

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Ed Feazel [ed.feazel@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:10 PM  
To: KJMWEB  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Ed Feazel (ed.feazel@gmail.com) writes:

I think that your advocating a tiered internet is one of the most irresponsible things a person in your position could do.

If a tiered internet is put into place, innovation will stop, and the only benefit will be for the Telcos. You have shown that your only concern is increasing the profits of Telcos by governmental actions.

Let the internet stay how it is, and there will continue to be LARGE benefits for all Americans. Or, as you have shown you believe to be the better course of action, change the internet and ensure that there will be no technological innovation, no increased value for the consumer, and no competition between providers.

Ed Feazel

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 208.63.179.88  
Remote IP address: 208.63.179.88

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Eddie W. Gochenour [eg1@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:39 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

**RECEIVED**

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Eddie W. Gochenour (eg1@hotmail.com) writes:

I recently read an article at [http://www.networkingpipeline.com/blog/archives/2006/03/fcc\\_chief\\_att\\_c.html](http://www.networkingpipeline.com/blog/archives/2006/03/fcc_chief_att_c.html) that stated on March 21 you have gave your support to AT&T and other telcos who want to be able to limit bandwidth to sites like Google, unless those sites pay fees to the telcos. There should be no bandwidth restrictions! This is simply wrong!

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 207.43.195.201  
Remote IP address: 207.43.195.201

Sandralyn Bailey

---

**From:** Edward Flynn [betterwearahat@mac.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:02 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Edward Flynn (betterwearahat@mac.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

To FCC Chief Kevin Martin, who yesterday gave his support to AT&T and other telcos who want to be able to limit bandwidth to sites like Google, unless those sites pay extortion fees.

Regarding Mr. Martin's support for such a a "tiered" Internet, I can only express the strongest opposition to such an idea.

Not only is the pandering to the outright greed of The Telco corporations, it is just amazingly stupid.

By allowing these companies to charge for such things as emails access, traffic access, web access and speed will only accomplish the following: Insure that only large websites, who can afford to pay these fees, will have access and visibility on the web; Limit free speech and the access to it by creating an economic barrier to web accessibility, which in the end would make our internet no better than the heavily censored Chinese internet access; destroy any economic incentive to get smaller companies to get involve with creating businesses on the net; and overall destroy whatever web based economy that might be blossoming at the moment which is helping to replace the lost jobs and businesses that are moving out of this country; and overall discourage people from actually using the internet and thereby effectively killing it.

Is that your goal? To kill The internet?

Because that is what will happen when you allow this mad plan of tiered internet fees to go forward.

Think about this and STOP IT.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 67.101.134.138  
Remote IP address: 67.101.134.138

**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Eldon Nelson [eldon\_nelson@ieee.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:38 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Eldon Nelson (eldon\_nelson@ieee.org) writes:

I believe that a tiered internet will stifle growth and free speech - as well as innovation. Please don't let big communication companies decide which sites get preferential treatment. The internet needs to be free and not cater to big telco demands to pay them more for better service. Their customers can pay this not the people trying to share ideas.

Thank you.

Engineer, Rochester, MN  
Eldon Nelson

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 66.188.220.191  
Remote IP address: 66.188.220.191

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Eric Goetschalckx [narf1983@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:13 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Eric Goetschalckx (narf1983@hotmail.com) writes:

So, not only do we pay taxes to subsidize some of the cost for fiber to the home, then we pay the ISP for connection, and then we pay for REGULAR SPEED ACCESS to my site? This is an extortion racket. If I go to a drive through restaurant, I pay for the food, I dont pay for how often I go, or how fast I want the food to come to me. You sir, are despicable.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.91.171.42  
Remote IP address: 192.91.171.42

**Sandralyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Eric Jackson [brains@fcc.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 4:49 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Eric Jackson (brains@fcc.gov) writes:

Dear Sir,

I believe your support of a tiered internet will in the end destroy the internet. Your support of a tiered internet goes against the very idea the internet has stood for thus far. You sir are a disappointment.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 69.24.161.112  
Remote IP address: 69.24.161.112

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Eric Linder [elinder912@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:22 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

**RECEIVED**

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Eric Linder (elinder912@yahoo.com) writes:

I am an IT professional I think you have it wrong on taxing VOIP and a tiered Internet. IP providers are businesses. They provide a service. Don't shift their responsibility for their services to the content providers they get their content from for free. Continue to ask the IP providers to spread there costs over there customers. You wouldn't charge a POTS user for the billion dollar merger and aquisitions deal he did over a POTS party line. The POTS provider got the deal content for free in that case. What is the difference.

Eric

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 206.169.67.6  
Remote IP address: 206.169.67.6

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Eric Nichols [dredful@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:41 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Eric Nichols (dredful@charter.net) writes:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Chairman,

What are you thinking? It's apparent that you are thinking with your nice fat wallet than with your head. AT&T does not have the right to limit bandwidth to or from any website. They claim they own the internet lines, so they should be able to limit how or when things run on them. Consumers paid for those lines to be built, and we are still paying for them every month. All I can say is that you are lucky you are not voted into that office.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.6.117.146  
Remote IP address: 12.6.117.146

**Sandralyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Erica Baker [princessfrozen@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:06 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Erica Baker (princessfrozen@gmail.com) writes:

You do a disservice to Americans by buckling to the whims of business. I do wonder what kind of kickbacks you're getting.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 65.5.3.112  
Remote IP address: 65.5.3.112

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Erik Lee [peckules@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:22 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Erik Lee (peckules@hotmail.com) writes:

I read a news article about your "tiered internet" comments and I'm dropping a line to tell you I think it's a VERY bad idea. Web site owners are ALREADY paying for the bandwidth they use, I wouldn't want to have to shoulder the burden of paying what I pay now for potentially slower internet connection. Thank you.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 209.58.254.130  
Remote IP address: 209.58.254.130

SandraLyn Bailey

**From:** Erin Shelton [erin.shelton@vanderbilt.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:21 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Erin Shelton (erin.shelton@vanderbilt.edu) writes:

I just wanted to drop a line to let you know how disappointed I am with your stance on allowing ISPs to charge sites such as Google extra for bandwidth. I remember when the FCC used to work for the good of the people, not the profit of corporations. Google and others already pay when they lease huge Internet pipes for their business. If these charges for leases are not adequate, whose fault is that? Certainly not Google's. I am further disappointed with your recent relaxation of Media Ownership rules. You should be ashamed that the FCC no longer serves the American people, but rather serves well healed corporations. Your supporting the two tiered Internet will essentially stifle the innovative environment that the Internet offers everyone, and will reserve this environment for the rich and powerful only. Shame on you. Don't I already pay FCC fees for Internet access that support Internet infrastructure build out? Now we should pay the Telcos for this again? You may be fooling the rest of the people, but you are not fooling me.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 129.59.160.138  
Remote IP address: 129.59.160.138

**SandraLyn Bailey**

RECEIVED

**From:** fish202@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:30 AM  
**To:** Kevin Martin  
**Cc:** KJMWEB; FCCINFO  
**Subject:** Tiered Internet Support, what were you thinking?

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I'm going to have to say I'm very disappointed in hearing that you(Kevin Martin) support a tiered internet. It goes against the very foundation of the internet and ABUSES taxpayer money. Telcos are given funds and allowed to charge extraneous service charges with the presumption that they'll use it to expand their network. Through their incessant complaining, they've made it seem like google and the like are getting a free ride... but they aren't. If anything, the telco's have not delivered on the promise of fiber to the home.

The internet and the lines owned by AT&T, Verizon, etc. are payed for by taxpayer money and shared by ALL organisations equally. As I'm sure you know, the initial roots of the internet are in military and educational funded lines. Allowing it to commercialize was but a natural progression. Allowing control over it is going to be akin to allowing privatized control of the nation's interstates. You want to use I-95? \$60 or take a backroad where you'll sit in traffic and get to your destination in maybe 3 weeks. It allows them to extort on something they haven't built and don't by any reasonable right own.

Please reconsider. Is there any further action, I as a citizen can take with this?

**Sandralyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Francis Shirfan [NakedMartini@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:48 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Francis Shirfan (NakedMartini@gmail.com) writes:

I hope AT&T is paying you a lot of money under the table... otherwise this doesn't say much for your intelligence.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 24.93.145.239  
Remote IP address: 24.93.145.239

**Sandralyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Francisco Gastelum [frank.gastelum@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:15 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Francisco Gastelum (frank.gastelum@gmail.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Hello FCC Commissioner,

Concerning your idea to be able to limit bandwidth to sites, unless those sites pay fees.

This so called "tiered" Internet service structure is a horrible idea! You sound like you have been bribed to support such an idea! Bring integrity and intelligence to the FCC, not small minded ideas like this whose only goal is to make the telco companies more money! You should easily realize that limiting bandwidth to sites in this "tiered" internet would limit new web technologies by only allowing big corporate entities who can afford to pay for "high-tier" bandwidth. This is a bad call and you should not support such a bad idea.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 136.166.1.3  
Remote IP address: 136.166.1.3

**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Geoff Lembke [glembke@purdue.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:05 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Geoff Lembke (glembke@purdue.edu) writes:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

When will your corruption end?

[http://www.networkingpipeline.com/blog/archives/2006/03/fcc\\_chief\\_att\\_c.html](http://www.networkingpipeline.com/blog/archives/2006/03/fcc_chief_att_c.html)

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.208.99.231  
Remote IP address: 12.208.99.231

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Greg Prine [gpprine@gregscomputerservice.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:08 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Greg Prine (gpprine@gregscomputerservice.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir,  
I don't think your agreement with the offering of tiered internet charges is correct, and is under thought. You are wrong.

Greg Prine

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 207.14.81.82  
Remote IP address: 207.14.81.82

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Gregory Church [firedrake38@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 22, 2006 10:50 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Gregory Church (firedrake38@yahoo.com) writes:

I am writing to state that I totally disagree with your recent decisions about so-called "indecent" shows and the fines you have levied. It would be more of a service to the American people if you actually served the majority of viewers and not just hose sending out carbon copy forms from the PTC.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 70.116.99.2  
Remote IP address: 70.116.99.2

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Howie Wyrick [howie@itshowie.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:15 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Howie Wyrick (howie@itshowie.com) writes:

I just finished reading your comments' relating to bandwidth regulation for companies like Google.

I find this stance reprehensible and simply unacceptable. You must be aware that the simplicity, open architecture and neutrality of the internet is what has caused it's boom. Any attempts to convolute this process will simply kill this booming electronic commerce. A new 'internet' would be sought, the commerce will be nothing but confused and it will all fail.

Over involved Government, is directly driving this Great Nation into the ground.

Do the right job, and keep these super rich companies like AT&T and Verizon in check. Keep clear and even competition as the priority. These companies are trying their hardest to re-form their monopolies again and your favor towards them will only seal us, the consumer - the American citizen's financial fate.

I beg that you reconsider your opinion and discontinue the apparent support to allow the thugs of Telcom to push our economy around for their own sheer profit.

Thank you

Howie Wyrick  
Michigan

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 170.232.2.203  
Remote IP address: 170.232.2.203

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Ian KP [sample@magick.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 5:48 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Ian KP (sample@magick.net) writes:

Support a tiered internet? Are you crazy? Are you stupid? I'm going to let my lack of a voice be heard against this one. Please, no matter the extent of your greed, don't be stupid, don't alienate everyone. You know we will not stand for it. How can you be a chairman with such a misguided mindset? This wired generation will, one day, have to stand-up for itself and we are better conneted than this country has ever seen before. We have been complacent so far, but don't think that will last forever. This isnt some empty threat, or a threat at all, it's just reality. Think about it.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.213.224.39  
Remote IP address: 12.213.224.39

**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Ivy Quihuis [chairmenmeow47@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:29 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Ivy Quihuis (chairmenmeow47@yahoo.com) writes:

So how much is AT&T paying ya? Charging customers twice for the same product is bad business.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 204.17.26.4  
Remote IP address: 204.17.26.4

**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

**RECEIVED**

**From:** ian fellows [ianedwardfellows@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 3:37 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

ian fellows (ianedwardfellows@yahoo.com) writes:

internet neutrality is essential to the functioning of the internet economy. Everybody buys bandwidth, and should not be discriminated against because they have not paid AT&T's extortions.

you are a fucking idiot if you can't see this.

Ian

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.101.164.99  
Remote IP address: 68.101.164.99

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: J. Grant Boling [gboling@whidbey.net]  
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 12:47 AM  
To: KJMWEB  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

J. Grant Boling (gboling@whidbey.net) writes:

NO! I am appalled that the FCC is advocating a 'tiered internet'! This kind of policy would be death to independant artists and musicians. I guess you don't care, since the Bush administration is solely concerned with corporate profit.

I can't believe how often I disagree with the FCC, I guess it must be nice to work in the halls of power where the only thing that matters is what the Emperor proclaims. The horrible part is that while Mr. Bush lives in a fantasy world, the rest of us are here in reality - suffering from the effects of his craven decisions.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 209.166.73.160  
Remote IP address: 209.166.73.160

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** James Crossett [andycrossett@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 6:46 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

James Crossett (andycrossett@charter.net) writes:

Hello Chairman Martin,

I want to express my concern about your possible sanctioning of a "tiered internet" where telcos and other providers can charge a premium for improved bandwidth while purposely slowing down others who dont pay the premium.

It is important to remember that all of us (users of the internet and websites that serve us content) pay for our bandwidth currently. Because I pay for my bandwidth, I expect this quality of service.

Allowing the providers of internet access to charge a premium to data providers over and above their cost of bandwidth means they can effectively pick winners and losers in the marketplace. In addition, allowing providers to charge these "premiums" for the tiered service will stifle innovation, as the entrenched services can afford to pay the premium while new up and coming services will be hindered in their ability to pay the premium.

The internet has been a great source of innovation and I feel it's important not to stifle this competitive environment with these unneeded barriers to entry.

I encourage you to consider this when making policy.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Best regards,  
James Andrew Crossett  
Fenton, Missouri

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 66.174.92.162  
Remote IP address: 66.174.92.162

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** James Engelhardt [jfesjunk@aim.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:33 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

James Engelhardt (jfesjunk@aim.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Sir:

I am sending you this email to express my outrage tht you are supporting a proposal by the telcos to charge web site operators for bandwidth, effectively creating a tiered internet.

Contrary to their own inflated opinions, it is not those telcos who have made the internet the thriving, valuable tool that it is today. Rather, it is the content providers who have done so. Internet access without those content providers is merely a wire coming into one's house. As it stands now, consumers are the ones who are paying the telcos for access to that content, and deserve free and unettered access to same.

I strongly urge you to reconsider your opinion. The FCC is there to protect the rights of consumers, not merely to insure bloated profits for poorly run companies. If you MUST get involved in this debate, how about looking into the billions of dollars in tax credits the telcos received in the 90s to provide universal broadband access, access which still does not ecise in many areas of the US?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 204.250.120.138  
Remote IP address: 204.250.120.138

**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

---

**From:** James Herndon [james.herndon@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:26 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

James Herndon (james.herndon@gmail.com) writes:

Dear Chairman Martin,

Your decision to support AT&T and other telephone companies in limiting bandwidth to specific sites displays at best an astonishing ignorance of market economics and game theory, or at worst an astonishing disregard for the role of the FCC as a regulatory commission. The probable implications include balkanization of the internet, a loss of respect for the FCC which marginalize it's influence, and severe damage to your career.

Best Regards

James Herndon

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.80.25.110  
Remote IP address: 68.80.25.110