

J Nackerud
2212 Eunice St.
Berkeley CA 94709

Sep 5th 2018

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,

Starting in 2013, we entered into a serious and detrimental encounter with AT&T, our provider at the time. This was recorded in a six page document titled: AT&T U-verse Debacle, which we will gladly forward to you upon request.

In 2013 AT&T announced that Fiber was coming to our neighborhood.

In August of 2015 we were told (a phone conversation) by an AT&T representative that Fiber was available at our address via U-verse with bandwidth as high as 12Mbps. After looking into this further and being assured that it was true, we agreed to the U-verse installation.

The results were:

Our throughput speed was cut in half; i.e., there was no fiber connection and AT&T had basically lied about availability and throughput benefits. Our DSL connection with our email provider, which AT&T had assured us would remain, was cut-off and an AT&T clone substituted. Our costs were increased and there was ABSOLUTELY no corresponding benefit. In fact, we lost our email connection and our throughput speed was cut in half.

We fought an intense battle with AT&T to regain our original service and they flat out refused to return us to our original state. We learned through others that there was an option known as LMI, a local provider staffed by former AT&T employees that could restore our connectivity and even provide a modest gain in our throughput. We switched to them and that turned out to be true.

The deep question behind all this is why would AT&T engage in such an outright deception? What would they gain? In our opinion, we were involved in an attempt by AT&T to exclude competitors (Earthlink) by rigging control of the DSL connections. It was a battle being fought with the consumer as a peripheral casualty. They are greedy and anti-competitive.

In our dealings with AT&T it seemed they had too many departments that appear to be loosely connected subsidiaries staffed by contract employees. This was often used as their explanation for providing no or unsuitable service. Note: fiber is still not available in our neighborhood.

We chose a competitive provider; LMI, and are keenly aware of how superior they are to AT&T. We would not like to see this relationship imperiled.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment and again, we think you would be very interested in reading our complete AT&T U-verse Debacle notes.

J Nackerud

