

7
ORIGINAL
FILE COPY

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Proposed tariff filings by)
SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH)
COMPANY clarifying when a nonpublished)
number can be disclosed and introducing)
Caller ID to TouchStar Service)

DOCKET NO. 891194-TL
FILED: 10/26/90

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

GLENN W. MAYNE

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

09670 OCT 26 1990

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

1 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2 REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

3 GLENN W. MAYNE

4 DOCKET NO. 891194-TL

5 Q. Please state your name and business address.

6 A. My name is Glenn W. Mayne; my business address is 2737
7 Centerview Drive, Knight Building, Suite 110, Tallahassee,
8 Florida 32399-0950.

9 Q. By whom are you employed, and what is your position?

10 A. I am employed by the Division of Communications,
11 Florida Department of General Services, as the Division
12 Director.

13 Q. Mr. Mayne, have you reviewed the testimony of A.
14 Rebecca Dunn and Joyce M. Brown?

15 A. Yes, I have reviewed each of their testimonies which
16 were prefiled in this case.

17 Q. Do you agree with Ms. Dunn's statement on page 5 of her
18 prefiled testimony lines 22 through 25 and Ms. Brown's
19 statements on page 4, line 4, and page 3, line 16, of her
20 prefiled testimony that caller identification blocking would
21 block the transference of a caller's number to 9-1-1?

22 A. No, I do not. It is my understanding that the caller's
23 number would display on the 9-1-1 system if the 9-1-1 system
24 had Automatic Number Identification (ANI) capabilities, even

1 if the caller used per call blocking when placing the call
2 or had line blocking where all calls would be blocked. At
3 the February 20, 1990, agenda conference, Mr. Marshall
4 Criser of Southern Bell assured the Division that this was
5 true. He said clearly that the transference of the numbers
6 to the 9-1-1 Emergency Systems will not be affected by the
7 use of blocking of CALLER ID deliverance.

8 Q. What would your reaction be if in fact the blocking of
9 CALLER ID display also blocked the transference of the
10 calling party's number to the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone
11 Number System.

12 A. I would be totally opposed to the implementation of
13 CALLER ID. Along with my responsibilities to state
14 agencies, as the Director of the Division of Communications,
15 I am also the Director of the Statewide Emergency Telephone
16 Number 9-1-1 System. In these capacities, I can not support
17 a custom calling feature that would endanger the lives of
18 state employees and the public either by the display of
19 their telephone number or the lack of display in an
20 emergency situation. Both Ms. Dunn and Ms. Brown are
21 exactly correct, it would be intolerable for CALLER ID
22 blocking to prevent the presentation of any and all
23 available Automatic Location Identification (ALI) data after
24 calling 9-1-1.

1 Q. Mr. Mayne, are you familiar with the Joint Task Force
2 on State Agency Law Enforcement Communications?

3 A. Yes, I am. The Joint Task Force was formed in 1984 by
4 executive order and by statutes in July, 1988, by addition
5 to Chapter 282, Florida Statutes.

6 Q. Please tell us the function of this Joint Task Force.

7 A. The Joint Task Force was established to acquire and
8 implement a statewide radio communications system to serve
9 state agency law enforcement.

10 Q. What agencies are represented in this Joint Task Force?

11 A. The Joint Task Force is composed of five members,
12 consisting of representatives of the Division of Alcoholic
13 Beverages and Tobacco of the Department of Business
14 Regulation, the Division of Florida Highway Patrol of the
15 Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, the
16 Department of Law Enforcement, the Game and Fresh Water Fish
17 Commission, and the Division of Law Enforcement of the
18 Department of Natural Resources.

19 Q. What is the Division of Communications' relationship to
20 the Joint Task Force?

21 A. The Division provides technical support to the Joint
22 Task Force Board of Directors and is responsible for the
23 design, engineering, acquisition, and implementation of the
24 current pilot project of what we feel will eventually evolve

1 into a statewide radio communication system.

2 Q. Mr. Mayne, are you familiar with the prefiled
3 testimony of Nancy H. Sims?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. On page 9, lines 14 through 21, Ms. Sims states that
6 law enforcement may have a problem with caller ID, but she
7 believes that Southern Bell has met their concerns. Are you
8 aware of Southern Bell offering the Joint Task Force an
9 acceptable solution to the display of a law enforcement
10 telephone number when an officer is patched from the state
11 agency law enforcement radio system to the local telephone
12 network?

13 A. No, I am not. I am not even aware that this issue has
14 been addressed by the industry. The pilot project for this
15 radio system is not complete and operational presently, so I
16 am sure it was an oversight of the telephone industry, but
17 it highlights how impossible it is to identify all these
18 situations that warrant alternatives to the display of the
19 calling party's number.

20 Q. Does the Board of Directors of the Joint Task Force
21 have a position on the Caller ID?

22 A. Yes, they support the policy of the Division of
23 Communications as stated in my prefiled testimony. Exhibit
24 1 of this rebuttal testimony is the "Joint Task Force on

1 State Agency Law Enforcement Radio Communication, Statement
2 on Caller ID".

3 Q. Would the Division of Communications' policy
4 accommodate the patched radio to telephone scenario
5 described previously?

6 A. Yes, the option of either per call blocking or line
7 blocking would give us the flexibility in the radio system
8 to resolve this problem of displaying a law enforcement
9 telephone number through the radio system into the public
10 switched network.

11 Q. Mr. Mayne, are you familiar with the prefiled testimony
12 of William C. Jones, Jr., a witness on behalf of United
13 Telephone Company of Florida?

14 A. Yes, I have read it.

15 Q. Did Mr. Jones have two definitions of CALLER ID which
16 he described on page 2, beginning with line 17?

17 A. Yes. There was one broad definition applying to the
18 feature which United calls Calling Party Identification
19 (CPID) in which there is the capability of passing a range
20 of information (including telephone number) about the
21 calling party through the network. Then there is a second,
22 more selective feature within CPID that passes only the
23 calling party's telephone number. United calls this Caller
24 ID.

1 Q. In your prefiled testimony on page 2, lines 15 through
2 18, you defined CALLER ID in the more specific sense that
3 Mr. Jones describes. Is that a correct statement?

4 A. Yes, it is. But I certainly agree with Mr. Jones' more
5 broad definition. I feel Mr. Jones' reference in his
6 testimony to calling party name, address or personal
7 identification codes, as well as industry documentation on
8 CCS37, establish the capability as well as the intent of the
9 telephone industry to expand the information passed along
10 with the telephone number to include more details concerning
11 the calling party. I further believe that subscribers have
12 the right to know how and when such expanded information
13 about them is being used. This Commission must carefully
14 consider how to regulate and/or monitor the use of such
15 information so that its use does not adversely affect the
16 subscribers' privacy, the day-to-day operation of their
17 businesses, or present a situation where others may use this
18 information in a harmful manner.

19 Q. Then on page 2, line 20 of your prefiled testimony
20 concerning the correctness of allowing blocking of CALLER
21 ID, did you mean just the calling party's number should be
22 blocked or any information that may be transferred in the
23 future?

24 A. In my testimony I addressed the telephone number only,

1 but if the information transferred with the number increased
2 from the seven digit number to include name, address, etc.,
3 then I would recommend that blocking cover all information
4 passed with the telephone number.

5 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

6 A. Yes, it does.