

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Petition by the residents) DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
of Polo Park requesting extended) ORDER NO. PSC-96-0242-PCO-TL
area service (EAS) between the) ISSUED: February 20, 1996
Haines City exchange and the)
Orlando, West Kissimmee, Lake)
Buena Vista, Windermere, Reedy)
Creek, Winter Park, Clermont,)
Winter Garden and St. Cloud)
exchanges.)
_____)

ORDER MODIFYING PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE AND
ESTABLISHING PRELIMINARY LIST OF ISSUES

On January 18, 1996, the Order Establishing Procedure was issued in this docket. See Order No. PSC-96-0093-PCO-TL. The Order established the dates governing the key activities of this case.

On February 5, 1996, a staff workshop was held to identify the preliminary list of issues. The issues as agreed upon are set forth below:

ISSUE 1: Is there a sufficient community of interest on the routes listed in Table A to justify surveying for nonoptional extended area service as currently defined in the Commission rules, or implementing an alternative interLATA toll plan?

TABLE A

REQUESTED INTERLATA ROUTES FOR EAS	
FROM:	TO:
Haines City (Except Poinciana 427 pocket)	Kissimmee, West Kissimmee
Haines City	Orlando, Lake Buena Vista, Windermere, Reedy Creek, Winter Park, Clermont, Winter Garden, St. Cloud
Haines City (including 427 Poinciana pocket)	Orlando, Lake Buena Vista, Windermere, Reedy Creek, Winter Park, Clermont, Winter Garden, St. Cloud

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
01973 FEB 20 96
FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

ISSUE 2: What other community of interest factors should be considered in determining if either an optional or nonoptional toll alternative should be implemented on these routes?

ISSUE 3: If a sufficient community of interest is found on any of these routes, what is the economic impact of each plan on the company (summarize in chart form and discuss in detail)?

- a) EAS with 25/25 plan and regrouping;
- b) Alternative InterLATA toll plan; and
- c) Other (specify)

ISSUE 4: Should subscribers be required to pay an additive as a prerequisite to surveying for extended area service or an alternative interLATA toll plan? If so, how much of a payment is required and how long should it last?

ISSUE 5: If a sufficient community of interest is found, what are the appropriate rates and charges for the plan to be implemented on these routes?

ISSUE 6: If extended area service or an alternative interLATA toll plan is determined to be appropriate, should the customers be surveyed?

In addition, the date for the filing of direct testimony and exhibits has been modified as follows:

- 1) Direct Testimony and exhibits - March 11, 1996
All Parties

Based on the foregoing, it is


ORDERED by Commissioner Julia L. Johnson, as Prehearing Officer, that Order No. PSC-96-0093-PCO-TL has been modified as discussed in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that the requirements of Order No. PSC-96-0093-PCO-TL shall remain effective except as modified in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that the preliminary issues for the hearing on June 14, 1996 are those set forth in the body of this Order.

ORDER NO. PSC-96-0242-PC0-TL
DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
PAGE 3

By ORDER of Commissioner Julia L. Johnson, as Prehearing Officer, this 20th day of February, 1996.



JULIA L. JOHNSON, Commissioner and Prehearing Officer

(S E A L)

DLC

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.

Any party adversely affected by this order, which is preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature, may request: (1) reconsideration within 10 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.038(2), Florida Administrative Code, if issued by a Prehearing Officer; (2) reconsideration within 15 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by the Commission; or (3) 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 or wastewater utility. A motion for reconsideration shall be filed with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code. Judicial review of a preliminary, procedural or intermediate ruling or order is available if review of the final action will not provide an adequate remedy. Such review may be requested from the appropriate court, as described above, pursuant to Rule 9.100, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.