

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT)	ORDER REQUIRING SERVICE
FILED BY LORETTA SPEAR, HILL CITY,)	UPGRADE AND FILING OF PLAN
SOUTH DAKOTA, AGAINST U S WEST)	
COMMUNICATIONS, INC. REGARDING)	TC98-155
TELEPHONE SERVICE OUTAGES AND)	
INADEQUATE SERVICE)	

On September 3, 1998, the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) received a complaint filed by Loretta Spear (Complainant), Hill City, South Dakota, against U S WEST Communications, Inc. (U S WEST). Complainant stated:

"In retrospect our telephone problems began in the spring of this year (1998). Starting with noisy lines (static) and later followed by temporary interruptions in service lasting anywhere from a few minutes to a couple of hours. These were not reported to repair service as the service would come back on. During this time the volume on the caller's voice would fluctuate. Several times the telephone would ring and when I answered, it would be a dead line. Approximately 4 weeks ago the line went dead for a day and I called repair service, By the time the repair man came the phone had started to work again. He did work on the service but stated the equipment is old. A week later the phone went dead again. (Friday, the day before the strike started) I called repair service again. This time supervisory personnel came out on a Sunday and worked on the line. I also advised him that our caller ID service which we had just purchased was not working. He stated we did not have that service as the equipment was old and not available to us. He also stated that the equipment upgrade was on the books but not enough money to do the work now. Perhaps next year. When calling to cancel Caller ID the customer service office said that we should have that service available to us, but would cancel our order and issue credit. I checked with repair service once again and was told by electronic voice that we might expect to have service by September 5. That will be 3 weeks without telephone service."

Complainant requested the following remedies: (1) That she receive a credit for all charges made by U S WEST for "Caller ID" services, and a credit for charges made by U S WEST for telephone services not received for a period of three weeks; and (2) That U S WEST be ordered by the Commission to upgrade her telephone services to a level comparable to other U S WEST subscribers residing in her residential area. U S WEST credited Complainant for the Caller ID billings, and has credited her account for the days she was without telephone service. The second remedy, an upgrade of service, is the subject of this Order.

The Commission reviewed the complaint during its duly noticed meeting on October 20, 1998, during which it voted unanimously to find probable cause and served the

Complaint on U S WEST. U S WEST filed its Answer to Complaint on November 16, 1998.

A hearing was held on December 15, 1998, beginning at 1:30 o'clock P.M., in Room 3rd Floor East, Rapid City Area School Administrative Offices, 300 6th Street, Rapid City, South Dakota. At the hearing, U S WEST stated it would test the facilities and take necessary steps to improve service to Complainant. On March 1, 1999, and April 2, 1999, U S WEST provided updates on the testing. In its April 2, 1999, letter, U S WEST stated it was proposing to replace the buried drop serving the Complainant and then test the service afterwards.

The Commission considered how to proceed on this matter at its May 12, 1999, meeting. After listening to comments from the parties, the Commission ordered U S WEST to replace the drop and test the system by June 8, 1999.

The matter again came before the Commission at its duly noticed June 8, 1999, meeting. U S WEST representative Edward Peters, who had been a witness at the December hearing, commented on work completed by U S WEST. Staff requested deferral of this matter to allow comment by a Staff witness who was not present at the June 8, 1999, meeting.

The deferred matter came before the Commission at its regularly scheduled July 29, 1999, meeting for decision, during which it was determined that:

1. The Commission has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to SDCL Chapters 1-26, 49-13, and SDCL Chapter 49-31, including 49-31-3, 49-31-7, 49-31-7.1, 49-31-7.2, 49-31-10, 49-31-11, 49-31-38, 49-31-38.1, 49-31-38.2, 49-31-38.3, 49-31-60, 49-31-85, and 49-31-98, and ARSD 20:10:01:07.01 through 20:10:01:15.01, inclusive, and 20:10:33:02, 20:10:33:03, 20:10:33:15, 20:10:33:16, and 20:10:33:25.

2. The telephone services provided by U S WEST to the Complainant, at all times relevant hereto, are not comparable to services being provided to certain other U S WEST subscribers residing in her immediate neighborhood.

3. The telephone services provided by U S WEST to the Complainant, at all times relevant hereto, were delivered through an analog carrier system, whereas certain other U S WEST subscribers in her neighborhood are served through a system capable of delivering digital services.

4. The analog system does not allow U S WEST to provide services to the Complainant at levels comparable to certain neighbors, and in the absence of an upgrade to digital delivery, the Complainant will continue to sustain service discrimination.

5. The manner, time, cost and resources required to provide digital delivery or to otherwise upgrade telecommunications services to the Complainant are unknown.

ACCORDINGLY, it is therefore

ORDERED, that U S WEST provide the Complainant a telecommunications plant capable of furnishing digital services at an acceptable internet speed; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that U S WEST develop a plan identifying the manner, time, cost, and resources required to provide digital telecommunications delivery to the Complainant. The plan shall specify an internet speed. The plan shall be submitted to the Commission within 90 days from receipt of this order and shall be subject to Commission approval. The plan shall include a cost-recovery schedule.

Dated at Pierre, South Dakota, this 17th day of August, 1999.

<p style="text-align: center;">CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</p> <p>The undersigned hereby certifies that this document has been served today upon all parties of record in this docket, as listed on the docket service list, by facsimile or by first class mail, in properly addressed envelopes, with charges prepaid thereon.</p> <p>By: _____</p> <p>Date: _____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(OFFICIAL SEAL)</p>

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

JAMES A. BURG, Chairman

PAM NELSON, Commissioner

LASKA SCHOENFELDER, Commissioner