

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Review of Requirements	)	DOCKET NO. 871394-TP
Appropriate for Alternative Operator	)	ORDER NO. 22269
Services and Public Telephones	)	ISSUED: 12-5-89
<hr/>		

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

- MICHAEL McK. WILSON, Chairman
- THOMAS M. BEARD
- BETTY EASLEY
- JOHN T. HERNDON

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL EXTENSION OF TIME

BY THE COMMISSION:

On December 21, 1988, we issued Order No. 20489 in this docket, which set forth the provisions and requirements which Alternative Operator Services (AOS) providers must comply with in order to provide intrastate operator services in Florida. Under the terms of the Order, the majority of its provisions were to go into effect within thirty days of the Order's issuance date. Several parties filed Motions for Reconsideration of the Order that we have addressed separately. Our decision in the instant Order is only intended to address a certain Motion filed by Southland Telephone Company (Southland) as detailed below.

By Order No. 20489, we directed all local exchange companies (LECs) to offer billing validation service to AOS companies, subject to terms and conditions further specified in that Order. Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company (Southern Bell) was ordered to comply with our billing validation service requirements shortly after the issuance of Order No. 20489. All other LECs were given the following directive:

All other local exchange companies shall comply with our policy to provide billing validation service and data. The LECs may provide their own data base, make arrangements with another LEC, or with a third party vendor. This shall be completed by January 1, 1990, unless a company makes an appropriate showing

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

11722 DEC -5 1989

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

ORDER NO. 22269  
DOCKET NO. 871394-TP  
PAGE 2

to the Commission no later than June 1, 1989, that this requirement is overly burdensome.

On May 12, 1989, our staff sent a reminder notice of all LECs, other than Southern Bell, advising them that any showing of undue burden in implementation was to be filed no later than June 1, 1989. Shortly thereafter, on May 17, 1989, Indiantown Telephone System, Inc. filed a Motion for Extension of Time to the June 1st deadline for making this showing. Substantially similar Motions were filed on May 22, 1989, by the Florida Telephone Company and Gulf Telephone Company; on May 23, 1989, by ALLTEL Florida, Inc., Quincy Telephone Company and St. Joseph Telephone and Telegraph Company; and on May 25, 1989, by Northeast Florida Telephone Company and Vista-United Telecommunications.

Each Motion requested that the deadline for making a showing of undue burden be extended through July 14, 1989. Each company asserted that such additional time was needed to allow the company to determine if the billing validation requirements could be met and, if so, how to best do this. Each company further explained that whether our billing validation service requirement was to be met by the LEC itself or through arrangements with another LEC or a third party vendor, additional time was needed for adequate scheduling and planning. Finally, each company argued that granting such an extension would not adversely affect any party. By Order No. 21511, issued July 5, 1989, we granted these Motions and extended the deadline for making a showing of undue burden through July 14, 1989.

On July 14, 1989, each of the eight LECs listed above filed a Motion for Additional Extension of Time and requested a sixty (60) day extension to the July 14, 1989, deadline. Additionally, on July 14, 1989, Southland filed a Motion for Extension of Time and also requested that the July 14, 1989, deadline be extended by sixty (60) days. All nine Motions were substantially similar to, though somewhat more detailed than, the Motions we considered when we granted the extension through July 14, 1989. By Order No. 21687, issued August 4, 1989, we granted these Motions and extended the deadline for making a showing of undue burden through September 12, 1989, for the nine above-named LECs that specifically requested such an extension.

ORDER NO. 22269  
DOCKET NO. 871394-TP  
PAGE 3

On September 12, 1989, Southland filed its Response to Order No. 20489 in which it asserts undue burden in meeting our billing validation requirements by the January 1, 1990, deadline. Southland cites two major obstacles facing the Company: the dual jurisdictional nature of the Company and the time and expense that would be incurred in meeting our billing validation requirement on an interim basis. Specifically, because Southland's Walnut Hill customers receive operator services from Southern Bell, while Southland's Molino customers receive their operator services from South Central Bell, the Company anticipates that providing billing validation service to both of these areas separately would be significantly more costly than providing such services as a total company. Further, Southland states that based upon the best information available to it, none of the potential vendors it has approached can make permanent arrangements to provide these services prior to March or April of 1990. Finally, Southland notes that it presently has no AOS provider operating within its service area.

Upon consideration, we find it appropriate to grant Southland an extension of time until May 1, 1990, in which to comply with the billing validation requirements of Order No. 20489. Further, we hereby direct Southland to provide our staff with interim reports on the progress made toward the May 1, 1990, implementation date. These reports shall be due on January 1, 1990, and March 1, 1990.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the request made in the Response to Order No. 20489 filed on September 12, 1989, by Southland Telephone Company is hereby granted to the extent set forth in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that Southland Telephone Company shall be granted an extension of time until May 1, 1990, in which to meet certain requirements of Order No. 20489 as set forth above. It is further

ORDERED that Southland Telephone Company shall file interim progress reports on January 1, 1990, and March 1, 1990, as set forth in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDER NO. 22269  
DOCKET NO. 871394-TP  
PAGE 4

ORDERED that this docket shall remain open.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission,  
this 5th day of DECEMBER, 1989.

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

( S E A L )

by: Kary Dizon  
Chief, Bureau of Records

ABG

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 the Commission's final action in this matter may request: 1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water or sewer utility by filing a notice of

ORDER NO. 22269  
DOCKET NO. 871394-TP  
PAGE 5

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 after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.