

**SUNSHINE PERIOD****RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**From:** jack@midpac.net  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 3:43AM  
**Subject:** (No subject)

Dear Sir;

One of the certain effects of the proposed rule changes now under consideration by the FCC whereby ILEC unbundled services will be eliminated to CLECs will be the demise of independent ISP nationwide - as the ILECs will raise the cost of PRI lines to unsustainable levels. We have already seen these actions in Verizon's and SBC's behavior in California and Hawaii with respect to DSL.

Is this what you really want - all the small and medium ISPs and all the associated services and revenue that is created and maintained locally as well as the competitive level of services they bring to the market place GONE!!

If you think this is an exaggeration please look into the California and Hawaii DSL markets. If you allow these companies to control access to the copper lines that they hold a virtual monopoly over you not only will create the conditions whereby existing services like locally provided dsl and dialup will disappear but you will also eliminate the possibilities for new technologies in wireless to be developed.

You are being asked to reinstate one of the most onerous monopolies ever allowed to be imposed in the US - with the resulting 50 years of stagnation and poor service. Think about this and think further that it was not until the Federal government broke up AT&T that the revolution in telecommunications really began to occur. Think carefully what you are being asked to do - this isn't only a question of a fight between many large telecommunications companies - this is about the potential destruction of the environment that allowed 15 years of unfettered technological creativity, entrepreneurial energy and innovation. Look at the fines levied against SBC - fines that this company considers simply as a part of the cost of doing business rather than the result of its flaunting the law. Look at Verizon's decisions NOT to provide broadband to those areas that do not provide ENOUGH ROI. Look even harder at the innovation and energy put forth by the small companies enabled by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Baby Bells have clearly embarked on an aggressive plan to re-monopolize as much of the Telco infrastructure as they possibly can - as owning this infrastructure will allow them to monopolize the services now supported by this infrastructure. Access to this infrastructure is vital to the competitive basis of a free society and vital to innovation and vital to sustaining a quality of service level that extends to the most local of levels. I urge you to think prudently and remember your history - remember the years of one phone company and what that was like when all you needed was a phone line.

As an addenda I'd like you to check into the level of service provided to Hawaii by Verizon. This company is reviled in Hawaii. It is a monopoly. The over riding opinion of its services and support is negative. It refuses to provide broadband to many areas. It is a virtual monopoly in Hawaii.

Sincerely  
Jack Hendrickson  
Lihue, Kauai, HI

---

Jumping through hoops to get E-mail on the road?  
You've got two choices: Join the circus, or use Molly Mail.

Molly Mail -- <http://www.mollymail.com>

---

Having trouble sending email from different locations ?  
Need a single outgoing mail server that will work from anywhere ?

Set it to smtp.com and never have to change it again !

<http://www.smtp.com>

---

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**From:** Don Fitzpatrick  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 9:53AM  
**Subject:** fair broadband access for small business

Mr. Powell,

As an owner of a small software company, my concern over potential changes in regulations affecting broadband access to the Internet stems from years of personal and business experience. It is difficult to overstate the importance of fairly-priced Internet access to small businesses.

To compete with large companies and, in some cases, to even be qualified as a supplier to many Fortune 500 companies, small businesses are forced to communicate electronically. Broadband Internet access for many small businesses today is a matter of survival, not convenience.

However, I have experienced considerable frustration with obtaining reasonably-priced broadband access for both myself and my customers. Today, after years of requesting better access at reasonable prices, many small businesses like ours still have no access available except for very costly T1 lines.

In our own case, even though we are located in a major industrial park in a suburb west of Milwaukee, Ameritech has simply chosen not to provide DSL service, apparently for marketing reasons. Because our survival depends on providing online customer help desk support, our company of only ten employees needs to spend \$1000/month for T1 access. This is a story I hear countless times from our small-business clients as well.

Both Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and the major cable suppliers are in an effective monopoly position and are able to cherry pick the services they offer, with little regard for what their customers actually require to operate competitively in today's high-speed environment.

The ideal solution would be for both ILECs and cable companies to be required to provide UNEs (and the cable equivalent) as a condition of their access to their markets so that all suppliers - both large and small - would be on a fair and level playing field. The potential lack of investment by major suppliers would not be an issue if it were a requirement for entry into consumer and small business markets for all monopoly suppliers. Allowing further restriction to access by the monopoly suppliers is not a satisfactory answer.

Please don't allow the situation to be perpetuated where the monopoly suppliers are able to continue to constrain access to these vital services at fair prices. Our country needs the vitality of small businesses, which in turn, badly need economical Internet access to participate fairly in our networked business environment.

Thank you for your service to our country.

Don Fitzpatrick, President  
InterNetworX Systems Inc.

[dwf@InterNetworXsystems.com](mailto:dwf@InterNetworXsystems.com)  
[www.InterNetworXsystems.com](http://www.InterNetworXsystems.com)  
262-792-0050 phone  
262-792-0620 fax

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**From:** Jeff Bower  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 10:13AM  
**Subject:** History to repeat itself!!!

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

HOW MANY TIMES DOES HISTORY HAVE TO REPEAT ITSELF. ONCE AGAIN THE COMMISSION IS ABOUT TO PUT FORTH ANOTHER REVIEW THAT WILL BE THROWN OUT IN COURT. ONCE AGAIN THE CHAIRMAN POWELL STANDS TO WRITE ANOTHER DISSENT THAT WILL SHOW WHY THE OTHER FCC COMMISSIONERS ARE INCOMPETENT IN CREATING A SOUND LEGAL STANCE TO PROMOTE TELECOMMUNICATIONS..... DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHY THESE GET THROWN OUT IN COURT. BECAUSE YOU CANNOT MAKE A LAW. ALL YOU DO IS INTERPRET THE LAW!!!!!!! THE SUPREME COURT DOESN'T TRADE UNE-P FOR STATES RIGHTS FOR LINESHARING. THAT IS NOT YOUR JOB. YOU CANNOT JUST TRADE CONCESSIONS. THAT IS NOT THE LAW!!!

DON'T WASTE A WHOLE YEARS WORTH OF WORK BY PUSHING FORTH A TRIENNIAL REVIEW PLAN THAT WILL BE THROWN OUT IN COURT. LISTEN TO MICHAEL POWELL. HE'S DISSENTED TWICE IN HISTORY ON THIS MATTER AND BOTH TIMES HE'S CORRECT IN HIS ANALYSIS. YOU MAY NOT LIKE THE GUY BUT AT LEAST HE KNOWS TO KEEP OWN PERSONAL AGENDAS OUT OF THE REVIEW PROCESS AND REVIEW BASED ON WHAT WILL STAND UP IN COURT. THATS WHY HES ALWAYS THE DISSENTER. BECAUSE HE'S NOT WILLING TO CIRCUMVENT THE LAW.

THIS IS SIMPLE. FOR EVERY STANCE, YOU SHOW IN THE TELECOM ACT OF 1996 YOU SUPPORTING EVIDENCE. IF ITS NOT IN THERE, DON'T VOTE THAT WAY. ITS BEEN DONE IN THE PAST AND EVERY SINGLE TIME IT HAS BEEN THROWN OUT IN COURT.

SOMETIMES I FEEL ITS THE FCC MAIN OBJECTIVE TO CONTINUE TO THROW THINGS INTO THE COURT!!!!!!

LOOK AT UNE. ALL OF UNE WILL BE THROWN OUT IN 1 DAY BECAUSE THE PRIOR COMMISSION MADE A 1 ERROR. THATS WHAT THE COURTS DO. THEY FIND 1 ERROR OUT THE WINDOW YOUR REVIEW GOES. THEY ARE THROWING OUT ALL OF UNE.

WHAT A WASTE ! YOU'RE GOING TO PUT FORTH A PLAN THAT WILL FUND THE LAWYERS FOR THE NEXT 2 YEARS INSTEAD OF THE TELECOM INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT IN TELECOM.

EXCELLENT JOB!

**From:** Steve Borsch  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 11:12AM  
**Subject:** About broadband....

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Chairman Powell,

I can't even imagine the issues you're wrestling with as the FCC is hammered on by lobbyists from all of the big players in telecom, tech company heads and others trying to preserve and extend their infrastructures or offerings...and restrict or limit competition. (Though I'm sure tech company heads are lobbying for federal investment to stimulate demand for I.T. products and services).

Without 'opening' free market dynamics by removing competitive obstacles to local-loop internet-based broadband offerings, I grow increasingly concerned that the massive engine of growth possibilities with digital technologies will remain stifled.

In the words of an old mentor of mine, "Borsch...just remember when you're negotiating a deal: everyone works toward their incentives. Discover these and you'll discover the keys to a successful deal." Aligning incentives for broadband investment must be job #1 for the FCC...is that right?

Just to illustrate the "bottom" and the "top" of what I see with the need for broadband, let me give you two examples. I wear two hats in my life: small business co-owner (with my wife) and a sales manager with the leading provider of enterprise-class web application software. The needs are quite different in these two areas, but broadband is key to both. Let me explain...

#### SMALL BUSINESS CO-OWNER

My wife runs a small publishing/consulting business ([www.trendcurve.com](http://www.trendcurve.com)) and broadband is \*as\* important to her as the telephone. In fact, email; ecommerce; publishing online; sending files to the printer; sending direct email pieces (which has been \*huge\* for her in cost-savings over snail-mail); allowing remote administration of her computers (since she cannot afford to have a systems admin on staff) and several other reasons make broadband an \*extremely\* important part of her business.

The kicker? The incredible obstacles and barriers she faced (as I did at home years ago) with DSL installation have been formidable. There is simply zero incentive for Qwest to hustle and install dry copper for a competing provider to supply her with DSL service (in this case, XO Comm. which she chose due to the multi-year and ongoing stunning incompetency USWest-then-Qwest has exhibited in several locations over the years with both she and I). Since XO is struggling for their life, the services and options available to her are expensive, limited and less than is available with business cable broadband (not yet available to her in her new office building).

She's just begun exploring VoIP (Vonage at [www.vonage.com](http://www.vonage.com)) as a way to perform outbound North American long distance calling activities and save

nearly \$400 per month in costs (which is a \*huge\* amount for her in a small business). Of course, I'm her defacto sysadmin and advisor on technology, and am concerned about discussions I've read online that VoIP may be in for some stiff regulations thus killing the cost advantages potentially.

More services; cheaper services and higher speed are all needs for her. The obstacles and barriers today are still too steep.

#### INTERNET SALES MANAGER

As a sales manager in Life Sciences with one of the leading enterprise-class internet software companies -- and a guy who lived through the 'peak' of the internet bubble and the trough of capital I.T. spending over the last two+ years -- I've formed some pretty strong opinions...

1. It is my fundamental belief that telecom's reluctance to aggressively embrace and roll-out DSL and other internet local-loop broadband options popped the internet bubble.

Telecom had zero incentive to rapidly create an infrastructure that would allow internet telephony options to flourish and kill their local telephony business. Long distance carriers were behind this too since a packet-based, internet VoIP acceleration would kill their long distance business (and even I have been seriously considering Vonage at home).

So cable broadband has been the primary installation winner in the broadband race. Even I tossed out DSL (again due to Qwest incompetency and moving of lines...but I won't digress in this email with an explanation) and took on cable broadband. However, with draconian "caps" and other troubling policies being considered by Time Warner and others, I view cable as being an option from which I'll flee the moment high speed DSL (or other competing technology) becomes available once again at my home.

With 802.11 build-outs and UWB possibilities looming on the horizon, I see the potential that always on; real-time accessible web/internet services will open up significant opportunities; drive investment; and stimulate the economy in ways we've not yet imagined.

2. National broadband is at least as important as the interstate highway system. You have a much better at-your-fingertips access to cost figures, but I've read estimates that -- in today's dollars -- the interstate highway system investment would equal roughly \$375B.

Since interstate highways carry mass vs. digital bits...this investment paid dividends in national defense certainly, but more so in stimulating free interstate commerce and movement by people.

I submit that a broadband infrastructure geared toward the moving of digital bits vs. mass promises to help eliminate pollution and oil consumption; stimulate products and services that the 'irrational exuberance' of the internet bubble hoped to provide; and that it will stimulate economic activity & investment in geographic regions of this country that are underutilized currently (by providing online services and

connectivity-to-companies that encourage job & company creation).

3. The company I'm with has an incredible portfolio of marquee customers in a wide variety of industries (including a lot of the cool dot.com companies). What I see and experience daily is a senior executive reluctance to invest in internet-based application development. Why? Partly the economy and the pending conflict with Iraq; partly the slow adoption of broadband; and partly the state of flux within the information technology sector.

But one thing is clear: always-on connections increase usage of web applications and content; wireless 802.11 connections have already increased demand for real-time access to information and companies web applications by mobile workers (and estimates are there are 40M of us); and that there is a slow-but-sure ramp-up in these kinds of adoption which is slowly creating a sense of urgency on strategists' part to invest in I.T. that is internet-centric.

My opinion? A major re-alignment of incentives in broadband -- and a national policy -- will create a significant sense of urgency on the part of CxO-level people to invest in technology as well as those consuming web content/applications (small, mid-size and enterprise companies as well as consumers) and get this internet engine of growth running well again.

-----  
I could go on and on but won't in this email. I applaud your efforts in free market activities and urge you to continue down the path of 'open' vs. 'regulated'. Thanks...

--  
Steve Borsch  
8907 Bradford Place  
Eden Prairie, MN 55347  
952.934.3599 home  
952.949.9393 office  
952.934.4034 fax

**From:** Morley Farquar  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 4:14PM  
**Subject:** Unbundled Network Elements Platform (UNE-P).

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner,

It seems to us that elimination of the Unbundled Network Elements Platform (UNE-P) would lead to total loss of competition in local phone service. This clearly must not be in the best interests of the consumer.

Sincerely, Mr. & Mrs. Morley S.

Farquar

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

**From:** Grant Millin  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 4:33PM  
**Subject:** Consider TURN policy first

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

Although market liberalization has some benefits, corporate market oligopolies have not always provided more, better, faster, and cheaper.

Please consider the reforms of The Utilities Reform Network and Public Citizen.

Thanks,

-- Grant Millin  
 WNC 911 Coalition for America  
 PO Box 1048  
 Asheville, NC 28802  
 Ph. 828.687.6900  
 Email: wnc911coalition@earthlink.net

URL: <http://thealliancefordemocracy.org/html/eng/1904-AA.shtml>

[www.democrats.com](http://www.democrats.com)

Stop Exploiting 911 for Bush's Political Gain: Move the 2004 Republican Convention Out of New York

"To George W. Bush, Karl Rove, and the Republican Party: We, the undersigned, are outraged by your cynical decision to hold the 2004 Republican Convention in New York City in a transparent and disgusting effort to exploit the profound pain of September 11 for the crass political gain of George W. Bush. Your motives are clear from the coverage in the New York Times: 'Republican officials said they chose New York over two competing cities, Tampa and New Orleans, in part because of what they described as the enormous political and emotional symbolism that has become attached to the city since the terror attack on Sept. 11, 2001.' Unfortunately, this is simply the culmination of a series of appalling actions by you to exploit 911 for political gain." Sign the petition!

3We have three huge warning signs. We1ve got terrorists connected to al-Qaeda out in Arizona, engaging in flight training, number one. Number two, we1ve got Moussaoui arrested and being interrogated in Minnesota. And number three, we1ve got the president being briefed while he1s on vacation in Texas about the possibility of these airplanes being hijacked. I mean, did it - was anything done about any of those things? (Sen. Edwards, ABC1s 3Good Morning America, 16 May 16, 2002)

Thoughtful Quotes... "If you would be a real seeker after truth, it is necessary that at least once in your life you doubt, as far as possible, all things." -- Rene Descartes

"They that can give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety". - Ben Franklin

3Each time a Human stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance." -Robert F. Kennedy, South Africa, 1966

"Things undreamt of are daily being seen, the impossible is ever becoming possible. We are constantly being astonished these days at the amazing discoveries in the field of violence. But I maintain that far more undreamt of and seemingly impossible discoveries will be made in the field of nonviolence. ✎ -- M. K. Gandhi

"That aspect of the modern crisis which is bemoaned as a "wave of materialism" is related to what is called the "crisis of authority". If the ruling class has lost its consensus, i.e. is no longer "leading" but only "dominant", exercising coercive force alone, this means precisely that the great masses have become detached from their traditional ideologies, and no longer believe what they used to believe previously, etc. The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear." -- Antonio Gramsci

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**From:** Charles Kalish  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 7:12PM  
**Subject:** de-regulation

Michael,  
Congratulations on a wonderful job representing the media business interests.

However, I would prefer that you not de-regulate the phone industry as the local Bells are asking. Any chance of you representing the rest of us for a change?

Charles Kalish  
San Francisco

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**From:** steven miller  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 7:14PM  
**Subject:** Nice try Mikey, the Baby Bells may have you in their pockets, but...

Despite a flurry of talks ahead of a vote due Thursday, Federal Communications Commission Chairman Michael Powell has failed to sway a majority of commissioners who oppose his plan to deregulate the regional Bells, say people familiar with the matter.

AP file  
Powell

The impasse means consumers likely will keep their array of discount choices for local phone service - but may enjoy fewer broadband options.

The standoff also sets up the unusual prospect of an FCC chairman being on the dissenting side for a major plan at the core of his agenda. A 3-2 vote against Powell's plan is expected.

Powell wants to stop forcing the Bells to rent call-routing switches and other parts of their networks to competitors at deeply discounted rates. AT&T and WorldCom have lured nearly 10 million local phone customers from the Bells by leasing their networks at discounts and then undercutting their retail prices.

Smiller

sioux city, ia

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**From:** LARS35@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 7:40PM  
**Subject:** Re: Telecom Decision 2/20/2003

Chairman Michael K. Powell

As a concerned individual involved with our Telecom Industry, I hope you make the right decision and allow Bell companies to charge the CLEC's with the appropriate rates. Don't let them "piggyback" on the strength of the main telephone company. We (the consumer) have seen no positive growth or competition evolve from the ruling passed in 1996. In fact, I've seen just the opposite. Consumers are waiting longer for service, outside infrastructures are deplorable and lay off's abound. In upstate New York alone, we have lost nearly 3,500 dedicated telecom technicians. Bell companies can't support the leaching effects of these CLEC's. They aren't trying to form their own backbone, they are merely using the existing facilities of the dominant telco company. They are getting basically a free ride. This truly hurts the company, the employee's, and most of all the consumers.  
Please abandon the 1996 telecom act. It doesn't work.

Sincerely,

Larry Briand  
Lars35@aol.com  
Western New York State

**RECEIVED**

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**MAR 18 2003**

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

**From:** Doreen McDaniels  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 9:21PM  
**Subject:** Phone Network Access

Dear Chairman Powell,

I believe that it is unfair to the local telephone companies to have to lease their lines at below cost prices to competitors. I liken the requirement to you having to buy a top of the line Lexus. You have to make the monthly payment, maintain it, pay to insure it and then have to let every neighbor on your block drive it when they want it, for however long they want it so long as they fill the gasoline tank when they are finished. If they are in an accident, you get to repair it on your insurance dime or out of your own pocket.

Sincerely,  
Doreen McDaniels

**RECEIVED**

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**From:** Kathy Pankow  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 10:42PM  
**Subject:** fair telecommunications policy

Dear Chairman Powell,  
Thank you for your efforts on behalf of SBC employees everywhere. Please ensure that a fair telecommunications policy will be enacted that encourages the growth and maintenance of our network. Please set fair wholesale prices and create a level playing field. CWA members have built the best network in the world and our jobs are at risk unless these unfair policies are changed. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,  
Kathy Pankow (wife of SBC employee)

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Tax Center - forms, calculators, tips, more  
<http://taxes.yahoo.com/>

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**From:** saabel3@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 10:45PM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Dear Chairmen,

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I am a telecom employee that was laid off due to the rules and regulations that were set forth by the government. I would hope that when you make your ruling that decides whether I and everyone else affected by you that you would take into consideration that my livelihood depends on your ruling on 2/20/03. Don't get me wrong, I agree with competition, but why would you let companies come in and give them a free ride based on an infrastructure that was built by myself and other employees with the resources provided by my employer, Verizon. It's just not fair, they don't have to go out there and replace the copper or fiber lines, we do!! If you are going to let them do that then they should have to pay for the maintenance.

Please! When you make your ruling all I ask is that you remember the people who aren't represented by lobbyists, influence, and especially money (actually, what's the difference?! Please remember that even though there are people who have basically bought and paid for this decision and expect it to be in their favor, there are a lot more people who are depending on YOU to make the most fair and the best decision for the working American people and their families, along with the people who expect the kind of service that they think that their money is paying for.

Please make the decision that's right and fair. In this case, when America is losing jobs left and right and you alone have the power to save tens of thousands of jobs I think that you have a responsibility to save American jobs.

Thank you for listening,  
Scott Abel

**From:** Martin Oppenheimer  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 10:55PM  
**Subject:** Re: Docket Nos. 02-52, 02-33, 01-337 and 01-338

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Powell,

Please make no changes in the Telecommunication Reform Act of 1996.

Proposals to suspend the Act as hyped by the Bell Companies would seriously hurt the small Internet Service Providers (ISP's) and Consumers of their Internet Services.

Respectfully,

Martin Oppenheimer N2HLA

**From:** saabel3@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Coppe, Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/19/03 10:56PM  
**Subject:** 2/20 HEARING: PLEASE READ!!!Fwd: (no subject)

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

To the Chairpersons of the FCC:

Please read the forwarded message and I urge you to consider my point of view along with thousands of others before you make your decision.

Sincerely,

Scott Abel

**CC:** saabel3@aol.com

**RECEIVED****SUNSHINE PERIOD**

MAR 18 2003

From: saabel3@aol.com

To: Commissioner Adelstein; Kathleen Abernathy; KM KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Mike Powell  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

cc:

Subject: (no subject)

Dear Chairmen,

I am a telecom employee that was laid off due to the rules and regulations that were set forth by my government. I would hope that when you make your ruling that decides whether I and everyone else affected by you that you would take into consideration that my livelihood depends on your ruling on 2/20/03. Don't get me wrong, I agree with competition, but why would you let companies come in and give them a free ride based on an infrastructure that was built by myself and other employees with the resources provided by my employer, Verizon. It's just not fair, they don't have to go out there and replace the copper or fiber lines, we do!! If you are going to let them do that then they should have to pay for the maintenance.

Please! When you make your ruling all I ask is that you remember the people who aren't represented by lobbyists, influence, and especially money (actually, what's the difference?)! Please remember that even though there are people who have basically bought and paid for this decision and expect it to be in their favor, there are a lot more people who are depending on YOU to make the most fair and the best decision for the working American people and their families, along with the people who expect the kind of service that they think that their money is paying for.

Please make the decision that's right and fair. In this case, when America is losing jobs left and right and you alone have the power to save tens of thousands of jobs I think that you have a responsibility to save American jobs.

Thank you for listening,  
Scott Abel

**From:** juan anaya  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 12:18AM  
**Subject:** theft

## SUNSHINE PERIOD

# RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

> Subject: STORY TIME

>

>

> Close your eyes and I'll tell you a story of a family in a country far,  
> far...Well you tell me where we are. Are they closed?There once was a  
> family that started a business hoping to provide for their family. It was  
> a small country store with just a few local customers,but they liked being  
> treated like family when they came to shop. (can you see it ?) The  
> customers loved to come to the store,because they knew that the family  
> made enough to provide for themselves, but they also invested money back  
> into the store to provide quality and great service.This was their number  
> one goal.And as the town grew the store grew as well, but always with the  
> same attitude to provide the best for their customers.(can you see it?)  
> Soon the family saved enough to add a new meat market with only the best  
> quality meats, and the town was happy.As ! time went on they added a  
> ; new bakery and hired new managers to help run each new department. They  
> also hired local kids and provided jobs while they went to school.  
> Everyone worked hard , because they knew at 5:00pm they would go home to  
> spend the time with their family which they had earned.(can you see it?)  
> The family hired many people from the town and invested much of their  
> earnings back into town projects. At the end of the day they went on  
> picnics and ball games and some served on the school board. And the town  
> was proud to have them as friends and neighbors.(can you see it?)On  
> several occasions, customers would ask "why don't you add gas pumps? If we  
> could buy gas here it would be the total package."The family decided if  
> this is what they wanted then it would be done.They also knew the quality  
> and service would follow.(can you see it?) But this is when things began  
> to change. When certain politicians! heard about the gas pumps they were  
> afraid of the changes to come, so they told the people it was bad for the  
> town.They told them if the family sells gas it would surely drive prices  
> up.(dont ask, it makes no sense.)The politicians told the family that if  
> they sold gas then they would have to let outsiders come into their store  
> and sell groceries. And to add to this they would have to sell to the  
> outsiders at a drastic cut in prices. Soon the outsiders came from  
> everywhere,even if they knew nothing about groceries. The politicians made  
> the family sell the outsiders steaks for 40cents apiece that the family  
> had to sell for \$1 to make any profit. The outsiders sold the steaks for  
> 60cents and made 20cents profit with nothing invested but greed..And at  
> the end of the day the outsiders laughed as they went home to leave the  
> family to clean up the store,pay the wages, pay the light bills and get  
> the store ready! for the next day. And the politicians were proud.(can you  
> see it?) Soon the outsiders moved into the bakery,the produce,and anywhere  
> they wanted with nothing to lose,and they cared very little for the  
> customers. Most just made money and moved on for the next group of  
> outsiders to move in.(can you see it?)When the town people asked for a  
> flower shop they had to explain that with the outsiders waiting to take  
> the profits they could never pay for a new shop.And the people were sad  
> .And the family lost customers.And the politicians were proud even though  
> they new it was bad for the town. But money,greed and the feel of power  
> had taken over.(can you see it?)Soon the family had to make many hard  
> decisions.First they let the school kids go because they could not afford

> to pay them. Then they let many of the employees go with the rest left to  
> do twice the work. Then many managers were laid off leaving the rest to  
> ! work 80 hour weeks because the family could not pay overtime. Soon there  
> were no picnics, ballgames or time with their families. Families were torn  
> apart and many lives ruined. This of course did not matter to the  
> politicians because they were well paid the whole time. Soon it did not  
> matter to the family because now it was a matter of survival. It had  
> finally come to the point that family did not come first. Life was not  
> good and no one lived happily ever after. They just lived. Can  
> you see it? Now open your eyes. Are you in a communist country, a terrorist  
> country. Does Castro rule this country? NO the town is the U.S. of A. LAND  
> OF THE FREE. And the family is Southwestern Bell and many other companies  
> hurt by crooked politicians. (CAN YOU SEE IT ?) We vote these people in  
> office. Open your eyes and let these people know!  
>  
>

as attachment inline text

Move to folder... Inbox [New Folder]

**From:** Jim Nedohon  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 8:53AM  
**Subject:** Local Competition

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**RECEIVED**

**MAR 18 2003**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

As an experienced former long distance marketing executive I can assure you that deregulation will not breed competition without safeguards in place. I was part of the long distance initiative prior to the divestiture of AT&T. I helped create a competitive environment that has benefited all ratepayers. Your actions at the FCC reflect your political alliances rather than your obligation to be a public servant. Perhaps you should consult the Justice Department to understand the dirty tricks the Bell monopolies employed after the divestiture of AT&T to better understand what can occur without the proper oversight and safeguards.

I'd be happy to discuss this further should you need some firsthand knowledge of what actions truly breed competition.

With regards,

Jim Nedohon  
Practical Solutions, LLC  
703-533-2016  
703-509-3400 Mobile  
jnedohon@earthlink.net

**From:** michael rando  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 9:52AM  
**Subject:** competition?

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am an employee at Verizon (for now). I have been with the company for over five years. Verizon has been laying off alot of employees and forcing employees to jobs at half salary. These are men and women who have children, houses, cars, school bills, etc. I understand the reasons for the need for competition in the telecom sector but has anyone given any thought to the actual weekly workers. When companies such as Verizon, SBC, ATT, and Worldcom etc. bottom lines are effected, the outcome is to layoff the regular workers at the "bottom". These are the employees who are at the customer level, These are the employees who deal directly with the quality and quickness of repairs and maintenance of the end users (customers). Although many companies may be offering lower costs, the price comes at the cost of reliabilty and quality. Has anyone added up the numbers of laidoff workers in the telecom industries, in the name of competition. Big companies do not layoff at the top, it is at the lower levels of employment that are affected. Verizon paid bonuses in the millions last year to the top three executives because of the great year we had then turn around and put their employees in the unemployment line! Doesn't the FCC care about the cost of the common worker when they are trying to figure out how to make the telecom indusy more competitive? I worked in a central office in Malden, Massachusetts for five years and have been forced to a crt job in Boston, that is until the next declared surplus. I can tell you that the amount of work in Malden has gone up while the work force has gone down. This type of company cost savings effects the customers quality of service. Now another company comes in and offers local service, at a discount rate, without hiring more than a few workers while the company who owns the central office is doing the actual wiring on the inside and out but to compensate for the discount rated lines, laysoff some of the central office workers and outside plant technicians. This is the benefit of competition.

I know that I am somewhat ignorant to the logistics at the higher levels of the telecom industry but I would just like to know that the FCC has given thought to the outcome of competition.

Thank You for your time, Michael Rando

**From:** Jon Watkins  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/20/03 1:20PM  
**Subject:** BOC and deregulation

**SUNSHINE PERIOD**

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Sir,

As a consumer, it is critical that the ILECS and BOCS be required to offer wholesale access to competitors to their networks; both the wires and central offices. The situation we are now in was caused by government regulation and created a monopoly. We, the customers paid for, no, overpaid for the build-out of this system. We the consumer deserve better access and rates.

A similar situation is that of highways. Consumers (in this case through taxes) have paid for highways. Would you advocate turning highways over to a monopoly company to set rates for the use of those roads? In telecommunications, a network has been built out at consumers expense and should be available to all competitors at the same low rate to use in servicing consumers at the lowest possible price.

If left to their own devices, ILECS and BOCs will squeeze out competition through high rates and other non-competitive practices. Take a real world example: Picus communications was forced out of business in large part because they could not get their customers hooked up to the systems in a timely fashion because of obstructionism by the ILEC.

Right now, and for the foreseeable future, the strong ILECs and BOCs must be controlled by the government to keep them from employing monopoly noncompetitive practices and charging competitors unfair rates for access to the network. What The FCC probably should consider is having companies that their sole function is to build out and maintain this network offering access to all competitors in fair competition.

What needs to be unregulated is the prices charged to consumers for end services and what services can be provided. For instance, in my area that Bell South operates, a business can not get a regular DSL line if run from a home from a competitor dsl provider.

It also makes no sense that I have to pay for a phone line that I don't use for voice services to the Bell company just to have a line for dsl. Aren't I paying for that line twice? The answer of course is yes. It is no wonder expansion of broadband has slowed!

Don't further hurt the market by allowing BOCs to enforce unequal access for competitors.

Regards,

Jon Watkins