Residence is in the twilight zone between cable, telephone and wireless services caused by noncompetitive exclusive franchises excluding our area from prime services. I have cue to grips with the idea I will never be able to afford prime speeds on my limited income. (I am allegedly retired, age 73 with income below $25,000 a year in a good year.)

I cannot afford to pay for differentials in rates that would speed up my internet speeds -- or for services that can pay for bandwidth that would push individuals in like economic situations as mine to slower, impoverished transfer speeds.

It was my understanding in school the FCC was established to preserve and regulate the airwaves (and now so much more) in the name of and for the PUBLIC good -- not just that of the paying public. I feel the corruption of this stewardship into a preservation of central profit making entities interests in controlling media access has been a hallmark of FCC regulatory actions, rather than that of the general (and some of us poorer) public.

Now the moves to allow the end of net neutrality by the "sale" or "regulation" of bandwidth and speed going to the highest bidder whilst denigrating the service to we who can just about afford a computer and connection to stay in touch with modernity is antithetical to the original charter and idealistic purpose of the FCC andf the good of the greater pubic.