

Public Comments by Case

Total Comments: 488

In Favor: 9

Opposed: 447

Undecided: 32

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Clarissa Alti	Web	I am opposed to allowing Century Link's petition to be allowed to operate under AFOR, because it would allow them to change rates, terms, and conditions, without the approval of the UTC.
	Ken Giesbers	Web	I do not think CenturyLink should be granted AFOR status. I am especially appalled at CenturyLink's underhanded and unethical behavior in notifying its customers. I received a PUBLIC NOTICE postcard in the mail today notifying me of the October 16 hearing. Unfortunately, today is October 17 - too late!
	James Willis	Web	<p>The difference between CenturyLink and their competitors is that CenturyLink is the only provider that has hardwired phone lines. My phone service migrated from Qwest to CenturyLink due to the buyout. I have only my landline phone with them. One of the reasons that I keep it is its reliability in power outages. Another reason is the 911 system.</p> <p>They have already increased domestic, instate and interstate long distance service fees to total \$\$8.99, whether I use the services or not. On my last bill I noticed what I believe to be a new charge: Non-Telecom Service Surcharge @ \$1.55. At this rate I say they need more price regulation, not less. If they want to compete with the other media providers, have them do so without including the landline part of their business. I choose to not bundle my landline with other communication forms to be able to afford it.</p> <p>Please do not let CenturyLink's request for "greater flexibility" pertain to landlines. Many people, such as seniors like my wife and I, who require a stable phone system can't afford an ever increasing phone bill to keep CenturyLink "competitive"!</p>
	Gail Phares	Web	When Century Link took over our phone service several years ago, they were touting "rural connectivity" as one of the benefits of their company over the previous one. We tried repeatedly to

			<p>get DSL instead of the dial-up computer service we had, and in the process learned a great deal about Century Link, none of it good. At least five times we were told "the service person will be there tomorrow" but no one ever came. No one from the company followed up to tell us that we were not getting DSL after all. At least twice we were billed for getting DSL when we didn't and then it took repeated phone calls and hours of time to get the charges removed. At least once during these calls, no one could find any record of our telephone account at all. Century Link has zero customer service. It is either too big to be able to run a reasonably efficient business or they are intentionally deceptive. This is a business that is in dire need of monitoring, regulation, and regular oversight. Automatic reporting requirements seem like an absolute minimal requirement for this company which is inept at best.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
	cindy house	Web	<p>I am opposed to their proposal. Eastern Washington is made up of mostly rural communities that still have sub standard telephone service compared to urban areas. These rural areas still need to have century link reporting to the UTC so they will be held responsible for non compliance. Without the UTC regulations I think century link will raise their rates beyond affordability forcing many families to go without service.</p>
	Marilyn Kelly	E-mail	<p>There are lots of us in Pacific Co. who continue to have unreliable or no cell phone transmission. Century Link is our only option. Please continue to regulate.</p> <p>Marilyn Kelly 1911 NE 245 Ocean Park, Wa. 98640 360 665 2584 dechemandy@icloud.com</p>
	Nick & Lois Chalich	Mail	
	Patrick McGuire	Web	<p>Allowing this company to change their rates without UTC approval is wrong. It gives Century Link the ability to raise rates and also to lower them but I doubt that any lowering would ever take place. The reason the UTC exists is to prevent overcharging the public and, no matter the honorable intent, when you place the Fox in charge of the Hen House, some Chickens will</p>

			frequently go missing. Please deny this petition.
	Michael D. Clark	Web	Comments rec'd via phone (SE). Customer just received the customer notice of the hearing today (Oct. 18). He doesn't think the company should be able to give such late notice of comment hearings. Customer does not approve of the proposal, and worries his telephone bill will jump over one-hundred percent. In these hard times, with all these companies becoming unregulated, he does not approve at all.
	Curtis Hall	Web	I oppose AFOR designation for Century Link in WA State. My Mom and I are a Century Link landline customer on the same bill, and if AFOR were granted by the commission, then Century Link could raise prices on her and others who live on a fixed income without justification to the commission and the permission of commission.
	Michael Real	Mail	
	Dennis Justis & Lauri Ann Chambers	Mail	
	Zona Scalph	Mail	
	Helen Snyder	Mail	
	Anonymous	Mail	
	Geri Konen	Mail	
	N Rencken	Web	It sounds like the consumer will lose again on the docket #UT-130477. The company should have to go through the UTC for any rate changes.
	Rebecca Blackadar	Web	I live on Orcas Island in the San Juan Islands. Here, CenturyLink is virtually a monopoly. They charge us the same rates for phone and internet services but deliver inferior service for the same price or more than charged to mainland communities. Many homes can't even get internet download speed of 1.5 mbps because they are in an area that is considered "bandwidth exhausted", in other words, over subscribed, with no plans for upgrading the infrastructure to improve service. Only a few homes in the main village can receive internet via broadband/cable from a recently established company that does not seem to have expanding their infrastructure as a primary goal at this time. If anything, CenturyLink needs more regulation, monitoring and oversight in remote, rural

			communities, like mine, where they are a monopoly. Allowing them to operate with regulations that don't restrict pricing increases will undoubtedly result in higher prices for the same far inferior service we currently receive.
	Jill Weiszmann	Web	<p>CenturyLink is already a monopoly and charges high rates. To give them carte blanche to charge whatever they want to charge without approval from the UTC. This would drastically hurt their current customers, especially since there is no other alternative option but them in this area.</p> <p>Thank you, Jill Weiszmann</p>
	Jo Sciola	Web	I am against, Century Link's request under AFOR, to be relieved of the normal reporting requirements. Telephone service, and companies are distinctly different than cable and telecommunication companies. In today's world telephones are a necessary utility, where cable and telecommunication companies are not. It appears Century Link is wanting to avoid the oversight of the UTC.
	Scott Schaffer	Web	<p>Century Link seeks a more flexible form of regulation in which it will be able to change rates, terms and conditions of its service without prior approval from the UTC. I strongly oppose this change.</p> <p>Century Link is a highly profitable company that enjoys a unique position in markets where it provides land-line telephone service. It has a huge market advantage over other telephone service providers there, having sole access to existing telephone lines. Land-line service and DSL internet rely on this infrastructure, and consumers have few choices. In my case, I have no other choice for high quality telephone service, and limited choices for internet. While the market is somewhat more competitive than it was decades ago, when phone companies had monopolies, this is far from a competitive marketplace. Consumers are victims of dominant corporations taking advantage of limited competition.</p> <p>Prices are already high. I pay close to \$80/month for a basic phone and internet package. This is far higher than I've paid at previous addresses in Washington, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. Since its acquisition of Quest, Century Link has maintained a poor quality of service in which customers have difficulty solving technical and billing problems. Century Link also plays a much-reduced role in the community through grant-making and civic activities. We must understand that the company seeks more flexibility, not to lower prices and better serve consumers, but to</p>

			<p>raise prices and make greater profits. Let us not be naïve. How much profit is enough? And how much leverage in a semi-competitive market is adequate?</p> <p>We need more regulation in telecommunications, not less. Century Link may face more regulation than some of its competitors, but it still enjoys a partially protected market position that greatly benefits its management and shareholders. To protect the interests of Washington citizens, I urge the UTC to decline CL's request and maintain the highest level of regulation over Century link and other telecommunications companies.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Scott Schaffer</p>
	Mary Anderson	Web	<p>I strongly protest the settlement agreement of August 22, 2013, which allows Century Link to operate under the AFOR; to change rates, terms, and conditions of service without the approval from the UTC; and to be relieved of automatic reporting requirements. All communications companies should be subject to control by the UTC. This arbitrary and random granting of AFOR exceptions to individual companies serves the motive of profit exclusively and not the good of the public. One of the functions of Century Link is the provision of landline service to Seattle area households. This service should not be subject to the capricious whims of a company that has been exempted from UTC controls established for the public good. All companies should be subject to UTC control without the nefarious negotiating represented by this proposed exemption of Century Link and other companies from control by the UTC.</p> <p>Mary Anderson</p>
	Jonelle Kemmerling	Web	<p>CenturyLink wants to be able to change rates and services without any kind of governmental supervision or review. They should not be allowed to have that kind of freedom when there is no competition for those services.</p>
	Brianna Manolopoulos	Web	<p>My partner and I qualify for the TAP. When we became housed, we contacted CenturyLink and informed them that we qualify for TAP and that we wanted to initiate landline phone service under TAP. From that initial phone call until we opened a claim with the UTC, we were given misinformation time and time again by CenturyLink and grossly overcharged. Even after many phone calls to CenturyLink explaining that we had applied for TAP and were awaiting the processing of our application, they sent us one notification that they were going to disconnect our phone service. We called CenturyLink yet again and explained that we were waiting for the processing of our TAP application (that they claimed to have not received the first time we</p>

			<p>submitted it). The representative to whom we spoke told us that they were going to put a hold on our account so our phone service would continue while the application was processed. Later, we received a second notification that our phone service was to be disconnected. We called CenturyLink again and explained the situation again. Again, we were told that our account would have a hold placed on it until our application could be processed. After this conversation, before the deadline listed on the disconnect notice, our phone service was disconnected. This was at a time when we were actively seeking both employment and housing. We had to use a payphone at a nearby gas station to contact CenturyLink and TAP yet again. TAP eventually informed us that filing a claim with the UTC may be an option for us. We decided to pursue this option from the gas station pay phone. Eventually, we were forced to pay CenturyLink's incorrect amount due in order to restore our phone service while we resolved the situation. UTC did a brilliant job of resolving our complaint, and the ransom money we were forced to pay to have service restored was ultimately credited to our account. Had it not been for UTCs involvement and ability to oversee CenturyLink's inept and corrupt practices, we would have taken a financial hit that was not legitimate and which we could ill afford.</p> <p>Please ensure that the UTC continues to have appropriate oversight over this awful, monopolistic company which is the only service provider available for TAP recipients for this critical utility.</p> <p>Thank you, Brianna Manolopoulos</p>
	Marlys Svensson	Web	<p>We have CenturyLink service for phone and internet at 2 different locations - Vashon, WA and Hyak, WA (Snoqualmie Pass area). We feel that no public utility should be allowed to change rates, terms or conditions of service for its customers without government oversight. (Government oversight means that we, the citizens of this country, have a say in rates, service, etc.)This includes CenturyLink's current request. While we realize that land lines are being overtaken by cellular service, causing an upheaval in the industry, we also feel that past experience in the U.S. has shown that all public utilities are an essential service that the government needs to have oversight of, otherwise greed, poor decisions, etc. by individuals and companies controlling these essential services cause great monetary and unforeseen damage to the public. The government has an essential role in providing reliable, equitable communication, transportation and other universally need services to all our citizens, disregarding the "profit" motive present in today's society. Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this request by CenturyLink. They are providing good</p>

			service, but do not need to be unsupervised in this respect.
	Brian McClain	Web	Century Link has been a constant disappointment in Wahkiakum County since I moved here 6 years ago. Their failure to provide the service they claimed to my father as well as myself has caused me to wish constantly for a viable alternative to century link's service. They constantly over sell their capabilities, i.e. the extremely poor service provided to the entire Skamokawa valley population, and are unfathomably slow to respond to trouble calls, it is a running joke in the community as to if or when a repair technician will ever show up to investigate a problem. The installation visit is almost immediate, but once they are being paid it is nearly impossible to get any help. Century Link's monopoly on the market in Wahkiakum county has to end, anyone wishing to provide a viable alternative to Century Link should receive the full backing of the community and the state.
	susan paullus-hart	Web	it doesn't matter that a hearing was held October 16th.I am just receiving the notice from Century Link in the US MAIL on this date: October 21st,2013.Perfect planning?????!!!!!!
	Rod Russell	Web	I feel all requests for rate changes should be approved by the the UTC. Thank you!
	Ella Vanderbilt	Web	I think it is important for all telecommunication providers to be regulated by the UTC, particularly with regards to increases in rates. Otherwise there is no external control on prices, which is particularly problematic given the lack of options for internet and phone providers already.
	Lisann Rolle	Web	I am opposed to CenturyLink being regulated under an AFOR. I believe that certain segments of the population are disproportionately reliant on the services of CenturyLink and that there is not adequate representation in the residential market to protect their interest. I am speaking primarily of the elderly population that relies heavily on traditional home phone service not accessible via cable/web providers. For them to have to switch to this form of access in order to enjoy the competitive market would be cost prohibitive for many. For this reason I believe the AFOR would result in rates that unreasonably prejudice the elderly population and put them at undue disadvantage. The addition of the high city utility taxes leveraged on home phone service coupled with the fee increases that will likely follow deregulation will have a disproportionate effect on this group. In general, I am concerned about an overall lack of regulation in this industry and would lobby for more instead of less. Given the high local/fed tax rates with no caps that are linked to these services it seems critical that direct oversight be retained.
	Blake Rankin	Web	In my lifetime I have never had poorer phone (and now internet) services, than that provided by CenturyLink. I lament the day that CenturyLink obtained permission to exclusively provide phone

			service to Lopez Island, and do not believe that "service" is their actual intent. I would hope that more competition might improve service here, or maybe that CenturyLink would bow out of this market entirely. I do not believe that any less regulation of CenturyLink could possibly lead us to better services. Currently our island is poorly served, and there appears to be no infrastructure upgrades forthcoming from our exclusive provider.
	leonard hanson	Web	Centurylink should not be allowed alternative form of regulation (AFOR). There is not sufficient competition in this market to control pricing; therefore, UTC approval is necessary to protect the public interest.
	Lorene Ehinger	Web	I am probably too late to comment for the CenturyLink hearing to become regulated under AFOR- just received the little notice in the mail - but I think that the only land line company in the state should answer to regulations commission on raising rates - after the whole industry was de-regulated in the nation, the rates of telephone sky-rocketed - and CenturyLink is probably feeling pressure from all of the free cell phones out there, but those of us that use land-lines need some protection. Thank you Lorene
	Aaron Arkin	Web	This is the same company that is spending thousands of dollars on TV advertising touting the fact that its high speed internet charge when bundled with its other services will not change for 5 years. And here they are asking for a classification change to permit them to increase rates without seeking UTC approval. This is a blatant subterfuge which should not be rewarded by removing regulatory barriers that are in place for the public's interest.
	Jason Paulsen	Web	Dear UTC Members, Please file this comment as OPPOSED to the action being sought by CenturyLink. The only conditions under which the petition requested by CenturyLink should be granted is with respect to a change in rate structure that results in a DECREASE of cost of service for its customers without a corresponding increase for any others. Any increase in rates should be subject to the same rigor as it is currently, with full UTC review prior to implementation. In rural communities like ours there simply are NO other telecommunications options (no cable, no/ little cellular service) and to grant the petition would result in a further monopoly which past history has shown will only hurt the public interest that the UTC is charged with serving.

			<p>Thank you for taking these comments seriously, and for the service the UTC provides in following up on customer mis-treatment issues by companies like CenturyLink.</p> <p>Thank you also for providing notice of this opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jason Paulsen Mazama, WA</p>
	Ms. H. W. Anderson	Web	Comments rec'd via phone (SE). Customer received the comment card from CenturyLink on Oct. 17, after the hearing date. She uses only the basic telephone service, and has no internet, long distance, or other add-ons. She is concerned that her bill has been steadily rising this year. Her only source of income is Social Security, which doesn't rise to keep up with utility cost. She doesn't want the company to keep raising their rates. She's just trying to get along and go along.
	Richard P. Sutter	Mail	
	Jacqueline Moreau	Mail	
	Larry Pinkley	Mail	
	Wallace Horne	Web	Docket # UT-130477. Aproving Century Link to adjust rates and making changes to their system without the State's oversight and approval is not a wise decision. Historically, review all other companies actions when oversight was lacking ie., as near as year 2008! The greed I saw, has left me lacking in TRUST of many companies. Century Link needs the State oversight, review and approval for their actions.
	Robert Denman	Web	Granting this proposal will only result in increasing already outrageous rates for their poor services. American companeies have been cheating the Ameican people for years. For TV, Internet and telephone the costs in foreign countries is around \$25.00 per month because they are using fibre optics which American companies refuse to do. Century link services are poor throughout their area for we have discussed this matter with others. Errors are continuous, advertising is beyond reason.If you want to read a single piece of news you have to listen to an advertisement. Email service insofar as composinsg or reading is poor. We are forced to provide access to more ads almost everytime we go to a website. As with television it povides poor programing along with

			<p>relentless brainwashing ads. With television we would prefer to choose our own programs rather than be saturated with programs designed to sell you something. Without adequate supervision by a commission overseeing their actions the result will as it has always been with American Corporations bad for the consumer. We urge you not to grant this proposal. Frankly, we are about ready dump the internet and television completely simply because it is not "providing a service" although to a certain extent it does, rather a means of filling our minds, including children with endless ads. We understand the need for advertising, but enough is enough. We are paying for a service by a company that is more interested in ad profits than in providing the excellent service that it should be providing. We are certain that the members of your commission use the internet and are familiar with what we are talking about. This also extends to Comcast We also find that when we use their programs such as stock watching, after putting them in a few days later they disappear. The same applies to weather temperature. Often when we try to adjust the home page of how we would like to view it when we attempt to do so it doesn't work. Although our belief may be extreme, we think that commissions such as yours should come down with an iron fist on American Corporations forcing them to provide excellent service. With Century Link there should be no "choice" in internet speed..it should be the highest and the best at all times for a reasonable price, which we consider should be \$25.00 per month. In order to get a lower rate we have to "bundle". In the case of our telephone, we pay \$33.00 per month for a phone we seldom use. Our total bill is around \$79.00 per month, but if we drop the phone the bill will rise to nearly the same level. One time we decided to watch TV on the Century Link internet service and found that we were asked to provide who we had cable TV with (Comcast) and then found that we could only watch the programs for the service we had signed up for rather than Century Link providing us with any TV station in the WORLD. Another company provides us with cell phone use for \$20.00 every three months. Century Link and others are outrageous. Do something about it if it is possible.</p> <p>Thank you for your service</p> <p>Robert Denman</p>
	R.L. Barnes	Web	<p>First of all the amount of money they charge for the small amount of service I get is already too much. Unless I'm mistaken Century Link has a monopoly on the hardline phone service in this area and I for one do not like having a gun held to my head in order to get an undeserved increase in rates.</p>

			R.L. Barnes
	Terrance Potter	Web	Where I live in rural Clark County, there is little true competition for land line phone and Internet service without the home owner incurring substantial costs. My rates continue to rise, but I've gotten no better service since CenturyLink (CenturyTel) took over my service territory. I've contacted the company repeatedly over the years to try to get them to repair the telephone pedestal run over by a dump truck near the NE corner of my property. It's now been that way for more than 7 years. I've also contacted CenturyLink/CenturyTel repeatedly to find out when they will be increasing the DSL Internet access speed for the lines they lease to Earthlink, but can't get a straight answer. I've been paying Earthlink for a higher DSL speed for years, but CenturyLink won't install the necessary central office equipment to service my location. No wonder people are moving away from land line phone service, there's little value added by having it at the price we're being charged now.
	Raymond M. Hughes	Web	Century Link is already the only provider in our area. That makes them a monopoly in the area. There is no competition to force them to keep from unnecessarily raising rates just for their own profit. They would be accountable to nobody for rate increases if their request is granted. They have historically given bad service in this area. They have erroneously charged my accounts incorrectly for payment of billings, causing me to pay for overdraw charges to the account they charged incorrectly. Their service is not nearly as good as our previous providers, which they should have not been allowed to buy out. Their people have very little practical knowledge, merely reading from a script when asked to correct problems. They always try to shift blame for interruption of service to the customer, rather than admitting their system is to blame. The people on the phone (they call it customer service) will not usually transfer you to their supervisor if they are incapable of solving the issue. You must call back again to try to find someone who will actually have the ability to help. When someone in customer service tells you they will provide the services you ask for at a price they quote, it usually does not come out that way. When questioned on a follow up call, they will deny that what was quoted is available, and refuse to connect you with the person who committed to the price originally. Century Link should clean up their act with the money they have, rather than be given the power to merely raise rates to pay for their incompetency. Please do not allow them the freedom to "change rates, terms, and conditions of service without approval from the UTC">
	Gayle Borchard	Web	Regarding docket item No. 030477, request by CenturyLink to operate under the terms of an AFOR: I am opposed to this proposal. History shows that rates will increase substantially, and I

			believe they are currently high enough. I believe Century Link is a good company, but I believe some of that goodness comes from your firm hand. Thank you for passing this along to the Commission. Gayle Borchard, CenturyLink customer
	William B. Woolf	Web	<p>October 9, 2013</p> <p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>Please accept the following as our written comment in the matter of Docket #UT-130477, to be heard by the Commission on October 16, 2013, regarding a petition by CenturyLink Companies to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR):</p> <p>While we understand the company faces a number of challenges where it operates in competition with other providers, that is not the case in every area. Specifically, CenturyLink either directly or through other providers using its facilities, is the ONLY hard-wired provider of broadband service to the residents of Marrowstone Island, in Jefferson County. In effect, it currently enjoys a practical monopoly. Indeed, most users in this area would welcome competition, as CenturyLink's broadband service is both slow and subject to outages. Because it is a DSL service, it is also subject to slowdowns at precisely the times when the most users are trying to connect.</p> <p>Regardless of what the Commission may choose to do in other areas served by CenturyLink, I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject the AFOR proposal for any areas in which any company, including CenturyLink, enjoys an effective monopoly, as it does on Marrowstone Island. It is entirely inappropriate to grant unrestricted authority for rates, terms and conditions of service to a monopoly, and doing so would constitute a gross violation of the public policy goals for which the Commission was created.</p> <p>Thank you sincerely for your attention,</p> <p>William B. Woolf Karen A. Swanson-Woolf 1301 Griffith Point Rd Nordland, WA 98358 (360) 385-4074</p>
	Barbara Haugaard	Web	Centurytel (Centurylink) provides poor service out here on the Key Peninsula. Yet they have no real competition here at this time. Other providers are worse. It sounds like they are preparing to raise rates, and with no viable competition it will be the consumer that pays.
	Dean Babbitt	Web	Dear Sirs,

			<p>As indicated in the public notice I received from Century Link regarding reclassification on your docket #UT-130477, I am totally opposed to the Century Link proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dean Babbitt</p>
	Gary & Jane Dotson	E-mail	<p>Please accept the following as our written comment in the matter of Docket #UT-130477, to be heard by the Commission on October 16, 2013, regarding a petition by CenturyLink Companies to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR):</p> <p>While we understand the company faces a number of challenges where it operates in competition with other providers, that is not the case in every area. Specifically, CenturyLink either directly or through other providers using its facilities, is the ONLY hard-wired provider of broadband service to the residents of Nordland, WA in Jefferson County. In effect, it currently enjoys a practical monopoly. Indeed, most users in this area would welcome competition, as CenturyLink's broadband service is both slow and subject to outages. Because it is a DSL service, it is also subject to slowdowns at precisely the times when the greatest number of users are trying to connect.</p> <p>Regardless of what the Commission may choose to do in other areas served by CenturyLink, I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject the AFOR proposal for any areas in which any company, including CenturyLink, enjoys an effective monopoly, as it does in Nordland, WA. It is entirely inappropriate to grant unrestricted authority for rates, terms and conditions of service to a monopoly, and doing so would constitute a gross violation of the public policy goals for which the Commission was created.</p> <p>Gary & Jane Dotson 8235 Flagler Rd. Nordland, WA 98358 360-301-2912</p>
	Maria Lesan & John Hickman	E-mail	To Whom it May Concern:

			<p>Please accept the following as our written comment in the matter of Docket #UT-130477, to be heard by the Commission on October 16, 2013, regarding a petition by CenturyLink Companies to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR):</p> <p>While we understand the company faces a number of challenges where it operates in competition with other providers, that is not the case in every area. Specifically, CenturyLink either directly or through other providers using its facilities, is the ONLY hard-wired provider of broadband service to the residents of Marrowstone Island, in Jefferson County. In effect, it currently enjoys a practical monopoly. Indeed, most users in this area would welcome competition, as CenturyLink's broadband service is both slow and subject to outages. Because it is a DSL service, it is also subject to slowdowns at precisely the times when the greatest number of users are trying to connect.</p> <p>Regardless of what the Commission may choose to do in other areas served by CenturyLink, I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject the AFOR proposal for any areas in which any company, including CenturyLink, enjoys an effective monopoly, as it does on Marrowstone Island. It is entirely inappropriate to grant unrestricted authority for rates, terms and conditions of service to a monopoly, and doing so would constitute a gross violation of the public policy goals for which the Commission was created.</p> <p>Thank you sincerely for your attention,</p> <p>Maria Lesan John Hickman 1173 Griffith Pt Road Nordland, WA 98358 360-379-3080</p>
	Kathleen Sayce	E-mail	I received a postcard from Century Link, a public notice about their petition to UTC to change their regulation status to an Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR), based on changes in the telecommunications industry in general. This card provided a URL to a UTC website where the settlement is purported to reside. I checked the URL, and this document is not there, or not with an active link so that it can be accessed.

			<p>I have a concern that with less regulation, and with the ability to raise rates, my community will find itself with spiraling costs for local phone access. There is no competitor for local service. Cell phones have made some inroads on this, but coverage is very spotty. Additionally, the transition to a mix of landlines and cell phones is fragmenting these smaller communities, because cell phone numbers are 'private'.</p> <p>Today is 10.9.2013; this postcard came today via USPS. The hearing is scheduled for 10.16.2013. The relevant document or documents are not available for review today, a week before the hearing. This may be an oversight, but it really does seem that UTC does not want any informed comments from the affected public in this state.</p> <p>Kathleen Sayce PO Box 91 Nahcotta WA 98637 360-665-5292 ksayce@willapabay.org</p>
	Bruce Turbitt	Web	<p>It is NOT in the public interest to grant CenturyLink the requested change - to allow rate and service changes without prior approval from the UTC. The reason is, that any monopoly such as CenturyLink must be price regulated or the public interest is negatively impacted.</p> <p>In spite of their protestations that the change is necessary due to "competition from cable companies, wireless and other companies" the statement is simply NOT TRUE! In the area where I live as well as many other areas served by CenturyLink, we have NO wireless, NO cable service, NO cell service and NO broadband internet - even by CenturyLink.</p> <p>As long as CenturyLink serves even ONE customer where the competition claimed doesn't exist, the argument is false and the requested change must be denied.</p> <p>Please protect those of us who do NOT have any other choice and find that the request is not founded on fact and must be denied.</p> <p>Thank You</p>
	Robert Koskey	Web	<p>To me, the key word in the mailing that was sent (which I needed a magnifying glass to read- very annoying)is "flexibility". The obvious interpretation is unregulated rate increase. The ridiculous trend of huge corporate profits must be overseen and regulations to reflect a sense of fairness to consumers. I am totally in favor of strict regulation by the UTC. A free rein by any giant corporation is dangerous. Thanks, Bob</p>

	Kate Sherry	Web	<p>I am submitting my objections to CenturyLink petition to the Commission to be regulated under AFOR, without any hope that my objections will make any difference. This is yet another excuse a big company is using in order to be able to raise their rates to an exorbitant amount. It appears from the past that the powers that be in WA State do not really care about the citizens of the state as permission is consistently given to these companies to be able to raise their rates. Witness PP&L and the MANY rate increases they have been granted in the last few years. I realize AFOR does not allow CenturyLink to raise its rates per se, but it would give them the wherewithal to be able to do so, once again putting quite a financial burden on the citizens of WA State.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
	B Monroe	Web	<p>In the interest of all rate payers, the UTC should continue reviewing ALL rate increases. Allowing any utility to increase rates anytime they choose is the same as giving them a blank check. Being regulated under the Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR) is not a good idea.</p>
	Cindy Headley	Web	<p>We live in a somewhat remote area. Centurylink is the only provider for conventional phone service, there are no cell phone services available, and Internet service options are limited to Centurylink or a satellite service such as Dish Network or Direct TV. Centurylink's service for our land line and internet is negligible. We paid for and were locked into a contract for their internet service which was to provide us with an internet connection speed that would allow us to use Netflix and YouTube. This was not the case. After repeated attempts to determine why the connection was so slow we were informed that Centurylink over-sold their capacity. There are too many users on the lines so everyone's speed is affected. Despite the fact that Centurylink admitted to over-selling their capacity they are not willing to upgrade their system or provide credits to those who contracted with them and did not receive the promised connection speed. We feel this is an issue not only for us but for those in our area with children in school and are required to use the resources available via the internet to complete assignments.</p> <p>We feel that Centurylink has taken advantage of their position in the area as the only provider available for phone and internet services. They have admittedly over-sold their capacity to provide the services they promised and refused to reduce the cost to the user, our land-line service is always disrupted and the lines have a lot of static that makes it difficult to hear. They have been unresponsive to correct or repair either of these issues. Our concern is that if Centurylink becomes unregulated their service will become even worse and their charges will go up. Competition in the area by providers willing to stand behind their products and services is needed to force</p>

			<p>Centurylink to employ better business practices.</p> <p>Cindy Headley</p>
	Harolds Gen Store	Web	I am a business owner and am against CenturyLink's request to be regulated under AFOR. I believe that they still need to be regulated and should continue to get permission from the UTC before they can change rates, terms and conditions of service.
	Erv Gasser	Web	CenturyLink is asking to be regulated under AFOR. I disagree! CenturyLink knows full well what technology is necessary for their business to compete. Now they want an edge over the competition and to raise rates to pay for their lack of planning. They need to take some of their profits and put them back into the company. Their lack of planning and mismanagement is not a reason to raise rates. I am totally against any rate increase or any change in regulation that will allow for that!
	Robert Snyder	Web	<p>We are sick and tired of CenturyLink i.e.(CenturyStink)continually adding new charges to our bill without any explanation what so ever.</p> <p>By allowing them an AFOR status, they could add new charges with total immunity from the customers.</p> <p>We have very poor service from CenturyLink and would leap for joy at the chance of one of their competitors taking over their system</p> <p>Like "Ma" Bell of old, trying to reach someone at CenturyLink to voice our concerns is nye on impossible. So please don't allow them the comfort of a blank check against their customers.</p>
	Diana Gasser	Web	I am writing in complete opposition to the change in regulation for CenturyLink to an AFOR. This request by CenturyLink is a sham. Because of their lack of planning and mismanagement now they want to be regulated differently so that they can raise their rates. A rate change is not necessary. They need to plan preperly for the advancement of technology. They are in the filed of technology. You'd think they would know that technology changes. But instead of planning for and implementing technology changes they want to raise rates and increase their profits. They need to use some of their profits and put it back into the company for technology changes. These are not poor doofs that have been caught offguard with the sudden advancement of technology. They just want to increase rates to pay for the changes they know they need to make and do not want to dig into their profit margins. A regulation change for their operation does not need to happen. I am totally opposed to this change and the guise to increase our rates!
	Christopher J	Web	Allowing a company that is already overpriced in comparison to it's competitors to raise rates even

	Guymon		more is not a good thing.
	Kevin Reidy	Web	<p>PHONE (DC)</p> <p>My comment is I'm not sure how CenturyLink works everywhere, but I live in Spokane. The company was supposed to upgrade for digital internet services and they have not followed through or made any improvements. I'm not in favor of this proposal as I believe they haven't invested much money for their infrastructure. The Commission still needs to regulate CenturyLink and I don't believe this proposal would benefit consumers but would make it worse.</p>
	David	Web	<p>I receive land line telephone service from Century Link in a remote portion of Skamania County north a Stabler. There is no alternate source of telephone service, unlike cities that have either cellular service or cable based phone services. In Stabler, there is neither, which is also the case for other sparsely populated, rural areas of the State.</p> <p>Consequently, approval of this petition will result in a monopoly (already the case) that will then be unregulated. The company could decide that providing service to remote areas is not economically feasible (long distances, many telephone poles, long distance wires, difficulty of servicing, etc.)and could arbitrarily raise the rates for rural users, making phone service for some unaffordable. If truly unaffordable, then the service would be cancelled which would cause a public safety issue: no access to emergency services like fire fighting or ambulances.</p> <p>For these reasons, unless there is a reliable alternative (cellular or cable)for telephone service, this petition does not serve the interests of the State or users/rate payers like myself.</p>
	susan stockunas	Web	<p>Century Link is petitioning to be regulated under an alternative form of regulation based on "the competition that the Century Link Companies face from cable companies wireless providers, and other companies". We bundle for land line, tv and DSL services with Century Link. Where we live on Marrowstone Island, Century Link has a monopoly on cable and wireless service and land lines. It is my understanding that, even those who have other DSL and TV providers, still pay Century Link a fee. It is my opinion that Century Link should continue under the present regulatory rules for the service in our area and any other areas where they have a monopoly.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this matter. The hearing is scheduled for October 16, 2003</p> <p>Susan Stockunas</p>

	william l. pettit jr	Web	UT-130477 i've totally lost all confedence in the company as it is. they offer such programs as bundling telling you it will cut costs which was a lie. my bill has done nothing but rose monthly since i've bundled .. to let this company do anything without your approval would be a terrible idea..as soon as i read what happens if granted i thought oh great thats all we need .. i understand a company needs to profit but this has gotten completely out of hand and thats with them being regulated .. i'd hate to see what they'd do unregulated .. thank you..
	Pat Bredeson	Web	This should not be granted because she thinks they still need oversite or regulation.
	Francis M Phillips	Web	I believe the company should be regulated and get UTC approval for any rate changes and any change to their services.
	Rick Miner	Web	<p>I have just today received the "Public Notice" undoubtedly required of Century Link (hereafter QWest) indicating the hearing being held only six days hence. Hardly timely notification! I am adamantly opposed to their change in status to further deregulate their business methods, which I already regard as deceptful and fraudulent.</p> <p>Their advertising already talks about "wonderful rates" while deleting such specifics as applying to new customers only, while those of us who have been with them for closing on 20 years pay at least twice the advertised "come-on" price, and if we drop other services, it would multiply to much more than that. Indeed, even the speeds are misrepresented in that they do not provide a disclaimer more than micro-print at screen's bottom which no sentient individual can actually read. IN FACT they already seem to be about as unregulated as is possible, in that they currently change rates, add fees, change details (such as due dates of billings, without notification) and services provided all without any notices to users. I remember out of the blue being told that I must (emphasize mandatory) change to a differrent email carrier as MSN would be changing and charging. Not believing their story after the change I kept my MSN without any charge ever (I know, hard to believe for Micro\$oft). However, relying on their proprietary software and user, I have been inundated with ads, spam, dropped messages, some never reaching recipients, inability to connect, freezing screens, and errors reflecting control of where I am "allowed" to go on searches.</p> <p>There have been several times I have tried to find better deals and packages within the system, but to no avail, and my bill has steadily increased well over \$30 from what was originally promised similarly to the current "it will never go up" ad. I have even gone to their "Loyalty" department and been told that it wasn't that they couldn't do anything for me, but that they wouldn't because they didn't have to..</p> <p>This seems to reflect the nature of the various Washington State agencies tasked with protecting</p>

			<p>the rights of consumers in WA state, such as the UTC, AG, and especially the Insurance Commission, who apparently abdicated its duties decades ago. This serious erosion of consumer protection is indicative of the current filing, and with their horrid history of attacking customers with fees and especially allowing third party companies to slam and abuse with unsubstantiated fees and charges already, I can seriously proclaim that none of this history and especially this filing, reflect any protection of public interest, but instead a serious indication of pandering to big business. If you really want to help foster competition, then it's time to deisolve the protected "boundaries" holding that monopolies exist to providers of certain services. Case in point, I can live without a landline, but desire better and more effective internet access. Calling the local FIOS dealer here I was told that they did not provide that service BECAUSE THAT WAS CENTURY LINKS AREA</p>
	Warren McNeely	Web	<p>As an exclusive land line user I have only one choice for a service provider. To allow them to have total freedom to increase prices at their discretion is to put my service in jeopardy as I have a fixed income and do not have any recourse for getting, or keeping, fair rates. Land line users have no other alternatives if they choose not to be cell phone dependent.</p>
	Ronald Johnson	Web	<p>CenturyLink should be denied any relaxation of regulation, their internet service has never provided the speed of service as advertised. Their customer service is rude and combative. I do live in an cell phone dead area, when that is remedied, I will be the first customer of CenturyLink to be an ex-customer.</p> <p>If their service was half as good as Verizon, they would not have so much competition.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ron Johnson</p>
	Marla Dee Miller	Web	<p>Century Link wishes to be regulated under ("AFOR"). Can change rates terms conditions without approval? Century Link is not a Company of integrity; they already "do exactly as they please". They will NOT answer questions about "non-identified fee's" listed as "misc. fee's", they DO raise their rates; put out advertising that "IMPLIES" a rate, but is not the truth when called on it. Like AVISTA..sick of price gouging, hikes...REGULATIONS NEED TO BE IN PLACE. WA. STATE UTC REALLY NEEDS TO BE INVESTIGATED BY A OUTSIDE FEDERAL SOURCE. Thisis a totally corrupt STATE!</p>
	Phyllis Gerber	Web	<p>My rates have already increased tremendously since I moved to my present location almost 10 years ago. And that's with them needing to get approval first. So I can only imagine how my rates</p>

			would increase if they don't need to get approval first. And they're going to price me out of the market. I'm on a limited income. I can't afford outrageous increases which is what I am afraid will happen if they are allowed to do this.
	Bruce Wheeler	Web	CenturyLink – Docket Number UT-130477 We are currently CenturyLink customers and opposed to changes in regulations that would allow them to raise our rates at will. They indicate that they need relief due to competition. For those of us who live in rural areas (we live in rural Grays Harbor county), they have no competition. I am sure that we are like many of their current customers, unable to obtain any other phone or internet service. In fact, the level of service we can receive is inferior to that provided by their competition in other areas. If they are allowed to go unregulated, we would be at their mercy. Given past experience with this company, we are certain that given the opportunity to go unregulated, they will raise our rates without benefit of improved service or additional capability.
	Russell Naber	Web	I wish to comment that I am NOT in support of Century Link's petition to be regulated under a Alternative Form of Regulation, especially that part specifying the ability to change rates and terms and conditions of service without approval of the UTC. Landline phone service must still be under public revue for rates and cost's. Thank You
	Steven Meacham	Web	Please do not deregulate Century Link. We live in a rural area with no other access to telephone service and high speed internet so there is not any price competition. Their advertised prices are misleading and their service is marginal. They need more not less oversight.
	Richard A Burkhalter	Web	I have a land line phone only and no other type of phone service . This proposal would allow Century links to raise their rates any time they wish without any over sight . They have a monopoly on land line service to me. The monopoly is the reason why you folks, UTC, was created to regulate their service. It was to protect and insure proper service without gouging the home owners for providing land line services . I object to their request. Richard A Burkhalter
	Kurt Steinbach	Web	To Whom it May Concern: Please accept the following as our written comment in the matter of Docket #UT-130477, to be heard by the Commission on October 16, 2013, regarding a

			<p>petition by CenturyLink Companies to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR):

While we understand the company faces a number of challenges where it operates in competition with other providers, that is not the case in every area. Specifically, CenturyLink either directly or through other providers using its facilities, is the ONLY hard-wired provider of broadband service to the residents of Marrowstone Island, in Jefferson County. In effect, it currently enjoys a practical monopoly. Indeed, most users in this area would welcome competition, as CenturyLink's broadband service is both slow and subject to outages. Because it is a DSL service, it is also subject to slowdowns at precisely the times when the greatest number of users are trying to connect.

Regardless of what the Commission may choose to do in other areas served by CenturyLink, I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject the AFOR proposal for any areas in which any company, including CenturyLink, enjoys an effective monopoly, as it does on Marrowstone Island. It is entirely inappropriate to grant unrestricted authority for rates, terms and conditions of service to a monopoly, and doing so would constitute a gross violation of the public policy goals for which the Commission was created.

Thank you sincerely for your attention,

Kurt Steinbach
Lisa J. VanHorn
630 East Marrowstone Road
Nordland WA 98358
Phone: 360-385-1045

kurtsteinbach@hotmail.com
</p>
	Harold R. Olson	Web	<p>It is totally inconceivable that the U.T.C. would even consider this proposal. The reputation of CenturyLink is full of misdeeds and complaints. They also have a very shady outlook on over pricing. and erroneous charges. We, as citizens of the State of Washington have cultivated the U.T.C. for our protection are you trying to rid the state of this type of protection and control? Please vote "NO" on the proposal.</p>
	Anna Ballard	Web	<p>PHONE (DC)

I am not in favor the AFOR proposal and allowing the company to change rates without commission review. I live on a fixed income and companies continue to increase rates while nothing get cheaper. They ought to decrease the phone rates for customer instead of raising rates. Their rates are higher than anyone else. I am 71 years and rely on local phone service but can't afford to pay too high bills. It keeps going up and up.</p>
	Virginia Lee	Web	<p>Docket #UT-130477 I fail to comprehend the reason for a utilities commission when there is no regulation or accountability of the utilities. We certainly have lots of "important people" (commissioners) who probably receive salaries larger than the "common folks" who are trying to feed their families. What do you do? The reason our country is in such a mess is because of this very deregulation that's happened in all areas. Let's get real. What is the ratio of income of CEO compared to employee at CenturyLink? Demands of the marketplace is not at issue here, it's</p>

			demands of the wealthy for more wealth, right? Start doing your jobs!
	Peter McWilliams	Web	Century Link is just looking for a reason to raise rates, fees, etc. They already charge more than most other companies but we have no choices. They make enough money as it is. Rate increases and fees and getting way out of hand for the services they and others like them provide. I am hoping you think about the little people at the end of the line instead of the corporations.
	Bruno & Treva DeLeeuw	Web	PHONE (SH) My husband and I are on the WTAP program and if they get what they are asking for we won't be able to afford phone service. ((I educated the customer on WTAP rate.)) I can understand why the company is doing this but everything in the world is going up. It's all about money and what we can give to our shareholders.
	ernest ford	Web	docket # UT-130477 We have unlimited with in and out of state telephone service and DSL provided by Verizon in Palm Springs Ca. It cost approx \$70.00 a month. My son has the same service with Centurylink in Dupont wa. It cost him approx. \$85.00 a month. We have the same service with Centurylink in Brinnon Wa. It cost us approx. \$105.00 a month. When one of our neighbors tried to obtain a DSL site, none were available. They just did not have any more sites. He had to go to dish because cable is not available. Reception is poor for him because his neighbors trees are to numerous. Centurylink bought the business from Embark who bought it from Sprint. No upgrades were done in the process of obtaining the business from Embark. Thank you for inviting comments!!!!
	James M Driskell	Web	Docket Number UT-130477 I received a card from CenturyLink indicating that they have applied to regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR). They cite competition from other forms of technology that restricts their ability to quickly adjust (read raise rates) because they have to appear before the UTC to request rate increases. They are the sole provider of copper based telephone service. If they are allowed to raise rates when ever they want without review, the public that uses the copper based telephone system will be held hostage to their rate increases. If the public had the option to switch to an another copper based communications carrier, granting CenturyLink AFOR status probably would not affect rates, just because of competition. However, until that option become available, CenturyLink should be closely regulated and they should be required to justify an and all rate increases and levels of service changes. I strongly oppose granting CenturyLink AFOR status. James M Driskell
	Elizabeth Oakes	Web	I have received a 4x6 postcard from CenturyLink with 20 lines of fine print on the back which was posted in Monroe, LA. This card and its "legalize" language is intentionally designed to

			discourage the recipient from trying to read and understand what it says. This card states that CenturyLink has asked the UTC to absolve it from traditional regulation because CL claims it now faces "competition" from wireless telephone companies, cable and dish television companies that also provide excellent telephone and internet service. CL even asks for protection from "other companies" that may provide even better service in future than the wireless phone and TV companies do now. Centurylink is asking for unregulated freedom from UTC approval to raise their rates and change/cancel services for which they have already contracted with existing customers. Even automatic reporting requirements are to be waived. Like the big railroads in the 20th century, CenturyLink and other land line telephone companies are rapidly becoming obsolete. That CenturyLink charges already high rates and gives poor customer service has encouraged much of the public to turn to more efficient, less costly communications services. This proposed deregulation will simply hasten the demise of CL's land line business while there is still a need for land lines in some areas. Yet those customers cannot be expected to "foot the bill" for CL's already incurred debts. This petition from CenturyLink to the UTC is NOT in the Washington State public's interest.
	Dixie Mortensen	Web	Sorry, but they seem to have enough freedom now to raise rates or change there "rules".
	Thomas Karasek	Web	Our rural area is served by Century Link and Comcast, but Comcast refuses to run their service to our home down our installed underground conduit, so we have a monopoly situation. Ours and other monopoly situations should be protected from unwarranted rate increases by state regulation. Similarly, our internet service is provided by Verizon, bundled with Century Link. Only Verizon provides a barely adequate signal to our rural valley, so this is another monopoly situation.
	Steve Routt	Web	Giving Century link the option to change rates without notice and for any reason is unfair. Reason being living in a area that only has one carrier we are held hostage to any rate they wish to charge. We do not any other carrier in the area for a land line, we would be force to have a cell phone or nothing at all. In rural areas we do not have dependable wireless due limited coverage. We also do not have cable companies to choose from like a city or urban area would have to choose from. The only flexibility you would be giving them is charging more and still give the limited service and not do any improvements.
	Robert Lieberman	Web	Allowing Century Link to change its rates, terms, and conditions of service without UTC approval is ridiculous and a slap in the face to Washington residents. I have purposely maintained my telephone service with Century Link and its predecessor companies for almost forty years as I do

			<p>not want to be subject to the predatory practices of a mostly unregulated monopoly as I am with Comcast on my cable TV and Internet services.</p> <p>I can assure you, approving this change will not "better meet the needs and demands of the marketplace" in my and thousands of other Washington households. [Quote from Century Link's public notice postcard.] Rather, approving this change can only lead to a change in rates and, as we all know, rates will not go down.</p> <p>Sincerely, Robert Lieberman 3113 NE 112 Circle Vancouver, WA 98686 Tel 360-573-9202</p>
	Paul Magnussen	Web	I am opposed to granting CenturyLink's request if it will allow them to raise their telephone rates without government oversight. I am concerned that they could raise their rates so high that people on a fixed or low income would not be able to afford to have telephone service.
	Mable Cole	Web	If this proposal happens I am going to bundle with Comcast. Why is this necessary?
	Debra Adair-Keys	Web	I DO NOT like the fact that Century Link can change rates on its own. I feel it should be regulated by the UTC
	Karl Holfeld	Web	DoWe strongly recommend a NO vote. No utility should have carte blanche over the public. In addition, the sure to follow rate increases would have a severely adverse effect on those who have no other means of communication other than their land-line. They already charge for the use of their lines in areas where DSL lines are not available by any other company. Thank you for the opportunity to cast our NO vote.
	Cindy Walters	Web	I am not in favor of Centurylink having the ability to set their own rates any time they feel like changing them. Therefore I do not support AFOR for this company. The documentation that they sent me claims they can raise rates. It doesn't appear that their change to AFOR will benefit the customer so at this time I am opposed.
	Darlene Reams	Web	I am opposed to Century Link being granted to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation. I do not want them to be able to change rates, terms and conditions without approval

			from the UTC. If approved, this would give them the freedom to charge us whatever they want and make entertainment a hardship on families. Please do not approve this for Century Link. Thank you for your time.
	James Arthur Cone	Web	Any time a company has a monopoly like it does in Sequim, the consumer is the clear loser. They have no choice but use the service provided by the monopoly. The cost of that service is always more expensive than it would be if there was competition. When there is a monopoly it must be regulated by an independent body to prevent noncompetitive pricing. Please continue to regulate CenturyLink as it is now.
	Howard E. Bowers III	Web	Just a fancy way to allow them to jack up the rates to any level, at any frequency to the public without any reporting to a public agency because they are not making enough money. Big joke! Smoke and Mirrors.
	Laura Crafton	Web	Hello, CenturyLink is attempting to be permitted to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC. Docket number is UT-130477. I disagree with this request and hope it is not granted. If CenturyLink can raise rates without a check and balance system from the UTC it will mean that people such as I will end up with phone bills we can't afford. I am not alone in this concern. My neighbor lady Darlene who is elderly and has no computer is concerned about unchecked raising of rates as well. Also, another acquaintance of my a young, single mom with low income would not want to see this happen either. She also has no access to computer so I write on their behalf. Basically, CenturyLink is affordable phone service and we wish to see it remain that way by continuing the need for approval from the UTC Thank you, Laura Crafton
	Daryl Raines	Web	We already have to many Foxes in the Hen House! Let's not add another one. To many Industries in this Country are unregulated and were paying the PRICE, THEIRS!
	Joesph A Willey	Web	Company should be held to the law about requesting changes from the UTC, or other companys would also have the right to make unilateral changes also, making any controls meaningless.
	Corwin Grey	Web	As a long time subscriber of CenturyLink I feel it would be in the public's best interest for CenturyLink be denied their AFOR request. While CenturyLink claims that their requirements under the UTC is causing them to be at a competitive disadvantage given increasing competition from wireless carriers, cable companies, and VOIP services, much of CenturyLinks subscriber

			<p>base is located in rural areas. In many, if not the majority, of these areas CenturyLink is the only wired telco service available. Many of these areas also have limited connectivity via anything other than satellite. This AFOR would create a situation in which CenturyLink would essentially be deregulated regarding rates and fees, yet still have a functional monopoly over critical infrastructure services. Many people have retained wired services due to lack of reliability of VOIP or cable phone services and issues with 911/e911 over VOIP, cable, wireless, satellite.</p> <p>I feel strongly that CenturyLink's for regulation under the AFOR request should be denied</p> <p>Thank you, Corwin Grey</p>
	James Dalton	Web	<p>With all the increased rates in electricity, natural gas, gasoline, etc, giving permission to Century Link to change rates without approval with increase another cost to many of us who are on fixed incomes or making very little due to the economy. Century Link has done little to improve our services in our area as it is "not cost effective" for them. Dial up internet is all we get and they will probably increase the rates for that if they can. UTC regulation is the only help we the people have in keeping cost in check, and believe me, I am not big on government regulation. We have no options for other phone service other than cell phones, but then we cannot use our home security, emergency service location,etc. Please say no to AFOR for Century Link. I would like to have the UTC to allow Century Link to "update" their technology to be competitive. They might want to start by updating and bringing at least DSL to the outlying areas. Having "dial up internet" is like having to keep rotary phones instead of touch tone. I thought it was a "mandate" to bring fast technology to the nation?</p> <p>Sincerely, James Dalton</p>
	Roger Drake	Web	<p>Phone companies need all the regulation they can get, and that's especially true of Century Link</p>
	Mr Paul J. Ferguson	Web	<p>What they CenturyLink) propose is just another way to increase cost to the public. Being a user and everything is working fine now, I see no reason for a change. Greater flexibility means greater cost to the public.</p> <p>Ref.("AFOR").</p> <p>Thank You.</p>
	Shay Gooding	Web	<p>In reference to docket number UT-130477, I am opposed to allowing CenturyLink greater</p>

			flexibility in pricing. The reason for this is that I am in an area that has only CenturyLink as an option for a service provider. Giving CenturyLink the ability to change their prices without proper oversight will allow them to essentially hold their services hostage. This will force many to either pay CenturyLinks' demanded price or go without the basic, essential service of phone and/or internet. Thank you for your time.
	Leo and Mary Driscoll	E-mail	<p>As long term elder Spokane residential customers of Century Link (and previously of Qwest), we oppose the proposal of Century Link to the UTC that it be allowed to change rates, terms, and conditions of services provided to us without approval of the UTC.</p> <p>The notion that cell phone competition will preclude exorbitant increases in rates is Pollyanna. Like most elders, we prize and rely exclusively on our land-line services and do not use cell phones. The public service commitments that were the quid pro quo for regulatory approval and easement access to public ways did not contemplate shedding those commitments. No showing has been made to consumers that fair, reasonable rates and service will prevail through non regulation; indeed the experience of our long lives has proven the opposite.</p> <p>We urge you to reject the proposal of Century Link, Docket No. UT-130477.</p> <p>Respectfully, Leo and Mary Driscoll, 4511 E. North Glenngrae Ln., Spokane, WA 99223 Telephone 509 747 7468</p>
	Charles Simis & Sally Murray	E-mail	<p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>Please accept the following as our written comment in the matter of Docket #UT-130477, to be heard by the Commission on October 16, 2013, regarding a petition by CenturyLink Companies to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR):</p> <p>While we understand the company faces a number of challenges where it operates in competition with other providers, that is not the case in every area. Specifically, CenturyLink either directly or through other providers using its facilities, is the ONLY hard-wired provider of broadband service to the residents of Marrowstone Island, in Jefferson County. In effect, it currently enjoys a practical monopoly. Indeed, most users in this area would welcome competition, as CenturyLink's broadband service is both slow and subject to outages. Because it is a DSL service, it is also subject to slowdowns at precisely the times when the greatest number of users are trying to connect.</p>

Regardless of what the Commission may choose to do in other areas served by CenturyLink, I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject the AFOR proposal for any areas in which any company, including CenturyLink, enjoys an effective monopoly, as it does on Marrowstone Island.

It is entirely inappropriate to grant unrestricted authority for rates, terms and conditions of service to a monopoly, and doing so would constitute a gross violation of the public policy goals for which the Commission was created.

Thank you sincerely for your attention,

To Whom it May Concern:

Please accept the following as our written comment in the matter of Docket #UT-130477, to be heard by the Commission on October 16, 2013, regarding a petition by CenturyLink Companies to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR):

While we understand the company faces a number of challenges where it operates in competition with other providers, that is not the case in every area. Specifically, CenturyLink either directly or through other providers using its facilities, is the ONLY hard-wired provider of broadband service to the residents of Marrowstone Island, in Jefferson County. In effect, it currently enjoys a practical monopoly. Indeed, most users in this area would welcome competition, as CenturyLink's broadband service is both slow and subject to outages. Because it is a DSL service, it is also subject to slowdowns at precisely the times when the greatest number of users are trying to connect.

Regardless of what the Commission may choose to do in other areas served by CenturyLink, I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject the AFOR proposal for any areas in which any company, including CenturyLink, enjoys an effective monopoly, as it does on Marrowstone Island.

It is entirely inappropriate to grant unrestricted authority for rates, terms and conditions of service to a monopoly, and doing so would constitute a gross violation of the public policy goals for which the Commission was created.

Thank you sincerely for your attention,

Charles Simis
Sally Murray
264 Mumby Rd

			<p>Nordland, WA 98358 360-379-0657 Sally Murray 264 Mumby Rd Nordland, WA 98358 360-379-0657</p>
	Ruth Messing	E-mail	<p>How can you possibly consider CenturyLink “to be treated as if it were competitively classified” when there is NO COMPETITION, at least on the North Olympic Peninsula? You are going to allow them to “change rates, terms and condition of a service without approval from the UTC”.??</p> <p>In my mind this makes no sense. It is currently hard enough to get them to cooperate on rates they have promised without giving them a free hand.</p> <p>Ruth Messing, CenturyLink customer 71 TOPAZ WAY Sequim, WA 98382-4739 360-683-8246</p>
	Paul Mittelstaedt	Web	<p>I would request that the Commission not grant Century Links request to be regulated under an Alternate Form of Regulation (AFOR) Docket # UT-130477) The UTC needs to be able to continue to regulate Century Link and require Century Link to continue be regulated and have rate requests, terms, and conditions of service submitted to and approved by the UTC. Granting Century Link the ability to unconditionally and without restraint change rates while operating as a monopoly will put current customers at increased financial liability. Customers will have limited options to opt out of services provided by Century Link and not provided by a different telecommunication service because of any number of geographical, financial and or regulatory policies.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>
	Delmar McKinley	Web	<p>Without oversight they may charge whatever they wish. I'm not too concerned about telephone useage as they compete with cell phone carriers. My problem is computer DSL. MSN is my internet service provider and if I have to go to another type of connection I cannot transfer all of the features of MSN, primarily the "favorites" on the task bar. This feature allows me to store places a I like to go to without entering the www type of search.</p>

	Steve Slettve	Web	<p>PHONE (SH)</p> <p>I don't believe that the change of regulation will be in the best interest of the consumer. I think it would give CenturyLink a greenlight to raise rates. I believe they need oversight. And it would not be in the best interest of the consumer.</p>
	Charles Taggart	Web	<p>As a former telcom employee I have always felt that the cable companies had an unfair advantage because their rates to provide the same products (internet, VoIP) were not as regulated as the traditional telcom companies. Anecdotally, it seems the cable companies raise their rates "every time you turn around". I have always felt the cable companies should have been as well regulated as the telcoms. Comcast Telephone of Washington, LLC is listed in your directory as "competitive class" and is afforded the "whatever the market bears" type of pricing.
 However, in this case I don't believe that CenturyLink should be regulated under the AFOR based on the demographics of the landline users who tend to be in the older age groups who are less likely to convert to wireless partly due to their limited income status. While the cost of living outpaces the rise in income for most of us, even a \$1.00 (one dollar) a month is another drain to our income.</p>
	Nancy Gleason	Web	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>I am a Century Link Customer and received notice that they wish to be regulated under AFOR, which means they would not have to get Commission approval to change rates. They have increased my rates exponentially since they purchased Quest - as Quest did when they purchased their predecessor - and they need to be more heavily regulated, not less. Given the runaway corporate profits in America today please do your jobs and get OUR telecommunication rates under control.</p> <p>Thank You for listening.</p>
	Craig Robbins	Web	<p>CenturyLink has done nothing to improve the services they provide since their offering of internet service after their takeover from Quest. The buried cable supplying service to the majority of the homes on our road has been exposed and marked by two orange cones since before they became our service provider and there has been no effort made to do whatever repair or update the cable was exposed for and get it reburied.</p> <p>Our "high speed" internet connection is slower than the air card service we previously had from Sprint and is less dependable.</p> <p>My experience with CenturyLink under their previous business name of Century Telephone as a</p>

			<p>business customer and doing utility inspection for WSDOT made me question their ability to improve upon the service and ability to provide improvements in services previously provided by Qwest. So far I have seen nothing in the way of service or service improvements from CenturyLink to change those concerns I had upon them becoming my service provider. Granting them the right to change rates, terms and conditions without approval from the UTC would not be in the best interest of their customers or the State of Washington</p>
	Amy Frazee	Web	<p>PHONE (SH)</p> <p>I don't understand how CenturyLink can base their request on the market system because there is nothing in our constitution that speaks to using the market system. But there is under Article 1, Section 8, that is supposed to take into consideration is the general welfare and they've always had these hearings in places that are impossible for us to go to and if we write a letter I understand that there's supposed to be someone there representing us. ((Customer was advised that the Attorney General represents the public's welfare.))</p> <p>The PUC is not supposed to be a rubber stamp for the utility and lately everything the utility asks for, no matter what kind of argument the customers put up, the PUC goes with whatever CenturyLink asks for.</p> <p>And I want an answer for them to give me the legal basis for them ignoring the constitution and saying that none of us have a right, have been asked about, if we want to give up our rights, they just go ahead and take them.</p> <p>**Please let me know the legal basis on which you say the market system determines the basis for them to do whatever they want, is what they're saying.**</p>
	James Voelzer	Web	<p>CenturyLink (CL) and it's predecessor Qwest, have a long history of poor product quality and less than stellar customer service; not to mention numerous legal infractions. Dish network has told me that many of the problems I've had with internet reception are typical of the link provider (CL). Additionally, through CL, I have a "Price for Life" for internet speed and on two occasions, CL has tried to void that by suddenly charging me the current rate on my monthly bill. I caught the change in both instances, eventually got the service changed back and received a credit for the extra billing. In the past two months, my bill has increased from ~\$66.00 to ~\$74.00 and I can't get a satisfactory reason why; once I'm able to access their circuitous customer service lines and</p>

			talk to an actual person, of course. I'm still trying! In the Public Notice I find the following statements revealing: "CenturyLink seeks greater flexibility....." 'This means that Century Link is permitted to change rates, terms, and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC.' '...(CL) will be relieved of automatic reporting requirements." From my limited perspective, CL needs more oversight, not less, and the UTC should assure State CL customers of that commitment. In some 28+ years living in WA I can't recall the State ever turning down a request for less oversight or a rate increase by a company, although I'm probably incorrect. In summary, I urge the UTC to DENY THE PETITION BY CENTURYLINK. I thank you for the opportunity to comment.
	Mark and Jane Richardson	Web	
	Diana Endresen	Web	I believe in the ability of the Utility Commission to oversee rates for the best public experience. I do not believe in allowing retail experience to dictate rates - I do not believe that corporations have the best interests of the public at heart - their reason for being is to satisfy their stockholders and/or ownership. There are innumerable occurrences of corporate decisions that did not serve the public, like when AT&T (before the divestiture in the mid-1970's) decided that 12 mobile phones were plenty for each urban area. Even though that situation was a US Federal situation, not a State of WA situation, the lesson I learned is the same: corporations need governmental oversight, most especially for telephones and other utilities that are a necessity in this day and age.. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.
	Carol Boyd	Web	I do not like the idea that CenturyLink would be able to make changes and raise rates without oversight from the UTC. My rates are already too high...\$260.00 for my monthly service including land line and 2 cell phones. Service is shabby. Reception is ridiculous in Shelton - we both need our cell phones for work - on call 24/7 - CenturyLink will not speak about more towers in this area. This request will let CenturyLink go wild. I VOTE NO!!!
	perry christensen	Web	I am against the proposed change. Without the monitoring by the UTC rates will go out of control. They are already charging more than the value of the service. As a senior I can't stand uncontrolled rate increases... Do not grant this request, Please....
	Angus Anderson	Web	I received a postcard in the mail on 10/10/2013 regarding CenturyLinks desire to not have to go before the Commission with rate changes or service changes. This public comment hearing is Oct

			16th. Six days away!!!!!!!!!!!! That's not much time to respond to this situation. But that is likely intentional. Today, 10/11/2013 I received a phone call from CenturyLink (phone number 877-999-3738) that my they are moving to fiber optic cable and that my internet service provider is incompatible with this technology. So I have to change to CenturyLink as my provider. This changes my email address that I've had for 12 years. I'd rather not! Guess what, they want to have us switched over as of Oct 16th. Is this a coincidence. I don't think so. My ISP, Olypen in Sequim, WA knows nothing about this. I am against this AFOR. I don't trust that the next phone call or just a notice in my phone bill won't be, "We're increasing your rates."
	Richard A. Halsaver	Web	While I'm not really a big fan of regulatory oversight, I'm certainly not agreeable to allowing unconstrained rate changes, changes to terms and conditions, and relief from automatic reporting while a firm almost singularly is providing a service without open, widely available, and advertised competition.
	David Wickersham	Web	It is very simple. If Century Link does this, we will find another carrier. There are plenty of them out there.
	Paul Moore	Web	CenturyLink is one of, if not the largest telco companies in the nation. They currently do not follow their own verbal policies that then enforce on DSL resalers. They constantly under selling their services that does not allow for any type of competition. Here in San Juan County they currently are the only company that has phone and/or internet service that covers the entire county. All other ISPs have a very small footprint. Allowing such a large predatorial company to be unregulated will only push smaller business out of the internet business and leave the consumers with very little, if any, alternatives.
	Derek Benigno	Web	Please do not allow CenturyLink the ability to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC. Please continue to enforce automatic reporting requirements on them.
	Marshal Roragen	Web	Centurylink in my opinion is a horrible company. I am actively looking for a replacement for this monopoly. My two main reasons are: I receive my bill only a few days before it is due (every month), and I must call every other month because of internet speed going progressively slower. And now they don't want to be regulated. To me they have proven that they can not self regulate. So I say NO. Thank you, Marshal
	Poma Rodrigues	Web	
	Kevin Feigen	Web	I do not want any deregulation (or what amounts to it) of any company providing a basic,

			<p>necessary service. I have a fixed income and a land line phone. I do not want CenturyLink to be able to raise my rates at will. Deregulation has proven to be a disaster - just look at Wall Street and the airlines for examples. Cable tv may not be a basic necessity (just a few stations), but telephone service is! We are being taken down by companies that take basic things and turn them into bells and whistles, which then determine everything. Basic phone service should not be held hostage to corporations' need to be competitive on bells and whistles. Also, the info I received says that CenturyLink will continue to be held to retail service quality requirements but will be relieved of automatic reporting requirements. Again, who was it government was supposed to be for?</p>
	Nancy Hartill	Web	<p>If I pay for two lines and I can't use either one for DSL internet usage because we are hooked up by radio signal and not by fiber optics,I don't think we should have to pay as much as those in downtown Chewelah. The bundles are always offered, but we can't take advantage of them fully. I use over 5 GB a month internet and those in Spokane can get unlimited data usage. Please consider this handicap when constructing the rates.</p>
	Jonathan Kay	Web	<p>Please don't allow CenturyLink to be regulated under an AFOR (Alternative Form of Regulation)!</p> <p>They are a HUGE corporation that ONLY wants to make as much money as legally possible!</p> <p>They already provide a VERY sub-standard service to the unfortunate Seattle residents who are forced to use their products, and despite their bad services, we are still forced to pay the going rate for these services.</p> <p>I have spoken with them regarding better service (eg, fiber connection) and their representatives have told me that they will not install fiber connections in our neighborhood because no other providers have fiber either.</p> <p>Thus, I can only conclude that they do not care about their customers and do not actually want to improve services--they only want to make as much money as possible.</p> <p>Cable and wireless providers do not provide similar services (land-line telephone (NOT VOIP) services and fiber connections) and Centurylink does not face any real threat from them.</p> <p>If they are not regulated, they will undoubtedly raise their prices even more, and continue to</p>

			<p>provide their very sub-standard services, and not make anything better for us, their customers.</p> <p>Please continue to regulate them as the monopoly they are and do not allow them to further take advantage of their captive customers!</p>
	Ladd Wikstrom	Web	<p>The landline telephone services should be considered a "public" utility as it were. This is due to the fact that it is a necessary part of everyday life, even though the public is using cell phones, to some degree, as their only source of telephonic communication. There are some people who cannot afford cell service, therefore, landline telephone services should not be exempted from the approval of the UTC for changes to rates, terms and conditions of a service. Thank you, Ladd Wikstrom</p>
	Larry Anderson	Web	<p>The landline telephone services should be considered a "public" utility as it were. This is due to the fact that it is a necessary part of everyday life, even though the public is using cell phones, to some degree, as their only source of telephonic communication. There are some people who cannot afford cell service, therefore, landline telephone services should not be exempted from the approval of the UTC for changes to rates, terms and conditions of a service. Thank you, Larry Anderson</p>
	Morgan Kay	Web	<p>Please don't allow CenturyLink to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation ("AFOR"). They are a huge corporation that I do not think has their customers' best interests in this move--I think they only want to gain the ability to charge their customers more without having to justify their rate raise to a governing body, which is not good for the customer.</p>
	Raymond H Ogle	Web	<p>I want Century Link to stay controlled by The UTC. I don't think a business of this type should be able to raise prices as they like. The USA has the most expensive internet cost in the entire world, compared to other countries. They need to answer to some form of control.</p>
	David J. Korkowski	Web	<p>I unequivocally dispute CenturyLink's contention that they operate in a sufficiently competitively environment to warrant relaxation of UTC oversight. The only real competition CenturyLink (C-link) has in my end of Seattle is Comcast/Xfinity. Both vendors structure the pricing of their broadband, telephone and television service into "package deals" that forestall consumer choice. Both companies employ "come-on" temporary deals to attract new customers and thereafter charge rates 60% or 70% higher. C-Link skirts responsibility for the cost of its television service by claiming it is merely only a billing agent for DirecTV. I have never heard of C-Link pressing DirecTV for better rates for C-Link customers; they feel no incentive to do so. I suspect that--if one could read the complete nature of their business collaboration--one would learn that C-Link</p>

			reaps a percentage of DirecTV's billings, and thus has a DISINCENTIVE to safeguard consumer interests. One needn't be very old to remember how explicitly C-Link argued a few years ago that its take-over of Qwest would save consumers money due to economies of scale. Now they want to curtail UTC checks on price increases. I believe C-Link is exactly the type of near-monopoly that the UTC was intended to control.
	Bruce Peterson	Web	Reference Docket #UT-130477 I am concerned that this proposal will allow Century link to raise rates and change service level without oversight. Our service from this company has been poor at best. There is a lack of response to service problems and an indifference to service failures. Allowing Century link to change service levels and rates without regulation will in my opinion result in a reduction of service and an increase in cost to the end user.
	Neil Van Blaricom	Web	Dear Commissioners My experience with CenturyLink has been so frustrating. Trying to ask about billing increases and changing services is so hard to accomplish. I am convinced CenturyLink discourages customers from getting real answers regarding billing increases. Telling me changes are made in service as I requested and then doing nothing. Baiting me into changing my service which later excluded me from my former service plan. These people need supervision! Left to their own devices will undoubtedly lead to increased service charges. Customers in my area have no alternative phone service. We will be victims to CenturyLinks criminal practices!
	R. Marean	Web	Any agreement that allows CenturyLink "...to change rates, terms and conditions of service without approval from the UTC" is a very bad idea as experience with any number of other companies (energy, mortgages, mining etc.) has demonstrated
	Sarath Kotelawala	Web	UTC should deny the petition as submitted by Century Link requesting that they be regulated under a "AFOR" . As this would give them a free hand to change Rates Terms and Conditions of Service without approval from the Commission. Century Link will have a free hand to raise rates as they please causing a burden on the Public that pays the bill. They have a Monopoly on the Landline service and the consumer is NOT given a choice to go to a different provider when the price goes up or the service deteriorates. Changes in Technology that they and all telecommunications companies talk about has not

			<p>provided the competition needed for a better deal for the customers.</p> <p>At the present time there are Third World countries that provide cheaper and better service to their customers than these providers in the US</p>
	Bill Kelly	Web	<p>So, the administrative lords of Century Link assert their non-democratic corporate government can't compete with the cable companies. Competition USED to mean lower prices for end users. In today's "United States", successful competition is apparently the ability to transfer the greater amount of surplus wealth derived from the labor, creativity and service of societies serfs and redistribute it into the pockets of global capitalist investors.

The overhead for the big investors who ultimately rule over these private corporate governments is the relatively minimal amount it takes to bribe a few corporate administrators and politicians into betraying the common interests of citizens by promising and often awarding them huge salaries, bonuses, under the table handouts and future private non-democratic corporate government positions.

Corporations steadily prove they are the enemy of the American Revolution as they hold the veil of threat over their indentured servants with wage and benefit cuts, layoffs and outsourcing of jobs. Why in such a terrible market place of burdensome public regulation has this democracy hating entity Century Link remained in Washington State several years?

The people of this nation funded the development of the internet over decades. Was this not enough? Having reached profitability and passed into the realm of private corporate government therein lies the assertion that 2.5 times more than European citizens pay for better internet service is not enough. Now this sociopathic corporate amoeba demands 4 times or more with no restrictions from the accountability that would otherwise be granted citizens of Washington state. Who allegedly representing the citizens will give this private government entity the perpetual green light while giving citizens increasingly more fiery red lights?

It is tragic to witness sinister corporate marketing and corporate speak successfully distort reality and bury the simple rule of thumb that would call for an examination of where wealth is flowing. Corporations are ultimately undoing the fundamentals of the American Revolution in a grave dishonor to those who died fighting for freedom from the oppressive and abusive tyranny of a minority of insiders. Our public governments are being steadily melded around private non-democratic corporate government interests that severely limit who receives representation.

Bil Kelly
</p> <p>Century Link has sent notice of a hearing with the ultimate goal to allow them to be "competitive" with cable companies. Competition USED to mean lower cost to the end user but what Century</p>

			<p>Link appears to be proposing is that they be allowed to raise their rates to not the current 2.5 times but upwards of perhaps 4 times or more what European citizens whose societies are less anti-social pay for such service. So, they would like to compete with other companies on how much they can skim off of Washington Consumers.

Corporations are proving increasingly they are enemies of a nation of, for and by the people but rather are private governments that serve a few insiders. They treat their own employees badly threatening to cut their wages and benefits. Clearly a few with a great deal of wealth and the bully pulpit have been attacking the common citizen for a long time. When is this assault on the fundamentals of the American Revolution going to end and when will these traitors be called to justice?

If Century Link is struggling to skim off enough surplus wealth from the serfs labor, service and creativity for their global and domestic capitalist investors, why have they remained here in Washington State for the past several years? They didn't build the internet, the U.S. taxpayer did. They are thieves. I hope the next generation declares war on the private non-democratic corporatocracy that is destroying the United States of America and call those who serve these anti-american revolutionary governments to justice in complete and utter revolt. It's happened before. I believe it will happen again.

It appears by Oct 16, this will go through. To this end, the traitors in government will further confirm they are not public servants in the least. They are proving to serve private corporate government. The Boston tea party was a revolt against such abuses against democratic society.

Bill Kelly
</p>
	Eoin Doherty	Web	<p>I am against Century Link looking to change their rates without permission from the UTC. Out here in Sequim we suffer from terrible slow Internet, so slow in fact that at times we can hardly down load a 3 minute news report or listen to Music.
They sat in their advertisements that we are getting 1.6 MBPS, where as in fact we are getting on average about half that at best during peak times. They have the cheek to charge for a sub par service and recently they tried to raise their rates on me. I told them under no circumstances should they be charging for something they are not in fact delivering.
To sum it up, I am against Century Link's request to be allowed to change rates without permission.</p>
	William Hawthorne	Web	<p>My internet fees are already too expensive, and I'm required by Century Link to have a land line through them in order to obtain DSL. I'm opposed to rule changes that will give them the power to increase my rates without oversight or notification.</p>
	bebette cazelais	Web	<p>docket number UT-130477
Not in favor of century link being permitted to change rates, terms and conditions of service without approval from UTC and being relieved of automatic reporting requirements.</p>

	Dmitry Erastov	Web	I oppose CenturyLink's proposal to be regulated under AFOR because it's an extra-market mechanism that would give the company an unfair competitive advantage. I believe that CenturyLink must compete with cable and wireless ISPs on fair market grounds and either invent new ways to survive or lose. It should not ask the government to protect it against changing market conditions.
	Matthew Marinos	Web	I am afraid that letting Century Link set rates or change services at will will hurt consumers. The service is already expensive and with this approval will only become more so. This should only be approved if it can be shown that the move will benefit consumers and keep prices down.
	Karl Rodrigues	Web	
	Alphonsus Rodrigues	Web	Re. Docket # 130477
	Roy Rodrigues	Web	
	Michael Bueckers	Web	<p>Please do not allow Qwest dba Century Link to raise the rates for internet connections. I have had a bad experience with them.</p> <p>The internet connection did not meet their posted data rates for more than 4 YEARS. I went around and around with them. The tech could not fix the connection because of technical problems but they did not tell me this. They kept me in the dark. They did not want to lose a customer. I an electronic communications systems specialist. I told them what was wrong, but I kept having to go around and around. Their service sucked.</p> <p>Then they tried to raise the cost for the connection. The price just kept going up without any prior notice. I called and went around and around with their sales representative until they sent me to their customer retention department. Now they have raised the rate again. The problem now is that Qwest dba Century Link now has spent money and has fixed the problem. My internet connection is good. Please make them lower their rates. Make them pay for their mistakes. I know that they have filed this request with you so they can raise their rates. It would not make sense for them to do this to allow them to lower their rates.</p> <p>PLEASE DON'T ALLOW THEM TO RAISE THEIR RATES. If you do, I will retaliate by getting a disconnect order for all Century link services that I have, and will make sure that my friends to not use Century link. I will turn my landline off and only use my cell phone. You, the state of Washington will lose tax monies.</p> <p>I will activate a new cell phone in another state.</p>

	Clyde or Carol Thorne	Web	As a 50+ years phone company subscriber we object to any AFOR for Century Link. Due to their now excess charges we are seriously considering disconnecting our land line. \$5.00 for not using a service and then \$5.00 to take off the \$5.00 fee? A 10 cent long distant call ends up costing \$2.10? Lets be reasonable and charge for services used and eliminate the charges for alleged taxes that are no longer collected by the government and go into the CEO's pocket. Thanks for listening and next time give more notice. Century Link sent out notice only 3 days before hearing.
	Robert Love	Web	Century Link just recently instituted the collection of Washington State Sales Tax and Pierce County Sales tax on their monthly bills. The RCW's state that sales tax for these services are based on the the customers physical location. The tax that Century Link is charging customers that are in unincorporated Pierce County is incorrect and to high. When Century Link was questioned, they customer Service Rep stated that the tax rate is based on the 911 city data, i.e. Gig Harbor outside city. This rate is not correct. The rate should be 1.4% for the county, not almost 3% as charged, and 6.5% for the state. If Century Link can't get the tax rates correct why should the Commission expect them to be fair and correct in setting the land line rates without monitoring and supervision?
	Blair & Barbara Patrick	Web	We are opposed to the company's proposal to be treated as if it were competitively classified. We are opposed to permitting the company to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC. We believe that without the UTC oversight the company would be tempted to run rampant with it's pricing and the public would be left with no recourse.
	GEORGE THOMAS	Web	American history over the last 20 to 30 years reveals that unregulated business and financial corporations have a real tendency to bite their customers and neighbors. Please, let's not let one more corporation off the leash. Government's duty to be watchdog over the natural selfishness built into capitalism must be strengthened. Not weakened.
	Therese Roberson	Web	I live in rural Stevens County and depend on my landline during times of power outages. I do not see giving up my landline anytime soon and am very concerned about the prospect of Century Link being able to charge whatever they want for me to have this service. I am a low-income household and depend on my landline for emergencies. Please reconsider giving Century Link free reign in this matter. Thank you.
	Arlen J Notch	Web	Century Link's request likely is a ploy to arbitrarily raise rates without UTC approval. Rates have risen over 13% since January 2012. Excessive, considering a land line is hard to justify if we have a cell phone and cable tv/internet service.

	Glenn Cummings	Web	Although the statement is about 'efficient and effective' it clearly is about rates. I have two Qwest services taken over by Century Link. 1) Landline and 2) DSL. If Century Link prevails, and if they raise their rates, I have no reason to remain loyal to them.
	Barry	Web	Re: UT 130477 Dear Commissioners; This is to request that you not allow CenturyLink to change rates and the terms and conditions of service without the approval of the Commission. Qwest was a terrible service provider and had one of the worst reputations in the industry for customer satisfaction. I don't see that the name change to CenturyLink has changed their disregard for customer service in any way. They lied to me about their service contract and while I am still a customer, I do not think they are an honest business enterprise that can be trusted to operate without your oversight and stringent reporting requirements. Please do not grant them their request or relieve them of their automatic reporting requirements. Sincerely, Barry Allison
	Joseph Morton	Web	Centurylink is a utility and as such needs to be regulated by certian rules. To allow them to circumvent those rules is to create a mistrust in the public. Should Centurylink wish to go into other sreas of business then they need to cease to be a utility. Allowing uncontroled regulation is paramount to misstrust and uncontroled pricing. Business practice doesnt allways need to begetting into new things. Should Centurylink wish to go into cell phones and internet business then they need to be regulated. I can see huge profits and no control over their business practice, just more profits that the public pays for less service. I urge a no voteon this application. Thank You
	Mitchell Montgomery	Web	I am not in favor of granting Century Link AFOR status. I am against granting the status because I see it as a way for Century Link to shift from a monthly rate to a data cap pricing structure similar to mobile phone plans. I feel Century Link is trying to capitalize on the growing popularity of streaming media content. As a consumer I am faced with enough fees from content providers. Century Link should be held accoutable by the UTC for rates, terms, and conditions.
	Duane Winebarger	Web	Docket number UT-130477 I oppose the company's proposal because they are just a rural phone company to me. They don't offer cable TV or high speed internet in my area. Why should they be able to raise the phone rates without UTC approval. That's why we have a UTC.
	Erinn Webber	Web	
	Craig Jackson	Web	Alternative Form of Regulation? This company needs more, not less regulation! When our service was owned by Qwest, we had better customer service and far fewer junk calls than under

			<p>the current ownership. It's pretty apparent that CenturyLink sold our phone contact information to everyone in sight. When called to ask why, they simply told us that we could, for a price, get most of this stopped. Why should we pay for something that they apparently created? We do not believe that any regulated utility should be able to disperse our unlisted information to anyone without specific legal authority. Now they want to be able to raise our rates without approval? Sounds like an unregulated MONOPOLY! If this happens, we will likely move our phone service to 100% cellular or to cable, the very entities that CenturyLink wishes to compete with. If they want to compete, they should look toward providing service that's better than the competition.</p>
	Carol Bennett	Web	<p>Century Link holds a monopoly on the alarm and emergency lines related to fire and safety in building across the state. There has been no technology change for this. For small buildings and property owners the responsibility of maintaining multiple phone lines for fire sprinkler and alarm monitoring is just part of rising costs for this one aspect of building maintenance. If this cost was allowed to increase due to the removal of oversight and approval of the UTC through automatic reporting by companies, unchecked rates, terms and conditions could impact users disproportionately and in a devastating way. Simple automatic reporting for this company is an important part of the protection for users of this mandatory service.</p> <p>Additionally, many areas are not served by cable or other affordable technological services beyond phone lines, even within urban areas. This industry (service by CenturyLink) is still an essential part of a portion of the population and that loss of reasonable services due to lack of oversight and review would be devastating. Do not remove responsibility of CenturyLink's automatic reporting requirements to UTC.</p>
	M. Anne Sweet	Web	<p>I do NOT believe that CenturyLink should be allowed to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC.</p>
	Mary E. Blair	Web	<p>UT-130477 is not in favor of the people who are now with CenturyLink. If this petition is granted, CenturyLink has the ability to raise their rates which people who are on fixed incomes will not be able to afford. With everything being raised higher and higher now, people are having a very hard time just being able to have a roof over their heads and food on the table. I do not want the poor people to have a harder time affording telephone and internet service. The internet may not be a necessity but the telephone is especially in an emergency.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Scott Rhodes	Web	<p>As a concerned consumer, please consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no equivalent telephone service available residentially. 2. They own all the infrastructure, so even if there was another phone company available, the price

			<p>would be unregulated due to the lease of the infrastructure.</p> <p>3. Their proposal contradicts my understanding of anti-trust law.</p> <p>Therefore, if this petition is granted in CenturyLink's favor, customers will be subjected to rate increases without approval from the UTC. This is not in the best interest of the public.</p> <p>Please deny this petition.</p>
	Gayle Pavola	Web	<p>I have CenturyLink internet and landline phone service. I am against CenturyLink being permitted to change rates, terms and conditions of service without approval from the UTC. Their rates are competitive, and are often raised. I don't want to be subjected to unregulated rate and terms.</p>
	Marvin Schroeder	Web	<p>Century Link would like to change rates, terms, and conditions without the need of approval. This is to "better meet the demands of the marketplace"? Well I am the marketplace! To change rates... without approval is not a position I want to be in. If this is allowed I will have to change companies possibly to out of state with out of state employees. How would that help me?</p>
	Kristin Godo	Web	<p>At the risk of stating the obvious this company is a monopoly. It's only 'competitor' in the area for fast internet is Comcast (now that Clearwire is gone). It has no competitors for land-line phone service. Believe me if I could get a better deal elsewhere I would no longer be a customer of this company but there is nowhere else to go. The idea of ceasing to regulate them is laughable. Even with regulation their rates are very high--w/o regulation they will be usurious. Please deny CenturyLink's petition to be regulated under AFOR.</p>
	Mr and Mrs S	Web	<p>Please, we are very afraid to include our name and address and telephone because if Century Link finds out we have written to you with our opinion, they could retaliate against us and cancel our telephone service.</p> <p>Please do not approve Century Link's petition to be regulated under AFOR.</p> <p>We are low-income Senior Citizens living in low-cost HUD regulated Senior Housing in Seattle. If you allow Century Link's petition it could hurt us and our aged, disabled and low-income friends and neighbors.</p> <p>Please do not okay their request.</p>

			Thank you.
	cheryl crane	Web	I don't want Century Link to be able to raise rates without my agreement. Docket # UT-130477 FYI: There was a tab that said enter docket number but would not let me enter it.
	Peter Beckford	Web	Summary: Petition of the CenturyLink companies to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation (AFOR) pursuant to RCW 80.36.135. I do not agree with any settlement that makes a major utility company necessary to "facilitate the operation of state or local government or to promote and secure the safety and protection of the civilian population" a competitively classified company. The legacy deregulation of the phone industry left us is one of constantly changing monthly rates for customers, back door deals for control of important communications highways, and an erosion of basic individual rights including the attempts to control the internet. One of the only democratic checks that the public has is the oversight provided by the UTC. This large interstate corporation owns a UTILITY that we all depend on. The fact that they pursue other business opportunities that are not traditional utilities does not give them the right under the WAC to be given the freedom to not report to the UTC. In fact, this is proof that they should. As a community, we rely on the cables connecting us all (whether wireless or not) to do the public business and for survival just like water or electricity.
	Marsha Brooks	Web	Less regulation is NOT in the favor of the people the laws are suppose to protect and regulate concerning this petition From CenturyLink to do this. They NEED to be held accountable and responsible. They already raise it and small print it and stick on us more fees and usage dollars already that is so out of control. They already run a monopoly and less regulation is NOT in the best interests of the people. YOU ARE HERE TO STAND UP FOR US AND THAT IS YOUR JOB. DO NOT GIVE THEM EVEN MORE LAX ACCOUNTABILITY. Thank you for listening.
	Patsy Schorr	Web	Century Link already has more than enough power to jerk ones account around willy nilly with no recourse.
	annie capestany	Web	docket number UT-130477 I do not believe Century Link should be able to change rates without approval of the UTC. It is important to have oversight of any rate changes. The UTC exists to protect consumers and I think it should maintain that roll with the telecom industry, especially with big players like Century Link
	Dale Halverson	Web	In the Ashord area, CenturyLink faces no competition. There are no other cable companies

			available to us. Thank you
	Nancy Melton	Web	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I received a notice in the mail (in fine, tiny print) that CENTURYLINK is trying to be treated as if it were "competitively" classified. If a change is permitted, they will be able to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC.</p> <p>I am a senior, on a very limited income. As it is now, I have a land line, no long distance and a relatively fast internet for only 3 more months on a twelve month contract.</p> <p>If CenturyLink is allowed to charge what it wants and when it wants then I strongly object. They make a lot of money, and I feel that they need more regulation, not less!</p> <p>They are very aggressive with their sales pitches and seem to forget that some of us do not have the means for unlimited cable , texting & long distance telephone service. In essence, we're not interested in a lot of cable TV choices or 'smart' phones.</p> <p>Please allow a provider such as CenturyLink not to become a predatory industry on peoples' pocketbooks!</p> <p>There is room for A LOT OF REGULATION HERE, PLEASE!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Nancy Melton</p>
	David & Dorothy Evans	Web	<p>We received a notice from Century Link concerning a settlement agreement hearing on October 16, 2013.</p> <p>As customers of Century Link (land-line telephone, Internet, television), we would strongly favor not allowing Century Link to change rates, terms and conditions of service without approval from the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. Century Link and Charter are the only options for individuals in this area. As it is, Century Link's rates, terms and conditions of service</p>

			are variable. Century Link need to be regulated.
	Bill Rumpf	Web	I am writing to oppose CenturyLink's proposal to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Refularion. My understanding is that this would give the company much more discretion over setting the rates and terms of their services. The telecom and cable industry in general and CenturyLink specifically is the most deceptive industry that I have to deal. They are a significant part of the monthly budget for many households. I am currently a CenturyLink customer, and I find their billing and contract for service extremely deceptive. They offer short term promotions only available with two year lock contract lock ins, and despite an advanced degree in public policy, I find it virtually impossible to decipher their fine print to calculate my cost over the term of the contract. I would favor MORE consumer oriented regulation of CenturyLink and its competitors. Please don't approve their AFOR petition.
	Granville Horn	Web	It would be irresponsible to allow any company of this size to be able to operate without some oversight from an outside agency. I'm sure it would be like putting the fox in charge of the security for the hen house.
	Joe Barto	Web	I am responding to a Public Notice about Centurylink's request to be regulated under a AFOR. While competitiveness of utilities is in the interest of all customers, I believe it is in the interest of the citizens for the UTC to scrutinize rate increases and term/service condition change proposals by the utility. The UTC should be aware of all changes.
	Loualta P. Vogel	Web	Removing CenturyLink from the jurisdiction of Washington's Utilities and Transportation Commission would free this business to raise its rates without any regulation. This I oppose.
	Harry Rollins	Web	Please do NOT revise the current settlement. Thank you, H.E. Rollins Docket #UT-130477
	Gordon Fleming	Web	None of the recent deregulation has been any good for the consumers. The stock market and housing markets proved that out. I feel that utility companies should have to have their rate increases justified and approved by some sort of oversight process. Eliminating this process will only make our rates go higher, with no recourse for unfair increases. How could this be good for anyone but the utility company profits?
	Michael D Chandler	Web	Unregulated phone service, et al, will increase the rates we pay. Other entities need to be regulated. People only have so much money. Century Link is only after corporate greed.
	Marion Shaw	Web	I have found the company to be very dictatorial to do business with. They give the customer no voice in the level of service you may purchase from them. Phone wire provided by Century Links

			<p>predecessor was installed several years ago, now the Century Links refuses to use the wire because it not up to current standards and will not provide high speed service but is good for phones. The party wanting to use these wires does not want high speed service only a phone line. The new, Century Links is demanding will cost \$5000 to install, a needless expense, Century Links should have less authority and not more, and learn to treat customers with respect. Century Links request should be denied!!!!</p>
	Steven Bolin	Web	<p>All this will do is let CenturyLink decide prices and likely result in even higher prices/ I am suppose to be onb a 5 year price lock with CenturyLink.</p>
	Sean Roulette-Miller	Web	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>>I recently purchased Centurylink DSL service at my address at 1505 29th ave, Seattle WA, 98122 and I would like to comment about how horrible my experience was on getting my service started. I had called Centurylink to activate my new service and I asked to get the lowest price available. I was told over the phone that I could get service 1.5 MB for 19.99\$/mo with an activation charg. I signed up for this service to begin on August 8th. When the service was supposedly activated I tried to plug in my modem but I didn't receive a signal. I spent hours working with Centurylink over the phone trying to troubleshoot my problems. The people that I talked to told me to try different outlets in the house and repeatedly asked me which modem I had purchased. I got fed up after plugging the modem directly into the telephone interface box on the outside of the house and still not receiving a signal. Finally on August 11th a technician came out to my house to check the DSL and the line was not connected to my house from the street.</p> <p>After I got my DSL installed I had another rude awakening when I got a cofirmation email from Centurylink about my account and it said that my monthly bill would be \$40.00/mo which was the flat rate with no introductory rate which I had been promised at \$19.99/mo. I called to find out what my bill would be and I was confirmed over the phone that I would be billed \$19.99 rate. When I got my first bill it was for \$40.00/mo rate plus taxes. I had to call again and talk to someone in the customer retention department. She told me that the rate I had been sold over the phone was not possible in my service area because they were offering higher speeds and the 19.99/mo rate was only available in areas where they didn't offer the higher speeds. But I had confirmed the rate when I had called after seeing on my email that the rate was 40.00.</p> <p>I had a terrible experience with getting my DSL service installed and I object to Centurylink being</p>

			regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation Thanks for reading my comments Sean
	Mary F. Rau	Web	Dear UTC, As one of many people who live in a rural area of Washington state that does not get cell phone service and relies on a land line for emergencies and frequent power outages, how will CenturyLink be prevented from charging outrageous and unaffordable rates for our land lines as the satellite providers are currently doing for our only option for internet and television? Please address this in making your decision. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Mary F. Rau
	Carlin R. Buchanan	Web	I am very much opposed to CenturyLink being allowed to change terms and conditions of service without approval. Since I do not think Comcast should be allowed to either, they remain on equal footing.
	Rodney Gingerich	Web	I would like to express my concerning regarding if Century Link is to be regulated under the Alternative Form of Regulations (AFOR). I do not think Century Link should be given greater flexibility in order to better meet the needs and demands of the marketplace. If Century Link is given these new flexibilities I think that Century Link will increase their costs, and expenses onto the consumer, and it will then further restrict the free marketplace that is so strongly desired by the consumers. I do not want Century Link to be able to change the rates at which they charge their customers, modify their terms and conditions of services without the approval of the Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC). I want the UTC to continue to have to approve and monitor such modification that Century Link may propost. I want Century Link to have to continue to provide automatic reporting requirements. If Century Link is not continued to be monitored by the UTC I fear that the costs that they charge their customers will sky rocket, and the quality of services that they offer will decrease and be of less value to the consumer.
	Jill Hackford	Web	New to the services of centurylink, every month they charge more than what was agreed at the time of hook up. We as consumers of CenturyLink have no power to stop what they do. When you are told your bill will be 59.60 per month then you are sent a bill for 106.00. Please do not approve them more power to do as they wish. I feel that the UTC is very important to all in concern. Than You, Jill Hackford
	David R. Nuetzmann	Web	Do not let the company raise it's rates. Or approve anything that will easily allow CenturyLink to raise it,s rates.

	Stephen Bond	Web	<p>Regarding Century Link's request to raise rates for phone subscribers under terms of the AFOR, I submit that they apparently have enough money to support the Football/Soccer Stadium in downtown Seattle. Perhaps they need to husband their resources and spend their advertising dollar in a less expensive and less flamboyant manner. Why should their subscribers have to pay for this? I view Century Link's request for less stringent regulation as just another example of rampant corporate greed.</p> <p>In these tough economic times it seems most of us are making do with a little less. Tell Century Link to join the club and stop whining.</p> <p>...And while you are at it, the next time you need to send the consumer a required notice of public hearing, post the full URL for comment in the document. It was difficult to find this comment page. Are you afraid of public comment?</p> <p>Thank You</p>
	Jeremy	Web	<p>Regarding "CenturyLink AFOR Petition - UT-130477", I am against this proposal. It would appear to give CenturyLink too much control over the rates to be charged for new service installations, especially for customers whose service location requires new buried wiring, aerial wiring, or repairs to existing wiring that no longer functions.</p>
	Ayna Meppelink	Web	<p>Docket number: UT-130477 CenturyLink has provided me with a stable landline phone connection for the past nine years. However, the company has apparently still made no provisions in regard to offering a lower rate for the disabled, those on SSI, and others living on dismally fixed incomes below the poverty line. When some years ago I requested a special rate, the company informed me that they did not really have one, but they gave me a five-dollar deduction that immediately disappeared with the next rate increase. The free cellphones advertised through the grocery stores are not available in my area, and probably not in many other rural and remote areas of Washington. I therefore protest against any kind of agreement that would allow CenturyLink to change its rates and pricing policies at will, unless the company is required to make a meaningful adjustment for those in need.</p>
	Alex Reid	Web	<p>Re: UT-130477 CentutyLink filed a petition based on competition? There is no competition. If you want a land line, you go to CenturyLink. If you want high speed internet, You go to CenturyLINK or Comcast. Everything is a monopoly or a cartel. They can charge what</p>

			they want and give poor service without caring about their customers. And their prices are ridiculously high and their service poor. I am a customer of both CenturyLink and Comcast. If there were actual competition, neither of these companies would last unless they changed their focus radically. Do not grant CenturyLink further regulatory relief. It is sure to come out of my pocket.
	del mcdaniel	Web	docket# ut-130477 petition to be regulated under an alternative form of regulation. CenturyLink would like to be able to change rates without approval from the UTC order to meet the demands of the market place. Rate increases will follow. Our monthly phone bill, with no long distance and all frills turned off, is \$35.04. What will it be when unfettered? I went to yahoo finance's website and found, under the stock ticker CTL, that centurylink is able to pay its shareholders \$2.16/year in dividends. They also awarded 153,100 shares of stock options to ten company officers during the last 12 months. At Friday's closing price that has a value of nearly five million dollars. Recent company news includes an article: "Centurylink heads to Las Vegas, brings Gigabit internet to Sin City". Included in the article was news of the same kind of upgrade and offer to residents of Omaha. Meanwhile here in rural Klickitat county, Washington State we have the same old copper infrastructure that has had a number of owners over the years. Dialup internet here is as slow as any dialup I've heard of anywhere. The cell service is very spotty. We are using satellite internet at over \$70/month due to centurylinks slow, old and worn plant. In nine years time I am unaware of substantial work other than basic trouble calls which are numerous here. So, in an area with high unemployment, low incomes and few other telecommunications options centurylink would like to be allowed to set rates as they see fit?
	pamela	Web	I've learned that WA may allow CL to set it's own rates for phone land lines & not be overseen. This is appalling! As a senior citizen living in a very rural area, I need my land line for safety. CL has a monopoly and I'm forced to use them. To allow them free rein in setting rates is daunting. Since I was forced to become their customer in 2011, I have had many negative experiences with their practices. The latest is they raised my internet rates by 1/3, downgraded my service, signed me up for a product I did not ask for, billed me for it, charged me a late fee when I didn't pay for it, I didn't know I had it, when I complained, charged me a fee to cancel it! Sound like borderline fraud to me. Who has been bought off! Don't let them screw over their senior customers just because more people are using cell phones.
	Damon Darley	Web	This proposal should be rejected.

			<p>Century Link provides traditional land line phone service to 3 primary populations who depend upon it. The elderly, the poor, and rural users. These populations are dependent on this traditional service because of monthly and hardware costs, technical challenges, and poor or non existent wireless service in some areas.</p> <p>Since Century Link provides this vital service to 3 of our most vulnerable populations, granting the AFOR will not meet the public policy goals of Washington State. Therefore this AFOR should be denied.</p> <p>Also, we received the public hearing notice in the mail on 10/12/2013, just 4 days prior to the hearing. This short notice includes a weekend. Thus not enough time is allowed for a proper response. The hearing should be rescheduled to allow timely notification, and effective public response.</p>
	James D Davis	Web	<p>We oppose the AFOR application filed by CenturyLink, docket number UT-130477. CenturyLink is facing no more competition than any other company in the same business and should not receive greater flexibility to change rates or terms and conditions. We live on a fixed income.
Thank you.</p>
	Mary Schlater	Web	<p>I do not think Century Link should be permitted to change rates without approval of the UTC.</p>
	sam Simone	Web	<p>CenturyLink is the 3rd largest telecommunication company in the United States and filed a petition with UTC to be regulated under an AFOR. This is nonsense. It is one of the most unreliable companies in operation, and to allow them approval to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without your approval is criminal.</p> <p>Please deny their request and tell them to "suck it up". They are just looking for preferential treatment in a competitive market.</p>
	Paul LaVigne	Web	<p>This company marketed low bundled rates that would never go up to customers. Fees, taxes and increases have pushed actual costs to consumers up to the extent that the initial offer is a bad joke played on customers. Nothing has been done to improve services to customers even though costs have markedly increased. It seems clear that the company had no intent at any time to live up to the offer made to secure customers. That kind of corporate behavior should not be rewarded. This is about corporate profits, not serving customers in my opinion. I urge a no vote.</p>
	Christina Scott	Web	<p>Please do not allow CenturyLink to change their rates. They will surely raise them and the consumer will suffer. Where I live on Vashon Island, I have no other option for phone or internet</p>

			<p>service. I can't go to any competitors because of my rural location. I will have to pay more for what is already sub par service. It certainly doesn't seem like they put their money into infrastructure but they have plenty of money for a sports stadium. This is just another way they will be able to gouge their customers while providing a less than desirable service.</p>
	Ann Heehn	Web	<p>Please to not allow Centurylink to be more flexible in setting their rates. I am already paying more for their service than necessary for poor quality.</p> <p>It is probably the worst phone provider I have ever experienced and wish I had another choice in my community. I it a monopoly with only their profits in mine, not their service to a customer.</p>
	Lori (Sparks) Nothstine	Web	<p>I have had this phone number for over 20 years. It started with Pacific Bell then, US West, then Qwest, now it belongs to Century Link. I have been a loyal customer and have paid my bills on time. I live in a area that has trees and I live on a private road. I have had dial-up for alot of years because they would not cover my area with dsl or cable. I checked often and was discouraged to find out the same answer...no we do not provide that in your area. That is not what my concern is. When it changed over to Century Link, I called every 6 months to see if they could provide dsl. I get the same same answer...no we do not provide that in yur area. Please try again in a couple of months. Well, I deecided to call my satelite company "Dish Network", which is my TV provider, for the faster internet. They were able to help me after I had some trees topped. Which was installed on September 4, 2013. When I called Century Link on September 4, 2013 to inform them to take of the dial-up (MSN) on my bill, I was on hold for over an hour. I called during business hours. I became frustrated and hung up. I called MSN (the phone number on my Century Link bill). I got a hold of someone. They said she was not autherized to make changes, call Century Link. I gave up, then called Century Link from an unavailable number and got a hold of someone. She said she was unatherized to take off the MSN charges. I informed her I was not going to pay the dial-up after September 4, 2013. I asked her what my bill would be after the dial-up was taking off. That what the monthly charge would be with the standard amount of the phone charges and the \$20 unlimited calling. I estimated according to looking at the bill \$46.99 plus tax. I do not understand what related monthly charges of \$12.43 is. She had me so confused...she had me on hold twice and gave me random estimates. I was at work and had to get off the phone. When I got my bill, the dial-up charges were still on there. I called Century Link. Again, I could not get a hold of anyone. On hold again. I called MSN. They said it was up to Century Link to take off the charges. I called Century Link back and press the new customer option. I FINALLY got hold of someone!!! He was more helpful then anyone I talked to there. It is sad
that I had to lie and</p>

			say I was a new customer to talk to someone. That is not me. Just wanted to if I was right in believing they are shady. THEY DO NOT HAVE GOOD CUSTOMER SERVICE (in my opition). I want to be treated fairly and respect after all these years. I still don't know what my montly bill is going to be. I would like to see detail charges on my bill, without the hide in charges!!!! Land lines should not cost that much anymore, due to cell phones. I have the basic number, caller id, repair and \$20 a month unlimited long distance. That's all!! Thank you for your time. Lori
	Larry Yarnell	Web	Re: Docket number UT-130477 I am not in favor of granting Century Link ANY power to set their own rates for service without oversight by the WUTC. The regulations, as they now exist, are already too relaxed in favor of Utility Companies, as rates continue to rise and quality of services decline. Unless there is a clear and direct need for a rate increase, and those monies received are required by law to be used for the defined need, no increase in rates should be allowed. An increase "in order to meet the needs and demand of the marketplace" is too imprecise a reason for any change in policy.
	Daniel Leen	Web	I am not in favor of less oversight regarding Century Link, as they have raised prices and I am unaware of any competing companies I can go to to receive similar services (a land line and "high speed" internet). They used to have lower prices, but now if you want the above services they just charge what they like and there is no alternative.
	Stephen May	Web	From what I have read in a newspaper article and the post card from Centurylink the company asking to be able to raise rates as often and in any amount without having any oversight. There isn't company in the world that is more concerned about their bottom line then providing any type of saving for their customers if they do not need approval for a rate increase. SO PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS GREAT SCAM ON PHONE CUSTOMERS.
	Jenny Garden	Web	CenturyLink should not be permitted to change rates, terms, and conditions of any service without approval of the UTC nor relieved of automatic reporting requirements. On the contrary, CenturyLink should be under the closest possible supervision. Even now, under present UTC requirements, CednturyLink engages in false advertising and charges for services with neither service nor charges spelled out prior to usage. I am concerned that consideration is being given to allow CenturyLink to change rates, terms, and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC, and to be relieved of automatic reporting requirements. On the contrary, Century Link should be under the closest possible scrutiny. This

			company engages in fraudulent practices. Even now, while under UTC supervision, CenturyLink falsely advertises its rates; adds and charges for services without having first spelled out such charges; and behaves in every way as if it were a monopoly.
	William E. Edwards, Sr.	Web	Century Link should be treated as other regulated companies, and should be required to to be responsible for automatic reporting requirements.
	Dorothy Morishima	Web	Re: CenturyLink petition to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation ("AFOR"), Docket: UT-130477 Dear Sir, CenturyLink provides several services, one being telephony utility which Qwest used to provide. A public utility is an organization that maintains the infrastructure for a public service. A public utility, regardless of the technology used, should be subject to forms of public control and regulation. I have always used Qwest. Qwest had the infrastructure lines in place providing analog transmission versus digital. Analog has been more reliable and secure. My security monitoring service uses the analog line. Telephony service over analog line has always been available, with minimal disruption - not so with digital service. When CenturyLink purchased Qwest the agreement was not to raise rates in 5 years. They have recently been aggressively advertising the 5 year rate. Now that 5 years is almost up, Centurylink wants to be regulated under AFOR where they are not regulated. I am extremely concerned what Centurylink telephony rates will rise unregulated as well as their customer service will be less responsive as expected by a utility service. I researched Centurylink complaint history in other states prior to CenturyLink acquisition of Qwest. Unregulated companies have never been beneficial to customers dependent on them since profit and stockholder are their priorities - e.g. airline companies, savings and loans. **** I want CenturyLink utility telephony service to be regulated and rates controlled. **** I also want services that Centurylink offers that customers have no other options, such as internet (DSL), to be regulated as well.
	Dr. R. Gerald Alvey	Web	Their proposal is simply an excuse to raise rates under the guise of supposed competition, whereas it's a case of apples and oranges. I am diametrically opposed to the proposal.
	Cathe Rutherford	Web	We live on San Juan Island in WA State. The only local landline telephone provider in San Juan County is CenturyTel/Link. It would be a mistake to allow CenturyTel/Link to be able to raise their rates in our County without Public Comment being made available to all San Juan County residents. Currently, CenturyTel/Link will not provide Wireless services to our County residents, yet they provide this service throughout their entire Nationwide system. We are at the mercy of CenturyTel/Link. I believe they are in the process of increasing their internet service speed links.

			I have noted that since CenturyLink acquired QWest my internet service has slowed down. I have tried to get a clear answer from CenturyTel (my service) provider and have been told there has been no change in my internet speed. This is a downright lie. Recently I had to pay for a service call for a technician to come out to my house to diagnose a problem. The problem was the splitter that CenturyTel provided was "fried" according to their technician. His solution was to take the same coupler from another connection in my house and replace the "fried" splitter with one of my connectors. For this I was charged \$50 + the cost of the splitter (\$10). Additionally, the technician backed into my mailbox holder and damaged the post. We have replaced the post. CenturyTel has refused to change the name on my account for 7 years. It was previously listed in my nephew's name. I assumed the account in March, 2007 and the bill comes to my name. But the CenturyTel service department still has the account listed under my nephew's name. My nephew is now deceased. In conclusion, to allow CenturyTel/Link to have the ability to raise their rates in our County would be a disservice to the taxpayers and residents of this County because we have no other local landline service except through CenturyTel/Link.
	Robert & Myrna Sherman	Web	As consumers,we think this is a terrible idea. Giving CenturyLink the ability to increase rates, change terms and conditions, WITHOUT OVERSIGHT, is granting a license to steal. The UTC is needed to protect the consumer. Please don't CenturyLink get away with this.
	Richard Fritz	Web	NO, NO, NO. Why would any public utility company be allowed to raise rates any time they like, we no government oversight, or public opinion.
	GLADYS ANDERSEN	Web	This AFOR proposal is the dumbest thing we have heard! As far as we know Century Link has a monopoly on hardwire service in this area and is the only, repeat ONLY, phone carrier that provides service at a reasonable cost to the consumer. The UTC needs to continue to regulate CenturyLink for the basic services they provide. No one is stopping them to provide unregulated services through another company, but Washington consumers and taxpayers need to be protected from oligopolies like CenturyLink as the public has no other protection for affordable basic services, which is public policy in the State. Cable ,wireless and other companies that provide internet charge way too much money for the average Washington resident who just wants basic service. A person or household shouldn't need to be poor or classified to be "in poverty" to be able to get somewhat affordable phone service that is regulated by the UTC of Washington. Stop another money grab by CenturyLink who provides only so-so service to begin with; PLEASE REFUSE THEIR PETITION TO "GO AFOR."
	Jeanie Carroll	Web	(PHONE) DC Customer would like to be contacted by phone on the outcome of this

			proposal. I am definitely not in favor of this proposal because I feel there should be regulation over their rates and services, just like it is now with the Commission.
	patricia simon	Web	Please deny CL's petition to be regulated under an AFOR. CL may have competition as an internet service provider, but it holds a monopoly on land line service. Despite its monopoly, it prices its land line services very high and has no options for more limited services (for example a limit on calls or minutes use/month). The price has recently increased nearly \$5/month. If it is allowed to begin changing rates, terms, and conditions of the service it offers without approval from UTC, the result will only be worse for land line customers who want to keep that service. This company has not been a particularly good steward of service in our community. Its reps are rude, its help when a few days extra to pay a bill is needed has disappeared, its service is less than before. Strange problems have occurred with my voicemail, the price of which has increased substantially. CL does nothing for the good of its clients, only for its own good. If this petition is granted, we consumers will be left worse off by a company that already demonstrates how little it cares for providing options and good service to its captive market. Please deny this petition.
	CHARLES ANDERSEN	Web	MEDSEN CORPORATION STRONGLY OPPOSES THE UTC ALLOWING CENTURYLINK TO GO TO AN ALTERNATIVE FORM OF REGULATION (AFOR). The UTC should continue to review their rates, terms, and condition of service to support the public policy of regulating an oligopoly's service to small businesses and the public, which have few cost effective alternatives, if any. Alternatives such as cable, wireless, and other companies do not fulfill the needs of Washington companies who want and need affordable basic phone service, without being forced to pay more for bundled, unregulated high priced "plans" that primarily benefit the companies offering the service. The UTC must maintain control and regulation over the basics such as rate setting, terms, and conditions of service to control CenturyLinks return on equity and assets, while providing the only affordable phone service alternative. Stop this grab for more money by CenturyLink! Please deny the petition!
	Steve Griswold	Web	CenturyLink has never been a trusted company. Their request must have a hidden agenda that will not favor the customers that are tied to them. Their service has always been poor and not customer focused. I would like to know what the commissions decision is.
	Reid Guthrie	Web	I have no other options than CenturyLink, so there is no competition in this market. I encourage you to consider the company's request, but urge you to make your primary goal the maintenance of

			a competitive environment.
	Cecelia McIlvoy	Web	<p>If passed this will give them the power to change things at their will whenever they choose. My income is so unlikely to increase.
I am a low income, disable 64 year old white, single woman. My phone is my life line to get help. I cannot pay for more increases because S.S. only gives me seven hundred and thirty one dollars. I will be put in the position of choosing between a phone or my medications. My greatest fear is I'll be left alone with no phone to call for help. I have worked my whole life as a min. wage worker and lived on what I made. I am not asking for handouts. If I can't afford I do without. Many times I go hungry, but do it so I won't be a burden on anyone. With Obama health care soon to be passed I don't see much hope for us old lower class retired hard working people. Maybe without all the free bees for people that are on welfare WHO CAN Work.... and mismanagement in companies, greed and theft among CEOs.... we could find way. I ask myself why is there always never any word of Welfare running low on money??? I was offered something free recently. I told this state employee I could not take it because I didn't need it and felt I would be dishonest if I took it. I cannot stress enough to you how many times he kept saying "BUT IT'S FREE". This has happened to me several times now. One of My favorite ones was when I was very ill, I asked an DSH employee If I could get a round trip on Metro to my doctor. This employee told to me no, but they would give a voucher for a round trip in a taxi. That cost would have the taxpayers about 150 dollars for the taxi, Metro round trip \$4.50. What Mess! I finally found a friend who took me. We should all be responsible and loose this GIVE ME attitude. Thank you for letting this uneducated women who never even made it through high school to blow off steam. I worked hard and am proud of it. P.S. I adore being a grandmother. Cecelia McIlvoy</p>
	Janet Schilke	Web	<p>Dear Sirs,
I received a mailing this week regarding the settlement agreement hearing. I am opposed to the idea that Century Link could change rates, terms, and conditions on my telephone plan or charges and services without approval from the UTC. Furthermore, for them to be relieved of of automatic reporting requirements, is also unacceptable to me.
I have been a customer of CenturyLink and its' predecessor, Qwest, for many years. Also, I have had a simple plan that works for a low-income senior, for a long time and don't wish to see any more increases or hidden fees slipped into place. If this settlement is passed, I will take my business to another phone company.
Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Janet Schilke
</p>
	Koen Veltman	Web	<p>For about 5 years I have been asking CenturyLink for a faster internet connection (we have the slowest DSL available). So far no improvements. I am certainly not in the mood for paying more</p>

			<p>for a service we don't get. No other provider is available in our area, CenturyLink should not take advantage of that monopoly. Thank you very much</p>
	Paul Russell	Web	<p>Ladies and Gentlemen;</p> <p>I am submitting this comment because of a post card "Public Notice" that I received because Century Link is requesting special treatment with regard to rate adjustments. They state that traditional regulation may not provide the most efficient and effective means of achieving the public policy goals of this state. This says to me that they want the ability to fleece the public and raise their profits whenever they wish. If you allow this conglomerate to do what they want, they will do the same as the real estate mortgage companies, the banks and other large corporations who will take their profit and damn the consumers. If the service is bad, they will not care, they have a captive market. They care little for the customer, who is an impediment to their profits as well as the means to their profits. Public relations is keeping the customers confused and baffled, and unwilling or unable to find a way to get similar or better service from a competitor.</p> <p>Please do not allow Century Link to opt out of the regulatory system. See what the Airlines, cable companies and other companies have done after deregulation. there is no incentive to compete.</p> <p>Thank You Paul Russell</p>
	Paul MacLeod	Web	<p>I am DEFINATELY against CenturyLink's petition to be "competitively classified" as they are a monopoly of land line telephone service. This is the only company in my town of Hoquiam, that offers telephone service. If you grant them their petition I know they will raise their rates to maximize their bottom line, with NO concern for the consumer. I depend on our "UTC" to protect me from monopoly companies like CenturyLink. I know they think that everybody can access other forms of phone service, but this is not the case. In our economically depressed county of Grays Harbor, we have the highest percentage of unemployed people in the state. We also have a lot of retired people living on a fixed income who do not have internet service. So, PLEASE do not grant their petition for "competitively classified" status. They are a monopoly and it is your responsibility to protect us from them.</p>
	W. E. Waxman	Web	<p>Dear Chairman Danner and Commissioners Goltz and Jones:</p>

			<p>I oppose allowing Century Tel free reign to make changes to the rates customers pay for telecommunications services without the oversight and regulation of the Commission. Left to their own counsel, corporations will almost always attempt to recoup their costs for doing business from the consumer while increasing the profit to their investors through increased rates above and beyond that actual cost. All services provided to consumers have costs associated with them and it is only fair that the consumer pay for services rendered. It is not fair or appropriate that corporations use the opportunity to pass along all of the costs of improving their operation to the consumer without justification and approval by the Commission.</p> <p>Thank you all for taking the time to consider my comments as well as continuing to provide the guidance and attention to detail required of those safeguarding us all from unreasonable actions on the part of corporations.</p> <p>Sincerely, Bill Waxman, Century Tel customer since late 2004.</p>
	chuck Chapman	Web	<p>I have yet to get a correct bill with them and will attach my letters of complaint along with my retired mothers letter who had the same issue as I signed her up the following month due to the promised cost lowereing with the " bundling". To date I have yet to have this resloved. I cannot stress hard enough that if they cannot get their current billing and fees on track with you overseeing them currently.What makes you think they will without regulatory supervision</p> <p>My name is Chuck Chapman and I have been a customer of Century like for over ten years with services of phone or phone and Internet. In February of 2013 after several calls into your office I found it cost effective to leave my local cable company and "bundle" with Century link. The notes on 2/10/13 about the call show a lowered cost if I did bundle my Internet, telephone and now adding Direct TV with a total monthly due of \$115.94 plus taxes and fees. The cost break down relayed to me over the telephone was \$50.99 adding Direct TV. This includes their 150 HD channels and promotion of three month of HBO/Showtime/Stars at no charge, which has been cancelled, three HD receivers, free installation and a discount of \$5.00 for good credit, which was approved over the telephone. With an order confirmation number of 64293519 and install confirmation number of 179645627 for the Direct TV. And the cost of \$64.95 plus taxes and fees for the remainder of my telephone and Internet, which included all services.</p> <p>Since my addition of Direct TY I have yet to come close to the promised cost. Examples are:</p>

A. Bill due date of 3/14/13 with \$284.75 -when I called I was informed that it will take two cycles to get it correct due to the credits between Century link and Direct TV. I was also informed that this might be a month and a half worth of billing

B. Bill Due date of 5/14/13 with \$222.71- called on this one and was shuffled back and forth the between Direct TV and Century link with no resolve. Since there seems to be separate notes on each service providers no interaction is possible and after many discussions with a supervisor some credits were issued.

C. Bill Due date of 6/14/13 with \$218.34- Again with multiple calls and no satisfaction and this letter in an attempt to reach higher managers and or Governmental and regulatory agencies.

My simple concerns are why have the promised charges not materialized? No changes in the service have been requested from me adding additional cost and the three-month HBO/Showtime/Stars has been cancelled. This cost or “Bundle” was one of the primary reasons to add an additions service with your company. It is also why I took notes on all Conversations and fees as the customer salesperson would not send me anything in writing confirming the cost quoted. I realize there are fees and taxes that are handed down to me, the consumer, but if you are unable to fulfill you promises which is the premise of an added service with your company. Along with holding me to a two year commitment with Direct TV I feel I have, as a ten plus year customer been, to say the least, mislead.

I welcome a resolve to the issue stated above and can be reached on my cellular although I will not have access to the statement identified so please do your homework before contacting me.

Sincerely,

Chuck Chapman
253) 549-6706

Dear Sirs,

My name is Roberta Chapman and I have been a customer of Century Link for many years with services of phone or phone and internet service. In March of 2013 after several calls into your office I found it cost effective to leave my local cable company and “bundle” with Century link. My notes on 3/20/13 about the call show a lowered cost if I did bundle my internet, telephone and

now adding Direct TV with a quoted monthly due of \$128.02 for the first month and 90.42 plus taxes and fees. The cost break down relayed to me over the telephone was \$50.99 adding Direct TV. This includes their 150 HD channels and promotion of three month of HBO/Showtime/Stars at no charge, two HD receivers, free installation and a discount of \$5.00 for good credit, which was approved over the telephone. Referencing the order confirmation number of 46243970 and install confirmation number of 42041927 for the Direct TV. This along with a \$31.43, which was paid.

Since my addition of Direct TY I have yet to come close to the promised cost. Examples are
A. Bill due date of 6/21/13 with \$335.96 -when I called I was informed that it will take two cycles to get it correct due to the credits between Century link and Direct TV. I was also informed that this might be a month and a half worth of billing.

B. Bill Due date of 7/21/13 with \$226.58- called on this one and was shuffled back and forth the between Direct TV and Century link with no resolve. Since there seems to be separate notes on each service providers no interaction is possible and after many discussions with a supervisor some credits were issued.

C. Bill Due date of 8/2113 with \$229.40- Again with multiple calls and no satisfaction and this letter in an attempt to reach higher managers and or Governmental and regulatory agencies if necessary.

My simple concerns are why have the promised charges not materialized? No changes in the service have been requested from me adding additional cost. This cost or “Bundle” was one of the primary reasons to add an additions service with your company. It is also why I took notes on all Conversations and fees as the customer salesperson would not send me anything in writing confirming the cost quoted. I realize there are fees and taxes that are handed down to me, the consumer, but if you are unable to fulfill you promises which is the premise of an added service with your company. Along with holding me to a two-year commitment with Direct TV I feel I have, as a multiple year customer, to say the least, mislead.

I welcome a resolve to the issue stated above internally before I address it on a wider scale externally. I can be reached at the below telephone number although I will not have access to the statement identified so please do your homework before contacting me.

Sincerely,

			Roberts Chapman (253) 759-2531
	Anne Marie Shanks	Web	The service CenturyLink provides is poor and they should not be allowed to be unregulated. I receive internet and land line phone service from CenturyLink. The internet usually is not functioning, much less at the speed you pay to receive. This year the land line was down, the internet was down and there was no recourse. We do not receive good cell service in this community. Emergency services do not receive adequate cell service. When the internet and land lines are down, it is dangerous. This is a community with many seniors. CenturyLink is the only provider for land phone service and any private internet providers go through CenturyLink to provide their service. There is no competition. I understand when the internet was down during ths summer SJ County companies lost millions of dollars because electronic transactions ceased. CenturyLink refuses to invest in infrastructure improvements to improve their service here. Thank you
	Edgar C. Norfleet	Web	I am 63 years old and have never had to deal with a worse-horrible company than Century Link. They are nothing more than lying thieves.Please do not allow docket number UT-130477 be approved. We the tax-paying citizens need your protection from predatory companies like Century Link. They lie cheat and steal, then hide behind young women in Utah. Century Link is ranked as one of the worse telecom companies in the entire USA. Thank you.
	william ladiges	Web	I don't think they need more flexibility
	Frank & Elizabeth Coyle	Web	CenturyLink states it wishes to be free of UTC oversight to better meet the needs and demands of the marketplace. This can only mean freedom from oversight to increase charges for services. However, CenturyLink cannot maintain a competitive edge in internet communications by increasing charges in that area. I suspect therefor that the increased charges will be allocated to the current landline phone service. They have a monopoly in this area and so the withdrawal of UTC oversight will place a considerable and unfair burden on the diminishing number of landline users. As more subscribers abandon landlines and move to mobile services the cost burden will increasingly be met by an aging and housebound population. As UTC your responsibility is to protect the public from exploitation. Please ensure that CenturyLink continues to have some aspect of oversight for this section of the public. Thanks for taking our concerns seriously.
	Claude Ginsburg	Web	Re: Docket No. UT-130477 Thank you for this opportunity to comment. It is not in the public interest to allow CenturyLink to raise rates on basic land line service without

			oversight. Many low-income people depend on their land line as a connection to the world; they cannot afford steadily rising rates on this service. This population, if they have internet service at all, is using DSL through their land line hookup. Any increases in the price of a land line will affect their ability to get basic services through the internet. Despite the rapid rise in cell phone ownership, CenturyLink still holds a monopoly for land line service, and by extension, DSL internet service. We cannot go to another provider for these services. There is no competition. The law was written to provide protection against just such a monopoly, that, given free reign, would raise rates to achieve maximum profit. Please enforce the law and continue to strictly regulate land line services through CenturyLink.
	carol b.olson	Web	I definitely do not want Century Link permitted to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC. They have too much control already. My telephone service has changed hands so many times since I have been connected to a phone system. I started out yrs ago with a 10 party line with telephone operators, "Number Please"? then 4 party line then a single party line in 1960. The corporations that have run the companies are too numerous to list. Just leave us old people alone with a nominal fee phone bill. thank you Carol B. Olson
	Ernest Griffith	Web	Background: During the Embarq & CenturyLink (CL) merger period we attended a meeting hosted by CL regarding the service change. At that meeting we were told that if at least ten current CL customers in our area requested high speed service, the service would likely be provided. We were able to get tentative commitments from 23 residents, which is 95% of all residents. After several months of decreasing CL response to progress inquiries, CL terminated responses altogether. I personally contacted CL corporate offices to inquire if there was any intention by CL to provide DSL to our area. CL response was, that due to cost, they had no intention of providing DSL to our area regardless of area interest or that T-1 lines was already in place. It should be noted that CL provides DSL service to residents that are less than 3 miles from our area. I am not in favor of the CL proposal (for the following reasons) 1. CL is the only land line company available in our rural area. Therefore they have no competition. 2. CL is not (and will not) provide the same level of service they provide in areas of competition. 3. CL should not be allowed to arbitrarily increase rates in areas of no competition to compensate for pricing decisions they make for areas they choose to compete in. Summary: For any area that CL is the sole (non compete) provider of land line services, they should not be regulated, or protected, by (AFOR) until consumers have other competitive choices. Or until CL provides the same services they provide in competitive areas.

	Janet Turner	Web	I always have to write about utility companies trying to raise my rates. I am on a pension and I know that CenturyLink is requesting this change so they can raise my rates. I have a land line phone because I am over 70 and do not have a cell phone and cannot change my phone service. Do not allow them this change. Thank you.
	Paul Routt	Web	If CenturyLink can't handle its competition in the marketplace, then it needs to go under rather than get favored status. Its service is already very expensive. Favored status will allow it to charge customers even more without justification. No bailout!!!
	Margaret Karey	Web	Company should give people a price break for a single land line phone. They are required for emergencies. Docket # 130477.
	Katherine P George	Web	Currently we bundle everything with CenturyLink except cell phones and satellite TV. If this request is passed, it will allow them to change the price of our internet service. Because we are rural customers, I feel as if we are being targeted. I think this will backfire for CenturyLink because customers will find other avenues to meet their needs. ~ Katherine P George
	Clay Jackson	Web	Regarding Docket # UT-130477 - Please do NOT grant this petition. While it may be true that telecommunications is now a more competitive marketplace, for many consumers, particularly in rural areas (such as our location), for "hard wired" landline service (which is still a "universal mandate), Centurylink is our only alternative and as a quasi-monopoly, MUST be regulated to prevent abuse and/or simply to compel them to provide reasonable customer service. Our specific case is an example of how even a regulated corporation can be non-responsive and even abusive. 2 years ago, we requested land-line phone service for our home. Despite speaking to 3 different "supervisors" on 3 different occasions, CenturyLink insisted that they did not provide service to our location. Only after intervention by UTC staff (after a complaint) were we provided with a "secret" phone number where their staff was able to schedule an installation. The installation itself was also completely botched - the "DMARC" was installed on the wrong side of our home, despite detailed instructions we left for the installer. Once the installation was completed, CenturyLink refused to admit their mistake, and left us to correct the problem (by installing a local buried cable) at considerable expense. If anything CenturyLink needs to be MORE closely regulated, and not allowed to further abuse ratepayers. Thank you for your time and consideration.
	Spero G Rockas	Web	>CenturyLink should not be able to raise rates unless the UTC approves it. We don't need another Ma Bell with higher rates for home service's.

			If the Attorney General's office is running out of things to do they should look into Comcast being part of the UTC to regulate their continual rate increases.
	David R. Williams	Web	<p>PHONE</p> <p>He is concerned about the company being able to change rates (increase) without having to go through the state. He is concerned because he feels the consumers should be protected under the state regulations. He would like the company's request to be denied because he feels they are doing this to get the state out so they can jack the prices up on customers.</p>
	Philip Cassady	Web	<p>Since Century Link is the only telephone provider in our area, and we need out telephone for communication in case of emergency, I believe strongly that CenturyLink should be operated under the existing regulations which require approval of the UTC before changing rates, terms and conditions of service.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our concerns, Philip Cassady</p>
	Bert Ostergren	Web	<p>Provided the UTC retains control over rate changes, terms and conditions of service - only then could I support AFOR. I urge the commission to retain their 'HAMMER' over telecommunication services (and the potential abuses of price gouging by ALL service providers, be they hardwired telecoms, cable, fiber or satellite). This principle must NOT be delegated away by AFOR, as currently written. I urge the commission to deny this change until such time as the consumer can be 'guaranteed' protection from monopolistic behavior(s) by telecommunication services doing business in the glorious State of Washington (and elsewhere around this country). PLEASE VOTE 'NO' to AFOR as written. I Thank you.</p>
	Lance D Minetti	Web	<p>I feel it necessary to comment on your "Century Link" requests. In my very recent experience with this "utility" They completely left me in a service less position bullying me with unwarranted collections by three different entities every time I challenged the collection agency's personnel. In order to repel CenturyLink management I had to file a small claims action against them.

In Short form their phone service and dispatch is atrocious. The installation of my service was done in such an unprofessional manner that the box was mounted to my house using dissimilar 3" shanked deck screws AND IT WAS NOT PLUMB. The fire threat alone was concerning when their "installer" mounted the "demark box" what if he had shorted something in my wire runs on the other side of the wall he could not see or even consider?

I have all of the past</p>

			documentation regarding this issue in my possession including the Court record where a CenturyLink Seattle manager and his associate drove to Spokane to answer my complaints in small claims court and basically came to Court with a three ring binder full of my calls and complaints trying to make me out as unreasonable. Our State DOES NOT have license requirements for phone work, THERE IS NO ONE TO CALL FOR COMPLIANCE ISSUES. I am completely disgusted by the lack of oversight they already enjoy. To allow them even more flexibility should be strongly apposed. Lance Minetti
	Victor Oddivak	Web	Do not allow this agreement to go forward. It says: "Century Link is permitted to change rates on a service w/o approval from UTC." This means Century Link can charge us whatever it wants anytime with no oversight. This is WRONG! DO NOT let this agreement go through! You can contact me via phone or mail about this.
	Francisco de la Cruz	Web	We live in a rural area that has minimal broadband service options. When we first moved here in 2003, we were limited to 56K Dial-up service to access the Internet. We spent over \$500 to get a 900 MHz over-the-air connection to the nearest ISP. Even with that service, connection speeds were less than 1.5 MB and over \$50 per month. Satellite Broadband service is now available but pricey; we do not have access to cable, so broadband from them is not available, and the current franchisee (Wave Cable) has no plans to expand its service area. There is NO REAL COMPETITION in this area (Clallam County) and to allow Centurylink to change rates, terms, and conditions of service without UTC approval is guaranteeing that we will get higher prices with less service. I retired from the telecom industry (25+ years), as did my wife (30+ years) and we have seen how this all shakes out from the inside. Just review where we are today with deregulation and you will see that it has been the case that despite all the promises made, we pay more for telecom services today than ever before. Giving Centurylink free rein to do what it wants in a near-monopoly market is the WRONG THING TO DO. WE URGE A NO VOTE ON UT-130477
	Michael Symonds	Web	As a CenturyLink customer, I can see that their change in status to an AFOR can lead only to reduced quality of service and increased cost. Please protect Washingtonians from business practices that lead to greater financial burdens and decreased access to information.
	Les	Web	Re DOCKET number UT-130477. Do NOT regulate Centurylink under an AFOR. Please keep it regulated as it is now and require it to get rate approval changes. "Pricing flexibility" just mean they just want to raise rates and then decide whether or not to offer service as it pleases them. And heaven knows what they will do with residential and business customers. The

			big companies will be able to negotiate favorable rates, but what about individual consumers and small businesses?
	Sandra Maupin	Web	Prior to CenturyLink's purchase of Qwest, I entered into a lifetime contract with Qwest for internet service at \$31.99 a month, plus taxes. CenturyLink has honored this lifetime contract thus far, but I am concerned that they are requesting regulation under AFOR in order to nullify lifetime agreements. I object to any contract changes and I would like to be informed of your decision regarding these lifetime contracts.
	Stephen Ichinata	Web	phone UT 130477 He feels it is a bad time to raise telephone rates due to the economy.
	Maureen McLean	Web	In this area, CenturyTel has a monopoly. The lack of competition means my bill for phone and internet is double what my brothers pay in the Seattle area. CenturyTel offers bundles that appear to be bargains, but if you are paying for things you don't use, and can not get what you do need without the bundle...the cost is heavy. I need internet, and basic phone...but am paying \$100 per month with no choice.
	Patrick McKee	Web	Centurylink should not be regulated under "AFOR" rules. Allowing Centurylink to set rates and terms will for certain lead to higher rates and lower quality services. Eliminating automatic reporting requirements will allow the company to offshore, or hide huge profits, and bury poor quality records. DON'T DO THIS The last thing I need is higher utility costs. Patrick McKee
	David S. Wise	Web	Comment on the horrible DSL bandwidth that we experience. Due to our experience with low delivered bandwidth, it is our opinion that Centurylink should continue to be held to the reporting requirements of an ordinary telephone utility. We infer that ordinary telephone service in this millenium includes the delivery of DSL services where Centurylink fails us so badly. Opinion: We feel that Centurylink continues to sell bandwidth that it does not have. The fact that Centurylink owns all the "outside plant" in our area is important to this situation. If

			<p>there were fiber connections to the Olympic Peninsula the situation would be much mitigated. In the absence of that investment, we feel that Centurylink should be held to the reporting requirements that it would escape via AFOR.</p> <p>Centurylink should report and publish its DSL performance statistics.</p> <p>Experience: We subscribe to 1.5Mbps DSL service. This is the lowest level, but Centurylink seems to bleed that bandwidth away whenever we turn our backs. For instance, last week we returned from a long vacation to discover download bandwidth below 0.5Mbps. When we called on October 9 (ticket number 42556815) Juanita reported that our line was *set* to 1.0Mbps! After raising it to 1.5 and resetting the line, we finally got 1.3Mbps download. Yet, again on October 14 we were down to 0.4Mbps, and---after another lengthy call to Customer "Service" (ticket number 42715875)---we were raised again to 1.3Mbps. Both phone calls took over half an hour of our time, as well as Centurylink employee time. (These times should be reportable, in aggregate, to the Utilities and Transportation Commission.)</p> <p>Possible solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install state-of-the-art outside plant on the Olympic Peninsula. Fiber! 2. Advertise only bandwidth that is already available at the customer's address. 3. When the customer takes the initiative to run his own speed tests on a Centurylink server (e.g. http://spdtst-dlls.tx.centurylink.net/) then those results should be reportable, in aggregate, to the UTC. 4. When the customer runs her own speed tests on a Centurylink server and those results fall far short of her contracted bandwidth, then those results should initiate an automatic followup and remedy on the carrier's side, without the need for the customer to initiate a service call. <p>We hope these comments help the UTC and Centurylink to deliver more efficient and economical service.</p>
	Melody Dickinson	Web	<p>This company provides the WORST phone and internet service I have ever seen. I have had so many service calls over the years I'm sick of calling. I cannot even stream a short video from them on my webpage. Unless this is going to speed them up, forget it....MY phone bill for 2 lines and internet is \$130.00 a month. Stupid</p>

	Arlie Morley	Web	<p>I am not in favor of CenturyLink's petition.
I was not notified of their petition until receiving a postcard in the mail last Thursday. This gives CenturyLink customers less than a week to research and comment on their petition.

I have also been dissatisfied with their service, particularly their customer service. There was a billing dispute where I believe the routing number on my check wasn't scanned properly. CenturyLink flagged this as a returned check and fined me. I spent nearly half a day on the phone being transferred from one service rep to another without resolution. In fact, I was dismissed with the rep claiming there was "nothing to dispute".

This attitude, the fact they have a monopoly over phone service in my area and the short timing of notification of UT-130477 worries me. I do not trust them with customer billing or service without oversight. I do not trust them not to raise their rates. As a customer locked into their service, I therefore do not support CenturyLink's petition. At the very least I believe the final deadline should be extended to allow the public time to review and comment.

Thank you.</p>
	Quinn Dahlstrom	Web	<p>This means Centurylink could make it more unbearable to pay for the services they provide. I pay 106.00 as it is now a month for phone, internet (wireless) and linebacker. Cable costs more-- so they could possible go as high as cable. This is ridiculous as it is now, why would I want to pay more and it will never go to less.</p>
	David Fietz	Web	<p>This comment is in response to a Public Notice mailing we recently received, stating that CenturyLink, because of competition from cable companies, wireless providers, and other companies, seeks "greater flexibility in order to meet the needs and demands of the marketplace." It went on to state that "...traditional regulation may not provide the most efficient and effective means of achieving the public policy goals of this state" and requests a change in its regulation allowing CenturyLink to "change rates, terms, and conditions of a service without approval of the UTC."</p> <p>We understand that CenturyLink's landline business is in serious decline. We value our landline connection as we live in a rural area with spotty wireless coverage, and realize that many urban customers have bailed on CenturyLink because they have much better wireless coverage in their areas. Nonetheless, this proposal represents a disingenuous and short-sighted notion on CenturyLink's part of how to deal with profound telecommunication marketplace changes. Raising their landline rates will only accelerate their customer loss, and as their cost becomes increasingly prohibitive, customers will increasingly seek and find other forms of phone support.</p>

			<p>Additionally, we wonder what exactly Washington's "public policy goals" are vis a vis CenturyLink. One significant unanswered demand of the marketplace is the longstanding desire of rural folks like us to have fast Internet connectivity provided by a utility like CenturyLink, instead of suffering along with dial-up or paying for spendy satellite Internet support. I have spoken with several CenturyLink representatives who basically assured me that hell will freeze over before CenturyLink provides such service to rural customers statewide, citing the "prohibitive cost" of the required infrastructure. We see a possible link between CenturyLink's stance on this, and electrification of rural areas in the U.S. via the Rural Electrification Act of 1935, which made it illegal for electric utilities to cherry-pick the most profitable areas while ignoring the not-so-profitable, and which provided loans to companies to aid them in achieving more widespread electrical support.</p> <p>The lack of imminence of Hades' frostiness aside, we recommend that the UTC reject CenturyLink's request to be relieved of regulation concerning customers rates, terms, and conditions of any service it provides.</p>
	Earl Weaver	Web	<p>Granting CenturyLink permission to raise rates as they choose can only result in higher rates. CenturyLink is counting on its customers to be too busy or not astute enough to catch rate issues. Our phone bills are used to steal from consumers all the time. The bills are overly complicated now. As a result companies are always looking to slip in charges for services we do not want and did not request or authorize. This is called slamming. Notice I have not commented on the possibly of rates declining. If CenturyLink is given the ability to set their own rates, rates will only go up. The U.S. already has the highest rates to access the internet than any other nation. Why make this valuable asset harder for people to use. Sincerely Earl Weaver</p>
	John Leonard	Web	<p>AFOR looks like a flagrant attempt to eliminate land line telephone service for us seniors.</p> <p>Permitting Century Link to raise land line rates unfettered by regulatory process will result in unjustified rates so prohibitively costly to seniors (and other low-tech, low income inhabitants) that the customer base will just disappear because of unaffordability. That, in turn, will justify the elimination of land lines.</p>
	Forresy Addy	Web	<p>Nothing causes me greater skepticism than a privately owned utility trying to evade regulation suggesting "competitive forces" will somehow automatically see ensure customer gets good service and a fair price. If the technology changes then the service providers AND the comminion rules that regulate them should adapt. I can conceive of no way that CenturyLink or</p>

			any of its few competitors will improve quality of service or progress of technology when they are actively, relentlessly, urgently pursuing a policy of market dominance until it's become a de-facto monopoly. It's significant I received notice mere day and a half before the OCT 16 hearing. I have no doubt CenturyLink spent months in the execution of their plan to evade regulation and short noticing those most affected by the alleged "improvement in service" was an important part of it. It's a standard tactic to frustrate opposition by allowing them no time to organize or even schedule to attend and be heard. I strongly urge the commission deny the proposals submitted by CenturyLink et al as anti-competetive in intent and for short notice to their customernr base.
	Alan P. Hansen	Web	Regarding Centurylink's request to deregulate a large portion of their business (move away from UTC regulation) I must request that the UTC deny their request. This move is profit driven and is not in the best interest of customers. Many customers, such as myself have no options. The only communication service available in my area is Centurylink (landline). We have no cellular reception nor is cable communication service reliable, i.e. no power/no cable/no emergency communications. As a matter of safety alone, this move should not be considered. Time and time again, deregulation of this type has proven to be only good for stock holders. Please deny this request! Thank you
	Darrell Klein	Web	Please do no allow docket 130477! I am in an area where they are the only utility (pretty much monopolised) and UsWest/Century Link is the most apathetic company I have ever encountered regarding customer service and the rates are far too high already.
	Anita Bryant	Web	Century Link provides service to my home phone. I desire for UTC to continue to oversee any rate/services changes and not grant the settlement which would allow revising the terms of the proposed AFOR so that Century Link could change rates, terms and conditions without approval from the UTC and be relieved of automatic reporting requirements. Thank you for requesting and considering my comments.
	Valerie Sammons	Web	I am an elderly person who has survived all the changes of company ownership from Ma Bell through now, Century Link. I have had the same phone number since about 1986. The telephone rates keep going up and up and my income is static. I keep my land line because it is what I am familiar with and I don't wish to incur the kinds of charges that I hear of for cell phone carriers. I run my computer off DSL and cannot afford cable. I think that Century Link has seen a way to make a lot more money and they don't want us old "land liners" holding them back. They are providing a vital community service for older people and that is what the definition of a public

			<p>utility is. They are a public utility not a cable company, although they do provide that service to some.

I think things should be left the way they are. I believe I speak for many older people who are unable to challenge this request on the part of Century Link.
</p>
	W.	Web	<p>Century Link provides a MONOPOLY service in its landlines.
Corporations that are in monopoly positions do not satisfy the public interest, and will not act to protect the public interest. They will have no incentive to do so.</p> <p>If it is relieved of regulatory oversight, the public of Washington State will pay a much higher price in both rates and access to land line telephony.</p>
	Barbara Moore-Lewis	Web	<p>This is a comment on the CenturyLink request for an Alternative Form of Regulation. In no way does this request serve the public good or the public interest. In their current business practices CenturyLink is deceptive and unresponsive. Loosening the rules for them would not improve their business, but rather allow them to further take economic advantage of state citizens.

In my case, I subscribe to high speed DSL. At least once a day the speed of my internet is that of dial up or less. I use my computer for my business and this impacts my ability to conduct my business.

The community is united against CenturyLink business practices. Here is a link to a community petition that has many comments on the ways that CenturyLink has been deceptive and non responsive: www.thepetitionsite.com/861/394/431/rural-jefferson-county-needs-reliable-high-speed-internet/. There are almost 200 signatures and many comments.</p>
	Bruce A Barr	Web	<p>October 14, 2013

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Ref: Docket No. UT-130477

To Whom It may Concern,

I wish to register my strong opposition to the CenturyLink Companies petition to be regulated under an Alternate Form of Regulation(AFOR). I can fully appreciate that operating under an AFOR will garner CenturyLink significant flexibility, leverage and potential increased profitability. However, at what and whose expense will these enhancements come?

I live in Medical Lake outside Spokane in an area where CenturyLink has a monopoly on residential phone service and High Speed DSL Internet service. We have, but one very minor Cheney-based cable company who, like CenturyLink, has no competition in the area. Cable Internet is available, but that cable service is not cost or feature effective. I started DSL service with CenturyLink two years ago. Since that time, even though I am contractually obligated for 12 months at a time, CenturyLink has found ways to increase the cost of my service each year that I have been a DSL customer. Apparently, CenturyLink is not contractually obligated to me! How then would it be in the best interests of rate</p>

			<p>payers and customers to allow CenturyLink to change rates and terms of condition of service without approval from the UTC, especially in the absence of automatic reporting of service quality matters?

No doubt in highly competitive areas where CenturyLink operates financial and service concessions by the company will be required in order for it to remain financially competitive. I have NO confidence that other customers in other less-competitive locations will NOT be used to make up for any shortfalls in revenues without oversight from the Commission. I have observed this phenomenon in the local/long distance telephone rates in my and other less population-dense areas of CenturyLink's service network.

I do not believe in government-approved monopolies, especially among providers of basic and fundamental services. Nevertheless, the UTC has allowed CenturyLink to operate as a monopoly in areas of the State such as mine. Why now would the Commission allow that monopoly to "self-regulate"? What is the avenue of redress of grievances for customers when the Commission is no longer monitoring?

Sincerely,

Bruce A Barr
208 S Washington Street
Medical Lake, WA 99022
509-299-7186

</p>
	Mary Meier	Web	<p>This "greater flexibility (pricing flexibility on landline phone rates) to better meet the needs and demands of the marketplace", is a decrease of regulations that they operate under. This sounds good for their bottom line but not necessarily for the masses that use their Landlines. I have a basic landline without long distance its cost is \$13.00, after all the added on charges (access recovery charge; federal access charges ++) my bill ends up to almost \$27.00, and it has been slowly been increasing. I do not think that this flexibility will decrease what the consumer pays, and to have a regular landline is not suppose to be a luxury, it is a necessity. CenturyLink is the largest local telephone company in Washington and to allow a decrease in the regulations that they operate under most likely would be a diservice to the people of our state.</p>
	Laurie Schwan	Web	<p>I am a senior and have only a need for a basic land line. I do not need nor want long distance, texting, 3 way calling, or bundling. Century Link is the only provider I can get a land line through and if allowed to change I fear that rate would increase drastically along with my basic internet.
My bill has increased by \$5/month just with new fees and surcharges recently. I do not want to be forced to pay for all the features the new cell phones have which I am confident they will do. I just want the very basic phone service possible at the lowest rate I can get. Please reject their proposal. I am sure other seniors feel the same way. Everything keeps increasing, but our incomes to pay for them. Thank you for allowing me to voice my opinion. Laurie Schwan</p>

	Jean Griffith	Web	<p>We, in WA., have had telephone service for 135 years. Landline service our legal right has been well guarded and tended by our WA. State Commission. Rural, city, and urban use has been served, safety of the public through landlines has been assured, communication with other citizens and state officials has been guaranteed, among the many other jobs the UTC has performed. Please continue the contract you, as a commission, have with us, state citizens. We need you to to approve what is best for the state in changing rates, terms and conditions of service, not a private phone company that changes those plus ownership on private whim. Thank you, Jean</p>
	sherap bashi	Web	<p>Century Link has near monopoly on land lines in my area. It also offers long distance phone service and internet service along with other media. However, it offers non-phone services at a competitive rate ONLY upon customer signing with its phone service and prevent its land-line phone customers getting none-phone services from others with its monopoly on land line in specific areas.</p>
	Jennfer Minich	Web	<p>I am opposed to Centurylink being able to change rates, terms, and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC or any relief from automatic reporting requirements.</p> <p>I believe we must have a well-regulated telecommunications industry, and the deregulation that has already occurred has been anti-consumer in so many ways. Do not continue down this path.</p> <p>As a consumer of basic phone service and internet, I am already concerned about the lack of service quality and accountability Centurylink has provided in our own household. Please do not treat Centurylink as if it's competitive - as far as I can tell, they are the only game in town for us, those who need a land line.</p> <p>With sincerity.</p>
	James Thomas	Web	<p>Dear UTC,</p> <p>I urge the Commission to reject the proposed settlement. CenturyLink should not be able to change rates, etc., without UTC approval. Rather the UTC should seek to regulate CenturyLink's competition and so level the playing field in that manner.</p> <p>I want to also lodge a complaint against CenturyLink for the late notice of the Oct. 16 UTC hearing, which I received only a few days ago.</p>

			<p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, James Thomas</p>
	Dawn Woolsey	Web	<p>For many low income customers Centry Link is the only affordable telephone link to 911 and community services. Century Link should not be allowed to price themselves out of the low income market. They are a utility not an entertainment provider.</p>
	Kristina Hart	E-mail	<p>I am writing in reference to the AFOR settlement agreement under consideration under docket number UT-130477, Century Link. We, in our neighborhood, are VERY concerned that a substantial portion of Century Link's customer base is not being represented fairly. Based on the content of the postcard that we received with less than a week's notice prior to the hearing scheduled for 16 OCT, Century Link is making the argument that we customers have a choice of service providers. At our address, and many others on the Kitsap and outlying peninsulas, that is not at all the case. Century Link is the only available provider of telecommunication services. We are not served by cable, our satellite TV service is one-way down load only, and our cellular service is marginal at best (even with the provider that claims to have the most cell towers in the US), consistently lacking in clarity and call connection reliability. Century Link is our only option and we already feel that many of their charges are either inflated or part of a "package" containing extraneous components that we must purchase in order to have some other service that we actually do need. We urge you to represent ALL Century Link customers including those of us without options, not just those who truly have alternatives, and ask you to please carefully consider your decision regarding Century Link's request for AFOR status. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, a very concerned citizen, Kristina Hart 4175 NE Gunderson Rd Poulsbo WA 98370 360 697-6899</p>
	W. Todd Harder	E-mail	<p>I am writing in reference to the AFOR settlement agreement under consideration under docket number UT-130477, Century Link. We, in our neighborhood, are VERY concerned that a substantial portion of Century Link's customer base is not being represented fairly. Based on the content of the postcard that we received with less than a week's notice prior to the</p>

			<p>hearing scheduled for 16 OCT, Century Link is making the argument that we customers have a choice of service providers. At our address, and many others on the Kitsap and outlying peninsulas, that is not at all the case. Century Link is the only available provider of telecommunication services. We are not served by cable, our satellite TV service is one-way down load only, and our cellular service is marginal at best (even with the provider that claims to have the most cell towers in the US), consistently lacking in clarity and call connection reliability. Century Link is our only option and we already feel that many of their charges are either inflated or part of a “package” containing extraneous components that we must purchase in order to have some other service that we actually do need.</p> <p>We urge you to represent ALL Century Link customers including those of us without options, not just those who truly have alternatives, and ask you to please carefully consider your decision regarding Century Link’s request for AFOR status.</p> <p>William Harder 4175 NE Gunderson Rd Poulsbo WA 98370 360 697-6899</p>
	David and Beverly Willison	E-mail	<p>A post card delivered October 10, 2013, notifies us of CenturyLink’s hearing before the UTC to be held at 6 PM October 16, 2013. This gives customers six days to respond—either to drive to Olympia from Sequim to attend the hearing, or compose a written response. Unfortunately responses will probably be limited because of other demands on time.</p> <p>Since our schedule won’t permit us to plan a minimum of a two-day trip on such short notice, we request consideration of our written comments.</p> <p>We live in the Diamond Point area about 14 miles East of Sequim. Where we live there is no competition whatsoever. There is no TV cable—we are forced to use either Directv or Dish Network-- there is no other phone service, and no other Internet service. (Hughes Internet Service doesn’t work here because of the proximity to Point Wilson’s electronic equipment.) No doubt other areas served by Centurylink have competition.</p> <p>Along with the brevity of the reply window, the post card fails to explain the proposal in direct, everyday language. This ambiguity may also deter many from attempting a reply. But the scant</p>

			<p>information provided on the post card appears to give CenturyLink carte blanche to change rates, terms and conditions of service without approval from UTC. This is tantamount to license to steal. Should we be forced to pay more for our service because other areas have some competition? That would be quite unfair.</p> <p>Please consider what effect granting its petition would have on all of Centurylink's customers.</p> <p>David and Beverly Willison, 192 Discovery View Dr., Sequim, WA 98382, 360-683-5962</p>
	Chin, Susan	E-mail	<p>FYI: Here is a copy of letter I just sent to Century link: From a customer's perspective, I feel that Century Link Business practices need to be regulated more, not less. The letter below expresses some of my concerns.</p> <p>Date: October 11, 2013 To: Century Link Fr: Susan Chin Account 206 835 5147 836R Re: not happy with century link service</p> <p>When I called to ask about your internet services, your salesperson told me that since I was a long time customer, that I could sign up for one year (12 month) and can extend if I wish after the year. He did not say that it will change to the standard rate (as stated on my bill).</p> <p>Also I asked about my computer specifications before I signed up to make sure I was able to get the wireless internet connection and was assured that my system fits the qualifications and would have no problem. Not true.</p> <p>I was on the phone for hours with your computer tech person; but she was not able to get me the wireless connection. I could only get internet with the Ethernet cable attached to my computer. When your tech person was unable to help me, she said I need to hire some outside Geek squad to fix this problem. That is not right; your tech department should be able to help me with this and I should not have to pay extra tech help from outside of century link. The salesperson told me that if I bought a Century Link modem/router, getting wireless internet would be easy.</p>

			<p>Also when I agreed to sign up for internet I told the salesperson that I would buy my own modem. I bought a Century Link Modem/router from Best Buys (about \$100). Only to find out days later that a Century Link modem/router for lease appeared on my doorstep unexpectedly. Then I had to spend more time returning my modem to Best Buys. And then I found out that Century link charged me \$14+ for shipping and I would be billed for leasing their modem. So I had to spend more time to call billing to change from leasing to buying the modem.</p> <p>Then I learn that I am not the only one that a modem/router turned up on their doorstep unexpectedly. I brought this up at a party and it was the joke of the party. Many folks had similar experiences with Century Link. It appears that Century Link continues hard sales practices that waste the customer's time and money.</p> <p>I just received a postcard informing me that Century Link wants to be reclassified to have fewer regulations on their business practices. From my perspective, that would not be good for the customer. If you make a promise to your customers, you better keep it. Or you will have no credibility and the customers will leave you in flocks.</p> <p>Susan Chin</p>
	Melinda Christensen	E-mail	<p>Hi, I would like to submit a comment for the alternative form of regulation for CenturyLink. We live in a rural area, where CenturyLink is our only choice for phone and one of two choices for internet. It would not matter what they charged if we had a choice and could change providers, but as we don't have a choice and have to pay almost double what people a few miles away have to pay, I would encourage you to please keep a cap on their charges.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Melinda Christensen 3818 W Ames Lk Dr NE Redmond WA 98053</p>
	Burk Ketcham	E-mail	<p>I writing to ask the Commission to deny Century Link's request to be freed from asking the Commission for approval of rate changes and terms of service. Century Link is a public service company which functions under public control because it serves a public need. I have no quarrel with the services Century Link has provided to me but I do object to it's wanting to be free to raise</p>

			<p>rates at will or make other changes that are not in mine or the public's interest. Corporations have no goal other than to make money - and the public be damned. But if they are a utility they operate under different rules and should be subject to government oversight</p> <p>As an 88 year old widower, I have a land line which serves my limited communication needs. It would seem that those of us who are seniors and still can function without a phone in our pockets at all times will suffer financially if you do not deny Century Link's request.</p> <p>Burk Ketcham 420 North 4th Street - A Tacoma, WA 98403 253-779-0152</p>
	Earl G Pilgrim	E-mail	<p>Re the above company no changes should be made until they have cleaned up their existing operation . They currently are the most difficult company to communicate with I have ever experienced . Every time I have tried to call them I have been put on hold while being subjected to non stop advertising . If after long holds you do get e real person it is usually in a foreign country talking to some one who is difficult to understand , and can't fix the problem . The old company they bought was always service oriented . Century Link is not .</p> <p>I terminated my service with them in Aug when they screwed up a bundling arrangement . I had a termination number . This was after spending over spending over a week with hours on the phone .They refuse to acknowledge this , and continue to bill me as a customer . They have closed the offices , and can only be reached by phone .</p> <p>Please don't change their operating status until they their service record improves .</p> <p>Sincerely ,</p> <p>Earl G Pilgrim 105 S.E. Arcadia PT. RD. Shelton , Wa. 98584 360 432 8292</p> <p>360 432 8292</p>
	Suzanne Hadley	Email	This is in response to the proposed AFOR for CenturyLink.

			<p>I have had "service" with CenturyLink for over 5 years now (only because of limited alternatives), and in my experience, this company exhibits an extraordinary level of disservice and deception to its customers.</p> <p>I have contacted the WA UTC and CenturyLink numerous times about unexplained increases in my bill, as well as charges that were not disclosed prior to my starting service. I have *never" received a written reply (the company refuses to reply in writing), and the telephonic contacts leave me shaking my head in disbelief at the representatives' lack of knowledge and their inability to communicate.</p> <p>I cannot imagine why the UTC would consider an AFOR that would allow the company "to change rates, terms and conditions of a service" without approval from the UTC. Things are bad enough as they are, and will only get worse under this proposed change.</p> <p>The public is NOT well-served by CenturyLink or the UTC in this proposed change.</p> <p>Suzanne W. Hadley, 603 Milwaukee Drive, Port Angeles, WA 98363, 360-457-1272</p>
	Mary Pat DiLeva	E-mail	<p>Consumers will best be served if you don't approve the settlement agreement allowing CenturyLink to be regulated under an AFOR. Don't approve CenturyLink's request and the settlement.</p>
	James Draper	E-mail	<p>I am currently a customer of CenturyLink; phone and internet. I am very unhappy with their service and oppose anything that would decrease either the supervision they are subject to or the standards to which they must adhere.</p> <p>Here's my story. Every day my internet slows down for two approx. one-hour periods, one early in the morning, the other around noon, to the extent that it is useless as a practical matter. I speculated, and advised CenturyLink, that it seemed to me that someone or company was doing a large data dump on a regular basis at those times and slowing down the internet for everyone else. I don't know if that's true but that's what it seemed like because the slowdowns were so regular and at other times the internet was ok. CenturyLink's response was to, effectively, say too bad, that I had a 3 year contract and I was stuck. I don't know what the "retail service quality requirements" are but whatever they are, I would say they've been violated in my case and CenturyLink doesn't seem to care. If you have any questions, you are welcome to call.</p>

			-- James W. Draper (425) 646-0104 Attorney
	Martin Taylor	E-mail	Hi, My name is Martin Taylor, I live on Orcas Island in San Juan County. I just received a card the mail from Centurylink announcing that they are to be allowed to operate under decreased regulation because of the increased competition they operate under. On Orcas Island as in the rest of San Juan County they operate under very close to zero competition. Except in very limited circumstances there is no alternative for home phone service or for Internet access. I would hope you would be supportive in making sure they got no exemption in our county. In fact I would like to see them forced to offer better service or required to offer their networks to competitors as they would have to in a city. Maybe if they are to receive reduced regulation in city areas where there is competition in return they could be required to offer much improved service in areas where they have and protect a monopoly. Thanks Martin
	Julian Levi	E-mail	To allow Century Link to change its rates, terms, and conditions of service without UTC approval is ridiculous and a slap in the face to Washington residents. I have maintained my telephone service with Century Link and its predecessor companies for thirty five years as I don't want to be subjected to the predatory practices of a mostly unregulated monopoly, as I am with Comcast on my cable TV and Internet services. I can assure you, approving this change will not "better meet the needs and demands of the marketplace" in my house and thousands of other Washington households. [Quote from Century Link's public notice postcard.] Rather, approving this change will only lead to change in rates, and, as we all know, rates will not go down.

			<p>Sincerely, Julian Levi 911 NE 109th Circle Vancouver, WA 98685 Tel 360-573-7062</p>
	don brown	E-mail	<p>I attempted to contact the alternate local service provicers listed - they don't even answer the telephone. AT&T's telephone menu requires an existing account number to proceed, so how is that supposed to work for new customers? And the telephone number for Trinsic rings endlessly. If Centurylink believes them unviable then let the PUD manage the regulated assets.</p> <p>I receive one or more solicitations monthly from Century link offering internet access and telephone service for about \$65/month. My current cost for these services is \$30. This explains their principal underlying reason for application UT-130477 - to kill off dial-up services that compete with their lucrative broadband and wireless plans. That their landlines are more valuable to them dead than alive creates a rather egregious conflict of interest in my opinion.</p> <p>A requirement to exit the competing services makes more sense than approval of UT-130477.</p> <p>don brown 360-452-4499 1107 W. 16th Port Angeles 98363</p>
	Ken Havens	E-mail	
	A. L. Abernathy	E-mail	<p>A direct quote form the mailing we as customers received on October 11, 2013 from Century Link---</p> <p>"Century Link seeks greater flexibility in order to better meet the needs and demands of the marketplace." The mailing is confusing and full of unknowns other than that the Commission will meet on these issues on October 16,2013. I would call this a "late notification". They must think we have no plans for the near future and have all the time we need to do some research on their issues. I tried</p>

			<p>to follow their directions on finding out some information--- a complete waste of time unless you know what to look for and are a lawyer. So, I will forgo these options and just tell you about my experiences with Century Link.</p> <p>First, I live in an area that doesn't have cell phone coverage. Other wise I would have left Century Link years ago. They are the only commercial company I have ever worked with that said I have to but the maximum selection option in order to get a "reduced price" (almost \$70.00/ month). We have tried other options for the reduced telephone costs, but they have all had major drawbacks and hidden fees.</p> <p>Second, The way there mailing is worded gives me the feeling that all they really want is the freedom to raise their rates when ever they want to do so.</p> <p>On general principle I encourage you to NOT be "under a Alternative Form of Regulation</p> <p>A. L. Abernathy 7434 McCormick Port Orchard, WA 98367</p>
	Rudy J. Susan	E-mail	<p>I am against any changes for Century Link AFOR and should not be given.</p> <p>Rudy J. Susan P.O. Box 807 Morton, WA 98356 1-360-496-5511</p>
	Becky McPherson	Mail	
	Laurie Cross	Mail	
	Dave Theis	Mail	
	Lisa Zeienr	Web	<p>Century Link has proved over and over again they cannot be trusted. Internet goes down for days because they refuse to spend the dimes necessary for a part or wasp spray when they get in the boxes. When Qwest had the service we saw technicians all the time keeping up the equipment. We see no one since Century Link. To allow them to do what they want with no oversight leaves</p>

			the consumer holding the bag and that needs to stop. We have no alternative where we live so allowing them to do what they want when they want only means more poor service and frustration. Please DO NOT allow them to hurt the consume any longer and I assure you they will if you allow it! They have not proved trustworthy to let them govern unwatched they will hurt the customer and Washington State if you allow them anything without a watchful eye for the consumer.
	Jim Thompson	Web	<p>Giving CenturyLink the right to raise rates as they see fit would send land line rates out of control. In the early 1990's I remember that cable television was de-regulated with the idea that the de-regulation would enhance competition and keep cost in line at the current rate. We all know the results of that cable television de-regulation, it wasn't long before rates started going through the roof. If you give CenturyLink the authority to openly increase rates, the Company will increases rates every time the chicken comes home to roost.</p> <p>Please don't give CenturyLink a free hand at rasing land line telephone rates.</p>
	Verda Whelden	Web	<p>They need to be accountable to the regulators. Since they have taken over from Qwest, they have raised my rates repeatedly and the service is the same. When I call to ask them, they just give me the run around. I am a senior on a limited income and cannot afford for them to be raising the cost of my phone service whenever they feel like it. They should have to justify why they need the extra money.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
	Margie Simpson	Mail	
	Ann Hogue	Mail	
	Jack Markley	Mail	
	Mary A. Lewis	Mail	
	Garland & Kristie Cable	Mail	
	Elizabeth K. Nelson	Mail	
	Robert J. Hough	Mail	
	Ed Lawson	Mail	
	John & Adelaide	Mail	

	Haferbecker		
	Sarah & Robert Atherton	Mail	
	Jerry Keesee	Mail	
	Carol Strommer	Web	PHONE (DC) I object to the proposal filed by CenturyLink, particularly being permitted to change the rates and services without approval by the UTC. I believe they need to continue to be regulated by the UTC.
	Charles R. Rambo	Web	Docket number UT-130477 is seeking less regulation and power to make decisions concerning my power company. I am a retired senior citizen living on a fix income. Income COLA has increased a total of 1.5% in the past THREE years. Seniors can not afford constant raising of rates. Power rates have increased way more than our COLA. If power companies are unregulated than it would be even worse. I do not want to ask for charity and do not feel that it is right that I be forced into a position that requires me to do so. One has only to look at past requested rate increases to know that, if allowed to go unchecked, rates would be far higher than they are now. Only regulation has kept them down to today's rates which are certainly high enough to allow reasonable profits.
	Nancy Lopce	Web	I do not want CenturyLink to be regulated under alternative form. The UTC should continue to regulate them. If this was granted it would give CenturyLink free reign to charge whatever they want. Why should they be exempt? They should be treated like all other utilities that you regulate. They also should be required to send meeting notifications out earlier than they are. I just received mine.
	Debbie Caruso	Web	I would prefer that CenturyLink not be treated as if it were competitively classified. Unfortunately, my experience is that they're already acting that way in a number of areas, such as frequent, intrusive, and wasteful marketing activities; billing errors and lack of transparency in invoicing; and repeated interruptions in services such as voicemail. So, now that I think about it, it seems to me that the only thing left is for the price increases to become blatant instead of disguised. "CenturyLink seeks greater flexibility in order to better meet the needs and demands of the marketplace." I can't help wondering if this is a joke of some sort; they haven't treated my needs as if I'm part of the marketplace; they have, though, constantly tried to sell me new services I'm not interested in. The reason I've continued to pay for my two landlines over the years is that I prefer the voice quality to any of the alternatives I'm aware of,

			wireless, VOIP, etc. But the truth is that I've been so disgruntled with CenturyLink that recently I've been looking into VOIP again. If CenturyLink wants to lose my business, then going for competitive classification is probably as good a way as any for them to put me over the edge. It's really too bad, because I distinctly prefer landlines, and I'm perfectly willing to pay the cost IF I get quality treatment from the vendor. But as is usually the case, when quality goes out the window then the consumer is left with nothing but consideration of who has the lowest price. If the public policy goals of this State are to ensure that an entity like CenturyLink serves the needs of the public, that's fine with me. If, on the other hand, the goal of the State is to help CenturyLink capture a larger share of the telecom marketplace pie, then I'm sorry I've wasted my time in sharing my opinion.
	Donna Bresnahan	Web	Centurylink is the sole and only provider of internet and hard-wired telephone service to our address, and also for many other addresses in our area. Because they have a monopoly on these services, they should not be competitively classified. Thank-you for your consideration.
	Greg Hanseroth	Web	With regards to CenturyLink's petition to be regulated under "AFOR": This is nothing less than an open door for unbridled and unregulated rate increases at their discretion. To quote the Public Notice postcard I received in the mail, "This means that CenturyLink is permitted to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC." That is doubletalk for rate increases. At the next rate increase, I will consider dropping my CenturyLink land line altogether and use my I-Phone exclusively. Most of my family has already done that.
	Faye Hayden	Web	(phone-mm I am not in favor of the company being able to change rates without proper notification. I am not in favor of them getting rid of landlines.
	Alma	Web	As I read the notice that was sent to me by CenturyLink, a company whose loyal customer I have been for more than 10 years, they are basically declaring themselves unable to function as a provider of the services for which I am paying them, unless the regulatory leash is slipped and they are allowed to do what they want (change rates, terms and conditions of service at their discretion) without approval from a regulatory body, and unless they would be relieved of "automatic reporting requirements". I feel like I have just been told that the company would be doing JUST FINE without all these pesky customers who are interfering with the company's maximising their bottom line; the company is literally going feral on us, demanding the freedom to do what it pleases to its customer base. Well, if this is indeed the case, they are about to lose at least one loyal long-term customer - and I am prepared to hazard a guess that there may be more out there for

			whom this might be the push to seek alternatives. If a company does not appear to value me, as a customer, I fail to see why I should continue to support it with my loyalty and my money. I deeply disapprove of this "agreement". I will be taking a very serious look at alternative services as a direct consequence of this information I have just received. It is not a choice I make lightly - just the sheer inconvenience and drama of switching out an essential service for no reason other than principle is something I would have much rather avoided, and have avoided so far to my probable detriment - but I will do this if it is necessary, and the terms under which CenturyLink seeks to operate as described in this notification do, I believe, make it necessary. I have already put the company on notice about this.
	David Altheide	Web	I oppose this company being excluded from usual regulation and oversight. The last thing that we need is more utilities entities raising premiums at their organizational whim in order to increase profits, usually at the expense of their customers (who really have very little choices for certain services). Thank you for your consideration. David Altheide Emeritus Regents' Professor Arizona State University
	Donna L. Beatty	Web	 Century Link (previously Qwest) has added additional, non-essential services to its product offerings in order to increase its profits. To use the fact that it is in competition with other companies who provide the same services as Qwest/Century Link added as justification for its deregulation is nothing short of outrageous. Telephone land lines are an essential service for those who cannot afford or accommodate other communications services such as cell phones, cable, and others. For a company that is selected to be the sole provider of land line service in an area, such as Century Link, to be exempted from regulation as a utility is unfair to those who depend on the company for a basic and necessary service and would set a dangerous precedent. Perhaps it would be understandable for Century Link's added services to be exempt from regulation, but certainly not the core service it provides to land line customers. I ask that the Utility Commission carefully consider the precedent this would set and reject Century Link's request to operate as an AFOR utility. It put itself in competition with other companies to increase its profitability and now wishes to use that competition as leverage to further increase its profitability at the expense of those who rely on the basic services it and its predecessors have provided. The request is outrageous and should be denied.
	Sharon Stevens	Web	I do not think it is fair to the consumer that CenturyLink can just change rates, terms and

			<p>conditions without first having them reviewed and notifying the consumer of there intentions so that people can speak up about them. It is hard enough to survive in our current economy without some company constantly wanting more money for there service. CenturyLink does not provide good internet service in all areas and yet they are constantly sending out advertisment in the mail, in our bills and on TV. This proposal SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED.</p>
	Mary Ferm	Web	<p>Century Link has a virtual monopoly for service in the two locations that I have phones in Washington State. On Bainbridge Island, cell phones do not work at my home. Cable goes out when the electric power goes out, (which is several times a year), and as I do not want to lose phone service, I do not consider cable as a viable option for my telephone. At our other residence on San Juan Island, cell phones do not work anywhere on the west side of the island, and cable is only available in limited locations and not for me. I would hope any changes to Century Link's regulations would not allow them to increase charges in locations where they are the only viable option.</p>
	Marie Troxel	Web	<p>I am not in favor of CenturyLink’s proposal. CenturyLink’s rates are very high already, and the service is very bad. I am certain this proposal, if granted, will not change the quality of service CenturyLink gave us so far, and it will only let them raise that rates without the UTC regulation.</p>
	Jon G. Schneider	E-mail	<p>BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</p> <p>In the Matter of the Petition of)) Docket No. UT-130477 THE CENTURYLINK COMPANIES, et al)) To be Regulated Under an Alternative) RESPONSE BY RATEPAYER TO Form of Regulation Pursuant to) PROPOSED SETTLEMENT RCW 80.36.135) AGREEMENT</p> <hr/> <p>RELIEF REQUESTED</p> <p>1. Undersigned Ratepayer requests that the Commission either deny said Petition or amend same</p>

to protect Ratepayer and others similarly situated on the grounds set forth herein.

FACTS

2. The undersigned and his wife are customers of Petitioner. The residence is located at 20619 Mainland View Place NE, Suquamish, WA 98392 (PO Box 1106), phone number (360) 779-3012. Petitioner is their sole source of telephone service. They have no cellular coverage or cable availability.

3. On October 10, 2013 Ratepayer received by mail a small card informing him of the current proceedings and the requirement that any response be submitted on or before October 16, 2013. Ratepayer reviewed online the proposed Settlement Agreement, Stipulated Plan for Alternative Form of Regulation, RCW 80.36.135, RCW 80.36.300, RCW 80.04.360 and other legal authority.

4. Ratepayer also conferred by telephone with Ms. Stefanie Johnson, the Regulatory Analyst with the Public Counsel Section of the Washington Attorney General's Office, who testified before the Commission regarding this case. She provided a brief summary of the issues in this matter.

5. Ratepayer's sole dependency on Petitioner for telephone service is not unique. Upon information and belief Ratepayer contends that many other persons including neighbors and others in this rural North Kitsap area - including members of an Indian tribe - are similarly situated.

6. Ratepayer believes, after the foregoing limited research, that if the Petition were granted Ratepayer and many other customers would no longer have their telephone rates and service regulated by the Commission but instead solely by the wishes and desires of Petitioner to serve its business purpose without regard to the effect on Ratepayer and others similarly situated over whom it enjoys a monopoly.

ANALYSIS

7. It is clear that the basis for Petitioner's request is the existence of outside competitive pressure from non-regulated companies. Petitioner needs the flexibility to respond to these market forces. Given those circumstances, Petitioner's request is reasonable and appropriate where such competitive conditions exist. However, in those markets where such competition is effectively

absent, the law does not allow the state to shirk its clear responsibility to those customers to protect them from the whims of the utility with a monopoly.

8. It may be reasonable to permit Petitioner freedom to compete in urban areas provided that the Commission retains jurisdiction to regulate rates and services for rural customers. Ratepayer is aware of the proposed concept of “rate averaging” by which rural customers would allegedly receive the same average rate as the urban customer.

9. The problem with that approach is that the potential exists that the rural customer would be charged a rate for services being furnished to an urban customer that the rural customer would be unable to access. This would contravene established state policy. RCW 80.36.300 provides (inter alia) “It is the policy of the state to: ... (3) Ensure that customers pay only reasonable charges for telecommunication service [and] (4) Ensure that rates for non-competitive telecommunication services do not subsidize the competitive ventures of regulated telecommunication companies.” (Irrelevant provisions omitted)

10. Indeed, the very statute upon which Petitioner relies to authorize its proposal, RCW 80.36.135, contains the restriction that any proposed alternative regulation “Not unduly or unreasonably prejudice or disadvantage any particular customer class. “ RCW 80.36.135(2)(f) Such would be the case here.

11. Finally, Appendix A to the Stipulated Plan previously referenced purports to list various statutes, including several important to the protection of Ratepayer, which Petitioner is asking the Commission to “waive”. With all due respect, the Commission lacks the authority to waive any statute. Furthermore, assuming arguendo that the legislature were to attempt to grant such authority to the Commission, such an attempt would fail under the doctrine of separation of powers.

12. Ratepayer respectfully requests that the Commission either deny the Petition or enter an order amending same to exclude or otherwise protect rural customers.

13. Ratepayer is prepared to testify under oath as to the truth of the facts set forth herein.

			<p>DATED this 14th day of October, 2013</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Jon G. Schneider Ratepayer</p>
	Judy de la Cruz	Web	<p>We currently pay \$80.00 per month for a land line and don't want CenturyLink to be able to raise rates without UTC oversight. CenturyLink is the only land line service available here on the peninsula. Alternatives such as Vonage use the DSL capability provided by CenturyLink. Cable service is also not available here. CenturyLink has no competition to force them to keep rates down. Please vote for the consumer, especially those of us in rural areas, rather than big business on this petition.</p>
	Craig Ritchie	Web	<p>The company recently merged and is huge. They do not yet provide much rural highspeed internet. I would like them to provide information (reporting) so we know what they are up to. I thought that's why the UTC exists. If they are now under the UTC and have rate control, that's certainly better than them just being able to raise rates whenever they want. It would not benefit the consumer in any way to approve this proposed change in status.</p>
	Karen Moran	Mail	
	Mora	Mail	
	Violet J. Reinkens	Mail	
	Evelyn Carney	Mail	
	Floretta & Evelyn White	Mail	
	Harold Bressler	Mail	
	William Wilkinson	Mail	
	J.B. Burns	Web	<p>docket # UT-130477 -- I've had the same phone # for 30+ years with 4 monopoly telephone companies. Nothing has changed over these 30 years save the monthly charges now billed at \$</p>

			69.68 per month for a single line. Two years ago my bill was \$50.24 per month as C.L. took over. A statement on my bill noted I was saving \$10./mo. On my 2/2012 bill, \$55.96, a statement noted I saved \$ 5.33/mo. (a 10% increase). My 3/2012 billing was \$63.11 and I was thanked for being a loyal customer. I complained and a \$10./mo credit was issued noting my savings in bold. A year later the bill was \$ 63.27 and now is \$ 69.68 . C.L. wants NO regulation? BS!!! In 2 years a 40% increase.
	Lucille Reiller	Web	(Phone-mm) I am not in favor of the company being able to control of their prices. The company needs somebody to regulate them with a very firm hand. They should not be able to raise their rates for five years. I wish they were more concerned about service to their customers, I have been a customer for 49 years. I want to jump ship and get a cell phone only. This has been going on since June with no help from the company. I have been on the phone for hours at a time, like as if my time is not valuable.
	Thomas Pacocha	Web	I am opposed to the CenturyLink petition for AFOR. I currently know of no other competitor for my home "land line" phone service. I have not the personal income nor the financial resources of such parties as the Sprint Corporation, the U.S. DoD and all other Federal Executive Agencies nor the CenturyLink Corporation itself to represent my interests with regard to telecommunications regulation. I pay taxes in the state of Washington and I rely on the Washington State UTC to represent my interests with regard to telecommunications matters. I am hard pressed to believe that relaxing the regulation of this corporation will serve my interests.
	Richard Hauf	Web	It has been my unfortunate experience with Century Link that if we as consumers do not have the UTC as our advocate in all things dealing with their services, we will have no recourse as they have continuously have had to have their feet held to the fire to do their required job. That includes not just service but prices too!!
	Milton Horst	Web	As I understand the Public Notice postcard I received from CenturyLink on October 12, they are seeking permission to change rates, etc., without approval from the UTC. The implication is that they need this freedom in order to keep pace with their competitors. If this is true, why aren't the competitors subject to the same UTC oversight as CenturyLink? UTC oversight is needed to protect the individual consumer such as myself. It needs to continue and be applied to all retail telecommunications providers.
	Lisa Stuebing	Web	My CenturyLink bill is ten times (yes 10 x) what I paid for service when I moved into this house. Sure, time has marched on -- but under that same scenario, popcorn would now cost approximately \$5.90 a pound, a paperback book would cost around \$69.50 and a cup of drip coffee from 7-11

			would cost \$10.00. I think we have already given this corporate giant enough perks. I would very much like you to continue to regulate CenturyLink. If you could reign them in a bit -- I'll bake you a batch of cookies. With many thanks for continued regulation in a climate that is harder and harder to do that -- I appreciate you! Lisa Lisa Stuebing Owner, Mud Puddle Fitness, LLC www.MudPuddleFitness.com
	Laura Federighi	Web	Allowing the private for profit company CenturyLink to be regulated under an "Alternative Form of Regulation" is essentially allowing this company to self-regulate. There is no alternative to a land-line based phone service. Therefore, Century Link has a monopoly and the market pressures for retaining the costs of the service do not exist. Further as a for profit company, they do not have the best interest of the public in mind. Their primary goal is to make profit for their shareholders. It is imperative that a low cost alternative for basic phone service is available to the citizenry. Please retain the regulatory oversight of the UTC for Century Link rates.
	Kirk & Mary Duncan	Web	We are very afraid that changing CenturyLink to an Alternative Form of Regulation will allow them to change our phone rates as they please. CenturyLink claims to want "greater flexibility in order to meet the needs and demands of the marketplace". While we understand that things are changing and many people are doing away with their landline altogether, we do not choose to do so and think that CenturyLink should just stay in the telephone business, which is a utility and should be regulated as such. We feel that they just want a free hand to do as they please, and that that would not be good for Washington State consumers. CenturyLink CHOSE to be in an industry that is regulated to benefit the communication requirements of communities and there are sound reasons to maintain that close regulation that serves the public. Thank you.
	Alicia Krokowski	Web	Phone-mm I am opposed to this change, it does not seem justified. And also they why this was handled has not been appropriate. According to this notice they knew about this case for two months and they did not notify me until yesterday. I am opposed to this change because a landline is a utility, it not like cable television. I am on a limited income, I have a bundle package and would not be able to afford the flucuations of prices would put someone like myself without a necessary service such as telephone service. I don't believe that this would help the residents of washington state. This company needs some sort of approval process for their prices.
	Robin Atkins	Web	Century Link already has a virtual monopoly, certainly of line telephone services. Traditional regulation of their rates, requiring approval from the UTC for changes. Thank you.
	Marshall Curtis	Web	This is in response to the "PUBLIC NOTICE" that I got from CenturyLink re: docket # UT-130477. On that legally required "PUBLIC NOTICE", they claim: "CenturyLink seeks

		<p>greater flexibility in order to better meet the needs and demands of the marketplace.....If the settlement is granted as requested,.....CenturyLink will be permitted to change rates, terms, and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC.....but will be relieved of automatic reporting requirements."

TRANSLATION: This is more about "CenturyLink seeks better flexibility in order to better meet the needs and demands of their profits" than for their customers ("marketplace"). I once signed up for their Internet and Voice bundling service and got such a high initial bill that I quit their internet service right away! I now pay about \$26/month for local only Voice (aka phone) service and I can't afford any more than that right now. You give them what they want and that rate WILL go up much faster. I vote "NO"</p>
	<p>David Fluharty</p>	<p>Web</p> <p>I am one of many small customers of CenturyLink. In its various permutations, I have been with this company and its successors for at least 35 years. While I agree that they provide good service, I am very reluctant to permit them to be exempt from UTC Oversight. I do not believe this is a policy that serves citizens of the state and it abdicates the role assigned to the UTC.</p> <p>As one small example that has apparently occurred under UTC oversight, I signed up for an internet plan at 19.95 for five years along with a much overvalued, in hindsight, unlimited calling program. Given that, in the last two months my rates have been increased \$3.00/mo for the last two months. There is nothing in the billing statements that explains why the guaranteed rate has already started to increase. There is no increase in taxes or other fees from federal or state sources. The culprit is in some kind of discount on "promotional fees" being withdrawn.</p> <p>As you might expect, I did not agree to a five-year contract for the same fee to be starting to be charged -- now \$6.00 a month more than the set amount. If that arrangement was in the fine print I did not read then I would argue that this was deceptive marketing and it is what I would expect UTC to be watching on my behalf as a citizen of Washington. Further, I am extremely concerned that if the possibly inadequate UTC monitoring actually allows me to be hit by these additional fees to which I did not agree, then I am terrified of what CenturyLink will do if its application for more flexible policies to meet the needs of the marketplace as if "were treated as competitively classified." Already under UTC regulation I feel that the consumer is being maltreated and I strongly urge that UTC retains it authority to examine competitive rates and other what I feel are suspicious practices.</p> <p>Please note that the card informing me of the hearing on October 16 arrived on October 12th in my</p>

			<p>mail. I hardly consider this adequate notice to the public.</p> <p>I would be happy to provide copies of my billing from CenturyLink and to answer any other questions the UTC might have. I have not had the time to contact CenturyLink to ask an explanation for these two monthly increases but I can assure you they were totally unexpected and unexplained in the billing and not in accord with any prior agreement.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>David Fluharty contact information above</p>
	cathleen robertson	Web	<p>centurylink is still a telecommunications company, providing a basic utility service. that they wished to (and went ahead) expand into other services for their customers is a business decision that comes with consequences. they are still a service provider and should be held to those standards. if they wish to divest themselves of the telecommunications portion of their company, they should work on that and offer basic telecom services under UTC oversight. this request will allow them to charge their customers rates that are in line with non-utility, for-profit companies, even as centurylink (and other telecom companies) have carved out territories for themselves. i live in such a territory: even though i would like to have another phone company, centurylink is the defacto provider and no other company can offer service here. they already have a monopoly on service areas, so why should the consumers have to pay for all the extras that would no-doubt be "included" in basic phone service if they were free of regulation as a utility.
definite NO on their proposal.</p>
	RAINA SEDORE	Web	<p>I am highly distressed to read that CenturyLink is petitioning this body for "greater flexibility" which will give them license to change rates, terms, and conditions of service without government regulation. CenturyLink has a monopoly in my area and I have no been pleased by their service. My internet is the slowest I've heard of in the continental USA, and I'm ten minutes (by car) outside the heart of state government. I've given up watching my favorite shows online or watching YouTube videos on my home computer because of the low level of broadband available through CenturyLink where I live. One of the reasons I'm hoping to move (within the county) in the next few years is to get better internet access.
All of these complaints are beside the fact that I find it alarming that a corporation as large as CenturyLink is petitioning for additional controls. Please do not give them additional power.</p>

	ILZE TOMSEVICS	Web	<p>I very strongly object to letting Century Link being unregulated. In rural areas, they do not have much competition. If I want to get cable for Internet service, I would have to pay \$4000 to have a ditch dug for Comcast's cable. I will not do that.

Century Link has always charged more in rural areas for service, than they do in urban areas. Just because they can get away with it. So if you let them become unregulated, they most likely will raise prices for services even more. Just how many stadiums does Century Link need to put their name on !

I am currently paying \$86 a month for phone and Internet service. I think that is extortion. I am retired, on Soc Security.

This will become like the TV issue when the Feds changed TV signal to digital. We have not been able to get any TV reception for years now. We are missing out on all those TV advertisements. Sounds like we might go backwards more and not have phone service or Internet.....I really would like to keep the Internet and phone service and ask you to regret Century Links request.

Thank you.
Ilze Tomsevics
852 286th AVE S.E.
Fall City WA.

425-222-6654
</p>
	James Doman	Web	<p>I am opposed to Century Link being allowed to make rate changes (increases) without the approval of the Washington State UTC for the following;
9/10/2013 our telephone service (two lines) was lost about 0815 hrs and returned 12 hours later, cable problem.
9/23/2013 telephone two lines and internet service lost about 0800 hrs (one line returned to service that evening) telephone & internet service returned 10/05/2013 1050 hrs. Cable problem.
10/09/2013 telephone and internet service lost about 1800 hrs, service returned 10/11/2013 1020 hrs. Cable and line problems.

This is the latest in many line outages in the thirty seven years we have lived here. There has been no improvement in the service in our area, the same copper wires on poles have been here for forty years. We have put up with telephone outages over the years however we signed up for Century Link internet service on 9/14/2013 and so far have not been satisfied, speed, 1.5mb max, is slow for high speed service and service is unreliable.

Overall calling the service 800 line has been unsatisfactory many operators are difficult to understand as English does not seem to be their primary language. Service appointments to repair our service were cancelled by Century Link service department with no explanation requiring scheduling a new service appointment which was always two days distant. Local field linemen have been very good to work with and do their best to return telephone to service once they are dispatched to the problem.
</p>
	C. Campbell	Web	<p>Dockett Number UT-130477
Based on my experience as a CenturyLink customer, I do not want any settlement agreement approved that will allow Century Link to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without approval from the UTC. I am no fan of the UTC [based on their</p>

			<p>overly bureaucratic response to me in a matter regarding Puget Sound Energy], but to allow CenturyLink to do what they please without any meaningful regulation would be completely irresponsible. I recently signed up for a service upgrade with CenturyLink in which they promise no change in the service rate for 5 years. I had wondered what their plans were for the rates when 5 years are completed and now it appears - based on the public notice I received - that they fully expected to be able to do whatever they want with rates in the future. So, I'm sorry to say, it certainly appears I have my answer. For once, I would like to see the UTC do something that is in the public's interest. Do not allow the proposed AFOR to be enacted.
</p>
	Fred Metzler	Web	<p>Re: Docket # UT-130477
I don't know the details of CenturyLink's apparent sob-story to the Commission, but it's safe to assume that they're seeking this change to maximize their profits, not to maximize and protect the public's access to this utility at an equitable price.

I expect that CenturyLink is looking to pander services to the affluent and profitable portions of the population, and stick it to that part of the population that can't go anywhere else. You know who they are... Think rural. Think poor. Think living only on Social Security.

The current rate approval mechanism enables CenturyLink to raise its rates whenever it can document a need to. But that need should be defined by what is necessary to protect the public interest, not simply by a desire to maximize CenturyLink's profits.

I urge you to be a Conservative, and make no change to the current regulatory mechanism, and deny CenturyLink's request for change.

Regards, Fred Metzler

</p>
	David Levin	Web	<p>I received a postcard today from CenturyLink advising me of my opportunity to comment on case UT-130477. This postcard, which I'm guessing was sent to hundreds of thousands of customers, at great expense and environmental cost, provides absolutely no information that an average customer could understand. It is printed in 6 point font and is written in legalese.</p> <p>Based on what I understand of the UTC's role, you are supposed to regulate companies in a way that provides fair prices and sufficient competition. A postcard mailing like this is clearly designed to simply satisfy some sort of statutory notice criteria, not to inform customers or the public about any meaningful facts. The things that you regulate often can impact the consumer choices that we have and the money that we pay.</p> <p>I urge you to reject CenturyLink's application until they have meaningfully informed the public about what case number UT-130477 is. I have absolutely no idea what this is about, but I'm guessing it will impact me in some way. How about something written in plain English, in 12</p>

			<p>point font, well organized in a way that explains this.</p> <p>Don't let businesses like this go through pro-forma steps of notifying the public of important issues. There is a reason the law was written to require notice, so make them live up to the requirement if they really want to see this change.</p>
	Betty M Corey	Web	<p>The idea that this company has plenty of competition is not true. We ONLY can access phone service (land-line) through Century Link. Other companies, we have been told have to rent line space from Century Link to get their service to other parts of Key Peninsula. However, past home on the east side of the peninsula is serviced ONLY by Century Like. A cable TV company (WAVE) is hardly considered telephone competition (and it's not even live yet). I hope you keep in mind many of our residents are elderly and on fixed incomes. Giving Century Link open permission to charge us as they please is NOT in the best interest of our citizenry. I speak as a resident, and a business customer at Palmer Lake Beach Club (502 lots). Thank you.</p>
	Jim Davison	Web	<p>The challenges of having competitors does not seem like a valid reason for CenturyLink to be able to skip the process of having proposed rate changes looked over by the UTC, especially if the competition much do the same. If that is not the case perhaps the competitors are getting an unfair advantage and should not be allowed to skip the process. The UTC appears to act as the arbitrator for the providers and the users, acting in fairness to both and it would not have that opportunity if the process were skipped.</p>
	Jo Ann Oliver	E-mail	<p>CenturyLink wishes to have less regulation which I am totally opposed to as one of its long suffering customers. This is a company that needs much, much more regulation. I had a contract for a lifetime price for internet. They refused to send a written copy, and, after I moved, raised the rate claiming that it was because I did not have a bundle. Had I been provided the original terms in writing, there would be no dispute. Their customer service is cavalier at best, and many of the people in customer service may try hard to help, but they are not trained well and often give out incorrect information that is contradicted the next time I call.</p>
	Edwin Hayes	E-mail	<p>Century Link should be regulated. Though I am sympathetic to their plight.</p> <p>Comcast and oll other major cable companies should be regulated as well on a basis comparable to Century Link.. There should not be any voids in service in the jursidictions where they operate. They should not selectively cover the regions they serve.</p>

			<p>Similarly, the 4 major cell phone carriers should be required to cover all of Washington, not just their selected parts of the State. The gross voids, in service, by the 4 cell phone carriers of Washington make Washington's coverage inferior to most developed countries.</p> <p>I understand the Utilities Commission may agree with me. It is really unfortunate our Legislature is more committed to the Cable and Cell Phone lobbies than the citizens of Washington.</p> <p>Edwin Hayes 1001 Cooper Point Road SW, Ste 140-286 Olympia WA 98502-1174</p>
	Marie Adair	E-mail	<p>PUBLIC NOTICE card from Centurylink came on 10-12-13 to advise me of their request for "AFOR" classification and that public comment is allowed at a hearing on the AFOR on October 16, 2013 at 6:00PM.</p> <p>My attempt to comment via the UTC comment webform was not allowed because the docket number was not accepted, neither could I find the docket number in the listings.</p> <p>Centurylinks' description of the waiver request says, if honored, it would exempt this utility from requiring UTCs' approval of rate change requests and from approval of change of terms or conditions of service.</p> <p>I certainly oppose that waiver unless all utilities are equally exempted.</p> <p>Ms Marie Adair e- marieadair1@gmail.com 28811 19th Ave. S. Federal Way, WA 98003 253 839-9051</p>
	Roger Gay	E-mail	<p>I received a post card from Century Link saying they were applying to be regulated under AFOR. I highly protest allowing Century Link the ability to change rates terms and conditions of service without UTC approval. I have had Century Link since it took over local phone service. I had two phone lines for years and paid about \$50 a month on average. One line was our regular phone line and the other was a fax line. I dropped the second line after Century Link took over and Century</p>

			<p>Link has managed, with UTC approval to raise my monthly bill again to the almost \$50 a month level with only one line.</p> <p>Basically, with UTC approval, Century Link has doubled my single line cost over the last 3 or 4 years and has given no extra service or product. I shudder to think what my bill would be with the extra line now.</p> <p>When I tried last year to drop my AT&T long distance service and go with Century Link they were not helpful. I could get long distance with a bundled service for products I do not want and it would cost me well over twice what AT&T was charging for long distance service. If I had a choice I would find another local phone service and drop Century ink like a hot potato.</p> <p>Century Link needs to be held accountable and continue to have the UTC regulate its service. If this is approved, it will give me a major reason to drop land line service altogether.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Roger Gay South Kitsap</p>
	Margaret Denn	Web	<p>Century Link is the only phone company available in the Ashford, Washington area. When you initiate service you do not get the price offered in their advertising. The billed amount changes almost every month. When a customer calls them, he/she is suddenly disconnected. They do not return calls or always send out requested information. They do not remove the charges for calls made by hackers. I cancelled the internet after three days when their technician could not find anything wrong at this end. I don't know how much longer it would have been out. I have been extremely unhappy with Century Link's service. They should not be a monopoly out here. Even their service technician agreed that their business practices are questionable.</p>
	Robbie Lieske	Web	<p>I don't want them to be able to raise rate at their own free will. We are held to our contracts but they would be able to do whatever they want. Not in favor of this.</p>
	Steven HGunt	Web	<p>This comment is in response to docket number UT-130477. I did not find about this action until 8:30PM 10/15/13 talk about being blind sided. This is typical of the service provided by CenturyLink. No notice of change and then no way to respond in a timely fashion. Until this organization improves it's customer relations they should not have more ways to make the public</p>

			unhappy.
	Marilynn Carlson	Web	<p>phone-mm: They are a monopoly for a landline service, as such I am hesitate for them to not be regulated. Landlines are the most dependable form of a communication. As monopoly, they should be regulated. As they serve low income population and many cannot afford the flutucation of prices. I am pleased with their service though.</p>
	John W. Hamilton	Web	<p>RE; Docket number UT-130477 Century Links request to be regulated under AFOR. Century Link states it wants "greater flexibility in order to better meet the needs and demands of the marketplace". I object to this because it has no statement or intent about needs of the customers or any customer service.</p> <p>I live in a rural area where I have no competitive alternatives and service is often marginal. Recently I had problems with phone connectivity and a clicking noise on the line then disconnect on calls.</p> <p>Having worked for the phone for 42 years I knew it was a pair-gain repeater and called in to repair. I got an off shore person who was rude and had a script to follow and wasted time by dispatching someone to my home. The Technician was polite and knew what they had to do and said they did not need to come here</p> <p>Even after this got fixed it started again and I had to go through this same routine. Century Link repair service people off shore do not give any service. Century Link people in their billing are rude and have corporate rules that make no sense at all. Example of that is they took double payment out on Auto deduct billing and could not rebate us without calling the bank to check on the funds being there. They were very rude in their responses.</p> <p>I don't believe that Century Link should get any regulation freedom since they make 700 million to 1 billion a year in profit that goes to share holders. I will say I believe that cable company's also need to be regulated in the same manner. Ever since deregulation service has suffered and customers have had to pay more and more.</p> <p>I don't see how this AFOR is going to help Century Link give better service to customers. I don't believe Century Link even cares to give better service, its just a move to get more money for less service. Let me repeat myself "its just a move to get more money for less service".</p> <p>Do not give Century Link an Alternative Form of Regulation.</p> <p>Sincerely;</p>

			John W. Hamilton
	Lynn W. Larsen	Mail	
	Joanne Melius	Web	phone-mm I want the UTC to regulate their rates. My concern is the DSL of the services and thats because there are no other options for my area other than satellite.
	Erin Longmoon	Web	Hello, I believe that large, massive companies - the size of CenturyLink - must be regulated to be certain that they comply with laws and consumer protections. If they are awarded AFOR status, then this oversight will be minimal and that can open the company up to charge whatever they wish and take advantage of consumers, (since they have few true competitors in the Washington market, they are able to corner many consumers into having to settle for their service - and high prices - or have no services at all). We need more options in this service sector, and we need regulation to protect us consumers. Thank you for considering my position.
	Erik Andersen	Web	CenturyLink (formerly CenturyTel) has a history of providing both substandard provisioning and customer service. CenturyLink needs to be regulated in a transparent fashion in which customers have not only knowledge of proposed changes, but are able to weigh in on them via the UTC. In many areas of the state they constitute a de facto monopoly where consumers have no alternative to their offerings. Therefore I strongly oppose the adoption of the proposed AFOR. Please, in the interest of both residential and commercial customers, vote to decline their proposal.
	Eric Stevens	Web	My concern with the proposal relates to the high potential of base rate and current fees being increased in an unregulated structure. Also, nothing would stop additional fees being added similar to the way that the airline industry operates. As CenturyLink has an effective monopoly in a number of areas in the state for landline service it must remain regulated in the best interests of the public.
	Sylvia N. Cortinas	Web	I would like UTC to continue to regulate CenturyLink and would like them to have to come to the UTC for rate increase approval. I am a WTAP customer and on a fixed income. UTC is responsible and seems to look out for the customer. Please do not let CenturyLink have the ability to increase rate without approval from you.
	Kathy Taylor Albert	Web	Ladies and Gentlemen of the Utilities and Transportation Commission:

			<p>Today you are considering a settlement between Century Link, your staff and the Public Counsel Division of the Attorney General's Office which is suggesting a revision of the terms of the proposed Alternative Form of Regulation. On April 1, 2013, Century Link filed a petition with the Commission to be regulated under the current AFOR. Then on August 22, 2013, this telecommunications company sought the above-cited revision. I am writing to disagree with the conditions of the settlement requested.</p> <p>If this settlement is granted as Century Link wishes, the company will be treated as if it were competitively classified. This means that Century Link will be permitted to change rates, terms and conditions of a service without approval of the UTC, and would be relieved of automatic reporting requirements. As a teleoommunications service upon which nearly everyone in our communities rely, Century Link is every bit a public utility as Seattle City Light or the gas company, and must be regulated as such. Reliable, affordable services are consistently available to the public when a public agency such as the UTC has the legal basis to monitor a company's management and delivery of it's truly "public" service. Such will only remain the case if the current Alternative Form of Regulation continues to be authoritative, providing Century Link with no relief of reporting requirements. The consequences of deregulation in other sectors of our society have been disasterous for our economy, ultimately causing the current Recession. Ladies and gentlemen of the Utilities and Transportation Commission, please decline to grant Century Link the requested revision of terms of the Alternative Form of Regulation.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted,</p> <p>Kathy Albert Seattle, WA</p>
	Lorie Lucky	Web	<p>I don't want Century Link to be able to change its rates without going through the UTC. In central Seattle we have almost no recourse but to use Century Link. The only other provider is WAVE Broadband, and their service (including the VOIP phone service) is pretty poor. In my neighborhood we cannot choose Comcast as a provider, so Century Link has a near-monopoly hold on us...and their rates are already high. I am charged MORE for not signing up for their LD plan than I would if I took their plan. (I prefer CREDO with its policy updates.) Please keep UTC looking over Century Link's shoulder. Thank you.</p>
	Harold Brown	Mail	

	Jim & Paula Culbertson	Mail	
	Ted Mah	Web	<p>I am adamantly opposed. Century Link only wants to increase fees and service cost unfettered.</p> <p>I have a plan from the former Qwest they would love to dissolve because I pay less than what Century Link prefers to receive.</p> <p>Please do not change the regulation for Century Link to AFOR.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Ted Mah</p>
	Ron Zelinski	Web	<p>Please do not allow Centurylink the ability to raise rates whenever they feel the need to get more money from their customers. Look what happened when the CABLE TV providers got their request for deregulation; they said it would lower prices and yet every year Comcast raises their rates. If you allow Centurylink to raise their rates anytime without the approval of the UTC expect more and more complaints about Centurylink. Centurylinks rates are high enough already and they do not deserve to have the ability to raise rates without the UTC's approval. Please think of the consumer. Centurylink already told me that the traditional landline(home phone services) is going to be phased out of service and not everyone can afford cell phone service. What is the consumer to do??</p>
	Steven D. Soltar	Web	<p>I strongly oppose granting Centurylink an extended period of reduced regulation for either its bundled telephone and other services or for its land-line telephone only services. The practices of this company reduce competition and consumer choices. For example, Centurylink must provide other companies access to use of Centurylink's internet infrastructure, however the company will not allow other ISPs access to its fiberoptic internet lines in order to restrict customer choices. If I want a faster speed, I must opt for Centurylink's bundled service--for which the Commission proposes to relax regulation of fees. Consumers such as myself will have an incentive to abandon small business providers of ISP service and subject ourselves to uncontrolled rate increases.</p> <p>While Centurylink has a relatively new name, the corporation's history of customer service is deeply tarnished and continues to be problematic. After several attempts, including one this past summer, to change the configuration of services to which I subscribe, the company has failed to</p>

			<p>make these changes, has provided inaccurate and incomplete information, and has demonstrated little regard for fulfilling its promises and contractual obligations to its customers. While customer service may not register as important to the current deliberations on the extent of regulatory control to exercise, I would argue that this company's reputation are indeed relevant and predictive of how they will make use of less oversight.</p> <p>Because Centurylink of its own accord made a business decision to increase the scope of its services into a competitive market does not in my judgement warrant the exemption they seek. If another landline telephone provider were available for me to use, I would jump to make the change.</p> <p>Thank you for considering denying the request for continued relaxation of regulations on Centurylink's rate setting abilities.</p> <p>Sincerely, Steven D. Soltar</p>
	Paul Hennes	Web	<p>CenturyLink is a public utility with a virtual monopoly in the land-line telephone business in Seattle. As I public utility CenturyLink should be regulated by the UTC.</p>
	Josh Moyer	Mail	<p>Greetings.</p> <p>I hope that it is not too late to include this comment for today's public hearing on CenturyLink's request to be subject to an Alternative Form Of Regulation. As we all know, the telecommunications service landscape has changed dramatically from the days when the regional bell operating companies were the super-dominant players and necessarily subject to increased regulatory oversight. I am not familiar with the merits and particulars of CenturyLink's request but am mindful that proper maintenance of facilities always needs to be a priority.</p> <p>Attached to this message are two photos of what I believe are CenturyLink overhead wire facilities at the southeast corner of the intersection of Bellevue Avenue and East Olive Street and on the east side of East Olive Way and just south of East Denny Way (exhibits A and B, respectively) in Seattle's Capitol Hill neighborhood where I resided until recently. As you can see, these facilities are poorly tended to and may be in violation of local codes for overhead utility wiring. (Accordingly, I am also CCing the chair of Seattle's Libraries, Utilities, and Center Committee so that they are also aware of the issue.)</p>

			<p>In the case of both exhibits, the facilities in question have been in the pictured states for a period of some months – if not longer – and in the case of the latter a tall person could potentially jump up and grab onto the indicated facility, potentially damaging it and risking harm to themselves and service interruption to CenturyLink’s customers.</p> <p>I wish CenturyLink the best in this increasingly competitive market but feel that they may need to be reminded that proper maintenance and inspection is always a must.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and for including my comment.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Josh Moyer JWM/jwm Enc.</p>
	Steve Gambrel	Web	<p>PHONE</p> <p>Ever since Centurylink has taken over Qwest it's been a nightmare. I have never had such a waiting time and now its 15 to 30 minutes sometimes it may be sooner but that is rare. The notice says they are asking to not be under the UTC rules and can change their rates and policies and they should not be allowed. Ever since they took over my phone bill has jumped. They have no customer service and unwilling to work with their customers. The UTC should not allow this filing to go through.</p>
	Ken Simons	Web	<p>According to the notice on 08/22/2013 the parties involved have already agreed to revising the TERMS of the proposed AFOR - so what the hell good does it do to VOTE ?</p> <p>makes about as much sense as trying to get a straight up answer from Century Link about your billing questions right now !</p> <p>We dropped one of the 2 phone lines we had here and signed up for their advertised \$19.95 high speed(which it is NOT) internet for 5 years - The bill for the Two lines was always around \$65.00 a month - It was explained to us the cost would be approximately the same after getting their</p>

			<p>DEAL - We have yet to get a bill for UNDER \$ 85.00 a month and can not get a straight answer as to why -</p> <p>When our contract is up with them we are done with them period !</p> <p>They are already have become the most expensive land line in the country -</p>
	donny	Web	<p>This idea is totally ridiculous!! The utc is in place to monitor and over see Century link in the PEOPLE"S INTEREST. If you allow them to get away with this kind of bullshit, it must mean that you are in co hoots/ in bed with, and taking advantage of the citizens who rely on utc to protect us from greedy corporations who just want more profit at any cost to us, the public.</p>
	Travis Nichols	Web	<p>I have been a Century Link subscriber since they took over the Quest brand in our area several years ago. The service we receive in Spokane County is terrible from this provider and I greatly fear that should we stop requiring service and rate approvals for this provider that the rates would increase dramatically and we would be stuck with the same terrible service. I believe that Century Link should continue to be regulated as a phone carrier in order to provide the most competition in our marketplace which currently has limited service options.</p>
	Susan Lehrer	Web	<p>De-regulation has a history of raising rates and consumer woes.</p> <p>Here's a novel idea:</p> <p>Let's level the playing field by increasing the regulations on the cable companies, wireless providers, and other companies to the same level for which Century Link is accountable.</p> <p>The consumers would then find a more equitable and affordable communications structure.</p>
	Diane Faletti	Web	<p>phone-mm</p> <p>I am afraid that they will raise their rates higher and higher. I want the UTC to continue to regulate them. Keep it the way it is.</p>
	Bonnie M. Timentwa	Web	<p>No, I do not believe that the companies ahoud increase rates to benefit thier companies, as we the people are in crisis, some of us do not have jobs and an increase will basically have us discontinue phone services.</p>
	David	Web	<p>Living on Lummi Island our service from CenturyLink is marginal at best. To enable a company</p>

			like CenturyLink the ability to raise its rate whenever it wanted would be a big disservice to its customers. Customer like us, who really have no reliable alternative, would not only continue to receive minimal service but would have to pay more for it. The highest strength we can get out here is 3MB. I can't imagine having to pay more for such minimal service, whenever CenturyLink felt like charging more, without continued oversight. Thank you.
	Pat Russell	Web	We do not have a choice of telephone provider here. The rates we pay now are over and above what we'd pay if we were able to choose. We have our internet through CenturyLink also. It seems to me that, if you "unregulated" them, our rates are very likely to go up. We live on Soc. Sec. and are just getting by now. Our phone is a necessity or we would not keep CenturyLink due to the high phone rates. We have a cell phone for "on the road" emergencies through AT & T. We don't have data, texting or any of the frills - used for phone only. They are all making high profits.
	Steven Ross	Web	I am NOT in favor of the CenturyLink petition for regulation under "AFOR". As a Washington State customer I am very concerned that if CenturyLink were to be granted "AFOR" status, CenturyLink would accelerate rate increases, reduce service quality, and reduce customer service on the North Olympic Peninsula where they have a single provider monopoly. The Public Notice on the CenturyLink petition was only provided a few days ago by mail, leaving only about 3 days to respond with public comment by October 16, 2013. Please DO NOT APPROVE the CenturyLink petition to be regulated under "AFOR". Thank you for representing and protecting the public interest in this matter. Steven Ross
	Joanna Grammon	Web	CenturyLink should not be able to change its rates or policies without governmental and public oversight. Living in a retired household of two generations, I and my mother both have limited incomes. Changes in the cost of telephone service, which is a basic need, would affect us, as many necessities are also increasing in price. "Greater flexibility" to me means that rates could be increased at will. Greater justification is more to the point.
	Tiffani Harvey	Web	PHONE (DC) I do not agree with the change because I don't feel that they should be able to change the prices as they want to. I like it going through the UTC so that it basically stays at UTC for regulation. CenturyLink is the only one that provides home phone service in my area.
	Ed Hansen	Web	We are of the opinion that Century link charges too much for its service now and if they are regulated we will have no defense against a price increase. We live in rural area and don't have a

			choice for what kind of service we receive. Right now the prices are high enough for the service we receive.
	Thuong Dinh	Web	
	Daniel Diinh	Web	
	Joseph H Thayer	Web	This company and its predecessors have given absolutely no confidence that allowing any reduction in regulation will in any fashion benefit the people of Washington State, the state itself, or, for that matter, the country as a whole. All such previous remissions for telecoms in general have proven to provide the opposite.
	Wendy Larson	Web	CenturyLink UT-130477 I am against this proposal as CenturyLink is not a competitive company in the landline industry. It holds a monopoly in the Forks area in which we live. We are not able to acquire a landline from another company if we desire. If CenturyLink is allowed to raise rates at will we do not have the opportunity to change providers. Please consider rural communities in your decision as we have a single provider and no competitive options. Thank you for considering my comment. Sincerely, Wendy Larson
	Don Wilson	Web	PHONE (SH) I want the State of Washington Utilities Commission to make sure that CenturyLink doesn't do anything without their permission. Because I don't trust them and I don't like their service.
	Lorree Milnee	Web	PHONE (DC) I am not in favor of the proposal because it appears that the company would not have enough oversight. I think regulation by the UTC is a good thing and hopefully company won't charge us additional rates for this. Oversight over the company is very important. I am opposed to it and don't think it's right.
	Don Olson	Web	I don't believe they should be exempt from the process of review with the UTC. I have over 12 phone lines between my home and business and cabin and there price hikes are exorbitant. It is my desire that the UTC keep them in check a little better.
	Barry Levy	E-mail	3751 S.W. Rose Street Seattle WA 98126-3441 October 16, 2013

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC)
1300 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W.
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia WA 98504-7250

Re: Century Link
Docket Number UT-130477

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This letter is submitted in opposition to the Alternate Form of Regulation (AFOR) reportedly agreed upon between Century Link Companies (d/b/a CenturyLink (CL)) and the Washington State Attorney General's Office, which yet requires WUTC approval and of which petition and agreement I learned only from a postcard mailed from Louisiana and received yesterday afternoon as a CL landline telephone subscriber.

From my reading of the summary explanation on the postcard it appears that the AFOR would grant CL the authority to "change rates, terms and conditions of service without approval from the UTC."

I write as a subscriber with a single "measured residence line" only who is charged for each of the fewer than the half-dozen out-going calls made each month and sometimes none. My concern is that removing WUTC oversight of rate increases and terms of service by CL will result in conditions that would require subscription to bundled services neither needed nor wanted and to prices that will reflect only what the market will bear and not what provides a fair return on investment.

CL landline service is fundamentally different from the "cable companies and wireless providers" with whom CL reports it competes for home telephone service. It should be treated differently as a result, that is, subject to close scrutiny and regulation.

First and foremost, landline service is a matter of basic public safety and personal security; no one is going to boot-up or search for a cell-phone in a darkened house in the middle of a stormy night, when there's an intruder breaking a window downstairs or when a medical emergency arises.

			<p>Having experienced all those things I know it's the landline connection that's most dependable, whose location is certain and whose service is sure.</p> <p>A second major difference is that landline service is rather at the whim of any caller more than the subscriber; the internet-connected computer and the cable-linked television do not turn themselves on. Having kept a phone log since 2005, I can report that more than 75% of the calls received here have been unwanted intrusions by telemarketers and robocalls, only too often at, shall we say, inopportune times. In sum, the landline is the agent of the caller and the annoying intrusions are suffered only because the phone represents that life line for aid for self, neighbors and passers-by.</p> <p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission October 16, 2013 Page 2</p> <p>With the recent extension of the state and local sales taxes to landline service, the monthly bill has already increased 9.5% here in King County and now reflects noticeably more for taxes, surcharges, federally-mandated access charges and funds (read "taxes" again) than the actual service and usage fees paid to CL. It appears, in fact, that the sales tax is being applied to the designated compulsory federal funds and the local 911 fee, that is, taxes to be paid on taxes.</p> <p>Having compared the costs and clear advantages of a pre-paid cell phone over a landline connection, this landline will be disconnected and the switch made just as soon as CenturyLink next raises the rates for measured residence lines. This, I am confident, they will do in short order if the Commission approves the AFOR to "meet the needs and the demands" not of the marketplace as their tardy Public Notice postcard asserts but of CenturyLink only.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Barry Levy</p>
	P.R. Loe	E-mail	To the Commission:

			<p>Century Link informs us that they have filed a petition to be regulated under an Alternative Form of Regulation, based on the competition that the Century Link Companies face from cable companies, wireless providers, and other companies.</p> <p>Conventional telephone service, as provided by Century Link, is regarded as a necessity, and is tax-supported through the Federal Universal Service Fund. Cable and wireless services are luxuries and are not tax supported.</p> <p>Luxuries and necessities, in my opinion, require different forms of regulation, and the petition should therefore be denied.</p> <p>Century Link is a relatively new service provider in this area. I feel certain that they were fully informed about our regulatory system when they purchased QWest. It will not be a hardship for them to continue to operate under the traditional form of regulation.</p> <p>P.R. Loe 2123 4th Av. N. Seattle 284-7152</p>
	Clifford R. Marsh	E-mail	<p>CLIFFORD R. MARSH 11414 105th Ave. S.W. Apt. J-5 Lakewood, Washington. 98498 253-582-4249</p> <p>10/17/2013</p> <p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W. PO Box 47250, Olympia, Washington 98504-7250</p> <p>Docket Number : UT-130477</p>

			<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>This past weekend I received a Public Notice card from CenturyLink. in the mail. Apparently CenturyLink Petitioned the WUTC to be regulated under an Alternative form of Regulation. As a senior citizen of Washington State , I strongly oppose this AOR. It will give CenturyLink to much control over rates and rate hikes. I feel by handing CenturyLink this settlement , my monthly home bill would double within a year or two. I currently pay \$ 13.50 for the line, and with taxes and surcharges added \$ 36.48 for a total of \$ 49.98 per month for one phone line. I now have to make a decision , should I keep this phone or say goodbye. I am a one income person who is living on a retirement check and barely getting by. Please make CenturyLink accountable. Thank You listening.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Clifford R. Marsh USA Retired</p>
	Richard Floyd	E-mail	<p>I'm writing oppose the regulation of CenturyLink under AFOR (docket number UT-130477). I see that the purpose of this is to treat CenturyLink as "competitively classified," but from my perspective living in rural Jefferson County, it's still a monopoly with total control over my telecommunication services. I couldn't tell from the documents what this change will mean for me. Could I lose my phone service or my Internet access? Will they be priced out of my reach?</p> <p>One might think, looking at the Washington Broadband Map, that I have many service alternatives. Nine are listed on the map. However, the map is "census block" based and shows "advertised" results. These both lead to a dramatic overestimate of availability in a rural, hilly, and heavily forested area like Jefferson County. Three of my listed options are wireless, but there is no usable wireless signal at this address. One is cable, but they don't serve this neighborhood. Four are satellite, but the heavy tree cover in this area precludes that option.</p>

			<p>That leaves CenturyLink. They advertise 10 - 25 Mbps service here, according to the map. The reality is that I get just over 1 Mbps service. That's not broadband under the accepted definitions. Even that took a year to activate because of oversubscription in this area. Many, many attempts to upgrade to faster service have failed. I've been told repeatedly that they have no current plans to offer faster speeds here.</p> <p>This is customer service?</p> <p>Phone and broadband service aren't luxuries. Rural Washington needs them to compete. The state needs them to be competitive. I see no evidence that CenturyLink is interested in providing these services even with regulatory oversight. I fear what will happen without it.</p> <p>Richard Floyd 630 Goss Rd Port Townsend, WA 98368 360-385-3950</p>
	D. Pardi	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>Please do not approve Century Link to be regulated under and “Alternative Form of regulation” (AFOR).</p> <p>I cannot bear the thought that Century Link will be permitted to change rates, terms and conditions of service without approval from the UTC. Prices are out of control as it is and I willingly pay taxes in order to enforce such regulations to keep big business in check and consumers protected as much as possible against out of control pricing.</p> <p>Thank you for your possible consideration and the opportunity to weigh in on this important issue.</p> <p>Best regards, D. Pardi Seattle Resident</p>
	Margaret Lee	Web	<p>1. The small-print postcard notice I received from Century Link was and is insufficient notice for me to become informed. I was hard to understand and sent to me at the 11th hour. I contacted the Washington State Attorney General's Office with this complaint.

2. The Defense</p>

			<p>Department's financial agreement with Century Link should be made public. Will they be given "special" rates?

3. As an older citizen with limited income I am VERY concerned that Century Link would no longer need your approval for rate increases (as I understand would be the case).

4. The Commission members should be concerned and ensure that Century Link customers have adequate opportunity to get the details of this proposal and comment.

Thank you for your work on my behalf.

Margaret Lee
</p>
	John Carrier	Web	<p>I live in a rural community. CenturyLink has no competition in my neighborhood. There is no cell coverage and there is no cable. I rely on them to provide phone service and internet (ADSL).</p> <p>I am greatly concerned by CenturyLink's proposal to relax regulations in order to become "more competitive". Where I am, there is no competition.</p>
	Roberta Fargo	Web	<p>I am against the company's proposal for two reasons primarily.</p> <p>First, they want to be competitively classified, so they have more freedom to raise prices. For one, they cannot be considered competitive if there is no competition. I have no choice in my phone carrier, otherwise I would have already switched. Since CenturyLink took over Quest, the service and integrity have dropped drastically.</p> <p>Which leads to my second reason. I do not trust this company to be fair. I have already been overcharged for their internet service: once when they began an increased rate on month 11 of my contract, rather than month 12 as it should have been. Then again when they raised the cost of the modem lease to \$6.95, despite my contract agreement saying it would be \$5.95. They claimed they had no idea at the time of my contract that their rates would increase. I told them they don't know the meaning of a contract. Another time, they tried to charge for a week of no service when they were "upgrading" the phone lines, which resulted in no phone service for the area they were servicing. I would have had no way to call emergency services should I have needed them. This was frightening, as I have medical issues that sometimes become severe. There is no reason the lines had to be down for that long for "upgrades", which I told them when I called, but they just tried to tell me my service would be better (which it wasn't).</p> <p>Finally, their customer service call line is poor at best - takes at least a half hour to get through, and then often misdirected and cut off.</p> <p>This company - this monopoly - does not deserve to be able to force their customers to pay higher rates for low quality phone service.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Roberta Fargo</p>

	Russell White	Web	I urge the WUTC to reject Century Link request for flexible regulation ("AFOR"). The WUTC needs to continue to regulate Century Link and should also extend regulatory control to non-traditional providers of telephone services via cable and internet.
	Roy Olson	Web	<p>Re: Docket Number UT-130477, exemption from rate filing.</p> <p>CenturyLink asks for an exemption from rate filing on the basis that it faces competition from cable companies, wireless providers, and other companies. In my case, this is not true.</p> <p>I live at 4804 Boston Harbor Road NE, Olympia. My residence is 2 miles from the Olympia city limits on an arterial road, subplatted behind the frontage property with an easement for utilities and my driveway. I am about 800 feet from the road.</p> <p>The only cable company is Comcast, which would charge \$18 per foot to lay cable, for thousands of dollars. Cell phones are not a viable alternative to my land line. When I purchased one, I got zero bars and instructions written by the illiterate for the illiterate. I returned it. Satellite is not a viable alternative. I would need to spend thousands of dollars to cut my trees, only to find out if I need to cut my neighbor's trees as well.</p> <p>Please find that CenturyLink should be required to submit supporting documentation for all rate increases.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Roy Olson</p>
	Lorie Hewitt	Web	My phone bill with CenturyLink has been going up monthly since last July, increasing 12.5% overall. Given this scenario, I don't think it is a good idea to allow the company to change rates, terms, and conditions of service without approval from UTC. However, I think all of Century Link's competitors should be held to the same level of oversight from UTC. So all the cable and wireless companies should also not be permitted to change rates, terms and conditions without approval by UTC.
	Jean Kent	Web	I appreciate, want, and NEED government oversight regarding company procedures. Please do not allow Century Link to become 'competitively classified.' Thank you for allowing me to give input and for watching out for Washington residents!

	Steve Proctor	Web	The public relies on the UTC to keep the duopolies like Comcast and Century Link in check. However they spin the "demands of the marketplace", in any practical sense each company has their own monopoly. I cannot get Comcast's services at my home. In order to switch providers I would have to move. So when faced with the prospect of Century Link changing my terms and conditions at will my only option is to cancel service and do without data services. Until I have the choice of using Century Link, Comcast or Verizon AT MY CURRENT RESIDENCE then they must fall under the jurisdiction of the UTC. P.S. I find it highly appropriate the petition to the UTC was filed on April Fool's Day.
	Bruce Lyon	Web	Dear Sirs et al; The history of CenturyLink and its predecessor is not one of exemplary behavior. I suspect they may yet be enjoying court monitoring for their past transgressions. Rather than freeing CenturyLink from regulation, I would like to see the Commission prepare a proposal to the Legislature that would bring VOIP services under equal regulation of the UTC. If the current trend, wherein CL customers end their land line service in favor of cellular phone service, continues. Then CL will desire to end their residential service altogether. It will not be in the public interest to allow CL to end residential service: Internet access is still far from universal; Land lines must be retained as an alternative to wireless in case of cyberattack or unusual sunspot activity.
	Alex Mahikoa	Web	I am TOTALLY AGAINST Century Links proposal for being unregulated as requested in docket # UT-130477. All utility companies should be regulated for the publics' safety.
	Thomas Rhoads	Web	Do not allow them to do this, it will only allow them to increase my bill for no reason other than to make profits, I am a long term user but they provide very little in return for what I pay for.
	Michael Wilson	In person	Mr. Wilson testified at the Oct 16 public comment hearing in Olympia.
	Thomas and Barbara Wilderbuer	In person	Mr. and Ms. Wilderbuer testified at the Oct 16 public comment hearing in Olympia.
	Steve J. Dragich	In person	Mr. Dragich testified at the Oct 16 public comment hearing in Olympia.
	Chancel Barber	In person	Mr. Barber testified at the Oct 16 public comment hearing in Olympia.
	William Butterfield	Web	It appears to me that CenturyLink is trying to use this as a way to skirt the regulation of the UTC. If this is approved, what is stopping companies like Xfinity/Comcast to request the same form of regulation?? CenturyLink has done just fine in this state for years under its current regulation.

			Allowing this will be terrible for the consumers of Washington. Do not allow this request to be approved.
	Tristen Star	Web	Dear Commission; I have lived with a disability for going on 40 years, and need my "landline" telephone. I am sole sufficient and have no one to check on me. I have lived like this for many years. There are no programs in my county that offer this service. I depend on my landline for my emergency needs, as cell doesn't guarantee to work during power outages. Although I work part time, even without my wages I would not qualify for low income assistance. My phone without long distance is over \$39.00 a month and I am concerned about uncontrolled increases. The majority of programs & services assume that individuals with disabilities or elderly qualify for "low income" benefits. Many of us are over the limits, and live as if we are low income, with the costs of food, medical etc. continually rising. Please consider the impact of CenturyLink & telephone increases and how that might affect the safety & well being of those with disabilities or the elderly. Thank you, Tristen Star MS Rehabilitation Counseling.
	Lurene Gisee	Web	This company has been extremely dishonest and has cost me much in funds for extra phones since the landline I pay them for does not work. I have tried to cancel contract, but they make every excuse to prevent me from doing so. My contract ends in November or December of 2013, and I want to be certain that they are forced to end the contract as I request. They do not provide a normal business address so we could talk cheaply. They insist I call, keep me on the line, cost me in cellular minutes and leave the problem unresolved. I want to end my contract with CenturyLink normally in December 2013, as the contract stipulates, I believe. thank you -- Lurene Gisee 409 York Street, Apt. 1019 Bellingham, WA 98225
	Wilma L. Williams	Mail	
	Shirley A. Geiger	Mail	
	Doreen Valley	Mail	
	Kathleen Nielson	Mail	
	David & Judy Teitzel	Mail	
	Lillian Gergen	Mail	

	Joseph & Mary St John	Mail	
	Muia Thong	Mail	
	Roger Smythe	Mail	
	Judy L. Chrisman	Mail	
	David Reitter	Mail	
	Karen Olinghouse	Mail	
	Mary Gray	Mail	
	J Tate	Mail	
	Thomas Green	Mail	
	Toni Lawrence	Mail	
	Gordon Smith & Sapphire Blue	Mail	
	Paul Liebert	Web	<p>I suspect that Century Link would impose unwarranted hikes in phone rates if they are free from control</p> <p>Also I resent that my card from Century Link only arrived 5 days before the hearing.</p>
	dan wyatt	Web	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Friday Harbor, WA has little or no cell coverage and CenturyLink has a monopoly on phone service. I'm afraid that if they can change rates and terms and conditions without your approval then our phone bills will continue to increase. I subscribe to CenturyLink's phone service and internet now and I am paying \$79.50 per month. I am on a fixed income and and I don't think they should be relieved of their automatic reporting requirements. I've had problems with their phone service...switching sounds and loud humming noises on the line for years and they still can't fix it. I was told that they buried their lines in the same hole as the electrical company has there lines in and that the loud humming noise is from the electric company's cables. Nevertheless, I don't think CenturyLink has any competition from other cell providers because of the monopoly they currently have over much of Washington state now. Most of the areas they cover are not covered by cable or wireless providers. I am against this petition. Thank you..Dan Wyatt Friday Harbor</p>

			WA 98250 360 378 7110
	Nancy Mears	Web	phone UT 130477 You do not want this to be granted. The company should not have free range to raise rates. The price is too high already. There should be some control.
	Michael Wyatt	Web	Century links would like to get out from under the more stringent reporting laws. This is not in the best public interest UNTIL Century Link starts taking care of all customer to similar level of service. Their commitment to high quality does not correspond to them providing a level of service to ALL, ONLY to whom it is convenient for them to provide such service. I pay \$50/for 3mbps dsl service. Century will NOT put in a line amplifier to give me better DSL service as they don't want to spend the \$\$\$. They have a monopoly on the service here as Comcast won't run the cable to me (What was the public service commission agreement with them--did they have to make service to all to do business on the island? They have not) Only by keeping them in a more stringent reporting will they continue to do right by the customer.
	Joan Easterlund	Mail	
	Valerie Sammons	Web	I am and elderly person who has survived all the changes of company ownership from Ma Bell through, now, Century Link. I have had the same phone number since about 1986. The telephone rates keep going up and up and my income is static. I keep my land line because it is what I am familiar with and I don't wish to incur the kinds of charges that I hear of for cell phone carriers. I run my computer off DSL and cannot afford cable. I think that Century Link has seen a way to make a lot more money and they don't want us old "land liners" holding them back. They are currently providing a vital community service for older people and that is what the definition of a public utility is. They are a public utility, not a cable company, although they do provide that service to some. I think things should be left the way they are. I believe I speak for many older people who are unable to challenge this request on the part of Century Link.
	Stephen Corthell	Web	It seems the changes sought by CenturyLink will enable them to raise landline rates at any time by any amount. This is not in the interest of landline customers, who have no alternative for landline service. Please decide against this proposal. Thank you.
	Bev Shenefield	Mail	I don't believe CenturyLink should be deregulated in any way. They already have too much leeway in their billing practices. I recently signed up for their internet service. The 1st month I was billed for the modem to buy and rent both. I called them and they said oh yes it will be corrected. I

			<p>paid what was actually due and next month another bill with an \$8 late charge. Another call to a supervisor and I hope it was fixed, haven't received the new bill yet.</p> <p>I have another thing I'm going to take up with them that I just noticed. I was told monthly bill would be \$39.95 (\$19.95 the first year), now I notice on the bill it is listed as \$55.95 after the 1st year. Bait and switch maybe?</p> <p>We have few internet providers with good service to our area of town. One (pocketinet) actually was honest enough to tell me they would rather not connect me because we would not get good service because of the large trees. I appreciate a company like that.</p> <p>If you haven't already, check customer comments on line. I knew what I was getting into but had little choice and intend to keep them in line or cancel. I will not put up with their games.</p> <p>(Harry) Bev Shenefield 629 E. Sumach St. Walla Walla, Wa. 99362 509-522-0718</p>
	Jack Miller	Web	I don't want them to change rates without UTC approval.
Undecided			
	Carolyn Horlacher	Web	I received a post card stating I would be able to see what changes Century Link was proposing by going to this site. I do not find any document explaining these. How will these proposed changes affect me as a customer and my service?
	B A Keller	Web	No comment, customer just wants to be on the mailing list for this case.
	Ruth McNiel	Mail	
	Arlene Weber	Web	With the rapid changes in technologies I realize that some things must change in the services companies provide. Unfortunately, each change usually means an increase in cost to consumers.

			<p>My mother and I carry ONLY local phone service. We do not have long distance calling, high speed internet service, TV, or cell phones because we cannot afford the excessively high costs of these services.</p> <p>We do pay our monthly bill for basic local service and we are suppose to be on the DO NOT CALL list; however, we receive up to 5 or more unsolicited calls per day often starting at 7:00 AM. CenturyLink told us that the only way we can actually stop those calls is to pay out even more to CenturyLink for caller ID and call blocking. Why do we have to pay more to prevent unwanted solicitation calls when we are on the supposed DO NOT CALL LIST? CenturyLink would make far more money off of those callers than off of us who have to suffer through those constant interruptions in our day! Those calls cause considerable disruption in our day when I'm trying to care for my disabled mother!

Any further change in CenturyLink status will automatically result in another increase in local phone service. We are not able to afford increased fees. We would change to another phone service if one existed that had lower fees and reliable service. We do need our land line service not only for our phone service, but also for our emergency monitoring (fire, burglary, medical), and dial-up computer.

Arlene Weber</p>
	Jerry Henderson	Web	<p>I just wanted to let you know that CenturyLink does not honor the agreement that they make with a customer. They told me they would match the offer that I had with the cable company. That bill was the same every month and CenturyLink agree to match that then they started adding fees and taxes to that amount which made the bill several dollars more than I was paying the cable company for the same service. I would still be with cable except my wife's heart monitor machine would not transmit properly over the cable phone. I have had quite a bit of trouble with CenturyLink which I understand probably has nothing to do with this hearing, but I thought I would convey my feelings about the company since they sent me a notice of this hearing.</p>
	Joseph S. Krolczyk	Web	<p>Undecided, because like a phone bill it reads like a legal document requiring a lawyer. Anyhow, my comment about Century Link is that they have a monopoly on us people in rural Lewis Co. as well as rural Pierce Co. Many rural households own a Smart T.V. or other electronic device which requires a higher speed internet. Me being one of these people only yesterday contacted Century Link in order to upgrade my internet speed. They told me that because of where I live that I was "out of luck". I thought, Nice Attitude. I wonder if Verizon or Comcast could be our area server if they would snub their customers ? In todays world of internet and telecommunications, it seems very strange that people can be treated like they dont matter because they dont live in a downtown enviroment. Thanks for your time...Joseph S. Krolczyk</p>

	Fred R. Bailey	Web	<p>I am concerned that Century Link is prohibited from offering service suspensions or a vacation hold on DSL or telephone during the months a person will be away from their private residence. For example, we spend our winters in Arizona, and cannot suspend or put our DSL on vacation status. Washington and Oregon appear to be the only states that prohibit that action. In an effort to cut expenses, we have to cancel our service and hook up again when we return. I would like to have the logic of this inane law explained to us, or see action taken to correct this.</p> <p>Thank you, R. Bailey</p>
	David Woolsey	Web	<p>I dislike any decision that effects my phone bill when the government allows the phone company to hold a monopoly on my service. There is no competition for the phone company so they can charge what they want and offer me whatever services they want to. There are more phone companies that offer a lot more for less money. Stop allowing phone and cable services to pay for an exclusive license to specific areas, they pay the local governments to be allowed to take advantage of us, the consumers and taxpayers. How about giving us a break for a change and allow competition.</p>
	Kenneth J Stanfill	Web	<p>Commission: I am concerned over this petition. If the regulation is change it sounds to me they have an open book to charge anything they want to phone bill. I am already being charge for long distance (that I do not use) and pay tax on it to. With this petition if passed will I end up paying more for my phone service? This sound to me like I am being held hostage because I don't have a choice on who I am able to get phone service. If this petition is in fact change the regulations so they can charge what want I am totally against it.</p>
	Barb Kurlinski	Web	<p>I do not favor the proposal if this is going to allow them to randomly increase rates. It appears that there willl be minimal if any regulation</p>
	Darrell Wilson	Web	<p>I got a notice about a hearing. It just sounds to me like a way to raise rates. Every time I talk to them they try to sell me something after I've told them several times I am on a fixed income and I can barely pay for the internet as it is</p>
	James L Youngman	Web	<p>While I understand the need for business to be competitive, the public notice post card I received from them concerning their proposal to be listed as an AFOR needs clarification on one sentence which states, "This means that CenturyLink is permitted to change rates, terms and conditions of service without approval from the UTC". Can I get an explanation of the advantages and</p>

			disadvantages of this targeted towards the customer?
	John V. Arroyo	Web	<p>I retired in 2009 after working over forty years. Our neighborhood does not get a strong cell signal, therefore my wife & I are forced to have a landline in addition to our cellphones. The monthly bills for two landlines (I will be eliminating one of them that I used as a fax line for years) are between \$85-87. This month's bill is \$87.22.</p> <p>Either landline rates have to be reduced or cellular communication infrastructure must have more towers.</p>
	Don Newman	Web	<p>I live in rural Cowlitz Cty. Qwest was readying to install fiber optic's into our area, but this was halted when Cent. Lk. took over. After two letter's to their Denver office, we're still told there are no plan's to provide their internet service. A phone call from a very rude man from their office informed me that "they were in the business to make money and the chance's of their extending the service our way was slim to none."</p> <p>Where is the money that was provided to them from the Fed. Gov. to provide this service? If they are allowed this change and do not provide this internet service to our area AND raise our rate's, it is w/ much anticipation that we cancel them and dispose of our land line. We have held out, long enough, that they should provide hi-speed service. We are fed up w/ their lack of provision and are ready to go either sat. or wireless. Thank you for hearing my comment/complaint. Sincerely, Don Newman</p>
	Richard Schelb	Web	<p>I don't think CenturyLink has earned my trust after several months of trying to fix problems with my phone bill. I also noted new charges with no explanation of what these charges were for. A prime example is we requested blocking of no name/no number calls, a service charge of \$18.75 was added, also without explanation. A \$5 credit for combining our DirectTV bill was dropped without notice. I'm not real happy with CenturyLink since they combined with Quest.</p>
	Hugh Jones	Web	<p>To whom it concerns,
Filing UT-130477.
CenturyLink is the only land line phone and internet service available to us and most rural folks. Please insure we are protected from arbitrary rate hikes. We are on a fixed income and can not adjust to them, and could lose our phone service if not protected by regulations of protection.
Thank You,
Hugh & Charlotte</p>
	Rosemarie Ramey	Mail	<p>To Whom it may Concern:</p> <p>Yesterday, wee received your "Public Notice" card, in regarding the changing rates, etc. If your rates go up a substantial amount, it will affect us. We are in our 70s and on a fixed income.</p>

			<p>We realize at this time, everyone is trying to survive, just to exist. The same for businesses. All I want to put forth is...when you make your increases...we hope it's not too high. Because we have no "internet" and because the only thing besides the phone is "Caller ID," we are now being charged an extra \$1.55 a month. Our phone bill is \$46.29 for the Oct. payment. We feel with all the monthly charges, it goes up and up. From Jan. 2013 until our Oct. 2013 payment, it's gone up \$5.18. To us, that's a lot. We also know the business has to survive and upkeep and workers have to be paid. Your business and all the rest of businesses are in a survival (survival) mode. Times are hard.</p> <p>Thank you for taking your time in reading this letter. I'm writing because we would not be there in person on the 16th.</p>
	anja Dean	Web	<p>Docket Number UT-130477 I just received the public notice card in the mail regarding the above listed docket number. From what I can glean from it, it would allow CenturyLink to change rates without needing to seek approval from the UTC. I don't understand what the purpose of this is. The card mentioned competition from cable companies, wireless providers, and other companies. We live in the country. There is no other cable company, and therefore no competition. So I don't see how this can work across the board for every single one of their customers. We are customers who don't really have a choice on the company we have. While I have always been the first to say CL has great service, I don't understand what the purpose of this is, aside from to get more money on CL's part? Thank you.</p>
	Jason Ahrens	Web	<p>I have received notice from CenturyLink regarding UT-130477 I would just like to comment that, any changes CenturyLink is granted must take into consideration fostering healthy competition without putting consumers at risk. In particular, where I live CenturyLink is the only viable "game in town" when it comes to internet. Wave has not yet improved the internet landscape in the area, and new projects that may offer some kind of third option are still at least a year away. I currently pay \$46.99 a month for a 5M/864k connection from CenturyLink. Though I pay for that, it is not what I get, often hovering closer to 4M. After several attempts to "fix" this, CenturyLink reported that they cannot, and instead offered to cap me at 3M. Indeed if you go to the CenturyLink webpage now, and enter my address, 3MB is the maximum available it shows. The 3M cap costs the same as the 5M I was supposed to be getting (and CenturyLink advertises on their website would be available to my house) This has been the situation ongoing for several years now. I live about a mile outside downtown Seattle.</p>

			<p>There has been no sign of improvement from CenturyLink, though the rest of Seattle can enjoy 12M as an average.

My main concern with the proposed change is ensuring, at minimum, no pressure is removed from CenturyLink to improve services into the "underserved" areas such as this, and they are not allowed to raise prices for such poor service in the face of no viable competition. Indeed, any regulatory changes that would put a company in essentially a monopoly position, and do not encourage development and improvements, should be seen as a disadvantage to the residents of the state.

Thank you.</p>
	Kevin Anderson	Web	<p>Having reviewed the RCW's concerning and your documents and the fact that you only had one testimony for Wholesale Rates, it appears the public has no specific idea what this is about. I could not find any specifics regarding rates, frequency of change, and alternatives for rate payers, users, if rates become too high. Land lines are still a major source of communications and not all are partaking of the electronic revolution, especially the elderly and the disabled. And the RCW does not appear to protect the consumer other than service levels.</p> <p>If this AFOR allows price and terms being changed At Will and without control for a monopoly service, most utilities are monopolies in their service area, then I CAN NOT SUPPORT THIS REQUEST by Century Link.</p>
	andy kim	Web	<p>Hello,
my name is andy kim.I have business in kitsap county called 7 imports
on april I called century link for price on new instatation for my new business.The rep code me around \$68.00 plus \$187.00 instalation and \$68.00 per month. we had an appointment on april 1 2013 but before I supposed get invoice from either e-mail or mail and I never got any statement or invoice from them and they said they sent out to my e-mail and I never got it.my first month bill was over \$200.00 and 3year contract.right now I'm paying \$83.00 to \$86.00 per month and 1 year contract and 2 years option I even complained to attorney general about this. I'm so glad someone is doing the right thing.I'm sure there is lots of small company like mine having a same problem.because of century link. I think somone have to do somethig about this rip off. I'm so glad someone out there doing something.I think business like century link they better not playing with small business like mine even there is lots of competition out there,instead playing with small business they should work on the better technology.If you need me to provide any evidence of mine...please let me know,
Thank you and Thank you very much!!!!
Andy Kim

</p>
	Patricia Herlevi	Web	<p>PHONE (DC)</p> <p>I am a concerned customer and not in favor of them being unregulated and raising the fees. I think</p>

			they should be regulated with the Commission so fees are reasonable and don't continue to go up. If anything becomes privatized, prices keep going up and consumer's don't have a say.
	Connie Gray	Web	Hello - The information provided on the post card that I received from CenturyLink (and received four days before the hearing!) did not provide enough information to form an informed opinion. However, I feel that CenturyLink needs to be regulated as much as is lawfully possible. It is about time that they have some competition! My rates have increased over 30% since January, 2013. I assure you that my only source of income, Social Security, has not increased anywhere close to that amount. I meet all of CenturyLink's criteria for a reduced rate for people in my situation except the requirement to not have had internet service for 90 days. That would be a severe hardship for me. Internet service is a major connection to the world for me. I feel that CenturyLink has been very creative in coming up with ideas to increase rates. I recently had to order a service that I do not want in an effort to reduce my cost. Thank you.
	Ed Stubington	Web	(PHONE) DC Customer would like to be contacted by phone regarding the outcome. There should be a public benefit under the new services that would be provided if this proposal was to pass. If they want to talk about competition, they can allow another company to come and provide services. If the Commission is going to give up their authority, there should be a memorialized benefit to all customers to receive from being unregulated.
	Thomas Hansell	Web	I would like to say that it would be best if centurylink and all outhter utlitys are required to stay under thetraditional regulations and not operate under afor . thank you Did you speak to a supervisor from your utility or transportation company? No
	Charles Reinsch	E-mail	Hello: Today is October 15, 2013. It is 2:40 pm, and my mail just arrived. There were two items: My bill from CenturyLink, and a Public Notice from CenturyLink announcing a hearing scheduled for tomorrow in Olympia. Can you please explain in what circumstances 24 hour notice is sufficient to advise the public of upcoming hearings to which they might wish to give comment?

			<p>I request that this hearing be postponed and rescheduled to a time sufficient to allow 30 days advance notice to the public, and that CenturyLink be responsible for providing said notice and certifying that such notice has been given.</p> <p>To fail to allow public comment to a hearing such as this, where the UTC is about to give a regulated company free reign to increase its rates arbitrarily without demonstrating need or qualification, is outrageous.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Charles Reinsch 2002 Condon Way West Seattle, Washington 98199 206-281-0713</p>
	Mark Fischer	Web	<p>I want to make sure that my ability to purchase DSL (digital subscriber line) transport from Century Link and connect it to an ISP (internet service provider) of my choice remains available to me at current prices or below.</p>
	Owen Kehoe	Web	<p>This is in Reference to Docket #UT-130477, which I received a notice in the mail about.</p> <p>I want to ensure that the proposed changes will preserve consumers' ability to use a third-party internet provider over CenturyLink DSL lines, and at a reasonable price. I may be mistaken, but I believe that UTC regulation is what has allowed third-party ISPs to be available over telephone-company owned copper wires. This has allowed small locally-owned ISPs to enter the residential broadband market and provide customers with more and better options than what CenturyLink can provide. As an example, I use a third party ISP that provides me with 4 static IP addresses, allows me to operate a home server and will even map reverse-DNS records to my server IP, and provides a direct connection to the Seattle Internet Exchange for low-latency connections to local peers; all for a lower price than CenturyLink's internet package.</p> <p>My fear is that, without regulation, CenturyLink would have incentive to increase the price of third-party ISP connections to a point where they are no longer competitive with the CenturyLink-only ISP offering. Other broadband providers such as Comcast have already done this.</p>

			Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
	Gregory Vouros	Web	This pertains to docket # 130477. I have read the documents associated with this docket, and not being a lawyer have found it difficult to comprehend the potential impacts. Can you explain in a paragraph, or send me a link to a document that can explain, what CenturyLink is requesting? It appears the company is seeking to not be subject to full regulation for a period of up to 7 years. If that is the case, what are the potential impacts of this? Are there any guidelines or restrictions with which CenturyLink would need to comply if this proposal is approved? I would like to review and comment on this proposal but can not do that until I clearly understand the potential impacts. I look forward to your prompt reply. Thank you.
	Paul S Wartes	Web	We are the hostage of Century Link. They are the only phone company in our area. We have no choice but to do business with them. Century has over extended its resources by providing DSL internet service with to little resources. In the evening it is impossible to watch a movies on the computer due to the slowness of the connection. Now Century Link is requesting less oversight in providing a service which translates into higher rates and poorer service for the customers. Why don't we have a choice of phone companies out here? Thank you, Paul Wartes
	Virginia Anderson	Web	I have contacted this CenturyLink, many times to get my problem resolved. They bill me twice for the same phone number. One bill is for \$28.52 and the other one is for \$19.15. I have had this number for 41 years. I started to call them when they took over some 2+years ago. I have been getting the run around ever since. I have talked to supervisors, managers, and left an email to the vise president of the company but no response. They keep telling me they haven't got the problem solved yet. How long does it take to correct this with our updated computers? I'm not sure what this proposal is all about but if it can straighten out me getting billed twice on the same number, I'm for it. Please let me know what action I can take to get this resolved. Thank you
	Marilene W. Habersetzer	Mail	
Yes			
	Terry Dahlquist	Web	I fully support CenturyLink's petition, docket UT-130477, to be regulated under AFOR. Landline telephone companies are no longer the pervasive monopolies they once were, but they are still critical infrastructure. They have become the underdogs in the communications industry and need

			all the flexibility possible to survive. (No, I do not work for them.)
	Jon DeGon	Web	It is time to release the regulated phone co.s to compete on a level playing field. They have been working since the ATT BREAKUP with one hand tied .Other co.s are able to change rates and compete with each other. I make it to be like owning a grocery store where your competitor is able to use your shelves without paying for any repair or upkeep. Of course you are able to sell your goods cheaper. Turn them loose let them compete.
	Carrie Higgins	Web	This is regarding docket number UT-130477 requesting an AFOR; it seems prudent that this be granted in order for CenturyLink to be competitive in the voice/data markets and better serve their existing customers. Thank you-
	Patricia Troxell	Web	I am in favor of anything that will bring broadband to my rural area. I have been waiting for 12 years to be able to have better service and speed than the DSL that we are having to contend with in this area. The monthly expenditures keep going up and the speed and service are severely lacking.
	Marilyn Stark	Web	We have been customers for nearly 50 years and small stock holders in Century Link when it was Qwest and even before so we have found them to be a responsible and helpful company and so we support the AFOR for Century Link's flexibility and competition with other telecommunication companies. (docket number UT-130477)Thank you, Marilyn and James Stark
	Patrick J Russell	Web	This is with respect to docket UT-130477. I am a private individual and a current customer of CenturyLink. I do not have any connection to the telecommunications industry. In fact, I am retired. I speak only as a long time residential customer and as an observer who has some technical background and has been observing the industry from the perspective of a residential customer for some time. I have internet access through Comcast and a cell phone through AT&T. I consider both of these companies competitors to CenturyLink but I don't think the playing field is level between CenturyLink and either of them. I find the CenturyLink service expensive and product offerings inflexible compared to these other companies. I also do not think that under the current regulatory regime CenturyLink can offer services that are competitive in the market to either of the companies I have named. I particularly note the situation with respect to Comcast. The "phone" business is frequently characterized as monopolistic and delivering poor quality.

			<p>Based on my experience, I would characterize Comcast as much worse than CenturyLink in terms of these two attributes. I want a company that has the legal and regulatory ability to compete head to head with Comcast. So I would see it as a plus if CenturyLink, which has access to telephone pole real estate for wire and fiber, and has access to other capabilities that would enable it to be a possible counterbalance to Comcast.</p> <p>I am also unhappy with my phone bill. I pay about \$25/mo when all the fees and taxes are included. This is for a "basic POTS" service with no caller ID, no long distance, no nothing in terms of "features". I can get much better "voice over IP" based service in terms of features from Comcast. As far as I can tell, CenturyLink can NOT offer a bundle of features similar to the one I get from AT&T on my phone and prospectively from Comcast as part of my internet bundle at a similar price due to regulatory constraints. So why have I not switched to Comcast? Because I appreciate the reliability and "always on" characteristics of my "land line" service. To the extent that this increased reliability may increase costs I consider it "value for service" and am willing to pay for it. But I would like to see CenturyLink's rates decreased and for them to be able to include caller ID, free US long distance, etc. in this lower priced offering. I would also like to see them able to provide "Comcast quality" internet access at a price that is lower than Comcast. I do NOT consider the DSL based service traditionally offered by telcos to be competitive. Access is spotty, reliability is lower, and speeds are much lower than the "fiber most of the way" Comcast offering.</p> <p>I am not an expert so I am not sure I understand the documents I read that are associated with this action. But if I understand them the cross subsidization of "rural" service continues. As I understand it, neither my AT&T cell service nor a potential Comcast "voice over IP" service would incur this cross subsidization cost. It looks like this cross subsidization would continue under the revisions CenturyLink is requested. I am adamantly OPPOSED to this. I believe this cross subsidization should be eliminated and that rural and other high cost areas should have to pay the full cost of service in their area. Frankly, most of the voters in these areas are anti-government. I believe we should give them their wish. Get government out of their lives. If that means increased and/or service reductions for them, so be it.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	lucille arnold	Web	<p>competition always calls for change you know that without change some one all ways looses. CHANGE makes for improvement. I AM with century link. thank you</p>

	Mike Todd	Web	<p>Dear Washington State UTC</p> <p>I completely support Century Link in there effort to have there hands untied so they can compete with others in the market place.</p> <p>This is long over due</p> <p>Mike Todd Port Angeles</p>
	Janette Brown	Web	<p>Though I have had no choice of telephone service provider in a day when competition is allowed in the field of telecommunications, I support national companies in doing the job. Sprint is largely Japanese owned.
Corporations need to be playing by the same rules as any other "people." As competition has been a cornerstone of healthy American business, I support Sprint's 'regulation'. I am also concerned the FCC, who was to decide the situation between CenturyLink and Sprint, has shut down. I wonder, then, what entity is to hold Sprint accountable.
Summarily, I favor protection of U.S. companies, whatever it takes to legally protect their interests.

Janette Brown
Seattle, WA 98115</p>