

From: Edd Haymond <ehaymond@BayNetworks.COM>  
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
Date: 12/22/97 3:49pm  
Subject: Telecom Act of 1996

96-128

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Sirs,

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.

This is totally unsatisfactory. An extra charge is already paid for the 800/888 number. How do you justify charging for this service again? If I am willing to pay for my incoming calls, my caller should not be required to pay for the same call again regardless of where they call from.

Sincerely

Edd Haymond

RECEIVED

DEC 22 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

2

From: <jim-venable@worldnet.att.net>  
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
Date: 12/22/97 2:51pm  
Subject: 1-800 charges from payphones

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

I would like to express my dissatisfaction with the effect that the Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket No. 96-128) has had on the use of 1-800 ( and 1-888) numbers from payphones. The very idea behind 1-800 numbers was that the calling party didn't have to pay, whether it was a consumer from a home phone, a customer at a payphone at an airport, or a runaway or abuse victim calling from a phone booth. By adding additional expenses to services perviously paid for, this has had the effect of having many 1-800 numbers being blocked from payphones, which is where they formerly had their greatest utility. I am very concerned that regulations would be passed in such a manner as to have a reckless disregard for their effects and impacts on the pubic good. 1-800 subscribers are already paying for their service, to force them to incur vastly increased costs can have a devastating effect. Payphone operators are businesses like any other, if they don't make money with a phone in a location, they will remove it, plain and simple. I would suggest that 1-800 ( and 1-888) numbers be exempted from the charges allowed or imposed by the Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket No. 96-128) and that payphone operators not be allowed to block 1-800 (and 1-888) numbers. In this way the impact on the public welfare could be minimized and the FCC and Congress would seem much less callous than they do now. I appologize if any of my statements are incorrect as to precise cause and effect, but the effects remain. All partys involved should either be exempted of all charges associated with a 1-800 ( or 1-888) call from a payphone, or all partys involved, payphone operator, local phone company, long distance phone company, etc., should have to absorb the costs as a cost of doing business, as they had done previously. Although not cc:'ed, I will be sending this message to my representatives in Congress, and other hopefully concerned and responsible partys.

RECEIVED

DEC 22 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Thank you,  
James P Venable, Jr.  
5307 Roanoke Ave.  
Newport News, VA 23605-2507  
Voice:(757)928-0455  
E-Mail: jpv@poboxes.com

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

2