Service Date: August ___, 2020

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS NORTHWEST, LLC D/B/A ZIPLY FIBER,	DOCKET UT
	FORMAL COMPLAINT
Complainant,	
v.	
KALAMA TELEPHONE COMPANY,	
Respondent.	

I Frontier Communications Northwest, LLC d/b/a Ziply Fiber (Ziply Fiber), formally complains against Kalama Telephone Company (Kalama) and alleges as follows:

I. OVERVIEW

Ziply Fiber complains against Kalama Telephone Company (Kalama) for violations of state laws and Commission rules arising from Kalama's unlawful encroachment on Ziply Fiber's service territory, Kalama's unlawful competition outside its service territory without proper certification by the Commission, and Kalama's unlawful operations outside its Commission-defined service territory without publicly posting a tariff and/or price catalog for the services it offers.

II. PARTIES

- Ziply Fiber is a certificated incumbent local exchange carrier with a WUTC-defined service territory in Washington. Ziply Fiber's service territory adjoins Kalama's service territory.
- 4 Kalama Telephone Company is a certificated incumbent local exchange carrier offering telecommunications services in a WUTC-defined service territory in the state of Washington.

III. JURISDICTION

The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to RCW 80.01.040, RCW 80.01.070, chapter 80.04 RCW including RCW 80.04.015, RCW 80.04.090, RCW 80.04.110, RCW 80.04.160, RCW 80.04.220, RCW 80.04.380, chapter 80.36 RCW including RCW 80.36.080, RCW 80.36.140, RCW 80.36.170, RCW 80.36.180, RCW 80.36.186, RCW 80.36.230, RCW 80.36.240, RCW 80.36.300, RCW 80.36.320, RCW 80.36.330, RCW 80.36.350, RCW 80.36.855, and chapters 480-80 and 480-120 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC).

IV. ALLEGATIONS AND CLAIMS

- The WUTC is granted the power to define service territory in RCW 80.36.230, and has done so for both Ziply Fiber and Kalama.
- At all times relevant to this Complaint, Kalama's defined service territory appeared on a map filed with their Commission-approved tariff.
- At all times relevant to this Complaint, Ziply Fiber's ILEC service territory in Washington appeared on exchange maps filed with its tariffs and approved by the Commission.
- 9 Kalama extended telecommunications services to several (at least ten) customers in Ziply Fiber's Woodland Exchange between 2010 and the present.
- 10 Kalama knew, or should have known, that they were extending service to customers outside their certificated service territory.
- 11 Kalama has admitted in writing that they knowingly accepted at least one additional order for service within the Ziply Fiber service territory within the last twelve months, even after they notified Ziply Fiber's predecessor Frontier that Kalama was serving customers outside their certificated service territory and in Frontier's Woodland exchange.
- 12 Kalama's CFO and outside counsel have both made written admissions to Kalama serving customers outside their tariffed ILEC service territory.

DOCKET UT-

13 Kalama has no certificate to provide competitive services outside its ILEC service territory.

- 14 Kalama appears to have no publicly filed tariff or price list for providing services outside its ILEC service territory.
- 15 Kalama is violating its WUTC-approved tariff by serving outside its defined service territory.
- On information and belief, Kalama worked with a developer to shield its intent to serve the area in question from Ziply Fiber's predecessor, Frontier.
- 17 Kalama's actions violated RCW 80.04.015 (Conduct of business subject to regulation Determination by commission).
- 18 Kalama is subject to penalties under RCW 80.04.380 by violating and/or failing to comply with state statutes and Commission rules.
- 19 Kalama's actions violated RCW 80.36.140 (Rates and services fixed by commission, when).
- 20 Kalama has violated RCW 80.36.170 by giving an unreasonable preference to approximately 10 Ziply Fiber service territory residents whom they allowed to subscribe for Kalama service.
- 21 Kalama has violated RCW 80.36.186 by giving itself an undue preference or advantage, and subjecting Ziply Fiber to a competitive disadvantage.
- On information and belief, Kalama may have violated RCW 80.36.300(4) by subsidizing competitive ventures with revenue derived from noncompetitive sources.
- 23 Kalama has flouted WUTC authority by neglecting to apply for classification as a competitive telecommunications company under RCW 80.36.320 before competing outside their service territory.
- WAC 480-80-010 and WAC 480-120-011 prohibit public service companies from deviating from Commission rules.

DOCKET UT- PAGE 5

- 25 Kalama is a public service company under the definition in WAC 480-80-030.
- 26 Kalama is not a competitive telecommunications company as defined in WAC 480-80-030.
- Under RCW 80.04.380, the Commission may penalize a public service company that violates any provision of Title 80 RCW or any rule of the Commission up to \$1,000 per day for each and every offense. Every violation is a separate and distinct offense.

V. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

- Ziply Fiber requests that the Commission find that Kalama committed numerous violations of state laws and Commission rules as set forth in the allegations above.
- Ziply Fiber requests that the Commission find that Kalama has unlawfully granted itself an unfair competitive advantage by encroaching on Ziply Fiber's service territory without appropriate authority.
- Ziply Fiber requests that the Commission find that Kalama has committed tortious interference with business expectancy against Ziply Fiber within the meaning of WPI 352.02.
- Ziply Fiber requests that the Commission find that Kalama must pay Ziply Fiber reparations and damages under RCW 80.04.220 and any other applicable statute, rule, or common law doctrine.
- 32 Ziply Fiber requests any and all other relief the Commission deems lawful and appropriate under the circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

George Baker Thomson, Jr.

Associate General Counsel

Ziply Fiber

Cos ANSI

1800 41st St., N-100

ATTN: Legal Dept.

Everett, WA 98203

george.thomson@ziply.com

425-261-5844

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF FORMAL COMPLAINT

I, Jessica Epley, affirm that I am over 18 years of age and am employed by Frontier Communications Northwest, LLC d/b/a Ziply Fiber (Ziply Fiber) as its Director of Regulatory and External Affairs. In that capacity I have examined the attached complaint against Kalama Telephone Company and verify that to the best of my knowledge and belief the facts stated therein are accurate. I have extensive personal knowledge of the facts and have represented Ziply Fiber in attempts to resolve these issues before this complaint was filed with the Commission. Further, affiant sayeth naught.

Jessica Epley, Regulatory and External Affairs Director

NOTARY

PUBLIC 09-03-2020

OF WASHI

STATE OF WASHINGTON) ss. COUNTY OF SNOHOMISH)

I certify that I know or have satisfactory evidence that <u>Jessica Epley</u> is the person who appeared before me, and said person acknowledged that she signed this instrument, on oath stated that she was authorized to execute the instrument and acknowledged is the <u>Regulatory and External Affairs Director</u> of <u>Frontier Communications Northwest, LLC dba Ziply Fiber</u>, to be the free and voluntary act of such party for the uses and purposes mentioned in the instrument.

DATED: August 18, 2020

Printed: Shannon M. Lipp

Notary Public in and for Washington My appointment expires: 09/03/2020