

06-74

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Collins, Angela [AFCollins@mintz.com]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 4:54 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein; Scott Bergmann
Subject: WC Docket No. 06-74; Cox Communications and Charter Communications Ex Parte Notification

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary



ex parte letter.pdf
(75 KB)

Attached please find a copy of the ex parte notification filed by Cox Communications and Charter Communications in WC Docket No. 06-74.

Thank you, Angela

Angela Collins
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW | Suite 900 | Washington, DC 20004
Phone: 202.434.7394 | Fax: 202.434.7400
E-mail: afcollins@mintz.com
Web: www.mintz.com

IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE

In compliance with IRS requirements, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties or in connection with marketing or promotional materials.

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY:

The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the person responsible for delivering the e-mail to the intended recipient, be advised you have received this message in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying is strictly prohibited. Please notify Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo immediately at either (617) 542-6000 or at ISDirector@Mintz.com, and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. You will be reimbursed for reasonable costs incurred in notifying us.

MINTZ LEVIN

Michael H. Pryor | 202 434 7365 | mhpryor@mintz.com

06-74
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-434-7300
202-434-7400 fax
www.mintz.com

November 17, 2006

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Notice of Oral *Ex Parte* Presentation - WC Docket No. 06-74, AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corporation Applications for Approval of Transfer of Control

Dear Secretary Dortch:

On November 16, 2006, Alexandra Wilson, Vice President of Public Policy for Cox Enterprises, Inc., Megan Delany, Senior Director and Legislative Counsel of Federal Government Relations for Charter Communications, Howard Symons of Mintz Levin, and the undersigned met with Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein and his legal advisor Scott Bergmann to discuss the issues set forth in the September 27, 2006 written *ex parte* presentation and the October 24, 2006 written comments filed by Advance/Newhouse Communications, Cablevision Systems Corp., Charter Communications, Cox Communications, and Insight Communications Company in the above-referenced docket. We also discussed the conditions proposed by AT&T and BellSouth and reiterated the need for interconnection-related merger conditions. Finally, we explained that the transiting and forbearance conditions proposed by AT&T/BellSouth were insufficient. During the meeting, the parties discussed and distributed the attached handouts.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael H. Pryor

Michael H. Pryor

Attachment

cc: Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Scott Bergmann

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.

BOSTON | WASHINGTON | NEW YORK | STAMFORD | LOS ANGELES | PALO ALTO | SAN DIEGO | LONDON

WDC 393401v.1

00-174

CONDITIONS TO ENSURE FAIR AND EFFICIENT INTERCONNECTION

- Extend section 251/252 interconnection rights to cable voice providers, regardless of technology or regulatory classification.
- Establish interconnection arrangements that enable the exchange of IP voice traffic using an optical level, IP interface at technically feasible points identified by the cable provider.
- Reaffirm the right of competitors to choose a single, technically feasible point of interconnection in a LATA and bar AT&T from imposing additional build out or trunking requirements.
- Reduce the costs and delay of negotiating interconnection agreements by permitting cable telephony providers to:
 - opt into any interconnection agreement approved in any in-region state, subject to state-specific pricing and performance plans.
 - opt into agreements even if not yet updated to reflect changes of law, if the cable providers agrees to negotiate an amendment.
 - use their existing agreement as a starting point for re-negotiation.
 - extend the term of existing agreements for up to three years, subject to amendment for changes of law.
- Exchange non-access traffic, including VOIP, on a bill and keep basis at the cable voice providers request.
- Require AT&T to provide transiting service pursuant to section 251 and at cost-based rates.

06-74

APPENDIX A

Cable Companies' Proposed Merger Conditions

Single POI per LATA

AT&T/BellSouth shall permit competitive providers to choose a single, technically feasible point of interconnection on AT&T/BellSouth's network, including choosing a single point of interconnection in a LATA. AT&T/BellSouth and the competitive provider shall each bear the financial responsibility for bringing their originating traffic that is subject to section 251(b)(5) to the chosen point of interconnection. AT&T/BellSouth and the competitive provider may mutually agree to establish additional points of interconnection as justified by sound network engineering and business practices. AT&T/BellSouth cannot unilaterally require the competitive provider to establish additional POIs based on levels of traffic set solely by AT&T/BellSouth.

Reducing Transaction Costs

- (1) AT&T/BellSouth shall make available any entire effective interconnection agreement, whether negotiated or arbitrated, that was entered into by AT&T/BellSouth or any affiliate, in any state in the merged entity's 22-state incumbent LEC operating territory, subject to technical feasibility and state-specific pricing and performance plans.
- (2) AT&T/BellSouth shall not refuse a request to opt into an agreement on the grounds that the agreement has not been amended to reflect changes of law, provided the requesting party agrees to negotiate an amendment regarding such change of law immediately after it has opted into the agreement.
- (3) AT&T/BellSouth shall allow a requesting party, at its option, to use the parties' pre-existing interconnection agreement as the starting point for negotiating a new agreement.
- (4) AT&T/BellSouth shall permit a party to extend the parties' current interconnection agreement, regardless of whether its initial term has expired, for a period of up to three years, subject to amendment to reflect changes of law after the agreement has been extended. During this period, the interconnection agreement may be terminated only via a competitor's request unless terminated pursuant to the agreement's "default" provisions.

Section 251 Rights for Cable Providers

AT&T/BellSouth shall agree to treat any cable telephony provider, regardless of the technology used or the classification of service, as a requesting telecommunications carrier under sections 251 and 252 and shall owe such provider the obligations it owes to a requesting telecommunications carrier under section 251(c). AT&T shall permit such cable telephony providers to opt into any entire interconnection agreement, including, without limitation, any opt in rights established as a condition of this merger. AT&T shall not contest the authority or jurisdiction of a state commission to approve, arbitrate or enforce any interconnection agreement negotiated with any cable telephony provider, either before the state commission (or the Commission acting in the place of a state commission) or on appeal of a state commission

06-74

*Comments of the Cable Companies
October 24, 2006
WC Docket No. 06-74
DA 06-2035*

determination regarding such interconnection agreement. This condition shall not expire unless superseded by statute or regulation clarifying the applicability of sections 251 and 252 to IP-enabled voice providers.

Transiting

The AT&T and BellSouth incumbent LECs will not increase the rates paid by existing customers for their existing tandem transiting service arrangements that the AT&T and BellSouth incumbent LECs provide in the AT&T/BellSouth in-region territory. As existing interconnection agreements are negotiated and as transit customers expand into new areas within this territory and request transiting arrangements in these areas, the transit rate for such arrangements will not exceed the rates paid under the customers' existing agreements with AT&T and/or BellSouth, or, if no transiting arrangements exist, the transit rate will not exceed the average transit rate available in interconnection agreements with other companies that have transiting arrangements using the same AT&T/BellSouth tandems. AT&T/BellSouth shall not refuse to negotiate the terms and conditions of transiting in the context of section 251 interconnection agreements.

Forbearance

For thirty months after the Merger Closing Date, AT&T/BellSouth will not seek a ruling, including through a forbearance petition under section 10 of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 160, or any other petition, altering the status of any facility being currently offered as a loop or transport UNE under section 251(c)(3) of the Act, or from any interconnection or collocation obligation under section 251 of the Act.

Sandra Lyn Bailey

CD-NA

From: Carolyn Davi (Palm City Chamber of Commerce) [carolyn@palmcitychamber.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2006 1:53 PM
To: ECFS; KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylorataweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: BellSouth and AT&T Merger



image001.gif (5 KB)

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

880 SW Martin Downs Blvd., Palm City, Florida 34990

772.286.8121

Dear Commissioners:

As the Executive Director of the Palm City Chamber of Commerce, I am writing to recommend approval of the BellSouth AT&T merger. I am familiar with the issues that set communities apart and balance them for economic expansion. Some of the issues include access to broadband internet service, infrastructure and a strong workforce. On behalf of the Palm City Chamber of Commerce membership (over 400 businesses which yields thousands of individuals), we are confident that the merger between BellSouth and AT&T will concentrate on one of the most important essentials required of any locality seeking to grow its economy and new jobs — universal broadband Internet access.

The Palm City Chamber of Commerce urges the Commissioners, without further delay, to approve the merger of AT&T / BellSouth for the better of our community and all communities alike.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Davi

Executive Director

Sandralyn Bailey

010-74

From: debbie.brown@psc.state.ms.us
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2006 3:30 PM
To: nielsen.cochran@psc.state.ms.us; KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein;
dtaylor@tateweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: AT&T/BellSouth Merger letter

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary



FCC letter
0.26.06.pdf (42 KB)

Dear Commissioners,

I am attaching a letter from Chairman Nielsen Cochran requesting that the Commission unanimously approve the pending merger between AT&T & BellSouth.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ms. Debbie Brown
Secretary to Chairman Cochran
MS Public Service Commission
601-961-5430

<<FCC letter 10.26.06.pdf>>

Confidentiality Note: The information contained in this email and/or document(s) attached is for the exclusive use of the individual(s) named above and may contain confidential, privileged and non-disclosable information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are strictly prohibited from reading, photocopying, distributing or otherwise using this e-mail or its contents in any way. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify me immediately.

Mississippi Public Service Commission

06-74

Post Office Box 1174
201-A Woolfolk State Office Building
Jackson, Mississippi 39215-1174



(601) 961-5430
(800) 356-6430
(601) 961-5824 Facsimile

Nielsen Cochran
Chairman

October 25, 2006

Chairman Kevin J. Martin
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Martin:

We are writing to you concerning the pending merger between AT&T and BellSouth. As you are aware, the Mississippi Public Service Commission, after spending a considerable amount of time reviewing the proposed merger, and conducting a public hearing, issued a unanimous order approving the merger without any condition.

It is our opinion that the Federal Communications Commission should move forward and approve the merger. Although we did not believe that any conditions were necessary, we believe that this merger and the conditions recently offered by AT&T will be good for Mississippi consumers. Most significantly, the merger will bring additional benefits to consumers in the area of broadband. AT&T's proposal to offer \$10 broadband access to new DSL customers, provide free DSL modems to existing AT&T-BellSouth dial-up service customers who subscribe to DSL, offer stand-alone DSL and increase deployment of broadband service to rural and lower-income areas will increase the availability and affordability of broadband to Mississippi consumers.

We ask that the Commission move quickly to approve this merger so our citizens can reap the benefits.

Sincerely,

Nielsen Cochran, Chairman

Leopold Bentz, Vice-Chairman

Bo Robinson, Commissioner

NC/drb

Home Address - 6 Drake Landing, Raymond, Mississippi 39154
(601) 837-9066

Sandralyn Bailey

010-74

From: Jeff Nowakowski [Jeff.Nowakowski@jppss.k12.la.us]
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2006 2:45 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: BellSouth - AT&T Merger



JAPSA Support
Letter1.pdf (97 ...)

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

JAPSA



06-74

Chairman Kevin Martin
Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate
Commissioner Michael Copps
Commissioner Robert McDowell
Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Support BellSouth / AT&T Merger, WC Docket No. 06-74

Dear Commissioners:

The merger of AT&T and BellSouth will deliver new and innovative broadband technologies to improve Louisiana's and our nation's educational capabilities. Therefore, I urge you to approve the merger promptly.

From distance learning to cutting-edge, in-classroom tools, our students and educators are already learning how technology can open new doors. Yet, we have barely begun to scratch the surface of the innovations in education that communications technology can make available to us. For this reason, the FCC should approve the merger of these two unique communications companies as quickly as possible.

We were pleased to learn recently that AT&T and BellSouth have proposed post-merger commitments, including a promise to bring *affordable* and *universal* broadband coverage to parents and students in Jefferson Parish. This broadband commitment will greatly benefit our educational system by:

- Speeding the deployment of exciting new broadband-based technologies and other promising innovations to our nation's schools and libraries and to students' homes.
- Enhancing *distance learning* capabilities, such as offering students greater access to advanced placement and other classes, providing new educational tools for students and others with disabilities, and providing new cost-effective learning tools that will enhance America's global competitiveness.
- Providing new economic growth and jobs for our young people.

Given the positive impact these commitments will bring to our educational system and young people, I urge you to approve the AT&T/BellSouth merger at the earliest possible date.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Marian Bernard
President
Jefferson Association of Public School Administrators

cc: Marlene Dortch, Commission Secretary

Sandralyn Bailey

106-74

From: Matt Davis [mattdavis@freecomusa.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 2:51 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: AT&T/BellSouth Merger

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary



image001.jpg (3
KB)

I have attached some thoughts for your consideration.

Thanks,

Matt Davis

(615)-229-2123



Commissioner
Copps.doc (101 KB..)



DL-74

Customer Service Local Voice: 615-229-1001
Customer Service Toll Free Voice: 1-877-739-9900
Customer Service Toll Free Fax: 1-888-252-9578
www.freecomusa.com
201 Skyline Drive
Dickson, Tennessee 37055

October 31, 2006

Dear Commissioner Capps,

I am the CEO of Freedom Communications USA, a CLEC servicing over 3500 primarily non-traditional credit customers throughout the BellSouth footprint. In light of the pending vote on the AT&T/BellSouth merger, I thought you may want to hear from a company servicing customers that this proposed merger will impact. Some key points for your consideration:

1. Since the DC court decision and our new contract with BellSouth we have struggled to make ends meet. Our cost of goods has risen 40%, and another cost increase is set to go into effect January 1, 2007.
2. Because we have no idea what BellSouth will demand in their contract beginning January 2008, we can not plan for long term growth. It seems that BellSouth is looking in every direction to negatively impact our bottom line.
3. Before our new contract with BellSouth, there was a commitment for level of service, and if that level of service was worse for us than the BellSouth customer, we were compensated. That compensation has all but dried up, but the level of service has not improved.
4. We remain at a disadvantage because of the constant barrage of solicitation and financial offers to "win back" customers we manage to get from BellSouth. One of our business customers claims that at least 3 times a week a BellSouth representative is either at their door or calling with more incentives to come back to BellSouth.
5. It may only be coincidence, but our Customer Service Representatives tell me that our orders continuously are becoming slower and slower...with many simply "not being received" as claimed by BellSouth.

We are a small business that mostly services customers that would otherwise not have a home telephone. BellSouth makes it so hard for us to make a profit that our existence as a CLEC is in jeopardy.

Now the incumbent is about to double in size, and we are frightened that without some concessions for the CLEC's coming from the FCC we will soon be unable to service our customers at all. The monopoly is back and we're in their sights.

Thanks,

Matt Davis
CEO
Freedom Communications USA
615-229-2123

Sandralyn Bailey

00-74

From: TennesseeRegulatory Authority [TennesseeRegulatory.Authority@state.tn.us]
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2006 1:18 PM
To: dtaylor@stateweb; Jonathan Adelstein; KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Robert McDowell
Subject: AT&T merger with Bellsouth

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary



AT&T merger with
BellSouth.pdf...

Attached are comments from Chairman Sara Kyle.

Sandralyn Bailey

From: A.W. Jones [busarty@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 05, 2006 12:41 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: att bls

06-74
FILED/ACCEPTED
DEC - 7 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Concerning the acquisition of BLS by ATT, Why is it that anything the Democrats are involved in just drags on and on? Just get on with whatever you have to do for approval and benefit of all concerned. I can't believe I voted for some of these people at one time.
A.W. Jones.

De-74

From: Ashley Pourciau [ashleypo@charter.net]
Sent: Sunday, November 05, 2006 12:34 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: AT&T/Bell companies

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary



_AVG
tification_.txt (212 f

Dear Mr. Martin,

I am writing to express my concern and lack of understanding of what is happening in the attempted merger of AT&T and the Bell Companies. As I recall, AT&T was split up in 1984 due to monopoly reasons and now it seems we are trying to put them back together. If it was good for the consumer to break them up then, how can it now be good for the consumer to have them back together. It took years to break up AT&T, along with probably several million dollars. What will the cost be to put them back together? It seems to me that by putting them back together this may in the future enable AT&T to get large enough to begin buying out or merging with other telecom companies and thus possibly create another monopoly to eventually deal with. Please pass along the above questions to others on the FCC committee working on this matter. Information was obtained from my past memory and the following.

Bell System divestiture

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

The break up of AT&T was initiated in 1974 by the U.S. Department of Justice anti-trust suit against the telephone monopoly. Under the terms of a settlement finalized on January 8, 1982, "Ma Bell" agreed to divest its local exchange service operating companies, in return for a chance to go into the computer business, AT&T Computer Systems. Effective January 1, 1984, AT&T's local operations were split into seven independent Regional Bell Operating Companies (RBOCs) known as the "Baby Bells". Afterwards, AT&T, reduced in value by approximately 70%, continued to operate all of its long-distance services, although in the ensuing years it lost portions of its market share to competitors such as MC and Sprint.

Contents

[hide]

- 1 Regional Bell Operating Companies (RBOCs)
- 2 Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs)
- 3 Effects
- 4 End of an era
- 5 Evolution of the RBOCs
- 6 Financial arbitrage

- [7 References](#)
- [8 External link](#)

06-74

[edit] Regional Bell Operating Companies (RBOCs)

[Map of the original and current companies.](#)

[Enlarge](#)

Map of the original and current companies.

- [Ameritech Corporation](#)
- [Bell Atlantic Corporation](#)
- [BellSouth Corporation](#)
- [NYNEX Corporation](#)
- [Pacific Telesis Group](#)
- [Southwestern Bell Corporation](#)
- [U S West, Inc.](#)

Thanks for your consideration in this matter.

Ashley Pourciau

14344 Grand Bay Road

Jarreau, La 70749

225-627-5777

ashleypo@charter.net

Sandralyn Bailey

1010-74

From: ben barnhill [brb3nc@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 04, 2006 12:29 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylorataweb; Robert D. Brown
Subject: AT&T/BellSouth Merger

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Commissioners,

I am a management retiree from the former AT&T. Now that we have been "merged" with SBC, retirees just learned that our medical benefits for next year will be under SBC's plan. Bottom line is there are no choices like we had before, less coverage and the will cost be more than double what we currently pay. I can provide you with documentation to support this if needed.

There are many issues to consider if this merger is in the "public interest". This is probably not one of them, however, I am sure thousands of BellSouth management retirees would like to know they will not be treated like we were. If this is a example of how at&t intends to reduce costs, I strongly urge you to vote against this merger.

Thank you,

Ben Barnhill

Low, Low, Low Rates! Check out Yahoo! Messenger's cheap PC-to-Phone call rates.

Sandralyn Bailey

010-74

From: Bob Hackett [bobtelagg@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2006 8:18 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Bob Hackett (bobtelagg@sbcglobal.net) writes:

Dear Chairman Martin, Please press ahead and call for a vote on the AT&T/BellSouth deal on Dec. 14. Do not be intimidated by Congressman Dingle. If the Dems want to try to kill the deal, make them do it sooner rather than later so everyone can see how anti-business they are.

Thanks, and good luck.

Bob Hackett

Tyler, TX

903-561-2302

bobtelagg@sbcglobal.net

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1

Remote host: 64.217.182.39

Remote IP address: 64.217.182.39

SandraLyn Bailey

06-74

From: cabdial@bellsouth.net
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2006 10:36 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; taylortateweb@fcc.gov; **FILED/ACCEPTED**
Subject: Individual American Comment: AT&T/BellSouth Merger

Importance: High

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Gentlemen:

What is the deal with continuing to delay the vote for the AT&T/BellSouth merger? Competition is real. It does not need to be "conditioned" or regulated. I work for BellSouth, not in any Executive Office, but in a front-line operation that has shrunk from 118 employees down to less than half of that number in six years. All these job losses can be directly attributed to increased competition from CLEC's, wireless providers, and most recently, digital phone providers including Vonage and our local Time-Warner Cable franchises. And, more job losses are likely around the corner due to this competition since disconnect orders continue to significantly outweigh new installation orders at an alarming rate. This has been an ongoing trend for almost five years now; just look at BellSouth's line loss data.

Again, competition is real—we feel its affects every day--and is on the rise. This deal, when approved--even without conditions--will not reverse this trend, and, thus, will not harm the competitive battleground for the dial-tone, data, and video pipeline to the end-user.

Forget the politics. Let's move forward with a good business decision for America NOW!!

Thank you,
Jeff Dail
4737 Beech Crest Place
Charlotte, NC

Sandralyn Bailey

06-74

From: Charles King [ck1940@conninc.com]
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2006 5:58 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein
Cc: dtayloratateweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: Att/Bellsouth

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

I hope that you put restrictions on ATT if the buyout of Bell South is to go through. I can't even get Bell South to get DSL into my area for last 5 years. Its down the street but they just give me a run around saying its not in the works for this area. Local complaints to NC PUC has not helped at all...ATT will just cut more service instead of improving it.....Thanks for allowing my input. Charles King

Sandralyn Bailey

06-74

From: Charles Tower [chuck.tower@bellsouth.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 02, 2006 10:02 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Charles Tower (chuck.tower@bellsouth.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

When are we going to get a vote on the AT&T purchase of BellSouth? How many times can the vote be delayed because two Dem's want a handout? I am getting bored with the BS coming out of D.C.; some of us regular citizens rely on big business to pay our mortgages. This buyout will be a great thing for the future. I work in this industry and can tell you BellSouth is dieing a slow death at the hands of unregulated cable companies. The AT&T purchase will put an end to that downward trend. I ask that you do something to get the FCC in gear here!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.153.229.97
Remote IP address: 70.153.229.97

Sandralyn Bailey

Do not

From: Charlie East [charlieeast@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2006 8:47 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein; Robert McDowell
Cc: dtaylor@tatewebb@fcc.gov
Subject: ATT/ BELLSOUTH

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am writing this to urge you to vote to allow the merger of ATT/BELLSOUTH to be approved and not let a merger that Will benefit the consumers in the market fall in another display of election year politics. A few years ago the Commission turned down a merger between ECHOSTAR and Hughes. That decision ultimately cost me local broadcast over satellite in Beaumont TX. There needs to be a more level playing field and this merger between ATT and Bellsouth will help us the consumers with greater technology and competition. If you want to be fair you could look into the false advertising being used down here by time Warner. I would gladly talk with you about that. The bottom line is please vote Yes and allow these companies to proceed

Thank you
Charlie R East

Sandralyn Bailey

01074

From: Cindy Reves [reves_c@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2006 9:55 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: AT&T - Bell South comments

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

I have been debating commenting on the AT&T/Bell South merger, was glad to see you delayed the vote again, but still hesitated to contact you. (So you are aware, I am a former SBC employee.) Mail I received today made me decide to share my knowledge with you and express my feelings.

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Please let me know if it is better to send you my thoughts in the body of an email, as an attachment to an email, via US mail or if you would prefer someone talk with me on the phone. If you prefer contact by phone, I have a day off scheduled next Monday, November 20.

Thank you for your time.

Cindy Reves
4752 Alexander
Wichita, KS 67204
316 831-0833 (home)

Want to start your own business? Learn how on [Yahoo! Small Business](#).