

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC

In the matter of:

)	
Proposed Fourth Quarter 2000)	
Universal Service Contribution Factor))
Released: September 8, 2000)	
)	
Federal State Joint Board on)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service)	
)	
Changes to the Board of Directors of)	
The Universal Service Administrative)	
Company)	CC Docket No. 97-21

Petition for Reconsideration

In accordance with Title 47, Chapter 1, Part 1, Section 1.106, I petition the Federal Communications Commission to reconsider the above captioned order because it is contrary to the intent of program regulation.

Section 54.507 of FCC Universal Service regulations set the annual funding cap at \$2.25 billion. During year one of the program substantially less than \$2.25 billion was committed to applicants, yet the Schools and Libraries Corporation failed to commit funds for internal connections to applicants with discounts below 70 percent.

This order releases \$170 million of year one carryover funds to carriers. This represents the last of an estimated \$448 million year one carryover. Because the funding cap was never reached in year one and because large numbers of applicants were not funded, I ask the Commission to reconsider this order and use the remaining \$170 million as carryover to fund year three and subsequent year's applications.

The CCB cited the Rural Healthcare program as precedence for the decision to refund carrier contributions:

<footnote 8> See 47 C.F.R. § 54.507. Specifically, at the end of the fourth quarter of 1998, the rural health care program had a balance of approximately \$86 million because collections accrued faster than actual demand for program

support. To ensure that unused collections were credited back to contributors, the Commission directed that the unused balance be applied over two quarters to reduce the contribution factors. See Proposed First Quarter 1999 Universal Service Contribution Factors and Proposed Actions, CC Docket No. 96-45, Public Notice, FCC 98-318 at 3-4 (rel. Dec. 4, 1998).

This logic is however in error because, unlike the Schools and Libraries program,

Rural Healthcare supply of funds far exceeded demand. In year one of the Schools and Libraries program, many deserving applicants were denied funding.

These remaining funds should be used in subsequent years for school and library applicants.

Respectfully Submitted,

Greg Weisiger

19 Tallwood Trail
Palmrya, VA 22963

September 18, 2000