Please retain full 100% net neutrality without a 'fast lane' concept. The 'fast lane' concept is merely linguistic gymnastics to avoid using the phrase 'slow lane'.

I understand you can reclassify broadband to be communications and not fall afoul of the Supreme Court ruling. Please do so.

Reasons - Social

1) Access to services and communications media will become dependent on peoples' ability to pay. If freedom of speech is a basic right - limiting access to some media financially is an unwarranted constraint.

2) Access to partisan political web sites could be constrained because someone did not pay for 'fast lane'. This is clearly not in the interest of the republic.

3) Free forms of education are dependent on broad band. Many of them include video - many of them are charity driven (e.g. Wikipedia, Khan Academy) and won't be able to avoid the 'slow lane'. This will constrain class mobility.

4) Social stability in America is disturbed right now. Left and Right are not talking. 1% versus 99% is part of the dialog. This issue is seen as elite versus common Americans and can be socially divisive.

Reasons - Economic Development

1) Innovation in America depends on lowering barriers to enablers - enablers including the internet. Schumpeter demands destruction - the Internet has been disruptive and enabled huge growth for America. Why mess with that? Why change the proven model to a dubious model (i.e. 'fast lane' will enable innovation).

2) Cable internet service at any address is monopolistic - the consumer has only one choice. That means which information is 'fast lane' and 'slow lane' is chosen by your address - with all the attendant social, economic and political implications. Mine is a rural address - I have only one fast internet choice. We always regulate natural monopolies. Asking for Net Neutrality seems like a fair compromise for cable companies enjoying the privilege of a natural monopoly.

3) The lowest capital businesses are software businesses. They are dependent on the ability to use the Internet to distribute their products. 'Slow Lane' will impede entrepreneurship in America.

4) I work in private industry. The profit imperative is real and important. However, the market will adjust. If the revenue opportunities for telecom companies around 'fast lane' are not available - the telecom companies will continue to innovate, the stock market will assess new valuations and life will go on. There is no reason to end Net Neutrality.

5) Other nations are not embracing 'fast lane' ideas. Don't give them an artificial advantage for innovation.

Thanks for considering my inputs.
Daryll Fogal.