

I'm writing to express my personal opinion about the above referenced proposed rule, as a citizen of the United States of America.

I think the question of "persons affected" is, as you have proposed, a good place to start. It seems to me that "persons affected" applies to anyone who might be affected by the rules and rulings in the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations. This of course includes every U.S. citizen, and also includes anyone who has legitimate business in or with the United States. It needn't include anyone else. But the cost of excluding such people seems unwarranted. Firstly, in most cases they will have no interest in the information, and hence will exclude themselves. Secondly, if they should happen to have some academic interest in the information, there is no harm in them gaining access to it. On that basis, I think it's reasonable to abbreviate this as "anyone online."

Does putting this material online create a digital divide? No, it does not. Putting the material online will result in the material being more available than it is presently. The people who might have difficulty accessing the information online are a subset of the people who currently cannot access it because it is not online. Internet access is available in public libraries throughout the nation. So I think this is not something that should worry you.

I think "reasonably available" does mean for free. Often those most in need of this information do not have the resources to pay for it, and particularly to pay for the use of proprietary search engines to search it. Putting it online will mean that it is searchable by any free search tool, e.g. Google.

I think the question of who should bear the cost is interesting, but tangential—once the decision is made, it will be clear how to fund it. If it has to be funded by the agencies, so be it, but I don't think this is the only option.

Sincerely,

Ted Lemon
34 Pleasant Street #1
Brattleboro, VT 05301