The National Broadband Plan in its current form has failed to help spur broadband adoption and has ignored issues like the lack of competition in the wire-line broadband market for providing fixed Internet connections, high prices, sub-par service etc. It has instead stated the goal to use taxpayer subsidized funding for high-tech infrastructure projects alone to expand broadband deployment. The market for slow dial-up Internet which we are trying to move away from to broadband is more competitive certainly than the broadband market. Just as dial-up is classified as a telecommunications service so should broadband. On the surface it sounds like a novel idea and expanding broadband is a fine idea. I believe in open and universal access to communications technologies like broadband. Unfortunately the market for such fixed services is an anti competitive duopoly of big cable and phone companies and has only gotten bigger unfortunately under President Obama's Administration with the Qwest Century Link merger and conditions have even gotten worse with the Comcast NBCU merger. President Obama has proposed a National Wireless Initiative to extend mobile broadband deployment. On the surface it sounds good but unless there is Network Neutrality rules of nondiscrimination which I'll get into below its not worth it. We need an Open Internet free of corporate gatekeepers. Net Neutrality helps preserve that. I oppose the Internet Blacklist bill in Congress as I oppose any discrimination or censorship by government or corporations. We need to preserve the Internet as it is an open platform for free flow of communication, free flow of information and commerce.

Now President Obama's National Wireless Initiative proposes auctioning off public spectrum to wireless providers like AT&T (Ma Bell), Verizon Wireless, Sprint Nextel, T Mobil (which AT&T wants to merge with a merger that should be rejected -- have already filed comments in the docket on this saying so and stating why) etc to expand broadband deployment. Unless public interest obligations are mandated and enforced though requiring they use that spectrum transparently and provide nondiscriminatory open access to the Internet over their wireless services using said public spectrum it should not be sold off for their corporate profit at our expense. The public interest and public good are too important. If the goal is just to expand broadband deployment by throwing money via taxpayer subsidies at big telecom and cable companies to deploy more fixed wire-line and more wireless mobile broadband services at their benefit while upholding the status quo its not worth it. We should also encourage municipal broadband networks development and oppose efforts like those by North Carolina's legislature to ban local governments from deploying municipal broadband networks in unserved areas that create competition for the duopoly big cable and phone companies. Users and innovators need an Open Internet so the future Googles and Yahoos of the world can compete based on the merits of their services and win or lose on their own. To allow ISP discrimination and let iSPs pick winers and losers is just wrong as they'll charge tolls -- extortion to web based firms to get their websites to load faster while relegating organizations with websites who cannot afford their extortion (independent, noncommercial small ma and pa outfits online) to a slow public lane. I refuse to support the carving of the Net into an unequal two-tiered Internet. The Google Verizon Wireless pact in a way proposed Network Neutrality remain for wire-line fixed broadband providers but the FCC would not

have authority to directly regulate them and have oversight -- they would have authority only on a case by case basis and must report to a commission established by the corrupt industry players and get their permission to protect the Internet while at the same time exempting wireless and mobile broadband services from Network Neutrality. Even if Net Neutrality remained just for wireline broadband but was exempt from wireless we would have an unequal two-tiered Internet -- a fast public, open and universal fixed lane to access the Internet and a wireless lane with so called managed or discriminatory services. That is unacceptable. We need Network Neutrality for both fixed and wireless services.

Not only are Republicans in Congress blocking regulations to protect the Internet from a corporate takeover, theyâ€™re actually calling net neutrality a government takeover.

Net neutrality is the status quo. It's the way the Internet operates right now: free and open. And itâ€™s up to us to make sure it stays that way.I urge the FCC to draft stronger Network Neutrality rules of nondiscrimination along with reclassifying the FCC's definition of broadband as a Title II Telecommunications service to ensure the FCC has the statutory authority and oversight authority to protect the free and open Internet from corporate gatekeepers who want to destroy the Internet as it has always existed -- destroy the best thing about the Web -- the free and open nature of the web which encourages public participation -- and make it a closed medium. The Internet is the last mile -- last medium in America left free and open to users and innovators. AT&T's proposed data caps on broadband DSL and UVerse service unfairly exempt their own video services from competitors. Likewise without Network Neutrality cable companies could institute data caps to discourage users from accessing cheaper and better alternatives online to their more expensive digital cable TV packages by limiting users ability to use Netflix's Watch Now streaming service, websites like YouTube currently owned by Google and other video sharing sites like Hulu etc. This will hurt competition and innovation. Competition in the wire-line market for fixed broadband connections is already a duopoly between big cable and phone companies. For antitrust reasons AT&T should never have been allowed to re-merge with SBC Communications and/or Bell South and it has done so with both already. As long as Ma Bell remains intact since AT&T was allowed to begin putting Ma Bell back together we do need Network Neutrality rules as incentives have changed and continue to change for these large service providers when they merge with other service providers and reduce competition and consumer choices. Also when content providers like NBC Universal get to merge with Comcast as has been approved unfortunately it also provides a conflict of interest for the combined company to discriminate against content it doesn't own. Comcast could discriminate against users of its digital cable TV and/or high speed Internet businesses accessing content over TV or over the Web preferring content Comcast doesn't own by blocking or slowing down access to said content. What's more Comcast could charge higher retransmission fees to other cable TV providers and even satellite TV providers to broadcast NBCU content Comcast owns on other provider's

platforms. Imagine Comcast getting to supply NBCU stations and/or networks for free to their customers but charging high retransmission fees to DirecTV, Dish Network, Time Warner Cable, Cox, etc to do the same. Now its standard practice for TV networks to charge service providers of cable or satellite TV service retransmission fees but when a service provider owns a content provider that service provider can offer it for free and unfairly require other service providers to pay a lot of money in retransmission fees to access the channels. It's worth taking a look even when retransmission fees are charged to any service provider by content providers (independent of a service provider) how much is being charged in retransmission fees so its not too excessive after all those fees get passed onto consumers. Incentives change when big companies get bigger and they develop a conflict of interest. This is also why I oppose the AT&T T Mobil merger. Wire-line broadband services are already a duopoly in the U,.S. between big cable and phone companies and that duopoly has only gotten worse unfortunately in President Obama's Administration as Qwest got to merge with Century Link and Comcast swallowed up NBC Universal. Now AT&T which already has re-established monopoly status in wire-line services and wants to abuse its market dominance there to discriminate on the Internet wants duopoly status in cellular phone and wireless mobile broadband services. If its merger with T Mobil is approved it will be bad for everyone except shareholders of the two companies and the executives. I have already filed comments in the docket on that merger rejecting it. The FCC has already ruled wireless market as not competitive enough the merger would reduce competition even more and give AT&T a monopoly on GSM cellular phones. Between AT&T and Verizon Wireless they would control 80% of the wireless phone market. In Canada also the situation is bad with an oligopoly for high speed or broadband Internet services but its even worse in the U.S. As President Obama said as a candidate along the 2008 Presidential campaign when you begin to allow packet discrimination by ISPs, and filtering smaller and independent voices especially noncommercial voices get unfairly squeezed out and there's less diversity. Unless these big companies are broken up to create new competition we do need Network Neutrality rules. No regulation after all is just as bad as too much regulation. Yet in the absence of sufficient regulations Republicans in Congress keep saying there's too much regulation and some of the new regulations already passed to protect consumers/taxpayers or the environment need to be removed when in fact we need to preserve them and hold big businesses accountable to the public. Any taxpayer subsidized funding for expanding broadband deployment whether for fixed or wireless connections must be spent transparently and reported. The Universal Service Fund should be overhauled to make public investments in expanding broadband but it should be done transparently and any companies that accept such funds must have public interest obligations.