

Sandralyn Bailey

96-45

From: Carol Foster [evensong54@odyssey.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2007 11:50 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

~~SECRET FILE COPY ORIGINAL~~

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Carol Foster (evensong54@odyssey.net) writes:

As someone concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose the big phone companies' plan to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

The plan being pushed by the big phone companies and some in Congress would change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." This 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 AND the FCC to reject 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.

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.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

SandraLyn Bailey

96-45

From: benjamin barber [kenbarber@iwon.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2007 2:03 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

benjamin barber (kenbarber@iwon.com) writes:

As someone concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose the big phone companies' plan to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

The plan being pushed by the big phone companies and some in Congress would change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." This 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 AND the FCC to reject 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.

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.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Sandralyn Bailey

96-45

From: Judith R Barber [judybarber2000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2007 2:02 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 2007

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

Judith R Barber (judybarber2000@yahoo.com) writes:

As someone concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose the big phone companies' plan to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

The plan being pushed by the big phone companies and some in Congress would change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." This 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 AND the FCC to reject 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.

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.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Sandralyn Bailey

96-45

From: kenneth l. barber [kenbarber@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2007 2:02 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

kenneth l. barber (kenbarber@yahoo.com) writes:

As someone concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose the big phone companies' plan to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

The plan being pushed by the big phone companies and some in Congress would change the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." This 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 AND the FCC to reject 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.

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.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

96-45

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Bonnie Morava [morava@occ.state.oh.us]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2007 11:00 AM
To: dtaylor@tateweb; Jonathan Adelstein; KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Robert McDowell; Scott Marshall
Subject: Notice of Ex Parte Communications by NASUCA in FCC Dockets 96-45, 01-92, 03-133, 04-36, and 06-122
Attachments: 06-122 RevMechExParteUpdate1-24-07.pdf

Please see the attached document which was filed via ECFS by the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates.

Thank you,
Bonnie Morava

Bonnie C. Morava
The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 W. Broad St., Ste 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 466-9591 - phone
(614) 466-9475 - facsimile
morava@occ.state.oh.us

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

THIS COMMUNICATION IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PERSON OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR PRIVILEGED LEGAL GOVERNMENTAL MATERIAL. ANY UNAUTHORIZED REVIEW, USE, DISCLOSURE OR DISTRIBUTION IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU ARE NOT OR BELIEVE THAT YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OF THIS COMMUNICATION, DO NOT READ IT. PLEASE REPLY TO THE SENDER ONLY AND INDICATE THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE, THEN IMMEDIATELY DELETE IT AND ALL OTHER COPIES OF IT. THANK YOU.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE _____