

VOTE SHEET

DATE: May 3, 1994

RE: DOCKET NO. 940139-FL - Investigation of CENTRAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF FLORIDA'S provision of Centrex Service to Royal Oaks Apartments in violation of Section 364.339(1)(b), F.S. Order No. 17111, Rule 25-24.560, F.A.C., and General Customer Services Tariff 23.8.3.

ISSUE 1: Recommendation that the Commission order Central Telephone Company (Centel) to discontinue the provision of centrex service for residential resale to Royal Oaks Apartments and other establishments in violation of Section 364.339(1)(b), F.S., Order No. 17111, Rule 25-24.560, F.A.C., and General Customer Services Tariff 23.8.3.

APPROVED

ISSUE 2: Recommendation that, if Issue No. 1 is approved, Centel should be ordered not to bill the contract termination charges that would normally be billed when centrex service is cancelled by the customer.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: Full Commission

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

Handwritten signatures of majority commissioners: Diane K. Kusch, [unclear], J. Tony Deane, Susan S. Clark, [unclear]

Four horizontal lines for dissenting signatures, all of which are blank.

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

Commissioner Lammelo dissented on issues

PSC/RAR33(5/90) 1 through 3

DATE: 04264 MAY-03
REC-REG. COORDINATING

Vote Sheet .
Docket No. 940139-TL
May 3, 1994

Issue 3: Recommendation that current residents of Royal Oaks should be allowed to retain the centrex service until August 7, 1994, if they wish. Royal Oaks should not be allowed to provide service to any new residents.

APPROVED

Issue 4: Recommendation that, if Issues Nos. 1 and 3 are approved, Royal Oaks should be required to notify all residents of their option to either remain on centrex service until August 7, 1994, or obtain service directly from Centel at any time before August 7, 1994, within 15 days of the Commission's order.

APPROVED

Issue 5: Recommendation that Royal Oaks should not be ordered to show cause why it should not be fined for providing telecommunications service to the public without prior Commission approval, in violation of Sections 364.33, and 364,335(3), F.S.

APPROVED

Issue 6: Recommendation that the Commission order Royal Oaks to refund the difference with interest between the amount it collected for telephone service that exceeds the amounts each resident would have paid if the resident had obtained service directly from Centel.

DENIED

Issue 7: Recommendation that, if no substantially affected person timely files a protest to the Commission's proposed agency action, this docket should be closed.

APPROVED