



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-

RECEIVED FPSC
SEP 5 AM 11:00
COMMISSION CLERK

DATE: September 5, 2001
TO: DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF THE COMMISSION ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES (BAYO)
FROM: DIVISION OF APPEALS (BELLAK) *icc B*
DIVISION OF COMPETITIVE SERVICES (MOSES) *[Signature]*
RE: DOCKET NO. 010988-TL - PETITION BY BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. FOR DECLARATORY STATEMENT REGARDING DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN ALEC 911 INFORMATION
AGENDA: 09/18/01 - REGULAR AGENDA - DECISION ON DECLARATORY STATEMENT - PARTIES MAY PARTICIPATE AT THE COMMISSION'S DISCRETION

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

FILE NAME AND LOCATION: S:\PSC\APP\WP\010988.RCM

CASE BACKGROUND

On July 20, 2001, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (BellSouth), pursuant to Rule 28-105.001, Florida Administrative Code, filed a Petition for Declaratory Statement (Petition). The Petition asks whether Section 364.24, Florida Statutes, prohibits BellSouth from providing to Florida counties the identity of each Resale Alternative Local Exchange Company (ALEC) that BellSouth remits 911 fees on behalf of and the amount of each resale ALEC's payments. BellSouth also asks whether Order No. PSC-99-1992-PAA-TP, issued October 12, 1999 (911 Order), and its ruling that certain 911 information is not confidential, is applicable to the identity of each resale ALEC that BellSouth remits 911 fees on behalf of and the amount of each resale ALEC's payment.

As a matter of form, staff interprets the request that the above questions be "determined" as a petition for a declaration that (1) Section 364.24, Florida Statutes, does not prohibit BellSouth from providing to Florida counties the identity of each resale ALEC for which it is remitting 911 fees and the amount of each resale ALEC's payments; and (2) a declaration that this information is non-confidential pursuant to the 911 Order.

In support of the Petition, BellSouth notes that ALECs were not prohibited from entering into a billing arrangement to bill and

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

11071 SEP-6 5

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

collect 911 fees. 911 Order, p. 4. However, BellSouth submits to each county a bulk amount that includes all fees generated by BellSouth's and the resale ALECs' end users. BellSouth does not separately identify the resale ALECs that it is remitting payment on behalf of or the amount of each resale ALEC's payment. A county has asked for this information to ensure that each ALEC is paying the appropriate 911 fee. Pursuant to the 911 Order, when ALECs themselves collect and submit the 911 fees to counties rather than having a LEC do it for them, they are required to provide the appropriate 911 County Coordinator, on a quarterly basis, "a list of all counties in which they operate, the number of access lines by county that are relevant in the calculation of the 911 fees, and the name of a contact person available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week". Additionally, the 911 Order requires all ALECs to provide counties with the most accurate customer information (name, address, telephone number) because the "integrity of the 911 database relies on accurate customer account information..." 911 Order at 3.

Simply stated, the Petition asks the Commission to declare that neither Section 364.24, Florida Statutes, nor confidentiality concerns prohibit BellSouth from giving the same 911-related information to counties concerning the ALECs BellSouth collects and remits 911 fees for as those ALECs would be required to give to counties if they did their own 911 fee collecting and remitting themselves.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Should the Commission declare that BellSouth's furnishing to counties the identity of resale ALECs for whom BellSouth collects 911 fees and the amount collected is not prohibited by Section 364.24, Florida Statutes?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. The Commission should declare that Section 364.24 does not prohibit BellSouth from furnishing this information to counties.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Section 364.24(2), Florida Statutes, provides, in pertinent part:

Any officer or person in the employ of any telecommunications company shall not intentionally disclose customer account records except as authorized by the customer or as necessary for billing purposes, or required by subpoena, court order, other process of court, or as otherwise allowed by law. [e.s.]

Section 364.24(2), Florida Statutes, provides two express exemptions from the prohibition against disclosure by telephone company personnel of customer account records that are relevant to this matter. First, the request by the ALEC that the LEC perform the function of collecting and remitting the ALEC's 911 fees necessarily implies authorization to report the same information that the ALEC would be required to report to counties if it did its own 911 fee collecting and remitting. Otherwise, for any practical purpose, the LEC would be unable to accede to the ALEC's request to collect and remit the fees.^{1,2} Moreover, the reporting of the information to counties is required by the 911 Order, therefore triggering the "otherwise allowed by law" exemption in Section 364.24(2), Florida Statutes.

ISSUE 2: Should the Commission declare that information concerning the identity of each ALEC and the amount of 911 fees remitted by each ALEC is non-confidential?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. The Commission should declare that this information is non-confidential.

STAFF ANALYSIS: As noted by BellSouth, the Commission found in the 911 Order that

the 911 fees currently remitted are derived directly from access line information, and, therefore, would not be confidential anyway. [e.s.]

911 Order, p. 6.

This non-confidential rationale encompasses expressly both the identity of the ALEC for whom the fees are collected and the amount remitted.

¹ The only exception would be in the case, not specified in the petition, where the ALEC arranged to report the required information itself.

² LEC's could, of course, include express authorization by ALECs as part of the agreement to perform the 911 fee collecting and remitting service.

DOCKET NO. 010988-TL
DATE: 09/05/01

ISSUE 3: Should this docket be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes.

STAFF ANALYSIS: When the order is issued, the docket may be closed.

RCB