



Energy and Technology Committee

March 9, 2021

Testimony Opposing:

Senate Bill 4, *An Act Concerning Data Privacy, Net Neutrality, Cyber Security And Fairness In Data Usage In The New Age Of A Digital Workforce.*

Allison M. Ellis, Senior Vice President, Frontier Communications

Chairman Needleman, Chairman Arconti, Senator Formica, Representative Ferraro, and distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony opposing parts of Senate Bill 4, *An Act Concerning Data Privacy, Net Neutrality, Cyber Security And Fairness In Data Usage In The New Age Of A Digital Workforce.*

Section 1 of the bill creates an unnecessary and onerous regulatory burden on the States broadband internet service providers. It also ignores that fact that Internet service providers doing business in Connecticut have already committed to abide by core net neutrality principles. Further, federal action is highly likely on this subject, and it is imperative that we avoid a patchwork of contradictory state Net Neutrality laws that vary state by state.

Frontier Communications has a strong history of supporting protections of consumer privacy but has serious concerns with Section 2. It seems to add unnecessary and confusing layers of requirements on both Connecticut consumers and providers and disrupt normal business operations unconnected to advertising. The Federal government is considering legislation affecting consumer privacy, and a uniform approach with a collaboratively crafted and comprehensive policy will best ensure transparency and protect against data misuse. Contradictory state laws are not only impossible for multi-state businesses like Frontier to implement but also create customer confusion and are contrary to the goal of data privacy laws that are fair, actionable and effective.

Section 3 of the bill requires the Public utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) to open a docket which is already open. In Docket No. 19-01-52, *PURA Investigation of Developments in the Third Party Pole Attachment Process*, PURA is already actively investigating the very issues as described in the bill.

There is also no need to reference the temporary attachment process in statute. Frontier (and the other pole owners) have undertaken aggressive work to manage the application volume and have liberally allowed third parties to “temporarily” attach while the application is still being processed. In fact, from 2017 to 2020, third parties placed over 44,000 temporary attachments on Frontier jointly owned poles (which will be converted to permanent attachments when the license process is complete).

Further, the fines in Section 3 are punitive and unrealistic and do not take into account the unprecedented increases in the amount of attachment applications.

For these reasons we respectfully request that you oppose sections 1, 2 and 3 of Senate Bill 4.