

Robert Armstrong  
1636 Fallen Leaf Drive  
Milpitas CA 95035

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,

If you accept the USTelcom proposal, then I will have a choice of exactly two broadband providers - Comcast or AT&T. That's fewer than I have now, not more! The USTelcom argument that their proposal would increase competition and offer consumers more choices is absurd on its face. There is only one set of wires in my back yard, and no one is adding any new ones. If the companies that own those wires aren't required to share access to them, then they'll be the only game in town.

USTelcom claims that things have changed since 1996 and that today we have VoIP, IPTV, texting, social media, and many other things that didn't exist then. That may be true, however all those still require broadband Internet access and the best way - the only practical way - to provide that to my home is by a wired service. THAT was true in 1996 and is still just as true today. The rules for accessing those wires should not change.

Lastly, the USTelcom argument that freeing ILECs from unbundling obligations will save consumers money is frankly offensive. How many times in the past has the telecom industry promised that "if you just remove this regulation, consumers will save money"? It never happens. USTelcom has no interest in saving consumers money - as a for profit business, they have an interest in increasing their own income at the expense of consumers. It is for precisely this reason that we have regulators, like the FCC, to protect the consumers from oligopolies like this.

Robert Armstrong