

Via Electronic Filing (ECFS)

June 18, 2018

Marlene H. Dortch
Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW, Room TW-A325
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: The State of Minnesota's Telecommunications Relay Services
Annual Consumer Complaint Log Summary (CG Docket No. 03-123)

Dear Ms. Dortch,

Pursuant to Code of Federal Regulations, title 47, section 64.604, paragraph (c)(1), the Minnesota Department of Commerce – Telecommunications Access Minnesota respectfully submits Minnesota's Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS) Annual Consumer Complaint Log Summary for the twelve month period commencing on June 1, 2017, and ending on May 31, 2018.

Minnesota Relay received seventeen (17) complaints during this reporting period. All complaints were timely resolved.

Attached please find the following report documents:

1. Complaint tally sheet categorizing complaints by type (Attachment A).
2. Complaint log summaries for complaints received June 1, 2017, through May 31, 2018, including the date of complaint, type of relay call, category number of complaint, nature of the complaint, date of resolution, and explanation of the resolution (Attachment B).

The report includes complaints received by the TRS state administrator, Minnesota Relay center supervisors, Minnesota Relay Outreach Office, Sprint Customer Service, CapTel Customer Service, and Sprint account manager that allege a violation of the federal TRS mandatory minimum standards.

Marlene H. Dortch

June 18, 2018

Page 2

Minnesota Relay's call volume (interstate and intrastate) by type of TRS call during the period of June 1, 2017, through May 31, 2018, was as follows:

- Traditional TRS *Total Calls*: 93,230
- Speech-to-Speech *Total Calls*: 11,663
- Captioned Telephone Service *Answered Calls*: 224,576
- Internet Protocol Captioned Telephone Service: Not applicable; Minnesota does not contract for this service.
- Internet Protocol Relay: Not applicable; Minnesota does not contract for this service.
- Video Relay Service: Not applicable; Minnesota does not contract for this service.

If I can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Rochelle Garrow, TAM Administrator

Phone: 651-539-1878

E-mail: rochelle.garrow@state.mn.us

cc: Daniel P. Wolf, MN Public Utilities Commission Executive Secretary
Michael McCarthy, MN Public Utilities Commission
Greg Doyle, MN Department of Commerce
Liz D'Anna, Sprint Relay

Minnesota Relay Complaints By Category

June 1, 2017 - May 31, 2018

SERVICE COMPLAINTS		Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	TOTAL	Percent
#00	Answer Wait Time													0	0%
#01	Dial Out Time													0	0%
#02	Didn't Follow Database Instructions													0	0%
#03	Didn't Follow Customer Instructions					1								1	6%
#04	Didn't Keep Customer Informed						1							1	6%
#05	Agent Disconnected Caller								1			1		2	12%
#06	Poor Spelling													0	0%
#07	Typing Speed/Accuracy										1			1	6%
#08	Poor Voice Tone													0	0%
#09	Everything Relayed													0	0%
#10	HCO Procedures Not Followed													0	0%
#11	VCO Procedures Not Followed													0	0%
#12	Two-Line VCO Procedure Not Followed													0	0%
#13	Background Noise Not Typed													0	0%
#14	Feelings Not Described													0	0%
#15	Recording Feature Not Used													0	0%
#16	Noise in Center													0	0%
#17	Agent Was Rude						1							1	6%
#18	Answering Machine Retrieval Problems													0	0%
#19	Spanish Service													0	0%
#20	Speech to Speech						2	2		1				5	29%
#21	Other Problem Type Complaint													0	0%
Sub-Total		0	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	1	1	1	0	11	

TECHNICAL COMPLAINTS		Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	TOTAL	Percent
#22	Lost Branding													0	0%
#24	Trouble Linking Up	1												1	6%
#25	Line Disconnected													0	0%
#26	Garbled Message													0	0%
#27	Database Not Available													0	0%
#28	Split Screen													0	0%
#29	Other Technical Type Complaint		2			1				1				4	24%
#57	Caller ID													0	0%
#58	Regional 800 Calls													0	0%
#59	Transmission (Can't hear or be heard)													0	0%
Sub-Total		1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	

MISC COMPLAINTS		Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	TOTAL	Percent
#31	On Screen Display													0	0%
#32	No 900 Number													0	0%
#34	Network Recording													0	0%
#35	Other									1				1	6%
Sub-Total		0	1	0	0	0	1								

TOTAL COMPLAINTS	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Report Year
	1	2	0	0	2	4	2	1	3	1	1	0	17

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
06/29/17	Voice	#24	<p>Customer stated that she tried to call both 711 and 1-800-627-3529 to place a relay call to a TTY user and that she was not able to reach a CA (she only heard TTY tones even though she waited for one minute). Customer tried calling on her business line and on her cell phone.</p>	8/1/2017	<p>Minnesota Relay outreach office explained that for the business line, it may be that the PBX is not configured correctly. They also explained that customer should wait for up to two minutes for the answering sequence to answers in voice. Customer's cellular service is through Verizon, so test calls were made on a Verizon cell phone and the call was sent to a Verizon customer service line. Contacted Verizon to notify them of the issue. On subsequent test calls on cell phone, calls to relay using 711 and the toll-free number were properly connected to Minnesota Relay. The business will address the PBX configuration issue.</p>
07/05/17	STS	#29	<p>When calling through STS the line kept cutting in and out and there seemed to be static on the line. The CA and the customer service rep were both having a hard time conversing. The customer said that the issue started happening last night.</p>	07/06/17	<p>Apologized for the problem and opened a trouble ticket. Also suggested that the customer call Century Link to check his line as there was static on the line when calling him back direct from the office phone. The quality supervisor spoke with the customer and did not experience static. The supervisor believes that what may have been perceived as "static" is feedback due to the devices being used by the STS user. The STS user's voice fades in and out. A customer service agent that was fielding the STS user's call said that she did not have too much trouble understanding the STS user. The quality supervisor spoke to the CA who used the term "static", and explained the difference between static and feedback, and had her listen with his headset to ensure the CA understood the difference. Contacted the STS user with an update.</p>

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
07/14/17	STS	#29	STS user shared that STS CAs are reporting static on his line. He requested that testing be completed on Minnesota Relay's dedicated STS toll-free number.	8/14/2017	A trouble ticket was opened. Spoke to the customer and he is seeing improvement. We continue to troubleshoot the static issue reported. We have learned that the issue is intermittent. IT tech found slips on some circuits and has changed the timing source to clear the slips.
10/17/17	STS	#03	STS user stated that the CA did not follow the customer's instructions. Customer wants follow-up.	10/17/17	Customer service apologized for any inconvenience this may have caused him. The supervisor met with the CA. The supervisor coached the CA to follow all customer instructions (even though the complaint didn't give the specific instructions that were not followed). The supervisor followed up with the customer, but the customer was unable to talk and asked the supervisor to call again later.
10/30/17	STS	#29	The customer reported that he is experiencing an ongoing issue regarding static. the customer stated that he had his phone line rewired by his local phone company and it was tested three times. The phone company determined that the static came from relay. He would like to have this resolved and would like follow up on this matter.	11/10/17	A Sprint technician made several test calls to Minnesota Relay's STS toll-free number and the calls were static free. The technician verified that the equipment that supports STS in MN was error free. At the same time, the customer opened a ticket with their LEC to trouble shoot further. The program manager followed up with the customer and explained the trouble shooting performed and asked if the customer's LEC completed their trouble shooting and the customer said yes. The program manager did not experience any static on the line when speaking to the customer. The program manager asked if it was okay to close the ticket and the customer agreed that the ticket could be closed.
11/3/2017	STS	#04	The customer stated that he called into Minnesota Relay and the CA couldn't understand him. He hung up and called back but he got the same CA. He asked for a supervisor, and the supervisor informed him that they were having equipment problems. Customer asked the supervisor to monitor a few of the calls, but supervisor replied that she did not have time to do so. Customer requested follow up via phone.	11/06/17	Supervisor conducted a follow up discussion with the on-duty supervisor. CAs were coached on asking for assistance. Supervisor followed up with the customer via phone.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
11/06/17	STS	#17	The customer stated that on a first call the CA couldn't understand him so the call was disconnected. When the customer called back, he got the same CA and asked for a supervisor. The customer stated that the assistant supervisor told him that there was a technical issue. The customer also stated that the assistant supervisor didn't have time to monitor a few calls. Customer wishes a follow up via phone.	11/06/17	Supervisor conducted a follow up discussion with the assistant supervisor. There was a technical issue reported. The supervisor followed up with the customer via phone. The customer understood the situation and was very receptive to the feedback provided.
11/15/17	STS	#20	The customer stated that he had to repeat himself three times with every transaction and that the CA still did not understand him. The customer requested follow up.	11/15/17	Customer service apologized and advised that the supervisor would be notified. The CA was met with and coached on different techniques when not able to understand a customer. A follow up call was made to the customer by the quality supervisor.
11/17/17	STS	#20	The customer reported that the CAs can't understand him or he is too quiet and the CAs can't hear him; it is a constant battle with them. The customer is willing to help but the CAs need to help with what the trouble is. The customer request follow up via phone.	11/17/17	Assistant supervisor apologized for the inconvenience. The CA was met with and coached on different solutions when having trouble understanding customers. A follow up call was made to the customer by the quality supervisor.
12/04/17	STS	#20	The customer stated that the supervisor couldn't understand him and that the supervisors need more training. The customer requested follow up via phone.	12/04/17	Assistant supervisor apologized for the inconvenience and assured the customer that everything was documented and would be given to the appropriate supervisor. The supervisor the customer issued the complaint about was not scheduled to work at the time of the incident. A follow up message was left on the customer's answering machine.
12/04/17	STS	#20	Customer stated that the CA could not understand him. Customer asked to be transferred to the Ohio center, but the CA would not do so. Customer stated that Minnesota center CAs need more training, and he is tired of having to repeat over and over to the Minnesota CAs. The customer requested follow up via phone.	12/04/17	Supervisor spoke to the CA and reiterated different option to try when the CA does not understand a customer. Supervisor left a follow up message on customer's answering machine.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
01/16/18	STS	#05	The customer reported that this morning it took eight times dialing and trying to connect to a STS CA. Each time he heard half of a ring, and then he heard a dial tone with no CA coming on the line. There was no recording and no answer; the calls just disconnected. Follow up requested.	01/23/18	Customer service apologized for the inconvenience and told him that a trouble ticket would be entered to investigate the cause of the issue. After a call detail record was completed on the date and times of the calls, it was determined that the line was disconnected by the CA, and that this was not a technical issue. The information was sent to the call center supervisor. Proper action was discussed with the CA. The quality supervisor made a follow up call to the customer, reached an answering machine, and left a message.
02/02/18	STS	#20	The customer has a message for the manager, stating that they need to conduct training at the Moorhead center because the CAs and supervisors there are new and they make him spell out every word. The customer requested follow up via phone.	02/02/18	Assistant supervisor thanked the caller for the feedback and assured him that his message would be forwarded. STS CAs were coached. A follow up call was made by the quality supervisor.
02/22/18	STS	#29	The customer was not able to access all Frequently Dialed Numbers. No follow-up requested.	02/22/18	Apologized to customer, and opened a trouble ticket. Customer needs to log out after making changes and then log back in and it will work.
02/28/18	VCO	#35	The customer would like to file a complaint on a specific CA. The customer is angry because she kept getting this CA when she called Minnesota Relay. She would hang up and call right back in and would get the same CA. The customer stated that the outbound party would not take her calls because of this CA. The customer does not need a follow up call.	3/21/2018	The assistant supervisor told the customer that they would pass this information along to the CA's supervisor to follow up with the CA on this matter. The supervisor met with the CA and coached her on remaining patient and professional on all calls, even if the customers get frustrated.
3/13/2018	CapTel	#07	The customer reported that the captions on the CapTel 840 were inaccurate.	3/14/2018	Customer service apologized and thanked the customer for bringing her experience to our attention. Customer service gathered details about the call with caption inaccuracies, and explained how captions are produced. Call details were sent to the appropriate supervisory staff for further follow-up with the CA who assisted with the call. The CA's supervisor increased monitoring and coaching to optimize the CA's captioning performance.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
4/4/2018	TTY	#05	The customer stated that they gave the number to call, and the CA would repeatedly ask for the number over and over, and then would disconnected the customer.	04/04/18	The assistant supervisor thanked the customer for bringing it to our attention and let them know that we would look into it. The supervisor followed up with the CA, who stated she did not remember the call or having any difficulty recently in retrieving a calling to number. The CA also stated that she would not disconnect a caller without going through the proper protocol or calling for supervisor's assistance. The CA was coached on always being sure to call for assistance if she is having any difficulties, and was reminded of the repercussions for disconnecting calls.