The attached document is part of a mass mailing. The number of identical documents as specified in the File Number/City, St. field have been received by the Commission on this same date. You may view the documents at the FCC Reference Information Center, at 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC, Room CY-A257.

14-28

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Christopher Warner

http://cwarner.kernelcode.com

Received & Inspected

JUN 0 2014

FCC Mail Room

Date: 24 May 2014

Federal Communications Commission
451 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
Regarding proceeding 14-28

To the commission,

It is with deep concern that I write this letter. Putting the issues of the Comcast/TimeWarner and now AT&T/DirectTV which are both very alarming to the side; Net Neutrality has been an issue I follow closely. Primarily because it's how I make my living while also being heavily involved on a day-to-day basis with some of the Internet's core protocols. After watching the C-SPAN coverage (which was streamed at very low quality) and listening to the commentary from this commission, it has become excruciatingly clear that there is a lack of fundamental understanding on how the Internet actually works.

If tiered levels of the Internet are allowed to exist you will be dismantling the inter prefix. If one provider can charge for escalated delivery of bits, ALL providers will eventually do the same. You will begin to have non-integrated networks, providers that don't allow their packets to travel over certain networks because they are too slow and or haven't paid the fee and it will be a bit of a mess. The reason we absolutely need Net Neutrality is because without it, the network in the US will be much slower than it is currently. Ceding jobs, science, technology and progress for us all. Other countries have been consistently moving their networks forward in first class ways at low cost to their citizens and they are doing this because it's an investment in a 21st century core component to the economy, communication, jobs and the progress of human-kind. We have citizens in this country that can't even participate on the Internet or at excruciatingly slow speeds, it's an absolute travesty we aren't doing more here.

Please, strongly consider which side of the track you fall here because at this point we absolutely need Common Carrier classification of the Internet.

Sincerely,

Christopher Warner

Christopher Warner
55 Herkimer St
Brooklyn, NY 11216

14-28 DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Received & Inspected

JUN 02 2014

FCC Mail Room

1118 Valerie Way
Santa Rosa, CA 95407-7428
May 24, 2014

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Internet Neutrality Commentary

Dear Commissioners:

I am still in awe of internet development by my government. Access and quality of this service for our citizens lags shamefully, however, despite our head start. Domestic service when I last checked was worse than that of 37 other countries, often much worse and much more expensive. "Fast lanes" are often the norm abroad, but they are universal –not relegated to favored customers for extra profit. I call that internet neutrality! I don't understand what Mr. Wheeler means by the term.

The profit motive seems the chief impediment to good internet service for a decent price. It is axiomatic that high prices cannot be charged for that which is abundant. The huge corporations charged with providing internet service naturally enough show little interest in making good service abundant. Little progress has been made in extending glass fiber cables to improve service despite financial incentives. Rural service is poor to nonexistent. I recently read a comment by one of the developers of the World Wide Web asserting that broadband service has no intrinsic finite limits. Let's have lots of that service by lots of providers!

It should go without saying that the change in the designation of internet service by Mr. Powell that deprived the FCC of authority to make appropriate changes must be reversed.

The cartel of internet providers had essentially no role in the development of the internet, and deserves no special opportunities not afforded to any utility.

Sincerely,

Jon Steenhoven

Jon Steenhoven

cc: President Obama

14-28

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Amber and Andrew Getz
2915 Deakin Street
Berkeley, California 94705
telephone: (510) 548-3274
facsimile: (510) 540-7564
e-mail: [redacted]

Received & Inspected
JUN - 2 2014
FCC Mail Room

May 24, 2014

Federal Communications Commission
445 – 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Chairman Tom Wheeler
Commissioner Mignon Clyburn
Commissioner Jessica Rosenworcel
Commissioner Ajit Pai
Commissioner Michael O'Reilly

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Although we have yet to understand "commercially reasonable", we are likely to oppose the Commission's proposed "net neutrality" rules.

Please define the internet as a regulable communications system, then propose rules for real "net neutrality".

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment,

Amber Getz

Andrew Getz

14-28

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Received & Inspected

JUN -2 2014

FCC Mail Room

Lawrence S Teixeira
25 North Bassett Road
Brockton, MA 02301

May 27, 2014

Federal Communication Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Mr. Chairman Tom Wheeler:

I'm writing you concerning the experimental suggestion you made in the last meeting, about considering faster lane in the internet for some internet services.

Simply put, if you throw a wound gazelle in front of lion, the wound gazelle is not going to regain her health she's going to be eaten by the lion. Unless you build a structure language within Internet rules, which can stand in the court of law, reinforcing that Internet services providers do not discriminate regardless of the amount their customer's Internet service bill is, all of us small and others customers are going to be discriminated against.

I have 1.0 mbps broadband services with Verizon for $39.99 per month. I call Verizon constantly to fix the slow speed as low as 3.2 download, 2.1 upload. Verizon tells me I have to many programs in the system. I have no one or any place to go to solve my problem.

Thank you for listen,

Sincerely,

Lawrence S Teixeira

14-28

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

507 7th St. SW
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Received & Inspected

JUN -2 2014

FCC Mail Room

May 24, 2014

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Net neutrality

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for an opportunity to provide my comments on Net neutrality.

As a retired librarian I am delighted that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 guarantees that schools and libraries have broadband connections and that the FCC oversees the funding of those connections through the E-rate. However I am concerned that there is a possibility that Net neutrality will be eliminated. With a tiered service teachers will have to choose between teaching tools available via the internet based on cost rather than curriculum suitability. Wealthy communities will have no problem absorbing those costs, while rural and impoverished communities will be forced to provide second tier education. That is no way to prepare the labor force and tax payers of the future.

The principle of Occam's Razor would suggest that net neutrality be applied to internet service providers and that broadband be reclassified as a telecommunications service. Or, as the younger generation would say, "Use the KIS principle, and Keep it Simple."

Thank you for adding my concerns to your deliberations.

Sincerely,

Britta Karlberg

Britta Karlberg