

Paul Clark
1100 Lincoln
Napa CA 94558

Sep 10th 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,

We had suffered with the truly poor service we were provided with AT&T coupled with price increases for analog phone line tied to the fire protection system in our commercial office building in Napa, CA. After fifteen years of ownership, we found out, quite by accident that AT&T had failed to even connect one of the two lines. We asked for a refund of the monthly fees and were told that the law required them to only pay back something like 18 months of the fifteen years. So we switched to Sonic. Not only did they take over and properly service the two phone lines, but at no additional charge, they provided internet access so we had a means to connect to our security cameras. And they did this at a monthly cost about half of what AT&T was charging us.

We have also had poor quality service at our two residences that are served by AT&T. They clearly don't really care whether or not you are getting the services for which you pay them. So we will be converting both locations to Sonic in the coming month.

AT&T forced us to leave DSL and move to Uverse, but after TELLING us that DSL was going away, they were unable, for six months to provide Uverse service to one location because they didn't actually have the infrastructure in place to allow them to provide Uverse.

In our primary residence, Uverse was also mandated. Since being forced to take Uverse, we've had about six weeks of no internet service because they are attempting to deliver Uverse over twisted pairs, with no fiber anywhere.

We are concerned about the anti-competitive positions taken by the major telcos. They do as little as they can with their outside plant, to allow them to deliver new services. On the other hand, we find that Sonic is working diligently to provide excellent service at competitive prices. Now they are facing regulatory challenges through your agency. You have done a deplorable job of protecting subscribers with "Do not Call." Do not compound that travesty with siding with the large telcos as they seek to use regulatory issues to thwart their new competition.

For once, do your jobs in favor of the citizens of this country. That would be a welcome change.

Paul Clark