

LOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

9/6-128

From: "Robert A. Stjernholm" <ras@rmweb.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/19/97 2:03pm
Subject: 800/888 access from a pay phone

The charge you are making callers pay is ridiculous and contradictory in thought of what an 800/888 number used to be and SHOULD be.

Reverse the decision.

RECEIVED

NOV 19 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: <YYGUY3003@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/19/97 4:32pm
Subject: It's NOT YOUR MONEY!!!!

You have no right to impose a \$0.30 charge on TOLL-FREE calls. LOOK AT YOURSLVES. Starting to look like some monarchist king????

What a bunch of money hungry crooks.

The United States Government is due for a MAJOR facelift. Hopefully, starting with yours.

I hope this letter made you mad, just as mad as you've made all that these stupid rules affect.

I am just as much a part of the government as you are. REMEMBER THAT

Eric Hayes

RECEIVED

NOV 19 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: <SeventhRow@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/19/97 8:37am
Subject: Pay phone surcharge

I am at a loss to understand the rationale behind the .30 cent surcharge for pay phone usage. It is not taxing the telephone service providers (ATT,MCI,etc), as the bill was intended, because they are passing the cost down to the consumer.

For example, in my case, a small business, my paging company will surcharge me .30 cents for every call made to my pager number from a pay phone. In my particular business several calls per week are made to my pager from pay phones, and could easily amount to \$ 10.00 per month. This is detrimental to my business, which is able to operate competitively only due to my low overhead.

Please either disallow the service providers to pass the cost down to the consumer or repeal the regulation altogether.

Thank you, Fred J Napolitano, Seventh Row Productions, 203-250-9697.

RECEIVED

NOV 19 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: Andrew B Peterson <abpeters@uiuc.edu>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/19/97 11:10am
Subject: 800/888 Pay Telephone Access

Dear Sir or Madam:

I have been recently informed by my wireless paging provider that the toll-free access using an "800" number I have come to rely on will no longer be available. This is due, of course, to the recent ruling by the FCC that allows carriers to charge for 800 calls made from pay telephones.

The 800 access is one reason I purchased a premium paging service-- allowing me to check my messages from any public telephone is a definite plus. I'm now told that I must dial a long-distance number to access my paging functions from a pay telephone. This ruling appears to only hurt the subscribers and seems unfair to paging companies, benefitting only the long-distance and local carriers.

I'd ask the FCC to listen to the opinions of paging customers around the country and reconsider this recent ruling.

Sincerely,

Andrew Peterson

RECEIVED

NOV 19 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

DUPLICATE FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: Karl Lherisson <Karl@northstar.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/19/97 10:26am
Subject: 800 number charges....

Re: FCC Tariff on dialing 800 numbers via payphone

I'm curious, as a pager owner, I already pay more to have a personal 800 number so that many of my relatives who cannot afford home telephones will have a way to contact me. I believe it is unfair to be charged extra whenever a relative pages me from a pay phone. Maybe its true, the poor pay more?

Karl Lherisson
NorthStar Technologies, Inc.
Systems Administrator

RECEIVED

NOV 19 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

TICKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

From: "Vartan, Kirk (NBC)" <Kirk.Vartan@nbc.com>
To: "fccinfo@fcc.gov" <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 11/19/97 12:27pm
Subject: 800 charges

This is very unfair. It is a total inconvenience to me to have to dial a new non-800 number from a payphone. Pagers and the like need to be accessed from public pay phones. I cannot see carrying extra card and numbers around because of some new ruling. I don't know where you got your support, but it was not from the working person.

Kirk Vartan

Because e-mail can be altered electronically,
the integrity of this communication cannot be guaranteed.

RECEIVED

NOV 19 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: Dan Kuchem <dkuchem@concentric.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/19/97 1:40pm
Subject: Pay Phone Bill

I would like to know what special interest groups effected the recent pay phone changes with the FCC. My grip is not the charge, but rather the poorly transitioned change and notification process.

This seems to me like another example of a poorly administered law by a big and out of control federal bureaucracy. Typical and additional proof that I was smart not to take a career path with the Federal Government...I'd go completely Nuts!

dk

RECEIVED

NOV 19 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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