

Via Electronic Filing (ECFS)

June 28, 2016

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 47 C.F.R. §64.604(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, 2015, and ending on May 31, 2016.

Minnesota Relay received seven (7) 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, 2015, through May 31, 2016, 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 28, 2016
Page 2

Minnesota Relay's call volume (interstate and intrastate) by type of TRS call during the period of June 1, 2015, through May 31, 2016, was as follows:

- *Traditional TRS Total Calls: 128,887*
- *Speech-to-Speech Total Calls: 10,959*
- *Captioned Telephone Service Answered Calls: 294,925*
- *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
Minnesota Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 600
Saint Paul, MN 55101-3165
Phone: 651-539-1878
Fax: 651-539-0109
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, 2015 - May 31, 2016

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	14%
#04	Didn't Keep Customer Informed													0	0%
#05	Agent Disconnected Caller								2					2	29%
#06	Poor Spelling													0	0%
#07	Typing Speed/Accuracy					1	1							2	29%
#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													0	0%
#18	Answering Machine Retrieval Problems													0	0%
#19	Spanish Service													0	0%
#20	Speech to Speech													0	0%
#21	Other Problem Type Complaint									1				1	14%
Sub-Total		0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	6	

TECHNICAL COMPLAINTS		Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	TOTAL	Percent
#22	Lost Branding													0	0%
#23	Charged for Local Call													0	0%
#24	Trouble Linking Up													0	0%
#25	Line Disconnected													0	0%
#26	Garbled Message	1												1	14%
#27	Database Not Available													0	0%
#28	Split Screen													0	0%
#29	Other Technical Type Complaint													0	0%
#57	Caller ID													0	0%
#58	Regional 800 Calls													0	0%
#59	Transmission (Can't hear or be heard)													0	0%
Sub-Total		1	0	1											

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

		Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Report Year Total
TOTAL COMPLAINTS		1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	7



Minnesota Relay Consumer Complaints for June 1, 2015 - May 31, 2016

Total Complaints: 7

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/24/2015	TTY	#26 (Garbled Message)	Customer is experiencing garbling on TTY relay calls. Customer requests follow-up.	7/7/2015	Customer service apologized for the issue and opened trouble ticket IM3070154. Tech Support contacted customer regarding issue and learned that Comcast was scheduled to come to the home. Comcast installed a new modem; issue appears to be resolved.
10/20/2015	CapTel	#07 (Typing Speed or Accuracy)	Customer's daughter reported that things she did not say appeared in the captions.	10/21/2015	Customer service apologized for the issue and thanked the customer for the feedback. The call detail was shared with call center management for follow-up with the CA by the CA's supervisor. The CA's supervisor met with the CA and discussed the customer's concern. The CA's supervisor discussed the policy of verbatim captioning, and increased the monitoring frequency for the CA to ensure consistent quality performance.
11/10/2015	TTY	#07 (Typing Speed or Accuracy)	The Customer stated that the CA was unable to do his calls. Also stated that the CA types slow. Customer requested a follow-up on this matter and stated that the print-out of the incident will be reported to the State Program Manager.	11/10/2015	Assistant Supervisor verified that the CA requested assistance on this call and that the call was not yet placed when the complaint was initiated. Assistant Supervisor requested a method of follow-up, but customer insisted that the call be processed and would not provide a follow-up direction.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
1/20/2016	TTY	#05 (Agent Disconnected Caller)	The customer reported that the CA stopped responding during the middle of a call. The customer told the CA that if she did not respond the customer would report her her to customer service. Follow-up requested.	2/3/2016	An apology was made to the customer about the experience and she was told that a report would be sent to the call center supervisor. The supervisor met with the CA. The CA stated that she was relaying the call and there was a breakdown in communication between the inbound and outbound parties, and the inbound blamed relay. The CA followed procedure and requested assistance from a supervisor. Attempts were made to follow-up with consumer, as per request; the line just rang and there was no answering machine.
1/20/2016	TTY	#05 (Agent Disconnected Caller)	The customer reported that the CA stopped responding during the middle of a call. The customer told the CA that if she did not respond the customer would report her her to customer service. Follow-up requested.	2/3/2016	The quality supervisor met with the CA and coached the CA on the importance of responding in a timely manner. The CA was advised of the consequences of disconnecting calls and was reminded to call for assistance on difficult calls. Three follow-up phone calls to the consumer were attempted but there was no answer or TTY answering machine.

Date Received	Type of Relay Call	Category Number of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
2/24/2016	STS	#21 (Other Problem Type Complaint)	Speech to Speech customer reported that it is frustrating at times that some CAs ask to repeat over and over and some CAs do not ask to repeat at all. In addition, the customer feels that some CAs are friendlier than others. The customer does not want a follow up.	2/29/2016	Assistant Supervisor apologized for the inconvenience and documented the concern.
3/29/2016	STS	#03 (Didn't Follow Customer Instructions)	Customer reported that the CA did not follow customers instructions, did not pay attention, and ignored the customer throughout the call. The customer also stated that the agent would not convey the customer's information to a retailer.	3/31/2016	CA was coached on proper procedure and the importance of following customer's instruction.