

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

INTERNET FILING

96-128

From: <Gcattanach@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 2/14/98 8:30am
Subject: 800/888 pay phone access fee

Please review your charges involved with charging for non-emergency toll free pay phone use.

\$.30 per call is excessive for the use of the phone. The fee should be \$.15 per call.

What procedure was used to determine that \$.30 per call was the correct amount to charge for pay phone use?

Glenn Cattanach
Gcattanach@aol.com

RECEIVED

FEB 17 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABOVE

2

INTERNET FILING

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

From: <djsky@mis.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 2/14/98 9:22am
Subject: 800/888 Pay Phone Charges

I do not think 800 and 888 phone customers should be billed for pay phone usage.

The cost of tracking and additional manpower of billing would outweigh any profit to the pay phone industry and add unfair costs to the customer.

If the pay phone industry has to be compensated it should be at the point of service, by the person making the call.

800 and 888 customers do not have control over who calls, from where or how many calls are received and billed to them.

I have experienced calls made to my 888 number from local pay phones and agree that it is not right.

If the person making the call is charged at the point of service I think some abuses would be corrected.

Doris Shouse
DJS Truckers Service
PO Box 577
Clay City, KY 40312
888-357-4285

RECEIVED

FEB 17 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABOVE

2

INTERNET FILING

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

From: John Wiseman <wiseman@ecologist.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 2/16/98 11:01am
Subject: payphone 800 surcharge

Gentlemen,

While I'm sure you have the highest of values and goals in mind as you write policy, unfortunately the end result and compromise falls somewhat short of ideal.

The payphone 800 service surcharge is one of those areas. Your memory may be short, but when the phone companies wanted to issue everyone one of their 800 numbers, their selling point was free access from payphones around the country. Of course they were beaten at their own game and now turned to you for a LEGISLATED GUARANTEED INCOME. It seems you have been duped frequently of late and this is yet another example of how to get government take the fall for corporate greed.

I hope you will review this decision and reverse it. As I see it, there is only one purpose, and that is to penalize small entrepreneurs in the 800 number marketplace. We all realize that the per minute charges still apply as always with 800 service, there are no free lunches, but the idea that any area of communications that the bell companies do not control completely should be surcharged out of existence is absurd and insulting.

PLEASE REVERSE THE SURCHARGE RULING FOR 800 numbers!

John Wiseman
1269 West Como Blvd.
Saint Paul MN 55103
(612) 488-4983

RECEIVED

FEB 17 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABOVE

2