

programs have been implemented which are now extremely abused. Thank you for your considerations. And finally, remember that the providers of the internet service which allows this letter to reach you would be severely affected by this tax.

Jeff Best  
piper@pathway.net

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Smith, Doug <dsmith@pathway.net>  
**To:** "jqello@fcc.gov" <jquello@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 5/6/97 10:41pm  
**Subject:** The May 8 Vote on Phone Rate Hike

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Dear Federal Communications Commission:

I urge you to vote against the proposed phone rate hike for the Universal Service program for three reasons:

46-262

1) Otherwise a sweeping new tax would be enacted before other viable and more fair alternatives (e.g., Net Day, access through existing state Internet networks) are studied.

2) The way the tax is structured would place an unfair burden upon Internet and online services and their subscribers--the very ones who encourage use of this important technology. If the tax is necessary, why not apply it 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 vote for fairness and vote down what amounts to a "modem tax". I thank you for thinking hard about this important issue in advance.

Sincerely,

Douglas J. Smith

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

**From:** <Laralouis@aol.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 10:32pm  
**Subject:** " Modem Tax"

This is to inform you that I strongly OPPOSE the so called " modem tax" which is to be voted upon on May 8, 1997. Please do not allow this to be implemented. Please vote NO.

Thank you,

Laura

96-262

**From:** "BOB MCCARTT" <rmccartt@ccia.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 10:27pm  
**Subject:** Modem Tax

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Dear Ms. Chong:

Please be advised that I am strongly opposed to the modem tax and urge you to do every thing you can to defeat it.

96-262

Regards,

R K McCartt

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Wilson, Lawrence A. <lwilson@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(SNESS)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 10:02pm  
**Subject:** "universal service" tax

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Commissioner Susan Ness:

The proposed tariff increase for phone lines will drive people from the lines and do a great disservice to paying citizens. Please do not approve this unfair tax on us.

L.A. Wilson, Jr

96-262

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

# SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Hockenberry, Dana M. <zomfa@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 9:42pm  
**Subject:** [Fwd: ALERT - FCC to raise phone rates]

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I would also like to voice my opposition to the tax.

Dana M. Hockenberry

96242

# SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Blair, Steven <sailair@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG,SNESS,JQUELLO,rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 9:12pm  
**Subject:** no modem tax

Chairman Reed Hundt, James Quello, Susan Ness, Rachelle Chong

Every one should have access to the information provided by the Internet. Once again it will hurt the little guy, who is all ready maxed out with taxes and fees of all sorts. PLEASE reconsider your option to increase or make a modem tax. Give the average guy a break!!!  
Sailair@pathway.net

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

96-262

# SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Graham, Robert <2077@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 9:08pm  
**Subject:** Modem Tax

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Consumer Affairs

A "Modem Tax" is unfair and totally unnecessary.  
Stop! think about what you are doing. lets study the alternatives  
Your solution to any modern day problem is to cry NEW TAX!! NEW TAX!!

96-262

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** "ROBERT BYRNE" <clipper@wmol.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 8:46pm  
**Subject:** VOTE NO

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Election Commission  
Office of Clerical

DO NOT PASS THE "MODEM TAX".  
WE DO NOT NEED ANOTHER GOVERNMENT GIVE AWAY.  
IF THE BIG BOYS REALY WANT TO HELP SCHOOLS...  
TELL EM TO GIVE UP PART OF THE \$800,000 EACH OF THEM GETS PER YEAR  
FOR OFFICE EXPENSE...  
R.B.

96262

SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** McEwen, Mary E. <elaine@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 8:51pm  
**Subject:** Universal Tax

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20541

Dear Commissioner Chong,

I am voicing my opposition to the "Universal Tax" or "Modem Tax" that the FCC is proposing to adopt. I already pay very high property taxes to support the school district, and property taxes to support the local library. If this tax is necessary, then it should be applied to all consumers and all businesses, not just internet and online service providers and their subscribers.

96-262

Thank you,

Elaine McEwen

# SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Gallagher, William Q. <quale@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 8:43pm  
**Subject:** Modem tax

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
U.S. Department of Justice

I am opposed to this tax due for vote on May 8. The average person has had more than enough rate increases throughout many areas. Encourage us to move forward with technology!

96-262

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 7 1997

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

**From:** Miller, Leonard <williepa@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 8:27pm  
**Subject:** modem tax

Please vote no . I am talking about the modem tax you are to vote on May8. I for one had to install a line just for my modem because of the poor service by the phone company in are area. I have a a line going to my computer just for the modem. I still have trouble getting on line every time it rains or snows.

Don't you think you should look at the phone service and some of the problems that consumers have before adding a tax?

Did anyone send out a survey to the coustomers in Pa? Do you know how many disabled people have modems and this is their only contact with the outside world? Their only pleasure may be the internet and you are going tax them even for this little bit of pleasure? Think about it.

96262

# SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Franklin, Clifford <cliff@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 8:27pm  
**Subject:** modem tax

I oppose the "Modem Tax" and I VOTE!

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Learning and Development  
Center of the Library

96-267

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Daggit, Edward <daggit@pathway.net>  
**To:** FCC Chairman Reed Hundt <rhundt@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 5/6/97 8:32pm  
**Subject:** May 8 Vote on Proposed Higher Internet Phone Line Charges

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

-- [ From: Edward A. Daggit \* EMC.Ver #2.5.02 ] --

Dear FCC Chairman and Commissioners:

I wish to protest the proposed new regulations which will result in higher telephone line charges for those who use the Internet. It is my understanding that these higher charges to be paid by internet service providers, online services and their customers would amount to between \$2.25 and \$3 billion annually. I am told that the lion's share of these charges would be used to subsidize low-cost communication services for organizations such as schools and libraries.

Certainly such publicly-supported organizations should have adequate communication services. However, since these organizations are beneficial to the general public, the cost of providing the needed services should be borne by the public at large, not just by individuals (such as myself) and businesses who use the Internet and the Internet Service Providers who make such usage possible. To help America compete successfully in the world economy, Internet usage by Americans should be expanded as rapidly as possible, not discouraged by imposing a hefty tax on Internet users and providers.

As you probably know, the Association of Online Professionals (AOP) opposes the proposed plan for three reasons:

- 1) If you approve the proposal on May 8, you will implement a sweeping new tax before considering alternatives such as providing 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 relate the anticipated revenue from the tax to the actual need.

While I am not a member of AOP, I agree with their reasons for opposing the proposed plan. Therefore I urge you NOT to approve it on May 8, but to reconsider it, addressing all pertinent issues including those raised in this letter, so as to find a more equitable and productive way of complying with the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Respectfully,

Edward A. Daggit  
430 Flower Avenue  
Grove City PA 16127

96-26  
262

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Book, Jim <jbook@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(JQUELLO)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 8:08pm  
**Subject:** "modem tax"

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Consumer Affairs

Commissioners:

Today I have just learned about the "modem tax". I run a BP service station in New Castle, Pa. In my station, I have two phone lines. One line is for phone conversation and the other is for my electronic credit card machine. At home I also have two lines. One is for my telephones, and the other is for my modem so my family still can call out and receive calls when I am on the computer. I, along with thousands(tens of- hundreds of) will be forced to pay increased internet access fees if the proposed bill passes. I can't think that this was the way this bill was supposed to work, by making me pay three times for it. Once at work, once at home, and a third time for internet access fee increases. Please reconsider this bill. I am not against the reason for this bill, but I can't but help to think that some of these double, triple, and more multiple charges were not foreseen. I hope that no one intentionally would create this burden for me. As far as free connections for schools, etc., I think that this would benefit everyone, and thus either everyone should pay a small part or no one should pay any.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
James R. Book  
2928 State Road  
New Castle, PA 16101  
jbook@pathway.net

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

96-262

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Stitt, Donald G. <dstitt@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rhundt)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 8:19pm  
**Subject:** FCC proposal for vote May 8th

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

Dear Mr. Hundt:

My internet carrier has just informed me that my rate will go up if the FCC passes a regulation this May 8th to increase rates to finance free access to ones who can not otherwise afford it, and to provide such access to schools and libraries at reduced rates. Being a small business man, and being in business only a few months, such an increase will be difficult. Please consider some other way to go. Please vote against the porposal.

Sincerely yours, Donald G. Stitt

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

96-262

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Ill Information Services <ffscout@iiservices.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 8:03pm  
**Subject:** NO, Please!

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Commissioner Chong:

As an already overburdened middle-class taxpayer, I urge you to vote NO on this new FCC regulation (sic-- tax). There are other ways to fund feel-good programs without making us pay more or go to the already too-huge major corporations like AT&T, MCI, etc.

96242

Send it back to the sponsors and tell them to fund it another way, please!  
Don't be party to another barrier to little-guy expansion!

Thank You,

Mike Banko

# SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Walker, George A. <professor@pathway.net>  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("lquello")  
**Date:** 5/6/97 7:39pm  
**Subject:** Modem Tax

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1997  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of Secretary

>Date: Tue, 06 May 1997 19:43:40  
>To: rhundt@fcc.gov  
>From: George Walker <professor@pathway.net>  
>Subject: Modem Tax

>

> Dear Commissioner:

>

>I strongly urge you to vote on Thursday to reject the "modem tax" scheduled for a vote. Personal reasons include having two residence lines well before the internet was a household word since one was needed for home business. For someone like myself who uses it probably less than 10 hours monthly, it just doesn't add up. Also, as a business owner with four lines, none of which involve the internet, I resent paying higher fees even if the long distance charges might decrease. These are charges I have some control over whereas with your proposal I have absolutely no way to control these costs. I am not in favor of anything which represents a subsidy to one group at the expense of another, and that is how I interpret this situation. Once again, please strongly consider rejecting this modem tax. Thank you.

>

>Sincerely,

>

>George Walker

>

**CC:** A7.A7(SNESS)

96-242

# SUNSHINE PERIOD

**From:** Ramsay, Les <lindentree@pathway.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(RCHONG)  
**Date:** 5/6/97 7:38pm  
**Subject:** modem tax

Vote NO for the modem tax!  
My God must you government drones force the working people to pay for  
the freeloaders again!  
Les Ramsay.....lindentree@pathway.net

MAY 7 1997  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Office of Security

96262