

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Fletcher Building
101 East Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

M E M O R A N D U M

July 22, 1993

TO : DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING
FROM : DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS [SHELPER, WIDELL] *raw*
DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES [GREEN] *W*
RE : DOCKET NO. 921193-TL - RESOLUTION BY PALM BEACH COUNTY *H for ABC*
COMMISSION FOR EXTENDED AREA SERVICE BETWEEN ALL
EXCHANGES IN PALM BEACH COUNTY.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL - PETITION BY THE RESIDENTS OF POLO PARK REQUESTING EXTENDED AREA SERVICE (EAS) BETWEEN THE HAINES CITY EXCHANGE AND THE ORLANDO, WEST KISSIMMEE, LAKE BUENA VISTA, WINDERMERE, REEDY CREEK, WINTER PARK, CLERMONT, WINTER GARDEN AND ST. CLOUD EXCHANGES.

DOCKET NO. 930234-TL - RESOLUTION BY THE LAKE COUNTY COMMISSION FOR EXTENDED AREA SERVICE (EAS) BETWEEN THE MT. DORA EXCHANGE AND THE SANFORD, GENEVA, AND OVIEDO EXCHANGES.

DOCKET NO. 930235-TL - RESOLUTION BY THE TAYLOR COUNTY COMMISSION FOR COUNTYWIDE EXTENDED AREA SERVICE (EAS) WITHIN TAYLOR COUNTY.

AGENDA: AUGUST 3, 1993 - CONTROVERSIAL - PARTIES MAY PARTICIPATE

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: I:\PSC\CMU\WP\921193.RCM

CASE BACKGROUND

- On June 9, 1993, Southern Bell filed a Motion for Modification of Order No. PSC-93-0029-PCO-TL, issued January 6, 1993. The Order directed the Company to perform traffic studies on specific intraLATA and interLATA routes within Palm Beach County. Southern Bell has asked for relief on the interLATA routes stating that it no longer performs the billing and collection function on these routes for AT&T, so therefore it does not have access to the data.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07908 JUL 22 93

1700 RECORDS/MAIL SERVICE

Docket No. 921193-TL
July 22, 1993

- On June 22, 1993, Southern Bell filed a Motion for Stay of Orders No. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930173-TL), PSC-93-0464-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930234-TL), and PSC-93-0434-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930235-TL). The Company requests a stay of these orders until a solution to the interLATA traffic studies for which Southern Bell does not bill is found.
- This recommendation will address these motions.

Docket No. 921193-TL
July 22, 1993

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Should Southern Bell's Motion for Modification of Order No. PSC-93-0029-PCO-TL be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes, Southern Bell's Motion for Modification of Order No. PSC-93-0039-PCO-TL should be granted, and the Company relieved of the requirements to file traffic data on the interLATA routes in Docket No. 921193-TL.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Southern Bell has filed a Motion for Modification of Order No. PSC-93-0039-PCO-TL seeking relief from filing traffic studies on interLATA routes. As Southern Bell stated in its Motion, on certain routes, it no longer performs the recording and rating of interLATA traffic for AT&T. Therefore, Southern Bell no longer has the data, nor does it have access to data that would allow it to comply with the requirements of Order No. PSC-93-0039-PCO-TL (Traffic Study).

Since Southern Bell does not have access to the interLATA traffic data, staff does not believe the Company should be ordered to provide it. It would be burdensome to Southern Bell to require it to get the traffic data from AT&T and then provide the data to the Commission. It is staff's opinion, that the traffic information should be provided by the IXCs that carry and rate the traffic. (This will be discussed in Issue 3 of this recommendation.)

Staff recommends that Southern Bell's Motion for Modification of Order No. PSC-93-0039-PCO-TL seeking relief from filing traffic studies on interLATA routes for which it does not have traffic data be granted.

Docket No. 921193-TL
July 22, 1993

ISSUE 2: Should Southern Bell's Motion for Stay of Order Nos. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930173-TL), PSC-93-0464-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930234-TL), and PSC-93-0434-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930235-TL) be granted.

RECOMMENDATION: Yes, Southern Bell's Motion for Stay of Order Nos. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930173-TL), PSC-93-0464-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930234-TL), and PSC-93-0434-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930235-TL) should be granted.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Southern Bell has filed a Motion for Stay of Order Nos. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930173-TL), PSC-93-0464-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930234-TL), and PSC-93-0434-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930235-TL). The Company requests a stay of these orders, which require specific traffic studies, until a solution can be reached on acquiring the interLATA traffic information for which Southern Bell does not rate or bill.

As discussed in Issue 1, there are certain interLATA routes that Southern Bell no longer performs the recording and rating of calls for AT&T. Therefore, Southern Bell no longer has the data, nor does it have access to data that would allow it to comply with the requirements of the traffic study orders.

In addition, staff is currently preparing EAS rule revisions for the Commission's review in Docket No. 930220-TL (Amendment to EAS Rules). One of the areas that staff is addressing is how to obtain interLATA traffic data when the LEC does not do the billing.

Based on the information provided, staff recommends that Southern Bell's Motion for Stay of Order Nos. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930173-TL), PSC-93-0464-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930234-TL), and PSC-93-0434-PCO-TL (Docket No. 930235-TL) be granted.

Docket No. 921193-TL
July 22, 1993

ISSUE 3: Should AT&T, MCI, Sprint and LDDS be required to provide the interLATA traffic data for Docket Nos. 921193-TL, 930173-TL, 930234-TL, and 930235-TL as outlined in Rule 25-4.060 (Community of Interest Considerations)?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes, AT&T, MCI, Sprint and LDDS should be required to provide interLATA traffic data for Docket Nos. 921193-TL, 930173-TL, 930234-TL, and 930235-TL as outlined in Rule 25-4.060 (Community of Interest Considerations).

STAFF ANALYSIS: Southern Bell's Motion for Modification brought to light one of the problems that staff knew eventually would surface and significantly impact EAS. Primarily that many of the IXCs are opting to do their own billing. As Southern Bell stated in its Motions, on certain routes, it no longer performs the recording and rating of interLATA traffic for AT&T. Therefore, Southern Bell no longer has the data, nor does it have access to data that would allow it to comply with the requirements of the traffic study orders.

Staff has concerns that by requiring traffic data from only the LECs and AT&T, which is the current situation, the traffic information that is received may not accurately reflect the true calling rates or distribution on a route. Initially, it was believed that since AT&T had the majority of long distance service in Florida, that the remaining IXC traffic would be insignificant and not alter the results of the traffic study even if provided. Now on a statewide basis AT&T handles about 62% of the traffic (based on access minutes of use); the four largest IXCs provide over 90% of Florida's long distance service (based on information provided by the IXCs in the PSC Regulatory Assessment Fee Form).

Without the traffic information, it is impossible for staff to determine if any of these interLATA routes have a sufficient calling volumes and distribution to meet our EAS rules.

Since Southern Bell does not have access to AT&T's interLATA data, AT&T should be required to file the interLATA traffic data directly with the Commission. Southern Bell should not be required to get the information from AT&T and file it on AT&T's behalf. This traffic information will provide staff with the necessary data to make a determination.

Moreover, it is staff's opinion that MCI, Sprint and LDDS should also be required to file interLATA traffic studies on these EAS dockets. Since these four IXCs represent more than 90% of the long distance market, the combined traffic studies will provide a

Docket No. 921193-TL
July 22, 1993

more accurate representation of the true calling volumes and distribution on these interLATA routes. For a given EAS route, the likelihood of any one customer using more than one IXC is remote. Therefore staff is comfortable with aggregating usage and customer lines across carriers to develop an overall calling rate per line.

In addition, AT&T, MCI, Sprint and LDDS should be required to provide traffic information in accordance with Rule 25-4.060 (Community of Interest Considerations), which states the criteria and time frame for preparing the traffic studies. Attachment A, B, C and D provide a list of the ordered routes.

Staff recommends that AT&T, MCI, Sprint and LDDS be required to file traffic studies in compliance with Rule 25-4.060 (Community of Interest Considerations) for the interLATA routes in Docket Nos. 921163-TL, 930173-TL, 930234-TL, and 930235-TL (See attachments A, B, C and D).

ISSUE 4: Should these dockets be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: No, these dockets should remain open until the Commission has made a decision on the EAS requests.

STAFF ANALYSIS: These dockets have EAS request pending and should not be closed. Once the traffic data has been provided, the Commission can make an EAS determination on the docket.

ATT. A

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ORDER NO. PSC-93-0434-PCO-TL
DOCKET NO. 930235-TL
PAGE 2

In Re: Resolution by the TAYLOR) DOCKET NO. 930235-TL
COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS) ORDER NO. PSC-93-0434-PCO-TL
for countywide extended area) ISSUED: 03/22/93
service (EAS) within Taylor)
County.)

RECEIVED

MAR 26 1993

ORDER REQUIRING TRAFFIC STUDY

BY THE COMMISSION:

CMU

Pursuant to a resolution filed with this Commission by the Board of County Commissioners of Taylor County, we have been requested to consider requiring implementation of extended area service (EAS) between all exchanges in Taylor County. Taylor County contains all or part of the Perry, Keaton Beach, and Cross City exchanges. The Cross City exchange is served by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company (Southern Bell) and is located in the Gainesville LATA (local access transport area), while the Perry and Keaton Beach exchanges are served by Gulf Telephone Company (Gulf) and are located in the Tallahassee Market Area (LATA). Both of these companies are subject to regulation by this Commission pursuant to Chapter 364, Florida Statutes.

In order for us to begin our evaluation and consideration of this request, it is necessary for the companies to prepare and submit certain traffic studies for review and appraisal. These studies should be based upon a minimum thirty (30) day study of representative calling patterns and shall be in such form, detail and content as will permit review by the Commission. The studies shall include, as a minimum, the following:

(a) The number of messages and calculated calling rates, with and without Foreign Exchange (FX) service, expressed in messages per access line per month (M/A/M), over each interexchange route and in each direction, segregated between business and residence users and combined for both (sample FX data may be submitted with adequate information to show sample adequacy and appropriateness). In a summary schedule, the route entries shall be ordered from highest to lowest M/A/M and shall be grouped as shown on the forms attached hereto as Schedules I and II.

(b) A detailed analysis of the distribution of calling usage among subscribers, over each route and in each direction, segregated between business and residence users and combined,

showing for each category, the number of customers making 0 calls, 1 call, etc., through 25 calls and 26 or more calls per month.

(c) Access line classification data showing, by classes of service, the number of access lines in service for each of the exchanges being studied.

(d) The interexchange toll rates, distance between rate centers, the number and duration of calls by time of day and the average revenue per message (ARPM) for the calls studied.

(e) The number of Foreign Exchange (FX) lines in service and the average calling volumes carried on these lines expressed in messages per month.

Where any alternative toll calling plan is already in place, the studies shall include, as a minimum, the following:

(a) The date the alternative calling plan was implemented and the tariff referenced.

(b) The number of subscribers currently signed up for the plan, segregated between business and residence users.

(c) A statement indicating whether the alternative calling plan messages are included in the M/A/M listed for the traffic studies.

The companies shall also submit a map of this area. The map shall be divided by exchanges with color coding to indicate different exchanges. Existing EAS routes shall be shown with arrowheads to indicate one-way or two-way EAS routes. On the same or another map, the proposed EAS routes shall also be indicated by arrowheads and the M/A/M and percent of subscribers making two or more calls per month shall be indicated for each direction of the proposed EAS route.

Finally, the companies shall submit an analysis of the data collected and other information it has gathered on the proposed routes. The analysis shall include, as a minimum, the following:

(a) A summary of the data provided in Schedules I and II.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

03118 MAR 22 93

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

SCHEDULE II

Docket No. 920235-TL
Interexchange Traffic Data

EAS - Between the Cross City, Keaton Beach, and
Perry exchanges, with separate studies for the
Taylor County pocket area of the Cross City exchange

Two-Way

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>AL&T</u>	<u>Messages</u>	<u>Calling Rate M/A/M*</u>	<u>Total Customers</u>	<u>Customers Making 1 or More Calls/Month Number Percent</u>
-------------	-----------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------	--

List Routes			<u>Part I - Routes greater than 2.00 M/A/M</u>			
			Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M			
			<u>Part II - Routes 1.99 to 1.00 M/A/M</u>			
			Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M			
			<u>Part III - Routes below .99 M/A/M</u>			
			Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M			

*Threshold levels as per Rule 25-4.060(3).

Two-Way = Calling Rate of 2.0 messages per access line per month (M/A/M)
with 50% of customers making 1 or more calls/month.

9

ATT.B.

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ORDER NO. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL
DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
PAGE 2

In Re: Petition by the)
residents of Polo Park)
requesting extended area service)
(EAS) between the Haines City)
exchange and the Orlando, West)
Kissimmee, Lake Buena Vista,)
Windermere, Reedy Creek, Winter)
Park, Clermont, Winter Garden)
and St. Cloud exchanges.)

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
ORDER NO. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL
ISSUED: 03/23/93

RECEIVED

MAR 26 1993

CMU

ORDER REQUIRING TRAFFIC STUDY

BY THE COMMISSION:

Pursuant to a Petition filed with this Commission by the residents of Polo Park, we have been requested to consider requiring implementation of extended area service (EAS) between the Haines City exchange and the Orlando, West Kissimmee, Kissimmee, Lake Buena Vista, Windermere, Reedy Creek, Winter Park, Clermont, Winter Garden and St. Cloud exchanges. The Haines City exchange is served by GTE Florida Incorporated (GTEFL); Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company (Southern Bell) serves the Orlando exchange. The West Kissimmee, Kissimmee, Windermere, Reedy Creek, Winter Park, Clermont, Winter Garden and St. Cloud exchanges are served by United Telephone Company of Florida (United). GTEFL, Southern Bell, and United are subject to regulation by this Commission pursuant to Chapter 364, Florida Statutes.

In order for us to begin our evaluation and consideration of this request, it is necessary for the companies to prepare and submit certain traffic studies for review and appraisal. These studies should be based upon a minimum thirty (30) day study of representative calling patterns and shall be in such form, detail and content as will permit review by the Commission. The studies shall include, as a minimum, the following:

(a) The number of messages and calculated calling rates, with and without Foreign Exchange (FX) service, expressed in messages per access line per month (M/A/M), over each interexchange route and in each direction, segregated between business and residence users and combined for both (sample FX data may be submitted with adequate information to show sample adequacy and appropriateness). In a summary schedule, the route entries shall be ordered from highest to lowest M/A/M and shall be grouped as shown on the forms attached hereto as Schedules I and II.

(b) A detailed analysis of the distribution of calling usage among subscribers, over each route and in each direction, segregated between business and residence users and combined, showing for each category, the number of customers making 0 calls, 1 call, etc., through 25 calls and 26 or more calls per month.

(c) Access line classification data showing, by classes of service, the number of access lines in service for each of the exchanges being studied.

(d) The interexchange toll rates, distance between rate centers, the number and duration of calls by time of day and the average revenue per message (ARPM) for the calls studied.

(e) The number of Foreign Exchange (FX) lines in service and the average calling volumes carried on these lines expressed in messages per month.

Where any alternative toll calling plan is already in place, the studies shall include, as a minimum, the following:

(a) The date the alternative calling plan was implemented and the tariff referenced.

(b) The number of subscribers currently signed up for the plan, segregated between business and residence users.

(c) A statement indicating whether the alternative calling plan messages are included in the M/A/M listed for the traffic studies.

Each company shall also submit a map of of its respective exchanges relevant to this order. The map shall be divided by exchanges with color coding to indicate different exchanges. Existing EAS routes shall be shown with arrowheads to indicate one-way or two-way EAS routes. On the same or another map, the proposed EAS routes shall also be indicated by arrowheads and the M/A/M and percent of subscribers making two or more calls per month shall be indicated for each direction of the proposed EAS route.

Finally, the companies shall submit an analysis of the data collected and other information it has gathered on the proposed routes. The analysis shall include, as a minimum, the following:

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

03192 MAR 23 93

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

10

ORDER NO. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL
 DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
 PAGE 5

ORDER NO. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL
 DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
 PAGE 6

SCHEDULE II

Docket No. 930173-TL
 Interexchange Traffic Data

EAS BETWEEN ALL EXCHANGES LISTED IN SCHEDULE III

Two-Way

From	To	AL&T	Messages	Calling Rate M/A/M*	Total Customers	Customers Making 1 or More Calls/Month	
						Number	Percent
List Routes							
				<u>Part I - Routes greater than 2.00 M/A/M</u>			
				Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M			
				<u>Part II - Routes 1.99 to 1.00 M/A/M</u>			
				Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M			
				<u>Part III - Routes below .99 M/A/M</u>			
				Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M			

*Threshold levels as per Rule 25-4.060(3).

Two-Way = Calling Rate of 2.0 messages per access line per month (M/A/M)
 with 50% of customers making 1 or more calls/month.

SCHEDULE III

Docket No. 920642-TL

ROUTES REQUIRING TRAFFIC STUDIES

Haines City (Except Poinciana 427 pocket)	Kissimmee West Kissimmee
Haines City	Orlando Lake Buena Windermere Reedy Creek Winter Park Clermont Winter Garden St. Cloud
Haines City (427 Poinciana pocket)	Orlando Lake Buena Windermere Reedy Creek Winter Park Clermont Winter Garden St. Cloud

12

ATT. C

RECEIVED

APR 2 1993

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ORDER NO. PSC-93-0464-PCO-TL
DOCKET NO. 930234-TL
PAGE 2

CMU

In Re: Resolution by the Lake) DOCKET NO. 930234-TL
County Board of Commissioners) ORDER NO. PSC-93-0464-PCO-TL
for extended area service (EAS)) ISSUED: 3/26/93
between the Mt. Dora exchange)
and the Sanford, Geneva, and)
Oviedo exchanges.)

ORDER REQUIRING TRAFFIC STUDY

BY THE COMMISSION:

Pursuant to Resolution No. 93-21 filed with this Commission by the Board of County Commissioners of Lake County, we have been requested to consider requiring implementation of extended area service (EAS) between certain exchanges in Lake and Seminole Counties. The exchanges affected by this EAS request are the Mt. Dora, Geneva, Oviedo, and Sanford exchanges. The Mt. Dora exchange is served by United Telephone Company of Florida (United) and is located in the Gainesville LATA (local access transport area), while the Geneva, Oviedo, and Sanford exchanges are served by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company (Southern Bell) and are located in the Orlando LATA. Both of these companies are subject to regulation by this Commission pursuant to Chapter 364, Florida Statutes.

In order for us to begin our evaluation and consideration of this request, it is necessary for the companies to prepare and submit certain traffic studies for review and appraisal. These studies should be based upon a minimum thirty (30) day study of representative calling patterns and shall be in such form, detail and content as will permit review by the Commission. The studies shall include, as a minimum, the following:

- (a) The number of messages and calculated calling rates, with and without Foreign Exchange (FX) service, expressed in messages per access line per month (M/A/M), over each interexchange route and in each direction, segregated between business and residence users and combined for both (sample FX data may be submitted with adequate information to show sample adequacy and appropriateness). In a summary schedule, the route entries shall be ordered from highest to lowest M/A/M and shall be grouped as shown on the forms attached hereto as Schedules I and II.
- (b) A detailed analysis of the distribution of calling usage among subscribers, over each route and in each direction, segregated between business and residence

users and combined, showing for each category, the number of customers making 0 calls, 1 call, etc., through 25 calls and 26 or more calls per month.

(c) Access line classification data showing, by classes of service, the number of access lines in service for each of the exchanges being studied.

(d) The interexchange toll rates, distance between rate centers, the number and duration of calls by time of day and the average revenue per message (ARPM) for the calls studied.

(e) The number of Foreign Exchange (FX) lines in service and the average calling volumes carried on these lines expressed in messages per month.

Where any alternative toll calling plan is already in place, the studies shall include, as a minimum, the following:

- (a) The date the alternative calling plan was implemented and the tariff referenced.
- (b) The number of subscribers currently signed up for the plan, segregated between business and residence users.
- (c) A statement indicating whether the alternative calling plan messages are included in the M/A/M listed for the traffic studies.

The companies shall also submit a map of this area. The map shall be divided by exchanges with color coding to indicate different exchanges. Existing EAS routes shall be shown with arrowheads to indicate one-way or two-way EAS routes. On the same or another map, the proposed EAS routes shall also be indicated by arrowheads and the M/A/M and percent of subscribers making two or more calls per month shall be indicated for each direction of the proposed EAS route.

Finally, the companies shall submit an analysis of the data collected and other information it has gathered on the proposed routes. The analysis shall include, as a minimum, the following:

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
03351 MAR 26 93
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

3

ORDER NO. PSC-93-0464-PCO-TL
DOCKET NO. 930234-TL
PAGE 5

SCHEDULE II

Docket No. 930234-TL
Interexchange Traffic Data

EAS - Between the Mt. Dora Exchange and
the Geneva, Oviedo, and Sanford Exchanges

Two-Way

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>AL&I</u>	<u>Messages</u>	<u>Calling Rate M/A/M*</u>	<u>Total Customers</u>	<u>Customers Making 1 or More Calls/Month Number Percent</u>
-------------	-----------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------	--

List Routes Part I - Routes greater than 2.00 M/A/M

Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M

Part II - Routes 1.99 to 1.00 M/A/M

Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M

Part III - Routes below .99 M/A/M

Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M

*Threshold levels as per Rule 25-4.060(3).

Two-Way = Calling Rate of 2.0 messages per access line per month (M/A/M)
with 50% of customers making 1 or more calls/month.

51

ATT.D

RECEIVED

AHS

MAR 8 1993

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CMU

ORDER NO. PSC-93-0321-PCO-TL
DOCKET NO. 921193-TL
PAGE 2

In Re: Request by Palm Beach) DOCKET NO. 921193-TL
County Board of County) ORDER NO. PSC-93-0321-PCO-TL
Commissioners for Extended Area) ISSUED: 03/02/93
Service Between all Exchanges in)
Palm Beach County)

ORDER REQUIRING TRAFFIC STUDY

BY THE COMMISSION:

This Order addresses the same subject matter previously addressed in Order No. PSC-93-0029-PCO-TL. This Order is being reissued to ensure adequate notice in recognition of the fact that United Telephone Company of Florida was inadvertently left off the mailing list for this docket and was not furnished a copy of Order No. PSC-93-0029-PCO-TL at the time it was issued. The reissuance of this Order is limited to United Telephone Company of Florida.

Pursuant to a resolution filed with this Commission by the Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners, we have been requested to consider requiring implementation of extended area service (EAS) between all exchanges in Palm Beach County. The area is served by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company (Southern Bell), and United Telephone Company of Florida which are subject to regulation by this Commission pursuant to Chapter 364, Florida Statutes.

In order for us to begin our evaluation and consideration of this request, it is necessary for the companies to prepare and submit certain traffic studies for review and appraisal. These studies should be based upon a minimum thirty (30) day study of representative calling patterns and shall be in such form, detail and content as will permit review by the Commission. The studies shall include, as a minimum, the following:

(a) The number of messages and calculated calling rates, with and without Foreign Exchange (FX) service, expressed in messages per access line per month (M/A/M), over each interexchange route and in each direction, segregated between business and residence users and combined for both (sample FX data may be submitted with adequate information to show sample adequacy and appropriateness). In a summary schedule, the route entries shall be ordered from highest to lowest M/A/M and shall be grouped as shown on the forms attached hereto as Schedules I and II.

(b) A detailed analysis of the distribution of calling usage among subscribers, over each route and in each direction, segregated between business and residence users and combined, showing for each category, the number of customers making 0 calls, 1 call, etc., through 25 calls and 26 or more calls per month.

(c) Access line classification data showing, by classes of service, the number of access lines in service for each of the exchanges being studied.

(d) The interexchange toll rates, distance between rate centers, the number and duration of calls by time of day and the average revenue per message (ARPM) for the calls studied.

(e) The number of Foreign Exchange (FX) lines in service and the average calling volumes carried on these lines expressed in messages per month.

Where any alternative toll calling plan is already in place, the studies shall include, as a minimum, the following:

(a) The date the alternative calling plan was implemented and the tariff referenced.

(b) The number of subscribers currently signed up for the plan, segregated between business and residence users.

(c) A statement indicating whether the alternative calling plan messages are included in the M/A/M listed for the traffic studies.

The companies shall also submit a map of the area. The map shall be divided by exchanges with color coding to indicate different exchanges. Existing EAS routes shall be shown with arrowheads to indicate one-way or two-way EAS routes. On the same or another map, the proposed EAS routes shall also be indicated by arrowheads and the M/A/M and percent of subscribers making two or more calls per month shall be indicated for each direction of the proposed EAS route.

Finally, the companies shall submit an analysis of the data collected and other information it has gathered on the proposed routes. The analysis shall include, as a minimum, the following:

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02317 MAR -2 83

FISC-RECORDS/REPORTING

16

(a) A summary of the data provided in Schedules I and II.

(b) A statement of population densities and demographics which would have an influence on how the traffic data is interpreted.

(c) A statement of known or strongly suggested reasons for the existence of a community of interest between the relevant exchanges (economic, social, and political factors). Such factors may include, but are not limited to, the location of schools, fire/police departments, medical/emergency facilities, and county and other governmental offices.

(d) A statement of any changes in surface transportation between the relevant exchanges which may have an influence on the development of a community of interest.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company, and United Telephone Company of Florida shall prepare and submit the studies referred to in Schedule III of this Order within ninety (90) days from the date of this Order.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 2nd day of March, 1993.



STEVE TRIBBLE, Director
Division of Records and Reporting

(S E A L)

CWM

SCHEDULE I

Docket No. 921193-TL
Interexchange Traffic Data

EAS BETWEEN ALL EXCHANGES IN PALM BEACH COUNTY
(See Schedule III)

One-Way

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>AL&T</u>	<u>Messages</u>	<u>Calling Rate H/A/H*</u>	<u>Total Customers</u>	<u>Customers Making 2 or More Calls/Month Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
-------------	-----------	-----------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------------	--	----------------

List Routes Part I - Routes over 3.00 M/A/M

Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M

Part II - Routes 2.99 to 2.00 M/A/M

Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M

Part III - Routes 1.99 to 1.00 M/A/M

Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M

Part IV - Routes below .99 M/A/M

Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M

*Threshold levels as per Rule 25-4.060(3)(a).

One-Way = Calling Rate of 3.0 messages per access line per month (H/A/H) with 50% of customers making 2 or more calls/month.

RECEIVED

SCHEDULE II

Docket No. 921193-TL
 Interexchange Traffic Data

EAS BETWEEN ALL EXCHANGES IN PALM BEACH COUNTY
 (See Schedule III)

Two-Way

From	To	AL&T	Messages	Calling Rate M/A/M*	Total Customers	Customers Making 1 or More Calls/Month Number	Percent
List Routes	<u>Part I - Routes greater than 2.00 M/A/M</u>						
	Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M						
	<u>Part II - Routes 1.99 to 1.00 M/A/M</u>						
	Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M						
	<u>Part III - Routes below .99 M/A/M</u>						
	Ordered large M/A/M to small M/A/M						

*Threshold levels as per Rule 25-4.060(3).

Two-Way = Calling Rate of 2.0 messages per access line per month (M/A/M) with 50% of customers making 1 or more calls/month.

SCHEDULE III

Docket No. 921193-TL
 Interexchange Traffic Data

EXCHANGES TO BE SURVEYED

Jupiter/Pahokee	Belle Glade/Clewiston (pocket)
Jupiter/Belle Glade	Pahokee/Jupiter
Jupiter/Boynton Beach	Pahokee/West Palm Bch
Jupiter/Delray Beach	Pahokee/Boynton Beach
Jupiter/Boca Raton	Pahokee/Delray Beach
Jupiter/Clewiston	Pahokee/Boca Raton
Jupiter/Clewiston (pocket)	Pahokee/Clewiston
	Pahokee/Clewiston (pocket)
West Palm Bch/Pahokee	Delray Beach/Jupiter
West Palm Bch/Belle Glade	Delray Beach/West Palm Bch
West Palm Bch/Delray Beach	Delray Beach/Pahokee
West Palm Bch/Boca Raton	Delray Beach/Clewiston
West Palm Bch/Clewiston	Delray Beach/Clewiston (pocket)
West Palm Bch/Clewiston (pocket)	Delray Beach/Belle Glade
Boynton Beach/Jupiter	Clewiston/Jupiter
Boynton Beach/Pahokee	Clewiston/West Palm Bch
Boynton Beach/Belle Glade	Clewiston/Pahokee
Boynton Beach/Boca Raton*	Clewiston/Belle Glade
Boynton Beach/Clewiston	Clewiston/Boynton Beach
Boynton Beach/Clewiston (pocket)	Clewiston/Delray Beach
	Clewiston/Boca Raton
Boca Raton/Jupiter	Clewiston (pocket)/Jupiter
Boca Raton/West Palm Bch	Clewiston (pocket)/W Palm Bch
Boca Raton/Pahokee	Clewiston (pocket)/Pahokee
Boca Raton/Belle Glade	Clewiston (pocket)/Belle Glade
Boca Raton/Boynton Beach*	Clewiston (pocket)/Boynton Bch
Boca Raton/Clewiston	Clewiston (pocket)/Delray Bch
Boca Raton/Clewiston (pocket)	Clewiston (pocket)/Boca Raton
Belle Glade/Jupiter	
Belle Glade/West Palm Bch	
Belle Glade/Boynton Beach	
Belle Glade/Delray Beach	
Belle Glade/Boca Raton	
Belle Glade/Clewiston	

*\$.25 plan