



Michael B. Fingerhut
General Attorney

401 9th Street, Northwest, Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004
Voice 202 585 1909
Fax 202 585 1897
PCS 202 607 0624
michael.b.fingerhut@mail.sprint.com

April 21, 2005

BY E-MAIL

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW,
Washington D.C. 20554

Re: *EX PARTE* PRESENTATION --*Telecommunications Relay Services And Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities*, CC Docket No. 98-67; Petition for Declaratory Ruling on Video Relay service Interoperability CG Docket No. 03-123

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On April 18, 2005, Paul Ludwick, Senior Product Manager, Government Systems Division for Sprint and the undersigned met with Jay Keithley, Acting Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau ("Bureau"), Tom Chandler, Chief of the Bureau's Disabilities Rights Office ("DRO") and Greg Hlibok a DRO staff member. The purpose of meeting was to discuss several issues in the above-referenced dockets. The issues discussed are as follows:

- Sprint explained why it elected not to file initial comments on the Petition for Declaratory filed by the California Coalition of Agencies Serving the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Sprint also urged that a decision granting the relief -- in whole or in part -- be narrowly tailored so as to minimize any untended and adverse consequences.
- Sprint discussed the fact that prisoners without any speech disabilities were utilizing Sprint's Speech-to-Speech services to make calls to individuals also without any speech disabilities so as to avoid paying collect charges for such calls. Sprint stated that it was seeking to ensure that the companies providing telephone services to prison pass the two digit number designation code indicating that the call is from a prison. If Sprint's relay centers are provided with this code the CAs will require that the call be made on a collect basis. Since the calls would no longer be free and since prisoners are only allowed to

make collect calls, there would be no economic advantage to making calls using TRS and prisoner abuse of TRS providers' speech-to-speech relay offering should end.¹

- Sprint brought up the fact that because of the plethora of new services being offered, individuals who are deaf or hard-of-hearing have the ability to talk to one another using two different services. For example, a Captel user can talk to a user of traditional TTY-based service, VRS user, or Internet Relay user. On such calls, two CAs -- the Captel CA who would voice to call to the Captel user and the CA typing the message to the TTY user or Internet Relay user or signing the call to the VRS user -- are necessary. Sprint stated its belief that because these calls are not like calls where both the calling and called party are using the same technology, *e.g.*, an TTY-to-TTY call or an Internet Relay-to-Internet Relay call, the submission of the minutes for the multiple CAs involved would not be "double-dipping."
- Sprint and the staff discussed the issue of whether TRS operators should honor requests by end users to block TRS calls.
- The staff asked for Sprint's opinion on whether a State should be allowed to require the offering of Captel services by the those seeking to win the State's TRS contract, when only two providers, Sprint and Hamilton, provide Captel service.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

cc: Jay Keithley
Thomas Chandler
Greg Hlibok

¹ Mr. Ludwick mentioned that Sprint had submitted a "white paper" on the issue of prisoner abuse of speech-to-speech TRS service to the Industry Standards group and the staff requested that they be furnished a copy. The undersigned delayed filing Sprint's *ex parte* notice here in order to obtain a copy of the "white paper" and include it with the filing. Unfortunately, Mr. Ludwick's reference to a "white paper" was mistaken. What Sprint submitted to the industry working group was simply an "Issue Identification Form" which is necessary to put an item on the agenda. If the staff wants a copy of the form that Sprint submitted, please contact the undersigned.