

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: MR SAM H CRESWELL <VPNV52A@prodigy.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/22/97 4:11pm
Subject: FCC Docket # 96-128

22 November 1997
Concerning : Docket # 96-128

Dear Sirs,

The \$0.30 charge for using a pay phone to make a calling card or travel card long distance call is out of proportion to the cost of the call.

I pay \$0.12 per minute for a long distance call. Why should I pay \$0.42 for a one minute call? My long distance company would only get 28% of the cost. Worse, if my call is answered by an answering machine, I would pay the local phone company \$0.30, while paying my long-distance company about \$0.05. That just isn't proportional.

I suggest 10% of the cost of the call, with a cap of \$0.30.

Yours,
Sam Creswell
P. O. Box 15173
San Antonio, Texas 78212-8373
210/732-4983

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Mark Nolan <mnolan@flash.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/22/97 7:51am
Subject: 800/888 Surcharge

9/6-128

As Usual. Big Business has screwed the little man with the help of the Federal Gov't.
The 800/888 surcharge will only hurt people that must use pay phones whom can not afford cell phones and the like. Do you not think long distance outfits make enough money? Why allow them to INFLATE there own costs and then claim they are hurting. Shame on you FCC!!!

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: Michael Bing <bingm@earthlink.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/22/97 1:55am
Subject: Absurd Pay Phone Charges For 800 numbers

The ruling that provides for \$.30 charges for 800 numbers from pay phones for pager access is unfair, burdensome, and discriminatory.

We are getting unfairly charged for 800 number calls. If these numbers are chargeable, ALL 800 numbers should be charged.

This is nothing more than a form of corporate gouging that makes pagers often more expensive than cell calls, depending on the length of the call and area called from.

RECEIVED
NOV 24 1997
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies 2
481A000E

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: Linc Madison <Telecom@LincMad.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/21/97 6:20pm
Subject: Payphone fee for use of 800/888 numbers is unreasonably high

The current FCC policy implementing a fee to be paid to pay telephone providers for the use of their equipment to complete a call to a toll-free number, is improper and unreasonable.

First, the amount set by the FCC for the reimbursement is clearly excessive. The marginal cost to the payphone provider of the toll-free call is zero; the only costs involved are fixed costs and the "opportunity cost" that the equipment is not available for another customer during the toll-free call. Neither of those costs amounts to anything remotely approaching 28 cents per call. Under the regulations under which the providers entered the business, they were guaranteed a profit of only 5 cents on a local call. I think that rate represents a much more reasonable reimbursement.

The second problem is that you are setting a flat-fee reimbursement, where a per-minute rate is more appropriate. I would propose a rate of one cent per minute.

By setting such an exorbitant reimbursement to payphone owners, you are giving them an undeserved windfall with no corresponding benefit to the consumer, and you are also creating dramatic distortions in several related markets.

If payphone owners are upset with the loss of revenue due to long distance calls placed with calling cards via toll-free numbers, the correct response is to price their own long-distance services more competitively, not to ask the government to add an unwarranted fee by fiat.

Please keep in mind that the ultimate purpose of deregulation is to benefit the CONSUMER. The consumer is paying much higher payphone prices, and will soon see higher prices for other services such as calling cards, but is realizing absolutely ZERO benefit. That is an unacceptable situation, and it is your legal duty to change your implementation of pay telephone deregulation to provide benefits to the consumer. If you fail to do so, you will be guilty of gross malfeasance and dereliction of duty.

Linc Madison * San Francisco, California * Telecom@LincMad.com
URL: < http://www.lincmad.com > * North American Area Codes & Splits

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

LOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Gary Brummond <tma*uni@unidial.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/21/97 8:35pm
Subject: 30 cent surcharge on payphone 800 calls

96-128

Dear Sirs:

I understand that the FCC has now imposed a 30 cent surcharge on all calls to an 800 service which originated from a pay telephone.

If this is the case, what could prevent a disgruntled person to go to pay telephone over a weekend, or at night, and make hundreds of telephone calls to a company's 800 number? It seems to me that more people are going to be hurt by this action, rather than benefit from it.

I welcome your thoughts.

Thank you,

Gary Brummond
Telephone Management Associates
2751 Via Hacienda
Fullerton, CA 92835
888/444-4TMA ---> but not from a payphone!
tma@unidial.com

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: Niko Sluzki <niko@jetcity.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/21/97 11:24pm
Subject: FLAME

The Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket No. 96-128) mandate requiring phone companies and Pay Phone Service Providers to charge \$.30 for all non-emergency 800/888 calls from pay phones (effective Nov. 17, 1997) STINKS!

This is completely unnecessary, extortive and lousy!

Shame on you!

Niko Sluzki
CTO, Encoding.com
niko@encoding.com

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

CKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: "Baggett, Landry" <Landry.Baggett@transamerica.com>
To: "fccinfo@fcc.gov" Return requested Receipt notifi...
Date: 11/24/97 11:16am
Subject: Telecom Act of 1996(Doc. No. 96-128)

This is in regards to the 800/888 service charge. How can you charge .30 for the use of the phone when the number is toll FREE... look in to this again. This is somewhat unfair.
LB.

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

BUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

9/6-128

From: <sam@ameritel.us.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/24/97 11:08am
Subject: Pay Station Service Charge

FCC

SUBJECT: PAY STATION SERVICE CHARGE

As a small long distance company, it is difficult for us to see how the FCC took it upon itself to create yet a whole new layer of difficulty for small companies like us to operate. We have no practical way of paying the hundreds of payphone owners from which our customers may place 800/888 or calling card calls.

In order to reimburse all owners properly, we would have to sign a contract with a company like ZPDI to act as a clearing house. The sign-up costs around \$20,000 and carries an exorbitant rate per call billed. Our monthly traffic from payphones is much less than the amount it will cost us just to bill such calls. This, added to the \$.284 or \$.30 or whatever it may be will literally exclude our company from handling ANY 800 traffic; a move that will hamper us from doing business at all. Currently our payphone traffic is just 2 or 3 % of our overall business - if that. It is literally a shame that because of such a small amount, our customers may leave us. Just about all our customers make at least one call a month from a payphone. Customers will not tolerate one company handling their 1+ traffic and another handling and billing their 800 and credit card traffic. We can literally be driven out of business by this narrow-minded decision.

If the Payphone operators want to collect a fee for using their equipment, why don't they just program the payphones in such a way that any such calls would have to take that fee up front. In this way, the end user would be made aware that it is the payphone owner and not the long distance carrier that is benefiting from that fee. No carrier would have to go through a maze of costly "clearing house" operations and small carriers like us would not be driven out of business. These owners are programming their phones to identify these calls anyway.

Sincerely,

Ameritel
1600 Clay Street
Napa, CA 94558

Sam Medina, General Partner
sam@ameritel.us.com

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("jeff_buckingham@callamerica.com")

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

DUPLICATE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: Mitul Rao <mitulr@comm.mot.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/24/97 11:59am
Subject: Block on SkyTel

To Whom it concerns,

I think that it is not a good idea to block the 800/888 numbers from the payphones. This is taking away the convenience from the customers. May be give a option or charge more to the carrier and leave the service for the customers.

Mitul

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

BUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: "Bates Unlimited" <BUAI@infohwy.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/24/97 4:00pm
Subject: Pay Telephone Compensation Plan

We recently were advised by our 800/888 carrier of the Pay Telephone Compensation Plan, which appears to be grossly unfair to the 800/888 subscriber.

As a service to our clients, we are already paying for their long distance charges to make the call. This compensation plan is equal to a double charge or penalty for offering an 800 number.

We receive a fair number of 800 nuisance calls, perhaps these could be eliminated if the caller had to deposit the \$.30 per call.

We request a review of this compensation plan and assign some responsibility to the caller.

Sincerely,

Lyle Bates

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: "theharrisons" <theharrisons@theonramp.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/23/97 3:28pm
Subject: Pay Phone Charges!!!!

To Whom It May Concern,

I just learned that Skytel will be passing along the \$.30 charge for any calls made from a pay phone to my 800# pager. This is ridiculous!!!!!!! An 800 number is an 800 number, FREE. The telephone companies are making millions from consumers now, to allow this to happen is not in the best interest of the average consumer. These costs are being passed on by businesses using 800#'s, just as in my case with Skytel.

If your looking out for me, I'd like to know how this is a benefit. I'd even like to know how you feel this is just!!!

Sincerely,
Scott Harrison
theharrisons@theonramp.net

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: <SOCRATES75@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/23/97 11:10pm
Subject: CHARGES FOR PAGERS FROM PUBLIC PHONES

To whom it may concern:

This "ACT" is but another means of some mindless idiot(s) in the FCC to interfere with business people's operations. There are some operations, like making and receiving phones calls from public phones, that because of necessity must be made. Now this is one additional incroachment in the operations of business. True, there are many phones that are being made from public telephones, however before this stupid act was passed someone should have made an inquiry into giving an allowance that before a charge could and would be implemented there would have to be a minimum of say, 20 calls per week/biweekly/monthly, etc. However, as is typical of idiots in Washington, D.C. there emerges sweeping statements/ no statements, or acts that encroaches on everyone's business activity. Yes, everyone's businesses activities.

I wish someone in the atmosphere level of "idiotism" AKA, Washington, D.C. would seriously consider the small businessman's financial bottomline and place themselves in his or her shoes.

This is but another stupid and ignorant act that emerges from that sewer-pit called Washington, D.C.

RECEIVED

NOV 24 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E