Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
		WC Docket No. 12-375
Rates for Interstate Inmate Calling Services)	

COMMENTS OF THE NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

The National Sheriffs' Association (NSA), by its attorney, hereby submits comments on the Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (SFNPRM), in which the Commission seeks comment on a number of issues in connection with the regulation of Inmate Calling Services (ICS). In it comments, NSA demonstrates that Sheriffs incur significant costs in allowing ICS in jails and that Sheriffs must be allowed to recover their costs to encourage the deployment of ICS. NSA supports a tiered rate structure for ICS rates to ensure that the rates for ICS providers that serve jails are sufficient to allow ICS providers to recover their costs. NSA also supports a transition of at least two years for the implementation of the rules.

NSA represents over 3,000 Sheriffs nationwide who operate approximately 80% of the jails in the country. Sheriffs, typically, are the chief law enforcement official of their counties with numerous duties in addition to the operation of county jails. The Sheriffs in the United States are very diverse and have different jurisdictional sizes and challenges, including budget constraints. Similarly, the size of the jails operated by Sheriffs and their inmate populations are very diverse with different challenges. Accordingly, the needs of Sheriffs with respect to ICS, the cost to provide ICS in jails and the cost to the Sheriffs to perform ICS-related duties varies by

¹ Rates for Interstate Inmate Calling Services, WC Docket No. 12-375, Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 14-158 (rel. October 22, 2014) (Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking or SFNPRM).

- Respond to ICS system alerts
- Forward alerts and recorded calls to investigators
- Conduct real-time monitoring of inmate conversations
- Analyze call recording of inmate conversations
- Burn CDs of conversations for further review by investigators
- Respond to law enforcement requests and subpoenas for call detail records and recordings

Facility officers also must perform various administrative functions when inmates have access to ICS. Facility officers may be required to perform duties such as:

- Be trained on the operation of the ICS system
- Answer questions from inmates and family members (how calls are billed, why calls are blocked, how to open an account to receive calls to CLEC and wireless carrier numbers)
- Maintain and administer the list of numbers to be blocked (facility numbers, officers' numbers, judges' numbers, witnesses' numbers, victims' numbers, jurors' numbers)
- Take requests from the public to have numbers blocked
- Administer prepaid cards and/or debit system, if utilized
- Train inmates on the use of ICS to include use of trust account balance inquiry, transfer of funds to debit account, placement of debit calls
- · Administer a PIN system, if utilized
- Administer a voice biometric system, if utilized
- Maintain an approved number list, if utilized
- Contact the ICS provider for service issues
- · Accompany ICS technicians while in the facility to service inmate phone systems
- Maintain negative databases of blocked numbers
- Initiate call traffic reviews
- Flag calls to specific phone numbers for review
- Flag calls from various cell blocks to the same phone numbers

In addition, facility officers have increased training requirements to learn to use the complex

ICS system, including:

- Administer the facility's phone use rules and restrictions
- Establish security levels and clearance codes for various officers
- Authorize selected facility officers for levels of access and control
- Remove and implement administrative blocks
- Administer special numbers, PREA, crime tip lines, attorneys, etc.
- Generate reports and statistical analyses
- Research and identify call traffic patterns

To determine the cost of performing duties associated with ICS, NSA conducted a survey

monitoring/security and administrative duties.

ICS Providers Should Pay Jails for the Costs Incurred to Allow ICS

The Commission asks for comment on how to enable facilities to recover the demonstrated costs related to the provision of ICS "in a manner that does not disrupt a market-based approach to lowering rates for end users of ICS." As an initial matter, the Commission is incorrectly focusing only on lower rates for end users. Section 276 of the Act requires the Commission to ensure the deployment of payphone services to the benefit of the general public. Denying payments to jails or restricting such payments to levels that do not at least cover costs, will have the effect of reducing the incentive and ability to allow ICS in jails.

In this regard, the Commission has it exactly backwards when it asks if site commissions hinder the widespread deployment of payphone services. On the contrary, site commissions and/or other payments to correctional facilities have made it possible for even the smallest of jails and jails with the most limited of budgets to allow this labor intensive activity. This conclusion is supported by the numerous comments in the record in which Sheriffs and jail administrators have stated that a loss of compensation from ICS providers would force them to reexamine whether and the extent to which, ICS would be allowed in their jail.

The NSA survey clearly shows that jails incur a significant cost for duties officers must perform if inmate calling services are to be allowed. Today's sophisticated ICS system requires technically proficient and experienced facility officers. Inmate phone services can only be provided when trained officers daily monitor and review information to protect the public from abuse and prevent criminal activity. Accordingly, jails must receive cost recovery to administer the ICS system. There is no valid reason to restrict the ability of jails to recover these costs from

 $^{^6}$ SFNPRM at ¶28.

correctional facilities for costs, such as security costs, that the Commission would likely consider reasonably and directly related to the provision of ICS.

As shown in the data provided by NSA, at least some portion of commission payments, in fact, reimburse jails for security and administrative costs directly related to ICS. Accordingly, the Commission's proposal to eliminate all commission payments is not justified.

The Commission also states that where states have eliminated site commissions, rates have fallen dramatically. The Commission predicts that prohibiting site commissions "will enable the market to perform properly and encourage selection of ICS providers based on price, technology and services rather than on the highest site commission payment." The Commission seeks comment on whether this approach will foster a competitive market that will ensure just and reasonable rates and fair compensation for ICS while minimizing regulatory burdens on ICS providers and the Commission.

It is not at all clear that site commissions must be eliminated to reduce ICS rates, especially since the Commission intends to cap all ICS rates. However, it is clear that eliminating payments to jails will reduce the ability and incentive of Sheriffs to allow ICS in jails. Accordingly, the Commission should not eliminate site commissions for jails.

A Single Nationwide ICS Rate Will Adversely Impact the Availability of ICS in Jails

The Commission asks whether it should establish one nationwide per minute rate for interstate and intrastate ICS or whether it should establish tiered rate caps. The record shows that the cost to provide ICS in jails, and especially smaller jails, is greater than the cost to serve prisons. Thus, as NSA has argued previously, a uniform ICS rate will not provide adequate compensation to ICS providers that primarily serve jails and smaller facilities and, as a result, a

⁷ SFNPRM at ¶21.

ICS, effective 90 days after adoption of a final order. The proposal urges the FCC to prohibit all in-kind payments and administrative fees not directly related to the provision of ICS. The proposal also argues that any compensation to correctional facilities must be nominal or else it will require higher ICS rates.

NSA notes that these three carriers primarily serve prisons and large jails. Therefore, it appears that their proposed ICS rate does not reflect the cost to serve small jails. A single rate as proposed by these carriers will not support ICS in all facilities and will decrease the deployment in jails, contrary to section 276 of the Act. A uniform, low rate also would provide no incentive to increase the number of ICS providers willing to provide service in small jails. On the contrary, it may encourage ICS providers to stop providing service in higher cost facilities altogether to increase their profit margins.

Similarly, the uniform, nominal compensation rate for jails proposed by these carriers does not accurately reflect the cost to Sheriffs to allow access to ICS in jails and, in particular, small jails. Accordingly, the nominal compensation rate proposed by the carriers will not provide adequate compensation to Sheriffs, which could lead to less access to ICS in jails.

A Transition Period of at Least Two Years Should be Adopted

The Commission asks about the impact of the ICS requirements on existing contracts between correctional facilities and ICS providers and asks if there should be a transition period before any new rules go into effect. The Commission asks whether 90 days after the effective date of the order is an appropriate transition period to comply with new rules and rate caps; whether a two year transition period should be allowed; or whether "one state or state subdivision budget cycle to transition away from site commission payments to allow facilities and states time to adjust" is the appropriate period. The Commission also asks for comment on

ICS in jails. Further, to reduce the impact of any new rules and to provide Sheriffs with the opportunity to adjust their budgets, the Commission should adopt at least a two-year transition period.

Respectfully submitted,

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

By: /s/ Mary J. Sisak

Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens, Duffy & Prendergast, LLP 2120 L Street, N.W., #300 Washington, D.C., 20037 (202) 659-0830 mjs@bloostonlaw.com

Its Attorney

Dated: January 12, 2015

41	24	23	22	21	100	:[15	6	17	15	ts	14	E .	12	E	10	9		7.	6	5		2 Sibe#		_	1 Work	*
1	2	20	të.	14		1 1	1	15 70.13	ĸ	E .	27	#	6	9 4		7	6		*	4	2	1	ADA			Souton.	8
	2	ŏ	д	30	2 10	Į,				3	0		č	5	5	15 14	2	12 . 24	6	9.	6	5 10.5	Heurs	Officer	Detention	Waskly	0
5 6360	3 8CS 5	5,352 6	9 \$419	8 \$56,10	5,000					3 \$42,640								4 \$49,895		5 \$32,56			Wages	Annual	officer	Detention	0
^	В.															-							Acres dec	Detention O		3	3
9000			\$2,000		, see	8	000	S22	1932	000	1,013	086		L076 ::	263	000	100	\$26,725	,069	. (11)	8	230	effe x	Michel Supe	Deta	W.	-
a i	2	4	Ľ,	8	100	1		4	E	35	7	7	•	7	4	100	22	H	30	*			Annak	Supervisor		Admin Neeldy D	
239000	\$40,000	\$29,000	\$55,500	570,720	pererent	לאפ סקח	\$52,000	\$56,150	\$43,591	\$48,348	\$38,072	267.800	\$45,000	258,968	\$27,359	260,000	\$37,232	\$66,560	\$38,168	\$42,486		700	Water	Annual		Detention	6
\$32.00			\$2,000		- danger	\$10 AG	DZ.TE\$	\$34,09	\$29,53	\$55,000	\$23,59	\$19,651	55,000	530,070	protes	216,000	514,086	\$33,135	\$5,094	58778		1	Senesits	Annual	Supervisor	Detention	=
0	2		0			200	0	4	7	•		1		9						6			Hours	Other			-
	\$35,500				1							ALL DOUGH					10000	567,500				\$19,615	Wages	Amnual	Other		-
	0									2000								\$32,830				\$ \$36,590	L	Annual	Other		*
						511		200		200		100						30				8	Q	Det	W		4
	i.	ú	s				0			ν	20	ch		1		2,5	2		~	25	15		5	3	Weekly		2
535,000	\$28,600	\$26,500	241,500	001'ect	-	355 335	\$36,400	\$44,650	\$40,394	\$42,640	\$36,451	539,702		200	529,789	OUN'CRC	\$29,702	\$49,895	\$29,744	\$32,562	\$42,134	\$57,692	Wages	Annual	Officer	Deterrition	×
510,000			52,00	-	. 41	\$7.55	\$21,84	\$28,53	\$21,93	\$40,000	524,01	SUCEE	2					526,725					١.,		Officer		6
			•				٥	2	2	2000				1 May 1		2.2.2				1		The same	Hear	Supervision	Detentio	Weekly	ļ,
**	•	w	٠			7	25	2.2	5		•						1	N	18	C	2	3	Annua	ē.	_	9000	ŀ
\$39,000	\$40,000	529,000	\$35,500		1	569.950	\$52,000	\$56,180	ZWE ENS	Res Res	336,022	ring'Toc	000	1006,000	CCETTY	- nonvone	267/160	566,560	BQT/REC	542/48b	000,000	100	Wages	Supervisor	Detention	- 4	1
\$12,000			\$2,000		4 100	510,493	\$31,200	534,094	\$29,997	25,000	523,585	TCG/STC	non/acc	avrinet.	COTOTE	Doorbard.	214,588	\$33,133	25,054	STL SUG	516,800		Senetics.	Annual	Suparvisor	Detention	,
			1					P								8				1			Hours	Diner			ŀ
2		o Seson						276,296		Comment of the second			None o	erecone . a		100 C 100 C		805,79\$ B		U	5 560,000	11 538,615	1	Annua	Other		ŀ
	11	e						OZTÍNES DE		141.000						1		05- 53/,350			8	15 516,590			Other		1
		5	3										Contract					2,00	3			990		i z			ŀ
33,540	TALSAT	8,775	975	2000	App c	10,009 III	14,976	erece	13.00	5,765			2000	2627	SERVICE OF STREET	7 277	1	7,700,0		2004	2000	TALL	1				
34,223	30,442	7,045	3,007			12,051	12,507	1		Corre	Truct	- Caller	1	4,720	1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0,000	onor o	0,000	200	0,000	2946		7 trational			
40,628		EYE'NT	4000			16,567	17,673	27.000		-		20,000	1700	900	1	7	1,1	11/11	1		5	10,715	Marutes	S IS ISSUE			1
\$400	- 5613	50/6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		2115	53,183	5950	Jen'Te	79766	200	200,20	0000	CT OFF	257	21 677	41001	17,000	20,000	20,000	Techte	200.00	20.00	DD-UE	- Allegare	Action	Circulated Calculated	Name and Address of the Owner, where
\$26	10	mire		re i	593	51,53	15		2,74	aprile .	of the	1000	61 70	461	417	4	100	50,00	14,7	37. 17	4.5	27.13	coense	- Samuel	Andrew	Calculation	1
35. OK	72,	20			6 3	12	\$7 15,	0	10	6 6	K. 40	100	, i		B 3	9 1	3 2	1.0	6 6		4.5	3 2	N. P. S.	THE THURS	Parame.	The second	
464 St	PS 269	or or	Sec.	4	32 12	876 \$1	052 54	1	000	900	200	200	17.	17.0 AZE	3 1	3	R .		1	200	6	200	200	The same of	A Aven	SCHOOL STORY	
1011	72DT	3.000	100	1364	731	1247	2.063		- Control														13		N. X	4	
50.006	Som.	1		000	\$0.323	50.119	Smooth	Contract Contract	San and	SO TRA	200	200	50000	TALUS	SD 206	\$0.024	777	200	2000	877 DS	Coppo	50.00	1	30		SPERMY	規則の開発
\$0.017	and the			5	\$1054	\$0.356	Same		3	5 20	2 1	3	200	50060	5050	50.186	2	5	5	5 20	775	2000	2000		afte ave		The Control

112	1	SS	2	53	k	2 2	2	8	49	å	1	47	46	6		[3	43	42	42	8	ŀ	8	30	37	36	35	1	:	33	32	1	92	5	29	228	27	26	25	24	23	2	1	10	t	1	1	1 1	i lt		il:	i k	1	: 1:	: -	٠	=	2	-1	on.	4	2 Site #				PAGE 1
į		134	19	132	1	1	3	129	128	111		126	125	r,	1	2	122	121	120	err		: 1	117	316	33	174	į	4	13	H	E		8 8	ğ	107	100	ĕ	ğ	103	202	101	8	3	8		8	1	2 1	2 1	8 %	1 2	2	3 5	8 8	æ	87	88	a	2	æ				TO LOSSO SALES CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	Second
5 %	;	8	847	233	ę	1 8	3	776	774	8		20	£1,817	703	1	65	687	8	2	į	1	3	619	265	165	5/5	1	2	8	550	¥	1	2	90	512	5	503	495	487	480	458	430	1	150	1 6	40	8		2	2 4	200	900	1	385	385	385	384	379	376	3	409	0	<u></u>		PKG/45
47	1	2	60	2		. 1	7	8	88		•		w	8		15	4	7	H	t		775	1	4	205	t.			38			ě			5	4	9.5	25	,		. 5	1				. 1		5 (971			78	20	ы	-11			6		Hours	Officer			
New Comp	-	\$40,928	527,373	187,856	200	245.77	201 303	539.521	\$65,364	may rat		\$48.571	\$48,496	337,500	27,72	500.004	\$35,940	\$33,000	\$33,432	Chillybe	200,000	250 053	559.552	\$35,172	535,965	227,720	-	The Party	\$32,573	334,428	2/1,300	-		50000	316 185	\$24,000	\$16,944	\$26,000	\$83,000	354,000	333,663	2007.000	Section .	2/2/2/2	2000	100,000	200,000	318 (33	CASON	2000	***	1	\$27.622	530,493	\$64,943	\$48,190	\$32,611	\$36,000	\$41,185	1	Wages		Officer	Deterration	
CHE WAY		\$13.91	\$12,307	\$20,536			BEC 05	\$12.56					\$27,854						\$16,291				656 EE5		\$9,590				\$5,654	\$16,126	ere/rec			\$10,000	20,020	\$6,442		510,000	\$22,250	221.800	TIE/YES	STATE	meter	200,000	900-125	Of 10	Can die	2000	409 SE2	546 914	210,000	CA COS	Cast DES	528	\$18,184	\$19,275		\$16,583	\$22,958		Benefits	Officar Annual	Detention		
			7 . 3	On Charles					ш ш		1000	w	f		2	7					1	774			t			100								4.2	13		D 0 210	2		20000		ŝ	5					21.0	Total Carried			6		H	t			1.5	Hours	Supervisor	Detention	Weeldy	
200,000	6	\$73,164	6 \$65,957	585,475	400	C-77490	,	\$50,770	8,E65 I	9 320	3	\$80,641		348,5	6 6 6 6	\$ 592,061	\$60,1	9 \$45,000	\$62,763				\$ \$68,798		\$42,927	7,000	CAL NO	\$77,000					COE ROS				ě	,	-			SOUTH STATE		ene.	504 403	7	and a second	\$70.022	\$5,500		\$53,096	545 448	\$60.093	\$44,512	\$67,51	\$68,540	\$35,00	S54,00	\$47,36	571,000	Wages	Annual	Supervisor	Detantion	AdrainIstrative
Tacket To			57 528,904			SPS CES DE			24 \$44,791			\$37,513	100	000,9114 000		7		00 \$54,000				67 \$32,667			27 \$12,878			3							×	00 \$15,500		7 \$25,000			Ī	720,027		1		San Ans				31			ŗ.		7 \$18,905	0 527,410		\$20,414				Annual	Supervisor	Datention	
		75			()			8	ţ.	ä	8	13		8	3 1	8	Sa	8	8		5	63	76		78	,	7		i-				5			8		00	2	5	5 6	J	4 5	5 2	56 8	į		n,	8		95 (90	н	4	Gi.	0		4000	Č	8			" Weekly		
200			30 \$50		1	13 6	50	200	4 574			\$32,207	33 \$29,372		0	2 547	3 \$75,840	22 22	5 536,474				17 12		\$ \$52,325	45.0	100	\$54090	38 \$31	4 350,459	200,000	2			16	81\$ 18,	3 \$35,558		343,	T June							17 554 509				SEX2	ŝ		1 \$32,032	3 \$39,	3 \$48,190	0 \$58,000	5 \$28,	1 \$41,542		Wages		r Other		
S design			\$50,237 \$2				\$24,000		\$74,292 \$2														\$44,832 \$2		ŗ.		, ,									900	988														- 1										S Benefits		r Other		
CHECK	12871		\$23,966	DEC'M		\$22,301			\$28,270			519,345	\$26,445	į.	1000	\$16,097	\$26,544	\$12,500	514,855		100		\$24,253		\$15,967				6259	100	2001	334.					3		a usu	20,000							\$16.368				SEG 015	\$22 150				\$19,275		\$13,262	\$22,958	20, 11, 10					
			46.2	-					48.5			16	49					X Z				ω.							25						200			a			3	200	1		2 5				3.5	=		105	i	178.00		15	1	23			Officer Hours	Detention	Weekly		
20 565	200		5 527,373			\$45 126			5 572,871				9 545,544		1	\$47,424	4 \$35,5		1 533,432				6 559,952		\$31,965	at 1,750	9		\$ \$32,573		e charte	-	9	SECTION AND	\$54,916				Confess.			S EES		H	\$43.971	No.	\$29,081	ď		\$49,420			\$47,422		564,9	06T'895		\$38,000			Wages	Annual	Officer	Detentio	
553 514 523 083	TO COM				ď			77.	371 \$39,713				544 530,792				340 \$12,579	111	167 ble 78		2		\$33,959					ě	73 55,694			27 27 27	410000		0,00725 97		September 1	rmicze 75		-		809 752 S		Ž.	71 \$22.378		81 \$10.987			20 \$46,914		t	22 \$39,890	=	43 518,184			00 \$16,583		10			Officer	ь	
083	CP.		1	OCC,UIC		530 265		895	713			845	792			097	579		167		-	965	959		065,65	222.20			169	240000		474	VIII TO THE PARTY OF		070					5	3	938		000	378	ľ	3月7			74 3.1		æ	CBC		284	25		82	8	REAL	S Hours	'n	r Detention	Was	
	10	*	22.25		1		in .	21 9	5.6					1	5	13	*	7 5				507	6 5	ė,				115				100		ts s		16 8			-	2.5		n :	000	5		S				2			10 51	26 5	1 51	9 8	6	5 55	23 54				ion Supervisor		Monttoning
572 824		-	ď			\$57,450			\$93,824			\$80,641		240,000		÷	\$60,168	\$45,000				\$85,967		570,300		ĺ		\$77,000			Seen S		558.240			\$57,000 \$		ŧ.				Ŋ.		Ä.		571.983		570,022			\$ 360/255	3		in the		3				8				pion Deta	Security
\$28.774	ENT PAS	\$24,875	\$23,966			\$37.845	\$14,674	\$18,689	\$44,791	10,000	\$65 UC\$	\$37,513		and the	\$14 500	\$24,100	\$21,058	\$54,000	27,175	100	1	\$32,667	\$35,976		272,276	1	211 137				1277164	0.0000000	\$12910	10,000	28,329	\$15,500		263,000		5	35,300	\$96372	\$14,027	\$7,500	\$25,436	809,055		: 000 OT\$		\$56,759	\$37, EZ2		\$51,111	\$356	\$18,905	\$27,416		20,414	22,958	\$26,000	He-		٩		
44.5	45		5		J	7			7.5	1			2			ğ	u	2							100	1		36				5	Ħ		2	2,5		1		1		221535		Taraca de			2		**	70		25		100	N	2		7	36.5	5	Hours	Ther	Weekly	:	
\$53,740	200 130		Ser Ros	, and the	27117	\$45,126			\$25,964	Sale and		567,673	348,408			\$34,219	\$69,600	\$25,000			300		\$44,832		676/700	300 034		\$49,920		120000		\$14 098	222.232			\$50,856			de la company	OUD EPS	4.14						\$54,509	12 1 1 1	\$74,000	\$69,088		\$67,172		A STATE OF	\$39,769	ONEFESS	538,000	\$28,000	\$48,097		Mages	Armual	Jago	!	
\$23.67%					250 536							\$24,880					\$24,360						\$44,832 \$24,253		706,016								\$11,713			\$13,560			Anadem.	\$31,000	1	3					\$16,368		\$46,700	\$55,533		\$22,150		.1	\$11,133	522,330	1	513,262	\$22,958	100	Stillened	Arnua	Other	!	
M 316,576				4.			28,351	111,202	267,3			0 68,633				1	0 124,934			74.0	163,611		246,572			Ġ	105.610	411.77	994/59		20 975		125,754	223,039	103,731			2000		144 878	125,98	85,923	102,030	67,112	109,83			4		N			25,769			EDCTOR :		ηĺ	g.	'n	Sathary.	T Chuck			
6 327,399			ï					2 105,911				60,454	1					447.784				7 148,557											100	9 222,790		_		1				72,897				97 191,655	3 133,90	12,64	5 146,68		4 4 134		9 22,73	1 . JOZ,75	128,24	998,002	100 0CC	3			100 000				manufactures of the same
99 379,432								11 116,729				54 73,027						64 45/ALZ				57 178,350							900				5.7	227,292				. 75	7 707 345					2 57,449				3 12,443				Ž,				CCA/estr o		140,536			13	F UMBON			-
22 512,120						77 \$3,492		-						•		1		155,66			8	\$3,197						\$976			Ü				7	Ū	7	5		Ę		Ŏ.		1		H		1 12	П.	3		÷		15		33,404		E			1	AUTOUR	Monthly	Colculated	STATISTICS OF THE PARTY OF
20 \$10,709	ij					'n							1						5		×	97 \$2,909			Ì										-3	8		7					\$232			5				10-				4	- 1	70,00	100		Zur'ec	,	-	accura t	MODEL N	d Chouses	ALC: NAME OF PERSONS
709 341,136										Ġ								PTC/TC4 1600	ś		Ŕ		ř										4							÷				500 63,058		: :				275,696			25,824		200,021			OCTOBER EN		1961	M 674	Annuove	Desays A		The latest and delication
136 50.036				100				ii				1							•			521 \$0.021	9			ij	465 \$0,020		ě																					\$0,100					1			50.00		SOD SO	47646 5000	an Author	Openies.	Allendor Commercial Co	THE PERSON NAMED IN
51/						Ĵ			٠					Ž												-										Š.		Ŗ,		N.															ă.		ä		g		301	diam'r.	- Annual Control	P-ANY	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH
\$0.031 \$0.067		Ī			_	Ū	į			_		secret centre			93			20000	1		20	\$ 50.00		0		5								50.014 50.019					D17 S0.036			ai				5		j		\$0.125 \$0.225		2		Strange St	and and		045 5000	STORY PROUS		047 \$0.052	- 17	a per Minute	1	100	The same of the sa

Survey Notes

- 1. Column B- ADP- Average Daily Population
- 2. Column Z- Calculated Monthly Admin. Expense

 $(((C^*52)/12)^*((D+E)/2080)) + (((F^*52)/12)^*((G+H)/2080)) + (((I^*52)/12)^*((J+K)/2080)) + (((I^*52)/12)^*((I+K)/2080)) + ((I+K)/2080)) + ((I+K)/2080) + ((I+K)/2080)) + ((I+K)/2080) + ($

3. Column AA- Calculated Monthly Security Expense

(((M*52)/12)*((N+O)/2080)) + (((P*52)/12)*((Q+R)/2080)) + (((S*52)/12)*((T+U)/2080)) + (((M*52)/12)*

4. Column AB- Average Monthly Call Minutes

AVERAGE(W,X,Y)

5. Column AC- Average Admin Cost Per Minute

+Z/AB

6. Column AD- Average Security Cost Per Minute

+AA/AB

7. Column AE- Average Total Cost Per Minute

+AD+AC