

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY  
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

RICK WILSON	)	
	)	
COMPLAINANT	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	CASE NO. 2000-437
VERIZON SOUTH, INC. f/k/a GTE	)	
SOUTH INCORPORATED	)	
	)	
DEFENDANT	)	

O R D E R

BACKGROUND

On September 19, 2000, Rick Wilson filed a formal complaint against Verizon South, Inc. f/k/a/ GTE South Incorporated ("Verizon South"). In his complaint, Mr. Wilson alleged dissatisfaction with Verizon South's Automatic Call Return service, also known as \*69 service. On October 4, 2000, Verizon South was ordered to satisfy the complaint or to file an answer to the complaint. On October 25, 2000, Verizon South filed its answer. An informal conference was held on December 4, 2000. Mr. Wilson did not appear at the conference.

DISCUSSION

\*69 service allows a called party to automatically retrieve the last incoming call to his number. Mr. Wilson alleges that upon activating the service, the number of the last call to his telephone was not given to him, yet he was charged for activating the service.

Mr. Wilson's position is that if he cannot be given the number of the party that last called him, he should not be charged for the service.

According to Verizon South, upon activation of the service, the customer receives an automatic voice response stating the number of the original caller and the customer is given the option of returning the call. However, if the original caller has blocking, either completely or partially, on his line, the customer using \*69 is advised that the number is marked private and cannot be disclosed. In such cases it is still possible to return the call by pressing 1. Customers will not be charged for incoming calls from outside the called party's local calling area or calls that cannot be dialed automatically.

At the informal conference, Verizon South explained that changes to its billing system to delete charges for unavailable call returns would approximate \$700,000 and that if required to make billing changes, it would discontinue offering the service in Kentucky. Also discussed was expansion of the service's description in directories to explain all outcomes of using \*69. Commission Staff also requested that Verizon South file the following: (1) the user guide regarding Automatic Call Return service that it distributes to customers, (2) all scripts used by service representatives regarding this service, and (3) a narrative description of all possible outcomes for the \*69 service. Such outcomes include instances in which the call to be returned is local and involves a listed number; the call is local and involves a private number or a number that has been blocked; the call to be returned is local and is from a customer of a wireless provider; and the call to be returned is long distance.

On March 7, 2001, Verizon South filed additional information, explaining that recent business decisions implemented on a national basis have resulted in removal of

the information pages from its directories. Accordingly, the question of service description expansion is moot. Verizon South filed its tariff revisions on March 9, 2001. The user's guide will include a clearer description of \*69 service at its next printing.

There is no evidence in the record that the provisioning of \*69 service under existing arrangements is unreasonable. Therefore, the Commission will not require Verizon South to modify its service. Moreover, the other information provided by Verizon South fulfills the requirements outlined in the informal conference memorandum. However, Verizon South must revise the user's guide so that it includes the language regarding \*69 service that is reflected in the revised tariff. In addition, Verizon South should change its recording so that it clearly explains to the caller using the \*69 service that even if a number is identified as blocked or private, the caller can attempt to return the call by dialing 1. Finally, Verizon South should clarify the script used by its customer representatives when describing the \*69 service. Verizon South should provide the Commission with a copy of the revised user's guide, a copy of the revised customer representatives' script, and a tape reflecting the revised language used in its recording.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Verizon South's March 9, 2001 tariff revisions are approved.
2. Verizon South shall file a copy of its revised \*69 service user's guide when available.
3. Within 30 days of the date of this Order, Verizon South shall file a tape reflecting its revised automated announcement.

4. Within 30 days of the date of this Order, Verizon South shall file a copy of the revised customer representative script used to describe \*69 service.

5. This case is closed and is removed from the Commission's docket.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 10<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2001.

By the Commission

ATTEST:

  
Executive Director