

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Adam BrodWolf
P.O. Box 167
Hathaway Pines, CA 95233
(800) 333-1349

RECEIVED
NOV 13 1997

PLEASE DO NOT CALL FROM A PAY PHONE. THANK YOU. (C)

Federal Communication Commission
Office of the Secretary, Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

30 October, 1997

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am very concerned about the matter of CC Docket 96-128 and FCC 96-388 in which it was required that ALL carriers must compensate Pay-phone providers with .35 per call. I am outraged at this. It is an injustice to discriminate against those whose customers generally call from pay phones. My small business is directed toward full-time RVrs who almost ALWAYS call me from pay phones. I estimate that my monthly expenses will go UP over \$300 per MONTH because of this, which will make it impossible for me to justify the hours I put in for the income.

Pay-phone providers fight it out all over the country to try to get their phones in a certain location. They are not entitled to a windfall profit due to unjust laws. They have the potential to make a profit if the caller must pay for the call, and they have the risk that the caller may call an 800 number in which someone ELSE pays for the call, but the cost of the call is in fact paid. They have always agreed to provide the service in order to catch all of the profit from callers who pay for calls.

Finally, this FCC rule is unjust because it dramatically increases the cost to businesses who provide 800 numbers by a very high and virtually uncontrollable amount. It will surely shut many businesses down. How can these businesses control which phone a customer will call from? I think that .35 cents is outrageous and unjustifiably high, but if there must be a charge, it surely should be to the one who can control which phone they use, and that is the caller, not the business they're calling.

I think this is totally wrong and I want it changed. I am very angry that my life will now suffer all because of a meeting you guys had.

Sincerely
Adam BrodWolf

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE _____

MITC

October 31, 1997



RECEIVED

NOV - 4 1997

FCC MAIL ROOM

Mr. William F. Caton
 Secretary, Federal Communications Commission
 1919 M Street, NW, Suite 222
 Washington, DC 20554

Dear Mr. Caton:

RE: Pay Telephone Re-Classification Compensation Provisions of Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-128. I wish to submit an informal filing to object to the proposed rate of \$0.284 as the default per call compensation rate for subscriber 800# calls made from pay phones.

1. Thousands of Private Businesses will receive unfair, significant surcharges.

Thousands of private businesses will see massive increases in their cost of the 800# service as a result of this new regulation. In Maryland one of my customers is facing a \$50,000.00 per year increase in their 800# phone bill.

Industries, employees, and customers who will be particularly hard hit are those that employ full-time and part-time lower income employees to provide services at remote accounts. Currently, these industries use 800# calls from pay phones to verify that the employee is on-site.

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| * Building Service Contractors (Janitors) | * Security Contractors (Guards) | * Installation Construction |
| * Swimming Pool Management (Lifeguards) | * HVAC Contractors | |

There are thousands of such businesses in the USA. Take for example, a company with 200 employees, calling twice a day to clock-in and clock-out from a pay phone:

Current charges:

200 x 2 x \$0.05 (typical call cost) = \$20 x 250 work days =
\$5,000.00 per annum

FCC Proposed Charges:

200 x 2 x (\$0.05 + \$0.284 surcharge) = \$133.60 x 250 =
\$33,400.00 per annum

2. No effective advance warning has been provided.

The vast majority of small businesses are totally unaware that this surcharge is coming into effect. The FCC has not taken these small companies into consideration. Instead, it has focused on the needs of large, well-financed telecommunication giants who have hired lobbyists and law firms to argue their cases. The needs of small business and the consumer have been ignored as usual.

3. The charge is unfair.

Currently all phone call charges are based on the duration of the call. A consumer calling for 5 seconds pays less than a consumer calling for 5 minutes. This is rational and accepted by everyone. Under this FCC regulation the 5 second caller pays the same surcharge.

4. The price increase is unreasonable.

For these callers the effective price increase will be 500-600%

I urge the FCC to reconsider these regulations in the light of this new information and delay any implementation until a more equitable solution can be found that does not significantly effect the financial viability of an important sector of the United States economy.

Sincerely,

John W. Graham
 President

No. of Copies rec'd _____
 List ABCDE _____

Management Information Technology Corporation

11791 Fingerboard Road, Green Valley Center, Suite D, Monrovia, Maryland 21770

Phone 301.865.5597 ■ Fax 301.865.3946