RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Richard Laursen
14012 93rd Ave NE , Bothell, Washington 98011

February 19, 2006 12:18 AM

Senator Patty Murray
U.S. Senate
173 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-0001

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

Dear Senator Murray:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard Laursen

cc:

FCC General Email Box

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Richard Laursen
14012 93rd Ave NE , Bothell, Washington 98011

February 19, 2006 12:18 AM

Senator Maria Cantwell
U.S. Senate
717 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-0001

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

Dear Senator Cantwell:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard Laursen

cc:

FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Richard Laursen
14012 93rd Ave NE , Bothell, Washington 98011

February 19, 2006 12:18 AM

Representative Jay Inslee
U.S. House of Representatives
403 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

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

Dear Representative Inslee:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard Laursen

cc:

FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Elizabeth Richter
15 Winthrop Woods Road , Huntington (Shelton), Connecticut 06484-5025

March 12, 2006 02:43 PM

Representative Christopher Shays
U.S. House of Representatives
1126 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

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

Dear Representative Shays:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.
Inflation and increased taxes have forced me to give up my retirement after 20 years and return to work to keep the roof over our heads. My husband has been in declining health for some time and having a low cost cell phone enables us to keep in touch while I'm at work. I cannot afford the increased cost of a flat-fee system and don't feel I should be burdened in order to help others when I myself am hurting financially.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Richter

cc:

FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Donald Green
528 Hartsboro Rd. , Wallingford, Vermont 05773

February 28, 2006 11:04 PM

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

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

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose your plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

You are proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge you to rethink this flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Donald Green

cc:

Representative Bernie Sanders
Senator Jim Jeffords
Senator Patrick Leahy

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Gary Forrest
3011 Barge St., Yakima, Washington 98902-2733

March 13, 2006 12:18 PM

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

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

Dear Chairman Martin:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin, you are proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge you to rethink your flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

My wife and I are senior citizens that use prepaid wireless. The thought that we and others like us should somehow subsidize business and their army of long distance dialers is not a good one.

I have passed along my concerns to Washington State's Congressional Delegation, Senators Patty Murray and Maria Cantwell plus Representative Doc Hastings. I have asked them for support in this matter.

Sincerely,
Gary Forrest
Gary Forrest

cc:

FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Alice Hummer

5661 Bayside Drive , Riverside, Ohio 45431-2205

March 13, 2006 12:19 PM

KEVIN J. MARTIN

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

Dear Representative Turner:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Alice Hummer

Alice Hummer

cc:

FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Elizabeth Lee Richter
5 Winthrop Woods Road, Huntington, CT 06484-5025
Phone: (203) 929-1321
E-mail: elizalr@aol.com

March 13, 2006

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

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

Dear Chairman Martin:

My husband and I retired in 1986. During the ensuing 20 years inflation has risen to such a high that we have had to give up our retirement and return to work in order, literally, to keep the roof over our heads. My husband has been in declining health for the last several years leaving the entire burden of making up the deficit to me.

I recently purchased an inexpensive cell phone and subscribed to a pay-as-you-use service. It has given me the power to keep in touch with my husband while I am at work. I could not afford the increased cost of a flat-fee system and don't feel I should be burdened in order to help others when I myself am hurting.

I have expressed my concerns to my congressmen and I urge you to withdraw your proposal to change the Universal Service Fund collection from a pay-for-what-you-use system to a monthly flat-fee.

Very truly yours,

Elizabeth Lee Richter

Elizabeth Lee Richter

Enc. Copy of letter to Rep. Christopher Shays

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

James Christian
28 Underwood Road , Tupper Lake, New York 12986-1007

March 13, 2006 10:48 AM

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

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

Dear Chairman Martin:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

The proposed change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge you to rethink this flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Sincerely,
James Christian

copies to:

Senator Charles Schumer
Representative John McHugh
Senator Hillary Clinton

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Leonard Hass

223 Sauter Rd, Central Square, New York 13036-3445

March 13, 2006

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

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

Dear Chairman Martin:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose your plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

You are proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers -- is unfair. I urge you to rethink this flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Leonard J. Hass, Jr.

0

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Deirdre Endsley
1308 N. Riley Ave., Indianapolis, Indiana 46201-1838

March 13, 2006 06:12 PM

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

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

Dear Chairman Martin:

As a retired person on a very limited income, and someone who makes very few long distance telephone calls, I am concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees. Therefore, I oppose your plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund. Why is it that those of us with limited income are continually supporting those with much more.

You, as Chairman of the FCC are proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge you to rethink this flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

I have also sent similar letters to Senators Evan Bayh, Richard Lugar and Congresswoman Julia Carson.

Sincerely,

Deirdre E Endsley

Deirdre Endsley

0

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Mitzi Ell

411 Burr Oak Road PO Box 204 , Foley, Missouri 63347

March 10, 2006 09:57 AM

Representative Todd Akin
U.S. House of Representatives
117 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

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

Dear Representative Akin:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Mitzi Ell

cc:

FCC General Email Box

0

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 20 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Mitzi Ell
411 Burr Oak Road PO Box 204 , Foley, Missouri 63347

March 10, 2006 09:57 AM

Senator Jim Talent
U.S. Senate
493 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-0001

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

Dear Senator Talent:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Mitzi Ell

cc:

FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 2 0 2006
FCC - MAILROOM

Mitzi Ell

411 Burr Oak Road PO Box 204 , Foley, Missouri 63347

March 10, 2006 09:57 AM

Senator Christopher Bond
U.S. Senate
274 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-0001

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

Dear Senator Bond:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as $707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Mitzi Ell

cc:

FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE