

EXHIBIT 14

WASHINGTON UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESPONSES TO SECOND DATA REQUESTS

Docket No.: UT-042022
Response Date: February 13, 2009
Requestor: AT&T
Respondent: T-Netix, Inc.
Prepared by: Joseph Ferretti

AT&T's Second Data Request No. 11: Describe in as much detail as possible the process by which rate disclosures were made to recipients of telephone calls from inmates at Washington state prisons where T-Netix provided equipment or services, and identify the person(s) most knowledgeable about this process.

T-Netix's Response to Second Data Request No. 11:

T-Netix objects to this Request on the ground that the term "Washington state prisons" improperly refers to all "reformatories, prisons, jails, or other correctional facilities in the State of Washington" rather than the three facilities identified by Complainants as originating the inmate collect calls at issue in this proceeding. Therefore, the Request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and expensive, oppressive, and not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

T-Netix further objects to this Request on the ground that the defined term "relevant period" improperly refers to "January 1, 1996 to the present" rather than from June 20, 1996 through December 31, 2000. According to telephone records that Complainants produced in response to T-Netix First Data Request No. 2, the latest month during which complainants received inmate collect calls for which they allege no prerecorded rate information was provided is November 2000. Therefore, the Request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and expensive, oppressive, and not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Subject to and without waiving these objections, T-Netix responds that rate disclosures were made available at Washington State correctional facilities by voice prompt or by voice response message. Upon information and belief, AT&T supplied the rates to be loaded by T-Netix onto computer cards that were installed into the premise-based equipment. The rates loaded into the system were AT&T rates and were those used for providing rate quotes. If a customer requested a rate quote, or if AT&T as the common carrier and telecommunications service provider for the facilities in question requested that rates be quoted on all calls, T-Netix would have been able to configure the system to provide the rate quote via a voice recording. Upon information and belief, individuals who may have knowledge of the facts described in this Response are Scott Passe, Engineer/System Architect; Ken Rose, Field Supervisor for Technicians; Gary Skinner, Manufacturing Engineer; and Alice Clements.

WASHINGTON UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESPONSES TO SECOND DATA REQUESTS

T-Netix's First Supplemental Response to Second Data Request No. 11:

Complainants have now identified a fourth institution as originating the inmate collect calls at issue in this proceeding. As a result, T-Netix withdraws its objection to this Request as to that institution.

T-Netix's Second Supplemental Response to Second Data Request No. 11:

Subject to and without waiving any objection stated herein, T-Netix further responds that, upon information and belief, rate quotes were provided to recipients of collect calls from inmates at the four facilities in question via a verbal voice recording.

T-Netix was a sub-contractor to AT&T. AT&T supplied the applicable rates to be loaded by T-Netix onto computer cards that were installed into the premise-based equipment. These cards included digitized voice files that were used to disclose the rate quotes. There were two forms of rate quote: (1) an "automatic" rate quote that would provide rates on every call without affirmative request by the called party, and (2) a customer-requested quote where the called party would be required to press a digit to receive a quote.

The automatic rate quote was preceded by an announcement such as: "You will be charged . . ." (See, for example, TNXWA20113). The customer-requested rate quote was preceded by a statement such as: "To hear rates, dial two after the tone . . ." (See, for example, TNXWA20030 and TNXWA20165). After the announcement, the system would quote the applicable rates.

The dates indicated on the Voice Prompt Log (TNXWA20049-222) show that recordings were made to provide oral rate quotes at correctional facilities prior to and during the 1996 through 2000 time period. The voice-prompt for the customer-requested rate quote appears on the Voice Prompt Log as early as June 1998 (See TNXWA20165). Additionally, the available Master Text Files (dating back to 1998) show rate quote language, including "To hear rates, dial two after tone . . ." (See TNXWA20025 - 48). T-Netix does not presently possess any Master Text Files prior to 1998.