

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

~~96-262~~
94-1
91-213
96263

From: James R. Duggan <JDuggan@mail.microsys.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/25/96 1:01am
Subject: Reform of Long Distance Access Charges

I whole heartedly support your proposal to review and re-set access charges for long distance access. There is no need for the high charges being assessed today.

However, I disagree with those who contend market forces will result in readjustment. The telephone companies charge those outlandish fees "because they are dictated by the government." I believe the FCC should adopt new rate structures for use by the industry. The new structure should declare the appropriate policy position regarding internet access providers.

James R. Duggan
16440 Tamra Lane
Riverside, California 92504-5728

RECEIVED

DEC 26 1996

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY**

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-262
96-263
RECEIVED RECEIVED

DEC 26 1996

DEC 26 1996

From: Scott McDonald <mcd@community.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/24/96 9:57pm
Subject: FCC adopts proposal to Reform Access Charges

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

As a private citizen who uses the Internet, there seems to be a duty to speak out against any access charge change by the commission that may negatively impact the end-user. =20

While it is clear that people are "coming online" in increasing numbers on a daily basis, it seems equally apparent that a number of the so-called "old-line" vested interests may once again see dollar signs in the skies of potential policy change.

Telephone companies come immediately to mind as entities that clearly will seek to find a way to charge more while providing less. The issue of an informed citizenry should also carry some weight. That is, the more people who are "on" the net, the more people who can communicate with government (as I am doing here) and each other.

When fees escalate, it only harms the little person, not the wealthy who may even have satellite-fed internet signal (Direct PC). Sure, if the access charges are only a few pennies per user, what could that hurt? Yet like most fee structures, which inevitably start out

"small", the danger is inevitable escalation of fees and surcharges.

Where is the "price point" where the average american would "pull the plug" on his or her net service? Is there a duty of the government to

provide internet access for the poor and the physically-challenged?

I think when it comes to the Internet, the tried-and-true policy of "Less (regulation) is More (Internet performance)" still makes sense.

In other words, the system "works", people are happy (by and large), so "why fix it (regulate or change access charges)?"

The FCC has long done an admirable job in managing broadcast media and this is a venue that clearly deserves continuity. Being a worldwide affair, assessing "access charges" on americans using the Internet is just another verbiage of the ugliest three-letter word in the dictionary: TAX.

The commission should strongly consider a "hands off" policy towards the Internet and "access charges". There can be no valid or compelling argument put forth toward charging our citizens more money for access to the world of information. To compete globally, it is in everyone's interest that as many of us as possible are able to communicate.

Scott McDonald
Vallejo CA.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-262
~~94-1~~
91-213
96-263

From: <Chessmen@ix.netcom.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/25/96 1:50pm
Subject: Access Fees Charged to ISPs by Phone Companies

I was pleased to read of your recent statement that ISPs will NOT be charged access fees from phone companies. For the record, I am against phone companies charging access fees to Internet Service Providers; the phone companies "fees" are bloated enough already.

RECEIVED

DEC 26 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

DEC 26 1996

96-262/
94-1
91-213
96-263

From: <audioguys@multiverse.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/25/96 2:07am
Subject: Access Charges

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

My letter concerns the Commissions comments regarding proceedings to reform interstate access charges. (CC Docket No. 96-262; CC Docket No. 94-1; CC Docket No. 91-213; CC Docket No. 96-263)

I agree and support the Commission in their belief that Internet Service Providers (ISP) should not be subject to interstate access charges as currently constituted.

I understand that the development of the Internet may strain local public switched telephone networks. However initiating access charges for ISPs would simply cause higher rates to consumers like myself. These access charges would be passed along to the consumer and limit the general population's ability to use the internet for communication, recreation, and education.

The phone traffic problem can be solved if the phone companies work with ISPs. The phone companies need to identify data calls and route them to special packet networks. The packet networks can handle a high volume of data calls at one time. With all the calls for internet access being routed to the packet networks; the rest of the phone system can handle standard voice calls. The phone companies should charge only for the service of routing calls to the proper network.

IBM, Microsoft, Netscape, Intel, and Novell have formed the DATA (Digital Affordable Telecommunication Access) Coalition to research this new technology.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter.

Brian Giese
17599 Whitney Rd.
Apt. 104
Strongsville, OH 44136

bgiese@bigfoot.com audioguys@multiverse.com

RECEIVED

DEC 26 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE