

CC96-262

From: Tim & Laura <lellenbecker@telis.org>  
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("president@whitehouse.gov")  
Date: February 7, 1997 8:03pm  
Subject: Taxing Internet Access

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

DM  
10

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Federal Communications Commission was approached by the 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 telephone 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 on 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, primary, or college education. The negative domino effect of this request is enormous.

I would like to add. You all can see that this is detrimental to this country. We are passing into the 21st century. Our children are using the internet as educational tools. Our own President during the State of the Union Address promoted the use of the internet and computers. We have a responsibility to our children to give them every benefit we possibly can if the United States of American is to successfully leap into the 21st century and beyond. These additional charges would severely hamper our efforts.

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 you for your time.

Sincerely,

Tim Ellenbecker

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

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 96-262

From: <RSPIER@aol.com>  
To: A7.A7(rchong)  
Date: February 8, 1997 8:04pm  
Subject: Telephone surcharges for Internet access

FEB 10 1997

Dear Madam:

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.

On one side are the local telephone providers who claim their switching stations are overloaded due to the internet overload and not able to provide good voice service as a result thereof. As can be expected, this is a half-truth ... actually, more like a 0.5% truth.

There are approximately

25,000 major switching stations in the USA and about 125 of them are routinely overloaded due to the use of voice lines used as data lines. Unsurprisingly, these are the switching stations located right next to the largest networking companies such as AOL, NETCOM, COMPUSERVE, and so on. So that leaves 24,875 switching stations that are NOT overloaded. It is true that the local telephone companies have some switching stations overloaded, but 95.5% of their switching stations are NEVER overloaded.

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,

Richard S. Pieringer aka RSPIER@aol.com  
720-A Blandin Ave  
Ft. Worth, TX 76111  
817-831-6327

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Thomas M.. Schaefer <schaefer@rtp1.intrex.net>  
**Date:** February 8, 1997 7:34pm  
**Subject:** Leased Access: FCC Accepts & Quotes Continental's Race-baiting Study

I was appalled to see the FCC accept and quote as evidence of possible subscriber losses, the race-baiting study conducted by Continental Cablevision. I urge everyone concerned about leased access to get a copy of Continental's comments filed on CS 96-60 and read the script for the phone interview in their "study".

In the telephone interview, conducted in relatively racially divided and tense Dade county Florida, the phone interviewer begins by describing leased access programming as "ethnically oriented". They then go on to ask whether the subscriber would find that programming more or less valuable than their current programming, and note that 60% of respondents volunteered that they would drop their cable service if such programming replaced existing offerings.

As far as I am concerned, the way this "study" was conducted and presented to the FCC is clear evidence that Continental has discriminated against "ethnically oriented" programmers in an attempt to gain market share. The FCC should have rejected Continental's comments outright and referred them to the Civil Rights enforcement division of the Justice department. Quoting this "study" in their ruling makes the FCC complicit with Continental's pathetic behavior.

Tom Schaefer  
Strategic Video

**CC:** J1.J1(FCCMAIL),A7.A7(sness,jquello,rchong),C1.C1(m...

FEB 10 1997

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

1096-262

**From:** samuel rogero <vrogero@digital.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 8, 1997 10:56pm  
**Subject:** docket96-263

To Whom it may concern,

This mail is to register my opposition to the requests of phone companies charging a per minute fee for on-line usage. This request is an outrage and an insult to the american people.

Due to incompetent management, shortsightedness and sheer greed, these corporations are demanding the public pay to upgrade thier antiquated systems. The upgrade of these systems should have begun years ago in an effort to remain competitive in a free market economy. For them to expect you to allow the public to be forced to subsidize the infrastructure and profits of private industry is ludicrous.

Furthermore, the cost of this scam to business, education from pre-k through college level, government and the average public could very well destroy the internet in the United States.

I urge you to reject this outrages attempt at monopolizing and blackmailing the American public.

Thank you for your consideration.

Samuel J. Rogero

1096-262

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE  
\_\_\_\_\_

CC 96-262

**From:** CD <cdavenport@pop1.fullerton.edu>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 9, 1997 12:52am  
**Subject:** Telephone charges

Dear Commissioner Chong:

I understand that telephone companies want to impose per minute charges for internet services. This is outrageous! I am diagnosed with prostate cancer like hundreds of thousands of other Americans. Many of us spend many hours per week on the internet in exchanging information (with Doctors and fellow patients on treatments that are appear useful. Additional charges as proposed by the telephone companies would severely hurt our ability to continue this practice. Please do NOT let this devastating proposal go forward. It would adversely affect many Americans and severely cut down on internet usage.

Thank you. Calvin Davenport, Anaheim, CA

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** gollo@why.net <gollo@why.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong,sness),J1.J1(FCCMAIL)  
**Date:** February 9, 1997 11:14am  
**Subject:** Internet Access charges

Dear FCC officials:

We are hearing about the charges per minutes for Internet access which are about to be levied against Internet Service Providers across the country. These charges will, of course, be passed along to the average User, who, for now, pays just \$20 per month for unlimited access in most places.

It is not the Users' fault if the local phone companies do not want to dig deep into their own pockets to build networks for the future. We in the telephone and networking business know just how much profit there is in Local Exchanges; if the Carriers around the country want to slap access fees on local ISPs, they will effectively crush the greatest revolution in Information Exchange since the invention of the Printing Press.

Ultimately, it is profoundly UNFAIR that the phone company wants to charge me more for my Data than for my Voice traffic. Please, please do not let this happen. Tell the phone companies to Do The Right Thing and build the network structure needed to carry us into the next century. The President's much-ballyhoo'd "Bridge to the 21st Century" should be, MUST be, a telecommunications bridge, the costs of which should not be placed on the backs of millions of Users who just want to access the world through their computers.

Thank you for your consideration of this critical matter.

Sincerely  
Gollo Garcia gollo@why.net

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** David <GTE/ysguy1@gte.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 9, 1997 11:40am  
**Subject:** urgent matter

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commisioner Rachelle Chong,

I understand that local telephone companies have filed a proposal with the FCC to impose per minute charges for my internet service. I don't believe that is fair. I'm already paying a fee to my internet provider, and the cost to my telephone company for the telephone line and now they are asking for more money from me that will be require me to pay an additional charge per minute? Where will it stop?

Please stop the greed of the money hungry companies. I feel that I'm already paying enough for the privelege to use the internet.

I thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

L. & D. Valdez

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: <jberyl@earthlink.net>  
To: A7.A7(rchong)  
Date: February 9, 1997  
Subject: docket 96-263

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Rachelle Chong,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has been approached by the local telephone companies for a PER MINUTE RATE increase for data lines and internet access. This would be a "MODEM TAX" essentially on a flat rate charge by the local telephone companies. 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.

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 implore 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,

[jberyl@earthlink.net](mailto:jberyl@earthlink.net)

Joseph Beryl  
10767 Magnolia  
Unit 101  
Anaheim CA 92804-6243

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE  
\_\_\_\_\_

CC 96-262

**From:** David M. Handley <103105.1607@CompuServe.COM>  
**To:** Rachelle Chong <rchong@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** February 9, 1997 11:34pm  
**Subject:** Phone Fee for Internet!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

Dear Commissioner Chong

I understand that 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. In my case it is even worst as I work extensively overseas. While I am gone my wife, children, and parents stay in touch on a daily basics. The reason I am working outside the USA is because my job market went away with the US Government downsizing. I can live with that but somebody else, local phone companies, now wants to make even more money on something I already pay dearly for.

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,

Dr. David M. Handley, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 6294  
Gulf Breeze, FL 32561-6294  
E-Mail: 103105.1607@compuserve.com  
Tel: (904)932-0199  
Fax: (904)932-2811

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

CC 96-262

**From:** <deannat@speedlink.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 8, 1997 6:02pm  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

deanna tachna (deannat@speedlink.net) writes:

I do not want you to approve the petition by the local phone companies for a sur charge for using the internet.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: speeddial25.speedlink.net  
Remote IP address: 205.254.183.125

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-263

**From:** Todd Ferry <brujo1@pipeline.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 8, 1997 5:37pm  
**Subject:** Surcharge for Telephone Connection to Internet

Dear Commissioner Chong;

Re docket 96-263, please note my vehement opposition to telephone companies' assessing surcharges for Internet use. I already have a separate dedicated phone line for my computer and feel that I, and most others, pay my fair share.

Thank you for your kind consideration.  
Sincerely,

Todd Ferry brujo1@pipeline.com

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** LeAnn Goettle <lgoettle@ross.ndak.net>  
**To:** J1.J1(FCCMAIL),A7.A7(jquello,sness,rchong),A4.A4(i...  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 1:09am  
**Subject:** docket 96-263

FEB 10 1997

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has been approached by the local telephone companies for a PER MINUTE RATE increase for data lines and internet access. This would be a "MODEM TAX" essentially on a flat rate charge by the local telephone companies. 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.

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 implore 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, LeAnn G. Goettle

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** DON NATALE <donxmas@prodigy.com>  
**To:** J1.J1(FCCMAIL)  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 12:12am  
**Subject:** Local Telephone Company Rate Review

FEB 10 1997

-- [ From: Donald W. Natale \* EMC.Ver #2.5.3 ] --

Dear Chairman Hundt and Commissioners,  
We understand that local telephone companies are requesting reviews of their rate schedules due to the increased use of local telephone lines to access the Internet. A review or consideration of a "per minute" use fee will be the demise of the Internet as we know it today. For almost 100 years, the local telephone providers have allowed the unrestricted use of residential and business lines by their customers. For almost 100 years they have enjoyed the income from providing this unrestricted service. Modern technologies have enabled the communication providers to operate their systems with fewer and fewer personnel and considerably lower operating expenses for equipment and maintenance.

If I as a subscriber to my local telephone company wish to spend the entire 24 hour day conversing with my friends and family, I would only be using that service that is being paid for today. I see no difference in the application of the service that is provided to me whether it is by personal vocal conversation or personal data exchange thru the Internet.

Just this past week, the President of the United States has been urging Congress and the United States school systems to find ways to put every classroom and every child on the Internet. A "minute use fee" by the local telephone company providers would have a devastating effect on this program. No school system in our country would be able to afford rates far in excess of what they are presently.

I urge the Commission to take a dim view of this proposal and take all steps necessary to protect the citizens of this country from over eager profit-oriented public utilities. We look forward to a meaningful and open discussion when the requests for "minute use fees" are presented to your Commission.

Most sincerely,

Donald W. Natale 7364 E. Hinsdale Drive  
Englewood, CO 80112-1753

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Tele. (303) 770-5989 e-mail - donxmas@prodigy.com

- c.c. Commissioner James Quello
- Commissioner Andrew Barrett
- Commissioner Susan Ness
- Commissioner Rachelle Chong
- Pie

CC: A7.A7(rchong,gclark),J1.J1(bettyfre),FCCMAIL.SMTP(...

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Robert Sampron <bsampron@plinet.com>  
**To:** FCCMAIL.SMTP("president@whitehouse.gov")  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 12:31am  
**Subject:** Local phone company requests for higher rates for Internet Access.

President William Jefferson Clinton  
Dr

Robert J.F. Sampron president@whitehouse.gov  
Littleton CO 80123

FEB 10 1997

8090 W. Calhoun

February 9, 1997

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

Dear Mr. President,

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 charged for either data or voice use of these lines.

If the issue is the inability of telephone monopolies to supply the hardware and software required to make the Internet thrive, thereby destroying the potential you and the Vice President envision for our nation and, especially, our school children, then perhaps all local telephone monopolies should be broken up and every market be opened to full competition. If monopolies wish to operate on the principle of higher prices based on higher demand, (the good old Supply/Demand cross graph) then it seems illogical to allow them to remain monopolies. I'm almost sure a competitive local phone market would be able to supply the hardware and software needed to develop the Internet for the lowest price possible, unlike the monopolies.

More importantly, it seems these surcharges or higher rates could kill the Internet in its U.S. starting gate. It seems tragic that, for the sake of a short-sighted surcharge, the United States would be placed at an immediate international technological and intellectual disadvantage.

This tragedy seems to destroy any hope the nation has for succeeding in the challenges in which we are engaged, challenges you made very clear in the State of the Union Address. Please don't allow these surcharges to take America from being the penultimate technological example in the world to being a technological LDC. Imagine a future historian writing about such a mistake.

Mr. President, thank you for considering my opinion on this pressing matter. I wish you, your family, and all in your administration the best four years in the history of our nation. I will always remember the statement you made about us Democrats and DNC members, that "we believe we all do well when we all do well". This seems as true to me about affordable Internet access as almost any issue facing the nation.

After all, doesn't our nation's future either sink into the abyss or ride high into the stars based on our ability to command the new technologies? Isn't it the destiny of these technologies to help each American develop the intellectual and social capacities necessary to achieve the full human potential?

Thank you, again, for considering my thoughts.

Sincerely,

Robert John Francis Sampron

cc: Vice President Albert Gore  
Senator Ben Nighthorse-Campbell  
Senator Wayne Allard  
Representative Dan Schaefer  
Commissioner Reed Hunt  
Commissioner James Quello  
Commissioner Susan Ness  
Commissioner Rachelle Chong

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC: A7.A7(rchong,jquello,sness),FCCMAIL.SMTP("vice.pre...

CC 96-262

**From:** Arne C Eastman <a244@megalink.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 5:57am  
**Subject:** "Per Minute Charges" for modems.

Please no, it's absurd and stupid. Stop coddling the phone companies.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE  
\_\_\_\_\_

CC 96-262

**From:** Arne C Eastman <a244@megalink.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 5:57am  
**Subject:** No per minute charges, please.

No per minute charges on data please. Stop coddling the damned phone companies.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-267

**From:** bert shapiro <berts@ComCAT.COM>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 9:06am  
**Subject:** internet

Local telephone company has filed a proposal with the FCC to impose per minute charges for internet service. It is my belief that internet usage will diminish if users were required to pay additional per minute charges. It is also contrary to the aim of President Clinton to make the Net easily (and freely) available to everyone.

I wish to register my stong objection to the proposal of charging and trust that this will be voted down by the FCC.

Sincerely,

Bert Shapiro

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: <designerforum@earthlink.net>  
To: A7.A7(rchong)  
Date: February 10, 1997 8:19am  
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

10/10/97

Tricia Zelis (designerforum@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Internet Users,

Please read this and email the FCC sending your comments concerning that the FCC wanting to impose per minute charges for your internet service.

Personally as a parent, concern citizen and small business person, I feel that the FCC is clearly not serving the public domain. As an example, for years the telephone company has protected as a monopoly for the prime reason to serve the needs of the public. During this period the telephone company has no competition in the market place. Most individuals could look back and know that the features and services of the telephone companies have not been for the benefit of the public. The public does not have a choice on which telephone companies they want to use. Therefore, I do not feel that the FCC should be allowed to impose per minute charges for the internet. If anything, a larger commitment by the Department of Commerce should be made to resolve issues as far as the telephone companies concerns about the usage. They are big enough and what we need is the freedom of choices and lower prices.

We need to stick together. Please email the FCC.

**\*\* Very Important: Please Read: \*\***

This was sent to me today and felt I should pass it along. Hope no one minds receiving the extra piece of mail.

Your local telephone company has filed a proposal with the FCC to impose per minute charges for your internet service. They contend that your usage has or will hinder the operation of the telephone network.

Internet usage will diminish if users were required to pay additional per minute charges. The FCC has created an email box for your comments, responses must be received by February 13, 1997. Send your comments to [isp@fcc.gov](mailto:isp@fcc.gov) and tell them what you think.

Every phone company is in on this one, and they are trying to sneak it in just under the wire for litigation. Let everyone you know here this one. Get the e-mail address to everyone you can think of.

[isp@fcc.gov](mailto:isp@fcc.gov)

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

Please forward this email to all your friends on the internet so all our voices may be heard!

Tricia Zelis

cc:Surfrider Foundation MNCB; Steven Humphrey; Tom Vinson; First Lady Hillary Rodhman Clinton; White House Survey Team; Vice President Al Gore; President Bill Clinton; Internet Use Discussion List; Stephen Pruitt; Sheryl Deane Parks; Kidsphere; [isp@fcc.gov](mailto:isp@fcc.gov)

~ Designers Forum ~  
Crete, Illinois U.S.  
[designerforum@earthlink.net](mailto:designerforum@earthlink.net)  
<http://home.earthlink.net/~designerforum>

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: Cust64.Max4.Chicago.IL.MS.UU.NET  
Remote IP address: 153.35.100.64

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** <ChrisOTB@aol.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong,sness,jquello),J1.J1(FCCMAIL)  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 1:27pm  
**Subject:** Tax per minute

Dear FCC

The tax per minute is a ridiculous and unfair proposal, which effectively restricts global connections, commerce and the free flow of ideas. Don't do it!

Chris Hewitt

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-267

**From:** <lobo666@rockbridge.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 1:54pm  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Jerry Wayne Beard (lobo666@rockbridge.net) writes:

Hello Ms. Chong,

Please don't let the Net go to a per minute charge..

Many of use would neve find anything on the net if our time was so limited.

This of course would be due to lack of being able to afford to be on the net if a "Per minute charge" is added.

Since you have your own web page, I'm sure you have done a fair share of web surfing, an like the rest of us enjoy finding new things.

Please don't inhibit people in the future from enjoying what we currently do.

Perhaps there is a way to charge a per minute fee to just the adult sites, that would help discourage people from making or using such sites. Otherwise I believe it would be a terrible mistake.. thank you for your time,

Jerry W. Beard

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0

Remote host: PPP6.ROCKBRIDGE.NET

Remote IP address: 206.151.4.16

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 94-262

**From:** DAVE F HEMBY <davidtheresa@juno.com>  
**To:** J1.J1(FCCMAIL)  
**Date:** February 9, 1997 8:52pm  
**Subject:** telephone rates

To whom it may concern

Re: phone rate hike

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,

David F Hemby

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

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

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Joseph Antal <airplane@golden.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 2:19pm  
**Subject:** [Fwd: Re: user fees for internet]

Message-ID: <32FF3687.5548@golden.net>  
Date: Mon, 10 Feb 1997 09:53:59 -0500  
From: Joseph Antal <airplane@golden.net>  
Reply-To: airplane, @golden.net  
Organization: Joseph Antal  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01Gold (Win95; I)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: isp0fcc.gov  
Subject: Re: user fees for internet  
References: <32FF3172.5BBA@golden.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

Joseph Antal wrote:  
> > The phone companies' proposal of user fees for internet time on a  
> per minute basis is preposterous! This would limit the access of the  
> information offered on the internet, to the very wealthy. Students,  
> public libraries and the general public would no longer be able to  
> utilize this great resource. It would be a step backwards in the  
> progress of our society. As the result of getting on line in  
> our home, we have had a new phone line put in. This would seemingly be  
> giving the phone companies more business, not less. Certainly, there  
> must be alternatives to their networking problems, then a per minute fee  
> for internet use! Please investigate those alternatives and don't  
> jeopardize the use of the great and wonderful resource that the internet  
> has become.

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE  
\_\_\_\_\_

CC 96-262

**From:** <der.whale@aol.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 10, 1997 4:41am  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Darrel Wallace (der.whale@aol.com) writes:

I am against the fcc letting the telephone co.s charge for online per minute charges. The net should be kept free for everybody.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: www-ad8.proxy.aol.com  
Remote IP address: 152.163.237.44

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

---

0096-262

From: org. 4-96 <peoples\_informer@juno.com>  
To: J1.J1(FCCMAIL)  
Date: February 9, 1997 8:29pm

Federal Communications Commission

I am writing you regarding the matter of the proposal which would allow local telephone companies to impose "per minute" charges for private citizens connecting to the Internet.

I am opposed to such a proposal, especially when such charges would be imposed on dialing a local number. To my memory, no telephone company has ever charged other than a basic flat rate for "local" calls.

A "per minute" charge for connecting to the Internet through a locally dialled number would all but cripple this valuable resource which has been made available to the general public.

A "per minute" charge would eliminate the "little guy" from Internet use and limit accessibility to this wealth of available information and resources to only the privileged class.

To allow telephone companies to charge a "per minute" usage fee for local dialing would be no less unreasonable than Public Libraries charging a "per minute" fee for the time it takes one to read one of their books.

The only acceptable accommodation for the telephone companies would be for the FCC to allow a very nominal (25 cents per month, maximum) "Internet Surcharge" to all telephone bills.

The Internet is a critically important communications medium, the use of which should not be discriminatory.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Oliver

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

----- End forwarded message -----

CC: A7.A7(jquello,sness,rchong),FCCMAIL.SMTP("presiden...

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

FEB 10 1997

**From:** Jerry Chessler <jchessler@earthlink.net>  
**To:** J1.J1(FCCMAIL)  
**Date:** February 9, 1997 10:57pm  
**Subject:** FCC and Internet

Dear Chairman Hundt:

I am writing to express my strong support for an open Internet system that is not stifled by the telephone companies and prices are dictated by them.

Over the past year, I have primarily used the Internet to help my husband in his fight against prostate cancer. In fact, it was through web sites dealing with his disease that we became informed consumers and actually formulated decisions on his mode of treatment and the doctor to perform these protocols. We learned much about a very complicated illness in a relatively short time period, and found needed encouragement from other men with prostate cancer and from the people who love them.

If this service would have been costly, we could not have afforded to be as thorough or as diligent as we were. There are many other people, who could not have afforded to anything thus creating a "class" system to Internet.

The Internet is an educational tool and, as in our case, one that can hopefully help to save a life. I urge you to not allow this wonderful tool become another profit center for telephone companies. It would deny valuable services to a great many people.

Thank you for listening.

Linda Chessler

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

cc: Commissioner James Quello: jquello@fcc.gov  
Commissioner Susan Ness: sness@fcc.gov  
Commissioner Rachelle Chong: rchong@fcc.gov

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

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE  
\_\_\_\_\_