

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Proposed tariff filing ) DOCKET NO. 930805-TL  
to introduce Caller ID-Deluxe by ) ORDER NO. PSC-93-1337-FOF-TL  
UNITED TELEPHONE COMPANY OF ) ISSUED: September 14, 1993  
FLORIDA )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

SUSAN F. CLARK  
JULIA L. JOHNSON  
LUIS J. LAUREDO

ORDER APPROVING TARIFF FILING

BY THE COMMISSION:

United Telephone Company of Florida (United or the Company) filed proposed revisions to its General Exchange Tariff on July 9, 1993. The purpose of the filing was to introduce Caller ID-Deluxe service. Caller ID-Deluxe is a feature similar to United's Caller ID service except it adds the calling subscriber's name to the number delivered to a Caller ID device. The feature will function in other ways identical to Caller ID, and most equipment displaying Caller ID information will also be able to display names. United's proposed Caller ID-Deluxe service is also similar to a recent filing by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company (Southern Bell) for the same service.

The Company filed cost summary information with its proposed tariff. The cost information provided showed an average overall cost for Caller ID and Caller ID-Deluxe features of approximately \$1.50 per month. The proposed rates for Caller ID-Deluxe will be the rates currently charged for Caller ID: \$7.00 for residential subscribers and \$10.00 for business. Initially, Caller ID-Deluxe will only be offered from the Company's nine 5ESS central offices. United has several other DMS-100 offices that will be gradually phased in over the next 18 months. This will negate much of the added value of Caller ID-Deluxe at first, so the Company believes that pricing the two services at the same price would be best until complete coverage of United's territory is completed.

We believe this filing is appropriate. The revenues projected for this upgrade appear to cover the Company's costs, the added

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

0988 | SEP 14 93

features should bolster demand for Caller ID services, and the majority of subscribers should be better served by Caller ID-Deluxe's introduction.

In addition, we also believe it is appropriate to require the Company to offer per-line blocking to law enforcement officers and domestic violence intervention workers at their residences at no charge. By Order No. 24546, issued in Docket No. 891194-TL, the Commission required per-line blocking for law enforcement/domestic violence offices. The blocking was not extended to agent's houses. The Commission had several concerns that prevented it from allowing per-line blocking to general subscribers or to law enforcement agents' private residences in that decision. Among the concerns were the diminished value of Caller ID as a deterrent for harassing calls, the default privacy advantage placed with the calling party instead of the called party, and the potential confusion over per-line blocking's function.

However, we have received some complaints from law enforcement personnel that not having per-line blocking at their residences is hindering their undercover crime prevention efforts with present Caller ID services (no name delivered). They have stated that they are hesitant to make return calls to possible suspects from their residences for fear that they may forget to dial \*67, or their children may somehow return a call to a suspect. We are concerned that Caller ID-Deluxe's delivery of the agent's name will elevate that concern. Many agents do not use their real names when conducting undercover investigations. Thus, we find that per-line blocking should be extended to agents' residences at their option. We also find that crisis intervention personnel be afforded the same treatment.

An earlier concern that prevented us from previously requiring per-line blocking to agents' houses is still an issue. Per-line blocking acts as a toggle switch for blocking calls; if \*67 is dialed from a line-blocked phone, it will turn the blocking off. This potential for confusion is of great concern to the Commission, so we shall require United to counsel each agency and agent requesting per-line blocking of this potential danger.

At the August 31, 1993 Agenda Conference, United agreed to file appropriate tariff changes and begin contacting the various agencies within 30 days after the effective date of this tariff. We note that the effect of this action will be to require per-line blocking of both Basic and Deluxe Caller ID services, as blocking

ORDER NO. PSC-93-1337-FOF-TL  
DOCKET NO. 930805-TL  
PAGE 3

provisions in the Company's switches cannot discern among the Caller ID variations. The Company shall also counsel the agencies and personnel on the potential advantages and disadvantages of per-line blocking.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that United Telephone Company of Florida's tariff introducing Caller ID-Deluxe is hereby approved, effective September 7, 1993. It is further

ORDERED that United Telephone Company of Florida shall file tariff revisions offering per-line blocking to law enforcement officers and domestic intervention workers at their residences at no charge, within 30 days after the effective date of this tariff. It is further

ORDERED that if a protest is filed in accordance with the requirement set forth below, the tariff shall remain in effect with any increase in revenues held subject to refund pending resolution of the protest. It is further

ORDERED that if no protest is filed in accordance with the requirement set forth below, this docket shall be closed.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 14th day of September, 1993.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STEVE TRIBBLE, Director  
Division of Records and Reporting

( S E A L )

PAK

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), 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.

The Commission's decision on this tariff is interim in nature and will become final, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed files a petition for a formal proceeding, as provided by Rule 25-22.036(4), Florida Administrative Code, in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036(7)(a)(d) and (e), Florida Administrative Code. This petition must be received by the Director, Division of Records and Reporting at his office at 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, by the close of business on October 5, 1993.

In the absence of such a petition, this order shall become final on the day subsequent to the above date.

Any objection or protest filed in this docket before the issuance date of this Order is considered abandoned unless it satisfies the foregoing conditions and is renewed within the specified protest period.

If this Order becomes final on the date described above, any party adversely affected may request judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or by the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting 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 of the date this Order becomes final, 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.