

STATE OF IOWA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
UTILITIES BOARD

IN RE: COMPLAINTS OF HELEN ADOLPHSON AND CHARLOTTE SKALLERUP	DOCKET NO. FCU-2013-0006
--	--------------------------

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION
AND MODIFYING REMAINING PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE**

(Issued February 12, 2015)

On December 16, 2014, an “Order Granting Consumer Advocate’s Request For Modification of the Partial Procedural Schedule” (December 16 Order) was issued in this case. The December 16 Order modified the procedural schedule previously set in in an “Order Modifying Partial Procedural Schedule,” issued on November 3, 2014, and an “Order Setting Partial Procedural Schedule and Discussing Fifth Prehearing Conference,” issued on October 14, 2014 (October 14 Order). The December 16 Order set a deadline of February 16, 2015, for Qwest Communications Company, d/b/a CenturyLink QCC, n/k/a CenturyLink Communications, LLC (CenturyLink), InterMetro Communications, Inc. (InterMetro), and Interstate 35 Telephone Company d/b/a Interstate Communications Company (Interstate) to file their responses and clarifications to the report filed by the Consumer Advocate Division of the Department of Justice (Consumer Advocate).

On February 11, 2015, CenturyLink filed a motion for an extension of time to file its response to the Consumer Advocate’s report. CenturyLink states its counsel

has had serious health issues causing CenturyLink to be unable to complete its response by the current deadline. Therefore, CenturyLink requests a ten-day extension to file its response. CenturyLink also requests that the Board give each party to this case a similar opportunity to delay their responses and move any remaining dates back for a commensurate period of time. The other parties to this case have no objection to CenturyLink's request.

The request is reasonable and should be granted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. As discussed in the October 14 Order, on or before February 26, 2015, CenturyLink, InterMetro, and Interstate must file any responses and clarifications they have regarding the Consumer Advocate's initial report. Any additional information or clarification must be supported by affidavit. Each of these telephone carriers has also committed to include any suggestions it has to solve call completion problems for customers in Iowa in its response.
2. If the Consumer Advocate has any reply or additional clarification, it must be filed on or before March 19, 2015.
3. As discussed in the October 14 Order, on or before April 27, 2015, CenturyLink and InterMetro must each file its proposed effective, preventative, long-term solutions to the call completion problems its customers have experienced in Iowa. These solutions must include specific actions CenturyLink or InterMetro has taken or will take, and a proposed timeline for when future actions will occur.

CenturyLink's proposal may be based on the solutions it has agreed to with the FCC, but the proposal must include commitments to the Board as to what CenturyLink will do in Iowa. InterMetro's proposal must include commitments to the Board as to what InterMetro will do in Iowa. If CenturyLink and the Consumer Advocate can agree on CenturyLink's solutions, it would be ideal. If InterMetro and the Consumer Advocate can agree on InterMetro's solutions, it would be ideal. In addition, the Board recognizes that even after CenturyLink's solutions have been implemented, an occasional call completion problem may occur. Therefore, part of the solution that must be proposed and implemented in these cases is the establishment of better procedures, including providing information to customers on how to most effectively report call completion problems, so customers may report and have their call completion problems addressed much more quickly and effectively than has occurred in the past.

4. As discussed in the October 14 Order, on or before May 26, 2015, any party may file a response to the proposed solutions.

5. At the conclusion of this procedural schedule, based on the filings of the parties, the undersigned administrative law judge will determine whether an additional procedural schedule needs to be set, and if one is needed, what the procedural schedule needs to include. The parties will be given the opportunity to provide input into this determination.

6. During the pendency of this additional procedural schedule, if Ms. Adolphson, Ms. Skallerup, or their mother, experiences any call completion problem and reports it to any of the parties, the appropriate telephone carrier must correct the problem, and either the applicable carrier or the Consumer Advocate must file a report with the Board explaining the problem and what was done to correct the problem.

UTILITIES BOARD

/s/ Amy L. Christensen
Amy L. Christensen
Administrative Law Judge

ATTEST:

/s/ Joan Conrad
Executive Secretary

Dated at Des Moines, Iowa, this 12th day of February 2015.