

A Diverse Range of Communities Support Net Neutrality

Table of Contents

[Faith Communities](#)

[Educators](#)

[Telecommuters](#)

[Rural Communities](#)

[Disability Communities](#)

[Artists](#)

[Communities of Color](#)

[Human Wellness](#)

Faith Communities

We, as organizations representing many diverse religious traditions, write to share our strong support for net neutrality protections to ensure Internet openness. Strong net neutrality protections are critical to the faith community to function and connect with our members, essential to protect and enhance the ability of vulnerable communities to use advanced technology, and necessary for any organization that seeks to organize, advocate for justice or bear witness in the crowded and over-commercialized media environment.

The faith community's strong contribution to our national dialogue should not be hampered. As the National Council of Churches Resolution on Network Neutrality and Internet Freedom explained, "Faith communities have experienced uneven access to and coverage by mainstream media, and wish to keep open the opportunity to create their own material describing their faith traditions." The Internet is an indispensable medium for people of faith – and others with principled values – to convey views on matters of public concern and religious teachings.

In sum, we are concerned about paid prioritization and other policies that will increase costs and limit opportunities for our organizations and the communities we serve. We urge you to adopt the strongest protections possible to protect an Open Internet and to use the strongest legal authority available so that you can eliminate paid prioritization and that these protections will survive court challenge. Robust net neutrality protections are essential for all sectors of society, including ours.

Letter to FCC from Church World Service, Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice, California (CLUE CA), Conference of Major Superiors of Men, Franciscan Action Network, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, Islamic Society of North America, National Council of Churches, USA Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Trabajo Cultural Caminante, United Church of Christ, OC Inc. and Justice and Witness Ministries, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, and World Association for Christian Communication, North America, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 15, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7522652985>.

I have testified in person before the FCC Commissioners in previous years on this same subject. My position remains the same. First Radio Parish Church of America was founded in 1926. We have been broadcasting in Maine ever since. These days we stream on YouTube. We bring hope. We teach love. We give encouragement to those in despair. We have 50,000 viewers daily. Without Net Neutrality our message of hope and love will be lost to those who need us the most.

Comments of Reverend Panangore, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 17, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019315699>.

My nonprofit, G-dcast, is providing free religious literacy videos to over 4,000 educators and 2 million end viewers to date. People love our content. But we're no Comcast. There's no way we can compete with these mega companies who will pay to make the internet in their image. That's not the future of media that we and other creators on the Internet think is best for Americans.

Comments of Sarah Lefton, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019202383>.

My husband and I work in a religious ministry. Helping not only our parishioners, but also those in need in our community, is often dependent on finding and accessing resources that people need, and the internet facilitates that to a large extent. We help people apply for jobs, find child care and medical providers, and pay their bills online. We also stay in closer touch with other churches across the country. Our resources are very limited. Please help us help others. Keep the internet open.

Comments of Anna Dellermann, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019291987>.

The internet is important to me as an artist of religious art that is not really a viable commercial product but I believe nonetheless deserves the opportunity to be brought before a wider audience. The internet, when relatively free, or, at least, inexpensive, provides me the means to disseminate my artwork. My art can be seen at www.faithartworks.com and also on my Facebook page under my name.

Comments of Don Emond, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018141563>.

I serve as the pastor of a small-town church. We're in the process of establishing our Internet identity; these days, if you don't have a presence on the Web, you may as well not exist. We don't have the budget to compete with big businesses (or even big churches), but we firmly believe that we have something to offer our community. I want the Internet to be a level field of free information rather than an obstacle to our work.

Comments of Benjamin P. Kempfert, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019202758>.

As the minister of a small church I've been able to bring up to 2,000 new users to my website a month by keeping my website fresh and innovative. However, with a pay to play scenario my congregation would not be able to afford much of a web presence and therefore, it would greatly impact how we would be able to grow our church.

Comments of Rev. Sara Quigley Brown, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019189264>.

Educators

I am writing in support of Title II for Net Neutrality to protect first amendment rights, and the democratic growth of the internet.

One only has to consider any other utility. It's absurd to think that the water utility would allow you to take a bath, but slow your water to a trickle if you want to shower. It's absurd to think the power utility would only let you run the Air Conditioning if you bought your AC from Sears. It's absurd to think that the phone company would charge more money if you call your friends than if you called a business.

Moreover, consumer should not have to pay twice to get internet services: Currently, we pay our ISP for internet access, and service providers (e.g., NetFlix) for movies. But the ISP's want to get paid an extra time, by NetFlix also. Consumers should get all the bandwidth they pay for, regardless of the source.

Comments of Michael Douma, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 18, 2014,

<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018214569/>

<http://www.webexhibits.org/>

<http://www.idea.org/>

Libraries and institutions of higher education depend upon an open Internet to carry out their missions and to serve their communities. Our organizations are extremely concerned that broadband Internet access providers that offer services to the general public (i.e., public broadband Internet access providers) currently have the opportunity and financial incentive to block, degrade or discriminate against certain content, services and applications. We thus support strong, enforceable policies and rules to protect and promote an open Internet.

Comments of American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, American Library Association, Association of American Universities, Association of College & Research Libraries, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, Association of Research Libraries, Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, Council of Independent Colleges, EDUCAUSE And Modern Language Association, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 18, 2014,

<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521701640>.

The advent of the digital age has revolutionized both the ways in which the public obtains information and how libraries provide it. While libraries have historically been physical spaces for quiet research and study, today libraries more commonly function as borderless hubs for collaboration, innovation, research, and discovery. Yet libraries' primary role in society remains the same: to provide users with consistent, reliable, and unbiased access to information they need regardless of their age, language, income, physical limitations, geographic barriers, or other circumstance.

Net neutrality is critical not only for the provision of Internet access, but because libraries are increasingly creating and making available content that they themselves host. For example, many academic libraries are part of coalitions that provide educational opportunities online to people around

the world in the form of Massive Open Online Course (MOOCs). MOOCs frequently provide online education in a video format. Many libraries, particularly those at universities, are also providing access to large datasets to promote research and collaboration.

Net neutrality is critical to libraries, their missions, and their patrons. The Internet serves as an important information and communication resource for all users, who are entitled to robust, fast, and dynamic access.

AALL, AAHSL, MLA, and SLA urge the FCC to create open Internet rules that preserve and defend the key principle of network neutrality. We strongly oppose any rules that would give ISPs the ability to offer “paid prioritization” of commercial content, thereby degrading access to the educational and governmental information that ensures Americans’ ability to stay informed. We believe Title II offers most practicable framework under which to do so.

Comments of American Association of Law Libraries (AALL), the Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries (AAHSL), the Medical Library Association (MLA), and the Special Libraries Association (SLA), GN Docket No. 14-28, July 8, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017878245>.

CodeCombat is a Y-Combinator-backed online game that teaches people to code. Since we were founded in early 2013, almost a million people (most of them young American students) have learned the basics and felt the excitement of programming and algorithmic thinking using our platform.

If our startup needs to strike deals with ISPs to prevent technical discrimination of the nature allowed by the Chairman’s proposal, our business will have to divert money from hiring employees and producing content, harming the growth of our business. Most of our competitors, which also have extremely bandwidth-heavy applications, would have to do the same.

Comments of CodeCombat, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 17, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018183094>.

I believe network neutrality must be protected. As a teacher in a public school where students have daily access to technology, I am appalled at the idea that my students could have less access to information because current broadband companies, and not users, to determine which sites predominate on the Internet. Additionally, as an educator who uses various forms of public media as well as paid-for media such as Amazon Prime and Netflix in my classroom, I would hate that my classroom resources might be restricted due to the effectiveness of my internet service if my school corporation chooses the most cost effective (cheaper) broadband service.

Comments of Leslie Wilhelmus, GN Docket No. 14-28, Jan. 8, 2015, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=60001007639>.

As a full time student (distance learning on the internet) in Information Technology and Cyber Security, an entrepreneur in online sales on Etsy and eBay, and while advancing my career, I use the

internet constantly. I believe in what the founders of the internet believed in, that the technology to send and transfer packets should be available to all.

Comments of Kelly Eley, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 15, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019074749>.

For me, the internet's greatest value is the access to educational content at an unprecedented level at an unprecedented price (free in some cases). MOOCs, Youtube tutorials, and other interactive educational content (e.g. Codecademy) are amazing learning tools, open and free for everyone. If cable companies are allowed to charge different rates based on content (e.g. like fast lanes for Netflix users), what will stop them from forcing users to pay premiums to access this rich educational content? Even if cable companies continue to allow free access to these educational resources, we should not give them the power to limit the quality (streaming speed) based on the content.

Comments of Jorge Tenorio, GN Docket No. 14-28, Nov. 13, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=60000979739>.

The Internet is the single more important tool at the average human's disposal. It is a vast repository of incredibly useful knowledge, which allows us to learn new skills like math (khanacademy.org), coding (codecademy.com), or other academia (coursera.org). The internet is a resource that allows us perspective into our natural world (scaleofuniverse.com), and into other cultures (couchsurfing.net). It even allows us to network (linkedin.com), maintain relationships with loved ones (facebook.com), and maybe even find that special someone (okcupid.com). The internet has amazing potential to better our culture as a whole, as it begs us to learn, to search and explore, to quantify and substantiate data, and to connect with others. The internet will usher us as a species into a new era of understanding, and we will all be better for it. To allow any possible hindrance of such a tool would be a mighty step backwards. Let knowledge reign, and don't let anyone create a monopoly (or oligopoly) on the speed, times, or methods at which we access said knowledge.

Comments of Joshua Herbert, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018136573>.

The Internet is important to me because it is how I can continue to grow my education. Through the easy access of videos from online classes, I was able to acquire the necessary tools to reach my current potential. I love the opportunity to enhance my education through sites like coursera.org, edx.org, and codecademy.com. There is an enormous wealth of free knowledge crawling on those sites for anyone with a decent internet connection. I have taken classes from all over the world from the University of London to Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. I love the chance to try classes from MIT and Harvard. So far, I have learned how to code Android apps, Python scripted arcade games, and even some Java. If pay-to-play Internet occurs, I fear that sites like coursera, edx, and codecademy would never exist and may even fail. Those sites all receive strong traffic (with 20K+ registered users per class) and the extra burden of pay-to-play Internet is not something they should be forced to endure, especially since majority of the classes offered on the site are FREE. We live in a day and age where a good education should be affordable to anyone. If pay-to-play Internet occurs, I fear the ripe youths of

America will miss out on many wonderful enriching opportunities. The Internet is not just about cats anymore.

Comments of Melissa, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018136452>.

As a music educator, I use services such as YouTube, Spotify, and Pandora to be an effective and meaningful teacher. If the internet is chopped up and patrolled like some toll booth you will seriously inhibit my ability to teach with in the budget that I am given.

Comments of Derek Scott, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019276288>.

As a teacher opening young minds to the power and wonder of chemistry, I rely on using the internet to provide amazing videos of chemical reactions that I cannot do in class for safety reasons. I use it for videos, worksheets, a way to share ideas with other educators. Keeping net neutrality is important to folks like me who already work in over burdened schools without enough funds to make ends meet. Keep the internet as is! Support educators opening students to the world's cultures, science, music. Help us make connections so our students grow to love learning for life and be curious as adults!

Comments of Jessica McKelder, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019274774>.

Telecommuters

Net neutrality is critical to the viability of teleworking. I am a remote worker, and rely on predictable Internet service to perform my job. I don't just need to remotely interact with my company. I also need to be able to remotely interact with my clients directly, including Federal Civilian agencies, DoD, and credit unions, as well as small health care providers. Net-neutrality ensures our company and our clients are able to satisfy our respective missions.

Comments of Brian Ruf, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018103070>.

As a small business owner who offices remotely from my clients...with a husband that works remotely for an IT company... we both rely completely on open internet access to earn a living.How can we assure that our local telecom company isn't going hurt our work and business for their own gain? Without net neutrality, we can't be assured they won't.

Comments of Leslie Halleck, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018097114>.

The internet is important to me because it allows me to work remotely (in Wisconsin) for my company based in North Carolina. I use the internet for research, web/phone conferences, as well as IP telephony. My family and I enjoy services such as streaming media (video, audio) for entertainment and education. Net neutrality allows me to do all of these things and doesn't limit my use in any way--the way it should be.

Comments of John Shadle, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018148051>.

As an employee who works remotely, the Internet is critical to my livelihood. It's how I conduct meetings, do research, and the platform on which my own code runs. I rely on the network neutrality of the Internet. Please give it the protection it needs and deserves by classifying the Internet as a common carrier.

Comments of Caleb Case, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018143125>.

I am disabled, and work remotely -- I telecommute. If my ISP decides my traffic can be shunted off onto the slow track, I may lose my ability to work.

Comments of Phil Stracchino, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018043763>.

As a telecommuter and web services software developer, I need to have confidence that a) I will be able to continue to work remotely, when my company HQ and most of our customers are hundreds or thousands of miles away, and b) that our customers will be able to use our software without having to worry about net providers throttling their bandwidth or holding their bandwidth for ransom.

Comments of Clay Helberg, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 15, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017992075>.

As an IT professional, I often have to work remotely. The quality and speed of the connection directly affects my efficiency and performance. If my ISP decides that I am exceeding some arbitrary capacity limit and puts me in a "slow lane", it directly threatens my ability to do my job and ultimately, my career. Most areas of the country have an effective ISP monopoly, so it is likely that I have no recourse. Comments of Jason Eberhardt, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 14, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017892615>.

I work remotely as a programmer for a small software development company based out New York. My job, as well as thousands of others who share my position, would become almost impossible if our download and uploads were slowed because we could not afford to pay a premium fee. Uploading our work to remote servers, downloading assets, and communicating with co-workers are all often done on small privately owned databases. Databases that already cost money to maintain. The idea that anyone should have to pay a premium to simply access their own work and materials, because they are not part of a few premier companies, is absurd.

Comments of Luke Irizarry, GN Docket No. 14-28, June 5, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017745672>.

The Internet is essential to my current employment because I telecommute rather than driving 60+ miles to the office. If my ISP decides that my company needs to pay extra in order for me to be able to connect to my corporate network effectively, their answer will be to require me to travel to the office or, even worse, terminate my position for a more local employee. Additionally, I'm not the only employee at the company in this position. While based in Connecticut, we have team members across the country including North Carolina, Montana, Texas and even California.

Comments of Mike Caldwell, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 15, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017992757>.

I use the Internet in both my personal and professional life. As a software engineer working remotely (telecommuting) to develop software applications for Internet-based communication, I am dependent on Internet connectivity directly for my livelihood and on a thriving, broader Internet-based economy to provide a marketplace for our goods.

Comments of David Scherba, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019205807>.

The internet is important to me because I am a person who works remotely for a company in Alaska... 4,5000 miles away from where I live in Ohio. I spend much of my time researching new and innovative ideas, products, and talent - to package for my event clients. I need to know that there will not be barriers to accomplishing my work. If ISP subscribers have an easier time loading websites of high paying companies then my ability to research new talent and bring that talent to my clients, will be challenged - making my job more difficult and increasing the chances that working remotely will not work for my company.

Comments of Gail Palmer, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019293328>.

My name is Tony Sherwood, and I work remotely for an internet-based company called Adafruit. As such, I am among a great many Americans who directly draw their paycheck from a free and open internet. Our economy depends on these companies being able to innovate, and they can't do that when giant incumbents with monopolies over most markets in the US get to pick winners and losers.

Comments of Tony Sherwood, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018130167>.

Rural Communities

We are writing to respectfully ask the Federal Communications Commission to stand up for the fair treatment of rural and Native communities online. We are entrepreneurs, artists, educators, activists, healthcare providers, and devoted community members and we deserve a fair playing field. The Open Internet has given us the opportunity to revitalize Rural America's local economies, share our culture with global audiences, and amplify rural voices in debates shaping our society.

Center for Rural Strategies on behalf of 47 Rural Groups, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 15, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019156149>.

I support an open internet because of what these changes could mean for people in poverty and in remote/rural areas.

I grew up in rural Alaska and West Virginia to a very poor family. We had internet access, which meant that despite my family's struggle and despite poor access to libraries, etc, I was able to find supplemental ways to educate myself beyond what I was getting in school.

Internet access was instrumental in allowing me to advance my education through self-teaching and supplemental/free sources online. If I hadn't had such access, I don't know that I would have ended up in college with a full scholarship (I couldn't have gone to college otherwise), that later allowed me to go

to graduate school also on full scholarship. Closing the door on poor peoples' ability to access open internet means closing the door on education for individuals like myself, where overrun and understaffed school systems are not enough, and without equal access to internet there are little ways to look beyond the walls of generational poverty.

Comments of Rachel Weaver, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 12, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018731479>.

Living in a rural area, I need access to so many different, little sites in order to know what is going on in my community. My local church, library, along with other sites, are vital for my day-to-day living. To remove my access to those, and related sites is harmful to me. I also visit websites on random subjects related to history for research purposes. As this is related to a new venture for income for myself, this will also affect the local and national tax base. I am also a fiber artist, needing to learn new techniques for weaving, felting, knitting, etc. There are many small blogs, etc, that have greatly increased my knowledge, but are very small and run by a single person. For my creativity, I need to see these sites quickly and easily.

Comments of Cynthia L, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 11, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018518806>.

Living in a rural / frontier area I am a local Computer business owner. I am my customers need open access to the internet. No one must be allowed to have faster access by buying so called fast lanes. My web site would be negatively impacted by people who really have no interest in helping local customers at their home or place of business, but because of buying preffered access would end up being the first point of contact.

Comments of Dan Becker, GN Docket No. 14-28, Jan. 22, 2015,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=60001010377>.

Please support net neutrality so us common people will not be sent to the back of the line. I live in a rural area and depend on the Internet for banking, communication , News, shopping, medication ordering & much more. Business Giants should not be given preferential treatment!

Comments of Dan Blackburn, GN Docket No. 14-28, Dec. 4, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=60000985645>.

NO to the TWO TIER system. No, no, no. Living in a rural area our internet capabilities is worse than living in a third world country. What takes our son 5 minutes to download in NYC, takes us 6 hours in rural California. I am horrified at the class society that continues to develop in this country. Freedom of information is one aspect of this discussion, equal access is the other. People moving to our small town now makes their decisions on where to buy based on the quality of the ISPs- which frankly, leaves much to be desired. Who would have thought 5 years ago that the value of your home would now be based on your access to fast reliable internet connections. Please, no to two tier systems...

Comments of Wendy GriffithsBender, GN Docket No. 14-28, Dec. 1, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=60000985215>.

As a small business owner and consumer living in rural central Maine I support the Presidents stand on net neutrality. The cost & availability of access is cumbersome for many in our area. A tiered internet would harm many in my community by making them even more out-of -touch and limiting their opportunities in the world. An even playing field for all in the way the world communicates would be good for all. The wealthy have many ways to have a better product/experience than the average Jane, they don't need to have that on the internet too.

Comments of Rocell Marcellino, GN Docket No. 14-28, Nov. 12, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=60000978134>.

Here, where i live, in rural areas of the country, we take pride in the fact that we're not left behind in the realm of the internet. In fact, businesses can survive in Mt. Shasta only for one reason?the internet. Mt. Shasta Solar is one of the best examples. Although the entirety of "net neutrality" is still unclear to me, i am sure that i'd like to keep the internet the way it is. It does not need Comcast or Time Warner other cable services to "make it better." It's really just fine as it is. Believe it or not, upsetting the balances of the internet can really be unsettling for the entire populace.

Comments of Andrew McLane, GN Docket No. 14-28, Nov. 3, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=60000975766>.

Unless we want to buy all our food staples from foreign countries, we must support our farmers and ranchers ability to conduct their businesses in rural areas. Not a single farmer or rancher can be successful in supplying the basics that our country needs without full internet access. Net Neutrality is no different than supplying electricity or phone service to ALL Americans. It is essential.

Comments of Jan Morrison, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 17, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018183612>.

Disability Communities

Consumer Groups seek to promote equal access for the 48 million Americans who are deaf, hard of hearing, late-deafened, deaf-blind, or deaf with mobility or cognitive disabilities to the informational, educational, cultural, and societal opportunities afforded by the telecommunications revolution. As advocates for technology and telecommunications policy that advances the public interest, RERC-TA and Professor Lewis strongly support the Consumer Groups' goal of ensuring that the fruits of an open Internet are accessible to all Americans—including those with disabilities.

Comments of Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. (TDI), National Association of the Deaf (NAD), Hearing Loss Association of America (HLAA), Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Advocacy Network (DHHCAN), Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center on Telecommunications Access (RERC-TA) and Clayton H. Lewis, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 15, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521707584>

The internet is important to be because, as a young man suffering from a severe, physical disability, I rely on it for information, entertainment, and to aid in the socializing, job-opportunity locating, and support-seeking that I cannot always get out and do on my own. I cannot afford to pay an arm and a leg for faster internet; only have one good leg as is. Without net neutrality, I'm concerned that it'd be significantly more difficult, if not impossible, for me to maintain the connection I currently have with the world despite my inability to regularly leave the house.

Comments of Randy Schneider, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019278139>.

The Internet is important to me because the wealth of uncensored material available is invaluable. My husband is disabled & we are on a fixed income. Each day fewer & fewer things are available without needing to pay a high price. The internet is one area that is an equalizer. Having information accessible to us, just as it is to someone with money is priceless. Please do not add another area where those of us, do to limited resources, are unable to access something that could substantially improve our lives. The ability to obtain information should be a right, not a privilege for only those with money.

Comments of Gayle McBain, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019266540>.

I am a disabled Veteran and the internet and the ability to keep in touch with friends and family keeps my spirits up tremendously. The thought of my internet being taxed (which is what this amounts to) and possibly having to pay extra could make getting my news and current events a much more tedious task. There are far too many people like myself on a fixed income and barely able to make it as it is, please help me to stay socially connected and informed of world events by keeping the internet neutral and equal for all.

Comment of James, GN Docket No. 14-28, Jan. 23, 2015,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=60001010635>.

Simply put as a disabled American I derive a great deal of humor and edification from the internet. A great many innovative sights are where I like to learn and gain a few laughs. Your policy may make these sites too expensive to run and also too expensive to start up.

Comments of Sean Herskowitz, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019285112>.

Because I am a disabled, elderly person, net neutrality is an important issue for me and others like me. It seems in this day and age, corporations run everything, including our government. The internet is a lifeline for those of us either housebound or barely able to get out. Now you may THINK we have a lot of time on our hands so why are we complaining? You and I both know how frustrating it is to wait for something to download. Our stress levels are exactly like everyone else only when we surf the web, we may be looking for important life sustaining issues. Or, yes, we may be playing Mahjong, but this may be the only activity we have. So we are asking your help in keeping corporations out of this part of our lives. This can be a matter of life or death, please try to understand this aspect of it.

Comments of BA McClintock, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019282732>.

As a 67 year old disabled divorcee the Internet is important to me because it allows me to stay informed as to the status of the world. That information comes from all sources - the Big Guys and the Little Guys who are just starting. I am not financially capable of paying large fees to get the information and I am offended and disgusted if the information I can afford is only that of the Big Guys telling me what they want me to hear. Very un-American.

Comments of Sharon Leek, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019278883>.

Artists

In a relatively short period of time, broadband Internet service has inspired tremendous innovation, which has in turn enabled individual artists and arts organizations to reach new audiences, cultivate patrons and supporters, collaborate with peers, stimulate local economies and enrich cultural and civic discourse.

The groups behind these comments believe strongly that the Federal Communications Commission must safeguard an open and accessible Internet for many reasons, including our sector's ability to inspire new generations of cultural ambassadors, creators and innovators using the most important communications platform in history.

There is a growing consensus within America's creative communities that an open and accessible Internet is crucial to a vibrant and diverse cultural ecosystem. Though each organization listed has a unique approach to doing business and advancing culture in the 21st century, we all believe in an ability to compete on a level online playing field based on the merits of our creative expression, goods and services. We support a legitimate digital marketplace that rewards creators and offers audiences new ways to engage with art. We feel strongly that the FCC must do everything in its power to prevent paid prioritization and a "fast lane" Internet for only the best-funded enterprises. The work of our members has both cultural value and economic value. Any rules to emerge from this process must take into account the millions of Americans whose contributions to our society give practical meaning to concepts such as "innovation," "ingenuity" and "entrepreneurship."

Comments of Alternate ROOTS, Americans for the Arts, American Community Television, American Composers Forum, Association of American Arts Presenters, Chamber Music America, Chorus America Dance/USA, Fractured Atlas, Future of Music Coalition, Independent Film & Television Alliance League of American Orchestras, National Alliance for Media Arts and Culture, National Alliance for Musical Theatre, National Performance Network, Network of Ensemble Theaters, New Music USA, OPERA America, Performing Arts Alliance, Sundance Institute, Theater Communications Group, and Writers Guild of America West, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 15, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521391670>.

We are filmmaker organizations devoted to the support and advocacy of independent documentary and narrative filmmaking, and the media arts; together, we serve over 400,000 filmmakers and media professionals nationwide. We agree with the Commission that an open Internet is essential for innovation, diversity, and freedom of expression. We therefore urge the Commission to bolster its transparency rule, reject blocking, discrimination, and paid prioritization, and seriously consider exercising its Title II authority to ensure that the Internet remains open.

Comments of International Documentary Association, Film Independent, National Alliance for Media Arts & Culture, Independent Filmmaker Project, Independent Filmmaker Project Minnesota, IFP Festival Forum, Kartemquin Educational Films, Inc, Minnesota Film & Television Board, Women in Film, Women in Film & Video, Yoav Potash, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 15, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521391670>.

Margaret Dunlap, Writer and Co-Executive Producer, The Lizzie Bennet Diaries

In 2011, I was between television jobs when I got an offer to write for a modernday web adaptation of *Pride and Prejudice*. It seemed like an interesting project, and a good way to fill my time for a few months.

Two years later I was on stage at the Creative Arts Emmy Awards as a coexecutive producer of *The Lizzie Bennet Diaries*. Our little show had become a transmedia juggernaut, with nine and a half hours of video content told over fifty weeks, five YouTube channels, and close to forty social media accounts on platforms ranging from Twitter to LinkedIn. It was named "the best Austen adaptation around" by *The Guardian* newspaper and won multiple awards for its innovative storytelling, including the 2013 Emmy for Outstanding Achievement in Interactive Programming. It garnered millions of views, inspired two spin-off series, a novelization published by Simon and Schuster, and introduced a whole new generation of fans to Jane Austen's classic novel.

None of this would have been possible without an Open Internet.

When the show began, we had no corporate backing, no studio, no network partnerships at all. No industry player was interested in making scripted Internet content for a young, female audience that didn't revolve around fashion, beauty, or lifestyle topics, even on a miniscule budget like ours. And that meant that we were posting episodes of our show exactly the same way that someone would put up a video of their cat. But thanks to the Open Internet and Net Neutrality, our videos loaded just as quickly and played just as well as anything on Netflix, Hulu, or NBC.com. That level playing field allowed an underserved audience to find and embrace the content that spoke to them, no matter where it came from. Personally, my work on *Lizzie Bennet* has led to career opportunities both on the web and in traditional media. But even more important, *Lizzie Bennet* has inspired its fans to make series of their own. We demonstrated to creators fresh out of film school that if they put out a quality product, the industry will take notice. And we showed young women with no connections to the entertainment industry at all that there was nothing stopping them from forming their own company, assembling their own writers' rooms, and putting their work out there for everyone to see. Not all of them will win Emmys, but the best will find their audience, and we will all be richer for it.

I mean that literally. Today's "kids on YouTube" are the next generation of American storytellers. They are the voices who will go on to create tomorrow's television shows and feature films, the very content that the companies arguing for privileged "fast lane" access will be so desperate to stream in a few years time.

Already this is happening with *The Lizzie Bennet Diaries*, which is now available on demand for Starz subscribers. Having an Open Internet ensures we will all be able to discover the next *Lizzie Bennet*. That isn't just a win for independent producers and marginalized voices. It's vital for the future of mainstream Hollywood.

Issa Rae, Writer/Creator, The Misadventures of Awkward Black Girl

I would never have had the opportunity to break into writing for television had it not been for the opportunities awarded to me by internet video platforms like YouTube. For years, I tried to break into

the industry traditionally (writing spec scripts, meeting execs, going to networking events, pitching shows), and I was always told that my work and my voice didn't have an audience. Sometimes this was shorthand for, "it's too black," or "we're afraid to take a chance on this." I created my third and most successful series, "The Misadventures of Awkward Black Girl" (ABG) based on what I was not seeing on television and writing for the series, producing it and distributing it for the 15-20 million viewers who tuned in was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. Not only did I prove executives who thought I didn't have an audience wrong, but I wasn't limited to the formulaic, "safe writing" that television networks expected. I was allowed unlimited creative freedom and direct access to my audience.

When television called, I took my first opportunity to create/write a show for Shonda Rhimes and ABC, but simultaneously, when ABG was going into its second season, I was able to license the series to Pharell's internet channel, "i am OTHER." Over the last couple of years, I've been able to sell various shows to online platforms, while the television pilot development process continues to span its feet. In fact, over 3 years of two television pilot deals, I've been able to produce and sell nearly 10 internet shows to internet outlets. If paid prioritization happens, not only will that jeopardize my opportunities as a writer to find opportunities outside a monopoly, but as a small, internet production company, I'll be shut out. This means that the audience that I (and my fellow content creator peers of color) cater to, an audience that is very much underwhelmed by what mainstream media has to offer, will suffer as well. This cannot happen ... again.

Christopher J. Smith, Writer/Creator, My Dad's Tapes

Writing for an online series is an amazing experience. It's faster, it's open to more creativity and finding an audience is much easier than writing for television. I created a web series as an experiment and it took off. The first episode was written, shot, edited and up for viewers all within the span of a week. The audience found it almost immediately and a series was born. As far as creativity, there is no limit to what you can do. People can become famous from one video on YouTube and it's amazing to watch what hits and what misses. It's also much, much cheaper to create new and fresh content.

Having this new platform means my content is available. Twenty years ago, writers were pounding the pavement playing the lottery game. Even ten years ago, videos online were few and far between. Now content creators are free to work within their own boundaries and rules. Obviously we all have to work around a websites Terms of Service, but in the long run, those doing the writing are now free to find an audience, whereas before if a script wasn't sold it was shelved.

But paid prioritization would more than likely shut me down, online anyway. It would set everyone back decades. Let the audience be the ones that choose what is watched, not who has the most money to pump into a limited system. I have explained this many times to people throughout my project, that television and broadcasting as we know it is going away. In the near future, everything will be streaming. Televisions will all be transformed into monitors that are hooked up to a computer and the internet. The distinction between a television show and web series will become blurred. As we move into this exciting future, audiences will no longer sit still for a show, but interact with it as well. As an episode plays out in front of them, all around will be open social media windows, whether that be Twitter or Facebook, or even a message board devoted to the series, the audience will interact with one another. Even now, fans of a show will join a chat room to discuss an episode as it streams. We are in an incredible time where interaction can grow exponentially on an open internet. The threat of losing

net neutrality is a huge concern of mine and will definitely stifle the growth of entertainment and media.

Jay Bushman, Transmedia Producer/Writer, The Lizzie Bennet Diaries

Hyperbole is a hallmark of most political debates, and it's easy to slip into when trying to make a passionately held point. So let me say bluntly that this is not hyperbole – creating a paid prioritization scheme would be an extinction level event for an entire generation of creators who have used the equal access the Internet provides to create careers, push boundaries and invent new forms of storytelling. I am one such creator. I started my career on a traditional trajectory, writing tv specs and producing indie short films. But with the rise of the Internet, I became fascinated with all the new ways you could tell a story, and changed my path to explore these new ways. I have spent years going into pitch meetings to discuss my work, only to be met with bewildered stares and refrains of “that will never work.” So I started to make projects on my own. And because the Internet was open, I had the ability to write and create projects myself and deliver them directly to the audience, without needing the approval of any gatekeepers. Jump ahead to today. A decade of experimenting with new ways of storytelling culminated in my work as a writer and Transmedia Producer of “The Lizzie Bennet Diaries” – the first YouTube-distributed series to be awarded a Primetime Emmy. Our show reached a huge audience – over 50 million and counting at this point, with 1 million new views a month a whole year after the end of the show. We did this with no studio or network backing, no marketing budget and no agency or brand support.

On an unequal internet, I would not have been able to do any of this work – the barriers to entry would be too high, and reaching an audience would be too difficult.

But even more importantly, the show inspired legions of new creators to make their own shows – many of them filming on webcams in their bedrooms and delivering content to growing online audiences. Many times I am asked by fans and new creators what advice I have for them, and I usually tell them this: 1) Start a project 2) Finish it 3) Start another 4) Repeat. Removing open access to the Internet will stifle the launch of this entire next generation of creators. We cannot afford that.

There is a historical equivalent to this question. In the early days of motion pictures, the Trust led by Edison ruthlessly stamped down attempts at independent production. In order to escape, many independent producers relocated – to Hollywood. Our entire industry in this city was built on opposing this kind of land-grabbing, cynical attempt to consolidate power in the hands of the few that already possess it. Today, there are no frontiers to move to across the continent – we're all connected together by this vast Internet. It's too important to let it be crippled.

Robin Schiff, Writer, Romy And Michele's High School Reunion, Almost Perfect, Grosse Pointe. Currently shooting a pilot that I wrote called Down Dog for Amazon

As opportunities have lessened for writers in broadcast and cable TV – smaller staffs, less money -- the internet has become the place for writers to get started, be creative, showcase their talents and, now, make a living. Writers can selffinance or work for small companies, they can own their product, and they have no restrictions on what they create. But this is only partly why it's crucial for net neutrality to be preserved.

There used to be a separation of church and state in the entertainment business.

But since the repeal of the Financial Interest and Syndication Rules the same companies are allowed to own and distribute creative product. As a result we now have only seven multi-national companies that own nearly all of the media outlets, newspapers, magazines, film companies, broadcast and cable TV, in the U.S. This is dangerous because once you have the same people deciding what is going to be shown, what stories are going to be told and how they will be told, they have too much control over shaping those stories. Now, if these same people are allowed to own the internet, we will truly have no place to be individuals and have freedom of expression. Monolithic control over media is a frightening outcome, but that's what will happen if net neutrality isn't maintained. I have been in the Writers Guild since 1980, and have served two terms on the Board of Directors of the Writers Guild. I care deeply about the opportunities for future generations of creative professionals. Shouldn't we preserve a space for individual creative expression and freedom, which now exists because of the Internet? Strong net neutrality rules are the only way to maintain the open Internet.

Peter Knight, Writer, BoJack Horseman

New video distributors like Netflix and Amazon means greater opportunity to bring your ideas to buyers who can fund them properly. I love the internet's DIY fervor and I will watch things people make for nothing on Vimeo, but at a certain point, it's nice to have (and see onscreen) some bells and whistles paid for by a company that believes they can get a return on their investment with your work. More buyers means more opportunity —and not just opportunity to make the things that could only work on network television. Healthy competition in the internet space (please don't tell anyone I respect that I used the phrase "internet space") will foster an appetite among buyers and viewers for more nuanced material and "pet projects".

As a fan and as a writer, I am genuinely grateful that there are studios who pay writers and directors and others to make movies and TV shows. And I know studios have a difficult job. They cannot guarantee the consistency of their product and they cannot guarantee their returns. I was a C+ Econ student and even I know that from a business perspective that's a nightmare. So what studios do is hedge. They make their product a little blander to avoid having to gamble on pricey, indulgent projects with seemingly limited appeal. I get this. I am complicit in this. But what must truly be maddening to the studios is that sometimes those pricey, indulgent projects are great and, worse still, sometimes they are even profitable. Paid prioritization just feels like another way to hedge. It would be so much easier for the studios if they made one kind of paste and could sell it at a fixed price. Instead they have countless projects of wildly varying costs and quality and a generation of end users who don't want to pay for any of it. That is a tough row to hoe. Creating a fast lane means they won't have to compete with anyone else who might be willing to take more chances creatively. So of course it's in their interests to do that and why they are pursuing it so tenaciously. I am in favor of Net Neutrality because anything that forces the studios out of the paste 13 business feels like a win for a writer. Especially if you aspire to prove everybody wrong about your pricey indulgent content with seemingly limited appeal. Having worked on a Netflix show recently I am very pleased to say the experience was... (if I were sitting across from you I would fiddle with my coffee cup for a moment to build tension then I would look up and say...) the same as network television. It's real. There was money to make the show right. There were lunches and PAs and turkey jerky and all the perks that a true artist should be able to forego, but I cannot. It felt legitimate in every way. One difference was that nobody talked about ratings. We really only concerned ourselves with the quality of the show and executing creator showrunner, Raphael BobWaksberg's vision.

Ruth Livier, Writer & Creator, YLSE

Back in 2000, when I originally wrote Ylse as a TV spec, there was absolutely no chance of it being produced. At a conference designed to nurture and support Latino talent, I approached an executive for advice who basically asked me, “Who are you for anyone to produce your show?” Others asked condescendingly, “Who’s going to watch this?” It was a slap in the face, especially from folks who had been invited to encourage us. The worst part was, their comments weren’t based on my writing. They had not read a single word. Their immediate objections were based entirely on the concept of a bicultural, bilingual, Latinadriven dramedy written by someone with no track record. I mean, I clearly had no idea how the business worked. Who was I to think that anyone would take me seriously? Plus, how exactly was I supposed to prove that there was a market for this type of content? There was no way in so, I filed the script away. Then, a few years later, everything changed. Technology advanced. Camera equipment was no longer cost prohibitive. The Internet suddenly put worldwide distribution at our fingertips. It all seemed too good to be true. But, it was true. And it was good. And it changed everything. We suddenly had unprecedented access to create, produce and distribute our content. In this exciting new frontier of a neutral non-discriminatory Internet, anyone could finally tell their stories from their point of view without getting discouraged, derailed or having their vision diluted. This was an empowering opportunity that had to be explored. So in early 2008, with the encouragement of some amazingly talented artists who were also hungry to work on a project that portrayed Latinos in a more balanced and non-stereotypical light, I took that old script out of the files reconceived, rewrote, and produced the award-winning web series, Ylse (www.Ylse.net). Ylse features modern progressive Latinos, something rare, if ever seen, in traditional media. We provided jobs for a very diverse workforce in front of and behind the cameras. And, because we were union signatory, our directors earned points towards their DGA membership and I earned points towards becoming the first person to join the Writers Guild via work in New Media. Joining the WGA was a personal honor, but it was significant in essence because it meant that Digital Media was in fact a viable alternative way in for the rest of us. It meant that programming on the web was not up to the same few decision makers who control traditional media. No longer would low-budgets, no track record or no connections mean there is no way in. Finally, thanks to the unprecedented open, neutral, non-discriminatory environment of the Internet, we independent artists finally had an unobstructed connection to a potential audience base, which meant that we could finally prove our market while encouraging others to follow suit.

As an artist, a woman, a Latina, an immigrant and an entrepreneur, the web has afforded me unprecedented opportunities to participate in content creation and distribution. Hopefully our work will empower the next generation to follow suit. I hope that, to them, having a platform where they can express themselves on an equal playing field with anyone else is nothing out of the ordinary. Because for us, it has been nothing short of revolutionary:

- The open Internet has given the rest of us an opportunity to work on and improve our crafts.
- It has given us the opportunity to provide jobs and creative outlets for a more diverse workforce.
- It has allowed us to define ourselves by telling stories from our points of view.
- It has allowed us to create more varied, complex and positive portrayals of our demos.
- It has given us the ability to connect directly with our audience and prove our markets.

- It has given us the ability to connect with like-minded people around the globe.
- It has empowered and motivated us to create content, knowing there is a distribution outlet for it.

The bottom line is, as long as the digital space remains neutral and does not go the way of traditional media, we will never again be disregarded by anyone who essentially asks, “Who are you to have your story be told?” We all deserve to have our stories told. We all deserve to be heard, to be acknowledged, and to not have to sit in the shadows until someone else decides that our lives are worthy of being reflected in the media. The web is the great equalizer. It is a revolutionary platform of hope and opportunity where diverse voices can finally partake in the national conversation at all levels. Ylse.net was made possible only because of the neutral Internet.

Reply Comments of the Writers Guild of America, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 15, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7522638911>.

The open Internet has powered the creative community’s pursuits and offerings in the 21st century. As members of this community, we urge the Federal Communications Commission to protect the open Internet as a vehicle for free expression and collaboration.

The open Internet’s impact on the creative community cannot be overstated. The Internet has enabled artists to connect directly with each other and with audiences. It has eliminated the barriers of geography and taken collaborations to new levels. And it has allowed people — not corporations — to seek out the film, music and art that moves them. Allowing broadband providers to control this once-open platform shifts power away from individual artists and creators and interferes with freedom of speech and expression.

Unless the Commission restores strong nondiscrimination protections based on a solid legal framework, creativity, cultural commerce and free expression will suffer.

Comments of Anti-Flag, Fred Armisen, Geoff Bailey, Jello Biafra, Sarah Browning (poet), Neko Case, Staceyann Chin, Kimya Dawson: The Moldy Peaches, Antsy Pants, The Bundles, The Uncluded, Davey D Michael Ealy, Fat Wreck Chords, Fugazi, Jonny 5: Flobots, Judah Friedlander, Rebecca Gates, Hank Green, Harry and the Potters, Mark Kates: Artist Manager, Fenway Recordings, Allison Kilkenny & Jamie Kilstein: Citizen Radio, Hari Kondabolu, Wayne Kramer: MC5, Jail Guitar Doors USA, Kronos Quartet, The Last Internationale, Evangeline Lilly, David Lowery: Cracker/Camper Van Beethoven, Jeff Mangum & Astra Taylor: Neutral Milk Hotel Mirah, Scott McCaughey: Young Fresh Fellows, Minus 5, Erin McKeown, Tom Morello, Thao Nguyen: Thao & the Get Down Stay Down, OK Go, Alec Ounsworth: Clap Your Hands Say Yeah, Ozomatli, Martín Perna: Antibalas, Joe Perry: Aerosmith, Billie Perry, Boots Riley, Rich Robinson: The Black Crowes, Benji Rogers: Founder of Pledge Music, Mark Ruffalo, James Schamus, Wallace Shawn, Jill Sobule, Charlie Starr: Blackberry Smoke, Michael Stipe: R.E.M., Oliver Stone, Jimmy Tamborello: Postal Service, Dntel, Figurine, Jonathan B. Tucker (poet), Corin Tucker: Sleater-Kinney, tUnE-yArDs, Nick Urata: DeVotchKa, Eddie Vedder: Pearl Jam, Roger Waters: Pink Floyd, Greg Wells, Alex Winter, Alicia Witt and YACHT, GN Docket No. 14-28, May 13, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521123629>.

Communities of Color

Voices for Internet Freedom et al., collectively Internet Freedom Supporters, respectfully urge the Commission to adopt strong, enforceable, and sustainable Open Internet rules that will protect the Internet as an open platform. Through the Internet, people of color are able to bypass traditional avenues replete with individual, institutional, and structural discrimination and insurmountable barriers to entry to embrace new opportunities for self-expression, entrepreneurship, political participation, education, employment, housing, healthcare, and many other vitally important human needs.

The advent and expansion of the Open Internet has been an incredible boon to communities of color, who have been historically underserved due to entrenched structural discrimination in existing networks and service providers. On the Internet, opportunities are infinite, barriers to entry are low, and communities are able to bypass broken legacy systems to take advantage of innovative offerings better tailored to suit their needs. Entrepreneurs of color can succeed without access to traditional financial tools and are able to seek investment through a variety of crowdfunding or microfinance websites. Creators and independent content producers can tell their own stories to defy stereotypes and create positive portrayals of their communities without needing buy-in from a major media conglomerate. People of color can engage in the political process, bringing their voices directly to those in power and going around any roadblocks designed to impede them. Beyond making these things possible, the Open Internet makes them practical and has already brought substantial change to the way members of our communities view themselves and interact with each other.

Strong and enforceable Open Internet rules are vital to the well being of communities of color, and necessary for the advancement of many of the Commission's policy goals. Such rules should be applied equally to mobile and fixed networks. Moreover, these rules must rest on Title II of the Communications Act to ensure that they can withstand judicial scrutiny.

Comments of Voices for Internet Freedom; Center for Media Justice; ColorOfChange; Free Press; National Hispanic Media Coalition (NHMC); AimHigh LA; Appalshop; Art Is Change; Chicago Media Action; Clarisel Media; Common Cause; Common Frequency; Dignity and Power Now; Easton Community Access Television; Families For Freedom, Inc.; Generation Justice; Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU); Iguana Films; Institute for Intellectual Property and Social Justice; Iraq Veterans Against the War; Latino Rebels; LatinoJustice PRLDEF; Librotraficante Movement; Line Break Media; Main Street Project; Martinez Street Women's Center; May First/People Link; Media Action Grassroots Network (MAG-Net); Media Alliance; Media Literacy Project; Media Mobilizing Project; Message Media Education; Mexican American Opportunity Foundation (MAOF); MujerLatinaToday.com; National Association of Hispanic Journalists (NAHJ); National Association of Latino Independent Producers (NALIP); National Consumer Law Center, on behalf of its low-income clients; National Institute for Latino Policy (NiLP); National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; News Taco; Organizing Apprenticeship Project; Paper Tiger TV; Presente.org; Radio Bilingüe; Ruth Livier; St. Paul Neighborhood Network; The Greenlining Institute; The People's Press Project; TURN (The Utility Reform Network); Women In Media & News (WIMN); Women, Action & the Media;

Working Films; Working Narratives; Young Women United, Protecting and Promoting an Open Internet, GN Docket No. 14-28, May 13, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521700026>.

Net neutrality is a crucial protection for the economic, civic, and creative lives of Asian American communities. There are few racial demographics so well-connected, for everything from commerce and the arts to political expression to keeping up with family. For these reasons, we believe Title II reclassification is in the best interests of our community, and for the preservation of key rights as emerging players in the American political landscape.

Like many communities of color, Asian Americans often find that we have limited access to mainstream media outlets to represent our stories and cover our issues. As a result, we rely heavily on independent media to communicate with each other, and represent our perspectives to the world. This includes viral YouTube music videos, which have given young performing artists new audiences, but also providing the resources to stand up for our communities' collective interests politically.

74% of all Asian American adults are immigrants. This startling statistic has wide-reaching implications, including deep familial ties to Asian countries of origin. Voice Over Internet Protocol and video conferencing software are essential for immigrant families to maintain these important relationships to grandparents, aunts and uncles, parents, and siblings.

Broadband access is a crucial part of Asian American civic, economic, and cultural life. Ensuring that broadband providers are required to provide continuing equal access to this crucial resource is a major concern for Asian American communities, especially young people. It is our hope that the FCC will protect the rights and interests of our diverse communities by reclassifying broadband internet service as a Title II common carrier utility.

Comments of 18MillionRising.org, Protecting and Promoting an Open Internet, GN Docket No. 14-28, May 13, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019160728>.

By rejecting the Commission's anti-blocking and anti-discrimination rules, the Verizon court has opened up the possibility that without the Commission's intervention, carriers will determine the winners and losers of the digital world.³ The consequences of losing equal access to the Internet, whether it is due to discrimination, blocking, or slowing down content, will disproportionately affect people of color. According to U.S. Census data, for every dollar of wealth a U.S. white family has, the median Asian family has about sixty-three cents, the median Latino family has seven cents, and the median Black family has less than a nickel.⁴ The racial wealth gap plaguing our communities causes people of color to spend a disproportionately larger amount of their income on telecommunications services.⁵ The digital divide, price and content discrimination, and the potential violation of free speech are problems that will affect consumers across all ethnic backgrounds. However, because communities of color are disproportionately subjected to various types of consumer abuse, they are in more critical need of protection that net neutrality provides. To our communities, net neutrality is not only a telecommunications issue, but a racial equity issue as well.

Internet discrimination—the ability of carriers to speed up some traffic and degrade others—is a critical issue for communities of color. More than being sensitive to the idea that tiered Internet is simply an act of separating the haves from the have-nots, people of color have a legitimate concern with possible redlining outcomes if the Commission decides to allow tiered Internet service or pricing.

Comments of The Greenlining Institute, The Global Action Project, Minnesota Center for Neighborhood Organizing, The People’s Press Project, Urbana-Champaign Independent Media Center and Media Literacy Project, Protecting and Promoting an Open Internet, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 18, 2014, available at <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521701840>.

The Media Action Grassroots Network (MAG-Net) is a national network, working for media change to end poverty, eliminate racism and ensure human rights. Together, our 175 members represent communities of color, low-income consumers, rural and Tribal members and migrant communities. In short, we represent the interests of the most marginalized communities in our nation.

Our Network believes the Open Internet plays a pivotal role in ensuring racial and economic equity in the 21st century. Without a strong legal framework that ensures the benefits of the Internet are broadly shared, our members are forced to navigate a platform that further entrenches and exacerbates harmful disparities. In particular, any devolution of network neutrality rules will harm independent artists, musicians and social justice advocates that currently use the open Internet to reach audiences otherwise inaccessible in a heavily corporatized and consolidated media. Without an Open Internet, these innovators and entrepreneurs face tremendous barriers to entry that choke their opportunities for creative expression, opportunity, democratic participation and community building.

In order to ensure an equitable future for our most vulnerable communities, it's essential that the FCC prioritize the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of voices that are often overlooked or undervalued.

Comments of Media Action Grassroots Network, Protecting and Promoting an Open Internet, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 18, 2014, <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018204447>.

The open Internet allows communities of color to tell their own stories and to organize for racial and social justice in the digital age. The mainstream media have often failed to allow people of color to speak for themselves. And thanks to economic inequality and runaway media consolidation, people of color own just a handful of broadcast stations. The lack of diverse ownership is a primary reason why the media have gotten away with portraying communities of color stereotypically. The open Internet gives marginalized voices an opportunity to be heard. But without Net Neutrality, ISPs can block unpopular speech and prevent dissident voices from speaking freely online. Without Net Neutrality, people of color will lose a vital platform to shape debates on issues that impact their communities’ well-being. And without Net Neutrality, millions of small businesses owned by people of color won't be able to compete against larger corporations online, which will further deepen the economic inequality in our nation’s most vulnerable communities.

Comments of Mallory Curtis, GN Docket No. 14-28, Sept. 17, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6019320404>.

Human Wellness

The American Academy of Pediatrics (the AAP) appreciates the opportunity to provide comment on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on the matter of Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet. The AAP is committed to the optimal physical, mental, and social health and well-being of all infants, children, adolescents, and young adults. It is the AAP's position that an Open Internet is a vital component in assuring access to healthcare for children and their families. As such, AAP is opposed to the implementation of paid prioritization because of its detrimental effects on the elimination of health disparities, efficiency of healthcare, and access to health information by parents and caregivers.

Comments of American Academy of Pediatrics, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 11, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017881148>.

Global Healthy Living Foundation has led the creation of disease-specific communities for those in need of information/support. One of those is CreakyJoints, a network of 70,000 arthritis patients and caregivers all around the US. Other communities include CreakyBones (osteoporosis) and RedPatch (psoriasis). Healthcare is at a point where information can and should be as prevalent as possible.

We are a non-profit, and we work by forging partnerships between insurance companies, pharmaceuticals, state legislators, state governors, and Congress. Our funds are limited, and we need to focus as much of them on our members as we can. Furthermore, our funding sources require that we use their funds to serve our members directly. We doubt that we could use those funds to pay for a "fast lane."

Comments of Global Healthy Living Foundation, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 10, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521678752>.

As an online-educator in the field of wellness, nutrition and Yoga, and an artist/illustrator, it would be a huge disservice to entrepreneurs as well as their customers seeking affordable and often times free information and products, if we were to end net-neutrality. Please do not allow these corporate giants to line their pockets with money they don't need in the name of stripping the people of their freedom of speech and expression.

Comments of Heather Bernklau, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018102947>.

I work as an IT specialist for a hospital chain. We do most of our work remotely. If the internet is not classified as neutral, setting different levels of internet service could kill a patient by detaining that doctor from delivering the correct information.

Comments of Joshua Ferguson, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018003237>.

As a yoga teacher I can stay connected to current information and connect to potential students. For instance I can watch videos on yoga techniques, advertise on facebook or twitter and visit sites that offer scientific articles on the benefits of yoga. Additionally as a parent I have access to lots of helpful parenting support and advice. My income is small so I could not afford to pay for extra internet use.

Comments of Tonya Salerno, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 16, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6018146175>.

My name is Fred Trotter. I am a healthcare data journalist and author. I am also the founder of CareSet Systems and DocGraph journal, a technical blogger for O'Reilly Radar, and co-author of the first Health IT O'Reilly book Hacking Healthcare, the most popular book summarizing Health IT topics for Meaningful Use (at least according to Amazon).

If we abandon net neutrality, someone is going to have to pay the fast lane tax for patients who want telemedicine solutions to really work. That means either patients are going to pay, or doctors are going to have to pay. Having an Internet slow lane will ensure that poor patients will not be able to have video telemedicine appointments (which operate just like streaming video) because their doctors do not have the technical expertise or budget to afford the Internet fast lane. Think I am kidding? Already the Office of the National Coordinator of Health IT(ONC) has seen that hospitals and practices that serve in minority communities are late adopters of healthcare technology.

Reply Comments of Fred Trotter of the DocGraph Journal, GN Docket No. 14-28, Aug. 5, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7521750528>.

The fact that we pay more than any other country in the world for internet and don't even break the top 20 in highest average speeds is a testimony to how bad the service already is. We do not need to make things any worse than they are. The internet is not broken, there is no need to "fix" it. Here are some other concerns that I have for the ending of net neutrality:

VA hospitals use telemedicine to provide care to veterans in remote locations. In fact, they are the largest user of telemedicine in the US. Without Net Neutrality, both VA hospitals and veterans will have to pay telecom ransoms to access care.

Comments of Kent Sumner, GN Docket No. 14-28, Nov. 12, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=60000977982>.

On behalf of the 4,381 individuals who signed on to our letter, the Alliance for Natural Health is requesting the FCC to reclassify Internet service providers (ISPs) as "common carriers" under Title II of the Communications Act. Without reclassification, we are concerned about that your newly released draft rules, which allow ISPs to charge companies for premium, "fast lane" content delivery, will destroy the most basic tenets of net neutrality.

A "fast lane" would make ISPs -- which are becoming increasingly monopolistic in many markets -- into the gatekeepers of the Internet: these mega-corporations and their friends with deep pockets would have the power to decide what content we will see quickly, and what content will be delivered to us much more slowly. Since one in four Internet users abandon websites that take four or more seconds to load, users will naturally gravitate toward "fast lane" sites that deliver content more quickly.

Comments of Alliance for Natural Health USA, GN Docket No. 14-28, July 15, 2014,
<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/view?id=6017984732>.