

60001122244.txt

Congratulations FCC! You've successfully reduced competition in my area and assured that our prices will increase in the near future. You, the politicians, and the AT&T-DirectTV executives are probably having a great time with this, but nobody I know of is kicking their heels up and celebrating.

I use to work for BellSouth, was a good company to work for...until AT&T came along and took over. I survived that merger for a while. As an employee I had great concessions on their wireless and U-Verse services, but family and friends were complaining about post-merger customer service going to hell and their rates going up. AT&T does not care about the customer at all (or for their employees to be honest since people lost their job due to the merger), and I'm quite sure the conditions set forth for AT&T to meet from that merger were never met. Strong chance they won't meet conditions of this merger either. AT&T has no interest other than making itself and the executives richer. I remember the topic of rural broadband kept coming up in company town hall meetings (both BellSouth and AT&T timeframes) and the executives kept dodging the question by claiming it wasn't in the company's best interest to pursue it. Truth is they didn't want to even think about servicing the rural areas. Most of my family lives in those areas and some of them just got U-Verse Internet in late 2013! The thing is, it can be done. We all know the technology is there and AT&T has enough money to make it happen, but they do not have any concern for rural America.

At the beginning of 2010, I and several others were forced to either hit the unemployment line or take a hideous job with their Israeli contractor (who was prone to laying people off every quarter regardless if you're doing a good job or not), simply because AT&T was concerned about their bottom line. Due to financial obligations, I had to take the hideous job until something better came along. Since I was forced out, I lost all concessions, and my bill with AT&T tripled. Since my wallet is not deep like that of an executive or a politician, I had to make changes. So I switched to a competitor for the TV service who, at the time but no longer the case, had a much better price...DirectTV. The other satellite providers and the \*ONLY\* cable company that services my subdivision (and I emphasize ONLY) didn't have better prices for me. Plus I dealt with that cable company before and they absolutely suck. Now that you've allowed these two corporate giants to merge, choices are reduced and prices will increase as history has proven.

I had AT&T's U-Verse installed in 2009 after the merger with BellSouth. Since then I've knocked it down to just Internet and the only other Internet option is the \*ONLY\* cable company that services my subdivision and as stated before, they suck. AT&T charged me \$48 for the month of February 2013. March 2013, it jumped to \$53 due to increase in the price for the speed I was getting and a brand new "High Speed Internet Equipment Fee". Why?? Where is the justification?? This fee is illogical since the equipment was installed in 2009 and neither the equipment nor the service has changed. Obviously AT&T invented this fee to milk more money from their customers (just wish that cable company didn't suck). Price stayed at \$53/month until March 2014...they doubled their "High Speed Internet Equipment Fee"...now \$55/month. April 2014...another increase...now \$60/month. March 2015...another increase...\$61/month. June 2015...just a little more...\$61.36/month, and that's what I'm being charged now. They have not changed any equipment out or increased my speed, so why in the hell are they creating bogus fees and increasing their prices????????? Why did you and the Alabama PSC allow this to happen?????

DirectTV is not exempt from complaints on price increases either, but the biggest problem I have currently, and I'm sure others do also, is paying for channels that I do not watch and have no interest in watching. Why can we not just pay for the channels we the consumers want and not have to pay for a "package" of channels that may only have 2 or 3 that interest me?? Why is that such a difficult concept for TV providers and the FCC? They've increased their prices and I've had to go to a lower package to compensate, more than twice from what I remember.

Now fast forward to 2015...FCC has given the go ahead for a fat telecom to get even fatter by absorbing a fat satellite TV provider. Guess I can expect one single huge bill arriving in my email inbox in the near future with AT&T plastered all over it.

60001122244.txt

Randall Stephenson may be jumping for joy, but safe to say a majority of Americans are not. I expect in the next few decades we'll see AT&T Divestiture Part Deux happening since the FCC will likely let them absorb all remaining telecom and TV providers.

In the Gettysburg address Abraham Lincoln referred to the government as "of the people, by the people, for the people". I think it is safe to say that he's rolling in his grave due to what the government has become... "of the corporations, by the corporations, for the corporations". Guess it's time to rename the government to "USA, Inc. (part of the AT&T family)" and issue an IPO...