

Mailed  
SEP 3 1992

Decision 92-09-012 September 2, 1992

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application )  
of Trans Pacific Telecommunications )  
Management, Inc., dba Transpac )  
Communications a California )  
Corporation, for a Certificate of )  
Public Convenience and Necessity to )  
Provide InterLATA Telecommunications )  
Services Within the State of )  
California. )

Application 92-05-005  
(Filed May 5, 1992)

O P I N I O N

Trans Pacific Telecommunications Management, Inc. (applicant), a California corporation, seeks a certificate of public convenience and necessity (CPCN) under Public Utilities (PU) Code § 1001 to permit it to resell interLATA telephone services in California.<sup>1</sup> Applicant also seeks exemption from the requirements of PU Code §§ 816-830, dealing with the issuance of stocks and other evidences of ownership and bonds, notes, and other evidences of indebtedness.

In Decision (D.) 90-08-032, as modified by D.91-10-041, the Commission established two major criteria for determining whether a CPCN should be granted. An applicant who does not own, control, operate, or manage telephone lines, as conventionally defined, (switchless reseller) must demonstrate that it has a minimum of \$75,000 in uncommitted cash or equivalent financial

<sup>1</sup> California is divided into ten Local Access and Transport Areas (LATAs) of various sizes, each containing numerous local telephone exchanges. "InterLATA" describes services, revenues, and functions that relate to telecommunications originating in one LATA and terminating in another. "IntraLATA" describes services, revenues, and functions that relate to telecommunications originating and terminating within a single LATA.

resources. This minimum requirement increases 5% per year starting in 1992. Thus, for the year 1992, the minimum requirement is \$78,750. In addition, an applicant is required to make a reasonable showing of technical expertise in telecommunications or a related business.

As evidence of sufficient unencumbered cash to pay expenses for the first year's operations, applicant submits a guarantee of \$100,000 from Mr. Son H. Luu, its Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Luu's financial statement shows that he is capable of performing the guarantee; therefore, adequate financial resources exist.

Mr. Gary L. Goforth, applicant's President, has three years' experience in telecommunications and numerous years of experience in marketing. Mr. Leonard Abramowitz, applicant's Vice President, has over six years of experience in telecommunications. Mr. Luu has built a successful accounting and financial planning company. Therefore, applicant has adequate technical expertise to operate.

We will authorize the interLATA service that applicant seeks to provide; but to the extent that the application seeks authority to provide intraLATA service, we will deny it.

Findings of Fact

1. Applicant served a copy of the application upon telephone corporations with which it is likely to compete.
2. A notice of the filing of the application appeared in the Daily Calendar on May 11, 1992.
3. No protests have been filed.
4. A hearing is not required.
5. On June 29, 1983, the Commission issued Order Instituting Investigation (OII) 83-06-01 to determine whether competition should be allowed in the provision of telecommunication transmission service within the state. Many applications to provide competitive service were consolidated with OII 83-06-01.

6. By interim decision D.84-01-037, and later decisions, we granted those applications, authorizing interLATA entry generally. However, we limited the authority conferred to interLATA service; and we subjected the applicants to the condition that they not hold themselves out to the public to provide intraLATA service, pending our final decision in OII 83-06-01.

7. By D.84-06-113, we denied the applications to the extent that they sought authority to provide competitive intraLATA telecommunications service. We also directed those persons or corporations not authorized to provide intraLATA telecommunication service to refrain from holding out the availability of such service; and we required them to advise their subscribers that intraLATA calls should be placed over the facilities of the local exchange company.

8. In past decisions, for good cause, this Commission has authorized waiver of the provisions of Rule 18(b) regulating service of the application on cities and counties in the service territory.

9. There is no basis for treating this applicant differently than those that filed earlier.

10. Applicant has a minimum of \$78,750 in uncommitted cash or equivalent financial resources, as required by D.90-08-032, as modified by D.91-10-041.

11. Applicant has made a reasonable showing of technical expertise in telecommunications (or in a related business), as required by D.90-08-032 (37 CPUC 2d 130 at 147 - 148, 156, 158). This showing includes a complete draft of applicant's initial tariff. (Id., p. 34.)

12. Applicant is technically and financially able to provide the proposed services.

13. Since no facilities are to be constructed, it can be seen with certainty that the proposed operation will not have a significant effect upon the environment.

14. Exemption from the provisions of PU Code §§ 816-830 has been granted to other resellers. (See, e.g. D.86-10-007 and D.88-12-076.)

15. Public convenience and necessity require the service to be offered by applicant.

Conclusions of Law

1. Applicant is a telephone corporation operating as a telecommunication service supplier.

2. Applicant is subject to:

- a. The current 4.0% surcharge applicable to service rates of intraLATA toll and intrastate interLATA toll to Fund Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (PU Code § 879; Resolution T-14960);
- b. The current 0.3% surcharge on gross intrastate interLATA revenues to fund Telecommunications Devices for the Deaf (PU Code § 2881; Resolution T-14400); and;
- c. The user fee provided in PU Code §§ 431-435, which is 0.1% of gross intrastate revenue for the 1991-92 fiscal year (Resolution M-4760).

3. The application should be granted to the extent set forth below.

4. Because of the public interest in competitive interLATA service, the following order should be effective immediately.

The State may grant any number of operative rights and may cancel or modify the monopoly feature of those rights at any time.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. A certificate of public convenience and necessity is granted to Trans Pacific Telecommunications Management, Inc.

(applicant) to operate as a reseller of the interLATA telecommunication service offered by communication common carriers in California, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Applicant shall offer its services only on an interLATA basis;
- b. Applicant shall not offer intraLATA services;
- c. Applicant shall not hold out to the public that it has authority to provide, or that it does provide, intraLATA services; and
- d. Applicant shall advise its subscribers that they should place their intraLATA calls over the facilities of the local exchange company.

2. Applicant is exempted from the provisions of Rule 18(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure which require service of the application on the cities and counties under which applicant proposes to render service.

3. To the extent that applicant requests authority to provide intraLATA telecommunication service, it is denied.

4. Within 30 days after this order is effective, applicant shall file a written acceptance of the certificate granted in this proceeding.

5. a. Applicant is authorized to file with this Commission, 5 days after the effective date of this order, tariff schedules for the provision of interLATA service. Applicant may not offer service until tariffs are on file. Applicant's initial filing shall be made in accordance with General Order (GO) 96-A, excluding Sections IV, V, and VI, and shall be effective not less than 1 day after filing.

b. Applicant is a nondominant interexchange carrier (NDIEC). The effectiveness of its future tariffs is subject to the schedules set forth in Ordering Paragraph 5 of Decision (D.) 90-08-032, as modified by D.91-12-013:

- "5. All NDIECs are hereby placed on notice that their California tariff filings will be processed in accordance with the following effectiveness schedule:
- "a. Inclusion of [Federal Communications Commission] FCC-approved rates for interstate services in California public utilities tariff schedules shall become effective on one (1) day's notice.
  - "b. Uniform rate reductions for existing services shall become effective on five (5) days' notice.
  - "c. Uniform rate increases, except for minor rate increases, for existing services shall become effective on thirty (30) days' notice, and shall require bill inserts, a message on the bill itself, or first class mail notice to customers of the pending increased rates.
  - "d. Uniform minor rate increases, as defined in D.90-11-029 for existing services shall become effective on not less than 5 working days' notice, and shall require bill inserts or a notice on the bill itself to inform customers of the increased rates.
  - "e. Advice letter filings for new services and for all other types of tariff revisions, except changes in text not affecting rates or relocations of text in the tariff schedules, shall become effective on forty (40) days' notice.
  - "f. Advice letter filings merely revising the text or location of text material which do not cause an increase in any rate or charge shall become effective on not less than five (5) days' notice."

6. Applicant may deviate from the following provisions of GO 96-A: (a) paragraph II.C.(1)(b), which requires consecutive sheet numbering and prohibits the reuse of sheet numbers, and (b) paragraph II.C.(4), which requires that "a separate sheet or series of sheets should be used for each rule." Tariff filings incorporating these deviations shall be subject to the approval of the Commission Advisory and Compliance Division's (CACD) Telecommunications Branch. Tariff filings shall reflect all fees and surcharges to which applicant is subject, as reflected in Conclusion of Law 2.

7. Applicant shall file as part of its individual tariff, after the effective date of this order and consistent with Ordering Paragraph 4, a service area map.

8. Applicant shall notify this Commission in writing of the date service is first rendered to the public within 5 days after service begins.

9. Applicant shall keep its books and records in accordance with the Uniform System of Accounts specified in Part 32 of the FCC rules.

10. Applicant shall file an annual report, in compliance with GO 104-A, on a calendar-year basis using the information request form developed by the CACD Auditing and Compliance Branch and contained in Attachment A.

11. The certificate granted and the authority to render service under the rates, charges, and rules authorized will expire if not exercised within 12 months after the effective date of this order.

12. Applicant shall send a copy of this decision to concerned local permitting agencies not later than 30 days from today.

13. The corporate identification number assigned to applicant is U-5286-C which shall be included in the caption of all original filings with this Commission, and in the titles of other pleadings filed in existing cases.

14. Within 60 days of the effective date of this order, applicant shall comply with Public Utilities Commission (PU) Code § 708, Employee Identification Cards, and notify the Chief of CACD's Telecommunications Branch in writing of its compliance.

15. Applicant is exempted from the provisions of PU Code §§ 816-830.


16. The application is granted, as set forth above.  
This order is effective today.

Dated September 2, 1992, at San Francisco, California.

DANIEL Wm. FESSLER  
President  
JOHN B. OHANIAN  
NORMAN D. SHUMWAY  
Commissioners

Commissioner Patricia M. Eckert,  
being necessarily absent, did  
not participate.

I CERTIFY THAT THIS DECISION  
WAS APPROVED BY THE ABOVE  
COMMISSIONERS TODAY

  
NEAL J. STULMAN, Executive Director