CK# 6266211 # 3500.00 4-2-01



2100 NE 30th Ave.

Ocala, F£ 34470-4875

Ph: 352 351-6600

Fx. 352 351-8263

01 138 -1 11 1: 20

March 27, 2001

Rip

DEPOSIT

DATE

D0534

APR 0 6 2001

Walter D'Haeselleer Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Sumard Oak Blvd Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Mr. D'Haeselleer,

TX097

This is in reference to docket #010128-TX for the City of Ocala. We have spoken to your office, specifically Kristen Craig and Ray Kennedy and have come to a mutual settlement agreement.

Please find attached a check in the amount of \$3500.00. I understand that acceptance of this settlement will clear City of Ocala of any violation of Section 364.183(1), F. S., Access to Company Records. If you have any questions, please contact me at 352-351-6600.

Sincerely,

Dean G. Shaw

Director

Ocala Electric Utility

xc: Fred Bryant
Diane McDonald
Rich Kent
Randy Hahn

APP .	
CAF	
CMP COM	
CTR	
ECR	
LEG	
OPC	
PAI RGO	
SEC	1
SER	
OTH	

:	i.	3
4	,	
1	3	-
3	Č.	
a Reserved	ŧ	7
	3	:
وليع	1	
¥į	يرجق زيترميقط مراحز	وز دوسا بالجامام وتصدد
₹.	Ę	ŧ
ž	'n	ž
Ž,	*:	3
5 ,	÷,	>
1	.	5 ₂
· ·	, ,	\$.
	₹ ₁ - 3	*
	- Ten Y	, ž
$D\epsilon$	an G. Shaw,	CPM
	· s	2. 3.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04252 APR-5=

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

State of 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-

DATE:

FEBRUARY 8, 2001

TO:

DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (BAYO)

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING, L. FORDHAM,

CHRISTENSEN, ELLIOTT)

DIVISION OF COMPETITIVE SERVICES (K. CRAIG)

RE:

INITIATION OF SHOW CAUSE PROCEEDINGS BY FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR APPARENT VIOLATION OF SECTION 364.183 (1), F.S., ACCESS TO COMPANY RECORDS.

DOCKET NO. 010126-TX - WIRELESS ONE NETWORK, L.P. D/B/A CELLULAR ONE OF SOUTHWEST FLORIDA

DOCKET NO. 010127-TX - CFT INC.

DOCKET NO. 010128-TX - CITY OF OCALA

DOCKET NO. 010129-TX - BROWARD BUSINESS SERVICE, INC. D/B/A FESTIVAL TELEPHONE SERVICES, INC. AND D/B/A

COMMUNICATION SERVICE CENTERS

DOCKET NO. 010130-TX - HAYES TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES,

INC.

DOCKET NO. 010131-TX - GOLDEN HARBOR OF FLORIDA, INC.

D/B/A HOMETOWN TELEPHONE OF FLORIDA, INC.

DOCKET NO. 010132-TX - INTERNATIONAL TELCOM, LTD.

DOCKET NO. 010133-TX - CRG INTERNATIONAL, INC. D/B/A

NETWORK ONE

AGENDA: 02/20/01 - REGULAR AGENDA - SHOW CAUSE - INTERESTED

PERSONS MAY PARTICIPATE

CRITICAL DATES: NONE

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: NONE

FILE NAME AND LOCATION: S:\PSC\CMP\WP\010126.RCM

DOCKET NOS. 010126-TX, 010127-TX, 010128-TX, 010129-TX, 010130-TX, 010131-TX, 010132-TX, 010133-TX
DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2001

CASE BACKGROUND

- July 6, 2000 Each of the certificated Alternative Local Exchange Company (ALEC) providers listed on page 8 was mailed a certified letter requesting information necessary for inclusion in the local competition report required of the Commission by Section 364.386, Florida Statutes.
- July 7-11, 2000 The certified letter return receipts (Attachment A, pages 9-12) from the July 6, 2000, mailings were signed by each of the companies listed on page 8.
- January 22, 2001 None of the companies listed on page 8 have responded to Commission staff.

The Commission is vested with jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Sections 364.183, 364.285 and 364.386, Florida Statutes. Accordingly, staff believes the following recommendations are appropriate.

DOCKET NOS. 010126-TX, 010127-TX, 010128-TX, 010129-TX, 010130-TX, 010131-TX, 010132-TX, 010133-TX

DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2001

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Should the Commission order each of the companies listed on page 8 to show cause why it should not be fined \$10,000 or its respective certificate, as listed on page 8, should not be canceled for apparent failure to provide the Commission access to information in accordance with Section 364.183(1), Florida Statutes, Access to Company Records?

The Commission should order each of the **RECOMMENDATION**: Yes. companies listed on page 8 to show cause in writing within 21 days of the issuance of the Commission's Order why it should not be fined \$10,000 or have its respective certificate, as listed on page 8, canceled for apparent failure to provide the Commission access to information in accordance with Section 364.183(1), Florida Statutes, Access to Company Records. Each company's response should contain specific allegations of fact and law. If any of the companies listed on page 8 fails to respond to the show cause order or request a hearing pursuant to Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, within the 21-day response period and the fine is not paid within ten business days after the 21-day response period, the facts should be deemed admitted, the right to a hearing should be deemed waived and the company's respective certificate, as listed on page 8, should be canceled. If the fine is paid, it should be remitted by the Commission to the State of Florida General Revenue Fund pursuant to Section 364.285, Florida Statutes. (K. Craig)

STAFF ANALYSIS: Pursuant to Section 364.285, Florida Statutes, the Commission may impose a fine or cancel a certificate if a company refuses to comply with Commission rules. Section 364.183(1), Florida Statutes, Access to Company Records, states in part:

364.183, Access to Company Records. -

(1) The Commission shall have access to all records of a telecommunications company that are reasonably necessary for the disposition of matters within the Commission's jurisdiction. The Commission shall also have access to those records of a local exchange telecommunications company's affiliated companies, including its parent company, that are reasonably necessary for the disposition of any matter concerning an affiliated transaction or a claim of anticompetitive behavior including claims of cross-subsidization and predatory pricing. The Commission may require a telecommunications company to file records, reports or other data directly

DOCKET NOS. 010126-TX, 010127-TX, 010128-TX, 010129-TX, 010130-TX, 010131-TX, 010132-TX, 010133-TX

DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2001

related to matters within the Commission's jurisdiction in the form specified by the Commission and may require such company to retain such information for a designated period of time.

Based on the certified letter return receipts (Attachment A, pages 9-12) staff received from the United States Postal Service, it appears that the companies listed on page 8 received the data request and could have responded. It is imperative that the Commission receive 100% participation to accurately reflect the status of local telecommunication competition to the Legislature and the Governor. Staff requested the information in order to comply with Section 364.386, Florida Statutes, Reports to the Legislature. Section 364.386, Florida Statutes, Reports to the Legislature, states in part:

364.386 Reports to the Legislature.-

- (1) The Commission shall submit to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the House of Representatives, on December 1, 1996, and on an annual basis thereafter, a report on the status of competition in the telecommunications industry and a detailed exposition of the following:
- (a) The overall impact of local exchange telecommunications competition on the continued availability of universal service.
- (b) The ability of competitive providers to make functionally equivalent local exchange services available to both residential and business customers at competitive rates, terms, and conditions.
- (C The ability of consumers to obtain functionally equivalent services at comparable rates, terms, and conditions.
- (d) The overall impact of price regulation on the maintenance of reasonably affordable and reliable high-quality telecommunications services.
- (e) What additional services, if any, should be included in the definition of basic local telecommunications services, taking into account advances in technology and market demand.
- (f) Any other information and recommendations which may be in the public interest.

By Section 364.285, Florida Statutes, the Commission is authorized to impose upon any entity subject to its jurisdiction a

DOCKET NOS. 010126-TX, 010127-TX, 010128-TX, 010129-TX, 010130-TX, 010131-TX, 010132-TX, 010133-TX

DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2001

penalty of not more than \$25,000 for each offense, if such entity is found to have refused to comply with or to have willfully violated any lawful rule or order of the Commission, or any provision of Chapter 364. Utilities are charged with knowledge of the Commission's rules and statutes. Additionally, "[i]t is a common maxim, familiar to all minds, that 'ignorance of the law' will not excuse any person, either civilly or criminally." Barlow v. United States, 32 U.S. 404, 411 (1833).

Staff believes that the conduct of each of the companies listed on page 8, by refusing to allow staff access to company records, in apparent violation of Section 364.183(1), Florida Statutes, has been "willful" in the sense intended by Section 364.285, Florida Statutes. In Order No. 24306, issued April 1, 1991, in Docket No. 890216-TL, In re: Investigation Into The Proper Application of Rule 25-14.003, F.A.C., Relating to Tax Savings Refund for 1988 and 1989 for GTE Florida, Inc., having found that the company had not intended to violate the rule, the Commission nevertheless found it appropriate to order it to show cause why it should not be fined, stating that "In our view, willful implies intent to do an act, and this is distinct from intent to violate a rule." Thus, any intentional act, such as the conduct of the companies listed on page 8 at issue here, would meet the standard for a "willful violation."

The companies listed on page 8 did not respond to the Commission's request for information. All have been certificated None of the companies have in Florida since at least 1997. reported any revenues and are apparently not providing telecommunications services in Florida. Nevertheless, they are still subject to the Commission's rules and Florida Statutes governing Alternative Local Exchange Companies (ALECs). amount recommended is consistent with amounts used for recent, similar violations.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission should order each of the companies listed on page 8 to show cause in writing within 21 days of the issuance of the Commission's Order why it should not be fined \$10,000 or have its respective certificate, as listed on page 8, canceled for failure to provide the Commission access to information in accordance with Section 364.183(1), Florida Statutes, Access to Company Records. Each company's response should contain specific allegations of fact and law. If any of the companies listed on page 8 fails to respond to the show cause order or request a hearing pursuant to Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, within the 21-day response period and the fine is

DOCKET NOS. 010126-TX, 010127-TX, 010128-TX, 010129-TX, 010130-TX, 010131-TX, 010132-TX, 010133-TX

DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2001

not paid within ten business days after the 21-day response period, the facts should be deemed admitted, the right to a hearing should be deemed waived and the company's respective certificate, as listed on page 8, should be canceled. If the fine is paid, it should be remitted by the Commission to the State of Florida General Revenue Fund pursuant to Section 364.285, Florida Statutes.

DOCKET NOS. 010126-TX, 010127-TX, 010128-TX, 010129-TX, 010130-TX, 010131-TX, 010132-TX, 010133-TX

DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2001

ISSUE 2: Should these dockets be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: No. If staff's recommendation in Issue 1 is approved and each of the companies listed on page 8 timely responds to its respective show cause order, its respective docket should remain open pending the resolution of the show cause proceedings.

Staff recommends that if any of the companies listed on page 8 fails to respond to the Order to Show Cause within the 21-day show cause response period and the respective fine is not received within ten business days after the expiration of the show cause response period, the company's respective certificate, as listed on page 8, should be canceled and its respective docket may be closed administratively. If any of the companies listed on page 8 pays the fine recommended in Issue 1, the company's respective docket should be closed. A protest in one docket should not prevent the action in a separate docket from becoming final. (B. Keating, L. Fordham, Christensen, Elliott)

STAFF ANALYSIS: If staff's recommendation in Issue 1 is approved and each of the companies listed on page 8 timely responds to its respective show cause order, its respective docket should remain open pending the resolution of the show cause proceedings.

Staff recommends that if any of the companies listed on page 8 fails to respond to the Order to Show Cause within the 21-day show cause response period and the respective fine is not received within ten business days after the expiration of the show cause response period, the company's respective certificate, as listed on page 8, should be canceled and its respective docket may be closed administratively. If each of the companies listed on page 8 pays the fine recommended in Issue 1, the company's respective docket should be closed. A protest in one docket should not prevent the action in a separate docket from becoming final.

DOCKET NOS. 010126-TX, 010127-TX, 010128-TX, 010129-TX, 010130-TX, 010131-TX, 010132-TX, 010133-TX DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2001

<u></u>		1	
DOCKET NO.	PROVIDER	CERTIFICATION DATE	CERTIFICATE NO.
010126-TX	Wireless One Network, L.P. d/b/a Cellular One of Southwest Florida	07/25/97	5181
010127-TX	CFT INC.	12/11/96	4748
010128-TX	City of Ocala	05/13/97	4865
010129-TX	Broward Business Service, Inc. d/b/a Festival Telephone Services, Inc. and d/b/a Communication Service Centers	12/11/96	4752
010130-TX	Hayes Telecommunications Services, Inc.	06/21/95	4032
010131-TX	Golden Harbor of Florida, Inc. d/b/a Hometown Telephone of Florida, Inc.	09/04/97	5211
010132-TX	International Telcom, Ltd.	12/17/97	5531
010133-TX	CRG International, Inc. d/b/a Network One	11/22/97	4847