

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I am strongly opposed to the per minute charges that are being considered under proceeding #96-45. On what basis can it be proper or justified to charge per minute based on the type of connection (data as opposed to voice) that is established? If this is really a problem for telco infrastructure, then why are they entering the Internet Service Provider business as quickly as they can? Once again, the telcos are trying to have themselves regulated into an advantageous position that stifles free competition from small and independently owned companies such as mine.

Beth Montes, President
I-Land Internet Services
215 S. Ohio
Sedalia MO 65301
In business since 1981, we employ 17 people.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

INTERNET FILING

96-45

1/12/98

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Paul Elliott
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email: drivesman@blazenet.net
Address Line 1: 213 Heistand Rd.
Address Line 2:
City: York State: PA
Zip Code: 17402 Postal Code:
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/9/98 19:51:44 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 199819970190

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1/12/98

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am totally opposed to any ruling or legislature that would cause a per minute charge to be assessed to my internet access account. I firmly believe the internet can only continue to grow with access based on a one time charge with unlimited access. The growth we've seen in the internet has resulted in the creation of new, high paying jobs, increased tax revenues and virtually unlimited independent business opportunities. The continued growth of the internet, I feel, will be ground to a halt by the passage of rules or legislation that basically penalize the consumer for accessing the internet.
Paul Elliott

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: arnshea clayton
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email:
Address Line 1: 4103 pine st
Address Line 2: apt 3R
City: philadelphia State: PA
Zip Code: 19104 Postal Code:
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/9/98 20:52:58 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 199819251877

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45
112198

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I strongly urge you not to allow the telephone cartels to charge for use of the local switches. It's interesting that the same companies interested in charging for use of local switches are the same companies that have done their best to impede the development of non-local-loop alternatives. ISDN has been around for ages, most businesses use ISDN to handle their voice telephone traffic. ISDN has, until recently, been NEAR IMPOSSIBLE to order and get installed for residential use (when I say impossible, I got my BSE from the Univ of Penn in Computer Science and found the procedure mindboggingly complicated. It used to take an hour just to get in touch with someone at Bellatlantic who knew what ISDN stood for, let alone set up service! Less than 1 year later, I was able to order residential ISDN, an ISDN all-in-one internal PC card, AND setup an internet account with bellatlantic, while breaking for lunch!). This is not limited to bellatlantic (you may have noticed that there are entire web sites devoted to similar woes; www.nynexsucks.com for instance).

I mention this because the telephone company's position, that internet traffic is overloading the local phone networks, is untrue. There actions in the past have indicated this; were there really a local-loop bandwidth crunch, then the telephone companies would not have spent the past decade fighting tooth and nail, the deployment of READILY AVAILABLE technologies t

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Roger D. Brittain
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email: rogerbrt@freewwwweb.com
Address Line 1: 1854 College
Address Line 2:
City: Lincoln Park State: MI
Zip Code: 48146 Postal Code: 1313
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/10/98 09:13:50 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998110965005

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1112198

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

This concerns a proposal to raise phone bill charges for Internet user and to provide every school in the US with Internet service, including installing telephone line where none are present.

I'm firmly AGAINST paying twice for my telephone service.
I'm firmly AGAINST hidden charges.
I'm firmly AGAINST extra charges applied to ISP's.
I'm firmly AGAINST actions taken without Congressional approval and public response.

Thank You. Roger D. Brittain

Please: If I'm in the wrong area, forward this message to who should receive it.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Record 1 of 1

Applicant Name: Lisa Sonnenberg

Proceeding Name: 96-45

Author Name:

Lawfirm Name:

Contact Name: applicant_name

Contact Email: todd@chaffee.net

Address Line 1: P.O. Box 523

Address Line 2:

City: Poncha Springs

State: CO

Zip Code: 81242

Postal Code:

Submission Type: 7

Submission Status: ACCEPTED

Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED

Subject:

DA Number:

Exparte Late Filed:

File Number:

Date Submission: 1/10/98 12:33:41

Date Filed:

Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00

Date Released:

Date Accepted:

Date Disseminated:

Confirmation # 1998110670452

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45

1/12/98

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I think I am paying enough as it is for my telephone usage and my internet service. I do not want to pay any more than what I am paying now. I think that to make us (that is the citizens of the United States), is consistent to highway robbery.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Kevin W. Cornette
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email: kcornette@tribune.com
Address Line 1: 435 N. Michigan Ave.
Address Line 2: Ste. 770
City: Chicago State: IL
Zip Code: 60611 Postal Code:
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/10/98 12:57:14 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998110823916

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45
112198

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I beleive the Telcos have a reasonable complaint regarding the classification of ISP's as and "extended" service provider. ISP's are leasing communications links from the telco's, and in turn, re-selling in part and as a whole these links to other ISP's. This is how Internet access is facilitated. As a result, the telco's networks are flooded with data traffic which leaves less and less room for voice and other types of traffic as the Internet's popularity grows. In addition, the telcos are picking up the tab for the ISP's, as telcos must pay certain fees due to their classification for which the ISP's are currently not responsible.

I beleive we are merely progressing through a period of major change in the telecommunications structure. As time goes on, new "things" emerge and we must re-write old legislation to compensate. The Internet crunch is one such "thing". I do not beleive we can simply ADD legislation to accurately compensate for these changes. From the bottom up, as far as I can see, the telecommunications laws as they relate to the future of Internet access must be carefully reviewed and re-written. Ultimately, the ISP's should be classified the same as the telcos. ISP's are pumping DATA over a network intended for VOICE, through pipes that are leased and cramming a network which they are not responsible for maintaining. ISP's are merely forwarding a fraction of their HS-Link bill to me, which is actually from Telco, with their name and logo on the invoice. I am essentially paying my telco for my own portion of a HS-line to the Net. Why shouldn't the ISP's be re-classified? As you can see, it is an inevitable conclusion.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Raymond Rooks
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email:
Address Line 1: 25500 Riverbend Dr., Apt E
Address Line 2:
City: Yorba Linda State: CA
Zip Code: 92887 Postal Code:
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/10/98 12:57:30 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998110329367

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1/12/98

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am opposed to revising the classification of ISPs. The consumer (me) will see their rates go up or their ISP fold due to these fees. This gives telephone carriers an unfair advantage because their ISP will be subsidised by these fees. I also think that the telephone companies make enough money already.

I hope you make the right decision and do not change the classification.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: **UNIVERSAL SERVICE** Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Phillip J. Young
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email: pyoung@lland.net
Address Line 1: Route 3, Box 238
Address Line 2:
City: Appleton City State: MO
Zip Code: 64724 Postal Code:
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/10/98 13:31:40 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998110044765

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45

1/12/98

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I oppose the proposed per minute charge to be levied by telephone companies for connection to an ISP.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Record 1 of 1

Applicant Name: James D Lehares

Proceeding Name: 96-45

Author Name:

Lawfirm Name:

Contact Name: applicant_name

Contact Email: sterett@ozarks.net

Address Line 1: Rt 4 Box 353

Address Line 2:

City: Warsaw

State: MO

Zip Code: 65355

Postal Code:

Submission Type: 7

Submission Status: ACCEPTED

Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED

Subject:

DA Number:

Exparte Late Filed:

File Number:

Date Submission: 1/10/98 13:40:20

Date Filed:

Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00

Date Released:

Date Accepted:

Date Disseminated:

Confirmation # 1998110662370

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1/12/98

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

As President of a small corporation in the Ozarks of Missouri I find that once again besides the outrageous charges that I have for substandard telephone service (6 lines that are noisy with every rain) I find it difficult to see why the FCC would be interested in allowing the phone companies to increase consumer and business costs for access to the Internet.

Aren't we paying enough already..? And why do the phone companies need more money. They sure as hell aren't using it to improve service in my area.. I pay more than the service that I receive with no option as to a provider. Just as bad as "Taxation without representation".

Think about what you are proposing to do.. We are now able to access information that we could not even have dreamed of before. Don't slow the growth on small business by allowing the phone companies to once again dictate the future of communication in this country..

They're only mad because they didn't come up with the idea in the first place.. Don't let them get any richer.. Look at all the \$ in advertising that they spend everyday.. They don't need the money.. The services that they advertise and promise may not even make here to the Ozarks for another 10 to 20 years.

Hell, I have to pay \$7.50 a month just for an access number to an ISP.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Sheryl Todd, Federal Communications Commission,
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email: agan@iland.net
Address Line 1: Mr. Brian J. Agan
Address Line 2: 1191 NE J Hwy
City: Windsor State: MO
Zip Code: 65360 Postal Code:
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/10/98 13:42:07 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998110341910

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING
96-45
1/12/98

RECEIVED
JAN 12 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

CC Docket No. 96-45 (Report to Congress.

This plan should not be implemented. I pay a reasonable charge for internet access now, and my provider pays the phone company for their phone time to provide this service to me. I could not afford to use the internet, nor could many other people, if this plan is implemented. This lack of access would affect everyone greatly, because not only is the internet used for entertainment but thousands of students use it daily for their studies. Is the state of education in this country so well off that we can afford to remove this tool from their learning experience.

Once again let me state clearly that I am opposed to this plan.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Martin Moyer
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email:
Address Line 1: 414 S.E. 1221
Address Line 2:
City: Knob Noster State: MO
Zip Code: 65336 Postal Code:
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/10/98 13:44:07 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998110789378

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

INTERNET FILING

96-45

112198

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Where does the Government have the right to side with the phone companies on the use of the Internet. Is it because that they are lining your pockets with cash to shut down allot of the Internet providers that are operating out there. Or is the phone company upset that there are not getting as much of the Internet business. Where is the "FREEDOM OF CHOICE" in this issue. I hope it is not in your "POCKETS" because I would vote against any Politicians that votes for this policy.

Have a nice day.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
*Applicant Name: Chris Kramer
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email:
Address Line 1: 615 Poplar Dr
Address Line 2:
City: Windsor State: MO
Zip Code: 65360 Postal Code:
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/10/98 14:18:04 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998110021938

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1/12/98

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

This issue really stinks! This is just another way for the wealthy telephone companies to get in on the action. I guess it really bugs them to see small businesses flourish. If any kind of per minute charge is levied against my internet access I will just stop using it. Do you know who that would hurt??? Not the telephone companies, not me but the small businesses that advertise on the net. I always thought the government was out to help the small businesses but if this goes into effect I'll know that that was a lie from the beginning.
Chris Kramer

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

Proceeding: UNIVERSAL SERVICE Record 1 of 1
Applicant Name: Robin Matheny
Proceeding Name: 96-45 Author Name:
Lawfirm Name:
Contact Name: applicant_name Contact Email:
Address Line 1: 417 West Gay Street
Address Line 2:
City: Warrensburg State: MO
Zip Code: 64093 Postal Code:
Submission Type: 7 Submission Status: ACCEPTED Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED
Subject:
DA Number: Exparte Late Filed: File Number:
Date Submission: 1/10/98 14:20:14 Date Filed: Date Rcpt: 1/12/98 00:01:00
Date Released: Date Accepted: Date Disseminated:
Confirmation # 1998110263542

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

INTERNET FILING

96-45
1/12/98

Im afraid if these fees are imposed upon the people for internet access it is the families that will lose. The large companies can afford these kinds of changes but the average consumer cannot. I fear myself that if these fees are inflicted upon me I will no longer be able to afford internet access. This would mean my children ages 7 and 9 would no longer have a complete source of world information. This would mean my husband, a police officer, would no longer be able to check out the latest in safty equiptment for his department. PLEASE think about the consiquenses on the American family. One of the great things about the internet is its availability to ALL people no matter the income. Please don't take away my freedom of the internet.

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1998

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**