

CC 96-262

**From:** <Gregoryjr@msn.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 12, 1997 9:20pm  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Greg Goolishian (Gregoryjr@msn.com) writes:

A friend of mine E mailed me with info on Phone Companies proposing a "special charge" for access online. The E-mail my friend sent me was unclear, is this proposal true? If it is, it sounds like another way the phone companies are stealing our money.

Thank You

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: Cust56.Max29.Philadelphia.PA.MS.UU.NET  
Remote IP address: 153.35.161.56

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Linda Nichols <lnichols@mail.bright.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 13, 1997 9:43am  
**Subject:** per minute rates for internet use

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

>Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 09:49:38

>To: isp@fcc.gov

>From: Linda Nichols <lnichols@bright.net>

>Subject: per minute rates for internet use >

>To whom it may concern;

>

>We finally find an affordable way for people to have access to the government

>regulations, irs rules, state laws, library of congress, etc. and now the

>telephone companies (who have been overcharging us for the past 10 years)

>want per minute rates for usage. I am against raising the rates for internet usage and if it goes to that I will no longer be able to afford to use the

>internet. I think that it's about time that people are given the better access

>to laws and regulations (which is what I use the internet for). If it comes down to that only those wishing to use the internet for cybersex purposes will

>be paying the high price.

>

>lnichols@bright.net

>

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** David J. Burgett <djb@mcc.cc.tx.us>  
**To:** A4.A4(isp)  
**Date:** February 12, 1997 9:12pm  
**Subject:** Docket item 96-263

David J. Burgett  
1400 College Drive  
Waco, TX 76708

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

I protest the concept of charging extra for Internet access. I think this item would cause chaos on the internet and throw the US back behind other developed (and even undeveloped) nations in the use of the internet.

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

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

**From:** <mark@kallista.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 12, 1997 7:45pm  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Mark A. Lebowitz (mark@kallista.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Chong:

I recognize that you're a very busy executive, but I am hoping that you can spare a few minutes to offer me some clarification on an alleged proposal by local telephone companies requesting permission to begin surcharging Internet access. A friend e-mailed me the following message:

----- Forwarded Message -----

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 litiagation. 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)

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

----- End of Forwarded Message -----

From the looks of it, this message is in regards to CC Docket 96-263. However, in reading this document, I'm having difficulty figuring out how the author of the above concluded that the "incentives" talked about in the docket automatically translate into per-minute Internet access charges. Was this Docket written in response to a proposal from one or more local telephone companies who want to surcharge Internet access? Are those specifically the "incentives" that the FCC is considering? If so, how would this affect users, like me, who already pay per minute for local phone calls? Did I even track down the right Docket?

Thank you very much for your time and attention. I truly appreciate the way in which you've made yourself so accessible to the public.

Sincerely,

Mark Lebowitz  
Chicago, IL

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: Remote IP address: 205.243.66.205

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Lois Mienert <adpl3lm@rvcux1.RVC.CC.IL.US>  
**To:** J1.J1(FCCMAIL),A4.A4(isp)  
**Date:** February 13, 1997 4:43pm  
**Subject:** CC Docket No. 96-263 (fwd)

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

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,

Lois Mienert  
243 Knoll Road  
Belvidere, IL 61008

Ph. 815-332-4667 e-mail: adpl3lm@rvcux1.RVC.CC.IL.US

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

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE



CC 96-262

**From:** <BsktsPlus@aol.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 13, 1997 12:16pm  
**Subject:** MODEM TAX

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

I see the government is thinking about ruining another marketplace before it even begins to flourish. First the government says every home should have a computer and be online...Yeah...so they can tax every home and everyone online. A bunch of hypocrisy. Taxing kids online learning  
, taxing consumers BROWSING in an online shopping mall etc...

Tom Formoso

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Bette Pritchett <BETTE.PRITCHETT@worldnet.att.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 13, 1997 7:26am  
**Subject:** Internet Access

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

Commissioner Rachelle Chong --

Please don't screw around and ruin the Internet like you guys did the phone company. I've done nothing but be hounded to death while I'm trying to work by MCI and ATT salespersons.

I'm in the process of convincing an International Professional Association and a state professional association that they should spend the money for WebSites, however, if you guys succeed in limiting access severely by letting the servers gouge the public by charging high rates per minute...then I'll have to recommend against it...the traffic just won't be there like now. If you government types could just leave well enough alone!!!! I've had access for five months now and have never had a problem getting on line. Maybe some of the servers aren't up to speed...why punish the rest of us? If it ain't broke, PLEASE DON'T FIX IT.

Bette Pritchett  
Happy in Austin

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: JAMES ROGERS <jrogers@imagin.net>  
To: A7.A7(rchong,sness)  
Date: February 13, 1997 12:44am  
Subject: CC Docket No. 96-263

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I urge you to reconsider adding additional cost to the Internet Service Providers (ISP) for local phone service. This will, of course, add additional cost to individuals and businesses that access the Internet. I do not need to go into how the Internet has created many new opportunities for commerce, education, and free expression of ideas and information. You already know this. By adding more cost for accessing the Internet, you alone have the opportunity to bring to a abrupt end all the advantage the Internet has brought to our economy and culture. Let the Telephone Companies increase their revenues the old fashion way - CUSTOMER SERVICES and MARKET EXPANSION. Not by restricting access to information via the Internet.

Also, if additional cost are passed on to businesses and individuals for Internet access, you will be putting the United States businesses and its citizens at a competitive disadvantage with rest of the world. The Internet is not just in the US. The information that can be accessed on the Internet is world wide. If you add another wall to climb to access knowledge that the rest of the world has access to, then you have put our citizens, especially our children, at a competitive disadvantage. And again, American students remain behind the rest of the world in education.

I urge you again to reconsider adding anymore cost to the ISPs that will then be passed on to businesses and individuals. Please deny the Telephone Company's request.

Sinceryl,  
James Rogers

E-mail jrogers@imagin.net

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** <Will2uam@aol.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong,sness,jquello),J1.J1(FCCMAIL),FCCMAIL...  
**Date:** February 12, 1997 10:04pm  
**Subject:** FCC Internet Access Charge Reform "CC Docket No 96-263"

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Sir,

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. I think this would be a "MODEM TAX" essentially on a flat rate charge by the local telephone companies. The telephone companies are already increased their profit as a result of increased number of phone lines into homes and businesses. People are already paying for use of the line, and I don't see what difference it makes whether it is being use for voice or data.

This request by the telephone companies is modivated by GREED. I believe this MODEM TAX would cause an added burden upon businessess as well as individuals and should be rejected.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

William T. Hicks  
221 First st.  
Wilmer, Texas 75172

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** ERICH R. FONT <BIG-POUND-HOUSTON@worldnet.att.net>  
**To:** J1.J1(FCCMAIL)  
**Date:** February 12, 1997 9:32pm  
**Subject:** Charging For Internet Line Use

I would like how far the phone companies are going to go in order to make more money from the small people on the Internet.  
I am talking about the 2 cent per min. charge that the telephone COMP. are trying to get you to pass on Internet access.  
They give the impression that for a flat fee of \$19.95 will give you unlimited access to the Internet, but than behind the backs of all the users they patition the F.C.C. for more fees.  
I'm totally agenst it because everyone don't have these Internet phones and we who don't want to pay for those who do.....  
The phone comp. started this as a good idea and in the back of their minds was this way to fleece money from the poor people.  
do not let this proposal go through.....

ERICH R.FONT

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**CC:** JAMES QUELLO <jquello@fcc.gov>

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

C 96-262

From: <allensafer@sprynet.com>  
To: A7.A7(rchong)  
Date: February 12, 1997 12:40am  
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Allen N. Safer (allensafer@sprynet.com) writes:

I just heard there is a proposal in front of the FCC by local telephone companies to start charging a per minute rate for Internet users. I am adamantly opposed to any discrimination against this emerging class of users by the phone company monopoly. Until there are viable alternatives to the local service phone service providers, the internet users of America deserve to be protected from discriminatory treatment. Other local phone calls are not charged by the minute, but rather by monthly access charges which internet users already pay. Please do not let the Baby Bells redefine what constitutes a long distance call.

In Washington State, US West was denied a rate increase by the State Utility Commission, and remarkably enough the service has deteriorated dramatically ever since. The Utility Commission found that the total revenue from all profit centers had increased dramatically; however, US West wants to isolate the "value-added" services from the cost of providing "basic" short line phone service, so they can get additional rate increases to upgrade their infrastructure. This of course is necessary to keep-up with the tremendous demand generated by extra line growth attributable to home offices and internet users.

If you now allow the holders of the monopoly to have their way with you, the incredible explosion in the exchange of information and ideas over the internet will slow to a crawl in response to a per minute "access" charge.

I remain a prudent believer in the duty and obligation of Government regulators to protect the public. Don't let the Phone Companies off the hook for intentional under-investment in capacity in favor of the high profit "value added" services which continue to make the phone companies very attractive stock investments. Caving in to these special interests now can only play as "Corporate Welfare" to the average citizen.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: dd18-122.compuserve.com  
Remote IP address: 199.174.175.122

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: John Castagna <ccastag@ix.netcom.com>  
To: J1.J1(FCCMAIL),A4.A4(isp)  
Date: February 12, 1997 7:13pm  
Subject: Re: CC Docket No. 96-263

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,

C. J. Castagna  
2 Peach Tree Court  
Parsippany, NJ 07054  
PH: 201-335-0907  
E-mail: ccastag@ix.netcom.com

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

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Ken Quast <jkq@miltona.means.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 12, 1997 6:29pm  
**Subject:** Proposed charge for modems

Commision Chong,

It is my understanding that a proposal has been made from phone companines to issue a monthly charge to those of us who have modems and fax machines. I feel this would be a very unfair charge as I feel I already pay for use of the lines through my phone and internet bills. I am on a fixed income and find the internet fun, educational and time consuming. This has been a great hobby for me and I would hate to have to give it up because of an increase cost to me issued by and already big money making company. Think of us little guys when you get to this one.

Thank you for your consideration on this most important matter to me.

Please respond and let me know if I can dismiss my concerns about this. Joan Quast e-mail address is jkq@means.net

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

0096-267

**From:** <r80dave@athenet.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 13, 1997 6:22pm  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

41537

David T. Wiener (r80dave@athenet.net) writes:

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

Dear Commisioner Chong,

First let me say thank you for having an address available for voicing concerns. It indeed seems strange that the other commisioners do not have their e-mail address listed even though there is a message welcoming us to the FCC page.

Next I would like to address the issue of charging a per minute fee by local phone commpanies. I do not feel that is either fair nor resonable to do so for either local calls or for accessing the internet. In today's world the phone company is already charging a fee for everything that you can possibly think of. If a person is paying for unlimited calling they should be entitled to unlimited calling. If the phone company wants to enter the free enterprise market of providing internet service let them provide the modems and the necessary employees to compete with the other companies out there. DO NOT let them make money off computer users who are simply connecting to a provider. This would be the epitome of skimming off someones elses work. Let the phone companies enter the competion for internet business like everyone else. Let them be competitive with everyone elses rates. DO NOT let them skim off the hard work of others, to do so would indeed be unfair.

Finally I would request that you pass along this letter to the other members of the FCC who do not see fit to provide an easy venue to e-mail them. Even though they seem to promote the web usage they don't practice it themselves with an easy e-mail address like you do. Thank you for providing an address.

Sincerely,  
David T. Wiener

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: pm-at-2-23.athenet.net  
Remote IP address: 204.120.6.123

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-267

From: <bb11@wf.net>  
To: A7.A7(rchong)  
Date: February 14, 1997 11:36am  
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Bud Breashears (bb11@wf.net) writes:

Commissioner Chong,

Would you have time to E-mail the members of Congress with oversight responsibilities of the FCC?

I'm very concerned with the cost of my Internet access possibly going up.

I live in a rural area and have only recently acquired Internet access via a local internet provider. Before, I had to pay the long distance toll charges for access.

I am surprised the phone companies are asking for additional funds from people like me due to a big increase in phone company facilities. Any increase in price will be directly proportional to a decrease in my usage. It would be great if someone could figure out a way to keep prices stable while facility usage goes up. Are you smart enough to figure this out? Are you smart enough to find someone to help you figure this out?

Thanks,  
Bud Breashears

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: dr-ppp10.wf.net  
Remote IP address: 208.134.150.109

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** <richardvlosky@sprintmail.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 14, 1997 11:14am  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Denese Ashbaugh Vlosky (richardvlosky@sprintmail.com) writes:

I was told recently that the telephone companies (all of them) are approaching the FCC to allow them to charge us an amount per minute that we are on the internet. As you know, we already pay a charge for local access through our telephone bill. They just want to cash in on the internet gravy train. I oppose being charged twice for the same service.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: sdn-ts-005txfwoRP03.dialsprint.net  
Remote IP address: 206.133.149.86

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Dan Townsend <Dan\_Townsend@msvl.wednet.edu>  
**To:** J1.J1(FCCMAIL),A7.A7(jquello,rchong),FCCMAIL.SMTP(...  
**Date:** February 14, 1997 11:00am  
**Subject:** charging for internet access

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Please no per minute charges for internet access. Let the people have something! Work for us not the phone companies. We are trying to bring kids online to have the encyclopedia at their fingertips. Phone charges would end all that. dan

--

-----  
Sent via ExpressNet/SMTP(tm), Internet Gateway of the Gods!  
ExpressNet/SMTP (c)1994-95 Delphic Software, Inc.  
-----

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

OC 96-262

**From:** Patricia Hawk <paha@cnilink.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 14, 1997 10:17am  
**Subject:** Phone Co's

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Ms. Chong;

As an internet user I am against this Bill presented by the phone co's. It is just another phone co. Fleecing of its users.

I already pay for a line into my house, and a connection charge to my server who in turn pays big bucks to the long distance co's for usage. The internet should be left for what it was intended, a place for the small guy to contact the world or just a friend with something in common. Enough is enough lets stop the phone co's in their tracks.

Thank you for your time

Pat Hawk  
paha@cnilink.com

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** DIANE E. TATAR <tatar@gtii.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 14, 1997 1:03am  
**Subject:** [Fwd: NOI (docket # 96-263) exact copy of formal comments]

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001  
Message-ID: <3303FF06.3E2D@gtii.com>  
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 21:58:30 -0800  
From: "DIANE E. TATAR" <tatar@gtii.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win16; I)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: fccinfo@fcc.gov  
Subject: NOI (docket # 96-263) exact copy of formal comments  
X-URL: http://www.fcc.gov/  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

Dear F.C.C. Commissioners:

Plaese do not allow a service charge to hinder myself and family from having access to the internet. President Clinton wants everyone to have the infomation highway in all schools, it would be a shame not to be able for my kids to have access at home. Its hard enough to make ends meet. The nickel and diming us to death never seems to quit. More money for schools, for parks, for roads, for seniors, for church and non-profit org., for health care, for government deficit spending, etc... not including food, shelter, transportation and clothing. We have a four, five and 16 yr.old. Access to us is important as parents. Help keep our costs where they are and our access to the bridge of the 21st century open.

Sincerely

Feb. 13 1997 Thomas and Diane Tatar  
20750 White Oak Dr.  
Lake Ann Mi. 49650  
tatar@gtii.com  
616.275.6991

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

CC 96-262

**From:** Bill Nugent <bnugent@capecod.net>  
**To:** FCC <isp@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** February 13, 1997 10:23pm  
**Subject:** CC 96-263

I strongly protest the move to permit LECs to charge ISPs per minute access fees on local modem calls. Queuing analysis shows there is no technical justification for the LECs massive PR campaign in "news" stories planted in papers across the U.S. that the switched network is in danger of collapse due to internet users. If the LECs need capital for upgrades that is what the bond and stock markets are for.

I suspect this is stage one of a move by LECs to monopolize the ISP market by driving small ISPs out of business via predatory pricing like Pacific Bell is now doing: offering 5 months of free and unlimited Internet service to users who install a second line.

There has been too little attention to corporate concentration of power in telecommunications, as in the unwisely permitted merger of NYNEX and Bell Atlantic.

Just as President Clinton calls for Internet connection in every classroom, per-minute access charges would make this financially prohibitive. This would also pose a hardship to Internet users of modest means and limit their usage to brief e-mail, rather than browsing. It would destroy the democratic nature of the Internet and reduce it to one more medium controlled by a very small number of large corporations.

I urge you to reject these petitioned tariff increases as unjustified technically or financially, and undesirable socially.

Sincerely,

William R. Nugent, P.E.  
President  
Forecast Technology Inc.  
330 Goody Hallett Drive  
Eastham, MA 02642

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

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

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** MR ALLEN R BRIDGES <BMZH18A@prodigy.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(sness,rchong),FCCMAIL.SMTP("jqello","rdhundert...  
**Date:** February 13, 1997 9:23pm  
**Subject:** On-Line Phone Charges

To Whom It May Concern;

I would just like to express myself, in the form of this letter, to let my government know how much I dont appreciate the way some business' try to get a complete MONOPOLY of what ,otherwise, would be a 'good deal' for the consumer. The 'On-Line' services are already in enuff trouble that they have had to bring down their prices and rates. And now , I understand, that the local telephone companies are trying to make a 'per minute' on-line charge. If it's made possible for them to do this....there will be a major decline in the use of on-line services, consequently meaning someone's JOBS.

I'm just letting you know my opinion of this and that I am in complete disagreement with it. If its allowed , I will have no choice but to drop my 'On-line" services. Something that would 'disconnect' children from the WWW and other Educational on-line services.

Sincerely,

Allen R. Bridges  
La Plata, MD

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Gregory Wiggs <GREGORYWIGGS@FTC-I.NET>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 13, 1997 9:35pm  
**Subject:** Docket 96-263

Dear Mrs. 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,

Gregory Wiggs KB4NIC  
403 Alice Dr. #84  
Sumter, S.C. 29150  
803-775-0384  
gregorywiggs@ftc-i.net

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

**From:** Kelly Geiser <woobus@mail.bright.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 13, 1997 10:53pm  
**Subject:** adding charges per minute.

>Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 22:47:58  
>To: isp@fcc.gov  
>From: Kelly Geiser <woobus@bright.net>  
>Subject: adding charges per minute.

>  
>Dear Sirs:  
> I don't feel that the phone companies need to be adding more  
>charges to customers. We already to much money for phone useage. I am >getting charge for having a service #69 to call back if  
>you don't get  
>the call in time. I don't even use this service, I do however use the internet,  
>but if the Phone companies add charges for the use of the internet, I will have to cancel my use of the internet, charges money per  
>minute is not right or even >fair. The phone companies will use money then gain, not to many people could  
>use the internet if that was to happen, I thought our President wants everyone  
>to have limted use of the internet for everyone, if the phone companies get to  
>charge so much money per minute, I guess no one will be able to use the internet.  
> It's about time someone give's us the little people a break stop allowing these companies from charging us so much money, it  
>would be nice for  
>a change to stop cheating the Amercan people.  
>Thank-you for your time,  
>Kelly Geiser  
>

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

0096-262

**From:** <pwessling@nckcn.com>  
**To:** A7.A7(rchong)  
**Date:** February 14, 1997 12:05am  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Pam Wessling (pwessling@nckcn.com) writes:

Mrs. Chong,

I have just recently become aware of the controversy surrounding the Telecommunications Companies desire to charge individuals for Internet Access. I am bothered by this concept because I, as an individual, cannot afford to pay for these services twice, once to them and once to my Internet service provider, no matter if they charge me directly or through my provider. I live in a rural area that has just recently acquired Internet Access and I value the information that is available to me through this service. If I am forced to pay more, I will have to disconnect these services. Where do we stop with the nickle and dime increases and how many more ways will the Telephone companies come up with charging the little people with "justified" expenses to keep lining their pockets with my hard earned money? I understand that they are a business and profit is the bottom line for them but where do we draw the line? It seems that the little people have lost their voice when forced to stand against "BIG MONEY". If the phone companies are successful in this strategy, who wins? Certainly not the majority. Please consider the people who stand nothing to gain by this move. I need information, not profit. If I have to pay outrageous prices for that information, I loose...my limitations will remain confined within the rural area

I now live in with no hope of expanding my knowledge or horizons.

Sincerely,

Pam Wessling  
Beloit, Kansas

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: Remote IP address: 206.253.56.48

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE