EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandralyn Bailey

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

06-122

ORIGINAL

From: Jean Connor [jean.connor@emersonnetworkpower.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2006 1:33 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Jean Connor (jean.connor@emersonnetworkpower.com) writes:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman, you, Kevin J. Martin's, plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund. (You) 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, YOU, Chairman Martin 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. This country does NOT need any more taxes, especially with the way things have gotten out of hand with CenturyTel, Cable TV, government pork bellies, etc. I can't even afford prescription drugs because our government is "free" paying illegal immigrants. Social Security will run out when my children are due to collect. I could go on and on about our government, but I hope you put your foot down on this tax issue - TODAY!!!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 66.195.232.121
Remote IP address: 66.195.232.121

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandralyn Bailey

06-122

From: Neiman Eaton [sirnte@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 10:57 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

ORIGINAL

Neiman Eaton (sirnte@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Chairman Martin,
I would like to comment on the FCC's recent decision to include wireless and VOIP's to the contribution of the universal service fund. Sir, I would have to respectfully disagree with the commission's decision to include these new area's of telecommunication to this fund. I for one do not understand the reasoning for wanting these burgeoning new areas of growth to have to commit to this fund. After reading each of the commissioners statements on why they voted for this inclusion I fully believe there is no logical reasoning as to why they need to be included. This fund was setup to help rural, schools, and low income people obtain communication. That's fine and noteworthy and part of the reason why it was created by congress. But I'm confused as to the recent statements that the fund has the possiblity of becoming underfunded and it needs new sources of revenue. Sir, this confuses me. We are not a nation of poverty and rural areas. How can this fund be losing money when we pay for school taxes, and there are other taxes on landline phones to contribute to all sorts of causes.? This in my opinion seems like a money grab. This new area is still in its infancy. Why punish or take from an industry that is still working the kinks out of their system. Sir, I am a working family man that is trying to scratch out a decent living. It has gotten to the point where a phone bill was being overwhelmed by the taxes on it in comparison to the services that I was being offered. And then comes along a new phone service that offers value and now a govt entity wants to start the slow strangulation of death on the consumer by implementing these onerous taxes. Sir I would hope that your commission reevaluates there decision again at there next meeting. I would love to come to a public forum to discuss my concerns. If your ever in the Houston area, I would love an invite at a public meeting to meet and talk and hear your reasoning for these decisions. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Neiman Eaton
---
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.91.37.140
Remote IP address: 69.91.37.140

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Peter Sisson [psisson@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 5:11 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

06-122

JUL 11 2006

ORIGINAL

Peter Sisson (psisson@gmail.com) writes:

Dear Kevin,

Having recently sold my company teleo (a skype competitor) to Microsoft, I have been deeply immersed in the VoIP market.

Your recent decisions to exempt DSL providers from contributing to the Universal Service Fund, and your decision to require Internet-based providers of phone service to contribute as well, seem to indicate that you believe Universal Service should apply only to phone service, and not to access to the Internet. You are passing up an historical opportunity to do something about the "digital divide," whereby low-income households cannot afford Internet access.

The universal access promise should be made for broadband Internet access, and ALL the applications that run over it. This means infrastructure providers of DSL and Cable Modem service (often the same companies that now provide phone service) should collect and apply broadband USF fees.

By transferring the telephony universal access scheme to Internet access in general, you take a big step toward ending the digital divide, and avoid singling out a single service (voice) that will soon be much like email in the way it is used and marketed. Taxing a specific application (voice) rather than the infrastructure across which all applications run is extremely misguided.

Similarly, taxing individual phone numbers would be akin to taxing email addresses. This will create an unnatural distortion in the economics of new phone applications and will stifle innovation. It's adds unnecessary complexity and is very bad idea.

The best and simplest way, bar none, to solve the Universal Service Fund issue is to apply the fee to broadband Internet access in general (e.g. DSL or cable modem), NOT to single out particular services that run over broadband. Phone service, as VoIP, is simply a software-based service running over broadband, just like email, e-commerce or any other internet application. To single out voice will create a distorting imbalance in the FCC's regulatory approach to the Internet.

The new mantra at the FCC should be Internet access for all. This will include phone service AND all the other applications that run on the Internet. That means collecting USF fees from the providers of Internet access. Its the simplest, cleanest regulatory approach available, and will provide plenty of money for the fund.

I would be glad to discuss this personally if you'd like to give me a call.

Peter Sisson
former President, CEO, and co-Founder
Teleo (now Microsoft)
Cell: 415 515 5940
Email: psisson@gmail.com

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 71.131.190.1
Remote IP address: 71.131.190.1

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED JUL 11 2006 Federal Communications Commission

06-122

From: Leonard Vincent [lvincent45@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2006 11:50 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: This is my opinion

ORIGINAL

I am so tired of the government agencies always making the average citizen pay more fees to support institutions and people who CAN'T AFFORD to pay the regular fees and phone company charges.

Already, an extra $15 is added on to the regular carrier charges as regularitory fees..WHEN WILL THIS END?? MY GUESS IS NEVER....you will keep charging us until we can't afford phone service anymore. I have cancelled my wireline service because of the fees imposed...a basic $27.95 a month charge equals $45 with ALL the GOVERNMENT FEES IMPOSED on the carriers...OF COURSE they carries PASS THE FEES ON TO THEIR FCUSTOMERS...

The FCC Commissioners probably pay the sames fees but they also make a LOT MORE MONEY that the average JOE does!!

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED 06-122

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Nicole Stevens [cyber_chic26@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 12:48 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylortateweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: Internet Phone Fees

ORIGINAL

JUL 7 Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary

Hello,

I want to voice my problem with the new rules that make internet phones pay the fees. I have vonage and I already pay the fees through my cable provider. You are double charging me. It is unfair.

-Nicole Stevens

Yahoo! Sports Fantasy Football '06 - Go with the leader. Start your league today!

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE