

Here in Oregon we recently had a highly publicized incident where a family got lost in a remote area for 10 days and the father actually died before the family could be rescued. Having cell phone coverage would have helped that family. I have a 13-year-old son. I know that in the next few years he will be driving into rural areas with friends and their families, and with his sports teams when they travel. As an American parent, I want to know that if my son is in trouble in a rural area, that he will be able to get a call through to me on his cell phone.

The above examples illustrate an important need for more and better coverage in rural areas. My understanding is that it is very questionable as to whether wireless companies will be able to continue to fill this need without the subsidy provided by the Universal Service Fund you are considering capping. I therefore ask that you not cap the Universal Service Fund, but instead look at expanding it.

There is also of course an equity issue. To me it makes sense that rural areas deserve the same coverage as urban areas. This is another reason I believe the USF should not be capped at this point in the evolution of wireless coverage.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.