

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RM8775

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

From: <Joey36@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 11:51pm
Subject: Re: No to Phone Companies Request

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Dear FCC - Please do NOT grant the major phone companies their request to charge Internet users a fee to use their telephone lines for all the online time.

We already pay a fee each month to the Online Service and also pay our monthly phone bill for long distance calls - isn't that ENOUGH? Thank you for your consideration of this.

Jo Ann Resteigen

(Joey36@aol.com)

Santa Cruz, CA

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

RM 8775

From: Daniel J. Klein <danny71@ix.netcom.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 11:50pm
Subject: Charge for e-mail phone lines

Dear Sirs,

E-mail is an important way for the public to inform each other and to stay informed in a Democracy. Please do not deny many people the use of this forum by imposing unnecessary charges on it.

Thank you for your kind attention. Dr. Daniel J. Klein 966 Pizarro Lane Foster City, Ca. 94404

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

From: Art_J <art@visiblesolutions.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 11/14/96 11:56pm
Subject: Phone Company Rip Offs

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

To whom it may concern:

Please do everything within your powers to prevent the telephone companies from imposing a per minute charge or any other type of charge for email. I am already paying for my phone service and don't feel that double charging is appropriate for any company. If the phone companies want to make additional money then it should be required that they provide an additional service for that charge and not be allowed to just arbitrarily tack on another charge to an existing service. Everyone knows there are lots of services that they can provide and even get paid for when it come to Internet and email related matters.

Don't let them raise my phone bill just because they want to profit from the internet and email!

Thank you.

Art Jantzen
Wayne, NJ USA art@visiblesolutions.com <http://www.visiblesolutions.com>

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RM8775

From: Caughlan - Kevin M. <caughlan@umd5.umd.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 5:31pm
Subject: internet surcharge

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

To whom it may concern: please do not allow the phone companies to spoil internet access by charging extra for this service. We finally have an equal access route to information, and the greedy telephone utility wants to take this away. Just say no for once. Sincerely, J. Caughlan, Kensington, MD

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

RECEIVED RM 8775

NOV 14 1996

From: osiris1 <osiris1@airmail.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 4:56pm
Subject: Opinion on universal access

BUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Thank you for this excellent FCC home page and access to the papers and articles on relevant issues. It is very informative and a good service to citizens. I wish to voice my opinion on the universal Internet access issue, specifically in regard to subsidizing the costs of ISP access, related phone line charges, computers (or the upcoming smaller

"net box" technology), any software as well as hardware that is necessary to fully use the Web.

To my way of thinking, it is dishonest to force private companies to give huge government-mandated discounts to rural and other consumers on all these technology items, and have people like me have to pay higher costs for everything named above. It would be more honest for the government to pass a tax measure covering a well-enumerated list of costs, so that the

American consumers paying for all this for other people would know exactly what the costs are. Otherwise, it all becomes hidden in the prices of the above-mentioned items, and the people getting the deep discounts think it's their "right" to have other people like me pay their way.

I also believe that most libraries and hospitals can afford the costs involved. Being technologically backward is not necessarily the result of being poor --- but may be the result of poor management or lack of foresight by city or town leaders in various communities. Any forced subsidies in the private sector are a dangerous way to fund what is essentially another government entitlement program. At least it should be done openly and honestly through a budget and tax agreement in the Congress, not by edict with the costs hidden in the prices of private goods and services.

I worked and sacrificed and saved all my life to be able to afford a computer, modem, and internet access charges. I didn't think it was a consitutional right to get it for virtually nothing. With tongue in cheek, may I request that if you force private companies to give 90% discounts to non-Net institutions and people, that I be refunded 90% of the money I paid for all this stuff since I bought this computer and accessed the Net in June of this year.

Thank you for your time, if anybody really read this. Have a good day. Yours truly,
Steve Schlarb

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

RM8775

NOV 14 1996

From: The Bell Family <jbell@bess.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 4:30pm
Subject: Re: charges to Internet users

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

We understand that telephone companies have petitioned the FCC to allow them to charge Internet users for the use of telephone lines. We wish to express our strong opposition to this proposal, and request that the FCC not grant the companies' petition.

Thank you, Jon, Mary and Sophia Bell

This message was sent from Bess.Net, a filtered Internet Access Provider
for children and families.

No. of Copies rec'd _____ /
List ABCDE _____

RM 8775

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Costello, Richard <costello@pubstaff.commerce.state.nc.us>
To: 'FCC' <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 11/14/96 11:23am
Subject: FW: [Fwd: CC/PA: Important Stuff...please forward]

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FCC:

I oppose any charge fees to Internet users, by public phone companies. Our TAX DOLLARS have paid for the Internet structure. Internet established by the US Universities and the US Military was funded through our TAX DOLLARS. Now companies, jumping on the Internet bandwagon, not only want a free ride, they want a "fee" ride. I say no! Let the phone companies establish there own private Internet backbone. These phone companies are charging access fees on our tax paid Internet backbone. They are casing the volume and traffic on the Internet. Finally, Internet users like phone call users, already pay call & toll charges. This is another greed play by corporations, using our tax paid facilities. They should be paying us!.

Richard Costello
Raleigh, NC costello@pubstaff.commerce.state.nc.us

From: Melissa Enyart
To: Connie Johnson - B&I; Conni Tucker; Dene Dawson; Dave Reynolds; Jim Nichols; Julie Snee; Martyn Johnson; Ed Gibson; George Jabbour; Costello, Richard
Subject: FW: [Fwd: CC/PA: Important Stuff...please forward]
Date: Thursday, November 14, 1996 10:52AM

From: Victoria M. Godwin
To: allispys
Cc: menyart
Subject: [Fwd: CC/PA: Important Stuff...please forward]
Date: Wednesday, November 13, 1996 10:47PM

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----64B547F26C9
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Lisa wrote:

>
> PLEASE EVERYONE EMAIL THE FCC, THEIR SENATORS,
> AND REPRESENTATIVES AND EXPRESS THEIR VIEWPOINT ON THIS ISSUE!!!
>
> >Hi,
> >
> > On a news broadcast last night from Denver, they said that the major
> phone
> >companies are petitioning the FCC to charge Internet users a fee, much like
> >long distance, to use their telephone lines for all their on-line time.
> > I am sending you the e addy for the FCC. Would you please send this
> >message to all your e-mail contacts asking them to write a short message to
> >the FCC in an effort to implore them NOT to grant the phone companies this
> >request?
> > fccinfo@fcc.gov
> >
>
>

-----64B547F26C9

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

1

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from pimaia2w.prodigy.com (pimaia2w.prodigy.com [198.83.19.71]) by silver.niia.net (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id UAA00747 for <vgodwin@niia.net>;
Wed, 13 Nov 1996 20:41:57 -0600 (CST)
Received: from listserv.prodigy.com (listserv.prodigy.com [198.83.19.40]) by pimaia2w.prodigy.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) with ESMTP id VAA30848; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 21:41:03 -0500
Received: (from majordom@localhost) by listserv.prodigy.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id WAA32467; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 22:18:36 -0500
Received: from smtp2.erols.com (root@smtp2.erols.com [205.252.116.102]) by listserv.prodigy.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) with ESMTP id WAA32434 for <pafun@listserv.prodigy.com>; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 22:16:30 -0500
Received: from LOCALNAME (phd-as8s27.erols.com [207.96.22.99]) by smtp2.erols.com (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id UAA01759; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 20:58:12 -0500 (EST)
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 1996 20:58:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199611140158.UAA01759@smtp2.erols.com>
X-Sender: chatty@pop.erols.com
X-Mailer: Windows Mail Version 2.1.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: (Recipient list suppressed)
From: Lisa <chatty@erols.com>
Subject: CC/PA: Important Stuff...please forward
Sender: owner-pafun@listserv.prodigy.com
Precedence: bulk
To: pafun@listserv.prodigy.com
X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

PLEASE EVERYONE EMAIL THE FCC, THEIR SENATORS,
AND REPRESENTATIVES AND EXPRESS THEIR VIEWPOINT ON THIS ISSUE!!!

>Hi,
>
> On a news broadcast last night from Denver, they said that the major phone
>companies are petitioning the FCC to charge Internet users a fee, much like
>long distance, to use their telephone lines for all their on-line time.
> I am sending you the e addy for the FCC. Would you please send this
>message to all your e-mail contacts asking them to write a short message to
>the FCC in an effort to implore them NOT to grant the phone companies this
>request?
> fccinfo@fcc.gov
>

Message From Lisa <chatty@erols.com> to Prodigy's Computer Crafts/Print Artist Mailing List

Prodigy Services Company is the sponsor of this newsletter.

Prodigy does not review and cannot be responsible for the content of the newsletter or related discussions.

To subscribe, unsubscribe, or get more information about Prodigy mailing lists, go to
<http://goodstuff.prodigy.com/lists/> or send a message with the word "help" in the body to
majordomo@listserv.prodigy.com

-----64B547F26C9--

CC: 'Sen. Jesse_Helms' <Jesse_Helms@helms.senate.gov>

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RM8775

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

From: Costello, Richard <costello@pubstaff.commerce.state.nc.us>
To: 'FCC' <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 11/14/96 11:23am
Subject: FW: [Fwd: CC/PA: Important Stuff...please forward]

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

FCC:

I oppose any charge fees to Internet users, by public phone companies. Our TAX DOLLARS have paid for the Internet structure. Internet established by the US Universities and the US Military was funded through our TAX DOLLARS. Now companies, jumping on the Internet bandwagon, not only want a free ride, they want a "fee" ride. I say no! Let the phone companies establish there own private Internet backbone. These phone companies are charging access fees on our tax paid Internet backbone. They are casing the volume and traffic on the Internet. Finally, Internet users like phone call users, already pay call & toll charges. This is another greed play by corporations, using our tax paid facilities. They should be paying us!

Richard Costello

Raleigh, NC costello@pubstaff.commerce.state.nc.us

From: Melissa Enyart

To: Connie Johnson - B&I; Conni Tucker; Dene Dawson; Dave Reynolds; Jim Nichols; Julie Snee; Martyn Johnson; Ed Gibson; George Jabbour; Costello, Richard
Subject: FW: [Fwd: CC/PA: Important Stuff...please forward]
Date: Thursday, November 14, 1996 10:52AM

From: Victoria M. Godwin

To: allispys
Cc: menyart
Subject: [Fwd: CC/PA: Important Stuff...please forward]
Date: Wednesday, November 13, 1996 10:47PM

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----64B547F26C9
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Lisa wrote:

>
> PLEASE EVERYONE EMAIL THE FCC, THEIR SENATORS,
> AND REPRESENTATIVES AND EXPRESS THEIR VIEWPOINT ON THIS ISSUE!!!
>
> >Hi,
> >
> > On a news broadcast last night from Denver, they said that the major
> > phone
> > companies are petitioning the FCC to charge Internet users a fee, much like
> > long distance, to use their telephone lines for all their on-line time.
> > I am sending you the e addy for the FCC. Would you please send this
> > message to all your e-mail contacts asking them to write a short message to
> > the FCC in an effort to implore them NOT to grant the phone companies this
> > request?
> > fccinfo@fcc.gov
> >
> >
> >

-----64B547F26C9

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from pimaia2w.prodigy.com (pimaia2w.prodigy.com [198.83.19.71]) by silver.niaa.net (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id UAA00747 for <vgodwin@niaa.net>;
Wed, 13 Nov 1996 20:41:57 -0600 (CST)
Received: from listserv.prodigy.com (listserv.prodigy.com [198.83.19.40]) by pimaia2w.prodigy.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) with ESMTP id VAA30848; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 21:41:03 -0500
Received: (from majordom@localhost) by listserv.prodigy.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id WAA32467; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 22:18:36 -0500
Received: from smtp2.erols.com (root@smtp2.erols.com [205.252.116.102]) by listserv.prodigy.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) with ESMTP id WAA32434 for <pafun@listserv.prodigy.com>; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 22:16:30 -0500
Received: from LOCALNAME (phd-as8s27.erols.com [207.96.22.99]) by smtp2.erols.com (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id UAA01759; Wed, 13 Nov 1996 20:58:12 -0500 (EST)
Date: Wed, 13 Nov 1996 20:58:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199611140158.UAA01759@smtp2.erols.com>
X-Sender: chatty@pop.erols.com
X-Mailer: Windows Mail Version 2.1.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: (Recipient list suppressed)
From: Lisa <chatty@erols.com>
Subject: CC/PA: Important Stuff...please forward
Sender: owner-pafun@listserv.prodigy.com
Precedence: bulk
To: pafun@listserv.prodigy.com
X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

PLEASE EVERYONE EMAIL THE FCC, THEIR SENATORS,
AND REPRESENTATIVES AND EXPRESS THEIR VIEWPOINT ON THIS ISSUE!!!

>Hi,
>
> On a news broadcast last night from Denver, they said that the major phone
>companies are petitioning the FCC to charge Internet users a fee, much like
>long distance, to use their telephone lines for all their on-line time.
> I am sending you the e addy for the FCC. Would you please send this
>message to all your e-mail contacts asking them to write a short message to
>the FCC in an effort to implore them NOT to grant the phone companies this
>request?
> fccinfo@fcc.gov
>

Message From Lisa <chatty@erols.com> to Prodigy's Computer Crafts/Print Artist Mailing List

Prodigy Services Company is the sponsor of this newsletter.
Prodigy does not review and cannot be responsible for the content of the newsletter or related discussions.

To subscribe, unsubscribe, or get more information about Prodigy mailing lists, go to
<http://goodstuff.prodigy.com/lists/> or send a message with the word "help" in the body to
majordomo@listserv.prodigy.com

-----64B547F26C9--

CC: 'Sen. Jesse_Helms' <Jesse_Helms@helms.senate.gov>

RM 8775

RECEIVED

From: Alex Rebo <alexr@visix.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 11/14/96 1:20pm
Subject: Issues

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Hi,
I've heard that local phone Co. are about to start charging for Inet access on a per minute basis. I've a Q: how are they (Co.) going to distinguish modem sending faxes, being on the Inet, uploading BBS or telnet'ing to the office, unless they plan to charge for all of the above.

I'd appreciate your response.
Thank you.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

AM 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL RECEIVED

From: Stephen F Schell <stfrsc@juno.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/13/96 7:29pm
Subject: Phone Companies and the Internet

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

To the FCC,

Hello. I want to express to you my complete opposition to any attempt on the part of the major phone companies to charge customers for time spent accessing the internet.

It is natural that they would seek to do this, due to the internet's explosion in popularity. I have watched with concern the tendency for these companies to position themselves as the major internet service providers.

The internet and world wide web are wonderful developments, unique in world history. Profiteering by the major phone companies would only serve to stifle development of this incredible resource. I implore the FCC to consider the prevention of exploitation of the internet to become a central part of it's mission.

Stephen F. Schell 3824 Clark Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90808 stfrsc@juno.com

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RM 8775

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Martyn Johnson <mjohnson@mail.commerce.state.nc.us>
To: 'SMTP:fccinfo@fcc.gov' <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 11/14/96 11:21am
Subject: Internet user fees

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

As a private and public user of the Internet I believe to allow major phone companies to charge users a fee, much like long distance, to use their telephone lines for all their on-line Internet time would suffocate innovation of uses of the Internet and reduce the dissemination of information.

Please do not allow the Internet to be removed from easy and cheap access of private and public users. I much prefer advertising on the Internet to a system of pay as you use the line time.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

No. of Copies rec'd _____ /
List ABCDE _____

RM 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: <catfish@netusa1.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 11:00am
Subject: A protest

Dear FCC,

I am writing to protest the phone companies' proposal to charge customers long distance for their Internet hours. I pay my phone bill, and I diligently sought an Internet provider with a local access number so I would NOT have to pay a long distance fee. Why should I have to pay twice for my Internet hours?

I see this proposal by the phone companies as just another example of how they wish to monopolize how we communicate with one another. For the phone companies to charge us for our Internet hours, on top of the fee we already pay our providers, would virtually shut the Internet down....a giant step backwards.

Sincerely,

John and Kim Speight

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RM 8775

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

NOV 14 1996

From: Rita Maroscher postal19 <postal19@ix.netcom.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 2:50pm
Subject: Internet usage toll

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I was informed that the Major phone companies are petitioning for=20 legislation of a toll for internet access through the phone lines.I think=
=20 this is wrong! We pay our phone bills and we should not be charged extra=20 for calling certain numbers.Is this subject up for review?Where can I get=
=20 additional information concerning this?Thank you.
Rita Maroscher postal19@ix.netcom.com
--=20
GIF89a=85

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE _____

RM 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

From: <dnilsen@cci-29palms.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 2:33pm
Subject: NO WAY

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Don't you think as an American public we are bled enough. Make the phone companies leave us alone. Talk about a free country. We live in a country where it costs to do anything. Even go to the bathroom. Hands of my internet. Keep the phone companies hands out of my pocket. I already give them money every month. I also pay the internet service. Get the criminals off our backs.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RM 8775

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

From: Cox, Nancy <NCOX@avpc.buffalo.edu>
To: 'fccinfo@fcc.gov' <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 11/14/96 1:49pm
Subject: Regulations concerning internet usage!

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I am upset to hear that the FCC is considering propositions by the conglomerate phone companies asking to charge for use of Internet time on the phone lines. We PAY for these phone lines initially when we request service and we PAY every month in our "basic rate" charge. We are charged for EVERY possible service (change of listing, call waiting, etc.) I know the phone companies can't conceive of the idea of GIVING service, which is already well compensated. I implore you NOT to grant this request.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RM8775

RECEIVED

From: SCN User <susie@scn.org>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 12:57pm
Subject: internet line charges

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I am a Washington resident and would like to place my opinion as being TOTALLY against new internet charges being imposed to pay for time spent using the telephone lines!

Susie

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

KM8775

RECEIVED

From: Jean Lamb <tlambs@magick.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 12:49pm
Subject: Re: TECH:RWL Internet fees

NOV 14 1996
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Dear FCC:

I think it's wrong to allow the phone companies to charge for a service they are already providing as part of their original package. You might as well charge an air fee for people in this country because they generally breathe! I pay for an extra line for my computer. I make only local calls on it. This particular additional charge will be just extra profit to the phone companies, and not as a recompense for any expense they are actually going through. And how are companies going to be able to tell whether a line is used for data transmission or not? Are you going to let them charge extra for all lines because a computer might be used on it? Doesn't this penalize people who don't have computers?

A case could be made that this would be forcing non-computer users to subsidize computer users who are on-line, as well. Are we going to see charges for listening to the radio next?

Sincerely,
Jean Lamb

Jean Lamb, tlambs@magick.net from Klamath Falls, where she is trying to work on two projects at the same time rather than actually deciding which one...

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

RM8775

From: Candace Nelson <candace@cruz.isle.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 11/14/96 4:13pm
Subject: Internet Phone Charges

RECEIVED
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
NOV 14 1996

Dear Sirs:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I am writing this to implore you NOT to grant the request for fees for internet user charges. I am disabled due to Multiple Sclerosis, and my internet contacts are the only "real life" support group I have. I could not afford to be on-line if it became more expensive. PLEASE do not grant this request.

Thank you for listening..

Candace Nelson
1853 Ives Ave. #82
Oxnard, CA 93033

(805) 486-1970

E-mail: candace@isle.net

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RECEIVED

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

BUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Scott <scotttt@pacbell.net>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 11/14/96 4:10pm
Subject: International Interexchange Telecommunications VIA the "Internet"

Any proposed increase in phone line provider fees associated with Internet access should consider the following.

Pacific Bell offers Residential Measured Rate Service for \$4.45 per month and a Flat Rate Service at \$8.35 per month in the San Francisco, CA bay area. Most Internet users pay for the Flat Rate Service to cover additional phone line time associated with Internet use.

If phone line provider fees are increased because of Internet access, a Measured Rate Customer should not have to pay the phone line provider for time connected to the Internet. To do so means that the customer would be paying for this time twice, once for time in excess of the Measured Rate allowance and again for proposed Internet access fees.

-- Walter Scott
3415 Jarvis Avenue
San Jose, CA 95118 mailto:scotttt@pacbell.net

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: <Taminar@aol.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 11/14/96 5:22pm
Subject: Internet Fees

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

NOV 14 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

The major long distance providers are making millions, if not billions, of dollars of profit each year. I don't see everyone in America going out and buying computers and software to make long distance phone calls using the Internet and thus bankrupting AT&T, MCI and Sprint.

The people who are most likely to use the Internet Long Distance Software are people who make frequent international calls and cannot afford to pay international call rates.

My experience with online and internet service providers is that the service is not trouble-free. If I want a clear connection, uninterrupted by a sudden lock-up of the system, I'm going to use my telephone. I think most people will for years to come.

Auriette Lindsey
Pensacola, Florida

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

NOV 14 1996

From: James W. Anderson <jander8@hotmail.com>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 11/14/96 5:03pm
Subject: Internet Telephone (I-phone) proceeding, et. al.

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of Secretary

I am strongly against the rulemaking as proposed by the telephone companies named in the petition for rulemaking ('petitioners').

I am apposed to the rulemaking on the following grounds.

1. Petitioners are trying to put some I-phone companies out of business and therefore may be putting the rulemaking forth as a way of circumventing antitrust laws that could be enforced against them in this case as a result of passage of the Telecommunications

Act of 1996 (the 'Telco Act'). In at least one case a company called

'Freephone' would be knocked out of business as they have offered their software free via a webpage and rather than have users pay for the software they have advertising which is displayed when a user visits their site and uses their product. They do offer a deluxe version for \$29.95 which has advanced features and allows the user to shut off the advertising if they wish to but otherwise the software and usage of same is free.

2. Software bundling and advertising of same: Many software developers are including one or more I-phone packages or support of same into their packages. Some of these companies are among the 'heavy hitters' in both the home and business marketplace. This could reduce the attractiveness of their technology due to the costs involved.

3. Loss of money to telco issues: Not true. In fact, AT&T offers unlimited access to users of its internet service (even if the customer does not even know of or use I-phones) and other telcos such as MCI have internet service packages aimed at the consumer market so they make money anyway.

4. Small business access to technology issues. If, in the worst case of this rulemaking, as costs would cut off fledgeling businesses and some smaller companies from the access to technology they need to both remain competitive and survive in today's economy. Charging by the minute or charging for I-phone packages other than purchase costs also would defeat Vice President Gore's vision of the Information Superhighway and other technology based legislative intent already enacted into laws at all levels of government.

It is assumed that the phone companies are trying to charge 'by the minute' for local access to internet services, it will backfire on them anyway as in some areas customers are charged a couple of cents a minute for 'message units' either as measured service or generally in such areas as New York City, etc. Since this varies from locality to locality it is impractical to do so.

In fact, why the complaint? they make their money locally whether the person is surfing the net or talking to a neighbor across the street! They have to face the fact that the US marketplace is a free market and to charge again for what is already provided as a free and is considered by the public as being free aside from ISP and local basic service charges will not be tolerated by the general public and could even be challenged in the courts and the Supreme Court as well as most lower courts would be compelled to rule against the Telcos in this matter. State legislators could act against the same matter as some local governments have already done when it came to taxing internet service (Tacoma, for example.)

The bottom line is: NO to per minute or other extra charges for internet access and/or I-phone usage. Certainly if will never pass muster in the courts if you pass this rulemaking at the commission level so it is useful to all concerned if you deny this rulemaking proceeding and if it were possible, to dismiss this proceeding known as RM-8775, with prejudice.

James W. Anderson
 639 West 100 North
 Provo, UT 84601-2661

Filed 14 Nov 1996

No. of Copies rec'd _____
 List ABCDE