

Stephen Armstrong
1732 Washington St Apt 3
San Francisco CA 94109

Jun 17th 2019

Via ECFS
Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: In the Matter of Petition of USTelecom for Forbearance Pursuant to
47 U.S.C. Section 160(c); WC Docket No. 18-141; Category 1**

Dear FCC,

I believe it's the job of the FCC to promote all available forms of communication, hence the name, Federal Communications Commission. As such, the suggestion by the FCC to remove a form of communication, namely bundled copper internet transmission, literally goes against the FCC's mission statement. The United States, in some places, might as well be in 1962. In what we will refer to as "the boondocks" of America, there is no national FCC requirement to have a cable company, which would then provide ISP service. If you remove the ability to transmit internet data over bundled copper in those areas, you will literally be denying internet access to tens of thousands, if not millions, of people. I live in San Francisco, a city of almost a million people, also touted as a technological center of our nation. By the way, the only way I can get internet access with any level of speed is through sonic.net ISP, which provides me 1.5 Mbps service over bundled copper, as well as landline phone service. The last time we had a city-wide power outage, all the cell phone towers went down as well. This meant that no one could make calls or get internet over their phones or digital modems. I, however, had landline phone service during the outage because telephone landlines have their own power! All I needed was a UPS for my DSL modem, and I would have been one of very few in the city to have phone AND internet during this power outage! This ability to have phone and internet during power outages is a key feature of bundled copper internet delivery service. It is a key reason why I chose sonic.net as my phone company and ISP provider. They provide me with both services for 1/3 the cost I would have to pay otherwise through AT&T and any other ISP in the area. Your proposal to end or severely limit internet access over bundled copper, therefore, runs contrary to your Commission's purpose, which is to ENSURE active competition through a level playing field policy. I am here by making you aware that I would be materially affected if your proposal were to be implemented, specifically, tripling my telephone and internet access costs, forcing me to use two companies instead of one for these services. If I have to go back to AT&T telephone service, I would be reduced to 384 kbps DSL service once again, because that company cannot deliver my internet service at any higher rate over my existing copper line. Advanced companies such as sonic.net utilize technologies that literally triple the speed of transmission over the same exact physical copperline. This does not require any infrastructure updating whatsoever, so it is a zero cost alternative option to cable provided internet. Cable provided internet with phone service, again, is three times the cost of what sonic.net can deliver to me. I believe you have become beholden to cable company lobbyists, and their moneys, as

evidenced by your Commission's willingness to even contemplate this change. Frankly, the FCC should be happy to license and regulate internet communications over spaghetti pasta, should it ever become technologically feasible! It is not the FCC's job to reduce options for communications. Rather, the FCC's job is exactly the opposite of that. So I urge you to follow that imperative and ignore calls from lobbyists to end a form of communication in the United States for their own financial reasons.

Stephen Armstrong