

## Public Comments by Case

Total Comments: 16

In Favor: 1

Opposed: 14

Undecided: 1

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No	Ann Radoslovich	E-mail	<p>I am writing you (the FCC) re: Frontier's request to be a competitive telecommunications company.</p> <p>Frontier has terrible customer service. When I call in to customer service they have outsourced their to a third party vendor who just reads information. My internet is consistently unavailable whenever it rains at my house, yet when I call, they have never offered to give me a credit and consistently say "It will be up in a short while. We are sorry for the inconvenience."</p> <p>Recently they raised my rates 20% saying they were eliminating my old Verizon Dynamic plan and have 'updated' their services, therefore their rates went up 20%. My cost of living keeps going up yet my hourly wage does not.</p> <p>I favor whatever efforts you can to regulate their rates, services and practices. What does 'minimum regulation' mean? Will you really provide oversight for their rates? I urge you to regulate costs for us 'basic internet' users. If people want really fast service or special features, let them pay for it.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ann Radoslovich RN BSN ACM                      (509) 782-1370                      Cashmere, WA 98815</p>

	Susan Paschke	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a resident of South Snohomish County and have lived here for 21 years. During that time we have had a minimum of three telephone company transitions. We depend on the WUTC to maintain a sense of fairness for our telephone service (landline) which we depend on. We are served by only one provider.....and at this time, it is Frontier. They bought out Verizon and made promises when they came in that nothing would change. I don't know about you, but this sounds like a leap towards lack of oversight that the public depends on, and a monumental change. If I was provided with the option to choose between two or more providers I may feel differently. But really? Giving Frontier as the sole providers of telephone service in my area a free pass to do what they want is NOT a public service! Please do not allow them to operate outside of your regulation and oversight.</p> <p>Thank you..... Susan Paschke 13621 26th Ave SE Mill Creek, WA 98012</p>
	Donald E. Parchen	E-mail	<p>concerning Frontiers classification request. In August 2009 when the company serving this area was Verizon, I responded to a mini-flyer in my billing statement that offered verizon internet for \$17.99 a month. the offer clearly stated the rate would not change. Since Frontier took over Verizon service for this area the rate remained the same until several months ago when Frontier raised the monthly rate by \$1.00 a month. I didn't notice the change on my statements until recently. Now Frontier is raising the rate for internet service about \$5.00 a month more. Telephone calls to Frontier and Verizon have provided no help as one claims the other has no records of such an offer of \$17.99 a month for internet. I am very much against granting minimal regulation to Frontier or Verizon for anything.</p> <p>Donald E. Parchen sr. 1111 Acacia Avenue Richland, Wa. 99354</p>
	Michelle McBeath	Mail	<p>Customer letter saved as attachment</p> <p>Customer is opposed to Frontiers petition. Says Frontier is the only landline choice for the areas it serves.</p>

			Customer does not consider cellular, VoIP or broadband services to be adequate substitutes for landline service.
			Customer lists examples of how Frontier provides poor service, and says, "Should you release them from UTC oversight, I doubt the quality of their service would improve."
	Karin F Gilmore	Mail	Customer is very concerned about Frontier becoming a competitive company. Says customer service is the worst she has ever experienced. Not many alternatives for service in Edmonds. Charges are already high for someone living on Social Security. Worried about costs to seniors.
	J. L. McGourty	Web	Docket UT-121994: Frontier informed their customers of their proposal in the fine print on the back of their bills. I am vehemently opposed to it. They state their case for being in a competitive market. However, from the perspective of their customers, they are a monopoly, and have behaved as such since they bought out Verizon. We have no choice of land-line phone carrier. We have no choice of internet provider. And as long as we have no land-line choice, we have no options for access to other services. We are locked. They have no competition and have been completely inflexible. For most of a year, with every statement, they tacked on extra charges that were erroneous, with an initial refusal to correct every one of them. Until we have the option of choosing another carrier, this proposal should not be allowed. Thank you.
	Beverly Smith	Web	Ms. is on a very limited income and can barely afford to pay her phone bill now. With a rate increase it will force her to disconnect her phone.
	GJ Donahue	Email	To whom it may concern:  Regarding docket UT-121994, I do not feel Frontier should have the unregulated authority to set rates without the WA Utilities & Transportation Commission approval and oversight. They have already raised rates on consumers through backdoor "surcharges" without UTC approval, so I'd be very concerned to think what they would do without needed UTC affirmation.
	Bill Allison	Phone	Regards, GJ Donahue  Mr says the company is poorly run, and stock is down to \$4 per share. He is aware of a company in NH that Frontier bought, which soon went bankrupt.

			Mr believes seniors like himself depend on reasonable rates that are most likely provided by a company that is regulated by the commission. There are already too many fees on bills, and bundles are very confusing.
Glen and Sandra Scalf	Mail		Customer letter saved as attachment. Customer says there is not competition in the area where they live. Not in favor of the company's proposal.
Rita A. Miller	Web		In regards to Frontier Communications' request to be classified a "Competitive Telecommunications Company" Docket UT-121994  As I understand it, their basic claim is that we (customers in my area of Eastern Wa.) have "reasonably available alternatives". Unfortunately that is not the case in my area. Frontier is the only available basic carrier.  I strongly urge you to maintain Frontier Communications' status as a more closely-regulated, non-competitive communications company.  Thank you for your time and consideration.
Judy Dawson	E-mail		Rita A. Miller  I am completely opposed to this "deregulation". Any time a company wishes to change the rules of the game, you can bet it isn't being done with the consumers best interests in mind. I am old enough to strongly remember Ma Bell. We do not need to return to that business model.
Diane Freethy	E-mail		Judy Dawson Everett, WA  re: UT-121994 - Frontier Communications  As to Frontier's request for "more pricing flexibility in setting phone rates and services" ... our residential phone bills increased another dollar this month!!!  We are rural customers in Skagit County and we disagree with the utility's contention that we have "available alternatives."

		<p>Moreover, the company DOES have a "significant captive customer base" for land line service in our area. Some rural residents don't have any other choice.</p> <p>We note that "Commission staff does not support competitive classification of single-line residential and business service." We hope staff will reconsider and recommend that the Commission deny Frontier's request for reclassification altogether ... at least in Skagit County.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this matter.</p> <p>Diane Freethy, President</p> <p>SKAGIT CITIZENS ALLIANCE for RURAL PRESERVATION</p> <p>PO Box 762, Sedro-Woolley WA 98284</p> <p>360-856-2290</p>
	<p>Michael Brunson</p>	<p>Note (jc): Mr. Brunson attended the public comment hearing in Everett on May 23. He arrived after the hearing was adjourned, and shared comments with Chairman Danner and staff. His comments were the same as those below, which he provided the same day via the UTC online comment form.</p> <p>Need to correct deficiencies, in the way they treat consumers. If they do not correct their deficiencies they need more regulations. They are using some sort technology that enables the company to defect when a customer make a three way call and then bills 75 cents for the call. The problem is the technology is giving a false positive, sometimes it tells the company that the customer has made a three way call and the customer has not. I have never made a three way call in my life but every month it shows that I have made three way calls. A service representative told me that if I make two consecutive calls then it that the system preceives that I made a three way call. Frontier needs to stop using this technology, they told me that they would put a block on three way calls but I am still continued to be billed for three way calling. They said they would give me</p>

<p>Undecided</p>			<p>a credit but was only for only the more recent months. I should not have to pay for any services that I have not used.</p>
	<p>Steve Walcker</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>My name is Steve Walcker. I have concerns about the petition that Frontier Communications Northwest has recently submitted to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, UT-121994. I live in Everett, WA. and am a consumer of Frontier products and services, a stockholder and an employee. As such, I realize that in one way or another I will be affected by the decision of the WUTC and your representation of Frontier subscribers here in Washington. Respectfully, my concerns center around various aspects of the idea that Frontier, as an ILEC, would like "minimal regulation" applied in regards to landline pricing flexibility, rates and terms of service due to "effective market competition." I'm also concerned about the statistical information that was cited in their petition; they went back to year 2000. Frontier Communications didn't operate as an ILEC in this state until July 1, 2010 (UT-090842). None of those statistics were used to determine Frontier's financial, managerial or technical fitness in transferring ownership of Verizon properties to Frontier Communications (UT-09082). Frontier's current President and COO, Dan McCarthy, testified before the WUTC that, (July 6, 2009 UT-090842) "Frontier feels the proposed transaction will ensure that the Company is large enough and has the financial wherewithal to weather challenges from competitors as well as economic uncertainty. As I will explain more fully below, acquiring the Verizon exchanges that are the subject of this transaction will increase the number of Frontier customers, the company's revenue, improve its balance sheet and free up additional cash to bring more services to Verizon's exchanges in Washington." Apparently that didn't work out, otherwise why would Frontier petition the WUTC for "minimal regulation" ?</p> <p>As well, the Commission recently experienced Frontier's failure to meet a December 31, 2011 deadline to its Broadband Plan (UT-090842 Final Order 06 Commitment 14) that resulted in Order 08 to extend the deadline in which the Commission was "troubled and disappointed with Frontier" and "Finally, we disapprove of Frontier's cavalier approach to our procedural rules and requirements." Further, Order 09 once again extended another deadline to allow Frontier to meet its voluntary commitment where the Commission expressed its on-going concerns about Frontier's inability to meet deadlines. Can Frontier be trusted with "minimal regulation" if they have trouble meeting deadlines?</p>

		<p>I'm concerned about what affect minimal regulation will have in regards to service order delivery (WAC 480-120-105), repair standards (WAC 480-120-440 and UT-090842 Final Order 06 attachment 1 "Retail Service Quality") and retail service rates ( UT-090842 attachment 1 "Retail Service Rates"). I believe that it is Frontier's goal to become as regulated-free as possible. In the competitive environment here in Washington, I would generally agree with that stance except for the fact that in order to accomplish that goal I have witnessed that Frontier is more interested in serving the interest of its stockholders at the expense of its subscribers. I believe the WUTC commissioners may have had the same concerns when they placed 30 conditions on the sale of Verizon properties to Frontier Communications (UT-090842).</p> <p>As a 20 year telephone company employee (GTE 1993-2000, Verizon 2000- 2010 and Frontier 2010 to the present) and 23 year telephone subscriber, I have witnessed how GTE and Verizon conducted business here in Washington in comparison to Frontier Communications. I am awestruck at what has transpired during these 2 ½ years under Frontier's ownership, here in Washington, from service order due dates that are currently out 2 ½ to 3 weeks in Lynnwood, WA, to CEO (Maggie Wilderrotter) statements, in regards to raising rates 46%, that caused the company to lose 23,000 Fiber Optic Service (FIOS) TV subscribers in the first quarter of 2011 (The Oregonian March 4, 2011). In fact, it wasn't until a recent (2/6/2013) all employees meeting at 1800 41st St, Everett, WA, that Mrs. Wilderrotter was aware that our due dates were out that far! I have so much more to say about this subject but, at this point, need you to understand that I believe there are other solutions that may be more appropriate to the dilemma faced by Frontier. Please understand that I want Frontier to succeed and thrive in the market, not just get by.</p> <p>While I make no claims of having all the answers, I have noticed that West Virginia has an Incentive Regulation Plan (Case No. 05-0040-T-PC) concerning Frontier that allows for price flexibility. What about the possibility of "fast-tracking" tariff requests? I also need for you to know that Frontier Communications has partnered with AT&amp;T wireless as a reseller of cellular service in order to mitigate revenue losses from Frontier subscribers who decide to "cut the cord." I believe an article from <a href="http://www.stopthecap.com">www.stopthecap.com</a> may shed more light on the idea that other Telcos, besides Frontier, would like to enjoy "minimal regulation." Tom Fitzgerald of the Kentucky Resources Council explains "AT&amp;T's long term agenda is deregulation and eventual abdication of its basic responsibility to provide affordable, essential basic telephone service to every resident in the state who wants it." (Don't Let AT&amp;T Abandon Rural Landlines, Appeals Kentucky Resource</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Council, Feb. 6, 2013). My concern is that Frontier Communications may attempt to do the same. Please don't let that happen. Please adjudicate this issue with the utmost care!</p> <p>Respectfully</p> <p>Steve Walcker 13031 27th Pl W Everett, WA 425.381.1984 pfoneguy@hotmail.com</p>
Yes	Gary D Raines	<p>I am an employee of Frontier Communications, and I am also a customer.</p> <p>As a customer I would like to say that I appreciate Frontier's business model of providing top-notch communications services to rural communities such as the one I live in. They are one of several high speed internet providers in the area. I can name at least five other providers that I can choose from if I decide their pricing or service is better (and I know more are coming). Frontier's landline business is also facing pressure from cellular and other clec companies.</p> <p>As an employee, I want Frontier to succeed for reasons that are obvious. As a customer, I want Frontier to have competitive pricing and service.</p> <p>I believe Frontier should be allowed to compete on a level playing field with all the other providers in the area. I hope that you will reclassify Frontier as a "competitive communications company"</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Gary D Raines 521 N Custer St</p>



