

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

VOTE SHEET

NOVEMBER 30, 1999

RE: DOCKET NO. 990694-TL - Joint petition of Citizens of Florida; Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General of the State of Florida; and American Association of Retired Persons to expand lifeline assistance plan eligibility criteria so customers with existing debts to local exchange companies may no longer be denied lifeline service as long as they subscribe to toll blocking service.

Issue 1: Should the Commission require the LECs to provide Lifeline service to eligible customers who have been previously disconnected for nonpayment of their telephone bills, as long as these customers also subscribe to toll blocking service?

Recommendation: Yes. Staff recommends that the Commission require the LECs to provide Lifeline service to eligible customers who have been previously disconnected for nonpayment of their telephone bills, with the provisions

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: Full Commission

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

Handwritten signatures in blue ink:
Susan J. Clark
Vol. Marcus
J. Terry Deaso
[Signature]

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

VOTE SHEET

NOVEMBER 30, 1999

DOCKET NO. 990694-TL - Joint petition of Citizens of Florida; Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General of the State of Florida; and American Association of Retired Persons to expand lifeline assistance plan eligibility criteria so customers with existing debts to local exchange companies may no longer be denied lifeline service as long as they subscribe to toll blocking service.

(Continued from previous page)

enumerated in the analysis portion of staff's November 18, 1999 memorandum. These requirements should be implemented within ninety (90) days of issuance of the order.

MODIFIED

Approved with modification that customers who defaulted on previous payment plans will not be eligible for Lifeline Service until they have made good on those payment plans. Further, the LECs should submit tariffs indicating they will not refuse to provide service (lifeline) for unpaid charges other than non-toll regulated service.

Issue 2: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. This docket should be closed if no person whose substantial interests are affected files a protest within 21 days of issuance of this Order. If no timely protest is filed, this docket should be closed.

APPROVED