

To whom it may concern:

I worked at a gas distribution company during the years of deregulation in the late 80s and early 90s. Before that time, our service offering was bundled gas sales. You could buy the gas from us and we got it from the producer and distributed it to each customer. After deregulation, a customer could go directly to the producer and negotiate their own gas prices and we, the distribution company, HAD to distribute it to you. The price we could charge is identical to the price we charged our bundled customers. We could not charge any more for distribution to a customer large enough to buy their own gas. This had the effect of creating a competitive market on the product. The distribution of it was not the target for competition and with good reason. There is infrastructure required to distribute. What if anybody who wanted to could tear up the street and put a pipe in it? Even if they were willing to and there was a business case, it's not better to have tons of pipes and tons of streets torn up.

This internet situation is very much like gas deregulation. It requires infrastructure and the best target for competition is the product. The competition needs to be focused on the content providers. If you focus on the wire or the fiber optic, you sacrifice the competition of the content. At the very least, if you are going to allow providers to charge more or less for certain things, then they MUST NOT be able to also provide content nor have the same parent company. By having both the content, and be able to out-price the competition, you actually destroy competition.

Please take this into consideration-

Debbie Lima

29382 Vista Plaza Dr

Laguna Niguel, CA 92677