

Public Hearing Testimony: Energy & Technology Committee
HB-5462 AAC Mobile Telephone Charges
March 8, 2010

Bill Reid
16 Scofield Road
Colchester, CT 06415

To The Energy & Technology Committee:

Thank you for allowing me to submit testimony in support of HB-5462.

In May of 2009, our cell phone (my son's but under my name) was up for renewal with Verizon. We did go to a local Verizon retailer in Colchester who did not have the phone that we wanted. We therefore ordered the phone on-line. The on-line ordering did not allow an option for declining Internet service. We chose the least expensive option that was a pay by the kilobyte that referenced only synchronizing e mail. No where was it stated about paying for any other service than that.

On 6/21/09, I received e mail notification for my Verizon bill. I checked it and found a bill for \$1700. I immediately called Verizon and asked about it and was told that it was for Internet service, not e-mail synchronization as was advertised. I asked if the phone could be disabled for Internet access and they told me, yes, all I had to do was call and ask to not allow it.

In order to waive the \$1700, and the \$1200 more that was coming on the next bill, Verizon (Stacey Riley) told me that the charges would be waived if I picked up a retroactive charge for \$44.99 per month for Internet access and kept it for the term of the agreement. I agreed to that to waive the charges.

We were at the Waterford Verizon store for another matter, we were talking about the incident and they were appalled that I would be made to take this plan. They switched it to a \$29.99 per month charge instead.

I feel that Verizon was misleading in their plan descriptions and should be required (all cellular carriers, not just Verizon) to allow "no Internet access" as the default in a contract and have to have customers make a decision to choose Internet access.

Thank you,

Bill Reid