

**STATE OF IOWA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
UTILITIES BOARD**

IN RE: RELIANCE TELEPHONE OF GRAND FORKS, INC. INMATE CALLING SOLUTIONS, LLC COMBINED PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS, LLC PRODIGY SOLUTIONS, INC. SECURUS TECHNOLOGIES, INC. NETWORK COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORP d/b/a NCIC INMATE COMMUNICATIONS CONSOLIDATED TELECOM, INC. ENCARTELE, INC.	DOCKET NO. TF-2019-0026 DOCKET NO. TF-2019-0030 DOCKET NO. TF-2019-0031 DOCKET NO. TF-2019-0032 DOCKET NO. TF-2019-0033 DOCKET NO. TF-2019-0037 DOCKET NO. TF-2019-0261 DOCKET NO. TF-2019-0270
---	--

REPLY TO OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR INTERVENTION

Global Tel*Link Corporation and Public Communications Services, Inc. (collectively, “GTL”) submit this Reply to the Iowa Utilities Board (“Board”) in support of their June 29, 2020 Petition for Intervention (“Petition”), pursuant to the July 1, 2020 Response (“Response”) filed thereto by the Office of Consumer Advocate (“OCA”). As shown in its Petition and herein, GTL has satisfied the elements of 199 IAC 7.13(3), warranting permission to intervene in the above-captioned matters.

1. The OCA opines that the Petition “is of questionable merit,” and asks “what benefit GTL would gain from intervention in the tariff dockets of the other inmate calling service

providers.” The notion of “benefit” is absent from 199 IAC 7.13(3), which is grounded on a party’s “interest in the subject matter of a proceeding.” GTL must, and did, demonstrate an interest in the subject matter of the proceedings into which it seeks to intervene and describe the effect of decisions rendered therein upon its interest. The OCA offers no response to the contrary.

2. The OCA contends that GTL’s concerns “can be voiced in its own docket,” but its selective and unequal treatment of alternative operator service (“AOS”) companies belies that claim. In its May 19, 2020 Reply to Office of Consumer Advocate Comments, Objections and Resistance to Request for Confidentiality, GTL summarized the OCA’s repeated practice of objecting to a particular tariff provision in one AOS docket, while opting not to object to near-identical provisions in other AOS dockets.¹ The OCA challenged this in its June 29, 2020 Additional Comments, but repeatedly urged, regardless, that “[a]ny decision reached by the Board in this docket should be applied uniformly to all inmate calling service providers.”² This statement clearly demonstrates that regulatory requirements incumbent upon GTL (and other AOS companies) may arise in a non-GTL docket, where GTL is bereft of the ability to engage in a substantive fashion. Accordingly, intervention is the only means by which GTL can preserve its ability to comment upon or object to such requirements, commensurate with basic principles of regulatory fairness.

¹ See Docket Nos. TF-2019-0039, *Global Tel*Link Corporation*, TF-2019-0040, *Public Communications Services, Inc.*, Reply to Office of Consumer Advocate Comments, Objections and Resistance to Request for Confidentiality, 5-6, nn.12-13 (noting near-identical language regarding taxes, fees, and surcharges between GTL’s tariff and eight other AOS tariffs to which the OCA did not object) and 8-10 (noting ICA’s failure to object to individual case base arrangement provisions in historical telecommunications service provider docket and pending AOS dockets) (May 19, 2020).

² See Docket Nos. TF-2019-0039, *Global Tel*Link Corporation*, TF-2019-0040, *Public Communications Services, Inc.*, Additional Comments, 2, 5 (June 29, 2020).

3. Relatedly, the OCA suggests that in the absence of a rule-making docket, “consistent, comprehensive, and industry-wide regulations of the sort referenced by GTL” cannot be achieved. GTL’s “reference” to such regulations was in fact a summary of the Board’s repeatedly stated goals for these AOS proceedings, as arising out of Docket No. RMU-2017-0004. Intervention, in the face of the OCA’s inconsistent and unequal treatment of AOS companies across the individual tariff dockets, is the means by which these goals can be achieved.

4. The OCA charges that the Petition is “untimely,” but fails to support this statement. No formal procedural schedule has been promulgated in these proceedings that would trigger the time limits specified in 199 IAC 7.13(1). Given the iterative quality of these proceedings, in which AOS companies have revised and clarified their submissions over time pursuant to formal orders and informal technical conferences, the OCA’s invocation of “timeliness” is unwarranted. Buttressing this is 199 IAC 7.13(5), which provides that leave to intervene will generally be granted by the Board “to any person with a cognizable interest in the proceeding” and affords the Board broad authority to condition intervention “to a particular stage of the proceeding.”

5. Opining on purportedly excessive historical inmate calling rates, the OCA insists that “[t]here should be no delay in the progress and conclusion of these dockets and the implementation of the tariffs.” The OCA has failed to demonstrate any relationship between these concepts and GTL’s requested intervention in the above-referenced matters. As GTL noted in its Petition, its experience in Iowa and across the nation will aid the Board in developing a sound record through presentation of relevant evidence and argument. Third-party objections, often grounded in misstatements of fact and law, have slowed progress in these matters; GTL’s

extensive knowledge and broad perspective on inmate calling services will redress them, to the benefit of Iowa consumers, correctional facilities, and inmates.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, GTL respectfully requests that the Board issue an order permitting it to intervene in the above-captioned matters.

Respectfully submitted,

**GLOBAL TEL*LINK CORPORATION
PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INC.**

/s/ John C. Pietila

John C. Pietila (AT 0006221)
Davis, Brown, Koehn, Shors & Roberts, P.C.
4201 Westown Pkwy, Ste. 300
West Des Moines, Iowa 50266
JohnPietila@davisbrownlaw.com
(515) 246-7871

Chérie R. Kiser (*pro hac vice* filed)
Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP
1990 K Street, N.W., Ste. 950
Washington, D.C. 20006
ckiser@cahill.com
(202) 862-8950

Its Attorneys

Dated: July 14, 2020

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on this 14th day of July 2020, he had the foregoing document electronically filed with the Iowa Utilities Board using the Electronic Filing System, which will send notification of such filing (electronically) to the appropriate persons.

/s/ John C. Pietila _____