

From: Messner, Ryan M. <mez@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 5:01pm
Subject: "modem tax"

SUNSHINE PERIOD
RECEIVED
MAY - 7 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I am writing in opposition to the "modem tax" that will be voted on Thursday, May 8, 1997. I view this tax as simply a way to punish Internet users and service providers. If this tax is necessary, it should be applied to all consumers and all businesses. I am a junior at Slippery Rock University and commute to class from New Castle, PA. Even though I am a student, this tax will affect me, while other students at SRU will not be affected. I don't see the justification behind it. Please vote in opposition to this tax on Thursday, May 8, 1997.

96-262

Ryan Messner

SUNSHINE PERIOD
RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: "M. Fruin" <mfruin@u.washington.edu>
To: A7.A7(rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 4:58pm
Subject: Internet line surcharge

Commissionerc

This application of an internet use surcharge is unjustified and outrageous. It is only a ploy to make extra money and is not warranted. Something as vital and affordable to all Americans such as the internet should not be placed out of the hands of average Americans. Please do not pass this proposal.

96-262

Michael S. Fruin
9248m 12th Ave, SW
Seattle, WA, 9810

Michael S. Fruin, RN, MN, ARNP
Dept. of Neurological Surgery
University of Washington-Harborview Medical Center
STROKE PREVENTION AND ASSESSMENT CENTER
e-mail mfruin@u.washington.edu

*****NURSE PRACTITIONERS...PART OF THE SOLUTION*****

Opinions expressed are not necessarily shared
by the University of Washington.

CC: A7.A7(RCHONG,JQUELLO),FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("ness")

From: Dewald, Marilyn <Dewald@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 4:48pm
Subject: phone rate raise

Is this proposed new tax, which will ultimately adversely affect Internet users the most, absolutely necessary? Please reject this proposal at least until it is determined to be absolutely essential to the Universal Service program. Marilyn Dewald

SUNSHINE PERIOD
RECEIVED
MAY - 7 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

96-242

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: lamMatt <mecook@hotmail.com>
To: A7.A7(JQUELLO,SNESSE,RCHONG,rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 4:26pm
Subject: May 8, 1997 vote on Universal Service Program "ModemTax"

I urge the commissioners to vote against the proposed "modem tax."
There are other and better ways to affect outreach to lower-income constituents than this new tax. It is ironic that you have the responsibility to vote on yet another tax on the virtual eve of "Tax Freedom Day," the day that denotes the nearly half of the year that the average American works to pay all of the taxes already imposed.

96-262

Please vote NO on the modem tax.

Matt Cook
21722 Evalyn Avenue
Torrance, CA 90503-6355
mecook@hotmail.com

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: Dave Nacy <nacy@sj.ptc.com>
To: A7.A7(rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 3:40pm
Subject: Funding From Telecommunications Industry Falicy

RECEIVED
MAY - 7 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

96-262

Chairman Hundt,

Today I was made aware of your plan to tax what you claim are "luxury items" in order to fund the provision of internet services to our nation's schools, libraries, and rural health care providers.

In case you've missed something, advances made in telecommunications have fundamentally altered how we, as a people, work.

I telecommute to San Jose from my home in Michigan. In order to accomplish this without blocking my home from receiving important calls, I've installed a second phone line. Far from being a luxury, this second line is a vital link and tool used for my employment.

I'm opposed to your plan to impose a tax on what I consider an essential service to do my work. I find your cavalier attitude as expressed in your statements as elitist and appalling.

Your announcement does not represent a plan to collect funding for classroom internet "from" the telecommunications industry. It's a scheme to tax the American people "via" the telecommunications industry.

Both President Clinton and leaders in Congress have declared that "the era of big government is over." Perhaps you weren't listening. What scares me more is that you deliberately choose to continually ignore them.

Sincerely,
David S. Nacy II.
Clarkston, Michigan

CC: A7.A7(JQUELLO, SNESS, RCHONG), FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("lette...

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: Bob McCourt <bmccourt@unix.cde.com>
To: A7.A7(rhndt)
Date: 5/7/97 3:21pm
Subject: MODEM TAX

RECEIVED
MAY 7 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

96-262

To Chairman Reed Hunt and Commissioner's

I Robert McCourt oppose the proposed plan for three reasons:

- 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.
- 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.

Robert J. McCourt

*****|
| Bob McCourt KI4RU E-Mail bmccourt@unix.cde.com |
| 507 Highland Dr. Phone 352-589-4078 |
| Eustis Fl |
| 32726-4403 Need a QSL Route |
| 20 Mi. NW of Orlando Try Me, 3 Databases |
| Listen, Listen Again, Then Listen Some more, Before You Call |

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

From: Wetzel, Judd F. <jfwetzel@pathway.net>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("rhundt@fcc.gov")
Date: 5/7/97 2:43pm
Subject: The "modem tax"

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I strongly oppose and hope you will vote against the proposed "modem tax" which you will soon consider. There must be some alternative for subsidizing the installation of Internet service to schools, libraries, and health care facilities. You can be sure that any increase on the provider is going to be passed on to the user, those who can least afford it. Internet service is already high enough and it may mean many would need to discontinue its use. It appears the general public would be penalized. Is not some form of state subsidy available to such institutions?

Judd F. Wetzel e-mail: jfwetzel@pathway.net
206 E. Northview Avenue phone : 412-658-4979
New Castle, PA 16105-2125

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: <pasmith@eagle1.eaglenet.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 2:29pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Peter A. Smith (pasmith@eagle1.eaglenet.com) writes:

Dear Sirs,

I was made aware of a proposed tax on residential and commercial phone lines to help pay for subsidised internet access for schools and libraries. Our county already takes care of this via the elected school board. This is a local issue, please mind your own business and we will mind ours. I count eight separate taxes on my phone bill as it is for a total of \$10.60;

RECEIVED
MAY - 7 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Federal Subscriber Line Charge	\$7.00
State 911 Fee	\$.10
Federal 911 Fee	\$.50
Universal Service Fee	\$.24
Federal Tax	\$1.43
State Tax	\$.35
AT&T Federal Tax	\$.59
AT&T MD Gross Receipts Tax Surcharge	\$.39

If you will notice, the federal tax is by far the largest. These taxes mount to 15.2% of my bill. And now I hear of this nutty proposal, from whichever quarter it comes, to add an additional tax to take care of a local issue. Please note the following points which I consider self evident;

My money belongs in my pocket.

As a responsible citizen, I deserve to have some say in local issues. (We have taken care of this locally.)

"The era of big government is over," Bill Clinton said.

Should I go on? Do you understand my point? My wife and I already have to work more than four months just to pay our tax burden. I would assume that you are in a similar position.

I do not expect a reply, but it would be appreciated. Thank you.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 207.19.93.102
Remote IP address: 207.19.93.102

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: Hosford, Darryl G. <hws@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 1:48pm
Subject: Increase in phone rates

Dear Sir:

I have been told that on May 8, the FCC will decide on an increase in fees for persons and businesses that have more than one phone line.

I would like to register my concern that this would be a modem tax for those like myself who have a second phone line, and place an unfair burden on ISP's.

Thank you for your consideration of this concern.

Sincerely,
Darryl Hosford

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: Kerr, Marion <nita@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 12:54pm
Subject: modem tax

Dear Commissioner Chong:

We are on a fixed income and the proposed modem tax will cause alot of problems.

We are asking PLEASE oppose this tax.

Thank you,
Mr. & Mrs. Wallace Kerr

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96262

From: Mike <me@nojunk.mail>
To: A7.A7(sness)
Date: 5/7/97 12:10pm
Subject: "Modem Tax"

RECEIVED
MAY - 7 1997
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Sirs:

As a taxpayer, and therefore your employer, I have a question for you. Why does government always seem to want to redistribute assets in whatever manner it's whims drive it? This proposal to charge me and my ISP for other people's connection to the internet is nothing more than government at it's most annoying and intrusive. Frankly, you have no moral right to do this.

Shall we subsidize everything else while we're at it? I'd like a nice new red Jaguar. Can you swing that for me? By extension, should there be a "Kotex tax" to help pay for school's usage of sanitary napkins? Isn't this exactly what you're suggesting is fair and equitable behavior?

Why don't you stop spending other people's money and let the economy deal with the redistribution of assets. It's much more efficient than Washington and it doesn't cost nearly as much.

Have you considered the impact of this tax on ISP's and their customers, or in your haste to make waste have you forgotten about the damage you're very likely to do?

An annoyed taxpayer,

Michael Cornett

--

My correct e-mail adress is: mikul@ptd.net
I've altered it in the header to avoid junk mail.

CC: A7.A7(RCHONG)

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: "Rollins, Ed" <erollins@Alkon.com>
To: "rchong@fcc.gov" <rchong@fcc.gov>
Date: 5/7/97 10:41am
Subject: Phone Rate Increase

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Electricity

To Whom It May Concern,

Leave the InterNet Rates alone! Ma Bell gets enough of my money as it is! NO RATE HIKE!

Respectfully

Edward D. Rollins

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: <rosing@neurophys.wisc.edu>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG,JQUELLO,SNESSE,rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 10:36am
Subject: Please vote against "modem tax"

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Please vote down the proposed "modem tax" rate structure. As long as I am paying taxes for a federal education cabinet, I think that bureacracy should use the money I already pay for helping out libraries and schools. Certainly the FCC and other public bodies should help the education department accomplish this grand task. Changing line rates of a few is not a good way to help many.

The idea of hooking up all schools and libraries is a good one. I don't even mind helping to pay for it. But just as I pay tax for schools which my children do not use, I think the taxes I already pay should go to this cause. I believe the best place to argue about this funding is the halls of congress, and the argument should be how much, not should it be done at all.

Sincerely,
Mike Rosing
Madison, Wisconsin

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: Eakin, Gerry L. <gle@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG, SNESS, JQUELLO, rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 10:09am
Subject: "NO" Modem Tax !!!

Hello

What happen to FCC protecting the people?

What this bill is going to do is hurt those of us that live on the edge. Some of us budget and can provide internet service to our children through small services like Pathway Net. When your bill passes it will increase my access charge to the net a cost increase I cant afford!

With my boys now useing the net more and more I have been trying to budget a extra line for this use. If this bill goes through that idea goes out the window and if the axcess charge goes up to much so does the net!

I think that your bill to provide Schools, Libraries, and Health care facilities at discount rates "WRONG"! They need to get a grip on their finances.

Why should a small portion of the people pay for service that will be available to all? If the money is really found to be needed then it should be on the ballet to be voted on. We the people should decide if we want to fund this service.

"Stop this Bill" it isn't a fair bill.

Over taxed Payer Gerry Eakin

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Packard, Craig <pack@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 9:55am

Please do not vote for the "modem tax" on may the 8th.

Thank You.

SUNSHINE PERIOD

06-262

From: "Rick Steele" <rmsteele@crystalogic.com>
To: A7.A7(JQUELLO,SNESSE,RCHONG,rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 9:52am
Subject: Universal Service program

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I would like to strongly voice my opposition to the Universal Service program or so called "modem tax". I feel that:

- 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.
- 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.

I also wonder why it is, that almost every day, my government thinks I am happy to part with even more of my hard earned money to pay for it's own wastefull use or to pay for someone else's. I must say I do not appreciate this attitude and I feel that the huge chunk I already pay in taxes and other government related expenses is taxing my and my companies ability to survive.

Please vote against this measure.

Thanks but no thanks.

Rick Steele
Vice President
Crystalogic, Inc.
(615) 391-9100 Voice
(615) 391-9997 Fax
rmsteele@crystalogic.com
<http://www.crystalogic.com>

SUNSHINE PERIOD *10-26-97*

From: Iannucci, Vince P. <vincei@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 9:51am
Subject: Modem Tax

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

This is a giant step backwards! There are other more creative, imaginative, and constructive ways to fund cheaper access for schools and libraries. But then again, as a government employee, you probably aren't used to much in the way of imagination and creativity. This is just another textbook example of big government interference with the delicate infrastructure of our free market economy. ISP's, large and small, are the developing backbone of our information driven society. An unfair and excessive tax such as the one you are proposing will skyrocket costs for users, drive many ISP's out of business, and eliminate local access for many users in rural areas. You'll send us all back to the stone age! WAKE UP!

SUNSHINE PERIOD 96-262

From: Young, James S. <jsy@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO,rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 9:20am
Subject: NO INCREASE IN INTERNET CHARGES!!!

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Dear FCC Chairman and Commissioners:

I am vehemently opposed to raising costs on internet services. Do not impose further costs on the users of the Internet, if you really want to provide good service to your constituents.

If you want to help for the vast majority of the citizens, LOWER the ACCESS CHARGES made by the LOCAL PHONE COMPANY MONOPOLIES to the Long Distance Providers AND KEEP INTERNET ACCESS AT CURRENT LEVELS. I believe the monopolistic local phone companies have convinced the FCC that it is an either/or choice. I firmly believe it is only the local phone company strangle hold that convinces the FCC that it is an either/or choice. They provide little service in return to their government supported MONOPOLY. I hear from some government sources that they believe that savings in access charges would not be passed on to consumers. This is ludicrous, free market activity will insure the savings are passed on. Invite competition as has been done to airlines and long distance companies. It is quite clear that the elimination of these monopolies and attendant regulations in these two industries has caused a quantum leap in the economy overall. Less regulation and more competition is the proven way for our society to progress! Do NOT inhibit the growth of the new source of power in our economy, the INTERNET!

I use the internet daily to allow my business to provide services in a cost efficient and timely manner.
PLEASE!

James S. Young PE
James S. Young and Associates
Consulting Engineers
457 Liberty Street
Grove City, PA 16127
412-458-6251
jsy@pathway.net

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: Thatcher, Earl <Thatcher@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(SNESS)
Date: 5/7/97 8:48am
Subject: internet rate changes

As a novice in the computer field, I wish to protest adding more to my phone bill and internet charges. I intended to get another phone for computer use only, but will hold off until you people are done playing games

Earl Thatcher

CC: A7.A7(RCHONG)

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: Dean Anderson <Dean_Anderson@compuserve.com>
Date: 5/7/97 8:31am
Subject: Don't tax extra phone lines!

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20541

Dear FCC Commissioners,

I urge you to vote against the proposal to increase the rates on second phone lines.

The internet has become one of the most important forces in our country that will ultimately bring millions of dollars of revenue into the US economy. At this critical stage of its development we need to resist the temptation to pile on taxes that will stunt its growth.

This is especially true with regard to internet and online service providers. Many of them are having a difficult financial time as it is and to further burden the small internet businesses that are the source of innovation in this country is a short-sighted policy.

If we want to tax someone to pay for the internet, we should look to the larger companies who can absorb the increased rates into their already bloated advertising budgets.

Sincerely,

Dean Anderson
President, Stellar Computer Services

CC: Rachelle Chong <rchong@fcc.gov>

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-202

From: Packard, Craig <pack@pathway.net>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 8:31am

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Office of Secretary

Please don't vote modem tax

craig packard

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: Spiker, Ronald <rspiker@datacustoms.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: 5/7/97 7:05am
Subject: Phone Line Tax

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Commissioner Rachelle Chong:

I am writing to express my disapproval in the proposed phone line tax. Once again another tax to punish businesses and consumers alike.

If passed, I will have my some of my extra lines (personal and business) disconnected, just to prevent you from taking more money from us. I'm sick of the constant tax increased imposed by the government.

Sincerely,
Ron Spiker

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

From: <JefferisP@aol.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO,rhundt)
Date: 5/7/97 12:26am
Subject: ALERT - FCC to raise phone TAXES rates!!!!!!!!!!!!

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Dear Senators Specter and Santorum,

Please prevent this business killing NEW tax from going into effect. This modem tax will hurt my fledgling business as well as my internet provider. We are trying to establish an internet education center and it will be adversely affected by this new modem tax. The FCC is planning to pass this tax without a vote of Congress!
Please do all you can to stop it:

Sincerely,

Jeff and Leigh Peterson
Grove City, PA 16127

This proposal is highway robbery and an imposition of unfair taxes on a fledgling industry.

Do NOT, I repeat DO NOT ENACT THIS TAX!

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

>The additional cost is estimated to be from \$4 to \$6 per line per
>month for businesses, and at least \$3.50 per line for consumers who
>have more than one telephone line to their homes. Details of the
>program are at <<http://www.fcc.gov/learnnet/welcome.html#rates>>.

>

>For consumers, this will be a disincentive to add lines for fax or
>modem usage, and has been labeled by some consumer groups as a
>"modem tax."

>

>The widest range of business users who have more than one telephone
>line will benefit from other reductions in long-distance charges
>that will offset the increases. This will not be the case for
>Internet Service Providers and online services, which have business
>lines used only for incoming dial-up access by their subscribers.
>ISPs and online services will therefore bear the brunt of the
>economic burden for this program.

>

>Under the proposed program, Internet Service providers would be
>required to provide connectivity to schools, libraries and health
>care facilities at discounts of 20% to 90% off of normal rates.

>This discounted amount would then be reimbursed to the ISP through
>the Universal Service program.
>
>The proposal has gone through a lengthy process of recommendation
>and comment, and is in its final stage. It requires only the vote
>of the FCC on May 8 to begin implementation.
>
>AOP opposes the proposed plan for three reasons:
>
>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.
>
>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.
>
>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:

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

~~~~~  
Jefferis Kent Peterson  
The Center for Biblical Literacy  
410 Woodland Ave.  
Grove City PA 16127

"Love the Lord with all your...MIND"

AOL: JefferisP  
Internet: jefferis@pathway.net  
CompuServe: Jefferis  
<http://www.cbl.org>  
Personal Pages: <http://www.pathway.net/jefferis/>  
Free Music: <http://www.pathway.net/jefferis/Composer.html>

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-262

**From:** Best, Jeff D. <piiper@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO,rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 11:48pm  
**Subject:** proposed tax on phone lines

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

I am writing to protest the proposed tax on additional phone lines to help defer the cost of offering low cost communications to schools, etc. Such a tax would cause many home owners to remove additional lines from their homes to avoid paying the tax. Money will not be raised; instead, it will be lost as many of the phone lines now being paid for are disconnected. This tax seems to target those who have lines dedicated to fax or modem use. If a tax on phone lines is needed, it should be applied to everyone, not just those who happen to have a need for additional lines.

I would hope that, when deliberating over this proposition, you take into account the hundreds of thousands of people who now use online services and fax to carry on everyday business and personal affairs. I would also hope that you consider alternatives to such a tax. They include Net Day and access through existing state Internet networks. If you do not understand what these refer to, then more research obviously must be done.

Finally, I have seen no evidence which supports the need for such a tax. If the program for cheap communication systems for schools, etc., does pass, what evidence exists to show that a tax is necessary to foot the bill, so to speak? Also, if a tax is necessary, what evidence supports the idea that this particular tax will cover the cost?

To conclude, I and many others oppose the tax and are afraid of the following:

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.

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.

Please consider what I have said, and remember that government's job is to protect the rights of the people, not to tax them to death in an attempt to push programs which may or may not be used to their full potential by those who should be helped. Remember also how many