Stephanie Kost

From: sherri kay [spyndr@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 2:38 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

sherri kay
8390 NW 25th St.
miami, FL 33122-1504

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael Powell
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Sherri

Stephanie Kost

From: shannon vick [hottgirl20042001@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2003 5:04 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: USF Change Unfair for Low-Volume Users

shannon vick
nokia
072/12355442
112 zinniact
rocky mount, NC 27801-3002

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 17, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

shannon
nokia
072/12355442

Stephanie Kost

From: Ron Smith [schwanda1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2003 11:16 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Opposed to Change in USF Collection

RECEIVED
2003
Commission
Secretary

Ron Smith
8001 Jefferson Highway APT 29
Baton Rouge, LA 70809-1647

October 15, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael Powell
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Ron Smith

Stephanie Kost

From: Robert OConnor [tracfone2@rocnet.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 02, 2003 7:12 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: USF Changes Concern Me

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Robert OConnor
09411412951
8 Great Oak Lane
South China, ME 04358-5330

November 2, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Robert OConnor
09411412951

Stephanie Kost

From: Ray Urbanz [rurbanz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2003 7:50 AM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Minorities Opposed to Change in USF Collection

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ray Urbanz
10015 Bayreuth Dr, SE
Huntsville, AL 35803-1163

November 12, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Ray Urbanz

Stephanie Kost

From: Paul Kozma [pkozma@tracfone.com]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2003 4:08 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Opposed to Change in USF Collection

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Paul Kozma
Pauls a Bitch
9999999999
25th st
Miami, FL 33140-4646

October 24, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge you to carefully consider the impact this would have on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. The proposal to move the USF to a number-based flat fee will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact consumers' ability to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you are considering changing it to what I think is an unfair plan, charging everybody $1 dollar or more per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless or landline phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. Americans don't pay a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paul Kozma's a bitch
Pauls a Bitch
9999999999

Stephanie Kost

From: pat engel [pengel@idi.net]
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2003 11:34 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Keep The USF Fair

RECEIVED

DEC 1 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

pat engel
4901 henry hudson pkwy
bronx, NY 10471-3217

November 3, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

pat engel

Stephanie Kost

From: Nestor Miranda [nmiranda@tracfone.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 2:38 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

Nestor Miranda
Project Manager
13816 SW 38 Lane
Miami, FL 33175-6491

RECEIVED

DEC 1 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael Powell
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Nestor
Project Manager

Stephanie Kost

From: Nestor Miranda [nmiranda@tracfone.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2003 11:15 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

Nestor Miranda
13816 SW 38 Lane
Miami, FL 33175-6491

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 28, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael Powell
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Nestor

Stephanie Kost

From: N Mir [nmiranda@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 2:29 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

N Mir
13816 SW 38 Lane
Miami, FL 33175-6491

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Thank you for helping us in this very important issue. We will communicate your concern to your elected official and various members of the Federal Communications Commission.

To learn more about TracFone Wireless, the largest independent prepaid wireless service provider in the U.S., feel free to visit us at http://www.tracfone.com.

Thank you again for your support.

Sincerely,

NM

RECEIVED

DEC 1 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Stephanie Kost

From: Mrs. Robert Taylor [TaylorMom2001@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 04, 2003 12:43 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Keep Current USF Contribution - It's Fair

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mrs. Robert Taylor
426 N. Washington
El Dorado, KS 67042-1857

October 4, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Mrs. Robert Taylor

Stephanie Kost

From: McCormack, Michael (Exchange) [MMcCormack@bear.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 6:54 AM
To: McCormack, Michael (Exchange)
Subject: Time Warner Telecom [TWTC]: Bear Stearns Full Report on 3Q03 Results

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

WTC10-28.pdf (56 KB)

Disclaimer.txt (416 B)

Attached, please find our full report on Time Warner Telecom's 3Q03 results, "Disconnects Weigh on Results". Please call or e-mail with any questions.

Key Points
* EPS were ($0.23), better than our ($0.27) estimate. However, quality of earnings was weak as EPS included $3.9M of non-recurring reciprocal compensation revenue, $7.6M of contract termination and minimum revenue commitment penalties, and $0.9M of investment gains.
* Total revenue was $167.2M, flat versus last year. However, excluding the onetime items above, revenue was $155.8M, down 6.8%.
* The company lost $3.5M ($0.7M related to MCI) of monthly recurring revenue during the quarter relative to $3.1M ($0.9M from MCI) in 2Q03. Approximately $7.9M of 3Q03 revenue was from WorldCom. Management believes that MCI bankruptcy-related disconnects are behind them, however disconnects could continue depending on MCI's ongoing network needs.
* During the quarter, the bankruptcy court handling MCI's proceedings approved the terms of a settlement with Time Warner Telecom. The net result was a cash payment to Time Warner Telecom of $2.0M, recognition of $5.2M of revenue and the reversal of $15.1M of expenses in 3Q03. The net result was a $20.3M favorable impact on EBITDA and net income that is not included in the ($0.23) EPS calculation.
* Capital expenditures for the quarter were $34.5M relative to $25.1M last year. The company again reduced its capital expenditure guidance for 2003. Original guidance of $200M was reduced to $150M last quarter. Management has now indicated that capital spending of $150M will be difficult to achieve.

<<TWTC10-28.pdf>>

Mike McCormack, CFA
Vice President
Bear, Stearns & Co.
383 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10179
212-272-4117 - Phone
212-272-2726 - Fax
Bear Stearns U.S. Wireline Services Equity Research

Robert Fagin / 212-272-4321 / rfagin@bear.com

Scott Goldman / 212-272-6112 / sgoldman@bear.com
Grace Y. Lee / 212-272-5201 / glee@bear.com
Mike McCormack, CFA / 212-272-4117 / mmccormack@bear.com Bernadette H. Morris / 212-272-4991 / bmorris@bear.com Steven L. Randall, CFA / 212-272-9408 / srandall@bear.com

Recent Bear Stearns U.S. Wireline Services Reports & E-Mails: Please Call or E-mail Us For Copies
* 10/23/03 - Level 3 - Margins Up Despite Revenue Decline
* 10/23/03 - Sprint Corp. - Beats Estimates On Cost Controls
* 10/23/03 - ALLTEL - Margins Slip; Wireless Net Adds Weak Again
* 10/22/03 - BellSouth - Positive Developments; Upgrading to Outperform
* 10/21/03 - AT&T - Strong Quarter; Reiterate Outperform

* 10/21/03 - SBC Communications - Cingular Hurts Profit; Has Wireline Bottomed?
* 10/17/03 - Industry - FTTP Update and USTA Conference Notes
* 10/17/03 - Qwest - Completed Audit Removes An Overhang
* 10/13/03 - Verizon - Update from the FTTH Conference
* 10/13/03 - AT&T - AT&T's Toll-Free Business
* 10/07/03 - Industry - Impact On Telcos: Our Take On The 9th Circuit Decision
* 10/07/03 - Industry - Preview of 3Q03 Results
* 10/01/03 - Industry - FAQs on USF: An Update on the Universal Service Fund
* 10/01/03 - Industry - Appeal of FCC Order Transferred to D.C. Circuit. What's Next?
* 09/24/03 - Verizon - Guidance Revised As Margin Pressure Continues
* 09/23/03 - SBC Communications - Weakness Continues; Reducing 2004 EPS Estimate
* 09/22/03 - Level 3 - Lowering Revenue Estimates on Preannouncement
* 09/17/03 - Equant - Market Conditions Still Tough
* 09/17/03 - Sprint Corp. - Update From Meetings With Management; Recombination Fully Reflected
* 09/16/03 - CenturyTel - Highlights from East Coast Analyst Day Conference
* 09/08/03 - Industry - Telecom Regulation Update: Internet Telephony
* 09/05/03 - Verizon - Verizon, Unions Come To Tentative Agreement
* 09/04/03 - Qwest - Negative Business Trends Persist, But Several Clouds Lifted
* 09/04/03 - Commonwealth Telephone Enterprises - No More Bs (But a New Chairman)
* 09/03/03 - Commonwealth Telephone Enterprises - Recapitalization Vote Set For Today...Sans One Large Holder
* 09/03/03 - Cincinnati Bell - Reduced Risk Profile; Upgrading to Peer Perform
* 09/03/03 - Industry - The DSL Report II: DSL as an Instrument of Competition
* 08/22/03 - Industry - FCC Order: Long Awaited Detail on Rules Governing Telecom Competition
* 08/19/03 - CenturyTel - High Fiber Diet
* 08/19/03 - Cincinnati Bell - Comments on CFO Resignation
* 08/14/03 - Verizon - Verizon Wireless Launches National Push To Talk Service
* 08/13/03 - CenturyTel - Highlights from West Coast Analyst Day Conference
* 08/08/03 - Citizens Communications - Decent 2Q03 Results; Challenging Revenue Environment
* 08/07/03 - CenturyTel - Analyst Day Handbook
* 08/06/03 - Commonwealth Telephone Enterprises - Good Results, But Greater Risk - The $300M Question Looms
* 08/04/03 - Qwest - Qwest and Sprint PCS: A Most Curious Deal
* 08/01/03 - Industry - MCI Is Sidelined From Government Contracts
* 08/01/03 - CenturyTel - Stellar 2Q03; Raising Estimates
* 08/01/03 - Cincinnati Bell - Despite Good Cash Flow, Long Way To Go
* 07/31/03 - Industry - Understanding Potential FCC Action on TELRIC
* 07/30/03 - Verizon - Wireless To The Rescue
* 07/30/03 - Time Warner Telecom - Headwinds Persist
* 07/29/03 - Equant - Despite Flat Top Line, Restructuring Yields Better Margins
* 07/29/03 - Sprint Corp. - Weak Top Line Saved by Cost Controls
* 07/28/03 - Verizon - Verizon Wireless 2Q03 Subscriber Results (e-mail)
* 07/25/03 - Industry - DSL ARPU Remains High (e-mail)
* 07/25/03 - Level 3 - Balance Sheet Issues Outweigh Genuity Synergies
* 07/25/03 - ALLTEL - Wireless Drives 2Q03 Outperformance
* 07/25/03 - SBC Communications - Cost Reduction Drives EPS
* 07/25/03 - AT&T - Dividend Hike Adds Excitement to In Line Quarter
* 07/24/03 - BellSouth - In-Line With Expectations
* 07/23/03 - Cincinnati Bell - Resignation of CEO (e-mail)
* 07/21/03 - Industry - Implications of Westell's Earnings Report for

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

the DSL Market (e-mail)
* 07/22/03 - Verizon - Highlights from Radio Shack earnings conference call (e-mail)
* 07/21/03 - Industry - "Take That, Cable": Thoughts on RBOC/Satellite Deals
* 07/15/03 - SBC Communications - DoJ Questions Michigan S. 271 Application (e-mail)
* 07/15/03 - Commonwealth Telephone Enterprises - Trimming Estimates to Reflect $250M Convertible Note Offering

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT(S) FOR A COMPLETE RECOMMENDATION ANALYSIS AND IMPORTANT DISCLOSURE INFORMATION.

RECEIVED

DEC 1 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Stephanie Kost

From: Marion Edridge [medr5406@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2003 4:17 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Note Regarding USF

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Marion Edridge
09411385843
112 35th Square SW
Vero Beach, FL 32968-3100

November 12, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Marion Edridge
09411385843

Stephanie Kost

From: Leilia MacNeil [hel_troy@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 07, 2003 8:52 AM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Opposed to Change in USF Collection

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Leilia MacNeil
206 Brookes Ave, Apt 5
Gaithersburg, MD 20877-2932

October 7, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

I do not make many calls. To be honest, I hate phones of any shape, size, or design. If I could, I would do without, but because it's considered a necessity, I do without a landline and use a wireless phone only when necessary. I own this cell phone solely for my safety and so others can contact me in case of an emergency.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

I am willing to contribute to the USF, but I should not be penalized for living with less telephone service than "normal." You website www.fcc.gov says that the USF is designed to provide services at "just, reasonable, and affordable rates." To be just and reasonable, charge the people that use the phone and tie up the phone lines.

Your website also says "Be a smart consumer. Shop around, and ask about each telecommunications company□s Universal Service charge. Compare the charges and choose a carrier based on your needs." I did--I got an

prepaid emergency cell phone. Stick with the equitable rates.

Sincerely,

Leilia MacNeil

RECEIVED

DEC 1 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Stephanie Kost

From: Kaut, David P. [DPKaut@LMUS.LeggMason.com]
Sent: Friday, October 03, 2003 11:25 AM
Subject: Legg Mason Washington Telecom & Media Insider

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Washington
lecom & Media Ins.

> See attachment for details & important disclosures and certifications.
>
>
> WASHINGTON TELECOM AND MEDIA INSIDER HIGHLIGHTS, October 3, 2003 (full
> note below)
>
> * AT&T-BELLSOUTH-COMCAST-IBM INTRIGUE. There were new reports this
> week that AT&T
> and BellSouth were engaged in merger talks, with Comcast and even IBM
> possibly involved. While we are skeptical such a complicated deal will
> materialize anytime soon, we do think the talks highlight
> BellSouth's advantage in strategic options, the interplay of cable and
> UNE-P, and consolidation issues.
> * SPRINT-NEXTEL ACCORD SIGNALS LNP SHIFT. Sprint and Nextel reached an
> accord on
> wireless local number portability, the first such implementation accord
> between unaffiliated carriers.
> * VONAGE, CALIFORNIA ESCALATE VOIP FIGHT. Vonage asked a court to
> block Minnesota
> assertions of VOIP jurisdiction and California made noises about VOIP
> needing state certification. FCC
> officials vowed to focus on the issue, but they may be planning just a
> preliminary inquiry for now.
> * SBC CLOSES IN ON FINAL 271 CLEARANCE. We believe the FCC is highly
> likely to approve
> SBC's long-distance filing for four Ameritech states, which would allow it
> to complete the 271 process.
> * MEDIA OWNERSHIP ON HOLD. Sen. McCain expects omnibus bill, and
> related media provisions,
> will take weeks to resolve; Sen. Dorgan not optimistic on cross-ownership;
> Third Circuit keeps the case.
> * ALSO: Items on Nebraska wireless assertion, California bill of
> rights delay, Cingular sued, FCC Nears
> Vote on USF Model, Digital must carry, DBS Northpoint appeal, DBS tax
> challenged, Do-not-call saga.
>
> <<Washington Telecom & Media Insider o03.pdf>>
>
> Blair Levin
> blevin@leggmason.com
> 202-778-1595
>
> Rebecca Arbogast
> rarbogast@leggmason.com
> 202-778-1978
>
> David Kaut
> dpkaut@leggmason.com
> 202-778-4341
>
>

IMPORTANT: The security of electronic mail sent through the Internet

is not guaranteed. Legg Mason therefore recommends that you do not send confidential information to us via electronic mail, including social security numbers, account numbers, and personal identification numbers.

Delivery, and timely delivery, of electronic mail is also not guaranteed. Legg Mason therefore recommends that you do not send time-sensitive or action-oriented messages to us via electronic mail, including authorization to "buy" or "sell" a security or instructions to conduct any other financial transaction. Such requests, orders or instructions will not be processed until Legg Mason can confirm your instructions or obtain appropriate written documentation where necessary.

Stephanie Kost

From: Joseph Henafelt [JHenafelt@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 8:15 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Minories Opposed to Change in USF Collection

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Joseph Henafelt
25 Sommerlyn Rd. Apt. #304
Colorado Springs, CO 80906-3401

October 30, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Joseph C. Henafelt

Stephanie Kost

From: John Meiser [aura2@efn.org]
Sent: Friday, November 07, 2003 12:05 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Note Regarding USF

RECEIVED

DEC 1 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

John Meiser
1150 West 15th Ave. #101
Eugene, OR 97402-3902

November 7, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

John Meiser

Stephanie Kost

From: John Burhoe [john.burhoe@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2003 6:00 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Note Regarding USF

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

John Burhoe
Manger of RF Operations
45 West St.
Milford, MA 01757-4142

October 2, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones? It is also not fair that funds like this are set up and then the goverment "steals" the money out of these funds and wastes the money in the general fund.

Sincerely,

John Burhoe
Manger of RF Operations

Stephanie Kost

From: Gregory A. Owens [gowens@highland.net]
Sent: Saturday, October 04, 2003 9:21 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Regarding Changes to USF Proposed by FCC

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Gregory A. Owens
Teacher/Consulant
534 E. Williamsburg St.
Whitley City, KY 42653-6080

October 4, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging $1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

I am opposed to the FCC proposal to charge $1 flat fee instead of charging according to volume usage per customer. Here's why...

I grew up in Fairfax Virginia, moved to Kentucky where my family is from, then became a teacher. I have been a teacher in two Kentucky schools districts over the past 21 years. Recently, I have been teaching in McCreary County Kentucky for several years, which is in an extremely low socio-economic area. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of our total student enrollment qualifies for for free/reduced school lunch programs. Our school district applies for USF discounts and is awarded discounts for several qualifying netword services, which do not have a direct impact on student achievement.

First of all it is apalling that McCeary County families pay land-line USF charges considering the family median income of $22,261 according to the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau. I am not in favor of a $1 a month flat charge unless the benefits would directly impact student achievement through the use of technology.

I have a feeling the changes proposed are to allow other rich counties to qualify for services that have not been able to meet the 85%-90% free/reduced lunch status over the last 6 years. If this is the case, I am vehemently opposed to charging $1 flat fee for USF instead of charging according to volume usage per customer.

Here is the real issue you should be concerned with. USF only allows for internal and external connections, and several other communication services that do not directly implact student access in schools. Many principals lack the training or interest to check email or utilize technology during teacher meetings. The fact that many do not expect technology to be used during instruction is outrageous. Sure, USF put

phones in every classroom, now the teacher can talk to friends and relatives during instruction. Sure, it helps us with network service fees, but students are rarely allowed to use computers for instruction because there are not sufficient computers available or computer labs sit idle with screen savers running, or the classroom computers are not turned on during the day.

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody $1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Gregory A. Owens
Teacher/Consulant