

Ted Haining
1115 18th Ave
Redwood City CA 94063

Jun 19th 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 am very concerned about news regarding efforts to deregulate UNE sales to independent competitive broadband providers in favor of incumbents.

In my home, I have pre-ordered fiber optic broadband from a local competitive provider, Sonic. My choice to do this is based on two factors. The first is quality of product. I have experience working with Sonic in two previous contexts. A school where my wife taught switched their DSL service from AT&T to Sonic between 2006 and 2008. AT&T was requiring the school to purchase a DSL loop from a Central Office a significant distance away, providing a level of bandwidth that was mediocre, at best. Sonic was able to connect to a Remote Terminal across the street from the school, providing a superior product at a very competitive price point.

The second factor is customer service. As a computer industry professional, I assisted my wife by providing volunteer IT support. As such, I had to deal with Sonic when issues arose with broadband service. As a local provider, Sonic provides a locally-based, superior level of customer service and responsiveness compared to large providers like AT&T. Based on that experience, I recommended Sonic to my father-in-law when he was moving into an assisted living facility to obtain DSL broadband. Here again, he and I both have found that Sonic provides a high level of customer service when problems with his DSL service sometimes occur.

Finally, let me register my general complaint about the philosophy taken by the FCC toward the telecommunications sector in general. Actions such as this to deregulate UNEs seem to stem from a notion that "health of the marketplace" and "deregulation to spur innovation" actually means favoring a small number of well established players, and boosting their profits, rather than providing much in the way of options for consumers on the ground. Looking around at the telecommunications, software, entertainment, health insurance, banking, and other industries, the desired meaning of the word "marketplace" to government regulators means perhaps 2-4 large conglomerates in a given sector that are big enough and profitable enough to effectively register their needs and provide steady returns to the financial markets.

In the case of broadband providers, this is particularly egregious. Without independent operators

like Sonic, I have two and only two ways to get broadband in my home: Comcast and AT&T. Both are very large corporations, that have spent much of the last 20 years leveraging their might in content delivery to go on to make large purchases in content production (racking up debt), in the hope of further profits. Until fiber optic service arrived in my neighborhood in the last few months, AT&T wasn't even much of a competitor -- DSL service was (and is) lousy compared to cable due to geography. That leaves me working with Comcast, which has generally left me feeling unimpressed with the customer service or their prices. Yes, I have a bundled service where the number of channels increases every year.... but prices do nothing but go up and up and up, and how much of that TV can I really watch?

I want choice. I want a healthy marketplace. I want innovation. I don't believe that creating a monopoly or a duopoly or whatever is the way to go about it. Let small operators provide competition to incumbent players.

Ted Haining