

Mali Henigman
494 27th Ave., #26
San Francisco CA 94121

Jun 18th 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,

After years of bait-and-switch from AT&T and their affiliate DirecTV, Sonic was recommended to me. I was forced to pay a penalty to end my association with AT&T after they enrolled me in a plan I had not asked for, but it was worth it not to have to deal with them any longer. At no time did I have satisfactory service from them. Costs skyrocketed; one always had to re-negotiate and it was never to the advantage of the customer. Dealing with them was always frustrating. Everything was extra and the bills each month were always different. Long distance was exorbitant, so I went without it for years, using long distance cards. AT&T was a nightmare. I ended my plan with DirecTV for the same reason and now am perfectly happy with antenna TV and Netflix.

I looked into Comcast. Every indication after phone conversations and investigation informed me it would be no better and just as expensive.

Sonic is a fantastic provider. When I call, I speak to a human who does follow-up on all calls. Unlimited national and international long distance is included in the monthly bill. When physical presence from techs is required, they come in a timely fashion and always show up when they say they will, unlike AT&T. The techs are knowledgeable and responsible. I had recently been hospitalized; my phone connection two days after I returned home was not working. I called from a friend's phone, telling them I needed to be reached by my doctors at all times, and the next day, they were here to fix the problem. When a module wears out, a new one is provided. Free of charge. My bill each month remains the same, within a few pennies more or less, depending on the fluctuation of state taxes. No bait-and-switch. Just excellent service. Real humans to speak with. Managers who call to make sure everything has been fixed to my satisfaction. My internet is completely reliable. My monthly bill includes phone (with the aforementioned long distance) and internet. It is affordable. The service is exemplary.

The question is why the FCC would not support this type of a company that supports its community. It must be greed of the larger companies that abhor competition. Aren't they big enough that they don't have to go after smaller providers? It must be that the smaller providers actually provide service the bigger companies don't want or need to provide their customers. I remember learning about monopolies when I was growing up, how bad they were, and why

competition was necessary for a healthy democracy. This is not a driving force any longer, it seems. Back to robber barons, eh? The FCC is supposed to exist for the benefit of American citizens as a watchdog of good business and communications, regardless of party affiliation. No more. The FCC has a duty to the citizens of this country to provide necessary, competent, and affordable telecommunication to all, including rural communities. This is why the FCC exists, not to be at the beck and call of big business to the detriment of the citizens of this country. To be there to protect the rights of all citizens to receive fair and unbiased communications on the airways and to be able to make sure everyone can afford a means of communication from phone and internet services. Please do remember this.

Sincerely,

Mali Henigman