

ORIGINALDecision No. 70874

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Morris M. Conklin and Petitioners,)
Complainants,)

vs.)

General Telephone Company, a cor-)
poration,)

Defendant.)

Case No. 8117
Filed January 22, 1965Investigation on the Commission's)
own motion into the equipment,)
services, facilities, operations,)
practices and resulting rates of)
the GENERAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF)
CALIFORNIA and THE PACIFIC TELE-)
PHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY.)Case No. 8143
Filed March 11, 1965Additional Appearance:Andrew Tokmakoff, for the Commission staff.OPINION AFTER FURTHER HEARING

These matters were consolidated and public hearings were held before Commissioner Mitchell and Examiner Gillanders at Covina on June 2, 3 and 4 and July 14 and 15, 1965. The matters were submitted at the conclusion of the July 15 hearing. By Decision No. 69884, dated November 2, 1965, the Commission ordered that:

1. Submission is set aside and further hearings are set for March 2, 3 and 4, 1966 at Covina, California.

2. Defendant shall have its president - as its top policy witness - advise the Commission at the time and place set forth above, what actions it has taken since January 1965 to provide satisfactory service in the areas specified in Case No. 8117 and Case No. 8143.

3. Defendant shall submit to the Commission at the further hearings a report detailing the action taken and the results obtained on service complaints presented to the Commission at its hearings in June and July 1965.

4. The Commission staff shall present testimony, at the time and place set forth above, which will inform the Commission whether or not defendant has met and continues to meet its service objectives in the Cities of La Puente, Covina, West Covina, Baldwin Park, Azusa, Irwindale, Glendora, Walnut and Pomona.

5. The Commission will hear testimony at the further hearings from the public and other interested parties on service conditions in the above-listed areas.

6. The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company is hereby dismissed from Case No. 8143.

Hearings were held at Covina before Commissioner Mitchell and Examiner Gillanders on March 2 and 3, 1966 and the matters were submitted on April 26, 1966 upon receipt of written statements by defendant and the Commission staff.

Defendant's president testified that since January of 1965 it accelerated materially its central office audit and rehabilitation program; it increased substantially the amount of contract labor it is using; it has improved the schedule calling for the installation of automatic central office routiners; it has successfully advanced certain central office equipment installations; it has completed the establishment and made functional its dial traffic administration organization; and it has established a trouble analyzation center for the Covina exchange.

He further testified that he believed the company has experienced a very marked improvement in the quality of its service

and that he believes the company is providing a most satisfactory grade of telephone service. He stated unequivocally that there are no problems that would affect the determination or capability of the company to continue to provide good telephone service.

A witness for defendant presented Exhibit 26 which detailed the action taken and the results obtained on service complaints presented to the Commission during the previous hearings. He testified that the complaining witnesses were again interviewed prior to the hearings in March 1966, and that Exhibit 26 shows that approximately 87 percent of these witnesses were by then either fully satisfied with the service or agreed that service had improved. Of the remaining 13 percent representing six witnesses, three could not be contacted for an interview, one noticed no improvement and only two rated service as unsatisfactory.

A staff engineer testified that he made an investigation of conditions in the Pomona and Covina Exchanges. His investigation included personal meetings with some 200 complainants, visits to many different central offices, a visit to the trouble center in Covina, talks with management personnel re their problems and plans, and personal review of the reports furnished to the Commission by the Company pursuant to the directions of the Commission. Based upon his investigation, he testified that the service conditions in the Covina and Pomona Exchanges are not yet at a satisfactory level.

Seven users of defendant's service testified as to service conditions in the Pomona and Covina Exchanges. Five of these witnesses had previously testified. Three testified that they were still having trouble and two testified that the service had improved greatly. Two witnesses had not previously testified. One of these witnesses testified that there was still trouble in the tandem

offices and the other stated that there had been no improvement in the past six months and that the trouble with incoming calls had become worse.

Defendant's western area general manager produced exhibits and testimony which may be summarized by the following question and answer:

"Q. Is it your opinion now that those standards of service as set forth in Mr. Sullivan's letter which is marked Exhibit No. 19 have been met?"

"A. Yes, sir. I would say that they have been substantially met."

The Commission has carefully reviewed the entire record in these matters and finds that the service conditions in the Cities of La Puente, Covina, West Covina, Baldwin Park, Azusa, Irwindale, Glendora, Walnut and Pomona are not yet at a satisfactory level.

The staff recommends that the cases be kept open and that it continue its close surveillance of defendant's service. Such surveillance can and will be done without keeping the cases open. Regulation and the jurisdiction of this Commission is a continuing thing and at any time the Commission, on its own motion, may reopen these matters if found to be advisable.

Complainants requested the Commission to investigate various service complaints which they listed in their complaint. At the close of the hearing, complainants' representative stated he felt everyone had had a full and complete opportunity to present their views regarding defendant's service. Complainants request the disfranchisement (sic) of defendant and its replacement by an organization qualified to enjoy the privileges of a public utility corporation. The Commission finds that this record does not warrant such an order. The Commission concludes that the complaint should be dismissed and the Commission's investigation be discontinued.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The complaint herein be, and the same hereby is, dismissed.
2. The investigation herein be, and the same hereby is, discontinued.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 21st day of JUNE, 1966.

Fredrick B. Melnick
President

George T. Grover
Commissioners

Augusta

William L. Bennett
Commissioners