Hello,

ISP’s should not be regulated using the rhetoric in older acts, such as the telecommunications act of 1996. “Promoting competition in the local telecommunications market” is vague and concerning language. This could very well pave the way for companies to create ‘slow’ and ‘fast’ lanes for internet speeds, throttle websites of their choosing, or include certain internet-based services for more money in package deals. Title II is a fair classification and does not need reevaluation.

Having a free, open internet is very important to me. I moved away from my home in London when I was 10 and I have benefited from free and reliable streaming, messaging, and web-chatting to keep in touch with my family. I can’t imagine how I would have grown up without seeing my family through regular Skype calls and Facebook video chats. If Title II is ended, displaced people like me may not have this opportunity to stay in touch with the ones they love.

I also rely on a free, open, unrestricted internet for my education and professional career. I am a member of many online scientific communities and programs. These groups benefit me in my choices of career options, networking opportunities, and for me to progress in my own work. I have published multiple scientific papers and abstracts online that I believe should be readily available for anyone to view.

Again, I believe the Title II is fair and the categorization of the internet should not require a rehearing. Many courts and companies alike have spoken about priced “fast lanes” that would have to be implemented if Title II is removed. This is against what I, and countless others, believe in.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,

Holly Hurding - Jones