

ORIGINAL



Richard A. Chapkis  
Vice President & General Counsel –  
Southeast Region

201 North Franklin St., FLTC0717  
P.O. Box 110  
Tampa, FL 33601

Phone: 813-483-1256  
Fax: 813-204-8870  
[richard.chapkis@verizon.com](mailto:richard.chapkis@verizon.com)

December 17, 2004

Ms. Blanca S. Bayó, Director  
Division of the Commission Clerk  
and Administrative Services  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RECEIVED FPSC  
DEC 17 AM 11:13  
COMMISSION  
CLERK

Re: Docket No. 040604-TL  
Adoption of the National School Lunch Program and an income-based criterion at  
or below 135% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines as eligibility criteria for the  
Lifeline and Link-up programs

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Please find enclosed for filing an original and 15 copies of the Rebuttal Testimonies of  
Carl R. Danner and Harold E. West, III on behalf of Verizon Florida Inc. in the above  
matter. Service has been made as indicated on the Certificate of Service. If there are  
any questions regarding this filing, please contact me at 813-483-1256.

Sincerely,

*Richard A. Chapkis*

Richard A. Chapkis

- MP
- COM 5
- CTR org.
- ECR \_\_\_\_\_
- GCL 1
- OPC \_\_\_\_\_
- MMS \_\_\_\_\_
- RCA \_\_\_\_\_
- SCR \_\_\_\_\_
- SEC 1
- OTH \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED & FILED

FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

*Danner*  
DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
13246 DEC 17 3

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

*West*  
DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
13247 DEC 17 3

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that copies of the Rebuttal Testimonies of Carl R. Danner and Harold E. West, III on behalf of Verizon Florida Inc. in Docket No. 040604-TL were sent via U. S. mail on December 17, 2004 to the parties on the attached list.

Richard A. Chapkis

Richard A. Chapkis

Adam Teitzman, Staff Counsel  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

ALLTEL Comm. Services Inc.  
Betty Willis  
One Allied Drive, B4F4ND  
Little Rock, AR 72203-2177

GT Com  
Mark Ellmer  
P. O. Box 220  
Port St. Joe, FL 32457-0220

Office of Public Counsel  
Charles J. Beck  
c/o The Florida Legislature  
111 W. Madison Street  
Room 812  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

TDS Telecom/Quincy Telephone  
Thomas McCabe  
P. O. Box 189  
Quincy, FL 32353-0189

Nancy B. White  
c/o Nancy Sims  
BellSouth Telecomm.,  
150 S. Monroe Street  
Suite 400  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Michael Gross  
Florida Cable Telecomm.  
246 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 100  
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Sprint-Florida, Incorporated  
Susan Masterton  
P. O. Box 2214  
Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214

Sprint Comm. Company  
Charles Rehwinkel  
315 S. Calhoun Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Rutledge Law Firm  
Kenneth Hoffman  
Martin McDonnell  
Marsha Rule  
P. O. Box 551  
Tallahassee, FL 32302-0551

Benjamin H. Dickens  
Mary J. Sisak  
Blooston Mordkofsky Law Firm  
2120 L Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037

Deborah Nobles  
TTSC  
505 Plaza Circle  
Suite 200  
Orange Park, FL 32073

Michael B. Twomey  
Post Office Box 5256  
Tallahassee, Florida 32314-5256

Coralette Hannon, Esquire  
Senior Legislative Representative  
AARP Department of State Affairs  
6705 Reedy Creek Road  
Charlotte, NC 28215-6096

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In re: Adoption of the National School )  
Lunch Program and an income-based ) Docket No. 040604-TL  
criterion at or below 135% of the Federal )  
Poverty Guidelines as eligibility criteria for )  
the Lifeline and Link-up programs )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF CARL R. DANNER**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**VERIZON FLORIDA INC.**

**DECEMBER 17, 2004**

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

13246 DEC 17 04

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 A. I am Carl R. Danner. I am a Director with Wilk & Associates/LECG, 201  
3 Mission Street, Suite 700, San Francisco, CA 94105. I previously filed  
4 direct testimony in this proceeding that described my experience and  
5 qualifications.

6

7 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY.**

8 A. My principal conclusions are as follows:

9

10 1. There appears to be some confusion in this proceeding about the  
11 term "self-certification." Verizon's existing lifeline program includes  
12 customer self-certification; the customer merely has to include some  
13 form of proof of program-based eligibility. The alternative proposal is for  
14 self-certification without proof. As Mr. West documents, Verizon accepts  
15 many forms of proof that the customer may already have, or can easily  
16 acquire.

17

18 2. Direct testimony in this proceeding did not establish that self-  
19 certification without proof will streamline the existing Lifeline application  
20 process. Additionally, as Mr. West documents, a review of the  
21 certification process confirms that it is typically brief and not  
22 burdensome for customers.

23

24 3. Given the relatively small amounts involved, it would be feasible for  
25 smaller ILECs to use Verizon's proposal (to surcharge their own access

1 line services for related costs) if the Commission determines that it is  
2 appropriate for these companies to receive support. Additionally, if an  
3 inter-company support fund is established -- notwithstanding Verizon's  
4 recommendation -- it would be unnecessary and unwise to require  
5 wireless and VoIP providers to participate in this fund.

6

7 4. No party contradicted Verizon's showing that most Lifeline  
8 subscribers would have telephone service even if they did not receive  
9 the Lifeline discount.

10

11 5. With regard to the funding outflow that Mr. Mann identified, California  
12 has recently opened a proceeding to bring its Lifeline program in  
13 compliance with federal verification requirements. This process will  
14 presumably lead to a reduction in California Lifeline subscribership, and  
15 therefore in the funding outflow from other states (including Florida)  
16 required to help pay for California's federal program costs.

17

18 **1. SELF-CERTIFICATION WITH PROOF IS APPROPRIATE**

19

20 **Q. DOES VERIZON NOW ENROLL CUSTOMERS IN THE LIFELINE**  
21 **PROGRAM BASED ON A FORM OF SELF-CERTIFICATION?**

22 **A.** Yes, as Mr. West documents in his direct testimony. Customers can  
23 self-certify merely by completing an application and providing a  
24 document showing that they participate in any of the qualifying  
25 programs. Customers can also be certified as eligible by the Office of

1 Public Counsel (OPC) (on an income basis) or by the Department of  
2 Children and Family Services (DCF).

3

4 **Q. FROM THE CUSTOMER'S STANDPOINT, HOW DOES VERIZON'S**  
5 **CURRENT SELF-CERTIFICATION PROCESS DIFFER FROM THAT**  
6 **WHICH IS PROPOSED IN THIS DOCKET?**

7 A. As Mr. Mann describes the proposal on behalf of the Commission Staff,  
8 the significant difference is that the customer would have to return a  
9 signed form claiming eligibility based on program participation, without  
10 including a document demonstrating participation in a qualifying  
11 program. In other words, Verizon now accepts self-certification with  
12 proof, whereas the proposal is to permit self-certification without proof.  
13 With regard to what eligible customers are asked to do to obtain the  
14 service, this is not much of a difference.

15

16 **2. SELF-CERTIFICATION WITHOUT PROOF WILL NOT**  
17 **ADDRESS COMMISSION STAFF'S CONCERNS ABOUT**  
18 **CUSTOMER BURDENS**

19

20 **Q. WHAT CONCERNS DOES COMMISSION STAFF WITNESS MANN**  
21 **PROPOSE TO ADDRESS THROUGH SELF-CERTIFICATION**  
22 **WITHOUT PROOF?**

23 A. Mr. Mann identifies a number of factors he believes makes program-  
24 based enrollment "quite lengthy and time-consuming for both the ETC  
25 and the customer." (Mann, page 7). Mr. Mann notes that ETCs may

1 check for (and ask satisfaction of) prior unpaid charges for telephone  
2 service, they may compare names to see that the eligible person is the  
3 one actually receiving Lifeline service, and they may check whether the  
4 applicant is already receiving Lifeline service. Mr. Mann then suggests  
5 that a streamlined certification process would “ease the burden on  
6 consumers, expedite needed assistance to the consumer, and result in  
7 increased subscribership...” (Mann, pages 6-7).

8

9 **Q. WOULD SELF-CERTIFICATION WITHOUT PROOF ADDRESS THE**  
10 **CONCERNS MR. MANN IDENTIFIES?**

11 A. No. Each of these steps is reasonable and would be undertaken  
12 whether the customer self-certifies with or without proof. Telephone  
13 companies are authorized by the Commission to check for past-due  
14 amounts and make payment arrangements prior to establishing any  
15 telephone service, which is a reasonable step not just because it is fair  
16 and appropriate for customers to pay valid charges, but also because  
17 telephone service (including Lifeline) includes credit (i.e., the ability to  
18 make calls and incur charges) that can be used to run up further  
19 payment obligations. Comparing the applicant’s name to that on the  
20 form of submitted proof is necessary and can hardly be considered  
21 burdensome. Checking for an existing Lifeline telephone in the eligible  
22 customer’s name enforces a basic rule regarding the service. As Mr.  
23 West discusses, these steps take very little time in practice, and do not  
24 delay the start of Lifeline service for eligible customers. Ms. Khazraee  
25 makes similar points on behalf of Sprint (Khazraee, pages 11-12).



1 Beyond these points, Mr. Mann does not provide any further arguments  
2 or evidence to suggest that self-certification with proof creates a time-  
3 consuming process for customers that self-certification without proof  
4 would cure.

5

6 **Q. TO TEST MR. MANN'S CONCERNS, DID VERIZON REVIEW ITS**  
7 **LIFELINE ENROLLMENT PROCESS TO DETERMINE WHETHER IT**  
8 **WAS LENGTHY AND TIME-CONSUMING FOR CUSTOMERS?**

9 A. Yes, as Mr. West describes, Verizon performed this review and  
10 determined that the existing process is little different from that used to  
11 provide any other kind of residential service.

12

13 **Q. MR. MANN ALSO SUPPORTS INCREASING THE INCOME**  
14 **ELIGIBILITY LIMIT TO 135 PERCENT OF THE POVERTY LEVEL,**  
15 **AND ADDING THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM TO THE**  
16 **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS. DO THESE PROPOSALS RAISE**  
17 **SIMILAR CONCERNS?**

18 A. No, as Mr. West described in his opening testimony. Although these  
19 proposed expansions of the Lifeline eligibility requirements would do  
20 little to increase telephone service penetration, the applicant would at  
21 least have to submit proof of eligibility. By contrast, the adoption of self-  
22 certification without proof would create the potential for fraud, waste and  
23 abuse and the other problems Mr. West describes.

24

25

1           **3.   SMALL ILEC FUNDING CONCERNS DO NOT REQUIRE**  
2                   **ESTABLISHING AN INDUSTRY-WIDE FUND OR TAXING**  
3                   **WIRELESS AND VOIP SERVICES**

4  
5   **Q.   IF AUTHORIZED TO SEEK FUNDING FOR THEIR LIFELINE**  
6           **DISCOUNTS, CAN SMALLER ILECS USE THE FUNDING**  
7           **APPROACH RECOMMENDED BY VERIZON?**

8   A.   Yes. With regard to the four companies represented by Mr. McCabe,  
9           the needed surcharge (based on 2003 access line and Lifeline  
10           subscribership data) would range from a low about 7.5 cents per  
11           line/month for ALLTEL, to a high of 18 cents/line/month for NEFCOM.  
12           For all small Florida ILECs in total (also including Frontier, ITS and  
13           SmartCity), monthly intrastate Lifeline benefits are quite small  
14           (approximately \$23,000 at present based on the updated four-company  
15           lifeline subscribership total Mr. McCabe provides).

16  
17   **Q.   SHOULD THE COMMISSION ESTABLISH AN INDUSTRY-WIDE**  
18           **FUNDING MECHANISM, AS MR. MCCABE RECOMMENDS, TO**  
19           **SUPPORT LIFELINE BENEFITS FOR SMALL ILECS?**

20   A.   No. It is not necessary to establish such a fund to recover whatever  
21           portion of the \$23,000 monthly requirement might be authorized to flow  
22           into the small ILECs (from other companies). Related administrative  
23           costs would not have to be very large to become significant by  
24           comparison.

25

1 Q. MR. MCCABE ALSO RECOMMENDS THAT A FUND REQUIRE  
2 WIRELESS AND VOIP PROVIDERS TO COLLECT REVENUES TO  
3 SUPPORT LIFELINE. PLEASE COMMENT.

4 A. Although I am not an attorney, I am advised that the Commission lacks  
5 jurisdiction over wireless and VOIP providers, and therefore cannot  
6 collect revenues from them to support Lifeline. Moreover, it is not  
7 necessary and would be unwise to include these technologies in any  
8 Lifeline fund that may be established. It is not necessary to go beyond  
9 wired service because the amounts in question could feasibly be  
10 collected from ILEC and CLEC customers. By comparison to the  
11 approximately 10 million access lines in Florida, the per-customer  
12 surcharge associated with collecting about \$23,000 (if the issue is  
13 supporting small ILECs) would be small. To get a rough idea of an  
14 upper bound for a surcharge under the present Lifeline program, the  
15 per-line cost for collecting all ILEC Lifeline support in rates would be  
16 about five cents per month (in a scenario under which the major ILECs  
17 might receive full recovery). Therefore – if the Commission determines  
18 that support is needed, and also that a fund should be established –  
19 there is no need to attempt to tax wireless customers (which would  
20 induce the harmful economic distortions I discussed in my opening  
21 testimony), or to try to cope with the jurisdictional and technical issues  
22 related to taxing VoIP service.

23  
24  
25

1           **4.    THERE IS NO ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE THAT AN EXPANDED**  
2                   **LIFELINE PROGRAM WILL INCREASE TELEPHONE**  
3                   **SUBSCRIBERSHIP**

4  
5   **Q.    DID OTHER WITNESSES PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**  
6           **TO SHOW THAT LIFELINE WILL INCREASE TELEPHONE**  
7           **SUBSCRIBERSHIP IN FLORIDA?**

8   **A.**    No. Mr. McCabe described Lifeline as part of universal service, but did  
9           not identify any related impact on telephone subscribership. Mr. Mann  
10          cited the same FCC Staff study I reviewed, which showed that (at most)  
11          a small minority of new Lifeline subscribers would have previously  
12          lacked service. Ms. Khazraee discussed the potential for increased  
13          program participation, but did not identify any resulting increase in  
14          telephone penetration. Mr. Morillo observed that BellSouth is unaware  
15          of any criteria or studies conclusively establishing that an increased  
16          base of eligible customers would lead to an increase in telephone  
17          penetration.

18  
19   **Q.    NOTWITHSTANDING MR. MANN'S TESTIMONY, HAS COMMISSION**  
20           **STAFF PREVIOUSLY OPINED ON WHETHER INCREASED LIFELINE**  
21           **SUBSCRIBERSHIP WOULD INCREASE TELEPHONE SERVICE**  
22           **PENETRATION?**

23   **A.**    Yes, the Commission's 2003 Lifeline Report to the Governor and state  
24          legislature noted the following with regard to the level of Lifeline  
25          participation among eligible households:

1           While the participation rates may seem low, this should not  
2           be interpreted that the non-participating eligible population  
3           are without telephone service. Compared to the 819,112  
4           households eligible for lifeline, the total number of Florida  
5           households without telephone service is approximately  
6           351,645...

7  
8           [W]ith the telephone penetration rate for the lowest income  
9           households at approximately 90%, it would appear that  
10          even without the Lifeline subsidy, most eligible households  
11          have telephone service.<sup>1</sup>

12  
13          In other words, the number of Lifeline-eligible households, based on  
14          125% of the poverty level, was over twice the number of households (of  
15          any income level) that lack telephone service in Florida. These figures  
16          are further evidence that the characteristics of the Lifeline program are  
17          not particularly related to whatever reasons exist for the remaining lack  
18          of wired telephone service in a small fraction of Florida households.

19  
20          **5. CALIFORNIA HAS BEGUN TO PLACE CONTROLS ON ITS**  
21          **LIFELINE PROGRAM**

22

---

<sup>1</sup> Florida Public Service Commission, "Number of Customers Subscribing to Lifeline Service and the Effectiveness of And Procedures to Promote Participation," A Report to the Governor, President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives (December, 2003), pages 3-4. Note that the approximately 90% reported penetration rate for the "lowest income" households reflected less than \$10,000/year. Among households with an income of \$10,000-\$19,999/year, the penetration rate in Florida was 94.3% as compared to an average for all households of 94.7%.

1 Q. WHAT CONCERN DID MR. MANN EXPRESS REGARDING  
2 FEDERAL FUNDING MECHANISMS?

3 A. Mr. Mann expressed concern with the net outflow of approximately  
4 \$30.6 million from Florida into the USF Low Income Support Mechanism  
5 (Mann, page 5). He noted that increased Lifeline subscribership in  
6 Florida could help keep this net flow from increasing. In my direct  
7 testimony, I noted that California's large Lifeline subscribership, whose  
8 eligibility is not verified, is the principal cause of the outflow from Florida  
9 and many other states. I also noted that if every state were to try to  
10 increase the size of its Lifeline program to capture additional funding  
11 from other states, the federal program would grow and ultimately burden  
12 customers in all states with greater support obligations unrelated to  
13 increasing universal service.

14

15 Q. HAS CALIFORNIA RECENTLY TAKEN FORMAL ACTION TO BEGIN  
16 TO ADDRESS THIS PROBLEM?

17 A. Yes. On December 2, 2004, the CPUC opened a rulemaking  
18 proceeding to adopt verification requirements for California's Lifeline  
19 subscribers.<sup>2</sup> The CPUC proposed that customers seeking to enroll in  
20 Lifeline service submit proof of income eligibility to an independent,  
21 third-party certifying agent. Ongoing subscribers would self-certify their  
22 continuing eligibility annually. The CPUC rulemaking decision is entirely  
23 focused on retaining eligibility for Federal funds for California's program,  
24 a priority that should help achieve meaningful control measures in

---

<sup>2</sup> CPUC Rulemaking (R.) 04-12-001, opened December 2, 2004. The CPUC's order is Exhibit CRD-2 attached to this testimony.

1           accordance with the FCC's direction in that regard (which the  
2           Commission helped inform through its expressions of concern).  
3           Accordingly, California's Lifeline subscriber totals should begin to fall  
4           when proof of verification begins to be enforced.

5

6   **Q.    DOES THAT COMPLETE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY AT THIS**  
7           **TIME?**

8   **A.    Yes.**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ALJ/KAJ/eap

Mailed 12/6/2004

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking Into  
Implementation of Federal Communications  
Commission Report and Order 04-87, As It  
Affects The Universal Lifeline Telephone Service  
Program.

FILED  
PUBLIC UTILITIES  
COMMISSION  
DECEMBER 2, 2004  
SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE  
RULEMAKING 04-12-001

**ORDER INSTITUTING RULEMAKING**

**I. Summary**

By this order, we institute a rulemaking into the implementation of the Federal Communications Commission's Report and Order, FCC No. 04-87 (Lifeline/Link-Up Order or Order), as it affects our Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS) program. In its Order, the FCC requires all states to document customers' income qualification for their income-based Lifeline/Link-Up programs. At the present time, the California ULTS program, which is based on income eligibility, allows participants to self-certify their income, with no process in place for documentation of customers' income.

In order to comply with the FCC's order, and to preserve the \$330 million annual support from the federal Lifeline/Link-Up programs, the Commission must adopt a process to certify participants' income. The primary goal of this Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) is to take the steps needed to preserve the \$330 million annual support from the federal Lifeline/Link-Up programs.

In addition, we recognize that some program participants do not have information available to document their income. We request parties to comment



on how ULTS should serve these low-income households that otherwise would qualify for ULTS but are unable to provide the required income documentation.

We also indicate that we would like to explore the possibility of implementing automatic enrollment for the ULTS program.

## **II. Background**

On June 22, 2004, the FCC released the Lifeline/Link-Up Order modifying the requirements for eligible telecommunications carriers (ETCs) to receive federal Lifeline/Link-Up funds. The Lifeline/Link-Up Order was intended to improve telephone subscribership and the effectiveness of the low-income support mechanism.

The Federal Lifeline program provides low-income customers with discounts of up to \$10.00 from the monthly cost of telephone service for a single telephone line in their principal residence.<sup>1</sup> The Federal Link-Up program provides low-income customers with 50% discounts, to a maximum of \$30.00, from the initial costs of installing telephone service.<sup>2</sup>

In its Order, the FCC expands the federal default eligibility criteria to include an income-based criterion. Furthermore, the Order requires states, like California, that operate their own income-based Lifeline programs to document low-income customers' income qualification.

Under the FCC's rules, states and territories have the authority to establish their own Lifeline/Link-Up programs that provide additional support to low-income consumers which incorporate the unique characteristics of each state. Some state and territories, however, have elected to use the federal criteria as

---

<sup>1</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 54.401(a)(2).

<sup>2</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 54.411(a)(1).

their default standard. These are known as “federal default states.” California has established its own program, the Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS) program.

Currently, California’s ULTS is a \$570 million program. Of this amount, approximately \$330 million is financed by federal Lifeline/Link-Up funds and \$240 million is from an all-end-user surcharge assessed on consumers’ intrastate telephone bills. California, however, could lose the \$330 million of federal Lifeline/Link-Up funds if California does not implement the FCC’s new program eligibility requirements by June 2005.

### **III. Income-Based Eligibility Requirements**

#### **A. Income-based eligibility in federal default states**

The Lifeline/Link-Up Order added an income-based criterion for participation in Lifeline/Link-Up in federal default states, if the ETC customer’s household income is at or below 135% of the Federal Poverty Guideline (FPG).<sup>3</sup> Each ETC must certify, under penalty of perjury, that a customer is qualified for Lifeline/Link-Up based on: 1) Customer self-certification, under penalty of perjury, of his/her qualification, and 2) Income document(s) supporting the income level of the customer.

ETCs in states that do not mandate state Lifeline support must implement certification procedures to document consumer income-based eligibility for Lifeline prior to that consumer’s enrollment. Acceptable documentation of income eligibility includes:

- prior year’s state, federal, or tribal tax return,

---

<sup>3</sup> The FCC stated that adding an income-based standard likely would capture some low-income customers who are not eligible for Lifeline/Link-Up because they no longer participate in the qualifying assistance program.

- current income statement from an employer or paycheck stub,
- Statement of benefits from Social Security, Veterans Administration,
- Statement of benefits from retirement/pension, Unemployment/Workmen's Compensation,
- federal or tribal notice letter of participation in Bureau of Indian Affairs General Assistance,
- a divorce decree
- child support document, or
- other official document.

**B. Income-based Requirements in States with Their Own Lifeline/Link-Up Program**

The FCC requires all states, including federal default states, to adopt procedures to document income-based eligibility for Lifeline/Link-Up. However, states like California that operate their own Lifeline/Link-Up programs have the flexibility to develop their own certification procedures, including the determination of what constitutes acceptable documentation to certify consumer eligibility under an income-based criterion. However, a state's procedures must include the following elements:

- States that develop their own certification procedures must establish a certifying entity(s), whether it is a state agency or an ETC.<sup>4</sup>
- Customers must self-certify, under penalty of perjury, that the presented documentation accurately represents their annual household income.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See ¶ 29 of the Lifeline/Link-Up Order. Unless otherwise indicated, all subsequent references to numbered paragraphs refer to the Lifeline/Link-Up Order.

<sup>5</sup> See ¶ 32.

- Consumers must self-certify, under penalty of perjury, the number of individuals in their households.<sup>6</sup>
- ETCs must certify that they are complying with Lifeline income certification procedures and that, to the best of their knowledge, documentation of income was presented.<sup>7</sup>
- States must establish a process to verify customers' continued eligibility for the ULTS program. Verification procedures may include random beneficiary audits, periodic submission of documents, or annual self-certification.<sup>8</sup>

#### **IV. Automatic Enrollment**

In its Order, the FCC encourages all states to adopt automatic enrollment as a means of certifying that consumers are eligible for Lifeline/Link-Up. The FCC made this suggestion on the basis of a recommendation by the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service (Joint Board). On December 21, 2000, the FCC requested that the Joint Board review the Lifeline/Link-Up program for all low-income customers. The Joint Board issued its *Recommended Decision* on April 2, 2003. In its *Recommended Decision*, the Joint Board recommended several changes to improve the effectiveness of the low-income support mechanism; automatic enrollment was one of those changes.

In its *Recommended Decision*, the Joint Board observes that participation in Lifeline/Link-Up increased in states that employed automatic enrollment, aggressive outreach, and intrastate multi-agency cooperation. The FCC agrees with the Joint Board that automatic enrollment may facilitate participation in Lifeline/Link-Up. However, the FCC reiterates the Joint Board's conclusion that

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> 47 C.F.R. §54.410(b)(i).

implementation of automatic enrollment could impose significant administrative, technological, and financial burdens on states and ETCs. The FCC recognizes the benefits of automatic enrollment, but also recognizes that requiring automatic enrollment may deter ETCs from participating in the Lifeline/Link-Up program because of the technical requirements associated with interfacing with government agencies or third party administrators.

The FCC declines to require states to adopt automatic enrollment at this time, but encourages those states that currently do not employ automatic enrollment to consider states that operate automatic enrollment as a model for future implementation.

We ask parties to provide information on how automatic enrollment works in other states and to comment on whether it is feasible to implement automatic enrollment in California.

## **V. California's ULTS Program**

The Commission established the ULTS program in 1984 in compliance with the Moore Universal Telephone Service Act. ULTS is an income-based program providing discounted basic telephone services to qualifying low-income households. Eligibility is based on a consumer's self-certification declaring, under penalty of perjury, that his/her household income meets the ULTS income guidelines. This self-certification is required on initiation of service, and annually thereafter. The ULTS eligibility criteria currently employed in California is consistent with sections 54.409 and 54.415 of the FCC's rules<sup>9</sup>, thereby, eligible for the Lifeline/Link-Up funding.

---

<sup>8</sup> See ¶ 33.

<sup>9</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 54.409(a) provides "[t]o qualify to receive Lifeline service in a state that mandates state Lifeline support, a consumer must meet the eligibility criteria established by the state

*Footnote continued on next page*

ULTS discounted services are provided by incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs)<sup>10</sup> and competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs)<sup>11</sup> which, in turn, receive reimbursement from the ULTS fund net of payments from the federal Lifeline/Link-Up programs. ULTS currently serves over 3.3 million low-income households with an annual cost in excess of \$570 million.

## **VI. Preliminary Scoping Memo**

The Lifeline/Link-Up Order requires states to document the income eligibility of qualifying households. If the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) does not adopt the new federal certification guidelines, California could lose over \$330 million of annual Federal Lifeline/Link-Up support. This OIR focuses primarily on the narrow issue of revising our income eligibility criteria to conform to the Lifeline/Link-Up Order in order to preserve the federal funding. To this end, we propose the following rule changes:<sup>12</sup>

- Certification occurs when an individual is applying to enroll in ULTS.<sup>13</sup> At certification, customers must self-certify, under penalty of perjury, as to the number of individuals in their household, that they meet the ULTS income guidelines, and that the presented documentation

---

commission for such support. The state commission shall establish narrowly targeted qualification criteria that are based solely on income or factors directly related to income.”

<sup>10</sup> All 21 ILECs are designated as ETCs and have been receiving federal Lifeline/Link-Up support for their ULTS customers. They serve over 90% of the total ULTS customers.

<sup>11</sup> The 24 CLECs that had received or are receiving reimbursements from the ULTS program are not ETCs. Since these CLECs are not eligible for the federal Lifeline/Link-Up support, they have been reimbursed wholly by ULTS.

<sup>12</sup> The Telecommunications Division will be directed to revise General Order (GO) 153, Procedures for Administration of the Moore Universal Telephone Service Act, to reflect rule changes adopted in this rulemaking. TD will also be directed to conduct a working group to revise the comprehensive list of recoverable costs and required supporting worksheets due to these rule changes.

<sup>13</sup> See ¶ 23.

accurately represents their annual household income. The income documentation must be reviewed by the certifying entity.

- Verification occurs annually after a customer has already been certified and enrolled in ULTS. The process verifies a customer's continued eligibility for ULTS.<sup>14</sup> At verification, customers must self-certify, under penalty of perjury, as to the number of individuals in their household and that they meet the ULTS income guidelines.

To implement the above rule changes, we also propose that:

- The Commission's Telecommunications Division (TD) will designate a certifying agent to perform the functions of certification and verification statewide.

The FCC's Order specifies that a certifying agent is to be responsible for certifying customers' eligibility to participate in ULTS based on customers' self-certifications supported by income documents. As such, the certifying agent plays a crucial role in shaping ULTS enrollment. We believe that a single entity should perform the certification/verification functions statewide. This way we can ensure that proper documents are received, review of income documentation is consistent, customers' sensitive and personal data are kept confidential, and our rules and procedures are properly followed. Having a single certifying entity, under the direction of TD, would alleviate our concerns and minimize fraud and abuse of the program. Furthermore, this independent third-party arrangement would allow ULTS customers to move or to change service provider within California without re-certification. However, any party that believes that the carriers that provide ULTS service should serve as certifying agents should explain why they believe that approach is preferable to using an outside certifying entity.

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

In addition, we would like to explore the possibility of implementing automatic enrollment. Parties should explore the models adopted in other states, as well as other models.

In this OIR, we seek comments on the following:

- Should the Commission adopt a certification process as outlined above in conformance with the FCC's income documentation requirement in order to continue to receive federal Lifeline/Link-up funding?
- If yes, what should constitute acceptable income documents?<sup>15</sup>
- If California does not conform to the FCC's income documentation requirement and is no longer eligible for continued federal funding, how should the Commission cover the shortfall caused by the loss of federal Lifeline/Link-Up support? Also, what safeguards should the Commission implement to minimize fraud and abuse of the program?<sup>16</sup>
- Should the Commission adopt the verification process outlined above in conformance with the FCC's verification requirement in order to continue to receive federal Lifeline/Link-up funding?
- Alternatively, should the Commission adopt other verification measures such as random beneficiary audits and/or periodic submission of documents?
- Should the Commission designate a single entity as certifying agent?
- Alternatively, instead of designating a single entity as certifying agent should each carrier serve as certifying agent for its customers?

---

<sup>15</sup> Since participation in the ULTS program is based on income, recommended income documents should provide some proof of income. Parties should also consider recommended income documents for individuals living on tribal lands.

<sup>16</sup> In paragraph 28 of the Lifeline/Link-Up Order, the FCC points out that "the Florida PSC [Public Service Commission] notes that California's Lifeline program, which utilizes self-certification of income-based eligibility, appears to have more households receiving the Lifeline discount than the Current Population Survey of Households data would indicate are eligible for the discount."



- Should the Commission adopt some sort of automatic enrollment for the Lifeline/Link-Up program? If so, please give specific information on how the program has been implemented in other states and how it would work in California.

We recognize that our proposed rule changes will likely result in excluding low-income households with no income documentation. Therefore, we also request parties to comment on how ULTS should serve low-income households that are unable to provide appropriate income verification.<sup>17</sup>

Parties that propose that ULTS should continue to provide assistance to low-income households that attest they would otherwise qualify but are unable to provide income documentation should provide the Commission with detailed proposals including an estimate of the cost of their proposed recommendation. Parties should also recommend safeguards that the Commission should implement to minimize fraud and abuse of the program. In their comments, parties should also identify the number of households that could be adversely affected by a policy that limits ULTS support to only those households that are able to provide the required income documentation.

## **VII. Category of Proceeding**

Rule 6(c)(2) of our Rules of Practice and Procedure<sup>18</sup> provides that an OIR “shall preliminarily determine the category” of the proceeding. This rulemaking is preliminarily determined to be quasi-legislative, as that term is defined in Rule 5(d). Our intention is to solicit comments on our proposed rule changes.

---

<sup>17</sup> This may include children and/or parents domestically functioning as separate households and have no income, or undocumented immigrants.

<sup>18</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all subsequent citations to Rules refer to the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

We do not anticipate holding evidentiary hearings since we do not foresee the need to receive testimony regarding adjudicative facts.<sup>19</sup>

### **VIII. Respondents**

For purposes of this proceeding, all California ILECs and CLECs that receive reimbursement from the ULTS fund will be named respondents. These entities will be maintained on the service list throughout the course of this proceeding.

### **IX. Official Service List**

The assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) will establish the initial service list for this proceeding by ruling on or before January 3, 2005. We plan to disseminate this OIR to provide broad public notice. The Executive Director shall serve copies of the OIR on: respondents to this proceeding as described above; committee members of the ULTS Trust Administrative Committee, Telecommunications Access for the Deaf and Disabled Administrative Committee and the Low Income Oversight Board; parties on the service lists of R.98-09-005 (the ULTS/GO 153 OIR); I.04-02-007 (The VOIP proceeding); National Indian Justice Center; and Richard Heath & Associates, contractor for the ULTS Marketing/Outreach program and the ULTS Call Center. The Executive Director shall also serve electronically, a Notice of Availability<sup>20</sup> of the OIR on jurisdictional telecommunications utilities, for which e-mail addresses are on file with the Commission, informing them that this OIR is available at:

---

<sup>19</sup> Rule 8(f)(1) defines "adjudicative facts" as facts which answer questions such as who did what, where, when, how, why or with what motive or intent.

<sup>20</sup> See Rule 2.3 regarding service, generally, includes use of a Notice of Availability in lieu of service of documents. This provision applies to documents in excess of 75 pages but may also be used with the permission of the ALJ.

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/industry/telco/index.htm>. For incumbent and competitive local exchange carriers whose e-mail addresses are not on file with the Commission, the Executive Director shall send those carriers, by regular mail, copies of the Notice of Availability of the OIR.

We invite broad participation and those who seek party status or wish to monitor this proceeding may do so by taking the steps described below:

- We shall assign party and non-party status in accordance with our usual conventions which recognize three categories of interested persons: Appearance (full party status, with all attendant rights and obligations, including service on all other parties and the state service category); State Service (non-party state employees who serve as recipients of service for their state agencies or for state officials); and Information Only (non-parties who do not receive full service but do receive all Commission-generated documents, such as rulings, proposed decisions and final decisions).
- In order to be placed on the initial official service list, interested persons should contact the Commission's Process Office by FAX (415/703-2823) or e-mail ([ALJ\\_Process@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:ALJ_Process@cpuc.ca.gov)) (Note, there is an underscore mark between "ALJ" and "Process"), no later than the close of business on December 15, 2004, and provide the following information:
  1. Name and organization represented, if any
  2. Address
  3. Telephone number
  4. E-mail address, if available
  5. Specify whether you should be assigned to the appearance, state service, or information only category.

The initial official service list will be posted on the Commission's website at [www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov) and will be updated periodically. Parties should check the website before making subsequent filings.

**X. Schedule**

In accordance with Rule 6(c)(2), we adopt the following preliminary schedule for the filing of opening and reply comments in this rulemaking. We see no need for evidentiary hearings. Any interested party who believes that hearings are required shall request hearings in their opening comments and indicate the nature of any evidence they would present were hearings to be held. Failure to make such a request in opening comments will be deemed a waiver of any request for hearings.

Objections to the preliminary categorization of this rulemaking or to the preliminary schedule shall be filed no later than 10 days after the issuance of this rulemaking and a courtesy copy shall be provided to the assigned ALJ by e-mail.

| <b>Date</b> | <b># of Days from Issuance of OIR</b> | <b># of Days (from Commission Decision)</b> | <b>Events</b>  |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 12/2/2004   | 0                                     |   | Commission issues OIR  |
| 1/14/2005   | 43                                    |   | Parties file comments  |
| 1/28/2005   | 57                                    |   | Parties file reply comments  |
| 3/22/2005   | 110                                   |   | Draft decision mailed for comment  |
| 4/21/2005   | 140                                   |   | Commission adopts decision   |
| 5/5/2005    | 154                                   | 14  | TD conducts working group revising/updating GO 153 consistent with Commission orders.  |
| 5/19/2005   | 168                                   | 28  | TD issues Request for Proposal or Invitation for Bid for the role of certifying agent.                                       |
| 8/23/2005   | 264                                   | 124   | TD issues draft resolution adopting revised GO 153 and approving certifying agent contract.                                  |
| 9/22/2005   | 294                                   | 154   | Commission adopts TD resolution.   |
| 10/28/2005  | 330                                   | 190   | Contract approved by the Department of General Services  |
| 11/16/2005  | 349                                   | 209   | Certifying Agent contract begins   |
| 5/1/2006    | 515                                   | 375   | Kickoff of the new certification/verification process by all parties including the certifying agent, carriers and consumers. |

The above schedule also includes timeline and administrative tasks that must be completed before the implementation of the new certification/verification process. Pursuant to the Lifeline/Link-Up Order,<sup>21</sup> states that operate their own income-based program are required to implement measures to certify income of consumers and measures to verify consumers' continued eligibility within one year from its publication in the Federal Register. The Lifeline/Link-Up Order was published in the Federal Register on June 22, 2004. Thus, the deadline for the commencement of our new certification/verification process is June 22, 2005. However, if we designate a certifying agent in lieu of having carriers certify and verify customers' eligibility for ULTS, we will not be able to meet the FCC's deadline because the state's contracting process requires until May 1, 2006 to get the certifying process in place. Therefore, if we do determine that it is preferable to use an outside certifying agent, we will direct the Legal Division to petition the FCC to request an extension of time to implement the Lifeline/Link-Up Order.

#### **XI. Public Advisor**

Any person or entity interested in participating in this rulemaking as a party and who is unfamiliar with the Commission's procedures should contact the Commission Public Advisor's Office in Los Angeles at (213) 576-7055 or (866) 849-8391, or e-mail [public.advisor.la@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:public.advisor.la@cpuc.ca.gov); or in San Francisco at (415) 703-2074 or (866) 849-8390 or e-mail [public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov). The TYY number is (866) 836-7825.

---

<sup>21</sup> 47 C.F.R. §54.410(c)(i).

## **XII. Ex parte Communications**

This proceeding is subject to Rule 7, which specifies standards for engaging in ex parte communications and the reporting of such communications. Pursuant to Rules 7(a)(4) and 7(d), ex parte communications will be allowed in this proceeding without any restrictions or reporting requirements until the Assigned Commissioner makes an appealable determination of category as provided for in Rules 6(c)(2) and 6.4. Following the Assigned Commissioner's determination, the applicable ex parte communication and reporting requirements shall depend on such determination unless and until the determination is modified by the Commission pursuant to Rule 6.4 or 6.5.

## **O R D E R**

Therefore, **IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. A rulemaking is instituted on the Commission's own motion for the purpose of implementing the Federal Communications Commission's Report and Order, FCC No. 04-87 (Lifeline/Link-Up Order), as it affects the Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS) program.
2. All incumbent local exchange carriers and competitive local exchange carriers that receive reimbursement from the ULTS fund shall be respondents in this proceeding.
3. The Executive Director shall cause this Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) to be served on: the respondents to this proceeding; committee members of the ULTS Trust Administrative Committee, Telecommunications Access for the Deaf and Disabled Administrative Committee and the Low Income Oversight Board; parties on the service lists of Rulemaking 98-09-005 (the ULTS/GO 153 OIR); Investigation 04-02-007 (the VOIP proceeding); National Indian Justice Centers;

and Richard Heath & Associates, contractor for the ULTS Marketing/Outreach program and the ULTS Call Center.

4. The Executive Director shall serve electronically a Notice of Availability of the OIR on jurisdictional telecommunications utilities, for which e-mail addresses are on file with the Commission, informing them that this OIR is available at: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/industry/telco/index.htm>. For incumbent and competitive local exchange carriers whose e-mail addresses are not on file with the Commission, the Executive Director shall send those carriers, by regular mail, copies of the Notice of Availability of the OIR.

5. The assigned Administrative Law Judge shall issue a ruling to establish the initial official service list for this proceeding on or before January 3, 2005.

6. The category of this rulemaking is preliminarily determined to be "quasi-legislative" as that term is defined in Rule 5(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

7. The preliminary schedule for this rulemaking is set forth herein. Consistent with the preliminary schedule, parties shall file comments by



January 14, 2005 and reply comments by January 28, 2005. All comments shall be filed with the Commission's Docket Office and served in accordance with the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure and this Order.

This order is effective today.

Dated December 2, 2004, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY  
President  
CARL W. WOOD  
LORETTA M. LYNCH  
GEOFFREY F. BROWN  
SUSAN P. KENNEDY  
Commissioners