

Section 1 - Bureau of Records Complet

Docket No. 060316-TI Date Docketed: 04/04/2006 Title: Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ956 by Nationwide Professional Teleservices, LLC, effective April 4, 2006.

Company: Nationwide Professional Teleservices

Official Filing Date: _____ Expiration: _____

Last Day to Suspend: _____

Referred to:

("O" indicates OPR)

CCA	(CMP)	ECR	GCL	PIF	RCA	SCR	SGA
	X		X				

Section 2 - OPR Completes and returns to CCA in 10 workdays.

Time Schedule

Program Module B13(c)

WARNING: THIS SCHEDULE IS AN INTERNAL PLANNING DOCUMENT
IT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO REVISION.
FOR UPDATES CONTACT THE RECORDS SECTION: (850) 413-6770

Staff Assignments

Due Dates

	Staff Assignments	Due Dates	Due Dates	
			Previous	Current
OPR Staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Current CASR revision level			
	1.			
	2.			
	3.			
	4.			
	5.			
	6.			
	7.			
Staff Counsel	8.			
	9.			
OCRs	10.			
	11.			
	12.			
	13.			
	14.			
	15.			
	16.			
	17.			
	18.			
	19.			
	20.			
	21.			
	22.			
	23.			
	24.			
	25.			
	26.			
	27.			
	28.			
	29.			
	30.			
	31.			
	32.			
	33.			
	34.			
	35.			
	36.			
	37.			
	38.			
	39.			
	40.			

Recommended assignments for hearing and/or deciding this case:
Full Commission ___ Commission Panel ___
Hearing ___ Staff ___
Date filed with CCA: _____
Initials OPR _____
Staff Counsel _____

Section 3 - Chairman Completes Assignments are as follows:

- Hearing Officer(s)

Commissioners						Hrg Exam	Staff
ALL	ED	DS	AR	CT	TW		

Prehearing Officer

Commissioners					ADM
ED	DS	AR	CT	TW	

Where panels are assigned the senior Commissioner is Panel Chairman: the identical panel decides the case.
Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
Approve.. 07804 AUG 24 08
Date: _____

Section 1 - Bureau of Records Completes

Docket No. 060316-TI Date Docketed: 04/04/2006 Title: Acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ956 by Nationwide Professional Teleservices, LLC, effective April 4, 2006.

Company: Nationwide Professional Teleservices

Official Filing Date: _____ Expiration: _____

Last Day to Suspend: _____

Referred to:

('O' indicates OPR)

CCA	(CMP)	ECR	GCL	PIF	RCA	SCR	SGA
	X		X				

Section 2 - OPR Completes and returns to CCA in 10 workdays.

Time Schedule

Program Module B13(c)

WARNING: THIS SCHEDULE IS AN INTERNAL PLANNING DOCUMENT
IT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO REVISION.
FOR UPDATES CONTACT THE RECORDS SECTION: (850) 413-6770

Staff Assignments		Due Dates	Previous		Current	
			Current CASR revision level			
OPR Staff	P Isler	<input type="checkbox"/> 0				
		1.	Memo to Docket File	NONE	05/02/2006	
		2.	Close Docket	NONE	05/02/2006	
		3.				
		4.				
		5.				
		6.				
		7.				
Staff Counsel	V McKay	8.				
		9.				
		10.				
OCRs		11.				
		12.				
		13.				
		14.				
		15.				
		16.				
		17.				
		18.				
		19.				
		20.				
		21.				
		22.				
		23.				
		24.				
		25.				
		26.				
		27.				
		28.				
		29.				
		30.				
		31.				
		32.				
		33.				
		34.				
		35.				
		36.				
		37.				
		38.				
		39.				
		40.				

Recommended assignments for hearing and/or deciding this case:
Full Commission _____ Commission Panel _____
Hearing _____ Staff _____

Date filed with CCA: 04/18/2006
Initials OPR _____
Staff Counsel _____

Section 3 - Chairman Completes

Assignments are as follows:

- Hearing Officer(s)

Commissioners						Hrg Exam	Staff
ALL	ED	DS	AR	CT	TW		
							X

Prehearing Officer

Commissioners					ADM
ED	DS	AR	CT	TW	
					X

Where panels are assigned the senior Commissioner is Panel Chairman: the identical panel decides the case.
Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

Approved: ED [Signature]
Date: 04/18/2006

STATE OF FLORIDA

COMMISSIONERS:
LISA POLAK EDGAR, CHAIRMAN
J. TERRY DEASON
ISILIO ARRIAGA
MATTHEW M. CARTER II
KATRINA J. TEW



DIVISION OF THE COMMISSION CLERK &
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
BLANCA S. BAYÓ
DIRECTOR
(850) 413-6770 (CLERK)
(850) 413-6330 (ADMIN)

Public Service Commission

April 6, 2006

Monique Byrnes
Technologies Management, Inc.
Post Office Drawer 200
Winter Park, Florida 32790-0200

Re: Docket No. 060316-TI

Dear Ms. Byrnes:

This will acknowledge receipt of an acknowledgment of cancellation of IXC Registration No. TJ956 by Nationwide Professional Teleservices, LLC, effective April 4, 2006, which was filed in this office on April 4, 2006, and assigned the above-referenced docket number. Appropriate staff members will be advised.

Mediation may be available to resolve any dispute in this docket. If mediation is conducted, it does not affect a substantially interested person's right to an administrative hearing. For more information, contact the Office of General Counsel at (850) 413-6248 or FAX (850) 413-7180.

Bureau of Records

I:\Records\acklet-no-app2.doc

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

07804 AUG 24 08

FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

Customers shouldn't pay for clean air

Progress Energy is a regulated utility because it is a monopoly that provides an essential service. Regulations passed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in March 2005 require that the Crystal River Energy Complex take steps to diminish pollutants.

One of two related regulations will permanently cap emissions of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. The deadlines on implementation begin in 2009.

When fully implemented, the rule will result in a reduction of sulfur dioxide emissions by more than 70 percent in affected areas and nitrogen oxide emissions by more than 60 percent from 2003 levels. The EPA, referring to the regulations when applied throughout 28 states, said, "This will result in \$85 (billion) to \$100 billion in health benefits and nearly \$2 billion in visibility benefits per year by 2015 and will substantially reduce premature mortality in the eastern United States."

reduction activities might be understandable from the point of view of stockholders and their profits, but it is not acceptable from the point of view of the ratepayers.

Are customers to bear the whole burden of protecting the health and welfare of all citizens and the environment from the company's dangerous byproducts?

The costs should be considered part of the price of doing business. If this was a regulation that put a company at a competitive disadvantage, that might

play into the argument, but that's not the case. In fact, the absence of competition creates a situation in which the company isn't continually pressed like other businesses to be ever increasingly more efficient and innovative in finding ways to save money to keep a competitive position in the marketplace.

It's a lot easier to lobby the PSC to pass on the costs.

Yes, Progress Energy is regu-

THE ISSUE:

Progress Energy request for compliance reimbursement.

OUR OPINION:

Company should be responsible for costs.

YOUR OPINION: Go to chronicleonline.com to comment about today's Chronicle editorial.

Customers shouldn't pay for clean air

Progress Energy is a regulated utility because it is a monopoly that provides an essential service. Regulations passed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in March 2005 require that the Crystal River Energy Complex take steps to diminish pollutants.

One of two related regulations will permanently cap emissions of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. The deadlines on implementation begin in 2009.

When fully implemented, the rule will result in a reduction of sulfur dioxide emissions by more than 70 percent in affected areas and nitrogen oxide emissions by more than 60 percent by 2022 levels. The EPA, referring to the regulations when applied throughout 28 states, said, "This will result in \$85 billion to \$100 billion in health benefits and nearly \$2 billion in visibility benefits per year by 2015 and will substantially reduce premature mortality in the eastern United States."

The second and companion new rule is the Clean Air Mercury Rule that will permanently cap and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants for the first time. The EPA said this rule makes the United States the first country in the world to regulate mercury emissions from utilities.

A collective "it's about time," might be heard reverberating around the nation. Both rules will directly affect the Progress Energy's Crystal River operation and the first will also impact the company's Anclote plant.

The problem is that Progress Energy wants its 1.5 million customers who rely on this essential monopoly to pay an estimated \$736 million for cleaning up what it's putting out in the environment that could hurt them — for example, from the Crystal River site, 11 million pounds of hydrochloric acid annually, 240,000 pounds of sulfuric acid

reduction activities might be understandable from the point of view of stockholders and their profits, but it is not acceptable from the point of view of the ratepayers.

Are customers to bear the whole burden of protecting the health and welfare of all citizens and the environment from the company's dangerous byproducts?

The costs should be considered part of the price of doing business. If this was a regulation that put a company at a competitive disadvantage, that might

play into the argument, but that's not the case. In fact, the absence of competition creates a situation in which the company isn't continually pressed like other businesses to be ever-increasingly more efficient and innovative in finding ways to save money to keep a competitive position in the marketplace.

It's a lot easier to lobby the PSC to pass on the costs.

Yes, Progress Energy is regulated in what it can charge, but there should never be an assumption that costs due to regulation should be automatically passed on to the consumers.

The request comes on top of the latest 12 percent increase due to fuel prices. Consumers struggle to pay their power bills and their escalating fuel bills. They don't get a subsidy for higher fuel prices to protect their budgets; they have to save that money somewhere else.

The company needs to convince ratepayers it is struggling to absorb the costs of producing cleaner electricity with innovative business techniques, and new technology and customers have to hope the PSC will ask the company to show cause of that.

It would be a particularly community-friendly move for Progress Energy to go beyond the minimum standards to protect the health of residents and the environment — not just doing what's legally required by

The second and companion new rule is the Clean Air Mercury Rule that will permanently cap and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants for the first time. The EPA said this rule makes the United States the first country in the world to regulate mercury emissions from utilities.

A collective "it's about time," might be heard reverberating around the nation. Both rules will directly affect the Progress Energy's Crystal River operation and the first will also impact the company's Anclote plant.

The problem is that Progress Energy wants its 1.5 million customers who rely on this essential monopoly to pay an estimated \$736 million for cleaning up what it's putting out in the environment that could hurt them — for example, from the Crystal River site, 11 million pounds of hydrochloric acid annually, 240,000 pounds of sulfuric acid mist, 530 pounds of mercury compounds, 10,000 pounds of arsenic compounds, as well as a few others.

The fact that a utility would petition the Public Service Commission (PSC) to be reimbursed for cleaning up the dangerous byproducts of their pro-

duced in what it can charge, but there should never be an assumption that costs due to regulation should be automatically passed on to the consumers.

The request comes on top of the latest 12 percent increase due to fuel prices. Consumers struggle to pay their power bills and their escalating fuel bills. They don't get a subsidy for higher fuel prices to protect their budgets; they have to save that money somewhere else.

The company needs to convince ratepayers it is struggling to absorb the costs of producing cleaner electricity with innovative business techniques, and new technology and customers have to hope the PSC will ask the company to show cause of that.

It would be a particularly community-friendly move for Progress Energy to go beyond the minimum standards to protect the health of residents and the environment — not just doing what's legally required by a deadline.

Should Progress Energy demonstrate that initiative, ratepayers might be willing to partner with the company for air quality that doesn't threaten their health in return for electricity.

THE ISSUE:
Progress Energy is just not responsible for compliance reimbursement.

OUR OPINION:
Company should be responsible for its costs.

YOUR OPINION: Do you agree? Visit www.enr.com to comment about today's products and services.