

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Proposed tariff filing to revise)	DOCKET NO. 911008-TL
Call Trace rates by UNITED TELEPHONE)	ORDER NO. 25350
COMPANY OF FLORIDA)	ISSUED: 11/14/91
)	

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

- THOMAS M. BEARD, Chairman
- SUSAN F. CLARK
- J. TERRY DEASON
- BETTY EASLEY
- MICHAEL MCK. WILSON

ORDER DENYING TARIFF FILING

BY THE COMMISSION:

On August 15, 1991, United Telephone Company of Florida (United or the Company) filed proposed revisions to its General Exchange Tariff to restructure its Call Tracing feature. United proposes to offer Call Tracing with banded rates, at an initial rate of \$7.00 per trace. The Company provided a summary of its costs for the feature, which equate to \$1.56 per activation at the \$7.00 rate. The Company did not propose to offer a blocking provision for this feature to prevent unauthorized use.

We find this tariff filing to be inappropriate for several reasons. First, we determined that banded rates were not appropriate for Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company's (Southern Bell's) Call Tracing feature and we do not believe they are appropriate for United, either. In addition, United's proposed rate is far in excess of the stated cost to provide the service. A review of the cost/rate information shows that the costs decrease as the rate decreases. This shows that the cost is demand driven: as the rate decreases, demand increases, driving costs downward. Given the cost information, a rate as low as \$2.00 could be appropriate for this feature. However, we find \$4.00 to be a more appropriate rate. A rate of \$4.00 makes United's rate comparable to both Central Telephone Company of Florida's (Centel's) approved rate of (\$4.00) and Southern Bell's anticipated rate of (\$4.50).

We also believe that the rate level for this feature should significantly discourage casual use, but not hinder customers who truly need the feature. Finally, United asserts that only its true incremental switching and labor costs were included for this service and that the Company has no way of projecting how much time will be spent with customers who demand the number or demand that

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

11299 NOV 14 1991

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

ORDER NO. 25350
DOCKET NO. 911008-TL
PAGE 2

United take some action. The Company claims that costs such as these were built into Southern Bell's tariff through its Annoyance Call Bureau cost allocation and that United's costs may increase if substantial time is spent dealing with customers over this matter.

In addition, we find it appropriate to require the Company to offer a blocking mechanism for Call Tracing, like the one proposed by Southern Bell. This will allow customers to block access to Call Tracing from their access lines and prevent unauthorized use. We shall require that the blocking function be offered under the same terms as 900/976 blocking: no recurring charge and no nonrecurring charge for 90 days from implementation or for 90 days after a customer's service is connected.

Finally, we find it appropriate to require the Company to file a report on this feature after one year's experience under the new rate structure. The report shall outline total costs, revenues, activations, complaints, and any other useful information regarding this feature. The report shall be filed by January 1, 1993. We may then revisit the rates, should actual costs and revenues differ significantly from the projections.

Upon consideration, we find it appropriate to deny United's tariff filing. Our recent decision on Southern Bell's offering as well as United's proposed rate lead us to this conclusion. The Company shall be required to refile its Call Tracing tariff within 30 days of the date of our vote on this matter (by November 14, 1991).

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the proposed tariff filing by United Telephone Company of Florida to revise its Call Tracing rates (T-91-396) filed August 15, 1991, is hereby denied for the reasons set forth herein. It is further

ORDERED that United Telephone Company of Florida shall refile its Call Tracing proposal in accordance with the terms and conditions specified herein. It is further

ORDERED that this docket shall remain open.

ORDER NO. 25350
DOCKET NO. 911008-TL
PAGE 3

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission, this 14th
day of november, 1991.

STEVE TRIBBLE, Director
Division of Records and Reporting

(S E A L)

by: Kay J. [Signature]
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.

The Commission's decision on this tariff is interim in nature and will become final, unless a person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed files a petition for a formal proceeding, as provided by Rule 25-22.036(4), Florida Administrative Code, in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036(7)(a)(d) and (e), Florida Administrative Code. This petition must be received by the Director, Division of Records and Reporting at his office at 101 East Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, by the close of business on 12/05/91

In the absence of such a petition, this Order shall become final on the day subsequent to the above date.

ORDER NO. 25350
DOCKET NO. 911008-TL
PAGE 4

Any objection or protest filed in this docket before the issuance date of this Order is considered abandoned unless it satisfies the foregoing conditions and is renewed within the specified protest period.

If this Order becomes final on the date described above, any party adversely affected may request judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or by 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 of the date this Order becomes final, 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.