

From: FishermanBOZ@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 8:03 AM
Subject: Vote to protect the consumer!

Keep CLEC access to last mile copper

Keep LINESHARING for COMPETITIVE CARRIERS

Keep AMERICAN CONSUMERS ALIVE AND WELL

Keep DSL COMPETITIVE
NO MORE BELLE MONOPOLIES

Thank You,

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Fred Roughton
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 12:11 PM
Subject: Fw: What is Line Sharing?

Subject: What is Line Sharing?

Line sharing is not a business term. It is a technology. It has nothing to do with competition unless you take it away.

Line sharing, which became technically possible in 1999, is simply the ability to run DSL over the same wire for which the consumer has already paid for voice.

If you remove it from the UNE list you have not gotten rid of line sharing. You have only gotten rid of the Bells being able to line share.

You have created a death knell for every facilities based DSL provider because if they want to sell the consumer DSL they will have to pay the Bell for a separate line and charge the customer for a separate line while the Bell will laughingly provide their own DSL on a line shared basis.

There could be no greater example of an un-level playing field.

If the Commissioners really want to take away line sharing then they should take it away from EVERYONE, including the Bells.

Make everyone buy an unnecessary second line.

The whole notion of taking away line sharing from only the competitors is so preposterous that it is hard to talk about it calmly.

We must preserve competition in DSL going forward. Please retain linesharing in your TR

Yours truly,

Frederick E. Roughton

1426 Cedar Lane

Norfolk, Va. 23508

757-423-5888

From: Fred Roughton
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 12:16 PM
Subject: What is Line Sharing?

Subject: What is Line Sharing?

Line sharing is not a business term. It is a technology. It has nothing to do with competition unless you take it away.

Line sharing, which became technically possible in 1999, is simply the ability to run DSL over the same wire for which the consumer has already paid for voice.

If you remove it from the UNE list you have not gotten rid of line sharing. You have only gotten rid of the Bells being able to line share.

You have created a death knell for every facilities based DSL provider because if they want to sell the consumer DSL they will have to pay the Bell for a separate line and charge the customer for a separate line while the Bell will laughingly provide their own DSL on a line shared basis.

There could be no greater example of an un-level playing field

If the Commissioners really want to take away line sharing then they should take it away from EVERYONE, including the Bells.

Make everyone buy an unnecessary second line

The whole notion of taking away line sharing from only the competitors is so preposterous that it is hard to talk about it calmly.

We must preserve competition in DSL going forward. Please retain linesharing in your TR

Yours truly,

Frederick E. Roughton

1426 Cedar Lane

Norfolk, Va. 23508

757-423-5888

From: George Gardner
To: George Gardner
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 3:18 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Warner
Senator Allen
Representative Cantor
Message text follows:

George Gardner
3002 Drakewood Court
Midlothian, VA 23113

February 13, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

3

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

George K. Gardner Jr.

From: George Issa
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 11:21 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

George Issa (gissa@rcn.com) writes:

So let me get this straight, if aol, earthlink, msn. yahoo! or speakeasy want to resell adsl products, their only choice will be 1 bell in a respected region? Is this America?

Kepp Line Sharing!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 208.204.155.241
Remote IP address: 208.204.155.241

From: Gerry Wiczerza
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 9:14 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Commissioner Adelstein,

I wish to express my concern over the latest news relating to line sharing and your impending decision

If it were not for the 1996 telecom act we would not have been afforded the options that ~~are~~/~~were~~ available for broadband internet connectivity. Under no circumstances should line sharing be eliminated nor costs be added to a line that is already being paid for relating to the lower frequency spectrum (voice).

While this is my fundamental concern, I am also concerned relating to rumors that you will put in place rules which will allow the RBOC's to put fiber in place and NOT allow competition to utilize it. Obviously this is the future of our interconnectivity and while it's not of major concern today, it will be 10-20 years from now. Competition should not be closed out from the last mile to a customer no matter what the connectivity is.

Keep rules in place or extend them to allow the public to have the broadest range of options of providers for their voice and data services.

Sincerely,

Gerry Wiczerza, P.E.
Stargate Automation
Michigan

From: Gordon Hathaway
To: Gordon Hathaway
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 7:24 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Edwards
Representative Myrick
Message text follows:

Gordon Hathaway
5802 Newell Dr.
Monroe, NC 28112-8455

February 13, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Gordon Hathaway

From: Gordon Hathaway
To: Gordon Hathaway
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 7:24 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Dole

Message text follows:

Gordon Hathaway
5802 Newell Dr.
Monroe, NC 28112-8455

February 13, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Gordon Hathaway

From: Ho, Ray
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 10:32 AM
Subject: Broadband DSL needs line sharing

Please keep line sharing as is.

Eliminating line sharing will lead to less choice and competition, and higher prices for consumers and small business for broadband services.

It also would slow the penetration of broadband services across the country delaying key benefits that can help the economy

From: Ho. Ray
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu. Feb 13, 2003 10:32 AM
Subject: Broadband DSL needs line sharing

Please keep line sharing as is

Eliminating line sharing will lead to less choice and competition, and higher prices for consumers and small business for broadband services.

It also would slow the penetration of broadband services across the country delaying key benefits that can help the economy

From: info@ftthcouncil.org
To: jadelste%fcc.gov, Lisa Zaina
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 10:40 AM
Subject: Proposed Rule Regarding Fiber to the Home

February 13, 2003

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

CC: Lisa Zaina

I understand that one of the Commission's goals in the UNE proceeding is to give the incumbents an incentive to invest in next generation facilities. **We** agree with that goal, and we presented a means for achieving this goal in our meetings with the Commission on January 17, 2003.

In this regard, we understand that there is some sympathy in the Commission for our proposals to accelerate fiber to the home ("FTTH"). Apparently, there is a consensus within the Commission for relieving FTTH from the unbundling and wholesale pricing rules in new builds and overbuilds. **We** understand, however, that you are struggling with the issue of how to deal with the existing copper loop in overbuild situations.

We believe this is a critical issue because it will have a profound effect on the rate of FTTH deployment. For example, if FTTH deployment is restricted to "new builds", we can expect only 1 - 2% of the access lines to be converted to next generation technology annually. This will simply be an insufficient volume to sustain the development of a FTTH industry. At this slow pace, it will take at least 50 years to achieve universal deployment.

On the other hand, if overbuilds are included in the equation, the rate of deployment will increase to 3 - 5% access lines annually. This will sustain the industry and achieve a reasonable pace of deployment.

So, the key is giving the ILECs an incentive to deploy in overbuild situations while not disadvantaging the CLECs that are using the existing copper loops. But a more fundamental issue is how to deal with the copper facilities that are used now but will, in time, become either obsolete or inadequate for higher capacity services and applications.

One way this may be achieved in the current environment and still promote FTTH deployment, is by relieving FTTH from the unbundling and wholesale pricing rules in overbuild situations, while still maintaining the copper loop where it is still being used by CLECs. Also, requiring the incumbents to keep the existing copper loop "connected to customers served by fiber in the loop and do not require the ILEC to incur relief and rehabilitation expenses until such time as the CLEC requests access.

This approach would give the CLECs access, but not require the incumbents to incur needless expenses to maintain the copper loop unless a CLEC needs it. It seems to **us** that sound public policy would not require ILECs to incur expenses to maintain facilities that would, in all

likelihood, never be used again by the vast majority of consumers.

Please see the attached proposed rule

Thank you for your consideration

Respectfully submitted,

Michael DiMauro
President, Board of Directors

James Salter
Past President, Board of Directors

FTTH Council
607-962-1983
ftthcouncil.org

Proposed Rule Regarding Fiber to the Home

To be inserted as a separate subsection in 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(a).

(X) Fiber to the home. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an incumbent local exchange carrier is not required to unbundle a loop (and equipment attached thereto), or any portion of a loop, that utilizes optical fiber from the central office all the way to a residential customer's premise (a "FTTH loop").

(i) New builds. Where an incumbent local exchange carrier deploys a FTTH loop to a residence that has no existing loop, it shall not be required to deploy a copper loop in addition to the FTTH loop.

(ii) Overbuilds. Where (A) an incumbent local exchange carrier deploys a FTTH loop to a customer's residence that is served by existing copper loop, and (B) the customer does not also subscribe to service from a competitive local exchange carrier using the existing copper loop, the incumbent local exchange carrier shall leave the existing copper loop connected to the customer's premise, but shall not be required to incur any expenses to assure that the existing copper loop remains capable of transmitting signals. If the customer subsequently elects to obtain service from a competitive local exchange carrier, the local incumbent exchange carrier shall, if necessary, restore the existing loop to serviceable condition.

(iii) Existing loop retirement. Where an incumbent local exchange carrier elects to retire an existing copper loop that is connected to a customer who is served by FTTH, it shall petition the Commission for approval of such retirement and the Commission shall make its determination on such petition within 90 days of submission.

From: James L. Henderson
To: James L. Henderson
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 10:20 AM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Frist
Representative Wamp
Message text follows:

James L. Henderson
900 Mtn. Crk. Rd. R320
Chattanooga, TN 374054500

February 13, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies arent required to allow competitors access to the market. Im also concerned about the Commissions move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

James L. Henderson

From: James L. Henderson
To: James L. Henderson
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 10:20 AM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Alexander

Message text follows:

James L. Henderson
900 Mtn. Crk. Rd. R320
Chattanooga, TN 374054500

February 13, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

James L. Henderson

From: JAMES WATSON
To: JAMES WATSON
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 3:27 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Shelby
Senator Sessions
Representative Cramer
Message text follows:

JAMES WATSON
3122 COUNTY ROAD 33
KILLEN , AL 35630

February 13, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

JAMES S. WATSON

From: Jeff Bower
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 8:44 AM
Subject: Linesharing

Please keep linesharing available to consumers of CLEC DSL. They are the ones that stand to lose if you remove their access to the high-frequency portion of the loop.

Regards,

Jeff Bower

From: Jennifer Whaley
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 9:24 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Jennifer L. Whaley

Access One, Inc.

820 W Jackson

6th Floor

Chicago IL 60607

ph 312.441.9947

fx 312.441.1010



February 5th, 2003

Dear Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein:

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, Access One, offers local telephone service in select SBC territories. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" – the ability to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their *continued market* dominance. Their strategy is to place certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to *limit* the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Whaley
Assistant to the Controller
Access One Incorporated

↳

From: Jim Roberts
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 12:24 PM
Subject: UNE-Platform Letter Jonathan Adelstein.doc



February 5th, 2003

Dear Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein:

I **ask** your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, Access One, offers local telephone service in select SBC territories. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" – the UNE-Platform – to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Jim Roberts
System Administrator
Access One Incorporated

From: Jim Roberts
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 12:26 PM
Subject: UNE-Platform Letter KathleenAbernathy.doc

o



February 5th, 2003

Dear Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy:

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, Access One, offers local telephone service in select SBC territories. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" - the UNE-Platform - to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Jim Roberts
System Administrator
Access One Incorporated