

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: raul <rh285@is8.nyu.edu>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 4/28/98 12:04pm
Subject: Pay Phone Access!!!!

96-128

RECEIVED

APR 29 1998

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary**

To whom it may concern,

I have been a Skytel paging customer for a number of years, and infuriated over the mandatory charge applied to restrict pay phone access to 800/888 numbers. I think it is extremely unfair to individual consumers whose communication costs are already a burden. Many businesses such as Skytel will definitely suffer as a result of individuals canceling their accounts due to the imposed charges. As I intend to do.

Sincerely,

A dissatisfied citizen in response to charges impeding the growth of easy communication.

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: "amikesh" <Andew.Mikesh@us.coopers.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 4/24/98 3:26pm
Subject: 800 number access fees from payphones

96-128

RECEIVED

APR 29 1998

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

=====
Andrew Mikesh, Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P. (US)
Tel: 212-259-1000 Fax: 212-259-xxxx
Internet: Andrew.Mikesh@us.coopers.com
=====

I just learned about the access fees that payphone providers can charge for using their payphones. Considering the outrageous fees these companies charge already for use of their payphones, I strongly disagree with their ability to charge for supposedly 'free' phone calls. Charging the equivalent of a local call's fee for a 'free' phone call is wrong. I could see a SMALL fee of a few pennies, which could be justified to cover the actual cost of the call, but it should be just a few pennies, not 30 cents!

MAYBE, if these independent payphone providers would provide better quality and more affordable service, I may change my mind. However, currently using one of these providers have ALWAYS created an unexpected and always negative experience.

Andrew Mikesh
50 Sherwood Road
Tenafly NJ 07670

2