

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
DEC 13 2005
FCC - MAILROOM

ale 45

2314 California St.
Berkeley, CA 94703-1610

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

DOCKED COPY ORIGINAL


Dear Mr. Martin:

Please drop plans to change the USF from collection on a usage basis to a flat fee. Citizens who save money by limiting their phone calls 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 because of unaffordable 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.

It is no defense to say that the law doesn't require phone companies to pass the charges on; they do so, regardless. Making those who use less pay for the calls of high-use customers is blatantly unfair.

Sincerely,




Carol Jenkins

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

December 5, 2005

FCC, Chairman
Kevin J Martin
445 12th Street South West
Washington, DC, 20554



96-45

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Mr. 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,

Sebastian Coronado
186 Normal Avenue, Apt. #1
Buffalo, New York 14213-2518

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED



55 Brennan Rd.
Ottsville, PA 18942

ab HS

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

Dear Mr. Martin:


DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Please drop plans to change the USF from collection on a usage basis to a flat fee. Citizens who save money by limiting their phone calls 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 because of unaffordable 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.

It is no defense to say that the law doesn't require phone companies to pass the charges on; they do so, regardless. Making those who use less pay for the calls of high-use customers is blatantly unfair.

Sincerely,



Larry & Gimone Hall

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE