C-141

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

NOV 21 2005

FCC - MAILROOM

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Carol Lancaster

15200 Brandywine Dr. SW , Cumberland, Maryland 21502-5817

November 02, 2005 07:20 PM

Representative Roscoe Bartlett
U.S. House of Representatives
2412 Rayburn House Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Representative Bartlett:

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.

A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.
The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensured that I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers taxed, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

cc: FCC Chair Kevin Martin, Congress

Sincerely,

Carol Lancaster

cc:

FCC General Email Box

Terry Baker
2623 Hill Park Dr , San Jose, California 95124-1735

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
NOV 21 2005
FCC - MAILROOM

November 10, 2005 02:19 PM

FCC
Chairman Kevin J Martin
445 12th St SW
Washington, DC, 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Chairman Kevin J Martin :

I have serious concerns regarding the Federal Communications Commissions' (FCC) position to change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection method to a monthly flat fee. Many of your constituents, including me, my friends, family and neighbors, will be negatively impacted by the unfair change proposed by the FCC.

As you know, USF is currently collected on a revenue basis. People who use more pay more into the system. If the FCC changes that system to a flat fee, that means that someone who uses one thousand minutes a month of long distance, pays the same amount into the fund as someone who uses zero minutes of long distance a month. Constituents who use their limited resources wisely should not be penalized for doing so.

A flat fee tax could cause many low-volume long distance users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers, to give up their phones due to unaffordable monthly increases on their bills. Shifting the funding burden of the USF from high volume to low-volume users is radical and unnecessary. In addition, it would have a highly detrimental effect on small businesses all across America.
The Keep USF Fair Coalition, of which I am a member, keeps me informed about the USF issue with monthly newsletters and up to date information on their website, including links to FCC information. While I am aware that federal law does not require companies to recover, or "pass along" these fees to their customers, the reality is that they do. As a consumer I would like ensure I am charged fairly. If the FCC goes to a numbers taxed, my service will cost more. And according to the Coalition's recent meetings with top FCC officials, the FCC has plans to change to a flat fee system soon and without legislation.

I will continue to monitor developments on the issue and continue to spread the word to my community. I request you pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know how a flat fee tax could disproportionately affect those in your constituency.

Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Terry Baker

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

November 12, 2005 8:00 PM

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
NOV 21 2005
FCC - MAILROOM

DOCKET FILE COPY

Richard Kooy
642 Ely Street
Allegan, MI 49010-1514

FCC
Chairman Kevin J. Martin
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Subject: RE: Federal-State Joint Board On Universal Service – Docket 96-45

Dear Chairman Martin,

I urge you to support the "Fair Share Plan" as a solution to current concerns with the Universal Service Fund (USF). The Fair Share Plan will keep the USF fair, ensuring that consumers like me do not pay the same rate into the USF as big businesses, regardless of how little I may use long distance.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition submitted the Fair Share Plan to the FCC on January 31, 2005. It expands who pays into the USF so that other technologies – not just phones – pay into the system. The Fair Share Plan collects the USF using a combination numbers – and revenue-based plan. This keeps the system fair, equitable and non-discriminatory.

Under the flat fee or numbers-based plan you are considering, people like me who make few long distance calls would pay the same as people or businesses that make many calls. I believe it would be unfair to charge low-volume and residential customers the same fees as big-volume residential or business customers.

I urge you to keep the USF fair, and adopt the Fair Share Plan. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Kooy

Richard L. Kooy
Allegan, Michigan

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

NOV 21 2005

FCC - MAILROOM

andrew froehle
28453 ottawa dr , browerville, Minnesota 56438

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

November 13, 2005 01:56 PM

The Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear The Federal Communications Commission:

The flat-fee Universal Service Fund proposal is unfair. I urge you to oppose this plan. I am one of the millions of consumers that will be unfairly taxed at a higher rate under the flat fee plan. The flat-fee would mean a tax hike for people like me -- consumers that use prepaid cellular phones or make few long distance calls.

I support the Keep USF Fair Coalition, and monitor this issue on their website. Stopping the flat fee tax is important to my family - not to mention my pocket book. You will hear from me again, until this issue is resolved fairly! The flat-fee is unfair, and un-American.

Under the flat fee proposal you are considering, people who make few long distance calls would pay the same as people or businesses that make many calls. In other words, low-volume and primarily residential customers would bear the same universal service fund burden as high-volume residential or business customers. I urge you to reject this flat-fee proposal.

Thank you.

cc: FCC Chair Kevin Martin, Congress

Sincerely,

andrew froehle

cc:

Representative Collin Peterson
Senator Mark Dayton
Senator Norm Coleman

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

SCHEDULE "A"

REAL PROPERTY IN TODD COUNTY, MINNESOTA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS, TO-WIT:

LOT TWENTY-THREE (23), BLOCK EIGHT (8) OF SYLVAN SHORES SOUTH, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF ON FILE AND OF RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER IN AND FOR SAID COUNTY AND STATE.

AND

LOT NUMBER TWENTY-FOUR (24), BLOCK NUMBER EIGHT (8), SYLVAN SHORES SOUTH, SUBDIVISION OF SYLVAN SHORES, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF ON FILE AND OF RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER IN AND FOR TODD COUNTY, MINNESOTA, SUBJECT TO ANY AND ALL RESERVATIONS, EASEMENTS, COVENANTS AND RESTRICTIONS WHICH ARE OF RECORD.

SUBJECT TO ANY EASEMENTS, RESTRICTIONS OR RESERVATIONS OF RECORD, IF ANY.

PROPERTY IS ABSTRACT

TAX ID# 26-0043100

ORDER NO. 1537107