

FILED OR LATE FILED

03/06/03

From: Mike Graf
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/6/03 5:26AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Mike Graf (weebies@earthlink.net) writes

Dear Commissioner Adelstein

I am writing as a US resident to ask you to vote NO for any deregulation of the 1996 Telecommunications Act I am asking you to vote NO for the Tauzin-Dingell Bill The reasons I am asking you to vote NO on deregulation are

Deregulation is Anti-competitive and Unfair to the consumer:

quote

After years of foot-dragging and lawsuits, the Bells now face real competition at the local level and they hate it Their latest ploy is to conjure up a crisis by trying to convince politicians that if the law isn't changed, investors won't back the telecommunications industry anymore

But, as the Economist magazine put it recently. "The crisis seems to dwell mostly in the imagination of [the Bells] lobbyists For the first time since the depressed 1930s, the Baby Bells have begun to lose home-phone lines to competition from wireless, long-distance and cable companies."

Yes, real competition is coming to local telecom and, with it, the usual benefits: better service and lower prices The latest tally shows that, thanks to UNE-P, competitors had signed up customers for 7.7 million lines That figure is projected to exceed 10 million by year end And rates are falling. In Michigan, SBC had to cut the price of local calling by some of its customers by one-third to compete, and, in New York, according to Consumer Reports, consumers have reduced their bills by an average of \$13 a month.

[;www.clec.com/waffling.shtml](http://www.clec.com/waffling.shtml)[?]

quote

And you can ask him (Ed Whitacre chairman & CEO SBC). The man is on a mission that is taking him everywhere, in a crusade to rebuild a monopoly that the United States Congress and the fifty states have just spent the last decade opening to competition, Ed is willing to come to your house to tell you why UNE-P is destroying the industry, and why the mechanisms put in place to bring competition to the industry must, themselves, be destroyed.

www.clec.com/not_easy_being_ed.shtml[?]

quote

SBC's 2nd Quarter Investment Briefing boasted a very healthy 42% rate of return on its wire-line operations, and Crain's Chicago Business reported on September 23 that the company was "the picture of

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96 98

financial health." with operating cash flow up "to more than \$6 6 billion."

Four days later, on September 27, SBC announced that it was cutting 11,000 jobs. And it was odd the way they announced it. As Forbes noted, most corporate bad news announcements are "brimming with positive spin to put the best possible light on the situation." But SBC "went out of its way to indicate that the sky is falling."

Now Daley paints a picture of SBC as in robust health one day and so desperately in trouble the next that it must fire 11,000 workers. Where's the real SBC?

The company's shareholders shouldn't put up with leadership like that. They should rehire the laid-off workers, cut Ed Whitacre's compensation package, and force the company to, as critics advised recently in the Wall Street Journal, stop spending "more time and energy complaining about regulation and fending off rivals than they have reorganizing their own business to better compete."

www.clec.com/jay_bryant_article.shtml [?]

quote

State regulators join forces in defense of UNE-P. states' rights

DEARBORN, Mich., Wednesday, Oct. 30. FCC chairman Michael Powell's office met with disapproval and resistance on Monday, as state regulators from across the nation voiced opposition to any attempt by the FCC to preempt states' rights to legislate critical telecommunications issues within their states. Regulators from a dozen states at a National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners ("NARUC") meeting rebuked the recent notion by SBC and other Baby Bells that the Bells are losing money on the unbundled network element platform ("UNE-P").

Wisconsin commissioner Joe Mettner said the assertion does not correlate well with the evidence. "There is recovery of costs. In setting costs there is cost of capital consideration. There is profit margin. There is a return on equity," he said. Unbundled network elements can and have been a profit center for the Bell companies, he said. "The idea that they're not recovering even so much as their costs is difficult to accept having looked at the evidence that I have."

The unified consensus of the state regulators was that they have been zealous in their states to ensure UNE prices in their states reflected reality. Regulators voiced a coordinated call for the FCC to give UNE-P a chance to work before making further changes. Repeatedly, state regulators said there had been scant evidence to support Bell company claims that UNE rates did not cover Bell company costs.

www.clec.com/state_regulators.shtml [?]

Please support the 1996 telecommunications act as it was written to create competition and provide consumers with choices. Please vote NO on deregulation.

Respectfully,

Mike Graf
3222 Hubbard
Wayne, MI 48184

EX PARTIAL OR LATE FILED 96 98

From: Jacintha Knapp
To: Commissioner' Adelstein
Date: 1/7/03 12 03PM
Subject: FCC to drop key phone competition rule-WSJ

Dear Commissioner Adelstein.

Enclosed is an article that was reported by Reuters' source

I'm urging you NOT TO PASS the law against the phone long distance companies (or any other companies who are interested and capable in providing local telephone services) be able to share the local carriers' networks. I believe that competition makes all of these companies perform more efficiently and better for the clients I DON'T WANT TO SEE THE BELL COMPANIES DOMINATE THE LOCAL TELEPHONE MARKET AT ALL AND IN THEIR MERCY I WANT US, THE CONSUMERS TO HAVE CHOICES AND TO BE ABLE TO PICK THE BEST (superior services and best possible rates) COMPANY AS OUR CARRIER!!

Thank you for your attention

Sincerely,
 Jacintha Knapp
 (Very Concerned Consumer)

1:20 AM ET 01106103

FCC to drop key phone competition rule-WSJ

NEW YORK. Jan 6 (Reuters) - U.S. regulators are preparing to stop making local phone companies rent their networks to rivals at cheap rates, a move that could reduce competition and price-cutting in the local phone market, the Wall Street Journal reported on Monday.

The expected change by the Federal Communications Commission would be a huge win for the four regional Bell companies, which are trying to continue their domination of the profitable local market, the report said

It could be a significant setback for their biggest competitors, the two already beaten-down long-distance giants. AT&T Corp and WorldCom Inc , which have struggled to make inroads into local phone service.

The revisions to the rules would be the most drastic change to the nation's telecommunications laws Since Congress passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which was predicated on allowing the Bells and the long-distance companies to enter each other's markets.

The move would essentially undo the FCC's key rules intended to make it easier for new providers of local service. including long-distance companies, to compete with the Bells: Verizon Communications , BellSouth Corp. , SBC Communications Inc , and Qwest Communications International Inc. " "

"Instead, the plan would force them to pay higher prices to rent network access or buy more of their own equipment. the article said "

"The plan, now a draft, could be voted on by the FCC commissioners early next month, the Journal said citing people familiar with the plan. It would then have to overcome likely legal challenges from the

03-09

long-distance companies and state regulators, who have been trying to foster competition and win lower rates in local phone service. In its current form, the plan would take two years to be phased in."

"REUTERS"

Reuters Logo

Information provided by Reuters Limited. Copyright (c) 2002 Reuters Limited. Reuters content is the intellectual property of Reuters Limited. Any copying, republication or redistribution of Reuters content, including by caching, framing or similar means, is expressly prohibited without the prior consent of Reuters. Reuters shall not be liable for any errors or delays in content, or for any actions taken in reliance thereon. Reuters, the Reuters Dotted Logo and the Sphere Logo are registered trademarks of the Reuters group of companies around the world.

EX PAPT OF LATE FILED

From: needmyjob
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/6/03 12 10AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

16 78

needmyjob (thecrawford@netzero net) writes

You people need to hurry with this stupid triennial UNE review! Please get off your fat asses and do something for the industry that you have allowed to go up in smoke! You need to help the big companies so the little parasites(clec) can survive Without a thriving ILEC, no one will survive...

Server protocol HTTP/1.0
Remote host 207.222.242.186
Remote IP address 207.222.242.186

1/6/03 12:10 PM

EX-DATED OR LATE FILED

96-98

From: Mark Mansour
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 116103 8 50AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Mark Mansour (mmansour@telecomsmart.com) writes

Mr Adelstein.

I was very disturbed to learn of Comm. Powell's plan to revise the rules that have made local telephone competition possible in our state (FL). I encourage you to oppose this initiative because it will eliminate local phone service choice for most of the millions of small and medium-sized businesses and virtually all residential consumers in the USA. This will result in considerable price increases on both Local and LD service since the Bells can now offer LD service in most areas.

As a small resell carrier (with over 12 years in the business) eliminating the UNE-P will probably put us out of business and leave the customer's we serve with higher prices and predictably poor Bell customer service.

We will NOT be able to raise the money needed to install local switching equipment. I hope the FCC will find some way to incent facility-based competition, not eliminate wholesale competition.

Server protocol HTTP/1.1
Remote host 216.199.143.46
Remote IP address 216.199.143.46

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Todd M. Coulter
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 116103 10:33AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Todd M Coulter (toddcoulter@yahoo.com) writes

Dear Mr Adelstein.

Please know that the RBOC's stangle hold on and unfair practices for competition in all areas, except for the markets they want to go in is quite UN-AMERICAN In a country where we advocate competition and fair pricing, please do not allow the opposite to happen I think, we the **people** deserve to **be** represented by our

government against big business and financial monopolies. PLEASE allow all competition, especially in the Local Phone Service, in the markets of telecommunication. It serves no purpose except for mopolies. NOT to let telecommunication competition be supported I appreciate your time and your support!!!

Best Regards,

Todd M Coulter
3762 Black Feather Trail
Castle Rock, CO 80104
3036600584

Server protocol HTTP/1.1
Remote host 63.211.241.130
Remote IP address 63.211.241.130

From: WadoDave@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/6/03 11:39AM
Subject: WSJ article

EX-PAUTE OR LATE FILED

96-98

I hope we are not going back to a monopoly system. I read this article and it looks to me like the RBOC'S get long distance plus your are giving them back their power

I hope we don't see what is reported to happen or it will be clear that the FCC is not in favor of competition and the RBOC money has been well spend buying FCC votes

This will be a sad day when companies are allowed to manipulate the system and keep a monopoly

D Bills

From: wendi fox
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/7/03 10 03AM
Subject: <No Subject>

I am writing to you begging you to make other telephone companies provide their own facilities. My husband is a blue-collar worker for SBC and he is about to lose his job if something doesn't happen fast SBC can not afford to continue to maintain lines and facilities at such reduced rates. That is why they have had to lay off thousands. My husband may be next We have moved twice to keep his job but we are scared stiff With the economy the way it is we need help Please help let the issue pass Make the other companies provide their own facilities. It is not fair for them to continue to make Bell go under.

Sincerely,

Wendi Fox
WendiFox777@hotmail.com

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96 98

From: Sharon Comden
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 11/7/03 1:36PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Sharon Comden (sharonec@harborside.com) writes

Apparently Mr Powell is pushing for FCC relaxation of the requirements that local phone companies must lease their lines to long distance carriers. According to the Wall Street Journal, he believes that requiring long distance carriers to build redundant and expensive new telecom networks will not impact the consumer, who pays for everything. Competition and deregulation have cost the consumer/taxpayer billions of dollars to pay for takeovers and restructurings. Some markets, according to the Journal article, are just beginning to see prices come down. Why do we need more turmoil now?

Mr Powell thinks that by forcing long distance carriers to build new networks, it will re-invigorate the telecom equipment industry. Who pays for this wasteful thinking? Whose roads and lands are dug up to do this? The taxpayers, the consumers, the citizens. Do we have any choice, NO. A bureaucrat in Washington D C makes the choice. This is bad government. Please block this piece of stupidity. It hurts the consumer and only benefits a few big businesses.

Server protocol HTTP/1.1
Remote host 12.45.50.70
Remote IP address 12.45.50.70

EX PARTI OR LATE FILED

96-98

From: Bill Kidder
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Mike Powell
Date: 1/7/03 4:19PM
Subject: Cessation of ILEC wholesale local services

Dear Commissioners.

As a 25-year, pre-divestiture, telecom industry professional, I strongly oppose the announced plan to eliminate or otherwise significantly alter the requirement for the ILECs to provide wholesale services to CLECs at reasonable rates.

This move will crush the nimble niche players and bar entry into the market of all but a few financial behemoths.

If this is a forgone decision, I would propose that in exchange for the right to charge more for wholesale services, each LEC would have to transfer the assets of rights of way, manholes, conduits and other non-cableswitching hardware to an independent company that will give unfettered access to these facilities to qualified alternative carriers.

I would be happy to speak to any or all of you regarding my position on this subject and the impact I feel it will have on the industry.

William Kidder
3048 Charlwood Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48306
248 377-0056 residence
248 760-0397 cellular

From: jeff Bower
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/8/03 8:35PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

46-48

jeff Bower (jeff.bower@demandmanager.com) writes.

RE FCC Meeting
Senator McCain and Senator Hollings.

Just a quick note with regards to your upcoming Senate committee meeting with the FCC commissioners

It is *vital* that Facilities Based DSL companies like Covad Communications be allowed continued access to the Bells bottleneck facilities (cooper loops to the home). Covad is a UNE-L DSL Broadband provider for AT&T, Sprint, Earthlink and AOL, among others, not a UNE-P (local telephone provider). They've followed the exact intent of the original Teleco Act of 1996 and have invested Billions in a national DSL rollout using their own equipment. Now the Bells want the FCC to change the rules and eliminate the facilities based DSL competition

The FCC needs to standup for competitive companies that have embraced the facilities based model. If the FCC gives into the Bells and kills the UNE-L DSL providers, what assurance does any voice company like AT&T or WCOM have if they are ordered to migrate their voice customers from UNE-P to a UNE-L platform. It would set a precedent that will discourage investment rather than encourage one

I urge you to support competitive Facilities-Based Telecom companies who are setting an example for the rest. Support Telecom companies that are (and have been) investing in facilities

Server protocol HTTP/1.1
Remote host 12.228.216.106
Remote IP address 12.228.216.106

EX-PARTIS OFFICIAL

96 78

From: Patrick Gibbons
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 119103 140PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Madam and Sirs:

It is an egregiously had idea to remove the rules that addressed the Bell monopolies opening up their lines to competitors They allow a dramatically more level arena for competition.

If the rules are rescinded, monopoly will effectively be restored and the negative effects will **be** many.

- The consumer will almost certainly suffer lack/elimination of choice.
- The consumer will almost certainly suffer an increase in rates
- Contrary to the view that it will somehow foster spending to telecom equipment suppliers to build out new networks, that is highly unlikely as the task is far too large and expensive for the limping competitors to embark on. It will further damage and "hamstring" the market.
- Currently remaining existing competitors will suffer possible extinction or at least severe damage.
- Aside from the Bells. all other carriers, already hurting, will be "knee-capped" in efforts to regain strength.

Do not give into the monopolistic greed of the Bells

Do not give into the Bell's self-serving lobbying efforts

Do not give into that which damages us -- which the retro changes removing competitive access to the networks will do

Sincerely,
 A concerned consumer, investor and American citizen,
 Patrick Gibbons

3514 Harvard Ave
 Dallas TX
 75205
 pbgiv@swbell.net

Sign-up for your own FREE Personalized E-mail at Mail.com
<http://www.mail.com/?sr=signup>

Meet Singles
<http://corp.mail.com/lavalife>

CC: john_mccain@mccain.senate.gov, president@whitehouse.gov

From: Doyle A. Buffington
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 11/9/03 8:20PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-98

Doyle A. Buffington(DAB@BCXCOM.com) writes:

Its your move! I profoundly agree with many of the consumers who believes in more deregulation and more competition. Line-sharing is a must and all local telephone companies should be ordered to implement resonable prices under the UNE-Platform, including the old GTE markets. In particular, following Alfred Kahn, the "Great Deregulator", I believe you don't have an effective market until you have at least three or four viable players. So line-sharing must be protected, because a DSL/cable duopoly is inclined to rig prices near monopoly levels. I also don't think "potential competition" is an adequate substitute for a market, and much of his argument is based on the possibility of additional competition, not the reality of actual competition. Rising consumer prices as costs drop dramatically is strong evidence the market isn't working. I can't accept any argument we need less competition!

Doyle **8** Edie Buffington
 811 Laurel Oaks Lane
 Colleyville, Texas 76034

 Server protocol HTTP/1.1
 Remote host 12.238.208.121
 Remote IP address 12.238.208.121

11/9/03

From: Jean Weber
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/9/03 11:28PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

NO PART OF THIS LETTER SHOULD BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

96-98

Jean Weber (jeaniew@myexcel.com) writes.

Hello Commissioner Adelstein

I am a resident in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and recently changed my local phone service from Southwestern Bell to Excel Communications (Their parent company is Var-Tec.) This company offered me a plan which has significantly lowered my monthly telephone cost since it is a combination local/long distance plan with great rates. I heard on CNBC that you may change the recent rulings that force the local phone companies like SBC to give low-cost access to competitors such as Excel/VarTec. I strongly encourage you to reconsider and let other companies continue to come into the market and have low cost access to our phone lines. They should be public domain anyway, it seems, and it clearly benefits me as a consumer to be able to choose an alternative carrier and save money. Why should the giants like SBC continue to prevail and stifle competition? Look what deregulation did to long distance rates? Please let this happen at the local phone service level as well.

Thank you'

Server protocol HTTP/1.1
Remote host 63.208.47.176
Remote IP address 63.208.47.176

From: Angelo Ventresca
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: 1/11/03 10:06AM
Subject: 1996 TELCO Act Changes

EX-PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-98

Please vote NO to the proposed changes to the 1996 TELCO Act. The present free market system is working very well.

Thank you

Angelo Ventresca Jr, MS EA

From: Angelo Ventresca
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/11/03 10:08AM
Subject: Changes to the 1996 TELCO Act

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-98

Please vote not to the proposed changes to the 1996 TELCO Act. The present free market system is working very well.

Thank you

Anyelo Ventresca Jr MS EA

From: LARRYDELOR@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/11/03 11:15AM
Subject: 1996 TELCO ACT

DATE: 01/11/03 11:15 AM

→
C
+

Regarding the pending changes in the subject act, I am asking that you vote "NO" to these changes
L L de Lorimier
20424 Remsbury PI
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

From: LARRYDELOR@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/11/03 11:20AM
Subject: 1996 TELCO ACT

NOT RECORDED OR LATE FILED

70-21

I am asking that you vote "NO" to proposed changes in the subject act.
Thank You

Mr L L deLorimier
20424 Remsbury Pl.
Montgomery Village. MD 20886

From: Angela Ventresca
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/11/03 10:10AM
Subject: 1996 TELCO Act

EX PARTE OR LAIN 1111

96 98

Please vote NO on the proposed TELCO Act changes. The present free market system is working very well

thank You

Angelo Ventresca. Jr , MS EA

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-98

From: LARRYDELOR@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/11/03 11:20AM
Subject: 1996 TELCO ACT

I am asking that you vote "NO" to proposed changes in the subject act
Thank You

Mr L L deLorimier
20424 Remsbury Pl.
Montgomery Village, MD 20886

From: JAMES MADDEN
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/11/03 12:00PM
Subject: 1996 Telecommunications Act

EX-111111 OR LATE FILED

96-98

Dear Sir, I email you asking that you vote NO on any and all proposed or planned changes to the 1996 Telecommunications Act. Especially rate increases! Sincerely, jwmadden@prodigy.net

From: JAMES MADDEN
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: 1/11/03 12:05PM
Subject: 1996 Telecommunications Act

COPIES OF THIS FILED

96.5

Dear Mrs./Miss Abernathy, I email you asking that you vote NO on any and all proposed or planned changes to the 1996 Telecommunications Act Especially rate increases! Sincerely,
jwmadden@prodigy.net

UNRECORDED COPY DATE FILTERED

From: JAMES MADDEN
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/11/03 12:09PM
Subject: 1996 Telecommunications Act

26-11

Dear Sir I email you asking that you vote NO on any and all proposed or planned changes to the 1996 Telecommunications Act Especially rate increases! Sincerely, jwmadden@prodigy.net