

Honorable Julius Genachowski
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington DC 20554

To Whom It May Concern At The Federal Communications Commission:

As I have made clear previously I have serious concerns about this transaction between Verizon Wireless, SpectrumCo and Cox Communications, which also involves the organization Cellco Partnership D/BA. The reason is Verizon Wireless striking anti competitive non-compete agreements with the cable companies who they are supposed to be competing with to provide consumers more choice and lower prices. Instead in a form of collusion they are partnering with the big cable companies. We don't want a return to the Ma Bell style telephone monopoly nor a cable cartel monopoly. The duopoly on fixed broadband Internet is unacceptable.

I believe the entire transaction has to be reviewed in full along with the anti-competitive effects of the new marketing agreements struck. Verizon Wireless says unlike the AT&T T-Mobile deal its deal should be approved and the approval process be sped up because its deal is purely a spectrum transaction that lacks the anti-competitive effects of that merger. However, the marketing agreements with

cable companies despite Verizon's objections and claims they don't matter should be included as part of the review process for its spectrum transactions. The marketing agreements will result in reduced competition in the market for fixed wire-line phone, Internet and TV service if Verizon Communications ends FIOS services because of the deal.

These anti-competitive non-compete agreements would lead to Verizon Wireless re-selling services from the cable companies and the cable companies re-selling wireless services by Verizon Wireless. Instead of competing with each other Verizon and the cable companies would become partners. This is unacceptable. Congress intended to make phone companies compete with cable companies when they last reformed the Telecom Act in 1996.