

I. Meeting Packet



State of Florida
Public Service Commission
INTERNAL AFFAIRS AGENDA

Tuesday, March 27, 2012
Immediately Following Commission Conference
Betty Easley Conference Center, Room 140

1. Approve March 14, 2012, Internal Affairs Meeting Minutes. (Attachment 1)
2. Draft Comments in Response to the Federal Communications Commission Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Lifeline and Link-Up Reform and Modernization released February 6, 2012. Approval is sought. (Attachment 2)
3. Draft Reply Comments regarding Subscriber Line Charges and Access Recovery Charges. Approval is sought. (Attachment 3)
4. Legislative Update. (No Attachment)
5. Executive Director's Report. (No Attachment)
6. Other Matters.

BB/css

OUTSIDE PERSONS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON
ANY OF THE AGENDAED ITEMS SHOULD CONTACT THE
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AT (850) 413-6463.



State of Florida
Public Service Commission
INTERNAL AFFAIRS MINUTES
Wednesday, March 14, 2012
9:33 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.
Betty Easley Conference Center, Room 140

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Brisé
Commissioner Edgar
Commissioner Graham
Commissioner Balbis
Commissioner Brown

STAFF PARTICIPATING: Baez, Hill, Kiser, Pennington, Futrell

1. Approve February 14, 2012, Internal Affairs Meeting Minutes.

The minutes were approved.

Commissioners participating: Brisé, Edgar, Graham, Balbis, Brown

2. Legislative Update.

Ms. Pennington updated the Commissioners on Legislative matters of interest.

Commissioners participating: Brisé, Edgar, Graham, Balbis, Brown

3. Executive Director's Report.

Mr. Baez updated the Commissioners on budget matters of interest, as a result of the Legislative Session.

Commissioners participating: Brisé, Edgar, Graham, Balbis, Brown

4. Other Matters.

There were no other matters discussed.

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: March 19, 2012

TO: Braulio L. Baez, Executive Director

FROM: Robert J. Casey, Public Utilities Supervisor, Division of Regulatory Analysis
Cindy B. Miller, Senior Attorney, Office of the General Counsel *CBM*

RE: Draft Comments in Response to the Federal Communications Commission Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Lifeline and Link-Up Reform and Modernization.

CRITICAL INFORMATION: Please place on the March 27, 2012 Internal Affairs. Comments are due April 2, 2012. **COMMISSION APPROVAL OF COMMENTS IS SOUGHT.**

On February 6, 2012, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) adopted a Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) seeking comment on a number of proposals to further reform and modernize the FCC's universal service Lifeline program. **COMMISSION APPROVAL OF COMMENTS IS SOUGHT.**

The FNPRM seeks comments on a number of issues including:

- State databases that can be used or accessed to determine Lifeline eligibility determinations.
- Privacy requirements in the establishment of a national or state eligibility database.
- The use of universal service funds to support digital literacy.
- Elimination of non-eligible telecommunication carrier (ETC) Lifeline resellers.
- Whether the Special Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) should be added to the list of qualifying federal assistance programs for Lifeline.
- Measures that would enable veterans who lack any income to demonstrate eligibility for Lifeline.

The Draft Comments encourage the FCC to consider the following:

1. Lifeline eligibility determinations can be streamlined by partnering with sister state agencies which provide assistance using Lifeline-qualifying programs.
2. The FPSC urges the FCC to maintain confidentiality of Lifeline applicant's personal identifying information when initiating a national eligibility database.
3. The FCC should continue to encourage public/private partnerships, and non-profit sector initiatives to increase digital literacy. Additional funding may be needed to encourage the development of sustainable digital literacy training programs. However, the training should not take funding away from the existing schools and libraries fund.¹
4. The implementation date of any rules eliminating Lifeline non-ETC resellers should be deferred to allow enough time for existing non-ETC resellers to obtain ETC designation. If non-ETC resellers choose not to apply for or obtain ETC designation, ample time should be allowed to provide to notice their Lifeline subscribers to allow them an opportunity to change their provider to an ETC to maintain their Lifeline discount.
5. Addition of the WIC program to the list of eligible qualifying Lifeline programs will benefit Florida by increasing the number of eligible consumers for Lifeline assistance.
6. A homeless veteran who lacks any income should be permitted to sign a certification under penalty of perjury that he or she has no income. Some form of additional certification should be included from an authorized U.S. Department of Veterans'

¹ This position concurs with discussions regarding Digital Literacy with the Florida Department of Management Services, Broadband Program Office.

Florida Public Service Commission
Lifeline and Link Up Proposed Comments to FCC
March 19, 2012

Affairs (VA) official, such as an outreach worker or program coordinator, indicating that the person in question is a homeless veteran or at risk of becoming homeless.

RJC
Attachment
cc: Charles Hill

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

DRAFT

In the Matter of:)	
)	
Lifeline and Link Up Reform and Modernization)	WC Docket No. 11-42
)	
Lifeline and Link Up)	WC Docket No. 03-109
)	
Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service)	CC Docket No. 96-45
)	
Advancing Broadband Availability Through Digital Literacy Training)	WC Docket No. 12-23

**COMMENTS OF
THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CHAIRMAN RONALD A. BRISÉ
COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR
COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM
COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS
COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN

April 2, 2012

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) submits these comments in response to the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) released on February 6, 2012. In this FNPRM (FCC 12-11), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) seeks comment on a number of proposals to further reform and modernize the Commission's universal service Lifeline program.

The FPSC encourages the FCC to consider the following:

1. Lifeline eligibility determinations can be streamlined by partnering with sister state agencies which provide assistance using Lifeline-qualifying programs.
2. The FCC should maintain confidentiality of Lifeline applicant's personal identifying information when initiating a national eligibility database.
3. The FCC should continue to encourage public/private partnerships, and non-profit sector initiatives to increase digital literacy.
4. The implementation date of any rules eliminating Lifeline non-eligible telecommunication carrier (ETC) resellers should be deferred to allow enough time for existing non-ETC resellers to obtain ETC designation. If non-ETC resellers choose not to apply for or obtain ETC designation, ample time should be allowed to provide notice to their Lifeline subscribers to allow them an opportunity to change their provider to an ETC to maintain their Lifeline discount.
5. Addition of the Special Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program to the list of eligible qualifying Lifeline programs will benefit Florida by increasing the number of eligible consumers for Lifeline assistance.

6. A homeless veteran who lacks any income should be permitted to sign a certification under penalty of perjury that he or she has no income. Some form of additional certification should be included from an authorized U.S. Department of Veterans' Affairs (VA) official, such as an outreach worker or program coordinator, indicating that the person in question is a homeless veteran or at risk of becoming homeless.

1) STATE DATABASE LIFELINE ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS

The FCC is seeking comment on how it can encourage the accelerated deployment of widespread state databases that can be used or accessed to streamline Lifeline eligibility determinations. As mentioned in Order FCC 12-11, the FCC is building on the proven success of practices developed and implemented at the state level, including in Florida. As shared in our April 6, 2011 comments to the FCC, the FPSC and the Florida Department of Children and Families (DCF) initiated a Lifeline coordinated enrollment process in 2007.

In 2008, the FPSC and the Florida DCF continued their partnership by working on the concept of a computer portal which would allow ETCs to verify in real-time whether Lifeline applicants are enrolled in a DCF qualifying eligible program. A real-time verification process was subsequently created to confirm a person's participation in a Lifeline-qualifying program, and is now available to all Florida ETCs. ETCs can log-in to a computer portal, enter the name, birth date, and last four digits of a Lifeline customer's social security number, and receive a response as to whether that customer currently is participating in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) program, Medicaid, or Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) program. Although this process would not verify participation in all Lifeline qualifying programs, FPSC data shows that over ninety percent of applicants using the Lifeline coordinated

enrollment process use SNAP, Medicaid, or TANF for eligibility. An inter-agency Memo of Understanding can be found at <http://www.floridapsc.com/utilities/liaison/pdf/lifelinemou.pdf>.

2) NATIONAL ELIGIBILITY DATABASE

In Order FCC 12-11, the FCC requires ETCs to transmit the name, address, telephone number, date of birth, last four digits of the social security number (SSN) and the means through which the consumer qualified for Lifeline to the duplicates database. In the FNPRM, the FCC states that it may be necessary for ETCs to collect and transmit the full SSN of the Lifeline applicant to a national eligibility database to determine eligibility.

Rule 25-4.0665(9), Florida Administrative Code, provides that:

Eligible telecommunications carriers shall only require a customer to provide the last four digits of the customer's social security number for application for Lifeline and Link-Up service and to verify continued eligibility for the programs as part of the annual verification process.

The FPSC believes that requiring a Lifeline applicant to provide a full social security number for the national eligibility database may create a barrier to Lifeline enrollment. The national eligibility database would contain the applicant's name, address, telephone number, date of birth, and full social security number. Many applicants would be reluctant to provide this information if they are made aware that government agencies and all ETCs would have access to this information. Many applicants for phone service refuse to provide a social security number to the providers when initiating phone service, and providers have allowed alternate identification in lieu of a person's social security number.

As expressed in the FPSC's April 6, 2011 comments,² the FPSC supports the creation of a database to verify consumer eligibility, track verification, and check for duplicates to ensure greater program accountability. The FPSC's concern is the protection of a Lifeline subscriber's/applicant's personal identifying information. Chapter 364.107, Florida Statutes, requires that personal identifying information of a participant in a telecommunications carrier's Lifeline Assistance Plan be confidential. Section 364.107(3)(a), Florida Statutes, provides that an officer or employee of a telecommunications carrier shall not intentionally disclose personal identifying information of a participant in a telecommunications carrier's Lifeline Assistance Plan made confidential and exempt, except as:

1. Authorized by the customer;
2. Necessary for billing purposes;
3. Required by subpoena, court order, or other process of court;
4. Necessary to disclose to an agency as defined in s. 119.011³ or a governmental entity for purposes directly connected with implementing service for, or verifying eligibility of, a participant in a Lifeline Assistance Plan or auditing a Lifeline Assistance Plan; or
5. Otherwise authorized by law.

Although the personal identifying information could be disclosed under certain conditions shown above, viewing of that information by third parties such as ETCs would not be permissible

² Comments of the Florida Public Service Commission in WC Docket No. 11-42, Lifeline and Link-Up Reform and Modernization; CC Docket No. 96-45, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; and WC Docket No. 03-109, Lifeline and Link-Up

³ "Agency" means any state, county, district, authority, or municipal officer, department, division, board, bureau, commission, or other separate unit of government created or established by law including, for the purposes of this chapter, the Commission on Ethics, the Public Service Commission, and the Office of Public Counsel, and any other public or private agency, person, partnership, corporation, or business entity acting on behalf of any public agency.

without customer authorization. The FPSC urges the FCC to maintain confidentiality of Lifeline applicants personal identifying information when initiating a national eligibility database.

3) DIGITAL LITERACY TRAINING

The FCC seeks comment on the effectiveness of digital literacy training classes. Order FCC 12-11 states that about 22 percent of non-adopters cite a digital literacy-related factor as their main barrier. This group includes those who are uncomfortable using computers and those who are “worried about all the bad things that can happen if they use the Internet.” Digital literacy skills are required in 50 percent of today’s jobs. This will grow to 77 percent in the next decade. The FPSC agrees that Digital literacy is increasingly essential to obtaining an education, searching for a job, learning job-related skills, accessing government information, participating in civic processes, and managing household and financial responsibilities. The FPSC believes that digital literacy training is a necessity in states such as Florida with a high population of elderly, non-English speaking, and low-income citizens.

The Digital Literacy Corps recommended in the Connect to Compete campaign would teach basic computer skills in libraries and schools which would be the natural place for this training. Additional funding may be needed to encourage the development of sustainable digital literacy training programs. However, the training should not take funding away from the existing schools and libraries fund.

Chairman Genachowski’s March 7, 2012 announcement of a new Public-Private initiative to encourage collaboration on broadband-related priorities such as digital literacy among government and private sector entities is a positive step. The FCC should continue to encourage public/private partnerships, and non-profit sector initiatives to increase digital literacy.

4) LIMITS ON RESALE OF LIFELINE-SUPPORTED SERVICES

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011, non-ETC resellers in Florida provided Lifeline service to 4,941 customers. Incumbent local exchange companies (ILECs) provided these companies with the Lifeline discount and subsequently claimed those amounts from the Universal Service Administrative Company. These non-ETC resellers provide service to some customers who would not qualify for service through an ILEC because of financial difficulties.

The FCC is asking for comment on its proposal to allow ETCs to receive Lifeline support from the Fund only when they provide Lifeline service directly to subscribers. This means that non-ETC providers would no longer be able to purchase Lifeline-resale lines from the ILECs. ILECs would not be eligible to seek reimbursement from the Fund for any low-income subscriber for whom it does not directly provide service.

The FPSC applauds the FCC's goal to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of the program, but believes that current subscribers of Lifeline resold service should be given consideration. As mentioned in the FNPRM, resellers are free to take steps to become ETCs and continue to resell Lifeline services, but the additional requirements of becoming an ETC may be too burdensome and costly for the small non-ETC resellers. The implementation date of any rules eliminating Lifeline non-ETC resellers should be deferred to allow enough time for existing non-ETC resellers to obtain ETC designation. If non-ETC resellers choose not to apply for or obtain ETC designation, ample time should be allowed to provide notice to their Lifeline subscribers to allow them an opportunity to change their provider to an ETC to maintain their Lifeline discount.

5) ADDITION OF THE WIC PROGRAM TO LIFELINE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

The FCC is seeking comment on whether adding WIC to the Lifeline eligibility criteria will advance its goal of ensuring universal availability of phone service to low-income

consumers. WIC is the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children. The program provides eligible participants a combination of supplemental nutritious foods, nutrition education, breastfeeding promotion and support, and referrals to health care and other social services.

WIC is available in all 67 Florida counties, and approximately 500,000 participants are served each month in Florida. To qualify for WIC, the total household income must be at or under 185% of the federal poverty guidelines; or, the person must be currently receiving Medicaid, Temporary Cash Assistance, or Food Assistance. However, persons applying for WIC do not have to be on a public assistance program. In Order FCC 12-11, the FCC points out that over 35 percent of WIC participants do not participate in another federal assistance program. The FPSC believes that adding the WIC program to the list of eligible qualifying Lifeline programs will benefit Florida by increasing the number of eligible consumers for Lifeline assistance.

6) ESTABLISHING ELIGIBILITY FOR HOMELESS VETERANS

The FCC is seeking comment on measures that would enable veterans who lack any income, but are not otherwise enrolled in a qualifying program, to demonstrate eligibility for Lifeline. The Veterans Homeless Initiative Office, a division of the VA, suggested that the FCC include homeless veterans programs as qualifying eligibility criteria.

Nationally, about one-third of the adult homeless population have served their country in the Armed Services. On any given day, as many as 250,000 veterans (male and female) are living on the streets or in shelters, and perhaps twice as many experience homelessness at some point during the course of a year. In Florida, persons who served on active duty in the U.S. military make up 13.3% of the homeless counted in 2011.

The Florida Council on Homelessness 2011 Report to the Florida Governor, Senate President, and House Speaker, states that Florida needs to commit its resources to assure that no money is left on the table and ensure that our veterans receive the assistance for which they are eligible. The FPSC believes that homeless veterans in Florida need communication services in order to stay in touch with family, have access to emergency services, and have the ability to make living, housing, and work arrangements. The FPSC believes that a homeless veteran that lacks any income should be permitted to sign a certification under penalty of perjury that he or she has no income. Some form of additional certification should be included from an authorized VA official, such as an outreach worker or program coordinator, indicating that the person in question is a homeless veteran or at risk of becoming homeless is included.

CONCLUSION

The FPSC continues to be proactive regarding the Lifeline and Link Up programs to ensure that low-income Florida consumers have the ability to obtain and retain affordable telephone service. The FPSC continues to strive for accountability in the universal service program and safeguard the USF from fraud, waste, and abuse. The FPSC appreciates the FCC's acknowledgement of Florida's efforts in Order FCC 12-11. The FPSC encourages the FCC to consider the proposed recommendations noted in these comments.

Respectfully submitted,
/ s /
Cindy B. Miller, Senior Attorney
Office of the General Counsel

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
(850) 413-6082

DATED: April 2, 2012

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: March 19, 2012
TO: Braulio L. Baez, Executive Director
FROM: Division of Regulatory Analysis (Fogleman, Shafer, Futrell)
Office of General Counsel (Miller)
RE: Draft Reply Comments regarding Subscriber Line Charges and Access Recovery Charges.

Critical Information: Please place on the March 27th Internal Affairs. Reply comments are due March 30th.

In last year's Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,¹ the FCC sought comments regarding the implementation of its access reform policies. Among these issues, the FCC sought comment on reform of end user charges, such as the Subscriber Line Charge (SLC) and the new Access Recovery Charge (ARC). The FCC also sought comment on establishing a requirement on carriers to include such line items in their advertised prices for service. Staff seeks Commission approval of the attached draft reply comments. The draft reply comments take the following positions:

- Oppose the continued use of the SLC and ARC in states such as Florida, where carriers can set their own rates constrained only by the market.
- Recommend that the FCC and the Separations Joint Board update the jurisdictional separations policy.
- Urge the FCC to limit use of the ARC to incumbent carriers that have lost interstate access revenues.
- Support the establishment of a sunset date when the ARC would be eliminated from consumers bills.
- Advocate that the FCC require carriers to include SLC charges (including ARCs) in their advertised price for services.

¹ FCC, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 11-161, Released November 18, 2011.

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

DRAFT

In the Matter of)	
)	
Connect America Fund)	WC Docket No. 10-90
)	
A National Broadband Plan for Our Future)	GN Docket No. 09-51
)	
Establishing Just and Reasonable Rates for Local Exchange Carriers)	WC Docket No. 07-135
)	
High-Cost Universal Service Support)	WC Docket No. 05-337
)	
Developing an Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime)	CC Docket No. 01-92
)	
Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service)	CC Docket No. 96-45
)	
Lifeline and Link-Up)	WC Docket No. 03-109

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

CHAIRMAN RONALD A. BRISÉ

COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR

COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM

COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS

COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN

March 27, 2012

The Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) submits these reply comments in response to the Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) released by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) on November 18, 2011.² These comments address the issues relating to both the new access replacement charge (ARC) adopted in its Order as well as the pre-existing rules regarding subscriber line charges (SLCs). In particular, the FCC seeks comment on the appropriate level and regulatory approach to such charges, as carriers increasingly transition to broadband networks.

REFORM OF END USER CHARGES

A number of commenters addressed end-user charges. In its comments, Windstream argues that “the Commission should not place a lower cap on SLC if it and/or state commissions continue to regulate the price of voice service.”³ By comparison, AT&T asserts that “carriers use subscriber line charges to recover real network costs, and thus those charges will continue to be needed in the short term.”⁴ AT&T also states that “as ILECs become non-price-regulated providers of all-IP services, ‘SLCs’ will become mere historical curiosities.”⁵

The FPSC questions the need for either the ARC or the SLC in states like Florida where incumbent LECs are no longer subject to either price cap or rate-of-return regulation. In these markets, carriers can adjust their rates, constrained only by the market, to recover their investments including revenues collected through the SLC and ARC. We do not believe that it is necessary to wait until the transition to an all IP network for the elimination of such line items. We urge the FCC to work with states to eliminate the SLC and forgo implementation of the ARC in markets where they

² FCC, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 11-13, WC Docket Nos. 10-90, 07-135, 05-337, 03-109, GN Docket No. 09-51, CC Docket Nos. 01-92, 96-45, released: November 18, 2011.

³ Comments of Windstream Communications, Inc. filed February 24, 2012, p. 7.

⁴ Comments of AT&T Inc., filed February 24, 2012, pp. 76-77.

⁵ Ibid.

are not necessary. States could accomplish this by certifying to the FCC that retail rates have been deregulated within their state.

The FPSC agrees with the comments of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates that any revenue recovery mechanism that is considered must be based on an updated separation/allocation policy and consider all of a carrier's revenue in determining when recovery of lost intercarrier compensation revenues is needed. This is consistent with prior comments made by the FPSC asserting the FCC consider all revenues prior to providing high-cost support.⁶ The Federal-State Separations Joint Board should be consulted regarding the updated jurisdictional separations policy. The current extended freeze does not reflect the current market characteristics and is in need of reform.

Should the FCC decide to move forward with ARC recovery, it should only be authorized where an incumbent LEC has lost intrastate access revenues, as recommended by the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Cable (DTC). We also agree with the Massachusetts DTC that the FCC should establish a defined sunset date when the ARC would be eliminated from consumers bills. We recognize that the ARCs will be phased down under the term of the Orders, and we believe a clear sunset date would provide certainty to the market.

ADVERTISED PRICE OF SERVICE

As described in the Order, the FCC expects incumbent LECs to include the new ARC charges as part of the SLC charge for billing purposes. However, SLC charges frequently are not included in the advertised price for incumbent LECs' services. The FPSC agrees with those commenters that urge the FCC to require that carriers include SLC charges (including ARCs) in their advertised price

⁶ Comments of the Florida Public Service Commission, filed April 14, 2011, pp. 11-12.

for services.⁷ This requirement will address consumer confusion involving the actual service price and promote competition by making it easier for consumers to compare prices of different service providers. It is also consistent with the Florida market of unregulated prices for retail services.⁸ It is time to abandon labels such as the SLC and ARC in states where carriers set rates , in order to better meet the free market goals of accurate pricing information for consumers.

CONCLUSION

The FPSC hopes to work with the FCC to eliminate unnecessary charges in Florida, where carriers set their rates, constrained only by the market, to recover their costs. In the alternative, the ARC should be limited to carriers that have had an intrastate access revenue loss. The FCC should establish a sunset date for this form of recovery. The FPSC recommends that the FCC implement requirements for the disclosure of all expected costs consumers would pay in their advertised prices. We believe that this will improve the conditions for competition and minimize consumer confusion.

⁷ Comments of the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Cable, filed February 24, 2012, p. 12; Comments of the California Public Utilities Commission, filed February 24, 2012, pp.11-12; and Comments of the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, filed February 24, 2012, p. 8.

⁸ HB 1231, the Regulatory Reform Act, was signed by Governor Scott on May 5, 2011, and became effective July 1, 2011. The bill eliminated retail regulation of local exchange telecommunications services by the FPSC, including the elimination of rate caps on all retail telecommunications services.

II. Outside Persons Who Wish to Address the Commission at Internal Affairs

NOTE: The records reflect that no outside persons addressed the Commission at this Internal Affairs meeting.

III. Supplemental Materials Provided During Internal Affairs

NOTE: The records reflect that there were no supplemental materials provided to the Commission during this Internal Affairs meeting.