

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Bates Marshall <batesmarshall@geocities.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/9/97 12:47pm
Subject: Surcharge for 800 Number Calls

96-128

RE: Surcharge for 800 Number Calls

To Whom It May Concern,

I'm writing to express my concern for a portion of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 that went into effect in October, 1997, after an FCC ruling. Specifically, the commission determined that companies which operate pay phones may levy a 28.4 cent fee on the receiving party if the call is made to an 800-number. This amount is far greater than the cost to place the call, and is unfair.

RECEIVED

DEC - 9 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

As a result of this ruling, many companies which operate 800-numbers have disallowed calls to their services from pay phones. This includes paging companies, trucking companies, and soon airline reservation systems. As a result, this ruling directly effects consumer access to vital products and services.

In addition, the FCC also recently put into effect the portion of the Telecommunications Act which deregulates pay phone charges. This portion is intended to create a market for pay phones, where the consumer has the choice, based on the rates charged. However, as a matter of fact, it is NOT the consumer at all who has a choice, but the owner of the property where the pay phone is located.

Does the FCC really think that the average convenience store will carry more than one kind of pay phone? This is ludicrous! The pay phones are installed by the property owner, and the property owner will install whatever type of phone will generate the most profit. The consumers end up paying MORE FOR EACH CALL, EVERYTIME. How is that competition? How does that help the consumer?

I am very concerned about these two issues, and I feel that the FCC is doing the American consumer a grave disservice. I urge you to reconsider these issues.

Yours very truly,

Bates Marshall
33 S. La Patera Lane
Santa Barbara, CA 93117-3214

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

From: Joel Schardt <jas@tc.umn.edu>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/8/97 7:06pm
Subject: 800# charges

RECEIVED

DEC - 9 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I disagree with your ruling allowing extra charges on 800 number calls from pay phones. On the face of it I think that it is bad for commerce, consumers in general, and for the credibility of the FCC. I know that it is all fairly complex, but toll-free should remain essentially toll-free to the caller.

Regards,
Joel Schardt

No. of Copies rec'd _____
Date FILED _____

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Norm Donofrio <norm@unforgettable.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/8/97 5:48pm
Subject: Unreasonable Pay Phone Charges

96-128

The telephone act described below is unreasonable. 30 cents is more than a "normal" phone call where someone must physically collect the money.... The ripple effect of this bill (some companies are removing 800 numbers from phone booth access) will hurt our ability to compete as a country. The overhead of allocating these costs is another case of US Government building a massive infrastructure requirement for small businesses.

RECEIVED

DEC - 9 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket No. 96-128) has mandated that a fee be paid by phone companies (AT&T, MCI, Sprint) to Pay Phone Service Providers for all non-emergency calls originating from pay phones, effective Nov. 17, 1997. Pay phone service providers and long distance carriers will be charging a combined total \$.30 access fee for each call to an 800/888 number made from a pay phone.

No. of Copies rec'd
FILED

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

From: <steverose@mediaone.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/8/97 10:39pm
Subject: Access Fees

Dear FCC,

I got a notice from World Com today stating that due to a recent decision by the FCC on Oct. 9 1997 that I would now have to pay a 30 cent access charge to call an 800 numbers from a pay phone. I was under the impression that it was the company that was receiving the calls, responsibility for paying the access charge, with the understanding that they could pass the charge onto the customer if they chose to. It seems that all the telephone companies have chosen to pass this cost directly to the consumer. (So much for so called freedom of the market, I would call it more collusion of phone companies)

I wouldn't mind these increases in phone charges if I saw an increase in better phone service and more choices in the market place for us consumers. From my viewpoint the Telecommunications Act of 1996 so far has helped the phone companies more than the end consumer. Although I am sure you would probably argue that. At least here in Michigan, Ameritech has been very successful in keeping most other competitors out of their really big markets, hence no real competition.

Here are just a few small requests from one small consumer:

1. Please consider what the impact will be on the end consumer before you end up approving more access charges for the big telephone companies. (By the way, no one likes using a regular pay phone because of the outrageous prices the charge per min.)
2. Please consider dropping the 30 cent access charge on 800 numbers until we have more real competition out there. (A lot of pay phones I use don't let me call an 800 number to my telephone provider because they want me to pay their outrageous rates)
3. If you chose not to drop the 30 cent access charge than please consider not raising that charge plus the hundreds of other charges that the telephone companies are always wanting to raise, until there is real competition out there.
4. Please let us make phone calls over the internet without access charges, this will bring those telephone companies in line.
5. Please help the companies wishing to offer satellite telephone access, so that we can bypass a lot of these telephone companies, thereby forcing them to truly compete in a free market.

Thanks for taking the time to read this,
Steve Rose
steverose@mediaone.net

RECEIVED

DEC - 9 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

From: <lfranck@ix.netcom.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/8/97 9:56pm
Subject: toll free no, or enduser charges

To Whom it may concern:

I think that it is patently unfair to consumers, that is individuals in the United States, to have the "toll free" become toll calls. Please reconsider the "little people" who have learned to use the toll free numbers to conduct business, make inquiries and otherwise communicate. Even though "endusers" will pay those charges it will discourage their use/availability.

Please repeal or redo the Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket #96-128) to address the needs of the people of the United States.

Thank you for your attention to this issue.

Lewis Franck

RECEIVED

DEC - 9 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

From: Aaron Barbour <abarbour@mindspring.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/9/97 2:01pm
Subject: disagreement with Telecom Act of 1996

I am writing to express extreme unhappiness with the ruling of the Telecom Act of 1996 allowing pay phone service providers to charge back toll-free calls to the owner of the toll-free line.

The owners of toll-free lines already pay the phone companies, who are the primary providers of pay phones, for the service of a toll-free connection. These rates are negotiated and agreed upon, so one would expect them to already be as fair as possible. Now these phone companies will essentially be charging themselves for the use of the toll-free numbers, of course ultimately passing the cost to the consumer. This seems all too much like a shady accounting trick to make even more money in the already very lucrative communications industry. To allow the phone companies to add these surcharges is simply unethical.

One of the greatest features of toll-free numbers has been the ability to do just what we are talking about - to access them from pay phones. As I have stated, the phone companies are already charging for this service, and will now be double-charging for it. Please do not let the communications lobbies, who pay few taxes due to numerous breaks, influence you to make decisions against the people who do pay taxes - the small businesses and people of America.

Sincerely,
Aaron Barbour
abarbour@mindspring.com

RECEIVED

DEC - 9 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABOVE

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

From: Nick Moody <moodyn@InfoAve.Net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/9/97 12:18pm
Subject: 800 # Mandate

To Whom it may Concern:

Concerning the mandate to make 800 numbers non-free from payphones. 800 numbers have always been known as a free all access number for people to get in touch with you. By taking out the access from payphones (or charging the 800 # owner) you are making 800 numbers non-free. Payphones are so prevalent throughout the US that you are significantly decreasing the number of ways a customer, friend, or a young daughter can get in touch with their salesman, friend, or father. I want to express my dissatisfaction with this decision and I hope that you will reconsider and revoke this mandate.

Sincerely US Citizen,

Nick Moody

<Auto Insert Footer>

Alternate Email Addresses:

MoodyN@ix.netcom.com

PwrSurf@aol.com

MoodyN@infoave.net

NickMoody@usa.net (least reliable)

Check out my NEW and IMPROVED page....!!

<http://www.netcom.com/~moodyn/index.html>

RECEIVED

DEC - 9 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd
LIB: ABCDE

2