

7521744409.txt

I am a citizen in the state of Texas whose livelihood depends on having a reliable internet connection, as I work out of my home. I have experienced the internet service of several of the major telecoms and have noted with interest reports that municipally owned internet service is consistently of higher quality than that provided by the private companies. I cannot say that my service experiences have been good, overall. Private telecom companies often have conflicts of interest in attempts to maximize their profits at the expense of their consumers; a municipally owned telecom does not have such conflicts. There would be no stifling of bandwidth requests to content providers that fail to pay "ransomesque" fees to the telecoms to provide full service. If a municipally owned telecom were treated as any other municipal utility then the company would be beholden to its customers, the taxpayers and not to shareholders and other outside interests.

By restricting the ability of a municipality to create a telecom utility if desired by its populace, the FCC is actually discouraging market competition. The telecom companies are still free to provide services to residents of that municipality -- they will just have to provide superior service. This is a "burden" that any company does and should face in the marketplace in order to stay pertinent and competitive. Without such competition, we get a situation like we have today -- where the telecom companies provide only a bare minimum of service because its customers do not have sufficient choice to take their business elsewhere in many regions. Large cities such as the one I live in are more fortunate in that they have some choice, but many suburban and rural locales have only a single internet service provider to "choose" from. Restricting a municipality from offering internet service merely stifles healthy competition to the detriment of the consumers.