

THIS IS A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE WRIGHT PETITION-DOCKET#96-128

TO: CHAIRMAN JULIUS GENACHOWSKI
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
PUBLIC COMMENT
445 12th STREET, SW
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

Received & Inspected

SEP 11 2012

FCC Mail Room

DEAR CHAIRMAN GENACHOWSKI:

I HAVE A FAMILY MEMBER WHO IS CURRENTLY INCARCATED IN A MICHIGAN PRISON. FOR MANY YEARS I HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO EXCESSIVE TELEPHONE RATES WHEN THEY CALL HOME. I'M TOLD THE EXTRA CHARGES GO TOWARDS SUPPORTING THE STATE'S PRISON BUDGET. IF THE STATE NEEDS ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR IT'S PRISON BUDGET THEN IT SHOULD COLLECT THOSE FUNDS FROM THE ENTIRE TAX BASE IN MICHIGAN AS PART OF RAISING GENERAL REVENUE: NOT SELECT A CERTAIN GROUP OF TAXPAYERS TO PAY MORE THAN EVERYONE ELSE. THAT UNFAIR AND DISCRIMINATORY.

KEEPING IN CONTACT WITH THOSE WHO ARE INCARCERATED HAS PROVEN TO BE ONE OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE TOOLS FOR A PRISONER'S REHABILITATION AND SUCCESS UPON RELEASE. THE POLITICIANS AND PRISON OFFICIALS PUBLICLY TRUMPET THE BENEFITS OF KEEPING PRISONERS AND THEIR FAMILIES CONNECTED, BUT BEHIND CLOSED DOORS THEY COLLUDE WITH PREDATORY TELEPHONE COMPANIES TO EXPLOIT THIS CRITICAL SERVICE. IN MICHIGAN, THE STATE AND TELEPHONE COMPANY ARE GENERATING \$10 MILLION ANNUALLY OVER AND ABOVE THE NECESSARY COST OF PROVIDING THE ACTUAL INMATE TELEPHONE SERVICE.

THE FCC SHOULD PROTECT CONSUMERS FROM JUST THIS TYPE OF PREDATORY BEHAVIOR. PLEASE PUT A CAP ON INMATE TELEPHONE RATES AND STOP THIS ABUSE ON THOSE WHO CAN LEAST AFFORD IT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION IN THIS MATTER.

SINCERELY,

Latasha Richburg

THIS IS A public comment for the Wright Petition (cc docket # 96-128)

Dear Chairman Genachowski,

My name is David Clevenger. I am an inmate in the California Prison system serving time in Eloy Arizona.

I have some comments about the now costlier phone calls from here at LA Palma Correctional Center.

Up until August 1, 2012 we were paying a .25¢ phone call hook up AND a .25¢ per minute call with a 30 minute time limit. Now we are to pay an added cost of a 15.7% tax on the end of our calls.

As inmates we do get paid for some job we are assigned to, varying from .08¢ to .15¢ an hour + 6 1/2 hours a day. So our month's pay varies from \$10-\$20. Then you may have restitution to pay for.

As for me my family is elderly and my parents would like to hear my voice once or twice a week, to let them know how I am doing and all what's going on in here. Before this new charge was added, now I'm having to inform my family I need to shorten the calls due to some added tax put upon us here.

This new tax will especially be tough with the upcoming holidays, and when family and friends are over to visit when I call, it will be like "Hi, Hello, nice to talk" and pass phone to another waiting guest.

I'm hoping you'll be able to help us out

Thank you
David Clevenger

Received & Inspected

SEP 11 2012

FCC Mail Room

DAVE Clevenger G49166
L.PCC
5501 N. LA Palma Rd PC 201
Eloy AZ 85131

THIS IS A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE WRIGHT PETITION-DOCKET#96-128

TO: CHAIRMAN JULIUS GENACHOWSKI
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
PUBLIC COMMENT
445 12th STREET, SW
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

Received & Inspected
SEP 11 2012
FCC Mail Room

DEAR CHAIRMAN GENACHOWSKI:

I HAVE A FAMILY MEMBER WHO IS CURRENTLY INCARCATED IN A MICHIGAN PRISON. FOR MANY YEARS I HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO EXCESSIVE TELEPHONE RATES WHEN THEY CALL HOME. I'M TOLD THE EXTRA CHARGES GO TOWARDS SUPPORTING THE STATE'S PRISON BUDGET. IF THE STATE NEEDS ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR IT'S PRISON BUDGET THEN IT SHOULD COLLECT THOSE FUNDS FROM THE ENTIRE TAX BASE IN MICHIGAN AS PART OF RAISING GENERAL REVENUE: NOT SELECT A CERTAIN GROUP OF TAXPAYERS TO PAY MORE THAN EVERYONE ELSE. THAT UNFAIR AND DISCRIMINATORY.

KEEPING IN CONTACT WITH THOSE WHO ARE INCARCERATED HAS PROVEN TO BE ONE OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE TOOLS FOR A PRISONER'S REHABILITATION AND SUCCESS UPON RELEASE. THE POLITICIANS AND PRISON OFFICIALS PUBLICLY TRUMPET THE BENEFITS OF KEEPING PRISONERS AND THEIR FAMILIES CONNECTED, BUT BEHIND CLOSED DOORS THEY COLLUDE WITH PREDATORY TELEPHONE COMPANIES TO EXPLOIT THIS CRITICAL SERVICE. IN MICHIGAN, THE STATE AND TELEPHONE COMPANY ARE GENERATING \$10 MILLION ANNUALLY OVER AND ABOVE THE NECESSARY COST OF PROVIDING THE ACTUAL INMATE TELEPHONE SERVICE.

THE FCC SHOULD PROTECT CONSUMERS FROM JUST THIS TYPE OF PREDATORY BEHAVIOR. PLEASE PUT A CAP ON INMATE TELEPHONE RATES AND STOP THIS ABUSE ON THOSE WHO CAN LEAST AFFORD IT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION IN THIS MATTER.

SINCERELY,

Myrna Baldwin
Myrna Baldwin

THIS IS A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE WRIGHT PETITION-DOCKET#96-128

TO: CHAIRMAN JULIUS GENACHOWSKI
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
PUBLIC COMMENT
445 12th STREET, SW
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

Received & Inspected
SEP 11 2012
FCC Mail Room

DEAR CHAIRMAN GENACHOWSKI:

I HAVE A FAMILY MEMBER WHO IS CURRENTLY INCARCATED IN A MICHIGAN PRISON. FOR MANY YEARS I HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO EXCESSIVE TELEPHONE RATES WHEN THEY CALL HOME. I'M TOLD THE EXTRA CHARGES GO TOWARDS SUPPORTING THE STATE'S PRISON BUDGET. IF THE STATE NEEDS ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR IT'S PRISON BUDGET THEN IT SHOULD COLLECT THOSE FUNDS FROM THE ENTIRE TAX BASE IN MICHIGAN AS PART OF RAISING GENERAL REVENUE: NOT SELECT A CERTAIN GROUP OF TAXPAYERS TO PAY MORE THAN EVERYONE ELSE. THAT UNFAIR AND DISCRIMINATORY.

KEEPING IN CONTACT WITH THOSE WHO ARE INCARCERATED HAS PROVEN TO BE ONE OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE TOOLS FOR A PRISONER'S REHABILITATION AND SUCCESS UPON RELEASE. THE POLITICIANS AND PRISON OFFICIALS PUBLICLY TRUMPET THE BENEFITS OF KEEPING PRISONERS AND THEIR FAMILIES CONNECTED, BUT BEHIND CLOSED DOORS THEY COLLUDE WITH PREDATORY TELEPHONE COMPANIES TO EXPLOIT THIS CRITICAL SERVICE. IN MICHIGAN, THE STATE AND TELEPHONE COMPANY ARE GENERATING \$10 MILLION ANNUALLY OVER AND ABOVE THE NECESSARY COST OF PROVIDING THE ACTUAL INMATE TELEPHONE SERVICE.

THE FCC SHOULD PROTECT CONSUMERS FROM JUST THIS TYPE OF PREDATORY BEHAVIOR. PLEASE PUT A CAP ON INMATE TELEPHONE RATES AND STOP THIS ABUSE ON THOSE WHO CAN LEAST AFFORD IT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION IN THIS MATTER.

SINCERELY,

Salena Baddis

THIS IS A PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE WRIGHT PETITION-DOCKET#96-128

TO: CHAIRMAN JULIUS GENACHOWSKI
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
PUBLIC COMMENT

445 12th STREET, SW
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

Received & inspected

SEP 11 2012

FCC Mail Room

DEAR CHAIRMAN GENACHOWSKI:

I HAVE A FAMILY MEMBER WHO IS CURRENTLY INCARCERATED IN A MICHIGAN PRISON. FOR MANY YEARS I HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO EXCESSIVE TELEPHONE RATES WHEN THEY CALL HOME. I'M TOLD THE EXTRA CHARGES GO TOWARDS SUPPORTING THE STATE'S PRISON BUDGET. IF THE STATE NEEDS ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR IT'S PRISON BUDGET THEN IT SHOULD COLLECT THOSE FUNDS FROM THE ENTIRE TAX BASE IN MICHIGAN AS PART OF RAISING GENERAL REVENUE: NOT SELECT A CERTAIN GROUP OF TAXPAYERS TO PAY MORE THAN EVERYONE ELSE. THAT UNFAIR AND DISCRIMINATORY.

KEEPING IN CONTACT WITH THOSE WHO ARE INCARCERATED HAS PROVEN TO BE ONE OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE TOOLS FOR A PRISONER'S REHABILITATION AND SUCCESS UPON RELEASE. THE POLITICIANS AND PRISON OFFICIALS PUBLICLY TRUMPET THE BENEFITS OF KEEPING PRISONERS AND THEIR FAMILIES CONNECTED, BUT BEHIND CLOSED DOORS THEY COLLUDE WITH PREDATORY TELEPHONE COMPANIES TO EXPLOIT THIS CRITICAL SERVICE. IN MICHIGAN, THE STATE AND TELEPHONE COMPANY ARE GENERATING \$10 MILLION ANNUALLY OVER AND ABOVE THE NECESSARY COST OF PROVIDING THE ACTUAL INMATE TELEPHONE SERVICE.

THE FCC SHOULD PROTECT CONSUMERS FROM JUST THIS TYPE OF PREDATORY BEHAVIOR. PLEASE PUT A CAP ON INMATE TELEPHONE RATES AND STOP THIS ABUSE ON THOSE WHO CAN LEAST AFFORD IT.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION IN THIS MATTER.

SINCERELY,

Antonia Baldwin

Sept. 1, 2012

Chairman Julius Gewachowski
Federal Communications Commission
Public Comments
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC - 20554

Received & Inspected

SEP 11 2012

FCC Mail Room

Dear Chairman Gewachowski,

This is a public comment for the Wright
Petition (CC Docket #96-128).

The phone rates at the Spring Creek Correctional
facility are out-of-line with what is reasonable
for myself, as well as my family. My wife has
been forced to purchase a land-line, as this facility
will not allow calls to cell-phones. ~~\$7.00~~ is the
average cost for a 30 minute call, and out-of-
state is over a dollar a minute. Some calls are
more, with no reason or explanation given.

Paul T. Stavejord #381330
Spring Creek Corr. Center
P.O. Box 5001
Seward, Alaska
99664-5001

SEP 11 2012

P.O. Box 4081
Frankfort, Kentucky 40604
August 31, 2012

FCC Mail Room

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Sir or Ma'am,

Please find enclosed a copy of a letter sent to Global Tel Link, a service provider that handles calls from inmates.

Can a company put a monetary amount on calls that a consumer can receive from an inmate, as long as the consumer pays bills promptly? Since different amounts are charged for different locations, this means some inmates can place more calls than others. A call to Kentucky, for example, costs approximately \$4 more per call, than a call to West Virginia.. I know this for a fact, as I have family in West Virginia who also receives calls from this inmate

Can a company change that amount with no notice, and then block a consumer from receiving collect calls because of exceeding the new amount? (The amount was reduced considerably, from \$75 in 30 days to \$35 in 30 days, with no one being advised that a change was taking effect. Even though I was well within my limit under the \$75 amount, the new amount, without notice, put me over the new limit.)

Can a company require a person who has always paid telephone bills on time to set up a prepaid account in order to receive calls? (And, if it is being done, can the company draw interest on this prepaid account?) I was blocked from receiving collect calls for the reason stated above. This company changed their amount without notice to anyone, and then would not allow a one-time courtesy unblocking of the line for consumers who had no previous notification that a change was taking effect.

Thank you for any information you can provide me concerning this situation.

Sincerely,



Emma L. Severn

els

Enclosure: Copy of Letter to Global Tel Link

P.O. Box 4081
Frankfort, Kentucky 40604
August 31, 2012

Global Tel Link
Complaint Department
P.O. Box 2827
Mobile, Alabama 36652

Dear Sir or Ma'am,

I have been receiving collect calls through Global Tel Link from my nephew who is incarcerated in Moundsville, West Virginia, since this service began handling calls from inmates at that institution. These telephone calls had been costing me \$8.35 per fifteen-minute call. I was advised in 2007 I could receive calls amounting to no more than \$30 in two days or \$75 in 30 days. I followed this schedule religiously and never once went over the allotted amount; although I have never really understood how a maximum monetary amount could be placed on my telephone calls as long as I paid my bills promptly.

On Saturday, August 18, 2012, when my nephew attempted to make his usual weekend collect call, I was advised that my line had been blocked. I called Global Tel Link to determine why my line was blocked, as I KNEW I had not gone over the mandated limit, only to discover that the limit had been changed on July 31 to \$35 in 30 days. This is a considerable change in a 30-day allotted amount (from \$75 to \$35); but the worst part is that neither I nor my inmate nephew had been notified of this change. (When I asked the representative when this change was made, I was told there had been several changes since 2007, but this one was made on July 31, 2012. During all the years since 2007, notice has never been given of any changes. Fortunately I was somehow lucky enough to not be caught up in any of the previous changes.)

I asked the representative from Global Tel Link if, as a one-time courtesy, my telephone could be unblocked to receive collect calls, as no one had been advised of this change and therefore could not adhere to the schedule; and even after the change was made on July 31, it was made retroactive and calls prior to that date were included. I was advised that once the line was blocked, it could not be unblocked. In order to talk with my nephew, I had no alternative but to set up a prepaid account and place at least \$25 into it.

My complaint is this:

How can one adhere to a rule if no one is advised of the rule? Did Global Tel Link make any effort to advise consumers and/or inmates that a change was being made and give time to let some of the previous calls fall off before putting a new rule into effect?