

David Hauer  
1441 Acton Crescent  
Berkeley CA 94702

Nov 12th 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.

I live in and run a small business in Berkeley, California. My Internet and phone service are currently provided by Sonic.net; previously, I used DSL Extreme. I have several friends and clients who have been using another local ISP, LMI.net, for years. The assertion that In the residential marketplace, competition will not be materially affected by forbearance from Section 251(c)(3) because there is effectively no remaining UNE-based competition in that marketplace is patently false.

Meanwhile, as a computer consultant, I support numerous clients who use Comcast or AT&T, and so have considerable understanding of what its like to be a customer of one of those behemoths. I am very happy to have the choice to go with a smaller, local provider; the customer service is in a different league, and the pricing is often better, to boot.

I will add that in my area, Sonic has offered new technologies (fiber being the most recent) and/or advantageous pricing or bundles before they were offered by AT&T. Its pretty clear that the competition afforded by Sonic is what has pushed AT&T to offer similar services and/or pricingand that, without such competition, I and many of my neighbors, community-members, and other fellow Americans would be worse off.

Its also clear that Section 251(c)(3) of the 1996 Telecom Act has been, and continues to be, an important factor in the viability of smaller providers nationwideand that its elimination or dismantling would have profound, deleterious impacts.

Please leave the provisions of Section 251(c)(3) intact.

Thank you.

David Hauer