

APR 10 1996

**From:** Chris Leblanc <Chris.Lebanc@natinst.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/9/96 8:30pm  
**Subject:** Internet Phone Communications

This is a Mime message, which your current mail reader may not understand. Parts of the message will appear as text. To process the rest, you will have to use a Mime compatible mail reader. Contact your vendor for details.

--IMA.Boundary.829096249  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Please do not allow the phone companies to charge for internet phone service. They are not offering any value nor have they had to invest in any capital equipment that they should be receiving a return on investment for.

It seems they are just trying to increase their profit without any expense. Companies are always getting tax breaks and other financial incentives leaving the individual to cover more and more taxes and fees. We are entitled to also be given a break from time to time from such costs and respectfully request that internet phone service remain nearly cost free to increase the number of users of this medium.

Forward Header

**Subject:** Internet Phone Communications  
**Author:** at NIC-MOPAC  
**Date:** 4/8/96 8:02 AM

The long distance companies are trying to kill the internet phone business before it has a chance to get started. Translated that means internet phone services will cost you more if it survives at all.

For those of you unfamiliar with internet phone services, it is a technology that allows you to complete a voice phone call through your computer to anywhere in the world at a fraction of the cost of a current phone call. If you have an unlimited service internet account which can be had for \$15-\$20 per month the cost per minute of connect time is basically free versus fifteen cents per minute or more during the day domestic and dollars per minute for international calls. The quality is not as good as a voice grade line but who is to say it won't improve. Technology marches on.

An internet phone capability is already built into in the new Atlas beta of the next version of Netscape Navigator World Wide Web browser. If you ever want to be able to try it, I suggest that you make your feelings known to the FCC before the opportunity gets taken away. For a limited time (30 days) they have an e-mail address at which you can send your opinion as to whether you think internet voice communications should become regulated.

Now is the time for the silent majority to speak. Spread the word to your friends and fellow professionals. Send your e-mail message to the FCC at: [rm8775@fcc.gov](mailto:rm8775@fcc.gov)

--IMA.Boundary.829096249  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; name="RFC822 message headers"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Received: from natinst.com by ccmil.natinst.com with SMTP  
(IMA Internet Exchange v1.04) id 165d6990; Fri, 5 Apr 96 20:27:37 -0600  
Received: from emout08.mail.aol.com (emout08.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.23]) by natinst.com (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP  
id UAA19918; Fri, 5 Apr 1996 20:27:36 -0600 (CST)  
From: JPadams@aol.com  
Received: by emout08.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id VAA19123; Fri, 5 Apr 1996 21

No. of Copies held \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

:27:04 -0500

Date: Fri, 5 Apr 1996 21:27:04 -0500

Message-ID: <960405212703\_265128209@emout08.mail.aol.com>

To: StvRapp@aol.com cc: chris.leblanc@ccmail.natinst.com, cjordan@leadbelt.com, Glyde@aol.com,  
irtgwb@neosoft.com, RHoleywell@aol.com, byrdtm@txpcap.hou.xwh.bp.com,  
Wade.Moses@natinst.com

Subject: Internet Phone Communications

--IMA.Boundary.829096249--

RECEIVED

APR 10 1996

**From:** Gabriel Collazo  
**To:** AR8000 Group, PA1.PA1.jrahtes  
**Date:** 4/9/96 11:03am  
**Subject:** AR8000 Recommendation

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Hello AOR AR8000 group:

After reading your comments and using an AR8000 at home, I'm leaning towards recommending the AR8000 with reservations, and to continue searching for an alternative hand held scanner that is not as prone to overload.

Although it overloads easily, the AR8000 does have a signal strength meter, a rudimentary spectral display, switchable backlighting for the display, and it has just about all of the demodulation modes that we need. Also, it uses conventional AA-size batteries, which are easy to find, and are now widely available in lithium formulation.

Any comments? Suggestions? Yes, no, maybe?

Thanks,  
Gabriel  
(202) 418-1212

**CC:** BSTUECKE

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** <SkyMacker@aol.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/9/96 10:26pm  
**Subject:** Internet Phones

RECEIVED

APR 10 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear FCC:

Regarding regulation of "internet phone", I would like to register my opposition to this strategy which is nothing more than "protectionism" of the incredibly overpriced long distance services currently offered by a select few companies. With "fair trade" as the popular standard by which business practices are now judged, how backward it would be to throw out this healthy competition which could bring some sanity into the marketplace. After all, telephone companies were just thrown a large bone by way of recent legislation - they have what they claimed was needed in order to compete - so, let the competition begin.

Meanwhile, crippling hardworking technologically minded Americans and preventing them from participating in the global village on the same footing as the rest of the community would be an overt and very noticed attack on our personal freedom. We have a right to employ available technologies to leverage our working environments providing we are not injuring others. Well, you could say that we would be injuring the pocketbooks of the corporations who want their long distance dollars (AT&T). However, protecting this fat cat would definately be the same as providing welfare to the rich.

Sincerely,

Jane Marion  
Concerned Citizen

Number of Copies Held 1  
A16BCDE

APR 10 1996

**From:** ronnie gauthier <gauthier@up.lib.mi.us>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/9/96 11:17pm  
**Subject:** ACTA Internet telephone complaint

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

APR 10 1996

COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION  
MICHIGAN LIBRARIAN

There is a way to have voice over the internet, good. The telco's should have no say as they get their cut from my phone line I use to connect to my provider.  
To say it should not be allowed for the reason that telco's already provide that service would be like Doubleday publishing trying to say you MUST use a printed book for classroom education.  
When a telco has a copyright on my personal communication then they can regulate where and how it is conducted, till then they should mind their own.

Ronnie Gauthier

Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
ACODE  
\_\_\_\_\_

APR 10 1996

**From:** John Morgan Salomon <john@CSUA.Berkeley.EDU>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/10/96 3:58am  
**Subject:** Internet Voice Traffic Restrictions

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I am firmly against any form of restrictions governing internet voice communications. While I understand that regulations and partial monopolies must exist for conventional telephone companies because of issues of phone line installation and ownership costs, as well as to prevent predatory business tactics on the part of uncertified local monopolies, this reasoning does not apply in the case of the internet.

The net is a free medium which has the potential to do away with the need for the restrictions imposed on communications by the need for telephone wires and switch boxes. The maintainers of portions of the internet make bandwidth on their lines available to anyone at a profit; how this is used is irrelevant, so long as it does not violate federal laws governing child pornography, drug trafficking, or similar atavistic practices. To regulate the traffic on the internet for the benefit of telephone companies afraid of losing business to more efficient, cheaper, and modern media would be to encourage blatant protectionism of obsolete forms of communication for the benefit of a few corporations' profits, and go against the grain of American innovativeness and free enterprise.

As a citizen of this country who believes in his constitution, I cannot rightfully respect any restrictive decisions made on this issue for a reason such as the maintenance of uncompetitive companies' portfolios.

-John Salomon

Printed Copies rec'd  
by ASCOE

**From:** Keith <asher@uts.cc.utexas.edu>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/10/96 2:44pm  
**Subject:** Don't Regulate Internet Phones

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

APR 10 1996

Today I got an e-mail message from a good friend at UT-Austin which surprised me. In it, he states that the FCC was considering regulating Internet Phone use. I am curious as to what methods your organization would utilize to do so?

Just finishing four years of business education, I understand the value of what the FCC does, both in maintaining standards and protecting and overseeing mission-critical American communication industries. But to extend your coverage to the Internet is risky and debatable at best. The long-distance telephone industry will surely be hurt by these I-phones, but if their product is far cheaper and just as good as anything the giants can offer, it should succeed, and succeed brilliantly.

I've never sent a message to any government organizations, begging them not to do something that is so obviously off kilter. I've mostly ignored the overhyped Communications Decency Act--it doesn't affect me and is none of my business. This, however, does affect me; I was planning to rely on this great innovation to keep in contact with my girlfriend when I head off to do consulting work for Ernst & Young in September.

So please, reconsider getting involved with regulating what information we users of the 'net send in our packets to one another. Whether it be information about the latest sports game, an electronic wedding invitation, or the voice of a girlfriend who misses her best friend and lover, the government just doesn't have a place here.

Thanks for listening, and if you have time, please reply. I'm anxious to hear what plans the FCC has in agenda, and the other side of the debate at hand.

---

Keith Jacobs

<http://uts.cc.utexas.edu/~asher/>

1  
SEARCHED \_\_\_\_\_  
SERIALIZED \_\_\_\_\_  
INDEXED \_\_\_\_\_  
FILED \_\_\_\_\_

BUCKET FULL OF SHIT

**From:** Richard Dry <Richard.Dry@natinst.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/10/96 10:45am  
**Subject:** Internet Long Distance

Dear Sirs,

I wanted to let you know that I personally think we have enough government in our lives with out anymore. I definitely DO NOT want to see the govt. regulate the internet long distance. When you stifle free enterprise in one place you hurt the whole country long term. Trivia question for you! What is the definition of a conservative? Someone who owns something! Because until you own something then you don't have anything to lose. Don't mess with a viable industry and slow down progress.

Sincerely Concerned,  
  
Richard Dry 1-800-433-3488.

1

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**From:** <Pinehill@aol.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(rm8775)  
**Date:** 4/10/96 11:20am  
**Subject:** Internet phone capabilities

I respectfully request that you do NOT let the various phone companies, long distance and/or local, destroy my ability to converse via the Internet, whether by dragging their feet on providing quality ISDN access or by raising the prices to exhorbitant rates. Among other things, this would destroy video conferencing before it even gets off the ground; and this is a relatively new capability that can make us all so much more efficient, imagine the decrease in the foreign oil we'd have to buy if we were able to transact virtual person-to-person business online with local phone calls. Enough.

Pam Niedermayer  
Chairman, VP Marketing  
Pinehill Softworks Inc.  
301 Main St.  
Falmouth, MA 02540-2751  
(508) 548-4470  
(508) 548-8731 FAX