

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

7/12/2007 7:14:48 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to  
jschmidt@corp.hometel.com.

jschmidt@corp.hometel.com wrote on 6/9/2007 11:01:24 AM :

Dear Commissioner Tate:

I am writing to endorse the recommendation of the Joint Board on Universal Service to place an interim, emergency cap on the amount of high-cost universal service support that competitive eligible telecommunications carriers may receive.

I appreciate your leadership and that of the Joint Board and staff as you consider the difficult questions associated with the distribution mechanism for universal service support.

We believe that this first step is the best way to begin a process to preserve universal service for the benefit of consumers. Without this critical action and leadership on the part of the Joint Board, the benefits that universal service provides to rural consumers would be in serious jeopardy.

Sincerely,

Justin Schmidt  
Plant Manager  
Home Telephone Co.  
501 North Douglas St.  
Saint Jacob, IL 62281  
jschmidt@hometel.com

FILED/ACCEPTED

**USF CAP**

AS

NOV - 2 2007

**Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.**

8/28/2007 9:41:09 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to alwazehear4u@aol.com.

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

alwazehear4u@aol.com wrote on 8/27/2007 7:51:54 PM :

valerie may  
10313 spring mill rd  
concord, VA 24538-2081

August 27, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell , I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

valerie may

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**USF CAP**  
**Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45.**

AS

8/24/2007 11:31:36 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to latonja@go-smt.com.

latonja@go-smt.com wrote on 8/24/2007 11:19:52 AM :

LaTonja Al-Hedaithy  
6312 Seven Corners Center  
Falls Church, VA 22044-2409

August 13, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country? isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

LaTonja Al-Hedaithy  
703-347-1344

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB**  
**USF CAP**

8/29/2007 12:57:47 PM - Email Acknowledgement sent to neverendin309@aol.com.

neverendin309@aol.com wrote on 8/28/2007 7:21:45 PM :

Mavis Hodges  
2593 Wades Gap Rd.  
Callaway, VA 24067-2251

August 28, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Mavis Hodges

**Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB**  
**USF CAP**

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**NOV - 2 2007**

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

8/21/2007 9:48:57 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to mike@mikethornsbury.com.

mike@mikethornsbury.com wrote on 8/17/2007 12:36:44 PM :

Michael Thornsbury  
6947 Mary Caroline Cir, Unit I  
Alexandria, VA 22310-4917

August 17, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Michael Thornsbury

FILED/ACCEPTED

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

8/24/2007 11:31:52 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to simplyrandys@aol.com.

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

simplyrandys@aol.com wrote on 8/24/2007 11:19:47 AM :

LORI SOLID  
4930 GATE CITY HWY  
BRISTOL, VA 24202-1250

August 10, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I'LL LET THE STUFF BELOW THIS STAY BUT PLEASE UNDERSTAND THAT IF IT HADN'T BEEN FOR WIRELESS SERVICE, THRU ALLTEL BECAUSE THAT'S THE ONLY ONE WE CAN GET HERE, THAT MY FINACEE AND I WOULD HAVE BEEN KILLED. AN ASSAULT BY NEIGHBORS HAPPENED IN 2005 AND HAD IT NOT BEEN FOR WIRELESS SERVICE TO INFORM POLICE WHAT WAS HAPPENING WE WOULD BE DEAD. WE LIVE ON A FARM AND THE ONLY WAY TO COMMUNICATE IS VIA OUR CELL PHONES. I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country? isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

LORI SOLID

FILED/ACCEPTED

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP  
8/23/2007 10:07:19 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to emmilliner@comcast.net.

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

emmilliner@comcast.net wrote on 8/22/2007 8:11:36 PM :

Edna Milliner  
511 South Main St.  
Lexington, VA 24450-2307

August 22, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Edna M Milliner  
540-817-0792

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:50:27 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to gpw52255@msn.com.

gpw52255@msn.com wrote on 8/9/2007 1:45:14 PM :

Greg Wonderly  
4762 Mandan Road  
Virginia Beach, VA 23462-3843

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell , I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Greg Wonderly

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP  
8/22/2007 5:35:53 PM - Email Acknowledgement sent to stovall125@aol.com.

stovall125@aol.com wrote on 8/21/2007 9:14:34 PM :

Jessica Stovall  
21921 Boydton Plank Road  
McKenney, VA 23872-2449

August 21, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Jessica Stovall  
804-478-4000

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

8/21/2007 10:03:25 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to apalm44@hotmail.com.

apalm44@hotmail.com wrote on 8/18/2007 4:36:24 PM :

Beatrice Palm  
110 28th Ave SE # 320  
Watertown, SD 57201-8421

August 18, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner Adelstein , I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of South Dakota and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Palm

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

/21/2007 9:48:38 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to patti2007@pie.midco.com.

patti2007@pie.midco.com wrote on 8/15/2007 5:55:13 PM :

Patti Childers  
710 w dakota apt 209  
pierre, SD 57501-1866

August 15, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Patti Childers  
605 222 7444

FILED/ACCEPTED

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

8/21/2007 10:02:18 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to claw0341@cox.net.

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

claw0341@cox.net wrote on 8/15/2007 10:00:15 PM :

Carol Lawrence  
1821 Settlers Landing  
Virginia Beach, VA 23453-3529

August 15, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell , I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Carol Lawrence  
757 348-0501

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:59:59 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to gomez.meww@gmail.com.

gomez.meww@gmail.com wrote on 8/15/2007 10:43:58 AM :

Meww Gomez  
7510 Bland Drive  
Manassas, VA 20109-6249

August 15, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell , I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Meww

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:46:37 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to my\_3\_cats\_1\_dog@yahoo.com.

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

my\_3\_cats\_1\_dog@yahoo.com wrote on 8/15/2007 12:31:37 PM :

Lisa Dodds  
26321 Dennis Drive  
Parksley, VA 23421-3860

August 15, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Lisa Dodds

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:47:35 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to mindela62@comcast.net.

mindela62@comcast.net wrote on 8/15/2007 12:38:55 PM :

Melinda Richards  
16087 Covey Circle  
AMISSVILLE, VA 20106-2264

August 15, 2007

Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to express my opposition to this unfair, arbitrary proposal. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I urge the FCC to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,

Melinda Richards  
540-937-3321

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

8/21/2007 10:01:09 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to hercreations@hotmail.com.

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

hercreations@hotmail.com wrote on 8/15/2007 2:47:58 PM :

Hilda Ward  
81 Woodlake Dr  
Charlottesville, VA 22901-1323

August 15, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Hilda Ward

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:58:35 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to gulliver\_eeb@yahoo.com.

gulliver\_eeb@yahoo.com wrote on 8/12/2007 9:31:15 PM :

Erin Burnette  
349 South Laurel Street  
Richmond, VA 23220-6230

August 12, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell , I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Erin Burnette

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**NOV - 2 2007**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB

USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:59:19 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to heuristic36@aol.com.

heuristic36@aol.com wrote on 8/15/2007 8:52:55 AM :

William J. Cushman  
9449 Elihu Hill Rd.  
Marshall, VA 20115-2852

August 15, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

William J. Cushman  
540-364-2415

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:54:08 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to humane1@comcast.net.

humane1@comcast.net wrote on 8/9/2007 3:48:46 PM :

Ann-Louise Brown  
138 Buckingham Drive  
Stephens City, VA 22655-2732

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Ann-Louise Brown

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:51:25 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to crsheltn@verizon.net.

crsheltn@verizon.net wrote on 8/9/2007 2:26:29 PM :

Charles Shelton  
po box 453  
grottoes, VA 24441-0453

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Charles Shelton

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:55:05 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to jmthiele@earthlink.net.

jmthiele@earthlink.net wrote on 8/9/2007 7:53:25 PM :

Joanne Thiele  
201 South Blake Rd.  
Norfolk, VA 23505-4405

August 9, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell, I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Joanne M. Thiele  
757 440-1076

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the SecretaryDockets 05-337 and/or Docket 96-45. AB  
USF CAP

8/21/2007 9:56:52 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to revsjh1049387635@aol.com.

revsjh1049387635@aol.com wrote on 8/10/2007 6:51:21 AM :

SHARAN HILL  
703 Anne St., SW  
Leesburg, VA 20175-3402

August 10, 2007

Robert McDowell

Dear Robert McDowell:

I understand that the FCC is considering several measures regarding the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am writing to urge you to oppose any proposal that would result in less wireless funding. Ideas like the proposed wireless-only cap are clearly anti-competitive, because they single out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country-isn't that the purpose of the USF?

The FCC should consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America: wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if USF funding for wireless is reduced, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

Commissioner McDowell , I urge you to vote against any proposal that would result in less funding for wireless service. Rural residents of Virginia and everywhere in America are counting on you to protect our public safety and encourage economic growth by supporting wireless funding from the USF.

Sincerely,

Sharan J. Hill

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

7/12/2007 7:13:40 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to cridenhour@intrstar.net.

cridenhour@intrstar.net wrote on 6/18/2007 10:56:58 AM :

Ms. Marlene Dortch  
Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TW-B204  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: In the Matter of High-Cost Universal Service Support, WC Docket No. 05-337; In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I would like to thank and praise Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate for her outstanding leadership as chair of the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service (Joint Board) and for her eloquent testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee on June 12, 2007. I also would like to express my full support of the Joint Board's recommendation to place an interim, emergency cap on the amount of high-cost universal service support that competitive eligible telecommunications carriers (CETCs) will receive over the next 18 months. The Joint Board's proposed interim cap will secure the near-term sustainability of the high-cost Universal Service Fund (USF). This is a necessary first step toward long-term USF reform that must be taken to sustain affordable communications services for generations to come.

The proposed interim measure will relieve the rapidly growing pressure on the high-cost USF mechanism resulting from the explosive growth in CETC USF support. Adopting the 18-month interim CETC USF cap will provide the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) enough time to develop and implement long-term USF reform measures without risking the sustainability of the fund or public safety.

This is the best way to begin a process to preserve universal service for the benefit of all consumers. Without this critical interim action and the leadership of Commissioner Tate the benefits that universal service provides to consumers would be in serious jeopardy in the very near future. For these reasons, I urge Chairman Martin and Commissioners Copps, Adelstein and McDowell to support Commissioner Tate and adopt the Joint Board's proposed emergency, interim cap on CETC high-cost universal service support.

Sincerely,

Charles Ridenhour

Star Telephone Membership Corporation

FILED/ACCEPTED

7/12/2007 7:14:57 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to  
lauriegrossnickle@adams.net.

NOV - 2 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

LaurieGrossnickle@adams.net wrote on 6/8/2007 6:02:53 PM :

June 8, 2007

Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room 8-A204  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: In the Matter of High-Cost Universal Service Support, WC  
Docket No. 05-337; In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on  
Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45

Dear Commissioner Tate:

I am writing to endorse the recommendation of the Joint Board on  
Universal Service to place an interim, emergency cap on the amount  
of high-cost universal service support that competitive eligible  
telecommunications carriers may receive.

I appreciate your leadership and that of the other members of the  
Joint Board and staff as you consider the difficult questions  
associated with the distribution mechanism for universal service

*support.*

We believe that this first step is the best way to begin a process to preserve universal service for the benefit of consumers. Without this critical action and leadership on the part of the Joint Board, the benefits that universal service provides to rural consumers would be in serious jeopardy.

Sincerely,

Lau

Laurie Grossnickle

Adams Telephone Co-Operative

cc: Chairman Kevin J. Martin  
Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein  
Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Commissioner Robert M. McDowell