

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON  
UM 1908, UM 2206**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
LUMEN TECHNOLOGIES, <sup>1</sup>	)	OREGON CITIZENS’ UTILITY
	)	BOARD’S REPLY TO LUMEN’S
Proposed Commission Action Pursuant to	)	BENCH REQUEST RESPONSES
ORS 756.515 to Suspend and Investigate	)	
Price Plan (UM 1908), and	)	
	)	
QWEST CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Investigation Regarding the Provision of	)	
Service in Jacksonville, Oregon and	)	
Surrounding Areas (UM 2206).	)	
	)	
Hearing Relating to Order Nos. 22-340 and	)	
<u>22- 422</u>	)	

Pursuant to Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) Moser’s December 14, 2022 Bench Request, the Oregon Citizens’ Utility Board (“CUB”) submits the following reply to the December 15 & 16, 2022 Bench Request responses submitted by Lumen Technologies (“Lumen” or “the Company”). CUB appreciates the opportunity to reply.

**I. BACKGROUND**

On September 23, 2022, the Oregon Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) issued Order No. 22-340 (“Order”), memorializing the Commission’s directive at the September 20, 2022 public meeting, directing Lumen to, among other things, “deploy a toll-free, 24/7 dedicated customer support line no later than Wednesday, September 28, 2022, to support customers in

---

<sup>1</sup> Formerly known as Qwest Corporation, United Telephone Company of the Northwest, CenturyTel of Oregon, and CenturyTel of Eastern Oregon.

Jacksonville, Applegate, and surrounding areas in southern Oregon,” and to “track and retain information on all tickets generated through this customer support line,” through the remainder of Staff’s investigation into whether Lumen’s Price Plan is in the public interest. Starting September 28, 2022, Lumen was directed to file reports every two weeks on customer service issue tickets containing information including but not limited to:

- the address, name, and contact information for the customer for whom the ticket has been generated;
- a description of the service issue;
- logs of customer contact regarding the service issue;
- actions taken to resolve the service issue; and
- information on the results.<sup>2</sup>

Lumen was to redact customer identifying information and file the reports in the docket, while unredacted versions were to be filed under a protective order.<sup>3</sup>

On December 14, 2022, ALJ Moser issued a Bench Request stating the reports had been developed but not filed in the docket and ordered Lumen to file redacted and confidential versions of the reports by 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, December 15, 2022, and providing that Parties may file replies no later than December 30, 2022.<sup>4</sup> At 4:57 p.m. on December 15, 2022, Lumen filed a response (“First Response”) stating it had “substantially complied” with the Commission’s orders, including the reporting requirements, because it had filed non-confidential reports in the Huddle platform in response to Staff’s Information Requests.<sup>5</sup> The Company indicated it would work with Staff to make sure future reports are “filed through the correct system” and that it would file confidential and nonconfidential versions of its next report on December 19, 2022.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> UM 1908 – Order No. 22-340 at 1 (Sept. 23, 2022).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> UM 1908 – Bench Request at 2 (Dec. 14, 2022).

<sup>5</sup> UM 1908 – Lumen’s Response to Bench Request (“First Response”) (Dec. 15, 2022).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 1-2.

On December 16, 2022, ALJ John Mellgren issued a Memorandum finding Lumen’s response to the Bench Request non-compliant and that it file a compliant response immediately.<sup>7</sup> Lumen responded to the Bench Request again (“Second Response”) by filing its Responses to Staff Information Requests 15-18 which included reports with customer confidential information redacted.<sup>8</sup> Confidential, unredacted versions of the reports have yet to be filed in the docket and the redacted versions that have been filed do not contain all the information required by the Order. CUB finds both of Lumen’s responses unsatisfactory and out of compliance with the Commission’s Order.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. Lumen is out of compliance with the Commission's directive to file confidential versions of customer service issue ticket reports.

The Order explicitly stated that Lumen was to file the reports in the docket.<sup>9</sup> Yet, Lumen believes uploading the customer service issue ticket reports in the Commission’s discovery platform, Huddle, puts it in compliance with the Order’s reporting requirement.<sup>10</sup> While CUB has access to Huddle, neither the Commissioners, the ALJs, nor the Commission decision-making staff have access to Huddle.<sup>11</sup> CUB agrees with ALJ Mellgren that Lumen has long participated in proceedings before the Commission and understands the difference between filing materials in the docket and conducting discovery through Huddle.<sup>12</sup> Notably, despite the Company’s assurances it would work with Staff to file its reports correctly, it has not filed either

---

<sup>7</sup> UM 1908 – ALJ Memorandum of Non-compliance at 1 (Dec. 16, 2022) (“Memorandum”).

<sup>8</sup> UM 1908 – Lumen’s Second Responses to Bench Request (Dec. 16, 2022) (“Second Response”).

<sup>9</sup> UM 1908 – Order No. 22-340 at 1.

<sup>10</sup> UM 1908 – Lumen’s First Response at 1.

<sup>11</sup> UM 1908 –Memorandum at 1.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

the confidential or redacted version of its December 19 report. Lumen has not complied with the Commission's requirements to file confidential, unredacted versions of the ticket reports.

**B. Lumen's redacted customer service issue ticket reports are inadequate.**

The information in the redacted reports is organized by columns with the following headings:

- impacted area;
- call timestamp;
- contact telephone number (redacted);
- customer name (redacted);
- caller name (redacted);
- address (redacted);
- account number (redacted);
- circuit telephone number (redacted);
- alternate contact telephone number (redacted);
- caller sms (redacted);
- caller email (redacted);
- ticket timestamp;
- sf case number;
- rx case number;
- cause;
- disposition.<sup>13</sup>

Lumen's reports appear to meet the requirement to include the redacted customer information (the address, name, and contact information). However, without the confidential unredacted versions to compare them to, the Commission cannot determine if Lumen is compliant with this requirement.

The Company has not provided descriptions of service issues. Assuming that the "cause" column is meant to meet the "description of the service issue" requirement, CUB finds Lumen's responses lacking. Lumen lists terms that appear to be company codes used internally: Repair flow- CSC; Subsequent.Status Only; and FASTFECTicketV1.FASTFECTicketV1.<sup>14</sup> However, one cannot understand the exact nature of the service issue based on these terms alone. A

---

<sup>13</sup> UM 1908 – Lumen's Second Response at 4-9.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

“description of the service issue” would clearly identify the customer problem. Words, phrases, or codes do not constitute a description if neither parties nor the Commission can reasonably understand the issue.

Likewise, assuming the “disposition” column contains information intended to meet the “actions taken to resolve the service issue” or “information on the results” reporting requirements, CUB finds these responses are unsatisfactory given they do not clearly provide this information if they do at all. The reader of the report may be able to surmise the status of the service issue of some tickets, terms like: Completed; Consumer Education.Issue Resolved; Dispatch.Customer; and Other. However, these terms do not identify what action was taken nor do they provide any information on the results. Rather, these also appear to be terms used internally for Lumen staff.<sup>15</sup>

On December 28, 2022, Lumen submitted a filing that explained some of the terms used for “cause” and “disposition”. While this document is helpful, it still fails to adequately explain the description of the service issue for each ticket. The ticket call timestamped as “10/5/22 16:17:06” identifies the cause of “Phone Line.No Dial Tone – All Phones” and explains that as “no dial tone is heard when lifting the handset on any and every telephone at that location.” This is a reasonably understood service issue. However, the disposition of that same ticket is “Other”, explained in the next column as “[o]ther indicates that the agent ticketing this interaction did not have any better option to pick from the set of menu of choices to add to this level of detail.” Neither this explanation nor anything else in the filing adequately addressed all “actions taken to resolve the service issue” or “information on the results”. Likewise, the call timestamped as “9/28/22 17:14:16” identifies the cause as “Repair Flow-CSC”. The explanation indicates the

---

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*

“Agent used Customer Service Console (CSC) tool” but provides no insight to the reason for the customer call. This ticket’s “disposition” is marked “Completed” which is explained as “CSC tool flows followed to completion”. Again, neither this explanation nor anything else in the filing shows the “actions taken to resolve the service issue” or “information on the results” for this ticket.<sup>16</sup>

Lumen has not provided logs of customer contact regarding the service issues. One can read the “call\_timestamp” as the time the customer reported the issue and the “ticket\_timestamp” as the time the service ticket was created (which are all shortly after the call was received).<sup>17</sup> However, there is no indication of when customers were contacted, the reason for contact, or any other information indicating the steps taken to address the customer service issue.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

It has been over three months since the Commission directed Lumen to file customer service issue ticket reports and over two weeks since the ALJ Bench Request directing the Company to come into compliance. The Company has had ample opportunity to comply with the Order. Even if Lumen were correct that it is “substantially compliant”, the Commission’s directives have not indicated any expectation other than full compliance. The Order stems from Lumen’s ongoing neglect of its obligation to provide its customers with safe and adequate service, despite its repeated promises to do so.

///

///

---

<sup>16</sup> UM 1908 – Lumen’s Response to ALJ Hearing Request at 1 (Dec. 28, 2022).

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*

///

Frankly, CUB is surprised at Lumen's boldness in treating the Commission with similar disregard. The record in this docket shows that Lumen has a history of failing to fully comply with Commission orders and CUB has seen no indication that Lumen will come into compliance with Order No. 22-340 on its own volition. CUB believes the Commission is well within its authority to penalize Lumen for its repeated noncompliance with the Order.

Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of December 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/Jennifer Hill-Hart*

Jennifer Hill-Hart, OSB #195484  
Policy Manager  
Oregon Citizens' Utility Board  
610 SW Broadway, Ste. 400  
Portland, OR 97205  
T. 503.227.1984  
E. [jennifer@oregoncub.org](mailto:jennifer@oregoncub.org)