



GARY HERBERT.
Governor
SPENCER J. COX
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah
Department of Commerce
Division of Public Utilities

FRANCINE GIANI
Executive Director

THOMAS BRADY
Deputy Director

CHRIS PARKER
Director, Division of Public Utilities

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public Service Commission

FROM: Division of Public Utilities
Chris Parker, Division Director
William Duncan, Telecom and Water Manager
Marialie Martinez, Customer Service Manager

DATE: August 04, 2014

RE: 14-041-01 – In the Matter of Formal Complaint of Kimberley and David Boger (Cali Cochitta B&B) vs. Frontier Communications of America, Inc.

Recommendation: Dismiss Complaint

Complaint Analysis:

On July 2, 2014, the Public Service Commission of Utah (Commission) forwarded to the Division of Public Utilities (Division) Mrs. Boger's email complaint against Frontier Communications of America, Inc. (Company). Mrs. Boger's complaint was processed and sent to the Company for a response per Commission Rule R746-200-8 Informal Review.

Mrs. Boger states that she has switched services over to Emery Telecom to have a better internet and phone service. Mrs. Boger adds that Emery has tried to connect to her service all day of July 1st but were at a standstill for all incoming calls from cell phones. Mrs. Boger alleged that the Company has held up any incoming calls received from cell phones with a recorded message to callers stating, "This number is no longer in service." Mrs. Boger adds that guests who were trying to make reservations cannot get through resulting in loss of business.

Company Response:

The Company has investigated the above statements and offers the following response.

"The complaint was referred to our Carrier Service Center who advised of the following information:

PON 4352594961 was sent to Frontier on 06/30/14 17:29 to port 4352594961 to Emery Telecommunications.

Orders 56418685 and 56418686 were issued by automation with a due date of 07/01/14.

Emery Telecommunications took the number via Neustar at 10:48am on 07/02/14.

There were two other phones [sic] numbers billing with this telephone number, 435-259-8167 and 435-259-4964.

Telephone number 435-259-8167 was being left on the account; therefore order 56418683 was placed to remove 435-259-4961 as the telephone number to bill together with.

Telephone number 435-259-4964 was a distinctive ring number. Emery Telecommunications sent a separate PON 4352594964 on 06/30/14 17:14pm to take 4352594964. Order 56418662 was issued with a due date of 07/01/14. Emery took the number via Neustar at 10:48 AM on 07/02/14.

The two telephones [sic] numbers would have been set on triggers for the due date of 07/01/14 and Frontier would have pulled the service out of our switch completely the morning of 07/02/14.

Until Emery activated there would have been a disconnect message to all callers not just cell phones.

It has been verified that both numbers are out of our switch.”

“07/03/14 10:53am I contacted Ms. Boger and attempted to explain the investigation above. She inquired stated “wouldn’t Emery have known to take the number on July 1st?” I explained that per our Carrier Service Center that cell phone callers would have received a disconnect message until Emery activated the number in Neustar. She states that Emery had made a call to Frontier to determine why callers were receiving a disconnect message and this did not resolve the issue. She wants to know who will pay for their loss of business. I advised that the porting out was scheduled for July 1st as requested and that the investigation would be sent to the Public Service Commission for review. She then stated F*** off as she disconnected the call.”

Frontier Specialist: Barbara Saunders
Department: Consumer Relations
Telephone Number: 877 433 3806 ext. 4194
Fax Number: 585 262 9505

Division Review and Recommendation:

Based on the Company’s response, the Division concludes that the complaint is over porting issue which falls under the Federal Communications Commission’s jurisdiction. The Division therefore recommends that the Formal Complaint against the Company be dismissed.