1 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (FCC) WORKSHOP ON FURTHER REFORM OF INMATE CALLING SERVICES July 9, 2014 9:30 AM - 4:12 PM 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554 Reported by: Chaz Bennett Capital Reporting Company

		2
1	APPEARANCES	
2	FCC REPRESENTATIVES:	
3	TOM WHEELER, Chairman	
4	MIGNON CLYBURN, Commissioner	
5	JESSICA ROSENWORCEL, Commissioner	
6	FCC MODERATORS:	
7	KALPAK GUDE, Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau	
9	RHONDA LIEN, Attorney, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau	
10	DAVID ZESIGER, Senior Counsel, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau	
12	LYNN ENGLEDOW, Assistant Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau	
13	CO-MODERATOR:	
14	DARRELL A. BAKER, Director, Utility Services, Alabama Public Service Commission	
15	PANELISTS:	
16	DARRELL A. BAKER, Director, Utility Services,	
17	Alabama Public Service Commission	
18	CHERYL A. LEANZA, Policy Advisor, United Church of Christ, OC Inc.	
19	TALILA A. LEWIS, Founder, Helping Education	
20	to Advance the Rights of the Deaf (HEARD)	
21	JESSE WIESE, Policy Analyst, Justice	
22	Fellowship	

		3
1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)	
2	PANELISTS (Cont'd):	
3	KARINA WILKINSON, Steering Committee Member, New Jersey Advocates For Immigrant Detainees	
5	PAUL WRIGHT, Executive Director, Human Rights Defense Center	
6	ALEKS KAJSTURA, Legal Director, Prison Policy Initiative	
7	LEE G. PETRO, Of Counsel, Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP	
9	WILLIAM L. POPE, President, NCIC	
10	VINCENT TOWNSEND, President, Pay-Tel Communications, Inc.	
11	ELIAS A. DIGGINS, Division Chief, Denver	
12	Sheriff's Department on behalf of the American Jail Association	
13	ALEX FRIEDMANN, Managing Editor, Prison Legal News	
15	KEVIN LANDRY, Assistant Director, Office of Detention Policy and Planning, U.S.	
16	Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security	
17	RICHARD "RICK" A. SMITH, CEO, Securus	
18	Technologies, Inc.	
19	THOMAS SWEENEY, Senior Vice President-Sales, Global Tel*Link	
20		
21	BRYAN F. BYRNE, Founder and Managing Partner, meshIP, LLC	
22	JAY L. GAINSBORO, Founder, JLG Technologies, LLC	

```
4
1
              A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont'd)
2 PANELISTS (Cont'd):
         GRANT GONGAWARE, Chief Architect, Telmate,
 3
         LLC
 4
         CHRIS MOORE, Vice President-Product
         Management, Global Tel*Link
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
```

	1 0	
		5
1	A G E N D A	9
	Welcome & Remarks	
2	Demonite has Chairman Hom Wheeler	
3	Remarks by Chairman Tom Wheeler, Commissioner Mignon Clyburn, and	
	Commissioner Jessica Rosenworcel	
4	Panel 1: Impact of Reform and Potential	
5	Need for Additional Reform	
6	Co-Moderators:	
7	Mr. Kalpak Gude, Chief, Pricing	
	Policy Division, Wireline	
8	Competition Bureau	
9	Ms. Rhonda Lien, Attorney, Pricing	
10	Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau	
11	Panelists:	
12	Mr. Darrell A. Baker, Director,	
13	Utility Services Division, Alabama Public Service Commission	
	rublic berviee dommibblen	
14	Ms. Cheryl A. Leanza, Policy Advisor, United Church of Christ,	
15	OC Inc.	
16	Ma Talila A Torria Foundan	
1 10	Ms. Talila A. Lewis, Founder, Helping Educate to Advance the	
17	Rights of the Deaf (HEARD)	
18	Mr. Jesse Wiese, Policy Analyst,	
4.0	Justice Fellowship	
19	Ms. Karina Wilkinson, Steering	
20	Committee Member, New Jersey	
21	Advocates for Immigrant Detainees	
	Mr. Paul Wright, Executive	
22	Director, Human Rights Defense	
	Center	

```
6
 1
                   A G E N D A (Cont'd)
 2
   Congressional Remarks
         Remarks by Congresswoman Eleanor
         Holmes Norton (D-DC)
 4
   Panel 2: Ancillary Charges
         Co-Moderators:
 6
              Ms. Rhonda Lien, Attorney, Pricing
 7
              Policy Division, Wireline
              Competition Bureau
 8
              Mr. David Zesiger, Senior Counsel,
 9
              Pricing Policy Division, Wireline
              Competition Bureau
10
         Panelists:
11
              Mr. Darrell A. Baker, Director,
              Utility Services Division, Alabama
12
              Public Service Commission
13
              Ms. Aleks Kajstura, Legal
              Director, Prison Policy
14
              Initiative
15
              Mr. Lee G. Petro, Of Counsel,
              Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
16
17
              Mr. William L. Pope, President,
              NCIC
18
              Mr. Vincent Townsend, President,
19
              Pay Tel Communications, Inc.
20 Q/A Session
21 Lunch Break
22
```

		-
1		7
1	A G E N D A (Cont'd)	
2	Panel 3: Understanding the Provision	
3	of ICS in Different Facilities	
	Co-Moderators:	
4	Ms. Lynne Engledow, Assistant	
5	Chief, Pricing Policy Division,	
6	Wireline Competition Bureau	
	Mr. Kalpak Gude, Chief, Pricing	
7	Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau	
8	competition pureau	
9	Mr. Darrell A. Baker, Director,	
9	Utility Services Division, Alabama Public Service Commission	
10		
11	Panelists:	
12	Mr. Elias A. Diggins, Division	
12	Chief, Denver Sheriff Department on behalf of the American Jail	
13	Association	
14	Mr. Alex Friedmann, Managing	
15	Editor, Prison Legal News	
1 13	Ms. Aleks Kajstura, Legal	
16	Director, Prison Policy Initiative	
17	THILLIACTVE	
18	Mr. Kevin Landy, Assistant Director, Office of Detention	
10	Policy and Planning, U.S.	
19	Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of	
20	Homeland Security	
21	Mr. Richard "Rick" A. Smith, CEO,	
	Securus Technologies, Inc.	
22		

```
8
 1
                   A G E N D A (Cont'd)
 2
        Panelists (Cont'd):
              Mr. Thomas Sweeney, Senior Vice
              President - Sales, Global
              Tel*Link
 4
 5 O/A Sesseion
 6
   Panel 4: New Technologies
         Co-Moderators:
 8
              Ms. Lynne Engledow, Assistant
 9
              Chief, Pricing Policy Division,
              Wireline Competition Bureau
10
              Mr. David Zesiger, Senior Counsel,
              Pricing Policy Division, Wireline
11
              Competition Bureau
12
         Panelists:
13
              Mr. Brian F. Byrne, Founder and
              Managing Partner, meshIP, LLC
14
15
              Mr. Jay L. Gainsboro, Founder, JLG
              Technologies, LLC
16
              Mr. Grant Gongaware, Chief
17
              Architect, Telmate, LLC
18
              Mr. Chris Moore, Vice President -
              Product Management, Global
19
              Tel*Link
20 Q/A session
21
22
```

```
9
1
                   A G E N D A (Cont'd)
2 Closing Remarks
3
         Mr. Kalpak Gude, Chief, Pricing
         Policy Division, Wireline
         Competition Bureau
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
```

		10
1	PROCEEDINGS	10
2	CHAIRMAN WHEELER: Thank you for coming.	
3	Roger, have I preempted you? Did you want to	
4	start this show off?	
5	MEMBER GOLDBLATT: You can.	
6	CHAIRMAN WHEELER: No, you come on. You	
7	got to I suddenly realize my role here is	
8	behind you, sir.	
9	MEMBER GOLDBLATT: I just want to go	
10	over anyone who had questions, people watching	
11	live on the Internet, send questions to	
12	LiveQuestions@FCC.gov. We have people with index	
13	cards for questions in the audience. Just raise	
14	your hand and some of our staff will come around	
15	and get it.	
16	We have cards with new wireless code.	
17	We have information on lunch; lunch will be 1:00	
18	o'clock to 2:00 o'clock. We're tight schedule.	
19	The only thing is just the this is	
20	the one year, almost, anniversary of the first	
21	workshop that we had on this subject, so it's kind	
22	of exciting.	

11 1 So now -- oh, the entire workshop will be video recorded, will be showing up -- we're -we're waiting for a transcriber, so we'll have a transcription soon, and with great pleasure, I now introduce Tom Wheeler, our Chairman. You might have met him before. 7 CHAIRMAN WHEELER: Thank you. So, thank you, Roger. I didn't know anything about lunch, 9 so I couldn't have been at all helpful about 10 lunch. But thank you, Roger. 11 We're here for one really simple reason 12 today, and that's because of Commissioner Clyburn 13 and her leadership on this important issue. Although, I guess I should say it is because of 15 Chairwoman Clyburn and her leadership on this 16 issue. 17 While she was Chairman of this Agency 18 she pulled this issue out of purgatory, kind of 19 the bowels of the Agency, and gave it the priority 20 that it deserves. We should all thank her for her 21 leadership in this. We should thank Commissioner 22 Rosenworcel for her role in bringing this along.

12 But let's make sure that we fully recognize that we are where we are today because of one person's 3 leadership. Insofar as the Commission's current plans, I have only three things to day. One, the reform of Inmate Calling Services is a priority, is a top priority for this Agency, and will remain so. 9 Secondly, that we recognize that more 10 needs to be done. The interim interstate rate cap 11 needs to be made permanent, and intrastate calling, which as you know is the majority of 12 13 calls, remains unreasonably high, and along with the burgeoning ancillary fees that get put on, has 15 to be addressed if not attacked. 16 Thirdly, that Commissioner Clyburn 17 continues to be the person on point, and all of us 18 look to her for her leadership, and I can assure 19 you that I intend to follow her lead as she is our 20 north star on this issue. 21 So today it's my privilege to welcome you to this workshop, and to introduce the person

		13
1	who is the reason why we are all here,	13
2	Commissioner Clyburn.	
3	(Applause.)	
4	COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Thank you so	
5	much, Mr. Chairman. I truly am continually	
6	grateful for your leadership and for the support	
7	that you have shown to me, and for this effort.	
8	Once again, good morning, everyone.	
9	Good morning, everyone.	
10	AUDIENCE: Good morning.	
11	COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: It's a good	
12	morning. Remember that.	
13	It is truly my pleasure to welcome you	
14	here today, as we analyze the impact of the FCC's	
15	2013 Inmate Calling Decision, and discuss the	
16	potential of additional reforms for Inmate Calling	
17	Services. We thank you all for coming, and wish	
18	to specially extend our appreciation to the	
19	outstanding participants in today's workshop.	
20	There are too many to mention, but allow	
21	me to recognize Darrell Baker from the Alabama	
22	Public Service Commission, and Kevin Landy (ph)	
I		

		14
1	from the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement,	
2	Department of Homeland Security.	
3	Reforming the Interstate Inmate Calling	
4	regime last year was an extremely proud moment for	
5	me and this Agency. The preceding language for	
6	almost a decade denying friends, family, and	
7	children of inmates relief from an egregious rate	
8	structure, upwards of \$17 for a fifteen minute	
9	call, and a \$4 connection for each call.	
10	With the support of my colleague,	
11	Commissioner Rosenworcel, we took action and found	
12	that the existing rates were not in line with the	
13	Communication's Act's requirement for just,	
14	reasonable, and fair rates, and I just a few short	
15	months what we are finding is that doing the right	
16	things has reverberating benefits. Studies have	
17	consistently shown that having meaningful contact	
18	beyond prison walls can make a real difference in	
19	maintaining community ties, promoting	
20	rehabilitation, and reducing recidivism.	
21	Making calls more affordable can	
22	facilitate all of these objectives and more.	

- 1 Recent data also show that reform is and was
- 2 critically needed. In April of 2014 the
- 3 Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice
- 4 Statistics released a report analyzing the five-
- 5 year recidivism rate in 30 states in 2005; over
- 6 400,000 prisoners were a result of this survey.
- 7 The report found that two-thirds, or
- 8 67.8 percent of prisoners were rearrested within
- 9 three years, and that three-quarters, or
- 10 approximately 76.6 percent we rearrested within
- 11 five years.
- This comes at a cost, and these costs
- 13 are enormous to us all. For in addition to the
- 14 impact of increased crime, crowded correctional
- 15 facilities, and the need to build expensive new
- 16 facilities, and not to mention the judicial time
- 17 to prosecute these offenses, studies estimate that
- 18 it costs an average of \$31,000 per year to house
- 19 each inmate.
- Not highlighted in this report, however
- 21 is the personal impact on families and
- 22 communities. There are 2.7 million children with

		16
1	at least one parent in prison, and they often want	
2	and need to maintain a connection.	
3	In addition to coping with the anxiety	
4	associated with a parent who is not there on a	
5	regular basis, these young children are often	
6	suffering severe economic and personal hardships,	
7	and are often doing poorly in school, all of which	
8	are exacerbated by unaffordable inmate calling	
9	rates.	
10	So as a society we have an obligation to	
11	do everything in our power to counter this. I	
12	take this obligation seriously and remain	
13	committed to making sure that the FCC does its	
14	part to make basic phone calls for all affordable,	
15	a requirement and a statute that for too long had	
16	been ignored.	
17	Last years order adopted rate caps for	
18	interstate calls of \$.21 per minute for debit	
19	calls, and \$.25 per minute for collect calls.	
20	While still higher than I would have liked, the	
21	relief for family and friends has been tremendous.	
22	Since February when the rates went into	

		17
1	effect, I've heard from providers that call	_ ,
2	volumes have increased as much as 30 percent.	
3	In addition to rate caps the Commission	
4	also made clear that regardless of the value of	
5	benefits, that site commissions may provide to	
6	inmates through welfare programs or other	
7	services, such payments should not be a part of	
8	the Inmate Calling Rates because they have no	
9	direct bearing on the cost of providing	
10	communication services.	
11	Although the D.C. Circuit did stay part	
12	of the reforms, the court left in place the	
13	Commission's rate caps and critical findings on	
14	the nature of site commissions.	
15	While a critical first step, the FCC's	
16	order acknowledged that we have more work to do.	
17	We asked a series of questions in the further	
18	notice of Proposed Rule Making on additional	
19	reforms including permanent rate caps, extended	
20	reforms to intrastate rates, and reforms on	
21	ancillary services.	
22	To ensure that results are firmly	

- 1 grounded on the best data, we also required that
- 2 all providers of inmate calling service file data
- 3 with their costs and that is due no later than
- 4 July 17th.
- 5 But today's workshop provides a unique
- 6 opportunity to evaluate the impact that these
- 7 reforms have had to date on inmates, consumers,
- 8 providers, and correctional facilities, and it
- 9 allows this agency to continue to ask how best to
- 10 structure additional reforms, to ensure just,
- 11 reasonable, and fair rates for both the consumer
- 12 as well as the provider.
- So as we evaluate our next steps, it
- 14 remains my hope that the states will follow the
- 15 FCC's lead, grab the baton, and enact their own
- 16 reforms. So I am particularly pleased that you
- 17 will hear today about Alabama's inmate calling
- 18 reforms adopted just last week.
- 19 Unfortunately, as I stand here, Alabama
- 20 is the exception, not the norm. Despite our cry
- 21 for intrastate reform, the call has largely gone
- 22 unanswered.

		19
1	I still hope, however, that other states	
2	will move and do so soon. But I feel that the FCC	
3	has both the duty and the authority to act under	
4	the statute if the states so not, or cannot.	
5	While I hope it will not come to that,	
6	if it does I will strive to find a path where FCC	
7	reforms could act as a ceiling or default if	
8	states have not or will not act.	
9	After we adopted the reforms last year I	
10	shared with staff, who worked so tirelessly on	
11	this item, that this action will have an immediate	
12	impact on people's lives.	
13	Thank you notes came in almost	
14	immediately, and thanks to the leadership and	
15	support of Chairman Wheeler additional reforms to	
16	the inmate calling regime remains a top priority.	
17	So once again, I'd like to thank the	
18	organizers of today's workshop. They have worked	
19	long hard hours to put this together.	
20	So to the Wire Line Bureau and Consumer	
21	and Government Affairs Bureau, you are terrific.	
22	Particularly Greg Hulegion (ph) and Lynne	

		20
1	Engledow. I always mess up names here; I'm really	20
2	famous for that, but thank you, nonetheless.	
3	So now we'll turn the mic over to	
4	Commissioner Rosenworcel who has been a friend and	
5	supporter in this effort, and I again thank all of	
6	you for this role in this your role in this	
7	worthwhile effort.	
8	Commissioner Rosenworcel.	
9	(Applause.)	
10	COMMISSIONER ROSENWORCEL: Good morning.	
11	First of all, let me thank Chairman Wheeler, and	
12	the staff of the Agency for holding this session	
13	today. But most of all let me thank all of you for	
14	being here and being a part of it.	
15	Now, I think when it comes to forces for	
16	good in this world, you can usually find that	
17	there are some strong women standing behind them,	
18	and in this case there are two women you need to	
19	know.	
20	The first is Martha Wright, who more	
21	than ten years ago found that it was unreasonably	
22	expensive for her family to communicate with her	

		21
1	grandson while he was incarcerated, and she	
2	thought that wasn't right so she did something	
3	that was extraordinary, just for a regular	
4	citizen. She decided to petition the Federal	
5	Communications Commission and pressure us to do	
6	something about it.	
7	So the second women you need to know is	
8	my colleague Commissioner Clyburn who ten years	
9	after that petition was filed dusted it off and	
10	said it was more than time for action.	
11	Under her leadership last year we did	
12	something about this. We made sure that families	
13	that are often separated by hundreds of miles from	
14	their incarcerated brethren have an opportunity to	
15	stay in touch.	
16	We made sure that when they called their	
17	family they don't actually have to spend as much	
18	for a single phone call as everyone in this room	
19	spends for their monthly unlimited wireless plan.	
20	She thought that wasn't right, and I'm proud to	
21	have joined her and done something about it.	
22	But I don't think we're done. We've got	

- 1 a road ahead. We've got to figure out how to
- 2 respond to the musing of a certain court. We've
- 3 got to make sure those interim rate caps we put in
- 4 place become permanent. We need to do something
- 5 about ancillary charges, and then we need to work
- 6 with our state counterparts, and not just Alabama,
- 7 but in every state in this country to figure out
- 8 how we can address the problem of intrastate
- 9 rates.
- 10 I think getting here today, gathering
- 11 like we are, is the start of it and I think if we
- 12 all work together we can make sure that though
- 13 justice has been delayed, it won't be denied.
- 14 Thank you.
- 15 (Applause.)
- 16 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Thank you. Now,
- 17 will Panel One please come up and our moderator is
- 18 Kalpak and Rhonda, will be sitting over here.
- 19 MR. GUDE: It's not often are able to
- 20 start, not only on time, but a little early. So
- 21 hopefully this is a start of a good trend for
- 22 today.

23 1 I wanted to take the opening to thank 2 everyone for coming, particularly our distinguished panel and all of our panels for the I think we have set up a very interesting program, and a set of discussions, which we hope will further the understanding of the Commission, 7 and the understanding of all of us, on these complicated issues with respect to ICS. 9 It is something, as you just heard from 10 the Chairman and from our Commissioners, this is 11 something that is on the top of the priority list of a set of issues for the Commission to address. 12 My staff in the pricing division of the Wireline 13 Competition Bureau is tasked with handling it and 14 15 addressing it as quickly as possible, and we are working a pace to move this along. I think this 17 workshop, and the continuing dialogue that we have 18 with others, is a strong effort to do that. 19 Let me start right off by introducing my 20 co- moderator, Rhonda Lien, who is a member of my 21 team in the Pricing Division, and I'll quickly

introduce the panelists, and then I think our plan

2.4 is to give each of the panelists five minutes to introduce themselves and provide a presentation of their thoughts on the issue, and then we will have some questions that first the staff of the FCC have put together, and then we'll open it up to questions from the audience, from the Internet, from far and wide. 8 This panel is, our panel one, is to 9 discuss the impact of reform and the potential 10 need for additional reform. Obviously, that's the central issue of the day. We have some other 11 12 panels that will follow that get into more 13 details. Our panelists include Darrell Baker, who 14 is from the Alabama Public Service Commission; Cheryl Leanza, Policy Advisor from the United 17 Church of Christ; Talila Lewis from Helping 18 Educate to Advance the Rights of the Deaf, or 19 HEARD; Jesse Wiese, Policy Analyst at the Justice 20 Fellowship; Karina Wilkinson, from the New Jersey 21 Advocates for Immigrant Detainees; and Paul Wright 22 from Human Rights Defense Center.

		25
1	So with that, I would like to turn it	
2	over first to Mr. Baker to start us off. Thank	
3	you very much.	
4	MR. BAKER: Thank you. I thank the FCC	
5	for the opportunity to participate in this	
6	workshop and for consideration of my comments.	
7	Alabama has an ongoing Inmate Calling	
8	Service Reform Proceeding. Our second order	
9	within the past 12 months was released Monday. In	
10	2009 Alabama capped inmate calling service,	
11	operator surcharges, and user rates.	
12	I'm of the opinion that the reforms thus	
13	far, though significant, have had very minimal	
14	impact because the preponderance of inmate calling	
15	is intrastate.	
16	The ICS industry can be compared to a	
17	multi chamber balloon. If you squeeze one chamber	
18	the contents will simply displace to another.	
19	Until both jurisdictions are addressed there will	
20	be no substantive relief for the majority of	
21	inmates and their families. Moreover, until	
22	sources of ICS revenue in each jurisdiction are	

		26
1	addressed, the industry will simply adjust for	
2	lost revenue in one area by charging more in	
3	another.	
4	The sources of revenue are calling	
5	rates, ancillary charges, charges for single	
6	payment services, and charges for other services,	
7	such as video visitation, voice mail, etcetera.	
8	Further reforms are necessary. I	
9	recommend a tiered rate structure. Cost supports	
10	shows that jails are more expensive to serve than	
11	prisons. Small jails are more expensive to serve	
12	than large county or metropolitan jails.	
13	Alabama's recommend ICS rates include lower rates	
14	for prisons. Future intrastate call studies will	
15	break this down even further.	
16	Ancillary charges or fees will be	
17	addressed in Panel Two. For some providers end	
18	user fees account for 40 percent or more of the	
19	charges inmate families must pay.	
20	Single payment services are inmate	
21	collect calls billed to recipient's mobile phone	
22	or to a credit card. The effective rates for	

27 these calls are as high as \$1 per minute. Moreover, such calls constitute a de facto circumvention of regulated ICS call rates. Providers will have you believe they have no control over the prices charged by third party services involved in single payment service. That assertion is blatantly false. If providers are permitted an alternative to regulated ICS rates it will encourage migration of calls to the 10 more lucrative alternative. Since February alone 11 when the FCC's interim rates were implemented several ICS providers quickly added their own 12 13 single payment service offerings. 14 What is to prevent providers from 15 establishing third-party intermediaries for 16 prepaid, collect, and inmate debit service in 17 order to circumvent that regulated rate structure? 18 Continuous voice biometrics should be 19 separated from the rates. The FCC added two cents 20 per minute to Pay-Tel's prepaid, collect, and 21 inmate debit call cost to recover the cost for continuous voice biometrics. 22

		28
1	This is problematic because continuous	
2	voice biometrics is not provided in most	
3	confinement facilities. To my knowledge, it is	
4	provided nowhere in Alabama, therefore, most	
5	providers are charging rates that allow for	
6	continuous voice biometrics without actually	
7	offering it.	
8	Video visitation service and prices	
9	should be regulated. Providers will have you	
10	believe that video visitation is not a	
11	telecommunication service, and therefore not	
12	subject to our jurisdiction. Nevertheless, there	
13	is a telephone instrument attached to the inmate's	
14	video visitation console and two attached to the	
15	visitor's console. The parties converse via	
16	phone.	
17	Some inmate providers are pressuring	
18	confinement facilities to eliminate face-to-face	
19	visitation with the lure of 20 percent site	
20	commissions. Providers are employing additional	
21	practices, which concern me.	
22	Confinement facilities incur costs for	

- providing ICS. Actual confinement facility costs must be identified and recovered via ICS rates or the facilities have no incentive for encouraging inmate's access to ICS, to ensure the equipment remains operational, and to pursue new service offerings for inmates and their families. 7 When a single provider embarks on a strategy to control the industry and therefore 9 exerts its will with regards to cost that all 10 providers must incur, future cost savings are 11 constrained, as are potential price reductions. Additionally, such conditions may present a 12 barrier for new market entrance. 13 Currently, one dominant ICS provider 14
 - 15 controls more than 75 percent of all the patents
 - 16 in the ICS industry, and is actively shopping for
 - 17 additional patents to add to its portfolio. Its
 - 18 competitors must enter licensing agreements with
 - 19 the provider or face the threat of litigation.
 - The Department of Justice has well
 - 21 recognized guidelines for analyzing the level of
 - 22 consolidation within a particular industry in

- 1 determining whether that level of consolidation
- 2 represents market power and/or antitrust concerns.
- 3 I raise this issue in order that the FCC, DOJ, or
- 4 other Federal agencies may consider reviewing the
- 5 (inaudible) practices being in the ICS industry,
- 6 and determine whether the practices employed by
- 7 one dominant provider are anti-competitive and an
- 8 attempt to control industry prices.
- 9 Before I finish I wish to acknowledge
- 10 Doug Dillard; we are a two-man show in Alabama.
- 11 Doug Dillard's on my staff and has spent the past
- 12 16 years researching this industry, inspecting
- 13 jails, talking to inmates, and corresponding with
- 14 sheriffs in Alabama. I thank you.
- 15 MR. GUDE: Thank you. Cheryl?
- 16 MS. LEANZA: Great. Hi, good morning,
- 17 everyone.
- 18 I want to thank my colleague Mr. Baker
- 19 for that really compelling testimony.
- 20 So I am here on behalf of the United
- 21 Church of Christ. It's called OC Inc., is the
- 22 Media Justice and Communication Rights Ministry of

31 the UCC. The ministry is actually celebrating this year the 50th anniversary of the lawsuit that originally gave citizens the right to have standing and participate at Federal Communications Commission proceedings, so we're delighted to be here and see the fruits of that today, to see all 7 these regular people here participating in an 8 agency. 9 Like I think many people here today, I am also here to express extreme thanks to that 10 11 Agency, to Commissioner Clyburn for her leadership while she was acting chair, and everybody who has 12 helped move this issue forward, and taken a ten 13 year old petition and at least made that a 15 reality. 16 I have, actually, a couple of examples 17 just as tokens. We talked about thank you notes, 18 and I have a couple of thank notes from the state 19 prison in Bridgeport, New Jersey, actually. 20 I just wanted to share these because, 21 you know, these are inmates who wrote this letter

to Chairwomen and Commissioner Clyburn to tell her

- 1 thank you, and I think as all of us in Washington,
- 2 D.C., know although we know that the Federal
- 3 Communications Commission impacts people's daily
- 4 lives, we on the inside, or even know where the
- 5 FCC is know that, it's rare that regular ordinary
- 6 people know that a federal agency has not only
- 7 impacted their lives, but done something to make
- 8 it better, and then that they wrote a thank you
- 9 note.
- 10 Not only has this very fancy thank you
- 11 note come in, but also this very plain two words
- 12 on a piece of paper ripped off the top of a card,
- 13 and I think it shows, you know, who here is --
- 14 they're in prison, and what are thinking about?
- 15 They're ripping off a piece of paper to write a
- 16 note to say thank you. Like, this is not a small
- 17 thing, even though it's just two words on a piece
- 18 of paper.
- 19 So I want to be sure that -- I will
- 20 submit these for the record, but I just wanted to
- 21 show and illustrate the impact and the benefit,
- 22 even though I think we have a long road to go, I

think there's people who this is impacting know that it's impacted them and they're grateful for the change. So that's really beautiful. One of the things that Unitized Church of Christ was able to contribute after the order that I also wanted to share for the record, was 7 just some basic materials for families and for prisoners, and I'm sharing it today in large part because I want to be sure that lots of people are 10 able to utilize them if -- it's still a pretty 11 recent decision; February wasn't actually that 12 long ago in the lives of many people, even though 13 it was snowing then and now it's hot. So we have a few things, the website is 14 15 UCCmediajustice.org. But they're very simple 16 FAQ's, what do I do links to state commissions if 17 you're having trouble with your local calls, so I 18 want that to be available to people, and I -- sort 19 of an illustration. 20 I want to thank the FCC, which has been 21 a pretty good partner. We had a lot of meetings 22 as we led up to the implementation of the decision

- 1 to make sure that people would be able to use the
- 2 decision, that would really benefit them, and so
- 3 they can always call the FCC's national call
- 4 number, 888-CALLFCC, if they have trouble.
- 5 But one of the things that I would
- 6 encourage the FCC to do, as we're all trying to
- 7 grapple with this new decision, and evaluate its
- 8 impact, is to go and look into its own data, into
- 9 its own call center, into the bureaus that collect
- 10 the information from the general public, tote that
- 11 up, share that.
- 12 Let's pinpoint, are there places where
- 13 we're seeing more calls or not, let's try to
- 14 figure out if there's places that need more
- 15 outreach, some people don't even know about it
- 16 yet. You know, we should be seeing some activity
- 17 there now that the rules are in place, and it
- 18 would be useful to do that.
- 19 So of the recommendations I have, both
- 20 now for the current decision, but then for other
- 21 future decisions, is to be sure the FCC is really
- 22 in a very affirmative posture. They have been

- 1 great, but I think at this point, now that we're -
- 2 if we're having a workshop, then let's see what
- 3 the FCC has in its data sites.
- 4 So those are two things that I was here
- 5 -- the third thing I'm here to talk about today is
- 6 just to really ask the FCC to move ahead on the
- 7 local rates. As my colleague said, the majority
- 8 of calls, especially when you talk about a jail,
- 9 are local calls and many calls, even in prison,
- 10 are local calls.
- 11 There are, unfortunately I think, there
- 12 are a number of sheriffs around the country that
- 13 have been very vocal at the FCC docket asking to
- 14 the FCC to provide them special accommodation, and
- 15 I think -- you know, we certainly should have a
- 16 conversation about what's going on there, but I
- 17 wanted to highlight, in fact, the example of the
- 18 sheriff in San Francisco, Ross Mirkarimi, and I'm
- 19 going one to probably slaughter his name, but --
- 20 who is actually working to bring down the rates in
- 21 his jail because he thinks they're too high, and
- 22 he called the high rates that were being charged

		36
1	in the San Francisco jail immoral.	
2	He said that 39 percent of the men and	
3	women in his jail in San Francisco are parents,	
4	and he releases some data, which I'll also submit	
5	to the record; it was actually documented in the	
6	San Francisco Chronicle, but 82 percent of the	
7	300,000 calls in about a year from his jail are	
8	local calls.	
9	So the FCC's decision did a lot, but it	
10	certainly did help for large numbers of the people	
11	who are in the jail in San Francisco.	
12	So in sum, I want to thank the FCC for	
13	the opportunity and the hard work, and hope that	
14	we can move ahead, looking not only at local	
15	rates, but some of the other important issues,	
16	like my colleague Talila will be talking about,	
17	the rights for disabilities; I think there's a	
18	number of pieces of unfinished business left.	
19	Thank you.	
20	MR. GUDE: Thank you, Cheryl. Talila?	
21	MS. LEWIS: Good morning, everyone.	
22	First, I would like recognize members of	

37 the deaf and disability community who are here with us today signaling our deep and unwavering commitment to universal access and equality, and then secondly, of course I would like thank the FCC for hosting this panel and for seeing fit to put me on it. 7 One year ago I sat here at this table and I was very hopeful that or leadership would 9 take positive steps toward ensuring that Inmate 10 Calling Services were affordable and accessible 11 for all prisoners and their families. 12 Among other things, I shared that inmate 13 calling service providers, departments of corrections across the nation, were both in 14 15 violation of federal disability rights laws that 16 mandate equal access to programs, services, and 17 activities for all people with disabilities. 18 I explained that accessible telecommunications is paramount for deaf 19 20 prisoners, particularly because their 21 incarceration is filled with language depravation 22 that is not compared to a hearing prisoner's.

- 1 Also, their incarceration is filled with physical
- 2 and sexual assault, not compared to prisoners who
- 3 are fully able bodied, and who are hearing.
- 4 Also because of their incarceration
- 5 experience is filled with depressing isolation
- 6 that leads to mental health conditions that
- 7 actually require that they actually have more
- 8 contact with people who can communicate in a way
- 9 that is effective for them.
- I also shared that the FCC's own reports
- 11 indicate that TTY calls are 12 percent of the
- 12 total relay volume in the United States and that
- 13 75 percent of all accessible telephone calls made
- 14 through relay in the United States are actually
- 15 made through video phones. But despite that fact,
- 16 at that time, only three prisons across the nation
- 17 had videophones installed.
- Today we are all here again holding out
- 19 hope for meaningful action from our leadership
- 20 because notwithstanding the Commission's September
- 21 26th order, thousands of deaf and hard of hearing
- 22 prisoners across the nation, and prisoners with

		39
1	speech challenges are continuously and continually	
2	disconnected and cannot communicate with family,	
3	loved ones, advocates, anyone.	
4	While we applaud the Commission's	
5	efforts to ensure that rates for Inmate Calling	
6	Services are just, reasonable, and fair, we again	
7	remind the Commission that there is no fairness	
8	without equality. Anything short of a Commission	
9	order mandating universal accessibility for Inmate	
10	Calling Services for departments of corrections	
11	across the United States will leave countless	
12	prisoners and their family members exactly where	
13	they were prior to the Commission's decision,	
14	which is completely disconnected.	
15	HEARD's deaf prisoner phone justice	
16	campaign, which is now in its 18th month,	
17	mobilized unprecedented participation from deaf	
18	prisoners across the nation. More than 100 deaf	
19	prisoners submitted comments, as did family	
20	members of deaf prisoners, deaf family members	
21	with hearing incarcerated loved ones, and	
i		

22 organizations including the American Civil

40 1 Liberties Union. 2 Among other things, these prisoners requested very basic things like operational, affordable, and equal telecommunications access, including videophones, caption telephones, working 5 TTY's that they actually have access to, and rates that take into account the despairingly slow and 8 consistently unreliable communication via TTY from 9 prison. 10 Last year I believed that simple principals of equity and justice would lead those 11 in positions of power down the right road, and so 12 13 I spared you many details of what goes on in our prison system for people who have disabilities, 15 and people who are deaf. 16 I did not tell you that in the past 17 three years there have been just three weeks where 18 I did not receive a report from a deaf prisoner, 19 and advocate, or a loved one about physical or 20 sexual assault of a deaf prisoner. That countless 21 deaf prisoners do not sleep or shower for fear of sexual assault. That deaf prisoners have traded 22

41 their bodies to make telephone calls with loved ones through hearing prisoners who have complete and full access to telecommunications. I did not tell you that as rampant as 5 sexual assault is against people with disabilities and deaf prisoners in our justice system, or 7 correction system, that of the 500 prisoners that we have found, not one can access the stop rate hotlines or the FCC hotline that Cheryl here just mentioned, to make note of the things that are 10 11 going on in our prisons. That is how isolating being deaf in our prisons is with the current 12 13 system. I have not told you how multiple cases 14 of deaf wrongful conviction that HEARD believes 16 are probably cases of wrongful conviction, we 17 cannot even investigate because we cannot 18 communicate with those who communicate in ASL, 19 because video phones are not set up in prisons 20 across the nation. 21 I did not share that deaf prisoners 22 report abuse most often after filing grievances

42 about lack of communication access at prisons, including lack of access to telecommunications. Or that solitary confinement is often used as a substitute for the provision of accommodations for, and protections to, this group of individuals. 7 I share these to illustrate two main things. The first is that there's an ongoing 9 crisis in our prisons, particularly related to 10 conditions of confinement for people with disabilities, and people who are deaf, and second 11 to dispel the myth that this is a deaf problem, 12 13 that this is an incarcerated person problem; this is an American and societal problem that needs to be addressed immediately. 15 16 Since all departments of corrections and 17 ICS's have the same requirements under federal 18 law, that all people with disabilities should be 19 included, not retaliated against, and have equal 20 access to programs, services, and activities at 21 any prison receiving federal funding, and in any 22 public accommodation, which the Supreme Court has

43 determined that prison are a public accommodation, and that the Supreme Court has established that everything that we determine about conditions of confinement should be based on the concept of evolving standards of decency, then we should make sure that ICS companies, providers, and 7 departments of corrections are fully aware of disability rights, and what disability access 9 looks like. 10 The only way to do that is from our people in positions of power, people in the 11 Federal Communications Commission, people at the 12 Department of Justice, please take action on this 13 issue. 14 15 I have other information about state 16 campaigns but I will hold those for questions. 17 Thank you. 18 MR. GUDE: Thank you. Jesse? 19 MR. WIESE: Thank you. Thank you to our 20 moderators, Chairman Wheeler, Commissioner 21 Clyburn, and Commission Rosenworcel. 22 Justice Fellowship is the advocacy

44 division of Prison Fellowship Ministries and works to reform the criminal justice system by advancing the principals of restorative justice. Prison Fellowship is currently active in over 380 prisons in the United States and remains the largest prison ministry in the world. 7 Through Justice Fellowship, Prison Fellowship Ministries has advocated for Inmate 9 Calling Service reform for several decades, and 10 its grateful to the Federal Communications 11 Commission for recognizing this as an important issue, and for adopting reasonable rate caps for 12 13 interstate phone calls. Though the impact of interstate only 14 15 reforms may not appear to be substantial in light of the larger problem of intrastate calls, it is 17 important, I think, to emphasize that these 18 reforms do provide a positive impact on thousands 19 of family's budgets. 20 As someone who was incarcerated for over 21 seven years with the majority of my family being out of state, I can personally attest that this 22

		45
1	simple reform would have saved my family thousands	
2	of dollars.	
3	In addition to these long await fiscal	
4	savings these reforms have an impact on public	
5	safety. Research has shown that maintaining family	
6	relationships is a significant factor in the	
7	reduction of recidivism.	
8	For example, the Jane Adams Center for	
9	Social Policy and Research determined that family	
10	roles and relationships are important in reentry	
11	planning. Family connections and other social	
12	networks impact not only families and children's	
13	well being, but also the achievement of social	
14	goals such as the reduction of crime, and the	
15	building of vibrant communities.	
16	Additional research shows that released	
17	prisoners who had closer family relationships and	
18	stronger family support, were more likely to have	
19	worked after release and were less likely to have	
20	used drugs.	
21	These findings have long been recognized	
22	by corrections officials, and even the Federal	

46 Bureau of Prisons states that telephone privileges are a supplemental means of maintaining community and family ties that will contribute to an inmate's personal development. When released prisoners have a 5 supportive family they are more likely to find a 6 7 job, less likely to use drugs, and less likely to be involved in criminal activities. 9 Creating easily accessible and 10 affordable communication mediums helps maintain, 11 and in many instances, rebuild these important 12 family ties. In light of this public safety impact, I 13 would strongly encourage the FCC to extend the 15 price caps to other communications within it jurisdictional authority, such as international 17 I would also suggest that the Commission 18 begin to closely monitor the costs of other 19 interstate communication mediums, such as email, 20 video conferencing, and voicemail. 21 Long distance communication by telephone is quickly becoming a medium of the past, and 22

47 though the bureaucracy of corrections is typically slow to implement technological changes, state and federal corrections are beginning to shift to more advanced communication methods, and if history is any indicator, it is only a matter of time before these updated forms of communication will be 7 subject to the current immoral policies we find ourselves fighting today. 9 Despite the Commission's recent reforms on interstate calls, there is still much work to 10 11 be done in bringing relief to the millions of American families with an incarcerated loved one 12 who reside in the same state. 13 Intrastate calls vastly outnumber 14 15 interstate calls and much of the heavy lifting is 16 now left to the states. 17 Though we don't believe the Commission should regulate intrastate calls, it can still be 18 19 a vital part of the reform process by becoming a 20 substantial resource for state public utility 21 commissions that desire to implement similar 22 reforms.

		48
1	Assisting state public utility	
2	commissions and organizations such as the National	
3	Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners to	
4	provide educational forums such as the one we are	
5	sitting at today, or workshops on how to	
6	successfully implement similar inmate calling	
7	service reforms at the state level, as well as	
8	encouraging other forms of communication, could be	
9	very helpful in advancing meaningful reform.	
10	Justice Fellowship strongly believes	
11	that these unjust prison telephone policies must	
12	be eradicated.	
13	Adopting such policy reforms will	
14	facilitate more communication between incarcerated	
15	men and women and their families enabling them to	
16	draw from the encouragement and accountability	
17	that those relationships provide.	
18	Keeping these relationships a priority	
19	enhances the well-being of men and women who are	
20	incarcerated, and protects the well-being of our	
21	communities.	
22	Justice Fellowship looks forward to	

			4.0
	1	continuing this dialogue with the FCC, and will	49
	2	continue to work with the state and local	
	3	governments on this important reform.	
	4	Thank you.	
	5	MR. GUDE: Thank you, Jesse.	
	6	Karina?	
	7	MS. WILKINSON: Hi. I also want to	
	8	thank the Commission for the opportunity to speak	
	9	here today, and for their leadership.	
	10	New Jersey has high rates and	
	11	commissions, and just two inmate phone service	
	12	providers operating in the state, Global Tel Link	
	13	and Securus, so I wanted to describe the changes	
	14	that have happened since the FCC order was	
	15	implemented.	
	16	For state prisons the Department of	
	17	Corrections in New Jersey eliminated their	
	18	commission that netted the state \$4 million last	
	19	year, and dropped the flat rate of \$.33 eventually	
	20	to \$.17 for both inter and intrastate calls. The	
	21	initial negotiations dropped the rate to \$.19 on	
	22	February 11th, and then separate negotiations on	
ı			

50 the March contract renewal dropped it to \$.17. 2 Neither the state nor the counties negotiated any change for the intrastate rates for the county jails, they only changed the interstate rates to meet the caps and the phone companies eliminated the commission on the interstate calls 7 only. So intrastate rates remain high, in some 9 cases more than twice as much as the interstate 10 cap, so the calls are \$7.75 or \$8.50 for a 15-11 minute call in most of the counties in New Jersey. Prior to the order some of the interstate rates 12 has been as high as \$15 for 15 minutes. 13 Bergan County, New Jersey, is the only 14 county that independently contracts with Global Tel Link. Though public records requests we received a letter from Global Tel Link to Bergan 18 County Sheriff's Department offering to raise 19 other rates and fees, presumably the interstate 20 rates, to offset the losses from GTL's eliminating 21 the commission on interstate calls following the 22 FCC order.

		51
1	Bergan County is scheduled to put out a	
2	request for proposals for a new contract sometime	
3	this summer. The board had approved the request	
4	going out last December.	
5	Though either of the two ways that the	
6	counties can contract independently or though the	
7	state contract, no county takes less than 50	
8	percent commission. The highest in New Jersey is	
9	70 percent.	
10	In terms of our New Jersey Phone Justice	
11	campaign, we had already been gathering the data	
12	from the state DOC and all the counties, and last	
13	year we had updated all that data. Once the order	
14	went into effect we redid our public records	
15	request to see what changes had happened.	
16	Over the past several year's attempts	
17	have been made to get similar legislation to what	
18	the legislation that exists in New York, where	
19	they eliminated commissions and made the winning	
20	bids have lowest rates rather than highest	
21	commissions.	
22	The governor in New Jersey and the	

52 legislature overall where unwilling to make the sacrifice, though we have support from individual legislators. In response to the FCC order the state eliminated the commissions but the contract is up for renewal in September. The county intrastate 7 rates, except for the most local calls, as I said, remain higher than the new interstate rates. 9 We have consistently heard from 10 immigrant detainees about the burdens of high 11 rates, and because most of the rates weren't 12 coming down to even the safe harbor rate, and 13 because we saw little change of getting legislation, in late April our coalition filed a 14 15 petition with the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities asking them to regulate rates and cap 17 them at \$.05 per minute, comparable to what New 18 York State has, and we also asked for the 19 elimination of commissions. 20 You can find our petition at 21 NJPhoneJustice.org. The petition was filed in 22 collaboration with the New York University School

- 1 of Law, Immigrant's Rights Clinic, Latino Justice
- 2 Praldev (ph), the New Jersey Institute for Social
- 3 Justice, and the Firm of DLA Piper. They all
- 4 worked on the petition and we have many more
- 5 supporting organizations, including the ACLU of
- 6 New Jersey.
- 7 We came to the issue because New Jersey
- 8 has some 2,000 jail beds that are contracted for
- 9 use by Immigration and Customers Enforcement.
- 10 Immigrant detainees, since they are in
- 11 administrative proceedings, have no right to an
- 12 attorney if they cannot afford one for their
- 13 immigration cases. They need to gather documents
- 14 to present to the court, so having fair phone
- 15 rates is critical for them.
- The other thing that I'll mention is
- 17 that we started in Newark because we discovered
- 18 that as the expansion of detention beds in Newark
- 19 was taking place a new contract was signed between
- 20 Homeland Security and Essex County in 2012, and in
- 21 that contract the county was prohibited from
- 22 commissions on immigrant detainees calls.

		54
1	We wrote to the county executive and	
2	informed ICE's Newark Field Office Director. The	
3	written response from the county was that they	
4	would not eliminate the commissions, and would	
5	only lower phone costs if they would keep the	
6	revenue the same.	
7	So we calculated that the county makes	
8	approximately \$900,000 per year on calls by	
9	inmates and detainees, so they're tied to the	
10	state contract so any renewal or change in the	
11	commissions for Essex County would also come up in	
12	September. Thank you.	
13	MR. GUDE: Thank you, Karina. Finally,	
14	Paul?	
15	MR. WRIGHT: Hi, I'm Paul Wright from	
16	the Human Rights Defense Center, I'd like to thank	
17	the FCC Commission for inviting me to speak today,	
18	and I'd also like to thank the Commission two for	
19	the leadership its shown on the issue of prison	
20	phone rates.	
21	The Human Rights Defense Center was also	
22	one of the organizations that founded the Prison	

- 1 Phone Justice Campaign to bring public awareness
- 2 and attention to the issue of prison phone rates,
- 3 and we encouraged the FCC to act starting back in
- 4 2011, and while the interim rate caps have been
- 5 great, as we heard from previous speakers, there's
- 6 a lot to be done.
- 7 One of the things that is still an
- 8 issue, of course, is the issue of jails and calls
- 9 from local detention facilities and the in-state
- 10 calling rates.
- Some of the things, as far as numbers
- 12 go, is we looked at the Los Angeles Jail, it's the
- 13 largest jail in the country, and their phone rates
- 14 are also among the highest. The jail receives a
- 15 67 percent commission on the phone calls made, and
- 16 that's totaling over \$40 million a year.
- 17 When we think about the numbers, on any
- 18 given day the Los Angeles Jail is averaging around
- 19 21,000 prisoners a day, which is larger than the
- 20 populations of the five smallest prison systems
- 21 combined. For example, it's more than the prison
- 22 system of the State of Vermont, which around 1,500

- 1 to 1,800 prisoners. So the numbers are fairly
- 2 large and there's a lot that remains to be done.
- 3 So far we have eight states that do not
- 4 receive commissions on their phone calls, and I
- 5 thin its telling that in all eight of those
- 6 examples the decision to not accept commissions
- 7 from the telecom industry was the result of
- 8 outside action from the utilities commission, the
- 9 legislature, or the government's office through
- 10 executive action.
- 11 I think it's also critical that we note
- 12 that in no cases that a requirement, or a demand,
- 13 that prison and jail accept commissions or
- 14 kickback from the telecom industry and they gouge
- 15 consumers. In fact, it's a perverse world indeed
- 16 where we have a situation where contracts are bid
- 17 out based on how much money is going to go to the
- 18 agency rather than who can provide the lowest cost
- 19 to the consumer.
- In at least four states, this includes
- 21 Virginia, Colorado, Florida, and Tennessee, the
- 22 utilities commission either does not have

- 1 authority, or the courts have held they do not
- 2 have authority to regulate the cost of prison
- 3 telephone calls, which leaves the FCC as the only
- 4 regulatory body that would have that authority to
- 5 do so.
- 6 The previous speakers have noted the
- 7 high impact that ancillary fees have also caused
- 8 on consumers who receive calls from people in
- 9 detention facilities. This continues to be an
- 10 ongoing issue, and in fact is one that's largely
- 11 been unaddressed by most of the regulatory reforms
- 12 we've seen in different parts of the country.
- Some of the utility commissions that
- 14 have tried to address this have been the Louisiana
- 15 utilities commission, and despite an order that
- 16 the cease collecting the ancillary fees, the
- 17 telecoms in that state have continued to do so in
- 18 defiance of the state utilities commission.
- 19 Some of the issues that we've also seen
- 20 too, I think as Commissioner Baker referred to is
- 21 as the balloon that you step on in one place it
- 22 bulges out somewhere else, is we also see some of

- 1 the contracts, for example, in Washington state --
- 2 in Washington State, which has historically had
- 3 some of the highest prison phone rates in the
- 4 country, the Washington DOC has received a \$5.1
- 5 million upfront fee at the signing of the contract
- 6 each year, and one of the things is that they
- 7 don't have a -- they do not have -- the calls are
- 8 not being billed per minute, rather the calls are
- 9 being billed on the flat fee for a 15 to 20 minute
- 10 call, which results in a very high individual per
- 11 minute fee, if that's calculated out.
- We also have situations there were many
- 13 times the calls are not able to be for the entire
- 14 20 minute duration, rather they're cut off before
- 15 then. We also have quality of service issues that
- 16 permeates the ICS industry as well, that are not
- 17 really addressed by the issue of fees.
- 18 For example, calls that are prematurely
- 19 terminated resulting in call backs and more fees
- 20 and more charges. These, I think are issues that
- 21 need to be addressed by the FCC as sell.
- So we'd like to applaud the fact that

- 1 FCC has shown leadership on this issue, and needs
- 2 to continue to show the leadership and enforce its
- 3 statutory duty and responsibility to ensure that
- 4 all consumers have access to fair and reasonable
- 5 phone rates, even if those consumers have loved
- 6 ones who are in detention facilities.
- 7 Nothing will show prisoners that the law
- 8 applies to everyone more than enforcing the rule
- 9 of law for everyone, even prisoners and their
- 10 families, and protecting them from rapacious
- 11 gouging by ICS providers and the government
- 12 agencies, and ending the process of monetizing
- 13 human contact.
- Recognizing the right to communication
- 15 as a human right and a fundamental one that should
- 16 not monetized, and enforcing the FCC's mandate
- 17 that phone rates be reasonable and fair is, I
- 18 think the obligation of the FCC and one that we
- 19 hope they will extend to the instate phone calls
- 20 as well. Thank you very much.
- 21 MR. GUDE: Thank you very much. I think
- 22 that was very helpful. Now, I'd like to start out

60 with a discussion and really open it up for folks to share your thoughts across so we make ask questions to individuals, but feel free to jump in, even if your name wasn't called for the question, and feel free to share your thoughts. Chervl? 7 MS. LEANZA: May I just make one point? I know both Darrell and Paul had mentioned 9 something about the differences between jails and 10 prisons, and that's a very important point, and I 11 do want to mention that we'll be discussing it later this afternoon in Panel Three. So we will 12 circle back and talk about that later. 13 MR. GUDE: Okay. But the first question 14 I wanted to ask is, as we have investigated the 16 issue, clearly site commissions is a running 17 theme, and we've heard it in many of your opening 18 comments as well. We've heard it from all sides in 19 this debate that site commissions are a 20 significant, if not the significant driver of 21 costs in very high phone rates in the ICS 22 industry.

61 1 On the other hand, we've heard from facilities saying the charges, or the payments, the site commission payments that are made, are used for many times critical services that benefit inmates, benefit those incarcerated individuals, whether it be through different simple things of board games and entertainment, whether it be blankets, whether it GED programs; lots of other 9 inmate benefits, or services. 10 The question that we have as a Commission is, one, is it appropriate and 11 consistent with the Act for the Commission to even 12 13 look at that? The Act itself says just, reasonable, and fair. So is that even appropriate 15 for the Commission to look at? 16 But from a consumer end, from an 17 advocate for inmates, what are your thoughts on 18 the potential loss of such services, and how that 19 would play out? 20 MR. WRIGHT: I'd like to address that. 21 I think as far as -- this is one of the excuses 22 that I think has been used as a reason and a

- 1 rational to try to maintain these high kickbacks.
- 2 In some states, for example Georgia, the Georgia
- 3 Department of Corrections states that it uses the
- 4 bulk of the phone commissions that are received to
- 5 provide mental health treatment for mentally ill
- 6 prisoners.
- 7 I think it's one of those things that
- 8 once a state chooses to incarcerate people the
- 9 have certain constitutional obligations to meet
- 10 and providing mental healthcare is one of those
- 11 obligations, and does anyone really think that the
- 12 State of Georgia is going to stop providing mental
- 13 health care treatment, force mentally ill
- 14 prisoners, if say for example, prisoners stop
- 15 making phone calls. These are, I think, some of
- 16 the fallacies with this.
- I think it's also critical to note that
- 18 there's no obligation or statutory duty that -- as
- 19 to what states do with the money the received from
- 20 the phone commissions that they receive, and some
- 21 states it reverts to the general fund, in other
- 22 states it may go to Department of Corrections, and

		63
1	there's no obligation or duty that the money	
2	actually go to benefit prisoners.	
3	Even if it does, I think we're	
4	forgetting that we're not writing on blank state	
5	here. Prisons have had telephone services since	
6	the early 1970s. The commissions and the kickback	
7	model did not come into vogue until the late	
8	1980s. So we have a 20-year period where services	
9	were provided to prisoners and they were paid for	
10	from other sources, such as commissary sales,	
11	donations, and other means.	
12	So it's not like if the money goes away	
13	these services are not going to be provided, and	
14	we have the example of eight states that	
15	eliminated commissions. New York State was	
16	receiving over \$20 million a year from phone	
17	commissions before they eliminated commissions.	
18	Last I heard the New York Department of	
19	Correctional Services are still functioning and	
20	services are still being provided to prisoners, so	
21	I would respectfully submit to the FCC that this	
22	whole argument is, for lack of a better term, a	

64 red herring. 1 2 MS. LIEN: I just wanted to make two points. I just want to make two points on top of Paul's excellent advocacy, as always. First of all what's really inappropriate about these fees is that they fall disproportionately and only on the families of the incarcerated. We don't have -- when we have taxes to take care of our public 9 parks and our national defense we don't tax on 10 particular part -- if you're a family of soldier 11 then you have to pay more to call them, because it's really expensive to run the Army. I mean, 12 that's not fair. 13 That's -- these people already are 14 15 undergoing a lot of difficulty in their lives, there's no reason why friends and family have to 17 be the one to support the services that are required to be given, as Paul said. 18 19 I think the second thing goes to a 20 Communications Act point, which is that, no, 21 unfortunately the FCC, whether it's good or not 22 good, the FCC is not permitted to allow an

- 1 unreasonable rate because it's done for a good
- 2 cause. If Verizon suddenly wanted to charge
- 3 certain mobile phone users a really high rate, but
- 4 they're like, but don't worry, we're going to take
- 5 all the money and we're going to give it to a
- 6 really good cause, it's still illegal; you can't
- 7 do it.
- 8 So I mean, I think whatever the
- 9 justification is in the minds of the folks who are
- 10 collecting those fees, the Federal Communications
- 11 Commission has to enforce its statute, which I
- 12 think has a consequence of actually being fair
- 13 because you don't want certain consumers to
- 14 subsidize particular services, that's very unfair,
- 15 but I don't think that the Commission really has
- 16 the ability to look to into it, even if it wanted
- 17 to.
- 18 MR. GUDE: Thank you. Darrell, I wanted
- 19 to bring you into this conversation, willingly or
- 20 unwillingly, because I know this has been a
- 21 challenge for everyone looking at this industry,
- 22 and your thoughts on this question, and the

66 broader challenges that you faced as Alabama looked at reform. MR. BAKER: Well, I'm not here to 3 advocate for or advocate against site commissions. The way that we look at it is the have been a fact, they are there, and at the state and local level governments are required to balance their budgets. So we have to consider the public interest, in terms of those budgets and policy 10 makers have to be given an opportunity to adjust 11 if those site commissions are reduced. I think it would be equally wrong to 12 13 come in and immediately flash cut and say you have to remove this from your budget, and then you 15 create a funding crisis at the state and local 16 level. 17 So that's why Alabama is looking at 18 transitioning these rates down. 19 MS. LIEN: Jesse, I have a question for 20 you, you mentioned that you don't believe that the 21 FCC should regulate local calls. You want to 22 expand on that for us, please?

67 1 MR. WIESE: You had to ask me that question. Yeah, I will just enter a caveat; I'm not an expert here, but just jurisdictionally from what I've looked at, but listening to Peter here on states that may have determined that they cannot regulate the calls within the state, their 6 7 utility commission, perhaps the FCC may have jurisdiction. So I'd have to look into that a little bit more. 10 But just from our perspective organizationally, we are strong believers in 11 federalism so trying to keep the reach of the FCC 12 within its property boundaries, as well as trying 13 to utilize the great reform that's happened here 15 in other states as well. So just trying to marry the two there. 17 MS. LIEN: I'd like to follow up a 18 little bit with Darrell. You've mentioned a few 19 points; you've talked a lot about what's happened 20 in Alabama. Can you just back up a little bit and 21 perhaps give us a little bit higher level view of 22 what has led to the very hard work, and the

- 1 granted interim, but the reforms that led to the
- 2 order that came out on Monday afternoon?
- MR. BAKER: We actually began our look
- 4 at reforming Inmate Calling Service approximately
- 5 ten months before the FCC order came out, and our
- 6 order came out in October of 2013. There was a
- 7 comment cycle, and since that comment cycle we
- 8 have developed this order and put a lot more
- 9 research into the industry, and what's going on,
- 10 and there is a comment cycle for this order that
- 11 will last to August 11th. Then the proposed
- 12 implementation date is October 1.
- 13 But once -- it's not over. I mean, in
- 14 our order we establish that we're going to
- 15 continue with cost studies, and we are looking at
- 16 doing cost studies every three years. So this is
- 17 just the beginning, it's not the end, and these
- 18 are interim rates.
- 19 MS. LIEN: Can I follow up on something
- 20 more specific too? You had mentioned that, and I
- 21 did your order, you had mentioned that you found
- 22 that FCC, the Federal Communications

69 Communications dealings with voice biometrics to be problematic. Can you expand on that a little bit, please? MR. BAKER: Yes. In the FCC's proceeding they looked at Pay-Tel's cost for 5 inmate debit and for pre-paid collect cost, and they added two cents per minutes to it. That is for recovering continuous voice biometrics. only problem is, in most cases, there are no 10 continuous voice biometrics in confinement 11 facilities. 12 There is voice authentication where you 13 do a voice match of the inmate as they get on the phone to verify that it's them. The continuous 15 voice biometrics goes from that point through the rest of the call. In most cases that's not 17 employed in most confinement facilities. 18 So if you have allowed for continuous 19 voice biometrics, and it's not being provided, 20 then I would conclude that some are being 21 overcharged. 22 MR. GUDE: Talila, I'd like your

70 thoughts, further thoughts, on what changes you've noticed since the Commissions rules have gone into effect, and what more needs to be done with, as you mentioned in your opening, within the Commission's jurisdiction. What can the Commission do? And what could the Commission do that -- what worked and what didn't work, in terms of on the interstate side, and as the Commission looks at what further to do, what gaps have come 10 out, at least at this point. 11 MS. LEWIS: So to be clear, right now deaf prisoners across the nation don't have access 12 13 to telecommunications. I mean there are a few prisons where videophones have been installed. 15 think the big change hasn't actually come from the 16 order necessarily, but from the increased dialogue 17 surrounding disability justice. 18 So many people, including some of the 19 folks in this room, who are presidents of 20 telephone companies, came to me saying, hey, I 21 thought what we had in our prison was sufficient; tell me more. 22

		71
1	So it's clear that people are	
2	interested. Departments of corrections have	
3	contacted me. But this shouldn't be something	
4	that me, the all-volunteer leader of a non-profit	
5	organization that is all volunteer should be	
6	providing.	
7	This should be information that's	
8	provided by people in positions of power so we	
9	don't have to do this individual by individual,	
10	you know, basis education.	
11	What I see as that would beneficial	
12	coming from the FCC would be guidance about	
13	disability. The FCC just established an all ASL	
14	consumer complaint hotline. Clearly, the FCC	
15	understands deafness, they understand disability,	
16	and it's easy enough for the FCC to then provide	
17	the information that it has in house in the next	
18	order to people who are interested in making sure	
19	that their services are accessible.	
20	That's something that doesn't require	
21	any authority per say, but just requires someone	
22	taking the time to move it from one order to the	

		72
1	next.	
2	That's what I want to see at least at	
3	base, and there needs to be a strong emphasis from	
4	the FCC on providing updated telecommunications,	
5	which since we know that more than 75 percent of	
6	relay calls from videophones, why are there only	
7	video phones in six prisons across the nation?	
8	Why isn't the FCC and the Department of Justice	
9	saying more on this topic?	
10	I believe that actually making	
11	information available to departments of	
12	corrections, to inmate calling services, and to	
13	family members so we know how we could be	
14	advocating, and loved ones, and advocates, and	
15	attorneys, that's actually what would be more	
16	beneficial than saying nothing on the topic at	
17	all.	
18	MS. LEANZA: I wanted to endorse sort of	
19	that approach. I think particularly in Washington	
20	when there's so many agencies with complex	
21	jurisdiction, and obviously the FCC has certain	
22	amounts of jurisdiction, but it has other	

- 1 limitations, but I think there's a huge service to
- 2 be made just in articulating those outlines.
- 3 Well, who does have jurisdiction? Who does that?
- 4 Who's the staff member that does it? Who could
- 5 have a meeting? Can you convene another meeting?
- 6 Can you convene a workshop? Can you convene a
- 7 workshop that brings in other governmental
- 8 agencies? Can you bring in leaders of state
- 9 prison associations to have -- I mean, I know
- 10 there's -- I think there's a panel later today
- 11 that maybe will touch on a little bit of this, but
- 12 I think there's a lot that you can do sort of from
- 13 a bully pulpit.
- 14 You know, it think Commissioner Clyburn
- 15 is a great leader, and it might be something she
- 16 or others would want to consider as just bringing
- 17 folks together, letting them know who to call,
- 18 letting them know what a best practice is.
- 19 So those don't require any authority
- 20 whatsoever, it just requires leadership and
- 21 information, and it's easy to undervalue when
- 22 you're inside a federal agency, the amount of

		74
1	knowledge that you have about how things work, and	
2	how easily you could probably, you know, open a	
3	couple of doors at least to know who is the right	
4	person to have in the room.	
5	So you know, when somebody is an	
6	advocate on the outside that can be extremely	
7	opaque. So I think there's a huge value in just	
8	getting the information out there. Then obviously	
9	pushing as you can on your authority to remedy	
10	this grave injustice, but there's a lot that can	
11	be done just with a little person power.	
12	MR. GUDE: Thank you. I think obviously	
13	this workshop is part of our bully pulpit of	
14	getting information out and trying to get broader	
15	knowledge.	
16	But it also helps us to understand what	
17	these specific issues are as we delve into the	
18	area further, the specifics don't always trickle	
19	up to the Commission, so again, we thank you all	
20	for coming in and sharing that with us.	
21	Let me ask Paul a question. You had	
22	mentioned in your opening statement that dropped	

75 calls continue to be a problem, but the ICS companies in many cases have told us that either that's not a problem, or not a significant problem going forward. Maybe you can share your thoughts a 5 little bit more on what you're hearing on the 6 7 dropped call issue. It clearly is a problem when it comes to the rate structure. But how is that 9 actually playing out in the real world? 10 MR. WRIGHT: The reports that we get from prisoners around the country and their family 11 members, and people who are intact with prisoners, 12 and our organization also receives calls from 13 prisoners as well from around the country, is low 15 phone call quality continues to be an issue, and 16 also dropped calls. Ostensibly, the dropped calls are often 17 18 a result of so-called three-way call detection 19 systems. My understanding is that what a three-way 20 call detection system does is it detects other 21 noises. Often that other noise can be someone 22 coughing, clearing their throat, or just

		76
1	background noise, which is very common in	
2	detention facilities, and this leads to the calls	
3	being dropped.	
4	Then when the call is dropped the	
5	prisoner has to call back again, which leads to	
6	another hook up fee, and a larger charge, and I	
7	think this is something that it artificially	
8	inflates the costs of the calls above and beyond	
9	the already high rates.	
10	We're consistently getting reports	
11	nationally about continued dropped calls.	
12	MR. GUDE: Has that changed at all in	
13	your sense since the Commission's order went into	
14	effect?	
15	MR. WRIGHT: No, we haven't seen any	
16	change in that. This has been a constant thing	
17	for at least the last ten years or so, and I think	
18	it started with the implementation of the so-	
19	called three-way call detection systems.	
20	MS. LEWIS: Can I just add to that? I	
21	would like to see that folks calling through	
22	TTY's, the few TTY's that are actually functional	

77 in our prisons actually have a worse situation with respect to dropped calls. One, because calls take exponentially longer when you're typing and English is not your first language. Two, because these limits that exist 5 anyway, there's a 15 minute cap on most calls, 6 7 really just for the deaf person who has to connect to relay, that takes eight minutes in and of 9 itself, so the deaf person is left with six 10 minutes to get -- talk to their attorney, or their 11 loved one, and then they have to do the call all over again, which clearly skyrockets very guickly. 12 13 Deaf people are still being charged a surcharge to use relay in prisons across the 15 nation. That hasn't changed since the last time I was here either. 17 Yes, dropped calls, I experience dropped 18 calls with prisoners who call me all the time, but 19 it's often because the -- well, I won't get into 20 all the technicalities of how a TTY works, but you 21 all understand how TTY's work, and it's through 22 sound. It's like Morse code, so if there's any

78 sound in the prison, and we know that there's tons of sound in a prison, the call is going to be perceived as there's some third-party, or what have you. So it's certainly an issue that affects us, and I think we actually pay lot more for it. 7 MR. WEISE: Yeah, I'd like to add to 8 Peter's comment if I could, as well as perhaps 9 implicate myself in the process. 10 You know, when I was in prison I had the fortunate ability to have my father, who was 11 middle class -- you know, I quickly looked at the 12 13 phone rates and realized I was going to pay about \$15 for 15 minutes, but a local call was a mere 15 \$2. 16 So I quickly ascertained, well, what I 17 need to do is get a local number. So I had my 18 father purchase a cell phone, get a local number, 19 I'd call that cell phone with the local number, 20 then I would have him forward the call to whoever 21 else I wanted to talk to. They would forward the 22 call, and then I could talk to anybody I wanted to

79 with -- for a mere \$2 for 15 minutes. For Peter's -- you know, with the three-2 way calling system, that's what it's there to detect, so that, you know, number one, for a number of reasons. First, they want to be able to monitor who you're calling and a three-way system 7 lets you call whoever you want, and secondly it's the more local numbers you have the less money you 9 get on the backend. 10 So I just bring that up because I think there are ways that people will figure out how to 11 make cheaper phone calls, and I think one of the 12 things you see in a prison system today is this 13 growing concern of cell phones being snuck into 15 prisons, and there's obviously security concerns with cell phones in prisons, but I also think it's 17 a result of this exorbitant high cost that we have 18 of people wanting to communicate with their loved 19 ones. 20 You also see kind of this raising up of 21 corporations who will, in essence, you pay a 22 monthly fee, \$8 or whatever it is, and they will

80 give you a local number that then somebody can put on their call list, and then you can make a local call, as opposed to a long distance call. So I think there are ways that people are looking -- I like the balloon analogy that he 5 said, because I mean, people are going to find a way. There's a little bit of a free market in there somewhere, and people are going to try to 9 find how to make the cheapest phone call. 10 I think there are -- what I've really learned through this whole process in advocating 11 for this, is there are many ways to attack the 12 dragon. I think perhaps coming at even 13 departments of corrections and say perhaps you 15 offer the ability for families to secure a local 16 number. Perhaps that's one way that you can do 17 that. 18 So I just really -- yeah, the hang ups, 19 and all of that, is a continual problem in our 20 prisons. 21 MS. LIEN: Thank you, Jesse. Darrell, how have you dealt with this in Alabama?

81 1 MR. BAKER: Just last week I was in the Elmore County, Alabama, detention facility as we spoke with inmates in ever cell block, and two a man they said their number one problem is dropped 5 calls. 6 It's dropped calls due to suspected 7 three- way call violations. This is why that's 8 happening; the software that screens for suspected 9 three-way calls is searching for DTMF signals, 10 which is Dual Tone Multi Frequency, it's when you 11 key in a number on your touchpad on your telephone you'll hear the various tones that are sending 12 13 that call to a third-party, or forwarding that 14 call. 15 So you can adjust the sensitivity of the 16 software to, obviously block more calls, or knock 17 off more calls, and that's what's happening. 18 You're getting a lot of background noise and those 19 calls are being bumped off. 20 If you have rates that have a set up and a per minute charges on top of it, what happens is 21 22 those inmates have to go through that calling

82 process again, and they get charged again. 2 Now, with the postalized rates that the FCC has recommended, and Alabama has recommended, that's going to be less of a problem. There won't be a need to refund, and the inmates if they are knocked off can recall again and the charge will 7 not be a problem, except the single payment services. 9 You've got to continue to monitor single payment services because they're going through 10 11 that screening process too for three-way calling, and if they're bumped off at some of those rates, 12 \$14.99 and \$9.99 for those calls, they'll have to 13 go back through and be charged those rates all 15 over again if they're bumped for three-way 16 calling. So we've got to look at that process. 17 MS. LEANZA: In considering that issue,

> (866) 448 - DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com © 2014

I wonder if the Commission couldn't -- I don't

know, for example, when the Commission did it's

last order there, and obviously that's still --

that's stayed at the moment, there's sort of a

presumption of when a rate is appropriate or not

18

19

20

21

- 1 appropriate, and then a process to prove whether
- 2 it is appropriate or not, I'm wondering if as the
- 3 Commission gathers more data on these incidents,
- 4 whether the type of call pricing, which
- 5 incentivizes problems like dropped calls, because
- 6 that increases the volume and increases the
- 7 revenue, could possibly be a flag, or something
- 8 that requires further justification.
- 9 Whereas if a prison or a jail had a rate
- 10 structure that was more likely to incentivize
- 11 appropriate use of the technology, and not abuse
- 12 of the technology to increase rates, that might be
- 13 a way to incorporate it into the FCC's framework
- 14 that it's used in that past that would -- you
- 15 know, it would help address this issue without
- 16 being so -- you know, without doing something
- 17 that's very specific, but that would at least be a
- 18 step in the right direction.
- 19 MS. LIEN: Karina, we haven't heard from
- 20 you in a while. I have two different questions
- 21 for you. One is, could you please discuss the
- 22 petition filed at the New Jersey of Public

		84
1	Utilities and what prompted that petition, which I	
2	know you touched on briefly, but if you could	
3	expand a little bit?	
4	We also have question from outside,	
5	which said you mentioned several examples of	
6	counties accessing high commission on local prison	
7	calls; how much do high commissions contribute to	
8	the overall problem of high ICS rates?	
9	MS. WILKINSON: Well, we've seen I'll	
10	answer the second one first we've seen the	
11	state reduce their rate from a flat rate of \$.33	
12	to \$.17, while eliminating the commission. So the	
13	rates can still be above a fair and just rate,	
14	even without a commission.	
15	I'm not sure what the state's motivation	
16	is for that, so I think we still have advocacy	
17	that we can do around bringing those rates down	
18	further. If our petitioner were the regulation	
19	that we're asking for from the Board of Public	
20	Unities were to bring the rates down, we see just	
21	across the river in New York 4.8 cents per minute.	
22	So what is New Jersey's interest in keeping the	

85 rates so high? 2 In terms of what motivated us, so in working with immigrant detainees, it's a constant complaint of the high rates. There have been petitions when they close down a facility, ICE closed down a facility in New York City, they moved people into the Hudson County Jail, and the rates in New York were 10 cents a minute, and they 9 came over to Hudson County, 88 detainees wrote a 10 petition, which they submitted to the New York 11 Times, the American Bar Association, and number -one of the top complaints was the phone rates. 12 They were able to make some kind of 13 change in that, but we know of people who are 15 detained and their children have to choose between calling their mother and eating. We know that 17 people come out of immigration detention with 18 thousand dollar phone bills. 19 I just wanted to commend the folks in 20 Alabama because even before the FCC order we had 21 one immigrant detainee who was in detention for 22 three and a half years, in about four different

		86
1	county jails, in New Jersey. Not the county where	
2	he was originally from. So and part of the time	
3	he was also detained in Alabama.	
4	So when he didn't have a court	
5	appearance ICE moved him down to Alabama, it was	
6	cheaper for him to call his sister from Alabama	
7	than from one county to another in New Jersey.	
8	So these are the kinds of things that	
9	motivated us to also, like I said, to file a	
10	petition with the Board of Public Utilities. Also	
11	the fact that we didn't think the legislative	
12	route was going to achieve what they were able to	
13	achieve in both other states, such as California,	
14	and New York.	
15	MS. LIEN: So am I understanding	
16	correctly that in New Jersey there is no	
17	prohibition on commissions; this is being decided	
18	on a county by county basis, is that correct?	
19	MS. WILKINSON: Yeah, there's no	
20	prohibition.	
21	MR. GUDE: I had a question for Paul.	
22	I know that HRDC keeps a great database	

87 of ICS contracts that are out there. Have you all seen since the Commission's order went into effect any changes in what you're seeing, in terms of the RFP's that you may have access to, or the contracts that come out, getting back to Darrell's comment about the balloon. Has there been a noticeable balloon effect in contracts trying to find cost, or abilities to make up revenue losses 9 in one place, versus another? 10 Or do you see really the, at least on the interstate side, rates coming down and having 11 a real benefit, and is that benefit also from the 12 13 bully pulpit perspective impacting intrastate rates in any positive way? 15 MR. WRIGHT: So far I think it's one of those things that it's too soon to tell. We 17 maintain the website at 18 www.PrisonPhoneJustice.org, and we have the 19 contracts for all 50 states, the Bureau of 20 Prisons, and a number of county jails around the 21 country. 22 Part of the problem with this is there's

- 1 a couple of problems in getting a quick answer to
- 2 your question, and number one is the lack of
- 3 transparency involved in getting this data. We
- 4 have at least one full time person at HRDC that
- 5 they're only job is to track down these contracts
- 6 and get the data on them. To say that's -- it's
- 7 quite the task is an understatement.
- 8 Some departments of correction are very
- 9 forthcoming with them, but unfortunately those are
- 10 the minority.
- 11 The other problem that we've got also is
- 12 that these contracts are multi-year contracts.
- 13 It's very common to see these contracts that are
- 14 five, six, seven eight years for the provision of
- 15 services with one-year extension options, so you
- 16 don't see a lot of renegotiation.
- 17 I think this also goes to -- is more of
- 18 a comment too about the lack of competition and
- 19 market consolidation within the ICS market, which
- 20 I think for practical purposes isn't really a
- 21 market. So we haven't really seen any type of
- 22 changes in the RFP's, and because these contracts

89 are such long-term contracts, we're probably not going to see any changes in the RFP's for some time to come. We're still gathering the data and we'll be reporting on that after we gather it, and we're probably looking at probably another six to eight months to be able to do that. 8 One of the ironic trends that we are 9 seeing, and that we're hearing from a lot of 10 prisoners and their families, is that because of 11 the FCC action out of state calls are now cheaper than in state and local calls. 12 13 So what we're seeing is people are setting up -- family members are setting up 15 numbers out of state so the prisons can call the out of state number, which then gets forwarded to 17 the family member, and it's cheaper than the in-18 state calls, which I think it's kind of a sad 19 commentary, but I think it also reflects the need 20 for uniformly low rates, and affordable and reasonable rates across the board so that everyone 21 can take advantage of the FCC's reform on this 22

90 1 effort. 2 MS. LIEN: Darrell, you mentioned in your opening comments the potential need, or the need for a transition period in Alabama. Can you expand on that a little bit please, as far as contract changes? 7 MR. BAKER: Yeah. Whether you agree or disagree with site commissions, they are in fact 9 there. I think in some cases there are local 10 budgets that depend on them. Local confinement 11 facility budgets. 12 Policy makers have to have an 13 opportunity to adjust going forward if you're going to do something with site commissions. 15 it's nice to say we need to eliminate site commissions, but you've got to consider those 17 policy makers, because like I say, you can create 18 a funding crisis at local jails, county jails, 19 city jails, if you don't accommodate for the 20 change, transition the change. 21 MR. GUDE: Let me follow up on that in 22 two ways. One, how big a percent of revenue for a

91 jail or prison is the commission they receive? other words, is it a tiny amount that really a transition is not really necessary, or is it a very large amount that a transition is almost critical, one. 6 Second, from a transition period, what's an appropriate transition period? We have heard 7 all kinds of commentary from let the contract run though, and don't tinker with the contract itself, 10 and in some cases that contract may go out many, many years with option years, and all of that, 11 versus no transition period at all. 12 13 So from your perspective being closer to the localities, what's your thoughts on that? 15 MR. BAKER: As far as the commissions go, it depends on the facility, and it depends on 17 the provider. 18 I will say that in Alabama we have 19 commissions as high as 84 percent. 20 MR. GUDE: But the percentage of 21 commission is very high, but as a percentage of 22 the budget for the facility itself. Obviously, if

92 it's less than a percent, one would believe that budget makers can accommodate for that rather quickly. If it's a large percentage it may be more problematic. 5 MR. BAKER: To be honest in your question, I haven't gone through and analyzed 6 7 those budgets. I presume that it's a lot higher than one percent. 9 What was the second part of your 10 question? 11 MR. GUDE: On the transition. The length of the transition that you find necessary, 12 13 or that you all looked at and thought through your process, this is required, or useful. 15 MR. BAKER: It depends on when you 16 implement the change. I mean if we're looking at, in Alabama, starting on October 1, obviously the 17 18 FY-15 budget has already been approved. So going 19 forward we looked at a transition transitioning 20 down over two years and implementing the final 21 rates in three years. 22 MS. LIEN: Getting back to Karina, I

93 have a follow up question, and this is for Karina and for everyone; several of you have mentioned 3 this. Your advocacy principally focused on immigrant detainees, which means that some portion of your calls must be international. How much of an issue are international ICS rates? 8 MS. WILKINSON: It's been hard to get the data on the international rates, so as Paul 10 was talking about, what's easily available is the 11 domestic rates. For some of the facilities we know that, for example, Bergen County I believe is 12 around \$20 for 15 minutes international. 13 really -- it's an issue. 15 The immigrant detainees, if you -- if you're facing deportation sometimes you need in 17 your -- to prepare your court case you need to get 18 documents from another country. If you have a 19 final order against you, you may need to prepare 20 to go back to a country where you haven't been in a while. 21 22 So these calls are critical and I don't

```
94
   have good data on all 21 counties, or even the
    state doesn't make available on their website what
   their international rates are.
              MS. LIEN: Is access to international
    calls an issue, or is the -- is it more of an
    issue of high rates?
 7
              MS. WILKINSON: I'm not aware of those
   issues, so I'm sorry.
 9
              MS. LEWIS: Can I just say something? I
   would just like to add; you asked what would be
10
11
   helpful in terms of what the Commission could do.
12
              I would like to see in the next order
   also a mandate that all ICS providers have a
13
   disability access plan in place within their,
15
   whatever it is that they submit to you all. I
   don't think that's asking too much, particularly
17
   because they are making so much money and it's
18
   really easy to do.
19
              MR. GUDE: We have a question from the
20
   audience for Darrell.
                           The BLM Commission
21
   regularly visits or inspects telephone systems and
22
    jails, do you see that the jails have a cost to
```

95 offer inmate phone services that can be offset by minimal commissions, transporting inmates, listening to calls, disciplinary actions from call abuse, etcetera. In other words, what are the costs for 5 facilities to make ICS available inside those 7 facilities, that properly, one could argue, is recovered or should be recovered through ICS 9 rates? 10 MR. BAKER: Well, that's something that we're looking at, and Alabama tends to work with 11 the sheriff's and local confinement facility 12 13 administrators in our state to do a time and motion study to determine what is involved, what 15 is their involvement in Inmate Calling Service? 16 I know that one of the requirements is 17 they have to monitor the calls, or a portion of the calls. They're also involved in actually 18 19 submitting trouble tickets on equipment, they're 20 involved in some billing disputes the inmates may 21 have with the provider. So there is a level of 22 involvement. We don't know how much that is right

96 now, so that's something we're going to determine going forward. MR. GUDE: Your sense from, as you said, 3 you've made trips to facilities throughout the state, how does that vary? Not just that, but the whole issue of jails versus prisons, small versus large, you noted that there are differences. Can you talk a little bit more about the cost differences from that perspective, the -- how 10 tiering from a cost recovery perspective, or a rate perspective, may or may not be useful or 11 necessary? 12 13 We have heard arguments on all sides of that; that tiering is useful, the breakdown should 15 be on call volume, or on some other basis. your thoughts and identification would be useful 17 on that. 18 MR. BAKER: We don't know, that's why 19 we're looking at it going forward. We're going to 20 look at the cost studies on a tiered basis for 21 jails. But you've got to know that there's going 22 to be smaller volumes at smaller jails, and so you

97 have a lot of the same fixed cost for those jails as you would for the medium size jails with a lower volume. 3 So you know there's going to be higher cost. So we're going to try to look at that going forward. 7 I will mention something that Bill Pope included in comments to the FCC about universal service fund; he said that the Commission ought to 10 consider eliminated universal service fund charges 11 to inmates. 12 What the Commission could also consider is taking that universal service fund that comes 13 from inmate calling and putting in a special pot 15 and compensating the higher cost jails, to keep the rates low in those jails. 17 MS. LEANZA: I just wanted to mention 18 really quickly, the United Church of Christ is the 19 long standing, along with our civil rights allies, 20 on the universal service fund, and particular the 21 lifeline fund. You know, clearly when people are 22 low income and they get a benefit for that fund, I

- 1 think that's important.
- 2 I just would be a little cautious about
- 3 what is this revenue going to be used for? Is it
- 4 used to compensate the jail, or is it used to
- 5 benefit -- I mean, I wouldn't want the subsidy
- 6 from an inappropriately high rate to then drain
- 7 money out of the universal service fund, which is
- 8 used to help low income consumers have a basic
- 9 lifeline connection, so that a jail could maintain
- 10 it's commission level and support it's facility on
- 11 non-telecom related issues. I think that would be
- 12 -- you know, really cautious.
- 13 I did also want to highlight in regard
- 14 to this conversation that I wonder, and I don't
- 15 have the data, but I think it would be a useful
- 16 enterprise to incorporate is, you know, what's the
- 17 role of new technologies to do some of this
- 18 monitoring?
- 19 I mean, my understanding from being in
- 20 this proceeding is that new technologies are
- 21 actually making -- you know, driving down costs
- 22 for monitoring, and all those things, because

- 1 they're often done on an automated basis, they're
- 2 often done in a centralized remote location. So
- 3 in fact, there may not be that same cost
- 4 differential for a small jail as a large facility,
- 5 because in fact the provider is centralizing those
- 6 services at a single place so their volume is
- 7 distributed over the whole facility, which think
- 8 is one of the things that the Commission
- 9 acknowledged when it -- you know, the last order.
- 10 So keeping that on the front burner in terms of
- 11 cost.
- 12 MR. GUDE: One last question -- I think
- 13 we're running out of time -- for Paul, you
- 14 mentioned that some states do not accept
- 15 commissions. Though your databases and analysis,
- 16 have you seen a direct correlation between that
- 17 and lower ICS rates?
- 18 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, there's a very direct
- 19 correlation. The December issue of 2013 of Prison
- 20 Legal News, we did a -- every two years we're
- 21 doing a comprehensive survey of the states, and
- 22 for example, New York State, which did away with

100 its commissions a few years ago, the cost of a call in-state and out of state is 4.8 cents a 3 minute. The service there is provided by Global Tel Link, and there's a direct correlation between the cost of the calls and the amount of the commission, and I think that one of the things that we're seeing in this proceeding, is we're seeing two things. We're seeing a lack of data 10 and transparency from the telecom industry, and 11 from the government agencies that contract with 12 them. 13 The fact that Prison Legal News is a non- profit is the organization having to gather 15 these contracts and make them available in one place, which no one had done before we did, I think is one of the things that makes it difficult 18 to have informed policy decisions if you don't 19 even have the data. 20 The telecom industry is not coming 21 forward with any information about their actual costs in providing these services, including the 22

101 security measures. We know the security measures have been touted as one of the reasons for the high cost of calls, yet again, I think that is also a red herring because the technology exists for call monitoring, call recording, all that other stuff. 7 Whenever we do phone calls to corporate calling centers and we get the message your call 9 is being recorded and may be monitored, it's the 10 same technology that's being used there. So the 11 costs there are being inflated. 12 But I think that the bigger flaw in --13 that we're seeing is the whole structure of the ICS system where the contracts are being bid on 15 who's going to get the biggest kickback or 16 commission, they're not being bid on who's going 17 to provide the lower service to -- the best 18 service at the lowest cost to the consumer, which 19 is ideally how these contracts should be bid. 20 When we look at the states like New 21 York, New Mexico, California, where the calls are 22 being -- where the contracts are being bid without

102 the commissions, we see the costs are significantly lower. The commissions are what's driving the cost of the calls. MS. LEANZA: I know the Commission's got a data collection and data requirement that's supposed to be submitted, I believe next week, and 6 7 I think there's some question about whether providers feel prepared to submit the data, and I would just like to go on record and hope that that 10 deadline is not extended. You know, the data is a 11 critical component, it's been the excuse for all 12 this time, it's been a reason why supposedly the 13 Commission couldn't act for a long, it's supposedly the basis for why we're having a 14 15 lawsuit over the basic -- the rates that were 16 adopted last year. 17 So then for the same people who are 18 controlling the data to then say, oh no, we're not 19 ready since you told us last August, almost a year 20 ago, that we're supposed to get data, that now we 21 need more time to submit data, you know, we've

seen this shell game of waiting, and waiting, and

103 waiting for more information, and I don't think that there's any appropriateness for there to be a 3 further delay. They've been on notice for an extremely long time that this data is required, and I can only speculate as to why at this time, all of a sudden, the data is once again not going to be available. This data needs to be collected, and needs to be collected on the deadline the FCC set, 10 and I strongly encourage decision makers here to 11 press ahead with that, and make sure that that data is collected, and that companies that do not 12 comply with FCC's rule about data collections are 13 appropriately sanction or fined, or whatever is 15 set forth, because that data needs to be collected. It's essential; we can't make policy 17 in a vacuum. 18 MS. LEWIS: Can I just add one thing to 19 that? I believe that all data that should be 20 collected should always have questions regarding 21 disability. Right now the large vacuum that 22 Paul's referring to with respect to contracts,

		104
1	same exits with where are people with disabilities	
2	in the system.	
3	So we know that there are 50 million	
4	people with disabilities with nation, but we have	
5	no idea how many people with disabilities are in	
6	prison systems, so it would be really important to	
7	collect that information so we can by we I mean	
8	the FCC and the Department of Justice can	
9	actually take meaningful steps in the right	
10	direction toward making sure that folks, wherever	
11	they may be in these systems, jails and prisons,	
12	are receiving access, but if you don't collect the	
13	data then you won't ever be able to do it.	
14	MR. GUDE: All right. Thank you very	
15	much. This brings to an end our first panel.	
16	Obviously, as you can tell, interesting issues, a	
17	lot of issues that are out there.	
18	Thank you so much panelists for joining	
19	us. This really helps frame our understanding and	
20	improve our understanding of the issues. Thank	
21	you.	
22	(Applause)	

105 1 COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Today I have a pleasure of both thanking all of you, particularly Mr. Gude and Ms. Lien, for a very dynamic last panel but also to introduce one of our nation's best treasures, Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Now in her twelfth term as a 7 representative for the District of Columbia, the Congresswoman is a ranking member of the House 9 Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on 10 Highways and Transit. In addition to her service 11 on the Transportation Committee, she is a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government 12 13 Reform. Before her congressional service, she was appointed by President Jimmy Carter to chair the 15 U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission making her the first woman to do so. When she 17 came to congress, she was already a national 18 figure, a noted civil rights leader, a feminist, a 19 tenured professor and a board member of three 20 Fortune 500 companies. 21 If you ask those who know her best what her major fault is, they will say that she will

106 never let go of a cause or an effort until the job The Congresswoman's work for full congressional voting representation and democracy for the people of the District of Columbia continues. Her accomplishment in breaking down barriers for those in her District are matched by her success in bringing home unique economic opportunities for her constituents, and her 9 support for reforms for those with few or no 10 advocates like the constituency at the center of 11 this workshop will never ever wane. 12 So ladies and gentlemen, it is a 13 pleasure for me to present a support, a friend, an American treasure, trailblazer, Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes- Norton of the District of 15 Columbia. 16 17 (Applause.) 18 CONGRESSWOMAN HOLMES-NORTON: First, let 19 me thank Commissioner Clyburn for those really 20 quite wonderfully gracious remarks. I mean you 21 would think that I deserve some credit for what 22 this Commission and what Commissioner Clyburn

- 1 herself did when she was Acting Chair of this
- 2 Commission. I understand that Chairman Tom
- 3 Wheeler is here. There may be other members of
- 4 the Commission here. All praise to you and that's
- 5 why I've come for what I think is really quite
- 6 extraordinary. You have to understand I come from
- 7 the "Do Nothing House of Representatives" so when
- 8 I'm invited to a session like this where
- 9 essentially what we've seen as a Commission that
- 10 not only got it done under Commissioner Clyburn
- 11 but then some and the then some, of course, has to
- 12 do with the follow-up right afterwards and with
- 13 this series of workshops today.
- 14 I want to thank the moderators. I want
- 15 to thank the Commissioners. We were so glad to
- 16 have it done candidly that we dared not think of
- 17 the afterwards. We didn't even contemplate
- 18 something as wonderfully professional as this
- 19 follow through panel is today. And I want to say
- 20 to those of you who have come to Washington, some
- 21 of you may not be from this area, that you have
- 22 done some very important work; you are doing some

- 1 very important work here today. It's one thing to
- 2 -- it's a very difficult thing for the Commission
- 3 to proffer regulations. For the most part, you
- 4 don't hear from such a Commission again. It
- 5 usually takes far longer to do the actual
- 6 regulations than it took Commissioner Clyburn and
- 7 the Commission to do these regulations. It had
- 8 taken some time and I want to say just how
- 9 appreciative we are of what the Commission did and
- 10 what you are doing here today.
- To make you understand that, you should
- 12 think of the FCC and the issues that are on its
- 13 plate all the time. They are trendy, technical
- 14 issues. I'm not always sure they have a face.
- 15 This one had a real face. And when Commission
- 16 Clyburn became the Acting Chair, it had a real
- 17 leader, a real leader who has made a difference to
- 18 hundreds of thousands of people who are
- 19 incarcerated and millions of their relatives. I
- 20 exaggerate none at all when I say how important
- 21 the regulation of these prison phone rates means
- 22 both to those directly involved and to the country

- 1 because of what it means when they get back home,
- 2 and according to all of the data we have, indicate
- 3 that the kinds of communication and contact you
- 4 are enabling them to have has everything to do
- 5 with their reintegration into the society.
- 6 I happen to chair the working group of
- 7 the Congressional Black Caucus who took special
- 8 interest in the Commission's work because 60
- 9 percent of those who are incarcerated in our
- 10 country today are people of color. That's the way
- 11 it's always been whether they are immigrants or
- 12 poor people, the people who are in the jails and
- 13 the prisons, I mean it's the people at the bottom
- 14 of the society.
- 15 Now this is America. Those people come
- 16 out and we try to not keep them at the bottom of
- 17 the society and we try to see what we should do to
- 18 make sure when they do come out, they are really
- 19 part of us. It's very hard to figure out.
- 20 And to tell you the truth, we have not
- 21 figured it out except for one approach. We do not
- 22 have the key to reducing recidivism but we do know

- 1 this. We have documented that of all the
- 2 approaches, the many approaches that are used to
- 3 reduced recidivism, the one that we can document
- 4 has the greatest effect is stimulating
- 5 communication from behind those bars with people
- 6 in the greater society who will support them and
- 7 who love them. It is the one vehicle we know of
- 8 that makes a difference to the successful
- 9 reintegration into society and makes a difference
- 10 into a safe -- and to public safety itself.
- So we were particularly moved by this
- 12 issue because the absence of reasonable phone
- 13 rates fell most heavily on those who could least
- 14 afford it, those, of course, were in prison but
- 15 their families as well. We and the Congressional
- 16 Black Caucus want to once again thank the
- 17 Commission. We were not sure that the Commission
- 18 would regulate both intrastate and interstate and
- 19 make calls and when it decided to do so, we were
- 20 overjoyed because most prisoners would have been
- 21 left out if both kinds of calls were not
- 22 regulated. It was clear to us and we cited what

111 we believed was definitive statutory authorization for the Commission doing what it did. 3 I can tell you this, that the families are, to this very day, very grateful. The face that this issue had on it happened to be a face from the District of Columbia because the lead plaintiff was a grandmother and her grandson. And when the petition was filed before the Commission, members of congress had a press conference and we brought that grandmother and her grandson -- her 10 grandson is now employed here in construction, one 11 12 of our biggest construction companies -- and we 13 let them speak for themselves. This grandmother had led the fight both in the courts and in the Commission for 10 years. She had no criticism to 15 She had only gratitude to offer and a plea 17 to make that somehow the others like her, because 18 after all, her grandson was there to speak for 19 himself, could have the opportunity to speak to 20 their loved ones and to have what the rest of us 21 take for granted. 22 So I've just come this afternoon to say

112 we don't take for granted what you're doing here at all. We are overjoyed by the fact that the Commission has sponsored these panels and by the kinds of issues you're looking at, the impact of the reform, and the need for additional reform. Do you know how unusual it is to hear a regulatory 7 agency talk about additional reform? They're so glad to get out of the regulations, to keep Congress from pounding on them that they just 10 don't want to hear anything more. We didn't have 11 to do a thing after we submitted our petition. are so grateful for how rapidly it got done. 12 could not be more grateful for this follow 13 through. We're especially grateful to those of 14 you who've come to participate in this follow through and perfect what the Commission has so 17 wonderfully done. For those involved and the 18 United States of America, thank you very much. 19 (Applause.) 20 COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Congresswoman, 21 thank you so very much. You mentioned during the 22 introduction that you were not sure why we were --

113 so I came to say generous -- but appropriate with our comments. I have a source in Congress and my source in Congress said to me during one of their critical meetings that a certain gentlewoman got up during the meeting and said -- talked about this effort and talked about our commitment to 7 getting things done and asked and charged and 8 challenged all of them to help, this then Acting Chair and this Commissioner in his effort, so for 10 that and so much more, I am grateful. We thank 11 you. The American people thank you and that is why I was so appropriate in my complements and 12 13 comments about you. So Roger, I know it's time for the next 14 15 panel and we are maybe one-and-a-half minutes late 16 and that's great in terms of FCC time. So thank 17 you so very much. I appreciate it. 18 (Applause.) 19 MEMBER GOLDBLATT: Will panel two please 20 come up. It was well worth the minute-and-a-half 21 by the way. 22 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Good morning. I'd

- 1 like to welcome panel two to the table this
- 2 morning to begin a second set of issues focusing
- 3 primarily on ancillary charges their prevalence,
- 4 their costs, the rates being charged for them, the
- 5 occurrence of new charges, recommendations for
- 6 reform which have been made generally in the
- 7 docket, and to generally get the opinions, the
- 8 reactions of our panelists on ancillary charges.
- 9 As we heard earlier, they have become a more
- 10 significant part of the charges that ICS consumers
- 11 pay for their service overall; hence the focus of
- 12 this panel.
- 13 I'd like to begin by introducing our
- 14 panelists. Mr. Darrell Baker already introduced
- 15 from the Alabama PCS; Ms. Aleks Kajstura, the
- 16 Legal Director from the Prison Policy Initiative,
- 17 a group that's been very active on this issue in
- 18 particular; Lee Petro, counsel from Drinker,
- 19 Biddle and Reath and lead counsel for the Wright
- 20 petitioners, been involved in this issue for a
- 21 long period of time as many of you have, most of
- 22 you have; Mr. William Pope, President of Network

- 1 Communications International Corporation or NCIC,
- 2 an ICS provider based on Longview, Texas; and
- 3 finally, Mr. Vincent Townsend, President of Pay-
- 4 Tel Communications, an ICS provider based in North
- 5 Carolina.
- 6 Thank you, and Mr. Baker, if you would
- 7 begin.
- 8 MR. BAKER: I thank the FCC for the
- 9 opportunity to participate in this workshop and
- 10 for consideration of my comments. The three
- 11 drivers of ICS revenues are ICS rates, ancillary
- 12 chargers, otherwise known as fees, and charges for
- 13 single- payment services. A fourth is video
- 14 visitation and it's growing rapidly. Site
- 15 commissions do not apply to customer fees and very
- 16 minimal commissions are offered on single-payment
- 17 services.
- Before proceeding, I'd like to make this
- 19 point. Some ICS providers charge reasonable fees
- 20 and if they offer single-payment services, the
- 21 charges are very reasonable by comparison. Their
- 22 attractiveness is excellent customer service and

- 1 square dealing with confinement facilities.
- 2 Unfortunately, being an honest broker is simply
- 3 not enough. They compete for exclusive
- 4 confinement facility contracts with a few ICS
- 5 providers who offer high site commissions using
- 6 exce3ssive fees and exorbitant charges for single-
- 7 payment services to compensate for reduced calling
- 8 income need to pay commissions and win the
- 9 contract. These providers win contracts because
- 10 the end-users of the service aren't the ones
- 11 making the choice for their service provider.
- 12 Alabama capped ICS rates in 2009.
- 13 Therefore, all providers are subject to the same
- 14 maximum rates. Since then, site commissions
- 15 skyrocketed to as high as 84 percent in our state.
- 16 Common sense alone will tell you that providers
- 17 cannot survive on 16 percent of the ICS revenue.
- 18 Those that awarded the contracts should have
- 19 figured that out as well.
- 20 So how do these providers do it? The
- 21 answer is excessive end-user fees supported by
- 22 exorbitant for single-payment services. So how do

117 you reform end- user fees? Alabama's approach is first, establish a basic level of ICS service and what is included in that basic service at no additional charge to the customer. If service is not defined, then anything may be considered ancillary by the provider. 7 We define basic service as prepaid, collect and inmate debit service wherein the customer is entitled to establish an account with a provider and have it maintained at no charge and 10 11 to have a means of funding that account at no charge. Other telecommunication carriers in 12 13 Alabama a required to provide their customers a monthly statement at no charge. ICS providers, 15 therefore, have the same requirement for all the inmate debit service. Additionally, those customers are entitled to a refund of their 17 18 prepaid charges at no cost to them. Beyond that basic level, the Commission 19 20 will consider fees. So what is ancillary beyond 21 that basic level of service? Payments by a credit card or a third-party payment transfer service,

118 bill processing for sync collect charges wherein the provider must pay to include their charges on another carrier's billing statement, charges for transferring funds from canteen trust funds to inmate calling accounts, and a small charge when the customer chooses an optional paper bill over the default electronic account statement. 8 What fees are not authorized? 9 Essentially, the remaining plethora of provider 10 fees. Alabama has never authorized an in trust state regulatory recovery fee. When providers 11 seek their certificate of convenience and 12 necessity authorizing them to provide service in 13 Alabama, they are aware that the service is 15 regulated requiring oversight and reporting. They know about the requirement for paying the 17 Commission inspection and supervision fees as well 18 as the requirement for collecting and remitting applicable taxes and government fees. Why then do 19 20 some regulators feel obligated to compensate 21 providers for things they've already agreed to do? 22 With all due respect to our host,

- 1 Alabama objects to the application of a federal
- 2 regulatory recovery fee and any U.S. self-
- 3 collection admin fee. Can anyone point me to an
- 4 FCC order that specifies what those fees are?
- 5 Providers are charging whatever they want. To
- 6 their credit, some of the ICS providers do not
- 7 apply these fees. The USF fee is calculated
- 8 quarterly with precision that would make a
- 9 watchmaker green with envy. The telephone relay
- 10 system is accurate to fractions of a cent but
- 11 providers are allowed to charge whatever they
- 12 please under the category of a regulatory recover
- 13 fee.
- One provider is assessing a 99 cent
- 15 charge to the first and fifth interstate call.
- 16 Another charges 3.49 if one just interstate call
- 17 is made by an inmate. Assume an inmate makes one
- 18 10-minute interstate call at the FCC's new interim
- 19 rates. The charge is \$2.10 but one provider
- 20 currently tacks on \$3.49 for regulatory recovery,
- 21 so that \$2.10 call just cost the customer \$5.59.
- 22 Additionally, that customer is assessed

Capital Reporting Company

Workshop on Further Reform of Inmate Calling Services 07-09-2014 120 disproportionately a higher proportion of regulatory costs than a caller who makes more interstate calls. Alabama's position is that we will allow this fee if the provider can point to an FCC rule or order that specifically authorizes it and the amount thereof. 8 Third-party payment transfer fees. 9 providers will attempt to persuade you that they 10 have no control over what their customers are 11 charged by third-party payment transfer services. 12 That claim is blatantly false. They exercise tremendous control over the charge. Why do one

- 13
- provider's customers pay \$5.00 and another
- 15 provider's customer's pay 11.95 to the same third-
- party transfer service? We suspect revenue
- 17 sharing arrangements exist between some providers
- 18 and third party payment transfer services.
- 19 Essentially, the customer is being charged twice
- 20 for the privilege of sending their money to the
- 21 provider. ICS providers have no incentive to seek
- 22 lower payment transfer fees for their customers.

121 In fact, they are free to sock it to them if they choose and some do. I'll close with this recommendation to 3 The myriad of end-user fees are the FCC. 5 confusing to customers. It does little good to boast about setting low rates. What comes out of the customer's pocket is what matters and fees are emptying those pockets. You're in the process of 9 studying costs for semi- permanent interstate ICS 10 rates. We're following the same path in Alabama. 11 As much as possible, incorporate all known measurable and justifiable provider costs and the 12 ICS rates excluding the truly elective ones for 13 the customer that I've mentioned previously. 15 Include reasonable costs for provider compliance with federal regulations. Together let's 17 eliminate all ancillary charges except those that 18 make sense. Make the rates a true reflection of 19 cost for providing the service rather than an 20 illusion. 21 When you have done so and addressed 22 single- payment services as well, all ICS

- 1 providers will be on a more level playing field in
- 2 terms of competing with one another. They will no
- 3 longer be able to underwrite promises of higher
- 4 site commission payments with the old standbys.
- 5 Thank you.
- 6 MS. KAJSTURA: Thank you again for
- 7 having us here on this panel and what's become now
- 8 an annual tradition. I'm Aleks Kajstura, the
- 9 Legal Director at the Prison Policy Initiative
- 10 where we've released two reports on the cost of
- 11 the calls to and from prison. And one of the
- 12 reports that deals specifically on fees was over
- 13 1200 pages long, so I'm going to attempt to kind
- 14 of consolidate it now here for you.
- As most of you know, the high cost of
- 16 phone calls can be traced back to the practice of
- 17 paying commissions to the jails and prison phone
- 18 systems and ancillary fees are no exception.
- 19 Today's high ancillary fees are a direct outgrowth
- 20 of the commission system. Because correctional
- 21 facilities are taking so much of the revenue
- 22 generated through phone rates, companies have

- 1 developed fees as a way to shield that profit from
- 2 the commission system, and they've become a robust
- 3 and hidden revenue stream. As a result, we found
- 4 that ancillary charges now make up about 38
- 5 percent of the money spent on phone calls. So
- 6 regulating ancillary fees is a significant and
- 7 important part of regulating the cost of the phone
- 8 services in correctional facilities.
- 9 To the point where -- there can really
- 10 be no meaningful regulation of phone costs without
- 11 controlling for fees because, you know, the ICS
- 12 companies have proven to be adept at charging fees
- 13 in order to bypass any burdens placed on the rates
- 14 part of the equation. We're already seen one
- 15 example of this within a month of the FCC's last
- 16 order, Securus. You know, it was their rates were
- 17 now capped. They changed their fees instead.
- And it's important to note, like Darrell
- 19 said, that these fees are charged at every step of
- 20 the process. They're charged for taking the
- 21 customer's money, for then holding the customer's
- 22 money, and then if the customer wants their money

124 back because their loved one is out of the facility, they charge money there, too. 3 So to kind of give you an idea of the scope of the problem, Securus, for example, has account funding fees that amount to 32 to 40 5 percent of the money deposited to the account, so that's 40 percent of the money gone before you ever make a phone call. And that's for a website or phone -- like automated phone deposits. 10 There's nothing fancy. And if somebody wants to 11 deposit money through a third-party such as MoneyGram, Western Union, the companies charge 12 fees there as well. Like Darrell said, there is a 13 wide variety that has pretty strong implications 15 of kickbacks going forth when -- in the cases that the companies are not directly charging an 17 additional fee on top of the deposit. And these 18 fees I mentioned are on the higher end but they're 19 not unusual and there's huge variation between 20 NCIC and Pay-Tel here, for example, providers. 21 are charging things on the lower end but the 22 larger companies like Securus and GTL which should

125 really have economies of scale and be able to get these fees down, they have -- they're charging fees two to three times as much. And that's just to get your money into the account. Then while the companies are holding 5 your money, they're going to charge monthly 6 7 billing fees, other charges on a monthly basis. And then if the account doesn't get used enough, it goes into inactive status. At that point, the 10 company is going to start charging fees as well. 11 But then if you want to avoid that and get your 12 money back, there are fees for taking your money 13 out.

- 14 So in conclusion, fees -- if fees are
- 15 unregulated, it will undermine any regulation of
- 16 phone rates that the FCC attempts. You can't have
- 17 a meaningful cap on the cost of a call when
- 18 companies can just switch their charges to fees.
- 19 So -- because what can seem like reasonable phone
- 20 rates when you look at the cost per minute, it
- 21 doesn't necessarily take into account the fees
- 22 that are charged to get you to that first minute

- 1 and then what happens after you hang up. And the
- 2 FCC kind of attempted to close off some of the
- 3 pricing structure loopholes that we've already
- 4 seen the in past for the increased cost for the
- 5 first minute and so on, and so it calculates the
- 6 fees based on a 15-minute phone call. But what
- 7 happens before that first minute and after the
- 8 15th matters just as much. Thank you.
- 9 MR. PETRO: Well, I'm fortunate to
- 10 follow Aleks and Mr. Baker because then I don't
- 11 have to get into all the details. My name is Lee
- 12 Petro. I'm the pro bono counsel for Martha
- 13 Wright. I'm of counsel at Drinker Biddle & Reath
- 14 and when I took over the case about five years
- 15 ago, the attorney that had been working on it
- 16 said, "You know, you just have to punch it across
- 17 the goal line." What he didn't say was that I had
- 18 to go 99 yards to get to the goal line. And so I
- 19 am fortunate and very thankful for the FCC and for
- 20 all of their staff and all the hard work that they
- 21 have done, and I refer to her as the "Action
- 22 Chairwoman Clyburn" because in her brief period,

127 she got more done that many chairman have done in the past. So I am very thankful for her -- and I've chased her away but it's okay. So thank you very much for having me here. I wanted to start with the basic 5 presumption or basic statement that the Communications Act specifically addresses 8 ancillary fees. Under Section 201 of the Communications Act, the FCC is obligated to deal 10 with charges, practices, classifications, and 11 regulations and require that those are just and So it's not a question, and it 12 reasonable. shouldn't ven be a debate, whether the FCC should 13 jump into this issue at all. They have the 15 jurisdiction and they have the obligation to correct unjust and unreasonable fees and ancillary 17 fees as well. 18 So, you know, what we have seen over the 19 years -- and, you know, the Prison Policy 20 Initiative has done a lot of the work that I cite 21 to, so thank you -- we have seen every time a 22 state has taken a look at the ancillary fees and

- 1 the underlying per minute and per call rates and
- 2 actually have been able to get the data from the
- 3 phone companies, those rates have come down and
- 4 the ancillary fees have been capped. That
- 5 happened in New Mexico. It happened in Louisiana
- 6 with a little bit of pushback from, you know, the
- 7 non -- from certain board members, and now in
- 8 Alabama.
- 9 And while the FCC has also asked for the
- 10 data, they haven't gotten it. You know, we
- 11 pointed throughout this proceeding to the initial
- 12 laundry list of specific data asks that the FCC
- 13 made in the notice of proposed rulemaking, and
- 14 none of the phone companies provided that
- 15 responsive information. There have been since
- 16 then cost studies provided by Pay-Tel that have,
- 17 you know, addressed their unique situation. But
- 18 generally speaking, the phone companies have
- 19 politely declined to provide that information. So
- 20 I'm envious that in Alabama, you were actually
- 21 able to get the data. It would be useful to see
- 22 that and hopefully next week we'll start crunching

129 the numbers with the data collection on July 17th. 2 From my perspective, I would -- I am surprised that the sheriffs and the departments of corrections are not more interested in tracking down these ancillary fees. As Alex noted, these are the non-commissionable fees but they equal 40 7 percent of the total amount of money that's being paid by the inmates' families to the phone 9 companies. 10 So in my mind, if the sheriffs and the, you know, the departments of correction are 11 12 interested in making sure that their budgets are 13 maintained and, you know, properly funded, it would seem to me that they should read their 15 contracts a little bit closer and realize that all of those fees are non-commissionable. And so we 17 can talk about commissions and we can talk - - and 18 whether you call them commissions or kickbacks or 19 whatever you want to call them, the fact is that 20 there is -- you know, 40 percent of the overall money being transferred in these relationships are 21 22 being left on the table. And so, you know, if

130 commissions are going to stay in place and if the fees are going to remain, then they need to be minimized and capped like what Alabama has done, what New Mexico has done, what Louisiana has done. 5 And, you know, I'll finish up just by pointing out that since February, we've seen 6 efforts to raise the fees and where the companies have announced that they're not going to be paying 9 commissions on the interstate communications, 10 they've also sent letters to their clients 11 indicating that they're willing to sit down and 12 figure out other ways to make the prison or the 13 jail whole. And one can only imagine the process of making them whole is by increasing other fees 15 that are not in the contract. So thank you very 16 much. 17 MR. POPE: First, I'd like to thank the 18 FCC for the invitation to serve on this panel and 19 thank Commissioner Clyburn and her staff for 20 pushing the right petition and the inmate phone 21 issue to a higher priority. 22 My name is Bill Pope. I'm President of

- 1 NCIC Inmate Phone Services. We've been in
- 2 business for about 19 years. We're the fourth
- 3 largest inmate telephone company servicing about
- 4 500 jails across the country. NCIC is an industry
- 5 leader in the movement to lowering fees charged to
- 6 inmate families which is demonstrative of our A-
- 7 plus rating with the Better Business Bureau.
- 8 We've also obtained accreditation with the Better
- 9 Business Bureau in 2012 showing that we can exceed
- 10 expectations of inmates and inmates' families with
- 11 responsible billing.
- 12 Furthermore, NCIC has worked diligently
- 13 on these FCC proceedings as well as on ICS
- 14 proceedings in the states of Louisiana and
- 15 Alabama. NCIC believes that the industry and end-
- 16 users benefit from a consistent rate and fee
- 17 schedule across the nation including all types of
- 18 facilities such as holding facilities, immigration
- 19 detention facilities, jails and prisons.
- 20 Oftentimes, an inmate will be -- can be booked in
- 21 a local facility. Then he's transferred to a
- 22 county facility and then ultimately end up in a

132 contract or a state facility and each one may be -- have a different phone provider in each facility. So that calls for the consistency and transparency in the rates and the fees. This consistency also helps eliminate 5 the stress the family members experience during the incarceration of their loved one. consistent rate and fee structure will also allow 9 family the comfort of understanding and trusting 10 the rates of each provider, that each provider will be charging because they will be the same. 11 12 Although telecom companies don't 13 normally welcome a regulation, we do see the need for the FCC and state regulators to set a standard 15 rate and fee structure similar to what Darrell at the Alabama Public Service Commission finalized 17 earlier this week. 18 How many fees are used in inmate calling 19 services? There are approximately 15 fees that 20 the different companies charge. Some of these fees are very similar to what you might see on 21 22 your home phone bill or your cell phone bill,

133 maybe government-imposed fees, some are cost recovery fees, some are licensing fees. Just to name a few, pretty much every company charges an account establishment fee either using a live operator or IVR or website to establish the account. They may have recharger funding fees, refund fees, bill statement fees, processing fees, and then you see your universal service fund fees and taxes. Some companies may charge carrier 10 recovery fees or technology fees, biometric fees. 11 I noticed on my Verizon wireless bill, there was an admin fee, and so a lot of inmate phone 12 providers charge administrative fees as well. 13 Ideally, based off of the research that 14 15 the 16 Alabama Public Service Commission did, 17 there is generally about six fees that all 18 providers charge: 19 the account establishment fee or the 20 initial funding fee either using a live account 21 representative or funding fees using a web page or 22 an IVR system; bill statement processing fees for

134 direct billing or billing on a telephone company bill; and then finally, there's the fees that Western Union or MoneyGram will charge to fund an account. A lot of these fees evolved out of new 5 billing methods that came to replace traditional 6 7 collect calling. Early on, all jail phones were just traditional collect calls only. A collect call could be validated, placed and the carrier 10 would send it out to the local phone company for 11 billing and then hope to expect maybe 80-85 percent of the revenue back on that phone charge. 12 13 As people transitioned to competitive phone providers and cell phone services, collect billing 15 began a quick decline and had to be replaced with new billing methods. Traditional collect calling 17 billing has also continued to increase in cost as 18 local phone companies increased the cost of 19 billing collect call charges on their phone bills 20 and have discontinued actively attempting to 21 collect those charges. 22 Prepaid collect calling from a jail was

135 used to replace traditional collect calling. Fees were instituted to cover the labor cost and credit card fees used in setting up prepaid collect calling accounts. This billing option can either require a live person to establish the account or to utilize a completely automated IVR system to save on labor costs. Many inmate phone providers use a live account representative to establish an account on a realtime basis in order to better handle a confused an upset family member who is 10 just finding out that their loved one has been 11 12 incarcerated. 13 In conclusion, our goal is -- should be to simplify these fees so they're easy to 15 understand for the family, simplify the rates for the inmates. And just to complement the Alabama 17 Public Service Commission on their work, they did 18 a thorough investigation of the rates and fees and 19 required providers to submit the cost data to 20 justify their fees. I know Darrell Baker and Doug Dillard undertook most of this project and the 21 result was a simplification of the fees that 22

136 inmate phone providers can charge to family members in the State of Alabama. We hope that the FCC and other states investigating inmate phone rates will closely review the recent Alabama ruling and consider it as a model for both the maximum rates and fees that can be charged for inmate telephone services. 8 MR. TOWNSEND: Great. My name is 9 Vincent Townsend. I'm with Pay-Tel 10 Communications. I want to thank the FCC for the 11 opportunity to be with you today and also complement all the panelists that have preceded 12 I think they've done a really good job of 13 hitting this issue. 15 I think it's clear -- I hope it's clear that unless the FCC addresses the issue of fees, 17 we're wasting a lot of everybody's time because 18 without addressing the fees, you're never going to 19 be able to bring real relief to the families that 20 are paying these bills.

prepare on is what fees have done. And the

One of the things that they ask us to

21

137 handouts, I think most of you all have seen these, but two handouts that I had prepared, one is -the first is a list of the fees, the highest fees that are out there of a variety of the different -- this is not an all- inclusive list but it's a fairly representative list. 7 I want to emphasize right off the start that a great number of companies don't charge all 9 of these fees and a good number of companies such 10 as Bill's company and my company that don't charge 11 these high fees. But this is the highest of the 12 fees that are out there. I put an asterisk by the ones that 13 increased since the order and I think that's 15 important to understand because that was the reaction of what's happened. There's been an 17 increase in the fees. 18 The second handout is a pie chart that 19 we prepared that really brings home, I think, the 20 message as to what's happening to the family's 21 money. As several folks pointed out, even before they make a phone call, they've got to make a 22

138 payment fee and how much is that. In the diagram here, that takes about a third of their money. And then there are recurring fees that happen on a monthly basis and they can come under a whole quise of different names and that takes about 10 percent of their money. And then if they have taken and placed just one single call at 1499, that takes about 15. 9 And the model here is driven off the fact that we have an understanding these folks, 10 11 for the most part, are limited income, maybe on fixed income, they have a finite amount of money, 12 13 So what happens to that money is critical as it relates to connection with their family 15 members. 16 And this example shows \$100.00, somebody 17 has \$100.00 in a month to give for phone calls. 18 They make four payments and this is what happens, 19 what's left. Out of the \$100.00, there is only

\$40.00 left to make phone calls. So when you do

great rate on the interstate call, and what does

the math on that, it takes the \$3.15 new rate,

20

21

139 it turn it into? The real cost to the family on that call is \$8.33. 3 Now that's -- the FCC did a great job in getting started but we ain't done yet, okay. until you fix the fees, it's like spitting in the You're, as I said, wasting everybody's time. 8 The reality here, the family gets 12 9 phone calls out of that 100 bucks. So that's 10 what's got to be addressed. It's got to be 11 addressed. And the other thing that's also 12 interesting and I appreciated Mr. Petro mentioning it, I couldn't do this to my clients. 13 have enough guts because they all legally wear 15 guns, okay. But if I was scraping 60 percent of the money off the top before I paid them 17 commissions, I couldn't do that. I respect them 18 too much to do that because it is total deception 19 to go into somebody and say, "Oh, I'm going to 20 give you 80 percent." Well, what's the 80 percent 21 on? It's really on 40 bucks. What's 80 percent of 40 bucks? Thirty-two percent (sic), okay. But,

140 you know, one day they'll wake up and when they do, I'm glad on I'm on that side and not doing 3 that. So -- but anyway, moving quickly, ancillary fees have gotten worse. I mentioned the 5 ones that I've starred on there. They've 7 increased -- payment fees have gone up with most providers since then. 9 The other thing is a lot of providers have no started the single-call program at the 10 11 higher rate for the call and that does a great job of moving commissionable revenue out of 12 13 commissionable revenue to bonus revenue which is much, much smaller. The fees that I charge, Bill 15 charges, are on the low end of that spectrum and I'll talk about that in just a second. 17 In terms of what needs to be done, I 18 think first and foremost, the FCC needs to decide 19 what fees are going to be allowed. Okay, my cut 20 on that is you ought to get rid of all of them 21 except the fees where the consumer makes a choice. 22 Let's say your family member is in prison, right,

141 and they're there and they're going to be there and you know that you can mail in a payment and you have no cost, no fee for mailing in the Then I don't believe your rate should include the cost for somebody who wants to use a live operator, which is much more expensive, to do a payment than it is to mail it. 8 So my cut on it is that number one, you 9 decide what you're going to do. Once you decide 10 that, then let's have the rest of those fees that 11 you approve the cost. The fees that I recommend 12 being included are the cost to do a payment on the 13 web, a cost to do payment on IVR, a cost of the live agent and then you have your other payment 15 processor like Western Union and Money Gram. believe also those fees ought to be the very best, 17 lowest fee. And so that gives the opportunity for 18 the family's money to be in phone calls, not be in And I think that's the starting point. 19 20 So if you went down the road with this, 21 what would you do? You'd decide the fees that

were going to be permissible. You'd ban all

- 1 others. You'd cap the fees or put a safe harbor
- 2 rate and it would apply across the country. The
- 3 other thing that I think would be unbelievably
- 4 helpful for the family members is to require the
- 5 vendors -- number one, we got a tariff for
- 6 everything; number two, we got to have it on our
- 7 website. You know, consumer wants to know what
- 8 they're being charged. They have the right to see
- 9 it. They should be able to go to my website and
- 10 see all my fees. We do that today and I know
- 11 several companies do that as well.
- 12 And the last thing, I think -- I know we
- 13 do this -- I think it's something that needs to be
- 14 done -- is provide the family a statement, right.
- 15 If they paid me money over the month, why not give
- 16 them a statement every month that says exactly
- 17 what they spent, what their payment was, any
- 18 state-mandated charges. I mean there are states
- 19 like South Carolina, God bless them, and I think
- 20 there are about eight charges that are their
- 21 mandated charged and it's confusing. And unless
- 22 you put that on a piece of paper for somebody to

143 see, it's really time-consuming to try to explain 2 it. 3 But anyway, in closing, I commend the FCC for what they've done. They got a great start but we're not there yet and we got to get moving. And the critical part of this is the fees. 7 you. 8 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Thank you to all our 9 panelists for your comments. We've got a series 10 of questions. We welcome, of course, questions 11 from the audience and from the internet. We're receiving questions via livequestion@fcc.gov and 12 via our Twitter account here. 13 Let me begin, Mr. Baker, with you. 14 You're in charge in your functions at the Commission of more than just prison pay phones. 17 You're in charge of utility regulation in a 18 broader sense. In those functions, you deal with 19 on a day-to-day basis for a long period of time 20 through your tenure telephone companies that 21 provide normal service, basic telephone POTS 22 service and other types of service.

		144
1	To what extent are fees like this, like	
2	what we've heard about this morning, what you've	
3	seen common and used in that setting, in the	
4	general provision of telephone service?	
5	MR. BAKER: Well, with the ILECS and	
6	CLECS, you have a basic level of service and	
7	that's why I think it's important to define what	
8	is basic inmate calling service. And that's a	
9	level of service at which everything is provided,	
10	you know, essentially at this charge and so any	
11	fee should be incorporated in the cost. Now	
12	but I think Mr. Townsend's right. When a customer	
13	has an option to go beyond that basic level of	
14	service and, for instance, on payments, they	
15	should be able to pay by cash, money order, check,	
16	and online banking at no charge. But now if they	
17	want to get that payment there quicker through the	
18	use of a credit card or through a payment transfer	
19	service, then they should pay extra for that. So	
20	I think it's really important to define basic	
21	level of service and then go from there.	
22	MODERATOR ZESIGER: Thank you.	

145 1 MODERATOR LIEN: I have a question. sorry, I'm going to start with first names. hope that's alright. Aleks, you had said that ancillary fees are a robust and hidden revenue stream, and I wanted to follow-up with that and also something that Bill said that consistency, 7 transparency, and simplicity should be the goal in rates including ancillary rates. How do we, as 9 the FCC, achieve this? How can we turn ancillary 10 fees into something that are consistent, 11 transparent, and simple instead of a robust and 12 hidden revenue stream? Aleks, anyone, please. 13 MS. KAJSTURA: Well, I think the simplest thing would be to start with the tools 15 that you already have such as the tariffs. If all the rates need to be tariffed, the fees should be 17 too, and I know so companies do it's definitely 18 not standard practiced. I mean that's just a 19 really simple that could be taken at least to get 20 a sense of the scope of the problem, what's 21 charged, how much for what in terms of, you know, 22 your data collection.

146 1 MR. PETRO: Well, we have argued that all of the fees should be eliminated in our proposal, and it's based primarily on the idea that the fees -- or the phone rate itself is so much higher than the cost to providing the service that the ancillary fees that we're talking about can be included in the 25 cents or 21 cents and still provide an equitable result for the phone 9 company as well. You know, we put information 10 into the record in our initial study showing that 11 the costs of providing the service is less than 5 12 cents. So to the extent that, you know, the other 14 or 9 cents, you know, 9 to 14 cents are going 13 to be chewed up in ancillary fees or the cost of providing those types of services, you know, the fees can be eliminated. 17 The other way of dealing with it if 18 you're not going to eliminate the ancillary fees 19 is to follow the path of what Alabama has done or 20 New Mexico where you say these are the fees that 21 you can do and you can charge no other fee than these. And I mean if the FCC is going to go down 22

147 the path of, you know, capping fees and not eliminating all of them, then I think that's the only way you keep it simple and you keep it -- and it's transparence on your website, it's on -- you know, it's on the tariffs, it's across the board, and then anytime a violation can be identified, it's a simple complaint process. 8 MR. POPE: On top of that, debit calling 9 normally doesn't have fees. That's a balance 10 that's moved out of the inmate's commissary or maybe he's purchasing a calling card. 11 generally, I don't think providers charge fees. I 12 know that we don't charge fees on the debit 13 calling, so we're talking basically about half the 14 15 calls which is mostly prepaid collect calling where the family does pay a fee if they speak with 17 a live account representative to establish that account on a realtime basis so they can use that 18 19 balance immediately. 20 MR. TOWNSEND: I think one of the 21 challenges, though, just to point to the debit is 22 Bill is correct that there is in many cases a fee

148 that's charged to the family to put the money into the debit account and that's got to be monitored so that there's' not any abuse there. MR. POPE: But further to that, a lot of times it's the commissary provider charging that and they don't even fall under the guise of the FCC, so let's --8 MR. TOWNSEND: Yeah, good point. 9 MODERATOR ZESIGER: I want to just draw your attention again to this pie chart, Vince, 10 that you put together. Thank you. That's of 11 service to the whole workshop here understanding, 12 13 of course, these are estimates. And just starting with you, Bill, if you could take a look at that, 15 does that make sense to you, too, as another provider? Is that the kind of breakdown that you 17 see in your business? 18 MR. POPE: I hadn't -- this is the first 19 time I've seen this chart. 20 MODERATOR ZESIGER: So let me let you 21 have a moment to take a look at it to be fair and 22 this takes a sum of \$100.00, Vince, if I

149 understand your pie chart here. Aleks, looking back at the work that you all did --3 MR. POPE: This is the worst case scenario. This is --5 MODERATOR ZESIGER: -- in your report last year, you tried to -- you attempt at least to estimate the total dollar value of all these fees. I thought that was a significant effort and I wonder if you'd comment on that in relation to 10 this. 11 MS. KAJSTURA: Sure. I think this would be a subsection of our pie chart that we did as a 12 13 cost of all the money spent on phone calls in the prison system, what percentage would fees be, and 15 this is as further breakdown of that. So this provides a lot of detail. Now one thing I think 17 that -- and we also had to rely on estimates. 18 used one company's fees and -- that were kind of 19 generally applicable and then extrapolated it from 20 there. So I think this kind of work that Vince 21 has put together is really great because these are 22 figures that nobody's been able to really find so

150 these kind of guesses and estimates are the best 2 we have. 3 And one thing to keep in mind here is there is great variability. Like this is based on \$100.00 but oftentimes, there are maximums just on 5 the payment processing fees here. There would be 7 great variability there based on what is the maximum you're allowed to put in at one time. 9 Oftentimes there are pretty low maximums set that 10 trigger that fee over and over again. So if 11 you're only allowed to put in say \$25.00 at a time, which is not unusual, and they charge your 12 13 \$10.00-\$15.00 a time, to get up to \$100. that's already going to be \$40.00-\$50.00 14 15 right there. 16 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Maybe go back to 17 you, Bill, if you have a moment to --18 MR. POPE: I think Vince's chart is kind 19 of a worst case scenario that yes, there is 20 situations where people deposit -- you know, if 21 they have \$100.00 to spend, they may ultimately only end up with about \$40.00 to spend on phone 22

151 1 calls. 2 Going back to Aleks and Peter Wagner with the Prison Policy Initiative, they did a large report on the fees, kind of broke out a lot of the fees. We actually had fees that they showed for us that I didn't even know existed in our tariff, so we quickly went in there and updated our tariffs, removed a lot of those fees. But generally, on our service, if somebody has 10 about \$100.00 to deposit, you know, between 90 to 11 92 percent of that, \$92.00 they'd be able to use for phone calling. 12 13 MODERATOR ZESIGER: I want to get back to the dollar amounts as well to kind of get a 15 sense of the scope of this issue. We've heard testimony and the report, Aleks, that your group 17 has done pointed to something approaching 40 18 percent of all expenses, and I think you said 40 19 percent of something like a billion dollars a year 20 of annual revenues for the industry. I don't want to put words in your mouth but is that roughly the 21 22 size of these funds or these revenues that are

152 derived from these fees today as well a year 2 later? 3 MS. KAJSTURA: We haven't been able to update our numbers a year letter. You know, this is a recurring theme here. This data is really hard to get. I know a couple of folks have mentioned more number and Vince has more in his 8 chart. The only one I've come across is Securus 9 raising their fees. So, no, we don't really have 10 updated numbers but I mean we expect to see a 11 shift. 12 MODERATOR ZESIGER: And to go to the two 13 providers, Bill and Vince, do those estimates sound close to what you experience, the percentage 15 amounts at least? I think it's 38 percent is what Aleks's study estimated the fees would represent 17 for all expenditures, all revenues? 18 MR. POPE: It can be that high. 19 Depending on the provider, it can be that high. 20 MR. TOWNSEND: I would argue that it's 21 actually getting higher with the advent of the single- call program. If you charge somebody 22

153 \$15.00 for a phone call and you put that in the mix, that's what's in this pie that moves it past their 38 percent. And that's really my observation is more companies have started engaging in that practice since the order. 6 And it accomplishes two things: 7 obviously revenue generator but two, it shields a tremendous amount of money from commissions because that revenue is not on the commission 10 bucket at 80 percent or whatever percent. It's 11 over here at 10 percent or 3 percent or whatever. 12 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Do we have any way 13 of estimating what percent of all ICS calls are single- call program calls? 15 MR. TOWNSEND: I mean the easiest way to do that would be for the sheriff to take his 17 commission statement this month and look at the 18 number of calls on it and then multiply it, you 19 know, by \$15.00 and multiply by \$10.00 on the 20 I mean we've looked at some of that other one. 21 I've seen some as high as 40 percent of the revenue -- is at 40 percent, not the measly 15 22

154 percent I have on here but as 40 percent of the revenue has been in the single calls. 3 MS. KAJSTURA: I just wanted to add that our chart was based on GTL which is the largest ICS provider, and so, you know, if you're asking Bill and Vincent here whether this reflects their 7 reality, I wouldn't expect it to because they're, again, way more on the reasonable end of things. GTL has some of the highest rates but they take up 10 such a huge share of the market that this is really representative of what it feels from the 11 12 perspective of the family members, is the 30 13 percent. 14 MR. TOWNSEND: Yeah. And the pie -- and 15 I appreciate Aleks saying that. I mean Bill mentioned 90 percent, 92 percent and that example 17 for us, the number of calls the family can make is 18 not the 12. It's more like 27 or 30 phone calls 19 out of the same amount of money. 20 MODERATOR LIEN: Darrell, can I ask 21 what's your experience been in Alabama with the single-call program? What have the challenges 22

155 been for you? 2 MR. BAKER: Well, I've been in telecommunications for 34 years and 32 at the Alabama Public Service Commission. And one thing I'll say is I have never seen an industry that is less transparent than this one. It is extremely 6 difficult to get data, to get information. So to get back to your question, I will say this. 9 are calls for Pay Now and Text-Connect that are 10 \$14.99 and \$9.95. There are also providers like NCIC over here who are charging \$5.95 for that 11 12 Text-Connect service. But again, if the FCC looks at what's 13 happened since February when they implemented the 15 interim rates, a lot of these providers have 16 jumped in now and started offering single-payment 17 services. And so the question is becoming why are 18 they doing that. Well, because there is a source 19 of revenue that's not regulated by the FCC's 20 rates. 21 MR. POPE: Further to what Darrell is 22 saying, and a lot of these -- the SMS text

156 messages are billed by the mobile carriers though, like Verizon, Spring, AT&T Wireless, and so they don't fall under the state regulators. MODERATOR ZESIGER: Lee, if I could --MR. PETRO: Sure. MODERATOR ZESIGER: -- direct a question 6 to you? In your opening remarks, you mentioned that Section 201 of the Communications Act was the jurisdictional basis for the Commission acting in 10 this area. Section 276 also addresses some of 11 this. I wonder if you have any comments about the role it plays in providing jurisdiction to the 12 13 Commission. MR. PETRO: Sure. You know, I picked 14 201 because they actually lay it out nice and 16 clean, and 276 does as well. You know, the FCC is 17 required to make sure that the rates are fair. 18 And in the order, the FCC made the -- or agreed 19 with us that a fair rate is one that's fair to 20 both the service provider and to the customer. 21 And so to the extent that these ancillary fees and, you know, the single-payment type calls

157 result in unfair and unjust and unreasonable rates, then the overall impact on the customer is -- no longer fits within the confines of Section So I would argue that because Section 276 not only deals with the interstate but it deals with intrastate as well, you're covered with 7 regard to moving forward and dealing with rates that are being charged for calls that stay within 9 the states as well. 10 So I mean I started out talking about Section 201 and the jurisdictional question 11 because quite frankly, you know, we've seen a lot 12 13 of back and forth in the filings over whether the FCC can even regulate this. And it's mystifying 15 to me because the FCC regulates so many other 16 aspects of telephone calls and basic POTS and the 17 rates that can be charged and the types of billage 18 you can get that, you know, Section 201 and 276 19 provide blanket coverage for inmate phone call --20 or inmate calling services as well. So, I mean, I 21 would be interested in seeing an analysis that 22 overturns that because I haven't seen it yet.

1	MODERATOR ZESIGER: Thank you.	158
2	MR. PETRO: Yeah.	
3	MODERATOR ZESIGER: Want to turn to the	
4	question of cost, the cost of these services.	
5	We've talked about the rates, of course, and	
6	Vince, your company, it kind of stands out in	
7	terms of our record at least, in terms of	
8	attempting to quantify those costs. Last summer	
9	your company submitted extensive cost data and	
10	cost data with regard to the provision of	
11	ancillary services. I wonder other providers	
12	have talked about the difficulty of analyzing and	
13	determining these costs. I wonder if you would	
14	address those questions and just how difficult is	
15	it to come up with a cost figure for some of these	
16	ancillary charges?	
17	MR. TOWNSEND: It's not easy, okay, but	
18	it's data that we keep separated. So by keeping	
19	it separated, we are able to track it and, of	
20	course, since our work last summer, we retained a	
21	consultant, Don Wood, to help us with that study	
22	and he gave us some good guidelines on how to help	

- 1 put all that data together. And then, you know,
- 2 once you have the format in place, it's been --
- 3 it's something we've been able to track and that
- 4 way be prepared for the data requests that you
- 5 folks most recently made.
- 6 It's important, I think -- go back to
- 7 what's been said -- but it's important to
- 8 emphasize that the starting point with our cost
- 9 study was we made a decision that all cost other
- 10 than the payment services were going to be in the
- 11 rate. Okay, so when we did our cost study, the
- 12 rate, our rate included instead of having several
- 13 other fees, just all that was in the basic
- 14 service. So we were then able to separate out and
- 15 have, okay, here's our cost to do an IVR payment,
- 16 a web payment, and here's our cost to do a live
- 17 agent payment. And, you know, it would be a much
- 18 more cumbersome project if we had eight fees and
- 19 I'm trying to allocate cost amongst all the fees.
- 20 So to me, the starting point is to decide what
- 21 fees you're going to allow and then tell me, you
- 22 know, allocate my cost to this fee and that fee

160 and then everything goes in the rate. 2 MODERATOR ZESIGER: And just to get a comparative perspective, Bill, Vince says that he's kept that data, and I guess as a matter of a normal course of business kept that data segregated or apart from his other financial data. How do you all keep your data? Is that the -- is there a way for you all to get at that kind of cost data? 10 MR. POPE: Yeah. There's a way to get to it. It will be difficult, especially if we 11 have to break it down by facility. That's one way 12 we've never looked at it before but looks like 13 we'll be doing that soon anyways. 15 MODERATOR ZESIGER: And with regard to ancillary charges, I don't -- I think that's not a 17 facility specific calculation that's requested so 18 it may be just a little bit easier? 19 MR. POPE: Yeah, that'll be easier. 20 We've got one flat fee structure nationwide. 21 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Good. And just to 22 turn, Darrell, to you on this question of the cost

161 of these services and how closely they compare to the rates. To what extent did the Alabama Commission look at the cost of these and use cost data or cost background to inform your process of setting the rates you set? 6 MR. BAKER: The Alabama Public Service Commission, we really don't have any cost data. mean if you look at the FCC record, they didn't have a whole lot either. You had Pay-Tel that 10 submitted their study and we got a hold of the 11 unredacted version of that study and went through You had the 2008 information that was sent to 12 the FCC but other than that, where's the cost 13 stated? They're not providing it, so we went -we basically used what was in the FCC record in 16 terms of the setting the fees. 17 MODERATOR LIEN: I'm going to follow-up 18 with you Darrell. You had mentioned that in 19 Alabama, you had recently moved to regulate third-20 party payment transfer fees. I wonder if you can 21 talk about that a little bit and Aleks or anyone else, if you have any knowledge of any other

		162
1	states that have acted accordingly, the same or	
2	differently than Alabama?	
3	MR. BAKER: If you look at payment	
4	transfer fees, we're essentially talking about	
5	Western Union and MoneyGram. Western Union has a	
6	service called "Quick Collect" and they charge	
7	\$9.95. We believe there is some revenue sharing	
8	that goes on with Quick Collect because we have a	
9	comment in our proceeding that said they don't	
10	want to reduce that fee because part of it goes to	
11	support this other service over here.	
12	They also have Western Union offers a	
13	prepaid service alternative to providers for \$5.95	
14	in Swift Pay, a different system. Swift Pay, I	
15	believe you have to enter into exclusive	
16	agreements with Western Union for \$5.50. So we	
17	have providers in Alabama that are offering to	
18	their customers to go through Western Union and	
19	pay fees that range from \$5.00 to \$11.95. Now	
20	wait a minute, Western Union charges \$9.95 for	
21	Quick Collect. How can it be \$10.95 or \$11.95? I	
22	think what you're going to find is that there are	

- arrangements that providers can make with Western
- Union to charge more than what it costs for Quick
- Collect in \$1.00 increments, and then that money
- is then returned back to providers so the customer
- is being charged twice. Did that answer your
- question?
- 7 MODERATOR LIEN: Does anyone have any
- 8 information about any other state that has acted
- 9 similarly to Alabama or differently? No?
- 10 MR. POPE: Louisiana is working on the
- They haven't finalized their fee schedule. 11
- 12 I know Nebraska is talking about it. City of San
- 13 Francisco is working on it. Then I've seen
- something recently about New Jersey looking at
- 15 rate regulation.
- 16 MR. PETRO: And New Mexico had adopted
- 17 just a blanket \$3.00 rate for -- regardless of how
- 18 you fund your accounts so, you know, -- and that
- was based on a comprehensive, or what we think is 19
- 20 a comprehensive, data collection effort on their
- 21 part. So -- and I think Commissioner Marks was
- here last year talking about that as well.

	164
1	MODERATOR ZESIGER: Lee, just to follow-
2	up on that point.
3	MR. PETRO: Yeah.
4	MODERATOR ZESIGER: Is the \$3.00 fee
5	applied to the third-party payment programs as
6	well as the direct?
7	MR. PETRO: My notes say yes. I can
8	follow- up and let you know.
9	MODERATOR ZESIGER: Sure.
10	MR. PETRO: But yea, as far as I can
11	tell, you know, they adopted a \$3.00 funding rate
12	and then prohibited any other charge other than
13	what they authorized, and that's why earlier I had
14	commented I mean if the Commission's going to
15	go down the road of permitting some rates to be
16	charged, ancillary fees, then I think what they
17	need to do is just articulate exactly what those
18	rates are and prohibit everything else.
19	And, you know, it would have been useful
20	if we got this information if the FCC got the
21	information when they asked for it in the NPRM in
22	December of 2012 or 9in the data collection

165 follow-up supplementary request in July of last year or even when they filed -- or even in response to the further notice. I think it's useful to remember that the FCC has asked for this specific information on at least three occasions in the past 12 months, 18 months and the parties have refused to give it. And so at a certain point, I think the FCC is under the obligation to just move forward, use the data that they have and 10 hopefully what comes in next week will look 11 halfway decent and will be accurate and adopt, you know, final rules. 12 13 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Good. I want to -go ahead, Alex, please. 15 MS. KAJSTURA: Let me follow-up on that. When the FCC takes a look at the third-party 17 payments, I think there are a couple of things 18 that you should look for. One, as Darrell 19 mentioned, some of the fees that are charged by 20 Western Union are much lower than the others and -21 - but some of those are then coupled with a fee

from the ICS company itself. So when basically

166 the ICS company doesn't take advantage of the kickback from Western Union, they just slap on their own fee instead. So that is something to watch for I think is that it wouldn't be enough just to lower the fees for Western Union. have to then also make sure that the company isn't 7 charging its own separate fee for having accepted the Western Union payment. 9 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Thank you. I want to step back for a moment. We've had several 10 statements from several panelists as to fees that 11 12 are appropriate and fees that are not appropriate. 13 I want to just kind of get a little more of a focus on that from each of the panelists. And 15 Darrel, I'll start with you to give you heads up here, and you've addressed this in part, but if 17 you can just be as specific as you can be this 18 morning -- this afternoon now, what are 19 appropriate types of charges and what kinds of 20 charges are problematic or inappropriate? 21 MR. BAKER: We -- again, we establish a basic level of service for ICS and then look

167 beyond that, you know, what should be provided in that to the customer free of charge in terms of ancillary charges or ancillary services. And then we go beyond that to see, okay, what is beyond And I think if the customer has an option on payment, if they want to submit payment by credit card which gets there quicker than money order or check, then we establish that as a fee because it's an option. And then there are 10 various ways of making payments. There's IVR, 11 there's live agent and they all carry with them 12 different costs. 13 And then the other thing is if we -- in Alabama, we say that everybody is entitled to an 15 account statement electronically except for debit. 16 Inmates obviously don't have access to it. But if 17 that customer wants a paper bill, then we 18 establish a minimal paper bill fee for them to going to get that service. So anything that's 19 20 optional. 21 MS. KAJSTURA: I agree with Darrell on 22 what he mentioned earlier about the regulatory

168 recovery fees. I mean that's just the cost of doing business. That shouldn't be feed out separately. And beyond that, you really need to take a look at how much the fees are apart from the question of which fee should or should not be allowed. You know, in life, we all pay convenience fees for all sorts of things we do with our credit cards but just the size of the those fees just doesn't even begin to compare to 10 the fees charged in this setting. 11 And one thing on -- I think Darrell mentioned grouping it into optional versus service 12 13 -- one thing to keep in mind would be in the jail setting where just circumstances necessitate a 15 quicker method of payment than sending a check that may take a week to get processed, so that 17 might be somewhere if that were the route that FCC 18 were to take, to maybe have some exceptions in 19 those cases. 20 MR. PETRO: I started earlier, none. 21 You know, as far as we have been able to 22 determine, the ancillary fees are a mechanism to

- 1 make up for reductions in rates. We've seen now
 2 with the reduction in the interstate rates an
 3 increase in the intrastate rates and an increase
 4 in the ancillary fees, and we have yet to see the
 5 data that would support that. And, you know, to
 6 the extent that there is data that would support
 7 the imposition of ancillary fees, and to the
- 8 extent that the ICS providers refused to provide
- 9 it to the FCC, then one approach would be to ban
- 10 ancillary fees and then have them come in and ask
- 11 for a waiver much like Pay-Tel did with their
- 12 waiver to substantiate a variation from the rule.
- So, you know, until we can get a cleaner
- 14 answer on what it actually costs to provide the
- 15 phone service and then what that rate should be $- ext{--}$
- 16 I mean if the FCC had adopted our 7 cent per
- 17 minute rate, then perhaps we could have a
- 18 discussion about what those -- or whether there
- 19 are good ancillary fees. But instead, we're at 21
- 20 and 25 which is what we had proposed back in 2007
- 21 based on 2005 data. And the fees are, you know,
- 22 as we're talking, \$11.00 for a wire transfer but

170 when you walk into, you know, Walmart, you're not paying \$11.95 for a wire transfer and you're not paying when you're on Amazon to use your credit card to make a payment. So, you know, until we can figure out 5 and get the different Lego pieces and start 6 stacking up what the costs are, I would say none. 8 MR. POPE: The Alabama Public Service 9 Commission covered about six fees in their recent 10 ruling. They had account funding fee with a live 11 operator. I mean prior to prepaid collect calling, inmates, you know, they couldn't speak to 12 13 a live operator, still don't let them speak to a live operator but we put them on hold and call out to the family and the family can talk to a live 15 16 operator realtime. So that's basically the fee is 17 used as a cost recovery to offer that live human 18 interaction there. 19 Generally, the fees had started out as a 20 cost recovery. Some of them probably moved up beyond the actual cost recovery. Some of the fees 21 -- there's like a voice biometrics fee. We have 22

171 to pay a license to a third party for that, so ideally I'd like to recover that. But, you know, for the most part, I believe the Alabama Public Service Commission covered most of the fees in their ruling. 6 MR. TOWNSEND: Yeah. I would echo again 7 what I said earlier. I think to me, what I characterize as ancillary fees are all these extra 9 things that really should be incorporated into the 10 cost of the call. To me, the fees that should be separated are the ones that are driven by consumer 11 12 If the family, as I stated earlier, the 13 loved one is in prison and they know that and they send in a payment or they do a bank transaction 15 and there is no cost, they ought to have the right to do that and not have their rate include the 17 cost that it takes for a family member to use a 18 live agent to set up an account. 19 And I appreciate Aleks's comment because

she's spot on. In the jail environment,

everything happens rapid fire, 25 hours a day, 7

days a week, and you take -- and a facility that

20

21

- 1 has 200 inmates, in that 30 days, you're going to
- 2 probably run about 625 inmates through the
- 3 facility, a third of which will make phone calls
- 4 and not one of them will be a revenue producer for
- 5 our company. The two-thirds -- that two- thirds,
- 6 those folks that are left, the 400, on average we
- 7 set up five accounts for each one of those four.
- 8 And again, rapid fire, all the time, 24 hours a
- 9 day.
- 10 And that individual makes that choice;
- 11 do they use a credit card and go on the web; do
- 12 they use a credit card and do it with an IVR; or
- 13 do they talk to a live agent. All of those costs
- 14 are different. What I tried to do and what I've
- 15 presented to the FCC last July in response to
- l6 their request was we said all of these other
- 17 things are in the rate. The only thing separate
- 18 are basically what the Alabama Commission did,
- 19 what Bill just talked about, is on this chart.
- 20 It's just to make a payment with the IVR, make a
- 21 payment with the web, do a live agent payment, and
- 22 then of course your other Western Union and your

- 1 MoneyGram. But I think those things are
- 2 imperative that those be treated separately.
- 3 Those be at cost, not be a profit center, and that
- 4 way the consumer -- and one thing we do -- just as
- 5 an side, really quickly -- is -- it's very
- 6 interesting.
- 7 Western Union doesn't like this news but
- 8 at one point in time, about 40 percent of our
- 9 customer base, the families, we saw were making
- 10 payments with cash. And so what we started
- 11 advertising on our website was the most economical
- 12 way was that they could go and get a debit card,
- 13 so they could then take the debit card, either buy
- 14 one at Walmart or Walgreens or somewhere, and then
- 15 take that card and then make a payment over the
- 16 web or on the automated phone system. And in our
- 17 world, that payment fee for us is three bucks. So
- 18 that beat the 5.95 we had at western Union which
- 19 is already low and it beat the 5.65 that was at
- 20 MoneyGram.
- 21 So again, educating the consumer, giving
- 22 them the choice, what's the most economical way if

		174
1	they want to get money on an account and do it	
2	quickly. In our environment, because we serve	
3	jails, we try to give them those tools so they can	
4	then make the intelligent choice.	
5	But from our perspective, having those	
6	things separated, having a cost for those, having	
7	it cost is paramount for this to be a viable model	
8	going forward, has to have that.	
9	MODERATOR ZESIGER: Thank you. This	
10	brings to a close our question and answer period.	
11	Thank you to the panelists for the second panel.	
12	You've made a significant and material	
13	contribution to our process. We look forward to	
14	continuing to stay in touch with you all and	
15	working with you all as we go forward.	
16	It's time for our lunch break at this	
17	point. I think we're due back 2:00 o'clock. Thank	
18	you.	
19	(Whereupon, off the record for a lunch	
20	recess.)	
21	MODERATOR GUDE: All right. Thank you,	
22	everyone. We are ready to start our panel number	

175 The topic of this panel is "Understanding the provision of ICS in different facilities, understanding cost structure, service differences, etcetera based on size of facility, based on prison, jails, other distinctions that are out there. 7 My fellow moderators, my colleague Lynne Engledow will join me and everyone has already met 9 Darrell Baker from the Alabama PCS. He has kindly 10 agreed to serve as a moderator here as well. 11 In terms of panelists, we have Elias Diggins, Denver Sheriff Department on behalf of 12 the American Jail Association. We have Alex 13 Friedmann from Prison Legal News. We have Aleks 14 15 Kajstura from Prison Policy Initiative, Kevin 16 Landy from the U.S. Immigration Customs 17 Enforcement Department of Homeland Security. We 18 have Richard Smith, CEO of Securus, and we have 19 Thomas Sweeney from Global Tel Link. 20 So, with that, we will turn it over to 21 Elias to kick us off. Thank you. 22 MR. DIGGINS: Good afternoon. It is

176 truly an honor and privilege to be before the FCC today and to represent jails from across this great nation. My name is Elias Diggins and I'm a Division Chief with the Denver Sheriff's Department in Denver, Colorado where I have served for 20 years. I'm here today as a Board member for the American Jail Association, a body of detention and corrections professionals who represent the voice of the United States 3,000-9 10 plus local detention facilities. 11 Through the work I've been involved with 12 in running one of the largest jails in the country 13 as well as my work with the American Jail Association, the American Correctional 15 Association, and the National Institute of Corrections Large Jail Network, and in 17 conversations with the National Sheriff's Association, I can tell you that at every 18 19 conference and every venue at every level, this 20 issue is on the forefront of discussion of jail 21 administrators of facilities of all sizes. When 22 discussing what is just, reasonable, and fair in

177 this forum, it is our hope that the same values are extended to us when considering the charge which we are called to do, to serve and protect our community by keeping America's jails safe and secure. 6 My first point of discussion is how sophisticated the phone systems have become and 7 how we as law enforcement officials have come to rely on this irreplaceable tool to combat crime at 10 all levels. Included in the comments to the FCC 11 regarding this issue was a correspondence from the 12 District Attorney of Denver Colorado, Mr. Mitch 13 In his letter, he specifically talks Morrissey. about the killing of Denver Bronco Darren Williams 15 and how the technology used in our inmate calling system became critical evidence in the conviction 17 of the parties to this horrible crime. 18 Unfortunately, criminal activity is often 19 generated from behind the walls of jails and those 20 involved are becoming even more smarter about how 21 to circumvent our discovery of their activities. 22 ICS providers must be allowed to remain

178 competitive as they continue to introduce newer, better and bolder technologies as we protect our community. Should the ICS providers or agencies who oversee jails not be able to afford to run them as they do today, we will certainly take a step back in the prevention of crime if these 6 7 systems are reduced to simple mechanisms, or in the worst case scenario, are removed altogether. 9 The second point I would like to make is there has to be a clarification from the FCC on 10 11 what is required in regard to commissions and cost recovery. This applies not only to the previous 12 interstate ruling but should be clearly spelled 13 out in any decision regarding intrastate 15 guidelines. There still exists today confusion not only amongst the many sheriffs and jail 17 administrators across the country but various 18 inmate calling systems providers also. To that 19 end, cost recovery will vary from jail to jail and 20 state to state as the salaries and expenses each agency incurs in managing their systems is ever 21 different. The salary of a sheriff's deputy who 22

179 is responsible for monitoring a system in Washington, DC is not the same as his counterpart in New Orleans or Dallas or Polk County, Florida or Salt Lake City. We're glad to hear that the FCC plans to work with each state or each state's sheriff's association to create a reasonable rate for cost recovery in their jurisdictions. 8 My last and final point is to address 9 the assertion that jail and prison administrators 10 are resistive to changing the rates or model of inmate calling systems and therefore, and I quote, 11 reducing recidivism is not one of our priorities. 12 13 Nothing could be further from the truth. been to jails in El Central, California, in 15 Brandon, Mississippi and Licking County, Ohio, and Tampa Bay, Florida and many others. There was not 17 one that I visited where the sheriff or jail administrator was focused on programs for 18 19 offenders which are geared toward reducing 20 recidivism. 21 In regard to inmate phone systems, we too want the folks in our custody to stay in

180 contact with their families since this helps them to stay focused on completing their sentences and allows them to take advantage of the opportunities to prepare prior to release and to be successful. When a person is worried about their family, they certainly are not concerned about the classes we have to offer. We want them to be engaged in those programs and staying connected to their 9 support system outside the jail helps them while 10 they're in custody and is important for them in 11 not returning. 12 We want to have the discussion regarding 13 what is just, reasonable, and fair when it comes to call rates. We simply just want to make sure 15 that the methodology to this issue comes with a balanced approach that preserves the interest of 17 all parties to the subject including the thousands 18 of law enforcement officers who are charged every day in serving America's jails. Thank you. 19 20 MODERATOR GUDE: Thank you very much, 21 Elias. Next, Alex Friedmann. 22 MR. FRIEDMANN: I would like to thank

- 1 Chairman Wheeler and the Commission for this
- 2 opportunity to address the continuing need for
- 3 reform of the prison telecommunications industry.
- 4 There are a number of cost drivers for the
- 5 provision of inmate calling services including
- 6 notably the commissions paid to contracting
- 7 government agencies such as departments of
- 8 corrections and sheriffs offices, plus there are
- 9 infrastructure costs of installing the phones
- 10 themselves and related hardware, security- related
- 11 costs regarding security features such as call
- 12 recording, three-way call detection biometrics
- 13 which are often software-based and automated, and
- 14 there are costs associated with setting up and
- 15 monitoring phone accounts for prisoners and those
- 16 they call, mainly their family members.
- 17 While inmate calling services in jail
- 18 are -- the cost of inmate calling services in
- 19 jails are reportedly higher than in prisons, the
- 20 actual cost of providing such services are largely
- 21 unknown because most prison phone providers have
- 22 not made their actual cost data of service

182 available to the Commission. Costs based on a tiered basis due to facility size may be appropriate but should be evidence-based and where the record lacks evidence, it's difficult to do that. 6 My discussion will focus on ICS 7 commissions which constitute a cost driver that if eliminated demonstrably results in lower prison 9 and jail phone rates. I'll first discuss state 10 prison systems. Eight states have eliminated ICS 11 commissions. These eight prison systems span a tremendous range in size form a prison population 12 of around 135,000 in California and 54,000 in New 13 York to around 6,500 in New Mexico and just 2,000 15 in Rhode Island. Yet when these states banned ICS 16 commissions, the results were remarkably similar. 17 Their phone rates dropped, often dramatically. 18 Using the example of a 15-minute collect 19 interstate call prior to the FCC's rate caps going 20 into effect, after New York dropped its 21 commission, phone rates fell almost 69 percent to 22 less than a nickel a minute, one of the lowest in

183 the nation. ICS rates in Michigan dropped 87 percent from \$17.34 to \$2.25 for a 15-minute collect interstate call, and South Carolina prison phone rates fell from \$5.19 for interstate calls to the current rate of a flat 99 cents, an 81 percent decrease. California is an instructive example because that state phased out its ICS commissions from a flat \$26 million dollars in 9 commissions prior to 2007 to zero in 2011. 10 commissions were phased out, in each successive 11 year, the cost of phone calls dropped accordingly 12 from \$17.30 for a 15-minute collect interstate call before 2007 to around \$6.60 in 2011 for an 13 almost 62 percent total decrease. 15 Note that in these examples, the need for infrastructure cost did not change in the 17 eight states that eliminated ICS commissions nor 18 did the need for security features in their phone systems. Despite the fixed infrastructure and 19

security costs, their phone rates plummeted

indicating that ICS commissions represent a

primary cost driver for prison phone services.

20

21

184 1 However, prisons are different from jails. While typically much smaller than prisons, jails have similar infrastructure and security needs. In addition, far more people cycle in and out of jails, around 11.6 million people per year, and some ICS providers have cited this churn as an additional cost driver for jail phone services. 8 After the Commission's rate cap for 9 interstate phone calls went into effect, the New 10 Jersey Department of Corrections stopped 11 collecting ICS commissions effective February 11th, 2014, and reduced its phone rates to a flat 12 13 17 cents per minute. As part of its ICS contract extension, the state included a matrix for phone 14 15 rates and commissions for county correctional facilities in New Jersey. Around 17 counties in 17 New Jersey act under the state's DOC contract. 18 Those counties participating include 19 those with small jails such as Hunterdon with 150 20 inmates, medium jails such as Summerset County 21 with 440 inmates, and large jails including Camden 22 County with around 1300 inmates. The matrix

185 consisted of a scale of commission rates and corresponding phone rates with only one exception as the ICS commissions decreased from a high of 56 percent to a low of 15 percent. Under six options in the matrix, the corresponding phone rates also decreased. For example, using 15- minute intra(inaudible) calls as an example, the rates dropped from \$5.50 with a 56 percent commission to 9 \$4.75 with a 55 percent commission to \$4.20 with a 10 54 percent commission to \$3.50 with a 35 percent 11 commission and so on. So as the commissioner percentages dropped, the phone rates dropped. 12 one exception was for the 53 percent commission 13 level which had slightly higher rates. 15 Note that these phone rates apply to 16 county facilities in New Jersey with different 17 population levels, different sizes and different 18 levels of churn, and the number of phones 19 installed at the facilities also differed. They 20 ranged from 15 to 165 phones in each jail. Yet in 21 spite of the varying infrastructure costs and the

consistent need for ICS security features in their

- 1 phone systems, the rates at these county
- 2 facilities were primarily dependent on one factor
- 3 which was the commission percentage. So this is
- 4 the actual chart. And the only differentiating
- 5 factor between the rates is the commissions. The
- 6 matrix is not based on facility size or facility
- 7 population level or facility churn. The only
- 8 corresponding factor with lowering of rates is
- 9 lowering of commission payments.
- 10 Finally, according to recent news
- 11 reports, San Francisco recently announced that it
- 12 was reducing its jail phone rates. The cost of a
- 13 15-minute collect in-state call will drop by 70
- 14 percent, and a 15-minute collect local call will
- 15 cost \$2.75 instead of \$4.45, a 38 percent
- 16 decrease. The jail security needs did not change.
- 17 They're not scaling back on security features in
- 18 their phone systems. The infrastructure costs for
- 19 the jails' phone system did not change. They're
- 20 not pulling phones out of the jail. The churn of
- 21 inmates processed through the jail has not
- 22 changed. So what changed? I called up Sheriff

187 Ross Mirkarimi yesterday and spoke with him and he said that the primary change is that his office will take in around 17 percent less in commissions under the new pricing structure. that's what changed, the commissions 5 changed. 6 7 So it appears that the primary cost driver for inmate calling services, whether in 9 prisons or in jails, regardless of facility size, 10 population levels, churn, infrastructure cost or 11 security features is the commissions that ICS 12 providers pay to the corrections agencies they contract with. There are definitely differences 13 in facility size and there may be some 15 justification for tiered rates, but those rates have to be based on evidence showing a difference 17 in actual cost of phone calls. Thank you. 18 MODERATOR GUDE: Thank you very much. 19 Aleks, I don't want to butcher your last name 20 again, so I'm going to stop there. Thank you. 21 MS. KAJSTURA: So our point of view at the Prison Policy Initiative is that any

188 difference between prisons and jails or differently sized facilities is just irrelevant to the question of predatory pricing. Sure, there are differences in providing services to different facilities and one of those factors might be the size of the facility. But that doesn't mean that people held in one size facility versus another should be denied some reasonable controls over the pricing of the telephone systems there. And so 10 from that perspective of whether or not the FCC 11 should protect customers that have loved ones in 12 jails, this distinction between facility size in 13 prison and jail is somewhat irrelevant. 14 And as an aside, some might find it 15 helpful to keep in mind that over 60 percent of 16 the jail population on any given day is not 17 convicted. There are people who have been 18 arrested. They're trying to make bail. They're 19 still presumed to be innocent under the law. 20 And it's also important to keep things

in perspective when talking about facility sizes

and types. For example, in the past, a lot of

21

189 folks have brought up the fact that, you know, there are all these facilities out there that are really small, very expensive, like 15-person jails. And sure, there are a few facilities that are that small and in a whole number -- as a whole number, it's not that small of a number of facilities but the people kept in those facilities make up one-fifth of one percent of the 9 incarcerated population of the United States. Or 10 if you go up to facilities that I think are 40 or 50 people, that becomes three percent of the 11 12 people that are incarcerated. So the FCC shouldn't really be driven by 13 discussion of these complete outliers on the 15 question of whether or not it should be applying these very necessary regulations to jails, jails 17 in general, especially since we found that it's 18 the jails that have the highest commission rates 19 and therefore the highest phone call rates. 20 And, you know -- so if the FCC decides 21 to -- that a line needs to be drawn somewhere in

terms of facility size, then I would argue against

190 using labels such as prison or jail to determine where that line should be drawn because, you know, for the applicability of those regulations because, for example, Elias's jail, like he mentioned, is one of the largest in the country. It's larger than five whole prison systems. there are five state prison systems where all the prisons in -- all the incarcerated people under that state system are a smaller than in that one 10 single jail. So in terms of economies of size and 11 in terms of having to deal with one person versus many facilities or central administration and all 12 13 those kinds of arguments, the label of jail or prison just isn't' a very helpful guideline. But I think in the end, the kind of 15 16 facility that your loved one is held in just 17 really shouldn't determine how much you have to 18 pay for a phone call. 19 MODERATOR GUDE: Thank you very much. 20 Kevin. 21 MR. LANDY: Hi. I'd like to thank the 22 Commissioners of the FCC for inviting me to speak

191 on this panel. You all may have noticed at the headquarters for the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Building is just across the street from the FCC building. For many of us at ICE, FCC is simply the agency with the nice courtyard where we can sit outside while we eat lunch. Our two 7 agencies have very different missions so it's gratifying that what brings me here today is our shared interest in ensuring low-cost telephone 10 services to detainees and not the delicious stirfrys at your cafeteria. 11 12 In my remarks today, I will primarily be 13 describing the rates and services provided through our ICE Detainee Telephone Service provider, also 15 known as DTS. Since 2010, these services have been provided by Talton Communications which was 17 awarded the DTS contract after a full and open 18 competition. Before getting into the details of 19 the DTS contract, some background on the agency's 20 unique detention system is necessary. 21 ICE detains approximately 34,000 at any given time in more than 200 facilities across the

- 1 country. More than 400,000 people each year are
- 2 booked into ICE custody for some length of time
- 3 with an average length of stay of under a month.
- 4 Most of the detention facilities that ICE uses are
- 5 county jails which have a mix ICE detainees and
- 6 non-ICE prisoners. However, most of our largest
- 7 facilities are operated by private contractors and
- 8 hold exclusively ICE detainees. We call the
- 9 latter dedicated facilities.
- 10 Paid telephone services are offered by
- 11 our DTS provider at 16 ICE detention facilities
- 12 including almost all dedicated facilities. These
- 13 facilities range in population from 300 to 1800
- 14 and collectively house approximately 13,000
- 15 detainees on average which represents about 40
- 16 percent of our average population.
- 17 The DTS contract is provided at no cost
- 18 to ICE with Talton assuming responsibility for
- 19 installation and maintenance of all necessary
- 20 hardware and network services. ICE receives no
- 21 commission from Talton. Detainees are charged low
- 22 rates of 10 cents per minute for domestic calls

193 with no additional connection fees or ancillary charges. These rates are well below the upper limit imposed by FCC's recent order on inmate calling services. ICE's DTS rates are lower even than the Safe Harbor rates which the FCC presumes charges to be lawful. 7 In its order, the FCC accordingly 8 applauded ICE's efforts to reduce rates to 9 reasonable, affordable levels. 10 ICE detainees are also charged a uniform rate of 15 cents per minute for international 11 calls to landlines and 35 cents per minute for 12 13 international calls to mobile phones. Since the DTS contract was awarded, the number of calls per 15 detainee and minutes per detainee has increased 16 substantially. 17 In addition, the DTS contract provides 18 for free telephone calling services to select 19 numbers through a centralized pro bono platform 20 which can be accessed at any detention facility 21 regardless of whether it's a pay services or 22 furnished by Talton or a different service

194 provider. This pro bono platform enables detainees who dial in to place free calls to a number of entities including foreign consulates, immigration courts, and hotlines operated by ICE and by the DHS Office of Inspector General. At many of the detention facilities 6 where Talton is not the primary provider, Talton 7 must pay per call compensation to ensure detainees have access to the pro bono platform. 10 additional costs are not passed along to ICE or to 11 the ICE detainees making the calls. 12 These low rates and the additional cost 13 of maintaining the pro bono platform have not come at the cost of decreased service or security. 14 15 DTS contract provides for a number of security features important to the confinement setting including utilization of voice biometrics and 17 18 remote live monitoring and recording capability 19 for all non- privileged calls. With respect to 20 service, Talton has recently increased the minimum 21 number of telephones available to one telephone 22 per every 10 detainees. It did so in response to

195 a non-binding provision in our most recent detention standards which establish the 10 to 1 ratio as a benchmark for optimal performance. ICE has an interest in ensuring low phone rates and sufficient access for its detainees even at facilities where its DTS 7 contractor is not offering paid telephone services. In fact, it is ICE policy incorporated in national detention standards that all detention 10 facilities provide reasonable and equitable access 11 for reasonably priced telephone services. 12 Since 2008, ICE detention standards have 13 required that contracts for telephone services comply with all applicable state and federal 14 15 regulations and that rates are based on rates and surcharges comparable to those charged to the 17 general public. Any variations from public rates 18 must reflect the actual costs associated with the 19 provision of services in a detention setting. ICE 20 conducts ongoing oversight to ensure facility 21 compliance with those detention standards. 22 However, it can be difficult for ICE to ensure

- 1 that rates are comparable to those charged to the
- 2 general public due to the complexity and variety
- 3 of telephone rates and plans.
- 4 FCC's recent order therefore provides
- 5 much needed clarity regarding the legal
- 6 requirement that telephone rates, charges, and
- 7 practices for detainees be just, reasonable, and
- 8 fair. And our DTS contract demonstrates that all
- 9 of the requirements in the FCC order can be met
- 10 without any reduction in security or quality of
- 11 services. Thank you.
- 12 MODERATOR GUDE: Thank you very much,
- 13 Kevin. Next, Richard Smith.
- 14 MR. SMITH: Thank you and thank you,
- 15 Chairman Wheeler, Commissioner Clyburn and
- 16 Commissioner Rosenworcel for putting this panel
- 17 together. It's a wonderful event in which we can
- 18 all share ideas on how to get this project done.
- 19 It's clear from the panels' debates that we've
- 20 heard so far that we need a lot of work to get
- 21 this done in the right way. We need to deal with
- 22 commissions. We need to deal with security issues

- 1 and we can't let these slip. And we need to deal
- 2 with rates and fees. It's a hard project. That's
- 3 why it's taken us nearly 10 years to get to the
- 4 point that we're at today, but it can be done and
- 5 I think it needs to get done right.
- 6 My name is Rick Smith and I represent
- 7 Securus Technologies. I'm the Chief Executive
- 8 Officer of the company. A little bit about
- 9 Securus. We've been in business for 26 years. We
- 10 serve almost one million out of the 2.3 million
- 11 inmates with some form of the products that we
- 12 have today. We have 1000 dedicated employees in
- 13 46 states and the District of Columbia. We allow
- 14 inmates to communicate with friends and family
- 15 members in a safe and secure way. We have 650
- 16 products, 650 products that we have, most of those
- 17 dedicated to safety and security, and we help to
- 18 protect society, inmates, corrections officers,
- 19 judges, witnesses, and more by making sure that
- 20 communications are well-intended and not used for
- 21 the wrong purposes. It's what we do that keeps us
- 22 all safe.

- 1 At some point in the presentation and
- 2 these discussions, I always get around to
- 3 discussing where I think we stand in terms of a
- 4 competitive company with competitive returns. And
- 5 I've heard three words during the session so far.
- 6 One is that rates are egregious. One is that
- 7 rates are abusive, and the other one is that rates
- 8 are predatory. I can look at our bottom line and
- 9 compare that to other companies' bottom lines.
- 10 Most of these companies you've heard of. And so a
- 11 few statistics before we can use any of those
- 12 words.
- I looked at net income, kind of what you
- 14 can get from public statements, as a percentage of
- 15 profit. And here's the listing. Verizon was at
- 16 14.3 percent; not bad. Time Warner was at 11.4
- 17 percent, and I'm going in descending order now.
- 18 AT&T, we've all heard of AT&T and what they do,
- 19 they're at 10 percent. Century Link, think of that
- 20 as U.S. West Embark, Century, pretty big company.
- 21 I think the fourth largest local exchange carrier
- 22 in the United States; they're at 5 percent. And

- 1 now Securus brings up the rear at 1.4 percent. So
- 2 Verizon makes roughly 10 times what I make on a
- 3 comparable basis. Time Warner makes eight times
- 4 what I make. AT&T makes seven times what I make.
- 5 Century Link makes four times what I make. I'm
- 6 not saying that any of those are bad. I'm just
- 7 putting these things in the proper perspective in
- 8 terms of what we make bottom line after all of our
- 9 costs, and commissions does represent a
- 10 significant portion of our costs is a relatively
- 11 small number.
- So we don't earn excessive profits. We
- 13 don't earn excessive profits. We don't earn
- 14 excessive profits. I said that three times for
- 15 the egregious and abusive and predatory kinds of
- 16 comments that come at us most of the time.
- 17 There are two charts that I have up here
- 18 and these go directly to the panel's theme,
- 19 understanding the provision of ICS in different
- 20 facilities and understanding what the cost drivers
- 21 are. The one on your left, that kind of vertical
- 22 one, I know you can't see that but you have this

- 1 data -- both these charts available to you. They
- 2 were passed out. If you don't have them, there
- 3 are copies over there. And we've been doing this
- 4 for a lot of years meaning looking at contracts,
- 5 putting together a model of what we can build for
- 6 these things.
- 7 And there are 85 different variables
- 8 that we've developed over the last 26 years, and
- 9 we've priced out approximately 50,000 contracts
- 10 over that period of time. So we have a relatively
- 11 large depth and breadth of experience on the cost
- 12 element side. And you can read these 85 items.
- 13 There are 16 numerically and then when you add up
- 14 all the bullets, there are a lot of things there.
- 15 Our business is complicated. Many people that I
- 16 talk to, some people who I think should know more
- 17 about our business, think it's the, you know, walk
- 18 down to the corner, put 10 cents in a pay
- 19 telephone, hear it ding and make your call. It's
- 20 a lot more complex than that and that complexity
- 21 needs to be taken into consideration in terms of
- 22 rates.

201 1 So a few fun things to look at. 2 store information on all calls. We have four petabytes of storage. I'm an engineering guy so I kind of love to say words like that. What that's equivalent to is 80 million four-drawer filing 6 cabinets worth of paper data. That's what it's 7 equivalent to, circles the globe twice if you stack all of the filing cabinets end-to-end-to-9 end. So we store lots of stuff. 10 One hundred and fifty tool-carrying technicians a big portion of our cost; 250 11 customer service people; 300 software development 12 13 people; 80,000 phones -- they're all ours -- we have installed; 5,000 video phones -- they're all 15 ours; 100 technical support people; 50 site administrators. 16 17 We complete 1.5 billion minutes of use 18 per year of traffic from inmates. We pay roughly 19 \$150 million dollars back to the facilities in 20 terms of commissions. It's my cost. We have 25 21 million lines of code that we have to maintain and 22 keep up and build on. We've got 24 million feet

202 of fiber, coax and copper cables that we've got to maintain. 3 We have cost of responding to subpoenas, warrants, testifying to chain of evidence requests. That happens every single week. 5 what we do and all of those things and more need to be reflected in terms of final rates to an end user customer. 9 Now to the chart over on the right. This is a little more interesting. I've grouped 10 11 these in terms of small, zero to 100; medium, 101 to 1,000; this is ADP, average daily population; 12 and then large, 1001 to 20,000; and then more than 13 20,000. Think about it as underwear sizes, small, 14 medium, large, extra large. You got to go beyond 16 that, I can't help you. 17 So we have average rates. That exclude 18 commissions. This is my cost, not other carriers' It's my cost. It excludes commissions 19 costs. 20 because that's the way the FCC likes to take a 21 look at cost now. And ultimately, you see 28 22 cents for really small facilities up to a really

- 1 big facility, like 10 cents.
- 2 A really small facility for me, smallest
- 3 facility I have is Gross Point Park, Michigan, has
- 4 ADP of two with one telephone. That's my smallest
- 5 facility. They're in the 0 to 100 block. My
- 6 biggest facility is the Florida Department of
- 7 Corrections. It's 87,000 or 89,000 inmates.
- 8 The next column starts to tell you that
- 9 these numbers vary a lot and that's what the FCC
- 10 has to look at. Look at the --we'll go to the 101
- 11 to 1,000 for example. You can see it on the chart
- 12 or that, even though the average is 17, the range
- 13 for those facilities -- and there are lot of them;
- 14 there are 511 that I have so it's a pretty big
- 15 database -- goes from 8 cents a minute to 70 cents
- 16 a minute, so pretty big range.
- 17 So rates per minute show significant
- 18 variability. That needs -- and we all need to be
- 19 careful of that, not to price prisons or jails out
- 20 of the features that they need to do their jobs
- 21 and protect us. Decisions on rates are life and
- 22 death issues for victims, witnesses, inmates,

204 officers, and society. I don't' use that term I mean it because I've seen it in the lightly. hundreds of letters that we get from our facilities. 5 So, we need to be thoughtful and balanced and we need to have those kind of 7 approaches to setting rates that take safety and security into consideration as well. Thank you. 9 MODERATOR GUDE: Thank you very much. Richard. Next and finally, Thomas Sweeney from 10 11 Global Tel Link. 12 MR. SWEENEY: Thank you and thank the 13 Commission for inviting me and thank you for putting me after Mr. Smith. That's a hard act to 15 follow. 16 I have little to add to what he said. 17 think I have a number 86 feature and that would be 18 the type of inmate, whether you, you know -- and 19 I'll use the example I have a couple of counties 20 in Florida where I live. You have what I call the 21 city counties that have a lot of gang issues and 22 very severe type of criminal. And a few miles

205 down the road, you can have a beach community, same size jail, where they have DWIs and some public misconduct, totally different type. You've got more investigators. You have more work You have more bandwidth, so there's -you know, we've talked about the differences between the departments of corrections facilities in counties, but there's really a difference between the county facilities, as Rick said. 10 I pride myself on being the old guy in the industry. We've talk so much. Somebody 11 12 mentioned earlier the first inmate phones went in 13 in the early 70's. I guarantee you it was the late 70's because I was there. I worked here in 14 15 the Bell Atlantic region, was involved with -- at that time, they were coin phones in a lobby. 17 Inmates would sign up for a call and they were 18 walked from their jail out to the lobby, an officer would sign who they were, how long they 19 20 talked, and who they talked to. 21 You fast forward to today. That's 22 pretty much what our systems do. But along the

- 1 way, I've seen unintended consequences. And I'm
- 2 glad to see that the whole industry here, we're
- 3 taking a step back and really studying what we
- 4 need to do because the first phones that went in
- 5 were live operator phones. That lasted about a
- 6 month before the central offices and the call
- 7 centers are yelling at me, Tom, you got to change
- 8 that because the inmates are calling up and asking
- 9 the operators what are you wearing, what time do
- 10 you get off, those type of things.
- 11 We went to an automated operator and
- 12 quickly, the facilities are saying now that they
- 13 have free access and I don't listen to what they
- 14 say, we're having, you know, security issues
- 15 happen, victims are being harassed, witnesses are
- 16 being harassed. So we came up with recording.
- 17 The first recordings were reel-to-reel,
- 18 Dictaphone, very expensive. As things have gone
- 19 on, we've seen the unintended consequences.
- 20 So my request is just to continue what
- 21 you're doing with making sure we study and make a
- 22 good decision before make a final decision. Thank

		207
1	you.	
2		
3		
4	MODERATOR GUDE: Well, thank you very	
5	much. Thank you, everyone. Obviously, we're going	
6	to start some questions and I'll kick this off by	
7	saying what we have heard and what we've seen	
8	through rates in different facilities and	
9	different places is rates as low as I believe	
10	we keep getting back to New York being somewhere	
11	around 5 cents a minute and from there going up.	
12	We've seen, Rick, from on your chart, your cost	
13	information by size of facility and other things.	
14	What I'm trying to understand and	
15	reconcile is at the ICE facilities, was it 10	
16	cents a minute? They seem to be able to provide	
17	adequate security. They are very pleased with the	
18	security. Clearly, they believe their systems are	
19	absolutely what they need to provide security to	
20	the public. New York seems very happy at 5 cents	
21	a minute, able to do what they are doing.	
22	The question that we have is what makes	

- 1 up the difference between such low rates at
- 2 certain facilities providing adequate security and
- 3 in other places rates that are significantly
- 4 higher? Again, leave out the issue of
- 5 commissions; we can circle back to that. But
- 6 absent commissions, what drives those additional
- 7 costs that require significantly higher rates to
- 8 recover those costs -- to you Rick and then to
- 9 anyone else. I apologize.
- MR. SMITH: You know, on the chart on
- 11 the right-hand side, we -- you know, our biggest
- 12 facility is 87,000 to 89,000 and for both of
- 13 those, I think you're talking about significantly
- 14 more ADP; if you put all the ICE facilities
- 15 together, significantly more ADP. But if you look
- 16 at the range -- don't look at the 10 cents, look
- 17 at the range. That just happens to be the
- 18 average. We go down to as low as 7 cents. So in
- 19 my mind, you know, a 5-cent facility or a 7-cent
- 20 facility, either one of those is a great rate.
- 21 I think the way you go from my 7 cents,
- 22 the low end of the range all the way up to 16

- 1 cents, the way you go up from 7 cents to 5 cents
- 2 is just more volume, more concentrated equipment,
- 3 better use of fixed assets, better use of people.
- 4 Those bigger facilities normally have a team of
- 5 our associates on site all of the time, not
- 6 assigned to anyone else, and you can make really
- 7 good use of those people versus you're serving
- 8 someplace in North Dakota where it may take a
- 9 technician four or five hours to drive to the
- 10 facility before they can put in any productive
- 11 time.
- So I think it's just economies of scale
- 13 going from my averages of 15 to 18 cents or from 7
- 14 cents to 5 cents. But I think, you know,
- 15 hopefully, the FCC would be thrilled if on big
- 16 facilities we could average somewhere between 5
- 17 and 7 cents excluding commission costs.
- 18 So the short answer -- that's the long
- 19 answer. The short answer is I think it's just
- 20 economies of scale. The bigger the facility, the
- 21 lower the cost as long as you set commissions off
- 22 to the side.

			210
	1	MODERATOR GUDE: Okay. So I'm just	
	2	trying to get clarity on this. Then that does	
	3	suggest size of facility makes a difference	
	4	MR. SMITH: Yes.	
	5	MODERATOR GUDE: in terms of cost.	
	6	MR. SMITH: It absolutely does.	
	7	MODERATOR GUDE: Okay.	
	8	MR. SMITH: Now let me go on further.	
	9	I've represented stuff there that's tiered. I	
	10	hate tiering. I would never if I were you, I	
	11	would never want to go to a tiering structure	
	12	because of all the administrative problems	
	13	associated with that, and which means that I truly	
	14	don't believe any facilities would be not served.	
	15	I think we, as an industry, would figure out a way	
	16	to service them all in some way.	
	17	But the administrative ease of having	
	18	one rate like we did on the interstate side we	
	19	could have tiered on the interstate side in the	
	20	interim rates and we didn't. We implemented that.	
	21	The price gap on the low end for the prepaid is 21	
	22	cents and we're at 17 cents. No facility is above	
1			

211 the Commission price gap of 21 cents, so we average 17. And I'm not a fan of tiering just because the administration because here's what I would tell you all to do, and I'll tell you how we'd look at the loopholes immediately. We would go to a big facility like 6 7 Florida. If you did, for example, an ADP or a minute of use kind of a tiering, we'd go to the big facilities and say instead of one contract, 10 we're going to have 34, one per facility because 11 they're different, they have different characteristics, they're in different parts of the 12 13 state so we migrate up to a higher rate. Within the facilities, I'd start to look at booking areas 14 15 versus detention areas versus the women's area and

- So we, as business people, are great in
- 18 terms of understanding the rules and, you know,
- 19 most people use the term "game" as like its

16

the men's area.

- 20 negative or illegal. I just view it as smart
- 21 business people will migrate to ways that will
- 22 allow them to make more money. So what I would

212 tell you thinking about only Securus, come up with 1,000 tiers and that would be great from my perspective. But from sitting in your shoes, I would say I need to keep this simple so I don't get the guys and ladies to game it, so that's why a single uniform rate, interstate-intrastate, both 7 together, makes a lot of sense to me from an administrative perspective and I truly believe 9 after we stop the complaining, we can figure out a 10 way to make that kind of a structure work. 11 MODERATOR GUDE: Tom, so I'm not going 12 to let you off the hook. 13 MR SWEENEY: Thanks, hard to expand on that. Personally, I think to postalize it -- we call postalize rates -- is at least easier to 15 16 explain to called parties, officers and inmates. 17 To answer your initial question of 18 what's the difference, it was mentioned earlier, 19 that (inaudible) New York, it's not really true. 20 UNISYS has a contract. We're a subcontractor so 21 not a personal knowledge of what's going on there. 22 I do caution that -- I do know there is some

213 grumbling through different trade shows that they would like to have some technology they couldn't get because they don't have commission to give the dollars away. I think that will come up in the next RFP. 6 So as I had mentioned earlier, be careful of your unintended consequences. When you 7 drop to a floor -- I think you mentioned it before, someone on the panel -- what's the 10 motivation for bringing new technology in there. 11 There will be service. We'll all do a good job. In this market, I've said from the very beginning, 12 13 service is pass/fail. If you don't provide good service, you're not -- no matter what commission 15 you offer, you're not going to get the business. So I agree with they'll all be serviced. But we 17 have 2200 individual facilities. I guarantee you 18 there are 2200 ways they're all set up. 19 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Mr. Diggins would 20 you like to provide the counterpoint? 21 MR. DIGGINS: Absolutely. I 22 respectfully disagree with Mr. Smith in regards to

- the tiering option from the jail administrator's perspective. I believe that our costs are not the same from small to medium to large jails and those costs including running the inmate calling systems are vastly different when you're talking about a 6-bed facility in Kettering, Ohio. It's not the same as a 2300-bed jail in Denver, Colorado or a 21,000 bed capacity system as you have in LA 9 County, and so the economies of scale on the 10 return on the investment for the inmate calling system obviously can't be paid back the same for 11 the same technology. We all want to have inmate 12 13 calling systems which record, which we can garner data from, which we can provide to law 15 enforcement. 16 And so for us, there is no way that you
- 17 can truthfully say from our end that a flat rate
- 18 across the board is palatable. And although it
- 19 may be easier for the providers when it comes to
- 20 the way that they have to run their business; for
- 21 us, it does not make sense. And I can tell you
- 22 that in speaking to jail administrators in those

- 1 small, medium, large and even mega jail systems,
- 2 all of who I know one or more of each, that they
- 3 would prefer to have a tiered system when it comes
- 4 to any rate structure which may be implemented for
- 5 intrastate calls.
- 6 MODERATOR GUDE: I want to just follow-
- 7 up a little bit on that. IN the Senator Stein
- 8 that what I'm hearing from Mr. Smith is the ease
- 9 would allow effectively averaging of rates across
- 10 different cost structures. Did I characterize
- 11 that correctly?
- MR. SMITH: Yes. And if I could just
- 13 expand on my answer, I don't think I'd have a
- 14 conflict with Chief Diggins. If you set the price
- 15 cap rate high enough, it would allow -- and the
- 16 market would take care of ultimately lower rates.
- 17 If Denver was kind of a little higher than
- 18 average, if you set the rate high enough, we'd be
- 19 able to float it down so that we'd be able to
- 20 provide all of the enhancements that Chief Diggins
- 21 would need for bigger facilities. It would float
- 22 down because the market push it down in terms of

```
216
   lower rates, higher -- to the highest ADP or the
   highest MOU facility.
 3
              So I'm not saying one rate for every
   facility in the United States. I'm saying set a
   cap and as long as it's high enough, trust the
 5
   market to force it down to suit all the size
 7
   facility needs. I don't know if that clarified it
 8
   all.
 9
             MODERATOR GUDE: Okay. I'm going to let
10
   you follow-up -- if you had any --
11
            MR. DIGGINS: No.
12
             MODERATOR GUDE: -- comments beyond
13
   that.
           MR. DIGGINS: I think Mr. Smith cleared
14
15
   it up.
16
             MODERATOR GUDE: Okay. Thank you. Did
17
   you have --
18
             MODERATOR BAKER: Well, yeah, I guess
19
   I'd like to follow-up to that. So you're say8ing
20
   that you set the rate cap high enough and even
21
   though the cost may be lower at prisons, they
   should pay the higher rates anyway?
22
```

217 1 MR. SMITH: No. The market would take care of -- in the bidding process, the RFP process, the market would take care of bidding that particular contract lower. At least that's the way that we see it working. The reason why my bigger facilities have lower prices, which is what 7 is really reflected here, lower prices, lower costs, is that we bid it down lower. We do not have -- for example, when the FCC set the 10 interstate rate for us, because we're mostly prepared, to 21 cents, we had no -- very few 11 facilities at 21 cents. Most were below that. 12 13 actually average 17. So even though we could have went to 21 14 15 cents for them -- and we actually approached some 16 facilities and said, "The price cap's 21, you're 17 at 18; do you want to go to 21?" Their response, 18 which I think is the proper response is no, we 19 want to have lower rates where we are, as low --20 and you know, we also approached one of our bigger 21 contractors, Missouri, and asked them -- they were 22 at a 7 cent minute rate -- and ask them, you know,

218 you have movement to increase that. They weren't interested in that. So they do care, because I think it matters to them, about lower rates. think the market would drive rates lower no matter 5 what the price cap is. 6 Sure, there are some facilities, especially lower ones that would hang around at 7 the price cap level, but in my mind, set the price 8 9 cap high enough, let the market take care of lower 10 rates. 11 And kind of the fly in that ointment is this, is commissions because you don't want to 12 have commissions driving rates higher just for the 13 sake of having rates higher and the highest 15 possible commissions. So that's why in my opening comments I said commissions are a big deal. 17 a very big deal for the facilities. It's a very 18 big deal for us because we're kind of like the tax 19 collector in terms of commissions. It's a very 20 big deal for the FCC and the states. And I think 21 that has to be dealt with, not eliminated but

dealt with in a way so that it doesn't harm the

219 1 facilities. 2 And that's tough. That's why I think this problem has been with us for 10 years. It's just a tough problem to solve unless you just x people out, and I don't think we ought to x anyone out of this process. I think we ought to let everyone have their piece and provide a lot of good data to the FCC and together, I think we 9 ought to be able to -- maybe not all be thrilled 10 about the outcome but at least be okay with the 11 outcome. MR. BAKER: I'd like to follow-up on 12 13 that. We just mentioned rates. What do you think about a comprehensive approach that includes rates 15 and fees and single-payment services? I mean 16 they're all part of one mechanism. MR. SMITH: I'm absolutely fine with 17 18 that. You know, some companies have migrated to 19 more fees and less in rate, like rate per minute. 20 And some companies have migrated to put everything 21 in rate per minute. I think that needs to be addressed. I think you're right on. I think 22

220 that's something that needs to be done. 2 MR. BAKER: Okay. 3 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Just moving a little bit. If we do all these wonderful reforms 5 that we're speaking about, do any of our panelists have opinions on appropriate transition periods to enact those reforms maybe from the facility side, the provider side, the advocate side, flash cut, 9 phase in over three years, five years, provide 10 some suggestions? 11 MR. DIGGINS: Absolutely. The fact of the matter is the majority of the sheriffs and 12 13 jail administrators who are receiving these funds into inmate welfare accounts are using them for 15 the good of those inmates. Twenty years ago when these services, these -- the technology was not 17 the same and perhaps the rate of return for those 18 funds was not the same. We didn't have programs 19 like mental health transition units inside of a 20 jail where someone with an AXIS-1 diagnosis who has a bipolar mental health disorder coupled with 21 a drug addiction is getting help while they're in 22

- 1 our custody. We didn't have programs like that,
- 2 like recovery in a secure environment where
- 3 someone who has an addiction to drugs can get that
- 4 recovery while they're in our custody. And so
- 5 today those programs exist and if there was a
- 6 flash cut to say that they no longer could be
- 7 funded, then I would say that that would increase
- 8 recidivism rather than reduce it because those
- 9 folks will come back to our communities possibly
- 10 even worse than when they came to us and none of
- 11 us want that. We want to return them back to the
- 12 community better than when they came and so that's
- 13 why those programs are in place.
- I would say that an appropriate response
- l5 to that would be to let the contracts run out in a
- 16 three to five-year period and during that time, if
- 17 those contracts began to expire, that they be
- 18 renewed under these new guidelines. But to allow
- 19 those counties, those departments to let those
- 20 contracts run their course and to start them anew
- 21 would allow them to prepare for any eventual
- 22 change.

222 1 MR. FRIEDMAN: And I understand that eliminating commissions or reducing rates significantly would pose a hardship for correctional facilities that have come to rely on the commission payments they get to fund these worthy programs. But prisoners' families have been suffering hardships for decades, and correctional facilities and service providers have been on notice that these are issues that need to be addressed for at least the past 10 years that 10 11 the Wright petition has been pending and certainly more recently, at least a year since roughly the 12 Commission introduced its order on rate caps and 13 reforms of the prison phone industry. 15 So this is not something that has been 16 done overnight. This is something that has been 17 done overnight. This is something that has been 18 done over a decade long period, and I think any 19 period of transition needs to be as minimal as 20 possible to ensure that reasonable rates, 21 reasonable fair rates are enacted across the board 22 for all facilities, intrastate and interstate and

kshop on Further Reform of Inmate Calling Services 07-09-2014

- 1 that's what justice requires.
- 2 One other point on the fact that the
- 3 commission payments are funding these programs
- 4 such as mental health and substance abuse
- 5 treatment, those are inherent programs that need
- 6 to be funded through public funds. Prisoners'
- 7 families who overwhelmingly pay the commissions
- 8 should not be the people who pay for these types
- 9 of programs alone. This is a public service.
- 10 Jails provide a public service for the public good
- 11 and the public needs to fund it. So to the extent
- 12 that commission payments are used for these worthy
- 13 programs, that's great. But prisoners' families
- 14 are not the ones who should be footing the bill as
- 15 they have done for the past several decades.
- MODERATOR GUDE: Elias, a response to
- 17 that, please?
- 18 MR. DIGGINS: Yes. Those funds are not
- 19 the only source for those programs. They assist
- 20 in us providing those programs but there are
- 21 literally tens of hundreds of programs which
- 22 inmates are involved in. Those programs that are

224 funded by these inmate welfare funds are a portion of that. 3 There are lots of other things that jail administrators do inside of the facilities which come from other sources. And so I don't want to paint the picture that is the only source for this. If it was not available with the supplemental for these, then the burden would be on all of the taxpayers in addition to what they 10 already incur for those costs. 11 All of our money comes from tax revenue 12 for each county. The sheriff's departments are 13 not self sufficient. We are run by county government which all of you know is based on tax 15 revenue. 16 And so everything that we do, we are 17 very responsible for when it comes to the revenue 18 that we receive from our county governments, and 19 any additional monies that we receive help us to 20 better prepare the inmates as they are released 21 back into society. 22 MS. KAJSTURA: Sure, I just noticed

- 1 we're kind of getting caught up in what I think
- 2 might be a false dichotomy in terms of cutting
- 3 these prices and therefore losing revenue. And I
- 4 think this kind of goes to Mr. Smith's comment
- 5 before that, you know -- he says that Securus
- 6 doesn't make egregious profits but they might
- 7 charge egregious prices. And that, I think, shows
- 8 that there is something seriously broken with this
- 9 system. And I think it's important to look to
- 10 places like New York that have really cut their
- 11 rates, what they've seen and which has been
- 12 mentioned repeatedly through filing t5o the FCC
- 13 and in the earlier panels today is that as the
- 14 prices drop, the call volumes increase making up
- 15 significant portions of the money and of the
- 16 profits.
- 17 MR. FRIEDMANN: If I could just chime in
- 18 briefly. On the charge that Securus provided, and
- 19 I think it is important to note that these are
- 20 Securus's costs, average rates excluding
- 21 commissions. So obviously, the cost to the
- 22 consumer is going to be much higher than the

226 average cost of 15 to 18 cents per minute. commissions add a significant amount onto this. 3 I also note that this range, if you look at the range of rates, excluding commissions, it's from 7 cents a minute to a \$1.22 a minute. means at some facilities, the cost to Securus of 7 providing that call ranges from about \$1.40 for a 20-minute call to over \$24.00 for a 20-minute call based on its own data, excluding commissions. 10 that vast range in there is something that needs 11 to be considered. Certainly, there might be differences in 12 providing services, small versus large facilities, 13 but when 5the cost to Securus for a 20-minute call 15 is \$24.00, then I think questions need to be asked 16 and answered. 17 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: I just had a 18 question, Mr. Smith, on this chart. Aleks just 19 noted the two middle columns say "rates" and the 20 yellow part down at the bottom refers to "costs." 21 Just --22 MR. SMITH: I used them interchangeable.

			227
	1	As part of my cost, I have a reasonable rate of	
	2	return, weighted average cost to capital cost of	
	3	equity cost. I go through all of that when I	
	4	determine those.	
	5	MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Okay, thank you.	
	6	MR. SMITH: You're welcome.	
	7	MODERATOR GUDE: Darrell.	
	8	MODERATOR BAKER: Mr. Smith and Mr.	
	9	Sweeney, I think I heard you correctly in that you	
	10	both agree that there needs to be a comprehensive	
	11	approach that looks at rates, fees and single	
	12	payment services. Would that be correct that you	
	13	all agree with that?	
	14	MR. SMITH: Yes.	
	15	MODERATOR BAKER: Okay. What then do	
	16	you think is do you see as the ICS providers'	
	17	obligation with respect to making cost data	
	18	available to regulators to accomplish that	
	19	purpose? What level of transparency should there	
	20	be?	
	21	MR. SMITH: Darrell, we provided our	
	22	first cost study. We call it kind of the woods	
-			

- 1 (ph) cost study and we spearheaded that as part of
- 2 the industry and we provided that to the FCC back
- 3 in 2008-2009 timeframe so we gave cost data then.
- 4 It was, you know, a relatively high-level study
- 5 but it was done by someone on the outside of the
- 6 company. We provided a more detailed analysis
- 7 2012-2013 and that was a name that begins with
- 8 "S". We used that consultant and I can't
- 9 pronounce it but we provided data then.
- 10 We're presently doing what I would call
- 11 maybe good, better, the best cost study that we've
- 12 ever done. We're using -- first of all, its' the
- 13 most expensive cost study we've ever done. It
- 14 will cost us about \$400,000.00. We will submit it
- 15 to the FCC on July 17th. We're working really
- 16 hard to meet their original date. We're trying to
- 17 provide everything that the FCC put out in terms
- 18 of requirements on the cost study and so that
- 19 should be available on the 17th.
- There will always be some areas that
- 21 aware blacked out but we're going to try to
- 22 minimize that this time so we can be as

229 transparent as we possibly can. It'll be, you know, rates per minute. It'll be the fees that we It'll be the cost base of the fees that we charge. So that will be our most significant effort done by what I'd call probably the best accounting/economic analysis firm that we know of 7 in the industry, FTI consulting. And like I said, that should be available shortly. 9 I think -- when you see it, I think you'll really -- you may not agree with it but I 10 11 think you'll really like it. But there are 12 numbers that are consistent with -- not exactly 13 because this -- note, this is kind of like our marketing database. They use kind the account 15 database, quote, the real numbers and so they'll be close to all of the numbers there in that first 17 -- or the first column over from ADP. 18 I think -- my prediction is you'll at it 19 and you'll say, "This is really pretty good." 20 Hopefully, that's what you'll say. 21 MR. BAKER: Will you make that economist available for questioning and for discovery?

		230
1	MR. SMITH: Yes, yes. That's	
2	MR. BAKER: Okay.	
3	MR. SMITH: that will be part of	
4	their work and they've done multiple they have	
5	a history of doing cost studies so, you know,	
6	doing that before the FCC and states is not unique	
7	for them.	
8	MR. BAKER: Okay.	
9	MR. SMITH: And I know you're a tough	
10	guy to please but we're going to try to please	
11	you.	
12	MR. BAKER: Thank you.	
13	MR. SMITH: You're welcome.	
14	MR SWEENEY: The difference between the	
15	CEO and the Salves VP is I don't have all those	
16	figures at my fingertips difference between CEO	
17	math and sales math but understand that in the	
18	past, although we you know, we have contracts	
19	for our costs and things, we didn't keep that. We	
20	weren't required to so I think we're in the same	
21	position. We are now looking at internally of	
22	people doing cost analysis and we will provide the	

231 same thing. 2 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Kevin, just from ICE, a question. We haven't heard much about international rates on our panels today, and hopefully just you could shed some light, fill in a little bit of a whole for us. Can you discuss the rates that ICE has for international calling and your opinion, if you can provide it, on whether the Commission should regulate those 10 international rates? 11 MR. LANDY: Sure. Because of the nature 12 of our population, of course, rates for 13 international telephone calls is incredibly important, both that the rates be reasonable but 15 also that we can present the rate structure to detainees in a way that is uniform and simple to 17 understand. Currently, ICE detainees are charged 18 a uniform rate of 15 cents -- I mentioned this 19 earlier -- per minute for direct connections to 20 landlines to any country and 35 cents for 21 connections to mobile phones. As a point of comparison, I just last 22

- 1 night looked up what I would be paying on my own
- 2 phone plan and also the competing provider for
- 3 where I live, having even -- notwithstanding the
- 4 monthly rate that I pay for that phone service,
- 5 looking at the countries where we have the
- 6 greatest number of detainees, Guatemala, Costa
- 7 Rica, Honduras and El Salvador, the international
- 8 rates that I would be paying were higher for
- 9 direct calls to landlines and for many other
- 10 countries where we have detainees, quite a bit
- 11 higher, the rates that I'd be calling if I didn't
- 12 have an international plan for which I'd be paying
- 13 an extra \$20.00 a month.
- 14 So far this fiscal year, we have
- 15 detained people from 200 different countries and
- 16 that number will continue to grow. And in our
- 17 prior contract, the rate structure was a list of
- 18 250 countries and 250 rates, and there is no -- I
- 19 don't -- I think it's hard to guarantee that
- 20 detainees at every housing unit in all of our
- 21 facilities are going to understand what the rates
- 22 are going to be when they place that call. So

233 having that uniformity is really important. 2 I think anyone who's an immigrant in this country, regardless of whether or not they're in ICE custody, if they find themselves in custody, obviously international calls could be very important to them. For us in particular, for many of our detainees, all of their family members and loved ones are in their home countries. Maintaining detainees' morale, allowing them to 10 maintain that relationship is incredibly 11 important. Even from a pragmatic perspective, a number of our detainees are aware that they're 12 13 going to be removed back to their home countries and need to make appropriate arrangements for 15 their departure. So that's also a humanitarian perspective but from the agency's perspective, 17 it's pragmatic as well. So low rates, uniform 18 rates, and I can't make recommendations to the FCC 19 but those are factors that are important to us. 20 MODERATOR GUDE: To follow-up on that 21 just to make sure, those international calls have 22 all of your security bells and whistles associated

			234
	1	with those as well, right?	
	2	MR. LANDY: Yes.	
	3	MODERATOR GUDE: Okay. As we're running	
	4	towards the end, I just wanted to give everyone on	
	5	the panel an opportunity. Many of you or I think	
	6	most of you who have been able to sit through the	
	7	other two panels heard comments on what the	
	8	impacts are or have been or have not been with	
	9	respect to intrastate services in sort of post the	
	10	FCC's interstate rules that came out, the interim	
	11	rules that came out last year and also the second	
	12	panel which was focused on ancillary charges. I	
	13	wanted to give you all an opportunity to have any	
	14	comments, share your thoughts, if there was	
	15	anything in there you felt you disagreed with,	
	16	agreed with, had other thoughts on, give you all	
	17	the opportunity.	
	18	MR. DIGGINS: 19'll jump in.	
	19	MODERATOR GUDE: Please.	
	20	MR. DIGGINS: First of all, I think I	
	21	didn't I forgot to thank the FCC for allowing	
	22	law enforcement to be at the table. Being the	
1			

235 only law enforcement officer who has been a part of these panels has been an honor and we are partners in this conversation and hope to stay at the table to have a fair, just, and reasonable response to this issue which is very important to us. 7 There was a comment made about prisons and jails being the same based upon the 9 populations. I just want to clarify that that is 10 not true. We are absolutely different. When you 11 talk about a facility, a prison facility that has 2200 inmates, generally they're there for a very 12 long time; some of them for a short stint for 5 to 13 10 years; some of them may be there for the rest 15 of their lives. And so an inmate calling system in that regard is a little bit different than a 17 facility of our size that may have 2200 beds but 18 processes 37,000 people per year for whom each we 19 have to set up a calling profile. 20 And so it's not an apples to apples 21 comparison when it comes to prisons and jails. 22 hope to continue to make that argument not just

236 here but in other venues. But the conversation regarding jails should come from jail folk and we're more than happy as an organization to continue to represent that. 5 MODERATOR GUDE: I can say we very much appreciate your coming here and we hope that you 6 can continue to be involved. We appreciate that. Our efforts will be benefitted by that. 9 MR. DIGGINS: Thank you. 10 MODERATOR GUDE: Alex. 11 MR. FRIEDMANN: Thank you. Just a 12 couple comments. I think it's important to 13 realize that although HRDC advocates for prisoners and their families, you know, nobody wants to see 15 rates so low that companies are not able to generate profit and maintain their services. You 17 know, it doesn't benefit anybody if companies 18 cannot meet the rates and they're doing below cost 19 business and they go out of business and inmates 20 can't make phone calls to their families. 21 So when we talk about having just, fair, and reasonable rates, that's exactly what we mean.

- 1 We don't mean unfair rates that are unfair to the
- 2 companies. We also don't mean rates that are so
- 3 high that they're unfair to prisoners' families.
- 4 There has to be a balance there. In order to have
- 5 that balance, you do have to have the data. You
- 6 have to have important cost data that allows you
- 7 to find that balance between reasonable rates on
- 8 both sides.
- 9 So Mr. Smith, when he discussed some of
- 10 Securus's finances, you know, he pointed out that
- 11 other companies have higher profit margins such as
- 12 10 percent with AT&T or 14 percent with Verizon.
- 13 The difference is if I'm doing business with a
- 14 company and I don't like their profit margin, I'll
- 15 just find another company. I don't like AT&T,
- 16 I'll go to Verizon. If I don't go Verizon, I'll
- 17 go with somebody else. I don't like my cell phone
- 18 plan, I'll change it form T-Mobile to Boost. But
- 19 people in prison and their families who
- 20 overwhelmingly pay for the cost of their calls
- 21 don't have that choice. They can't simply switch
- 22 from one carrier to another because there are

238 basically monopolies on prison and jail phone services once the company has the contract. And although Securus might have a very 3 low, say, 1.4 percent net profit, we still don't really know what that profit is because that data is not made publicly available in terms of how 7 much they're actually making until that cost data is entered into the record. 9 One comment that was made by Mr. Smith was that the -- we should trust the market to 10 11 force the prices down. In other words, if we just 12 trust the competitive nature of the market, then 13 things will resolve down to a certain level that's fair and just. But competition only works if the 15 nature of the contracts is to benefit the 16 consumers. So long as we have inmate service 17 contracts for phone services that are based on the 18 highest commission percentage rather than the 19 lowest cost to the consumer, the competitive 20 forces don't work because they're non-existent. 21 Thank you. 22 MS. KAJSTURA: I actually wanted to

- 1 reply to the comment about the size of the
- 2 facility. So yeah, there are some facilities that
- 3 have tremendous churn and annually about 12
- 4 million people cycle through jails and, you know,
- 5 that's a number that's problematic for many
- 6 reasons. But there are states where -- I think
- 7 Louisiana, over 50 percent of the population in
- 8 jails is serving out their sentence. They're just
- 9 happened to be placed inside of a jail instead of
- 10 a prison. So just -- it just doesn't serve as a
- 11 clear-cut line is all I was saying.
- MR. LANDY: I would just like thank the
- 13 FCC for all the tremendous work it's been doing in
- 14 this area. I've spoken about our DTS contract
- 15 where we have, obviously, greater control over
- 16 rates and services. But in my capacity conducting
- 17 -- or collaborating on detention reform
- 18 initiatives, information is also incredibly
- 19 important. And we have a lot of facilities where
- 20 we don't have our DTS contract. There are jails
- 21 and contract-operated facilities which are very
- 22 important partners to us, and I don't want to

240 suggest that, you know, I understand at all what the pressures are in their very different systems. But the information that the FCC is 3 currently collecting is going to be very helpful to us, because having more information about facilities that we use, it just allows us to better understand basically what we're paying for and what the situation of all of our detainees is. 9 So thank you very much. 10 MODERATOR GUDE: Thank you. Rick. 11 MR. SMITH: A couple points. Inter equals intra, I've said that to the Commission 12 13 before. I think that the rates ultimately and what you do, they should be very similar on the 15 interstate state side and on the intrastate side. 16 I think commissions is the elephant in 17 the room. It represents roughly 50 percent of our 18 cost structure and we have built a model as an 19 industry where the facilities that we serve rely 20 on those commissions. And I don't think it's fair 21 to pull that away without some kind of support 22 mechanism in its place, whether that's a

241 transition period or it's a cap on commissions but it isn't fair to the facilities that have participated in this process where we just kind of, you know, forget commissions and say it can't be done anymore. That's what we've done on the interstate side so far and it's -- I think it's worked to a great degree for us because it only represented 10 percent of total commissions. 9 you can kind of pull that down a little bit and 10 facilities aren't gutted in terms of the 11 commission number. But I think commissions is an 12 issue that needs to be dealt with in the open, in 13 an economic kind of way. I absolutely agree with Alex Friedmann 14 15 and I thought I make this part of my comments that -- and I didn't think I'd ever agree with you on 17 anything -- but I do agree on the notion of 18 competition works as long as you can kind of deal 19 with commissions in some because that's the part 20 of the equation that makes it not work, although 21 where there are low commissions or capped 22 commissions, I have seen many facilities, for the

- 1 good of inmates and friends and family members,
- 2 decide contracts based on who can provide -- and
- 3 I'm sure you, too, have -- who can give me the
- 4 lowest possible rate; you know, I care about
- 5 commissions and you can give me 25 percent, but
- 6 who -- the firm that can give me the lowest
- 7 possible rate for inmates and friends and family
- 8 members wins. And that's an okay model. We can
- 9 participate in that model okay but it comes back
- 10 to it is a very tough issue for you and for the
- 11 states.
- 12 I think it should be dealt with on a,
- 13 quote, a fair way. I love that term because you
- 14 have to be fair to all the people who've built
- 15 this business model over the last 20 years, and
- 16 you got one tough job trying to do that.
- 17 MODERATOR GUDE: Thank you. Thomas, you
- 18 have the last word.
- 19 MR SWEENEY: Yeah, just I echo what Mr.
- 20 Friedmann said, fair and reasonable. I like that.
- 21 And let's make sure we take our time and get to
- 22 the place where it works for everyone.

243 1 MODERATOR GUDE: All right. Thank you, everyone. This was a great panel. I think we got a lot out of this. I hope you all will continue to stay involved as the process continues. Your input is critical. Thank you. 5 6 (Applause.) (Whereupon, off the record for a brief 8 recess.) 9 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: (Inaudible) forms of 10 communications in correctional settings beyond the 11 traditional wireline telephone call. 12 And my name is Lynne Engledow. Assistant Division Chief in the Pricing Policy 13 Division of the Bureau and David Zesiger, Senior 15 Counsel in the Division. We will just go 16 alphabetically down the line and start with Mr. 17 Byrne. 18 MR. BYRNE: Thank you. I want to thank 19 the FCC for allowing me to be a part of this and 20 talk about new technologies. And as this workshop 21 is focused on inmate calling services and this 22 panel is specifically targeted to new

- 1 technologies, I'd like to focus my opening
- 2 comments on a new solution to the problem of
- 3 contraband cell phones that also provides enhanced
- 4 telephone access to detainees and their families.
- 5 The first payphone was installed in
- 6 Hartford, Connecticut in a bank in 1889. The
- 7 first payphone in jail, as we heard earlier,
- 8 probably in the 70's. Ironically, the same
- 9 device, admittedly with very sophisticated back-
- 10 end controls is still being used in prisons and
- 11 jails around the world 125 years later. Yet when
- 12 was the last time you personally used a pay phone?
- 13 The reason for this are cell phones.
- 14 As many of you may be aware, contraband
- 15 cell phones are a significant issue in prisons and
- 16 jails across the country and indeed around the
- 17 world. Over 15,000 were confiscated in California
- 18 alone in 2012. In fact, Georgia Department of
- 19 Corrections Commissioner Brian Owens has stated
- 20 illegal cell phone use in Georgia prisons has
- 21 developed to epidemic proportions and is now the
- 22 system's greatest safety threat. There is no

245 doubt that the use of unrestricted cell phones in prisons is a serious security risk and that some of it is for criminal use and criminal activity. However, it has been shown that the vast 5 majority of contraband cell phone use is by detainees seeking more frequent and affordable 7 interaction with family and loved ones, interaction that is now severely restricted by the limited number and shared use of prison pay phones. We believe that contraband cell ph ones 10 are a problem of both and supply and demand. 11 to the demand for the cell phones in prison, there 12 13 is an active and highly lucrative pipeline of supply. Most prison administrations have focused 15 on restricting the supply of contraband cell 16 phones through detection, managed access jamming, 17 and search. However, like the problem of drug 18 smuggling, without addressing the demand for 19 contraband, the problem will never be solved. 20 We have developed a solution called 21 meshDetect which helps to reduce the demand for contraband cell phones by siphoning off the 22

- 1 legitimate desire for more frequent telephone
- 2 access between detainees and their loved ones.
- 3 meshDetect is a secure prison cell phone solution
- 4 that gives detainees highly customized cell phones
- 5 with all the security and control features of
- 6 prison payphones. This allows those detainees
- 7 whose only desire is for legitimate, non-criminal
- 8 contact with families to use wireless technology
- 9 safely and securely. By siphoning off and co-
- 10 opting this non-criminal wireless usage, we
- 11 significantly reduce the overall demand for
- 12 contraband cell phones and therefore the
- 13 profitability for those smuggling these devices.
- 14 Less financial reward for cell phone smugglers
- 15 changes the risk-reward equation and makes it much
- 16 less appealing given the high personal and
- 17 professional risk for those who are caught
- 18 smuggling in cell phones.
- 19 In addition to reducing the demand for
- 20 and therefore the supply of contraband cell
- 21 phones, enhanced access to telecommunication
- 22 services has proven significant additional

- 1 benefits of reducing recidivism, improving
- 2 detainee behavior, and increasing officer safety.
- 3 Eventually, all technology trends reach the prison
- 4 walls. In fact, the Department of Justice
- 5 recently mandated that the federal Bureau of
- 6 Prison Halfway House detainees be given controlled
- 7 access to cell phones to facilitate communication
- 8 with potential employers and family. With the
- 9 meshDetect, all deserving detainees can benefit
- 10 from wireless technology safely and securely.
- 11 Thank you.
- 12 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Mr. Gainsboro.
- 13 MR. GAINSBORO: Thank you. I just want
- 14 to begin very briefly by saying that I think the
- 15 FCC has done an excellent job in tackling a really
- l6 tough problem and I want to thank the FCC for
- 17 inviting me to speak today. So thank you, guys.
- 18 Keep up the good work.
- 19 The inmate telephone provides an
- 20 important and critical link to keep inmates in
- 21 contact with their friends and families. The
- 22 transition from freedom to confinement is a

248 challenging one. Unfortunately, the same inmate phone is also used to threaten and harm the public. Documented cases of such crimes include threatening, intimidating, blackmailing and murdering crime victims as well as jurors, witnesses, informants, public servants and others. 7 One important and proven technology that has provided significant public safety protection 9 for inmate calling systems is voice biometrics. 10 This technology was first deployed in the 11 corrections industry in the early 1990's and was 12 referred to as pre-call validation. These systems 13 required inmates to speak a specific pass phrase during an enrollment process that was then stored 15 in a voice print database. In order for an inmate to place call, the inmate would have to enter a 17 PIN and then say their specific pass phrase for 18 their call to be released to the telephone 19 network. 20 In 2007, a new continuous voice biometric identification technology referred to as 21

CVI was first launched in the corrections

- 1 industry. This technology developed originally
- 2 for the U.S. Department of Defense eliminated the
- 3 need for the inmate to say a specific pass phrase
- 4 and simply required a non word- specific 45 second
- 5 sample of inmate speech. A model of the inmate's
- 6 voice was created and stored in a voice-matching
- 7 database. The voice model was then subsequently
- 8 compared to each phone call placed from the
- 9 correctional facility.
- 10 CVI offered significant benefits over
- 11 the earlier 1990's pass phrase validation
- 12 technology because any unauthorized inmate
- 13 entering the phone conversation at any time could
- 14 be automatically identified as well.
- Prior to the advent of CVI, the industry
- 16 had no way to quantify the amount of PIN sharing
- 17 and stealing that was going on in correctional
- 18 facilities. As a result of the accuracy and
- 19 capabilities of the newer CVI technology, a test
- 20 was run on over 50 million inmate phone calls and
- 21 included correctional agencies with as few as 75
- 22 inmates all the way up to an agency that had more

250 than 13,000 inmates. The test revealed that greater than one out of every 15 phone calls placed by inmates was either a PIN misused or a PIN abused phone call. Once these calls could be automatically 5 identified, call reviewers could spend their time 6 just reviewing PIN abused calls. When inmates misuse or abuse PINs, there is a high correlation with criminal activities and correctional agency 10 policy violations. 11 The future of CVI for protecting the 12 public, inmates, and correctional staff for regular phone calls, video calling, Voice Over IP 13 calling, and cellular phone calls is very 14 15 promising. Under development is an entirely new generation of technology designed to further 17 protect the public. These developments include a 18 greater ability to zero in on the inmate phone 19 calls that are most likely to be involved in 20 criminal calling activities. 21 During recent beta tests of this new 22 improved and expanded technology at the New

251 Hampshire Department of Corrections, the system was able to identify within seconds a criminal phone call where one inmate ordered a hit on another inmate. As a result, the agency was able to have knowledge of the planned assault significantly before the assault took place. same beta test system has identified hundreds of similar types of calls. These calls have included 9 attempts to circumvent the justice system and 10 other criminal actions. In another important safety- related detection, the system identified 11 an inmate who was arranging with an outside party 12 13 for drugs and other contraband to be smuggled into the facility. Correctional staff used the system's 15 detection information to intercept the contraband and the co-conspirator was arrested. 17 As inmate phone rates decline, inmates will begin making more phone calls. The challenge 18 19 for the correctional agency and the industry will 20 be to find those calls where inmates are 21 threatening or attempting to harm the public. Due

to the fact that in excess of 20 percent of all

252 inmate PINs are misused or abused and that these inappropriate uses are highly correlated with threats and harm to the public safety, it is in the greater public interest to have the cost of these technological safeguards be included in the cost of providing inmate phone service. 7 In closing, continuous voice identification is one technology that will continue to offer an economically feasible method 10 of decreasing the risk of inmate calling to the 11 public, other inmates, and correctional staff while still allowing the inmate to communicate 12 13 with his friends and family. 14 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Mr. Gongaware. 15 MR. GONGAWARE: First, I'd like to thank the FCC for organizing and hosting this workshop, 17 and I'd like to thank them for allowing me to 18 talk. 19 My name is Grant Gongaware. I am the 20 founding engineer at Telmate and currently Telmate's chief architect. I have been 21 responsible for much of Telmate's software 22

253 development, hardware planning, and networking design. I would like to spend a couple of minutes discussing Telmate's development and implementation of new technologies. Then I'd like to spend a few minutes discussing the challenges we have and anticipating the costs associated with those new technologies. 8 First, the development and 9 implementation .: Telmate attributes most of its 10 success to the engineering of new VOIP and 11 broadband technologies and our freedom to introduce these to and compete in the 12 13 ICS marketplace. From a hardware perspective, we maintain three primary platforms: 15 One, a VOIP phone system which provides telephony service; two, shared media stations which operate over broadband and wireless networks; and three, 18 shared tablet computers which also operate over 19 broadband and wireless networks. Of these, I 20 think the media stations and the tablets offer the 21 most potential. 22 When available, inmates can use shared

254 stations and tablets to access what we refer to as either self-contained or supervised services. Self- contained services are one-sided. include games, streaming music, education, and law library tools, commissary ordering, and the Cloud storage needed to support these offerings. 7 Supervised services are multi-sided. Those include private text-based messaging 9 systems, photo sharing, internet browsing and 10 video visits. Obviously, supervised services 11 require a higher level of security because inmates can use them to send unsolicited communications, 12 13 and all supervised services therefore require manual review cues and automated biometrics. They 15 also require filtering, logging, tracking, 16 storage, searchability, and live access. 17 We offer new technologies through 18 innovative self-contained and supervised broadband 19 services. On the self-contained side, we are 20 developing access points for digital goods like 21 music albums, game upgrades and videos. We are

leading the push to Deleon and implement education

- 1 and e-learning tools. In fact, we are particularly
- 2 excited about a pilot program at Oregon DOC for a
- 3 learning lab. When complete, Oregon DOC inmates
- 4 will enjoy \$270,000.00 in new computing equipment
- 5 which will benefit inmates immediately. We are
- 6 also offering Cloud storage solutions for storing
- 7 music, contacts, games, and documents which will
- 8 remain available to the inmate after their
- 9 release.
- On the supervised service side, we offer
- 11 social media and video visitation services. Some
- 12 of these services are cutting edge and push the
- 13 comfortable limits of hardware and software.
- 14 Those services are also making contact management
- 15 particularly important. We are helping inmates
- 16 safely access existing content managing services
- 17 like Facebook, Yahoo, Google, and (Inaudible) and
- 18 Yahoo address books so they can stay connected
- 19 with friends and family.
- This brings me to my second point.
- 21 Telmate and the rest of the industry experience
- 22 huge challenges in anticipating and funding costs

256 associated with developing, implementing, and maintaining these new systems and services. I'll give three reasons: First, inmates find ways to misuse new product offerings adding hidden costs and increasing the cost of providing even the most basic services, for example, paperless commissary ordering. At some institutions, we offer paperless facilities where inmates can order commissary, submit other requests and grievances 10 electronically. It sounds simple but inmates 11 found a way to misuse the commissary ordering system as a communications back channel. We have 12 13 since spent more time and resources adding safeguards to the commissary ordering system than 15 we did building the original service itself just to prevent abuses. 17 The same is true about inmate calendars 18 where calendars were being used as a back channel and for profile photos that we use in our social 19 20 media program where rapidly-changing profile 21 pictures were misused as a communication device. 22 These simple examples highlight how

257 difficult and time-consuming and costly it is to engineer and innovate communication tools among 3 inmate populations. A second reason that we face difficulties funding often significant new 5 technology costs are storage and maintenance costs 6 for both self-contained and supervised services. We must maintain a record of these service offerings online often for years or decades which 9 10 is expensive. 11 Finally, a third difficulty we face in anticipating changing costs of regulatory 12 compliance. To date, Telmate has been successful 13 in large part because it's able to design, 14 15 implement, and deploy new and better products quickly. But while it's relatively small size and 17 advanced innovative product offerings have allowed 18 Telmate to compete successfully in the ICS market, 19 complicated and changing regulatory systems 20 jeopardize Telmate's ability to innovate. We fear 21 that forcing more attention towards the back 22 office will hinder our ability to innovate at the

258 forefront at a time when breakthroughs in technologies are permitting market forces to improve the price and service of inmate communications. For these reasons, the FCC should continue to let ICS providers innovate freely in 7 the broadband space where innovation can most improve inmate lives and where market forces have 9 encouraged companies like Telmate to introduce new 10 technology at lower prices. Thank you. 11 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Thank you. Mr. 12 Moore. MR. MOORE: Thank you. I'd also like to 13 thank the FCC for inviting us here. 15 And I'll talk a little bit about the evolution of inmate communications. And it's 17 always been a balance between convenience, 18 contact, and public safety starting with letters 19 and face-to-face visits evolving to standard 20 payphones that allowed an additional level of 21 contact and convenience moving to coinless collect 22 only phones when inmates were no longer allowed to

259 have coins, but these were phones with no 2 security. 3 And while it was focused early on in providing more contact and more convenience, each time we did that, as Mr. Gongaware said, it created potential security hold that had to be 7 filled. Each time you offer something new, you have to take into account the ways in which it may be misused which is how we got to inmate calling 10 systems with basic call controls, things like call 11 supervision, selective recording, PINs, allowed call lists, investigative features, these were 12 13 things that were a benefit to public safety and also security. 15 From there we moved to things like voicemail, voice biometrics, key word search, 17 transcription. These were things that allowed 18 both more contact. They improved inmate safety, I 19 think as Mr. Gainsboro explained, in regards to 20 the voice biometrics, an inmate trying to protect 21 their PIN number and the way voice biometrics 22 allows them to do that and from there, going to

260 things like intelligence tools, data analytics, location-based services, geo-fencing and contraband cell phone control; again, focused on public safety to reel in the beast, to get things back under control for the products that we had deployed. 7 Where we see things going now: wallmounted, multi-service kiosks. So we heard about the need for video calls for inmates with 10 disabilities. We've seen a desire for video 11 visitation, for other inmate services, for 12 programs, for educational content. 13 One of the things that I want to point out is those are needs and those things are not 15 something that is at a minimum cost to do the research and development. It is the inmate 17 telephone providers that bear the cost of the 18 development for the kiosk, to put that device on 19 the wall, to do the -- to provide the additional 20 bandwidth, to develop and do the software 21 development research for the applications that go in that device, for the additional maintenance and 22

261 support to support the device once it's on the 2 wall. 3 And these are all a benefit to the incarcerated individual and to their friends and It's more contact, it's better contact the contact that you get from a video visit versus what you would get from a simple telephone call or an email. And while it is better contact, email can be an effective tool in that you can get more 10 frequent contact perhaps at a lower cost. 11 Where we see the market going from there is to secure hand-held, multi-service devices as 12 13 Mr. Gongaware said. You know, how do you then take that thing off the wall and put it in the 15 hands of someone so they can use it at their convenience. So you again focus on more contact, more convenience. We believe that that would 18 reduce recidivism if you can improve that contact. 19 But it goes back to on one hand, while we want to 20 do that, the other hand is how do you actually pay 21 for that; how do you make that thing happen so 22 that you can give that inmate that benefit. And

262 there are a number of benefits to be had there. And so that's a thing that we continue to explore. 3 Thank you. MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: I'll start off the questions and welcome any questions from the web 5 or the room or Twitter. 7 Just curious about the RFP process or processes with the correctional facilities. Are you seeing requests for these types of services in 10 the RFPs or is it more of you all educating 11 correctional facilities as to your offerings? well have they been embraced by the correctional 12 institutions? Whoever wants to take that? 13 MR. MOORE: I would say it depends. 14 know, as we've talked about facilities are very different, their needs are very different, also their education and knowledge of what's available 18 to them is very different. So you've got some 19 customers that are at every trade show. They read 20 technology magazines. They think about how could 21 you take a thing that's in the consumer market and

bring that into the inmate market. They consult

- 1 with us about what is the best way to do that.
- 2 You've got others that keep a more simple approach
- 3 in regards to how they run a facility and may not
- 4 be aware.
- 5 So I would say we've seen everything
- 6 from very detailed specifications in an RFP to
- 7 absolutely nothing and an approach of well just
- 8 tell us everything that you could potentially
- 9 provide.
- 10 MR. GAINSBORO: Yeah. I would add in my
- 11 experience, similar to what Chris said, is that
- 12 you have a range and specifically when people are
- 13 dealing with serious issues and problems -- I can
- 14 give you a recent example where we had a potential
- 15 customer who was really -- wanted to provide debit
- 16 calling to their inmates in general. And what
- 17 happened was that funds were being put on but
- 18 through extortion and other means like that, funds
- 19 were -- you know, some large inmate would come to
- 20 smaller inmate or whatever and use force. And
- 21 what happened is that in two different cases, one
- 22 particular case one of our agencies was aware of

264 what we did and came to us and asked and actually added that to the RFP. 3 In another case, they were unaware of it and when they were made aware of it, all of a sudden, they said, "This can solve our problems and protect funds." And which in the context of what we've talked about today, this idea of protecting the inmate families as well as their funds and the inmates, I think, is where you see 10 it. So the answer is both. 11 MR. BYRNE: I think for our particular solution, the cell phone is seen as a risk and so 12 there is a lot of education and discussion around 13 the security of the system and seeing the cell 15 phone not as a risk but as a potential tool or reward and a way to enhance communication between 17 detainees and prisoners. So I would say that it's 18 more push than pull at this particular time for 19 this solution. 20 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Okay. Anybody 21 else? 22 MR. GONGAWARE: I would agree on -- for

265 Telmate's tablets that those who are unfamiliar with it do also consider it a risk. But as they become familiar with it, there is more interest. MODERATOR ZESIGER: Mr. Gongaware, you 5 mentioned the challenges to funding these new technologies, developing them and maintaining 6 them, fixing them when they get out and are misused in the marketplace. I wonder if we just go down the panel or whoever wants to address this 10 question but maybe get some different opinions on 11 how these things are funded. These all look 12 bright and promising. I'm sure there are risks 13 involved but we just -- I think it might be helpful to hear how you actually get these funded. MR. GONGAWARE: You know, I don't know 15 the details on how they're funded. I'm glad that 17 they are funded. I love building them and 18 Telmate, I think, has good opportunities to keep 19 building these in most of our contracts that we 20 service today. 21 MR. MOORE: From my standpoint, I mean if I understand your question, we fund them

- 1 internally. There is not a grant that we get.
- 2 There is not an external source of funds. It is
- 3 for us. GTL has a budget for research and
- 4 development, for engineering, for the staff. If
- 5 we have to go to a third party to provide a
- 6 particular service -- I think before Jay's company
- 7 was acquired, it was a service that you could get
- 8 from them. And so you may have to consult with a
- 9 third party or contract with a third party to get
- 10 that service. But again, I mean those are
- 11 internal costs to us.
- MR. BYRNE: For meshIP, this is -- we're
- 13 a startup so it's all self-funded internal
- 14 funding.
- MR. GAINSBORO: In our particular
- 16 situation, I'll tell you one quick little story.
- 17 We knew there was a problem in the industry where
- 18 inmates were communicating with other inmates even
- 19 though they were separated between facilities.
- 20 And it was a big problem. In fact, the Federal
- 21 Bureau of Prisons felt that one of the riots that
- 22 occurred back in the mid- 90's happened as a

- 1 result of -- they were coordinated riots in about
- 2 four or five facilities around the country, and
- 3 they said if you could ever help us solve this
- 4 problem, it would be wonderful. And so we kind of
- 5 talked about it but it was very, very expensive in
- 6 the mid-90's. And as we got smarter as a company
- 7 in how to build technology like this, we
- 8 eventually embarked on it, self -- self basically
- 9 invested in it.
- 10 And then the challenge, and I think this
- 11 would probably help the FCC a little bit was once
- 12 we built it, everybody said, "Well, we don't think
- 13 it's a real problem" or whatever. And so we ended
- 14 up -- we put in hundreds of thousands of dollars
- 15 and eventually, what we decided to do as a company
- 16 was to give it away. And it wasn't totally like
- 17 we were being altruistic. We felt we had invested
- 18 the money and it could be beneficial to the
- 19 industry. And actually, part of the technology
- 20 you heard about today that I referred to was that
- 21 technology.
- 22 So the answer to your question is that

268 funding usually for an entrepreneurial startup or whatever is usually some entrepreneur has some creative means of doing it and finds the money, takes it from some other place and 24:23 (inaudible). 6 MODERATOR ZESIGER: The flip side of the 7 funding question then -- and again, my question was really about internal funding but also impact 9 on end user rates, to what extent to expenditures 10 made here impact end user rates, and so maybe just 11 one more question, follow-up on that point. And then -- well, start with that. 12 MR. MOORE: You know, so if we have a 13 thing that we've developed internally, it's 15 something new and we have to recover the cost of 16 that, then there may be a rate impact in the near 17 term for that. If it's a thing that is specific 18 to a particular opportunity and it is a service or 19 feature that we have to get from a third party and 20 we pay that third party for it and it's directly 21 attributed to that opportunity, then yes, that 22 could be a component of that rate as well. So --

269 and that's an important point. 2 It's not that -- I know folks think about -- we've heard a lot about basic telephone service and making the call and it's recorded and that's what you've got. I think as Mr. Smith said, there is a lot more to it than that. know, that's as basic as an FM radio in a car. There is so much more that goes into so when you 9 layer in voice biometrics, you layer in geo-10 fencing, location-based services, some of these 11 other things that are new and emerging technologies that require licensing from third 12 parties to provide to keep that public safety but 13 also to increase contact, those are things that 15 would be a part of that rate. 16 MR. GAINSBORO: I think in general, most 17 of us would allocate a certain percentage, 18 relatively small compared to our overall, but a 19 certain percentage of our annual expenditures to 20 an R&D type of, you know -- does that answer your 21 question? 22 Sure. That's more MODERATOR ZESIGER:

270 the corporate overhead kind of aspect of it. last follow-up question on the rate side, on the costs. Give us an idea of samples of the types of prices for these interesting new technologies you offer to end users? 6 MR. GONGAWARE: For Telmate, like our 7 messaging service, I think, averages 25 cents a message which is a text message, like an average text and other interesting things. Photos are a 10 little bit more. They're like averaging 26 cents. 11 A video visit is -- well, a local video visit is almost always free which is interesting, but then 12 we offer remote visits at a lot of our facilities 13 and those average about 30 cents a minute for a 15 remote video visit. 16 MR. BYRNE: For meshDetect, for the 17 wireless calling, we can offer the permanent rate 18 underneath the rate caps that you've stipulated 19 for long distance. Unlike the traditional wall 20 phones, it's a flat rate very similar to what 21 you're used to with your personal cell phone.

the same permanent rate no matter whether you're

- 1 calling across the street or across the country.
- 2 And unique, I think, for this service vis-a-vis
- 3 the payphone service is we don't charge any per
- 4 call charge. We understand as you use your cell
- 5 phone, your calls would drop occasionally. That's
- 6 the nature of wireless. So we think it would be
- 7 unfair to charge a per call upfront fee and then
- 8 if that call drops, you're going to have to redial
- 9 that call and take another hit at that. So the
- 10 effective rate, it can, in many cases, be less
- 11 expensive than what a prisoner would be paying on
- 12 a traditional payphone.
- 13 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Great. I have a
- 14 question from the web and they actually beat me to
- 15 one that I was going to ask you about. We just
- 16 had this news piece put in the record and it is
- 17 about how Knox County, Tennessee is replacing in-
- 18 person visits entirely rather than supplementing
- 19 them with video visitations. So instead of even
- 20 having the option for an in-person visit if you're
- 21 able to get to the facility, you're required to do
- 22 video visitation.

272 1 Do you all have any opinions about that practice? Do steps need to be taken to guarantee that there is a balance between the accessibility of video visitation, particularly for, as our panelist Talila Lewis told us, hearing impaired Is there a balance needed between that accessibility and the actual human connection to see your person in the flesh, any opinions on 9 that? 10 MR. MOORE: From my standpoint, you know, we generally let the market and the customer 11 drive what we do there. You know, we focus on 12 13 filling a product need. We're not experts on the sociology of how inmates interact with families, 15 so we kind of look to them and the Chief that was here earlier to give us guidance on what's working 17 for them in that regard and then we react and 18 evolve to that. 19 MR. GONGAWARE: Similar for Telmate. 20 The facilities decide how they want to handle the 21 visits. But in the case where they do have video 22 visits, it's interesting that they can do more

273 simultaneous visits at a time and they can have longer visit hours, early in the morning, later at night, you know, off the normal work hours which is, I think, beneficial to everyone. 5 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Okay. You have something else? 7 MODERATOR ZESIGER: Maybe just a followup question to the whole panel. On the impact of 9 these technologies on inmate behavior, does it 10 help in terms of security or safety internal to 11 the jails? 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would say both. 13 I think that in some ways, they've helped; in some ways, they've hurt. We use the example of when, 15 say, debit phone calling was first introduced, so when you went from collect only and that was the 17 only way a call could go out to debit, inmates had 18 funds, inmates had control of their calls, inmates 19 had a PIN number that they would enter, and this 20 is what Jay alluded to, I think it helped in that 21 they had the ability to make more calls, to make 22 calls to cell phones that they couldn't have done

274 under collect because we didn't have collect billing arrangements. But what it did is it introduced a safety problem with the inmate in that they may be strong-armed to provide their PIN number to someone else so that person could use So it was both sides of it. It helped in one way; it hurt in another. 8 So then we look at technology to say 9 what can we do to solve the hurtful part of that 10 and then as we solve that, at some point, someone 11 figures out another way and you continue to address the problems in that way. 12 13 MR. GAINSBORO: I can address that specifically. So when we go in -- and the process

- 15 that happens with continuous voice biometrics is
- 16 you go in and you do an enrollment. And normally,
- 17 what happens is that you take your -- the
- 18 enrollment people that go in are normally escorted
- 19 by correctional officers. When our people go into
- 20 a living unit, basically the first thing they say
- 21 is that you now can have you funds protected. And
- 22 prior to that, before this technology goes in,

- 1 they know their funds are subject to abuse or
- 2 misuse or whatever. And what happens is -- and
- 3 its' funny that you mention Knox County and that
- 4 example because Knox County happens to be one of
- 5 our customers through Pay-Tel. And it turns out
- 6 that they love the technology because they were
- 7 having this problem and now they could identify
- 8 which inmates were actually stealing or strong-
- 9 arming other inmates' funds.
- 10 So the answer to your question is that
- 11 the technology, when used appropriately, actually
- 12 benefits significantly inmates and the inmates'
- 13 families.
- MR. BYRNE: I have a quick point on
- 15 that. There's been study after study that's shown
- 16 that more frequent contact with family reduces
- 17 recidivism so the ability to use a cell phone,
- 18 have a longer conversation because somebody's not
- 19 waiting in line to use the phone after, you're
- 20 restricted to 15 minutes because it is a shared
- 21 use resource, will facilitate that improved
- 22 contact. Also, by using a cell phone, you would

276 be able to have privacy. Now I'm not talking secrecy because every call is recorded and can be monitored and listened to. But to have a little privacy, to be able to have a personal conversation with a loved one, talk about your health, talk about problems at home without, you 7 know, everybody around you I think would also be very beneficial. 9 There was a prison in the UK called Lowden Grange where they had a huge problem with 10 11 contraband cell phones and they installed -actually installed a phone in each cell. And what 12 they found from installing a phone in each cell --13 they'd hardwired it, which is a very expensive way 15 to go about this -- was that recidivism was There were fewer fights, less incidents 17 of self-harming, and they even had fewer positive 18 drug tests after making this change. So there is 19 clear proof that increased communication does help 20 with behavior and recidivism. 21 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: You have another 22 one?

277 1 MR. MOORE: And on that point, I would like to add one thing there and just one thing to point out, that while additional access or more access to those devices is of value, there is also a balance to how do you pay for those devices. most instances, it's not the facility or the end user or the inmate that's actually buying the device that they're using to make that communication. So another part of that is what is 10 the right way to get that thing paid for that you 11 can put it into their hands. 12 MR. GONGAWARE: I wanted to mention that 13 Oregon DOC did a study after Telmate installed its videophones which included visitation and 14 15 messaging and paperless grievances. And violence was -- violent incidents were down significantly. 17 I don't have the number with me. I can follow-up 18 with that but their -- their did have a study on 19 that. 20 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Kind of following

up, do you think that new -- the desire for new

technologies is for -- because there is a problem

21

278 that needs to be fixed and that technology is the way to fix it? Or is it decreased costs of the technologies? Or is it a combination of the both, or? 5 MR. MOORE: From our standpoint, it's definitely not reduced cost because deploying 6 7 these things, it is additional cost. It's the cost to hire engineers. It's the cost to source 9 third-party software. It's the cost to put these 10 solutions together. So it's generally a business problem in the industry, for us at least, that 11 drives this new technology or it may be an 12 13 opportunity that we see. When I say a business problem, that doesn't mean a problem that the jail 15 is having. It may be the problem is how do we create an environment that inmates can have more 17 contact, or how do we create an environment that 18 inmates can get more access to educational 19 content. We've talked very little about wall-20 mounted kiosks or handheld devices that have that 21 capability, but a lot of that comes from that 22 business problem which is how do you educate

		279
1	offenders to help reduce recidivism, how do you	
2	get them more contact to help reduce recidivism,	
3	how do you get them a job skill to help reduce	
4	recidivism.	
5	MR. GONGAWARE: I'm not sure about the	
6	level of desire for new technologies but we're	
7	definitely building lots of new technologies. I	
8	love building it. It's fun.	
9	We do have requests from facilities.	
10	They want certain features. They want	
11	enhancements. And we have some of our own	
12	interesting ideas that we work on. So I don't	
13	know what the true source of all the desire is.	
14	MR. GAINSBORO: I think I've always been	
15	personally very driven by solving people's	
16	problems, so I would say the vast majority of our	
17	the technology needs and stuff comes from, you	
18	know, people that are having really significant	
19	problems and they need them solved. So does that	
20	address your question?	
21	MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Yes, thank you.	
22	MR. BYRNE: I think in our specific	

- 1 case, it's really about the problem that was --
- 2 continues to grow and that's contraband cell
- 3 phones. And as the phones get smaller and harder
- 4 to find and more and more money is spent trying to
- 5 detect them and take them out of the jail, how do
- 6 you address the real demand. And if its' all
- 7 crime-based conversations, then this makes no
- 8 sense. But it's pretty clear that it's not
- 9 because when they'll put in managed access jammers
- 10 that eliminate the use of contraband cell phones,
- 11 the use of the wall phones goes up. So if I was
- 12 using that cell phone in order to have a
- 13 conversation I didn't want monitored or recorded,
- 14 I'm not going to go to the wall phone and use that
- 15 vehicle. So it's clear that there's a demand for
- 16 enhanced conversation and maybe lower rates as
- 17 well.
- 18 MODERATOR ZESIGER: So, you all are the
- 19 ones who are looking to the future and trying to
- 20 push us all into the future in terms of new types
- 21 of services and technologies for inmates and their
- 22 friends and families, so you have a special kind

281 of front row seat to the crystal ball, if you will, from your own perspectives of the future and what's next. It might be interesting for us to just hear from you, if you have any thoughts about where is all this headed? What's the next generation? What's the next big thing that you see coming? MR. MOORE: For us, I think it's where I 9 ended the evolution of inmate communications and 10 it is the handheld device. So all of the things 11 that are being developed in regards to applications to benefit the inmate, things like 12 13 email, like educational content, job skills and other things, how do you then get that into an 15 environment that they can use more readily. because we talked about if it's stuck on the wall, 17 that may not be convenient. So how do you get it 18 to a place that they can use it regularly at an 19 affordable cost that benefits them. 20 MR. GONGAWARE: For friends and family, 21 we're developing Smartphone apps and Tablet apps 22 to make contact with inmates much more accessible,

282 much easier. I can see that we'll continue improving those apps. I mean they're easy to update. We don't charge for these apps. And then on the inmate side, I'm 5 thinking a little further out there but I can see Cloud storage being important for them. People have personal digital goods out there that they need to have access to and music they bought, books they bought, and we need to provide a 10 solution to get them in and out of the facility 11 safely. 12 MR. GAINSBORO: You know, it's 13 interesting you said "we're pushing." I don't feel like we're pushing. I think -- you know, 15 just a distinction, I think we're being pulled because, you know, I've been in the industry for 17 25 years, maybe more than these guys -- I don't 18 know -- 25 years now and I've watched what 19 happens. And what happens is we introduce new 20 technology and it's to solve a problem, and then all of a sudden, what happens is that there's a 21 22 new problem that evolves and it's like an arms

283 race that continues to go back and forth. 2 I think specifically where we're focused in the future is the company really wants to automatically identify as quickly as possible and as economically as possible which calls are representing the greatest public risk. And I think without taking that into account, we really are doing, from my perspective, the public an 9 injustice because to just simply look at this 10 problem through well, we'll just give them new 11 technology I think, personally, is somewhat irresponsible. AND I think we need -- that's an -12 13 - you know, we're dealing with an inmate population. We're not dealing with, you know --14 15 and granted, the vast majority of them are fine but that small percentage creates a lot of risk, 17 and there's a lot of things you can point to in 18 this country, you know, about examples of that. 19 So we're focused on how do we make 20 inmate calling safer in the future and that's what 21 we're doing. 22 MR. BYRNE: Without discounting the

284 risk, it is a consumer market of a sort. detainees will eventually be back out and hopefully better off having served their time. And so you need to give them the tools to continue to improve themselves, to educate themselves, to stay connected to family and society, look for 7 jobs in an automated way as much as possible just like you see outside the prison walls. 9 technology does reach but the challenge is to make 10 sure that it's used appropriately, properly and 11 its manageable and monitorable but eventually, they will have devices like we all do. 12 13 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: I will give you all an opportunity to say any final words. If not, I 15 think that is a good question to end on where 16 we're going next, and if there is anything else 17 anybody wants to take the opportunity to say or --18 MR. MOORE: (Inaudible) time today. 19 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: Thank you. Thank 20 you very much. Great. 21 (Applause.) 22 MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: We have closing

		285
1	remarks. We'll just if we could just turn	
2	around and Kalpak will	
3	MODERATOR GUDE: Sorry.	
4	MODERATOR ENGLEDOW: close us out for	
5	the day.	
6	MODERATOR GUDE: Thought it would be a	
7	little quicker instead of having everyone	
8	relocate. First of all, I wanted to thank	
9	everybody for coming. Obviously, this is a	
10	complicated issue. It's more complicated even	
11	than we thought when we first started. There are	
12	obviously very critical issues of for inmates	
13	and their families and friends, the impact of high	
14	rates to them. There are security issues. There	
15	are jail issues and prison issues. This is a	
16	complicated set of things we deal with and all of	
17	you coming here, participating, sharing with us	
18	your knowledge and expertise improves our	
19	understanding and frankly, I hope and believe it	
20	will improve the end product of what comes out of	
21	this process.	
22	So let me start by saying again, thank	

286 you to everyone for coming. I particularly want to thank Congresswoman Holmes Norton for making the time to come here and again elevate the importance of this issue at a different level, at a political level but at an understanding level that really impacts people. 7 Also want to thank, obviously, Chairman Wheeler and Commissioners Clyburn and Rosenworcel 9 for really leading the effort at the Commission to 10 move this process. As you all know, this is one 11 that has been sitting here for over 10 years. Commissioner Clyburn, when she was acting 12 13 Chairwoman, drove the process to really get it moving again and she deserves an enormous amount of credit for taking on this tough challenge. 16 I finally want to also thank the great 17 staff that I have in my division at the Pricing 18 Policy Division in the Wireline Telecommunications 19 Bureau and the Consumer and Government Affairs 20 Bureau at the FCC as well as the AV staff, the 21 social media team, our interpreters, everyone

who's involved. It really does take a small

287 village to make all of this happen. 1 2 Finally, I wanted to thank Darrell Baker, Elias Diggins and Kevin Landy. I'm calling you all out as government officials and representatives from different parties. here and share your knowledge and expertise with 7 us, Darrel, you traveled from Alabama; Elias, you came all the way from Colorado; and Kevin walked 9 across the street. But in all cases, we really 10 appreciate folks coming in and all of the 11 panelists and the audience as well. This really has been instructive to us and will move the 12 13 process forward. But thank you very much. 14 appreciate it. 15 Please stay involved in the process. This is not the end by any means. The Commission 17 intends to continue. We will probably have 18 another opportunity for the public to comment. 19 hope you all do. And continue to be involved and 20 help us and guide us move in the right direction. 21 Thank you again. 22 (Whereupon, at 4:12, the workshop was adjourned.)

		288
1	CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC	
2	I, CHAZ BENNETT, the officer before whom the	
3	foregoing hearing was taken, do hereby certify	
4	that the testimony appearing in the foregoing	
5	hearing was taken by me in audio recording and	
6	thereafter reduced to typewriting under my	
7	supervision; that said transcription is a true	
8	record of the proceedings; that I am neither	
9	counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of	
10	the parties to the action in which this deposition	
11	was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative	
12	or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by	
13	the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise	
14	interested in the outcome of this action.	
15		
16		
17		
18	CHAZ BENNETT	
19	Digital Reporter	
20		
21		
22		

	,	
1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION	289
2		
3		
4	I, LUCY T. TURNBULL, hereby certify that I am	
5	not the Court Reporter who reported the following	
6	proceeding and that I have typed the transcript of	
7	this proceeding using the Court Reporter's notes	
8	and recordings.	
9		
10	The foregoing/attached transcript is a true,	
11	correct, and complete transcription of said	
12	proceeding.	
13		
14	Jacy /u-	
15	Date DOCY T. TURNBULL, CET-743	
16	Transcriptionist	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

	verification of the district restriction of the second of	
1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION	290
2		
3		
4	I, CORINNE YANOSY, hereby certify that I am	
5	not the Court Reporter who reported the following	
6	proceeding and that I have typed the transcript of	
7	this proceeding using the Court Reporter's notes	
8	and recordings.	
9		
10	The foregoing/attached transcript is a true,	
11	correct, and complete transcription of said	
12	proceeding.	
13		
14	Pami el	
15	Date CORINNE YANGSY	
16	Transcriptionist	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

	1 46		
\$	\$2.75 186:15	\$8 79:22	10-minute 119:18
\$.05 52:17	\$20 63:16 93:13	\$8.33 139:2	11.4 198:16
\$.17 49:20 50:1	\$20.00 232:13	\$8.50 50:10	11.6 184:5
84:12	\$24.00 226:8,15	\$9.95 155:10	11.95 120:15
\$.19 49:21	\$25.00 150:11	162:7,20	11th 49:22 68:11
\$.21 16:18	\$26 183:8	\$9.99 82:13	184:12
\$.25 16:19	\$270,000.00 255:4	\$900,000 54:8	12 25:9 38:11
\$.33 49:19 84:11	\$3.00 163:17	\$92.00 151:11	139:8 154:18 165:6 239:3
\$1 27:1	164:4,11		103.0 239.3 1200 122:13
\$1.00 163:3	\$3.15 138:21	0 0 203:5	1200 122.13 125 244:11
\$1.22 226:5	\$3.49 119:20	0 203.3	
\$1.40 226:7	\$3.50 185:10	1	12th 1:14
\$10.00 153:19	\$31,000 15:18	1 5:4 68:12 92:17	13,000 192:14 250:1
\$10.00-\$15.00	\$4 14:9 49:18	195:2	1300 184:22
150:13	\$4.20 185:9	1,000 202:12 203:11 212:2	135,000 182:13
\$10.95 162:21	\$4.45 186:15		14 146:13 237:12
\$100 150:13	\$4.75 185:9	1,500 55:22	14.3 198:16
\$100.00	\$40 55:16	1,800 56:1	1499 138:7
138:16,17,19 148:22 150:5,21	\$40.00 138:20	1.4 199:1 238:4	15 50:10,13 58:9
151:10	150:22	1.5 201:17	77:6 78:14 79:1
\$11.00 169:22	\$40.00-\$50.00	1:00 10:17	93:13 132:19
\$11.95 162:19,21	150:14	10 85:8 111:15 138:5 153:11	138:8 153:22 185:4,6,20
170:2	\$400,000.00	192:22 194:22	193:11 209:13
\$14.99 82:13	228:14	195:2 197:3	226:1 231:18
155:10	\$5.00 120:14 162:19	198:19 199:2	250:2 275:20
\$15 50:13 78:14	\$5.1 58:4	200:18 203:1 207:15 208:16	15,000 244:17
\$15.00 153:1,19		219:3 222:10	150 184:19
\$150 201:19	\$5.19 183:4	235:14 237:12	15-minute 126:6
\$17 14:8	\$5.50 162:16 185:8	241:8 286:11	182:18 183:2,12
\$17.30 183:12	\$5.59 119:21	100 39:18 139:9 201:15 202:11	186:13,14
\$17.34 183:2	\$5.95 155:11	201:13 202:11	15-person 189:3
\$2 78:15 79:1	162:13	1000 197:12	15th 126:8
\$2.10 119:19,21	\$6.60 183:13	1001 202:13	16 30:12 116:17 192:11 200:13
\$2.25 183:2	\$7.75 50:10	101 202:11 203:10	208:22

	1 46	'	
165 185:20	2009 25:10 116:12	26th 38:21	400 172:6
17 184:13,16	201 127:8	27 154:18	400,000 15:6
187:3 203:12	156:8,15	276 156:10,16	192:1
210:22 211:2	157:11,18	157:4,18	440 184:21
217:13	2010 191:15	28 202:21	445 1:14
17th 18:4 129:1	2011 55:4		45 249:4
228:15,19	183:9,13	3	46 197:13
18 165:6 209:13 217:17 226:1	2012 53:20 131:9	3 7:2 153:11	10 177.13
1800 192:13	164:22 244:18	3,000 176:9	5
	2012-2013 228:7	3.49 119:16	5 146:11 198:22
1889 244:6	2013 13:15 68:6	30 15:5 17:2	207:11,20
18th 39:16	99:19	154:12,18 172:1	209:1,14,16
19 131:2	2014 1:10 15:2	270:14	235:13
1970s 63:6	184:12	300 192:13 201:12	5,000 201:14
1980s 63:8	20554 1:15	300,000 36:7	5.65 173:19
1990's 248:11	20-minute	32 124:5 155:3	5.95 173:18
249:11	226:8,14	34 155:3 211:10	50 51:7 87:19
	20-year 63:8	34,000 191:21	104:3 189:11
2	21 94:1 146:7	35 185:10 193:12	201:15 239:7 240:17 249:20
2 6:4	169:19 210:21	231:20	
2,000 53:8 182:14	211:1 217:11,12,14,16	37,000 235:18	50,000 200:9
2.3 197:10	,17	, i	500 41:7 105:20 131:4
2.7 15:22	21,000 55:19	38 123:4 152:15 153:3 186:15	
2:00 10:18 174:17	214:8	380 44:5	50th 31:2
20 28:19 58:9,14	2200 213:17,18	39 36:2	511 203:14
176:6 242:15	235:12,17	39 30:2	53 185:13
251:22	2300-bed 214:7	4	54 185:10
20,000 202:13,14	24 172:8 201:22	4 8:6	54,000 182:13
200 172:1 191:22	24:23 268:4	4.8 84:21 100:2	55 185:9
232:15	25 146:7 169:20	4:12 1:11 287:22	56 185:3,8
2005 15:5 169:21	171:21 201:20	40 26:18 124:5,7	5-cent 208:19
2007 169:20	242:5 270:7	129:6,20	5the 226:14
183:9,13 248:20	282:17,18	139:21,22	220.11
2008 161:12	250 201:11 232:18	151:17,18	6
195:12	26 197:9 200:8	153:21,22 154:1	6,500 182:14
2008-2009 228:3	270:10	173:8 189:10 192:15	60 109:8 139:15
		174.13	

	1 4 <u>2</u>	,	
188:15	208:12	absence 110:12	accessing 84:6
62 183:14	88 85:9	absent 208:6	accommodate
625 172:2	888-CALLFCC	absolutely 207:19	90:19 92:2
650 197:15,16	34:4	210:6 213:21	accommodation
67 55:15	89,000 203:7	219:17 220:11	35:14 42:22
	208:12	235:10 241:14	43:1
67.8 15:8		263:7	accommodations
69 182:21	9	abuse 41:22 83:11	42:4
6-bed 214:6	9 1:10 146:13	95:4 148:3 223:4 250:8	accomplish
	9:30 1:11	275:1	227:18
7	90 151:10 154:16	abused 250:4,7	accomplishes
7 169:16 171:21	90's 266:22	252:1	153:6
208:18,21 209:1,13,17	92 151:11 154:16	abuses 256:16	accomplishment 106:5
217:22 226:5	99 119:14 126:18	abusive 198:7	according 109:2
70 51:9 186:13	183:5	199:15	186:10
203:15	9in 164:22	accept 56:6,13	accordingly 162:1
70's 205:13,14		99:14	183:11 193:7
244:8	A	accepted 166:7	account 26:18
75 29:15 38:13	abilities 87:8	access 29:4	40:7 117:9,11
72:5 249:21	ability 65:16	37:3,16 40:4,6	118:7 124:5,6
76.6 15:10	78:11 80:15	41:3,8 42:1,2,20	125:4,8,21
7-cent 208:19	250:18	43:8 59:4 70:12	133:4,6,19,20
	257:20,22	87:4 94:4,14	134:4 135:5,8,9
8	273:21 275:17	104:12 167:16	143:13
8 203:15	able 22:19 33:5,10	194:9 195:5,10 206:13 244:4	147:17,18 148:2 167:15 170:10
80 139:20,21	34:1 38:3 58:13	245:16 246:2,21	171:18 174:1
153:10 201:5	79:5 85:13	247:7	229:14 259:8
	86:12 89:7 104:13 122:3	254:1,16,20	283:7
80,000 201:13	104:13 122:3	255:16 277:3,4	accountability
80-85 134:11	136:19 142:9	278:18 280:9	48:16
81 183:5	144:15 149:22	282:8	accounting/
82 36:6	151:11 152:3	accessed 193:20	economic 229:6
84 91:19 116:15	158:19 159:3,14	accessibility 39:9	accounts 118:5
85 200:7,12	168:21 178:4	272:3,7	135:4 163:18
86 204:17	207:16,21 215:19 219:9	accessible	172:7 181:15
	234:6 236:15	37:10,18 38:13	220:14
87 183:1	251:2,4 257:14	46:9 71:19	accreditation
87,000 203:7	271:21 276:1,4	281:22	131:8
,	2,1.212,0.1,1		131.0

		,	
accuracy 249:18	251:10	added 27:12,19	136:18 245:18
accurate 119:10	active 44:4 114:17	69:7 264:2	adept 123:12
165:11	245:13	addiction 220:22	adequate 207:17
achieve 86:12,13	actively 29:16	221:3	208:2
145:9	134:20	adding 256:4,13	adjourned 287:22
achievement	activities 37:17	addition 15:13	adjust 26:1 66:10
45:13	42:20 46:8	16:3 17:3 45:3	81:15 90:13
acknowledge 30:9	177:21 250:9,20	105:10 184:4	admin 119:3
acknowledged	activity 34:16	193:17 224:9	133:12
17:16 99:9	177:18 245:3	246:19	
ACLU 53:5	Act's 14:13	additional 5:5	administration 190:12 211:3
	actual 29:1 100:21	13:16 17:18	
acquired 266:7	108:5 170:21	18:10 19:15	administrations
across 37:14	181:20,22 186:4	24:10 28:20 29:17 45:16	245:14
38:16,22	187:17 195:18		administrative
39:11,18 41:20	272:7	112:5,7 117:4 124:17 184:7	53:11 133:13
60:2 70:12 72:7	actually 21:17	193:1 194:10,12	210:12,17 212:8
77:14 84:21	28:6 31:1,16,19	208:6 224:19	administrator
89:21 126:16	33:11 35:20	246:22 258:20	179:18
131:4,17 142:2	36:5 38:7,14	260:19,22 277:3	administrators
147:5 152:8	40:6 63:2 65:12	278:7	95:13 176:21
176:2 178:17	68:3 70:15	Additionally	178:17 179:9
191:3,22 214:18 215:9 222:21	72:10,15 75:9	29:12 117:16	201:16 214:22
244:16 271:1	76:22 77:1 78:6	119:22	220:13 224:4
287:9	95:18 98:21		administrator's
	104:9 128:2,20	address 22:8	214:1
act 19:3,7,8 55:3	151:5 152:21	23:12 57:14	-
61:12,13 64:20	156:15 169:14	61:20 83:15	admittedly 244:9
102:13 127:7,9 156:8 184:17	217:13,15	158:14 179:8 181:2 255:18	adopt 165:11
204:14	238:7,22 261:20	265:9 274:12,13	adopted 16:17
	264:1 265:14	279:20 280:6	18:18 19:9
acted 162:1 163:8	267:19 271:14		102:16 163:16
acting 31:12 107:1	275:8,11 276:12	addressed 12:15	164:11 169:16
108:16 113:8	277:7	25:19 26:1,17 42:15 58:17,21	adopting 44:12
156:9 286:12	Adams 45:8	42:15 58:17,21 121:21 128:17	48:13
action 14:11 19:11	add 29:17 76:20	139:10,11	
21:10 38:19	78:7 94:10	166:16 219:22	ADP 202:12 203:4
43:13 56:8,10	103:18 154:3	222:10	208:14,15 211:7 216:1 229:17
89:11 126:21	200:13 204:16		
288:10,14	226:2 263:10	addresses 127:7 136:16 156:10	Advance 2:20
actions 95:3	277:2		5:16 24:18
		addressing 23:15	

	1 48	,	
advanced 47:4	107:12,17	25:7,10 28:4	64:22 120:4
257:17	against 41:5 42:19	30:10,14	132:8 159:21
advancing 44:2	66:4 93:19	66:1,17 67:20	197:13 211:22
48:9	189:22	80:22 81:2 82:3	215:9,15
		85:20 86:3,5,6	221:18,21
advantage 89:22	agencies 30:4	90:4 91:18	allowed 69:18
166:1 180:3	59:12 72:20	92:17 95:11	119:11 140:19
advent 152:21	73:8 100:11	114:15 116:12	150:8,11 168:6
249:15	178:3 181:7	117:13	177:22 257:17
advertising	187:12 191:7	118:10,14 119:1	258:20,22
173:11	249:21 263:22	121:10 128:8,20	259:11,17
	agency 11:17,19	130:3 131:15	· ·
Advisor 2:18 5:14	12:7 14:5 18:9	132:16 133:16	allowing 233:9
24:16	20:12 31:8,11	135:16 136:2,4	234:21 243:19
advocacy 43:22	32:6 56:18	146:19 154:21	252:12,17
64:4 84:16 93:4	73:22 112:7	155:4	allows 18:9 180:3
advocate 40:19	178:21 191:5	161:2,6,19	237:6 240:6
61:17 66:4 74:6	249:22 250:9	162:2,17 163:9	246:6 259:22
220:8	251:4,19	167:14 170:8	alluded 273:20
advocated 44:8	agency's 191:19	171:3 172:18	all-volunteer 71:4
	233:16	175:9 287:7	
advocates 3:3	agent 141:14	Alabama's 18:17	alone 27:10
5:20 24:21 39:3	159:17 167:11	26:13 117:1	116:16 223:9
72:14 106:10	171:18	120:4	244:18
236:13	172:13,21	albums 254:21	alphabetically
advocating 72:14	· ·		243:16
80:11	ago 20:21 33:12	Aleks 3:6 6:13 7:15 114:15	already 51:11
Affairs 19:21	37:7 100:1 102:20 126:15	122:8 126:10	64:14 76:9
286:19	220:15	145:3,12 149:1	92:18 105:17
		151:2,16 154:15	114:14 118:21
affects 78:5	agreed 118:21	161:21 175:14	123:14 126:3
affirmative 34:22	156:18 175:10	187:19 226:18	145:15 150:14
afford 53:12	234:16		173:19 175:8
110:14 178:4	agreements 29:18	Aleks's 152:16	224:10
affordable 14:21	162:16	171:19	alright 145:3
16:14 37:10	ahead 22:1 35:6	Alex 3:13 7:14	S
40:4 46:10	36:14 103:11	129:5 165:14	alternative
89:20 193:9	165:14	175:13 180:21	27:8,10 162:13
245:6 281:19		236:10 241:14	altogether 178:8
	ain't 139:4	allies 97:19	altruistic 267:17
afternoon 60:12	Alabama 2:14,17	allocate 159:19,22	
68:2 111:22	5:12 6:12 7:9	269:17	am 1:11 13:5 18:16 30:20
166:18 175:22	13:21 18:19	207.17	
afterwards	22:6 24:15	allow 13:20 28:5	31:10 86:15

		,	
113:10 126:19	ancillary 6:4	30:7	apples 235:20
127:2 129:2	12:14 17:21	antitrust 30:2	applicability
252:19 288:8,11	22:5 26:5,16		190:3
289:4 290:4	57:7,16 114:3,8	anxiety 16:3	
Amazon 170:3	115:11 117:6,20	anybody 78:22	applicable 118:19
	121:17	236:17 264:20	149:19 195:14
America 109:15	122:18,19	284:17	application 119:1
112:18	123:4,6	anymore 241:5	applications
American 3:12	127:8,16,22	•	260:21 281:12
7:12 39:22	128:4 129:5	anyone 10:10 39:3	
42:14 47:12	140:5 145:4,8,9	62:11 119:3	applied 164:5
85:11 106:14	146:6,14,18	145:12 161:21	applies 59:8
113:11 175:13	156:21	163:7 208:9	178:12
176:7,13,14	158:11,16	209:6 219:5	apply 115:15
America's 177:4	160:16 164:16	233:2	119:7 142:2
180:19	167:3 168:22	anything 11:8	185:15
	169:4,7,10,19	39:8 112:10	
among 37:12 40:2	171:8 193:1	117:5 167:19	applying 189:15
55:14 257:2	234:12	234:15 241:17	appointed 105:14
amongst 159:19	and/or 30:2	284:16	appreciate 113:17
178:16	anew 221:20	anytime 147:6	154:15 171:19
amount 73:22		-	236:6,7
91:2,4 100:6	Angeles 55:12,18	anyway 77:6 140:4 143:3	287:10,14
120:7 124:5	anniversary 10:20	216:22	· ·
129:7 138:12	31:2		appreciated 139:12
153:8 154:19	announced 130:8	anyways 160:14	
226:2 249:16	186:11	apart 160:6 168:4	appreciation
286:14		apologize 208:9	13:18
amounts 72:22	annual 122:8		appreciative
151:14 152:15	151:20 269:19	appealing 246:16	108:9
analogy 80:5	annually 239:3	appear 44:15	approach 72:19
	answer 84:10 88:1	appearance 86:5	109:21 117:1
analysis 99:15	116:21 163:5	appearing 288:4	169:9 180:16
157:21 228:6	169:14 174:10		219:14 227:11
229:6 230:22	209:18,19	appears 187:7	263:2,7
Analyst 2:21 5:18	212:17 215:13	applaud 39:4	approached
24:19	264:10 267:22	58:22	217:15,20
analytics 260:1	269:20 275:10	applauded 193:8	r
analyze 13:14	answered 226:16		approaches 110:2 204:7
•	anticipating 253:6	Applause 13:3 20:9 22:15	
analyzed 92:6	255:22 257:12	20:9 22:15 104:22 106:17	approaching
analyzing 15:4		112:19 113:18	151:17
29:21 158:12	anti-competitive	243:6 284:21	appropriate
		4 4 3.0 404.41	

<u></u>	ع ۲ ۵ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰ ۰)	
61:11,14 82:22 83:1,2,11 91:7 113:1,12	arms 282:22 Army 64:12	7:13 48:3 85:11 175:13 176:7,14,15,18	audience 10:13 13:10 24:6 94:20 143:11
166:12,19 182:3 220:6 221:14 233:14	arrangements 120:17 163:1 233:14 274:2	179:6 associations 73:9	287:11 audio 288:5
appropriately 103:14 275:11 284:10	arranging 251:12 arrested 188:18 251:16	Assume 119:17 assuming 192:18 assure 12:18	August 68:11 102:19 authentication
appropriateness 103:2 approve 141:11 approved 51:3	articulate 164:17 articulating 73:2 artificially 76:7	AT&T 156:2 198:18 199:4 237:12,15	69:12 authority 19:3 46:16 57:1,2,4 71:21 73:19 74:9
92:18 approximately 15:10 54:8 68:4	ascertained 78:16 aside 188:14 ASL 41:18 71:13	Atlantic 205:15 attached 28:13,14 attack 80:12	authorization 111:1 authorized
132:19 191:21 192:14 200:9 apps 281:21 282:2,3	aspect 270:1 aspects 157:16 assault 38:2	attacked 12:15 attempt 30:8 120:9 122:13	118:8,10 164:13 authorizes 120:6 authorizing
April 15:2 52:14 architect 4:3 8:17 252:21	40:20,22 41:5 251:5,6 assertion 27:7 179:9	149:6 attempted 126:2 attempting	118:13 automated 99:1 124:9 135:6 173:16 181:13
area 26:2 74:18 107:21 156:10 211:15,16 239:14	assessed 119:22 assessing 119:14 assets 209:3	134:20 158:8 251:21 attempts 51:16 125:16 251:9	206:11 254:14 284:7 automatically
areas 211:14,15 228:20 aren't 116:10	assigned 209:6 assist 223:19	attention 55:2 148:10 257:21 attest 44:22	249:14 250:5 283:4 AV 286:20
241:10 argue 95:7 152:20 157:4 189:22	Assistant 2:11 3:15 7:4,17 8:8 243:13 Assisting 48:1	attorney 2:8 5:9 6:6 53:12 77:10 126:15 177:12	available 33:18 72:11 93:10 94:2 95:6 100:15 103:8
argued 146:1 argument 63:22 235:22	associated 16:4 181:14 195:18 210:13 233:22 253:6 256:1	288:12 attorneys 72:15 attractiveness 115:22	182:1 194:21 200:1 224:7 227:18 228:19 229:8,22 238:6 253:22 255:8
arguments 96:13 190:13 arming 275:9	associates 209:5 association 3:12	attributed 268:21 attributes 253:9	253.22 253.8 262:17 average 15:18

	1 46	<u> </u>	
172:6	69:4 81:1 90:7	133:14 146:3	become 22:4
192:3,15,16	91:15 92:5,15	150:4,7 154:4	114:9 122:7
202:12,17	95:10 96:18	163:19 169:21	123:2 177:7
203:12 208:18	114:14 115:6,8	175:4 182:1	265:3
209:16 211:2	126:10 135:20	186:6 187:16	becomes 189:11
215:18 217:13	143:14 144:5	195:15 224:14	
225:20 226:1	155:2 161:6	226:9 235:8	becoming 46:22
227:2 270:8,14	162:3 166:21	238:17 242:2	47:19 155:17
averages 209:13	175:9 216:18	basic 16:14 33:7	177:20
270:7	219:12 220:2	40:3 98:8	bed 214:8
averaging 55:18	227:8,15 229:21	102:15	beds 53:8,18
215:9 270:10	230:2,8,12	117:2,3,7,19,21	235:17
	287:3	127:5,6 143:21	begin 46:18
avoid 125:11	balance 66:7	144:6,8,13,20	114:2,13 115:7
await 45:3	147:9,19	157:16 159:13	143:14 168:9
awarded 116:18	237:4,5,7	166:22 256:6	247:14 251:18
191:17 193:14	258:17 272:3,6	259:10 269:3,7	
	277:5	basically 147:14	beginning 47:3
aware 43:7 94:7	balanced 180:16	161:15 165:22	68:17 213:12
118:14 228:21	204:6	170:16 172:18	begins 228:7
233:12 244:14	ball 281:1	238:1 240:7	behalf 3:12 7:12
263:4,22 264:4		267:8 274:20	30:20 175:12
awareness 55:1	balloon 25:17	basis 16:5 71:10	behavior 247:2
away 63:12 99:22	57:21 80:5	86:18 96:15,20	273:9 276:20
127:3 213:4	87:6,7	99:1 102:14	
240:21 267:16	ban 141:22 169:9	125:7 135:9	behind 10:8 20:17
AXIS-1 220:20	bandwidth 205:5	138:4 143:19	110:5 177:19
11110 1 220.20	260:20	147:18 156:9	believe 27:4 28:10
B		182:2 199:3	47:17 66:20
backend 79:9	bank 171:14 244:6	baton 18:15	72:10 92:1
			93:12 102:6
background 76:1	banking 144:16	Bay 179:16	103:19 141:4,16
81:18 161:4	banned 182:15	beach 205:1	162:7,15 171:3
191:19	Bar 85:11	bear 260:17	207:9,18 210:14
backs 58:19			212:8 214:2
bad 198:16 199:6	barrier 29:13	bearing 17:9	245:10 261:17
	barriers 106:6	beast 260:4	285:19
bail 188:18	bars 110:5	beat 173:18,19	believed 40:10
Baker 2:14,16	base 72:3 173:9	271:14	111:1
5:12 6:11 7:8	229:3	beautiful 33:3	believers 67:11
13:21 24:14			believes 41:15
25:2,4 30:18	based 43:4 56:17	became 108:16	48:10 131:15
57:20 66:3 68:3	115:2,4 126:6	177:16	TO.10 131.13

Bell 205:15	168:3 170:21	248:21	147:5 176:6
bells 233:22	202:15 216:12	biometrics	214:18 222:21
benchmark 195:3	243:10	27:18,22 28:2,6	boast 121:6
beneficial 71:11	bid 56:16	69:1,8,10,15,19 170:22 181:12	bodied 38:3
72:16 267:18	101:14,16,19,22 217:8	170.22 181.12	bodies 41:1
273:4 276:8	bidding 217:2,3	254:14	body 57:4 176:7
benefit 32:21 34:2	Biddle 3:7 6:16	259:16,20,21	bolder 178:2
61:4,5 63:2	114:19 126:13	269:9 274:15	bono 126:12
87:12 97:22 98:5 131:16	bids 51:20	bipolar 220:21	193:19
236:17 238:15		bit 67:9,18,20,21	194:1,9,13
247:9 255:5	bigger 101:12 209:4,20 215:21	69:3 73:11 75:6	bonus 140:13
259:13 261:3,22	217:6,20	80:7 84:3 90:5 96:8 128:6	booked 131:20
281:12	biggest 101:15	129:15 160:18	192:2
benefits 14:16	111:12 203:6	161:21 197:8	booking 211:14
17:5 61:9 247:1 249:10 262:1	208:11	215:7 220:4	books 255:18
275:12 281:19	bill 97:7 118:1,6	231:6 232:10 235:16 241:9	282:9
benefitted 236:8	130:22 132:22	258:15 267:11	Boost 237:18
Bennett 1:19	133:7,11,22 134:2 140:14	270:10	bottom 109:13,16
288:2,18	145:6 147:22	Black 109:7	198:8,9 199:8
Bergan 50:14,17	148:14 150:17	110:16	226:20
51:1	152:13 154:6,15	blacked 228:21	bought 282:8,9
Bergen 93:12	160:3 167:17,18 172:19 223:14	blackmailing	boundaries 67:13
best 18:1,9 73:18		248:4	bowels 11:19
101:17 105:5,21	billage 157:17	blank 63:4	Brandon 179:15
141:16 150:1	billed 26:21 58:8,9 156:1	blanket 157:19	breadth 200:11
228:11 229:5 263:1	billing 95:20	163:17	break 6:21 26:15
	118:3 125:7	blankets 61:8	160:12 174:16
beta 250:21 251:7	131:11	blatantly 27:7	breakdown 96:14
better 32:8 63:22 131:7,8 135:9	134:1,6,11,14,1	120:12	148:16 149:15
178:2 209:3	6,17,19 135:4	bless 142:19	breaking 106:5
221:12 224:20	274:2	BLM 94:20	breakthroughs
228:11 240:7	billion 151:19 201:17	block 81:3,16	258:1
257:15 261:5,8		203:5	brethren 21:14
284:3	bills 85:18 134:19 136:20	board 51:3 52:15	Brian 8:13 244:19
beyond 14:18 76:8 117:19,20	Bill's 137:10	61:7 84:19	Bridgeport 31:19
144:13 167:1,4	biometric 133:10	86:10 89:21	brief 126:22 243:7
	piometric 133:10	105:19 128:7	DITCI 120.22 243.7

	1 46	1	
briefly 84:2	201:22 267:7	242:15	216:5,20
225:18 247:14	building 45:15	278:10,13,22	218:5,8,9 241:1
bright 265:12	191:3,4 256:15	butcher 187:19	capabilities
	265:17,19		249:19
bring 35:20 55:1	279:7,8	buy 173:13	
65:19 73:8 79:10 84:20	built 240:18	buying 277:7	capability 194:18 278:21
136:19 262:22	242:14 267:12	bypass 123:13	
		Byrne 3:20 8:13	capacity 214:8
bringing 11:22 47:11 73:16	bulges 57:22	243:17,18	239:16
84:17 106:7	bulk 62:4	264:11 266:12	capital 1:19 227:2
213:10	bullets 200:14	270:16 275:14	capped 25:10
	bully 73:13 74:13	279:22 283:22	116:12 123:17
brings 73:7 104:15 137:19	87:13		128:4 130:3
174:10 191:8	bumped 81:19	C	241:21
199:1 255:20	82:12,15	cabinets 201:6,8	capping 147:1
broadband	burden 224:8	cables 202:1	caps 16:17
253:11,17,19		cafeteria 191:11	17:3,13,19 22:3
254:18 258:7	burdens 52:10 123:13	calculated 54:7	44:12 46:15
broader 66:1		58:11 119:7	50:5 55:4
74:14 143:18	Bureau		182:19 222:13
broke 151:4	2:7,9,10,12	calculates 126:5	270:18
	5:8,10 6:7,9 7:5,7 8:9,11 9:4	calculation	cap's 217:16
broken 225:8	15:3 19:20,21	160:17	caption 40:5
broker 116:2	23:14 46:1	calendars	car 269:7
Bronco 177:14	87:19 131:7,9	256:17,18	card 26:22 32:12
brought 111:10	243:14 247:5	California 86:13	117:22 135:3
189:1	266:21	101:21 179:14	144:18 147:11
browsing 254:9	286:19,20	182:13 183:6	167:7 170:4
	bureaucracy 47:1	244:17	172:11,12
BRYAN 3:20	bureaus 34:9	caller 120:2	173:12,13,15
bucket 153:10	burgeoning 12:14	Camden 184:21	cards 10:13,16
bucks 139:9,21,22	burner 99:10	campaign 39:16	168:8
173:17		51:11 55:1	care 62:13 64:8
budget 66:14	business 36:18	campaigns 43:16	215:16 217:2,3
91:22 92:2,18	131:2,7,9	. 0	218:2,9 242:4
266:3	148:17 160:5	candidly 107:16	careful 203:19
budgets 44:19	168:2 197:9 200:15,17	canteen 118:4	213:7
66:8,9 90:10,11	211:17,21	cap 12:10 50:10	Carolina 115:5
92:7 129:12	213:15 214:20	52:16 77:6	142:19 183:3
build 15:15 200:5	236:19 237:13	125:17 142:1	carrier 133:9
10.10 200.0		184:8 215:15	Caller 155.9

	1 ag	-	
134:9 198:21	237:17	231:18,20	31:22
237:22	244:3,13,15,20	270:7,10,14	challenge 65:21
carriers 117:12	245:1,5,10,12,1	Century	251:18 267:10
156:1 202:18	5,22	198:19,20 199:5	284:9 286:15
carrier's 118:3	246:3,4,12,14,1	CEO 3:17 7:21	
	8,20 247:7	175:18	challenged 113:8
carry 167:11	260:3 264:12,14	230:15,16	challenges 39:1
Carter 105:14	270:21 271:4	, i	66:1 147:21
case 20:18 93:17	273:22	certain 22:2 62:9	154:22 253:5
126:14 149:3	275:17,22	65:3,13 72:21	255:22 265:5
150:19 178:8	276:11,12,13	113:4 128:7	challenging 248:1
263:22 264:3	280:2,10,12	165:7 208:2	chamber 25:17
272:21 280:1	cellular 250:14	238:13	
	cent 119:10,14	269:17,19 279:10	change 33:3 50:3 52:13 54:10
cases 41:14,16 50:9 53:13	169:16 217:22		52:13 54:10 70:15 76:16
56:12 69:9,16	center 3:5 5:22	certainly 35:15	85:14 90:20
75:2 90:9 91:10	24:22 34:9 45:8	36:10 78:5	92:16 183:16
124:15 147:22	54:16,21 106:10	178:5 180:6	186:16,19 187:2
168:19 248:3	173:3	222:11 226:12	206:7 221:22
263:21 271:10		certificate 118:12	237:18 276:18
287:9	centers 101:8	288:1 289:1	
	206:7	290:1	changed 50:4
cash 144:15	central 24:11	certify 288:3	76:12 77:15
173:10	179:14 190:12	289:4 290:4	123:17 186:22
category 119:12	206:6	CET-743 289:15	187:5,6
Caucus 109:7	centralized 99:2		changes 47:2
110:16	193:19	chain 202:4	49:13 51:15
caught 225:1	centralizing 99:5	chair 31:12	70:1 87:3 88:22
246:17	Ü	105:14 107:1	89:2 90:6
	cents 27:19 69:7	108:16 109:6	246:15
cause 65:2,6 106:1	84:21 85:8 100:2	113:9	changing 179:10
caused 57:7	146:7,12,13	chairman 2:3 5:2	257:12,19
caution 212:22	183:5 184:13	10:2,6 11:5,7,17	channel 256:12,18
cautious 98:2,12	192:22	13:5 19:15	characteristics
	193:11,12	20:11 23:10	211:12
caveat 67:2	200:18 202:22	43:20 107:2	
cease 57:16	203:1,15	127:1 181:1	characterize 171:8 215:10
ceiling 19:7	207:11,16,20	196:15 286:7	
	208:16,18,21	Chairwoman	charge 65:2 76:6
celebrating 31:1	209:1,13,14,17	11:15 126:22	82:6 115:19
cell 78:18,19	210:22 211:1	286:13	117:4,10,12,14
79:14,16 81:3	217:11,12,15	Chairwomen	118:5
132:22 134:14	226:1,5		119:11,15,19
	9-		

	1 ag		
120:13 124:2,12	158:16 160:16	children 14:7	citizens 31:3
125:6 132:20	162:20	15:22 16:5	city 85:6 90:19
133:9,13,18	166:19,20 167:3	85:15	163:12 179:4
134:3,12 136:1	193:2,6 196:6	children's 45:12	204:21
137:8,10 140:14	234:12		
143:15,17	ahawaina 26.2	chime 225:17	civil 39:22 97:19
144:10,16	charging 26:2	choice 116:11	105:18
146:21	28:5 119:5	140:21 171:12	claim 120:12
147:12,13	123:12	172:10 173:22	
150:12 152:22	124:16,21	174:4 237:21	clarification
162:6 163:2	125:2,10 132:11 148:5 155:11		178:10
164:12 167:2	148:3 133:11	choose 85:15	clarified 216:7
177:2 225:7,18		121:2	clarify 235:9
229:3,4	chart 137:18	chooses 62:8	•
271:3,4,7 282:3	148:10,19	118:6	clarity 196:5
	149:1,12 150:18	Chris 4:4 8:18	210:2
charged 27:5 35:22 77:13	152:8 154:4	263:11	class 78:12
	172:19 186:4		classes 180:6
82:1,14 113:7 114:4 120:11,19	202:9 203:11	Christ 2:18 5:14	
123:19,20	207:12 208:10	24:17 30:21	classifications
125:19,20	226:18	33:5 97:18	127:10
136:6 142:8,21	charts 199:17	Chronicle 36:6	clean 156:16
145:21 148:1	200:1	Church 2:18 5:14	cleaner 169:13
157:8,17 163:5	chased 127:3	24:17 30:21	
164:16 165:19		33:4 97:18	clear 17:4 70:11
168:10 180:18	Chaz 1:19		71:1 110:22
192:21 193:10	288:2,18	churn 184:6	136:15 196:19
195:16 196:1	cheaper 79:12	185:18 186:7,20	276:19 280:8,15
231:17	86:6 89:11,17	187:10 239:3	clear-cut 239:11
chargers 115:12	cheapest 80:9	circle 60:13 208:5	cleared 216:14
charges 6:4 22:5	check 144:15	circles 201:7	clearing 75:22
26:5,6,16,19	167:8 168:15	Circuit 17:11	clearly 60:16
58:20 61:2	Cheryl 2:18 5:14	circumstances	71:14 75:7
81:21 97:10	24:16 30:15	168:14	77:12 97:21
114:3,5,8,10	36:20 41:9 60:6	circumvent 27:17	178:13 207:18
115:12,21 116:6		177:21 251:9	CLECS 144:6
117:18	chewed 146:14		
118:1,2,3	chief 2:7,11 3:11	circumvention	clients 130:10
119:16 121:17	4:3 5:7 7:5,6,12	27:3	139:13
123:4 125:7,18	8:9,16 9:3 176:4	cite 127:20	Clinic 53:1
127:10 133:3	197:7 215:14,20	cited 110:22 184:6	close 85:5 121:3
134:19,21	243:13 252:21	citizen 21:4	126:2 152:14
140:15	272:15	CIUZEII 21.4	174:10 229:16
142:18,20			

	1 ag		
285:4	104:7,12 117:8	comes 15:12 20:15	254:5
closed 85:6	118:1	75:8 97:13	256:6,9,11,14
closely 46:18	134:7,8,14,16,1	121:6 165:10	commission 1:3
136:4 161:1	9,21,22 135:1,3	180:13,15	2:14,17 5:13
130.4 101.1	147:15	214:19 215:3	6:12 7:9 13:22
closer 45:17 91:13	162:6,8,21	224:11,17	17:3 21:5
129:15	163:3 170:11	235:21 242:9	23:6,12 24:15
closing 9:2 143:3	182:18 183:3,12	278:21 279:17	31:5 32:3 39:7,8
252:7 284:22	186:13,14	285:20	43:12,21 44:11
	258:21 273:16	comfort 132:9	46:17 47:17
Cloud 254:5	274:1		49:8,18 50:6,21
255:6 282:6	aallaatad	comfortable	
Clyburn 2:4 5:3	collected	255:13	51:8 54:17,18
11:12,15 12:16	103:8,9,12,16,2	coming 10:2 13:17	55:15 56:8,22
13:2,4,11 21:8	0	23:2 52:12	57:15,18
31:11,22 43:21	collecting 57:16	71:12 74:20	61:3,11,12,15
73:14 105:1	65:10 118:18	80:13 87:11	65:11,15 67:7
	184:11 240:4		70:6,8 74:19
106:19,22	application 102.5	100:20 236:6	82:18,19 83:3
107:10 108:6,16	collection 102:5	281:7 285:9,17	84:6,12,14
112:20 126:22	119:3 129:1	286:1 287:10	91:1,21
130:19 196:15	145:22 163:20	commend 85:19	94:11,20
286:8,12	164:22	143:3	97:9,12 98:10
co 23:20 246:9	collections 103:13	comment 68:7,10	99:8 100:7
251:16	collectively	78:8 87:6 88:18	101:16 102:13
coalition 52:14	192:14	149:9 162:9	105:15 106:22
	collector 218:19	171:19 225:4	107:2,4,9
coax 202:1		235:7 238:9	108:2,4,7,9,15
code 10:16 77:22	color 109:10	239:1 287:18	110:17
201:21	Colorado 56:21		111:2,8,15
coin 205:16	176:5 177:12	commentary	112:3,16 117:19
	214:7 287:8	89:19 91:8	118:17 122:4,20
coinless 258:21	Columbia 105:7	commented	123:2 132:16
coins 259:1	106:4,16 111:6	164:14	133:16 135:17
collaborating	197:13	comments 25:6	143:16 153:9,17
239:17		39:19 60:18	155:4 156:9,13
	column 203:8	90:3 97:8	161:3,7 170:9
collaboration	229:17	113:2,13 115:10	171:4 172:18
52:22	columns 226:19	143:9 156:11	181:1 182:1,21
colleague 14:10	combat 177:9	177:10 199:16	185:1,8,9,10,11,
21:8 30:18 35:7	COMDAC 1 / /:9	216:12 218:16	13 186:3,9
36:16 175:7	combination	234:7,14 236:12	189:18 192:21
collect 16:19	278:3	241:15 244:2	204:13 209:17
26:21 27:16,20	combined 55:21		211:1 213:3,14
34:9 69:6	Combined 33.21	commissary 63:10	222:5,13
J+.7 U7.U		147:10 148:5	

222.2 12 221.0	100.17		102.10
223:3,12 231:9	122:17	communication	123:12
238:18 240:12	129:17,18	17:10 30:22	124:12,16,22
241:11 286:9	130:1,9 139:17	40:8 42:1	125:5,18
287:16	153:8 178:11	46:10,19,21	128:3,14,18
commissionable	181:6	47:4,6 48:8,14	129:9 130:7
140:12,13	182:7,11,16	59:14 109:3	132:12,20 133:9
· ·	183:8,9,10,17,2	110:5 247:7	134:18 137:8,9
commissioner	1 184:11,15	256:21 257:2	142:11 143:20
2:4,5 5:3	185:3 186:5	264:16 276:19	145:17 153:4
11:12,21 12:16	187:3,5,11	277:9	198:9,10
13:2,4,11 14:11	196:22 199:9	communications	219:18,20
20:4,8,10 21:8	201:20	3:10 6:19 21:5	236:15,17
31:11,22 43:20	202:18,19	31:4 32:3 43:12	237:2,11 258:9
57:20 73:14	208:5,6 209:21	44:10 46:15	company 1:19
105:1 106:19,22	218:12,13,15,16	64:20 65:10	125:10 131:3
107:10 108:6	,19 222:2 223:7		
112:20 113:9	225:21	68:22 69:1	133:3 134:1,10
130:19 163:21	226:2,4,9	115:1,4 127:7,9	137:10 146:9
185:11	240:16,20	130:9 136:10	158:6,9 165:22
196:15,16	241:1,4,8,11,19,	156:8 191:16	166:1,6 172:5
244:19 286:12	21,22 242:5	197:20 243:10	197:8 198:4,20
Commissioners	ĺ	254:12 256:12	228:6 237:14,15
23:10 48:3	Commission's	258:4,16 281:9	238:2 266:6
107:15 190:22	12:4 17:13	Communication's	267:6,15 283:3
286:8	38:20 39:4,13	14:13	company's 149:18
	47:9 70:5 76:13	COMMUNICAT	comparable 52:17
commissions	87:2 102:4	IONS 1:3	195:16 196:1
17:5,14 28:20	109:8 164:14		199:3
33:16 47:21	184:8	communities	
48:2 49:11	commitment 37:3	15:22 45:15	comparative
51:19,21	113:6	48:21 221:9	160:3
52:5,19 53:22		community 14:19	compare 161:1
54:4,11	committed 16:13	37:1 46:2 177:4	168:9 198:9
56:4,6,13 57:13	Committee 3:3	178:3 205:1	
60:16,19	5:20 105:11,12	221:12	compared 25:16
62:4,20	common 76:1		37:22 38:2
63:6,15,17	88:13 116:16	CO-	249:8 269:18
66:4,11 70:2	144:3	MODERATOR	comparison
84:7 86:17		2:13	115:21 231:22
90:8,14,16	communicate	Co-Moderators	235:21
91:15,19 95:2	20:22 38:8 39:2	5:6 6:5 7:3 8:7	compelling 30:19
99:15 100:1	41:18 79:18	companies 43:6	•
102:1,2	197:14 252:12	50:5 70:20 75:2	compensate 98:4
115:15,16	communicating	103:12 105:20	116:7 118:20
116:5,8,14	266:18	111:12 122:22	compensating
		122,22	

97:15	121:15 195:21	05.12 116.1 4	73:16 90:16
	257:13	95:12 116:1,4 194:16 247:22	97:10,12 117:20
compensation 194:8		confines 157:3	136:5 265:2
	complicated 23:8 200:15 257:19		consideration
compete 116:3	285:10,16	confiscated	25:6 115:10
253:12 257:18	comply 103:13	244:17	200:21 204:8
competing 122:2	195:14	conflict 215:14	considered 117:5
232:2		confused 135:10	226:11
competition	component 102:11 268:22	confusing 121:5	considering 82:17
2:7,9,10,12		142:21	177:2
5:8,10 6:7,9 7:5,7 8:9,11 9:4	comprehensive 99:21 163:19,20	confusion 178:15	consisted 185:1
23:14 88:18	219:14 227:10	congress 105:17	
191:18 238:14	computers 253:18	111:9 112:9	consistency 132:3,5 145:6
241:18	-	113:2,3	·
competitive	computing 255:4	congressional 6:2	consistent 61:12 131:16 132:8
134:13 178:1	concentrated	105:13 106:3	145:10 185:22
198:4 238:12,19	209:2	109:7 110:15	229:12
competitors 29:18	concept 43:4	Congresswoman	consistently 14:17
complaining	concern 28:21	6:3 105:5,8	40:8 52:9 76:10
212:9	79:14	106:14,18	console 28:14,15
complaint 71:14	concerned 180:6	112:20 286:2	,
85:4 147:7	concerns 30:2	Congresswoman'	consolidate 122:14
complaints 85:12	79:15	s 106:2	
complement	conclude 69:20	connect 77:7	consolidation 29:22 30:1
135:16 136:12	conclusion 125:14	connected 180:8	88:19
	135:13	255:18 284:6	
complements 113:12	conditions 29:12	Connecticut	conspirator 251:16
	38:6 42:10 43:3	244:6	
complete 41:2 189:14 201:17	conducting	connection 14:9	constant 76:16 85:3
255:3 289:11	239:16	16:2 98:9	
290:11	conducts 195:20	138:14 193:1	constituency 106:10
completely 39:14		272:7	
135:6	conference 111:9 176:19	connections 45:11	constituents 106:8
completing 180:2	- 1 01-2	231:19,21	constitute 27:2
complex 72:20	conferencing	consequence	182:7
200:20	46:20	65:12	constitutional
	confinement	consequences	62:9
complexity 196:2 200:20	28:3,18,22 29:1 42:3,10 43:4	206:1,19 213:7	constrained 29:11
	69:10,17 90:10	consider 30:4 66:8	construction
compliance	07.10,17 70.10		

	1 ag	-	
111:11,12	281:13	91:8,9,10	260:3,5 273:18
consulates 194:3	contents 25:18	100:11 116:9	controlled 247:6
consult 262:22	context 264:6	130:15 132:1	controlling
266:8		184:13,17	102:18 123:11
	continual 80:19	187:13	
consultant 158:21	continually 13:5	191:17,19	controls 29:15
228:8	39:1	192:17	188:8 244:10
consulting 229:7		193:14,17	259:10
	continue 18:9	194:15 196:8	convene 73:5,6
consumer 18:11	49:2 59:2 68:15	211:9 212:20	,
19:20 56:19	75:1 82:9 178:1	217:4 232:17	convenience
61:16 71:14	206:20 232:16	238:2 239:14,20	118:12 168:7
101:18 140:21	235:22 236:4,7	266:9	258:17,21 259:4
142:7 171:11	243:3 252:9	contracted 53:8	261:16,17
173:4,21 225:22	258:6 262:2		convenient 281:17
238:19 262:21	274:11 282:1	contracting 181:6	conversation
284:1 286:19	284:4 287:17,19	contract-operated	35:16 65:19
consumers 18:7	continued 57:17	239:21	98:14 235:3
56:15 57:8	76:11 134:17	contractor 195:7	236:1 249:13
59:4,5 65:13	continues 12:17		275:18 276:5
98:8 114:10	57:9 75:15	contractors 192:7	280:13,16
238:16	106:5 243:4	217:21	ŕ
contact 14:17 38:8	280:2 283:1	contracts 50:15	conversations
59:13 109:3		56:16 58:1	176:17 280:7
180:1 246:8	continuing 23:17	87:1,5,7,19	converse 28:15
247:21 255:14	49:1 174:14	88:5,12,13,22	convicted 188:17
258:18,21	181:2	89:1 100:15	
259:4,18	continuous	101:14,19,22	conviction
261:5,6,8,10,16,	27:18,22 28:1,6	103:22	41:15,16 177:16
18 269:14	69:8,10,14,18	116:4,9,18	coordinated 267:1
275:16,22	248:20 252:7	129:15 195:13	copies 200:3
278:17 279:2	274:15	200:4,9	•
281:22	continuously 39:1	221:15,17,20	coping 16:3
contacted 71:3	contraband	230:18	copper 202:1
	244:3,14	238:15,17 242:2	CORINNE
contacts 255:7	245:5,10,15,19,	265:19	290:4,15
contained 254:3	22 246:12,20	contribute 33:5	corner 200:18
Cont'd 3:1,2 4:1,2	251:13,15 260:3	46:3 84:7	
6:1 7:1 8:1,2 9:1	276:11 280:2,10	contribution	corporate 101:7
·	, in the second second	174:13	270:1
contemplate	contract 50:1		Corporation
107:17	51:2,6,7 52:5	control 27:5 29:8	115:1
content 255:16	53:19,21 54:10	30:8 120:10,13	
260:12 278:19	58:5 90:6	239:15 246:5	corporations

	1 ag		
79:21	186:8	216:21 225:21	6:8,15 8:10
correct 86:18	cost 15:12 17:9	226:1,6,14	114:18,19
		227:1,2,3,17,22	126:12,13
127:16 147:22 227:12 289:11	26:9 27:21 29:9,10 56:18	228:1,3,11,13,1	243:15 288:9,12
290:11	57:2 68:15,16	4,18 229:3	counter 16:11
	69:5,6 79:17	230:5,22 236:18	
correction 41:7	87:8 94:22	237:6,20	counterpart 179:2
88:8 129:11	96:8,10,20	238:7,19 240:18	counterparts 22:6
correctional	97:1,5,15	252:4,6 256:5	counterpoint
15:14 18:8	99:3,11 100:1,6	260:15,17	213:20
63:19 122:20	101:3,18 102:3	261:10 268:15	
123:8 176:14	117:18 119:21	278:6,7,8,9	counties 50:2,11
184:15 222:4,8	121:19	281:19	51:6,12 84:6
243:10	121.19	Costa 232:6	94:1 184:16,18
249:9,17,21	ŕ	Costa 232.0	204:19,21 205:8
250:9,12	125:17,20 126:4 128:16 133:1	costly 257:1	221:19
251:14,19	134:17,18	costs 15:12,18	countless 39:11
252:11	135:2,19 139:1	18:3 28:22 29:1	40:20
262:8,11,12	141:3,5,11,12,1	46:18 54:5	
274:19	3 144:11	60:21 76:8 95:5	countries
		98:21 100:22	232:5,10,15,18
corrections 37:14	146:5,14 149:13	101:11 102:1	233:8,13
39:10 42:16	158:4,9,10,15	114:4 120:2	country 22:7
43:7 45:22	159:8,9,11,15,1	121:9,12,15	35:12 55:13
47:1,3 49:17	6,19,22	123:10 135:7	57:12 58:4
62:3,22 71:2	160:9,22	146:11 158:8,13	75:11,14 87:21
72:12 80:14	161:3,4,7,13	163:2 167:12	93:18,20 108:22
129:4 176:8,16	168:1		109:10 131:4
181:8 184:10	170:17,20,21	169:14 170:7	142:2 176:12
187:12 197:18	171:10,15,17	172:13	178:17 190:5
203:7 205:7	173:3 174:6,7	181:9,11,14	192:1 231:20
244:19	175:3 178:11,19	182:1 183:20	
248:11,22 251:1	179:7	185:21 186:18	233:3 244:16 267:2 271:1
correctly 86:16	181:4,18,20,22	194:10 195:18	
215:11 227:9	182:7	199:9,10 202:19	283:18
	183:11,16,22	208:7,8 209:17	county 26:12
correlated 252:2	184:7 186:12,15	214:2,4 217:8	50:4,14,15,18
correlation	187:7,10,17	224:10 225:20	51:1,7 52:6
99:16,19 100:5	192:17	226:20 230:19	53:20,21
250:8	194:12,14	253:6 255:22	54:1,3,7,11 81:2
	199:20 200:11	256:4 257:6,12	85:7,9 86:1,7,18
correspondence	201:11,20	266:11 270:3	87:20 90:18
177:11	202:3,18,19,21	278:2	93:12 131:22
corresponding	207:12 209:21	coughing 75:22	179:3,15
30:13 185:2,5	210:5 215:10		184:15,20,22
	210.3 213.10	counsel 2:10 3:7	185:16 186:1
·			100.10 100.1

	1 ag		
192:5 205:9	144:18 167:7	231:17 240:4	184:4 239:4
214:9 224:12,13,18	168:8 170:3 172:11,12	252:20	
271:17 275:3,4	286:15	custody 179:22 180:10 192:2	D.C 17:11 32:2
couple 31:16,18	crime 15:14 45:14	221:1,4 233:4,5	
74:3 88:1 152:6	177:9,17 178:6	, in the second of the second	daily 32:3 202:12
165:17 204:19	248:5	customer 115:15,22	Dakota 209:8
236:12 240:11	crime-based	117:4,9 118:6	Dallas 179:3
253:2	280:7	119:21,22	dared 107:16
coupled 165:21	crimes 248:3	120:19 121:14	Darrel 166:15
220:21		123:22 144:12	287:7
course 37:4 55:8	criminal 44:2 46:8	156:20 157:2	
107:11 110:14	177:18 204:22 245:3 250:9,20	163:4	Darrell 2:14,16 5:12 6:11 7:8
143:10 148:13	251:2,10	167:2,5,17	13:21 24:14
158:5,20 160:5	 	173:9 201:12	60:8 65:18
172:22 221:20	crisis 42:9 66:15 90:18	202:8 263:15 272:11	67:18 80:21
231:12			90:2 94:20
court 17:12 22:2	critical 17:13,15	customers	114:14 123:18
42:22 43:2	53:15 56:11	117:13,17 120:10,14,22	124:13 132:15
53:14 86:4	61:4 62:17 91:5 93:22 102:11	120:10,14,22	135:20 154:20
93:17 289:5,7	113:4 138:13	188:11 262:19	155:21 160:22
290:5,7	143:6 177:16	275:5	161:18 165:18
courts 57:1	243:5 247:20	customer's 120:15	167:21 168:11
111:14 194:4	285:12	121:7 123:21	175:9 227:7,21 287:2
courtyard 191:5	critically 15:2	Customers 53:9	Darrell's 87:5
cover 135:2	criticism 111:15	customized 246:4	Darren 177:14
coverage 157:19	crowded 15:14		
covered 157:6	crunching 128:22	Customs 3:16 7:19 14:1	data 15:1 18:1,2 34:8 35:3 36:4
170:9 171:4		175:16 191:2	51:11,13 83:3
create 66:15 90:17	cry 18:20	cut 58:14 66:13	88:3,6 89:4 93:9
179:6 278:16,17	crystal 281:1	140:19 141:8	94:1 98:15
created 249:6	cues 254:14	220:8 221:6	100:9,19
259:6	cumbersome	225:10	102:5,8,10,18,2
creates 283:16	159:18	cutting 225:2	0,21 103:5,7,8,12,13,
Creating 46:9	curious 262:7	255:12	15,19 104:13
creative 268:3	current 12:4	CVI 248:22	109:2
credit 26:22	34:20 41:12	249:10,15,19 250:11	128:2,10,12,21 129:1 135:19
106:21 117:21	47:7 183:5		145:22 152:5
119:6 135:2	currently 29:14	cycle 68:7,10	155:7
	44:4 119:20		

	1 46	ı	T
158:9,10,18 159:1,4 160:4,5,6,7,9 161:4,7 163:20 164:22 165:9 169:5,6,21 181:22 200:1 201:6 214:14 219:8 226:9 227:17 228:3,9	22 41:6,12,15,21 42:11,12 70:12 77:7,9,13 deafness 71:15 deal 127:9 143:18 190:11 196:21,22 197:1 218:16,17,18,20	decency 43:5 decent 165:11 deception 139:18 decide 140:18 141:9,21 159:20 242:2 272:20 decided 21:4 86:17 110:19	definitely 145:17 187:13 278:6 279:7 definitive 111:1 degree 241:7 delay 103:3 delayed 22:13 Deleon 254:22
237:5,6 238:5,7 260:1 database 86:22 203:15 229:14,15 248:15 249:7	241:18 285:16 dealing 116:1 146:17 157:7 263:13 283:13,14 dealings 69:1	267:15 decides 189:20 decision 13:15 33:11,22 34:2,7,20 36:9 39:13 56:6 103:10 159:9	delicious 191:10 delighted 31:5 delve 74:17 demand 56:12 245:11,12,18,21 246:11,19
databases 99:15 date 18:7 68:12	deals 122:12 157:5 dealt 80:22 218:21,22 241:12 242:12 death 203:22 debate 60:19 127:13 debates 196:19 debit 16:18	178:14 206:22 decisions 34:21 100:18 203:21 decline 134:15 251:17 declined 128:19 decrease 183:6,14 186:16 decreased 185:3,6 194:14 278:2	280:6,15 democracy 106:3 demonstrably 182:8 demonstrates 196:8 demonstrative 131:6 denied 22:13 188:8
285:5 days 171:22 172:1 day-to-day 143:19 DC 1:15 179:2 D-DC 6:3 de 27:2 deadline 102:10 103:9 deaf 2:20 5:17 24:18 37:1,19 38:21	27:16,21 69:6 117:8,16 147:8,13,21 148:2 167:15 173:12,13 263:15 273:15,17 decade 14:6 222:18 decades 44:9 222:7 223:15 257:9	decreasing 252:10 dedicated 192:9,12 197:12,17 deep 37:2 default 19:7 118:7 defense 3:5 5:22 24:22 54:16,21 64:9 249:2 defiance 57:18	Denver 3:11 7:12 175:12 176:4,5 177:12,14 214:7 215:17 denying 14:6 Department 3:12,16 7:12,19 14:2 15:3 29:20 43:13 49:16 50:18 62:3,22 63:18 72:8 104:8 175:12,17
39:15,17,18,20 40:15,18,20,21,	December 51:4 99:19 164:22	define 117:7 144:7,20 defined 117:5	176:5 184:10 203:6 244:18 247:4 249:2

	1 46		
251:1	286:14	detect 79:4 280:5	256:21
departments	deserving 247:9	detection 75:18,20	260:18,22 261:1 277:8 281:10
37:13 39:10	design 253:2	76:19 181:12	
42:16 43:7 71:2	257:14	245:16	devices 246:13
72:11 80:14	designed 250:16	251:11,15	261:12 277:4,5
88:8 129:3,11 181:7 205:7	desire 47:21	detects 75:20	278:20 284:12
221:19 224:12	246:1,7 260:10	detention 3:15	DHS 194:5
departure 233:15	277:21 279:6,13	7:18 53:18 55:9	diagnosis 220:20
_	despairingly 40:7	57:9 59:6 76:2	diagram 138:1
depend 90:10	despite 18:20	81:2 85:17,21 131:19 176:8,10	dial 194:2
dependent 186:2	38:15 47:9	191:20 192:4,11	dialogue 23:17
Depending 152:19	57:15 183:19	193:20 194:6	49:1 70:16
depends 91:16	detail 149:16	195:2,9,12,19,2	dichotomy 225:2
92:15 262:14		1 211:15 239:17	•
deploy 257:15	detailed 228:6 263:6	determine 30:6	Dictaphone 206:18
deployed 248:10		43:3 95:14 96:1	
260:6	details 24:13	168:22 190:1,17	differed 185:19
deploying 278:6	40:13 126:11 191:18 265:16	227:4	difference 14:18
1		determined 43:1	108:17 110:8,9
deportation 93:16	detained 85:15 86:3 232:15	45:9 67:5	187:16 188:1
deposit 124:11,17		determining 30:1	205:8 208:1 210:3 212:18
150:20 151:10	detainee 85:21	158:13	230:14,16
deposited 124:6	191:14 193:15 247:2	develop 260:20	237:13
deposition 288:10		developed 68:8	differences 60:9
deposits 124:9	detainees 3:3 5:20 24:21 52:10	123:1 200:8	96:7,9 175:3
depravation	53:10,22 54:9	244:21 245:20	187:13 188:4
37:21	85:3,9 93:5,15	249:1 268:14	205:6 226:12
depressing 38:5	191:10	281:11	different 7:2
	192:5,8,15,21	developing 254:20	57:12 61:6
depth 200:11	193:10	256:1 265:6	83:20 85:22
deputy 178:22	194:2,8,11,22	281:21	132:2,20 137:4
derived 152:1	195:6 196:7 231:16,17	development 46:4	138:5 162:14 167:12 170:6
descending	231:10,17	201:12 250:15	172:14 175:2
198:17	232:0,10,20	253:1,3,8	178:22 184:1
describe 49:13	240:8 244:4	260:16,18,21 266:4	185:16,17 188:4
	245:6 246:2,4,6		191:7 193:22
describing 191:13	247:6,9 264:17	developments	199:19 200:7
deserve 106:21	284:2	250:17	205:3 207:8,9
deserves 11:20	detains 191:21	device 244:9	211:11,12 213:1

214:5 215:10	104:10 287:20	169:18 176:20	docket 35:13
232:15	directly 108:22	177:6 180:12	114:7
235:10,16 240:2	124:16 199:18	182:6 189:14	document 110:3
262:16,18	268:20	264:13	
263:21 265:10		discussions 23:5	documented 36:5
286:4 287:5	Director 2:14,16	198:2	110:1 248:3
differential 99:4	3:4,6,15 5:12,22		documents 53:13
	6:11,14	disorder 220:21	93:18 255:7
differentiating	7:8,16,18 54:2	dispel 42:12	DOJ 30:3
186:4	114:16 122:9	displace 25:18	
differently 162:2	disabilities 36:17	_	dollar 85:18 149:7
163:9 188:2	37:17 40:14	disproportionatel	151:14
difficult 100:17	41:5 42:11,18	y 64:6 120:1	dollars 45:2
108:2 155:7	104:1,4,5	disputes 95:20	151:19 183:8
158:14 160:11	260:10	distance 46:21	201:19 213:4
182:4 195:22	disability 37:1,15		267:14
	ě ,	80:3 270:19	
257:1	43:8 70:17	distinction 188:12	domestic 93:11
difficulties 257:5	71:13,15 94:14	282:15	192:22
difficulty 64:15	103:21	distinctions 175:5	dominant 29:14
158:12 257:11	disagree 90:8		30:7
	213:22	distinguished	Don 158:21
Diggins 3:11 7:11	disagreed 234:15	23:3	
175:12,22 176:3	J	distributed 99:7	donations 63:11
213:19,21	disciplinary 95:3	District 105:7	done 12:10
215:14,20	disconnected	106:4,6,15	21:21,22 32:7
216:11,14	39:2,14	111:6 177:12	47:11 55:6 56:2
220:11 223:18	discontinued	197:13	65:1 70:3 74:11
234:18,20 236:9	134:20		99:1,2 100:16
287:3		division 2:7,10,12	106:2
digital 254:20	discounting	3:11 5:7,9,12	107:10,16,22
282:7 288:19	283:22	6:7,9,12	112:12,17 113:7
diligently 131:12	discovered 53:17	7:5,7,9,11	121:21 126:21
		8:9,11 9:3	127:1,20
Dillard 30:10	discovery 177:21 229:22	23:13,21 44:1	130:3,4
135:21		176:4	136:13,22 139:4
Dillard's 30:11	discuss 13:15 24:9	243:13,14,15	140:17 142:14
	83:21 182:9	286:17,18	143:4 146:19
ding 200:19	231:6	Division,Wireline	151:17
direct 17:9	discussed 237:9	2:9	196:18,21
99:16,18 100:5			197:4,5 220:1
122:19 134:1	discussing 60:11	DLA 53:3	222:16,17,18
156:6 164:6	176:22 198:3	DOC 51:12 58:4	223:15
	1 752.25		
231:19 232:9	253:3,5	184:17 255:2,3	228.5 12 13
231:19 232:9 direction 83:18	discussion 60:1	184:17 255:2,3 277:13	228:5,12,13 229:5 230:4

	1 46	1	
241:5 247:15	185:8,12	134:7 205:13	260:12 278:18
273:22	drops 271:8	248:11 259:3	281:13
doors 74:3	drove 286:13	273:2	effect 17:1 51:14
doubt 245:1		earn 199:12,13	70:3 76:14
Doug 30:10,11	drug 220:22 245:17 276:18	ease 210:17 215:8	87:2,7 110:4
135:20		easier 160:18,19	182:20 184:9
	drugs 45:20 46:7 221:3 251:13	212:15 214:19	effective 26:22
dragon 80:13		282:1	38:9 184:11
drain 98:6	DTMF 81:9	easiest 153:15	261:9 271:10
dramatically	DTS 191:15,17,19	easily 46:9 74:2	effectively 215:9
182:17	192:11,17	93:10	effort 13:7 20:5,7
draw 48:16 148:9	193:4,14,17 194:15 195:6		23:18 90:1
drawn 189:21	196:8 239:14,20	easy 71:16 73:21 94:18 135:14	106:1 113:6,9
190:2	·	158:17 282:2	149:8 163:20 229:5 286:9
Drinker 3:7 6:16	Dual 81:10	eat 191:6	
114:18 126:13	due 18:3 81:6		efforts 39:5 130:7
drive 209:9 218:4	118:22 174:17 182:2 196:2	eating 85:16	193:8 236:8
272:12	245:11 251:21	echo 171:6 242:19	egregious 14:7
driven 138:9	duration 58:14	economic 16:6	198:6 199:15 225:6,7
171:11 189:13		106:7 241:13	· ·
279:15	during 112:21	economical	eight 56:3,5 63:14 77:8 88:14 89:6
driver 60:20	113:3,5 132:6 198:5 221:16	173:11,22	142:20 159:18
182:7 183:22	248:14 250:21	economically	182:10,11
184:7 187:8	dusted 21:9	252:9 283:5	183:17 199:3
drivers 115:11		economies 125:1	either 51:5 56:22
181:4 199:20	duty 19:3 59:3 62:18 63:1	190:10	75:2 77:16
drives 208:6		209:12,20 214:9	133:4,20 135:4
278:12	DWIs 205:2	economist 229:21	161:9 173:13
driving 98:21	dynamic 105:3	edge 255:12	208:20 250:3 254:2
102:3 218:13		Editor 3:13 7:14	
drop 186:13 213:8	<u>E</u>	educate 5:16	El 179:14 232:7
225:14 271:5	earlier 114:9 132:17 164:13	24:18 278:22	Eleanor 6:3 105:5
dropped 49:19,21	167:22 168:20	284:5	106:15
50:1 74:22	171:7,12 205:12	educating 173:21	e-learning 255:1
75:7,16,17	212:18 213:6	262:10	elective 121:13
76:3,4,11	225:13 231:19	education 2:19	electronic 118:7
77:2,17 81:4,6 83:5 182:17,20	244:7 249:11	71:10 254:4,22	electronically
183:1,11	272:16	262:17 264:13	167:15 256:10
100.1,11	early 22:20 63:6	educational 48:4	
	!!		

	1 46		
element 200:12	137:7 159:8	214:15 234:22	222:20
elephant 240:16	employed 30:6	235:1	ensuring 37:9
elevate 286:3	69:17 111:11	enforcing 59:8,16	191:9 195:4
Elias 3:11 7:11	288:9,12	engaged 180:7	enter 29:18 67:2
175:11,21 176:3	employee 288:12	engaging 153:5	162:15 248:16
180:21 223:16	employees 197:12	engineer 252:20	273:19
287:3,7	employers 247:8	257:2	entered 238:8
Elias's 190:4	employing 28:20	engineering 201:3	entering 249:13
eliminate 28:18	Employment	253:10 266:4	enterprise 98:16
54:4 90:15	105:15	engineers 278:8	entertainment
121:17 132:5	emptying 121:8	Engledow 2:11	61:7
146:18 280:10	enables 194:1	7:4 8:8 20:1	entire 11:1 58:13
eliminated 49:17		175:8 213:19	entirely 250:15
50:6 51:19 52:5 63:15,17 97:10	enabling 48:15 109:4	220:3 226:17	271:18
146:2,16		227:5 231:2 243:9,12 247:12	entities 194:3
182:8,10 183:17	enact 18:15 220:7	252:14 258:11	entitled 117:9,17
218:21 249:2	enacted 222:21	262:4 264:20	167:14
eliminating 50:20	encourage 27:9	273:5 276:21	entrance 29:13
84:12 147:2	34:6 46:14 103:10	277:20 279:21	entrepreneur
222:2		284:13,19,22 285:4	268:2
elimination 52:19	encouraged 55:3 258:9		entrepreneurial
Elmore 81:2		English 77:4	268:1
else 57:22 78:21	encouragement 48:16	enhance 264:16	envious 128:20
161:22 164:18	encouraging 29:3	enhanced 244:3	environment
208:9 209:6 237:17 264:21	48:8	246:21 280:16	171:20 174:2
273:6 274:5	endorse 72:18	enhancements	221:2 278:16,17
284:16		215:20 279:11	281:15
email 46:19 261:8	end-to-end-to 201:8	enhances 48:19	envy 119:9
281:13	end-user 116:21	enjoy 255:4	epidemic 244:21
Embark 198:20	121:4	enormous 15:13	equal 37:16 40:4
embarked 267:8	end-users 116:10	286:14	42:19 105:15
embarks 29:7		enrollment	129:6
	enforce 59:2 65:11	248:14	equality 37:3 39:8
embraced 262:12	enforcement 3:16	274:16,18	equally 66:12
emerging 269:11	7:19 14:1 53:9	ensure 17:22	equals 240:12
emphasis 72:3	175:17 177:8	18:10 29:4 39:5 59:3 194:8	equation 123:14
emphasize 44:17	180:18 191:3	195:20,22	241:20 246:15
			2 11.20 2TU.13

equipment 29:4	175:4	evolves 282:22	exchange 198:21
95:19 209:2	evaluate 18:6,13	evolving 43:5	excited 255:2
255:4	34:7	258:19	exciting 10:22
equitable 146:8	event 196:17	exacerbated 16:8	9
195:10	eventual 221:21		exclude 202:17
equity 40:11		exactly 39:12 142:16 164:17	excludes 202:19
227:3	eventually 49:19	229:12 236:22	excluding 121:13
equivalent	247:3 267:8,15 284:2,11		209:17 225:20
201:5,7	,	exaggerate 108:20	226:4,9
eradicated 48:12	everybody 31:12	example 35:17	exclusive 116:3
	167:14 267:12	45:8 55:21	162:15
escorted 274:18	276:7 285:9	58:1,18 62:2,14 63:14 82:19	exclusively 192:8
especially 35:8	everybody's	93:12 99:22	excuse 102:11
112:14 160:11	136:17 139:6	123:15 124:4,20	
189:17 218:7	everyone 13:8,9	138:16 154:16	excuses 61:21
essence 79:21	21:18 23:2	182:18 183:7	executive 3:4 5:21
essential 103:16	30:17 36:21	185:6,7 188:22	54:1 56:10
essentially 107:9	59:8,9 65:21	190:4 203:11	197:7
118:9 120:19	89:21 93:2 174:22 175:8	204:19 211:7	exercise 120:12
144:10 162:4	207:5 219:7	217:9 256:6	exerts 29:9
Essex 53:20 54:11	234:4 242:22	263:14 273:14	exist 77:5 120:17
	243:2 273:4	275:4	221:5
establish 68:14	285:7 286:1,21	examples 31:16	
117:2,9 133:5 135:5,8 147:17	everything 16:11	56:6 84:5	existed 151:6
166:21 167:8,18	43:3 109:4	183:15 256:22 283:18	existing 14:12
195:2	142:6 144:9		255:16
established 43:2	160:1 164:18	exce3ssive 116:6	exists 51:18 101:4
71:13	171:21 219:20	exceed 131:9	178:15
	224:16 228:17	excellent 64:4	exits 104:1
establishing 27:15	263:5,8	115:22 247:15	exorbitant 79:17
establishment	evidence 177:16	except 52:7 82:7	116:6,22
133:4,19	182:4 187:16	109:21 121:17	expand 66:22
estimate 15:17	202:4	140:21 167:15	69:2 84:3 90:5
149:7	evidence-based	exception 18:20	212:13 215:13
estimated 152:16	182:3	122:18 185:2,13	expanded 250:22
estimates 148:13	evolution 258:16	· ·	•
149:17 150:1	281:9	exceptions 168:18	expansion 53:18
152:13	evolve 272:18	excess 251:22	expect 134:11
estimating 153:13	evolved 134:5	excessive 116:21	152:10 154:7
etcetera 26:7 95:4	evolveu 134.3	199:12,13,14	expectations
ексекега 26: / 95:4			

extent 144:1	184:16	203:1,2,3,5,6
146:12 156:21	185:16,19 186:2	207:13
	188:2,5	208:12,19,20
	,	209:10,20
		210:3,22
external 20012		211:6,10 214:6
extortion 263:18		216:2,4,7 220:7
extra 144·19		235:11,17 239:2
	,	249:9 251:14
		263:3 271:21
		277:6 282:10
	-	
21:3 107:6	*	facing 93:16
extrapolated	,	fact 35:17 38:15
149:19	,	56:15 57:10
extreme 31·10		58:22 66:6
		86:11 90:8
•	, ,	99:3,5 100:13
	7	112:2 121:1
155:6	5 5	129:19 138:10
	*	189:1 195:8
F		220:11 223:2
face 29:19		244:18 247:4
108:14,15	· ·	251:22 255:1
111:4,5		266:20
,		facto 27:2
·		
		factor 45:6
faced 66:1		186:2,5,8
face-to-face 28:18		factors 188:5
258:19		233:19
facilitate 14·22	,	fair 14:14 18:11
	-	39:6 53:14
	,	59:4,17 61:14
		64:13 65:12
	*	84:13 148:21
*	,	156:17,19
* *	-	176:22 180:13
		196:8 222:21
*		235:4 236:21
	,	238:14 240:20
,	*	241:2
116:1 122:21		
123:8 131:18,19	189:22 190:16	242:13,14,20
	146:12 156:21 161:2 169:6,8 223:11 268:9 external 266:2 extortion 263:18 extra 144:19 171:8 202:15 232:13 extraordinary 21:3 107:6 extrapolated 149:19 extreme 31:10 extremely 14:4 74:6 103:4 155:6 F face 29:19 108:14,15 111:4,5 257:4,11 Facebook 255:17 faced 66:1 face-to-face 28:18 258:19 facilitate 14:22 48:14 247:7 275:21 facilities 7:2 15:15,16 18:8 28:3,18,22 29:3 55:9 57:9 59:6 61:2 69:11,17 76:2 93:11 95:6,7 96:4	146:12 156:21 161:2 169:6,8 223:11 268:9 external 266:2 extortion 263:18 extra 144:19 171:8 202:15 232:13 extraordinary 21:3 107:6 extrapolated 149:19 extreme 31:10 extremely 14:4 74:6 103:4 155:6 F face 29:19 108:14,15 111:4,5 257:4,11 Facebook 255:17 faced 66:1 face-to-face 28:18 258:19 facilitate 14:22 48:14 247:7 275:21 facilities 7:2 15:15,16 18:8 28:3,18,22 29:3 55:9 57:9 59:6 61:2 69:11,17 76:2 93:11 95:6,7 96:4 188:2,5 189:2,4,7,10 190:12 191:22 192:4,7,9,11,12, 13 194:6 195:6,10 199:20 201:19 202:22 203:13 204:4 205:7,9 206:12 207:8,15 208:2,14 209:4,16 210:14 211:9,14 213:17 215:21 217:6,12,16 218:6,17 219:1 222:4,8,22 224:4 226:6,13 232:21 239:2,19,21 240:6,19 241:2,10,22 270:13 272:20 279:9 facility 29:1 81:2 85:5,6 90:11 91:16,22 95:12 98:10 99:4,7 116:4 124:2 131:21,22 131:21,22 131:21,22 132:1,3 160:12,17 171:22 172:3 175:4 182:2 186:6,7 187:9,14

	U	C 20	
fairness 39:7	245:7 247:8	143:4 145:9	194:16 203:20
fall 64:6 148:6	252:13 255:19	146:22 148:7	246:5 259:12
	261:5 275:16	155:13	279:10
156:3	281:20 284:6	156:16,18	
fallacies 62:16		157:14,15	February 16:22
false 27:7 120:12	family's 44:19	161:8,13,15	27:10 33:11
225:2	137:20 141:18	164:20	49:22 130:6
	famous 20:2	165:4,8,16	155:14 184:11
familiar 265:3	fan 211:2	168:17 169:9,16	federal 1:3 21:4
families 15:21		172:15 176:1	30:4 31:4 32:2,6
21:12 25:21	fancy 32:10	177:10 178:10	37:15 42:17,21
26:19 29:6 33:7	124:10	179:4 188:10	43:12 44:10
37:11 45:12	FAQ's 33:16	189:13,20	45:22 47:3
47:12 48:15	_	190:22 191:4	65:10 68:22
59:10 64:7	fast 205:21	193:5,7 196:9	73:22 119:1
80:15 89:10	father 78:11,18	202:20 203:9	121:16 195:14
110:15 111:3	fault 105:22	202.20 203.9 209:15 217:9	247:5 266:20
129:8 131:6,10		218:20 219:8	federalism 67:12
136:19 173:9	FCC 1:3 2:2,6	225:12	
180:1 222:6	16:13 19:2,6	228:2,15,17	fee 58:5,9,11 76:6
223:7,13	24:4 25:4 27:19	2 2	79:22 118:11
236:14,20	30:3 32:5 33:20	230:6 233:18	119:2,3,7,13
237:3,19 244:4	34:6,21	234:21 239:13	120:5 124:17
246:8 247:21	35:3,6,13,14	240:3 243:19	131:16 132:8,15
264:8 272:14	36:12 37:5 41:9	247:15,16	133:4,12,19,20
275:13 280:22	46:14 49:1,14	252:16 258:5,14	138:1 141:3,17
285:13	50:22 52:4	267:11 286:20	144:11 146:21
	54:17 55:3 57:3	FCC's 13:14	147:16,22
family 14:6 16:21	58:21 59:1,18	17:15 18:15	150:10 159:22
20:22 21:17	63:21 64:21,22	27:11 34:3 36:9	160:20 162:10
39:2,12,19,20	66:21 67:7,12	38:10 59:16	163:11 164:4
44:21	68:5,22	69:4 83:13	165:21 166:3,7
45:1,5,9,11,17,1	71:12,13,14,16	89:22 103:13	167:8,18 168:5
8 46:3,6,12	72:4,8,21 82:3	119:18 123:15	170:10,16,22
64:10,16 72:13	85:20 89:11	155:19 182:19	173:17 271:7
75:11 89:14,17	97:8 103:9	193:3 196:4	feed 168:2
132:6,9	104:8 108:12	234:10	
135:10,15 136:1	113:16 115:8	fear 40:21 257:20	feel 19:2 60:3,5
138:14 139:1,8	119:4 120:5		102:8 118:20
140:22 142:4,14	121:4 125:16	feasible 252:9	282:14
147:16 148:1	126:2,19	feature 204:17	feels 154:11
154:12,17	127:9,13	268:19	
170:15	128:9,12 130:18		fees 12:14
171:12,17 180:5	131:13 132:14	features 181:11	26:16,18 50:19
181:16 197:14	136:3,10,16	183:18 185:22	57:7,16
233:7 242:1,7	139:3 140:18	186:17 187:11	58:17,19 64:5

	1 age 27			
65:10	166:5,11,12	116:19	fined 103:14	
115:12,15,19	168:1,4,7,9,10,2	figures 149:22	fingertips 230:16	
116:6,21	2	230:16 274:11	finish 30:9 130:5	
117:1,20 118:8,10,17,19	169:4,7,10,19,2 1 170:9,19,21	file 18:2 86:9		
118.8,10,17,19	171:4,8,10	filed 21:9	finite 138:12	
120:8,22	193:1 197:2	52:14,21 83:22	fire 171:21 172:8	
121:4,7	219:15,19	111:8 165:2	firm 53:3 229:6	
122:12,18,19	227:11 229:2,3	filing 41:22	242:6	
123:1,6,11,12,1	feet 201:22	201:5,8 225:12	firmly 17:22	
7,19 124:5,13,18	fell 110:13 182:21	filings 157:13	first 10:20 17:15	
125:2,3,7,10,12,	183:4	fill 231:5	20:11,20 24:4	
14,18,21 126:6	fellow 175:7		25:2 36:22 42:8	
127:8,16,17,22	Fellowship 2:21	filled 37:21 38:1,5 259:7	60:14 64:4 77:4 79:5 84:10	
128:4	5:18 24:20		104:15 105:16	
129:5,6,16	43:22 44:1,4,7,8	filling 272:13	106:18 117:2	
130:2,7,14 131:5	48:10,22	filtering 254:15	119:15 125:22	
131:3	felt 234:15 266:21	final 92:20 93:19	126:5,7 130:17	
132:4,16,17,21	267:17	165:12 179:8	137:3 140:18	
,13,17,21,22	feminist 105:18	202:7 206:22	145:2 148:18	
134:2,5	fencing 260:2	284:14	177:6 182:9	
135:1,3,14,18,2	269:10	finalized 132:16	205:12 206:4,17 227:22 228:12	
0,22		163:11	229:16,17	
136:6,16,18,22	fewer 276:16,17	finally 54:13	234:20 244:5,7	
137:3,9,11,12,1 7 138:3 139:5	fiber 202:1	115:3 134:2	248:10,22	
140:5,7,14,19,2	field 54:2 122:1	186:10 204:10	252:15 253:8	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	fifteen 14:8	257:11 286:16 287:2	256:3 273:15	
141:10,11,16,19	fifth 119:15		274:20 285:8,11	
,21 142:1,10	fifty 201:10	finances 237:10	fiscal 45:3 232:14	
143:6 144:1 145:4,10,16	fight 111:14	financial 160:6 246:14	fit 37:5	
145.4,10,16			fits 157:3	
18,20	fighting 47:8	financially 288:13	five 15:4,11 24:1	
147:1,9,12,13	fights 276:16	finding 14:15	55:20 88:14	
149:7,14,18	figure 22:1,7	135:11	126:14 172:7	
150:6 151:4,5,8	34:14 79:11	findings 17:13	190:6,7 209:9	
152:1,9,16	105:18 109:19	45:21	220:9 267:2	
156:21	130:12 158:15	finds 268:3	five-year 221:16	
159:13,18,19,21 161:16,20	170:5 210:15 212:9	fine 219:17	fix 139:5 278:2	
162:4,19 164:16		283:15	fixed 97:1 138:12	
165:19	figured 109:21		183:19 209:3	
	Į.			

	1 46	-	
278:1	272:6 287:10	forum 177:1	246:1 261:10
fixing 265:7	follow-up 107:12	forums 48:4	275:16
flag 83:7 flash 66:13 220:8	145:5 161:17 165:1,15	forward 31:13 48:22 75:4	FRIEDMAN 222:1
221:6 flat 49:19 58:9 84:11 160:20 183:5,8 184:12	216:10,19 219:12 233:20 268:11 270:2 277:17 footing 223:14	78:20,21 90:13 92:19 96:2,19 97:6 100:21 157:7 165:9 174:8,13,15	Friedmann 3:13 7:14 175:14 180:21,22 225:17 236:11 241:14 242:20
214:17 270:20 flaw 101:12	force 62:13 216:6 238:11 263:20	205:21 287:13 forwarded 89:16	friend 20:4 106:13
flesh 272:8 flip 268:6	forces 20:15 238:20 258:2,8	forwarding 81:13 founded 54:22	friends 14:6 16:21 64:16 197:14
float 215:19,21 floor 213:8	forcing 257:21 forefront 176:20	Founder 2:19 3:20,22 5:16	242:1,7 247:21 252:13 255:19 261:4 280:22
Florida 56:21 179:3,16 203:6	258:1 foregoing 288:3,4	8:13,15 founding 252:20	281:20 285:13 front 99:10 281:1
204:20 211:7 fly 218:11	foregoing/ attached 289:10	four-drawer 201:5	fruits 31:6 frys 191:11
FM 269:7	290:10 foreign 194:3	fourth 115:13 131:2 198:21	FTI 229:7
focus 114:11 166:14 182:6 244:1 261:16	foremost 140:18	fractions 119:10 frame 104:19	full 41:3 88:4 106:2 191:17
272:12 focused 93:4	forget 241:4 forgetting 63:4	frame 104:19 framework 83:13	fully 12:1 38:3 43:7
179:18 180:2 234:12 243:21	forgot 234:21 form 182:12	Francisco 35:18 36:1,3,6,11 163:13 186:11	fun 201:1 279:8 functional 76:22
245:14 259:3 260:3 283:2,19	197:11 237:18 format 159:2	frankly 157:12	functioning 63:19
focusing 114:2	forms 47:6 48:8	285:19 free 60:3,5 80:7	functions 143:15,18
folk 236:2 folks 60:1 65:9 70:19 73:17 76:21 85:19 104:10 137:21 138:10 152:6	243:9 forth 103:15 124:15 157:13 283:1 forthcoming 88:9	121:1 167:2 193:18 194:2 206:13 270:12 freedom 247:22 253:11	fund 62:21 97:9,10,13,20,2 1,22 98:7 133:8 134:3 163:18 222:5 223:11 265:22
159:5 172:6 179:22 189:1 221:9 269:2	fortunate 78:11 126:9,19 Fortune 105:20	freely 258:6 Frequency 81:10	fundamental 59:15
		frequent 245:6	funded 129:13

	1 46	T	
221:7 223:6	games 61:7 254:4	gets 89:16 139:8	281:20
224:1	255:7	167:7	goods 254:20
265:11,14,16,17	gang 204:21	getting 22:10	282:7
funding 42:21	gap 210:21 211:1	52:13 74:8,14	Google 255:17
66:15 90:18	•	76:10 81:18	9
117:11 124:5	gaps 70:9	87:5 88:1,3	gotten 128:10 140:5
133:6,20,21	garner 214:13	92:22 113:7	
164:11 170:10 223:3 255:22	gather 53:13 89:5	139:4 152:21 191:18 207:10	gouge 56:14
257:5 265:5	100:14	220:22 225:1	gouging 59:11
266:14	gathering 22:10		government 19:21
268:1,7,8	51:11 89:4	given 55:18 64:18 66:10 188:16	59:11 100:11
funds 118:4	gathers 83:3	191:22 246:16	105:12 118:19
151:22	geared 179:19	247:6	181:7 224:14
220:13,18	S	gives 141:17 246:4	286:19 287:4
223:6,18 224:1	GED 61:8	_	governmental
263:17,18	general 34:10	giving 173:21	73:7
264:6,9 266:2	62:21 144:4	glad 107:15 112:8	government-
273:18 274:21	189:17 194:5 195:17 196:2	140:2 179:4	imposed 133:1
275:1,9	263:16 269:16	206:2 265:16	governments 49:3
funny 275:3		Global 3:19 4:5	66:7 224:18
furnished 193:22	generally 114:6,7 128:18 133:17	8:3,18 49:12	government's
Furthermore	147:12 149:19	50:15,17 100:4	56:9
131:12	151:9 170:19	175:19 204:11	governor 51:22
future 26:14	235:12 272:11	globe 201:7	grab 18:15
29:10 34:21	278:10	goal 126:17,18	
250:11	generate 236:16	135:13 145:7	gracious 106:20
280:19,20 281:2	generated 122:22	goals 45:14	Gram 141:15
283:3,20	177:19	God 142:19	grandmother
FY-15 92:18	generation 250:16	GOLDBLATT	111:7,10,13
	281:6	10:5,9 113:19	grandson 21:1
G		gone 18:21 70:2	111:7,10,11,18
Gainsboro 3:22	generator 153:7	92:6 124:7	Grange 276:10
8:15 247:12,13	generous 113:1	140:7 206:18	grant 4:3 8:16
259:19 263:10	gentlemen 106:12	Gongaware 4:3	252:19 266:1
266:15 269:16	gentlewoman	8:16	granted 68:1
274:13 279:14 282:12	113:4	252:14,15,19	111:21 112:1
	geo 260:2 269:9	259:5 261:13	283:15
game 102:22 211:19 212:5	Georgia 62:2,12	264:22 265:4,15	grapple 34:7
254:21	244:18,20	270:6 272:19	9 11
2J7.21	211.10,20	277:12 279:5	grateful 13:6 33:2

	1 ag	2 3 0	
44:10 111:4	grumbling 213:1	221:18	266:22
112:12,13,14 113:10	GTL 124:22	guise 138:5 148:6	happens 81:21
	154:4,9 266:3	guns 139:15	126:1,7
gratifying 191:8	GTL's 50:20	guts 139:14	138:13,18 171:21 202:5
gratitude 111:16	guarantee 205:13	gutted 241:10	208:17
grave 74:10	213:17 232:19	guy 201:3 205:10	274:15,17
great 11:4 30:16	272:2	230:10	275:2,4
35:1 55:5 67:14	Guatemala 232:6	guys 212:5 247:17	282:19,21
73:15 86:22	Gude 2:7 5:7 7:6	282:17	happy 207:20
113:16 136:8 137:8 138:22	9:3 22:19 30:15	202.17	236:3
137.8 138.22	36:20 43:18		harassed
143:4 149:21	49:5 54:13 59:21 60:14	half 85:22 147:14	206:15,16
150:4,7 176:3	65:18 69:22	halfway 165:11	harbor 52:12
208:20 211:17	74:12 76:12	247:6	142:1 193:5
212:2 223:13	86:21 90:21	Hampshire 251:1	hard 19:19 36:13
241:7 243:2 271:13 284:20	91:20 92:11	•	38:21 67:22
271.13 284.20 286:16	94:19 96:3	hand 10:14 61:1 261:19,20	93:8 109:19
	99:12 104:14	ŕ	126:20 152:6 197:2 204:14
greater 110:6 239:15 250:2,18	105:3 174:21 180:20 187:18	handheld 278:20 281:10	212:13 228:16
252:4	190:19 196:12		232:19
greatest 110:4	204:9 207:4	hand-held 261:12	harder 280:3
232:6 244:22	210:1,5,7	handle 135:10	
283:6	212:11 215:6	272:20	hardship 222:3
green 119:9	216:9,12,16	handling 23:14	hardships 16:6
Greg 19:22	223:16 227:7 233:20 234:3,19	handout 137:18	222:7
grievances 41:22	236:5,10 240:10	handouts 137:1,2	hardware 181:10 192:20 253:1,13
256:9 277:15	242:17 243:1	hands 261:15	255:13
Gross 203:3	285:3,6	277:11	hardwired 276:14
	guess 11:14 160:4	hang 80:18 126:1	
grounded 18:1	216:18	218:7	harm 218:22 248:2 251:21
group 42:5 109:6	guesses 150:1	happen 109:6	252:3
114:17 151:16	guidance 71:12	138:3 206:15	Hartford 244:6
grouped 202:10	272:16	261:21 287:1	
grouping 168:12	guide 287:20	happened 49:14	hate 210:10
grow 232:16	guideline 190:14	51:15 67:14,19	haven't 76:15
280:2	guidelines 29:21	111:5 128:5	83:19 88:21 92:6 93:20
growing 79:14	158:22 178:15	137:16 155:14 239:9 263:17,21	128:10 152:3
115:14	100.22 170.10	237.7 203.17,21	157:22 163:11

	1 46		
231:3	HEARD's 39:15	herself 107:1	216:1,2 218:14 238:18
having 14:17	hearing 37:22	he's 131:21	
33:17 35:2	38:3,21 39:21	147:11 160:4	high-level 228:4
53:14 87:11	41:2 75:6 89:9	hey 70:20	highlight 35:17
100:14 102:14	215:8 272:5	· ·	98:13 256:22
122:7 127:4	288:3,5	Hi 30:16 49:7	
159:12 166:7	heavily 110:13	54:15 190:21	highlighted 15:20
174:5,6 190:11	l	hidden 123:3	highly 245:13
206:14 210:17	heavy 47:15	145:4,12 256:4	246:4 252:2
218:14 232:3	held 57:1 188:7	high 12:13 27:1	Highways 105:10
233:1 236:21	190:16	35:21,22 49:10	· ·
240:5 271:20	help 36:10 83:15	50:8,13 52:10	hinder 257:22
275:7 278:15	98:8 113:8	57:7 58:10	hire 278:8
279:18 284:3	158:21,22	60:21 62:1 65:3	historically 50.2
285:7	197:17 202:16	76:9 79:17	historically 58:2
headed 281:5	220:22 224:19	84:6,7,8 85:1,4	history 47:4 230:5
	267:3,11 273:10	91:19,21 94:6	hit 251:3 271:9
headquarters	276:19	98:6 101:3	hitting 136:14
191:2	279:1,2,3	116:5,15	S
heads 166:15	287:20	122:15,19	hold 43:16 161:10
health 38:6		137:11	170:14 192:8
62:5,13	helped 31:13	152:18,19	259:6
220:19,21 223:4	273:13,20 274:6	153:21 185:3	holding 20:12
276:6	helpful 11:9 48:9	215:15,18	38:18 123:21
healthcare 62:10	59:22 94:11	216:5,20 218:9	125:5 131:18
	142:4 188:15	237:3 246:16	Holmes 6:3 105:5
hear 18:17 81:12	190:14 240:4	250:8 285:13	106:15 286:2
108:4 112:6,10	265:14	higher 16:20 52:8	
179:4 200:19	helping 2:19 5:16	67:21 92:7	HOLMES-
265:14 281:4	24:17 255:15	97:4,15 120:1	NORTON
heard 2:20 5:17	helps 46:10 74:16	122:3 124:18	106:18
17:1 23:9 24:19	104:19 132:5	130:21 140:11	home 106:7 109:1
41:15 52:9 55:5	180:1,9 245:21	146:5 152:21	132:22 137:19
60:17,18 61:1	ĺ	181:19 185:14	233:8,13 276:6
63:18 83:19	hence 114:11	208:4,7 211:13	Homeland 3:16
91:7 96:13	hereby 288:3	215:17 216:1,22	7:20 14:2 53:20
114:9 144:2	289:4 290:4	218:13,14	175:17
151:15 196:20	here's 159:15,16	225:22 232:8,11	Honduras 232:7
198:5,10,18	198:15 211:3	237:11 254:11	
207:7 227:9	hereto 288:13	highest 51:8,20	honest 92:5 116:2
231:3 234:7		55:14 58:3	honor 176:1 235:2
244:7 260:8	herring 64:1	137:3,11 154:9	hook 76:6 212:12
267:20 269:3	101:4	189:18,19	hope 18:14 19:1,5
		,	10pc 10.14 19.1,3

_	1 46	·	
23:5 36:13	233:15	165:22 166:1,22	ill 62:5,13
38:19 59:19	hundred 201:10	169:8 175:2	I'll 23:21 36:4
102:9 134:11		177:22 178:3	53:16 84:9
136:2,15 145:3	hundreds 21:13	182:6,10,15	121:3 130:5
177:1 235:3,22	108:18 204:3	183:1,7,17,21	140:16 155:5
236:6 243:3	223:21 251:7	184:6,11,13	166:15 182:9
285:19 287:19	267:14	185:3,22 187:11	204:19 207:6
hopeful 37:8	Hunterdon	199:19 227:16	211:4
_	184:19	253:13 257:18	237:14,16,18
hopefully 22:21	hurt 273:14 274:7	258:6	256:2 258:15
128:22 165:10		ICS's 42:17	262:4 266:16
209:15 229:20	hurtful 274:9		
231:5 284:3		I'd 19:17 54:16,18	illegal 65:6 211:20
horrible 177:17	I	59:22 61:20	244:20
host 118:22	I9'll 234:18	67:8,17 69:22 78:7,19 113:22	illusion 121:20
hosting 37:5	ICE 85:5 86:5	114:13 115:18	illustrate 32:21
252:16	191:4,14,21	130:17 171:2	42:7
	192:2,4,5,8,11,1	190:21 211:14	illustration 33:19
hot 33:13	8,20 193:10	215:13 216:19	
hotline 41:9 71:14	194:4,10,11	219:12 229:5	I'm 20:1 21:20
hotlines 41:9	195:4,8,12,19,2	232:11,12	25:12 33:8
194:4	2 207:15 208:14	241:16 244:1	35:5,18 54:15
	231:3,7,17	252:15,17 253:4	66:3 67:2 83:2
hours 19:19	233:4	258:13	84:15 94:7,8
171:21 172:8	ICE's 54:2		107:8 108:14
209:9 273:2,3	193:4,8	idea 104:5 124:3	122:8,13
house 15:18 71:17	ĺ –	146:3 264:7	126:9,12,13
105:8 107:7	ICS 7:2 23:8	270:3	128:20 130:22
192:14 247:6	25:16,22 26:13	ideally 101:19	136:9 139:19
housing 232:20	27:3,8,12	133:14 171:2	140:2 145:1,2
	29:1,2,4,14,16	ideas 196:18	159:19 161:17
HRDC 86:22 88:4	30:5 43:6 58:16	279:12	176:3,6 187:20
236:13	59:11 60:21	identification	197:7 198:17
Hudson 85:7,9	75:1 84:8 87:1 88:19 93:7	96:16 248:21	199:5,6 201:3 206:1 207:14
huge 73:1 74:7	94:13 95:6,8	252:8	210:1 211:2
124:19 154:10	99:17 101:14		210.1 211.2 212:11 215:8
255:22 276:10	114:10	identified 29:2	216:3,4,9
	115:2,4,11,19	147:6 249:14	219:17 237:13
Hulegion 19:22	116:4,12,17	250:6 251:7,11	242:3 243:12
human 3:4 5:22	117:2,14 119:6	identify 251:2	265:12,16 276:1
24:22 54:16,21	120:21	275:7 283:4	279:5 280:14
59:13,15 170:17	121:9,13,22	ignored 16:16	282:4 287:3
272:7	123:11 131:13	8	
humanitarian	153:13 154:5	ILECS 144:5	imagine 130:13
	100.10 10 1.0		

	1 46		
immediate 19:11	92:16 254:22	improving 247:1	97:8 117:3
immediately	257:15	282:2	141:12 146:7
19:14 42:15	implementation	inactive 125:9	159:12 177:10
66:13 147:19	33:22 68:12		184:14 249:21
211:5 255:5	76:18 253:4,9	inappropriate	251:8 252:5
	Í	64:5 166:20	277:14
immigrant 3:3	implemented	252:2	includes 56:20
5:20 24:21	27:11 49:15	inappropriately	219:14
52:10 53:10,22	155:14 210:20	98:6	
85:3,21 93:5,15	215:4	inaudible 30:5	including 17:19
233:2	implementing	212:19 243:9	39:22 40:5 42:2
immigrants	92:20 256:1		53:5 70:18
109:11	implicate 70.0	255:17 268:5	100:22 131:17
	implicate 78:9	284:18	145:8 180:17
Immigrant's 53:1	implications	Inc 2:18 3:10,18	181:5 184:21
immigration 3:16	124:14	5:15 6:19 7:21	192:12 194:3,17
7:19 14:1	importance 286:4	30:21	214:4
53:9,13 85:17	l • 1	incarcerate 62:8	inclusive 137:5
131:18 175:16	important 11:13 36:15 44:11,17		income 97:22 98:8
191:2 194:4	45:10 46:11	incarcerated 21:1,14 39:21	116:8 138:11,12
immoral 36:1	49:3 60:10 98:1	42:13 44:20	198:13
47:7	1		
immost 5.4 12.14	104:6 107:22 108:1,20	47:12 48:14,20	incorporate 83:13
impact 5:4 13:14 15:14,21 18:6	123:7,18 137:15	61:5 64:7 108:19 109:9	98:16 121:11
19:12 24:9	144:7,20	135:12 189:9,12	incorporated
25:14 32:21	159:6,7 180:10	190:8 261:4	144:11 171:9
34:8 44:14,18	188:20 194:16		195:8
45:4,12 46:13	225:9,19 231:14	incarceration	increase 83:12
57:7 112:4	233:1,6,11,19	37:21 38:1,4	134:17 137:17
157:2	235:5 236:12	132:7	169:3 218:1
268:8,10,16	237:6 239:19,22	incentive 29:3	221:7 225:14
273:8 285:13	247:20 248:7	120:21	269:14
	251:10 255:15	incentivize 83:10	
impacted 32:7	269:1 282:6		increased 15:14
33:2		incentivizes 83:5	17:2 70:16
impacting 33:1	imposed 193:3	incidents 83:3	126:4 134:18
87:13	imposition 169:7	276:16 277:16	137:14 140:7
impacts 32:3	improve 104:20	include 24:14	193:15 194:20 276:19
234:8 286:6	258:3,8 261:18	26:13 118:2	
impaired 272:5	284:5 285:20	121:15 141:5	increases 83:6
	improved 250:22	171:16 184:18	increasing 130:14
imperative 173:2	259:18 275:21	248:3 250:17	247:2 256:5
implement		254:4,8	incredibly 231:13
47:2,21 48:6	improves 285:18	included 42:19	
		meiuded 72.17	

	1 ag		
233:10 239:18	inform 161:4	44:8 48:6 49:11	186:21
increments 163:3	informants 248:6	61:9 68:4	197:11,14,18
		69:6,13 72:12	201:18 203:7,22
incur 28:22 29:10	information 10:17	95:1,15 97:14	206:8 212:16
224:10	34:10 43:15	117:8,16 118:5	220:15 223:22
incurs 178:21	71:7,17 72:11	119:17 130:20	224:20 235:12
indeed 56:15	73:21 74:8,14	131:1,3,6,20	236:19 242:1,7
244:16	100:21 103:1	132:18 133:12	247:20 248:13
	104:7 128:15,19	135:7 136:1,3,7	249:22
independently	146:9 155:7	144:8 157:19,20	250:1,3,7,12
50:15 51:6	161:12 163:8	177:15 178:18	251:17,20
index 10:12	164:20,21 165:5	179:11,21	252:11 253:22
indicate 38:11	201:2 207:13	181:5,17,18	254:11
109:2	239:18 240:3,5	187:8 193:3	255:3,5,15
	251:15	204:18 205:12	256:3,8,10
indicating 130:11	informed 54:2	214:4,10,12	258:22 260:9
183:21	100:18	220:14 224:1	263:16 264:9
indicator 47:5	infrastructure	235:15 238:16	266:18 272:14
	105:9 181:9	243:21 247:19	273:17,18
individual 52:2	183:16,19 184:3	248:1,9,15,16	275:8,9,12
58:10 71:9	185:21 186:18	249:3,5,12,20	278:16,18
172:10 213:17	187:10	250:18	280:21 281:22
261:4		251:3,4,12,17	285:12
individuals 42:6	inherent 223:5	252:1,6,10,12	inmate's 28:13
60:3 61:5	initial 49:21	255:8 256:17	29:4 46:4
industry 25:16	128:11 133:20	257:3	147:10 249:5
26:1 29:8,16,22	146:10 212:17	258:3,8,16	
30:5,8,12	Initiative 3:6 6:14	259:9,18,20	Inmates 167:16
56:7,14 58:16	7:16 114:16	260:11,16	205:17
60:22 65:21	122:9 127:20	261:22 262:22	innocent 188:19
68:9 100:10,20	151:3 175:15	263:19,20 264:8	innovate
131:4,15 151:20	187:22	273:9 274:3	257:2,20,22
155:5 181:3		277:7 281:9,12	258:6
205:11 206:2	initiatives 239:18	282:4 283:13,20	innovation 258:7
210:15 222:14	injustice 74:10	inmates 14:7 17:6	
228:2 229:7	283:9	18:7 25:21 29:6	innovative 254:18
240:19 248:11	inmate 1:7 12:6	30:13 31:21	257:17
249:1,15 251:19	13:15,16 14:3	54:9 61:5,17	in-person 271:20
255:21 266:17	15:19 16:8 17:8	81:3,22 82:5	input 243:5
267:19 278:11	18:2,17 19:16	95:2,20 97:11	<u> </u>
282:16	25:7,10,14	129:8 131:10	inside 32:4 73:22
inflated 101:11	26:19,20	135:16 170:12	95:6 220:19
inflates 76:8	27:16,21 28:17	172:1,2	224:4 239:9
initates /0.0	37:9,12 39:5,9	184:20,21,22	Insofar 12:4

r	1 46		
inspecting 30:12	intends 287:17	233:5,21	12:22 23:22
inspection 118:17	inter 49:20 240:11	internet 10:11	24:2 105:4
Inspector 194:5	interact 272:14	24:6 143:11 254:9	178:1 253:12 258:9 282:19
inspects 94:21	interaction		introduced
installation	170:18 245:7,8	interpreters 286:21	114:14 222:13
192:19	intercept 251:15	interstate 12:10	273:15 274:3
installed 38:17	interchangeable	14:3 16:18	introducing 23:19
70:14 185:19	226:22	44:13,14 46:19	114:13
201:14 244:5	interest 66:9	47:10,15	introduction
276:11,12 277:13	84:22 109:8	50:4,6,9,12,19,2	112:22
installing 181:9	180:16 191:9 195:4 252:4	1 52:8 70:8 87:11 110:18	invested 267:9,17
276:13	265:3	119:15,16,18	investigate 41:17
instance 144:14	interested 71:2,18	120:3 121:9	investigated 60:15
instances 46:11	129:4,12 157:21	130:9 138:22	investigating
277:6	218:2 288:14	157:5 169:2 178:13 182:19	136:3
instate 59:19	interesting 23:4	183:3,4,12	investigation
in-state 55:9	104:16 139:12	184:9 210:18,19	135:18
100:2 186:13	173:6 202:10	217:10 222:22	investigative
instead 123:17	270:4,9,12 272:22 279:12	234:10 240:15	259:12
145:11 159:12	281:3 282:13	241:6	investigators
166:3 169:19	interim 12:10	interstate- intrastate 212:6	205:4
186:15 211:9	22:3 27:11 55:4		investment
239:9 271:19	68:1,18 119:18	intimidating 248:4	214:10
285:7	155:15 210:20		invitation 130:18
Institute 53:2 176:15	234:10	intra 240:12	invited 107:8
instituted 135:2	intermediaries	intra(inaudible 185:7	inviting 54:17
	27:15		190:22 204:13
institutions 256:7 262:13	internal 266:11,13 268:8 273:10	intrastate 12:11 17:20 18:21	247:17 258:14
		22:8 25:15	involved 27:6
instructive 183:6 287:12	internally 230:21 266:1 268:14	26:14 44:16	46:8 88:3
		47:14,18 49:20	95:14,18,20 108:22 112:17
instrument 28:13	international 46:16	50:3,8 52:6	114:20 176:11
intact 75:12	93:6,7,9,13	87:13 110:18 157:6 169:3	177:20 205:15
intelligence 260:1	94:3,4 115:1	178:14 215:5	223:22 236:7
intelligent 174:4	193:11,13	222:22 234:9	243:4 250:19 265:13 286:22
intend 12:19	231:4,7,10,13 232:7,12	240:15	287:15,19
	434.1,14	introduce 11:5	- , -

	1 48		
involvement	58:15,20 74:17	146:3 147:4,5,7	153:21 155:2
95:15,22	94:8 98:11	148:5 152:15,20	163:13 172:14
IP 250:13	104:16,17,20	153:10 154:18	176:11 198:5
	108:12,14 112:4	157:14	202:10 204:2
ironic 89:8	114:2 196:22	158:17,18	206:1 210:9
Ironically 244:8	203:22 204:21	159:2,3,6,7	213:12 239:14
irrelevant	206:14 222:9	165:3 167:9	240:12 279:14
188:2,13	263:13	172:20 173:5	282:16,18
ŕ	285:12,14,15	174:16 182:4	IVR 133:5,22
irreplaceable	item 19:11	188:20 189:6,17	135:6 141:13
177:9	items 200:12	190:6 191:7	159:15 167:10
irresponsible		193:21	172:12,20
283:12	It'll 229:1,2,3	196:17,19	
Island 182:15	it's 10:21 12:21	197:2,3,21	
isn't 72:8 88:20	13:11 22:19	200:17,19	jail 3:12 7:12
166:6 190:14	30:21 32:5,17	201:6,20 202:19 203:7,14	35:8,21
241:2	33:2,10,13	203:7,14 209:12,19	36:1,3,7,11 53:8
	55:12,21	212:19 214:6	55:12,13,14,18
isolating 41:11	56:11,15	212.19.214.0	56:13 83:9 85:7
isolation 38:5	62:7,17 63:12	218:16,17,19	91:1 98:4,9 99:4
issue 11:13,16,18	64:12,21 65:1,6	219:3 225:9	130:13 134:7,22
12:20 24:3,11	68:13,17	226:4 232:19	168:13 171:20
30:3 31:13	69:14,19	233:17 235:20	175:13
43:14 44:12	71:1,16 73:21	236:12 239:13	176:7,13,16,20
53:7 54:19	77:19,21,22	240:20 241:1,6	178:16,19
55:2,8 57:10	78:5 79:3,7,16	257:14,16	179:9,17 180:9
58:17 59:1	81:6,10 82:19 83:14 85:3	258:16 261:1,5	181:17 182:9
60:16 75:7,15	87:15,16	264:17 266:13	184:7 185:20
78:5 82:17	88:6,13	267:13	186:12,16,20,21
83:15 93:7,14	89:17,18 90:15	268:14,17,20	188:13,16
94:5,6 96:6	92:1,3,7	269:2,4 270:20	190:1,4,10,13
99:19 110:12	93:8,13,14	272:22 277:6	205:2,18
111:5 114:17,20	94:17 98:10	278:5,7,8,9,10	214:1,7,22 215:1 220:13,20
127:14 130:21	101:9	279:8	224:3 236:2
136:14,16	102:11,12,13	280:1,8,15	238:1 239:9
151:15 176:20	103:16 108:1,2	281:8,16	244:7 278:14
177:11 180:15	109:11,13,19	282:12,20,22	280:5 285:15
208:4 235:5	113:14 115:14	284:10 285:10	
241:12 242:10 244:15 285:10	123:18 127:3,12	I've 17:1 67:4	jails 26:10,11,12
286:4	136:15 137:5	80:10 107:5	30:13 50:4 55:8
	139:5,10,21	111:22 121:14	60:9 86:1 87:20
issues 23:8,12	142:13,21 143:1	127:3 140:6	90:18,19 94:22
36:15 57:19	144:7,20 145:17	148:19 152:8	96:6,21,22
			97:1,2,15,16

	1 46		
104:11 109:12	Jimmy 105:14	48:10,22 51:10	killing 177:14
122:17 131:4,19	JLG 3:22 8:15	53:1,3 55:1	kindly 175:9
174:3 175:5 176:2,12 177:4,19 178:4 179:14 180:19 181:19	job 46:7 88:5 106:1 136:13 139:3 140:11 213:11 242:16 247:15 279:3	70:17 72:8 104:8 223:1 247:4 251:9 Justice's 15:3 justifiable 121:12	kinds 86:8 91:8 109:3 110:21 112:4 166:19 190:13 199:15
184:2,3,5,19,20, 21 186:19 187:9	247:13 279:3 281:13	justification 65:9	kiosk 260:18
188:1,12	jobs 203:20 284:7	83:8 187:15	kiosks 260:8 278:20
189:4,16,18 192:5 203:19	join 175:8	justify 135:20	knew 266:17
214:3 223:10	joined 21:21	K	knock 81:16
235:8,21 236:2 239:4,8,20	joining 104:18	Kajstura 3:6 6:13	knocked 82:6
244:11,16 273:11	judges 197:19 judicial 15:16	7:15 114:15 122:6,8 145:13 149:11 152:3	knowledge 28:3 74:1,15 161:22 212:21 251:5
jammers 280:9 jamming 245:16	July 1:10 18:4 129:1 165:1 172:15 228:15	154:3 165:15 167:21 175:15	262:17 285:18 287:6
Jane 45:8 Jay 3:22 8:15	jump 60:3 127:14 234:18	187:21 224:22 238:22	known 115:12 121:11 191:15
273:20	jumped 155:16	Kalpak 2:7 5:7 7:6 9:3 22:18	Knox 271:17 275:3,4
Jay's 266:6 jeopardize 257:20	jurisdiction 25:22	285:2	
Jersey 3:3 5:20 24:20 31:19	28:12 67:8 70:5 72:21,22 73:3 127:15 156:12	Karina 3:3 5:19 24:20 49:6 54:13 83:19	LA 214:8 lab 255:3
49:10,17 50:11,14	jurisdictional 46:16 156:9	92:22 93:1	label 190:13
51:8,10,22	157:11	Kettering 214:6 Kevin 3:15 7:17	labels 190:1
52:15 53:2,6,7 83:22 86:1,7,16	jurisdictionally	13:22 175:15	labor 135:2,7
163:14 184:10,16,17	67:3 jurisdictions	190:20 196:13 231:2 287:3,8	lack 42:1,2 63:22 88:2,18 100:9
185:16	25:19 179:7	key 81:11 109:22 259:16	lacks 182:4
Jersey's 84:22 Jesse 2:21 5:18	jurors 248:5 justice 2:21 5:18	kick 175:21 207:6	ladies 106:12 212:5
24:19 43:18 49:5 66:19	15:3 22:13 24:19 29:20	kickback 56:14 63:6 101:15	Lake 179:4
80:21	30:22 39:15 40:11 41:6	166:2	landlines 193:12 231:20 232:9
Jessica 2:5 5:3	43:13,22 44:2,3,7	kickbacks 62:1 124:15 129:18	LANDRY 3:15

_	1 48	-	
Landy 7:17 13:22	late 52:14 63:7	leads 38:6 76:2,5	Lego 170:6
175:16 190:21	113:15 205:14	Leanza 2:18 5:14	length 92:12
231:11 234:2	later 18:3	24:16 30:16	192:2,3
239:12 287:3	60:12,13 73:10	60:7 72:18	less 45:19 46:7
language 14:5	152:2 244:11	82:17 97:17	
37:21 77:4	273:2	102:4	51:7 79:8 82:4
			92:1 146:11
large 26:12 33:8	Latino 53:1	learned 80:11	155:6 182:22
36:10 56:2 91:4	latter 192:9	learning 255:3	187:3 219:19
92:3 96:7 99:4	launched 248:22	least 16:1 31:14	246:14,16
103:21 151:4		56:20 70:10	271:10 276:16
176:16 184:21	laundry 128:12	72:2 74:3 76:17	lets 79:7
200:11	law 42:18 53:1	83:17 87:10	let's 12:1 34:12,13
202:13,15 214:3	59:7,9 177:8	88:4 110:13	35:2 121:16
215:1 226:13	180:18 188:19	145:19 149:6	140:22 141:10
257:14 263:19	214:14 234:22	152:15 158:7	148:7 242:21
largely 18:21	235:1 254:4	165:5 212:15	
57:10 181:20	lawful 193:6	217:4 219:10	letter 31:21 50:17
larger 44:16 55:19		222:10,12	152:4 177:13
76:6 124:22	laws 37:15	278:11	letters 130:10
190:6	lawsuit 31:2		204:3 258:18
	102:15	leave 39:11 208:4	letting 73:17,18
largest 44:6 55:13		leaves 57:3	9 ,
131:3 154:4	lay 156:15	led 33:22 67:22	level 29:21 30:1
176:12 190:5	layer 269:9	68:1 111:14	48:7 66:7,16
192:6 198:21	lead 12:19 18:15		67:21 95:21
last 14:4 16:17	40:11 111:6	Lee 3:7 6:15	98:10
18:18 19:9	114:19	114:18 126:11	117:2,19,21
21:11 40:10		156:4 164:1	122:1
49:18 51:4,12	leader 71:4 73:15	legal 3:6,13 6:13	144:6,9,13,21
63:18 68:11	105:18 108:17	7:14,15 99:20	166:22 176:19
76:17 77:15	131:5	100:13 114:16	185:14 186:7
81:1 82:20	leaders 73:8	122:9 175:14	218:8 227:19
99:9,12	leadership	196:5	238:13 254:11
102:16,19 105:3	11:13,15,21		258:20 279:6
123:15 142:12	12:3,18 13:6	legally 139:14	286:4,5
149:6 158:8,20	19:14 21:11	legislation	levels 177:10
163:22 165:1	31:11 37:8	51:17,18 52:14	185:17,18
172:15 179:8	38:19 49:9	legislative 86:11	187:10 193:9
187:19 200:8	54:19 59:1,2	J	
231:22 234:11	73:20	legislators 52:3	Lewis 2:19 5:16
242:15,18		legislature 52:1	24:17 36:21
244:12 270:2	leading 254:22	56:9	70:11 76:20
lasted 206:5	286:9	legitimate 246:1,7	94:9 103:18 272:5
145ttu 200.J			414.3

	1 46	<u> </u>	
Liberties 40:1	175:19 198:19	194:18 204:20	209:18,21 216:5
library 254:5	199:5 204:11	206:5 232:3	222:18 235:13
-	247:20	254:16	238:16 241:18
license 171:1	links 33:16	livequestion@fcc.	270:19
licensing 29:18		gov 143:12	longer 77:3 108:5
133:2 269:12	list 23:11 80:2	S	122:3 157:3
Licking 179:15	128:12	LiveQuestions@F	221:6 258:22
	137:3,5,6 232:17	CC.gov 10:12	273:2 275:18
Lien 2:8 5:9 6:6 23:20 64:2		lives 19:12 32:4,7	long-term 89:1
66:19 67:17	listen 206:13	33:12 64:15	8
68:19 80:21	listened 276:3	235:15 258:8	Longview 115:2
83:19 86:15	listening 67:4	living 274:20	loopholes 126:3
90:2 92:22 94:4	95:3	LLC 3:21,22 4:3	211:5
105:3 145:1	listing 198:15	8:14,15,17	Los 55:12,18
154:20 161:17	, and the second	LLP 3:8 6:16	losing 225:3
163:7	lists 259:12	lobby 205:16,18	loss 61:18
life 168:6 203:21	literally 223:21	local 33:17	losses 50:20 87:8
lifeline 97:21 98:9	litigation 29:19	35:7,9,10	
lifting 47:15	little 22:20 52:13	36:8,14 49:2	lost 26:2
G	67:9,18,20,21	52:7 55:9	lot 33:21 36:9
light 44:15 46:13	69:2 73:11	66:6,15,21	55:6 56:2 64:15
231:5	74:11 75:6 80:7	78:14,17,18,19	67:19 68:8
lightly 204:2	84:3 90:5 96:8	79:8 80:1,2,15	73:12 74:10
likely 45:18,19	98:2 121:5	84:6 89:12	78:6 81:18
46:6,7 83:10	128:6 129:15	90:9,10,18	88:16 89:9 92:7
250:19	160:18 161:21	95:12 131:21	97:1 104:17
limit 193:3	166:13 197:8	134:10,18	127:20 133:12
	202:10 204:16	176:10 186:14	134:5 136:17
limitations 73:1	215:7,17 220:4 231:6 235:16	198:21 270:11	140:9 148:4 149:16 151:4,8
limited 138:11	241:9 258:15	localities 91:14	155:15,22
245:9	266:16 267:11	location 99:2	157:12 161:9
limits 77:5 255:13	270:10 276:3	location-based	188:22 196:20
line 14:12 19:20	278:19 282:5	260:2 269:10	200:4,14,20
126:17,18	285:7		203:9,13 204:21
189:21 190:2	live 10:11	logging 254:15	212:7 219:7
198:8 199:8	133:4,20	long 16:15 19:19	239:19 243:3
239:11 243:16	135:5,8	32:22 33:12	264:13 269:3,6
275:19	141:6,14 147:17	45:3,21 46:21	270:13 278:21
lines 198:9 201:21	159:16 167:11	80:3 97:19	283:16,17
link 49:12	170:10,13,14,15	102:13 103:5	lots 33:9 61:8
50:16,17 100:5	,17 171:18	114:21 122:13	201:9 224:3
50.10,17 100.5	172:13,21	143:19 205:19	

279:7	280:16	260:22	marketing 229:14
Louisiana 57:14	lowering 131:5	major 105:22	marketplace
128:5 130:4	186:8,9	majority 12:12	253:13 265:8
131:14 163:10	lowest 51:20	25:20 35:7	Marks 163:21
239:7	56:18 101:18	44:21 220:12	
love 110:7 201:4	141:17 182:22	245:5 279:16	marry 67:15
242:13 265:17	238:19 242:4,6	283:15	Martha 20:20
275:6 279:8	Í		126:12
	lucrative 27:10 245:13	makers 66:10	match 69:13
loved 39:3,21 40:19 41:1		90:12,17 92:2 103:10	
47:12 59:5	LUCY 289:4,15		matched 106:6
72:14 77:11	lunch 6:21 10:17	man 81:4	material 174:12
79:18 111:20	11:8,10	manageable	materials 33:7
124:1 132:7	174:16,19 191:6	284:11	math 138:21
135:11 171:13	lure 28:19	managed 245:16	230:17
188:11 190:16		280:9	
233:8 245:7	LYNN 2:11		matrix 184:14,22
246:2 276:5	Lynne 7:4 8:8	management 4:5 8:18 255:14	185:5 186:6
low 75:14 89:20	19:22 175:7		matter 47:5 160:4
97:16,22 98:8	243:12	managing 3:13,20	213:14 218:4
121:6 140:15		7:14 8:14	220:12 270:22
150:9 173:19	M	178:21 255:16	matters 121:7
185:4 192:21	magazines 262:20	mandate 37:16	126:8 218:3
194:12 195:4	mail 26:7 141:2,7	59:16 94:13	maximum 116:14
207:9	ĺ	mandated 142:21	136:6 150:8
208:1,18,22	mailing 141:3	247:5	
210:21 217:19	main 42:7	mandating 39:9	maximums
233:17 236:15	mainly 181:16	_	150:5,9
238:4 241:21	maintain 16:2	manual 254:14	may 17:5 29:12
low-cost 191:9	46:10 62:1	March 50:1	30:4 44:15 60:7
Lowden 276:10	87:17 98:9	margin 237:14	62:22 67:5,7
	201:21 202:2		87:4 91:10 92:3
lower 26:13 54:5	233:10 236:16	margins 237:11	93:19 95:20
97:3 99:17	253:14 257:8	market 29:13 30:2	96:11 99:3 101:9 104:11
101:17 102:2	maintained	80:7 88:19,21	101:9 104:11
120:22 124:21	117:10 129:13	154:10 213:12	132:1 133:6,9
165:20 166:5		215:16,22 216:6	150:21 160:18
182:8 193:4 209:21 215:16	maintaining	217:1,3 218:4,9	168:16 182:2
216:1,21	14:19 45:5 46:2	238:10,12	187:14 191:1
217:4,6,7,8,19	194:13 233:9	257:18 258:2,8	209:8 214:19
217.4,0,7,8,19 218:3,4,7,9	256:2 265:6	261:11	215:4 216:21
258:10 261:10	maintenance	262:21,22	229:10
250.10 201.10	192:19 257:6	272:11 284:1	

	1 46		
235:14,17	measly 153:22	233:7 242:1,8	270:7 277:15
244:14 259:8	measurable	men 36:2 48:15,19	met 11:6 175:8
263:3 266:8	121:12	men's 211:16	196:9
268:16 274:4	measures 101:1		method 168:15
278:12,15 281:17		mental 38:6	252:9
	mechanism 168:22 219:16	62:5,10,12 220:19,21 223:4	methodology
maybe 73:11 75:5	240:22	·	180:15
113:15 133:1		mentally 62:5,13	
134:11 138:11	mechanisms	mention 13:20	methods 47:4
147:11 150:16	178:7	15:16 53:16	134:6,16
168:18 219:9 220:7 228:11	media 30:22	60:11 97:7,17	metropolitan
265:10 268:10	253:16,20	275:3 277:12	26:12
273:7 280:16	255:11 256:20	mentioned 41:10	Mexico 101:21
282:17	286:21	60:8 66:20	128:5 130:4
	medium 46:22	67:18 68:20,21	146:20 163:16
mean 64:12 65:8	97:2 184:20	70:4 74:22 84:5	182:14
68:13 70:13 73:9 80:6 92:16	202:11,15 214:3	90:2 93:2 99:14	mic 20:3
98:5,19 104:7	215:1	112:21 121:14	
106:20 109:13	mediums 46:10,19	124:18 140:5	Michigan 183:1 203:3
142:18 145:18	meet 50:5 62:9	152:7 154:16	
146:22 152:10	228:16 236:18	156:7 161:18	mid 266:22
153:15,20		165:19 167:22	mid-90's 267:6
154:15	meeting 73:5	168:12 190:5	middle 78:12
157:10,20 161:8	113:5	205:12 212:18	226:19
164:14 168:1	meetings 33:21	213:6,8 219:13 225:12 231:18	
169:16 170:11	113:4	265:5	Mignon 2:4 5:3
188:6 204:2	mega 215:1		migrate 211:13,21
219:15 236:22	member 3:3 5:20	mentioning	migrated
237:1,2 265:21	10:5,9 23:20	139:12	219:18,20
266:10 278:14	73:4 89:17	mere 78:14 79:1	migration 27:9
282:2	105:8,11,19	meshDetect	_
meaning 200:4	113:19 135:10	245:21 246:3	miles 21:13 204:22
meaningful 14:17	140:22 171:17	247:9 270:16	
38:19 48:9	176:6	meshIP 3:21 8:14	million 15:22
104:9 123:10	members 36:22	266:12	49:18 55:16
125:17	39:12,20 72:13	mess 20:1	58:5 63:16
means 46:2 63:11	75:12 89:14		104:3 183:8 184:5 197:10
93:5 108:21	107:3 111:9	message 101:8	201:5,19,21,22
109:1 117:11	128:7 132:6	137:20 270:8	239:4 249:20
210:13 226:6	136:2 138:15	messages 156:1	
263:18 268:3	142:4 154:12	messaging 254:8	millions 47:11
287:16	181:16 197:15		108:19
	ļļ		

	ı ag	·	
mind 129:10	113:15 193:15	174:9,21 175:10	141:15,18
150:3 168:13	201:17 253:2,5	180:20 187:18	142:15 144:15
188:15 208:19	275:20	190:19 196:12	148:1 149:13
218:8	Mirkarimi 35:18	204:9 207:4	153:8 154:19
minds 65:9	187:1	210:1,5,7	163:3 167:7
		212:11 213:19	174:1 211:22
minimal 25:13	misconduct 205:3	215:6	224:11 225:15
95:2 115:16	missions 191:7	216:9,12,16,18	267:18 268:3
167:18 222:19	 Mississippi	220:3 223:16	280:4
minimize 228:22	179:15	226:17	MoneyGram
minimized 130:3		227:5,7,8,15	124:12 134:3
	Missouri 217:21	231:2 233:20	162:5 173:1,20
minimum 194:20	misuse 250:8	234:3,19	•
260:15	256:4,11 275:2	236:5,10 240:10	monies 224:19
Ministries 44:1,8	misused 250:3	242:17 243:1,9	monitor 46:18
ministry 30:22	252:1 256:21	247:12 252:14	79:6 82:9 95:17
31:1 44:6	259:9 265:8	258:11 262:4	monitorable
		264:20 265:4	284:11
minority 88:10	Mitch 177:12	268:6 269:22	
minute 14:8	mix 153:2 192:5	271:13 273:5,7	monitored 101:9
16:18,19	mobile 26:21 65:3	276:21 277:20	148:2 276:3
27:1,20 50:11	156:1 193:13	279:21 280:18	280:13
52:17	231:21	284:13,19,22	monitoring
58:8,9,11,14		285:3,4,6	98:18,22 101:5
77:6 81:21	mobilized 39:17	moderators 2:6	179:1 181:15
84:21 85:8	model 63:7 136:5	43:20 107:14	194:18
100:3 125:20,22	138:9 174:7	175:7	monopolies 238:1
126:5,7 128:1	179:10 200:5	moment 14:4	-
162:20 169:17	240:18	82:21 148:21	month 39:16
182:22 184:13	242:8,9,15	150:17 166:10	123:15 138:17
185:6 192:22	249:5,7		142:15,16
193:11,12	moderator	Monday 25:9 68:2	153:17 192:3 206:6 232:13
203:15,16,17	22:16,17 23:20	monetized 59:16	
207:11,16,21	113:22 143:8	monetizing 59:12	monthly 21:19
211:8 217:22	144:22 145:1	S	79:22 117:14
219:19,21	148:9,20 149:5	money 56:17	125:6,7 138:4
226:1,5 229:2	150:16 151:13	62:19 63:1,12	232:4
231:19 270:14	152:12 153:12	65:5 79:8 94:17	months 14:15
minute-and-a-	154:20 156:4,6	98:7 120:20	25:9 68:5 89:7
half 113:20	158:1,3	123:5,21,22	165:6
minutes 24:1	160:2,15,21	124:2,6,7,11	Moore 4:4 8:18
50:13 69:7	161:17 163:7	125:4,6,12	258:12,13
77:8,10 78:14	164:1,4,9	129:7,21 137:21	262:14 265:21
79:1 93:13	165:13 166:9	138:2,6,12,13	268:13 272:10
17.1 73.13		139:16	200.13 2/2.10

277:1 278:5	143:5 157:7	238:12,15 271:6	186:10 271:16
281:8 284:18	220:3 258:21	NCIC 3:9 6:17	nice 90:15 156:15
morale 233:9	286:14	115:1 124:20	191:5
Moreover 25:21	multi 25:17 81:10	131:1,4,12,15	nickel 182:22
27:2	multiple 41:14	155:11	night 232:1 273:3
morning	230:4	nearly 197:3	NJPhoneJustice.o
13:8,9,10,12	multiply	Nebraska 163:12	rg 52:21
20:10 30:16	153:18,19	necessarily 70:16	nobody 236:14
36:21 113:22 114:2 144:2	multi-service	125:21	nobody's 149:22
166:18 273:2	260:8 261:12	necessary 26:8	·
Morrissey 177:13	multi-sided 254:7	91:3 92:12	noise 75:21 76:1 81:18
Morse 77:22	multi-year 88:12	96:12 189:16	
	murdering 248:5	191:20 192:19	noises 75:21
mostly 147:15 217:10	music 254:4,21	necessitate 168:14	non 100:14 128:7
	255:7 282:8	necessity 118:13	194:19 249:4
mother 85:16	musing 22:2	negative 211:20	non-binding 195:1
motion 95:14	myriad 121:4	negotiated 50:3	
motivated 85:2	myself 78:9	negotiations	non- commissionabl
86:9	205:10	49:21,22	e 129:6,16
motivation 84:15	mystifying 157:14	neither 50:2 288:8	non-criminal
213:10	myth 42:12	net 198:13 238:4	246:7,10
MOU 216:2	mym 72.12	netted 49:18	none 108:20
mounted 260:8	N	network 114:22	128:14 168:20
278:20	nation 37:14	176:16 192:20	170:7 221:10
mouth 151:21	38:16,22 39:18	248:19	nonetheless 20:2
move 19:2 23:16	41:20 70:12	networking 253:1	non-existent
31:13 35:6	72:7 77:15	networks 45:12	238:20
36:14 71:22 165:9 286:10	104:4 131:17 176:3 183:1	253:17,19	non-ICE 192:6
287:12,20		Nevertheless	non-profit 71:4
moved 85:7 86:5	national 34:3 48:2 64:9 105:17	28:12	non-telecom
110:11 147:10	176:15,17 195:9	Newark 53:17,18	98:11
161:19 170:20	nationally 76:11	54:2	nor 50:2 183:17
259:15	nation's 105:4	newer 178:1	288:9,13
movement 131:5		249:19	norm 18:20
218:1	nationwide 160:20	news 3:14 7:14	
moves 153:2		99:20 100:13	normal 143:21 160:5 273:3
moving 140:4,12	nature 17:14 231:11	173:7 175:14	
, ,	431.11		normally 132:13

	1 46		
147:9 209:4		offer 80:15 95:1	ointment 218:11
274:16,18	0	111:16 115:20	okay 60:14 127:3
north 12:20 115:4	objectives 14:22	116:5 170:17	138:13
209:8	objects 119:1	180:7 213:15 252:9 253:20	139:4,15,22
Norton 6:3 105:6	obligated 118:20	252.9 255.20 254:17 255:10	140:19 158:17
106:15 286:2	127:9	254:17 253:10	159:11,15 167:4
notably 181:6	obligation	270:5,13,17	210:1,7
NOTARY 288:1	16:10,12 59:18	offered 115:16	216:9,16 219:10 220:2 227:5,15
	62:18 63:1	192:10 249:10	230:2,8 234:3
note 32:9,11,16	127:15 165:8		242:8,9 264:20
41:10 56:11 62:17 123:18	227:17	offering 28:7 50:18 155:16	273:5
183:15 185:15	obligations	162:17 195:7	old 31:14 122:4
225:19 226:3	62:9,11	255:6	205:10
229:13	observation 153:4	offerings 27:13	one-and-a-half
noted 57:6 96:7	obtained 131:8	29:6 254:6	113:15
105:18 129:5		256:4 257:9,17	one-fifth 189:8
226:19	obviously 24:10 72:21 74:8,12	262:11	
notes 19:13	72.21 74.8,12 79:15 81:16	offers 162:12	ones 39:3,21 41:2
31:17,18 164:7	82:20 91:22		59:6 72:14
289:7 290:7	92:17 104:16	office 3:15 7:18 54:2 56:9 187:2	79:19 111:20 116:10 121:13
nothing 59:7	153:7 167:16	194:5 257:22	137:13 140:6
72:16 107:7	207:5 214:11		171:11 188:11
124:10 179:13	225:21 233:5	officer 197:8 205:19 235:1	218:7 223:14
263:7	239:15 254:10	247:2 288:2	233:8 245:7,10
notice 17:18 103:4	285:9,12 286:7		246:2 280:19
128:13 165:3	OC 2:18 5:15	officers 180:18 197:18 204:1	one-sided 254:3
222:9	30:21	212:16 274:19	one-year 88:15
noticeable 87:7	occasionally		· ·
	271:5	offices 181:8 206:6	ongoing 25:7 42:8 57:10 195:20
noticed 70:2 133:11 191:1	occasions 165:5		
224:22	occurred 266:22	officials 45:22	online 144:16
		177:8 287:4	257:9
notion 241:17	occurrence 114:5	offset 50:20 95:1	onto 226:2
notwithstanding	o'clock 10:18	oftentimes 131:20	opaque 74:7
38:20 232:3	174:17	150:5,9	open 24:5 60:1
nowhere 28:4	October 68:6,12	oh 11:1 102:18	74:2 191:17
NPRM 164:21	92:17	139:19	241:12
numerically	offenders 179:19	Ohio 179:15	opening 23:1
200:13	279:1	214:6	60:17 70:4
	offenses 15:17		74:22 90:3

	1 46		
156:7 218:15	271:20	organizers 19:18	69:21
244:1	optional 118:6	organizing 252:16	overhead 270:1
operate 253:16,18	167:20 168:12	original 228:16	overjoyed 110:20
operated 192:7	options 88:15	256:15	112:2
194:4	185:4	originally 31:3	overnight
operating 49:12	order 16:17 17:16	86:2 249:1	222:16,17
operational 29:5	25:8 27:17 30:3 33:5 38:21 39:9	Orleans 179:3	oversee 178:4
40:3	49:14 50:12,22	Ostensibly 75:17	oversight 105:12
operator 25:11	51:13 52:4	others 23:18	118:15 195:20
133:5 141:6 170:11,13,14,16	57:15	73:16 111:17	overturns 157:22
206:5,11	68:2,5,6,8,10,14 ,21 70:16	142:1 165:20	overwhelmingly
operators 206:9	71:18,22 76:13	179:16 248:6 263:2	223:7 237:20
opinion 25:12	82:20 85:20	otherwise 115:12	Owens 244:19
231:8	87:2 93:19	288:13	
opinions 114:7	94:12 99:9	ought 97:9 140:20	<u> </u>
220:6 265:10	119:4 120:6 123:13,16 135:9	141:16 171:15	pace 23:16
272:1,8	137:14 144:15	219:5,6,9	page 133:21
opportunities	153:5 156:18	ours 201:13,15	pages 122:13
106:8 180:3	167:8 193:3,7	ourselves 47:8	paid 63:9 129:8
265:18	196:4,9 198:17	outcome	139:16 142:15
opportunity 18:6	222:13 237:4 248:15 256:8	219:10,11	181:6 192:10 195:7 214:11
21:14 25:5	280:12	288:14	277:10
36:13 49:8 66:10 90:13	ordered 251:3	outgrowth 122:19	paint 224:6
105:15 111:19	ordering 254:5	outliers 189:14	•
115:9 136:11	256:7,11,14	outlines 73:2	palatable 214:18
141:17 181:2	ordinary 32:5		panel 5:4 6:4 7:2
234:5,13,17		outnumber 47:14	8:6 22:17 23:3 24:8 26:17 37:5
268:18,21 278:13	Oregon 255:2,3 277:13	outreach 34:15	60:12 73:10
284:14,17	organization 71:5	outside 56:8 74:6	104:15 105:4
287:18	75:13 100:14	84:4 180:9	107:19
opposed 80:3	236:3	191:6 228:5 251:12 284:8	113:15,19
optimal 195:3	organizationally	outstanding 13:19	114:1,12 122:7 130:18
opting 246:10	67:11	S	174:11,22 175:1
1 0	organizations	overall 52:1 84:8 114:11 129:20	191:1 196:16
option 91:11 135:4 144:13	39:22 48:2 53:5	157:2 246:11	213:9 234:5,12
167:5,9 214:1	54:22	269:18	243:2,22 265:9 273:8
,		overcharged	213.0

	1 ag		
panelist 272:5	97:20 114:18	146:19 147:1	170:4 171:14
panelists 2:15 3:2	217:4 233:6	Paul 3:4 5:21	172:20,21
4:2 5:11 6:10	263:22	24:21 54:14,15	173:15,17
7:10 8:2,12	264:11,18	60:8 64:18	227:12
23:22 24:1,14	266:6,15 268:18	74:21 86:21	payments 17:7
104:18 114:8,14	particularly 18:16	93:9 99:13	61:2,3 117:21
136:12 143:9	19:22 23:2		122:4 138:18
166:11,14	37:20 42:9	Paul's 64:4 103:22	144:14 165:17
174:11 175:11	72:19 94:16	pay 6:19 26:19	167:10 173:10
220:5 287:11	105:2 110:11	64:11 78:6,13	186:9 222:5
	255:1,15 272:4	79:21 114:11	223:3,12
panels 23:3 24:12	286:1	115:3 116:8	,
112:3 196:19		118:2 120:14,15	payphone 244:5,7
225:13 231:4	parties 28:15	143:16	271:3,12
234:7 235:2	165:6 177:17	144:15,19	payphones 246:6
panel's 199:18	180:17 212:16	147:16 155:9	258:20
*	269:13 287:5	162:14,19 168:6	Pay-Tel 3:10
paper 32:12,15,18 118:6 142:22	288:10,13	171:1 187:12	124:20 128:16
	partner 3:20 8:14	190:18 193:21	136:9 161:9
167:17,18 201:6	33:21	194:8 200:18	169:11 275:5
paperless 256:6,8	partners 235:3	201:18 216:22	
277:15	239:22	223:7,8 232:4	Pay-Tel's 27:20
paramount 37:19		237:20 244:12	69:5
174:7	party 27:6 81:13	245:9 261:20	PCS 114:15 175:9
navant 16:1 /	120:16,18	268:20 277:5	pending 222:11
parent 16:1,4	161:20 171:1	paying 118:16	•
parents 36:3	251:12 266:5,9	122:17 130:8	people 10:10,12
Park 203:3	268:19,20	136:20 170:2,3	31:7,9 32:6
parks 64:9	pass 248:13,17	232:1,8,12	33:1,9,12,18
-	249:3,11	240:7 271:11	34:1,15 36:10
participants	pass/fail 213:13		37:17 38:8
13:19		payment 26:6,20 27:6,13 82:7,10	40:14,15 41:5
participate 25:5	passed 194:10 200:2	115:13 116:7	42:10,11,18
31:4 112:15		117:22	43:11,12 57:8 62:8 64:14
115:9 242:9	past 25:9 30:11	120:8,11,18,22	70:18 71:1,8,18
participated	40:16 46:22	120.8,11,18,22	75:12 77:13
241:3	51:16 83:14	140:7	79:11,18
	126:4 127:2	141:2,4,7,12,13,	80:4,6,8
participating 31:7 184:18 285:17	153:2 165:6	14 142:17	85:7,14,17
	188:22 222:10	144:17,18 150:6	89:13 97:21
participation	223:15 230:18	159:10,15,16,17	102:17
39:17	patents 29:15,17	161:20 162:3	104:1,4,5 106:4
particular 29:22	path 19:6 121:10	164:5 166:8	108:18
64:10 65:14	Pati 17.0 121.10	167:6 168:15	109:10,12,13,15
		107.0 100.12	107.10,12,13,13

	1 ag		
110:5 113:11	109:9 116:15,17	222:18,19 241:1	perverse 56:15
134:13 150:20	123:5 124:6,7	periods 220:6	petabytes 201:3
184:4,5 188:7,17	129:7,20 134:12 138:6	permanent 12:11	Peter 67:4 151:2
189:7,11,12	139:15,20,21,22	17:19 22:4	Peter's 78:8 79:2
190:8 192:1	151:11,18,19	121:9 270:17,22	petition 21:4,9
200:15,16	152:15	permeates 58:16	31:14
201:12,13,15 209:3,7	153:3,10,11,13, 21,22	permissible	52:15,20,21
211:17,19,21	154:1,13,16	141:22	53:4 83:22 84:1
219:5 223:8	173:8 182:21	permitted 27:8	85:10 86:10
230:22 232:15	183:2,6,14	64:22	111:8 112:11 130:20 222:11
235:18 237:19	185:4,8,9,10,13	permitting 164:15	
239:4 242:14	186:14,15 187:3	258:2	petitioner 84:18
263:12 274:18,19	188:15 189:8,11 192:16	person 12:17,22	petitioners 114:20
274:18,19 279:18 282:6	198:16,17,19,22	42:13 74:4,11	petitions 85:5
286:6	199:1 237:12	77:7,9 88:4	Petro 3:7 6:15
people's 19:12	238:4 239:7	135:5 180:5 190:11 271:18	114:18 126:9,12
32:3 279:15	240:17 241:8	272:8 274:5	139:12 146:1
per 15:18	242:5 251:22		156:5,14 158:2
16:18,19	percentage	personal 15:21 16:6 46:4	163:16 164:3,7,10
27:1,20 52:17	91:20,21 92:3	212:21 246:16	168:20
54:8 58:8,10	149:14 152:14	270:21 276:4	ph 13:22 19:22
69:7 71:21	186:3 198:14 238:18	282:7	53:2 228:1
81:21 84:21	269:17,19	personally 44:22	245:10
125:20 128:1 169:16 184:5,13	283:16	212:14 244:12	phase 220:9
192:22	percentages	279:15 283:11	phased 183:7,10
193:11,12,14,15	185:12	person's 12:2	•
194:8,22 201:18	perfect 112:16	perspective 67:10	phone 16:14 21:18 26:21
203:17 211:10	performance	87:13 91:13	28:16 39:15
219:19,21 226:1	195:3	96:9,10,11	44:13 49:11
229:2 231:19 235:18 271:3,7	perhaps 67:7,21	129:2 154:12	50:5 51:10
, in the second of the second	78:8	160:3 174:5 188:10,21 199:7	53:14 54:5,20
perceived 78:3	80:13,14,16	212:3,8 214:2	55:1,2,13,15
percent 15:8,10	169:17 220:17	233:11,16	56:4 58:3 50:5 17 10
17:2 26:18 28:19 29:15	261:10	253:14 283:8	59:5,17,19 60:21
36:2,6 38:11,13	period 63:8 90:4	perspectives	62:4,15,20
51:8,9 55:15	91:6,7,12	281:2	63:16 65:3
72:5 90:22	114:21 126:22	persuade 120:9	69:14 75:15
91:19 92:1,8	143:19 174:10	1	78:13,18,19
	200:10 221:16		

	1 ag	-	
79:12 80:9	276:12,13	259:21 273:19	145:12 165:14
85:12,18 95:1	280:12,14	274:4	223:17 230:10
101:7 108:21	, i		234:19 287:15
	phones 38:15	pinpoint 34:12	
110:12	41:19 72:7	PINs 250:8 252:1	pleased 18:16
122:16,17,22	79:14,16 134:7	259:11	207:17
123:5,7,10	143:16 181:9		pleasure 11:4
124:8,9	185:18,20	pipeline 245:13	13:13 105:2
125:16,19 126:6	186:20 193:13	Piper 53:3	106:13
128:3,14,18	201:13,14	-	100.13
129:8 130:20	205:12,16	placed 123:13	plethora 118:9
131:1 132:2,22	206:4,5 231:21	134:9 138:7	plummeted
133:12	244:3,13,15	239:9 249:8	183:20
134:10,12,13,14	245:1,10,12,16,	250:3	
,18,19 135:7	22	places 34:12,14	plus 131:7 176:10
136:1,3 137:22	246:4,12,18,21	207:9 208:3	181:8
138:17,20 139:9	240.4,12,18,21	225:10	PM 1:11
141:18 146:4,8	259:1 270:20	plain 32:11	pocket 121:7
149:13 150:22	273:22 276:11	*	-
151:12 153:1	280:3,10,11	plaintiff 111:7	pockets 121:8
154:18 157:19	ĺ í	plan 21:19 23:22	point 12:17 35:1
169:15 172:3	photo 254:9	94:14 232:2,12	60:7,10 64:20
173:16 177:7	photos 256:19	237:18	69:15 70:10
179:21	270:9	planned 251:5	115:19 119:3
181:15,21	phrase 248:13,17	*	120:5 123:9
182:9,17,21	249:3,11	planning 3:15	125:9 141:19
183:4,11,18,20,	·	7:18 45:11	147:21 148:8
22	physical 38:1	253:1	159:8,20 164:2
184:7,9,12,14	40:19	plans 12:5 179:5	165:8 173:8
185:2,5,12,15	picked 156:14	196:3	174:17 177:6
186:1,12,18,19	picture 224:6		178:9 179:8
187:17 189:19	•	plate 108:13	187:21 197:4
190:18 195:5	pictures 256:21	platform 193:19	198:1 203:3
222:14 232:2,4	pie 137:18 148:10	194:1,9,13	223:2 231:22
236:20 237:17	149:1,12 153:2	platforms 253:14	255:20 260:13
238:1,17	154:14	-	268:11 269:1
244:12,20 245:5		play 61:19	274:10 275:14
246:3,14 248:2	piece 32:12,15,17	playing 75:9	277:1,3 283:17
249:8,13,20	142:22 219:7	122:1	ŕ
250:2,4,13,14,1	271:16	plays 156:12	pointed 128:11
8 251:3,17,18	pieces 36:18 170:6	- v	137:21 151:17
252:6 253:15	pilot 255:2	plea 111:16	237:10
260:3 264:12,15	-	please 22:17 43:13	pointing 130:6
270:21 271:5	PIN 248:17	66:22 69:3	points 64:3 67:19
273:15	249:16	83:21 90:5	240:11 254:20
275:17,19,22	250:3,4,7	113:19 119:12	0.110
	!		

	U	C 47	
policies 47:7	95:17 199:10	122:16 153:5	231:15
48:11	201:11 224:1	272:2	presentation 24:2
policy	portions 225:15	practiced 145:18	198:1
2:7,8,10,12,18,2	pose 222:3	practices 28:21	presented 172:15
1 3:6,15 5:7,9,14,18	position 120:4	30:5,6 127:10	presently 228:10
6:7,9,14	230:21	196:7	preserves 180:16
7:5,7,16,18	positions 40:12	pragmatic 233:11,17	President 3:9,10
8:9,11 9:3	43:11 71:8	ŕ	6:17,18 8:3,18
24:16,19 45:9 48:13 66:9	positive 37:9	praise 107:4	105:14 114:22
90:12,17 100:18	44:18 87:14 276:17	Praldev 53:2	115:3 130:22
103:16 114:16		pre-call 248:12	President-
122:9 127:19	possible 23:15 121:11 218:15	preceded 136:12	Product 4:4
151:3 175:15 187:22 195:8	222:20 242:4,7	preceding 14:5	presidents 70:19
243:13 250:10	283:4,5 284:7	precision 119:8	President-Sales 3:19
286:18	possibly 83:7	predatory 188:3	
politely 128:19	221:9 229:1	198:8 199:15	press 103:11 111:9
political 286:5	post 234:9	prediction 229:18	pressure 21:5
Polk 179:3	postalize	preempted 10:3	pressures 240:2
poor 109:12	212:14,15	prefer 215:3	•
poorly 16:7	postalized 82:2	prematurely	pressuring 28:17
Pope 3:9 6:17	posture 34:22	58:18	presumably 50:19
97:7 114:22	pot 97:14	prepaid 27:16,20	presume 92:7
130:17,22 147:8	potential 5:4	117:7,18 135:3	presumed 188:19
148:4,18 149:3 150:18 152:18	13:16 24:9	147:15 162:13 170:11 210:21	presumes 193:5
150.16 152.16	29:11 61:18 90:3 247:8	pre-paid 69:6	presumption
160:10,19	253:21 259:6	• •	82:22 127:6
163:10 170:8	263:14 264:15	Prepaid 134:22	pretty 33:10,21
population 182:12	potentially 263:8	prepare 93:17,19 136:22 180:4	124:14 133:3 150:9 198:20
185:17 186:7	POTS 143:21	221:21 224:20	203:14,16
187:10 188:16 189:9 192:13,16	157:16	prepared 102:8	205:22 229:19
202:12 231:12	pounding 112:9	137:2,19 159:4	280:8
239:7 283:14	power 16:11 30:2	217:11	prevalence 114:3
populations 55:20	40:12 43:11	preponderance	prevent 27:14
235:9 257:3	71:8 74:11	25:14	256:16
portfolio 29:17	practical 88:20	present 29:12	prevention 178:6
portion 93:5	practice 73:18	53:14 106:13	previous 55:5

_	1 ag		
57:6 178:12	12:6,7 19:16	41:2,6,7,21	89:1,6 170:20
previously 121:14	23:11 48:18	45:17 46:5	172:2 229:5
1	130:21	55:19 56:1	244:8 267:11
price 29:11 46:15	prison 3:6,13 6:14	59:7,9 62:6,14	287:17
203:19 210:21	7:14,16 14:18	63:2,9,20 70:12	problem 22:8
211:1 215:14	16:1 31:19	75:11,12,14	42:12,13,14
217:16 218:5,8	32:14 35:9	77:18 89:10	44:16 69:9
258:3	40:9,14 42:21	110:20 181:15	75:1,3,7 80:19
priced 195:11	43:1 44:1,4,6,7	192:6 222:6	81:4 82:4,7 84:8
200:9	48:11 54:19,22	223:13 236:13	87:22 88:11
prices 27:5 28:8	55:2,20,21	237:3 264:17	124:4 145:20
30:8 217:6,7	56:13 57:2 58:3	prisoner's 37:22	219:3,4 244:2
225:3,7,14	70:21 73:9	-	245:11,17,19
238:11 258:10	78:1,2,10 79:13	Prisoners 223:6	247:16
270:4	83:9 84:6 91:1	prisons 26:11,14	266:17,20
	99:19 100:13	38:16	267:4,13 274:3
pricing	104:6 108:21	41:11,12,19	275:7 276:10
2:7,8,10,11	110:14 114:16	42:1,9 44:5 46:1	277:22
5:7,9 6:6,9 7:5,6	122:9,11,17	49:16 60:10	278:11,14,15,22
8:9,11 9:3 23:13,21 83:4	127:19 130:12	63:5 70:14 72:7	280:1 282:20,22
126:3 187:4	140:22 143:16	77:1,14	283:10
188:3,9 243:13	149:14 151:3	79:15,16 80:20	problematic 28:1
286:17	171:13	87:20 89:15	69:2 92:4
	175:5,14,15	96:6 104:11	166:20 239:5
pride 205:10	179:9 181:3,21	109:13 131:19	
primarily 114:3	182:8,10,11,12	181:19 184:1,2	problems 83:5
146:3 186:2	183:3,22 187:22	187:9 188:1	88:1 210:12
191:12	188:13	190:8 203:19	263:13 264:5
primary 183:22	190:1,6,7,14	216:21 235:7,21	274:12 276:6
187:2,7 194:7	222:14 235:11	244:10,15,20	279:16,19
253:14	237:19 238:1	245:2 266:21	proceeding 25:8
	239:10	privacy 276:1,4	69:5 98:20
principally 93:4	245:9,12,14	private 192:7	100:8 115:18
principals 40:11	246:3,6 247:3,6	254:8	128:11 162:9
44:3	276:9 284:8		289:6,7,12
print 248:15	285:15	privilege 12:21	290:6,7,12
_	prisoner 39:15	120:20 176:1	proceedings 31:5
prior 39:13 50:12	40:18,20 76:5	privileged 194:19	53:11 131:13,14
170:11 180:4	271:11	privileges 46:1	288:8
182:19 183:9	prisoners 15:6,8	• 0	process 47:19
232:17 249:15	33:8 37:11,20	pro 126:12 193:19	59:12 78:9
274:22	38:2,22	194:1,9,13	80:11
priorities 179:12	39:12,18,19,20	probably 35:19	82:1,11,16 83:1
priority 11:19	40:2,21,22	41:16 74:2	92:14 121:8
	10.2,21,22		72.1T 121.U

	1 ag		
123:20 130:13	profits	244:21	282:9
147:7 161:4	199:12,13,14	proposal 146:3	provided 28:2,4
174:13 217:2,3	225:6,16	• •	63:9,13,20
219:6 241:3	program 23:5	proposals 51:2	69:19 71:8
243:4 248:14	140:10 152:22	proposed 17:18	100:4 128:14,16
262:7 274:14	153:14 154:22	68:11 128:13	144:9 167:1
285:21	255:2 256:20	169:20	191:13,16
286:10,13		prosecute 15:17	192:17 225:18
287:13,15	programs 17:6	-	227:21
processed 168:16	37:16 42:20	protect 177:3	228:2,6,9 248:8
186:21	61:8 164:5	178:2 188:11	
	179:18 180:8	197:18 203:21	provider 18:12
processes 235:18 262:8	220:18	250:17 259:20	29:7,14,19 30:7
	221:1,5,13	264:6	91:17 95:21 99:5 115:2,4
processing 118:1	222:6	protected 274:21	99:5 115:2,4 116:11 117:6,10
133:7,22 150:6	223:3,5,9,13,19, 20,21,22 260:12	protecting 59:10	118:2,9
processor 141:15	, ,	250:11 264:8	119:14,19
producer 172:4	prohibit 164:18	protection 248:8	120:5,21
•	prohibited 53:21	•	121:12,15
product 8:18	164:12	protections 42:5	132:2,10
256:4 257:17	prohibition	protects 48:20	148:5,16 152:19
272:13 285:20	86:17,20	proud 14:4 21:20	154:5 156:20
productive 209:10	ĺ	-	191:14 192:11
products	project 135:21 159:18 196:18	prove 83:1	194:1,7 220:8
197:11,16	197:2	proven 123:12	232:2
257:15 260:5		246:22 248:7	providers 17:1
professional	promises 122:3	provide 17:5 24:2	18:2,8 26:17
107:18 246:17	promising 250:15	35:14 44:18	27:7,12,14
	265:12	48:4,17 56:18	28:5,17 29:10
professionals	promoting 14:19	62:5 71:16	37:13 43:6
176:8		101:17 117:13	49:12 59:11
professor 105:19	prompted 84:1	118:13 128:19	94:13 102:8
proffer 108:3	pronounce 228:9	142:14 143:21	115:19
*	proof 276:19	146:8 157:19	116:5,9,13,16,2
profile 235:19		169:8,14 195:10	0 117:14
256:19,20	proper 199:7	207:16,19	118:11,21
profit 100:14	217:18	213:13,20	119:6,11
123:1 173:3	properly 95:7	214:14 215:20	120:9,17,21
198:15 236:16	129:13 284:10	219:7 220:9	122:1 124:20
237:11,14	property 67:13	223:10 228:17	133:13,18
238:4,5	proportion 120:1	230:22 231:8	134:14 135:7,19
profitability		242:2 260:19	136:1 140:8,9
246:13	proportions	263:9,15 266:5	147:12 152:13
		269:13 274:4	155:10,15

	1 ag	<u>-</u>	
158:11	133:16 135:17	putting 97:14	quick 88:1 134:15
162:13,17	155:4 161:6	196:16 199:7	162:6,8,21
163:1,4 169:8	170:8 171:3	200:5 204:14	163:2 266:16
177:22 178:3,18	195:17 196:2		275:14
181:21 184:6	198:14 205:3	0	quicker 144:17
187:12 214:19	207:20	Q/A 6:20 8:5,20	167:7 168:15
222:8 227:16	223:6,9,10,11		285:7
258:6 260:17	248:3,6,8	quality 58:15	
provider's	250:12,17	75:15 196:10	quickly 23:15,21
120:14,15	251:21	quantify 158:8	27:12 46:22
,	252:3,4,11	249:16	77:12 78:12,16
Providers 27:4	258:18 259:13	quarterly 119:8	92:3 97:18
28:9,20 119:5	260:4 269:13		140:4 151:7
provides 18:5	283:6,8 287:18	question 60:5,14	173:5 174:2 206:12 257:16
149:16 193:17	288:1	61:10 65:22	283:4
194:15 196:4	publicly 238:6	66:19 67:2	
244:3 247:19	pull 240:21 241:9	74:21 84:4	quite 88:7 106:20
253:15	264:18	86:21 88:2	107:5 157:12
providing 17:9		92:6,10 93:1	232:10
29:1 62:10,12	pulled 11:18	94:19 99:12	quote 179:11
71:6 72:4	282:15	102:7 127:12	229:15 242:13
100:22 121:19	pulling 186:20	145:1 155:8,17 156:6 157:11	
146:5,11,15	pulpit 73:13 74:13	158:4 160:22	R
156:12 161:14	87:13	163:6 168:5	R&D 269:20
181:20 188:4		174:10 188:3	
208:2 223:20	punch 126:16	189:15 207:22	race 283:1
226:7,13 252:6	purchase 78:18	212:17 226:18	radio 269:7
256:5 259:4	purchasing	231:3 265:10,22	raise 10:13 30:3
provision 7:2 42:4	147:11	267:22 268:7,11	50:18 130:7
88:14 144:4		269:21 270:2	
158:10 175:2	purgatory 11:18	271:14 273:8	raising 79:20
181:5 195:1,19	purpose 227:19	275:10 279:20	152:9
199:19	purposes 88:20	284:15	rampant 41:4
public 2:14,17	197:21	questioning	range 162:19
5:13 6:12 7:9		229:22	182:12 192:13
13:22 24:15	pursue 29:5		203:12,16
34:10 42:22	push 215:22	questions	208:16,17,22
43:1 45:4 46:13	254:22 255:12	10:10,11,13	226:3,4,10
47:20 48:1	264:18 280:20	17:17 24:4,6	263:12
50:16 51:14	pushback 128:6	43:16 60:3	ranged 185:20
52:15 55:1 64:8	pushing 74:9	83:20 103:20	<u> </u>
66:8 83:22	130:20	143:10,12	ranges 226:7
84:19 86:10	282:13,14	158:14 207:6	ranking 105:8
110:10 132:16	202.13,14	226:15 262:5	_
		,	

	1 ag		
rapacious 59:10	270:2,17,18,20,	156:17	56:18 58:8,14
_	22 271:10	157:2,7,17	92:2 121:19
rapid 171:21		158:5 161:2,5	221:8 238:18
172:8	rates 14:12,14	163:11	271:18
rapidly 112:12	16:9,22 17:8,20	164:15,18	
115:14	18:11 22:9	169:1,2,3	rating 131:7
rapidly-changing	25:11	179:10 180:14	ratio 195:3
256:20	26:5,13,22	182:9,17,21	rational 62:1
	27:3,9,11,19	183:1,4,20	
rare 32:5	28:5 29:2	184:12,15	reach 67:12 247:3
rate 12:10 14:7	35:7,20,22	185:1,2,5,7,12,1	284:9
15:5 16:17	36:15 39:5 40:6 49:10	4,15	react 272:17
17:3,13,19 22:3		186:1,5,8,12	reaction 137:16
26:9 27:17 41:8	50:3,5,8,12,19,2 0 51:20	187:15	
44:12 49:19,21	52:7,8,11,16	189:18,19	reactions 114:8
52:12 55:4	53:15 54:20	191:13 192:22	readily 281:15
65:1,3 75:8	55:2,10,13 58:3	193:2,4,5,8	ready 102:19
82:22 83:9	59:5,17 60:21	194:12	174:22
84:11,13 96:11	66:18 68:18	195:5,15,17	
98:6 131:16	76:9 78:13	196:1,3,6 197:2	real 14:18 75:9
132:8,15	81:20	198:6,7 200:22	87:12
138:21,22	82:2,12,14	202:7,17	108:15,16,17
140:11 141:4	83:12	203:17,21 204:7	136:19 139:1
142:2 146:4		207:8,9	229:15 267:13
156:19	84:8,13,17,20	208:1,3,7	280:6
159:11,12 160:1	85:1,4,8,12	210:20 212:15	reality 31:15
163:15,17	87:11,14 89:20,21 92:21	215:9,16	139:8 154:7
164:11	93:7,9,11 94:3,6	216:1,22 217:19	realize 10:7
169:15,17	95:9 97:16	218:3,4,10,13,1	129:15 236:13
171:16 172:17	99:17 102:15	4 219:13,14	
179:6 182:19	108:21 110:13	222:2,20,21	realized 78:13
183:5 184:8	114:4 115:11	225:11,20	really 11:11 20:1
193:11 208:20	116:12,14	226:4,19 227:11	30:19 33:3
210:18 211:13	119:19	229:2	34:2,21 35:6
212:6 214:17	121:6,10,13,18	231:4,7,10,12,1	58:17 60:1
215:4,15,18	121:0,10,13,16	4	62:11 64:5,12
216:3,20	123:13,16	232:8,11,18,21	65:3,6,15 77:7
217:10,22	125:16,20	233:17,18	80:10,18 87:10
219:19,21	128:1,3	236:15,18,22	88:20,21 91:2,3
220:17 222:13	132:4,10	237:1,2,7	93:14 94:18
227:1 231:15,18	135:15,18	239:16 240:13	97:18 98:12
232:4,17	136:4,6	251:17 268:9,10	104:6,19 106:19
242:4,7	145:8,16 154:9	280:16 285:14	107:5 109:18
268:16,22	155:15,20	rather 51:20	123:9 125:1
269:15	155.15,20		136:13 137:19
			150.15 157.17

	1 46		
139:21 143:1	reasonably	recipient's 26:21	recovered 29:2
144:20 145:19	195:11	recognize 12:1,9	95:8
149:21,22	reasons 79:5	13:21 36:22	recovering 69:8
152:5,9 153:3	101:2 239:6	recognized 29:21	recovery 96:10
154:11 161:7 168:3 171:9	256:3 258:5	45:21	118:11 119:2,20
173:5 189:3,13	Reath 3:8 6:16	recognizing 44:11	133:2,10 168:1
190:17 202:22	114:19 126:13	59:14	170:17,20,21
203:2 205:8	rebuild 46:11		178:12,19 179:7
206:3 209:6		recommend	221:2,4
212:19 217:7	recall 82:6	26:9,13 141:11	recurring 138:3
225:10 228:15	receive 40:18 56:4	recommendation	152:5
229:10,11,19	57:8 62:20 91:1	121:3	red 64:1 101:4
233:1 238:5	224:18,19	recommendations	
247:15 263:15	received 50:17	34:19 114:5	redial 271:8
268:8 279:18	58:4 62:4,19	233:18	redid 51:14
280:1 283:3,7	receives 55:14	recommended	reduce 84:11
286:6,9,13,22 287:9,11	75:13 192:20	82:3	162:10 193:8
<u> </u>	receiving 42:21	reconcile 207:15	221:8 245:21
realtime 135:9	63:16 104:12	record 32:20 33:6	246:11 261:18
147:18 170:16	143:12 220:13	36:5 102:9	279:1,2,3
rear 199:1	recent 15:1 33:11	146:10 158:7	reduced 66:11
rearrested	47:9 136:4	161:8,15 174:19	110:3 116:7
15:8,10	170:9 186:10	182:4 214:13	178:7 184:12
reason 11:11 13:1	193:3 195:1	238:8 243:7	276:16 278:6
61:22 64:16	196:4 250:21	257:8 271:16	288:6
102:12 217:5	263:14	288:8	reduces 275:16
244:13 257:4	recently 159:5	recorded 11:2	reducing 14:20
reasonable 14:14	161:19 163:14	101:9 269:4	109:22
18:11 39:6	186:11 194:20	276:2 280:13	179:12,19
44:12 59:4,17	222:12 247:5	recording 101:5	186:12 222:2
61:14 89:21	recess 174:20	181:12 194:18	246:19 247:1
110:12	243:8	206:16 259:11	reduction 45:7,14
115:19,21	recharger 133:6	288:5	169:2 196:10
121:15 125:19	recidivism 14:20	recordings 206:17	reductions 29:11
127:12 154:8	15:5 45:7	289:8 290:8	169:1
176:22 179:6	109:22 110:3	records 50:16	reel 260:4
180:13 188:8 193:9 195:10	179:12,20 221:8	51:14	
195.9 195.10	247:1 261:18	recover 27:21	reel-to-reel
227:1 231:14	275:17	119:12 171:2	206:17
235:4 236:22	276:15,20	208:8 268:15	reentry 45:10
237:7 242:20	279:1,2,4	200.0 200.13	refer 126:21 254:1

r	1 46		
referred 57:20	272:17	227:18	relocate 285:8
248:12,21	regarding 103:20	regulatory 48:3	rely 149:17 177:9
267:20	177:11 178:14	57:4,11 112:6	222:4 240:19
referring 103:22	180:12 181:11	118:11	remain 12:7 16:12
refers 226:20	196:5 236:2	119:2,12,20 120:2 167:22	50:8 52:8 130:2
reflect 195:18	regardless 17:4	257:12,19	177:22 255:8
reflected 202:7	163:17 187:9	ŕ	remaining 118:9
217:7	193:21 233:3	rehabilitation 14:20	remains 12:13
reflection 121:18	regards 29:9		18:14 19:16
	213:22 259:19 263:3 281:11	reintegration 109:5 110:9	29:5 44:5 56:2
reflects 89:19 154:6			remarkably
	regime 14:4 19:16	related 42:9 98:11 181:10 251:11	182:16
reform 1:6 5:4,5 12:6 15:1 18:21	region 205:15	288:9	remarks 5:1,2
24:9,10 25:8	regular 16:5 21:3	relates 138:14	6:2,3 9:2 106:20
44:2,9 45:1	31:7 32:5		156:7 191:12
47:19 48:9 49:3	250:13	relation 149:9	285:1
66:2 67:14	regularly 94:21	relationship	remedy 74:9
89:22 105:13	281:18	233:10	remember 13:12
112:5,7 114:6 117:1 181:3	regulate 47:18	relationships	165:4
239:17	52:16 57:2 66:21 67:6	45:6,10,17	remind 39:7
reforming 14:3	110:18 157:14	48:17,18 129:21	remitting 118:18
68:4	161:19 231:9	relative 288:11	remote 99:2
reforms 13:16	regulated	relatively 199:10	194:18
17:12,19,20	27:3,8,17 28:9	200:10 228:4 257:16 269:18	270:13,15
18:7,10,16,18	110:22 118:15		remove 66:14
19:7,9,15 25:12	155:19	relatives 108:19	removed 151:8
26:8 44:15,18	regulates 157:15	relay 38:12,14	178:8 233:13
45:4 47:9,22 48:7,13 57:11	regulating 123:6,7	72:6 77:8,14 119:9	renegotiation
68:1 106:9	regulation 84:18		88:16
220:4,7 222:14	108:21 123:10	release 45:19 180:4 255:9	renewal 50:1 52:6
refund 82:5	125:15 132:13		54:10
117:17 133:7	143:17 163:15	released 15:4 25:9 45:16 46:5	renewed 221:18
refused 165:7	regulations	122:10 224:20	repeatedly 225:12
169:8	108:3,6,7 112:8	248:18	1
regard 98:13	121:16 127:11	releases 36:4	replace 134:6 135:1
157:7 158:10	189:16 190:3 195:15	relief 14:7 16:21	
160:15 178:11		25:20 47:11	replaced 134:15
179:21 235:16	regulators 118:20	136:19	replacing 271:17
	132:14 156:3	100.17	

		Ī	
reply 239:1	160:17	275:21	retained 158:20
report 15:4,7,20	requests 50:16	resources 256:13	retaliated 42:19
40:18 41:22	159:4 202:5	respect 23:8 77:2	return 214:10
149:5 151:4,16	256:9 262:9	103:22 118:22	220:17 221:11
reported 1:19	279:9	139:17 194:19	227:2
289:5 290:5	require 38:7	227:17 234:9	
	71:20 73:19		returned 163:4
reportedly 181:19	127:11 135:5	respectfully 63:21	returning 180:11
Reporter 288:19	142:4 208:7	213:22	returns 198:4
289:5 290:5	254:11,13,15	respond 22:2	
Reporter's 289:7	269:12	responding 202:3	revealed 250:1
290:7		•	revenue 25:22
	required 18:1	response 52:4	26:2,4 54:6 83:7
reporting 1:19	64:18 66:7	54:3 165:3	87:8 90:22 98:3
89:5 118:15	92:14 103:5	172:15 194:22	116:17 120:16
reports 38:10	117:13 135:19	217:17,18	122:21 123:3
75:10 76:10	156:17 178:11	221:14 223:16	134:12
122:10,12	195:13 230:20	235:5	140:12,13
186:11	248:13 249:4	responsibility	145:4,12
represent 152:16	271:21	59:3 192:18	153:7,9,22
176:2,9 183:21	requirement	responsible	154:2 155:19
197:6 199:9	14:13 16:15	131:11 179:1	162:7 172:4
236:4	56:12 102:5	224:17 252:22	224:11,15,17
	117:15		225:3
representation	118:16,18 196:6	responsive 128:15	revenues 115:11
106:3	requirements	rest 69:16 111:20	151:20,22
representative	42:17 95:16	141:10 235:14	152:17
105:7 133:21	196:9 228:18	255:21	reverberating
135:8 137:6	requires 71:21	restorative 44:3	14:16
147:17 154:11	73:20 83:8	restricted 245:8	
representatives	223:1	275:20	reverts 62:21
2:2 107:7 287:5	requiring 118:15		review 136:4
represented 210:9	- 0	restricting 245:15	254:14
241:8	research	result 15:6 56:7	reviewers 250:6
	45:5,9,16 68:9	75:18 79:17	
representing 283:6	133:14	123:3 135:22	reviewing 30:4 250:7
	260:16,21 266:3	146:8 157:1	
represents 30:2	researching 30:12	249:18 251:4	reward 246:14
192:15 240:17	reside 47:13	267:1	264:16
request 51:2,3,15	resistive 179:10	resulting 58:19	RFP 213:5 217:2
165:1 172:16		results 17:22	262:7 263:6
206:20	resolve 238:13	58:10 182:8,16	264:2
requested 40:3	resource 47:20		RFPs 262:10

RFP's 87:4 88:22	Roger 10:3	214:4 234:3	sat 37:7
89:2	11:8,10 113:14		save 135:7
Rhode 182:15	role 10:7 11:22	S	saved 45:1
Rhonda 2:8 5:9	20:6 98:17	S.W 1:14	savings 29:10
6:6 22:18 23:20	156:12	sacrifice 52:2	45:4
Rica 232:7	roles 45:10	sad 89:18	saw 52:13 173:9
Richard 3:17 7:21	room 21:18 70:19	safe 52:12 110:10	say8ing 216:19
175:18 196:13	74:4 240:17 262:6	142:1 177:4	scale 125:1 185:1
204:10	Rosenworcel 2:5	193:5 197:15,22	209:12,20 214:9
Rick 3:17 7:21	5:3 11:22 14:11	safeguards 252:5	scaling 186:17
197:6 205:9 207:12 208:8	20:4,8,10 43:21	256:14	scenario 149:4
240:10	196:16 286:8	safely 246:9 247:10 255:16	150:19 178:8
rid 140:20	Ross 35:18 187:1	282:11	schedule 10:18
right-hand 208:11	roughly 151:21	safer 283:20	131:17 163:11
rights 2:20 3:4	199:2 201:18	safety 45:5 46:13	scheduled 51:1
5:17,22	222:12 240:17	110:10 197:17	school 16:7 52:22
24:18,22 30:22	route 86:12	204:7 244:22	scope 124:4
36:17 37:15	168:17	247:2 248:8	145:20 151:15
43:8 53:1	row 281:1	251:11 252:3	scraping 139:15
54:16,21 97:19 105:18	rule 17:18 59:8	258:18 259:13,18 260:4	• •
riots 266:21 267:1	103:13 120:5 169:12	269:13 273:10	screening 82:11
		274:3	screens 81:8
ripped 32:12	rulemaking 128:13	sake 218:14	search 245:17 259:16
ripping 32:15	rules 34:17 70:2	salaries 178:20	
risk 245:2 246:17	165:12 211:18	salary 178:22	searchability 254:16
252:10 264:12,15 265:2	234:10,11	sales 8:3 63:10	
283:6,16 284:1	ruling 136:5	230:17	searching 81:9
risk-reward	170:10 171:5	Salt 179:4	seat 281:1
246:15	178:13	Salvador 232:7	second 21:7 25:8
risks 265:12	run 64:12 91:8		42:11 64:19 84:10 91:6 92:9
river 84:21	172:2 178:4	Salves 230:15	114:2 137:18
road 22:1 32:22	214:20 221:15,20	sample 249:5	140:16 174:11
40:12 141:20	224:13,20	samples 270:3	178:9 234:11
164:15 205:1	263:3	San 35:18	249:4 255:20 257:4
robust 123:2	running 60:16	36:1,3,6,11	
145:4,11	99:13 176:12	163:12 186:11	secondly 12:9 37:4 79:7
		sanction 103:14	J1.4 17.1

	1 ag		
seconds 251:2	89:9,13 100:8,9	send 10:11 134:10	197:10 239:10
secrecy 276:2	101:13 157:21 262:9 264:14	171:14 254:12	240:19
Section 127:8		sending 81:12	served 176:5
156:8,10	seek 118:12	120:20 168:15	210:14 284:3
157:3,4,11,18	120:21	Senior 2:10 3:19	service 2:14,17
secure 80:15	seeking 245:6	6:8 8:3,10	5:13 6:12 7:9
177:5 197:15	seem 125:19	243:14	13:22 18:2
221:2 246:3	129:14 207:16	sense 76:13 96:3	24:15 25:8,10
261:12		116:16 121:18	27:6,13,16
	seems 207:20	143:18 145:20	28:8,11 29:5
securely 246:9	seen 57:12,19	148:15 151:15	37:13 44:9 48:7
247:10	76:15 84:9,10	212:7 214:21	49:11 58:15
security 3:16 7:20	87:2 88:21	280:8	68:4 73:1 95:15
14:2 53:20	99:16 102:22		97:9,10,13,20
79:15 101:1	107:9 123:14	sensitivity 81:15	98:7 100:4
175:17	126:4 127:18,21	sent 130:10	101:17,18
181:10,11	130:6 137:1	161:12	105:10,13
183:18,20 184:3	144:3 148:19	sentence 239:8	114:11 115:22
185:22	153:21 155:5		116:10,11
186:16,17	157:12,22	sentences 180:2	117:2,3,4,7,8,16
187:11	163:13 169:1	separate 49:22	,21,22
194:14,15	204:2 206:1,19	159:14 166:7	118:13,14
196:10,22	207:7,12 225:11	172:17	120:16 121:19
197:17 204:8	241:22 260:10	separated 21:13	132:16 133:8,16
206:14	263:5 264:12	27:19 158:18,19	135:17
207:17,18,19	segregated 160:6	171:11 174:6	143:21,22
208:2 233:22		266:19	144:4,6,8,9,14,1
245:2 246:5	select 193:18		9,21 146:5,11
254:11	selective 259:11	separately 168:3	148:12 151:9
259:2,6,14	self 119:2 224:13	173:2	155:4,12 156:20
264:14 273:10	254:3 267:8	September 38:20	159:14 161:6
285:14		52:6 54:12	162:6,11,13
Securus 3:17 7:21	self-contained	series 17:17	166:22 167:19
49:13 123:16	254:2,18,19	107:13 143:9	168:12 169:15
124:4,22 152:8	257:7		170:8 171:4
175:18 197:7,9	self-funded	serious 245:2	175:3 181:22
199:1 212:1	266:13	263:13	191:14 193:22
225:5,18	self-harming	seriously 16:12	194:14,20
226:6,14 238:3	276:17	225:8	201:12 210:16
, and the second		servants 248:6	213:11,13,14
Securus's 225:20	sell 58:21		222:8 223:9,10
237:10	semi 121:9	serve 26:10,11	232:4 238:16
seeing 34:13,16	Senator 215:7	130:18 174:2	252:6 253:16
37:5 87:3	Schatti 213./	175:10 177:3	255:10 256:15
		<u> </u>	

	1 46		
257:8 258:3	254:2,3,7,10,13,	191:9 245:9	shows 26:10 32:13
265:20	19	253:16,18,22	45:16 138:16
266:6,7,10	255:11,12,14,16	275:20	213:1 225:7
268:18 269:4	256:2,6 257:7		
270:7 271:2,3	260:2,11 262:9	sharing 33:8	sic 139:22
	269:10 280:21	74:20 120:17	sides 60:18 96:13
serviced 213:16		162:7 249:16	237:8 274:6
services 1:7	servicing 131:3	254:9 285:17	sign 205:17,19
2:14,16 5:12	serving 180:19	shed 231:5	_
6:12 7:9 12:6	209:7 239:8	shell 102:22	signaling 37:2
13:17	Sesseion 8:5	sheriff 7:12 35:18	signals 81:9
17:7,10,21	session 6:20 8:20	153:16 175:12	signed 53:19
26:6,20 27:6	20:12 107:8	179:17 186:22	
37:10,16	198:5		significant 25:13
39:6,10 42:20		sheriffs 30:14	45:6 60:20 75:3 114:10 123:6
61:4,9,18	setting 89:14	35:12 129:3,10	149:8 174:12
63:5,8,13,19,20	121:6 135:3	178:16 181:8	199:10 203:17
64:17 65:14	144:3 161:5,16	220:12	225:15 226:2
71:19 72:12	168:10,14	sheriff's 3:12	229:4 244:15
82:8,10 88:15	181:14 194:16	50:18 95:12	246:22 248:8
95:1 99:6	195:19 204:7	176:4,17 178:22	249:10 257:5
100:22	settings 243:10	179:6 224:12	279:18
115:13,17,20	seven 44:21 88:14	she's 171:20	
116:7,22	199:4		significantly
120:11,18 121:22 123:8		shield 123:1	102:2
131:1 132:19	several 27:12 44:9	shields 153:7	208:3,7,13,15
131.1 132.19	51:16 84:5 93:2	shift 47:3 152:11	222:3 246:11
146:15 155:17	137:21 142:11		251:6 275:12
157:20 158:4,11	159:12	shoes 212:3	277:16
159:10 161:1	166:10,11 223:15	shopping 29:16	signing 58:5
167:3		short 14:14 39:8	similar 47:21 48:6
181:5,17,18,20	severe 16:6	209:18,19	51:17 132:15,21
183:22 184:7	204:22	235:13	182:16 184:3
187:8 188:4	severely 245:8		240:14 251:8
191:10,13,15	sexual 38:2	shortly 229:8	263:11 270:20
192:10,20	40:20,22 41:5	showed 151:6	272:19
193:4,18,21	Í	shower 40:21	similarly 163:9
195:8,11,13,19	share 31:20 33:6	showing 11:2	•
196:11 219:15	34:11 41:21	131:9 146:10	simple 11:11
220:16 226:13	42:7 60:2,5 75:5	187:16	33:15 40:10
227:12 234:9	154:10 196:18		45:1 61:6
236:16 238:2,17	234:14 287:6	shown 13:7 14:17	145:11,19
239:16 243:21	shared 19:10	45:5 54:19 59:1	147:3,7 178:7
246:22	37:12 38:10	245:4 275:15	212:4 231:16

256:10,22 261:7	122:4 201:15	slow 40:7 47:2	246:13,18
263:2	209:5	small 26:11 32:16	snowing 33:13
simplest 145:14	sites 35:3	96:6 99:4 118:5	snuck 79:14
simplicity 145:7	sitting 22:18 48:5	184:19	so-called 75:18
simplification	212:3 286:11	189:3,5,6 199:11	social 45:9,11,13
135:22	situation 56:16	202:11,14,22	53:2 255:11
simplify	77:1 128:17	203:2 214:3	256:19 286:21
135:14,15	240:8 266:16	215:1 226:13	societal 42:14
simply 25:18 26:1	situations 58:12 150:20	257:16 269:18 283:16 286:22	society 16:10
116:2 180:14 191:5 237:21	six 72:7 77:9	smaller 96:22	109:5,14,17
249:4 283:9	88:14 89:6	140:14 184:2	110:6,9 197:18
simultaneous	133:17 170:9	190:9 263:20	204:1 224:21 284:6
273:1	185:4	280:3	sociology 272:14
single 21:18	size 97:2 151:22	smallest 55:20	
26:5,20 27:6,13	168:8 175:4	203:2,4	sock 121:1
29:7 82:7,9 99:6	182:2,12 186:6 187:9,14	smart 211:20	software 81:8,16 201:12 252:22
115:13 116:6 121:22 138:7	188:6,7,12	smarter 177:20	255:13 260:20
152:22 153:14	189:22 190:10	267:6	278:9
154:2 190:10	205:2 207:13	Smartphone	software-based
202:5 212:6	210:3 216:6 235:17 239:1	281:21	181:13
227:11	257:16	Smith 3:17 7:21 175:18	soldier 64:10
single-call 140:10	sized 188:2	173.18	solitary 42:3
154:22	sizes 176:21	204:14 208:10	solution 244:2
single-payment 115:16,20	185:17 188:21	210:4,6,8	245:20 246:3
116:22 155:16	202:14	213:22 215:8,12	264:12,19
156:22 219:15	skill 279:3	216:14 217:1 219:17	282:10
siphoning 245:22	skills 281:13	226:18,22	solutions 255:6 278:10
246:9	skyrocketed	227:6,8,14,21	
sir 10:8	116:15	230:1,3,9,13 237:9 238:9	solve 219:4 264:5 267:3 274:9,10
sister 86:6	skyrockets 77:12	240:11 269:5	282:20
sit 130:11 191:6	slap 166:2	Smith's 225:4	solved 245:19
234:6	slaughter 35:19	SMS 155:22	279:19
		171711 1 1 1 /./.	
site 17:5,14 28:19	S		solving 279:15
60:16,19 61:3	sleep 40:21	smuggled 251:13	solving 279:15 somebody 74:5
60:16,19 61:3 66:4,11	sleep 40:21 slightly 185:14	smuggled 251:13 smugglers 246:14	somebody 74:5 80:1 124:10
60:16,19 61:3	sleep 40:21	smuggled 251:13	somebody 74:5

<u></u>	1 46	ī	
141:5 142:22	space 258:7	speech 39:1 249:5	stands 158:6
151:9 152:22 205:11 237:17	span 182:11	spelled 178:13	star 12:20
	spared 40:13	spend 21:17	starred 140:6
somebody's	speak 49:8 54:17	150:21,22 250:6	start 10:4
275:18	111:13,18,19	253:2,5	22:11,20,21
somehow 111:17	147:16	spends 21:19	23:19 25:2
someone 44:20	170:12,13	-	59:22 125:10
71:21 75:21	190:22 247:17	spent 30:11 123:5	127:5 128:22
213:9 220:20	248:13	142:17 149:13	137:7 143:4
221:3 228:5		256:13 280:4	145:2,14 166:15
261:15 274:5,10	SPEAKER	spite 185:21	170:6 174:22
ĺ .	273:12	spitting 139:5	207:6 211:14
someplace 209:8	speakers 55:5		221:20 243:16
sometime 51:2	57:6	spoke 81:3 187:1	262:4 268:12
somewhat 188:13	speaking 128:18	spoken 239:14	285:22
283:11	214:22 220:5	sponsored 112:3	started 53:17
somewhere 57:22	spearheaded	spot 171:20	76:18 139:4
80:8 168:17	228:1	Spring 156:2	140:10 153:4
173:14 189:21	special 35:14	square 116:1	155:16 157:10
207:10 209:16	97:14 109:7	<u> </u>	168:20 170:19
sophisticated	280:22	squeeze 25:17	173:10 285:11
177:7 244:9	specially 13:18	stack 201:8	starting 55:3 92:17 141:19
sorry 94:8 145:2	specific 68:20	stacking 170:7	148:13 159:8,20
285:3	74:17 83:17	staff 10:14 19:10	258:18
sort 33:18 72:18	128:12 160:17	20:12 23:13	starts 203:8
73:12 82:21	165:5 166:17	24:4 30:11 73:4	
234:9 284:1	248:13,17	126:20 130:19	startup 266:13
sorts 168:7	249:3,4 268:17	250:12 251:14	268:1
sound 77:22	279:22	252:11 266:4	state 22:6,7 31:18
78:1,2 152:14	specifically 120:6	286:17,20	33:16 43:15
,	122:12 127:7	stand 18:19 198:3	44:22
sounds 256:10	177:13 243:22	standard 132:14	47:2,13,20
source 113:2,3	263:12 274:14	145:18 258:19	48:1,7
155:18 223:19	283:2		49:2,12,16,18
224:6 266:2	specifications	standards 43:5	50:2 51:7,12
278:8 279:13	263:6	195:2,9,12,21	52:4,18 54:10
sources 25:22	specifics 74:18	standbys 122:4	55:22 57:17,18
26:4 63:10	-	standing 20:17	58:1,2 62:8,12
224:5	specifies 119:4	31:4 97:19	63:4,15 66:6,15
South 142:19	spectrum 140:15	standpoint 265:21	67:6 73:8 84:11
183:3	speculate 103:6	272:10 278:5	89:11,12,15,16, 18 94:2 95:13
100.0	Speculate 103.0	2/2.10 2/0.3	10 74.4 73.13

state-mandated 174,14,179,22 271:1 287:9 275:1 statement 74:22 180:2 192:3 stress 132:6 submit 32:20 36 statement 74:22 255:18 284:6 strive 19:6 63:21 94:15 117:14 118:3,7 27:6 133:7,22 stayed 82:21 strong 20:17 23:18 67:11 167:6 228:14 153:17 167:15 staying 180:8 strong 20:17 23:18 67:11 256:9 statements 166:11 198:14 stealing 249:17 275:8 strong-armed 85:10 102:6 states 15:5 18:14 Steering 3:3 5:19 stronger 45:18 submitted 39:19 85:10 102:6 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 stronger 45:18 submitting 95:1 submitting 95:1 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 strongly 46:14 48:10 103:10 subsequently 86:13 87:19 290:14,21 101:20 83:18 123:19 83:10 101:13 subsequently 99:14,21 101:20 stimulating 110:4 stimulating 110:4 160:20 175:3 subsidize 65:14 183:17 197:13 stint 235:13 187:4 210:11 subsidy 98:5 179:5 184:		1 46		
118:11 127:22 132:1,14 136:2 156:3 163:8		253:16,20 254:1	store 201:2,9	
118:11 127:22 132:1,14 136:2 156:3 163:8 status 125:9 status 255:6 storing 255:6 182:9 183:7 184:14 190:7,9 195:14 211:13 240:15 statutory 59:3 62:18 111:1 stay 17:11 21:15 130:1 157:8 174:14 179:22 streaming 254:4 171:12 244:19 174:14 179:22 streaming 254:4 streaming 254:4 177:12 244:19 174:14 179:22 streaming 254:4 strea		statistics 15:4	stored 248·14	206:3
132:1,14 136:2 156:3 163:8 178:20 179:5 statute 16:15 19:4 65:11 statutory 59:3 62:18 111:1 statutory 59:3 62:18 111:1 15:5,12 stream 123:3 145:5,12 subject 10:21 28:12 47:7 16:13 180:17 275:8 strements 166:11 198:14 states 15:5 18:14 19:1,4,8 46:1 47:16 56:3,20 62:2,3,19,21,22 63:14 67:5,15 86:13 87:9 99:14,21 101:20 131:14 136:3 142:18 157:9 162:1 182:10,15 183:17 197:13 218:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 state's 84:15 179:5 184:17 stopped 184:10 st				stuff 101.6 201.9
156:3 163:8 178:20 179:5 statute 16:15 19:4 65:11 story 266:16 strategy 29:8 strategy 29:4 stricegy 29:12 27:12 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:5 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:5 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:5 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:14 27:1 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:14 28:12 47:7 27:1 28:14 28:12 47:7 28:14 28:12 47:7 28:14 28:12 47				
182:9 183:7 184:14 190:7,9 195:14 211:13 240:15 statutory 59:3 62:18 111:1 145:5,12 stated 161:14 171:12 244:19 state-mandated 142:18 235:3 243:4 streem 174:22 117:14 118:3,7 127:6 133:7,22 142:14,16 153:17 167:15 statements 166:11 198:14 states 15:5 18:14 191:4,8 46:1 47:16 56:3,20 62:2,3,19,21,22 63:14 67:5,15 86:13 87:19 99:14,21 101:20 131:14 136:3 142:18 157:9 162:1 182:10,15 183:17 197:13 218:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 state's 84:15 179:5 184:17 States 38:12,14 39:11 44:5 179:18 stopped 184:10 storage 201:3 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 166:20 182:10 23:18 16:10 153:16 102:8,217 275:8 strong 20:17 167:6 228:14 255:9 submit 32:20 36:32 194:15 102:8,21 135:16 167:6 228:14 255:9 submit 32:20 36:32 194:15 102:8,21 135:16 167:6 228:14 255:9 submit 32:20 36:32 194:15 102:8,21 135:17 167:6 228:14 275:8 strong 20:17 167:6 228:14 255:9 submitted 39:15 35:19 277:4 167:6 228:14 255:9 submitted 39:15 85:10 102:8,21 135:10 167:6 228:14 275:8 strong 20:17 275:8 strong 20:17 275:8 strong 277:4 167:6 228:14 48:10 103:10 submitting 95:1 submitting 95:1 subsection 149: substantial 147:0 14			storing 255:6	
184:14 190:7,9 195:14 211:13 240:15 stated 161:14 171:12 244:19 171:12 244:19 171:12 244:19 184:14 179:22 184:18 235:3 243:4 streem 174:22 117:14 118:3,7 127:6 133:7,22 142:14,16 153:17 167:15 statements 166:11 198:14 states 15:5 18:14 191:1,4,8 46:1 47:16 56:3,20 62:2,3,19,21,22 63:14 67:5,15 86:13 87:19 99:14,21 101:20 131:14 136:3 142:18 157:9 162:1 182:10,15 183:17 197:13 218:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 state's 84:15 179:5 184:17 State's 84:15 179:5 184:17 State's 84:15 179:18 179:19 storage 201:3 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 170:40 179:10 189:14 112:18 176:9 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 170:40 170:40 179:14 189:19 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 170:40 170:40 179:40 140:40 150:40 140:40 150:40 140:40 150:40 140:40 150:40 140:40 150:40 140:40 150:40 140:40			story 266:16	
State 14 19 19 19 19 19 19 19		65:11	strategy 29:8	
195:14 211:13 240:15 stay 17:11 21:15 130:1 157:8 174:14 179:22 180:2 192:3 271:1 287:9 275:1 160:10 178:6 153:17 167:15 statements 166:11	,	statutory 59:3		
stated 161:14 stay 17:11 21:15 streaming 254:4 subject 10:21 28:12 47:7 171:12 244:19 180:2 192:3 271:1 287:9 275:1 275:1 275:1 275:1 28:12 47:7 275:1 275:1 28:12 47:7 275:1 275:1 28:12 47:7 275:1 275:1 28:12 47:7 275:1 274:4 275:2 274:4 274:4 274:4 274:4 274:4 274:4 274:4 274:4 274:4		· ·		212:20
130:1 157:8	240:15	ctox 17:11 21:15	ŕ	subject 10:21
state-mandated 174:14 179:22 street 1:14 191:3 275:1 275:1 state-mandated 142:18 235:3 243:4 stress 132:6 submit 32:20 36 statement 74:22 255:18 284:6 strive 19:6 submit 32:20 36 177:14 118:3,7 27:6 133:7,22 stayed 82:21 strong 20:17 23:18 67:11 20:8,21 135: statements 166:11 198:14 states 15:5 18:14 275:8 strong-armed 274:4 256:9 submitted 39:19 85:10 102:6 states 15:5 18:14 Stein 215:7 stronger 45:18 stronger 45:18 submitting 95:1 submitting 95:1 47:16 56:3,20 stein 215:7 strongly 46:14 48:10 103:10 subsection 149: 46:13 87:19 206:3 strongly 46:14 48:10 103:10 subsection 149: 86:13 87:19 206:3 steps 18:13 37:9 27:17 75:8 subsequently 162:1 182:10,15 stim 235:13 126:3 132:8,15 160:20 175:3 subsidize 65:14 179:5 184:17 stop 41:8 62:12,14 86:12,14 187:20 212:9 structures 215:10 substantial 44:1	stated 161:14		streaming 254:4	28:12 47:7
state-mandated 180:2 192:3 271:1 287:9 275:1 statement 74:22 117:14 118:3,7 225:18 284:6 strive 19:6 submit 32:20 36 117:14 118:3,7 227:6 133:7,22 stayed 82:21 strong 20:17 23:18 67:11 226:28:14 128:14 statements 166:11 staying 180:8 strong-armed 275:8 stb mitted 39:19 states 15:5 18:14 Steering 3:3 5:19 stronger 45:18 stb mitted 39:19 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 stronger 45:18 stb mitting 95:1 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 strongly 46:14 submitting 95:1 86:13 87:19 206:3 strongly 46:14 submetting 95:1 86:13 87:19 206:3 structure 14:8 subsequently 99:14,21 101:20 stim 133:9 104:9 272:2 83:10 101:13 subsidize 65:14 18:21 18:20,15 stim 235:13 187:4 210:11 subsidize 65:14 179:5 184:17 stip 191:10 stop 41:8 62:12,14 structures 215:10 substantial 44:1 19:16 state's 84:15 stip 191:10 stuck 281:16 <td>171:12 244:19</td> <td></td> <td>street 1:14 191:3</td> <td>116:13 180:17</td>	171:12 244:19		street 1:14 191:3	116:13 180:17
142:18 235:3 243:4 stress 132:6 submit 32:20 36 statement 74:22 255:18 284:6 287:15 strive 19:6 63:21 94:15 117:14 118:3,7 127:6 133:7,22 stayed 82:21 strong 20:17 23:18 67:11 167:6 228:14 142:14,16 153:17 167:15 staying 180:8 strong 20:17 23:18 67:11 256:9 statements 166:11 275:8 stealing 249:17 23:124:14 256:9 states 15:5 18:14 19:1,4,8 46:1 Steering 3:3 5:19 strong-armed 274:4 states 15:5 18:14 19:1,4,8 46:1 step 17:15 57:21 stronger 45:18 submitted 39:19 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 strongly 46:14 48:10 103:10 subpoenas 202: 66:13 87:19 206:3 steps 18:13 37:9 104:9 272:2 83:10 101:13 subsequently 121:1 182:10,15 stimulating 110:4 stint 235:13 126:3 132:8,15 subsidize 65:14 18:12 20 230:6 239:6 242:11 stir 191:10 structures 215:10 substantial 44:1 179:5 184:17 stop 41:8 62:12,14 187:20 212:9 <td>state-mandated</td> <td></td> <td>271:1 287:9</td> <td>275:1</td>	state-mandated		271:1 287:9	275:1
statement 74:22 255:18 284:6 strive 19:6 63:21 94:15 117:14 118:3,7 287:15 stayed 82:21 strong 20:17 122:8,21 135: 127:6 133:7,22 staying 180:8 72:3 124:14 256:9 153:17 167:15 staying 180:8 stealing 249:17 23:18 67:11 23:18 67:11 198:14 stealing 249:17 275:8 strong-armed 274:4 stint 215:7 states 15:5 18:14 19:1,4,8 46:1 Steering 3:3 5:19 stronger 45:18 submitted 39:18 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 stronger 45:18 submitting 95:1 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 strongly 46:14 48:10 103:10 62:2,3,19,21,22 83:18 123:19 structure 14:8 subsequently 99:14,21 101:20 steps 18:13 37:9 83:10 101:13 126:3 132:8,15 subsidize 65:14 18:17 197:13 stint 235:13 126:3 132:8,15 160:20 175:3 subsidize 65:14 239:6 242:11 stir 191:10 stop 41:8 62:12,14 231:15 232:17 substantial 44:1 193:16 stop 41:8 62:12,14 187:20 212:9			stress 132:6	submit 32:20 36:4
117:14 118:3,7 287:15 stayed 82:21 127:6 133:7,22 142:14,16 153:17 167:15 staying 180:8 stealing 249:17 275:8 strong-armed 275:8 strong-armed 274:4 187:10 102:6 112:11 158:9 161:10 stronger 45:18 strongly 46:14 48:10 103:10 structure 14:8 18:10 26:9 27:17 75:8 structure 14:8 18:10 26:9 27:17 75:8 structure 14:8 18:10 26:9 27:17 75:8 subscition 149: subscitio				
117.14 13.37, 127:6 133:7,22 142:14,16 153:17 167:15 statements 166:11 198:14 states 15:5 18:14 19:1,4,8 46:1 47:16 56:3,20 62:2,3,19,21,22 63:14 67:5,15 86:13 87:19 99:14,21 101:20 131:14 136:3 142:18 157:9 162:1 182:10,15 183:17 197:13 218:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 state's 84:15 179:5 184:17 States 38:12,14 39:11 44:5 112:18 176:9 189:9 198:22 180:8 staying 180:8 staying 180:8 72:3 124:14 256:9 submitted 39:19 85:10 102:6 112:11 158:9 85:10 102:6 112:11 158:9 85:10 102:6 12:11 158:9 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10 85:10 103:10				102:8,21 135:19
121.0 131.7 132.10 131.14 136.3 142.18 157.9 162.1 182.10,15 183.17 197.13 218.20 230.6 239.6 242.11 state's 84.15 179.5 184.17 States 38:12,14 39:11 44:5 121.8 176.9 189.9 198:22 189.9 198:22 182.10 182.10 189.10 199.12 189.19 198:22 189.9 198:22 182.10 182.10 182.10 189.10 199.12 189.9 198:22 189.9 198:22 184.17 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 189.19 198:22 184.17 184.10 189.19 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10 189.19 184.20 184.10	′		O	*
153:17 167:15 statements 166:11 275:8 strong-armed 275:10 102:6 112:11 158:9 161:10 85:10 102:6 112:11 158:9 161:10 112:11 158:9 161:10 submitted 39:19 85:10 102:6 112:11 158:9 161:10 submitting 95:1 85:10 102:6 112:11 158:9 161:10 submitting 95:1 stronger 45:18 submitting 95:1 submitting 95:1 submitting 95:1 submitting 95:1 submitting 95:1 subpoenas 202: subsection 149: subsection 149: subsection 149: subsection 149: subsection 149: subsequently 249:7 subsidize 65:14 substance 223:4 substance 223:4 substance 223:4 substantial 44:1 substantial 44:1 47:20 substantially 193:16 substantiate 169:12 169:12 169:14		ľ		256:9
statements 166:11 stealing 249:17 275:8 strong-armed 85:10 102:6 112:11 158:9 161:10 submitting 95:1 47:16 56:3,20 stein 215:7 stronger 45:18 submitting 95:1 62:2,3,19,21,22 step 17:15 57:21 strongly 46:14 subpoenas 202: 63:14 67:5,15 166:10 178:6 206:3 structure 14:8 subsection 149: 99:14,21 101:20 steps 18:13 37:9 27:17 75:8 subsequently 249:7 131:14 136:3 142:18 157:9 104:9 272:2 83:10 101:13 subsidize 65:14 183:17 197:13 stimulating 110:4 160:20 175:3 substance 223:4 182:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 stir 231:15 232:17 substantial 44:1 179:5 184:17 stop 41:8 62:12,14 187:20 212:9 stuck 281:16 substantially 193:16 storage 201:3 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 45:24 45:24		staying 180:8		submitted 30·10
states 15:5 18:14 275:8 strong-armed 274:4 112:11 158:9 161:10 states 15:5 18:14 19:1,4,8 46:1 Stein 215:7 stronger 45:18 submitting 95:1 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 strongly 46:14 subpoenas 202: 62:2,3,19,21,22 63:14 67:5,15 86:13 87:19 206:3 structure 14:8 subsection 149: 99:14,21 101:20 steps 18:13 37:9 104:9 272:2 83:10 101:13 subsidize 65:14 183:17 197:13 stint 235:13 126:3 132:8,15 subsidize 65:14 183:17 197:13 stint 235:13 187:4 210:11 substance 223:4 239:6 242:11 stipulated 270:18 structures 215:10 substantially 195: 184:17 stop 41:8 62:12,14 structures 215:10 substantially 193:16 studies 14:16 studies 14:16 substantiate 193:16 storage 201:3 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20		stealing 249:17	275:8	
states 15:5 18:14 Stein 215:7 stronger 45:18 submitting 95:1 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 strongly 46:14 submounting 95:1 62:2,3,19,21,22 63:14 67:5,15 83:18 123:19 48:10 103:10 subsection 149: 86:13 87:19 99:14,21 101:20 steps 18:13 37:9 27:17 75:8 subsequently 131:14 136:3 142:18 157:9 162:1 182:10,15 stimulating 110:4 stimulating 110:4 stimulating 110:4 subsidize 65:14 183:17 197:13 stint 235:13 187:4 210:11 substance 223:4 239:6 242:11 stipulated 270:18 231:15 232:17 substantial 44:1 179:5 184:17 stop 41:8 62:12,14 240:18 substantially 193:16 stuck 281:16 substantiate 161:10 substantiate 169:12 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20		275:8	strong-armed	
states 15:5 18:14 19:1,4,8 46:1 Stein 215:7 stronger 45:18 submitting 95:1 47:16 56:3,20 step 17:15 57:21 strongly 46:14 subpoenas 202: 62:2,3,19,21,22 83:18 123:19 48:10 103:10 subsection 149: 63:14 67:5,15 166:10 178:6 structure 14:8 subsection 149: 86:13 87:19 206:3 structure 14:8 subsequently 99:14,21 101:20 steps 18:13 37:9 27:17 75:8 subsidize 65:14 131:14 136:3 104:9 272:2 83:10 101:13 subsidize 65:14 183:17 197:13 stimulating 110:4 126:3 132:8,15 subsidize 65:14 183:17 197:13 stint 235:13 187:4 210:11 substance 223:4 239:6 242:11 stir 191:10 240:18 substantial 44:1 179:5 184:17 stop 41:8 62:12,14 240:18 structures 215:10 substantially 193:16 stuck 281:16 substantiate 169:12 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 16:14 42:4		Steering 3·3 5·19	274:4	
19:1,4,8 46:1		· ·	stronger 45·18	
62:2,3,19,21,22 63:14 67:5,15 86:13 87:19 99:14,21 101:20 131:14 136:3 142:18 157:9 162:1 182:10,15 183:17 197:13 218:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 state's 84:15 179:5 184:17 States 38:12,14 39:11 44:5 112:18 176:9 189:9 198:22 83:18 123:19 166:10 178:6 206:3 steps 18:13 37:9 104:9 272:2 stimulating 110:4 stint 235:13 stipulated 270:18 substantial 44:1 stipulated 270:18 stipulated 270:			<u> </u>	S
63:14 67:5,15 86:13 87:19 166:10 178:6 structure 14:8 subsection 149: 99:14,21 101:20 steps 18:13 37:9 27:17 75:8 subsequently 249:7 131:14 136:3 142:18 157:9 104:9 272:2 83:10 101:13 subsidize 65:14 183:17 197:13 stimulating 110:4 126:3 132:8,15 subsidize 65:14 183:17 197:13 stint 235:13 187:4 210:11 substance 223:4 239:6 242:11 stipulated 270:18 212:10 215:4 substantial 44:1 179:5 184:17 stop 41:8 62:12,14 240:18 structures 215:10 States 38:12,14 187:20 212:9 stuck 281:16 substantially 12:18 176:9 storage 201:3 15:17 26:14 substantiate 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20	,	-		subpoenas 202:3
86:13 87:19 206:3 18:10 26:9 249:7 99:14,21 101:20 steps 18:13 37:9 27:17 75:8 249:7 131:14 136:3 104:9 272:2 83:10 101:13 subsidize 65:14 162:1 182:10,15 stimulating 110:4 126:3 132:8,15 subsidy 98:5 183:17 197:13 stint 235:13 187:4 210:11 substance 223:4 239:6 242:11 stipulated 270:18 231:15 232:17 substantial 44:1 240:18 240:18 substantially 193:16 stuck 281:16 substantiate 12:18 176:9 storage 201:3 254:6,16 255:6 15:17 26:14 substantive 25:2 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 14:14 43:4				subsection 149:12
99:14,21 101:20 131:14 136:3 142:18 157:9 162:1 182:10,15 183:17 197:13 218:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 state's 84:15 179:5 184:17 States 38:12,14 39:11 44:5 112:18 176:9 189:9 198:22 104:9 272:2 stimulating 110:4 stimt 235:13 stipulated 270:18 substantial 44:1 stipulated 270:18 stip				subsequently
33:14,21 101.20 steps 18:13 37:9 27:17 75:8 131:14 136:3 104:9 272:2 83:10 101:13 142:18 157:9 162:1 182:10,15 126:3 132:8,15 183:17 197:13 183:17 197:13 187:4 210:11 218:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 187:20 212:9 179:5 184:17 187:20 212:9 240:18 187:20 212:9 187:20 212:9 189:9 198:22 189:9 198:22 189:9 198:22 131:14 136:3 104:9 272:2 120:10:13 126:3 132:8,15 160:20 175:3 187:4 210:11 212:10 215:4 231:15 232:17 240:18 240:18 substantially 193:16 stuck 281:16 15:17 26:14 169:12 15:17 26:14 15:17 26:14 68:15 16 96:20 16:14 43:4		206:3		
142:18 157:9 104:9 272:2 33:10 101:13 stabstate 65:17 162:1 182:10,15 183:17 197:13 126:3 132:8,15 subsidy 98:5 218:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 212:10 215:4 substance 223:4 stir 191:10 240:18 240:18 substantial 44:1 state's 84:15 240:18 structures 215:10 substantially 12:18 176:9 12:18 176:9 storage 201:3 studies 14:16 substantiate 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 14:4 42.4		steps 18:13 37:9		
162:1 182:10,15 stimulating 110:4 160:20 175:3 substance 223:4 183:17 197:13 stint 235:13 187:4 210:11 substance 223:4 218:20 230:6 stipulated 270:18 212:10 215:4 substantial 44:1 239:6 242:11 stir 191:10 240:18 substantially 179:5 184:17 stop 41:8 62:12,14 structures 215:10 substantially 187:20 212:9 stuck 281:16 substantiate 169:12 substantiate 169:12 substantiate 169:12 substantiate 160:20 175:3 substantial 44:1 231:15 232:17 240:18 240:18 structures 215:10 187:20 212:9 stuck 281:16 189:9 198:22 storage 201:3 254:6,16 255:6 15:17 26:14 68:15 16 96:20 14:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:4:		104:9 272:2		
183:17 197:13 stint 235:13 187:4 210:11 substance 223:4 239:6 242:11 stipulated 270:18 212:10 215:4 substantial 44:1 239:6 242:11 stir 191:10 240:18 substantial 44:1 39:11 44:5 stop 41:8 62:12,14 structures 215:10 substantially 187:20 212:9 stuck 281:16 substantiate 12:18 176:9 storage 201:3 15:17 26:14 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20		stimulating 110:4		subsidy 98:5
218:20 230:6 239:6 242:11 stipulated 270:18 212:10 215:4 47:20 state's 84:15 240:18 240:18 substantial 44:1 states 38:12,14 39:11 44:5 112:18 176:9 storage 201:3 studies 14:16 substantiale 15:17 26:14 15:17 26:14 substantiate 169:12 16:15 16 96:20 16:15 16 96:20 16:15 16 96:20	,			substance 223:4
239:6 242:11 state's 84:15 179:5 184:17 States 38:12,14 39:11 44:5 112:18 176:9 189:9 198:22 stipulated 270:18 stipulated 270:18 231:15 232:17 240:18 substantially 193:16 stuck 281:16 stuck 281:16 15:17 26:14 68:15 16 96:20 substantiate 169:12 substantive 25:2				
state's 84:15 stir 191:10 240:18 substantially 179:5 184:17 stop 41:8 62:12,14 structures 215:10 193:16 States 38:12,14 stopped 184:10 stuck 281:16 substantiate 112:18 176:9 storage 201:3 15:17 26:14 substantiate 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 14:4 42.4		stipulated 270:18		
states 38:12,14 stop 41:8 62:12,14 structures 215:10 substantiary States 38:12,14 39:11 44:5 stopped 184:10 stuck 281:16 substantiate 112:18 176:9 storage 201:3 15:17 26:14 substantiate 189:9 198:22 169:12 substantiate		stir 191:10		
States 38:12,14 187:20 212:9 stuck 281:16 substantiate 39:11 44:5 112:18 176:9 storage 201:3 15:17 26:14 substantive 25:2 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 substantive 25:2		ston 41.8 62.12 14		
States 38:12,14 stopped 184:10 stuck 281:16 substantiate 39:11 44:5 112:18 176:9 storage 201:3 15:17 26:14 substantive 25:2 189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 substantive 25:2		-	structures 215:10	193:16
112:18 176:9 189:9 198:22	_		stuck 281:16	substantiate
112:18 176:9 189:9 198:22 storage 201:3 254:6,16 255:6 15:17 26:14 substantive 25:2		stopped 184:10	studies 14·16	169:12
189:9 198:22 254:6,16 255:6 68:15 16 96:20 14:4 42 4		C		substantive 25:20
257:6 282:6 128:16 230:5 substitute 42.4	216:4	257:6 282:6	*	substitute 42:4
stations 205:5 success 106:7	stations 205:5			success 106:7

	- 0	C 03	
253:10	246:20	233:21 242:3,21	122:18 177:7
successful 110:8	support 13:6	265:12 269:22	178:7,18,21
180:4 257:13	14:10 19:15	279:5 284:10	179:11,21
	45:18 52:2	surprised 129:3	182:10,11
successfully 48:6	64:17 98:10	_	183:19 186:1,18
257:18	106:9,13 110:6	surrounding	188:9 190:6,7
successive 183:10	162:11 169:5,6	70:17	205:22 207:18
sudden 103:7	180:9 201:15	survey 15:6 99:21	214:4,13 215:1
264:5 282:21	240:21 254:6	survive 116:17	240:2 248:9,12
	261:1		254:9 256:2
suddenly 10:7		suspect 120:16	257:19 259:10
65:2	supported 116:21	suspected 81:6,8	system's 244:22
suffering 16:6	supporter 20:5	Sweeney 3:19 8:3	251:14
222:7	supporting 53:5	175:19	
sufficient 70:21	supportive 46:6	204:10,12	
195:5 224:13		212:13 227:9	t5o 225:12
suggest 46:17	supports 26:9	230:14 242:19	
210:3 240:1	supposed	Swift 162:14	table 37:7 114:1 129:22 234:22
	102:6,20		235:4
suggestions	supposedly	switch 125:18	
220:10	102:12,14	237:21	tablet 253:18
suit 216:6		sync 118:1	281:21
sum 36:12 148:22	Supreme 42:22 43:2	system 40:14	tablets 253:20
summer 51:3		41:6,7,13 44:2	254:1 265:1
158:8,20	surcharge 77:14	55:22 75:20	tackling 247:15
, i	surcharges 25:11	79:3,6,13	<u> </u>
Summerset	195:16	101:14 104:2	tacks 119:20
184:20	sure 12:1 16:13	119:10 122:20	taking 53:19
supervised	21:12,16	123:2 133:22	71:22 97:13
254:2,7,10,13,1	22:3,12 32:19	135:6 149:14	122:21 123:20
8 255:10 257:7	33:9 34:1,21	162:14 173:16	125:12 206:3
supervision	43:6 71:18	177:16 179:1	283:7 286:15
118:17 259:11	84:15 103:11	180:9 186:19	Talila 2:19 5:16
288:7	104:10 108:14	190:9 191:20	24:17 36:16,20
supplemental	109:18 110:17	214:8,11 215:3	69:22 272:5
46:2 224:8	112:22 129:12	225:9 235:15	talk 35:5,8 60:13
	149:11	251:1,7,9,11	77:10 78:21,22
supplementary	156:5,14,17	253:15	96:8 112:7
165:1	164:9 166:6	256:12,14	129:17 140:16
supplementing	180:14 188:3	264:14	161:21 170:15
271:18	189:4 197:19	systems 55:20	172:13 200:16
supply	206:21 218:6	75:19 76:19	205:11 235:11
245:11,14,15	224:22 231:11	94:21 104:6,11	236:21 243:20
213.11,17,13			

	1 ag	1	
252:18 258:15	77:20	132:12	76:17
276:5,6	technician 209:9	telecommunicatio	tends 95:11
talked 31:17 67:19 113:5,6	technicians 201:11	n 28:11 117:12 246:21	Tennessee 56:21 271:17
158:5,12 172:19 205:6,20 262:15	technological 47:2	telecommunicatio	tens 223:21
264:7 267:5	252:5	ns 37:19 40:4 41:3 42:2 70:13	tenure 143:20
278:19 281:16	technologies	72:4 155:3	tenured 105:19
talking 30:13	3:18,22 7:21	181:3 286:18	term 63:22 105:6
36:16 93:10	8:6,15 98:17,20	telecoms 57:17	204:1 211:19
146:6 147:14	178:2 197:7 243:20 244:1	telephone 28:13	242:13 268:17
157:10 162:4 163:12,22	253:4,7,11	38:13 41:1	terminated 58:19
169:22 188:21	254:17 258:2	46:1,21 48:11	terms 51:10 66:9
208:13 214:5	265:6 269:12	57:3 63:5 70:20	70:7 85:2 87:3
276:1	270:4 273:9	81:11 94:21	94:11 99:10
talks 177:13	277:22 278:3 279:6,7 280:21	119:9 131:3 134:1 136:7	113:16 122:2
Talton 191:16	ŕ	143:20,21 144:4	140:17 145:21
192:18,21	technology	157:16 188:9	158:7 161:16
193:22 194:7,20	83:11,12 101:4,10 133:10	191:9,14 192:10	167:2 175:11 189:22
Tampa 179:16	177:15 213:2,10	193:18 194:21	190:10,11 198:3
targeted 243:22	214:12 220:16	195:7,11,13	199:8 200:21
	246:8 247:3,10	196:3,6 200:19	201:20 202:7,11
tariff 142:5 151:7	248:7,10,21	203:4 231:13 243:11 244:4	210:5 211:18
tariffed 145:16	249:1,12,19	246:1 247:19	215:22 218:19
tariffs 145:15	250:16,22 252:8 257:6 258:10	248:18 260:17	225:2 228:17 238:6 241:10
147:5 151:8	262:20	261:7 269:3	273:10 280:20
task 88:7	267:7,19,21	telephones 40:5	terrific 19:21
tasked 23:14	274:8,22 275:6,11	194:21	test 249:19 250:1
tax 64:9 218:18 224:11,14	278:1,12 279:17 282:20 283:11	telephony 253:15 Telmate 4:3 8:17	251:7
taxes 64:8 118:19	282:20 283:11 284:9	252:20 253:9	testifying 202:4
133:9		255:21	testimony 30:19
taxpayers 224:9	Tel 6:19 49:12 50:16,17 100:5	257:13,18 258:9	151:16 288:4
team 23:21 209:4 286:21	115:4 175:19 204:11	265:18 270:6 272:19 277:13	tests 250:21 276:18
	Tel*Link 3:19 4:5	Telmate's	Texas 115:2
technical 108:13 201:15	8:4,19	252:21,22 253:3 257:20 265:1	text 155:22 270:8,9
technicalities	telecom 56:7,14 100:10,20	ten 20:21 21:8 31:13 68:5	text-based 254:8

	8	C 03	
Text-Connect	242:17	187:5 197:2	124:10,19 134:2
155:9,12	243:1,5,18	201:4,6	137:16 148:3
thank 10:2	247:11,13,16,17	202:5,20	160:10
11:7,10,20,21	252:15,17	203:4,9 204:14	167:10,11
13:4,17	258:10,11,13,14	205:21 209:18	170:22 205:5,8
19:13,17	262:3 279:21	210:9 212:5	275:15 280:15
20:2,5,11,13	284:19 285:8,22	217:4 218:15	282:21 283:17
20:2,3,11,13	286:2,7,16	219:2 220:1	they'd 151:11
25:2,4	287:2,13,21	221:12 223:1,13	276:14
30:14,15,18	thankful 126:19	229:20 230:1	
31:17,18	127:2	233:15 236:22	they'll 82:13
32:1,8,10,16		238:13 239:5	140:1 213:16
33:20	thanking 105:2	240:22 241:5,19	229:15 280:9
36:12,19,20	thanks 19:14	242:8 262:2,21	they're 32:14,15
37:4	31:10 212:13	269:1,5,7,22	33:2,15 35:21
43:17,18,19	that'll 160:19	271:5 275:15	54:9 58:14 65:4
49:4,5,8		277:7 280:2	82:10,12,15
54:12,13,16,18	that's 11:12 24:10	283:12,20	88:5 95:18,19
59:20,21 65:18	33:3 55:16	theme 60:17 152:5	99:1 101:16
74:12,19 80:21	57:10 58:11	199:18	112:7 123:20
104:14,18,20	60:10 64:13,14 65:14 66:17	themselves 24:2	124:18 125:2,6
106:19	67:14 69:16	111:13 181:10	130:8,11 135:14
107:14,15	71:7,20 72:2,15	233:4 284:5	141:1 142:8
110:16	75:3 79:3 80:16		154:7 161:14
112:18,21	81:7,17	thereafter 288:6	180:10
113:10,11,16	82:4,20,21	therefore 28:4,11	186:17,19
115:6,8 122:5,6	83:17 88:6	29:8 116:13	188:18
126:8 127:3,21	94:16 95:10	117:15 179:11	198:19,22
130:15,17,19	96:1,18 98:1	189:19 196:4	201:13,14 203:5
136:10 143:6,8	101:10 102:5	225:3 246:12,20	211:11,12
144:22 148:11	107:4 109:10	254:13	213:18 219:16
158:1 166:9	113:16 114:17	thereof 120:7	220:22 221:4
174:9,11,17,21	124:7,8 125:3		233:3,12 235:12
175:21	129:7 137:14	there's 33:1 34:14	236:18 237:3
180:19,20,22	139:3,9,11	36:17 42:8 55:5	238:7,20 239:8
187:17,18,20	141:19 144:7,8	56:2 62:18 63:1	265:16 270:10
190:19,21	145:3,18	64:16 72:20	277:8 282:2
196:11,12,14	147:2,9,10	73:1,10,12	they've 103:4
204:8,9,12,13	148:1,2,11	74:7,10 77:6,22	118:21 123:2
206:22 207:4,5	150:14 153:2,3	78:1,3 79:15	130:10 136:13
216:16 227:5	155:19 156:19	80:7 82:21 86:10 87:22	137:22 140:6
230:12 234:21	160:12,16,17	86:19 87:22	143:4 225:11
236:9,11 238:21	164:13 167:19	96:21 97:4	230:4 273:13,14
239:12 240:9,10	168:1 170:16	99:18 100:5	thin 56:5
		102:7 103:2	

	1 ag	-	
third 27:5 35:5	three-way	136:11 142:10	tote 34:10
81:13 120:15,18	75:18,19 76:19	152:1 176:2,6	touch 21:15 73:11
138:2 161:19	79:6 81:9	178:5,15	174:14
171:1 172:3 257:11 266:5,9	82:11,15 181:12	191:8,12 197:4,12 205:21	touched 84:2
268:19,20	thrilled 209:15	221:5 225:13	touchpad 81:11
269:12	219:9	231:4 247:17	•
Thirdly 12:16	throat 75:22	264:7 265:20	tough 219:2,4 230:9 242:10,16
-	throughout 96:4	267:20 284:18	247:16 286:15
third-party 27:15 78:3 117:22	128:11	today's 13:19 18:5	touted 101:2
120:8,11 124:11	thus 25:12	19:18 122:19	
164:5 165:16	tickets 95:19	tokens 31:17	toward 37:9 104:10 179:19
278:9	tied 54:9	Tom 2:3 5:2 11:5	towards 234:4
thirds 172:5	tiered 26:9 96:20	107:2 206:7	257:21
Thirty-two	182:2 187:15	212:11	Townsend 3:10
139:22	210:9,19 215:3	Tone 81:10	6:18 115:3
Thomas 3:19 8:3	tiering 96:10,14	tones 81:12	136:8,9 147:20
175:19 204:10	210:10,11	tons 78:1	148:8 152:20
242:17	211:2,8 214:1	tool 177:9 261:9	153:15 154:14 158:17 171:6
thorough 135:18	tiers 212:2	264:15	
thoughtful 204:5	ties 14:19 46:3,12	tool-carrying	Townsend's 144:12
thoughts 24:3	tight 10:18	201:10	traced 122:16
60:2,5 61:17 65:22 70:1 75:5	time-consuming	tools 145:14 174:3	
91:14 96:16	143:1 257:1	254:5 255:1	track 88:5 158:19 159:3
234:14,16 281:4	timeframe 228:3	257:2 260:1 284:4	
thousand 85:18	tinker 91:9		tracking 129:4 254:15
thousands 38:21	tiny 91:2	top 12:7 19:16 23:11 32:12	
44:18 45:1	tirelessly 19:10	64:3 81:21	trade 213:1 262:19
108:18 180:17	·	85:12 124:17	traded 40:22
267:14	T-Mobile 237:18	139:16 147:8	
threat 29:19	today 11:12	topic 72:9,16	tradition 122:8
244:22	12:2,21 13:14 18:17 20:13	175:1	traditional
threaten 248:2	22:10,22 31:6,9	total 38:12 129:7	134:6,8,16
threatening 248:4	33:8 35:5 37:2	139:18 149:7	135:1 243:11 270:19 271:12
251:21	38:18 47:8 48:5	183:14 241:8	
threats 252:3	49:9 54:17	totaling 55:16	traffic 201:18
three-quarters	73:10 79:13	totally 205:3	trailblazer 106:14
15:9	105:1 107:13,19 108:1,10 109:10	267:16	transaction
10.7	100.1,10 107.10		171:14

	1	i	
transcriber 11:3	105:9,11	109:16,17 143:1	251:8 262:9
transcript	transporting 95:2	174:3 228:21	270:3 280:20
289:6,10	traveled 287:7	230:10	typewriting 288:6
290:6,10	treasure 106:14	trying 34:6	typically 47:1
transcription 11:4		67:12,13,15	184:2
259:17 288:7	treasures 105:5	74:14 87:7	typing 77:3
289:1,11	treated 173:2	159:19 188:18 207:14 210:2	typing //.s
290:1,11	treatment 62:5,13	228:16 242:16	U
Transcriptionist	223:5	259:20 280:4,19	U.S 3:15 7:18 14:1
289:16 290:16	tremendous 16:21	TTY 38:11 40:8	105:15 119:2
transfer 117:22	120:13 153:8	77:20	175:16 198:20
120:8,11,16,18,	182:12 239:3,13	TTY's 40:6 76:22	249:2
22 144:18	trend 22:21	77:21	UCC 31:1
161:20 162:4 169:22 170:2	trends 89:8 247:3	turn 20:3 25:1	UCCmediajustice
	trendy 108:13	139:1 145:9	.org 33:15
transferred 129:21 131:21	trickle 74:18	158:3 160:22	UK 276:9
		175:20 285:1	ultimately 131:22
transferring 118:4	tried 57:14 149:6	TURNBULL	150:21 202:21
	172:14	289:4,15	215:16 240:13
Transit 105:10	trigger 150:10	turns 275:5	unaddressed
transition 90:4,20	trips 96:4	twelfth 105:6	57:11
91:3,4,6,7,12	trouble 33:17 34:4		unaffordable 16:8
92:11,12,19 220:6,19 222:19	95:19	Twenty 220:15	unanswered
241:1 247:22	true 121:18	twice 50:9 120:19	18:22
transitioned	212:19 235:10	163:5 201:7	unauthorized
134:13	256:17 279:13	Twitter 143:13	249:12
transitioning	288:7 289:10	262:6	unaware 264:3
66:18 92:19	290:10	two-man 30:10	
	truly 13:5,13	two-thirds 15:7	unbelievably 142:3
transparence	121:13 176:1 210:13 212:8	172:5	
		type 83:4 88:21	undergoing 64:15
transparency 88:3 100:10	trust 118:4,10	156:22	underlying 128:1
132:4 145:7	216:5 238:10,12	204:18,22 205:3	undermine
227:19	trusting 132:9	206:10 269:20	125:15
transparent	truth 109:20	typed 289:6 290:6	underneath
145:11 155:6	179:13	types 131:17	270:18
229:1	truthfully 214:17	143:22 146:15	understand 71:15
Transportation	try 34:13 62:1	157:17 166:19 188:22 223:8	74:16 77:21
_	80:8 97:5	100.22 223.0	107:2,6 108:11
•	•		

	1 46		
135:15 137:15	uniformity 233:1	unlimited 21:19	98:15 128:21
149:1 207:14	uniformly 89:20	unprecedented	164:19 165:4
222:1 230:17 231:17 232:21	unintended	39:17	user 25:11 26:18
240:1,7 265:22	206:1,19 213:7	unreasonable	117:1 202:8
271:4	Union 40:1	65:1 127:16	268:9,10 277:7
understanding	124:12 134:3	157:1	users 65:3 131:16
7:2 23:6,7 75:19	141:15	unreasonably	270:5
86:15 98:19	162:5,12,16,18,	12:13 20:21	USF 119:7
104:19,20 132:9	20 163:2 165:20	unredacted	usually 20:16
138:10 148:12	166:2,5,8 172:22 173:7,18	161:11	108:5 268:1,2
175:1,3	·	unregulated	utilities 52:16
199:19,20 211:18 285:19	unique 18:5 106:7 128:17 191:20	125:15	56:8,22
286:5	230:6 271:2	unreliable 40:8	57:15,18 84:1
understands	UNISYS 212:20	unrestricted	86:10
71:15	unit 232:20	245:1	utility 2:14,16 5:12 6:12 7:9
understatement	274:20	unsolicited 254:12	47:20 48:1,3
88:7	United 2:18 5:14	unusual 112:6	57:13 67:7
undertook 135:21	24:16 30:20	124:19 150:12	143:17
undervalue 73:21	38:12,14 39:11	unwavering 37:2	utilization 194:17
underwear	44:5 97:18	unwilling 52:1	utilize 33:10 67:14
202:14	112:18 176:9 189:9 198:22	unwillingly 65:20	135:6
underwrite 122:3	216:4	update 152:4	
unfair 65:14	Unities 84:20	282:3	V 102.17.21
157:1 237:1,3	Unitized 33:4	updated 47:6	vacuum 103:17,21
271:7	units 220:19	51:13 72:4	validated 134:9
unfamiliar 265:1		151:8 152:10	validation 248:12 249:11
unfinished 36:18	universal 37:3 39:9	upfront 58:5	
unfortunately	97:8,10,13,20	271:7	value 17:4 74:7 149:7 277:4
18:19 35:11	98:7 133:8	upgrades 254:21	
64:21 88:9	University 52:22	upon 235:8	values 177:1
116:2 177:18 248:1	unjust 48:11	upper 193:2	variability 150:4,7 203:18
	127:16 157:1	ups 80:18	ŕ
UNIDENTIFIED 273:12	unknown 181:21	upset 135:10	variables 200:7
uniform 193:10	unless 136:16	upwards 14:8	variation 124:19 169:12
212:6 231:16,18	142:21 219:4	usage 246:10	
233:17	Unlike 270:19	useful 34:18 92:14	variations 195:17
		96:11,14,16	variety 124:14
	l .	70.11,17,10	

video 11:2 26:7	260:11 271:22	wait 162:20	ways 51:5 79:11
206:15 248:5	115:14 255:11	Wagner 151:2	119:9
victims 203:22	visitation 26:7 28:8,10,14,19	W	watchmaker
Vice 3:19 4:4 8:3,18			watching 10:10
	270:11,15 271:20 273:2	VP 230:15	watched 282:18
vibrant 45:15	visit 261:6	voting 106:3	watch 166:4
viable 174:7	vis-a-vis 271:2	volunteer 71:5	139:6
via 28:15 29:2 40:8 143:12,13	Virginia 56:21	96:22 225:14	wasting 136:17
	violent 277:16	volumes 17:2	267:16
vertical 199:21	violence 277:15	209:2	wasn't 21:2,20 33:11 60:4
209:7 211:15 226:13 261:6		96:15 97:3 99:6	
188:7 190:11	violations 81:7 250:10	volume 38:12 83:6	72:19 107:20 179:2
96:6 168:12	147:6	VOIP 253:10,15	32:1 58:1,2,4
versus 87:9 91:12	violation 37:15	voice-matching 249:6	Washington 1:15
version 161:11	Vince's 150:18		warrants 202:4
Vermont 55:22	154:6	voicemail 46:20 259:16	199:3
237:12,16	115:3 136:9		Warner 198:16
198:15 199:2	Vincent 3:10 6:18	259:16,20,21 269:9 274:15	wane 106:11
133:11 156:2	158:6 160:3	252:7	173:14
Verizon 65:2	149:20 152:7,13	249:6,7 250:13	Walmart 170:1
verify 69:14	Vince 148:10,22	248:9,15,20	284:8
venues 236:1	village 287:1	15,19 170:22 176:9 194:17	177:19 247:4
venue 176:19	211:20	69:1,8,10,12,13,	walls 14:18
vendors 142:5	view 67:21 187:21	27:18,22 28:2,6	281:16
ven 127:13	videos 254:21	voice 26:7	280:11,14
280:15	277:14	vogue 63:7	261:2,14 270:19 278:19
vehicle 110:7	70:14 72:6	vocal 35:13	wall 260:7,19
vastly 47:14 214:5	38:17 40:5	vital 47:19	287:8
279:16 283:15	videophones	272:21,22 273:1	walked 205:18
vast 226:10 245:4	271:19,22 272:4,21	270:13 271:18	walk 170:1 200:17
varying 185:21	261:6 270:11,15 271:19,22	254:10 258:19	Walgreens 173:14
203:9	255:11 260:9,10	visits 94:21	wake 140:1
vary 96:5 178:19	250:13 254:10	visitor's 28:15	, and the second
	115:13 201:14	visited 179:17	waiver 169:11,12
various 81:12 167:10 178:17	46:20 72:7	visitations 271:19	275:19
	28:8,10,14 38:15 41:19		waiting 11:3 102:22 103:1
137:4 196:2	28:8,10,14	272:4 277:14	waiting 11.2

	1 ag	-	
80:4,12 90:22	285:1	172:22 173:7,18	118:1
130:12 167:10	well-being	we've 21:22	where's 161:13
211:21 213:18	48:19,20	22:1,2 57:12,19	Whereupon
256:3 259:8	well-intended	60:17,18 61:1	174:19 243:7
273:13,14	197:20	82:16 84:9,10	287:22
wear 139:14		88:11 102:21	
wearing 206:9	we're 10:18	107:9 122:10	wherever 104:10
_	11:2,3,11 21:22	126:3 130:6	whether 30:1,6
web 133:21	31:5 34:6,13	131:1,8 143:9	61:6,7,8 64:21
141:13 159:16	35:1,2 63:3,4	144:2 151:15	83:1,4 90:7
172:11,21	65:4,5 68:14	153:20 157:12	102:7 109:11
173:16 262:5	76:10 84:19	158:5 159:3	127:13 129:18
271:14	89:1,4,5,9,13	160:13,20	154:6 157:13
website 33:14	92:16 95:11	166:10 169:1	169:18 187:8
	96:1,19 97:5	196:19 197:9	
87:17 94:2	99:13,20		188:10 189:15
124:8 133:5	100:8,9 101:13	198:18	193:21 204:18
142:7,9 147:4	102:14,18,20	200:3,8,9	231:9 233:3
173:11	112:14 121:10	201:22 202:1	240:22 270:22
we'd 58:22	123:14 121:10	205:6,11 206:19	whistles 233:22
211:5,8	136:17 143:5,11	207:7,12	79.20
215:18,19	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	228:11,13 241:5	whoever 78:20
ĺ	146:6 147:14	260:10 262:15	79:7 262:13
week 18:18 81:1	162:4 169:19,22	263:5 264:7	265:9
102:6 128:22	174:17 179:4	268:14 269:3	whole 63:22 80:11
132:17 165:10	197:4 206:2,14	278:19	96:6 99:7
168:16 171:22	207:5 210:22	whatever 65:8	101:13
202:5	211:10 212:20		130:13,14 138:4
weeks 40:17	217:10 218:18	79:22 94:15	148:12 161:9
	220:5 225:1	103:14 119:5,11	189:5 190:6
weighted 227:2	228:10,12,15,16	129:19	206:2 231:6
WEISE 78:7	,21 230:10,20	153:10,11	
	234:3 236:3	263:20 267:13	273:8
welcome 5:1	240:7 266:12	268:2 275:2	whom 235:18
12:21 13:13	272:13 279:6	whatsoever 73:20	288:2
114:1 132:13	281:21		who's 73:4
143:10 227:6	282:13,14,15	Wheeler 2:3 5:2	
230:13 262:5	283:2,13,14,19,	10:2,6 11:5,7	101:15,16 233:2
welfare 17:6	283.2,13,14,19,	19:15 20:11	286:22
220:14 224:1		43:20 107:3	whose 246:7
	West 198:20	181:1 196:15	who've 112:15
we'll 11:3 20:3	western 124:12	286:8	242:14
24:5 60:11 89:4	134:3 141:15	Whenever 101:7	
128:22 160:14 203:10 213:11	162:5,12,16,18,	Whereas 83:9	wide 24:7 124:14
	20 163:1 165:20		Wiese 2:21 5:18
282:1 283:10	166:2,5,8	wherein 117:8	24:19 43:19
	, ,		

67:1	158:11,13	12:22 13:19	54:1 85:9
Wilkinson 3:3	161:20 265:8	18:5 19:18	www.PrisonPhon
5:19 24:20 49:7	wonderful 196:17	23:17 25:6 35:2	eJustice.org
84:9 86:19 93:8	220:4 267:4	73:6,7 74:13	87:18
94:7		106:11 115:9	07.10
William 3:9 6:17	wonderfully 106:20 107:18	148:12 243:20	Y
114:22	112:17	252:16 287:22	Yahoo 255:17,18
		workshops 48:5	
Williams 177:14	wondering 83:2	107:13	YANOSY
willing 130:11	Wood 158:21	world 20:16 44:6	290:4,15
willingly 65:19	woods 227:22	56:15 75:9	yards 126:18
win 116:8,9	work 17:16	173:17	yea 164:10
wind 139:6	22:5,12 36:13	244:11,17	year's 51:16
winning 51:19	47:10 49:2	worried 180:5	yelling 206:7
wins 242:8	67:22 70:7 74:1 77:21 95:11	worry 65:4	yellow 226:20
	106:2 107:22	worse 77:1 140:5	yesterday 187:1
wire 19:20 169:22 170:2	108:1 109:8	221:10	vet 34:16 101:3
	126:20 127:20	worst 149:3	139:4 143:5
wireless 10:16	135:17 149:2,20	150:19 178:8	157:22 169:4
21:19 133:11	158:20	worth 113:20	182:15 185:20
156:2 246:8,10 247:10	176:11,13 179:5	201:6	244:11
253:17,19	196:20 205:4	worthwhile 20:7	York 51:18
270:17 271:6	212:10 230:4		52:18,22
	238:20 239:13 241:20 247:18	worthy 222:6	63:15,18 84:21
wireline 2:7,10,12	273:3 279:12	223:12	85:6,8,10 86:14
5:7,9 6:7,9 7:5,7		Wright 3:4 5:21	99:22 101:21
8:9,11 9:3 23:13 243:11 286:18	worked 19:10,18	20:20 24:21	182:14,20
	45:19 53:4 70:7	54:15 61:20	207:10,20
wish 13:17 30:9	131:12 205:14 241:7	75:10 76:15 87:15 99:18	212:19 225:10
witnesses 197:19		114:19 126:13	you'll 81:12
203:22 206:15	working 23:16	222:11	229:10,11,18,19
248:6	35:20 40:5 85:3		,20
woman 105:16	109:6 126:15 163:10,13	write 32:15	young 16:5
women 20:17,18	174:15 217:5	writing 63:4	you've 67:18,19
21:7 36:3	228:15 272:16	written 54:3	70:1 82:9 90:16
48:15,19	works 44:1 77:20	wrong 66:12	96:4,21 144:2
women's 211:15	238:14 241:18	197:21	166:16 174:12
wonder 82:18	242:22	wrongful	198:10 205:3
98:14 149:9	workshop 1:6	41:15,16	262:18 263:2
156:11	10:21 11:1	wrote 31:21 32:8	269:5 270:18

	0	
\overline{Z}		
zero 183:9 202:11		
250:18		
Zesiger 2:10 6:8		
8:10 22:16		
113:22 143:8		
144:22 148:9,20		
149:5 150:16		
151:13 152:12		
153:12 156:4,6		
158:1,3		
160:2,15,21		
164:1,4,9		
165:13 166:9		
174:9 243:14		
265:4 268:6		
269:22 271:13		
273:7 280:18		