

September 4, 2019

Via e-Filing

Mr. Daniel P. Wolf
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147


Re: In the Matter of a Commission Inquiry into the Service Quality, Customer Service, and Billing Practices of Frontier Communications
Docket No.: P-407, 405/CI-18-122

Dear Mr. Wolf:

Enclosed via eFiling, please find Reply Comments of Frontier Communications of Minnesota, Inc. and Citizens Telecommunications Company of Minnesota, LLC in response to the August 21, 2019 Initial Comments of the Office of the Attorney General-Residential Utilities and Antitrust Division in the above-entitled docket.

The filing contains protected data, as defined in Minn. R. 7829.0100, subp. 19a. The information marked as protected data is being supplied to the Commission by Frontier, is subject of efforts by Frontier that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy, and derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable by proper means by, other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use. Accordingly, the information marked as protected data is trade secret information under Minn. Stat. §13.37(1)(b). Frontier requests that this data be treated as nonpublic and private or confidential data under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minn. Stat. Ch. 13, and as protected data under the Commission's rules.

Very truly yours,



Richard J. Johnson
Attorney at Law
(612) 877-5275
Rick.Johnson@lawmoss.com

RJJ/keb
Enclosures
cc: Parties of Record
4822518v1

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED**

State of Minnesota
Before the
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Katie Sieben	Chair
Dan Lipschultz	Commissioner
Valerie Means	Commissioner
Matt Schuerger	Commissioner
John Tuma	Commissioner

In the Matter of a Commission Inquiry into the
Service Quality, Customer Service, and Billing
Practices of Frontier Communications

Docket No. P407, 405/CI-18-122

**REPLY COMMENTS OF
FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS OF MINNESOTA, INC. AND
CITIZENS TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANY OF MINNESOTA, LLC**

Frontier Communications of Minnesota, Inc. and Citizens Telecommunications Company of Minnesota, LLC (“Frontier”) submit these Reply Comments in response to the August 21, 2019 Initial Comments of the Office of the Attorney General—Residential Utilities and Antitrust Division (“OAG Initial Comments”). The OAG Initial Comments recommended 19 modifications to the Proposed Stipulation of Settlement Pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 237.076, filed on August 2, 2019 (“Proposed Settlement”).¹

As explained below, none of the OAG’s recommended modifications are needed, many would cause unnecessary delays in implementation of the Proposed Settlement, and some would prevent implementation. These consequences should be avoided because, as the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) recognized:

- “The alternative to the [Proposed Settlement] is a contested case” which “would undoubtedly be a prolonged and expensive undertaking;”²

¹ OAG Initial Comments at 16-19.

² Statement in Support of Proposed Stipulation of Settlement at 7 (Aug. 2, 2019) [*hereinafter* “ALJ Statement”].

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

- The Proposed Settlement is “a fair and reasonable way to deal with the multitude of service quality issues raised by Frontier’s customers in this proceeding”³ and
- “[T]he sooner the Commission reviews and approves the proposal, the better for Frontier’s customers.”⁴

Further, the reasoning and analysis of OAG Initial Comments to support the proposed modifications are flawed, as explained below. As a result, the Commission should approve the Proposed Settlement without modification.

A. Substantial evidence supports the Proposed Settlement without any further development of the record, which will merely delay its implementation.

The OAG Initial Comments contend that the Proposed Settlement “fails to include a single reference to the phrase ‘substantial evidence’” and “fails to include any stipulated factual background.”⁵ The record in this case, including the ALJ Statement and terms and conditions of the Proposed Settlement itself, provide substantial evidence that the Proposed Settlement is in the public interest.

The Commission accepted settlements of telephone service quality matters in the *US West Settlement Order* and *McLeod Settlement Order* based on the terms and conditions of the settlements in those cases.⁶ No separate comments to support the settlement were presented in the McLeod matter. While Joint Comments by the Department, OAG, and US West supporting the settlement were presented in the US West matter, the ALJ Statement in this proceeding provides significantly more assurance of substantial evidence to support the Proposed Settlement than existed in the US West case. As explained below, the Commission can and should rely on the ALJ

³ ALJ Statement at 7.

⁴ ALJ Statement at 7.

⁵ OAG Initial Comments at 8-9.

⁶ *In the Matter of an Investigation into U S WEST Communications, Inc. ’s Service Quality*, Docket No. P421/CI-95-648, Order Accepting Settlement with Modifications at Amended Stipulation (May 2, 1996) [hereinafter “*US West Order*”]; *In the Matter of a Joint Complaint of the Office of the Attorney General and Minnesota Department of Commerce and Request for Temporary Relief*, Docket P5323/C-03-140, Order Accepting Settlement and Dismissing Complaint (2003) [hereinafter “*McLeod Settlement Order*”].

Statement and the terms and conditions of the Proposed Settlement to support its acceptance without any further modification.

The Proposed Settlement has eliminated the need for any further record development because the Proposed Settlement itself assures the benefits of specific customer remedies and ongoing, enforceable commitments to improve service. Accepting the Proposed Settlement also serves the public interest by allowing the Commission to avoid additional procedures that will add unnecessary expense and delay without any customer benefits.

B. The OAG’s concern that the Commission lacks authority to require specific customer remedies is not a defect of the Proposed Settlement, but instead underscores one of its most significant benefits.

The OAG Initial Comments discuss Minnesota and 8th Circuit case law holding that the Commission lacks authority to order payment of specific customer remedies⁷ and “recommends that the Commission more closely analyze whether the Proposed Settlement provides for remedies that go beyond the authority granted to the Commission by the Minnesota Legislature.”⁸ While the OAG Initial Comments conclude that this is a potential defect in the Proposed Settlement, these cases actually provide additional *support* for the Proposed Settlement because the Proposed Settlement makes possible customer benefits that could not be achieved through a contested resolution of this matter.

The Minnesota Supreme Court and 8th Circuit have held that the Commission lacks authority to order payment of specific customer remedies.⁹ However, neither of those cases

⁷ OAG Initial Comments at 11 (citing In re Qwest’s Performance Assur. Plan, 783 N.W.2d 571 (Minn. Ct. App. 2010) and Qwest Corp. v. Minn. Pub. Utils Comm’n, 427 F.3d 1061 (8th Cir. 2005)).

⁸ OAG Initial Comments at 11.

⁹ In re Qwest’s Wholesale Service, 702 N.W.2d 246, 262 (Minn. 2005) (“[T]he MPUC does not have statutory authority, either express or implied, to impose the self-executing payments as an enforcement mechanism...”); Qwest, 427 F.3d at 1065 (“While we agree that these statutes give MPUC broad statutory authority to regulate the telecommunications market in Minnesota, none of them vest MPUC with the express authority to order remedial relief.”).

impede the Proposed Settlement because neither of those cases involved a settlement in which the regulated entity had agreed to provide the customer remedies under challenge.

While these cases establish that the Commission cannot impose customer remedies, that limitation does not impede acceptance of the Proposed Settlement, as demonstrated by the Commission's approval of the 1996 US West Settlement that also included specific customer remedies.¹⁰ In approving that settlement, the Commission relied on those customer remedies, among other provisions, to find the settlement was in the public interest.¹¹

The importance of Frontier's agreement to provide these remedies also underscores the need to refrain from seeking to impose added obligations that could eliminate the primary benefits of these remedies. Specifically, the absence of Commission authority to require specific customer remedies and the importance of such remedies to individual customers is one of the most significant public interest benefits of the Proposed Settlement. That benefit is available as a result of Frontier's acceptance of remedies that the Commission could not require (even after a contested case). Accordingly, the Proposed Settlement should be accepted without the modifications.

C. Frontier provided over \$180,000 in customer credits under its AFORs without need for any reporting requirements or other supervision, which shows there is no basis for concern or modifications to compel future credits.

The OAG has recommended that the Commission “[require] Frontier to make an upfront dollar-specific payment to a *nonrefundable escrow account* to discourage the company from arbitrarily denying both past and future customer claims.”¹² The implication is that Frontier arbitrarily will deny remedies to customers. To the contrary, undisputed facts demonstrate that

¹⁰ See, *US West Settlement Order* at Amended Stipulation, p. 3-7.

¹¹ *US West Settlement Order* at 2 (“The settlement provides compensation for past service quality deficiencies.”) and 3 (“The settlement sets minimum performance standards . . . , plus individual customer remedies for failing to meet them.”) and 6 (“For the reasons set forth above, the Commission finds the settlement . . . is supported by substantial evidence and in the public interest.”).

¹² OAG Initial Comments at 17 (emphasis added).

there is no basis for such an implication, much less for modifications intended to force Frontier to do what it has proven it will voluntarily do.

The Proposed Settlement provides customer credits for future service shortfalls and for prior service issues “for which the customer has not already been credited or refunded.”¹³ This provision recognizes that Frontier previously provided over \$180,000 in individual customer remedies called for under the Frontier-MN and CTC-MN AFOR Plans. The individual customer credits already provided by Frontier included: (1) residential and business out of service conditions not restored within 24 hours; (2) residential and business repeated service issues; (3) residential and business missed service appointments; and (4) service installations not met. Those credits already provided are summarized below:

**Summary of Frontier AFOR Credits
2015-2018**

	Total Amount Credited	Total customers credits
	[NOT PUBLIC DATA BEGINS]	
2015	██████████	██████████
2016	██████████	██████████
2017	██████████	██████████
2018	██████████	██████████
		NOT PUBLIC DATA ENDS]
Total	\$181,734	14,289

Those customer credits were provided by Frontier under the AFOR Plans without any regulatory reporting,¹⁴ much less “non-refundable” escrow funding.

Finally, the Proposed Settlement further includes a process for direct oversight by the Department and Commission of claims for prior service issues in which the Department may

¹³ Proposed Settlement at Section II, p. 4.

¹⁴ There was no provision in the AFOR Plans for filing with the Commission or other reporting of credits provided to customers, and the Department had not requested this information from Frontier. As a result, the fact that these credits were provided may not have been generally known.

review and challenge any determination by Frontier that a particular customer is not eligible for the remedies.¹⁵

D. The OAG’s Initial Comments do not consider the delays, uncertainties, and other detriments that would result from not accepting the Proposed Settlement.

The OAG Initial Comments recommend that the Commission consider “whether the Proposed Settlement’s remedies are proportional to the gravity of Frontier’s *alleged conduct*”¹⁶ and claims that the “pervasiveness of Frontier’s *alleged violations* of Minnesota’s telecommunications laws is well supported by the record.”¹⁷ The limitation that the conduct and violations are merely “alleged” (not proven) and disputed by Frontier is ignored. Frontier’s March 5, 2019 Response to the Department Report explains how the claims of violations by Frontier in the Department Report are subject to many significant disputed factual issues that would necessitate a contested case proceeding to resolve.¹⁸ As the ALJ recognized, the consequence of these disputes is that “[t]he alternative to the [Proposed Settlement] is a contested case.”¹⁹ The ALJ is correct in this assessment.

Minn. Stat. § 237.081 provides that if “the commission finds that a significant factual issue raised has not be resolved to [the Commission’s] satisfaction, ... the commission shall order that a contested case hearing be conducted under chapter 14”²⁰ The Commission has consistently ordered contested cases in Commission-initiated investigations under Minn. Stat. § 237.081 where there are unresolved factual issues. For example, the Commission ordered a contested case in its investigation under Minn. Stat. § 237.081 into possible discriminatory practices regarding US

¹⁵ Proposed Settlement at Section II, p. 8.

¹⁶ OAG Initial Comments at 12 (emphasis added).

¹⁷ OAG Initial Comments at 10 (emphasis added).

¹⁸ Frontier’s March 5, 2019 Response at 27-73.

¹⁹ ALJ Statement at 7.

²⁰ Minn. Stat. § 237.081, subd. 2(a) and 2(c).

West's MegaBit services, determining that "it cannot resolve, on the basis of the record before it, many of the issues listed below. They turn in part on factual issues best developed in formal evidentiary proceedings."²¹ Minnesota courts have also consistently remanded matters back to the Commission when a contested case was not held and the evidence in the record did not support the Commission's decision.²²

These decisions support the ALJ's conclusion that:

[T]he parties' resources are better directed to implementing the [Proposed Settlement], thereby providing customer remedies and improving service, than to litigating. A contested case would undoubtedly be a prolonged and expensive undertaking.²³

E. The Commission's modification of the 1996 US West Settlement does not support any modification of the Proposed Settlement.

The OAG Initial Comments compare the Proposed Settlement to the 1996 US West Settlement and recommends adding provisions to facilitate Commission rejection at a later time.²⁴ The OAG's comparison and reliance on the Commission's modification of 1996 US West Settlement are unsound because of the vast differences between that settlement and the Proposed Settlement.

The Proposed Settlement consists of 29 pages of single spaced terms backed-up by over 26 reports²⁵ and 11 required service improvements and related plans.²⁶ As the ALJ recognized, "The

²¹ *In re Complaint Relating to U S WEST Communications, Inc.'s Promotion of its MegaBit Services*, Docket No. P421/C-98-997, Notice and Order for Hearing (Nov. 20, 1998); see also *In re Commission Investigation into Qwest Corporation's Provision of Network Elements to CLECs and into Related Marketing Practices Targeting CLEC Customers*, Docket No. P421/CI-09-1066, Notice and Order for Hearing (Apr. 26, 2010) and *In re Complaint of Desktop Media, Inc. Against Qwest Corporation Regarding Disputed Charges*, Docket No. P421/C-05-1209, Notice and Order for Hearing (July 3, 2008).

²² *In re Minn. Pub. Utils Comm'n Initiation of Summary Investigation*, 417 N.W.2d 274, 287 (Minn. Ct. App. 1987); *In re Request for Service in Qwest's Tofte Exchange*, 666 N.W.2d 391, 397 (Minn. Ct. App. 2003).

²³ ALJ Statement at 7.

²⁴ OAG Initial Comments at 13.

²⁵ Proposed Settlement at 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23.

²⁶ Proposed Settlement at 4, 9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21.

[Proposed Settlement] covers an extraordinarily wide range of specific commitments by Frontier.”²⁷ Further, implementation of these commitments is backed up by oversight provided by both the Department and Commission.²⁸ These features fully support the ALJ’s observation that “To arrive at mutually acceptable solutions, both the Department and Frontier had to carefully consider each other’s objections to proposals and creatively respond.”²⁹

By comparison, the 1996 US West Settlement included virtually no reports and no opportunity for future supervision or input by the Commission.³⁰ Accordingly, the Proposed Settlement provides the Commission the ongoing ability to supervise service improvement that was missing from, and caused modification of, the 1996 US West Settlement.

F. None of the OAG’s recommended changes should be accepted.

The following are Frontier’s Responses to the 19 specific recommendations made by the OAG for modifications to the Proposed Settlement. As explained further below, none of these recommendations is needed, many would cause delays in implementation of the Proposed Settlement, and some would prevent implementation.

A. Substantial Evidence.

- 1. Requiring the parties to submit a list of past Frontier customer complaints for which there is an agreement concerning the availability of remedies.*

Frontier Response: Frontier has responded to all complaints filed with the Commission and the Proposed Settlement includes a detailed process to inform Frontier customers of the opportunity to submit claims. Attempting to develop a pre-agreed list of customers who will receive remedies would be laborious, be far less inclusive, and cause delay in providing remedies to customers.

²⁷ ALJ Statement at 6.

²⁸ Proposed Settlement at 1-2.

²⁹ ALJ Statement at 5-6.

³⁰ *US West Settlement Order* at 5.

2. *Requiring the parties to further elucidate the extent to which substantial evidence in the record supports a finding that the Proposed Settlement resolves the issues framed by the Commission.*

Frontier Response: Embellishing the record is unnecessary because the terms of the Proposed Settlement provide ample substantial evidence that the issues framed by the Commission are resolved on terms very favorable to customers. One of the most significant public interest benefits of the Proposed Settlement is that it provides significant past and future customer remedies. The OAG Initial Comments explain that the Commission could not require such remedies, even with a full contested case record.³¹ In contrast, there is no legal obstacle to the Commission approving customer remedies in the Proposed Settlement Frontier has accepted.

B. Public Interest.

3. *Requiring the parties to submit proposals regarding the timeframe by which the Department will complete its investigation into the Excluded Issues and Reserved Matters over which the Department and/or Commission have jurisdiction and explain the Commission's options for next procedural steps after completion of such Department investigation.*

Frontier Response: There is no reason that the implementation of the Proposed Settlement should be delayed while Excluded Issues and Reserved Matters are being reviewed. Attempting to generate such a timetable would delay implementation of the Proposed Settlement and the resulting significant benefits to customers.

4. *Requiring the parties to further elucidate the extent to which the Proposed Settlement's past remedies would be resolved in a more definite and timely manner than if the Commission were to refer this matter to a contested case hearing.*

Frontier Response: The Proposed Settlement provides the Commission clear authority to achieve specific customer remedies (unlike the Commission's lack of authority to order such remedies). Further, a contested case would require at least 12 months (and could require far more time), making the Proposed Settlement also far more timely.

5. *Requiring the parties to further elucidate the extent to which the Proposed Settlement would provide the Commission with a reasonable assurance regarding Frontier's compliance with Minnesota's telecommunications statutes and rules in light of the 1996 Order Accepting US West Settlement with Modifications.*

Frontier Response: The Proposed Settlement provides substantial assurance of future compliance through extensive reporting and service obligations, backed up by detailed and ongoing oversight by the Department and Commission, including the ability to require modifications by Frontier. In contrast, the 1996 US West settlement provided no such terms.

³¹ OAG Comments, p. 11-12.

6. *Requiring the parties to further elucidate the extent to which the Proposed Settlement provides for reasonable remedies compared with Frontier's alleged conduct in light of the 1996 Order Accepting US West Settlement with Modifications.*

Frontier Response: Several factors show the Proposed Settlement provides appropriate remedies. First, the Proposed Settlement includes detailed service improvement plans (with ongoing direct regulatory oversight) that far exceed the 1996 US West Settlement (or any prior settlement before the Commission). Second, the Proposed Settlement provides far more detailed customer-specific remedies than the 1996 US West Settlement. Third, the 1996 US West Settlement does not provide a meaningful point of comparison because of US West's position in 1996 as a near monopoly service provider (with customers having minimal service alternatives from other wireline other wireless providers), unlike the current case.

C. Remedies Under The Proposed Settlement.

7. *Resolving the parties' apparent disagreement over what constitutes a complaint for purposes of administering the Proposed Settlement. See Proposed Settlement at 15, Section III.G.7.*

Frontier Response: It is unnecessary to resolve the broad scale legal issue to implement the Proposed Settlement, and settlements are often implemented precisely because parties do not agree on the underlying legal issues. Pursuing such an unnecessary issue will provide no benefits to Frontier customers, but will delay (and could even prevent) implementation of the Proposed Settlement. Further, Commission action regarding a definition of "complaint" would inappropriately impact other carriers who are not parties to this docket.³²

8. *Clarifying, as appropriate, that the Commission initiated its investigation to vindicate the rights of individual Frontier customers, in order to insulate the Proposed Settlement from potential section 16A.151 challenges.*

Frontier Response: No clarification is necessary or appropriate. The Proposed Settlement is insulated from Section 16A.151 challenges because the Proposed Settlement is clearly within the exception provided at Minn. Stat. § 16A.151, subd. 2(a) that applies when "a state official litigates or settles a matter on behalf of specific injured persons or entities", as explained by the Minnesota Court of Appeals in *In re Qwest's Performance Assurance Plan*.³³

9. *Requiring Frontier to make an upfront dollar-specific payment to a nonrefundable escrow account to discourage the company from arbitrarily denying both past and future customer claims.*

Frontier Response: This coercive recommendation rests on a premise that does not exist (that Frontier is likely to arbitrarily deny customer claims), ignores facts that refute that premise (Frontier's provision of over \$180,000 of customer credits during its recent AFORs without

³² The March 5, 2019 Comments of the Minnesota Telecommunications Alliance demonstrates that the resolution of this legal question has a wider impact than just this case.

³³ 783 N.W.2d 571 (Minn. Ct. App. 2010).

any reporting or other direct regulatory supervision), and ignores the oversight provided by the Department and Commission under Sections I.F and II of the Proposed Settlement. This recommendation, and its implications, are unacceptable to Frontier.

10. Imposing a stayed civil penalty to be later recovered by the Office of the Minnesota Attorney General pursuant to section 237.461 in the event Frontier either continues to violate telecommunication laws or otherwise fails to comply with the Proposed Settlement.

Frontier Response: There is no basis for any civil penalties, stayed or otherwise, and a contested case process would be needed for any attempt to provide such a basis. This recommendation, and its implications, are unacceptable to Frontier. As a result, taking up such a recommendation will cause delays at best and could eliminate the basis for the Proposed Settlement to be implemented at all.

11. Exploring additional enforcement measures that compensate Frontier customers without contravening legal precedent finding that the Commission is without express or implied authority to compel remedial damages.

Frontier Response: This recommendation appears to call for an exploration of additional measures to enforce compensation of customers that the OAG Initial Comments demonstrate the Commission cannot require. Such a process is certain cause delay and add confusion regarding the customer remedies that are a core benefit of the Proposed Settlement to the disadvantage of customers, while providing nothing useful.

12. Amending Section I.G to require Frontier to include in its quarterly report to the Department the details regarding all customer complaints for which Frontier denied the remedies provided for in Section I.G.1-6.

Frontier Response: This recommendation appears to reflect the mistaken assumption that these future customer remedies rest on formal customer complaints. To the contrary, customer credits will be provided in response to service issues identified by Frontier or a customer in the normal course of business (like the over \$180,000 of customer credits provided under the Frontier-Minnesota and CTC-Minnesota AFORs). Since these remedies are not driven by customer complaints, there is no basis to report the number of customer complaints denied.

13. Clarifying, as appropriate, whether the Commission may approve (with or without modifications) the remedial relief provided to Frontier customers under section 237.076 without violating past legal precedent holding that the Commission is without express or implied legislative authority to order remedial relief.

Frontier Response: No clarification is needed or appropriate. The Commission's approval of the 1996 US West Settlement demonstrates the Commission's authority to approve customer specific remedies in the context of a settlement.

14. Amending the Proposed Settlement to require a specific claims process for future Frontier customer complaints alleging violations of Section I.G.1-6 similar to the claims process for past Frontier violations as elucidated in Section II.

Frontier Response: As explained above, Frontier provided over \$180,000 in customer credits to over 14,000 customers under the Frontier AFOR Plans without any reporting or active supervision, much less the need for any formal procedure. These facts demonstrate there is no need for added procedures in the Proposed Settlement.

D. Ongoing Commission Authority Over The Proposed Settlement.

15. Maximizing the Commission's ability to terminate that agreement in the event Frontier continues to violate telecommunication laws in light of the 1996 Order Accepting US West Settlement with Modifications.

Frontier Response: This recommendation should be rejected because the Proposed Settlement contains detailed service improvement plans under ongoing regulatory oversight by the Department and Commission that were completely absent from the 1996 US West Settlement. In addition, the 1996 US West Settlement arose in the absence of service alternatives for customers while the Proposed Settlement arises in the context of multiple service alternatives from landline, mobile, and internet service providers.

E. Miscellaneous.

16. Amending Section VII.D so that the parties are provided ten days to respond to a Commission order modifying the Proposed Settlement to align the timeframe with that contained in section 237.076.

Frontier Response: Frontier has no objection to the use of either the ten day period set forth in Minn. Stat. § 237.076, or the shorter three business day period set forth in the Proposed Settlement, so long as both Parties (the Department and Frontier) are subject to the same time period.

17. Clarifying the extent to which the Department's or the Commission's actions to vindicate the rights of Frontier customers impact or otherwise preclude those customers' legal or administrative abilities to independently seek relief from Frontier.

Frontier Response: The Section VII.E requires no clarification, reading as follows:

E. Individual Customer Rights Not Affected: This Proposed Settlement and any Commission Order accepting the Proposed Settlement do not preclude any Frontier customer(s) or former customer(s) from taking any action, including but not limited to, filing a separate complaint with the Commission regarding the customer's or former customer's Frontier service before or after any Commission Order accepting the Proposed Settlement. (emphasis added).

18. Requiring Frontier to waive any equitable arguments (e.g., statutes of limitation, repose, etc.) that would preclude the Commission, the Department and/or any individual Frontier citizen from seeking remedies under the Proposed Settlement.

Frontier Response: Section VII.E of the Proposed Settlement (quoted above) requires no clarification, and Frontier's agreement to the Proposed Settlement does not require embellishment with waivers, which will inevitably be subject to uncertainty and interpretation and use in unanticipated ways, which will make such a change unacceptable to Frontier.

19. Moving the Excluded Issues and Reserved Matters from Section III.S-X, which governs future Frontier conduct, into Section I to clarify that such excluded issues and matters relate both to past and future Frontier conduct.

Frontier Response: Relocating Sections III.S through III.X from one part of the Proposed Settlement to another is unnecessary and will provide no clarification since Sections III.S through III.X are equally clear in any location.

F. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above and in the ALJ Statement and in the Frontier's August 21, 2019 Comments, the Commission should the Commission should approve the Proposed Settlement without modification, contrary to the OAG Initial Comments.

Dated: September 4, 2019

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

MOSS & BARNETT, PA

/s/

Richard J. Johnson
Moss & Barnett, P.A.
150 South Fifth Street
Suite 1200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612-877-5275
Rick.Johnson@lawmoss.com

and

Kevin Saville
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
Frontier Communications
401 Merrit 7
Norwalk, CT 06851
203-614-5030
Kevin.Saville@ftr.com

Attorneys on Behalf of Frontier Communications

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In the Matter of a Commission Inquiry into the
Service Quality, Customer Service, and Billing
Practices of Frontier Communications

Docket No.: P-407, 405/CI-18-122

Karen E. Berg certifies that on the 4th day of September, 2019, she filed a true and correct copy of the **Reply Comments of Frontier Communications of Minnesota, Inc. and Citizens Telecommunications Company of Minnesota, LLC in response to the August 21, 2019 Initial Comments of the Office of the Attorney General-Residential Utilities and Antitrust Division**, by positing it on www.edockets.state.mn.us. Said document was also served via e-mail as designated on the Official Service List on file with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission and attached hereto.

/s/ Karen E. Berg

Karen E. Berg

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Scott	Bohler	scott.bohler@ftr.com	Frontier Communications Corporation	2378 Wilshire Blvd Mound, MN 55364-1652	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Linda	Chavez	linda.chavez@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 280 Saint Paul, MN 55101-2198	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Brent	Christensen	bchristensen@mnta.org	Minnesota Telecom Alliance	1000 Westgate Drive, Ste 252 St. Paul, MN 55117	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Generic Notice	Commerce Attorneys	commerce.attorneys@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	445 Minnesota Street Suite 1800 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Ron	Elwood	relwood@mnlisap.org	Mid-Minnesota Legal Aid	2324 University Ave Ste 101 Saint Paul, MN 55114	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Shannon	Heim	shannon.heim@lawmoss.com	Moss & Barnett A Professional Association	150 S. 5th Street, Suite 1200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Katherine	Hinderlie	katherine.hinderlie@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	445 Minnesota St Suite 1800 St. Paul, MN 55101-2134	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Linda	Jensen	linda.s.jensen@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1800 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, MN 551012134	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Richard	Johnson	Rick.Johnson@lawmoss.com	Moss & Barnett	150 S. 5th Street Suite 1200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Jeff	Oxley	jeff.oxley@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	600 North Robert Street St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
William	Phillips	wphillips@aarp.org	AARP	30 E. 7th St Suite 1200 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Generic Notice	Residential Utilities Division	residential.utilities@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012131	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Janet	Shaddix Eling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	7400 Lyndale Ave S Ste 190 Richfield, MN 55423	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Daniel P	Wolf	dan.wolf@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Place East Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_18-122_Official
Patrick	Zomer	Patrick.Zomer@lawmoss.com	Moss & Barnett a Professional Association	150 S. 5th Street, #1200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_18-122_Official