

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1  
Applicant Name: Robert A. Kenney  
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:  
Lawfirm Name:  
Contact Name: applicant\_name Contact Email: kenney@netstakes.com  
Address Line 1: 350 East 30 Street  
Address Line 2: Apt. 3S  
City: New York State: NY  
Zip Code: 10016 Postal Code:  
Submission Type: 67 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED  
Subject:  
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:  
Date Submission: 1/8/98 19:45:42 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/9/98 00:01:00  
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:  
Confirmation # 199818231468

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN - 9 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96-45  
1/9/98

**RECEIVED**

**JAN - 9 1998**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

I truly hope you want be lobbied into into raising the rates of Internet access by the phone companies. There are plenty of other items - FAX machines, call waiting, - how come these aren't "overloading their systems"? How come they're so eager to add new phone extensions and pay features if they can't handle it?

No one I know stays connected to the Internet via a modem (phone line) for more than 20 minutes, and most ISP's "time out" connections that are inactive for a certain number of minutes.

The phone companies are clearly using their position as means to "force out the smaller businesses" - like my local ISP, (where, incidentally, Customer Service actually exists!).

Didn't you break up their monopoly 10 years ago?? Don't put it back together! Stop Proceeding 96-45. Please, don't make me, a hard-working consumer subsidize the greedy Bells.

Thank you,

Robert Kenney  
New York

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE  Record 1 of 1  
Applicant Name: Robert Berman  
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:   
Lawfirm Name:   
Contact Name: applicant\_name Contact Email: Bermans@erols.com  
Address Line 1: 1915 Grand Court  
Address Line 2:   
City: Vienna State: VA   
Zip Code: 22182 Postal Code: 3413  
Submission Type: 103  Submission Status: ACCEPTED  Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED   
Subject:   
DA Number:  Exparte Late Filed:  File Number:   
Date Submission: 1/8/98 20:53:47 Date Filed:  Date Rcpt: 1/9/98 00:01:00  
Date Released:  Date Accepted:  Date Disseminated:   
Confirmation # 199818329734

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN - 9 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96 - 45

119198

I am strongly opposed to any reclassification of Internet Service Providers (ISPs) as telecommunications services or any other telco-concocted scheme to charge this customer more than other commercial users. The FCC should reject the telco proposal to charge ISPs an additional, usage or access charge. The proposal has no economic cost-based foundation. It is, at best, nothing more than a raid on the consumer by a rapacious monopolist; and, at worst, an anticompetitive practice detrimental to consumers. Universal service can best be supported by requiring telcos contribute to a fund based in proportion to their benefits.

**RECEIVED**

**JAN - 9 1998**

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Not Cost Based  
-----

The telcos are, at best, attempting to replace the concept of marginal cost pricing with the notion of pricing for the marginal load or user -- grandfathering all other loads at the lower prices. If there is an additional load placed on the network -- and the telcos certainly have NOT demonstrated that, than ALL users of the network during the time of the additional load should be assessed the same price. The FCC should reject this improper pricing basis and attempt to redefine economic principles.

Raid on the Consumer by Rapacious a Monopolist  
-----

The telco proposal cannot even be justified on a value-of-service pricing basis. The value is not provided by the telco, but by the Internet generally. The FCC should not permit the rapacious telcos to extract value they did not create simply because they possess the monopoly power to do so. The Internet clearly represents significant value to the consumer. Competition in provision of internet access by Internet Service Providers (ISP) has driven the price of access down to a competitive level -- resulting in significant consumer benefits. The telco proposal amounts to nothing less than an attempt to exercise monopoly power to extract those consumer benefits.

Anticompetitive Practice Detrimental to Consumers  
-----

The telco proposal is anticompetitive on its face, and detrimental to the market in the long-term and to consumers. Charging the ISP an additional charge over-and-above the cost of service places that ISP at a clear competitive disadvantage vis-s-vie the telcos in the provision of those services. Telcos are already entering the ISP market as well as other information and entertainment related markets (e.g., cable television, pay-per-view movies, etc.). The ability to raise their competitors' costs by creating bogus fees represents an anticompetitive practice that is detrimental to consumers, and will reduce competition in the market in the future.

Telcos Should Contribute Directly To the Universal Service Fund  
-----

Local telcos should be the exclusive contributors to a universal service fund. Past telco value of service arguments have related to the size of the system. That is, the more customers, the greater the potential calling combinations, purposes and values, and hence the greater the value of telephone service and the greater the revenues from connected customers. Telcos directly benefit from the growth

of telecommunication service and should therefore be the one to contribute to the fund -- in proportion to their benefit.

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1

Applicant Name: jim bowden

Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:

Lawfirm Name:

Contact Name: applicant\_name Contact Email: bowdenj@iquest.net

Address Line 1: 551 north dearborn street

Address Line 2:

City: indianapolis State: IN

Zip Code: 46201 Postal Code:

Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED

Subject:

DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:

Date Submission: 1/8/98 21:44:43 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/9/98 00:01:00

Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:

Confirmation # 199818109457

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN - 9 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96 - 45

1/9/98

Please try and resist raising a new tax for the Internet. I know, as a government agency you cannot resist the temptation. But you would not be serving the interest of the public by creating a new tax for the internet.

**RECEIVED**

**JAN - 9 1998**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1

Applicant Name: Steven F. Desch

Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:

Lawfirm Name:

Contact Name: applicant\_name Contact Email: reddog@erinet.com

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Address Line 1: 6500 Woodville Drive

Address Line 2:

City: Dayton State: OH

Zip Code: 45414 Postal Code: 2852

Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED

Subject:

DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:

Date Submission: 1/8/98 23:11:19 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/9/98 00:01:00

Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:

Confirmation # 199818474350

RECEIVED

JAN - 9 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96-45  
1/9/98

Dear FCC,  
If you make the ISP's pay an access fee to the telephone companies,  
then the ISP's will raise their prices for internet access. The  
telephone companies are already gouging the consumer for internet  
access now. Have you checked what they want for an ISDN line? Or  
even a second telephone line? If they get what they want they will  
have the consumer coming and going. I thought the government was  
against monopolies? Is this one central phone system all over again?

**RECEIVED**

**JAN - 9 1998**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Thank you for listening.  
Steven F. Desch

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** Record 1 of 1  
Applicant Name: **Michael Cox**  
Proceeding Name: **96-45** Author Name:   
Lawfirm Name:   
Contact Name: **applicant\_name** Contact Email: **michael.cox@alliedsignal.com**  
Address Line 1: **RR 2, Box 291**  
Address Line 2:   
City: **Edwards** State: **MO**  
Zip Code: **65326** Postal Code:   
Submission Type: **7** Submission Status: **ACCEPTED** Viewing Status: **UNRESTRICTED**  
Subject:   
DA Number:   
Exparte Late Filed:  File Number:   
Date Submission: **1/9/98 07:49:27** Date Filed:   
Date Rcpt: **1/9/98 07:51:47**  
Date Released:   
Date Accepted:   
Date Disseminated:   
Confirmation # **199819129078**

**DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

**RECEIVED**

**JAN - 9 1998**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

**INTERNET FILING**

96 - 45

1/09 / 98

Ref: CC Docket No. 96-45

In reference to the above docket (proposed telco fee for internet usage), I would like to state that I would have no real objection to it if I had any conviction or evidence that it would actually make any improvement.

For the last year and a half I have put up with (and resigned myself to) having to dial into my ISP three or four times before I get routed through a switch that will stay connected for more than five minutes. The local phone company doesn't seem to be able to fix it (or doesn't care to).

I would object to having to pay more for a sub-standard service.

Cordially,

Michael Cox  
michael.cox@alliedsignal.com

**RECEIVED**

**JAN - 9 1998**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**