

SUNSHINE PERIOD DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** <widdick@ix.netcom.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 4:24pm  
**Subject:** Telecommunications

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

06-45

Dear Friends,

Thank you for supporting the Telecommunications Act and the Federal-State Joint Board discount plan for schools and libraries.

As a teacher, I can see the daily need for access to such valuable resources. At present my class is able to pick up daily stock quotes for math, they are following Linda Finch as she attempts to re-create the journey of Amelia Earhart, they also are using the web for their World War II research project. It is a tool that we cannot afford to deny our children.

Thank you again for your support,

F. Widdick

**CC:** A7.A7(RCHONG),FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("jqello@fcc.org","s...

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

**From:** <widdick@ix.netcom.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 4:19pm  
**Subject:** telecommunications-joint board

Dear Friends,

Thank you for supporting the Telecommunications Act and the Federal-State Joint Board discount plan for schools and libraries. As a teacher, I can see the daily need for access to such valuable resources. At present my class is able to pick up daily stock quotes for math, they are following Linda Finch as she attempts to re-create the journey of Amelia Earhart, they also are using the web for their World War II research project. It is a tool that we cannot afford to deny our children.

Thank you again for your support,

M.B.Dyer

**CC:** A7.A7(RCHONG, SNESS, JQUELLO)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Henderson, James <andy@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 2:47pm  
**Subject:** FCC vote on Universal Service

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

96-43

We would like to express our objections to the "Universal Service" that you will be voting on tomorrow. We believe it is discriminatory in that it will tax internet and online service and their subscribers. If this tax is necessary, it should apply to all consumers and businesses alike.

Sincerely,  
James and Nancy Henderson

**CC:** A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO)

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45'

**From:** <Nowarebel@aol.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 2:47pm  
**Subject:** Internet for RHC Providers

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

May 7, 1997

Commissioner Rachelle Chong  
Federal Communications Commission  
E-Mail: rchong@fcc.gov

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Chong:

It is our understanding that the Federal Communications Commission is scheduled to vote this week to adopt regulations governing "universal service" policies as part of the implementation of the Telecommunication Act of 1996.

The universal service policies of the Act mandate that the FCC direct telecommunication rate subsidies to schools, libraries and rural health providers. In the case of health care, the FCC must make telecommunication rates for eligible health care providers comparable to telecommunications rates for similar services in urban areas.

The goal of this provision is to lessen the difference between the quality of health care services available in urban areas and those in rural areas, many of which suffer from a lack of health care resources and access to medical professionals, as well as the burden of being at greater distances from advanced medical technology and treatment facilities.

We feel that "telehealth" has the potential to help our member hospitals and health systems improve the quality and lessen the cost of health care delivery in rural areas. That's why we hope you will help keep the telecommunications costs for our facilities as low as possible by adopting the following policy positions related to universal service provisions:

Universal service should support distance charges.

Universal service should support toll-free connections to the Internet.

Thank you for your immediate consideration and support on this issue. If I can provide additional information, or be of assistance in any way, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Charles R. Daugherty  
Administrator

CRD/jb

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** Thatcher, Earl <Thatcher@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 2:41pm  
**Subject:** internet charges  
As a novice in the computer field, I wish to protest adding more to my

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45

**From:** John <iloxib@goldinc.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 1:55pm  
**Subject:** Universal Service

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

John wrote:

>

> Mailer-Daemon@fcc.gov wrote:

>>

>> The message that you sent was undeliverable to the following:

>> jquell (user not found)

>>

>> Possibly truncated original message follows:

>>

>> -----

>>

>> Subject: Universal service

>> Date: Wed, 07 May 1997 12:20:26 -0500

>> From: John <iloxib@goldinc.com>

>> To: sness@fcc.gov

>> CC: jquello @fcc.gov

>>

>> Dear Commissioner

>>

>> Re: "Universal Service", A provision of the Telecommunications Act of

>> 1996.

>>

>> Why are Internet and On-Line subscriber's to be taxed unfairly? Why not

>> tax all consumer's and businesses?

>>

>> How can the tax be imposed with insufficient study on the subject?

>>

>> Again as with all government agencies we the little one's get the brunt

>> of taxes.

>>

>> Thank you,

>>

>> John Kovach

>> 209 Parker Ave N.E.

>> Canton, OH 44704

>>

>> E-Mail k8bnr@jbic.com

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-45

**From:** <BeckleyC@aol.com>  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("AK-Telecom-L@galileo.uafadm.alask...  
**Date:** 5/7/97 1:32pm  
**Subject:** Re: From the internet

This listserve recently received a call to oppose the use of the Universal Service Fund to bring affordable direct internet access to schools and libraries at an affordable rate.

Some of the reasons cited:

<1) The FCC will implement a sweeping new tax before studying the alternatives (e.g., Net Day, access through existing state Internet networks).>

The issue of affordable bandwidth, especially in Alaska, is not a new problem or issue. This forum has discussed it endlessly. We have been searching for a solution, literally, for years. Now, when a viable solution is proposed, we hear a call for "more studies". It is my understanding that the USF was created to allow for universal access in those areas which can not economically support this service. It spreads the cost over a larger pool of support.

Net Days are great for wiring schools, the ASTF, under Lt. Gov. Ulmer's leadership, is stepping up to the plate and offering concrete solutions. However, Net Days don't pay \$3000/mo for leased lines as much of rural Alaska would be charged. I find it a little difficult to try to support a \$3000/mo. leased line connection with bake sales.

<2) The tax is structured to specifically punish Internet and online services and their subscribers. If the tax is necessary, it should be applied to all consumers and all businesses.>

The USF is not designed to PUNISH anyone. That is an incorrect and loaded statement. The USF is designed to help provided access to those in areas where universal service is not economicall feasible. You will be hard pressed to find any language in USF regulations which directs the FCC to "punish" anyone.

Before we hear that those people who can't afford to pay shouldn't have this service, let's remember that the roads on which we drive (especially in Alaska), the low cost foods we enjoy year around, portions of our children's education, and yes, even our phone service are results of subsidies from the tax dollars of our fellow Americans in the lower 48. Some things in our lives are important enough that we must look beyond the private sector initiative and help create the frameworks and structures to allow the private sector to provide services to all.

Also, in my experience, I find that when students become internet-savy, their

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

parents purchase home computers and get online at home as well. This promotes more sales for computer companies as well as local loops for LECs and long distance income for IXCs.

<3) There has been insufficient study of the subject. There is little or no data to support the need for the tax, or to indicate whether the current proposal will be enough to do the job.>

There certainly has been a great amount of input. Commissioner Chong visited Alaska and saw first hand, the glaring need for a solution. Hearings have been held, the problem has been defined. There has been a great period for proposing alternative solutions. Simply because a solution being proposed is one with which one interest group disagrees does not support the claim that there has not been sufficient study or input. The FCC has been open in process and active in soliciting input.

RECEIVED  
MAY - 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

<AOP encourages all online services and their subscribers to voice their opposition to this "modem tax" by contacting the FCC immediately. Contact information is as follows:

Chairman Reed Hundt: rhundt@fcc.gov  
Commissioner James Quello: jquello@fcc.gov  
Commissioner Susan Ness: sness@fcc.gov  
Commissioner Rachelle Chong: rchong@fcc.gov>

Thank you for the e-mail addresses. I will certainly take the time to voice my support for the USF proposal.

Chick Beckley  
Asst. Superintendent  
Aleutians East Borough School District  
Cold Bay, Alaska - Home of the best 14.4 20c/min. dial-up connection in Alaska!

CC: A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO,rhundt)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

9645

**From:** Seybert, William <sts@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 12:46pm  
**Subject:** fcc universal service plan damaging to ISPs

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

"FCC UNIVERSAL SERVICE PLAN - VOTE NO"  
Thank you deramom@pathway.net

RECEIVED

MAY -- 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

**CC:** A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45

**From:** <Gigawatt@blkbox.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 12:29pm  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Connor Herridge (Gigawatt@blkbox.com) writes:

More Local Phone Charges - They're Back Again

Just when we, the public, have defeated the 'penny a minute' proposed local telephone company charge for internet services, these same local phone monopolies are back again, knocking at the FCC's door.... and it appears that their newest proposal is a request for an additional charge to any customers that has more than one telephone line, at the same location.... (the line that is used for internet or fax services, of course).

Don't these people ever quit?... Another government approved charge against the pocketbooks of the people, for the benefit of a local telephone monopoly, is not in the best interest of the public.... in fact, it would be much better to wait, and let the free market decide what local telephone service should cost.

In a free market, when one company raises its rates, then another company may step in and provide the same services at the old price, or offer a whole new mix of goods or services, even cheaper... so why is the FCC even considering giving the local Telephone Company Monopoly more of our hard earned monies? This whole bizarre event, where the local telephone companies believe that they will eventually prevail in getting new, government imposed phone charges, is beginning to make me believe that there may be other reasons that these charges may eventually be implimented... reasons that we, the public, are not privy to... and perhaps it has to do with some of President Clinton's recent campaign contribution problems... and then again, this may be speculation on my part...

....so whatever the reasons for the request for another government approved charge against our pocketbooks, I hope that the FCC can resist the power and intrigues of these telephone monopolies, and their rich lobbyist, and their lawyers, and their unique political connections... and I hope that the FCC will deny the line charge fee, and let the free market finally decide which phone company gives the best local telephone deal to the American Consumer.

We don't need the FCC to institutionalize another fixed charge to our home telephone bill before the telephone de-regulation process is complete...

Just my opinion, Connor

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45

**From:** "Tisza, William K." <wktisza@prodigy.net>  
**To:** Reed Hunt <rhundt@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 5/7/97 11:58am  
**Subject:** Universal Service Bill

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

-- [ From: William K. Tisza \* EMC.Ver #3.1 ]--

I urge you to vote against the "Universal Service" bill.

This bill and its' proposals would unfairly tax me as a individual Inter-net user.

Thank you,

William K. Tisza  
Fairview Park, Ohio

**CC:** James Quello <jquello@fcc.gov>

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-48  
RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

**From:** KATHY BIZARRO <kbizarro@nhha.org>  
**To:** A7.A7(SNESS,RCHONG,JQUELLO)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 11:51am  
**Subject:** Telecommunications regulations affecting telemedicine

My name is Kathy Bizarro, Vice President/Strategic Information Services at the New Hampshire Hospital Association. I understand that you will be reviewing the regulations today regarding telemedicine. I just wanted to take a moment to send my comments to you:

1. Rural healthcare providers should have access to the same fee structures that urban healthcare providers pay. In New Hampshire, the majority of our state is considered rural. Hospitals in rural areas are forced to pay very high rates to access high speed lines or in some cases they do not have access to the high speed lines at all. The New Hampshire Hospital Association supports the elimination of distance charges.
2. The Internet is becoming an essential tool for healthcare providers. Again, rural areas are forced to pay toll charges to reach the Internet, whereas urban areas have access to several different services at local phone rates. Rural areas need assistance to pay for long distance charges if no local charge is available to them. The New Hampshire Hospital Association supports the need for universal access to cover toll-free connections to the Internet.

Thank you for your time on this matter.

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45

**From:** Jerry <ironcrow@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO,rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 11:25am  
**Subject:** Universal Service

RECEIVED  
MAY - 7 1997  
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Dear Sir,

I don't usuall get involved in this kind of thing, however I would like to point out a couple of issues that maybe you have not considered.

1. If this plan provides for schools to have access, does it provide for children to have access at home. Under this plan it appears that isp providers will be raising their rates to compensate for their increased burden. I know that I had a hard time making the decission to connect because of the cost. An increase may force me to go off-line and my child uses the internet for school work and to explore the world. I would hate to have discontinue because of a rate increase.

2. Isn't it the responsibility of the school district to allocate funds for these types of services? Why do we have school boards and Priciples in these schools. If they feel it is necessary put it in the budget.

In closing I would like to say that we don't need another Government program to increase the burden on the working man. Yes I earn my money and if My school district could not give my child internet service in school and this is something I felt was necessary I would move or send my child to another school that does have these programs. I don't feel my child should have to suffer at home when they don't even use the computers as part of the curiculum anyway. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jerry Hasson

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45

**From:** "Eddy R. Stockton" <wchospital@skn.net>  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("jquello@fcc.gov")  
**Date:** 5/7/97 11:10am  
**Subject:** Telecommunications Act of 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

KHA - An Association of Kentucky Hospitals and Health Systems supports universal service regulations as part of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. These regulations will give our rural facilities more cost effective access to telecommunications and enable them to provide better care to patients in their communities.

**CC:** A7.A7(RCHONG)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45

**From:** Kapsar, Jr., Paul J. <seeker@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 10:59am  
**Subject:** Universal Service Plan

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Dear Comission Members,

I am writing to express my objections to being taxed for the "privilege" of having a second phone line in my home. My children, all under the age of 18, have chosen to bring the second line into the house at their expense so they can spend time as they want talking to their friends, direct pc-pc connections and of course using the internet without interfering with the on call responsibilities of myself and my wife for our healthcare jobs.

This is the second time in a short period of time the phone companies or the FCC has singled out the internet user for and extra charge.

Please modify or eliminate this plan  
Paul J Kapsar Jr  
513 Stewart Ave  
Grove City PA

**CC:** A7.A7(RCHONG, SNESS, JQUELLO)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45

**From:** Salsbury, Dave <Salsbury@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG, SNESS, JQUELLO, rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 10:46am  
**Subject:** Universal Service

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

"On May 8, 1997, the Federal Communications Commission will vote on a proposal regarding "universal service." Universal Service is the program that subsidizes low-cost communication services for organizations and entities who might otherwise not be able to afford access to these services."

=====  
=====

Ladies & Gentlemen:

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed new tax for funding the Universal Service Program. While I applaud the idea of providing low-cost Internet connectivity to schools and nonprofit organizations, I do not believe that the cost involved should be borne by local ISP's and their subscribers. If you want to tax someone - tax the big corporate telecommunications companies such as AT&T, MCI, Sprint, etc. Better yet, why not ask them to directly donate the needed connectivity to the schools and libraries. These larger firms can afford to subsidize this worthwhile cause. Local ISP's and their customers cannot!

My father-in-law works for such a local ISP. I can tell you that they are barely breaking even - much less making some big profit! They provide a valuable service to a large, rural population, that otherwise would not have access to affordable Internet service. You may not realize, but the larger ISP's do not yet offer access outside of large metropolitan areas.

Therefore, people in smaller towns depend on local concerns for their access to the information and communication provided by the Internet. My father-in-law's firm is typical of most ISP's located in smaller areas. These are small businesses, with little to no profit margin. They are providing a service to their communities, as well as jobs for their employees.

There are also many people, such as myself, who use their Internet access to look for employment. I am currently unemployed. I certainly cannot afford to pay any more, than I now am, for Internet access service. I depend on the Internet, as a resource in my job search. I am sure that there are many other people in the same position as I am.

In sum, please do not place the burden, of funding this initiative, on the shoulders of small local businesses and their subscribers. Instead, why not work with larger telecomm firms to donate these services? That

would make much more sense than an indirect tax, which will only be 'robbing Peter to pay Paul'.

Sincerely,

David K. Salsbury

###

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45  
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** Joe Zimmerman <Joe.Zimmerman@1201.ima.infomail.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 8:04am  
**Subject:** Please Vote No

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Commissioner Chong:

Subject: FCC Universal Service Plan

I urge you to oppose the subject plan, when it comes before the FCC for a vote.

The principle reasons for my opposition to this plan are:

1) The FCC will implement a sweeping new tax before studying the alternatives (e.g., Net Day, access through existing state Internet networks).

2) The tax is structured to specifically punish Internet and online services and their subscribers. If the tax is necessary, it should be applied to all consumers and all businesses, since it would apparently benefit all children or users of the targeted facilities.

....(Require the schools, School Districts, to reduce the expenditure on sports and put some of that money back into the education system! A change in priorities of the education system back to the basic education would not be a bad idea anyway. Additional taxes are going out of vogue. Please be on the leading edge of this evolution with more creative ideas on how to obtain the same goal with less money.)....

3) The proposal as it now reads will hurt the small computer users, small businesses and growing number of Retirees, who do not need to be taxed any further. Infact we do not need any more taxes period. My retirement income is shrinking enough without additional taxes!

Please vote NO!

Thanks for your time, and consideration in this matter.

Joe A. Zimmerman  
Retired

--- Blue Wave/Max v2.30

|  
| Fidonet: Joe Zimmerman 1:382/1201  
| Internet: Joe.Zimmerman@1201.ima.infomail.com  
|

| Standard disclaimer: The views of this user are strictly their own.

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45  
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** <Robdarrow@aol.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 7:32am  
**Subject:** FCC Schools Support Please

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

May 5, 1997

Dear Commissioner Chong:

As the Library Media Teacher at Alta Sierra Intermediate School in Clovis, California, I know first hand of the importance of having our students on the Internet and learning how to research and find information.

I would ask that you support the recommendations of the Federal-State Joint Board which calls for discounts ranging from 20-90% on all types of telecommunications services.

This is critical for our school district to allow our students not only to use Internet resources at a reduced rate for equal access for every child, but also for other telecommunication technologies such as distance learning.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,  
Rob Darrow, Library Media Teacher (rob\_darrow@aol.com)  
Alta Sierra Intermediate School  
380 W. Teague Ave.  
Clovis, CA 93611  
(209) 297-8522

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-45

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

**From:** Pollock, Audrey A. <tcn@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/7/97 2:03am  
**Subject:** universal service proposal

Commissioner Rachelle Chong:

I am opposed to the FCC universal service proposal to subsidize low-cost communication service to certain organizations. As a private citizen and business person my tax dollar already subsidizes most of these organizations and I do not want the burden of another hidden "tax".

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Audrey Pollock

SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** McConnell, Clyde R. <clydem@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 11:46pm  
**Subject:** Universal Service

I urge you to reject this proposal.

Clyde McConnell  
E-mail at clydem@pathway.net

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL *2/8*

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** "Elaine T. Harrison" <eharrison@iswt.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 11:42pm  
**Subject:** proposed changes?

Please--if I heard right--Please don't sock it to us with increased fees for extra phone lines. That will discourage a lot of us. We will just back off. And if you also have in mind to tax isp's, so they will increase their user fees, we will just back off the whole thing. Maybe who are on line now are just making it. Please don't consider adding to isp's woes. We don't need a disincentive or modem tax. I think isp's will fail, with this. Even increasing their fees...will cost them customers. Thanks for hearing me out. Elaine Harrison .. eharrison@iswt.com

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

96-485

**CC:** A7.A7(JQUELLO,SNES,RCHONG)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** Lane, Mary Lou <lulane@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 11:12pm

I am strongly opposed to the FCC plan to raise the rate of lines which will trickle down to the consumer for internet service. I feel that this is a strong advantage to business and enables them to prosper. I cannot understand why you would want to make the small business and consumer pay a higher price and give the schools anywhere from 20 to 90 percent discount. My son uses the internet more at home for educational purposes then at the school. I understand that some children are not able to do this due to lack of availabilty of a computer but why punish those of us that have worked hard and are able to provide it? It is always the worker that is highly punished. I would like to know who will benifit from this increase?

RECEIVED

MAY - 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Consumer Affairs

96-45

SUNSHINE PERIOD

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

96-425

**From:** Conkle, William <billdee@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG, SNESS, JQUELLO, rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 10:50pm  
**Subject:** Proposed raise of phone rates to Internet users

To the Federal Communications Commission:

I support the Association of Online Professionals in requesting that you vote against the proposed regulations which will result in higher charges for those who use the Internet.

AOL opposes the proposed plan for three reasons:

- 1) The FCC will implement a sweeping new tax before studying the alternatives.
- 2) The tax is structured to specifically punish Internet and online services and their subscribers. If the tax is necessary, it should be applied to all consumers and all businesses.
- 3) There has been insufficient study of the subject. There is little or no data to support the need for the tax, or to indicate whether the current proposal will be enough to do the job.

If any, or all of the above statements are true, the tax should be tabled until these issues are satisfied.

William J. Conkle  
New Castle, PA