EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: <nrodrigu@mtel.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/17/97 4:05pm
Subject: Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket No. 96-128)

96-128

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

The above docket has recently been brought to my attention. As a parent I would like to voice my concern at this mandate. My 800 pager is no longer accessible as a toll free # from a payphone. My daughter in emergency situations can no longer contact me unless she has money in her pocket.

The whole reasoning behind this type of pager lie in the comfort that at any point in time my child could contact me. This toll free # has been a lifesaver on more than one occasion. It appears we come to an age where we have forgotten the common man and his needs.

Thanks for listening.

RECEIVED

DEC 17 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

DEC 17 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: G Larson55 <GLarson55@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/17/97 2:17pm
Subject: Re: Fees -Reply

Thank you for sending the information on the charges that will effect payphones. I have read the order and understand the reasoning, however, as a consumer I must object.

The order seems attempts to redress a perceived wrong in that payphone companies felt they were being cheated everytime someone used a pay phone to place a long distance call through another provider using and 800#. As far as that logic goes, it may be reasonable for a provider of service such as AT&T, etc., to be required to pay a fee to the pay phone operator, but the order as issued has directly impacted consumers in unreasonalble ways.

For example, nationwide paging services are blocking 800 numbers that are place from pay phones. This has seriously impacted my business activity and complicated my business travel needlessly. In addition, the use of prepaid phone cards has become difficult or unreasonably expensive. I have a personal 800 number from a small service provider that is for my college student children to call home at reasonable costs to me plus my aging parents use it for the same purpose. The cost of that has risen outrageously as a result of your ruling.

Fair is fair.....why is the public penalized and inconvenienced to redress a complaint by pay phone operators (I question the legitimacy of their complaint as well) ?? Technology exists today to add charges to specific 800 numbers (large service providers) while leaving the legitimate and essential use of 800 numbers by the general public for pagers, etc., from pay phones untouched. Please reconsider the ruling.

Glen Larson
glarson55@aol.com

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Eldon Heller <eheller@attmail.com>
To: Federal Communications <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 12/17/97 11:19am
Subject: FCC MANDATED PAY PHONE CHARGES

96-128

RECEIVED

DEC 17 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

WE STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE NEW PAY PHONE COMPENSATAION RULING. PAY PHONE CUSTOMERS PAY FOR THE USE OF THE PHONE BEFORE THEY CAN DIAL AND WE PROVIDE AN 800# FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF OUR CLIENTS NOT TO SUBSIDIZE THE GOVERNMENT. JUST ANOTHER WAY FOR THE GOVERNMENT TO RIP OFF THE TAX PAYERS.