

Sandra Lyn Bailey

Dec-74

From: R. Joseph Morris [rjmsr@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Saturday, November 11, 2006 7:50 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: AT&T Merger Vote

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Importance: High

Chairman Martin,

I don't know if one person can make a difference or if you will personally see this email, but felt compelled to at least voice my opinion.

I urge you to file the necessary documents to allow the member that has been currently abstaining from voting on this issue to break the tie and get it done. I know from the record that as chairman, if you feel the issue is in the publics' best interest, you are allowed to do this. The Democrats on the committee are not in favor of the merge from day one since Justice Department approved the issue, and it does not matter how many concessions are granted because they *do not* wish to see it happen. The Democrats never favor large merges anyway according to past history. So far they have successfully stalled the issue, and if allowed to continue into next year, it will be held up in committee hearings indefinitely.

I am a systems technician with Bellsouth Communications Systems here in Atlanta, GA, and firmly believe this merge is a positive aspect for the consumer on a personal and business level. We are excited about the future prospects for employees and consumers with the merge, and are in a hold pattern for career and personal plans until this is over with. We need to be competitive with the cable industry as a whole.

Do the right thing, and get it done before the end of the year please!

Regards,

R. Joseph Morris

404-729-7500

SandraLyn Bailey

00-74

From: Richard Marotte [Rmaro@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2006 1:35 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Richard Marotte (Rmaro@optonline.net) writes:

Hi,
First of congratulations on your new term. As a Republican I am glad to have you aboard. I believe in business allowing growth and survival. But on the same issue I do not see giving them unyielding power, be it in mergers or rules. The purpose of Jusge Greens act was to allow growth and stimulate competition.
Fairness amongst the bells has not been great or even good. Having this competition allows for better services and job growth. This is how our country will continue to grow. Vz, Bls just to mention a few have not treated the FCC with respect. Many occassion they have shown total disregard for the FCC and their rules. Please help enforce the rules that have been written and agreed upon. Again odd luck and much success in your new term and future.

Richard Marotte
334 Nevada Steet
Lindenhurst NY 11757

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 24.186.146.179
Remote IP address: 24.186.146.179

Sandralyn Bailey

06-74

From: Robert F. Perks [lhp002@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2006 9:16 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Robert F. Perks (lhp002@comcast.net) writes:

Cease the political posturing on the at&t / Bellsouth merger. This merger is needed to offer some serious competition to the cable companies and promote the leveraging of the country's telecommunications infrastructure to better manage costs and pricing. Please act/

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 71.57.163.169
Remote IP address: 71.57.163.169

Sandra Lyn Bailey

106-74

From: robert t. dawson [oakroyal@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2006 10:32 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

robert t. dawson (oakroyal@hotmail.com) writes:

why are you allowing these democrats to delay the vote on the AT&T and Bell south mearger.
Also robert mcdowell should have to vote. vote now

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.112.117.5
Remote IP address: 66.112.117.5

SandraLyn Bailey

06-74

From: Rod Jordan [rod@sleekcom.com]
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2006 4:33 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Rod Jordan (rod@sleekcom.com) writes:

I was just wondering if the roadblocks that the two democratic commissioners were placing in the way of the BellSouth AT&T merger was delaying deliver of your new shirts with the AT&T logo affixed above the left front pocket?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.99.79.250
Remote IP address: 68.99.79.250

Sandralyn Bailey

06-74

From: Ron [Schipper@www.fcc.gov]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 7:12 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ron (Schipper) writes:

I live in Atlanta and am all for the ATT taking over Bell South. It would give me DSL and phone service at a lower cost to me. Ron Schipper

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 74.237.8.158
Remote IP address: 74.237.8.158

Sandralyn Bailey

De-74

From: Sandra Padron [ariztokat_921@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 25, 2006 8:27 PM
To: Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Robert McDowell
Cc: FCCINFO; theloneconsumer@yahoo.com
Subject: Bellsouth & ATT Merger

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Importance: High

Please stop the ATT/Bellsouth merger. Bellsouth has covered up numerous "unethical" governmental investigations (see attached).

I worked at Bellsouth for 9 years in Florida involved in regional (9 States) sales. I was terminated as a "Whistleblower" with 4 - 5 other employees.

Bellsouth has a history of unethical business practices and paying to cover up investigations. I have a box load of evidence and depositions from 1999. The evidence includes corporate "proprietary" information.

I think that allowing Bellsouth to merge with ATT would take us back instead of forward, incrementing the cover-ups and corruption that currently exists, as well as, the non compliance.

Sincerely,

Sandra L Padron (former Bellsouth Employee - Miami-Florida)

P O Box 140812

Coral Gables, Fl. 33114-0812

(305) 480-0981

Get free, personalized commercial-free online radio with MSN Radio powered by Pandora

SandraLyn Bailey

06-7A

From: SCar151224@aol.com
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 2:45 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: BLS/ATT merger

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

It is time for you to get off your rear and move the merger along. What is your problem? GET IT
DONE

Sandra Lyn Bailey

06-74

From: Sumit K. Majumdar [majumdar@utdallas.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2006 10:27 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sumit K. Majumdar (majumdar@utdallas.edu) writes:

Dear Chairman Martin,

I request that the complete rationale for the proposed merger of AT&T and Bell South, which are two large local exchange carriers, the consequences of previous mergers and the likely consequences of this merger be reviewed, and in the light of the review the proposed merger be not approved.

My colleagues and I have carried out significant empirical research on the topic. I am personally able to base my comments on substantial experience of undertaking research on the telecommunications sector and also am an Editor of the "Handbook of Telecommunications Economics."

The economic reason always advanced for mergers to occur is that:

- [1] efficiencies will be enhanced, and
- [2] the combined companies will have more resources to upgrade the technological infrastructure.

Thus, customers will gain. This reason, that the welfare of the consumer is paramount, is always given for the approval of mergers by regulatory authorities. It is the primary reason. Mergers have to be efficiency enhancing.

Before any merger is approved, the regulatory authority in question will have thoroughly investigated the welfare consequences of a proposed merger by various studies. One of these studies would be an evaluation of all the past mergers that the regulatory authority would have approved, to assess whether consumers have benefited or not from the previous merger approvals.

In a comprehensive study my colleagues and I examined if the various mergers of the telecommunications companies in the US over the years had contributed to economic progress. In the course of our evaluation of the existing evidence and literature, we did not come across any evaluations by regulatory authorities of the impact of their past merger decisions. We carried out such an evaluation, of the impact of all of the mergers of the local exchange companies, the crucial segment providing basic connectivity to millions of American households, which took place between 1988 and 2001.

Our analysis revealed that, indeed,

- [a] the mergers led to increased market power. The firms had augmented their ability to generate relatively higher revenues. Sales volume growth was not noted; revenue increases were due to price increases;
- [b] no efficiency gains were noted. In fact, measures of operational performance, expected to significantly improve, had deteriorated following mergers;
- [c] under investment of technology was observed following mergers. Thus, most critically, the expectations that mergers would lead to up-gradation of the national communications infrastructure were completely vitiated.

The approval of the past telecommunications mergers has led to substantial welfare losses for the American consumer. This is what the evidence shows. Past regulatory decisions in approval of the mergers have not had the expected effect. In fact, the effect has been quite the opposite. Today's observed lack of productive efficiency and technological progressiveness of the merged US companies means that the welfare of the US consumer has been significantly compromised. The United States is now a laggard in the deployment of broadband, a technology critical for global competitiveness.

Against this backdrop of hard negative evidence, showing that past mergers have not worked, the current AT&T-Bell South merger is being decided. There are only negative

06-71

efficiency and welfare consequences associated with the proposed merger.

- If allowed, it will create a monopoly that stifle competition and will control the communications infrastructure for hundreds of million of American consumers.
- If allowed, it will lead to further deterioration of productivity of the sector. It will not enhance productivity in the sector.
- If allowed, it will lead to further underinvestment in technology and high quality infrastructure, the subsequent deterioration of productivity of the sector and a negative spillover effect into all other sectors of the US economy since the telecommunications sector is a fundamental input into almost all other economic activity.

The decision to approve the AT&T-Bell South merger will need a leap of faith. The evidence on past local exchange mergers suggest that future mergers of local exchanges companies, such as AT&T and Bell South, will lead to substantial negative economic consequences for millions of American consumers. If the AT&T-Bell South merger is approved, the welfare of the American consumer may be compromised in perpetuity.

Professor Sumit K. Majumdar
majumdar@utdallas.edu

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.149.51.154
Remote IP address: 69.149.51.154

DEC - 7 2006

Olo 7A

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Tdeast77@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2006 12:21 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: BLS-ATT merger

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

To Whom It May Concern,

I am currently a shareholder in these companies and believe that the delay of this merger by the democrats is unwarranted. ATT has already said they will make concessions to allow adequate competition. I currently do not utilize either of these companies services because I have found better deals elsewhere. This move by the democratic party is just posturing to flex their muscles after winning the elections and they are using the American public as an excuse to do so. If this is a sign of things to come, God help America. Please consider pushing this deal through before the 1st of the year.

Respectfully,

Dr. Todd D. East

SandraLyn Bailey

06-74

From: Tdeast77@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2006 12:21 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb; Robert McDowne
Subject: BLS-ATT merger

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

To Whom It May Concern,

I am currently a shareholder in these companies and believe that the delay of this merger by the democrats is unwarranted. ATT has already said they will make concessions to allow adequate competition. I currently do not utilize either of these companies services because I have found better deals elsewhere. This move by the democratic party is just posturing to flex their muscles after winning the elections and they are using the American public as an excuse to do so. If this is a sign of things to come, God help America. Please consider pushing this deal through before the 1st of the year.

Respectfully,

Dr. Todd D. East

Sandralyn Bailey

FILED/ACCEPTED

De-74

DEC - 7 2006

From: Terry Small [tsmall4@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 23, 2006 6:48 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylor@tateweb.com; Robert McDowell
Subject: BellSouth and AT&T Merger

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I think it is reprehensible that 2 commissioners can hold over 300,000 people hostage as they inflict their politics into business solutions. With all of the state PCs, the DOJ and many others giving their approval of this merger and not imposing any regulations, why does the FCC think it has the power to hold up these proceedings? Do you all feel you know more about business, its impact on the people and other business than all of these folks? Your job is to monitor and control business that pose a threat to other business and free enterprise. How can you put controls on a business and not put the same controls on all of the businesses in that arena? Politics should not play a part in these decisions.

All BellSouth and AT&T have ever stated is that they want to play on an even field with all of the other participants in the same business. We have been forced to provide service to competitors at below profit rates so they can be in business to compete against us. They do not have to help pay us to replace plant damaged during a disaster, but they can complain because we are not doing it fast enough to please them.

The public will gain from eventual lower rates, more options, better service and more overall competition.

This is to ask that you move forward quickly on approving this merger with no restrictions.

Terry Small
Birmingham AL.

SandraLyn Bailey

FILED/ACCEPTED

06-74

From: Todd Tibbetts [toddt@gatelegration.com]
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2006 10:46 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

DEC - 7 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Todd Tibbetts (toddt@gatelegration.com) writes:

I'm a long time supporter of the GOP and own a small telecom business. I'm very familiar with Bellsouth, at&t, their monopoly advantages, and many of their employees. I encourage you to vote against the merger. This would be in the best interest of our industry and it's consumers.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.34.166.133
Remote IP address: 70.34.166.133

Sandralyn Bailey

DEC - 7 2006

From: TONY JACKSON [tonyjackson@pacbell.net]
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2006 12:40 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratweb
Subject: APPROVE ATT / BELLSOUTH

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chairman Kevin J. Martin: KJMWEB@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael J. Copps: Michael.Copps@fcc.gov
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein: Jonathan.Adelstein@fcc.gov
Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate: dtayloratweb@fcc.gov
Commissioner Robert McDowell: Robert.McDowell@fcc.gov

I SUPPORT AT&T ACQUIRE OF BELLSOUTH WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS!

THANK YOU FOR YOUR APPROVAL,
ANTHONY B. JACKSON

Sandralyn Bailey

06-74

From: Vernon H. Ferris [vernonh@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2006 2:29 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

Vernon H. Ferris (vernonh@bellsouth.net) writes:

Congratulations on your reappointment.

I just found out that you will be meeting on AT&T/BellSouth merger. For the merger to take place I believe is in violation of the government breakup of the AT&T system the first time.

According to the information that I received from both companies, AT&T has more liability than BellSouth and BellSouth has been out performing AT&T on the stock market by \$10+/- each day.

On top of that CEO of BellSouth stands to make within 90 days upon merger approximately 47 +million over a period of time and office space in Atlanta plus secretary for 7 years.

This merger would not be in the best interest of the stockholder let along the public.

Very truly yours,

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.80.245.28
Remote IP address: 65.80.245.28

Sandra Lyn Bailey

06-174

From: Wayne Enslow [wenslow@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2006 5:01 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Wayne Enslow (wenslow@bellsouth.net) writes:

You people are absolutely amazing. You have politicized a business decision, and now can't seem to make inroads into who or what is needed to reach approval. The lot of you should be thrown out. Republicans, democrats, independents are all represented in the ranks of the two companies who are merging - and you as the leader of an organization can't seem to lead your group to consensus.

Pathetic.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.211.217.93
Remote IP address: 68.211.217.93

From: Zoreta Harris [zoreta@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2006 12:20 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

Zoreta Harris (zoreta@bellsouth.net) writes:

I question the hold up on the Bellsouth/at&t merger. The net neutrality issues should be for every company not just the 2 merging. No one knows how these issues will affect the consumers. So how can it hold up the merger?

The AT&T-BellSouth merger: The real story -- AEI-Brookings Joint Center Policy Matters
Robert Hahn and Scott Wallsten
October 2006

The proposed 80 billion dollar merger between AT&T and BellSouth, which was on the fast track, has suddenly hit a brick wall. Approved without conditions by the Department of Justice, the merger now awaits a decision by the Federal Communications Commission.

FCC Chairman Kevin Martin has announced his desire to approve the deal. But the Commission finds itself deadlocked—with two commissioners in favor, two opposed, and one recused because of prior work for an AT&T competitor. Because merger approval requires a majority, AT&T will need to offer "concessions" that will persuade at least one opposing commissioner to vote for the merger.

While this vote is undoubtedly the real story for AT&T, BellSouth, and K-Street lobbyists, it misses two other real stories that have far more economic significance.

Our first real story is the byzantine telecommunications merger approval process itself. These mergers are rightly subject to antitrust review by the Department of Justice. In Congress' view, DOJ merger experts—arguably some of the world's finest—are not sufficiently qualified to analyze telecom mergers. Because the FCC is charged with regulating telecommunications policy, it must also approve these mergers.

Exposing a merger to such double jeopardy undoubtedly has its benefits. In principle, a merger that DOJ decides is good for society could actually be bad. The FCC can serve as a final arbiter in such cases and add appropriate conditions to the merger or disallow it.

The problem is that there is no reason to think the FCC will be better than the DOJ at identifying good mergers. It's not just that the FCC's merger expertise pales by comparison. There is a deeper institutional problem, and that leads us to our second story, which is a whopper.

The relevant question in a merger review should be whether the merger will benefit society. Unfortunately, the need for getting FCC approval often becomes a vehicle for special interests to advance particular agendas unrelated to a merger.

For example, in the 2000 AOL-Time Warner merger proceedings, Microsoft, Yahoo!, and a host of other long-forgotten companies joined together to demand that the FCC force AOL—then the dominant provider of instant-messaging services—to make its messaging software compatible with everyone else's. In response, the FCC told AOL that future "advanced" instant-messaging services would have to work with its competitors' software.

Perhaps the Commission should have regulated instant-messaging interoperability. But that decision should have had nothing to do with a merger between a dialup Internet company and a media giant.

We see similar shenanigans today in the AT&T-BellSouth merger, where the agenda du jour is net neutrality. A precise definition is tough to pin down, but mandatory net neutrality basically would impose strict conditions on how providers of high-speed Internet connections can run their business. Among other things, broadband providers would be

06-74

required to treat all data running across their networks equally. So for example, they would not be allowed to charge particular content providers like YouTube extra for higher quality connections to their customers.

As part of a host of conditions aimed at winning the support of a third commissioner, AT&T proposed abiding by certain net neutrality guidelines for 30 months. It's Our Net, a group advocating for net neutrality, has already announced that this is not enough, in hopes of ushering in a full-blown net neutrality policy.

Our point here is not to rehash the pros and cons of net neutrality. All sides agree that the outcome of the net neutrality debate could dramatically affect the development of the Internet. Rather, our point is that the resolution of such important policy questions should be decided on their own merits through serious analysis. Congress—not two commissioners with an opinion and two firms eager to consummate a merger—should make the call on net neutrality if it thinks regulation is needed.

The real story behind the proposed AT&T-BellSouth merger affords two important lessons. First, having two agencies review telecommunications mergers is one too many. Second, imposing major merger conditions with little or no economic analysis is not the right way to make policy that could affect 300 million Americans.

11/21/2006

Printer Friendly Version

Content Owner Info

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 139.76.128.71
Remote IP address: 139.76.128.71



06-24

Sandralyn Bailey

06-74

From: CARTER HALL, VICTORIA (SBCSI) [vc3624@att.com]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 4:44 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein; Scott Bergmann; Barry Ohlson
Cc: CARTER HALL, VICTORIA (SBCSI)
Subject: November 17 2006 Ex Parte

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 7 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Importance: High



image001.jpg (2
KB)



Nov 17 2006
Adelstein Ex Parte...

Attached is a copy of the Ex Parte *In the Matter of Review of AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corp. Application for Consent to Transfer of Control, WC Docket No. 06-74*, filed with the Secretary today, November 17, 2006.

Victoria Carter-Hall

AT&T Services, Inc.

Federal Regulatory Department

1120 20th Street, NW, Suite 1000

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 457-2080 (direct)

(202) 289-3699 (fax)

E-mail: vc3624@att.com



Robert W. Quinn, Jr.
Senior Vice President
Federal Regulatory

AT&T Services, Inc. T: 202.457.3851
1120 20th Street, NW F: 832.213.0243
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036

06-74

November 17, 2006

VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., SW, Room TWB-204
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Notice of Oral Ex Parte Communication
In the Matter of Review of AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corp. Application
For Consent to Transfer of Control, WC Docket No. 06-74

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On Thursday, November 16, 2006, Jim Cicconi, Wayne Watts and I met with Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein, Scott Bergmann, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Adelstein and Barry Ohlson, Senior Legal Advisor to Commissioner Adelstein, to discuss issues related to the aforementioned proceeding. During the course of that meeting, we discussed the ex parte previously filed on Friday, October 13, 2006 and the contents therein. In addition, we discussed merger conditions previously proposed by other parties in this proceeding. Our discussion was consistent with all of the filings made by AT&T and BellSouth in this proceeding.

One electronic copy of this Notice is being submitted to the Secretary of the FCC in accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules.

Sincerely,

cc: Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
Scott Bergmann, Legal Advisor
Barry Ohlson, Sr. Legal Advisor