

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Robert Schwartz [ihborbobobo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:06 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Robert Schwartz (ihborbobobo@yahoo.com) writes:

In regards to comments that AT&T can charge whatever they want and limit bandwidth.

I think you are wrong, mis-guided, and bought/sold. I wish to lodge a formal complaint. Your comments are undemocratic and show you to be a corporate stooge.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 129.171.49.106
Remote IP address: 129.171.49.106

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Ronald Hinton [RHbusiness@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 5:35 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ronald Hinton (RHbusiness@gmail.com) writes:

As a well informed internet user, I would like to let you know that I am against anything that would allow for companies to limit the speed which communications can take place.

After reading the article on

http://www.networkingpipeline.com/blog/archives/2006/03/fcc_chief_att_c.html

I was very distressed that you side with AT&T on this issue. If this trend is allowed to go through, then it can and likely will have very chilling effects on internet use and openness.

Both the end customer and any company paying for a website's operation are paying for their connections, and being an open network, it's not a backbone provider's place to restrict traffic.

Thank you for your consideration.

-Ronald Hinton

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.129.80.223
Remote IP address: 66.129.80.223

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Ross Corliss [Ross.Corliss@valpo.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:42 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ross Corliss (Ross.Corliss@valpo.edu) writes:

I'm surprised and alarmed to see support for the tiered internet model. I was under the impression that every business and home connection to the internet was already paid for - if each party is paying for their up- and down-stream bandwidth, why are telcom companies justified in asking some parties to pay for someone else's downstream?

It seems that if there's a disparity in the system somewhere, it could be resolved through the peering arrangements already made by the network providers, and need not involve the users that connect to those providers.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 18.252.6.1
Remote IP address: 18.252.6.1

Sandralyn Bailey

From: rstaaf@direcway.com
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:00 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: So called Tiered Internet

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I have read with some concern about your support of a "tiered internet" where telcos will have the ability to charge sites for their bandwidth. Considering that I am a US taxpayer I would like an explanation of how this will make the internet better for me as a consumer? I just can't see how this will benefit anyone but the telcos. Seems once again our government is far more concerned with big business than it is with us taxpayers.

Just my 2 cents...

Bob

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Russ Eckert [Russ.Eckert@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:00 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Russ Eckert (Russ.Eckert@gmail.com) writes:

Chairman Martin,

I'd like to write you a short note asking that you reconsider your stance on the creation of a tiered internet. By allowing this the FCC may be stifling innovation and causing harm to the public. I'm sure you've received thousands of letters like this, so I won't prattle on. Have a good day.

Sincerely,
Russ Eckert

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.196.236.86
Remote IP address: 216.196.236.86

SandraLyn Bailey

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Ryan D. Meyer [rmeyer@youthinkitweprintit.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:25 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ryan D. Meyer (rmeyer@youthinkitweprintit.com) writes:

As the owner of a small business, I find your stance on network neutrality more than distasteful. Allowing CLECs the right to prioritize their network goes against EVERYTHING the Internet stands for. I will make it my goal, as I am soon leaving management of my company, to bring you down. Change your stance, you evil, evil animal.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 71.213.227.165
Remote IP address: 71.213.227.165

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Ryan Rowland [trrowland@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:06 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ryan Rowland (trrowland@hotmail.com) writes:

I understand the tiered internet design allows for taxation of commerce but I think you're missing the big picture. You're going to be putting so many small businesses out of business that its going to do more damage than good. Not the mention the mass exodus you will encounter if this happens. I know many people in our small company of 80 employees fully intends to cancel their ISP subscription should this happen. Yes, life without internet will be devastating, but I refuse to touch your money mongering abomination.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.237.70.157
Remote IP address: 216.237.70.157

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Ryan Yelland [ryanyelland@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:15 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ryan Yelland (ryanyelland@hotmail.com) writes:

I just read a statement regarding a tiered internet is something supported by the FCC. In the same article I read that it was deemed acceptable to double dip for the same service if you are a monopolistist telecom (AT&T) that was already broken up for being a monopoly some years ago.

I find this disturbing, reprehensible, and outright criminal to charge a person to access a service (end user), a service to allow access (website aka google), and to again charge the service again "special rates" on top of it.

This is yet another symptom of big government supporting big business at any cost to the country as a whole.
Drop this tiered internet garbage and leave the internet alone.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.29.117.32
Remote IP address: 65.29.117.32

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Sam Bowling [Sam.Bowling@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:28 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sam Bowling (Sam.Bowling@gmail.com) writes:

I am confused as to why you agree with large corporations that it's ok to limit service to non-paying sites. This is charging twice for the same data. I pay a monthly fee to these providers to cover for the bandwidth costs they incur upon my use. Why can the corporations charge again for the same data being transmitted?

I thought you guys were made to help the little people and stop big corporations from doing this. If such a thing were put in place I'd be paying AT&T twice to visit my own webpage! How is that not extortion?

The reason the internet has been so successful as a means of information exchange is because it has remained a neutral party where people can discuss topics. Having sites intentionally lagged will make users look elsewhere for information. This will effectively destroy popular sites or web sites as they become popular and cross over to "the next level" of the internet.

Sam

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.205.34.215
Remote IP address: 12.205.34.215

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Sceva Lewis [BlackEyedSceva7@yahoo.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

Sceva Lewis (BlackEyedSceva7@yahoo.com) writes:

You are a fool, when you go home at night, and you think about what you have done. How you have corrupt the powers in this country. I hope that you feel an overwhelming guilt, and know that you will likely never, ever, be forgiven for what you have done.

You have destroyed our country, and will go down in history as the man that ended everything, just for money.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.46.199.125
Remote IP address: 68.46.199.125

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Scott Michalczyk [smichalczyk@colesys.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:28 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Scott Michalczyk (smichalczyk@colesys.com) writes:

If it is true in fact that you are in support of a tiered internet, then you are truly a disgrace to humanity. I would love to hear your thoughts behind this...

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.73.1.204
Remote IP address: 209.73.1.204

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Scott Stacher [FCC@Stacher.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:25 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Scott Stacher (FCC@Stacher.com) writes:

The Internet is a unique utility, not a product to be sold or managed. The idea of a tiered approach is the first step toward censorship. Your organization is supposed to represent the rights of the PEOPLE, not the companies of America. Please focus on representing the best interest of all of us and not just the Republican Party.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.234.224.19
Remote IP address: 69.234.224.19

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Seth Lankford [seth.lankford@duke.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 5:05 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Seth Lankford (seth.lankford@duke.edu) writes:

Kevin,

I hope that some of your comments the other day at the TelecomNext show were misinterpreted. Looking at networkingpipeline.com they believe that: "Martin told attendees that telcos should be allowed to charge web sites whatever they want if those sites want adequate bandwidth."

Obviously a customer must pay their ISP for their network usage - but they should not have to pay the kind of "extortion fees" that people have been getting worked up about. Paying for a certain amount of data transfer at a certain rate is already in everyone's contract with their ISP - paying telcos to make sure they don't use traffic shapers to decrease the quality of service of those who do not pony up some sort of "QOS" fee is nearing extortion. Look at the highway system - do people who pay more taxes get to drive over the speed limit? In some countries this may be true - but not in the US.

I think you should clarify that the different tiers of broadband access already exist and are managed by ISPs like Cox and TimeWarner - and that asking for extortion fees to ensure QOS is not something telcos should be allowed to do.

The questions we should be asking are of the telcos and can be found here:
<http://muniwireless.com/community/1023>

Have you read Bruce Kushnick's "The \$200 Billion Broadband Scandal" ?
<http://www.newnetworks.com/broadbandscandals.htm>

cheers,
-seth

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.104.204.211
Remote IP address: 12.104.204.211

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Shaun Root [root88@ice.org]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:59 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Shaun Root (root88@ice.org) writes:

Not cool.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 167.230.38.116
Remote IP address: 167.230.38.116

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

SandraLyn Bailey

~~RECEIVED~~

From: Stephen Gallucio [dns@simplestreet.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:37 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Stephen Gallucio (dns@simplestreet.com) writes:

FCC Chief: AT&T Can Limit Net Bandwidth

That's just not right.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.211.39.254
Remote IP address: 65.211.39.254

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Stephen Jones [stephenkj@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 3:45 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Stephen Jones (stephenkj@gmail.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,

American Telcos cannot be allowed to create a multi-tiered internet. Consumers already pay for their bandwidth, and content providers already pay for their bandwidth. Downgrading services and forcing them to pay a second time to have normal access is ridiculous.

The government allows the Telcos to provide the services they do, and to lay the lines that they lay, and to hold the relative monopolies that they hold under the assumption of public good and that they will be common carriers, completely ambivalent to what is being sent on the lines.

Moreover, the government creates tax and other incentives to benefit to Telcos to encourage the creation of modern fiber networks and other advancement. These benefits were given to the Telcos with promises of services which have yet to be delivered. Further lining the pockets of the Telcos by allowing this tiered internet is unacceptable and counter productive to future new internet technologies.

Thank you.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.86.141.133
Remote IP address: 64.86.141.133

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Steve Johnson [stevej@mojocode.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2006 5:22 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Steve Johnson (stevej@mojocode.com) writes:

Your recent public comments seem to indicate that you believe ISP's, like verizon/comcast/att, should be able to charge premiums to certain websites to carry their traffic. The problem with this "tiered internet" philosophy is that I have already paid my ISP to carry the traffic and the traffic is mine. In the interest of democracy and commerce, the internet carriers must remain traffic neutral and not be able to either favor their own services or block/restrict the traffic of others. That would be like allowing Ford or GM charge Chrysler extra fees to allow Chrysler customers drive on a public road.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 70.217.160.33
Remote IP address: 70.217.160.33

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Steven Wilson [steve@ka6s.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:40 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Steven Wilson (steve@ka6s.com) writes:

I find the concept of a tiered Internet as proposed in your speech a BAD idea! The carriers ARE being paid well for services being provided already. You might as well go the way the Chinese are, an separate net!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.81.240.50
Remote IP address: 64.81.240.50

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Terry Oelmann [pipefiter46060@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 7:06 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Terry Oelmann (pipefiter46060@yahoo.com) writes:

Sir, I am one of the majority of the people in this country and we are getting tired of setting back and letting the weak minded people of this country get there way, its time to tell them to set down and shut up! We/I am tired of the government regulating us to death! The governments so called "good" ideas end up as usuall costing the average guy more money! Like water heaters, 3 years ago the government stuck there nose in to make them "better" and as usuall did NOT think things thru! well the average guy that bout the affordable ranch style home, or mobil home ends up paying big money when it comes time to change them now because they are wider now and do not fit thru the standard openings like they used to!,,,,, same goes for the FCC, stick to governing the radio airwaves such as FM radio and ham operators and leave the internet alone! AT&T has made enough profit over the years, if you find that making google pay more is the right thing to do, then in the same law you pass for that then you also need to FORCE the internet companys to lower there prices for residential service drasitcly! fair is fair!! and it wont stop there! Just do what the majority is ready to tell the minority to do! "set down and shut up!" we are tired of being told what to do by the same stupid people that need a tag on a hair dryer not to use in or near water, these stupid people need to be told enough is enough!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.205.71.103
Remote IP address: 12.205.71.103

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Theodore Kisner [kisner@physics.ucsb.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:15 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Theodore Kisner (kisner@physics.ucsb.edu) writes:

Dear Mr. Chairman,

It is with deep regret that I learned recently of your views supporting the proposed extortion by the telecommunication industry.

All players on the internet have ALREADY PAID for their network connections. If the telecom industry needs to raise rates to cover costs, then fine. However, the telecom industry is trying to change the very structure of the internet and the way traffic is routed.

The (false) analogy thrown around is that this is like putting in a "toll" road on the information superhighway. This is false because we *already* pay tolls- where a larger toll gets us more bandwidth (similar to charging a semi-truck a larger toll than a car). The proposed tiering would be like charging red cars more than blue cars, or charging Fords more than Chevys.

A "tiered" internet is a recipe for disaster. In a free market, consumers could "vote with their wallet" and effectively kill this lunacy. Unfortunately, we have state-sanctioned monopolies rather than a free market. Most communities have only 1 or 2 choices in broadband service.

The internet backbone is critical infrastructure that was built with assistance from taxpayers. The FCC needs to proactively protect the neutrality of this infrastructure. Anything less simply confirms our fears that the FCC is nothing but a shill for the telecom industry.

Thank you for your time.

-Theodore S. Kisner

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.108.240.216
Remote IP address: 68.108.240.216

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Thomas R. Beaber [trbeaber@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 12:05 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Thomas R. Beaber (trbeaber@yahoo.com) writes:

I personally dont think any change in the internet is warrented. The main reason is the fact the high speed access is not even countrywide and what is called highspeed is not really reliable. Allowing telcos to charge access fees for companies like google is just plain dumb. Google already pays for its bandwidth and the enduser pays for bandwidth. i dont see where the telcos are losing out. Many telco companies are unopposed in many areas. so consumer cant just jump ship and choose another service.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 207.108.54.122
Remote IP address: 207.108.54.122

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Timothy Schoenharl [tschoenh@cse.nd.edu]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 12:57 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Tiered Internet

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Martin,

I am a Computer Science Ph.D. student, a citizen and a taxpayer. I would just like to share my thoughts and feelings based on years of professional experience.

Unfettered, fast access to the internet is ABSOLUTELY VITAL to ensuring American competitiveness in the global marketplace. Inexpensive broadband allows me to maintain high productivity at work and home, which allows me to earn more money, pay more taxes and keep our economy growing. By allowing monopolistic ISPs to create a tiered internet, we will be killing the "goose that laid the golden egg". Productivity will fall and we will be unable to compete with countries like South Korea and Japan that offer inexpensive broadband.

We must look at the internet as the fundamental service that it is. It is as important to businesses today as electricity. By allowing what is essentially a cartel to regulate access we risk the future welfare of our nation. These corporations will earn a short-term profit while we sacrifice the long-term viability of our economy. At present, manufacturing jobs are steadily flowing overseas. The reason our economy continues to grow in spite of this is that we are shifting to a knowledge-based economy. And fundamental to that shift is the internet.

I hope that you will consider my comments. I understand that I am very passionate about this issue and I hope that you can understand that my passion for this issue is inherently linked to my love of my country and my heartfelt desire for us to continue to be a prosperous society.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Timothy Schoenharl

Ph.D. Student
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana, USA
574-631-7596

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Tom Burdick [tburdil@uic.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:32 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Tom Burdick (tburdil@uic.edu) writes:

Charging even more money for the internet would stifle innovations, prevent the small one man businesses from ever starting off. All of the big huge internet businesses that exist today were started often times by a small 1 or 2 man shop, allowing AT&T and their greed charge more to access such small sites would in destroy them. All of the wonderful free internet sites available on the internet today would likely be unable to afford such ridiculous fees, and no one would want to visit sites that cost them, it wouldn't be very practical. I think what your missing is what is good for the general public. Instead your looking at whats good for the State and the Corporation.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.148.43.87
Remote IP address: 24.148.43.87

SandraLyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: Vaughn Teegarden [vaughnt@iplenus.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:45 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Vaughn Teegarden (vaughnt@iplenus.com) writes:

After reading about your support for AT&T to demand surcharges from large sites such as Google, I knew I had to write. AT&T is already getting paid. I buy access to the internet from a local cable company. The local cable company buys access from a larger provider, and so on, up to the large Telcos. Google, Yahoo, or any other large internet service does the same thing. They are buying the bandwidth they need to run their service from some provider. In other words, THEY ARE ALREADY PAYING FOR IT! This is clearly double dipping on the part of AT&T and the other Telcos, sanctioned by YOU, and I can't see anything good coming from it.

Here is an analogy. Suppose I go out to a restaurant with 20 of my best friends. We all order, we all buy drinks, we all chip in to leave a great tip. But when we go to leave, the manager comes up and says "I'm sorry, but because you are a large party, we're going to have to charge you another 50%, because you took up so many seats." If this happened to you, you'd raise holy hell. Yet this is the same situation you are putting Google and others in. They are coming in, buying BIG chunks of services in the form of the pipes into their facilities, and then being asked to pay again. So what if they pay a third party, who is then paying for the bandwidth from the telco? The telco is still getting paid for that bandwidth. It's the same thing.

If AT&T and others need more cash to support the services they provide, then they need to be raising their access fees across the board, fairly, and not targeting internet services that I am already paying to access.

We've got a pretty good thing going in the Internet here in America. It's driving commerce like crazy, and you want to throttle it? You're going to screw things up if you continue on this path.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 67.77.141.37
Remote IP address: 67.77.141.37

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Whatever [none@here.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:18 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Whatever (none@here.com) writes:

Thanks for the AT&T ruling. Glad to know that the FCC is here to protect us in times of crisis. How about a bill to remove this outdated body of government waste

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.102.254.33
Remote IP address: 64.102.254.33