

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED



James W. Spurlock
Government Affairs Director

Suite 1000
1120 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
202 457-3878
FAX 202 457-2127
EMAIL spurlock@att.com

ERRATUM

January 27, 1999

Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW Room TWB-204
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RE: Ex Parte CC Docket 96-128
Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and
Compensation Provision of the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Ms. Salas:

The attached Ex Parte letter was filed on Friday, January 15, 1999 and references a meeting that took place on Tuesday, January 12, 1999. The date on the attached, December 12, 1999 was incorrect and should have been January 12, 1999. An erratum is being submitted to reflect this inadvertent error. Please include it in the record of the above referenced proceedings.

Four copies of this Notice are being submitted to the Secretary of the FCC in accordance with Section 1.1206(a)(1) of the Commission's rules.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jim Spurlock".

cc: Mr. Kyle Dixon

No. of Copies rec'd 0+3
List ABCDE



James W. Spurlock
Government Affairs Director

Suite 1000
1120 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
202 457-3878
FAX 202 457-2127
EMAIL spurlock@att.com

January 15, 1999

Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW Room TWB-204
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
JAN 15 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RE: Ex Parte CC Docket 96-128
Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and
Compensation Provision of the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Ms. Salas:

On Tuesday, December 12, 1999, Richard Rubin of AT&T, Richard Whitt of MCIW, George Ford of MCIW, Steve Augustino representing CompTel, Richard Juhnke of GTE Sprint, Tiki Gaugler of Qwest, and I met with Legal Advisor Kyle Dixon (Office of Commissioner Powell) to discuss the above-captioned docket.

We discussed strong concerns relevant to any future Commission action that does not contain a bottom-up analysis of relevant payphone provider costs and a recognition that the average volume of calls per payphone per month cannot be significantly less than the call volume recently determined by the Commission in its Second Report & Order. It was specifically emphasized that Congress mandated the Commission in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to set a fair price for economic payphones and that it has allowed the Commission to permit state regulatory bodies to deal with any future potential issues involving non-economic public payphones through a state-specific process.

Two copies of this Notice are being submitted to the Secretary of the FCC in accordance with Section 1.1206(a)(1) of the Commission's rules.

Sincerely,

cc: Mr. Kyle Dixon