

The few filed comments from industry confirm NASUCA's view.

For example, PayTel asserts that its fees are reasonable, and questions those charged by other providers.³ But PayTel presents only limited information on its own costs: a single chart containing only a single total average cost.⁴ This does very little to support PayTel's own fee proposals.⁵

Network Communications International Corp. ("NCIC") purports to identify many of its cost components,⁶ but fails to quantify those costs. That does not respond to the Commission's request for information.

Global Tel*Link Corporation ("GTL") devotes its comments to arguments about why the Commission should not regulate ICS, rather than providing the information requested. These arguments have already been addressed.

Some industry commenters address issues that are important but on the periphery of the inmate calling concerns addressed by NASUCA, such as MSS's discussion of the need to block cellphones within correctional facilities.⁷ And JLG seeks to have the Commission recognize – and monetize – the costs to society in general from allowing inmate calling:

We believe this white paper shines an important light on the public safety issues associated with inmate phones. We trust that now that the FCC has been provided with detailed information into some of the key public safety aspects of inmate phone calling, that the FCC will also take into account the safety of the crime victims, the witnesses, the jurors, the public servants and other vulnerable populations, as well as all of their loved ones — in addition to the safety of the general public.⁸

³ Comments of Pay Tel Communications, Inc. ("Pay Tel") at 1-4.

⁴ *Id.* at 8.

⁵ *Id.* at 6.

⁶ NCIC Comments at 3-8.

⁷ See generally, Comments of Marcus Spectrum Solutions ("MSS"); see also NCIC Comments at 6-7.

⁸ Comments of JLG Technologies, LLC, White Paper at 11.

JLG's solution is, apparently, for all facilities to use its technology. As with MSS, JLG's comments are off-point.⁹ If a facility uses JLG's technology to protect the general public, then it must seek funding, but it should not be predetermined that those costs should be loaded onto the cost of individual calls.¹⁰

Comments from prisoner advocacy groups add further information on the level of ICS fees charged by ICS providers,¹¹ but of course cannot supply data on the providers' cost. As asserted by NASUCA in its initial comments, now is the time for the Commission to act. The failure of the ICS providers to meaningfully respond to the Commission's inquiries should be viewed as the basis for FCC action to reduce ICS fees (and rates generally).

Charles Acquard, Executive Director
NASUCA
8380 Colesville Road, Suite 101
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Telephone (301) 589-6313
Fax (301) 589-6380

July 24, 2013

⁹ See DA 13-1445.

¹⁰ And thence onto inmates and the inmates families and friends.

¹¹ See Petitioners' Comments.