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By the Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau:

# introduction

1. In this Order, we find good cause to grant a limited, temporary waiver of the interim interstate inmate calling service (ICS) rate caps to Pay Tel Communications, Inc. (Pay Tel).[[1]](#footnote-2) The rate cap rule at issue was adopted by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) in the *Inmate Calling Report and Order and FNPRM* and will become effective on February 11, 2014.[[2]](#footnote-3) For the reasons discussed below and with the limitations and additional commitments identified herein, we grant Pay Tel a narrow waiver of the Commission’s ICS rate cap rule for nine months unless the Commission decides to take action on intrastate ICS rate caps sooner, then such Commission Order would supersede this waiver. This waiver will provide Pay Tel with sufficient time to pursue any necessary intrastate rate changes through the applicable state processes in light of the aggregate impact of Pay Tel’s ability to recover its costs with the application of the interim interstate ICS rate caps.

# Background

1. In 2003, a group of inmates, their friends and families as well as advocacy groups (collectively Wright Petitioners) filed a rulemaking petition with the Commission to address ICS practices.[[3]](#footnote-4) The petition requested that the Commission prohibit exclusive ICS contracts and collect-call-only restrictions in correctional facilities.[[4]](#footnote-5) In 2007, the same petitioners filed an alternative rulemaking petition, requesting that the Commission reform high ICS rates by requiring a debit-calling option in correctional facilities, prohibiting per-call charges, and establishing rate caps for interstate ICS.[[5]](#footnote-6) The Commission sought and received comment on both petitions.[[6]](#footnote-7) In December 2012, the Commission granted the two petitions for rulemaking and adopted a notice of proposed rulemaking seeking comment on their proposals.[[7]](#footnote-8) The Commission released the *Inmate Calling Report and Order and FNPRM* on September 26, 2013.[[8]](#footnote-9) On January 13, 2014, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit issued a partial stay of the *Inmate Calling Report and Order and FNPRM*, pending the court’s resolution of petitions for review of the *Order*.[[9]](#footnote-10) The *Partial Stay Order* did not stay the interim rate cap rule at issue in this Order.[[10]](#footnote-11)
2. Section 201 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act) requires that all carriers’ interstate rates be just and reasonable.[[11]](#footnote-12) To be just and reasonable, rates must ordinarily be cost-based absent an explanation for a departure[[12]](#footnote-13) as well as include a reasonable return.[[13]](#footnote-14) Section 276 of the Act additionally requires that payphone rates be fair.[[14]](#footnote-15) As part of its analysis in the *Inmate Calling Report and Order and FNPRM*,the Commission found that “the marketplace alone has not ensured that interstate ICS rates are just and reasonable and they are fair to consumers, as well as providers.”[[15]](#footnote-16) For example, the record in this docket showed that “inmates, or those whom they call, pay as much as $17.30, $10.70 or $7.35 for a 15-minute interstate collect call, depending upon the facility where the inmates are incarcerated.”[[16]](#footnote-17) The Commission concluded “that the rate reforms we begin in this Order are necessary to ensure [interstate ICS rates] are just and reasonable”[[17]](#footnote-18) and “necessary to implement section 276(b)(1)’s ‘fair compensation’ directive.”[[18]](#footnote-19)
3. As part of interstate ICS rate reform, the Commission adopted interim interstate ICS rate caps of $0.21 per minute for interstate debit and prepaid calling and $0.25 per minute for collect calling “to place an upper limit on rates providers may charge for interstate ICS.”[[19]](#footnote-20) The Commission determined that the interim rate caps established in the *Order* were “set at sufficiently conservative levels to account for all costs ICS providers will incur in providing ICS.”[[20]](#footnote-21) The interim rate caps were set based on cost studies submitted in the proceeding, including a cost study submitted by Pay Tel.[[21]](#footnote-22) The Commission also reaffirmed its earlier finding that site commission payments, “fees paid by ICS providers to correctional facilities or departments of corrections in order to win the exclusive right to provide inmate phone service,”[[22]](#footnote-23) are an apportionment of profit, not a cost of providing ICS.[[23]](#footnote-24) Waiver of the interstate ICS rate caps is available for those “extraordinary circumstances” where a particular ICS provider “believes that it has cost-based rates for ICS that exceed [the] interim rate caps.”[[24]](#footnote-25)
4. *Pay Tel’s Petition.* Pay Tel is an ICS provider based in North Carolina that currently serves correctional facilities in thirteen states.[[25]](#footnote-26) Pay Tel filed its Petition for waiver of the Commission’s interim interstate ICS rate caps on January 8, 2014.[[26]](#footnote-27) The Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) released a Public Notice seeking comment on Pay Tel’s Petition on January 9, 2014.[[27]](#footnote-28) As described below, interested parties commented on the Petition and Pay Tel filed supplementary information and modified its request in response to questions raised by Bureau staff.[[28]](#footnote-29)
5. In its Petition, Pay Tel requests a waiver of the Commission’s rule establishing interim interstate ICS rate caps[[29]](#footnote-30) and approval to continue to charge its current interstate ICS rates.[[30]](#footnote-31) Pay Tel acknowledges that the Commission relied on Pay Tel’s Cost Study in setting the interim rate caps[[31]](#footnote-32) and Pay Tel expressly bases its waiver request on the total company average per minute costs it produced.[[32]](#footnote-33) We agree that the Pay Tel Cost Study accurately represents Pay Tel’s costs of providing ICS.[[33]](#footnote-34) Pay Tel asserts that here, however, there is good cause for a waiver because the *Order* “fails to properly consider the impact that below-cost intrastate rate restrictions will have when working in tandem with the *Order*’s interstate rate caps.”[[34]](#footnote-35) Specifically, Pay Tel asserts that it “cannot recover its costs on a holding company level if it is required to charge the *Order*’s interim interstate rates.”[[35]](#footnote-36) Pay Tel bases this assertion on rate restrictions in five of the ten states where it provided service in 2012, that are mandated by either “the applicable state regulatory requirements or by the facility provider.” [[36]](#footnote-37) Pay Tel claims such restrictions require it to provide intrastate service at below-average-cost rates.[[37]](#footnote-38) Because of the interaction between these below-average-cost intrastate rates and the limits imposed by the interim interstate rate cap, Pay Tel asserts that it cannot meet its total company revenue requirement while complying both with our interstate rate caps and the relevant state rate requirements.[[38]](#footnote-39) Pay Tel estimates this disparity will result in a shortfall of approximately 11 percent of its total 2012 revenue.[[39]](#footnote-40) The shortfall, Pay Tel asserts, leaves it in an “economically unsustainable situation” that will force it either to go “out of business” or to “substantially curtail its operations,” likely by terminating service in the smallest facilities it serves.[[40]](#footnote-41)
6. In addition to its request for a waiver of the Commission’s rate caps, Pay Tel further requests that the Commission allow Pay Tel “to continue charging its existing interstate rates.”[[41]](#footnote-42) The Petition states that “this relief will permit Pay Tel to remain in business as the Commission continues to investigate the appropriate regulatory environment for the ICS industry.”[[42]](#footnote-43) Pay Tel also commits that it “will not charge interstate rates any greater than its existing rates” and “will remain bound by the Ancillary Charges provisions of the Order’s rate requirements and commit[ ] to charging no more than its current fees” in the event its waiver request is granted.[[43]](#footnote-44) Pay Tel asserts such relief will be in the public interest in that it will ensure the viability of Pay Tel and avoid a reduction in competition among ICS providers,[[44]](#footnote-45) it will mean that “ICS services will likely not be curtailed,”[[45]](#footnote-46) and it will not “result in a financial windfall to Pay Tel.”[[46]](#footnote-47) Pay Tel requests that the Commission review and approve its Petition before the rate caps adopted in the *Order* take effect on February 11, 2014.[[47]](#footnote-48)
7. The Wright Petitioners filed comments on the Petition, stating that they “do not oppose FCC review of the Waiver Request to determine if relief is necessary.”[[48]](#footnote-49) The Wright Petitioners request that if the Commission determines that a waiver of the rate caps for Pay Tel is necessary, that the waiver be “narrowly tailored.”[[49]](#footnote-50) Pay Tel submitted reply comments, noting that no commenting parties opposed the relief Pay Tel requested.[[50]](#footnote-51) The Human Rights Defense Center (HRDC) also submitted comments that address data, analyses, and claims made by Pay Tel in support of its waiver Petition.[[51]](#footnote-52) While HRDC does not dispute Pay Tel’s financial and operational data, it questions Pay Tel’s assertion that its operations would be financially unsustainable under the provisions of the *Order*.[[52]](#footnote-53) HRDC asserts that Pay Tel “has not addressed other options which remain available to it.”[[53]](#footnote-54) Specifically, HRDC asserts that Pay Tel could renegotiate its contracts, seek waivers from state regulatory agencies’ rules where necessary, or reconsider doing business in states that impose below-cost rate requirements.[[54]](#footnote-55) In its reply comments, Pay Tel notes that HRDC “has not identified any errors in the analysis present[ed] by Pay Tel.”[[55]](#footnote-56)
8. *Pay Tel’s Supplemental Filings*. In evaluating Pay Tel’s Petition, Bureau staff questioned whether allowing Pay Tel to continue to charge its existing rates following the effective date of the rules[[56]](#footnote-57) would result in Pay Tel recovering interstate revenues that are currently used to pay site commissions that are based on interstate revenues.[[57]](#footnote-58) The Commission confirmed in the *Order* that such site commission payments “are not part of the cost of providing ICS.”[[58]](#footnote-59) In response to staff inquiries, Pay Tel filed additional data and analyses in support of its waiver request and revised its request for relief.[[59]](#footnote-60) Specifically, Pay Tel filed a revised shortfall analysis, information on change of law provisions in its contracts, and interstate site commission data.[[60]](#footnote-61) Pay Tel also provided Bureau staff with its audited financial statements.[[61]](#footnote-62) Pay Tel further supplemented its Petition to add a “commitment that Pay Tel will not assess a rate for interstate long distance calls in excess of $0.46/minute for existing or new clients.”[[62]](#footnote-63) Additionally, Pay Tel commits not to charge interstate rates at any correctional institution any greater than its existing rates,[[63]](#footnote-64) and to implement the “rate of $0.46/minute as a ‘postalized’ rate without any additional per-call surcharges” (except in facilities with interstate rates currently below the proposed $0.46/minute rate).[[64]](#footnote-65) Pay Tel states that “[t]his revised commitment reflects . . . the elimination of interstate commissions from Pay Tel’s interstate rates.”[[65]](#footnote-66) Pay Tel asserts that grant of the requested relief will be in the public interest since it “will, in no way, result in a financial windfall to Pay Tel,”[[66]](#footnote-67) “will permit Pay Tel to remain in business,”[[67]](#footnote-68) and will “ensur[e] that consumers of interstate services receive meaningful decreases in interstate rates.”[[68]](#footnote-69)
9. *Applicable Waiver Standard.* Pay Tel seeks a waiver under the Commission’s general waiver rule as informed by additional guidance included in the *Order*.[[69]](#footnote-70) Section 1.3 of the Commission’s rules states that the Commission’s rules may be waived for good cause shown.[[70]](#footnote-71) Waiver of the Commission’s rules “is appropriate only if special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule and such deviation will serve the public interest.”[[71]](#footnote-72) In the *Order*, the Commission stated that “the petitioner bears the burden of proof to show good cause exists to support the request” and identified factors to be considered in reviewing a waiver request.[[72]](#footnote-73) It further stated that ICS providers “will have opportunities to seek waivers to the extent the framework adopted in this Order does not adequately address their legitimate costs of providing ICS.”[[73]](#footnote-74) The Commission noted that “petitions for waiver of the interim rate caps would account for extraordinary circumstances.”[[74]](#footnote-75) The Commission concluded that, for both substantive and administrative reasons, it would evaluate waivers at the holding company level.[[75]](#footnote-76) It delegated authority to the Bureau to “request additional information necessary for its evaluation of waiver requests and to approve or deny all or part of requests for waiver of the interim rate caps adopted herein.”[[76]](#footnote-77)

# discussion

1. We conclude that Pay Tel has met its burden of proof to establish good cause to grant a limited, temporary waiver of the Commission’s interim ICS rate cap rule. Based on a thorough review of the information provided by Pay Tel, we conclude that Pay Tel has shown that the combination of its existing below-average-cost state ICS rates and the Commission’s interim rate caps, which accurately reflect its average total company costs constitute “extraordinary circumstances”[[77]](#footnote-78) that justify temporary waiver of the Commission’s rate caps, and that the waiver will be in the public interest.[[78]](#footnote-79) We note that Pay Tel’s data submissions adequately address the factors relevant to the review of its Petition as identified in the waiver provisions of the *Order*.[[79]](#footnote-80) Pay Tel does not dispute that the cost study relied upon by the Commission continues to accurately represent its average costs of providing ICS service. Instead, it maintains that it cannot recover its costs plus a reasonable return while complying both with our interim interstate rate caps and its existing intrastate rate requirements because some of these intrastate rates are below its actual costs. We therefore grant this temporary waiver to afford Pay Tel additional time to pursue appropriate changes to its intrastate requirements, which when brought to appropriate levels should permit Pay Tel to charge rates in compliance with our requirements. We therefore limit the duration of this waiver to nine months unless the Commission decides to take action on intrastate ICS rate caps sooner, then such Commission Order would supersede this waiver.
2. We review Pay Tel’s request under the Commission’s standard waiver analysis as informed by the additional guidance included in waiver provisions of the *Order*. This requires Pay Tel to establish good cause for a waiver by demonstrating that it faces special circumstances that warrant a waiver and by showing that a waiver would be in the public interest. Pay Tel cites as special circumstances the Commission’s average-cost-based interstate rate caps and below-average-cost state rates, the combination of which precludes it from recovering its total company costs of providing ICS. We therefore must review and verify: 1) the data and analyses that establish Pay Tel’s average cost and; 2) the data and analyses that support Pay Tel’s quantification of its intrastate shortfall.
3. *Corporate Structure.* As an initial matter and consistent with the *Order’s* waiver provisions, we review Pay Tel’s request and supporting data at the holding company level.[[80]](#footnote-81) Pay Tel’s Petition states that “Pay Tel has a one-tier corporate organizational structure” and that “[a]ll of its ICS operations are conducted as Pay Tel Communications, Inc.”[[81]](#footnote-82) There is no evidence in the record of any parent company or other corporate entity having an ownership interest in Pay Tel, nor is there evidence that Pay Tel has an ownership interest in other corporate entities. Additionally, given that Pay Tel’s corporate structure includes no subsidiaries or affiliates, there are no inter- or intra-company allocations, transactions or interests that might otherwise impact our analysis of Pay Tel’s Petition and require the submission of additional data.
4. *Cost Showing.* To establish that it faces special circumstances warranting a waiver, Pay Tel must first demonstrate its total company average cost of providing ICS in order to provide a baseline for assessing its intrastate shortfall claims. We find that the supporting data and analyses submitted by Pay Tel, including a cost study[[82]](#footnote-83) which we find accurately reflects the company’s cost of providing ICS, audited financial statements,[[83]](#footnote-84) and data on its average interstate site commission payments,[[84]](#footnote-85) are sufficient to establish that its average total company per-minute cost is at the interim interstate rate cap.[[85]](#footnote-86) The cost data in Pay Tel’s Cost Study were corroborated by cost data from its audited financial statements[[86]](#footnote-87) and we find it remains valid but note, as the Commission discussed in the *Order*,that our actions here are not a blanket endorsement of the study.[[87]](#footnote-88) Pay Tel’s interstate site commission payment data supplemented the site commission data from its cost study and identified the site commissions assessed on Pay Tel’s interstate ICS.[[88]](#footnote-89)
5. *Impact of Below-Cost Intrastate Rates*. To support its request, Pay Tel also establishes that it faces below-average-cost state rate mandates and quantifies the magnitude of the resulting revenue shortfall it incurs. Pay Tel’s Petition includes a detailed analysis that concludes that it incurs a total intrastate shortfall of approximately $2.8 million, approximately $1.2 million of which is offset by interstate revenues.[[89]](#footnote-90) We find the data and analyses Pay Tel submitted sufficient to verify these claims. Pay Tel’s Petition included detailed rate, call volume and revenue data by facility and by type of inmate calling service, which enabled an independent assessment of its intrastate revenue shortfall assertions.[[90]](#footnote-91) These data were corroborated by comparable data in its financial statements.[[91]](#footnote-92) Pay Tel also provided summary descriptions of the below-cost intrastate rate mandates it claims cause its intrastate shortfall along with excerpts from the relevant mandates by state.[[92]](#footnote-93) Given Pay Tel’s average cost and its intrastate revenue shortfall, we conclude that it has demonstrated that it faces special circumstances that warrant a waiver.
6. *Public Interest Showing*. Finally, Pay Tel must also demonstrate that a waiver of the Commission’s interim interstate ICS rate caps is in the public interest. We find that Pay Tel has demonstrated that a limited, temporary waiver will serve the public interest. It will ensure that Pay Tel continues to provide highly-secure ICS to inmates and their families at the facilities which it serves.[[93]](#footnote-94) We further note that a waiver will be consistent with our statutory obligation under section 201(b) of the Act and, pursuant to section 276, will “promote competition” and “promote the widespread deployment of payphone services to the benefit of the general public.”[[94]](#footnote-95) Finally, and importantly, Pay Tel has asserted that setting a rate cap at $0.46 per minute will ensure that the great majority of people most affected by Pay Tel’s interstate ICS rates – the inmates in the facilities Pay Tel serves and their families – will see immediate and substantial rate decreases when this Order becomes effective because it will result in a reduction of over 40 percent from average existing interstate ICS rates of $0.81 per minute.[[95]](#footnote-96)
7. We limit the waiver we grant to the revised $0.46 per-minute rate cap Pay Tel proposed in its Third Supplemental Filing.[[96]](#footnote-97) This revised rate cap reflects, on a per-minute basis, the “elimination of interstate commissions from Pay Tel’s interstate rates”[[97]](#footnote-98) consistent with the *Order’s* determination that site commissions are not a recoverable component of interstate ICS rates.[[98]](#footnote-99) Granting Pay Tel’s revised waiver request will, according to Pay Tel, “permit Pay Tel to remain in business.”[[99]](#footnote-100) We note that the $0.46 per minute rate cap will enable Pay Tel to continue to recover that portion of interstate revenues that is currently available to Pay Tel to offset its intrastate shortfall. Specifically, the Bureau estimated the amount of revenue the revised $0.46 per minute rate cap would yield Pay Tel by using the Wood Intrastate Shortfall Analysis to calculate its total interstate ICS revenue less its total interstate site commission payments and its total cost of providing interstate service.[[100]](#footnote-101)
8. A grant is also consistent with the *Inmate Calling Order on Remand and NPRM*,which notes that:

[u]nless an ICS provider can show that (i) revenue from its interstate or

intrastate calls fails to recover, for *each* of these services, both its direct costs

and some contribution to common costs, or (ii) the *overall* profitability of its

payphone operations is deficient because the provider fails to recover its total

costs from its aggregate revenues (including both revenues from interstate and

intrastate calls), then we would see no reason to conclude that the provider has

not been ‘fairly compensated.’[[101]](#footnote-102)

The data submitted by Pay Tel demonstrate that it falls within the second category enumerated above, further supporting the decision to grant the waiver. Moreover, we agree with Pay Tel that reducing its interstate ICS rates to no more than $0.46 per minute will “ensur[e] that consumers of interstate services receive meaningful decreases in interstate rates.”[[102]](#footnote-103)

1. *Duration of Waiver.* We grant Pay Tel a temporary waiver in order to provide it with an opportunity to address below-average-cost rate mandates at their source – at the state level and with the individual facilities it serves. Pay Tel explains that the intrastate revenue shortfalls it experiences result either from state regulatory mandates or contractual provisions predicated on state mandated rates. We agree with HRDC that Pay Tel nevertheless is not constrained from pursuing relief in either instance.[[103]](#footnote-104) Specifically, Pay Tel can follow existing processes within the relevant states to seek necessary intrastate rate changes, or waivers, in light of the impact of the interim interstate ICS rate caps.[[104]](#footnote-105) Further, as the Commission asserted in the *Order*, ICS providers, like most commercial entities, generally can renegotiate contract terms with the facilities they serve, particularly where such contracts contain change of law provisions.[[105]](#footnote-106) The fact that certain of Pay Tel’s ICS contractual rates are predicated on rates that state commissions established for local exchange service does not change our analysis of the ability of providers to seek necessary intrastate rate changes. Additionally, we recognize that the Commission has an open proceeding that is considering final interstate ICS rates and potential action on intrastate ICS rates.[[106]](#footnote-107) In light of these circumstances, we find it is in the public interest to grant Pay Tel temporary relief while it pursues relief in the states, and we therefore limit the duration of the waiver to nine months unless the Commission decides to take action on intrastate ICS rate caps sooner, then such Commission Order would supersede this waiver.[[107]](#footnote-108)
2. For these reasons, we conclude that Pay Tel has demonstrated good cause for the Bureau to grant a limited, temporary waiver of the Commission’s rule establishing interim interstate ICS rate caps. Furthermore, we find the following conditions to be consistent with Pay Tel’s proposed commitments and in the public interest: Pay Tel (1) may not assess a rate for interstate long distance ICS calls in excess of $0.46 per minute for existing and new clients and may not charge interstate rates any greater than its rates as of February 10, 2014 if those rates were under $0.46 per-minute;[[108]](#footnote-109) and Pay Tel (2) may charge no more than its current fees.[[109]](#footnote-110) Pay Tel notes, however, that changes in circumstances may justify a change in its fee structure.[[110]](#footnote-111) Given the spirit of the *Inmate Calling Report and Order and FNPRM*, increasing ancillary fees to offset the rate caps could thwart reforms and relief for inmates and their families. We therefore adopt Pay Tel’s additional commitment that it “will assess the minimum in fees which are necessary to recover its costs.”[[111]](#footnote-112) Further, to the extent Pay Tel assesses any new or increased fees, in addition to notifying its customers,[[112]](#footnote-113) we require it to also notify the Commission and to include an updated analysis of its cost and revenue data. Any such new or increased fees may impact the need and justification for the instant waiver.[[113]](#footnote-114) As a result, we adopt the waiver with these conditions.
3. We authorize such rates for a period of nine months unless the Commission decides to take action on intrastate ICS rate caps sooner, then such Commission Order would supersede this waiver. This period of time will provide Pay Tel an opportunity to seek modification of the intrastate rates it cites in its Petition. States should recognize the Commission’s and the Bureau’s actions in this proceeding as part of a broader effort to establish a consistent framework of cost-based rate caps for ICS generally and work with the relevant parties to that end. We allow Pay Tel up to seven days from the release of this Order to make the rate changes adopted herein.[[114]](#footnote-115) We implement this limited, temporary waiver to ensure that Pay Tel recovers its total costs, on a holding company basis, for providing ICS.

# Ordering clauses

1. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 1, 4(i), 5(c), 201, and 276 and of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 155(c), 201, and 276, and sections 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3 of the Commission’s rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3, that the Petition for Waiver of Interim Interstate ICS Rates filed by Pay Tel Communications, Inc. on January 8, 2014 IS GRANTED to the extent and subject to the conditions set forth above, for a duration of nine months, beginning on February 11, 2014 and ending on November 11, 2014 unless the Commission decides to take action on intrastate ICS rate caps sooner, then such Commission Order would supersede this waiver.
2. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Petition for Waiver of Interim Interstate ICS Rates filed by Pay Tel Communications, Inc. on January 8, 2014, and subsequently revised on January 23, 2014, is DENIED to the extent not granted herein.
3. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Petition for Partial Stay of *Rates for Interstate Inmate Calling Services* Order filed by Pay Tel Communications, Inc. on November 26, 2013 in WC Docket 12-375 is DISMISSED AS MOOT.
4. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order SHALL BE EFFECTIVE upon release.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Julie A. Veach

Chief

Wireline Competition Bureau
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