

HB1868 HD1

Measure Title: RELATING TO TELECOMMUNICATIONS.
 Report Title: Telecommunications; Rates; Basic Exchange Service
 Description: Limits to retail basic exchange services the services for which a telecommunications carrier must obtain approval from the Public Utilities Commission to charge a rate higher than the filed tariff rate. (HB1868 HD1)
 Companion: SB2108
 Package: None
 Current Referral: EDT, CPN
 Introducer(s): HERKES

<u>Sort by Date</u>		Status Text
1/17/2012	H	Prefiled
1/18/2012	H	Introduced and Pass First Reading.
1/19/2012	H	Referred to CPC, FIN, referral sheet 2
1/20/2012	H	Re-referred to CPC, referral sheet 5
1/20/2012	H	Bill scheduled to be heard by CPC on Wednesday, 01-25-12 2:00PM in House conference room 325.
1/25/2012	H	The committees on CPC recommend that the measure be PASSED, WITH AMENDMENTS. The votes were as follows: 12 Ayes: Representative(s) Herkes, Yamane, Carroll, Coffman, Ito, Keith-Agaran, McKelvey, Souki, Tsuji, Ching, Marumoto, Thielen; Ayes with reservations: none; Noes: none; and 3 Excused: Representative(s) Brower, Cabanilla, Luke.
2/2/2012	H	Reported from CPC (Stand. Com. Rep. No. 59-12) as amended in HD 1, recommending passage on Second Reading and placement on the calendar for Third Reading.
2/2/2012	H	Passed Second Reading as amended in HD 1; placed on the calendar for Third Reading with none voting aye with reservations; none voting no (0) and Representative(s) Okamura excused (1).

2/6/2012	H	Passed Third Reading with none voting aye with reservations; none voting no (0) and Representative(s) McKelvey, Takai excused (2). Transmitted to Senate.
2/7/2012	S	Received from House (Hse. Com. No. 10).
2/7/2012	S	Passed First Reading.
2/15/2012	S	Referred to CPN.
2/16/2012	S	Re-Referred to EDT, CPN.
3/13/2012	S	The committee(s) on EDT added the measure to the public hearing scheduled on 03-16-12 1:30PM in conference room 016.
3/16/2012	S	The committee(s) on EDT deferred the measure until 03-19-12 1:15PM in conference room 016.
3/19/2012	S	The committee(s) on EDT recommend(s) that the measure be PASSED, UNAMENDED. The votes in EDT were as follows: 4 Aye(s): Senator(s) Fukunaga, Wakai, Baker, Solomon; Aye(s) with reservations: none ; 0 No(es): none; and 1 Excused: Senator(s) Slom.
3/22/2012	S	Reported from EDT (Stand. Com. Rep. No. 2923) with recommendation of passage on Second Reading and referral to CPN.
3/22/2012	S	Report adopted; Passed Second Reading and referred to CPN.
3/27/2012	S	The committee(s) on CPN will hold a public decision making on 03-30-12 9:30AM in conference room 229.



NEIL ABERCROMBIE
GOVERNOR

BRIAN SCHATZ
LT. GOVERNOR

STATE OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

KEALI'I S. LOPEZ
DIRECTOR

335 MERCHANT STREET, ROOM 310

P.O. Box 541

HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

Phone Number: 586-2850

Fax Number: 586-2856

www.hawaii.gov/dcca

TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

THE TWENTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE
REGULAR SESSION OF 2012

FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 2012
9:30 A.M.

TESTIMONY OF JEFFREY T. ONO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF
CONSUMER ADVOCACY, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND CONSUMER
AFFAIRS, TO THE HONORABLE ROSALYN H. BAKER, CHAIR,
AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

HOUSE BILL NO. 1868, H. D. 1 - RELATING TO TELECOMMUNICATIONS

DESCRIPTION:

This measure proposes to exclude all services except for basic exchange services from the requirement to obtain Public Utility Commission ("PUC" or "Commission") approval prior to charging a rate higher than the filed tariff rate.

POSITION:

The Division of Consumer Advocacy ("Consumer Advocate") opposes this proposed measure.

House Bill No. 1868, H. D. 1
Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection
Friday, March 30, 2012, 9:30 a.m.
Page 2

COMMENTS:

This measure proposes to amend Section 269-16.85, Hawaii Revised Statutes, by removing the requirement to obtain Commission approval prior to charging a higher than the filed tariff rate for any retail telecommunications service except for the basic exchange service.

The Consumer Advocate acknowledges that the intent of the measure may have been to seek consistency with the treatment of intrastate telecommunications services, relating to costs, rates and pricing, as fully competitive. The Consumer Advocate notes, however, that allowing a telecommunications carrier the opportunity to charge higher rates than what is provided for in the carrier's filed tariff goes against public and regulatory policy for transparency and notice. In addition, there would be no opportunity for the Consumer Advocate to review whether the carriers' intent to raise rates for ancillary services may be for the sole purpose of subsidizing lower rates for basic exchange services, basically a potential end run around the Commission's review process. Thus, the requisite review and Commission approval necessary for raising rates for basic exchange services could be rendered moot.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

HB 1868 HD1

RELATING TO TELECOMMUNICATIONS

**JOHN KOMEIJI
SR. VICE PRESIDENT & GENERAL COUNSEL**

HAWAIIAN TELCOM

March 16, 2012

Chair Fukunaga and members of the Committee:

I am John Komeiji, testifying on behalf of Hawaiian Telcom on HB 1868 HD1, Relating to Telecommunications. Hawaiian Telcom strongly supports this measure.

The purpose of this bill is to continue the State's effort to level the regulatory playing field in retail telecommunications services and ensure that Hawaii's telecommunications marketplace remains vibrant and strong. This bill recognizes the competitive telecommunications marketplace in Hawaii and makes clear that as part of engaging in the marketplace every telecommunications carrier needs the flexibility to revise its rates as the marketplace demands.

Specifically, under the bill any telecommunications carrier may adjust a rate for any retail telecommunications service, other than basic exchange service, that is higher than the current filed tariff rate for that service without needing approval from the Public Utilities Commission (PUC); conversely, the bill retains the current requirement for PUC approval for any increase in rates to basic exchange service (e.g. single line residence and business service, which consists of plain old telephone service, and access to such services as 911 and operator services).

Passage of this measure will help to create a marketplace in which all carriers can compete equally. It allows Hawaiian Telcom a similar degree of pricing flexibility for non-basic exchange services (e.g. three-way calling, answering service, speed dialing, vacation service, and business services such as Centrex, private line and data services) afforded other telecommunication services including wireless, cable and Voice over Internet Protocol ("VoIP"), which are either unregulated or are not subject to the same degree of regulations as landlines.

Dramatic technological changes within the telecommunications industry have resulted in significant competition for Hawaiian Telcom. Today, local consumers can choose telecommunication services from wireless, cable and VoIP alternatives to the traditional landline. As a result of this intense competition, the number of our landline customers has declined dramatically. The reality is that this trend is certain to continue.

Hawaiian Telcom is currently subject to many antiquated state laws and requirements. Some of our laws date back to the early 1900s to an era when the incumbent local exchange carrier was a monopoly and the landline was the only means for a consumer to communicate. Until recently, existing state laws and requirements have not changed to reflect the fact that Hawaiian Telcom is no longer a monopoly and is now subject to significant competition. This competitive reality necessitates the need to continually assess the regulatory requirements that have historically attached solely to Hawaiian Telcom to allow Hawaiian Telcom the opportunity to compete on an equal footing with our competitors.

Promoting fair competition with consistent regulatory treatment of all competitors is the best way to ensure consumers receive quality service at fair prices. Hawaii's outdated rate-of-return regulations are no longer relevant in today's competitive landscape and should be changed. Telecommunication rates are extremely price sensitive and we understand this fact. As an example, Hawaiian Telcom's last rate case was filed with the PUC over fourteen years ago and our rates have not increased since that time. Present circumstances, however, dictate that some non-basic services may need to be better aligned to reflect fixed costs being spread over a shrinking customer base.

In summary, the regulatory requirements that are the subject of this bill unjustly apply to Hawaiian Telcom and do not apply to our wireless, cable, or VoIP competitors and out of fairness must be changed. Our company supports this effort to provide the incumbent local exchange carrier with a more level regulatory playing field which will in turn help our company to provide consumers with what they demand: more innovation, quality service, and greater selection of new products and offerings.

Based on the aforementioned, Hawaiian Telcom supports this measure and respectfully requests your favorable consideration. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Lyndall W. Nipps
Vice President, Regulatory -Western Region



tw telecom inc.
9665 Granite Ridge Drive
Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92123
858-805-6050

Honorable Rosalyn H. Baker, Chair
Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection

RE: HB 1868 HD1 - **Relating to Telecommunications**
March 30, 2012; Hawaii State Capitol Room 229 – 9:30 AM

Aloha Chair Baker, Vice Chair Taniguchi and Members of the Committee:

I am Lyndall Nipps, Vice President of Regulatory Affairs for **tw telecom of hawaii lp** ("TWTC"), which has operated in Hawaii since 1994, providing voice, Internet and data networking, and managing nearly 25,000 access lines to state and local governments, military, and businesses in the State. Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony on HB 1868 HD1.

Our concerns are the following:

1. Hawaii's enterprise business market differs greatly the residential market. While many providers exist on equal footing in delivering residential retail communications services, that same fair competition does not yet exist in the business market. Today, competition in the enterprise business market is insufficient and regulation is still required to assure that businesses can acquire alternative telecommunications services from smaller, innovative telecommunications carriers. Regardless of the underlying technology at use, the Public Utilities Commission ("PUC") should retain the ability to address anticompetitive behaviors, including predatory or discriminatory pricing, and to resolve disputes between carriers, e.g. interconnection arrangements and dispute resolution.
2. As was raised by the Consumer Advocate "allowing a telecommunications carrier the opportunity to charge higher rates than what is provided for in the carrier's filed tariff goes against public and regulatory policy for transparency and notice. In addition, there would be no opportunity for the Consumer Advocate to review whether the carriers' intent to raise rates for ancillary services may be for the sole purpose of subsidizing lower rates for basic exchange services, basically a potential end run around the Commission's review process. Thus, the requisite review and PUC approval necessary for raising rates for basic exchange services could be rendered moot."

TWTC shares the Consumer Advocate's concerns that the amendments proposed in HB 1868 HD1 are much more significant than they appear at first glance. As a starting point, Section 269-16.85 requires the PUC to treat retail telecommunications services, under the PUC's telecommunications rules, as fully competitive, and apply all its rules in accordance with that designation. Those rules require that all fully competitive services be "offered on prices, terms and conditions reflected in a tariff filed with the PUC." For fully competitive services, prior PUC approval is not required to change rates, but rates must be as stated in the tariff.

TWTC believes the requirement that pricing be in accordance with a tariff is very important. It allows the PUC, Consumer Advocate and interested parties to know what a carrier is charging for its services. This is important in order to prevent discriminatory pricing and cross-subsidization.

The requirement that a carrier file and tariff and comply with the tariff is separate from the issue of whether or not a carrier is required to obtain PUC approval to change its tariff (and therefore its rates). The existing language at the end of Section 269-16.85 is somewhat confusing, since it refers to obtaining PUC approval to charge "a higher rate than the rate in the tariff." Generally, a carrier should never charge a higher rate than what is in its tariff. TWTC understood that the original intent of this language was to require PUC approval to increase rates for retail services.

To allow a carrier to charge a rate higher than what is in its tariff is inconsistent with the first sentence of Section 269-16.85, which requires the PUC to apply its rules in accordance with the "fully competitive" designation. It is also poor policy.

For these reasons we respectfully request the following amendment:

"(a) Notwithstanding section 269-16.9 or any other law to the contrary, the public utilities commission shall treat residential retail intrastate telecommunications services, under the commission's classification of services relating to costs, rates, and pricing, as fully competitive and apply all commission rules in accordance with that designation. In addition, a telecommunications carrier shall not be required to obtain approval or provide any cost support or other information to establish or otherwise modify in any manner its rates, fares, and charges for residential retail services, or to bundle any such service offerings into a single or combined price package; provided that a telecommunications carrier, except upon receiving the approval of the commission, shall not ~~charge a higher~~ increase a rate for any residential retail telecommunications basic service [than the rate for the same service included in the telecommunications carrier's filed tariff]. All residential retail rates, fares, charges, and bundled service offerings shall be filed with the public utilities commission for information purposes only."

Thank you for the opportunity to offer our comments and proposed amendments to this legislation.

Sincerely,

/s/

Lyndall Nipps

Vice President, Regulatory Affairs-Western Region

tw telecom of hawaii lp

Email: Lyndall.Nipps@twtelecom.com