was just based on historical numbers.

Again, we made a specific adjustment to the Item 4, I mean, 14, line 14, just because we thought that that was a more reasonable -- based on history and based on we thought that 10,000 was more reasonable than the 15 requested.

We also reduced some signaling equipment based on looking at what actual had been and what we thought might happen this year. We made it 10,000 instead of the 7,000, which we are -- actually we're higher than Option 2 but lower than the proposed budget.

We reduced the accessories and supplies, the same sort of rationale. And I did not -- we did not -notedly, we did not reduce the repair because we believe that they will see some additional repair this year because they're going off warranties.

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

For Category 3, again, the Option 2 reflects what we believe their actual was for -- or estimate of their actual for last year. Ours was again the 10 percent because of the -- pure and simple because of the outreach reduction we made. It is the corresponding reduction to what we believe what would happen to distribution and training. And so that was the cause for our -- is this getting what you want or -- okay.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Absolutely.

MS. SALAK: Okay. I just want to make sure. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes. Yes, thank you, please.

MS. SALAK: Item 25 is a large item. Their actual for last year, they spent their budget for outreach, which was the 574,626. They had committed it by the time that we were writing the recommendation, so we believed that -- we called it spent. We reduced it to \$500,000. In light, Option 1, the whole premise behind Option 1 was reducing expenses because landlines are, you know, falling and there are fewer people to pay

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

for it, and so it's a heavier burden on fewer people.

Advertising, we actually adjusted the -- both columns. We went beyond what was actually, we thought, was their actual for last year for Option 2. But in addition, we made an adjustment because we didn't think they needed quite as much advertising for the one position that they had available at that time.

We did cut legal expense in half. We did that because we are suggesting that perhaps if they go hourly as opposed to doing a retainer. So that was -- if that doesn't work, they can tell us next year. Because, you know, we just thought that perhaps -- we did an estimate of number of hours we thought perhaps they would use and this is the amount we came up with.

We didn't -- we did cut dues and subscriptions in half just because -- or, no, this is computer consultation. We noticed that their history was half of what it was, you know, what their request was. They added some additional people coming in four hours a week to look at how their computers were operating and whether or not they had bugs and that kind of stuff. So we cut that back.

I'll just -- I think I'll just -- I'll jump to health insurance. There were a couple of adjustments, if I remember right, there were a couple of adjustments

in this one. This is where we would have cut out their long-term and short-term disability. There was also an adjustment made for the tax credit that they would get, and so we added -- we deducted the tax credit also. We thought -- they thought perhaps it would go away. Legally, we said, well, we'll base it on current law. We believe that they would still get it. We did use last year's amount. That could vary somewhat.

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

The next real major adjustment we made was to retirement, which would be line 41. And that was due mostly -- we want them to -- the employees to pay for part of their retirement, which seems to be the normal practice of most companies these days. So this was having -- they pay 11.1 percent. We were suggesting that the FTRI still pay 8.1 but have the employees pay 3.

The employee compensation, just in keeping with cutting costs that we thought that most of the employees had already had a raise in the last several years, so we would suggest for a year that they not have any raises.

Temporary employment, this is one I -- I think this is double counting because they included the temporary employment and the full salaries. And so if you're missing somebody, you wouldn't have your full

salaries. But that -- so that would be the adjustment for Option 1. And the other would just be the -- our projected expenses.

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

Payroll taxes, that was because we reduced the salaries and so we were just -- just a fallout issue. We reduced -- in line 48 we reduced their travel and business expenses. We looked at what we -- they projected for the last year. Well, what we projected for their final expense for last year. They had added a few non-event-related trips, and so we just virtually cut those out is what we did.

We go to employee training on line 50. That was just an oversight that they included something that was not during this calendar, this fiscal year. So we made that adjust in 50.

> So that's pretty much -- oh, there we go. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Ms. Salak. MS. SALAK: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Madam Chair. Ms. Salak, can you remind me, please, what Category 50 -- excuse me -- line 53, Category 6 is? That acronym is just --

MS. SALAK: That is the program that we discussed in the background that they have -- that was from the FCC where they would distribute some equipment

0	0	0	0	2	7
<u> </u>	~	~	~	_	

that was -- and they have chosen to not do that any 1 2 longer. 3 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's right. MS. SALAK: So we have it as a reference 4 point, but it's no longer considered. 5 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's great. Thank you. 6 7 The NDBEDP. MR. WILLIAMS: National Deaf/Blind Equipment 8 9 Distribution Program. 10 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. Like I said, 11 that acronym was just not clicking for me. So I do 12 recall that issue, so thank you very much. 13 Madam Chair, thank you for the opportunity. 14 CHAIRMAN BROWN: No, I appreciate that. And, Ms. Salak, thank you for walking us through some of the 15 16 major adjustments. And I'm happy that we're spending 17 some time on this, discussing it, because it is a very important job that we have here. Really, we are the 18 19 ones that will hold FTRI accountable for keeping the 20 line and keeping the budget lean. So I appreciate the 21 Commissioners getting into these issues. And, as 22 always, staff, thank you for your fine work on it. 23 Is Mr. Horton retired? 24 MS. SALAK: Yes, ma'am. 25 CHAIRMAN BROWN: He is.

000028

MS. SALAK: But he is here. Yes.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: He is. Okay. All right. Thank you.

Commissioners, I don't see any other lights, so I think we're ripe for a motion at this time.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not quite there yet, but let me put this out if -and see if there is some discussion. I also -- and thank you to -- thankful to our staff for obviously the very detailed work and review and analysis that they have done on this, and, of course, thankful to the representatives of FTRI for the good work that you do and the service that you provide.

I do believe that for a program such as this that has a statutory mission and is clearly providing a service that is necessary and useful to a certain population is important, and I clearly support that. I do believe that having a healthy reserve for such a program is appropriate, especially when it is somewhat bound to the whims and travails of the FCC change process and also potentially, as a result, then dependent upon legislative action as a follow-up to help implement.

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

I am supportive with my understanding of the

numbers, I am supportive of the change at this point in time from 12 cents to 11 cents for the surcharge recommending -- or recognizing that this issue will be back before the Commission next year and potentially could be adjusted, if necessary. And, of course, as was pointed out, that prior to that, FTRI could certainly come back for a subsequent request, if there was a need.

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

Again, recognizing that I do believe a healthy reserve is appropriate under these circumstances under Option 2, the potential tap into that reserve of approximately, my understanding, 40- to 65,000 annually I do think is appropriate. That keeps the reserve strong and healthy, if indeed that is needed.

I also am supportive of giving the -- or making sure that FTRI has the ability to shift between category with that 12 percent cap. I think that's an appropriate management tool. And so with that, Madam Chair, just some general thoughts, and I look forward to any further discussion.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Commissioner Edgar, and agree with almost all of those comments you made too. Thank you.

Commissioners, any other comments before we get into a motion?

Commissioner Brisé.

000030

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think I'm pretty close to, conceptually to some of the issues that Commissioner Edgar brought forward. There's just one thing from a philosophical perspective. I believe that boards that are in place to set budgets, it's their job to set their budget. And part of my concern with Option 1 is that we are -- from my perspective, if we pursue Option 1, we get really into the micromanaging of the budget. So I think Option 2 provides us with that greater flexibility and still provides FTRI the flexibility that they might need in order to make decisions down the line in this year, and they always have the option to come back if it doesn't meet their needs.

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

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you for those comments, Commissioner Brisé.

Guys to my left, any comments? I am ready to entertain a motion. Somebody's got to jump.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Madam Chair. With that request and direction, I'll put this out, and if there's discussion, I'm welcome to it, of course.

I would move approval of Option 2, with the reduction of the surcharge from 12 cents to 11 cents. And I'm not sure if there's -- if this is an addition or

000031 not, but I would ask that we grant the FTRI the 1 2 10 percent management tool category to category shift, if necessary, within their professional judgment. 3 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Is there a second? 4 COMMISSIONER BRISE: I would second that. 5 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Any further 6 7 discussion? Okay. We have a motion, a second. All those in favor, say aye. 8 9 (Vote taken.) 10 Opposed? Excellent. Thank you. The motion 11 passes. 12 Best of luck to you this year. Thank you. 13 Moving on to Item 3. Thank you. 14 MR. WILLIAMS: Chairman Brown, before we 15 leave, I just wanted to get some clarification. 16 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Oh, my goodness. You 17 know what? I apologize. I intended to include this in Apologies to you all. I would move approval 18 my motion. 19 of Issue 2, the appointments of Mr. D'Angelo and 20 Mr. Wata, and then also Issue 3, if that carries. 21 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Excellent. Is there a 22 second? 23 COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Second. 24 CHAIRMAN BROWN: All those in favor, say aye. 25 (Vote taken.) FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

			000032
1		CHAIRMAN BROWN: The motion passes. Thank	
2	you.		
3		Is that the	
4		MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.	
5		CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Commissioner	
6	Edgar.		
7		COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.	
8		(Agenda item concluded.)	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
		FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	

	000033
1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	COUNTY OF LEON) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission
5	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically
7	reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this
8	transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
10	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
11	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	DATED THIS 15th day of July, 2016.
13	Diffid finite foch day of oury, 2010.
14	
15	Linda Boles
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR
17	FPSC Official Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION



Parties Staff Handout Internal Affairs/Agenda on 717116 Item No. 2

Fiscal Year	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016 YE/E
Total Core Expenditures	\$5,891,703	\$5,066,067	\$4,634,021	\$4,166,422	\$4,071,914	\$3,929,724
Client Services (N, M, E, R, FU)	52,217	43,179	36,480	33,222	30,925	28,922
Outreach Activities	3,147	2,941	2,807	3,163	2,713	1,963
Customer Calls (FTRI)	16,252	19,464	23,495	29,467	28,347	25,466
Applications Provided	1,536	1,001	1,534	1,031	831	1,157
Total All Services	73,152	66,585	64,316	66,883	62,816	57,508
Ratio \$ Core/All Services	\$80.54	\$76.08	\$72.05	\$62.29	\$64.82	\$68.33

Core Expenditure Per Service Provided FY 2010 – 2016 Excluding CAT I (Traditional Relay & CapTel Services) & NDBEDP

*Three RDCs (Miami, West Palm Beach, Sarasota/Bradenton) ceased conducting FTRI services during this fiscal year (FY 2015-2016). During FY 2014-2015 these three RDCs accounted for 852 New client services and 2,031 total services and 196 outreach activities (\$65.78).

6.30.2016