

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition of At&t
Communications of the Southern
States, Llc Requesting
Suspension of and Cancellation
of Switched Access Contract
Tariff No. Fl2002-01 Filed by
Bellsouth Telecommunications,
Inc.

DOCKET NO. 020738-TP
ORDER NO. PSC-03-0031-FOF-TP
ISSUED: January 6, 2003

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of
this matter:

LILA A. JABER, Chairman
J. TERRY DEASON
BRAULIO L. BAEZ
MICHAEL A. PALECKI
RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY

ORDER GRANTING PARTIAL MOTION TO STRIKE, DENYING PETITION TO
SUSPEND AND CANCEL, AND GRANTING REQUEST FOR HEARING

BY THE COMMISSION:

Background

On June 2, 2002, pursuant to Section 364.051, Florida
Statutes, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth) filed an
Access Service Tariff (T-020572, or Contract tariff), which became
effective on June 17, 2002. That filing introduced Florida's first
contract tariff for access services, BellSouth Switched Access
(SWA). BellSouth identified it as Contract Tariff No. FL2002-01.

On July 16, 2002, AT&T Communications of the Southern States,
LLC (AT&T) filed a Petition requesting suspension of and
cancellation of Switched Access Contract Tariff No. FL2002-01 filed
by BellSouth (Petition). AT&T also requested a formal
administrative hearing pursuant to Sections 120.569 and 120.57(1),
Florida Statutes.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00107 JAN-63

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

On August 12, 2002, BellSouth filed its Response and Answer to AT&T's Petition (Response) and another Access Tariff Filing introducing BellSouth SWA Pricing Flexibility (T-020828, or Revised tariff), which BellSouth identified as Contract Tariff No. FL2002-02.

On September 13, 2002, AT&T filed a Motion for Leave to File an Amended Petition (AT&T Motion). Attached to that pleading was the Amended Petition of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC Requesting Suspension of and Cancellation of General Intrastate Access Tariff Filed by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (Amended Petition). In its Amended Petition, AT&T claimed the requested relief in its original Petition should apply as well to the subsequent tariff that BellSouth filed. The Amended Petition, which contained 22 exhibits in support of AT&T's allegations, was filed in order to achieve a more timely and efficient resolution of the issues raised in both of the BellSouth tariffs. On September 23, 2002, we issued Order No. PSC-02-1291-PCO-TP, granting AT&T's Motion.

On October 3, 2002, BellSouth filed an Answer to and Partial Motion to Strike in response to the AT&T Amended Petition. (Response to Amended Petition and Partial Motion) On October 10, 2002, AT&T filed its Response and Opposition to BellSouth's Partial Motion to Strike.

On October 30, 2002, we requested additional information from both parties. On November 14 and 15, 2002, we received the responses to those requests.

I. Motion to Strike

BellSouth's October 3, 2002 response to AT&T's Amended Petition was styled as both an "Answer" to the Amended Petition as well as a "Partial Motion to Strike." The "Answer" portion of BellSouth's Response will be addressed later in this Order.

BellSouth

BellSouth asserts that the Prayer for Relief in AT&T's Amended Petition "makes what amounts to a demand that the Commission

unlawfully coerce BellSouth to provide AT&T with a discriminatory discount of the type it has long demanded." AT&T pleads that:

. . . The Commission find and order that BellSouth shall pay damages to AT&T measured as the difference between the amount AT&T paid (or will pay) for intrastate access services and the amount AT&T should have paid, assuming AT&T's absolute volumes (not growth) would exceed the volume that triggered discounts of the carriers under [the] general tariff.

BellSouth believes AT&T is seeking a "pure volume" discount for its exclusive benefit as the largest carrier; BellSouth claims that demand is "ridiculous" for reasons set forth below.

BellSouth states that AT&T's request for damages "is not legally tenable for the simple reason that this Commission does not have the legal authority to award monetary damages." According to BellSouth, there is no legal theory to support the contention that AT&T has been (or will be) damaged in some way that corresponds to AT&T's requested relief.

BellSouth believes this plea for relief demonstrates that AT&T's motivation in this proceeding is to utilize procedural gamesmanship as a means to attempt to coerce BellSouth into providing it a pure volume discount. According to BellSouth, this action would have the effect of discriminating against all other carriers.

BellSouth requests that this Commission should immediately strike AT&T's request for damages. BellSouth asserts:

The [AT&T] plea for damages is legally untenable in that, even if AT&T were to prevail entirely on its claim, the Commission lacks the legal authority to award monetary damages. Moreover, even if the Commission had such authority, there is absolutely no legal theory that would support an award of monetary damages under the bizarre calculation method described by AT&T.

In summary, BellSouth urges that AT&T's request for damages should be summarily stricken.

AT&T

On October 10, 2002, AT&T filed its Response and Opposition to BellSouth's Partial Motion to Strike. In that Response, AT&T first disputes BellSouth's claims that this Commission is without authority to award damages. In support of its argument, AT&T states:

BellSouth's blanket statement that the Commission does not have any authority to award damages is without citation to any authority. This bald unsupported statement is simply wrong. The Commission has long exercised its authority to award damages. In the many cases in which the Commission determined that a customer was overcharged by a utility, the Commission has awarded damages to the customer in the amount of the overcharge. When the local service of a BellSouth customer is out of service for a period of more than twenty-four hours, BellSouth must pay damages to the affected customer in the form of a credit to that customer's bill pro-rated for the portion of the customer's monthly service charge for the time the service was down.

AT&T next acknowledges that the Commission does not have the broad latitude in the amounts and types of damages that are the purview of the civil courts, but does have authority to award damages in certain instances. AT&T claims that the Commission has authority to order the relief requested pursuant to Section 365.051(5) (a) and (b), Florida Statutes.

The remainder of the AT&T Response restates the arguments made in earlier pleadings on the merits of the tariff. Those arguments will be fully discussed later in this Order.

Analysis

We find that this issue is easily disposed of by one simple fact of law. This Commission lacks any legal authority to award the type of monetary damages sought by AT&T. The two examples cited by AT&T of damages awarded by the Commission are restitutions which are very specifically prescribed by rule. The damages sought by AT&T are, first, highly speculative. Secondly, it appears that

there is no objective way in which the subject damages could actually be calculated. Finally, we agree with BellSouth that even if the requested damages could be identified and legally ordered, it would simply amount to an untariffed discount to AT&T, which could be construed as discriminatory.

AT&T claims that this Commission has authority to order the relief requested pursuant to Section 365.051(5) (a) and (b), Florida Statutes. We assume that AT&T instead to reference Section 364.051(5)(a) and (b), Florida Statutes, pursuant to which the Commission is to ensure that all similarly situated customers are treated fairly in the market. We do not, however, believe this provision authorizes the Commission to award damages. See Southern Bell Tel. And Tel. Co. v. Mobile America Corp., 291 So. 2d 199 (Fla. 1974) ("Nowhere in Ch. 364 is the PSC granted authority to enter an award of money damages (if indicated) for past failures to provide telephone service meeting the statutory standards . . ."). This Commission, as a matter of law, may not grant the relief requested by AT&T in its Amended Petition. Accordingly, BellSouth's Partial Motion to Strike will be granted.

II. Request for suspension of and cancellation of Tariff

AT&T

In its Petition, AT&T requests suspension of and cancellation of BellSouth's Access Service Tariff Filing (T-020572), Switched Access Contract Tariff No. FL2002-01, and second, a formal administrative hearing pursuant to Sections 120.569 and 120.57(1), Florida Statutes. AT&T claims that BellSouth's tariff "seeks to fundamentally change the switched access landscape in Florida." In its Amended Petition, AT&T claims the requested relief in its original Petition should apply as well to the subsequent tariff that BellSouth filed. AT&T appears to assume, incorrectly, that BellSouth's Switched Access Contract Tariff No. FL2002-01 was replaced and superceded by the subsequently filed Switched Access Contract Tariff No. FL2002-02. However, we note that both tariffs are currently in effect.

AT&T contends that prior to BellSouth filing its Access Service Tariff Filing (T-020572), it was limited to only one option for purchasing switched access services, and BellSouth charged all

long distance carriers the same access charges. AT&T alleges that this is the first time BellSouth has offered a customer-specific contract service arrangement for switched access services.

AT&T states that the BellSouth tariff is structured in such a way that the discounts apply only if the carrier's Minutes of Use (MOU) volumes are steadily increasing. Under the legal standards established by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), growth discounts and associated growth tariffs are discriminatory. AT&T states:

"Growth discounts," as defined by the FCC, are pricing plans under which incumbent LECs offer reduced per-unit access service prices for customers who commit to purchase a certain percentage above their past usage, or reduced prices based on growth in traffic placed over an incumbent LEC's network.

According to AT&T, the tariff at issue is a "growth tariff" because it provides the following:

- a. To qualify for discounts, the IXC in Year 1 must exceed the minimum usage specified; in Year 2, it must exceed 102% of the minimum usage; and by Year 4, it must exceed 110% of the minimum usage.
- b. BellSouth applies a discount to the revenue associated with minutes that exceed the minimum usage (i.e., growth or incremental volumes up to 30% of the minimum usage) during the relevant year.

Under the BellSouth tariff, Contract No. FL2002-01, BellSouth will reduce access rates for a certain carrier by up to 35% while, at the same time, continuing to charge the regular tariffed rates to all other long distance carriers, "including those which have the same amount of usage as that unnamed contract carrier." AT&T further contends that IXCs with lower MOU volumes could receive large discounts based on their positive incremental growth when the larger IXCs with significantly higher, but declining, MOUs would not receive a discount at all. According to AT&T, Florida law does not allow for this type of special contract, contending "its design and in its ultimate effect [is] in violation of Sections

364.051(5), 364.08, 364.09, 364.10, and 364.3381, Florida Statutes, and Section 251(g) of the Telecommunications Act."

AT&T believes that BellSouth has developed such an arrangement to benefit its IXC affiliate, BellSouth Long Distance, Inc. (BSLD); though BSLD is not yet authorized to operate in Florida. AT&T believes that BellSouth is discriminating against IXCs whose intrastate volumes historically have been declining. AT&T believes BSLD would (or may soon) experience a growth in MOU volumes. AT&T states that a tariff that benefits an affiliate company would be a clear violation of the nondiscrimination requirements of Section 272 of the 1996 Act, as the FCC recognized:

. . . if a BOC [Bell Operating Company] charges other firms prices for inputs that are higher than the prices charged, or effectively charged, to the BOC's section 272 affiliate, then the BOC could create a 'price squeeze' . . . [that] may allow the BOC affiliate to win customers even though a competing carrier may be a more efficient provider in serving the customer.

In its Amended Petition, AT&T also states that BellSouth concurrently filed similar tariffs in all nine states of its service area and at the FCC, even though the FCC has prohibited "growth tariffs." In addition to the instant proceeding, AT&T has contested these filings in North Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee. AT&T elaborates on the prohibitive aspects of "growth tariffs," citing two FCC proceedings:

1. In the *Transport Rate Structure and Pricing* proceeding, the FCC reaffirmed a policy allowing incumbent local exchange carriers to offer volume and term discounts for switched transport services. However, with respect to such offerings, the FCC also determined that "growth" discounts were not permitted . . .
2. In the Access Charge Reform Fifth Report and Order, the FCC confirmed its rejection of growth discounts and tariffs. ILEC supporters of growth tariffs failed to provide any evidence that growth tariffs would assist in the development of a competitive access market, and accordingly the FCC rejected their use . . .

AT&T contends that the timing of BellSouth's tariff filings is also a cause for concern, coming just two days after receiving Section 271 authority to provide interLATA services in Georgia and Louisiana. Also, in the interstate filing, BellSouth described its federal SWA Contract Tariff as a "volume and term plan" discount, though AT&T contends that the increasing volume requirements make clear that the tariff really is only a "growth" tariff. Importantly, discounts do not apply to all of the carrier's volumes, but only as to volumes that exceed the stated minimum volumes.

AT&T claims that at the state level, the North Carolina Utilities Commission (NCUC) rejected BellSouth's access filing in that state, "because it was not in the public interest." AT&T claims that the NCUC "soundly dismissed" BellSouth's assertion that the tariff at issue there would keep traffic on its network, suggesting instead that BellSouth should offer a volume-only discount plan. Page 5 of the NCUC Order states, in part:

. . . if the aim is to stimulate the volume of purchases (and, hence, revenue), it would better serve the public interest if the discounts were volume-based, instead of being based upon percentage increases over a baseline. After all, even a relatively modest percentage increase in the volume of purchases from a high-volume IXC could dwarf the increased volume coming from a low-volume IXC or a group of them. This would mean that much more revenue for BellSouth.

Additionally, and very recently, BellSouth's similar filings in the states of Georgia and Tennessee were voluntarily withdrawn, according to AT&T, though a revised version of the tariff was subsequently filed in Tennessee. Although outside of BellSouth's operating area, AT&T contends the Texas Public Utility Commission also "has determined that 'growth' tariffs are discriminatory and thus rejected an intrastate 'growth' tariff of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company."

BellSouth

BellSouth states in its Response that the Contract tariff "is the product of an agreement between BellSouth and Sprint." Although it was crafted as a specific arrangement for Sprint, BellSouth states:

[The Contract] "tariff functions much like a Contract Service Arrangement. Further, it has always been BellSouth's intention to make the same discount plan available to all IXCs and to file appropriate Contract Tariffs to memorialize these agreements as well. (Underline in Original)

Concurrent with the filing of its Response, BellSouth filed another tariff introducing BellSouth's SWA Pricing Flexibility (T-020828, Revised tariff, or Switched Access Contract Tariff No. FL2002-02). The Revised tariff formally makes the Contract tariff discount plan available to every IXC. BellSouth explains that the Revised filing enables BellSouth to offer its IXC customers intrastate contract tariffs that are customized to meet their needs. BellSouth elaborates on the Revised tariff:

[F]or any carrier wishing to accept the plan, a minimum usage is established. Setting the minimum usage entails reviewing both the volume of usage and the usage patterns of the IXC over the previous 18 months, then projecting this usage forward for an additional 12 months. In order to be eligible for the discount plan, a carrier's minimum usage must be at least .5 billion MOU per year. Based on the volume of its minimum usage (assuming it meets the above-mentioned threshold), an IXC is eligible for one of three discount bands. In each band, there are specified percentage discounts that apply for usage that exceeds the minimum usage.

We note, however, that although the Revised tariff has different parameters, it is substantially similar to the Contract tariff. The specific parameters of the Contract tariff were developed based upon carrier-specific (e.g., Sprint) usage.

BellSouth asserts that neither tariff includes a penalty of any sort for an IXC that contracts to purchase services under the tariffed terms, but does not achieve the designated increases in volume. In its Response to Amended Petition, BellSouth elaborates:

If a carrier does not qualify by having sufficient volume, then it is not eligible to buy from the [subject] tariff. If the carrier does qualify, then it may receive the discount by increasing the volume of its switched access purchases as set forth in the tariff. If it fails to do so, however, there is no penalty. In this instance, the carrier would simply pay for access at the tariffed rate that would otherwise apply. Thus, there is no commitment to purchase increased access services, nor is there any penalty for failing to do so.

BellSouth states that it has set the discount levels so that the greater the percentage increase over the baseline usage, the greater the discount. In its Response, BellSouth offers:

Setting the discount based, in part, upon the percentage increase allows both large and small IXCs to benefit financially from increasing the volume of minutes that they purchase from BellSouth. For example, even a relatively small IXC can obtain a discount by increasing proportionately the amount of its purchases.

BellSouth claims that the FCC granted it the pricing flexibility in February of 2001 to offer these types of switched access service arrangements.

BellSouth argues that IXCs have available to them an unprecedented array of alternatives for purchasing switched access services. BellSouth asserts that an increasing number of IXCs are providing long distance service by obtaining access either through the use of their own facilities or the facilities of carriers other than BellSouth.

BellSouth flatly disputes AT&T's contention that its tariff was designed to be advantageous to its long-distance affiliate. The Company claims:

[E]ven at the future point where BSLD might become eligible for this discount program under the terms that would apply to all carriers, the discount plan is structured so that, as a practical matter, it will likely be permanently unavailable to BSLD.

Regarding AT&T's allegation that its tariff is discriminatory, BellSouth states that this "is really nothing more than a complaint that BellSouth has not proposed a discount that suits AT&T's desire to both use BellSouth's switched access services less in the future and receive a discount on the declining amount of switched access that it does purchase." (Underlines in Original) BellSouth asserts that the purpose of this tariff is to provide an incentive for IXC customers to remain on its network, and if AT&T does not avail itself of the offering, "this in no way renders the tariff discriminatory."

Because the FCC Orders speak for themselves, BellSouth states that it is not required to cite to any FCC orders to contradict the Orders cited by AT&T. Nonetheless, the FCC has never considered the merits of a growth tariff like the subject BellSouth tariffs, according to BellSouth. Based on the FCC's definition of a "growth tariff," BellSouth believes that a true "growth tariff" entails an established commitment from the buyer to future growth in order to obtain the discounted price; BellSouth stresses that the subject tariffs do not entail any sort of commitment, but rather, the "discount levels are based on usage bands." BellSouth concludes that the FCC has never considered a tariff of this sort, and thus, AT&T's contention that the FCC has prohibited, under the general rubric of "growth tariffs," an offering like the one at issue is "simply wrong."

BellSouth claims that AT&T's argument concerning "growth" tariffs is premised entirely on the contention that "the subject tariffs violate federal law, specifically §§ 47 U.S.C. 202 and 272." BellSouth points out that AT&T, however, does not specifically delve into any applicable Florida law, and has not filed a claim before the FCC to this effect. BellSouth urges that the FCC has never even considered a tariff structured like the one here at issue, and has never ruled, as AT&T claims, that all growth tariffs are prohibited by § [47 U.S.C.] 202. In essence, claims

BellSouth, AT&T is arguing only federal law before the Florida Commission.

Finally, BellSouth points out that AT&T's assertion that this discount would be of no interest to any IXC other than BSLD is clearly rebutted by the fact that Sprint has entered into a Letter of Agreement to purchase service under this discount plan. BellSouth respectfully requests that the Commission dismiss AT&T's Petition and deny all relief requested therein.

Analysis

As mentioned previously, AT&T's Petition requests two specific forms of relief, suspension and cancellation of both BellSouth tariffs, and a formal administrative hearing pursuant to Sections 120.569 and 120.57(1), Florida Statutes. We note that the arguments presented by AT&T and BellSouth addressed these topics in a combined manner; we will do so as well.

As noted previously, BellSouth's Revised tariff has somewhat different parameters than the Contract tariff, primarily because the Contract tariff was narrowly structured in accordance with Sprint's usage. For comparison purposes using the Sprint usage bands (or usage ranges), the volume discount percentages would be the same under the Contract and the Revised tariffs. We note, however, that the Revised tariff has an entry threshold of 500,000,000 MOUs, and is generally available for any IXC that meets the parameters. The terms of the earlier BellSouth tariff plan (that AT&T thought was custom-crafted for BSLD) are now universally available for any carrier that meets the thresholds of the tariff. This partially mitigates the "discrimination" argument proffered by AT&T, since carriers other than BSLD that meet the requirements of the tariff could avail themselves of it. Nevertheless, the "discrimination" argument cannot be conclusively dismissed on this basis alone, particularly in light of the argument regarding whether the BellSouth tariffs offer "growth discounts."

In both its original Petition and the Amended Petition, AT&T repeatedly describes the BellSouth SWA tariffs as "growth tariffs." BellSouth bluntly disputes this characterization of the subject tariffs, although we note that both parties cite the above-noted definition of a "growth discount," and the FCC order from which the

quote was gleaned, for support. Though AT&T cites numerous federal orders and decisions from other state commissions that concern "growth discounts," none provided a more targeted or alternative definition. Therefore, this case turns on interpreting whether the subject tariff offerings of this instant proceeding meet the definition of a "growth discount."

To that end, we critically examined the cited passage that each party relies upon. The comma within the cite after the word "usage" and the word "or" following the comma suggest that two items need to be considered. To facilitate analysis, we inserted dividing brackets to separate the first and second parts of the sentence ("Part A" and "Part B"), as shown below:

"Growth discounts," as defined by the FCC, are "pricing plans under which incumbent LECs offer [A] reduced per-unit access service prices for customers who commit to purchase a certain percentage above their past usage, or [B] reduced prices based on growth in traffic placed over an incumbent LEC's network.

The interpretation of this passage turns on whether "Part B" is merely a restatement of "Part A," or, rather, a second consideration that is separate and distinct from "Part A." BellSouth seems to rely on the former as the basis for its position. Under the theory that "Part B" is merely a restatement of "Part A," one can argue that the subject tariffs do not require a commitment since there is no penalty or liability for failing to meet the pre-established threshold. Accordingly, this analysis supports BellSouth's position that the subject tariffs do not provide impermissible growth discounts. However, under the theory that "Part B" is separate and distinct from "Part A," the subject tariffs do appear to violate "Part B," which leads to the conclusion that these tariffs do provide impermissible growth discounts.

Next, we consider which theory is more plausible. While "Part A" and "Part B" are worded differently, the two parts are, conceptually, rather similar. Both address reduced prices for increasing volume. A closer review suggests that there may well be a distinction between "Part A" and "Part B." "Part A" may address the situation where a carrier commits to purchasing greater

volumes, whether ultimately needed or not, and "Part B" may address the situation where a carrier's traffic volumes actually grow. However, because each party supports a contrasting interpretation of the cited text, an administrative hearing would present a forum for additional argument beyond that contained in the pleadings received to-date.

We note that AT&T does not offer much in the way of Florida-specific argument, other than to state that "the design of [the BellSouth SWA tariff] and the ultimate effect [is] in violation of Sections 364.051(5), 364.08, 364.09, 364.10, and 364.3381, Florida Statutes, and Section 251(g) of the Telecommunications Act." Nothing more of substance is offered, although any determination of undue discrimination would need to consider competitive alternatives to BellSouth's Switched Access service. While BellSouth asserts that there are many competitive alternatives, minimal supporting detail is provided.

AT&T places considerable emphasis on the August 13, 2002 decision of the NCUC, wherein that state commission rejected the proposed tariff for "not being in the public interest." The NCUC concluded that the BellSouth's tariff plan was "biased against high-volume IXCs." We note that BellSouth has not filed any other tariff of this type in that state since withdrawing the initial (Contract) filing. However, the parties may be pursuing a region-wide settlement of the issues of this proceeding, though we are puzzled that AT&T has only formally contested the BellSouth tariffs in selected states.

Both parties rely on the FCC's definition of a "growth discount" to support their respective positions. Given the parties' contrasting conclusions, a hearing would be useful to elicit evidence that could assist in determining the proper interpretation and application in this case. In addition, a hearing would enable parties and this Commission to further explore the competitive alternatives to BellSouth's Switched Access service, which would be useful in determining whether the subject tariffs are unduly discriminatory under state law or a reasonable, authorized response to competitive pressure.

ORDER NO. PSC-03-0031-FOF-TP
DOCKET NO. 020738-TP
PAGE 15

Conclusion

In summary, we find that BellSouth's Switched Access Contract Tariff No. FL2002-01 (T-020572), and BellSouth SWA Pricing Flexibility, Contract Tariff No. FL2002-02 (T-020828), should not be suspended or canceled at this time, but that AT&T's request for a formal administrative hearing pursuant to Section 120.569 and 120.57(1), Florida Statutes, should be granted.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Partial Motion to Strike AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC's request for damages is hereby granted. It is further

ORDERED that the Amended Petition of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC Requesting Suspension of and Cancellation of General Intrastate Access Tariff Filed by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. is hereby denied. It is further

ORDERED that AT&T Communications of the Southern States, LLC's request to set this matter for hearing is hereby granted. It is further

ORDERED that Docket No. 020738-TP shall remain open pending resolution of the remaining issues.

ORDER NO. PSC-03-0031-FOF-TP
DOCKET NO. 020738-TP
PAGE 16

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 6th Day
of January, 2003.

BLANCA S. BAYÓ, Director
Division of the Commission Clerk
and Administrative Services

By: Kay Flynn
Kay Flynn, Chief
Bureau of Records and Hearing
Services

(S E A L)

LF

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request: 1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services, 2540 Shumard Oak

ORDER NO. PSC-03-0031-FOF-TP
DOCKET NO. 020738-TP
PAGE 17

Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water and/or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.