

memorandum

DATE: ~~February 11, 1997~~

3/10/97

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

REPLY TO

ATTN OF: Commissioner Rachelle B. Chong

SUBJECT: Access Charge Reform Docket No. 96-262

CC

MAR 12 1997

TO: Acting Secretary William F. Caton

Enclosed are e-mails that I have received regarding the NPRM on Access Charge Reform, Docket No. 96-262. Kindly include them as part of the record for this docket.

Thank you very much.

CC 96-262

From: Adrienne R Mackey <amac@SineWave.com>
To: C1.C1(rhunt),A7.A7(jquello,sness,rchong)
Date: February 5, 1997 10:01am
Subject: Per minute charges for Internet service

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

To the members of the FCC

Please do not impose perminute charges for Internet service. I speak as a retired teacher for myself and for elementary school children, knowing how much good the internet has done to motivate children to write. Extra charges would make the internet less accessible to those who need it most.
The internet should be allowed to grow - per minujte charges by local telephone companies would encourage just the opposite.

Sincerely, Adrienne Mackey, San Jose, Calif.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEB 5 1997

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

CC 96-262

From: <cmoury@nettally.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 5, 1997 5:57pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Clarence A. Moury (cmoury@nettally.com) writes:

I just saw a post on the net about the phone company wanting to charge people a per minute charge for the internet connection, and I would like to let you know that I strongly disagree with them. It will push me off the net, for one. I also think that it will cause a lot of other people to leave the internet. Now that may be good for the phone company, but it will hurt many people with a limited income, and those who are not able to get out. People who are shutins or house bound, whose only communication with other people, is the internet.

Thanks for letting me air off, Clarence

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 216.orlando-006.fl.dial-access.att.net
Remote IP address: 207.146.69.216

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEB 6 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC96-262

From: <feezels@pacbell.net>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 6, 1997 1:43pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Corinne E. Carpenter (feezels@pacbell.net) writes:

I received an e-mail today stating that local phone companies are attempting to push through the FCC the ability to charge internet users by the minute for service. with the following address to respond to: isp@fcc.gov

which I promptly did. This is something that the deadline is February 13, 1997 to respond to this information.

My comments were pretty much along the lines of President Clinton's State of the Union address and how it is a priority in the United States to promote and pay for more education to the tune of 51 billion dollars.

Because of an on-the-job injury and disability that resulted from that injury I have now re-entered academia at the age of 53 because my skills were no longer viable.

I use the internet extensively to work on school assignments and this would seriously hinder my ability to continue my education in a manner that I can afford, so I am definitely against this.

Also, I question how something as big as this can be slipped by the public, could you please give me some clarification on this matter?

Most sincerely,
Corinne Carpenter

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: ppp-206-170-120-82.sndg02.pacbell.net
Remote IP address: 206.170.120.82

FEB 6 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-267

From: <clochmul@chem.duke.edu>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 6, 1997 10:13am
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

charles h. Lochmuller (clochmul@chem.duke.edu) writes:

I have tried sending this to ISP@fcc.gov but Duke's DNS cannot find it. Can you pass it on? Please?
I want to record my strong objection to this proposal. I am Professor of Chemistry and Professor of Biochemical Engineering here at Duke. My use of telephone connection and that of our students is primarily to establish SLIP/PPP connection to the Duke IPC to recover files from lab computers and to use these data to work at home. It is also used for mail/talk/ftp during those times when I am at home working. It is thus a quite professional non-profit use.

The fact is that internet connection poses no greater load on telephone companies than the legion of teenage boys and girls who spend hours talking to each other about >very< important 'stuff' every afternoon and evening. Once the phone connection is made, no more bandwidth is consumed by bursts of TCP/IP protocol information than by cries of "Cool!", "Eccch!" and general conversation. Yes, if the internet connection was a true 10baseT or 100 base T provided by the telephone company as a direct link to an Internet IPC they provided, a charge would be reasonable. So is the current charge for a "Class A leased line" such as those some of my neighbors who are GLAXO-Wellcome employees are provided by their employer. But my use is that of a regular telephone and the service is such that while I can send at 38.4 kB General Telephone provides me with a noisy enough line that most often I can connect at 1/2 that rate. The proposed surcharge is based on bogus claims.

There is no reason to permit the phone providers with an opportunity to exploit customer use of the phone system because the internet is becoming popular. If the President is right in his State of the Union prediction and every home will have a computer in 5-7 years, then 90% will use telephone internet connection. Why should that provide a no additional cost ATT/GTE/ the 'Bells' financial windfall?

C. H. Lochmuller
Professor
Duke University

FEB 6 1997

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: async251-53.async.duke.edu
Remote IP address: 152.3.251.53

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC96-262

From: <isp@airmail.net>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 6, 1997 2:23pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Iris Speckman (isp@airmail.net) writes:

Re: Access Reform CC Docket #96-262 Sir: I request that careful consideration be given to charge of fees by telephone companies for use of lines by internet clients. I would hope that those companies would not be permitted to levy fees that would be prohibitive for the general public to enjoy the benefits of internet access. Respectfully, Iris Speckman

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: dal11-25.ppp.iadfw.net
Remote IP address: 206.66.4.91

FEB 6 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC96-262

From: <dbwells@ix.netcom.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 6, 1997 11:37pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Home Page

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Davis Wells (dbwells@ix.netcom.com) writes:

One of the hottest Internet rumors floating through email these days is concern about per minute line charges by the phone companies for internet access. The reasoning goes that because of Internet users, local capacity is being overloaded and the phone companies want more money for expansion. I have looked through the FCC web site and have read Chairman Hundt's comments on not letting phone companies get carried away with charging extra for internet use. But I haven't found anything else on the subject. Are there current or future proposals for per minute charging pending from the phone companies at this time? I, myself, and almost everyone that I know that uses the internet have purchase and pay for a second phone line dedicated to internet use. So the phone companies are already receiveing additional revenue from internet users. As a concerned Internet user I would think additional charges would slow the use of the internet (it certainly would reduce my use).

Thank You for your time.

Sincerely,
Davis Wells

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: aus-tx4-04.ix.netcom.com
Remote IP address: 199.35.201.132

FEB 6 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: Charles Lochmuller <clochmul@chem.duke.edu>
To: Rachelle Chong <RCHONG@fcc.gov>
Date: February 6, 1997 4:42pm
Subject: Re: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage -Reply

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Rachelle Chong

> > Dear Professor,
> > I appreciate reading your comments and will have them filed in
> our access charge docket. > > Thanks for writing,
> Com'r Rachelle Chong
> > you are welcome. FCC would do the world a favor by revealing exactly what the access charge is for. Is it for anyone dialing a commercial IPC or is it anyone using digital transmission{ how would they know?} or ????. Ther is a lot of fury at the user level about this one. PErhaps a general message to University Sys Admins or some such?

Comment in the absence of detail is a difficult if not fruitless as an exercise.

C.H.Lochmuller

FEB 6 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

From: <hfspc002@email.csun.edu>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 6, 1997 2:12pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

FEB 6 1997

Bernardo Attias (hfspc002@email.csun.edu) writes:

Dear Commissioner Chong,

It has come to my attention the local phone companies are planning to begin charging a per-minute fee for local calls in order to capitalize on the use of Internet Service Providers. While I have no objection to telephone companies earning a profit for their valuable public services, I do feel that the profit motive of the telephone companies must always be carefully weighed against the public interest.

In this case, they are going too far. Telephone companies are already making enormous profits from the increasing use of the Internet by U.S. citizens. I am a professor using the Internet extensively in my courses at the California State University Northridge. I have joined many Americans in installing a second telephone line in my home for my use of the Internet. Such actions on the part of heavy Internet users such as myself (not to mention businesses and organizations which in some cases have several dedicated telephone lines) already earn the telephone companies much profit from Internet usage.

My students are by and large low- to middle-income working people. In my classes it is required that they take advantage of the extensive educational resources available on the Internet. A per-minute surcharge for local telephone calls would greatly restrict such students' ability to use these resources, not to mention adding another layer of charges to local voice calls. I know that many of my students (not to mention countless others across the nation) would not be using the Internet at all if they were paying an additional surcharge for each telephone call.

You at the FCC are in a position to do something about this. I agree with your regulatory philosophy of "simple pragmatic regulation." I feel that regulation should always be carefully considered. In this case, I think the benefits of regulation outweigh the possible costs. I urge you to put a stop to these surcharges, which represent a wholesale sellout of public resources to the interests of private greed.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bernardo Attias

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: max1-24.wavenet.com
Remote IP address: 206.117.73.24

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

0096-262

From: <shaun@eagnet.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 7, 1997 9:24am
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Shaun Mullenix (shaun@eagnet.com) writes:

I, like most people I'm sure, disagree with the idea/plan of charging per minute fees on internet used #'s. This is just another ploy by our government to cash in on the www, and a way for the phone companies also. It would only benefit them both to make it lawful to do so; especially the government, through the taxes recieved by this charge. I think we as citizens have not only a right but a duty to inform and question those that represent us. This is my request that no additional charges be included to any phone # associated with internet usage.

Respectfully,
Shaun Mullenix

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: bg1-89.eagnet.com
Remote IP address: 199.76.206.89

FEB 7 1997

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

CC 96-262

From: <LCDINFL@aol.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 7, 1997 3:54pm
Subject: Phone Co/Internet access chgs

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Chong,

The Federal Communications Commission was approached by local telephone companies to implement *additional charges for internet access* via telephone lines.

- This proposal is totally UNacceptable ! -

There should be no difference in the rates between the use of the lines for voice vs data/accessing the internet.

The negative domino effect of this request will be *enormous* both to consumers directly and INdirectly, much less to students/education.

This request by the local phone companies appears to be generated by greed. The request is inappropriate. New technologies are becoming available for data transfer and accessing the internet, albeit, these technologies are not universally available to all Americans.

Allowing the local telephone companies permission to charge addition fees for data/internet access will impact our economy negatively and, therefore, is grossly OBJECTIONABLE -

- Businesses, both large and small, will pass the increase to consumers as a result of this action. - The internet is a magnificent tool for information and many citizens will not be able to pay the additional fees. - Educational access to the internet for our children, adolescents, and adults will be compromised if fees for access are implemented. Educational budgets throughout the United States are limited whether private, public or primary education or college education. An additional & unwarranted surcharge is not in their best interest.

In summary, I implore you to DENY this request by the local telephone companies, and to allow the current flat rate structure which the local telephone companies are currently using whether for voice or data or internet access to stand. Thank your in advance.

Sincerely,
Lynn-Claire Davis, Editor
People Searching News (adoption magazine)

FEB 7 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: Lisa Patterson <tsalagi@earthlink.net> **DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**
To: A4.A4(isp)
Date: February 7, 1997 1:58pm
Subject: Docket 96-263

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am appalled that the Federal Communications Commission would even consider the proposal of local telephone companies to implement additional charges for internet access via telephone lines. It is a grievous mistake to consider that use of telephone lines for data is somehow different from using the telephone lines for voice. This request appears to be founded in greed. The local telephone companies have no doubt recognized yet another opportunity to fleece an already over-burdened American public with concocted fees for services that are currently provided. Approval of such an activity is akin to putting the proverbial fox in the hen house.

History recounts the exploits of several famous and infamous legendary figures who made their mark by relieving an unwilling and unprotected public of their meager belongings. One cannot help but call to mind the legendary bandits of the old American west and their exploits relating to America's young, but already monopolistic railroads. The difference between that time and the present was that relieving anyone of their hard-earned money required the use of force, whereas today, it is done with deception, false advertising, double-talk and outright lies relating to ever-mounting installation and maintenance costs.

While everyone is quick to point out the doctrine of free enterprise and competition in the marketplace, the telephone industry is no longer engaged in the practice of free enterprise and competition in the marketplace when dealing with the individual consumer. The common man really has no choice other than no service.

In a time when major emphasis on a national and international basis is being placed on education and the need for increasing the accessibility of the public to the ever-increasing wealth of educational materials, this is an opportunity for you, as a regulating body, to assist in the construction of the Bridge to the 21st Century by not allowing the imposition of such an unfounded tax.

Lisa Patterson
4489 B Woodland Drive
New Orleans, LA 70131

FEB 7 1997

CC: J1.J1(FCCMAIL),A7.A7(jquello,sness,rchong),FCCMAIL...

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC96-262

From: Robert Wood <robtwood@micron.net>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 6, 1997 9:38pm
Subject: internet access

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I understand that local phone companies are requesting a per minute charge for use of the phone lines for Internet access. I read it this morning in the Statesman (local newspaper) and then found a comment about it on the Internet. If they get this approved then there will be many people who will not be able to access the Internet and it will effect all aspects of the Internet system. Schools will be affected as well as the local user. President Clinton in his state of the Union address mentioned that competer access was one of the points that deserved special attention. One of his goals was to have computer access for everyone. This will seriously hamper those efforts. I understand that the FCC will have to rule on this. I would like to indicate that some of us are against this measure very much. I feel that it will be in the public interest to allow inexpensive access to the Internet system.

Thank you for your assistance

Robert Wood 10610 Conway Ave
Boise, Idaho 83709
(208) 376-9462

FEB 7 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Paul Bach <pbach@InfoAve.Net>
To: A4.A4(isp)
Date: February 7, 1997 11:25am
Subject: docket 96-263

I am a legally blind 51 year old woman. The internet has been Godsend to me because it is a window on the world I would not otherwise have.

The Federal Communications Commission was approached by local telephone companies to implement additional charges for internet access via telephone lines. This is totally unacceptable. There should be no difference in the rates between the use of the lines for voice versus data and accessing the internet.

This request by the local phone companies appears to be generated by greed. The local phone companies would not be asking for this rate increas

FEB 7 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-267

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Kythera Grunge <kythera@angelic.com>
To: A4.A4(isp)
Date: February 7, 1997 9:03pm
Subject: ISP charge

It has come to my attention that there is discussion that the telephone companies wish to place a per minute charge on internet usage to ISP, and this will be calculated per phone line from home phones. ISP users would have to pass the cost to the individual user, such as myself. I for one would not be able to afford such a usage charge.

At 1 cent a minute, it would increase my phone bill by \$216 a month, at \$1 a minute I'm looking at \$21,600 a month, I don't know many people who could afford \$216 and no one who could afford \$21,000!

The net is an incredible educational and informational tool for the world. I teach students, for free, around the world...my web site offers information that is not easily accessible by any other means. I was not born wealthy, most of my students have little money...I don't think I'm unusual in my situation.

It would be a tragic loss to world peace and communication if your commission bows to the request of phone companies...thousands of average citizens will no longer be able to afford access, I don't think that is what you want, it's certainly not what your employer, the people, want. Don't ok it.

Rev. Kythera Ann Grunge
14197 Hwy 9
Boulder Creek, CA 95006

408-338-7139 kythera@angelic.com <http://www.geocities.com/~kabbalah>
Fax:408-338-1613

CC: A7.A7(rchong)

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-268

From: Dominic Orlando <dominic@leonardo.net>
To: J1.J1(FCCMAIL)
Date: February 7, 1997 3:43pm
Subject: Electrons are electrons!

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner,

Recently, the local phone companies approached the FCC asking for additional charges for Internet access by telephone. This is completely unreasonable. What's the difference between voice and internet data traveling through wire? Electrons are electrons! The rates should stay the same. Indeed, they must.

The local phone companies seem to be following the dictates of their greed-driven monopolys. If these same phone companies want a rate increase for email, then why not for faxing, teleconferencing and other voice technologies?

Allowing local phone companies permission to charge more for Internet and data transmission can have only one effect... it will stifle the nascent and burgeoning growth of the new Internet economy and community! Consumers and users will be saddled with the expense, resulting in either its slow-down or collapse. This will destroy the 21st century's great hope... killed by 20th century's greedy lack of foresight.

The children and adults of the next epoch will remember that a formidable educational tool, the Internet, was the last book thrown into the flames by the unthinking, callous and mistrustful "book burners" of the 20th century!

I implore you, as a citizen of the United Staes and a netizen of the world, to refuse this shallow request by the local phone companies. Let the democracy of the marketplace, along with the current flat rate system, continue nurturing the Internet's rapid and necessary growth.

Sincerely,

Dominic Orlando

CC: A7.A7(jquello,sness,rchong)

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: 4404 OSS/MOC <4404ossmoc@psab.aorcentaf.af.mil>
To: 'rchong@fcc.gov' <rchong@fcc.gov>
Date: February 7, 1997 7:04pm
Subject: docket 96-263

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEB 8 1997

>Dear Ms. Chong,

>

>>The Federal Communications Commission was approached by local telephone
>companies to implement additional charges for internet access via telephone
>lines. This is totally unacceptable. There should be no difference in the
>rates between the use of the lines for voice versus data and accessing the
>internet.

>>

>>This request by the local phone companies appears to be generated by
>greed. The local phone companies would not be asking for this rate increase
>if the issue was access for additional voice technology. Perhaps, the real
>issue is that the local phone companies have not kept their technologies
>current especially with data lines and, therefore, wish to do this now with
>inappropriate charges on the use of voice lines for data and accessing the
>internet. New technologies are becoming available for data transfer and
>accessing the internet, however, these technologies are not universally
>available to all Americans.

>>

>>Allowing the local telephone companies permission to charge addition fees
>for data and internet access will hurt our entire economy. Business, both
>large and small, will pass the increase to consumers. Consumers will pay
>more for goods and services as a result of this action. In addition, the
>internet is a magnificent tool for information and many citizens will not
>be able to pay the additional fees. Educational access to the internet for
>our children, adolescents, and adults will be compromised if fees for
>access are implemented. Educational budgets throughout the United States
>are limited whether private, public or primary education or college
>education. The negative domino effect of this request is enormous. >>
>>In summary, I employ you to deny this request by the local telephone
>companies and allow the current flat rate structure which the local
>telephone companies are currently using whether for voice or data or
>internet access. Thank your for your time.

>>

>>Sincerely,
>>Michael A. Kimmelman

>

>

>

>

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: 4404 WG/CPO, COMMAND POST <4404WGCP0@psaD...>
To: 'rhundt@fcc.gov' <rhundt@fcc.gov>
Date: February 7, 1997 7:18pm

> The Federal Communications Commission was approached by local telephone companies to implement additional charges for Internet access via telephone lines. This is totally unacceptable. There should be no difference in the rates between the use of the lines for voice versus data and accessing the Internet.

> This request by the local phone companies appears to be generated by greed. The local phone companies would not be asking for this rate increase if the issue was access for additional voice technology. Perhaps, the real issue is that the local phone companies have not kept their technologies current especially with data lines and, therefore, wish to do this now with inappropriate charges on the use of voice lines for data and accessing the Internet. New technologies are becoming available for data transfer and accessing the Internet, however, these technologies are not universally available to all Americans.

FEB 8 1997

> Allowing the local telephone companies permission to charge addition fees for data and Internet access will hurt our entire economy. Business, both large and small, will pass the increase to consumers. Consumers will pay more for goods and services as a result of this action. In addition, the Internet is a magnificent tool for information and many citizens will not be able to pay the additional fees. Educational access to the Internet for our children, adolescents, and adults will be compromised if fees for access are implemented. Educational budgets throughout the United States are limited whether private, public or primary education or college education. The negative domino effect of this request is enormous.

> In summary, I employ you to deny this request by the local telephone companies and allow the current flat rate structure which the local telephone companies are currently using whether for voice or data or Internet access. Thank your for your time.

Sincerely,

Jeff Valenzia

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

"He loves being on the air . . . and it's kind of funny," explained = the DJ (a spokesman for Bubba says Lovell may make an in-person appearance on the show Jan. 15). "Tommy thinks he's a star now. I send limos down, carry him to 2001 Odyssey (strip club) for a lap dance, and he signs autographs in my club."

What Bubba says could be true. But it also raises questions about how far today's on-air personalities will go to get a ratings point. Sure, crass, sophomoric behavior is nothing new to radio =85 especially in Tampa Bay. But when did things get so mean?

On the AM side, there is confrontational WFLA-AM talker Mark Larson, who presents a Humpday "Homo News" segment featuring items focused on gay life =85 complete with crude, derogatory terms for sexual activities liberally thrown around.

Not far removed from him is Ron Diaz and Ron Bennington's Ron and Ron Show =85 once produced locally, it's now broadcast from South Florida, airing here on WZTM-AM 820 =85 which has offered a former Ku Klux Klan Grand Wizard, "Whitey," doing a "Week in Race" report.

Nationally known shockmeisters such as Howard Stern and Don Imus have already pushed the boundaries of shock radio, but this kind of stuff goes even further. Sexual talk and sophomoric stunts are one thing, but racism, sexism and making fun of the mentally disabled?

Scratch the surface, however, and you'll find two powerful motivations at work.

Money and ratings.

Morning drive time is already the most hotly contested slot in radio, setting the tone for the audience a station receives the rest of the day. In the Tampa Bay area =85 the country's 21st-largest radio market =85 that means a potential \$78.5-million or so in revenues at stake (1995 figures courtesy of Duncan's Radio Guide).

"Mornings are where the money is," says Boston-based radio consultant Donna Halper. "What you're seeing in Tampa is just people jockeying for position. It's no different than 60 Minutes bumping against Dateline NBC for ratings."

"There are people losing their jobs every hour with the consolidations going on," says Tim Menowsky, a Tampa-based radio consultant who once served as general manager at WRBQ-FM (Q-105). "Ron Bennington is one of the funniest guys on a comedy stage. Bubba's too talented not to realize he can entertain people without the sophomoric stuff. But . . . I guess the pressure to perform causes you to take risks."

Larson says he considered discontinuing his Humpday news segments, but the ratings spiked by 25 percent whenever they were on. Guess what happened? The segments stayed.

"I'm here to make money and ratings for Jacor," says Larson, who, like Bubba, works for a station that's owned by the Cincinnati-based conglomerate. "I'm not here to make everybody happy. If some people don't like what I do, I don't care."

Bubba himself is under similar pressures. Thanks to the recent deregulation of the radio industry, Jacor now owns Bubba's former home WFLZ-FM, which has the highly rated M.J. and B.J. show on mornings, and WUSA-FM, which offers Mason Dixon in mornings.

The plan, according to Bubba, is for WFLZ to win the young women's demographic, ages 18-34 and younger. Dixon gets the older women, say, ages 30 to 50. After moving to a bigger transmission tower, classic rock stalwarts WTBT-FM (Thunder 105) will take older men and Bubba gets the young guys.

But for that to work, Bubba has to get his new audience's attention. And that comes with stunts such as "Toys for T=85s," a recent promotion in which Bubba offered listeners a free flash of the sizable chests of exotic dancers at 2001 Odyssey in exchange for an unwrapped toy collected for charity.

"Maybe I am cracking the mike a little more . . . working a little harder," says Bubba, who now faces an audience much older than the teens who dominated his nighttime WFLZ program. "If I can rule the morning airwaves like I did at night, it's going to be awesome. I'm going to be a very rich man, and this station will make a lot of money."

It's all part of Jacor's plan for domination of the Tampa Bay area =85 hitting the airwaves with a focused team of morning shows that could capture up to 30 percent of the town's market, Dixon says.

His comments, minus the percentage figure, are echoed by Gabe Hobbs, a program director at Jacor in Tampa. "We want to minimize collateral damage to other shows. It makes sense that we would fine tune the stations as much as possible."

"You're looking at a major player in the market that, no matter how you cut it, is really tapped into all those different demographics and will have great success with revenues," adds Tony Novia, contemporary hit radio editor for Radio and Records magazine. "They're building great radio superstars."

CC 96-263

From: <BWCASteve@aol.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong,sness,jquello),J1.J1(FCCMAIL),A7.A7
Date: February 8, 1997 2:28pm
Subject: Telephone Co. Internet Profits; Docket #96-263.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL 0 DM 1997

Ladies and gentlemen:

The Federal Communications Commission was approached by local telephone companies to implement additional charges for internet access via telephone lines. This is totally unacceptable. There should be no difference in the rates between the use of the lines for voice versus data and accessing the internet.

This request by the local phone companies appears to be generated by greed. The local phone companies would not be asking for this rate increase if the issue was access for additional voice technology. Perhaps, the real issue is that the local phone companies have not kept their technologies current especially with data lines and, therefore, wish to do this now with inappropriate charges on the use of voice lines for data and accessing the internet. New technologies are becoming available for data transfer and accessing the internet, however, these technologies are not universally available to all Americans.

Allowing the local telephone companies permission to charge addition fees for data and internet access will hurt our entire economy. Business, both large and small, will pass the increase to consumers. Consumers will pay more for goods and services as a result of this action. In addition, the internet is a magnificent tool for information and many citizens will not be able to pay the additional fees. Educational access to the internet for our children, adolescents, and adults will be compromised if fees for access are implemented. Educational budgets throughout the United States are limited whether private, public or primary education or college education. The negative domino effect of this request is enormous.

In addition, many people add extra telephone lines for internet use, rather than using their regular line. The telephone companies have profited from this fact, as they are doubling or even tripling the number of lines going to many residences, and doubling or even tripling the profits which they would normally make from these customers. State Public Utility Commissions guarantee a rate of return to regulated telephone companies, and I question whether telephone companies need any assistance whatsoever from the Federal Government when their profits are regulated on a local basis, in each State.

We have to draw the line somewhere. These local companies have refused to spend the money to upgrade their lines and switching equipment with technology that was available well before the demand rose so drastically, even as experts were predicting a huge increase in useage. Now they want consumers to finance upgrades so they can make more money. I thought I expanded if I generated enough business, and kept up with expected growth so I would be able to expand. The local phone companies have failed to do that. Now other technologies threatend their golden egg, and we, the users do not need to pay to keep that golden egg intact.

Allowing local phone companies permission to charge more for Internet and data transmission can have only one effect... it will stifle the nascent and burgeoning growth of the new Internet economy and community! Consumers and users will be saddled with the expense, resulting in either its slow-down or collapse. This will destroy the 21st century's great hope... killed by 20th century's greedy lack of foresight.

The children and adults of the next epoch will remember that a formidable educational tool, the Internet, was the last book thrown into the flames by the unthinking, callous and mistrustful "book burners" of the 20th century!

I implore you, as a citizen of the State of Minnesota and a netizen of the world, to refuse this shallow request by the local phone companies. Let the democracy of the marketplace, along with the current flat rate system, continue nurturing the Internet's rapid and necessary growth.

I ask you to deny this request by the local telephone companies and allow the current flat rate structure which the local telephone companies are currently using whether for voice or data or internet access. Thank your for your time.

Sincerely,

Steve Marden
SKMarden@USInternet.com
2415 Foshay Tower
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612)332-8828

SKMarden@USInternet.com

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("president@whitehouse.gov","vice.pres...

CC96-262

18 DEM

From: Richard Ausili <rausili@rio.com>
To: Commissioner Rachelle Chong <rchong@fcc.gov>
Date: February 8, 1997 4:23am
Subject: Additional phone rates for InterNet use

Dear Representative Chong,

The Federal Communications Commission was approached by local telephone companies to implement additional charges for internet access via telephone lines. This is totally unacceptable. There should be no difference in the rates between the use of the lines for voice versus data and accessing the internet.

This request by the local phone companies appears to be generated by greed.

The local phone companies would not be asking for this rate increase if the issue was access for additional voice technology. Perhaps, the real issue is that the local phone companies have not kept their technologies current especially with data lines and, therefore, wish to do this now with inappropriate charges on the use of voice lines for data and accessing the internet. New technologies are becoming available for data transfer and accessing the internet, however, these technologies are not universally available to all Americans.

Allowing the local telephone companies permission to charge additional fees for data and internet access will hurt our entire economy. Business, both large and small, will pass the increase to consumers. Consumers will pay more for goods and services as a result of this action. In addition, the internet is a magnificent tool for information and many citizens will not be able to pay the additional fees. Educational access to the internet for our children, adolescents, and adults will be compromised if fees for access are implemented. Educational budgets throughout the United States are limited whether private, public or primary education or college education. The negative domino effect of this request is enormous.

In summary, I employ you to deny this request by the local telephone companies and allow the current flat rate structure which the local telephone companies are currently using whether for voice or data or internet access. Thank your for your time.

Sincerely,

Richard Ausili
1500 Main St. # 23
Springfield, Oregon 97477-4936

rausili@rio.com

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

From: Charles / Lori Moran <ingalls@earthlink.net>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 7, 1997 9:24pm
Subject: The Internet

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

10

CC 96-262

Dear Ms. Chong,

It has come to my attention that the Federal Government is coming under pressure by the telephone companies to add a per minute tax or a special fee for data transfers. Such fees and taxes are totally unacceptable.

Our Country is great because of the enormous amount of freedom that we all enjoy. The Internet allows free exchange of news, opinion, and thought for all who are able to purchase a simple PC or go down to the local library and use public equipment. To suggest that a special fee for computer hook ups and a tax on the Internet is a slap in the face of all Americans who love freedom and should not be tolerated. Greed is the motivator in this case and the greedy executives at the phone companies should be told where to stick their fee.

I wish to thank you for your time and consideration of my ideas. I trust you will have the intestinal fortitude to stand up to those who would like to reap profit from a public forum (perhaps these people are the same ones who came up with pay toilets and pay air at gas stations and malls?)

Sincerely,

Charles L. Moran III

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE