

7. Increased budgetary costs to provide alternative mechanisms for inmate calls. This lack of funding may result in the reduction of the availability of inmate phones.

Along with these major concerns, I also see a problem with who is going to fund the change to Billed Party Preference. BPP is an expensive technology which will work to the detriment of our facility. Therefore, I am strongly opposed to BPP and I encourage the FCC to do the same.

Thank You,



Sheriff David W. Troutman
County of Summit
53 University Avenue
Akron, Ohio 44308

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF DICKINSON

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

P.O. BOX 609
IRON MOUNTAIN, MICHIGAN
49801

PHONE 806-774-6262

Aug 10

July 28, 1994

DONALD J. CHARLEVOIX
SHERIFF

FRANCIS J. MCCARTHY
UNDERSHERIFF

RECEIVED

92-77

AUG - 1 1994

Federal Communications Commission
FCC Secretary's Office
1919 M Street, NW Room 222
Washington D.C. 20554

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RE: Billed Party Preference
For 0+ InterLATA Calls

Dear FCC Members,

I have been made aware of a pending regulatory issue that needs to be stopped as it would affect the way Sheriff's Departments along with other Law Enforcement Agencies and Correctional Facilities in the way our inmate phone system is currently handled.

The issue is called Billed Party Preference. Billed Party Preference, (commonly referred to as BPP), is a regulation that states that the person being billed for the call, (in this case the inmates's attorney, friends, family, etc.), is the only one who can determine what telephone company handles the call. Basically it is specifically designed to eliminate the providing of collect calls by a single phone company, such as the provider of our current inmate phone system.

What will happen is that many and multiple phone companies, that I am not contracted with, will be able to handle calls from our phone system. This will dramatically reduce our inmate phone provider's ability to control calling from our facility.

If the collect call recipient chooses another company, other than our inmate phone company, this company will most likely not be equipped to handle inmate calls. It will most likely also not be aware that the call is coming from a correctional facility, resulting in fraud. This also results in large lost revenue to our inmate phone company making it impossible for them to continue our service in the manner we select and with the benefits we currently have. Particularly, it will reduce our inmate phone commissions substantially at best and our control of inmate calling. Three other particular areas that will be affected to our detriment, namely:

1. We will lose blocking control of our inmate phone calls.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0

2. We will lose a revenue stream and the inmate family phone costs could go up.

3. The potential for fraud will creep back into the system.

Along with these major concerns, I also see a problem with who is going to pay for all this?

I eagerly oppose the BPP and encourage the FCC to do the same.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Donald J. Charlevoix, Sheriff

c/c Congressman Bart Stupak
Senator Carl Levin
Senator Donald W. Riegle Jr.
Vice President Al Gore

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

SEVIER COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
SEVIER COUNTY JAIL
LT. KERRY MEACHAM

250 NORTH MAIN
RICHFIELD, UTAH 84701

PHONE (801) 896-6433
FAX (801) 896-6081

JULY 11, 1994

VINCENT TOWNSEND
APCC INMATE PHONE SERVICE TASK FORCE
P.O. BOX 8179
GREENSBORO, NC. 27419

AUG 22 1994

DEAR MR. TOWNSEND

I HAVE REVIEWED THE PROPOSED BILLING PARTY PREFERENCE ACT CONCERNING INMATE TELEPHONE SYSTEMS AND FIND THAT I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF THIS ACTION. I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT ANYONE WOULD BE SERVED OR RECEIVE ANY KIND OF BENEFIT FROM THIS ACTION. IT APPEARS TO ME THAT IT WOULD COST TOO MUCH TO IMPLEMENT AND WOULD END UP COSTING MORE MONEY FOR INMATE PHONE CALLS TO THEIR FAMILIES, AS THE COSTS WOULD BE PASTED ON TO THE CUSTOMERS. IT IS CLEAR THAT IF IT BECOMES TOO EXPENSIVE FOR INMATES AND THEIR FAMILIES, THEY WOULD COMPLAIN TO THE POINT THAT IT WOULD BE MORE BENEFICIAL FOR THE JAILS AND PRISONS TO TAKE OUT THE PHONES INSTEAD OF DEALING WITH THEM, RESULTING IN EXTENSIVE LOST CONTACT BETWEEN INMATE AND FAMILY.

SINCERELY,



KERRY MEACHAM
JAIL COMMANDER

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY (ORIGINAL)

SEVIER COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
SEVIER COUNTY JAIL
LT. KERRY MEACHAM

250 NORTH MAIN
RICHFIELD, UTAH 84701

PHONE (801) 896-6433
FAX (801) 896-6081

RECEIVED
THIS 22 1994
CANCELLED
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

JUL 22 4 41 PM '94

JULY 11, 1994

VINCENT TOWNSEND
APCC INMATE PHONE SERVICE TASK FORCE
P.O. BOX 8179
GREENSBORO, NC. 27419

RECEIVED
JUL 22 1994
FCC MAIL ROOM

DEAR MR. TOWNSEND

I HAVE REVIEWED THE PROPOSED BILLING PARTY PREFERENCE ACT CONCERNING INMATE TELEPHONE SYSTEMS AND FIND THAT I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF THIS ACTION. I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT ANYONE WOULD BE SERVED OR RECEIVE ANY KIND OF BENEFIT FROM THIS ACTION. IT APPEARS TO ME THAT IT WOULD COST TOO MUCH TO IMPLEMENT AND WOULD END UP COSTING MORE MONEY FOR INMATE PHONE CALLS TO THEIR FAMILIES, AS THE COSTS WOULD BE PASTED ON TO THE CUSTOMERS. IT IS CLEAR THAT IF IT BECOMES TOO EXPENSIVE FOR INMATES AND THEIR FAMILIES, THEY WOULD COMPLAIN TO THE POINT THAT IT WOULD BE MORE BENEFICIAL FOR THE JAILS AND PRISONS TO TAKE OUT THE PHONES INSTEAD OF DEALING WITH THEM, RESULTING IN EXTENSIVE LOST CONTACT BETWEEN INMATE AND FAMILY.

SINCERELY,



KERRY MEACHAM
JAIL COMMANDER

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

copy