

From: JACK BROCIK <little.guy@internetMCI.com>
To: "FCCINF@FCC.GOV" <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 12/6/97 2:49pm
Subject: PAYPHONE 800 & 888 PHONE CALLS

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

-- [From: JACK BROCIK * EMC.Ver #2.3] --

DEAR SIR

If I understand correctly a 800 or 888 number called from a pay phone is now charged a .30 fee for every call placed. This seems to be a ruling in favor of Big Dollar phone companys. The 800 and 888 numbers should not be classified as toll free number then.

A .30 cents charge for this seems extremely expensive.

Jack Brociek

RECEIVED

DEC - 8 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: <jf@oxy.edu>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/6/97 3:47pm
Subject: Toll Free Access Fees

96-128

These are unfair! If a payphone company wants to put in a payphone someplace public and connect it to the PSTN - then they have to allow toll free calls to be made without making money - they will have to make it up for people that use coins or the default operator service. Too many already block incoming calls, etc...

RECEIVED

DEC - 8 1997

Jonathan Finestone
PO Box 3333
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
310.786.4118

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Brian Cail <cail@superlink.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/7/97 2:19pm
Subject: ruling to pass fee on 800/888 calls from payphones

96-128

To whom this may concern:

I am writing regarding Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket No. 96-128) which allows payphone owners to pass along a 30 cent charge for 800/888 calls made from their phones.

Whoever let this bill pass ought to be fired or kicked out of their elected job!!! The phone companies make enough money as is and do not need 'Big Brother' putting more cash in their pockets. The purpose of an 800/888 number is for the call to be free. You government workers have lost your minds again.

Big businesses with 800/888 numbers ought to be beating down your doors on this protesting the fees that will be passed on.

Shame on you!

Brian Cail.

+-----+
BRIAN J. CAIL Bridgewater, New Jersey, USA
cail@superlink.net http://mars.superlink.net/cail
+-----+

RECEIVED

DEC - 8 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

From: Jon Tyson <jet@abel.math.harvard.edu>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/8/97 1:15am
Subject: Pay phones

RECEIVED

DEC - 8 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I just ordered a pager and found that now it can't be called from pay phones. I signed a 1-year contract.

I'm furious about this.

-Jon Tyson

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: andrusha <andrusha@nkn.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/8/97 8:29am
Subject: No subject was specified.

So I pay for an 800 or 888 number. I have a pager attached to that number.

I'm stuck in the middle of Nevada. No money. I find a pay phone.

And my number is blocked!!! What were you thinking FCC?

Dumb, dumb, dumb!!!

96-128

RECEIVED

DEC - 8 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2

From: "Miller, Eric M." <eric_miller@merck.com>
To: "fccinfo@fcc.gov" <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 12/8/97 2:38pm
Subject: Pay Phones and 800 Numbers

96-128

I just wanted to voice my opinion in regards to the recent enforcement
of Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket No. 96-128).

This makes business and personal communication very inconvenient.

Thank you,

Eric
Eric M. Miller
Research Information Systems - Support
Voice: 610.397.7306 FAX: 610.397.7666
Mail: UN-205, 2282B Internet: Eric_Miller@merck.com

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

DEC - 8 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

File of the Commission
12/8/97

2

From: glenn landenberger <g13@earthlink.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO),FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("president@whitehou...
Date: 12/8/97 4:19pm
Subject: Pay-Phone Fees

The "deregulation" of pay-phones, as it currently stands, is fundamentally flawed; because the purchaser of pay-phone service has a choice neither of hardware, or of service (unlike that for long-distance service, for example), there IS no competition, other than that between services competing for prime vending locations. As such, the Commission's decision is a great dis-service to the taxpayer. Moreover, as the benefits of that decision are clearly accrued to one particular class of people, pay-phone operators, at the expense of the public, it flies in the very face of the telephone's accepted designation as a utilitarian object, hence the regulation of phone companies as utilities. In the eyes of the general public, then, the Commission's decision looks like nothing so much as a "buy-off" or perversion of the decision-making process, much the way the recent "auctioning" of the spectrum for digital broadcast appeared.

I would urge the Commission, should there be any doubt as to the public view of these matters, to solicit the appropriate opinion polls from recognized polling services. I would urge the Commission to mend its ways and provide relief, with particular regard to the pay-phone matter, to the public and do a better job of operating in the interests of the people who pay the bills, as opposed to the junkets, fact-finding tours, etc.

Very Truly,

Fred H. Francis
francis@chapman.edu

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("francis@chapman.edu")

96-128

RECEIVED

DEC - 8 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL