
NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

FROM THE OFFICE OF DISTRICT 5 COMMISSIONER SANDY JONES

PRESS CONTACT » CARLOS PADILLA » 505-827-4446 » carlos.padilla2@state.nm.us

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 5, 2017

NEWS RELEASE

Complaints of Poor Service, Billing Issues Plague Windstream; Prompt PRC Inquiry

SANTA FE – New Mexico Public Regulation Commission (NMPRC) Chairman Sandy Jones first informed the Commission of potential problems with Windstream Communications affecting communities and customers in southern New Mexico during the Commission’s meeting on April 26. At that time, Chairman Jones stated that his office had been receiving complaints from Sierra and Otero counties, where customers reported sporadic service “at best” for years and others saying they had been without any service for more than a month.

After that, the complaints about Windstream began to flow into the NMPRC from various parts of the state, and seemed to indicate continuous problems in rural areas of New Mexico, ranging from telephone service described as being of “poor quality” to some areas reportedly without any emergency 911 service.

These issues prompted Chairman Jones to seek the support of the Commission and investigate the matter.

As a mid-size carrier, Windstream is subject to the Commission’s Quality of Service Standards, which state that at least 85 percent of the telecommunications company’s service outages be rectified within 24 hours.

The Commission is also looking into whether Windstream may have misused fund support provided through the Universal Service Fund (USF) for purposes other than to “preserve and advance universal service.”

In addition, the Commission will investigate if Windstream has been charging city franchise fees to customers who do not reside within the city’s charging these fees.

The Commission voted 5-0 in support of issuing an order to investigate any potential violations of the New Mexico Telecommunications Act, and whether the Commission should impose sanctions and fines against Windstream if the company is in fact found to be in violation.

###