

**Exh. SP-16
Docket UT-171082
Witness: Susie Paul**

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

Complainant,

v.

**QWEST CORPORATION D/B/A
CENTURYLINK QC,**

Respondent.

DOCKET UT-171082

**EXHIBIT TO
TESTIMONY OF**

Susie Paul

**STAFF OF
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

*Email to Alice Fiman from Jerolyn Ochs Regarding
Extension of Service, dated March 28, 2017*

April 6, 2018

Activity Type: Email

Exh. SP-16

Docket UT-171082

Page 1 of 2

Activity Date: 3/28/2017, 12:18:41 PM

To: afiman@utc.wa.gov;

From: Jerolyn.Ochs@CenturyLink.com

Subject: FW: WA UTC Complaint CAS-20417-Y7K6M8 for Robert Saum Jr.
CRM:0043044

Attachments: 0

Body:

Good afternoon-

We are not obligated to provide service in a development where the developer has refused to sign a PAHD. The line extension rule does not apply inside a development. That is specified within the rule itself. "*Extension of service, as defined in this rule, does not apply to extensions of service to developments or to extensions of service for temporary occupancy or temporary service.*"

At this time, if the homeowner will provide a conduit under the street between the pedestal and his home, CenturyLink can provide service. Because the line extension rule does not apply, there is no allowance for the extension and the homeowner is responsible to provide the path. Otherwise, there is an alternative service provider in the development for landline service. Similarly, other homeowners in this development would be required to provide a path to their homes if they wanted service from CenturyLink.

Thank you.