

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Resolution by the ) DOCKET NO. 921194-TL  
Liberty County Board of County ) ORDER NO. PSC-93-1705-FOF-TL  
Commissioners for extended area ) ISSUED: November 29, 1993  
service between East Point and )  
Bristol, and East Point and )  
Hosford. )  
\_\_\_\_\_)

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

J. TERRY DEASON, Chairman  
SUSAN F. CLARK  
JULIA L. JOHNSON  
LUIS J. LAUREDO

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AGENCY ACTION  
ORDER REGARDING EXTENDED AREA SERVICE

BY THE COMMISSION:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN by the Florida Public Service Commission that the action discussed herein is preliminary in nature and will become final unless a person whose interests are adversely affected files a petition for a formal proceeding, pursuant to Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code.

I. REQUEST FOR EAS

This docket was initiated pursuant to Resolution No. 92-15 passed by the Liberty County Board of Commissioners requesting extended area service (EAS) between the Eastpoint exchange, and the rest of Liberty County. The Eastpoint to Carrabelle route is not addressed in this docket because the route was reviewed in Docket No. 900302-TL and the \$.25 message plan was implemented between Eastpoint and Carrabelle on July 19, 1992. St. Joe Telephone (SJT or the Company) serves the Bristol, Carrabelle, Hosford, and Eastpoint exchanges. These exchanges are all in the Panama City LATA. By Order No. PSC-93-0030-PCO-TL, issued January 6, 1993, we required the Company to conduct traffic studies on the routes at issue. Having reviewed the traffic data, based on Rule 25-4.060(3), Florida Administrative Code, none of the routes qualify for nonoptional, flat rate, two-way EAS.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

12666 NOV 29 93

PSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

## II. ALTERNATIVE PLAN

While the traffic data indicates that the Eastpoint exchange as a whole does not have a community of interest with the Bristol and Hosford exchanges, the results of the **pocket** traffic study indicate that there is a community of interest between the residents of Liberty County served from the Eastpoint exchange and the Bristol exchange which is its county seat. Calling rates to the Hosford exchange from the Eastpoint pocket do not indicate a community of interest.

Historically, the Commission has implemented the \$.25 calling plan on routes that exhibited a substantial calling volume and/or distribution. Typically, these cases were close to meeting our flat rate EAS requirements but failed either on the distribution or volume level by a small percentage. With the exception of the aforementioned pocket route, the routes were not close to meeting our requirements. We do not make a determination on the Eastpoint (Liberty County pocket)/Bristol route at this time because we are currently investigating EAS on a generic basis which may result in a more meaningful way to address pocket areas which exhibit a significant community of interest. When this investigation is complete we will consider the Eastpoint (Liberty County pocket)/Bristol route.

## III. BOUNDARY CHANGE

We have considered the feasibility of moving the pockets into a Liberty County exchange to resolve the calling problems. However, St. Joe estimates that the cost to move the 56 Eastpoint (Liberty County) customers to the Bristol exchange to be \$135,839.49 (\$2,425.71 per customer), and the cost to move the seven (7) Carrabelle (Liberty County) customers to the Bristol exchange to be \$119,187.60 (\$17,026.80 per customer). On October 1, 1993, our staff visited the Eastpoint central office to review the facilities and has recommended that the engineering specification and the cost estimates provided by St. Joe Telephone are appropriate.

Since boundary changes do not require an additive, the Company does not have any way to recover the cost. As a result, a boundary change could place upward pressure on local rates for all of St. Telephone's ratepayers, not just the Eastpoint (Liberty County pocket) customers. Because of the high cost involved, we find that

ORDER NO. PSC-93-1705-FOF-TL  
DOCKET NO. 921194-TL  
PAGE 3

a boundary change is not a tenable solution for the Liberty County pockets.

Therefore, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that no toll routes qualify for nonoptional, flat rate, two-way toll free calling. It is further

ORDERED that no alternative plan shall be offered on the toll routes considered in this docket. It is further

ORDERED that the Eastpoint (Liberty County pocket)/Bristol route shall be considered when our generic EAS investigation is completed. It is further

ORDERED that a boundary change to move the Liberty County pockets of the Eastpoint and Carrabelle exchanges into an existing Liberty County exchange is cost prohibitive. It is further

ORDERED that this docket shall be closed at the end of the PAA protest period assuming no timely protest is filed pursuant to the requirements set forth below.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 29th day of November, 1993.

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

( S E A L )

CWM

Chairman Deason dissented from this Decision.

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 action proposed herein is preliminary in nature and will not become effective or final, except as provided by Rule 25-22.029, Florida Administrative Code. Any person whose substantial interests are affected by the action proposed by this order may file a petition for a formal proceeding, as provided by Rule 25-22.029(4), Florida Administrative Code, in the form provided by Rule 25-22.036(7)(a) and (f), 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 December 20, 1993.

In the absence of such a petition, this order shall become effective on the day subsequent to the above date as provided by Rule 25-22.029(6), Florida Administrative Code.

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 and effective 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 wastewater 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 effective date 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.