

VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY - feerule@ftc.gov

April 10, 2003

Office of the Secretary,
Room 159,
Federal Trade Commission,
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW,
Washington, DC 20580

RE: Telemarketing Rulemaking--Revised Fee NPRM Comment. FTC File No. R411001

Dear Sir or Madam:

This letter is in response to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking filed by the Federal Trade Commission seeking comments to the Telemarketing Sales Rule Fees issue (16 CFR Part 310). As the average consumer, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this particular proposed rule.

I feel, as many other consumers do, that the national 'do-not-call' list provides a greatly needed service and should be emplace as soon as possible. This bothersome and annoying practice of telemarketing is a nuisance to many. With the 'do-not-call' list consumers will finally have the right to choose whether or not they would like to be the targets of this type of business. As long as regulations are recognized and the Federal Trade Commission remains actively involved, then fair and equal opportunities can still continue for these businesses.

The 'do-not-call' list will also be beneficial to the telemarketing sector of business. Instead of wasting time and money on calls that would not have created any business transactions, telemarketers can now concentrate on the portion of the population that might be more inclined to use there services. I do understand businesses point of view when they claim that many telephone calls that are made to consumers are not always the typical telemarketing call. Sometimes these calls are courtesy calls, opportunities for individuals to save money, or a promotional deal a business is having. Even if this is the case, it is the customers right to be on the 'do not call' register and they have to understand that by doing so they might lose out on some potentially good deals.

I understand that the 'do not call' register is set to come into effect on October 1, 2003 and that this notice of proposed rulemaking is filed n regard to a fee that the FTC wants to establish on telemarketers and other businesses. I am sure with this notice you will be receiving many comments from these businesses about how this could possibly be very detrimental to their profits. Businesses might complain that they have been opposed to the 'do not call' register from the beginning and now they are going to have to pay for a service that will limit their business. Not only will they have to pay the FTC to use the register but they will also have to pay more employees to check the register every three

months while creating and distributing updated call lists. The negative issues for these businesses are countered by the will of the public. It is clear that the public wants this 'do not call' registry. The public does not want to have to pay with their tax dollars the estimated \$18,100,000 that it is projected to cost for this service. This is a fix for the economy to save these businesses by allowing them to continue to perform these phone calls but only to the people that want them. By making these companies pay the cost to operate the register, some of their profits might go down in the beginning but after the initial phases are emplaced, profits should go back to normal because more calls will be made to the right people.

Please remember the average consumer even after you get many letters from companies explaining the hardships that this fee might cause. It is the consumer in which the FTC is created to protect and though you might not get many public comments from the consumer compared to companies, you must remember why this fee has been proposed. It is the best way to fund a project that has already been passed and is ready to be implemented.

Once again, I would just like to reiterate my support for this revised fee. Please accept this letter for considerate before making any changes to the proposed rule and if I can provide you with any additional information or testimony please feel free to contact me at 703-919-4669 or by email cstora@vt.edu.

Sincerely,

Christine L. Stora