

000677

B. Hopkins
Broomfield, Colorado [REDACTED]

Re: CAN-SPAM Act Rulemaking, Project No. R411008

To the Commissioners,

I applaud your efforts to curb the problem of unsolicited bulk email. However, I am concerned about the proposed requirement for merchants to maintain suppression lists.

There are so many problems and costs associated with this idea, and so much damage done to consumers and businesses alike, that I feel I must urge you to consider this matter most carefully.

Requirement of the use of suppression lists will seriously damage many of the legitimate publications available on the net. My specific concern is for harm to publishers who require permission from the consumer prior to adding them to any list.

They're not who CAN-SPAM was designed to put out of business, but this requirement will very likely have that effect. Spammers do not and will not adhere to these "suppression lists" that are proposed. Other methods, designed to target those that purposefully and obviously send unsolicited email, will have a better effect on the SPAM than this proposed ruling.

In light of the depressed economy, seriously limiting the means of small businesses to LEGITIMATELY do business will further impact the rebound of the economy.

In addition, requiring a physical address in the email could put many single female home business owners at risk. To many, a separate P.O. Box requires protection in today's world. Requiring single women to put their home address in their email would put them at great risk. Unfortunately, that would be irresponsible at best. In your world, would you want the world to know where your daughter slept, ate, worked, and lived? With today's technology, ANYONE can get driving directions right to her home within 5.2 seconds. How comfortable would YOU feel knowing your daughter is forced to put her safety at risk just because she works from home?

There's also the potential for significant harm to consumers, because of the problem of properly knowing their intent when they unsubscribe from a list. On top of that, these suppression lists could easily fall into the hands of spammers, leading to more spam instead of less.

I was quite surprised at the potential problems this ruling could involve, and urge you in the strongest possible terms to reconsider its implementation in light

000677

of these problems,

Respectfully,

B. Hopkins
B. Hopkins
Colorado, USA