## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

## BEFORE THE UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

\* \* \* \* \*

In the Matter of

THE COMPLAINT OF THE WEST KENTUCKY ) LAND & CATTLE COMPANY, INC. AGAINST ) CASE NO. 7846 SOUTH CENTRAL BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY )

## ORDER

On February 14, 1980, the Commission received a letter from Dr. W. B. Shouse, D.V.M., Manager, West Kentucky Land & Cattle Company (Complainant), concerning problems with telephone service provided by South Central Bell Telephone Company (Bell). On March 18, 1980, the Commission received a letter from Bell discussing the difficulties and corrective measures taken, and on April 23, 1980, a letter was received from Complainant stating that the service problems persisted, and requesting a hearing before the Commission.

After consideration of the correspondence and being advised, the Commission on its own motion set the matter for hearing on May 15, 1980, at 1:30 p.m., Eastern Daylight Time, in the Commission's offices at Frankfort, Kentucky. The hearing was held as scheduled and all parties of interest were given the opportunity to be heard.

At the hearing, it was established that Complainant had experienced problems with phone service, and Bell acknowledged these problems. Bell further discussed the maintenance and corrective actions which have been taken to alleviate these problems, all as more specifically outlined in the correspondence and record.

The Commission is of the opinion that there are two (2) important issues in this matter. The first is whether Bell has taken reasonable actions in correcting problems which have occurred. The record indicates that the facilities required to serve Complainant have been subject to considerable problems, many of them outside the direct control of Bell. The record further indicates that as service problems were reported by Complainant, Bell responded promptly and diligently to correct those problems. Complainant stated in his testimony that it was his opinion that Bell had "---done whatever



they can do. They have worked with us.---" (T.R.8)

The second issue is whether Bell has taken, and intends to take, corrective actions to assure minimal service disruption to Complainant in the future. Complainant stated that he desired only to have the problem resolved and to obtain high-quality, continuous phone service in the future. The record indicates that actions have been and are being taken to help alleviate future potential problems.

The Commission, after considering this matter, including the hearing and all correspondence of record, and being advised, is of the opinion and finds that:

1) Complainant has experienced problems with telephone service, and is entitled to expect, and receive, high-quality, continuous phone service;

2) Bell has acted in a reasonable manner to correct problems which have occurred in the past, and has undertaken improvements to insure, to the best extent possible, that such problems are minimal in the future;

3) Bell should be required to provide a summary of trouble reports from Complainant, and actions taken to correct those problems, for the ninety (90) day period following the date of this Order, to insure that the on-going corrective actions taken will provide the best quality of service which can reasonably be provided to Complainant.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that South Central Bell shall provide to the Commission, within (105) days of the date of this Order, a summary of trouble reports received from West Kentucky Land and Cattle Company, and actions taken to correct those problems, for the ninety (90) day period following the date of this Order.

The Commission further requests that West Kentucky Land and Cattle Company, Inc., inform the Commission of unusual telephone service problems which may occur during the ninety (90) day period mentioned above, and the Commission retains the prerogative to reopen this matter for further consideration should it be shown that the facilities' improvements undertaken by South Central Bell have not provided adequate telephone service to West Kentucky Land and Cattle



n an the second

ATTEST:

Secretary



Company, Inc.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 2nd day of July, 1980.

UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION in an Chairman

Vice Chairman

Mary Rey Osken Commissioner



;

. .



John S. Hoffman did not participate in the Opinion and Order in this case.