

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Proposed tariff filing ) DOCKET NO. 910179-TL  
to introduce the extended calling) ORDER NO. PSC-92-0323-FOF-TL  
service (ECS) plan which allows ) ISSUED: 05/11/92  
the conversion of intraLATA toll )  
routes between exchanges of )  
Tampa, Clearwater, Tarpon Springs)  
and St. Petersburg to 7-digit )  
local measured service by GTE )  
FLORIDA INCORPORATED. )  
\_\_\_\_\_)

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

THOMAS M. BEARD, Chairman  
SUSAN F. CLARK  
J. TERRY DEASON  
BETTY EASLEY

ORDER ON FEBRUARY 26, 1992,  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

BY THE COMMISSION:

By Order No. 25708, issued February 11, 1992, we approved GTE Florida Incorporated's (GTEFL's or the Company's) proposed Extended Calling Service (ECS) plan, with several modifications. As approved, the plan provides for seven-digit dialing between the Tampa, St. Petersburg, Clearwater, and Tarpon Springs exchanges. All routes which were not already flat rated will be rated at \$.10 for the first minute and \$.06 for each additional minute, for business customers, with no off-peak discount. Residential customers, on the other hand, will be charged \$.25 per call, regardless of call duration. Plant City was added as an ECS exchange, with calling to the Tampa exchange only. The premium flat rate option presently available on the Plant City/Tampa route is to be continued. Pursuant to Order No. 25709, issued February 11, 1992, ECS between the Tampa, St. Petersburg, Clearwater, and Tarpon Springs exchanges went into effect on March 7, 1992, while the Plant City/Tampa ECS route went into effect on May 2, 1992.

GTEFL also proposed, and we approved, a separate, additional charge if customers wish to obtain a list of each of their ECS calls on their monthly bills. The rate for bill detail is \$1.75 per month per customer bill, plus \$.12 for each page of ECS billing detail.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04638 MAY 11 1992

PSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

On February 26, 1992, the Office of Public Counsel (OPC) filed a Motion for Reconsideration (Motion). In its Motion, OPC asserts that customers face two unattractive alternatives regarding billing of ECS calls: (1) they can acquiesce to the bill detail charges; or (2) they will have no means to dispute the one-line charge for ECS calls on their monthly bills.

At our December 16, 1992, Agenda Conference, there was discussion as to what a customer would do if he contested his bill for ECS charges, but had not subscribed to bill detail. We directed the Company to explore the feasibility of a record retention policy of thirty to sixty days for customers not subscribing to bill detail.

OPC believes that instead of directing the Company in the manner described above, we should take additional evidence on the matter of ECS billing and record retention. OPC asks that we direct GTEFL to file a detailed cost study showing the incremental cost of providing bill detail for ECS calls and to submit evidence concerning the cost of a record retention policy of thirty to sixty days. All of this evidence, OPC suggests, should be considered at an evidentiary hearing, either in this docket, or as part of GTEFL's upcoming rate case.

GTEFL filed its Response to OPC's Motion on March 9, 1992. GTEFL asserts that OPC's Motion has not raised any matter which we overlooked or failed to consider and, therefore, should be denied. We agree with the Company. We conducted a complete evidentiary hearing on GTEFL's proposal, as well as a number of service hearings in GTEFL's territory. OPC has not pointed us to any information that we overlooked or failed to consider. The Company is in the process of compiling information pursuant to our directive in Order No. 25708 and anticipates filing its report by the end of May, 1992. After our review of this data, we will determine what additional action, if any, we believe should be taken. Accordingly, OPC's Motion shall be denied.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the Motion for Reconsideration filed on February 26, 1992, by the Office of Public Counsel is hereby denied for the reasons set forth herein. It is further

ORDER NO. PSC-92-0323-FOF-TL  
DOCKET NO. 910179-TL  
PAGE 3

ORDERED that this docket shall remain open pending the outcome of our exploration of the record retention policy as discussed herein.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission, this 11th day of May, 1992.

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

( S E A L )

ABG

NOTICE OF 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 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 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.