

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
Capital Circle Office Center, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

M E M O R A N D U M

August 31, 1995

TO: DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (BAYO)

FROM: DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHELFER, CHASE, WIDELL) *AKS JC*
DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (CANZANO) *RT*

RE: DOCKET NO. 921193-TL - RESOLUTION BY PALM BEACH COUNTY
COMMISSION FOR EXTENDED AREA SERVICE BETWEEN ALL
EXCHANGES IN PALM BEACH COUNTY. *E H*

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL - PETITION BY THE RESIDENTS OF POLO
PARK FOR EXTENDED AREA SERVICE (EAS) BETWEEN THE HAINES
CITY EXCHANGE AND THE ORLANDO, WEST KISSIMMEE, LAKE BUENA
VISTA, WINDERMERE, REEDY CREEK, WINTER PARK CLERMONT,
WINTER GARDEN AND ST. CLOUD EXCHANGES.

DOCKET NO. 930234-TL - RESOLUTION BY LAKE COUNTY BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS FOR EXTENDED AREA SERVICE (EAS) BETWEEN MT.
DORA EXCHANGE AND THE SANFORD, GENEVA AND OVIEDO
EXCHANGES.

DOCKET NO. 930235-TL - RESOLUTION BY THE TAYLOR COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR COUNTYWIDE EXTENDED AREA
SERVICE (EAS) WITHIN TAYLOR COUNTY.

DOCKET NO. 930978-TL - RESOLUTION BY CITY OF FORT MEADE
REQUESTING EXTENDED AREA SERVICE (EAS) FROM FORT MEADE TO
THE LAKELAND, WINTER HAVEN, WAUCHULA, ZOLFO SPRINGS, AND
MULBERRY EXCHANGES.

DOCKET NO. 940026-TL - RESOLUTION BY PUTNAM COUNTY BOARD
OF COMMISSIONERS FOR EXTENDED AREA SERVICE (EAS) BETWEEN
ALL EXCHANGES IN PUTNAM COUNTY, AND PETITION BY RESIDENTS
OF FLORAHOME (659) FOR EAS TO THE KEYSTONE HEIGHTS
EXCHANGE IN PUTNAM COUNTY.

DOCKET NO. 940406-TL - RESOLUTION BY LAKE WALES CITY
COMMISSION REQUESTING EXTENDED AREA SERVICE (EAS)
THROUGHOUT POLK COUNTY.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

08515 AUG 31 95

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

**AGENDA: SEPTEMBER 12, 1995 - REGULAR AGENDA - PROPOSED AGENCY
 ACTION - INTERESTED PERSONS MAY PARTICIPATE**

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: I:\PSC\CMU\WP\930173TL.RCM

CASE BACKGROUND

- The Commission postponed making decisions for the dockets involved in this recommendation until after the conclusion of the extended area service (EAS) rulemaking docket (930220-TL). This delay was to enable staff to investigate the problems concerning EAS and revise the rules. One of the areas staff was directed to review was interLATA traffic information. Southern Bell and GTEFL were granted relief by the Commission from conducting interLATA traffic studies because they no longer perform the billing and collection functions on these routes for AT&T. Therefore, Southern Bell and GTEFL do not have access to the necessary data. The Commission's intention was to use rulemaking to determine the appropriate utility (local exchange company or interexchange carrier) to provide the interLATA traffic information.
- Because of the new legislation, the proposed EAS rules will not be considered. The EAS rulemaking docket (930220-TL) was closed at the August 15, 1995 agenda, and staff was directed to address the pending EAS dockets grouped together based on subject type (intraLATA alternative plan, interLATA alternative plan, pocket situations, interLATA traffic studies, supplemental community of interest criteria, and Commission ordered interLATA routes that were denied by Judge Greene).
- This recommendation will address the pending EAS dockets for which interLATA traffic information is not available. In Issues 1-7, staff recommends either (a) not requiring additional traffic data, or (b) considering the docket under another EAS subject type. In Issue 8, staff recommends which dockets should be closed and which dockets should remain open.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

PERTINENT ORDERS:

- By Order No. PSC-93-1168-FOF-TL, in Docket Nos. 921193-TL, 930173-TL, 930234-TL, and 930235-TL, issued August 10, 1993, the Commission granted BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. d/b/a Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company's (Southern Bell) Motion for Stay of Order No. PSC-93-0437-PCO-TL. The order specified that Southern Bell shall not be required to file traffic data on the interLATA routes in these dockets.
- By Order No. PSC-94-0304-FOF-TL, in Docket No. 930173-TL, issued March 16, 1994, the Commission granted GTE Florida Incorporated's (GTEFL) Motion for Modification of Order No. PSC-94-0091-PCO-TL. The order further specified that GTEFL shall not be required to file traffic data on the interLATA routes in this docket.
- By Order No. PSC-94-0167-FOF-TL, in Docket No. 930978-TL, issued February 10, 1994, the Commission granted GTEFL's Motion for Modification of Order No. PSC-93-1521-PCO-TL. The order further specified that GTEFL shall not be required to file traffic data on the interLATA routes in this docket.
- By Order No. PSC-94-0763-FOF-TL, in Docket Nos. 940026-TL and 940027-TL, issued June 21, 1994, the Commission granted Southern Bell's Motion for Modification of Order Nos. PSC-94-0169-PCO-TL (940026-TL) and PSC-94-0136-PCO-TL (930027-TL). The order further specified that Southern Bell shall not be required to file traffic data on the interLATA routes in these dockets.
- By Order No. PSC-94-1019-FOF-TL, in Docket No. 940406-TL, issued August 23, 1994, the Commission granted GTEFL's Motion for Modification of Order No. PSC-94-0666-PCO-TL (940026-TL) and PSC-94-0136-PCO-TL (930027-TL). The order further specified that GTEFL shall not be required to file traffic data on the interLATA routes in this docket.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Should traffic studies be required on the Southern Bell interLATA routes listed in Table A in Docket No. 921193-TL?

TABLE A

REQUESTED INTERLATA ROUTES FOR EAS	
FROM:	TO:
Clewiston	Jupiter, West Palm Beach, Pahokee, Belle Glade, Boynton Beach, Delray Beach, Boca Raton
Clewiston (Palm Beach County Pocket)	Jupiter, West Palm Beach, Pahokee, Belle Glade, Boynton Beach, Delray Beach, Boca Raton

RECOMMENDATION: No. Traffic information was available on all of the Palm Beach County routes except from the Southern Bell exchanges into the pocket portion of the Clewiston exchange. Traffic data was available from the Clewiston exchange and pocket area, which is served by United, into the Palm Beach County exchanges. In past dockets, traffic studies have shown that the community of interest is from the smaller exchange into the larger exchange. Staff does not believe the additional interLATA traffic information would change the outcome of this docket. Therefore, staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Southern Bell and United provided traffic information on 48 of the 60 routes requested in the Palm Beach County EAS docket. The Commission granted Southern Bell's motion for relief from filing the traffic studies on the 12 interLATA routes. Southern Bell stated that it no longer performs the recording and rating of interLATA traffic for AT&T; therefore, it no longer has the data, nor does it have access to the data.

At the July 22, 1993 agenda, the Commission considered requiring AT&T, MCI, Sprint and LDSS to provide the interLATA traffic data, but deferred a decision until the conclusion of the EAS rulemaking docket (930220-TL). In the EAS rulemaking docket, several workgroups were held to discuss whether the local exchange companies (LECs) or the interexchange carriers (IXCs) should provide the interLATA traffic data. The primary concern from both groups was that they did not capture interLATA traffic data in a manner that would comply with the EAS rules regarding traffic studies. The LECs and the IXCs stated that it would require major modifications to their billing system requiring many man hours and

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

extensive expense. Staff had proposed in the new rules to require the LECs to provide the data.

As stated previously, because of the new legislation, the proposed EAS rules will not be considered. The EAS rulemaking docket (930220-TL) was closed at the August 15, 1995, agenda and staff was directed to address the pending EAS dockets grouped together based on subject type (intraLATA alternative plan, interLATA alternative plan, pocket situations, interLATA traffic studies, supplemental community of interest criteria, and Commission ordered interLATA routes that were denied by Judge Greene).

By Order No. PSC-93-1828-FOF-TL, issued December 27, 1993, the Commission ordered Southern Bell to survey the Belle Glade, Pahokee, Delray Beach and Boca Raton routes for EAS to West Palm Beach. In addition, the Boynton Beach exchange, which has the \$.25 plan to Boca Raton, was to be balloted for EAS to the Boca Raton exchange. The Commission also specified that the Clewiston/Belle Glade route should be evaluated when an acceptable interLATA alternative toll plan was approved. None of the five routes passed the ballot.

At the August 15, 1995 agenda the Commission ordered extended calling service (ECS) on the following five routes within Palm Beach County: Boca Raton/West Palm Beach, Delray Beach/West Palm Beach, Belle Glade/West Palm Beach, Pahokee/West Palm Beach and Boynton Beach/Boca Raton. ECS rates residential calls at \$.25 per call regardless of duration, and business calls are rated at \$.10 for the first minute and \$.06 for each additional minute. With the exception of the Boynton Beach/Boca Raton route, these routes failed the ballot for nonoptional, flat rate, two-way EAS. The Boynton Beach/Boca Raton route already has the \$.25 plan (both residential and business calls rated at \$.25 per call), so it will be converted from the \$.25 plan to ECS.

Traffic data was available on the majority of routes in the Palm Beach County EAS request, and traffic information was available on the routes from the Clewiston pocket into Palm Beach County. The interLATA data that was not available is what staff considers in the reverse direction. The primary calling interest is from the Clewiston pocket into Palm Beach County. This traffic data was provided by United. The reverse traffic data, from Palm Beach County into Clewiston, has not been provided. In past dockets, traffic studies have shown very low calling rates in the reverse direction, indicating that the community of interest is from the smaller exchange into the larger exchanges.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

Staff does not believe the additional interLATA traffic information will change the outcome of this docket. Therefore, staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket. Since traffic data was available in the pertinent direction, and historic cases indicate very little community of interest in the reverse direction, staff does not believe that a sufficient community of interest exists to warrant EAS or an alternative toll plan (as stated previously, the Clewiston/Belle Glade route is pending a decision for an interLATA alternative toll plan).

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

ISSUE 2: Should traffic studies be required on the GTEFL and Southern Bell interLATA routes listed in Table B in Docket No. 930173-TL?

TABLE B

REQUESTED INTERLATA ROUTES FOR EAS	
FROM:	TO:
Haines City (Except Poinciana 427 pocket)	Kissimmee, West Kissimmee
Haines City	Orlando, Lake Buena Vista, Windermere, Reedy Creek, Winter Park, Clermont, Winter Garden, St. Cloud
Haines City (including 427 Poinciana pocket)	Orlando, Lake Buena Vista, Windermere, Reedy Creek, Winter Park, Clermont, Winter Garden, St. Cloud

RECOMMENDATION: No. Because GTEFL was unable to provide traffic data in the format required by the EAS rules from the requesting exchanges and Southern Bell cannot provide the required data in the reverse direction, staff does not have sufficient information to make a recommendation regarding whether routes in Table B qualify to be balloted for EAS. Since this EAS request involves a pocket, staff recommends that this docket be evaluated in the forthcoming recommendation on "pocket" areas.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Unlike Issue 1, traffic information on the requesting exchanges is unavailable. United and Vista-United provided traffic studies on their interLATA routes. The Commission granted GTEFL and Southern Bell's motion for relief from providing their interLATA traffic data. GTEFL and Southern Bell stated that they no longer perform the recording and rating of interLATA traffic for AT&T; therefore, they no longer have the data, nor do they have access to the data.

Because traffic data could not be provided by GTEFL in the format required by the EAS rules from the requesting exchanges or from Southern Bell in the reverse direction, staff does not believe it has sufficient information to make a recommendation regarding whether routes in Table B qualify to be balloted for EAS. In order to be considered for balloting for EAS, Rule 25-4.060(3), Florida Administrative Code, requires a calling rate of at least three (3) Messages per Access Line per Month (M/A/Ms) in cases where the

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

petitioning exchange contains less than half the number of access lines as the exchange to which extended area service is desired. This rule further requires that at least 50% of the subscribers in the petitioning exchange make two or more calls per month to the larger exchange to qualify for traditional EAS.

As stated in Issue 1, staff recognizes the complications and expense associated with providing the required interLATA traffic information in rule format, if it can be provided at all by the LEC or IXCs. However, the rules require traffic data or other community of interest data to make a determination on whether the routes should be balloted for nonoptional, two-way, flat rate EAS.

This pocket area is located in the northeast portion of Polk County and borders on four counties (Polk, Orange, Lake and Osceola) and three LATAs (Tampa Market Area, Orlando, Gainesville). Based on staff's analysis, the subscribers' desire to call these interLATA points does not involve calling to local government offices, schools, or emergency services, but rather calling into the Orlando, Kissimmee and Clermont areas.

Since it appears it is not feasible to request interLATA traffic data consistent with the existing rules on these pocket routes, staff believes it is appropriate to evaluate this docket along with the other pending dockets that have "pocket" concerns. This will enable staff to apply the same criteria and consideration to all the pending "pocket" dockets.

Therefore, because interLATA traffic data could not be provided by GTEFL and Southern Bell as required by the EAS rules, staff does not have sufficient information to make a recommendation regarding whether any routes in Table B qualify to be balloted for EAS. Since this EAS request involves a pocket, staff recommends that this docket be evaluated in the forthcoming recommendation on "pocket" areas.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

ISSUE 3: Should traffic studies be required on the Southern Bell interLATA routes listed in Table C in Docket No. 930234-TL?

TABLE C

REQUESTED INTERLATA ROUTES FOR EAS	
FROM:	TO:
Mount Dora	Geneva, Oviedo, Sanford

RECOMMENDATION: No. Traffic information was provided by United from the requesting exchange, Mount Dora, into the Geneva, Oviedo and Sanford exchanges. The Southern Bell interLATA routes are in the reverse direction, which historically have shown very little community of interest. Staff does not believe the additional interLATA traffic information will change the outcome of this docket. Therefore, staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket.

STAFF ANALYSIS: United provided traffic information from the Mount Dora exchange, which was the requesting exchange, to the Geneva, Oviedo and Sanford exchanges. By Order No. PSC 94-1379-FOF-TL, issued November 14, 1994, the Commission denied EAS on all routes for which traffic data was available.

The Commission granted Southern Bell's motion for relief from filing the traffic studies on the remaining interLATA routes. Southern Bell stated that it no longer performs the recording and rating of interLATA traffic for AT&T; therefore, it no longer has the data, nor does it have access to the data.

As discussed in Issue 1, the Commission directed staff to address the problem with interLATA traffic studies in the EAS rulemaking docket (930220-TL). Because of the new legislation, the proposed EAS rule docket was closed at the August 15, 1995 agenda. Staff will file recommendations on the pending EAS dockets based on subject type.

Traffic data was available, in this docket, from the requesting exchange. The interLATA data that was not available in the format required by the EAS rules was in the reverse direction. In past dockets, traffic studies have shown very low calling rates in the reverse direction, indicating that the community of interest is from the smaller exchange into the larger exchanges.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

Staff does not believe the additional interLATA traffic information would change the outcome of this docket, since traffic data was available from the requesting exchange. Therefore, staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket. Since traffic data was available in the pertinent direction, and historic cases indicate very little community of interest in the reverse direction, staff does not believe that a sufficient community of interest exists to warrant EAS or an alternative toll plan.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

ISSUE 4: Should traffic studies be required on the Southern Bell interLATA routes listed in Table D in Docket No. 930235-TL?

TABLE D

REQUESTED INTERLATA ROUTES FOR EAS	
FROM:	TO:
Cross City	Keaton Beach, Perry
Cross City (Taylor County Pocket)	Keaton Beach, Perry

RECOMMENDATION: No. Because Southern Bell could not provide traffic data from the requesting exchange or pocket area in the format required by the EAS rules, staff does not have sufficient information to make a recommendation regarding whether the routes in Table D qualify to be balloted for EAS. Since this EAS request primarily involves a pocket situation, staff recommends that this docket be evaluated in the forthcoming recommendation on "pocket" areas.

STAFF ANALYSIS: As discussed in Issue 2, traffic information in the format required by the EAS rules on the requesting exchanges is unavailable. Gulf Telephone Company provided traffic studies on their interLATA routes; however, Southern Bell was unable to provide the traffic studies in rule format from the requesting exchange. The Commission granted Southern Bell's motion for relief from providing interLATA traffic data. Southern Bell stated that they no longer perform the recording and rating of interLATA traffic for AT&T; therefore, it no longer has the data, nor does it have access to the data.

Because traffic data could not be provided by Southern Bell as required by the EAS rules from the requesting pocket exchange, staff does not believe it has sufficient information to make a recommendation regarding whether any routes in Table D qualify to be balloted for EAS. In order to be considered for balloting for EAS, Rule 25-4.060(3), Florida Administrative Code, requires a calling rate of at least three (3) Messages per Access Line per Month (M/A/Ms) in cases where the petitioning exchange contains less than half the number of access lines as the exchange to which extended area service is desired. This rule further requires that at least 50% of the subscribers in the petitioning exchange make two or more calls per month to the larger exchange to qualify for traditional EAS.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

As stated in Issue 1, staff recognizes the complications and expense associated with providing the required interLATA traffic information consistent with the EAS rules, if it can be provided at all by the LEC or IXCs; however, the rules require traffic data or other community of interest data to make a determination on whether routes should be balloted for nonoptional, two-way, flat rate EAS.

This Taylor County pocket area (known as Steinhatchee) is served from the Cross City exchange which is primarily located in Dixie County. Taylor County residents served from the Cross City exchange cannot call their county government offices, schools or emergency services, which are located in Perry (the county seat) without incurring a toll charge.

Staff has had numerous calls and letters from the Taylor County Commission, Taylor County, Steinhatchee Community Projects Board and the residents of Steinhatchee requesting help from the Commission to resolve this problem. Taylor County also took an active role in the EAS rulemaking docket by participating in the workgroup assigned to resolve the pocket and interLATA traffic problems.

Since it appears it is not feasible to request interLATA traffic data consistent with the EAS rules on this pocket route, staff believes it is appropriate to evaluate this docket along with the other pending dockets that have "pocket" concerns. This will enable staff to apply the same criteria and considerations to all the pending "pocket" dockets.

Therefore, because traffic data could not be provided by Southern Bell in the format required by the EAS rules, staff does not have sufficient information to make a recommendation regarding whether routes in Table D qualify to be balloted for EAS. Since this EAS request involves a pocket, staff recommends that this docket be evaluated in the forthcoming recommendation on "pocket" areas.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

ISSUE 5: Should traffic studies be required on the GTEFL interLATA routes listed in Table E in Docket No. 930978-TL?

TABLE E

REQUESTED INTERLATA ROUTES FOR EAS	
FROM:	TO:
Lakeland, Winter Haven, Mulberry	Fort Meade

RECOMMENDATION: No. Traffic information was provided by United from the requesting exchange, Fort Meade, into the Lakeland, Winter Haven and Mulberry exchanges. The GTEFL interLATA routes are in the reverse direction, which historically have shown very little community of interest. Staff does not believe the additional interLATA traffic information will change the outcome of this docket. Therefore, staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket.

STAFF ANALYSIS: United provided traffic information from the Fort Meade exchange, which was the requesting exchange, to the Lakeland, Winter Haven and Mulberry exchanges. By Order No. PSC 94-1379-FOF-TL, issued November 14, 1994, the Commission ordered the Fort Meade exchange to be balloted for EAS to the Lakeland exchange. The order further specified that none of the remaining routes warranted any form of toll relief. The survey passed and EAS was implemented on the Fort Meade/Lakeland route on May 13, 1995.

The Commission granted GTEFL's motion for relief from filing the traffic studies on the remaining interLATA routes. GTEFL stated that it no longer performs the recording and rating of interLATA traffic for AT&T; therefore, it no longer has the data, nor does it have access to the data.

As discussed in Issue 1, the Commission directed staff to address the problem with interLATA traffic studies in the EAS rulemaking docket (930220-TL). Because of the new legislation, the proposed EAS rule docket was closed at the August 15, 1995, agenda. Staff will file recommendations on the pending EAS dockets based on subject type.

Traffic data was available, in this docket, from the requesting exchange. The interLATA data was not available in the

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

format required by the EAS rules in the reverse direction. In past dockets, traffic studies have shown very low calling rates in the reverse direction, indicating that the community of interest is from the smaller exchange into the larger exchanges.

Staff does not believe the additional interLATA traffic information would change the outcome of this docket since traffic data was available from the requesting exchange. Therefore, staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket. Since traffic data was available in the pertinent direction, and historic cases indicate very little community of interest in the reverse direction, staff does not believe that a sufficient community of interest exists to warrant EAS or an alternative toll plan.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

ISSUE 6: Should traffic studies be required on the Southern Bell interLATA routes listed in Table F in Docket No. 940026-TL?

TABLE F

REQUESTED INTERLATA ROUTES FOR EAS	
FROM:	TO:
Hawthorne (and pocket)	Crescent City, Florahome, Pomona Park, Welaka, Hastings (and pocket)
Pomona Park	Melrose (and pocket), Orange Springs (and pocket)
Keystone Heights	Crescent City, Pomona Park, Welaka, Hastings (and pocket),
Welaka	Melrose (and pocket), Orange Springs

RECOMMENDATION: No. Traffic information was provided by ALLTEL and Southern Bell on 66 of the 84 requested routes. With the exception of three pocket areas, Keystone Heights, Melrose and Orange Springs, the remaining Putnam County exchanges have either EAS or the \$.25 plan to the county seat, Palatka. The \$.25 plan was ordered on these three interLATA routes in an earlier Putnam County EAS docket (Docket No. 910528-TL), but was subsequently denied by Judge Greene. Staff does not believe the interLATA traffic information on the remaining interLATA routes will change the outcome of this docket. Therefore, staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket. The three interLATA routes that were denied by Judge Greene (Keystone Heights/Palatka, Melrose/Palatka, and Orange Springs/Palatka) should be addressed in the forthcoming "interLATA toll alternative" recommendation along with the other pending dockets with similar concerns.

STAFF ANALYSIS: ALLTEL and Southern Bell provided traffic information on 66 of the 84 routes. At the August 29, 1995 agenda, the Commission denied EAS on all of the routes for which traffic data was available and further decided that none of these routes warranted an alternative toll plan.

The Commission granted Southern Bell's motion for relief from filing the traffic studies on the remaining interLATA routes. Southern Bell stated that it no longer performs the recording and

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

rating of interLATA traffic for AT&T; therefore, it no longer has the data, nor does it have access to the data.

As discussed in Issue 1, the Commission directed staff to address the problem with interLATA traffic studies in the EAS rulemaking docket (930220-TL). Because of the new legislation, the proposed EAS rule docket was closed at the August 15, 1995, agenda. Staff will file a recommendation on the pending EAS dockets based on subject type.

Traffic data was available, in this docket, on a majority of the routes. Since all of the exchanges, except for the Keystone Heights, Melrose and Orange Springs pocket areas, have EAS or the \$.25 plan to their county seat (Palatka), staff does not believe any further traffic data is warranted. These three pocket routes will be evaluated in the forthcoming "interLATA alternative plan" recommendation. Based on the traffic data that was available, none of the routes warranted EAS or the \$.25 plan. Staff does not believe any additional traffic data will change the outcome of this docket. Therefore, staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket. The three interLATA routes that were denied by Judge Greene (Keystone Heights/Palatka, Melrose/Palatka, and Orange Springs/Palatka) should be addressed in the "interLATA toll alternative" recommendation along with the other pending dockets with similar concerns.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

ISSUE 7: Should traffic studies be required on the GTEFL interLATA routes listed in Table G in Docket No. 940406-TL?

TABLE G

REQUESTED INTERLATA ROUTES FOR EAS	
FROM:	TO:
Lake Wales	Avon Park, Bowling Green, and Fort Meade

RECOMMENDATION: No. Traffic information was provided by GTEFL and United for most of the requesting exchanges. The traffic information that was provided from the Lake Wales exchange indicated no community of interest. Staff believes that the remaining interLATA routes involving the Lake Wales exchange will have similar calling patterns. Therefore, staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket.

STAFF ANALYSIS: GTEFL and United provided traffic information on the Polk County routes involving the Lake Wales exchange. By Order No. PSC-94-1470-TL, issued November 30, 1994, the Commission denied EAS on all the routes for which traffic data was available.

The Commission granted GTEFL's motion for relief from filing the traffic studies on the remaining interLATA routes. GTEFL stated that it no longer performs the recording and rating of interLATA traffic for AT&T; therefore, it no longer has the data, nor does it have access to the data.

As discussed in Issue 1, the Commission directed staff to address the problem with interLATA traffic studies in the EAS rulemaking docket (930220-TL). Because of the new legislation, the proposed EAS rule docket was closed at the August 15, 1995, agenda. Staff will file recommendations on the pending EAS dockets based on subject type.

Traffic data was available, in this docket, on many of the requested routes. All of the requested routes involve Lake Wales, which has toll-free calling to its county seat, Bartow. Based on the traffic data provided on Lake Wales, none of the routes warranted any form of toll relief. Therefore, staff does not believe the additional interLATA traffic information would change the outcome of this docket since traffic data was available from

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

the requesting exchange. Staff recommends that no further traffic data be required in this docket.

DOCKET NO. 930173-TL
DATE: August 31, 1995

ISSUE 8: Should the dockets in this recommendation be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: With the approval of Issues 3, 5, 6 and 7, Docket Nos. 930234-TL, 930978-TL, 940026-TL and 940406-TL should be closed if no protests are filed within 21 days of the issuance of the order. A protest regarding one route should not keep the action regarding other routes from becoming final. Docket Nos. 921193-TL, 930173-TL, and 930235-TL should remain open pending the resolution of other issues.

STAFF ANALYSIS: With the approval of Issues 3, 5, 6 and 7, Docket Nos. 930234-TL, 930978-TL, 940026-TL and 940406-TL should be closed if no protests are filed within 21 days of the issuance of the order. A protest regarding one route should not keep the action regarding other routes from becoming final. Docket Nos. 921193-TL, 930173-TL, and 930235-TL should remain open pending the resolution of other issues.