

RECEIVED

SandraLyn Bailey

From: John McCain [mccainj@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:26 AM  
To: KJMWEB  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

DOCKET FILE: COPY ORIGINAL  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

John McCain (mccainj@gmail.com) writes:

Regarding your comments at the TelecomNext show:

I understand that you have made a statement of support for a "tiered internet service" where providers such as Google or Microsoft could be surcharged by telecom providers for their very popular and widely used network services.

Such providers are already paying for network access. I as a user of such services also pay for network access. By allowing a "tiered service", you are making it possible for telecoms to charge for the same service three times, and making it possible for telecoms to arbitrarily extort popular content providers or face punitive restrictions for a network they have already paid to access.

I find these statements to be deeply disturbing and profoundly contrary to the public interest. I intend to express that concern to my elected officials should these statements be reflected in regulatory action by the FCC.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 24.227.108.66  
Remote IP address: 24.227.108.66

SandraLyn Bailey

From: John Muir [jrmuir@hotmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:50 AM  
To: KJMWEB  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

John Muir (jrmuir@hotmail.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,

I have heard that in a speech you recently gave, you support the major telcos in limiting network bandwidth to particular high-traffic websites unless a fee is paid by the end company.

You should reconsider this stance. The end user pays for access to the internet. As does the taxpayer who still has been left out in the cold when it comes to high speed subsidized fiber. There is no good reason for any ISP to limit traffic to any particular site. They are offering a public service with many unaccountable benefits. By allowing them to create a tiered internet where popular websites get charged additional fees (they already pay for their own bandwidth just to have the website online, and it's typically charged per megabyte) the very nature of the internet will change. Everyone pays fees to access the net. No website would exist if it didn't pay for its own bandwidth. Now you're talking about allowing these telcos to essentially double charge for the same service.

By removing access, or otherwise significantly slowing access, to the reasons people use a service, the service providers will soon find their customers moving elsewhere. Perhaps neither you nor they realize that though.

If you made it through all that, then I thank you for reading my opinion and for your time.

Sincerely,

John Muir

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 156.153.255.186  
Remote IP address: 156.153.255.186

**Sandralyn Bailey**

---

**From:** John Patterson [janprimus@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:04 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

**RECEIVED**

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

John Patterson (janprimus@gmail.com) writes:

Your comment about letting the Telco's charge bandwidth users such as google.com is so good damn greedy its almost criminal. I as a consumer already pay for that bandwidth monthly. You are advocating nothing more than doubledipping. Shame on you.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.42.155.253  
Remote IP address: 68.42.155.253

Sandralyn Bailey

From: John Thomson, Jr. [jcthomsonjr@wisc.edu]  
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:36 AM  
To: KJMWEB  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

John Thomson, Jr. (jcthomsonjr@wisc.edu) writes:

Chairman Martin,

I am writing to express my concern over your recent comments on Internet Network neutrality. If I understand your position correctly, you are advocating for allowing ISPs to charge tiered rates to content providers on the net because this will provide funds to drive network investment.

Unfortunately, this will also have the undesired effect of reducing competition on the net. Large firms which can afford the tiered pricing will have a better chance of success than smaller competition. And, as you correctly stated on Feb 10th, we must "seek to eliminate any unreasonable barriers to entry and to address other issues that we find impede such progress."

Tiered network service would be such a barrier. I urge you to reconsider your position to favor Internet network neutrality to promote lively competition on the net. There are many other ways to drive investment in the network, such as demand and charges to consumers, that destroying one of the net's greatest structural assets would be an avoidable mistake.

Thank you for your service and attention,  
-John Thomson  
PhD Student  
University of Wisconsin, Madison  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 128.104.102.222  
Remote IP address: 128.104.102.222

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Jon Franklin [a99tandem@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:31 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Jon Franklin (a99tandem@gmail.com) writes:

So apprently you support extortion... Who's pocket are you in? My best guess is At&t.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 24.1.155.220  
Remote IP address: 24.1.155.220

RECEIVED

SandraLyn Bailey

**From:** Jon Haynes [jhaynes@falsesoul.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:34 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Jon Haynes (jhaynes@falsesoul.com) writes:

How is it that a lawyer with extremely limited experience in the area of Communications, barring your stunningly impressive position as legal Advisor to FCC Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth gets to be the head of the FCC?

I guess with your limited experience with communications services, and your apparent "corporations-should-be-able-to-do-whatever -they-want" attitude I can understand how you would accept and promote the idea of a tiered internet where companies like AT&T can charge whatever they want to particular websites. Let me break this down for you: As company I approach local Telco ABC in my area and I purchase a full DS3 (if you're unsure that this is I suggest you try out Google), and I host my own web servers at my company. My company pays for that pipe, and the people who view the page pay for their bandwidth to their local ISP/Telco, in your infinite understanding why should AT&T be able to charge my company more because my website gets more traffic? My company already pays a hefty price for the DS3, where is the justification in charging additional fees?

You're a shill for the fleecing of America by the corporation, and this is coming from a registered Republican who works in the telecommunication industry. There is a reason that Ma Bell was broken up, and you are allowing them to reform and destroy the neutrality of the Internet. This will ultimately come back and cause more charges to the consumer because companies will just pass on the charges on down the line.

With utmost sincerity,

Jon Haynes

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 216.145.76.19  
Remote IP address: 216.145.76.19

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

**From:** Jonathan Frappier [frappier.jonathan@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:51 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Jonathan Frappier (frappier.jonathan@gmail.com) writes:

Limiting access to websites who cannot pay hurts users more than anything. I already pay Comcast for access to the internet, why should I be limited to how quickly I can get to certain sites? While the idea in theory sounds good, it is not a good theory in practice. The internet is a global network and should be accessible by whoever pays for service through their ISP at the speeds they pay for.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 63.138.170.34  
Remote IP address: 63.138.170.34

RECEIVED

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Jonathan McKamey [jmckamey@imaginant.com]  
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:00 PM  
To: KJMWEB  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Jonathan McKamey (jmckamey@imaginant.com) writes:

Dear Sir,

I was rather upset to see you endorse the idea of allowing telephone companies to limit the bandwidth of sites such as google.

I pay \$45 a month for 'unlimited' internet connection. Google does not contact ME, I contact THEM. Restricting my internet access to some websites because that website will not pay the telco is outrageous.

Since I am the one buying the service, if the internet provider needs to make more money, they should be charging the customer (me).

I find the proposal outrageous, and yet another way for internet providers to limit their customers service, without telling the customer.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 70.100.122.222  
Remote IP address: 70.100.122.222

RECEIVED

SandraLyn Bailey

---

**From:** Jonathan Sutton [dalai98@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:06 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Jonathan Sutton (dalai98@yahoo.com) writes:

Please, no tiered internet. Net neutrality is a key reason for the internet's success. Tiered speeds and access is a form of censorship which I am wholly against.

Thanks,  
Jonathan

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 65.96.254.160  
Remote IP address: 65.96.254.160

RECEIVED

Sandralyn Bailey

**From:** Jordan Thevenow-Harrison [jordan.th@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:23 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Jordan Thevenow-Harrison (jordan.th@gmail.com) writes:

Having dealt with the FCC before I was impressed when I got my ham radio license. Now, you have overstepped your bounds by allowing telecommunications providers to control bandwidth based on their own politics and competitions. The \*only\* people who are punished as a result of your decision are the American consumers that maintain your livelihood. I hope you come to your senses and reverse this decision immediately.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 12.202.161.195  
Remote IP address: 12.202.161.195

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

**From:** Joshua Casner [jcasner1@binghamton.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:31 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Joshua Casner (jcasner1@binghamton.edu) writes:

So, you're all for the concept of tiered networks then?  
Next you'll have the post office charge people for getting alot of mail, then, because it's using the post office service to deliver it? The internet is the single greatest tool of our time. Please don't let the telecom giants take complete control of it.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 128.226.208.37  
Remote IP address: 128.226.208.37

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

**From:** Justin Brusky [asimovrobot@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 24, 2006 1:57 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Justin Brusky (asimovrobot@yahoo.com) writes:

Endorsing a tiered internet? This is ridiculous and seems like a good way stop forward progress in a number of different areas. The US is already far behind much of the world in broadband penetration... why would people need broadband if anyone can go throttling sites at will and extorting money in order to allow their traffic to pass uninhibited. Rethink this position. Also possibly think about getting out of the pocket of what is fast reorganizing into good 'ol Ma Bell.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 66.191.85.29  
Remote IP address: 66.191.85.29

**Sandralyn Bailey****RECEIVED**

**From:** Justin Spaeth [jspaeth@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:19 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Justin Spaeth (jspaeth@gmail.com) writes:

Mr. Martin I just found out about your decision to allow for a tiered internet. While i think it is good that they cannot degrade services they are currently giving I still think that is giving the telcos too much. It will only be time before they try and degrade service too. I also think that this could definately hurt free commerce on the net. New sites would be required to pay a (most likely) exhorbent fee to try and compete with a site that has been around for years. The idea of a tiered internet appals me because I am already paying for my internet access and the companies that they are trying to make pay are also paying for the bandwith that they use, and it just seems evil that they want to charge for access a third time. While I doubt that you will read this I just wanted you to hear my opinion on this matter. Thank you for your time, and have a nice day

Justin Spaeth

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 24.182.145.177  
Remote IP address: 24.182.145.177

**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

RECEIVED

**From:** Justin Thiel [jthiel@Tech-geek.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:33 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Justin Thiel (jthiel@Tech-geek.net) writes:

Why oh why do you want to let AT&T throttle their bandwidth to major content providers. (i.e. Google) If I'm google I'm sure I'm paying hundreds of thousands of dollars per year for net access. Also as a consumer I'm paying anywhere from 15-40 dollars per month for my home internet access. So we are both paying for our fair share of internet access. It isn't fair since google uses the net more that they pay more. If AT&T wants to charge them more next time they negotiate the contract thats fine since google can then shop for a new providers (if possible) but to just start up fees suddenly that prey directly on your business is no better than the mafia of the 50's and 60's.

Please stop this. Or send me some of that money you got from AT&T

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 66.190.5.48  
Remote IP address: 66.190.5.48

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

**From:** Justin Wherrity [justin\_wherrity@sra.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:21 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Justin Wherrity (justin\_wherrity@sra.com) writes:

How much did At&T pay you?

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 65.210.87.198  
Remote IP address: 65.210.87.198

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

**From:** Karl Abele [keatone24@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:55 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Karl Abele (keatone24@hotmail.com) writes:

Those lines have been subsidized by the people of America. The people own them and the big telcos have no right to charge for bandwidth usage. This will backfire. You have been warned.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 209.6.208.36  
Remote IP address: 209.6.208.36

Sandralyn Bailey

**From:** Kelly Dunn [eagoid@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:41 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Kelly Dunn (eagoid@hotmail.com) writes:

When I purchase my bandwidth from an ISP I expect to get what I pay for. Creating such a tiered network would be like paying twice, which in common law is illegal. I will not support nor use any network, corporation or service that attempts to install such a tiered system. Your name will go down in history as the new Charles Boycott. In case you are unfamiliar with the story behind the name, he was the landlord in Ireland who refused to lower rent during famine, leading to the original boycott. Refusal to use a telco service will now be called a Martin. Welcome to history.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 24.161.73.200  
Remote IP address: 24.161.73.200

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

**From:** Kenneth Myers [alphageek72@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:20 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Kenneth Myers (alphageek72@gmail.com) writes:

Sir,

I am deeply opposed to the "tiered" Internet services proposed. As a paying customer, I pay a set fee each month for my Internet access. EVERY website pays a separate fee to host their website. Why should a website such as Google be charged AGAIN, when both Google and I are paying for access? This would be like both people paying for a long distance call, rather than just the caller. It makes no sense, and will drive smaller start-up web businesses out of business, and put US customers at a disadvantage to users in other countries.

Thank you for your time.

-Kenneth Myers, California High School Teacher

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 71.130.177.26  
Remote IP address: 71.130.177.26

**Sandralyn Bailey**

RECEIVED

**From:** Kevin Denton [zwarbyt@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:23 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Kevin Denton (zwarbyt@gmail.com) writes:

DO NOT CHARGE GOOGLE FOR BANDWIDTH ON ISP'S THATS CORRUPCION AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 216.153.131.66  
Remote IP address: 216.153.131.66

**SandraLyn Bailey**

RECEIVED

**From:** Kevin Martin [km@wrong.iam]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:21 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Kevin Martin (km@wrong.iam) writes:

Your decision to allow telecom companies to charge large websites "Suchas Google, and Yahoo" is a wrong decision.

A tiered internet will effectivly break. The internet as we know it today. And create a large advertising medium that no one is interested in.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 142.59.255.43  
Remote IP address: 142.59.255.43

**SandraLyn Bailey**

**From:** Kevin Sawyer [sawyerk@apci.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 20, 2006 1:18 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Adelstein  
**Subject:** Deregulation (FCC Order 05-150)

**RECEIVED**

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Importance:** High

Dear Commissioner Adelstein-

We are an ISP and Technology Supplier in Fairview Heights, Illinois and serve 1,500 customers. Deregulation will harm our business and the ability to provide competitive services to our customers. Consumers need and deserve the choice they enjoy today and deregulation will take away their right to choose providers and services. Anti-competitive practices by SBC/Ameritech (now AT&T) reduced our base of subscribers by 3,500 over the past five years.

President Bush signed Executive Order 13272 on August 13, 2002 requiring federal agencies to implement policies protecting small entities when writing new rules and regulations. President Bush' Small Business Agenda states that every new business starts with an idea for a better product or process, which has been the driving force of Internet innovation we enjoy today.

These ideas become reality only when confident entrepreneurs are willing to take economic risks and ISP's have gallantly taken this risk. Small businesses are the heart of the American economy because they drive innovation-new firms are established on the very premise that they can do a better job and recognize that a one-size-fits-all approach is not good for business and innovation.

A few legacy carriers cannot continue to benefit from valuable government grants and licenses, including the use of public rights-of-way, and be allowed to extend those rights in a way that bars others from offering their service to the public.

President Bush has called for recognition that supporting America's small businesses is critical to ensuring continued job creation. Today, small businesses create two-thirds of new private sector jobs in America, employ more than half of all workers, and account for more than half of the output of our economy.

The FCC has been entrusted with protecting consumers, encouraging economic development, and ensuring that competition is allowed to develop, rather than being quashed by a deregulated monopoly. Already, we are seeing the Bells move to increase prices, and without regulation, small business will be harmed, thousands more ISP's will be forced out business, highly-skilled workers will lose their jobs and consumers will lose the choice of platform for broadband services and support.

Deregulation will be bad for America and we encourage you to reconsider deregulating open access and Computer Inquiries.

Sincerely,

Kevin Sawyer, President/CEO  
Applied Personal Computing, Inc.  
sawyerk@apci.net  
618.632.7282

**SandraLyn Bailey**

**From:** Kimberly Israel [kac15228@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 24, 2006 7:03 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Cc:** malenchite@gmail.com  
**Subject:** AT&T network neutrality decision

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Martin,  
I am very disappointed in the stand you have taken regarding network neutrality - specifically the idea that AT&T and other companies should be permitted to require websites to pay to get adequate bandwidth. This policy could result in shutting down new, small, or less popular sites that cannot afford to pay such fees, reducing the variety of content that makes the internet such a wonderful resource.

I realize that the telecommunications companies are in business to make a profit, and so if bandwidth use is increased, the money has to come from somewhere. A simple solution, however, does exist: companies need only charge their ISP customers for the bandwidth they use - regardless of what site that bandwidth comes from.

It shouldn't matter if I as an ISP customer want to access a large site like Google or a tiny site like someone's personal blog as long as I pay for the bandwidth I use to view these sites. Having the charge for bandwidth on the customer side instead of the website side would preserve individual's ability to access whatever websites they choose while still allowing telecommunications companies to make a fair profit. I hope you will reconsider your position.  
Sincerely,  
Kimberly Israel  
Durham, NC

---

Do You Yahoo!?  
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around  
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Sandralyn Bailey

---

**From:** Kyle D. Johnson [dream\_spawn@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 7:32 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Kyle D. Johnson (dream\_spawn@hotmail.com) writes:

Tiered internet? Are you a retard? I have this feeling that you don't even know what the internet is or how to use it, so what do you care if you screw it up? When are you going to stop thinking about filling your own pockets and start thinking about the people you are supposed to be representing? You are contributing to this country looking like Nazi Germany (control of information anyone?). Thanks a lot.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 65.31.180.136  
Remote IP address: 65.31.180.136

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Kyle Echols [Kyleechols@gmail.com]  
 Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:59 PM  
 To: KJMWEB  
 Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
 Office of the Secretary

Kyle Echols (Kyleechols@gmail.com) writes:

Good Afternoon,

I'm writing because I understand, from various articles posted around the internet, that you have sided with telco's idea that charging an additional fee for web sites to get "priority" access to their network is a good idea. The problem with this is very simple.

1.) The END USER pays the provider for (for example) 3mbit internet connection, which in ANY other business means 3mbit available to every thing you want to use it for. This "idea" of the telco's says, we will give you up to 3mbit IF the site/server/host your connecting to pays us this extra money, if not we reserve the right to make that site crawl along at or below dial up speeds if we choose.

2.) The site/server/host is ALREADY paying a connect fee for their bandwidth otherwise they wouldn't be online. Why ok a tax for these sites when in the long run it can only serve to break the foundation upon which the internet was built and significantly limit innovation and cooperation, this will further push the rest of the world to do everything possible to force the United States into giving up control of internet contracts (such as ICANN).

3.) This decision will set us FARTHER behind in high speed internet connections. Want proof? Look at Japan 100Mbit to the home for less than we pay for 5mbit. If you want to do something to help the internet consider pushing to have speeds raised to the customer and rates lowered (we are currently among the most expensive as far as cost per mb).

This idea is coming from the same telco that was broken up 20 yrs ago (due to monopoly violations) and currently trying to piece themselves back together, do you have ANY plans to stop this ? As chairman of the FCC it is YOUR JOB to stop this AND work FOR THE PEOPLE not against. I will be forwarding this message to my congress people and push for actions such as these to be stopped. Since the department that is responsible for it seems to be unable and/or unwilling to do so.

Thank you for your time and I sincerely hope you take these points into consideration,

Kyle Echols  
 kyleechols@gmail.com

-----  
 Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
 Remote host: 63.99.187.207  
 Remote IP address: 63.99.187.207

RECEIVED

Sandralyn Bailey

---

**From:** Larissa Hersom [larissah@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:40 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Larissa Hersom (larissah@gmail.com) writes:

When I pay for my internet service, I expect free and opportunity to load and search whatever sites I choose, all with equal access. You are infringing on my right to do so.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.185.198.41  
Remote IP address: 68.185.198.41