

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW OF THIS REPORT	1
Organization of this Chapter	1
Key Conclusions and Recommendations resulting from this study	1
Conclusions	
Recommendations	3
The Genesis of this Study	4
Organization of this Report	5
Chapter Summaries	6
Principal observations and takeaways	29
2: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND FOR THIS STUDY	39
The Genesis of this Study	41
Overview of OIR.11-12-001 to evaluate URF ILEC Service Quality performance	44
The GO 133-C/D Service Quality measurements applicable to URF ILECs	49
Trouble Reports per Hundred access lines ("TRPH")	50
90% out-of-service conditions to be cleared within 24 hours	52
Sources of data used in this Study	55
The AT&T and Verizon/Frontier GO 133-C/D submissions	56

Table of Contents

Financial data	57
Data analysis	58
Consistency among the various sources of data	59
Tables	
Table 2.1: Percent Out-Of-Service Cleared Within 24 Hours	52
Table 2.2: Principal GO 133-C/D Trouble Report Data Elements	57
3: CALIFORNIA ILEC NETWORK OVERVIEW	61
The relationships between the two largest California ILECs and their respective corporate parents: A brief history.	65
AT&T California	65
Frontier California	66
The ILECs' service areas in California	68
AT&T California	71
Frontier California	75
Central Office Switch Technology	77
AT&T California	77
Frontier California	80
Outside Plant Distribution Area Technology	81
OSP Architecture in general	81
Frontier California	84
AT&T California	94
Summary and conclusions	102

Table of Contents

Tables and Figures

Table 3.1:	AT&T California Technical Field Services Districts	71
Table 3.2:	AT&T California Construction & Engineering (C&E) Districts	72
Table 3.3:	Frontier California Geographic Operating Areas	75
Table 3.4:	AT&T California Central Office Switches and Capacities	77
Table 3.5:	Frontier California Central Office Switches and Capacities	81
Table 3.6:	Frontier California Population at Locations Where <i>FiOS</i> -Capable FTTP Plant has been Deployed	86
Table 3.7:	Frontier California Types of Broadband Services at Each Central Office	87
Table 3.8:	AT&T California Households at Which Some Form of "Broadband" Service is Currently Available	94
Table 3.9:	AT&T California Availability of Broadband by Technology Category	96
Table 3.10:	Fiber-Equipped and Low-Speed DSL Availability- ILEC Central Offices and Lines in Service as of December 2017	103
Figure 3.1:	AT&T California ILEC service areas	69
Figure 3.2:	Frontier California ILEC service areas	70
Figure 3.3:	AT&T Technical Field Services (“TFS”) Districts	73
Figure 3.4:	AT&T Construction & Engineering (“C&E”) Districts	74
Figure 3.5:	Frontier California Operating Areas (“OPAs”)	76
Figure 3.6:	Principal components of an ILEC local distribution network	82
Figure 3.7:	Frontier Distribution Area Technology – Long Beach wire centers	93
Figure 3.8:	Relationship between the maximum download data rate and the length of the copper distribution segment of a subscriber line between the Central Office or Node and the end user.	95

Table of Contents

Figure 3.9:	AT&T Distribution Area Technology Maps	
	a. Map Legend	97
	b. Mountain View	98
	c. San Carlos	99
	d. San Diego	100
	e. Bakersfield	100
	f. Los Angeles area	101
	g. Oakland / East Bay	101
	h. San Francisco	102
4:	ILEC RESPONSES TO SERVICE OUTAGES	105
	Introduction: Organization of this Chapter	108
	Data collection and reporting pursuant to General Order 133-C and subsequent 133-D	108
	Trouble Reports, in general	110
	The "raw" Trouble Report data	114
	The California ILEC market environment	115
	Identifying long-term trends from actual month-to-month experience	121
	Physical and Environmental Factors Affecting ILEC Service Quality	123
	Analysis of Principal Service Quality metrics: Service Quality at the individual wire center level	125
	Tables and Figures	
Table 4.1:	Quantities of Trouble Reports and Actual Out-of-Service Conditions – January 2010 Through December 2017	111
Table 4.2:	Quantities of Trouble Reports and Out-of-Service Conditions Adjusted to Exclude Sundays and Holidays per GO 133-C/D – January 2010 Through December 2017	112
Table 4.3:	Most Common AT&T Cause Codes and the Number of Occurrences 2010-2017	113
Table 4.4:	Principal Trouble Report Data Elements	115
Table 4.5:	Sample of Individual Wire Center Trouble Report and Out-of-Service Data Summary	127

Table of Contents

Figure 4.1:	California ILECs saw a precipitous drop in demand for circuit-switched legacy voice access lines over the 2010-2017 period, only a portion of which were replaced by ILEC-provided VoIP services.	118
Figure 4.2:	A substantial share of California ILEC residential line losses was the result of customer migrations to cable MSOs and other ILEC competitors.	118
Figure 4.3:	California ILEC business customers also migrated to competing service providers that offer SIP trunking, virtual PBX, and other VoIP services.	119
Figure 4.4:	Perhaps the largest source of the shift in demand away from ILEC and other wireline voice services in California has been the mushrooming growth in demand for wireless.	119
Figure 4.5:	The Decrease in AT&T-California Out-of-Service Incidents Over the 2010-2017 Period Has Been Less than in Proportion to the Drop-off in Total POTS Lines in Service.	120
Figure 4.6:	In order to examine how service quality metrics evolve over time, we use statistical techniques to calculate long-term trends from the pattern of month-to-month variations in the data.	122
Figure 4.7:	The incidence of service outages is highly correlated with weather conditions – particularly with precipitation.	124
Figure 4.8:	The incidence of service outages is highly correlated with weather – ██████████ area precipitation and Verizon/Frontier ██████-area out-of-service incidents (2010-2017).	124
4A:	SERVICE QUALITY ANALYSIS: AT&T CALIFORNIA	133
	Demand conditions affecting AT&T POTS services	140
	Trouble Reports and POTS Lines in Service – a more granular perspective	142
	AT&T Service Quality performance	160
	“Adjusted” vs. “actual” results	160
	Out-of-service more than one hour	160
	Duration of out-of-service conditions	162

Table of Contents

Out-of-service conditions cleared within 24 hours	166
How competition has affected AT&T's response to service quality issues	183
Effects of geographic and other wire center attributes upon performance results	186
Fiber optic upgraded wire centers	206
Wire Center Size	211
Access Line Loss	215
Urban/Suburban/Rural	219
ILEC Organizational Assignment	223
Summary	227
 Tables and Figures	
Table 4A.1: AT&T California drop-off in POTS demand at wire centers of varying sizes January 2010 – December 2017	140
Table 4A.2: AT&T California Out-of-Service Over 24 Hours' Duration per 100 POTS Lines in Service – 20 Poorest Performing and 10 Best Performing Wire Centers 2016-2017	143
Table 4A.3: AT&T California Average Out-of-Service Duration – 20 Poorest Performing and 10 Best Performing Wire Centers 2016-2017	144
Table 4A.4: AT&T California Percent Out-of-Service Cleared Within 24 Hours – 20 Poorest Performing and 10 Best Performing Wire Centers 2016-2017	145
Table 4A.5: AT&T California Days Required to Clear 90% of Out-of-Service Conditions – 20 Poorest Performing and 10 Best Performing Wire Centers 2016-2017	146
Table 4A.6: AT&T California Trouble Report and Out-of-Service Data for 2016-2017	147

Table of Contents

Table 4A.7:	AT&T California Quantities of Actual and Adjusted ("CPUC") Out-of-Service Conditions, January 2010 Through December 2017	166
Table 4A.8:	AT&T California Wire Center Performance Trends Over the Period 1Q2010 - 4Q2017	169
Table 4A.9:	AT&T California Percentages of Actual and Adjusted ("CPUC") Out-of-Service Conditions Cleared Within 24 Hours and Days Required to Clear 90%	179
Table 4A.10:	AT&T California Basic Residential (POTS) Access Line Service Rate Increase History 2006-2018	185
Table 4A.11:	AT&T California Wire Center Attribute Dimensions and Categories	187
Table 4A.12:	AT&T California Wire Center Attribute Classifications	188
Table 4A.13:	Summary of AT&T Attribute Dimension Graphs	206
Table 4A.14:	AT&T California Classifications of Wire Centers by POTS Lines in Service as of January 2010	211
Table 4A.15:	AT&T California Classifications of Wire Centers by POTS Line Loss Percentage January 2010 Through December 2017	216
Table 4A.16:	AT&T California Technical Field Services (TFS) Districts Total Wire Centers and Wire Centers Upgraded with Fiber to Support Broadband Services as of December 2017	224
Figure 4A.1:	The decrease in the number of AT&T California out-of-service incidents has roughly corresponded with the drop-off in access lines in service over the 2010-2017 period.	141
Figure 4A.2:	Over the full 2010-2017 period, the trend of AT&T California out-of-service incidents per 100 access lines (actual) has been increasing.	161
Figure 4A.3:	There has been a steady increase in the average duration of AT&T California out-of-service incidents lasting more than one hour (actual)	161
Figure 4A.4:	The average duration of all AT&T California out-of-service incidents (actual) has been on the rise over the 2010-2017 study period	163

Table of Contents

Figure 4A.5:	The average duration of all AT&T California (actual) out-of-service incidents over 24 hours has significantly increased over the 2010-2017 study period	163
Figure 4A.6:	The average duration of all AT&T California out-of-service incidents (adjusted) has been increasing over the 2010-2017 study period	164
Figure 4A.7:	The average duration of all AT&T California (adjusted) outages lasting more than 24 hours has been increasing over the 2010-2017 study period	164
Figure 4A.8:	The rate of AT&T California out-of-service conditions over 24 hours (actual) has risen by about █% over the 2010-2017 study period	165
Figure 4A.9:	AT&T California has not come even close to achieving the GO 133-CD §3.4(c) goal of 90% of all OOS cleared within 24 hours (actual)	181
Figure 4A.10:	The percentage of all AT&T California OOS cleared within 24 hours (adjusted) has consistently fallen far short of meeting the GO 133-C/D §3.4(c) 90% cleared within 24 hours standard	181
Figure 4A.11:	It continues to take many days for 90% of AT&T California out-of-service incidents to be cleared (actual)	182
Figure 4A.12:	It continues to take many days for 90% of AT&T California out-of-service incidents to be cleared (adjusted)	182
Figure 4A.13:	Wire centers that have been upgraded with fiber optic facilities have fewer out-of-service incidents per 100 access lines (actual)	209
Figure 4A.14:	Wire centers that have been upgraded with fiber optic facilities have shorter average duration for OOS over 24 hours (actual)	209
Figure 4A.15:	Wire centers that have been upgraded with fiber have higher pct of all OOS cleared within 24 hours (actual)	210
Figure 4A.16:	It takes fewer days to clear 90% of outages (actual) in wire centers that have been upgraded with fiber optic facilities	210
Figure 4A.17:	The largest wire centers generally experience the lowest out-of-service rate per 100 lines in service (actual)	213

Table of Contents

Figure 4A.18: The largest wire centers generally exhibit the shortest average duration of OOS over 24 hours (actual)	213
Figure 4A.19: The largest wire centers generally exhibit the highest percentage of all OOS cleared within 24 hours (actual)	214
Figure 4A.20: The largest wire centers generally require the fewest number of days to clear 90% of all out-of-service incidents (actual)	214
Figure 4A.21: Companywide, AT&T California has experienced a net loss of 71.66% of its POTS access lines in service over the 2010-2017 period	215
Figure 4A.22: AT&T California wire centers with the largest POTS line losses are experiencing the smallest increase in OOS per 100 lines in service (actual)	217
Figure 4A.23: AT&T California wire centers with the largest POTS line losses are experiencing the shortest average durations of OOS over 24 hours (actual)	217
Figure 4A.24: AT&T California wire centers with the largest POTS line losses are experiencing the highest percentages of all OOS cleared within 24 hours (actual)	218
Figure 4A.25: AT&T California wire centers with the largest POTS lines losses requires the fewest number of days to clear 90% of all OOS (actual)	218
Figure 4A.26: AT&T California. OOS per 100 lines in service (actual) has been increasing except in the highest density categories	221
Figure 4A.27: AT&T California. average duration of OOS over 24 hours (actual) has increased the most in areas with the lowest population density	221
Figure 4A.28: AT&T California. pct of all OOS cleared within 24 hours (actual) has remained stable but has improved in areas with the highest population density	222
Figure 4A.29: The number of days required for AT&T California. to clear 90% of all OOS (actual) has increased, except in areas with the highest population density	222

Table of Contents

Figure 4A.30: AT&T California. OOS per 100 lines in service (actual) vary inversely with the type of area being supported by each TFS district -- lowest in the largest metro areas	225
Figure 4A.31: The average duration of OOS over 24 hours (actual) is longest -- and has been increasing -- in AT&T California TFS districts covering non-metro and rural areas	225
Figure 4A.32: The [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] AT&T California. TFS districts have the highest percentages of OOS to be cleared within 24 hours (actual), and shows significant gains in this metrics	226
Figure 4A.33: The [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] AT&T California. TFS districts require the fewest days to clear 90% of all OOS (actual), and show significant gains in this metric	226
4F: SERVICE QUALITY ANALYSIS: VERIZON/FRONTIER	229
Introduction: A bifurcated approach to the analysis of Verizon/Frontier performance	236
Demand conditions affecting Verizon/Frontier POTS services	237
Trouble Reports and POTS Lines in Service – a more granular perspective	240
Verizon/Frontier Service Quality Performance	249
Effect of persistent access line losses on the volume of customer trouble reports	249
Out-of-service conditions	251
Duration of out-of-service conditions	255
Out-of-service conditions cleared within 24 hours	256
Effects of geographic and other wire center attributes upon performance results	273
Wire Centers that had been upgraded to FTTP	282
Wire Center Size	286
Access Line Loss	289

Table of Contents

Urban/Suburban/Rural	293
ILEC Organizational Assignment.	296
Summary	300
Tables and Figures	
Table 4F.1: Verizon California Drop-Off In POTS Demand At Wire Centers Of Varying Sizes January 2010 - December 2015.	238
Table 4F.2: Frontier California Drop-Off In POTS Demand At Reporting Units Of Varying Sizes April 2016 - December 2017.	238
Table 4F.3: Verizon/ Frontier California Percent Out-of-Service Over 24 Hours Durations Per 100 POTS Lines in Service -- 20 Poorest Performing and 10 Best Performing Wire Centers 2Q2016-4Q2017.	241
Table 4F.4: Verizon/ Frontier California Average Out-of-Service Duration -- 20 Poorest Performing and 10 Best Performing Wire Centers 2Q2016-4Q2017.	242
Table 4F.5: Verizon/ Frontier California Percent Out-of-Service Cleared Within 24 Hours -- 20 Poorest Performing and 10 Best Performing Wire Centers 2Q2016-4Q2017.	243
Table 4F.6: Verizon/ Frontier California Days Required to Clear 90% of Out-of-Service Conditions -- 20 Poorest Performing and 10 Best Performing Wire Centers 2Q2016-4Q2017.	244
Table 4F.7: Frontier California Trouble Report Out-of-Service Data for 2Q2016-4Q2017.	245
Table 4F.8: Percentages Of Actual And Adjusted ("CPUC") Out-of-Service Conditions Cleared Within 24 Hours And Days Required To Clear 90%.	257
Table 4F.9: Verizon California Wire Center Performance Trends for the period 1Q2010-4Q2015.	263
Table 4F.10: Frontier California Reporting Unit Performance Trends for the period 2Q2016-4Q2017.	268

Table of Contents

Table 4F.11:	Verizon/ Frontier California Wire Center Dimensions and Categories.	274
Table 4F.12:	Verizon/Frontier California Wire Center Attribute Classifications	275
Table 4F.13:	Summary of Verizon/Frontier Attribute Dimensions Graphs	281
Table 4F.14:	Verizon/Frontier California Classifications of Wire Centers and Reporting Units by POTS Lines in Service.	286
Table 4F.15:	Verizon/Frontier California Classifications of Wire Centers by POTS Line Loss Percentage.	290
Table 4F.16:	Frontier California Operating Areas	296
Figure 4F.1:	Total Verizon/Frontier California POTS Access Lines Service Decreased By 68.2% From January 2010 Through December 2017.	239
Figure 4F.2:	The Number of Out-Of-Service Incidents Has Experienced a Greater Decrease Than the Drop-Off in Access Lines in Service over the 2010-2017 Period	250
Figure 4F.3:	There has been a steady downward trend in the number of out-of-service incidents per 100 access lines in service over the 2010-2017 period.	250
Figure 4F.4:	The number of out-of-service incidents exceeding 24 hours per 100 access lines has been decreasing over the full 8-year period, although it had spiked shortly after the Frontier takeover in 2016 (actual).	251
Figure 4F.5:	The average actual duration of all out-of-service conditions had been improving steadily under Verizon ownership, then spiked upward following the Frontier takeover, but seems to have once again resumed its downward trend.	252
Figure 4F.6:	Average actual (actual) duration of all out-of-service incidents in excess of one hour in duration.	253
Figure 4F.7:	Average actual (actual) duration of all out-of-service incidents in excess of 24 hours in duration.	253

Table of Contents

Figure 4F.8:	Average duration of all out-of-service incidents adjusted for Sundays and holidays	254
Figure 4F.9:	Average duration of all out-of-service incidents in excess of 24 hours adjusted for Sundays and holidays	254
Figure 4F.10:	Percentage of all out-of-service conditions cleared within the first 24 hours (actual).	260
Figure 4F.11:	Percentage of all out-of-service conditions cleared within the first 24 hours (adjusted for Sundays and holidays).	260
Figure 4F.12:	Days required to clear 90% of all out-of-service conditions (actual).	261
Figure 4F.13:	Days required to clear 90% of all out-of-service conditions (adjusted for Sundays and holidays).	261
Figure 4F.14:	There have been fewer out-of-service conditions per 100 access lines in wire centers with FTTP upgrades.	284
Figure 4F.15:	Service outages are shorter in wire centers that have received FTTP upgrades.	287
Figure 4F.16:	FTTP-upgraded wire centers clear a higher percentage of out-of-service conditions within 24 hours.	285
Figure 4F.17:	The number of days needed to clear 90% of service outages is shorter in FTTP-upgraded wire centers.	285
Figure 4F.18:	The largest wire centers exhibit the fewest number of out-of-service conditions per 100 access lines.	287
Figure 4F.19:	Service outages tended to be shorter in larger wire centers during the period of Verizon ownership; results under Frontier are indeterminate.	287
Figure 4F.20:	The largest wire centers tend to clear a higher percentage of out-of-service conditions within 24 hours.	288
Figure 4F.21:	The number of days needed to clear 90% of service outages is shortest in the largest wire centers.	288

Table of Contents

Figure 4F.22:	Wire centers that had experienced the greatest drop-off in demand for POTS services exhibited the fewest number of out-of-service conditions per 100 access lines.	291
Figure 4F.23:	Service outages tended to be shortest in wire centers that had experienced the greatest drop-off in demand for POTS services.	291
Figure 4F.24:	Wire centers that had experienced the greatest drop-off in demand for POTS services tended to clear a higher percentage of out-of-service conditions within 24 hours.	292
Figure 4F.25:	The number of days needed to clear 90% of service outages is shortest for wire centers that had experienced the greatest drop-off in demand for POTS services.	292
Figure 4F.26:	Wire centers serving areas with the highest population density exhibit the fewest number of out-of-service conditions per 100 access lines and, under Verizon management, improved over the period.	294
Figure 4F.27:	Service outages tend to be shorter in wire centers serving the more densely populated areas.	294
Figure 4F.28:	Wire centers serving the more densely populated areas tend to clear a higher percentage of out-of-service conditions within 24 hours.	295
Figure 4F.29:	The number of days needed to clear 90% of service outages is shortest for wire centers serving more densely populated areas.	295
Figure 4F.30:	Operating Areas responsible for wire centers serving the more densely populated area exhibit the fewest number of out-of-service conditions per 100 access lines.	298
Figure 4F.31:	Service outages tend to be shorter in those Operating Areas serving more densely populated areas.	298
Figure 4F.32:	Operating Areas serving the more densely populated areas have the best record of clearing a high percentage of out-of-service conditions within 24 hours.	299

Table of Contents

Figure 4F.33: The number of days needed to clear 90% of service outages is shortest for those Operating Areas serving the largest and most densely populated areas.	299
5: INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: AT&T	301
Introduction	304
Network operation, maintenance and construction	304
Plant maintenance and capital investment	306
Summary and conclusions	348
Tables	
Table 5.1: AT&T California 2010-2017 Outside Plant Rehabilitation Investment in Relation to Total Gross Plant Additions	307
Table 5.2: AT&T California 2010-2017 Outside Plant Rehabilitation Investment in Relation to Total Outside Plant Gross Additions	307
Table 5.3: AT&T California Total 2010-2017 Gross Plant Additions from Various Data Sources	309
Table 5.4: AT&T California Gross Annual Outside Plant Additions 2010-2017	309
Table 5.5: AT&T California Gross 2010-2017 Plant Additions by Plant Category	310
Table 5.6: AT&T California 2013-2017 TFS Outside Plant Rehabilitation Expenses in Relation to Total Outside Plant Maintenance Costs	311
Table 5.7: AT&T California Changes in the Mix of Gross Telecommunications Plant in Service	312
Table 5.8: AT&T California Total Cable & Wire Gross Additions (Acct 2410) and Construction & Engineering OSP Rehab Expenditures by Wire Center 2013-2017	314

Table of Contents

Table 5.9:	AT&T California Total Cable & Wire Maintenance Expenses (Acct 6410) and Technical Field Services OSP Rehab Expenditures by Wire Center 2013-2017	328
Table 5.10:	AT&T California Total Cable & Wire Gross Additions (Acct 2410) and C&E OSP Rehab Expenditures – 50 Wire Centers with Largest Plant Additions 2013-2017	344
Table 5.11:	AT&T California Total Cable & Wire Maintenance Expenses (Acct 6410) and Technical Field Services OSP Rehab Expenditures – 50 Wire Centers with Highest Cable & Wire Maintenance Expenditures 2013-2017	346
6:	INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: FRONTIER	349
	Introduction	351
	Frontier California’s Outside Plant Maintenance, Inspection, and Repair Programs	352
	Plant maintenance and capital investment	357
	Fiber-to-the-Premises upgrades	365
	Summary and conclusions	366
	Tables	
Table 6.1:	Frontier California Gross Outside Plant Additions per Frontier Response to DR-03F 2016-2017	358
Table 6.2:	Frontier California Gross Outside Plant Additions per Frontier Response to DR-04F 2016-2017	358
Table 6.3:	Frontier California Outside Plant Gross Additions by Wire Center 2016-2017	359
Table 6.4:	Frontier California Gross Outside Maintenance Expenses 2016-2017	364
Table 6.5:	Frontier California Gross Outside Plant Additions from Various Sources 2016-2017	365
7:	AT&T CORPORATE AND CALIFORNIA ILEC INVESTMENT POLICIES	367

Table of Contents

Introduction	370
Competition and deregulation	372
AT&T California remains the underlying provider of most retail local network services being offered under the AT&T California or other AT&T affiliate brand names	373
The AT&T California component of parent AT&T Inc. revenues have been steadily diminishing, as has the share of the overall AT&T capital budget that is being allocated to the California ILEC.	374
AT&T California’s response to the rapidly eroding demand for legacy POTS services has not been to cut prices to retard such “cord-cutting,” but instead to implement large rate increases so as to “harvest” as much revenue from the remaining POTS customers as long as they continue to retain their service	378
AT&T California has been consistently disinvesting in its California local network infrastructure.	380
Persistent disinvestment, extensive affiliate transactions at self-serving transfer prices, extraordinarily large rate increases, and deteriorating service quality all point to “harvesting” as AT&T California’s overarching strategy for its legacy services and customers.	386
Wireline voice services have not been the focus of AT&T California’s capital investments over the 2010-2017 period.	386
Investments at individual wire centers	393
Summary and conclusions	409
Tables	
Table 7.1: AT&T California and AT&T Inc. Total Operating Revenues 2010-2017	375
Table 7.2: AT&T California and AT&T Inc. Legacy Switched Access Lines in Service 2010-2017	375
Table 7.3: AT&T California Operating Revenues Decreased, but by Far less than the Decrease In Legacy Switched Access Lines 2010-2017	376

Table of Contents

Table 7.4:	AT&T California Legacy Switched Access Line Revenues Have Decreased by a Greater Percentage than for Total Operating Revenues Generally, but Still by Far less Than the Decrease in Legacy Switched Access Lines 2010-2017	377
Table 7.5:	AT&T California Net Income and Dividend Payments to Parent AT&T Inc. 2010-2017	380
Table 7.6	AT&T California Pattern of Investment 2010-2017	381
Table 7.7	AT&T California Affiliate Transactions with Other Units of AT&T Inc. 2010-2017	384
Table 7.8:	AT&T California Gross Plant Additions 2010-2017	388
Table 7.9:	AT&T California Digital Electronic Switching Gross Additions and Retirements 2010-2017	389
Table 7.10:	AT&T California Circuit Equipment Gross Additions and Retirements 2010-2017	390
Table 7.11:	AT&T California Gross Plant Additions 2010-2017	392
Table 7.12:	AT&T California Gross Additions per Access Line in Service – 30 Wire Centers with the Lowest Per-Line Expenditures	394
Table 7.13:	AT&T California Gross Additions per Access Line in Service – 30 Wire Centers with the Highest Per-Line Expenditures	395
Table 7.14:	AT&T California Gross Additions per Access Line in Service	396
8:	VERIZON/FRONTIER CORPORATE AND CALIFORNIA ILEC INVESTMENT POLICIES	411
	Frontier’s 2016 acquisition of Verizon’s ILEC operations in California, Texas & Florida	415
	A brief history of Frontier	420
	Frontier retains its critical role in the California telecommunications infrastructure	431

Table of Contents

Verizon California revenues had been steadily diminishing, as had its share of the overall parent company Verizon Communications, Inc. capital budget that was being allocated to the California ILEC.	432
Verizon California had been consistently disinvesting in its California local network infrastructure.	438
The focus of Verizon/Frontier California’s capital investments over the 2010-2017 period	443
Summary and conclusions	448
 Tables and Figures	
Table 8.1: Frontier Communications, Inc. Customer Counts by Service Category, 2016-2018	418
Table 8.2: Verizon ILEC Divestitures and Frontier ILEC Acquisitions, 2005-2016	421
Table 8.3: Frontier and Verizon Total Switched Access Lines in Service (Nationwide – 2000-2014)	422
Table 8.4: Verizon California and Verizon Communications Inc. Total Operating Revenues	433
Table 8.5: Verizon California and Verizon Communications Inc. Legacy Switched Access Lines in Service	434
Table 8.6: Verizon/Frontier California Average Legacy Switched Access Lines in Service, 2010-2015	435
Table 8.7: Verizon/Frontier Operating Revenues Decreased, but by Far Less than the Decrease in Legacy Switched Access Lines, 2010-2017	435
Table 8.8: Verizon California (U-1002) Legacy Switched Access Line Revenues Have Decreased Roughly in Proportion to the Decrease in Legacy Switched Access Lines, 2011-2015	436
Table 8.9: Verizon/Frontier California Basic Residential (POTS) Access Line Service Rate Increase History, 2006-2018	437

Table of Contents

Table 8.10:	Verizon/Frontier California (U-1002) Net Income and Dividend Payments to Parent Companies, 2010-2017	438
Table 8.11:	Verizon/Frontier California (U-1002) Pattern of Investment, 2010-2017	439
Table 8.12:	Verizon California (U-1002) Affiliate Transactions with Other Verizon Units, 2011-2015	441
Table 8.13:	Verizon California Gross Plant Additions, 2010-2015	444
Table 8.14:	Frontier California Pattern of Investment, 2016-2017	445
Table 8.15:	Frontier California ■ Wire Centers That Accounted for 75% of 2016-17 Gross Plant Additions	447
Figure 8.1:	Frontier Communications stock prices 2015-2018	416
Figure 8.2:	Frontier and Verizon Total Switched Access Lines in Service between 2000 and 2014.	420
Figure 8.3:	Following of its acquisitions, Frontier's revenue resumed its pattern of steady erosion, producing a sort of "sawtooth" effect.	422
Figure. 8.4:	As with revenues, each of Frontier's major ILEC acquisitions produced a large, one-time spike in total access lines served, followed in each instance by a steady drop-off in demand following the acquisition, producing a similar type of "sawtooth" effect.	423
Figure 8.5:	Each of Frontier's major ILEC purchases involved substantial debt financing, almost quadrupling between 2010 and its peak in 2017.	426
Figure 8.6:	While its various acquisitions produced large increases in the number of customers and total operating revenues, their impact upon Frontier's net earnings was a succession of steep declines.	429
Figure 8.7:	Frontier's cumulative five-year total return in comparison to the five-year total return for all S&P 500 Index stocks and for all S&P Telecommunications Services Index stocks.	430
9:	ASSESSMENT OF SAFETY, REDUNDANCY AND RESILIENCY OF NETWORK(S): AT&T	449

Table of Contents

Introduction	452
Central office and PSAP redundancy	452
Central office connection redundancy	452
Public Safety Answering Point routing redundancy	456
Back-up power requirements and availability	468
Central offices	468
Electronic field equipment	482
Allocation of resources and labor in the event of major emergencies	482
Redundancy and resiliency processes and procedures in emergencies	483
West Region Disaster Preparedness	483
Disaster First Strike Team (DFST)	485
Summary	486
 Tables and Figures	
Table 9.1: AT&T California – Central Office Switch Entities with Route Diversity to the Public Switched Network	457
Table 9.2: AT&T California – Central Office Switch Entities with Public Switched Network and PSAP Route Diversity	459
Table 9.3: AT&T California – Central Office Back-up Power Minimum Requirements and Availability	469
Figure 9.1: The Public Switched Network is organized in a hierarchical structure	453
Figure 9.2: Diverse physical routing. Class 5 central office (on right) has connectivity to [REDACTED] tandem switches (diverse routing); Class 5 central office (on left) has connectivity to [REDACTED] tandem (no diverse routing).	455

Table of Contents

10: ASSESSMENT OF SAFETY, REDUNDANCY AND RESILIENCY OF NETWORK(S): FRONTIER	487
Introduction	490
Central office and PSAP redundancy	490
Central office connection redundancy	490
Public Safety Answering Point routing redundancy	502
Back-up power requirements and availability	509
Central Offices	509
Electronic Field Equipment	512
Allocation of resources and labor in the event of major emergencies	512
Redundancy and resiliency processes and procedures in emergencies	513
Summary	514
Tables and Figures	
Table 10.1: Frontier California Central Offices with Physical and/or Logical Diverse Connections to the PSTN	496
Table 10.2: Frontier California Central Offices with No Diversity	498
Table 10.3: Frontier California Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and Host Central Offices	503
Table 10.4: Frontier California Central Offices with at Least 8 Hours of Back-up Power	510
Figure 10.1: Frontier Network Map Legend	491
Figure 10.2: Portion of Frontier network in rural areas of central California.	592
Figure 10.3: Illustrative host/remote central office configuration.	593

Table of Contents

Figure 10.4:	Portion of Frontier network in Los Angeles and Orange Counties.	594
Figure 10.5:	Handling of E911 calls via Selective Routers and Automatic Line Identification (“ALI”) database lookups.	506
Figure 10.6:	Frontier’s network and PSAPs connections serving California’s [REDACTED].	508
11:	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	515
	A persistent and long-term service quality problem for legacy services	518
	Recommendations	524
	Managing the transition from legacy to current technology services	530
	Conclusion	532
	Tables and Figures	
Table 11.1:	AT&T California Wire Center Size vs. Access Line Losses 2010-2017	518
Table 11.2:	AT&T California Weighted Average Median Household Income in Wire Centers with and without Fiber Upgrades	521
Figure 11.1:	Out-of-service incidents per 100 access lines in service is lowest in the highest income areas, highest in the lowest income areas.	519
Figure 11.2:	Out-of-service duration is shortest in highest income areas.	519
Figure 11.3:	Areas with highest household incomes also have the highest percentage of outages cleared within 24 hours.	520
Figure 11.4:	High income areas generally require the fewest days to clear 90% of out-of-service conditions.	520
12:	COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION STAFF SITE VISITS	535
	Introduction	439

Table of Contents

Criteria for Selecting Site Visits for Network Exam	539
AT&T	539
Frontier	540
Site Visit Guidelines	541
Methodology	541
AT&T Trip Reports	542
Marin County – Nicasio, Inverness and San Geronimo	542
Marin County Photographs	545
Mendocino County – Boonville, Fort Bragg, Potter Valley and Hopland	548
Mendocino County Photographs	551
Sutter, El Dorado and Nevada Counties: Pleasant Grove, Nicolaus, Georgetown, Lake of the Pines and Placerville	554
Sutter, El Dorado and Nevada County Photographs	557
San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties: Menlo Park and Los Altos	560
Menlo Park and Los Altos Photographs	562
Frontier Trip Reports	564
Santa Clara County – Blossom Hill and Montebello Central Offices in Los Gatos	564
Los Gatos (Blossom Hill and Montebello) Photographs	566
Tables and Figures	
Table 12.1: AT&T California Physical Site Visit Locations	540
Table 12.2: Frontier California Physical Site Visit Locations	541

Table of Contents

Table 12.3:	Marin County Physical Site Visit Information	543
Table 12.4:	Mendocino County Physical Site Visit Information	546
Table 12.5:	Sutter, El Dorado and Nevada Counties Physical Site Visit Information	554
Table 12.6:	Sam Mateo and Santa Clara Counties Physical Site Visit Information	561
Table 12.7:	Los Gatos – Blossom Hill and Montebello Physical Site Visit Information	564
Figure 12.1.	Marin County Site Visit Locations	543
Figure 12.2.	Mendocino County Site Visit Locationsz	549
Figure 12.3.	Lack of broadband in Potter Valley (map shows the town, not full exchange area)	551
Figure 12.4.	Sutter, El Dorado and Nevada Counties	555
Figure 12.5.	Menlo Park and Los Altosz	561
Figure 12.6.	Los Gatos Central Offices	565
	Site Visit Request Letter (Sample with redactions)	569
	Exchange Maps provided by AT&T	571
	Exchange Maps from AT&T – Menlo Park and Los Altos	571
	Exchange Maps from Frontier - Montebello and Blossom Hill (Los Gatos)	572
Figure 12.7.	Map of Inverness Exchange	573
Figure 12.8.	Map of Nicasio Exchange	574
Figure 12.9.	Map of San Geronimo Exchange	575
Figure 12.10.	Map of Boonville Exchange	576
Figure 12.11.	Map of Fort Bragg Exchange	577

Table of Contents

Figure 12.12.	Map of Potter Valley Exchange	578
Figure 12.13.	Map of Pleasant Grove Exchange	579
Figure 12.14.	Map of Nicolaus Exchange	580
Figure 12.15.	Map of Lake of the Pines Exchange	581
Figure 12.16.	Map of Georgetown Exchange	582
Figure 12.17.	Map of Georgetown Exchange	583
Figure 12.18.	Map of Menlo Park Exchange	584
Figure 12.19.	Map of Los Altos Exchange	585
Figure 12.20.	Map of Montebello Exchange	586
Figure 12.21.	Map of Blossom Hill Exchange	587

APPENDICES

4A-1	Individual wire center service quality data – AT&T California
4V-1	Individual wire center service quality data – Verizon California
4F-1	Individual wire center service quality data – Frontier California