

Original

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-98

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Documents

Written communication

- HARMAN COMM. SIGNEES

11 thru 13

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-98

From: Andre
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 8:32 AM
Subject: Line sharing - please preserve all competitor rights to copper and existing RTs

Dear Commissioner Copps,

Please preserve cheap competitor access to existing copper lines and RTs!

The expansion of broadband depends on reasonable prices to the consumer, which in turn hinges on the preservation of competition - not just inter-modal competition (i.e., DSL vs. Cable), but intra-modal competition (i.e., DSL vs. DSL as well). This is especially true because in many places, there is no choice - only DSL OR Cable is available.

Unless you preserve competitors' access, at very reasonable prices (determined by local regulators, who are in the best position to judge), to the copper lines to consumers' homes, you will in effect be creating "monopoly pools" across the country. And the RBOC and cable monopolists in these areas will cross subsidize their monopoly profits into areas where they face competition, with the effect of killing off their competition.

I have a masters' degree in economics, but it doesn't take anywhere near that to come to this rather obvious conclusion. Let's call a spade a spade.

Please preserve line sharing and access to EXISTING RTs at rates determined by local regulators. If RBOCs want to create new facilities to serve new markets, I suppose they could be granted exclusivity to those new investments - but they should not have any right to preferred or sole access to the existing network - it was paid for long ago by the taxpayers.

Thank you for your attention on this matter

Sincerely,

Andre Williamson
Silver Spring, MD
301 585 2056

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

DOCUMENT OFF-LINE

This page has been substituted for one of the following:

- o This document *is* confidential **(NOT FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION)**

- o An oversize page or document (such as a map) which was *too* large to be scanned into the ECFS system.

- o Microfilm, microform, certain photographs or videotape.

- o Other materials which, for one reason or another, could not be scanned into the ECFS system.

The actual document, page(s) or materials may be reviewed **(EXCLUDING CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS)** by contacting an Information Technician at the FCC Reference Information Centers) at **445** 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC, Room CY-A257 Please note the applicable docket or rulemaking number, document type and any other relevant information about the document in order to ensure speedy retrieval by the Information Technician

51 written ex parte

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-98

From: andrew.mcneill@if.dk
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 1:37 AM
Subject: Don't remove 'LINE-SHARING' (high frequency portion of voice lines)

Don't remove 'LINE-SHARING' (high frequency portion of voice lines)

This is the only means of bringing competition into the local residential DSL market.

Any fool can see that

Andrew McNeill

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: ANTHONY FORTINO
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 7:57 PM
Subject: Fwd: Preserve Line Sharing

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From ANTHONY FORTINO
To afortino@comcast.net
cc
Subject Fwd Preserve Line Sharing

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From ANTHONY FORTINO
To Mike Powell
cc
Subject Preserve Line Sharing

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner

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.

Thank you for your support of competition.

Sincerely

Anthony P. Fortino
Rochester Hills, Michigan

From: Beth Zivkovic
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu. Feb 13, 2003 12:05 PM
Subject: Save the Platform

RECEIV

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary



RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the SecretaryFebruary 13th, 2003

Dear Commissioner Michael Copps:

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,

Beth Zivkovic
Access One Incorporated

From: beth@cehca.org
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 12.2003 4:30 PM
Subject: Reject Bells' Monopoly Bid

Message from TURN

1 main st

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear FCC Commissioner: Elimination of competitive access to wholesale phone networks will kill local competition and leave consumers with the worst of both worlds, an unregulated monopoly. Please reject the Bells self serving proposals to eliminate the UNE-Ps, which would pave the way for a bigger, meaner phone monopoly unrestrained by regulatory oversight.

Sin

Generated by :
EasyForm - Copyright 1999 by Thomas J. Delorme
<http://getperl.virtualave.net>

From: Bill Newton
To: Mike Powell, Kevin Martin, Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps
Date: Thu. Feb 13, 2003 10:28 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Florida Consumer Action Network
2005 Pan Am Cir Ste 200
Tampa, FL 33607

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2303

February X, 2003

Federal Communications Commission

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Abernathy, Adelstein, Copps and ~~Martin~~: Office of the Secretary

Almost seven years after Congress passed the groundbreaking Telecommunication Act, the promise of real local phone competition is finally starting to become a reality for consumers in Florida.

According to the most recent data released by your agency, new market entrants provide service to more than nine percent of local telephone lines in Florida, up from **six** percent in December 1999. As a result, tens of thousands of Florida residents are now benefiting from greater choice and better pricing in local phone service.

However, just as competition begins to take hold, we understand that the Commission is considering a proposal that would significantly scale back or even eliminate the very regulations - known as Unbundled Network Element Platform, or UNE-P - that have played a critical role in promoting the recent surge in local phone competition.

Were the Commission to initiate such a major reversal of policy, all the progress that has been made in Florida to bring real local phone competition to residential markets would be reversed. Once again, consumers would be stuck with little or no choice, and the savings and service improvements that accompany increased competition would quickly evaporate.

Rather than adopting policies that would only serve to undermine telecom competition, we urge the Commission to demonstrate its commitment to the interests of consumers, and the future of competition, by reaffirming your support for UNE-P.

Indeed, according to a report issued recently by the National Association of State Consumer Advocates, the continued existence of UNE-P is vital to the future of local competition in local markets across the country.

The report found that, in many markets, the vast majority of residential and small business consumers who have switched their local phone service to a new competitor are served by market entrants who rely on the UNE-P system. In Texas, for example, competitors that depend on UNE-P provide service to 77 percent of switched customers. Without the current UNE-P structure, the report concludes, "it is unlikely that even the limited amount of residential competition that exists today could survive."

It is also critical that the Commission preserve the position of state regulators in maintaining and promoting competition in our telecom markets. State utility regulators like the Illinois Commerce Commission have played a vital part in opening local telephone markets across the country up to competition, and we believe that they are best placed to make decisions that impact local markets

For local phone competition to continue to develop and flourish, state authorities must continue to have the flexibility to carry out their Congressionally mandated role of keeping local telephone markets open, and setting fair UNE-P prices.

Moreover, the Commission proposals that limit open access to communications networks, including fiber

networks are wrongheaded. Without open, non-discriminatory access to broadband networks, consumers will not realized the full potential of the Internet. Recent FCC decisions on broadband access policy threaten to inhibit innovation ad consumer choice in the high-speed Internet marketplace.

The Federal Communications Commission has both an obligation and a responsibility to protect the public interest, and promote the interests of consumers. If the FCC opts to abandon the pro-competition UNE-P and broadband framework established by the Telecom Act, just as it begins to deliver real savings and benefits to ordinary consumers, it will have failed on both counts.

We thank you for your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

Bill Newton
Executive Director
Florida Consumer Action Network
2005 Pan Am Cir Suite 200
Tampa, FL 33607
813-877-6712
813-877-6651 FAX
Billn@fcan.org

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: BUTCHBETZ@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 8:13 AM
Subject: Line Sharing

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

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

Thank You

Richard Betz

From: c gengler
To: Michael Copps
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 10:47 AM
Subject: Linesharing should be kept

Dear Comissioner Copps:

I have heard rumors that a deal was proposed to eliminate linesharing. This would be a huge mistake.

Linesharing and the limited competition that companies such as Covad have offered are the only things that have kept DSL access at reasonable levels

I am a Marketing Professor at Baruch college in New York. However, you do not need a Ph.D. to know that RBOCs will raise prices quickly without competition, and fewer people will have broadband access at higher prices.

If one of the FCCs goals is to bring broadband to every home in America, ending linesharing is a step away from that goal, not a step forward.

Sincerely,
Charles Gengler. PhD
Professor of Marketing
Baruch College

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day
<http://shopping.yahoo.com>

From: Carol Brownell
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 4:30 PM
Subject: Letter Regarding Changes

Dear Commissioner Copps:

I wrote to you awhile back asking that you encourage opening of the local telephone service competition. That was the best thing that has happened in the past 6 years. Consumers, who have been paying entirely too much for services, finally have some real choices when it comes to local and long distance services. The 1996 Telecommunications Act may not be perfect, but after 6 years and intelligent decisions by the FCC Commissioners, the consumers have some options that they never had before. That is a GREAT thing!

Even though SBC, BellSouth, Qwest and Verizon are complaining and whining that these smaller companies are taking away their customers--they are being paid for the use of their lines. The customers are leaving because they finally have a competitive choice. Everyone works very hard to earn a living. To spend double and triple for service from the present-day phone monopolies is criminal. Up until recently, consumers did not have a choice. Now they do. I would hate to see all that undone.

There are many reasons for the huge layoff in jobs, the loss of stock value, and the pressure the telecom monopolies are feeling. Even though the monopolies want everyone to believe it's these local market competitors that are the cause of this--nothing could be further from the truth. If they were giving consumers a good product at a competitive price and good customer service, they would not have the losses they are experiencing. They've been price-gouging customers for years and we, the consumers, are tired of it.

Most of their losses are from mismanagement of funds, top-heavy organizational set-ups, overspending on advertising that doesn't work, overspending on exploring foreign areas for service and just plain greed. Spending tens of millions of dollars a day on TV advertising, celebrities, telemarketers and switch-back bonus checks has not given the monopolies the loyal customers they've wanted. Besides, "Tweety Bird" didn't need \$2 million for that 30-second commercial--he's not even real! After 19 years of doing something that is not working, you'd think they would change their strategies and try to learn what does work for some smaller companies that are succeeding.

There's a downturn in lots of industries now, not just telecom. Maybe it's time for all these industries and companies to take a harder look at where they're wasting money and trim the "fat" and develop more efficient companies, the honest way--and not have to have the rules of the 1996 Telecom Act changed for their benefit. We consumers are happy with having a choice.

Thanks for listening

Respectfully

Carol Brownell
Atlanta, GA

From: Charles VanDrunen
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 4:29 PM
Subject: Linesharing

Please keep competition alive Keep linesharing

Charles VanDrunen

From: Chloe6172@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 12:22 AM
Subject: TR Review

Dear Commissioner Copps:

Please keep line sharing as it is now

Anything less will lead to less choice and competition and higher prices for customers and small businesses for broadband service.

Additionally, the deployment of broadband would ultimately be slowed across the country thus delaying key benefits that would help our economy.

Thank You.

Marilyn Sands
Wyomissing, PA

From: Donald Pernberton
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 6:04 AM
Subject: Please keep line-sharing

Mr. Copps

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.

Thank you Mr. Donald Pemberton

From: Donald Pernberton
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 6:04 AM
Subject: Please keep line-sharing

Mr. Copps

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.

Thank you Mr. Donald Pemberton

From: Donald Pemberton
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 7:59 PM
Subject: please keep line-sharing

Mr. Copps

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.

Thank you Mr. Donald Pemberton

From: Ed Hoey
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 4:30 PM
Subject: Line Sharing

Sir:

As a DSL user I feel it is critical to maintain the status quo re: line sharing.

Line sharing is the only reason affordable high speed DSL is available to the public

regards
Ed

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day
[http //shopping.yahoo.com](http://shopping.yahoo.com)

From: Edward Sullivan
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 8:00 PM
Subject: Line Sharing

Dear Commissioners and Chairman Powell

Please do not eliminate line-sharing. I have been a Covad DSL customer for almost 3 years and the service is reliable, (1 outage because verizon gave away my pair...the **VZ** field techs have NO means to test for digital signals on consumer loops), the employees are very responsive and the billing is accurate and dependable.

I can say NONE of this for Verizon.

1. Their service is not reliable. My Verizon service was terminated twice because of personnel errors (T1 line and DSL Line...yes in my house...I'm a geek). They also created a **party** line between my phone line and my neighbors fax line which they refused to troubleshoot because I had dial tone. I have an outstanding issue with the PUC because of this issue...my neighbor's long distance charges went on my bill and Verizon would not give me the credit.

2. Their employees are not courteous. I've had several discussions with no resolution as described above. They are very bureaucratic and have very little interest in helping their customers. I should not have to go to a third party(PUC) to resolve a billing issue. **A** tech once showed up at my house intoxicated and passed out on my lawn. (Fall of 2000.. day strike was announced...he must have been celebrating)

3. Billing system is a MESS. Many examples...too numerous to list

My other less than adequate broadband options are as follows:

1. Cable (RCN or Comcast). In addition to Covad. I have had Comcast and RCN. The quality of service is very poor. The bandwidth is variable, the systems are prone to outages, and the latency is less than adequate during peak times. RCN has very nice customer focused employees, but Comcast's employees are neither.

2. Satellite. Latent. Shooting signals into space does horrible things to round trip ping times and trace routes. Not very useful for heavy peer to peer applications.

3. Verizon DSL. My stomach aches thinking of being forced to deal with them for DSL.

I don't want to deal with Verizon for DSL. DSL is a great product...I love Covad. Please please please don't make me deal with Verizon. Keep line sharing!!!

Sincerely,

Edward Sullivan

From: Edwards, Gary
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 2:34 PM
Subject: 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

Thank You

Gary Edwards

From: EflerInv@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein. Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 6:11 AM
Subject: line sharing

Please continue line sharing for high speed Internet. (DSL)

Don't give this back to the Bells.

1) The Bells made their agreement with Senator Hollings. in exchange for long distance.

2) Very bad for the country and broadband to return that competitive advantage to the Bells.

3) Keep the last mile open.

If you give control of last mile to the Bells, you can say good-bye to residential broadband.. and growth. Which will have a direct effect on home based business....a trend in this country, which helps parents take care of their children instead of day care. DSL will be priced out of range. Haven't you learned by now the Bells have no integrity? What ever empty promises they may give you, won't be kept or enforced by you or any other future Chairman or Commissioners regardless of your admirable intentions.

I do not want the Bells to have a competitive advantage, or monopoly to my house or business.

Thank you for reading this mail.

This is a historic time. How do you want history to view you during the time of broadband and the Internet revaluation? As an American, or an extension of the Bell office.

Please do the right thing not the Bell thing.

Respectfully,
American, Tax payer, Voter, concerned citizen
Randall Effler

From: eleastlansing <eleastlansing@yahoo.com>
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu. Feb 13, 2003 8:20 AM
Subject: keep line sharing

Mr. Copps,

We must keep line sharing, it is good for competition

Dan Bakita

From: FisherrnanBOZ@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: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 12:13 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: George K Issa
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 4:27 PM
Subject: Triennial Review - Keep Line Sharing! This From a College Student!

Hello,

My name is George Issa and I am a Junior at Northeastern University in Boston, Ma where I study Finance and MIS.

I am very concerned about line sharing and what is being done at the federal level to preserve it.

One, the Bells all push the benefits of line sharing when they advertise their DSL products (i.e short install times, same line, and no need to be home for installation). I think it would be extremely unfair for a data CLEC not to be given this right as well. CLEC's who use line sharing are paying for each line. This is almost like free money for the Bells. They do not pay anything to have a CLEC rent the high frequency portion of the loop; just for basic maintainance that would be completed regardless if the high frequency was being used.

Also, if UNE-P is abolished over time or with certain guidelines (which I agree with), once a CLEC becomes facilities-based, not only will they have to buy new switches/ATM's/DSLAM's, but also pay huge upfront costs for providing an unnecessary copper line to a customers house. A cost that will most likely be turned to the customer.

As a person who loves competition and America, please do everything in your power to keep line sharing where it is today. Do not let the big business / money influence who the government works for, the typical hard-working American. Remeber that Martin!

Thank you.

George K Issa
617.201.0207 - Cell
617.364.7545 - Home

From: Gerry Wiczerza
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 9:15 AM
Subject: Line Sharing

Commissioner Copps,

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: Glaser. Garry S.
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu. Feb 13,2003 2:46 AM
Subject: DSL Line Sharing

Mr. Copps,

I'm sending you this message to urge you and the other commissioners to preserve line sharing. Removing or increasing the cost of sharing an existing copper line will only increase consumer costs and further reduce the number of choices.

Example:

Here at the Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula (CHOMP) we are in the process of phasing out 100's of private Frame Relay, ISDN, and dialup circuits and replacing them with DSL and VPN services. These existing private circuits provide remote doctor offices and clinics with CHOMP services such as email and patient care management.

To date we have converted about a dozen remote sites to DSL and in all cases we have been forced to use SBC for DSL provisioning. I am continuously checking other DSL providers (with better rates) for availability as we convert these remote sites but no alternative providers are available YET. We would prefer to use multiple DSL providers not only because of price but for redundancy. If one provider has network issues, it does not affect all our sites.

The lack of multi-provider DSL availability may be because of remote terminal access or small market issues but if forced line sharing is terminated, CHOMP will be stuck with SBC. I can't believe this the outcome you are striving for.

Please preserve line sharing!

Thanks and best regards,

Garry Glaser

Confidentiality Notice:

This is a transmission from Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula. This message and any attached documents may be confidential and contain information protected by state and federal medical privacy statutes. They are intended only for the use of the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please accept our apologies and notify the sender.

Thank you

From: Ho, Ray
To: Michael Copps
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: Jeff Bower
To: Michael Copps
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: John Erb
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 4:30 PM
Subject: Tri Review

The abuses of the ILECs are so well documented (their foot dragging, obstructionism, monopolistic abuses, etc. with respect to the Telecom Act), that there can only be one reason for any of you to go along with their wish list and that is that they are buying you off with promises of campaign contributions or worse.

The CLEC industry **is** the only reason that people and businesses today aren't still forced to use ISDN lines at inflated prices. Let the ILECs maintain the last mile and open up access to those lines to all comers and watch how quickly investment and speedy internet access ramps up. You guys are killing the industry with the uncertainty that results from the way you play with the rules or threaten to play with the rules.

Don't be misled by the promises of the ILECs to cover the nation in fiber if only unfettered. The best predictor of how a person or corporation will behave in the future is how they have behaved in the past. The miserable record of the ILECs is there for all of you to see. Don't condemn the nation to ten more years like the last ten.

The US is being left behind in the broadband race, but the ILECs are not the winning horse in this race. Open up the nation's broadband pipes to all comers in a fair market. And for God's sake stay the course so the rules are clear, understandable, consistent, durable and ENFORCED.

John Erb

From: John Erb
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 2:09 PM
Subject: ILEC Bells

I am stunned by the reports that you are considering giving in to the ILECs based on their promise that they alone can make investments in high speed internet access.

On what basis is this at all believable? Their track record is pathetic. They are only offering DSL now because CLEC competitors began to offer it

Please preserve line sharing and market competition for the ILECs.

John Erb

From: John Mora
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 2:02 PM
Subject: Linesharing Removal Hurts Broadband AND Local Voice Competition

Dear Commissioner Copps

I am concerned about recent reports which indicate that linesharing may not be federally mandated in current drafts of the favored plan initiated by NARUC and modified by Commissioner Martin.

A potentially unintended consequence of linesharing removal would be the ability of the Bells to close certain lines to local voice competition. The Bells currently have millions of DSL customers -- removal of linesharing would mean that local competitors could not lease the voice segment of the line without losing their DSL service. In many areas, RBOC DSL is the only form of broadband available.

As a consumer, linesharing is very important to me because it removes the barrier of the last mile (which would be impossible for any competitor to replicate), and allows competitors to offer DSL at competitive rates. In fact, I have seen a gradual decrease in rates, from over \$200/month in 1998, to just around \$40/month currently. This reduction in price is a direct result of competition.

Simply put, removal of linesharing would lead to higher prices for broadband internet access, less competition for local voice service, and slower deployment of next generation broadband solutions. I hope you take these critical factors into consideration when making your decision.

Thank you for your attention

Best Regards
John Mora

From: JTAN
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 7:57 PM
Subject: line sharing

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: KENfromTN100@aol.com
To: traceross@aol.com
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 2:09 PM
Subject: KEEP Line-Sharing!! Otherwise, prices will ONLY GO UP(like cableTV)

Commissioner,

Without Competition, VOICEBDATA SERVICES WILL ONLY GO UP....JUST LIKE CABLE TV.

For the sake of the Consumers..... PLEASE KEEP LINE-SHARING

Thank You for your consideration

From: Laura Adams
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 2:26 PM
Subject: keep line sharing!

Please don't eliminate line sharing. It is wrong to undermine competition! As a small business owner I am worried about my bottom line. This will create higher prices for broadband services. not lower them. Why in the world would you see it any other way?

Please think about the many people who have to count their pennies when trying to make a profit!
Laura Adams
5301 Mohawk Ln
Fairway, KS 66205

From: Levi Wallach
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy. Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13,2003 12:22 **AM**
Subject: Keep line sharing as is

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

Thank You.

Levi Wallach

From: Martin Pedersen
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 1:26 AM
Subject: 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

Thank You

Best regards

Martin Pedersen
Team Electric Oy Ab

Tel.: +358 9 85695489

Fax: +358 9 4122024

Mobile: +358 415015491

e-mail: martin.pedersen@team-electric.com <http://www.team-electric.com>

From: Mdadokjr@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13.2003 8:21 AM
Subject: Line Sharing

Dear Mr. Copps:

As a consumer, I am very much against the elimination or curtailing of line sharing. I believe that expansion of DSL will only occur if competition is **preserved**. I also believe that a significant expansion of broadband use by businesses and consumers will have a very positive effect on the economy.

Sincerely,
Michael D. O'Keeffe
2/13/03

From: Melissa Staehle
To: Michael *Copps*
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 1:43 PM
Subject: Save the UNE-Platform

Please see the attached letter.



February 13,2003

Dear Commissioner Michael Copps:

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 WE-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,

Melissa Staehle
Marketing Representative
Access One Incorporated

From: michael walsh
To: Mike Powell, KQAWBSITE@fcc.gov. Michael Capps
Date: Thu, Feb 13.2003 12:24 AM
Subject: BellSouth Deception!

Hello Ms. Winters: Sun Sentinel Newspaper, FLL

I was referred to you by Maggie the business editor who told me that you handle BellSouth Telecommunications etc.

I have pertinent data for you concerning a charge that all BellSouth customers are paying that very few of us know anything about. This charge is neither mandated by the FCC or collected by them. Also the PSC as BellSouth has stated has not ordered BellSouth to list this charge as an "FCC charge".

The charge in question is the: " FCC Charge For Network Access". In actualitie this charge is really a " Subscriber Line Charge" with BellSouth listing the charge saying that it is an "FCC Charge"? In order to fully inform you of what their currently doing to confuse the majority of their customers we need to examine this charge in detail etc

The FCC has authorized a " Charge". The FCC does not require that BellSouth charge a charge. BellSouth claims that this charge is necessary to recover their costs for interstate access to the transmission lines for long distance calls only? Subscribers are also charged whether they make long distance calls or not?

The truth **Ms. Winters** is that once those transmission lines are installed their is minimal maintenance necessary unless their is wind damage from a storm etc. The charge as it is listed is deceiving as the majority of their customers think that the charge is an FCC Charge as it is currently listed. BellSouth does not desire to lose a good thing that is currently bringing in Hundreds of Millions of dollars every month for each telephone line etc. If they were honest about this charge they would be listing it as a " Subscriber Line Charge" which is exactly what it is!

Unsuspecting consumers have no idea as to who is collecting this charge thinking that it is a government charge as it so states etc. Another fact that needs to be brought forward is that this charge continues to increase with it currently at \$6.00 ,with it also being "Capped" by the FCC? Last year the charge was \$4.35, and later this year it will increase once again to \$6.50!

How can a charge be "Capped" that continues to increase on a yearly basis whenever BellSouth needs more of our money? I have written to both the FCC and the PSC and their downplaying this entire matter. In fact the FCC realizes what has occurred here, and also the PSC to a point where their not even responding intelligently to address this unwarranted and excessive out of line charge etc?

I have numerous letters from both BellSouth's attorney where she has contradicted herself explaining this charge. I also have information from the PSC titled, " Navigating Your Phone Bill". I also received a consumer fact sheet from the FCC.

This case has merit and i feel that the general public needs to know what is going on here. I will attach the letters i received from BellSouth along with information from the FCC. I will also e-mail you the pamphlet that i received from the PSC on "Navigating Your Phone Bill etc".

Please let me know if you require further information on this issue as i have researched this extensively to uncover the truth about this unjustified charge etc.

Thanks Ms Winters

Sincerely,

Michael Walsh

Spokesman. (954) 966-0466

Tired of spam? Get advanced junk mail protection with MSN 8

CC: jadelstein@fcc.gov, Kevin Martin, ljaber@psc.state.fl.us, tdeason@psc.state.fl.us

From: MKLOUIE@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 10:46 AM
Subject: RE: 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

Thank you very much

Sincerely,

Melvin Louie

From: rnrnwwhh
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 1:22 PM
Subject: preserve line sharing!

Dear Commissioners:

I am extremely concerned about discussions taking place at the FCC. and the implications these discussions have for the our country. Recently, there have been discussions aimed at eliminating linesharing for DSL communications, or changing wholesale line pricing to make in infeasible to compete with RBOC offerings. I ask that rethink these issue because of the following reasons:

- 1) It will decrease competition
- 2) The RBOCS have already declared their intent to raise prices and it will cost consumers BILLIONS almost immediately
- 3) Higher Prices will slow broadband deployment.
- 3) Without competition, their is no driving force for the RBOCs to spend on innovation and improvement, it would not be profitable.

Please help keep
broadband deployment on track for the economic future of our country.

Sincerely,

Margaret Hander
Orford, NH
altenergy@covad.net

CC: kabernath@fcc.gov. Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein

From: Richard T. Hartman
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2003 7:56 PM
Subject: 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

Thank You

Dr. Richard Hartman

From: Rick Leach
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu. Feb 13, 2003 7:25 AM
Subject: linesharing

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

Thank You

From: Sandra Haverlah
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 1:07 PM
Subject: Letter from Texas Consumer Association

Texas Consumer Association
44 East Avenue, Suite 202
Austin, Texas 78701

February 12, 2003

Chairman Powell:

Almost seven years after Congress passed the groundbreaking Telecommunication Act, the promise of real local phone competition is finally starting to become a reality for consumers in Texas.

According to the most recent data released by your agency, new market entrants provide service to more than sixteen percent of local telephone lines in Texas, a dramatic increase from only four percent in December 1999. As a result, millions of Texas residents are now benefiting from greater choice and better pricing in local phone service.

However, just as competition begins to take hold, we understand that the Commission is considering a proposal that would significantly scale back or even eliminate the very regulations - known as Unbundled Network Element Platform, or UNE-P - that have played a critical role in promoting the recent surge in local phone competition.

Were the Commission to initiate such a major reversal of policy, all the progress that has been made in Texas to bring real local phone competition to residential markets would be reversed. Once again, consumers would be stuck with little or no choice, and the savings and service improvements that accompany increased competition would quickly evaporate.

Rather than adopting policies that would only serve to undermine telecom competition, we urge the Commission to demonstrate its commitment to the interests of consumers, and the future of competition, by reaffirming your support for UNE-P.

Indeed, according to a report issued recently by the National Association of State Consumer Advocates, the continued existence of UNE-P is vital to the future of local competition in local markets across the country.

The report found that, in many markets, the vast majority of residential and small business consumers who have switched their local phone service to a new competitor are served by market entrants who rely on the UNE-P system. In Texas, for example, competitors that depend on UNE-P provide service to 77 percent of switched customers. Without the current UNE-P structure, the report concludes, "it is unlikely that even **the** limited amount of residential competition that exists today could survive."

It is also critical that the Commission preserve the position of state regulators in maintaining and promoting competition in our telecom markets. State utility regulators like the Public Utility Commission of Texas have played a vital part in opening local telephone markets across the country up

to competition, and we believe that they are best placed to make decisions that impact local markets.

For local phone competition to continue to develop and flourish, state authorities must continued to have the flexibility to carry out their Congressionally mandated role of keeping local telephone markets open, and setting fair UNE-P prices.

Moreover, the Commission proposals that limit open access to communications networks, including fiber networks are wrong. Without open, non-discriminatory access to broadband networks, consumers will not realized the full potential of the Internet. Recent FCC decisions on broadband access policy threaten to inhibit innovation ad consumer choice in the high-speed Internet marketplace.

The Federal Communications Commission has both an obligation and a responsibility to protect the public interest, and promote the interests of consumers. If the FCC opts to abandon the pro-competition UNE-P and broadband framework established by the Telecom Act, just as it begins to deliver real savings and benefits to ordinary consumers, it will have failed on both counts.

We thank you for your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

Sandra Haverlah
President Texas Consumer Association

cc: Commissioners Martin, Abernathy, Adelstein and Copps

CC: Kevin Martin, Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Adelstein. Michael Copps

From: Scott Sutton
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 2:16 AM
Subject: Please keep line sharing as is.

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.

Thank You.

Scott Sutton

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day

From: Steve Brown
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Feb 13.2003 9:40 AM
Subject: 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

Thank You

Steve Brown

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day

From: STOCKZRUS@aol.com
To: Michael **Copps**
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 7:51 AM
Subject: TR REVIEW

Save the American consumer

Vote to KEEP LINESHARING

Vote to KEEP COMPETITION ALIVE IN AMERICA

Vote to ALLOW CLECS ACCESS TO THE LAST MILE

Thank you, a concerned voter and consumer of DSL

From: Tanya Dupuis
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 7:24 AM
Subject: linesharing

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

Thank You

Impossible is a word to be found only in the dictionary of fools.
--Unknown

From: Thom Hart
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 12:16 PM
Subject: RE: CC Docket No 01-338

I'm writing to you concerning CC Docket No. 01-338, Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers.

As President of our local economic development organization, I see how communication technology effects business in our community and therefore support the following points:

1. Broadband facilities should not have unbundling requirements extended to them. Broadband development is extremely important in creating new jobs in the communications sector and increasing capital spending. Small and large businesses depend more and more on Broadband products and services, and freeing broadband investment from costly unbundling requirements will help business.
2. The telecom industry needs a national framework created by the FCC that will provide incentives for facility investment and will create an environment allowing for increased competition. This can be accomplished by the FCC eliminating unbundled switching and the unbundled element platform.
3. The FCC should eliminate facility unbundling rules as these have been counter productive to development in the telecommunications industry and the high tech manufacturing sector. Jobs, capital investment and capital spending have both been negatively effected by these irrational unbundling rules

Thom Hart
Quad City Development Group
(309) 788-7436 or (563) 326-1005
www.quadcities.org

CC: Kathleen Abernathy. Michael Coppins. KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein

From: Tiffany Jones
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 5:17 PM
Subject: Save the UNE-Platform

<<UNE-Platform Letter Michael Copps.doc>>

Tiffany Jones

Dedicated Provisioning Manager

Access One, Inc.

820 W. Jackson Blvd

6th Floor

Chicago, IL 60607

312.441.9908

fax 312.441.1010

Toll Free 800-804-8333 x 908



February 13th, 2003

Dear Commissioner Michael Copps:

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,

Tiffany Jones
Dedicated Provisioning Manager
Access One Incorporated

From: TPRESCH1@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2003 11:01 AM
Subject: line sharing

please keep line sharing, competition is good for arnerica

From: bicyclepower
To: Michael Copps
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 8:59 PM
Subject: PRESERVE LINE SHARING!!!!!!!!!!!!ETC!!!!!!!!!!

RECEIVED

I implore you to PRESERVE LINE SHARING, GIVE OPEN ACCESS TO ALL including CLEC's and NOT to RE-MONOPOLIZE THE BELLS!!!!!!!!!!!!!! I find it simply horrible that during times like these, that we the people are in, that the members of the FCC would even consider selling their souls to the Baby Bells. Look yourselves in the mirror and make the right choice for THE CONSUMER!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Thank you,
Robert P. Corrette

FEB 7, 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary