Dear FCC:

Monopolies are very dangerous businesses.

They lead to higher costs, lesser performance products and poorer service for consumers.
And do their big bucks damndest to strangle innovations and businesses that could conceivably have an impact on them.

So,

I propose that a condition of the merger be that the current cost / performance and service be enforceably required to improve.

For me, that means:
Broadband
1.5 Mbit/sec download
300 Kbit/sec upload
for $36.95/month.

I'd like an enforceable guarantee that I will initially receive that level of performance at that price.
And that it will improve, over time!

For example, consider that Optimum OnLine (OOL) in NY ***CURRENTLY*** offers 10M/1M for $39.95 !
www.optimumonline.com
How about that as the minimum target goal in 3 or 5 years?
For $39.95!
Why not a target of 100M/100M further down the road?
And then 1G/1G?

Without a requirement for further improvement,
will a bigger monopoly be *more* or *less* likely to be a positive factor in improving cost performance?

My theory is that 10M/1M won't actually be much more expensive to offer, if at all.
I believe the *real* bandwidth bottleneck is the human brain.
Even with a gazillion bits per second, a human being can still only process so much info.
More bits per second is more about latency and burst speed.
Rather than aggregate data bandwidth.
IMHO - In My Humble Opinion.

Most Sincerely,
John Woodward