

7521169694.txt

I moved from Washington, DC to Chattanooga, TN around three months ago. In Washington, I had one option for the provision of internet for seven years living in five different locations: Comcast. As a subscriber to Netflix, I noticed a substantial decline in the quality of our service toward the end of last year. It was only recently that I realized that noticeable decline in service quality was concurrent with negotiations between Netflix and Comcast about establishing a fast lane for the internet.

Since moving to Chattanooga, I have had the pleasure of having access to three different high speed internet service providers, the best of which is clearly EPB, our local utility that invested millions in the fastest publicly owned fiber-optic network in the western hemisphere. For the same price that I paid Comcast in Washington, DC, for spotty service that got even worse when Comcast was negotiating with content providers, I now get 1,000 MBPS.

Giving Comcast and other internet service providers the right to extort content providers for access to a faster lane will only encourage the complacency that ISPs so blatantly show through the quality of service they provided for the cost they charge and serves to benefit the monopoly from which they have so handsomely benefited for years.

Rather, the provision of internet should either be called what it is, a utility, or the monopolies that exist in every major city and many mid-sized city must be broken up.

Certainly, no consumer could conceivably benefit from the future affect of licensed extortion, and that is precisely what will happen in the absence of legal protection of net neutrality.

My only consolation in the event you elect to give in to the companies that pay so much for influence is having a publicly owned utility providing my internet.