KCHO TC97-090 1097-090 DOCKET NO. In the Matter of IN THE MATTER OF THE FILING BY STOCKHOLM-STRANDBURG FOR TELEPHONE COMPANY DESIGNATION AS AN ELIGIBLE **TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER** Public Utilities Commission of the State of South Dakota DATE MEMORANDA 6/1797 Tilled and Malera, 6/1997 C Fox Filling; 11/7 97 Optim for and Nature of Hearing, 12/2 97 porscript of Waring Held on 18/19/97, 12/2 97 porscript of Waring Held on 18/19/97, 13/17 97 Ending of tod Conductors of Sow Bids and Palue of Entry of Cube, 13/17 97 Carding of tod Conductors of Sow Bids and Palue of Entry of Cube, 13/17 97 Carding of tod Conductors of Sow Bids and Palue of Entry of Cube, 13/17 97 Carding of tod Conductors of Sow Bids and Palue of Entry of Cube, 13/17 97 Carding of tod Conductors of Sow Bids and Palue of Entry of Cube, 13/18 97 Sufficience and First by Plan for Stackholm Strandburg; Filed and Ascheted;

TC97-090

Meyer & Rogers

ATTORNEYS AT LAW-

P.O. BOX 89 · ONIDA, SOUTH DAKOTA 57564 · TELEPHONE 605/258-2654

BRIAN B MEYER DARLA POLLMAN ROGERS

June 16, 1997

RECEIVED

JUN 17 1997

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

William T. Bullard, Executive Director PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION State Capitol Building 500 East Capitol Avenue Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Re: Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company

Dear Mr. Bullard:

Please find enclosed herein original and ten copies of Stockholm-StranJburg Telephone Company's REQUEST FOR ETC DESIGNATION.

Sincerely yours,

Deres Allman Rogers

Darla Pollman Rogers Attorney at Law

DPR/ph

Enclosures

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission State Capitol 500 E. Capitol Pierre, SD 57501-5070 Phone: (800) 332-1782 Fax: (605) 773-3809

TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE FILINGS

These are the telecommunications service filings that the Commission has received for the period of

06/13/97 through 06/19/97 If you need a complete copy of a filing faxed, overnight expressed, or mailed to you, please contact Delaine Kolbo within five days of this filing.

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE INTERVENTION FILED DEADLINE

REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

TITLE/STAFF/SYNOPSIS

TC97-076	Application by Journey Telecom International, Inc. for a Certificate of Authority to operate as a telecommunications company within the state of South Dakota. (Staff: TS/TZ)			
TC97-091	06/17/97	07/07/97		
Application by Crystal Communications, Inc. for a Certificate of Authority to operate as a telecommunications company within the state of South Dakota. (Staff: TS/TZ) Applicant seeks authority to provide local telecommunications services and interexchange telecommunications services. The Applicant will not offer any local telecommunications services within a Rural Telephone Company service area without seeking separate Commission authority.			67/07/97	
TC97-104	Application by Quintelco, Inc. for a Certificate of Authority to operate as a telecommunications company within the state of South Dakota. (Staff: TS/TZ) Applicant "intends to subscribe to and resell all forms of inter-exchange and intra-exchange telecommunications services in the state of South Dakota, including local dial tone services, Message Telephone Service, Wide Area Telephone Service, WATS-like services, foreign exchange service, private lines, te lines, access service, cellular service, local switched service and other services and facilities of communications common carriers and other entities."	06/19/97	07/07/97	
	REQUEST FOR ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANY STATUS	3		
TC97-077	Intrastate Telephone Company, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Intrastate Telephone Company is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota: Bradley (784), Castlewood (793), Clark (532), Florence (758), Hayti (783), Lake Norden (785), Waubay (947), Webster (345), Willow Lake (625) and Bryant (628). Intrastate Telephone Company, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/13/97	07/07/97	

TC97-078	Interstate Telecommunications Cooperative, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Interstate Telecommunications Cooperative is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota. Goodwin (795), Clear Lake (874), Gary (272), Estelline (873), Brandt (876), Astoria (832), Toronto (794), West Hendricks (479), Elkton (542), White (629), Brookings Rural (693), Sinai (826), Nunda/Rutland (586), Wentworth (483) and Chester (489). Interstate Telecommunications Cooperative, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/13/97	07/07/97
TC97-080	West River Cooperative Telephone Company pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. West River Telephone is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges: Bison (244), Buffalo (375), Camp Crook (605-797) and (406-972). Meadow (788) and Sorum (866) West River Telephone, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/16/97	07/07/97
TC97-081	Stateline Telecommunications, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Stateline is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges. Newell (456), Nistand (257) and Lemmon (605-374) and (701-376). Stateline, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the ADM (505-374) and (701-376).	06/16/97	07/07/97
TC97-083	Accent Communications, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area. Accent is the facilities-based exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges. Bristol (492), Doland (635), Frederick (329), Hecla (994), North Hecla (701-992) and Mellette (887). Accent, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/CH)	06/17/97	07/07/97
TC97-084	James Valley Cooperative Telephone Company pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. James Valley Cooperative Telephone Company is the facilities-based exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota. Andover (298), Claremont (294), Columbia (396), Conde (382), Ferney (395), Groton (397), Houghton (885) and Turton (897). James Valley Cooperative Telephone Company, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/CH)	06/17/97	07/07/97
TC97-085	Heartland Communications, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Heartland Communications is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota: Platte/Geddes (337). Heartland Communications, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff, HB/CH)	06/17/97	07/07/97

TC97-086	Midstate Telephone Company, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Midstate Telephone Company is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota: Academy (726), Delmont (779), Ft. Thompson (245), Gann Valley (293), Kimball (778), New Holland (243), Pukwana (894), Stickney (732) and White Lake (249). Midstate Telephone Company, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/CH)	06/17/97	07/07/97
TC97-087	Baltic Telecom Cooperative pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area. Baltic Telecom Cooperative is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges: Baltic (529) and Crooks (543). Baltic Telecom Cooperative, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/17/97	07/07/97
TC97-088	East Plains Telecom, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54,201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area. East Plains Telecom, Inc. is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges: Alcester (934), Hudson (984), and East Hudson (712-982). East Plains Telecom, Inc., to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/17/97	07/07/97
TC97-089	Western Telephone Company pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Western Telephone is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges: Cresbard (324), Faulkton (598) and Orient (392). Western Telephone, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/17/97	07/07/97
TC97-090	Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Stockholm is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota. Stockholm-Strandburg (676, Revillo (623) and South Shore (756). Stockholm, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/17/97	07/07/97
TC97-092	Kennebec Telephone Co. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Kennebec Telephone Co. is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges: Kennebec (869) and Presho (895). Kennebec Telephone Co., to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/CH)	06/18/97	07/07/97
TC97-093	Jefferson Telephone Co., Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Jefferson Telephone Co., Inc. is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchange: Jefferson (966). Jefferson Telephone Co., Inc., to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/CH)	06/18/97	07/07/97

TC97-094	Sully Buttes Telephone Cooperative, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area. Sully Buttes Telephone is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges: West Onida (264), Hitchcock (266), Seneca (436), Tolstoy (442), Onaka (447), Wessington (458), Langford (493), Rosholt (537), Tulare (596), Highmore (852), Harrold (875), Ree Heights (943), Hoven (948), Blunt (962) and East Onida (973). Sully Buttes Telephone, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/CH)	06/19/97	07/07/97
TC97-095	Venture Communications, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area. Venture Communications is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges: Onida (258), Bowdle (285), Roscoe (287), Pierpont (325), Britton (448), Britton, ND (701-443), Roslyn (486), Wessington Springs (539), Selby (649), Gettysburg (765) and Lebanon (768). Venture Communications, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff, HB/CH)	06/19/97	07/07/97
TC97-096	SANCOM, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. SANCOM is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota: Wolsey (883), Parkston (928) and Tripp (935). SANCOM, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/CH)	06/19/97	07/07/97
TC97-097	Sanborn Telephone Cooperative pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Sanborn Telephone is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota. Ethan (227), Mt Vernon (236), Letcher (248). Forestburg (495), Artesian (527), Woonsocket (796) and Alpena (849). Sanborn Telephone, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/CH)	06/19/97	07/07/97
TC97-098	Beresford Municipal Telephone Co. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Beresford Tel. is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchange: Beresford (763). Beresford Tel., to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/19/97	07/07/97
TC97-099	Roberts County Telephone Cooperative Association pursuant to 47 U S C 214(e) and 47 CFR 54 201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area. Roberts County Telephone Cooperative Association is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges. North New Effington, ND (701-634), New Effington (637) and Claire City (652). Roberts County Telephone Cooperative Association, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/19/97	07/07/97

		CASE ID AN ART	Sec. 32. 42. 97. 52	
TC97-100	C97-100 RC Communications, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area. RC Communications is the facilities- based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges: North Veblen, ND (701-634), Wilmot (938), Peever (932), Veblen (738) and Summit (398). RC Communications, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)			
TC97-101	C97-101 Splitrock Properties, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Splitrock Properties, Inc. is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota: Howard/Carthage (772) and Oldham/Ramona (482). Splitrock Properties, Inc., to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)		07/07/97	
TC97-102	Splitrock Telecom Cooperative, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area. Splitrock Telecom Cooperative, Inc. is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges: Brandon (582) and Garretson (605-594) and (507-597). Splitrock Telecom Cooperative, Inc., to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/KC)	06/19/97	07/07/97	
TC97-105	Tri-County Telecom, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 47 CFR 54.201 hereby seeks designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. Tri-County Telecom, Inc. is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota: Clayton (825) and Emery (443). Tri-County Telecom, Inc., to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above identified exchange areas. (Staff: HB/CH)	06/19/97	07/07/97	
	FILING OF TYPE 1 PAGING AGREEMENT		1	
TC97-079	U S WEST Communications, Inc. filed for approval by the Commission the Type 1 Paging Agreement between KJAM Mobile Paging and U S WEST. "This Agreement was reached through voluntary negotiations without resort to mediation or arbitration and is submitted for approval pursuant to Section 252(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996KJAM Mobile Paging and U S WEST further request that the Commission approve this Agreement without a hearing and without allowing the intervention of other parties. Because this Agreement was reached through voluntary negotiations, it does not raise issues requiring a hearing and does not concern other parties not a part of the negotiations. Expeditious approval would further the public interest."	06/16/97	07/07/97	
	NONCOMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FILINGS			
TC97-082	U S WEST Communications filed tariff sheets that remove references to exchanges that have been sold by U S WEST. The sale was effective June 1, 1997. In addition, this filing includes some text changes and clean-up items. U S WEST has requested an effective date of June 1, 1997, for this filing. (Staff: DJ/CH)	06/17/97	NA	

FILING OF INFORMATIONAL INTRASTATE PAYPHONE TARIFFS

NA East Plains Telecom, Inc. on June 13, 1997

NA

NA

Important Notice: The Commission is compiling a list of internet addresses. If you have an internet address please notify the Commission by E-mailing it to Terry Norum at terryn@puc.state.sd.us. Faxing the address to the Commission at 605-773-3809



Capitol Office Telephone (605)773-3201 FAX (605)773-3809

Transportation/ Warehouse Division Telephone (605)773-5280 FAX (605)773-3225

> Consumer Hotline 1-800-332-1782

TTY Through Relay South Dakota 1-800-877-1113

Internet billbit put state.sd.us

Jim Borg Chairman Pam Nelson Vice-Chairman Laska Schoenfelder Commissioner

William Bullard Jr. Executive Director

Edward R. Anderson Hartan Best Martin C. Bettmann Charlie Bolle Sue Cichos Karen E. Cremer Marlette Fischbach Shirleen Fugitt Lewis Hammond Leni Healy Camrun Hoseck Dave Jacobson Bob Knadle Delaine Kolbo Terri J Lesmeister Jeffrey P. Lorensen Terry Norum Gregory A. Rislov Tammi Stangohr Sleven M. Wegman **Rolayne Ailts Wiest**

٠

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission



State Capitol Building, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070

October 1, 1997

Mr. Richard D. Coit Executive Director SDITC P. O. Box 57 Pierre, SD 57501

RE: Eligible Telecommunications Carrier application, TC97-090 Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company

Dear Mr.Coit:

The above-referenced application has been reviewed by the staff of the Public Utilities Commission. The following additional information is needed in order for the Commission to consider this application:

 Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. 54.101(a)(4), single-party service or its functional equivalent must be made available by an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier (ETC) to receive universal service support mechanisms. Does the above-referenced company have this service?

 Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. 54.101(a)(6), access to operator services must be made available by an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier (ETC) to receive universal service support mechanisms. Does the above-referenced company have this service?

 Pursuant 247 C.F.R. 54.405 and 54.411, Lifeline and Link Up services must be made available by an ETC to qualifying low-income consumers. Does the applicant company, as referenced above, make these services available to qualifying consumers?

4. Please provide a verification by an authorized officer, under oath, to the Commission in which the applicant represents to the Commission that the facts stated in the Request for ETC Designation and the response to data request nos. 1, 2 and 3 above, are truthful.

Please respond by October 14, 1997. Upon receipt of this information, it will be evaluated by staff and the matter will be scheduled for consideration by the Commission. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

PLEASE NOTE THAT STAFF'S POSITION IS THAT THE COMMISSION CAN ONLY MAKE AN ETC DESIGNATION FOR THOSE EXCHANGES WHICH ARE LOCATED IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

Sincerely,

(nomer) it in

Karen Cremer Staff Attorney

cc Harlan Best

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE FILINGS BY THE FOLLOWING TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES FOR DESIGNATION AS ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS:	
VIVIAN TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-068 }
GOLDEN WEST TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE, INC.) TC97-069)
VALLEY CABLE & SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.) TC97-070)
VALLEY TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.) TC97-071)
SIOUX VALLEY TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-073)
MOUNT RUSHMORE TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-074)
FORT RANDALL TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-075)
INTRASTATE TELEPHONE COMPANY COOPERATIVE, INC.) TC97-077)
INTERSTATE TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE, INC.) TC97-078)
WEST RIVER COOPERATIVE TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-080)
STATELINE TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.) TC97-081)

ACCENT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.	}	TC97-083
JAMES VALLEY COOPERATIVE TELEPHONE COMPANY	}	TC97-084
HEARTLAND COMMUNICATIONS, INC.	}	TC97-085
MIDSTATE TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC.	}	TC97-086
BALTIC TELECOM COOPERATIVE	}	TC97-087
EAST PLAINS TELECOM, INC.	}	TC97-088
WESTERN TELEPHONE COMPANY	}	TC97-089
STOCKHOLM-STRANDBURG TELEPHONE COMPANY	;	TC97-090
KENNEBEC TELEPHONE CO., INC.	}	TC97-092
JEFFERSON TELEPHONE CO., INC.	}	TC97-093
SULLY BUTTES TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC.	}	TC97-094
VENTURE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.	}	TC97-095
SANCOM, INC.	}	TC97-096

SANBORN TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE	}	TC97-097
BERESFORD MUNICIPAL TELEPHONE CO.	;	TC97-098
ROBERTS COUNTY TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION	}	TC97-099
RC COMMUNICATIONS, INC.	}	TC97-100
SPLITROCK PROPERTIES, INC.	}	TC97-101
SPLITROCK TELECOM COOPERATIVE, INC.	}	TC97-102
TRI-COUNTY TELECOM, INC.	}	TC97-105
FAITH MUNICIPAL TELEPHONE COMPANY	}	TC97-108
ARMOUR INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE	}	TC97-113
BRIDGEWATER-CANISTOTA INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE COMPANY	;	TC97-114
UNION TELEPHONE COMPANY	}	TC97-115
MCCOOK COOPERATIVE TELEPHONE	;	TC97-117
KADOKA TELEPHONE COMPANY	;	TC97-121

8143 .45 .2

BROOKINGS MUNICIPAL TELEPHONE	;	TC97-125
HANSON COMMUNICATIONS INC. D/B/A HANSON COUNTY TELEPHONE COMPANY	}	TC97-130
HANSON COMMUNICATIONS INC. D/B/A MCCOOK TELECOM	}	TC97-131
WEST RIVER TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE	}	TC97-154
MOBRIDGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CO.	}	TC97-155
U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.	;	TC97-163
THREE RIVER TELCO	;	TC97-167

The South Dakota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) received requests from the above captioned telecommunications companies requesting designation as eligible telecommunications carriers.

The Commission electronically transmitted notice of the filings and the intervention deadlines to interested individuals and entities. On June 27, 1997, the Commission received a Petition to Intervene from Dakota Telecommunications Systems, Inc. (DTS) and Dakota Telecom, Inc (DTI) with reference to Fort Randall Telephone Company (Docket TC97-075). On July 15, 1997, at its regularly scheduled meeting, the Commission granted intervention to DTS and DTI in Docket TC97-075. No other Petitions to Intervene were filed.

The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to SDCL Chapters 1-26 and 49-31, including 1-26-18, 1-26-19, 49-31-3, 49-31-7, 49-31-7, 1, 49-31-11, and 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1) through (5)

The issues at the hearing shall be as follows: (1) whether the above captioned telecommunications companies should be granted designation as eligible telecommunications carriers, and (2) what service areas shall be established by the Commission.

A hearing shall be held at 1:30 P.M., on Wednesday, November 19, 1997, in Room 412, State Capitol, Pierre, South Dakota. It shall be an adversary proceeding conducted pursuant to SDCL Chapter 1-26. All parties have the right to be present and to be represented by an attorney. These rights and other due process rights shall be forfeited if not exercised at the hearing. If you or your representative fail to appear at the time and place set for the hearing, the Final Decision will be based solely on the testimony and evidence provided, if any, during the hearing or a Final Decision may be issued by default pursuant to SDCL 1-26-20. After the hearing. The Commission will consider all evidence and testimony that was presented at the hearing. The Commission will then enter Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and a Final Decision regarding this matter. As a result of this hearing, the Commission may either grant or deny the request from any of the above captioned telecommunications companies requesting designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier, and the Commission shall establish service areas for eligible telecommunications carriers. The Commission's decision may be appealed by the parties to the state Circuit Court and the state Supreme Court as provided by law. It is therefore

ORDERED that a hearing shall be held at the time and place specified above on the issues of whether the above captioned telecommunications companies should be granted designation as eligible telecommunications carriers, and the Commission shall establish service areas for eligible telecommunications carriers.

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, this hearing is being held in a physically accessible location. Please contact the Public Utilities Commission at 1-800-332-1782 at least 48 hours prior to the hearing if you have special needs so arrangements can be made to accommodate you.

Dated at Pierre, South Dakota, this / day of November, 1997.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document has been served today upon all parties of record in this docket, as listed on the docket service list, by facsimile or by first class mail, in properly addressed envelopes, with charges prepaid thereon.

OFFICIAL SEAL

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION: Commissioners Burg, Nelson and Schoenfelder

WILLIAM BULLARD JR

Executive Director

1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMI OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DA	
2		RECEIVED
3		RECEIVED
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE FILINGS BY THE FOLLOWING TELECOMMUNICATIONS) DEC 0 2 1997
5	COMPANIES FOR DESIGNATION AS ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS:	SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
6	VIVIAN TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-068
7	GOLDEN WEST TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE, INC.) TC97-069
8		j
9	VALLEY CABLE & SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.) TC97-070
10	VALLEY TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATES, INC.) TC97-071
11	SIOUX VALLEY TELEPHONE COMPANY)) TC97-073
12		1 1037-073
13	MOUNT RUSHMORE TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-074
14	FORT RANDALL TELEPHONE COMPANY	TC97-075
15	INTRASTATE TELEPHONE COMPANY COOPERATIVE, INC.) TC97-077
16	INTERSTATE TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE, INC.)) TC97-078)
17	WEST RIVER COOPERATIVE TELEPHONE)
18	COMPANY) TC97-080
19	STATELINE TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.) TC97-081
20	ACCENT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.)) TC97-083
21	The second se) TC97-084
22	COMPANY	1
23	HEARTLAND COMMUNICATIONS, INC.) TC97-085
24	MIDSTATE TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC.	TC97-086
	BALTIC TELECOM COOPERATIVE)) TC97-087
25	EAST PLAINS TELECOM, INC.)) TC97-088

1		
2	WESTERN TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-089
3	STOCKHOLM-STRANDBURG TELEPHONE COMPANY	TC97-090
4	KENNEBEC TELEPHONE CO., INC.) TC97-092
5	JEFFERSON TELEPHONE CO., INC.) TC97-093
6	SULLY BUTTES TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC.) TC97-094
7	VENTURE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.)) TC97-095
8	SANCOM, INC.)) TC97-096
10	SANBORN TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE)) TC97-097
11	BERESFORD MUNICIPAL TELEPHONE CO.) TC97-098
12	ROBERTS COUNTY TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION)) TC97-099)
3	RC COMMUNICATIONS, INC.)) TC97-100
4	SPLITROCK PROPERTIES, INC.)) TC97-101
5	SPLITROCK TELECOM COOPERATIVE, INC.) TC97-102
6	TRI-COUNTY TELECOM, INC.) TC97-105
7	FAITH MUNICIPAL TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-108
8	ARMOUR INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-113
9	BRIDGEWATER-CANISTOTA INDEPENDENT)
20	TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-114
21	UNION TELEPHONE COMPANY	TC97-115
2	MCCOOK COOPERATIVE TELEPHONE COMPANY) TC97-117
23	KADOKA TELEPHONE COMPANY)) TC97-121
24	BROOKINGS MUNICIPAL TELEPHONE)) TC97-125
25	HANSON COMMUNICOATIONS INC., D/B/A)) TC97-130

	provide the second se	and a second	the second design of the secon
1	HANSON COUNTY TELE	EPHONE COMPANY	1
2	HANSON COMMUNICATI MCCOOK TELECOM	IONS INC., D/B/A)) TC97-131
3			1
4	WEST RIVER TELECON COOPERATIVE	MUNICATIONS) TC97-154
5	MOBRIDGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CO.)) TC97-155
6	U S WEST COMMUNIC	ATIONS, INC.	TC97-163
7	THREE RIVER TELCO) TC97-167
8			_;
9			
10	HEARD BEFORE	THE PUBLIC UTILIT	LES COMMISSION
11			
12	PROCEEDINGS:	November 19, 1997 1:30 P.M.	7
13		Room 412, Capitol Pierre, South Day	
14			
15	PUC COMMISSION:	Jim Burg, Chairma	in
		Laska Schoenfelde Pam Nelson, Commi	er, Commissioner Issioner
17			
18	COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:	Rolayne Ailts Wie	
19		Camron Hoseck	19L
20		Karen Cremer Harlan Best	
21		Bob Knadle Gregory A. Rislov	
22		David Jacobson	
23			
24			
25	Reported by: Lor	i J. Grode, RMR	
	The second s		

			APPEARANCES	
	For	US West:	William P. Heaston	
		ob nebe.	1801 California Street	
			Suite 5100	
			Denver, CO 80202	
			and	
			Tamara A. Wilka	
			P.O. Box 5015	
1			Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5	015
	For	SDITC:	Richard D. Coit	
			P.O. Box 57 Pierre, SD 57501 E. Sol	-
			Fierre, 50 57501 E. 501	onon
	For	Ft. Randall		
			P.O. Box 89 Onida, SD 57564	
			INDEX	
1	Witt	ness		Page
		Don Lee		12
1		Bill Hauger		46
		Bob Barfiel Harlan Best		52 54
		Jon Lehner		67
		Harlan Best		86
1				

	5
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN BURG: Okay. We'll go ahead and get
3	started. I'll begin the hearing for the dockets
4	relating to the eligible telecommunications carriers
5	designation. The time is approximately 1:50. The date
6	is November 19, 1997; and the location of the hearing
7	is Room 412, State Capitol, Pierre, South Dakota.
8	I am Jim Burg, Commissio: Chairman.
9	Commissioners Laska Schoenfelder and Pam Nelson are
10	also present. I'm presiding over this hearing. The
11	hearing was noticed pursuant to the Commission's Order
12	For and Notice of Hearing issued November 7, 1997.
13	The issues at this hearing shall be as
14	follows: One, whether the requesting
15	telecommunications company should be granted
16	designation as eligible telecommunications carriers;
17	and, two, what service areas shall be established by
18	the Commission.
19	All parties have the right to be present and
20	to be represented by an attorney. All persons so
21	testifying will be sworn in and subject to
22	cross-examination by the parties. The Commission's
23	final decision may be appealed by the parties to the
24	State Circuit Court and the State Supreme Court.
25	Rolayne Wiest will act as Commission

1	counsel. She may provide recommended rulings on
2	procedural and evidentiary matters. The Commission may
3	overrule its counsel's preliminary rulings throughout
4	the hearing. If not overruled, the preliminary rulings
5	will become final.
6	At this time I'll turn it over to Rolayne for
7	the hearing.
8	MS. WIEST: I'll take appearances of the
9	parties. Rich, who do you represent?
10	MR. COIT: I'm here today representing all of
11	the SDITC member companies, and also Kadoka which has
12	recently applied for membership with the coalition.
13	And Darla Rogers is here representing some companies,
14	and I guess she could indicate for the record which
15	ones she's representing.
16	MS. ROGERS: I'm here representing Valley;
17	Stockholm-Strandburg; Golden West, including Vivian;
18	and Sully Buttes and Venture.
19	MS. WIEST: Could you repeat those again?
20	Valley, Stockholm-Strandburg, Vivian, Golden West.
21	MS. ROGERS: Golden West, Sully Buttes and
22	Venture.
23	MS. WIEST: U S West.
24	MR. HEASTON: Bill Heaston and Tammy Wilka
25	for U S West Communications.

	7
1	MS. CREMER: Karen Cremer, Commission staff.
2	MR. HOSECK: Camron Hoseck, Commission
3	staff.
4	MS. WIEST: We have had a request to take one
5	of these dockets first and that's TC97-075. Do any of
6	the parties want to make an opening statement before we
7	begin?
8	Why don't you proceed with 075 then.
9	MR. COIT: Sure, that's fine. I really don't
10	have an opening statement. There are a couple of
11	exhibits that we would like to admit. And I understand
12	there's also been some letters sent to the Commission
13	that we would like to admit into the record as evidence
14	on the ETC questions. And that would be Exhibit Number
15	1, which is the application of Fort Randall for ETC
16	designation, and Exhibit No. 2, which is the response
17	of Fort Randall to a data request from staff, dated, I
18	believe, October 1st. And there are two letters. I
19	don't know if we've marked those yet.
20	(EXHIBITS NO. 3 and 4 WERE MARKED FOR
21	IDENTIFICATION.)
22	MR. COIT: There are two other exhibits that
23	have been marked Exhibit No. 3. Kathy Marmet, is that
24	the letter of Dakota or is Exhibit 3 the letter.
25	MS. MARMET: Exhibit 3 is the letter of

8 1 Dakota. 2 MR. COIT: So the Exhibit 3 is the letter from Robert Marmet to the Commission, and Exhibit 4 is 3 a letter from Mike Bradley to the Commission. 4 MS. WIEST: What's the date of that letter, 5 the letter from Bradley? 6 7 MR. COIT: November 18th. MS. WIEST: Because I have one dated November 8 18th and one the 19th. 9 MR. COIT: I think so. Is that right, 10 Exhibit 3, is that the 19th? Okay. I had a letter 11 that was dated yesterday, but the ones we have marked 12 for admission today, I believe both the letters are 13 dated the 19th, November 19th. 14 15 MS. WIEST: So the letter from Mr. Bradley is 16 dated the 19th? MR. COIT: Yes. Sorry about that. 17 18 MS. WIEST: And that's Exhibit 4. MR. COIT: I don't know why they're dated 19 differently. The 19th is the one we're seeking 20 admission on, I believe. Yes, they are identical so 21 we're seeking admission of the 19th letter. 22 23 MS. WIEST: I think they're not exactly identical but we'll go with the 19th. Could I see the 24 letter from Dakota? I don't believe we got copies of 25

fering those
have
would
rtaining
is on
nd the
ice. I
able to
written
the
ect.
ou feel
I was
on
answer
n now

ė.

	10
1	and December 2nd. There are witnesses here today for
2	some of the other applications, but there is not a
3	witness here today with respect to Fort Randall's
4	application.
5	MS. WIEST: The only other thing I would
6	suggest is that perhaps the Commission could just have
7	it clarified by another affidavit from the person.
8	CHAIRMAN BURG: We could approve it on the
9	basis of that clarification.
10	MS. WIEST: A late-filed exhibit just
11	clarifying that since we are taking affidavits from the
12	witnesses on other issues.
13	MR. COIT: I appreciate that option.
14	MS. WIEST: Otherwise, are there any other
15	questions relating to 075?
16	CHAIRMAN BURG: Can we make bench decisions?
17	MS. WIEST: Staff will have something too.
18	They'll have testimony on all of the cases. Does staff
19	want to go now, or do you want to go at the very end?
20	MR. HOSECK: Originally we had planned to go
21	after the applicants had.
22	MS. WIEST: All the applicants?
23	MR. HOSECK: Yes. And if these are treated
24	en mass or something fairly close to that, then we
25	would be prepared to put on our case in a similar

11 manner. 1 CHAIRMAN BURG: That's fine. 2 3 MS. WIEST: Let's just go through them and then we'll have Harlan as the witness. Let's go back 4 5 to TC97-068. Does anyone have any questions on TC97-068? 6 CHAIRMAN BURG: Just a clarification. 7 What 8 data request response is this? 9 MS. WIEST: Yes. That would be in that 10 packet. 11 MR. COIT: Is there a chance that we could consider or deal with these en mass as Mr. Hoseck has 12 13 indicated or suggested? MS. WIEST: I'd rather not just because on a 14 15 few of them I have a couple questions on some of them. 16 MR. COIT: Okay. Should I go ahead and 17 introduce the exhibits? 18 MS. WIEST: Yes. 19 MR. COIT: With respect to Docket TC97-068 20 there are two exhibits. Exhibit No. 1 is the actual ETC request filed by Vivian Telephone Company. And 21 Exhibit No. 2 is the response of Vivian Telephone 22 Company to a data request from Commission staff. 23 We would move the admission of those exhibits. I do not 24 have the dates. I don't have them here with me. 25

0-47.45.44

Okay. Yeah, the date on the Exhibit No. 1 is 6-1997, 1 and the date on the response to the data request is 2 10-14-97. 3 CHAIRMAN BURG: 6-9; right, not 6-19? 4 5 MR. COIT: 6-19 -- 6-9, excuse me. MS. WIEST: Okay. Is there any objection to 6 7 admitting Exhibits 1 and 2 in 068? If not, they've A been admitted. Again, Rich, on Exhibit 2, the first 9 question, it says we provide single party service 10 throughout. I guess I'll assume that means all 11 customers? MR. COIT: I would call Don Lee. Don Lee is 12 here representing Vivian as well as some of the other 13 companies. Don Lee, do you want to take a seat? 14 15 DON LEE. called as a witness, being first duly sworn, 16 17 was examined and testified as follows: 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COIT: 19 Could you respond to Commission counsel's 20 0. 21 question, please? A. Yes. The answer to your question is, yes, it 22 does indicate that they provide service private line 23 2.4 throughout the study area. MS. WIEST: Single party to all customers? 25

	13
1	It's available to all customers?
2	A. Right.
3	MS. WIEST: Thank you. That's the only
4	question I have. Does anybody else have any questions
5	for this witness for 068? If not, thank you. I did
6	admit Exhibit 1 and 2. 069.
7	MR. COIT: We would move the admission of
8	Exhibits No. 1 and 2 in 069, and that is an ETC request
9	or application dated 6-9-97 and response to a staff
10	data request dated 10-14-97.
11	MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, they've
12	been admitted.
13	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER Excuse me, I do
14	not have the data request up here with me for some
15	reason. I'm sorry about this, but I need to go back
16	and ask Mr. Lee about the Lifeline, Link Up. I think
17	was that covered in the data request? I'm sorry to be
18	behind the eight ball, but I did not have that and so I
19	need to know whether this company is doing Lifeline.
20	Link Up now or whether you need to whether you
21	intend to have that implemented by 1-1?
22	A. You're referring to the Vivian Telephone
23	Company?
24	
25	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Yeah, Vivian is
63	what we're doing now.

Vivian Telephone Company does provide A . 1 Lifeline and Link Up throughout its system with the 2 exception of the Vivian Exchange, and they anticipate 3 providing it in the Vivian Exchange by January 1, 4 1998. 5 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: But anticipated 6 and doing it are two different things. And I think I'm 7 going to have to be assured that you're either going to 8 do it or that you're going to ask for something from 9 10 us. 11 A. Do you want a commitment that we will do it 12 by that date? 13 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I think that's 14 one of the requirements, if I'm reading the Act right. 15 A. Yeah. 16 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: And I think 17 that's important that we have that on the record. A. Certainly, Commissioner. The answer is, yes, 18 19 they are committed to providing it by 1-1-1998. 2.0 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Thank you. CHAIRMAN BURG: Just a question, a general 21 one on that. On the toll, what do we call it toll 22 control? Do we need a statement on those, too, or a 23 24 request for a waiver? 25 MS. WIEST: They did actually request waivers

	r
1	in their original applications.
2	MR. COIT: I was at the conclusion of going
3	through, I guess, the questions and so forth, I was
4	basically before the Commission acts on any of
5	these, going to restate the request. But if the
6	Commission has questions of Mr. Lee with respect to
7	certain aspects of providing it, I would yeah, I
8	would suggest you go ahead and ask it.
9	CHAIRMAN BURG: No, I don't have a problem as
10	long as we know all of them that's going to apply to.
11	In other words, if it applies to every one of them,
12	then the statement at the end saying it applies on all
13	of them is adequate for me. Or if you have some that
14	already could do the toll control, we need to know
15	that. I doubt if there are any at this time.
16	MR. COIT: No, we don't. And the waiver
17	request is included in all the applications. But just
18	to make sure it was ruled on, I was intending on
19	bringing it up again at the end.
20	CHAIRMAN BURG: Okay. That's fine with me.
21	MS. WIEST: Any other questions of this
22	witness regarding 068 and 069? 15 not, we will go to
23	TC97-070.
24	MR. COIT: Again, I would move for the
25	admission of two exhibits in TC97-070, and that is the

	16
1	ETC application or request dated 6-10-97 and response
2	to staff's data request dated 10-97.
3	MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, Exhibits
4	1 and 2 have been admitted. Are there any questions
5	with regard to this docket? If not, let's go to
6	TC97-071.
7	MR. COIT: We would move for the admission of
8	Exhibits No. 1 and 2, request for ETC status dated
9	6-10-97 and response to data request of staff dated
10	10-9-97.
11	MS. WIEST: Any objection to Exhibits 1 and
12	27 If not, they've been admitted. Are there any
13	questions regarding TC97-071? If not, we will go to
14	TC97-073.
15	MR. COIT: We would move for the admission of
16	Exhibit No. 1, ETC request dated 6-11-97 and Exhibit
17	No. 2, response to staff data request dated 10-14-97.
18	MS. WIEST: Any objections to Exhibits 1 and
19	2 being admitted? If not, they have been admitted.
20	Any questions regarding 073?
21	MR. COIT: I would note that Dennis Law, who
22	is the current manager of Sioux Valley Telephone
23	Company, is available if the Commissioners have any
24	questions.
25	MS. WIEST: Any questions? If not, we'll go

	17
1	to TC97-074.
2	MR. COIT: We would move for the admission of
3	Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request dated 6-12-97
4	and Exhibit No. 2, response to staff data request dated
5	10-31-97.
6	MS. WIEST: Are there any objections? If
7	not, 1 and 2 have been admitted. Are there any
8	questions concerning 074? I have the same question on
9	this one, Rich, with respect to the data request number
10	one.
11	MR. COIT: Would an affidavit be adequate?
12	MS. WIEST: Yeah, as far as all customers.
13	MR. COIT: Okay. I will make sure that gets
14	filed.
15	MS. WIEST: Any questions on 074? If not,
16	let's go to TC97-077.
17	MR. COIT: We would move for the admission of
18	Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request and that's
19	dated 6-13-97. Also move for admission of Exhibit No.
20	2, which is a response to data request dated 10-9-97.
21	And there is also an Exhibit No. 3 in this docket, a
22	supplemental response to staff data request. It's
23	dated 10-28-97. We move the admission of all three
24	exhibits.
25	MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, those

	10
1	three exhibits have been admitted. Are there any
2	questions regarding this docket?
3	MR. COIT: I believe Mr. Lee is representing
4	ITC today as well?
5	MR. LEE: That's right.
6	MS. WIEST: Okay. Let's go to TC97-078.
7	MR. COIT: We move for the admission of
8	Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request dated 6-13-97
9	and move for the admission of Exhibit No. 2, which is
10	response to staff data request dated 10-9-97.
11	MS. WIEST: Any objection to those exhibits?
12	If not, they've been admitted. Any questions
13	concerning this docket? Let's go to TC97-080.
14	MR. COIT: We move for the admission of
15	Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request dated 6-16-97,
16	and also move for admission of response to staff data
17	request Exhibit No. 2, which is dated 10-14-97.
18	MS. WIEST: Any objection to Exhibits 1 and
19	27 If not, they've been admitted. Any questions
20	regarding this docket? If not, let's move to
21	TC97-081.
22	MR. COIT: We move for the admission of ETC
23	request dated 6-16-97, which is Exhibit No. 1, and also
24	Exhibit No. 2, response to staff data request, dated
25	10-15-97.

	19
1	MS. WIEST: Are there any objections to 1 and
2	2? If not, they've been admitted. Any questions
3	regarding this docket? So, Rich, with respect to this
4	one, you will be asking at the end about the waiver for
5	the single party and all the other waivers; is that
6	right?
7	MR. COIT: Is there a waiver request in the
8	Stateline on the single party issue?
9	MS. WIEST: Yes.
10	MR. COIT: I wasn't aware of that. I
11	understood there were some companies that had purchased
12	U S West exchanges that were still in the process of
13	converting some party lines. But, yes, if they need a
14	waiver, I guess so. I'll renew that request. I don't
15	have any factual information I can provide. I don't
16	believe, Mr. Lee, are you here representing Stateline?
17	MR. LEE: I am. And in conversations with
18	Stateline management yesterday, they indicated that
19	they would likely need a waiver request until March,
20	April time frame when they can finish the construction
21	to provide all one party service.
22	MS. WIEST: And in their application they're
23	actually asking for a one-year waiver; correct?
24	MR. LEE: But they're willing to shorten it
25	up.

MS. WIEST: So you probably just need a 1 2 waiver until June? MR. LEE: That would be adequate. 3 MS. WIEST: June 1st? 4 CHAIRMAN BURG: Do we need to act on the 5 waivers now? 6 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Do you want a 7 motion on the waiver now? 8 MS. WIEST: Let's talk about that. The thing 9 10 is that all of these. I believe, are going to also need a motion on the waivers for the one year on the toll 11 12 control, and we haven't been doing any of those motions 13 at this time. CHAIRMAN BURG: We have to take each of those 14 separate motions, do you think, at the end for the toll 15 control? 16 17 MS. WIEST: Yes. If we want to go --18 MR. COIT: We could pick it up here now and start doing waivers. That might be the easiest way. 19 CHAIRMAN BURG: If we got to go through each 20 21 one. 22 MR. COIT: Rule on them as you go through. CHAIRMAN BURG: Easier than going back. 23 24 MS. WIEST: Okay. For 081 with respect to 25 the waiver until June 1st, 1998, concerning single

	21
1	party service to all customers, and the second waiver
2	on toll control for one year one year from what
3	date, Rich?
4	MR. COIT: I think I would guess that that
5	would be from the date of the order.
6	MS. WIEST: Okay.
7	MR. COIT: On the toll control? You're
8	speaking to the toll control; correct?
9	MS. WIEST: Yes, toll control.
10	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I have a question
11	as long as we're talking about the waivers both on toll
12	control and on the single party service. As long as
13	you're asking for waivers, let's make sure it's done
14	properly and that we're not back here in two months
15	asking for more waivers. I would hate to go through
16	this process, or would not like to go through this
17	process again. I think we need to be accurate when
18	we're doing it. I also have a question about what
19	meets the requirements of the Act? How much of a
20	waiver can we give? I don't know as I know the answer
21	to that.
22	MS. WIEST: Right. The time actually in the
23	FCC Order is not specified. But it does say in
24	paragraph 89, I believe, that the Commission must, upon
25	a finding of exceptional circumstances, you can make a

waiver for single party services for a specified period 1 of time. And also on the toll limitation the company 2 must also show exceptional circumstances exist and need 3 for additional time to upgrade. They should have to 4 show individual hardship, individualized hardship or 5 6 inequity warrants additional time to comply and that would better serve the public interest that is in 7 strict adherence to the time period and it should 8 extend only as long as the exceptional circumstances 9 exist. 10

MR. COIT: I would note that in the 11 applications, while we've requested a year, we've also 12 indicated that within that period of time we would file 13 some information with the Commission indicating, you 14 15 know, when the capability is available. If the 16 Commission -- what we have -- and Mr. Lee, I think, can 17 answer some questions in the area of toll control that 18 I can't answer. But we're faced with a situation today 19 where the capabilities are just not available. If a 20 year is too long, you know, from our perspective we 21 really didn't know when it would be available and 22 that's why we requested a year. But if there's better information on that, maybe the time period can be 23 24 different. But right now we really don't know when the capability is going to be available. 25

1	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I hate to belabor
2	the point, and I know everyone wants to get through
3	this, but to me it's very important that we do it
4	right. And so if it means that we need to answer the
5	question when we grant these waivers and we send these,
6	or you send them on to the FCC, we need to be sure that
7	you have spelled out why these companies at least
8	this is what I'm understanding why these companies
9	can't do toll control and why it's going to take that
10	long of a period of time to do single party service.
11	And so I think that should be in the application
2	somewhere, or at least in our motion as we approve it,
13	or we should have something on the record to support
14	where we're going.
15	MS. WIEST: They do explain the reasons in
1.6	their application, their original application, with
17	respect to toll control.
8	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Okay.
9	MS. WIEST: But if there are any further
20	questions that the Commission would like to ask at this
21	time, if you need more information on that, we could do
2	that now.
3	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I would like to
4	know and this probably isn't true of all companies.
5	But of the ones you're testifying for at least,

Mr. Lee, where they're at in deploying the technology that we need to do these two things and what kind of delays you might expect. Because I don't want this to not go forward the way that it's been perceived that it should go forward.

MR. LEE: Sure. Okay. I might respond to 6 that in general; and then if there are specific 7 questions, I'd be happy to do that. But the issue of 8 toll limitation, which I believe under the FCC's 9 10 description identifies a toll restriction and a toll control, and the issue at hand is in the toll control, 11 which my understanding is to indicate that the end user 12 subscriber is to be able to control the amount of its 13 monthly bill, at which time a restriction automatically 14 kicks in and disallows access to the long distance 15 network. To my knowledge, there is no switch vendor in 16 the United States today who provides that capability 17 within its switch. I know that the vendors are working 18 on it. I could not sit here with a clear conscience 19 and indicate that on X date that I would expect it will 20 be available. Given my honest opinion, I would doubt 21 that it's available to the general population within a 22 year's time period. And therein is the reason I 23 believe that SDITC members ask for the one-year period 24 because we don't anticipate it being available. 25

1 The second or alternative to that is a software provisioning of toll control. And, again, to 2 my knowledge, there is no interface between a software 3 system and a switch that has that capability. 4 Primarily because it would take real time rating of a 5 customer's usage; and because the customer control 6 switch interexchange carrier it's choosing, there are a 7 myriad of optional call plans and rate structures that 8 would be applied. And, to my knowledge, there just is 9 no technology, nor software, available to carry out 10 11 that program. COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: And if I recall 12 right, it doesn't -- it's not permissive, one or the 13 other. You really to need to do all of the above. 14 MR. LEE: It includes both, that's correct. 15 16 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I believe some companies have asked the FCC for clarification, that 17 sort of thing. And as far as I know, you might have 18 better information than I do that that decision has not 19 been handed down by the FCC. 20 21 MR. LEE: A, I doubt I have better information; and, B. I agree it has not been handed 22 down, to my knowledge. There is that clarification 23 procedure request in front of the FCC. 24 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Okay. 25

25

0-45 .45 .22

	26
1	CHAIRMAN BURG: To my knowledge, everybody
2	can offer toll limitation; right, from what we've had
3	to get a general statement?
4	MR. LEE: I'm going to define as toll
5	restriction, if I can, instead of toll limitation, yes.
6	CHAIRMAN BURG: Toll blocking is what I
7	mean. Everybody can offer that?
8	MR. LEE: To my knowledge, that's a true
9	statement.
10	CHAIRMAN BURG: And I guess my position is to
11	me, the other I really don't see, you know, since
12	you said it's not available, I can't see them implying
13	it or even putting it into here. I think it satisfies
14	all of our needs. I have no problem giving the full
15	year or more as long as it gets through FCC, which at
16	this time it appears it should. So I don't see this
17	point to me in making it a shorter limit because I
18	don't think it will interfere with the ETC
19	establishment.
20	MR. LEE: I would agree with that and then
21	would point out in the applications the companies have
22	indicated that they will investigate and will work with
23	their switch vendors so that when it does become
24	available, they're willing to implement it. I think
25	that the telephone companies feel that once it becomes

27 available, it is in the public interest and would be 1 very supportive of that concept. 2 CHAIRMAN BURG: With that I'll move that we 3 grant the one-year waiver on toll -- what is it 4 called? Toll limitation? Toll control? 5 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second. 6 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I'm going to 7 concur with that as long as the motion is understood 8 that there will be some formal way to limit toll for 9 these customers just so that everybody understands the 10 11 motion. 12 CHAIRMAN BURG: I think in every application you agreed that you can do toll restriction --13 MR. LEE: Right. 14 15 CHAIRMAN BURG: -- if I remember reading the applications, and that to me is satisfactory. 16 17 MR. LEE: Thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN BURG: Do you want them as a separate motion? Okay. I'll also move -- which one do 19 20 we need on this one? MS. WIEST: The single party service until 21 22 June 1st. 23 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move that we grant a waiver in TC97-081 in the single party requirement 24 until June 1, 1998. 25

3

· YUS

28 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second. 1 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 2 MS. WIEST: Any other questions in 081? Do 3 you want to go back now? 4 CHAIRMAN BURG: It might be easier to go back 5 and get these others. 6 7 MR. COIT: Whatever. 8 MS. WIEST: We'll go back to 068, and the 9 motion in 068 will be for the one-year waiver on toll 10 control. CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move that we grant the 11 waiver of toll control in TC97-075. 12 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second. 13 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 14 MS. WIEST: 068. 15 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant the toll 16 17 -- I mean I'll move we grant the waiver for toll 18 limitation. MS. WIEST: Toll control. I'm sorry, we have 19 to be accurate because what the FCC did is they call it 2.0 combined toll control and toll blocking as toll 21 22 limitation. 23 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant the waiver for toll control in TC97-068. 24 25 COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.

1	29
1	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
2	MS. WIEST: For one year?
3	CHAIRMAN BURG: Yes.
4	MS. WIEST: 069.
5	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll keep making them. I'll
6	move we grant the toll control waiver in TC97-069 for
7	one year.
8	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.
9	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
10	MS. WIEST: 070.
11	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move that we grant toll
12	control in TC97-070 for one year, the waiver for one
13	year.
14	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Second it.
15	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
16	MS. WIEST: 171.
17	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move that we grant toll
18	control, the waiver for toll control, in TC97-071 for
19	one year.
20	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.
21	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
22	MS. WIEST: 073.
23	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant the waiver
24	for toll control in TC97-073 for one year.
25	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.

	30
1	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
2	MS. WIEST: 074.
3	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant the waiver
4	for toll control in TC97-074 for one year.
5	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.
6	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
7	MS. WIEST: 077.
8	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant the waiver
9	for toll control in TC97-077 for one year.
10	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.
11	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
12	MS. WIEST: 078.
13	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant the waiver
14	for toll control in TC97-078 for one year.
15	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.
16	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
17	MS. WIEST: 080.
18	CHAIRMAN BURG: And I'll move we grant the
19	waiver for toll control in TC97-080 for one year.
20	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.
21	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
22	CHAIRMAN BURG: We did 81; right, and we are
23	done with 81.
24	MS. WIEST: Any further questions on 081?
25	083, TC97-083.

	31
1	MR. COIT: We would move for the admission of
2	the ETC request filed by Accent, dated 6-17-97, and
3	Exhibit No. 2, the response to staff data request which
4	is dated 10-8-97.
5	MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, 1 and 2
6	have been admitted. Any questions regarding 083?
7	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant the toll,
8	the waiver for toll control in TC97-083 for one year.
9	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.
10	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
11	MS. WIEST: TC97-084.
12	MR. COIT: We move for the admission of the
13	ETC request dated 6-17-97, which is marked Exhibit No.
14	1, and we move for the admission of Exhibit No. 2, the
15	response to staff data request dated 10-8-97.
16	MS. WIEST: Are there any objections? If
17	not, they've been admitted.
18	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant the waiver
19	for toll control in TC97-084 for one year.
20	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Seconded.
21	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I'll concur.
22	Does this have a single party question on this one?
23	MS. WIEST: No. They said in their original
24	application that they are offering single party service
25	to all consumers.

AN. GA. WAL

	32
	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I got a sticky on
	2 it. Sorry. James Valley; right?
	3 MS. WIEST: I believe in their okay.
	4 Yeah, that was Bob's question. And the reason he had
	5 the question is it was actually in the original
	6 application. So if you look at the original
	7 application on page two, under question number three,
	8 they do state that they provide single party service to
	9 all consumers in their service area. Number four down
1	0 on that list.
1	1 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Okay.
1	2 MS. WIEST: Thank you. Okay. Let's go to
1	3 TC97-085.
1	4 MR. COIT: We move for admitting of Exhibit
1	5 No. 1, the ETC request, dated 6-17-97, and Exhibit No.
1	6 2, the response to staff data request dated 10-10-97.
1	7 MS. WIEST: Any objections? If not, they've
1	8 been admitted. I have the same question here with
1	9 respect to question number one.
:	0 MR. COIT: Mr. Benton is available to respond
:	1 to questions, I believe. Is this Heartland? Right?
:	2 Or, Don, can you respond to any questions?
:	3 MR. LEE: Mark has asked me to respond on his
:	4 behalf, which will be Heartland Communications, and
	5 they are offering all single.

33 MS. WIEST: Single party was offered to all 1 customers? Any other questions concerning this 2 Is there a motion? 3 docket? CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move that we grant the 4 waiver for toll control to TC97-089 for one year. 5 6 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 7 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. MS. WIEST: 085, I believe. 8 9 CHAIRMAN BURG: Excuse me, 85. MS. MIEST: TC97-086. 10 11 MR. COIT: We move for the admission of ETC request, Exhibit No. 1, dated 6-17-97, and response to 12 staff data requests, Exhibit No. 2, which is dated 13 10-10-97. 14 15 MS. WIEST: Any objections? If not, they have been admitted. Same question, can you answer 16 17 that, Mr. Lee? 18 MR. LEE: I'm sorry, I don't have the associated companies with the exhibit numbers. Which 19 20 company are we referring to? MR. COIT: Midstate. 21 MR. LEE: They are currently all private line 22 23 services. 24 MR. COIT: Single party; correct? 25 MS. WIEST: Single party to all customers?

8

2AN

.45

-215

34 MR. LEE: Correct. 1 MS. WIEST: Any other questions in this 2 docket? 3 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant the toll 4 5 control waiver in TC97-086 for one year. 6 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 7 8 MS. WIEST: TC97-087. 9 MR. COIT: We move for the admission of 10 Exhibit No. 1, ETC request, dated 6-17-97, and Exhibit No. 2, response to staff data request, dated 10-16-97. 11 12 MS. WIEST: Any objections? If not, Exhibits 1 and 2 have been admitted. 13 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant toll 14 control waiver in TC97-087 for one year. 15 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 16 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 17 18 MS. WIEST: Again, I'd have a question on 19 this one, Rich. 20 MR. COIT: Mr. Lee is representing Baltic as well. 21 22 MR. LEE: Baltic is currently all private line. I'm sorry, single party. I should use the right 23 24 term, single party service. 25 MS. WIEST: To all customers?

	35
1	MR. LEE: Correct.
2	MS. WIEST: Thank you. TC97-088.
3	MR. COIT: We move for the admission of
4	Exhibit No. 1, ETC request dated 6-17-97, and response
5	to staff data request, which is Exhibit No. 2, which is
6	dated 10-17-97.
7	MS. WIEST: Any objections? If not, Exhibits
8	1 and 2 have been admitted.
9	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver
10	on toll control in TC97-088 for one year.
11	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it.
12	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
13	MS. WIEST: Can you answer my question on
14	this one, Mr. Lee?
15	MR. LEE: Company name, please?
16	MS. WIEST: East Plains.
17	MR. LEE: Currently is all single party
18	service.
19	MS. WIEST: Thank you.
20	MS. WIEST: TC97-089.
21	MR. COIT: We move for the admission of
22	Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request dated 6-17-97,
23	and the admission of Exhibit No. 2, which is a response
24	to staff data request, dated 10-21-97.
25	MS. WIEST: Any objections? If not, they've

36 been admitted. Same question. 1 MR. COIT: I don't believe that Mr. Lee is 2 here representing Western today. What did they say in 3 the response? 4 5 MS. WIEST: They said Western Telephone offers single party service. My question is do they 6 offer to every customer again? 7 MR. COIT: Well --8 9 MS. WIEST: Can you do a late-filed on that? MR. COIT: We can do an affidavit on that 10 11 one, I guess. CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 12 on toll control for TC97-089 for one year. 13 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 14 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 15 MS. WIEST: Okay. Let's go on to TC97-090. 16 17 MR. COIT: We move for the admission of 18 Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request dated 6-17-97. and Exhibit No. 2, which is the response to staff data 19 20 request dated 10-24-97. MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, they've 21 22 been admitted. Any questions concerning this docket? CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move that we grant a 23 waiver on toll control in TC97-090 for one year. 24 25 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it.

	37
1	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
2	MS. WIEST: TC97-092.
3	MR. COIT: We move for the admission of
4	Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request of Kennebec
5	Telephone Company dated 6-18-97, and move for the
6	admission of Exhibit No. 2, which is the response to
7	staff data request dated 10-10-97. And I would note
8	that Mr. Rod Bauer is here to respond to any questions
9	that the Commissioners or staff may have concerning
10	their request.
11	MS. WIEST: Any questions concerning this
12	docket? If not, do you have a motion?
13	CHAIRMAN BURG: Did we admit both those?
14	MS. WIEST: I'm sorry, I did not. I will
15	admit Exhibit Numbers 1 and 2.
16	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move that we grant a
17	waiver on toll control in TC97-092 for one year.
18	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it.
19	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
20	MS. WIEST: TC97-093.
21	MR. COIT: We would move for the admission of
22	Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request of Jefferson
23	Telephone Company, dated 6-18-97, and move also for the
24	admission of Exhibit No. 2, response to staff data
25	request, which is dated 10-10-97. And I would note

8-43 .45 .27

that Mr. Dick Connors is available to answer any 1 questions concerning the Jefferson request. 2 MS. WIEST: Any objection to the exhibits? 3 If not, they've been admitted. Any questions 4 concerning this docket? 5 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 6 7 for toll control in TC97-093 for one year. COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 8 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 9 MS. WIEST: TC97-094. 10 MR. COIT: We'd move for the admission of 11 Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request dated 6-19-97, 12 and move for the admission of Exhibit No. 2, which is 13 the response to data request dated 10-15-97. 14 15 MS. WIEST: Any objection to Exhibits 1 and 27 If not, those exhibits have been admitted. Do you 16 17 have any witnesses for this one? MR. COIT: Mr. Lee is available for both 18 19 Sully Buttes and Venture. MS. WIEST: I just had a question, I guess, 20 concerning single party service because in this one it 21 does say should facilities not allow immediate single 22 party service, Sully Buttes may offer multi-party 23 service until the facilities are restored or installed 24 25 to allow for single party service. Has that occurred

1	in the past?
2	A. Currently Sully Buttes Telephone has no
3	multi-line. The fact is all single party service. I
4	think they added that language such that if there were
5	a disaster that they had to respond to, they wanted to
6	reserve the right to offer party line under the
7	emergency basis only. But they have for a number of
8	years been all single party service.
9	MS. WIEST: Any other questions?
10	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver
11	on toll control for TC97-094 for one year.
12	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it.
13	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Well, I'll
14	concur.
15	MS. WIEST: TC97-095.
16	MR. COIT: We would move for the admission of
17	ETC, Exhibit No. 1, dated 6-19-97, and admission of
18	Exhibit No. 2, response to data request dated
19	10-15-97. I would point out that I believe that there
20	might be an issue with respect to single party service
21	waiver in this case as well.
22	MS. WIEST: Right. At this time are there
23	any objections to Exhibit 1 and 2? If not, they've
24	been admitted. Yes. And it would appear they would
25	need a waiver. And my question for apparently they

•

have three multi-party customers and they plan to 1 install single party service during the 1988 2 construction season. So I guess my question is 3 apparently they haven't asked for a waiver. Are you 4 doing so at this time? 5 MR. COIT: Yes, we would on their behalf. 6 7 And I think Mr. Lee would be able to respond to 8 questions on that. I assume so anyway. MR. LEE: Sure. But that would be correct, .9 we do need a waiver. The same June 1 date would be 10 11 acceptable to us. MS. WIEST: June 1, okay. 12 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 13 in single party service to June 1, 1998, in TC97-095. 14 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I would second that. 15 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Sure, 1'11 16 17 concur. CHAIRMAN BURG: And I'll also move that we 18 19 grant a waiver for toll control on TC97-095 for one 20 year. COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 21 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 22 MS. WIEST: TC97-096. 23 MR. COIT: I move for the admission of ETC 24 25 request, Exhibit No. 1, dated 6-19-97, and move for the

41 admission of Exhibit No. 2, response to data request 1 dated 10-10-97. 2 MS. WIEST: Any objections? If not, they've 3 been admitted. Any questions concerning this docket? 4 5 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver on toll control in TC97-096 for one year. 6 7 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 8 9 MS. WIEST: TC97-097. MR. COIT: We move for the admission of 10 Exhibit No. 1, ETC request, dated 6-19-97, and Exhibit 11 No. 2, response to data request date 10-10-97. 12 13 MS. WIEST: Any objections? If not, they've been admitted. Does anybody have any questions 14 15 concerning this docket? CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 16 for toll control in TC97-097 for one year. 17 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 18 19 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 20 MS. WIEST: TC97-098. 21 MR. COIT: We move for the admission of ETC request dated 6-19-97, which is marked Exhibit No. 1, 22 and admission of Exhibit No. 2, which is the response 23 to data request dated 10-14-97. 24 MS. WIEST: Any objection to Exhibits 1 and 25

8143.45.29

2? If not, they've been admitted. Are there any 1 questions concerning this docket? 2 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move that we grant a 3 waiver for toll control in TC97-098 for one year. 4 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 5 6 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. MS. WIEST: TC97-099. 7 MR. COIT: We move for the admission of 8 Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC dated 6-19-97, and 9 admission of Exhibit No. 2, which is the response to 10 data request dated 10-9-97. 11 12 MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, they've 13 been admitted. I have the same question on this one. 14 The question is do we have single party service, and 15 the answer is yes? MR. COIT: Mr. Lee, are you here for Roberts 16 17 County or not? MR. LEE: No. 18 MR. COIT: Then we probably need to handle 19 20 that, I suppose, by the affidavit. MS. WIEST: Okay. 21 MR. LEE: Rich, are we talking about Roberts 22 23 County or --24 MR. COIT: Roberts County. MR. LEE: I know from another source other 25

1	than this that as manager of the South Dakota
2	Association of Telephone Co-ops and the daily requests
3	we've had there that they do, in fact, provide all
4	single party service throughout Roberts County Co-op,
5	if that will suffice for your information here.
6	MS. WIEST: Is that sufficient?
7	MS. CREMER: That's sufficient.
8	MS. WIEST: Okay.
9	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver
10	for toll control in TC97-099 for one year.
11	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it.
12	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
13	MS. WIEST: TC97-100.
14	MR. COIT: We move for the admission of
15	Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request dated 6-19-97,
16	and admission of Exhibit No. 2, response to data
17	request dated 10-9-97.
18	MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, they've
19	been admitted. Same question on this one.
20	MR. LEE: I don't know the answer.
21	MR. COIT: There is Mr. Lee is not here
22	representing RC Communications today, so I suspect
23	we'll have to deal with that with a late-filed exhibit
24	if that's okay.
25	MS. WIEST: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 1 for toll control in TC97-100 for one year. 2 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 3 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 4 MS. WIEST: TC97-101. 5 6 MR. COIT: We move for the admission of Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request dated 6-19-97, 7 8 and Exhibit No. 2, response to staff data request dated 10-14-97. 9 MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, they've 10 been admitted. Any questions concerning this docket? 11 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant waiver for 12 toll control in TC97-101 for one year. 13 14 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 15 16 MS. WIEST: TC97-102. MR. COIT: We move for the admission of 17 Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC dated 6-19-97, and 18 Exhibit No. 2, which is a response to data request 19 20 dated 10-14-97. 21 MS. WIEST: Any objections? If not, 1 and 2 have been admitted. Any questions concerning this 22 23 docket? CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 24 for toll control in TC97-102 for one year. 25

45 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 1 2 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 3 MS. WIEST: TC97-105. MR. COIT: We move for the admission of ETC 4 request, Exhibit No. 1, dated 6-19-97, and admission of 5 6 Exhibit No. 2, response to data request dated 10-14-97. 7 MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, Exhibits R 1 and 2 have been admitted. Any questions concerning this docket? 9 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 10 for toll control in TC97-105 for one year. 11 12 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 13 MS. WIEST: TC97-108. 14 MR. COIT: We move for the admission of ETC 15 16 request, Exhibit No. 1, dated 6-23-97, and the admission of Exhibit No. 2, response to staff data 17 request dated 10-14-97. 18 M3. WIEST: Any objection? If not, Exhibits 19 1 and 2 have been admitted. Same question. Can you, 20 Mr. Lee, answer that one? Is that single party service 21 22 available for --23 MR. COIT: For Faith. MR. LEE: I do not represent them, I'm sorry. 24 MR. COIT: We would request permission to 25

014N .45 .N-

provide that via affidavit. 1 MS. WIEST: Okay. 2 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 3 for toll control in TC97-108 for one year. 4 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 5 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 6 MS. WIEST: TC97-113. 7 MR. COIT: We move for the admission of 8 9 Exhibit No. 1, ETC request dated 6-25-97, and Exhibit No. 2, response to data requests dated 10-9-97. 10 11 MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, they've 12 been admitted. I have the same question on this one. MR. COIT: This is Armour. Bill Haugen can 13 14 respond to your question. 15 MR. HAUGEN: Yes, I can answer that. BILL HAUGEN, JR., 16 called as a witness, being first duly sworn, 17 was examined and testified as follows: 18 19 EXAMINATION 20 MR. HAUGEN: Good afternoon. 21 MS. WIEST: And I would just like to ask you if you currently provide single party service to all of 22 23 your customers in your area. MR. HAUGEN: Single party service is 24 available to all of our customers in Armour Independent 25

47 Telephone Company service area. It has been since the 1 late seventies. 2 MS. WIEST: Are there any others questions of 3 this witness? Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 5 for toll control in TC97-113 for one year. 6 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second. 7 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 8 9 MS. WIEST: TC97-114. MR. COIT: We move for the admission of ETC 10 request of the Bridgewater-Canistota Telephone Company, 11 which is dated 6-25-97, that's Exhibit No. 1. And also 12 move for the admission of Exhibit No. 2, which is 13 response to data requests of staff dated 10-9-97. And 14 Mr. Haugen is here as well to respond to any questions 15 in this docket. 16 MS. WIEST: First of all, any objection to 17 Exhibits 1 and 2? If not, they've been admitted. And 18 I would ask the same question. 19 20 MR. HAUGEN: Single party service is 21 available to all the customers in the Bridgewater-Canistota Exchanges. 22 MS. WIEST: Thank you. Any other questions 23 24 of this witness? CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 25

	48
1	for toll control in TC97-114 for one year.
2	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it.
3	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
4	MS. WIEST: TC97-115.
5	MR. COIT: We would move the admission of
6	Exhibit No. 1, the ETC request of Union Telephone
7	Company, dated 6-25-97, and Exhibit No. 2, response to
8	data request which is dated 10-9-97.
9	MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, Exhibits
10	1 and 2 have been admitted. And I would ask the same
11	question in this docket.
12	MR. HAUGEN: Single party service is
13	available to all the customers in the Union Telephone
14	Company service area, Hartford and Wall Lake Exchanges,
15	again, has been since late seventies.
16	MS. WIEST: Thank you. Any other questions
17	of this witness?
18	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver
19	for toll restriction in TC97-115 for one year.
20	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it.
21	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
22	MS. WIEST: Thank you. TC97-117.
23	MR. COIT: We move for the admission of
24	Exhibit No. 1, ETC request dated 6-30-97, and Exhibit
25	No. 2, response to data request dated 10-14-97.

MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, Exhibits 1 2 1 and 2 have been admitted. Any guestions concerning 3 this docket? CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 4 for toll control in TC97-117 for one year. 5 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 6 7 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. MS. WIEST: TC97-121. 8 9 MR. COIT: We move for the admission of Exhibit No. 1, the ETC request of Kadoka, dated 7-3-97, 10 and the admission of Exhibit No. 2, response to data 11 12 requests dated 10-28-97. MS. WIEST: Any objections to Exhibits 1 and 13 14 2? If not, they've been admitted. Any questions 15 concerning this docket? CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 16 for toll control in TC97-121 for one year. 17 18 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'll second it. 19 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 20 MS. WIEST: TC97-125. MR. COIT: We'd move for the admission of ETC 21 request, Exhibit No. 1, dated 7-7-97, and Exhibit No. 22 2, response to data request of staff, which is dated 23 24 10-29-97. MS. WIEST: Any objection to Exhibits 1 and 25

2? If not, they've been admitted. Any questions 1 concerning this docket? 2 CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 3 for toll control in TC97-125 for one year. 4 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it. 5 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 6 MS. WIEST: TC97-130. 7 MR. COIT: We would move for the admission of 8 Exhibit No. 1, the ETC request dated 7-10-97, and 9 Exhibit No. 2, the response to data request dated 10 11 10-14-97. MS. WIEST: Any objection to Exhibits 1 and 12 If not, they've been admitted. Any questions 13 2? 14 concerning this docket? CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver 15 for toll control in TC97-130 for one year. 16 17 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I would second it. 18 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur. 19 MS. WIEST: TC97-131. 20 MR. COIT: We would move the admission of ETC request Exhibit No. 1, which is dated 7-10-97, and 21 Exhibit No. 2, response to data request dated 10-14-97. 22 MS. WIEST: Any objection to Exhibits 1 and 23 2? If not, they've been admitted. Any questions 24 25 concerning this docket?

	51
1	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver
2	for toll control in TC97-131 for one year.
3	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it.
4	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
5	MS. WIEST: TC97-154.
6	MR. COIT: We would move into the record
7	Exhibit No. 1, the ETC request, dated 9-10-97, and also
8	Exhibit No. 2, the response to data request dated
9	10-16-97.
10	MS. WIEST: Any objection to Exhibit 1 and
11	2? If not, they have been admitted. Let's see, on
12	this one this was one of a couple that no time period
13	was requested for the waiver. I assume you still want
14	the one year?
15	MR. COIT: Mr. Barfield is here. He could
16	respond. He's Mr. Bob Barfield, manager for West
17	River.
18	MS. WIEST: They request a waiver but this is
19	one of the few ones that didn't ask for one year, as
20	far as I can see, or any time period. So I was
21	wondering if there was any different time period that
22	was being requested.
23	BOB BARFIELD,
24	called as a witness, being first duly sworn,
25	was examined and testified as follows:

	52
1	EXAMINATION
2	MR. BARFIELD: In response to your question,
3	since the vendor does not have a date, as far as we
4	know, at this time to provide this, that's the reason
5	we didn't ask for a certain time period on the waiver.
6	MS. WIEST: But we will need a time period.
7	MR. COIT: Would you be willing to accept the
8	one-year time period that is being granted to other
9	companies?
10	MR. BARFIELD: We sure would.
11	CHAIRMAN BURG: And I think the thought
12	behind it is if there still isn't any solution, then it
13	would be renewed or we'd request. With that, I'll move
14	that we grant a waiver for toll control in TC97-154 for
15	one year.
16	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I would second it.
17	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
18	MS. WIEST: Let's go to TC97-155.
19	MR. COIT: We would request admission of
20	Exhibit No. 1, which is the ETC request of Mobridge
21	Telecommunications, which is dated 9-10-97, and also
22	Exhibit No. 2, which is the response to data request
23	dated 10-16-97.
24	MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, Exhibits
25	1 and 2 have been admitted. And I would have the same

	53
1	question with respect to the length of the waiver.
2	MR. BARFIELD: And the response would be the
3	same. We would ask for a year on the waiver.
4	MS. WIEST: Thank you. Any other questions?
5	CHAIRMAN BURG: With that I'll move that we
6	grant a waiver on toll control in TC97-155 for one
7	year.
8	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second it.
9	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I concur.
10	MS. WIEST: Thank you. Let's skip to
11	TC97-167.
12	MR. COIT: I would just note that Three River
13	Telco is not an SDITC member compan', so I'm not really
14	here today to represent Three River Telco.
15	MS. WIEST: Nobody is here?
16	CHAIRMAN BURG: Do we have any questions on
17	it, or do we have to have representation?
18	MS. WIEST: Somebody needs to move it in.
19	MR. COIT: Well, if you're looking for a
20	body, I guess I can serve as the body.
21	MS. CREMER: Otherwise, I can move to admit
22	the two exhibits, Number 1, 10-10-97, the request for
23	ETC, and 11-7-97, the amended oh, I'm sorry, that's
24	U S West. Let me try that again. 10-16 of '97 is the
25	request and 11-13-97 is the amended request, and I

	54
1	would ask that they be admitted in.
2	MS. WIEST: Any objection? If not, they've
3	been admitted. Are there any questions concerning this
4	docket? I would note that their application does
5	request a waiver for one period for toll control.
6	CHAIRMAN BURG: There isn't a question on the
7	single party line, though, is there?
8	MS. WIEST: No.
9	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move we grant a waiver
10	for toll control in TC97-167 for one year.
11	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'd second.
12	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Concur.
13	MS. WIEST: At this time did you want to go
14	to U S West, or is Harlan going to speak to these
15	dockets?
16	MS. CREMER: We'll finish up these first.
17	MS. WIEST: Okay.
18	(STAFF'S EXHIBIT NO. 1 WAS MARKED FOR
19	IDENTIFICATION.)
20	HARLAN BEST,
21	called as a witness, being first duly sworn,
22	was examined and testified as follows:
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. HOSECK:
25	Q. Would you state your name for the record,

	55
1	please.
2	A. Harlan Best.
3	Q. And what is your job?
4	A. I am deputy director of fixed utilities for
5	the Public Utilities Commission, South Dakota.
6	Q. And have you been present in the hearing room
7	this afternoon for the hearing on these applications?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And have you had the opportunity to review
10	the caption in the notice of this hearing which lists
11	the cases which are before the Commission on this date?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And are you familiar with the applications in
14	each of these cases?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. As a part of your job, have you reviewed
17	those applications?
18	A. Yes, I have.
19	Q. You have before you an exhibit numbered
20	Staff's No. 1; is that correct?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And is that an exhibit that you prepared in
23	the course of your duties?
24	A. Yes, it is.
25	Q. Just briefly explain to the Commission,

9140 . MA . WALD

	56
1	please, what that exhibit entails.
2	A. What I have done on this exhibit is across
3	the top is listed each of the companies requesting
4	eligible telecommunications carrier status, the
5	associated docket number, and the staff counsel that is
6	assigned to the respective dockets. Down the side, the
7	left-hand side, is the requirements that are set forth
8	for ETC status. Populated within the columns is the
9	responses that the respective companies gave within
10	their exhibits 1 and Exhibit 2 that have been admitted
11	into the record.
12	Q. And are there any changes or corrections to
13	this exhibit that you would like to make at this time?
14	A. One that I am aware of is under Vivian
15	Telephone, Docket TC97-068, under the Lifeline and Link
16	Up it shows that it will be available 1-1-97. It
17	should be 1-1-98. I'm not aware of any other
18	corrections.
19	MR. HOSECK: Okay. At this point in time I
20	would move Staff's Exhibit No. 1 into evidence. This
21	is intended as testimony for all of the dockets en mass
22	with the exception of U S West.
23	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: U S West is on
24	here though.
25	MR. HOSECK: That would be handled later.

	57
1	MS. WIEST: Is there any objection?
2	MR. COIT: My comment would be that I just
3	received this so I haven't had an opportunity to go
4	through to make sure this is all accurate. I guess I
5	can take Mr. Best's word that it is accurate and I'll
6	have to do that, I guess. Other than that, I don't
7	have any comment.
8	MS. WIEST: Do you want an opportunity to
9	look it over?
10	MR. COIT: Well, it might take me a while, so
11	I don't have any objection.
12	MS. WIEST: Okay. Then Staff Exhibit No. 1
13	will be admitted into all of the dockets that we have
14	gone through so far.
15	MR. HOSECK: Okay. Thank you.
16	Q. Based on the review of these dockets that you
17	have done and relying to whatever extent you may on
18	Staff's Exhibit No. 1, did the applicant companies meet
19	the requirements of becoming an eligible
20	telecommunications carrier?
21	A. Yes, they have, with the noted late-filed
22	affidavits that will be done in a number of the
23	dockets.
24	Q. And with regard to advertising services
25	exchange-wide, do you have a recommendation to the

	58
1	Commission for a provision to be included in an order
2	which would come out of these proceedings?
3	A. Yes. Staff's recommendation for advertising
4	would be that the ETC carrier be required to advertise
5	at least once each year; and if they have any rate
6	change, that that rate change be advertised when it
7	does change.
8	Q. And in conclusion, do you have an opinion as
9	to whether or not the applicants contained on Exhibit
10	1, with the exception of U S West which has not had its
11	case heard yet at this time, whether or not those
12	applicants meet the qualifications as an eligible
13	telecommunications carrier?
14	A. With staff's review that has been undertaken,
15	yes, they do meet the requirements for ETC status.
16	MR. HOSECK: I have no further questions of
17	this witness.
18	MS. WIEST: Are there any questions of this
19	witness? Mr. Coit?
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. COIT:
22	Q. I assume when you talked about advertising
23	rate changes that you're referencing the rates just for
24	the essential services that are supported by universal
25	service?
	a service of the day of the service

	59
1	A. Yes.
2	MR. COIT: No further questions.
3	MS. WIEST: Ms. Rogers?
4	MS. ROGERS: No, no questions.
5	MS. WIEST: Mr. Heaston?
6	MR. HEASTON: No.
7	CHAIRMAN BURG: The only question I'd have is
8	there any is advertising identified in any way? Is
9	there any criteria for what advertising means in the
10	context of this? Is the methods in the FCC Order as
11	well?
12	MS. WIEST: I'm sorry, what was the
13	question?
14	CHAIRMAN BURG: The question I had for Harlan
15	or anybody else is, is there a meaning, is there a
16	description, definition for advertising, what that
17	constitutes?
18	MS. WIEST: Under the statute itself
19	214(e)(1)(B) they must advertise the availability of
20	such services and if you're referring to the services
21	that are supported by federal universal service and the
22	charges therefore using media of general distribution.
23	CHAIRMAN BURG: Okay. I think that satisfies
24	me.
25	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Does that mean for

1	Lifeline and Link Up, they have to advertise this
2	once?
3	MS. WIEST: That would be under staff's
4	recommendation, I believe.
5	A. Yes, once each year.
6	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, frankly, I don't
7	think it's adequate.
8	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Are you doing
9	that? Are you to follow up excuse me, to follow
10	up on Commissioner Nelson's question, are you
11	recommending that they advertise once each year after?
12	I believe our order said that you have to send an
13	application to everyone once initially and then to
14	every new customer. You're requesting this
15	advertisement of Lifeline, Link Up in addition to,
16	would that be accurate or not?
17	A. Right. The Lifeline, Link Up under TC97-150,
18	which was issued yesterday, states that it shall be
19	a form shall be, or a letter shall be sent to present
2.0	customers, and then this would be an advertisement of
21	it. They'd have to do advertisement of this for at
22	least once each year.
23	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Okay. Thank you.
24	COMMISSIONER NELSON: So is the answer to
25	Laska's questions it's in addition to?

A. Yes. They would do it originally, and once a 1 year after. 2 MS. WIEST: How would they advertise? 3 Where? 4 A. Where would they advertise? 5 MS. WIEST: Yes. 6 7 A. Whatever general distribution it meets according, I assume, it means newspapers and those 8 9 types of publications. 10 MS. WIEST: So it could be my type of general distribution media once a year? 11 Whatever is available within their given 12 Α. exchanges that they serve. 13 MS. WIEST: And it would only be for those 14 15 services supported right now by federal universal 16 service? 17 A. Yes. 18 MS. WIEST: And every time they changed a rate for one of those services, then that would have to 19 be re-advertised at that time? 20 21 Α. Yes. MS. WIEST: Are there any other questions of 22 this witness? If not, thank you. Actually, I do. 23 Could you retake the stand, Harlan? I guess we have a 24 question for you. Could you look at your exhibit for 25

Venture Communications, TC97-095? 1 A. Yes. 2 MS. WIEST: Does the answer to number four, 3 single party service, we did grant them a waiver 4 5 because currently they do not have single party service apparently to three customers? 6 7 A. Yes. 8 MS. WIEST: So would that be incorrect there. your question there? 9 A. It would be a clarification there to it, yes. 10 MS. WIEST: Okay. Thank you. Do you have 11 12 anything further, Mr. Hoseck? 13 MR. HOSECK: Staff has nothing further. 14 Thank you. MS. WIEST: Do you want to take a short break 15 16 until we go to U S West? 17 MR. COIT: When does the Commission -- are 18 you going to wait until the end to rule on all of these 19 with respect to the actual ETC designation? MS. WIEST: That's why we're taking a short 20 21 break. (AT THIS TIME A SHORT RECESS WAS TAKEN.) 22 23 MS. WIEST: Let's get started again. And we 24 will go to TC97-163. 25 MR. HEASTON: And I would move admission of

	63
1	Exhibit 1, which is the request, and Exhibit 2, which
2	is the amended request, and Exhibit 3, which is the
3	service territory map. That's Exhibit 1, 2 and 3
4	respectively in the docket.
5	MS. WIEST: Any objection to Exhibits 1, 2
6	and 3? Do you have a copy of the service territory
7	map? Are there any objections to Exhibits 1, 2 and 3?
8	If not, they've been admitted. You may proceed,
9	Mr. Heaston.
10	MR. HEASTON: We would also join in the
11	motion on the toll control. The reason we did not seek
12	a waiver in the initial application is because as I
13	read Paragraph 388 of the Order in the DA 97-157
14	indicated that toll blocking would be sufficient in the
15	meantime and it was dependent upon when you upgraded
16	switches. And so we do not feel we need a waiver of
17	toll control, but the common wisdom seems to be there
18	needs to be a waiver, so we will follow the herd here
19	and request the toll control waiver also.
20	And we are also one of the parties to the
21	request of the FCC to reconsider the toll limitation,
22	that this includes both toll blocking and toll
23	control. And I guess we would also point out that with
24	the implementation of number portability that is going
25	to impact toll control somewhat significantly. And so

3045 45 45

	64
1	while we agree with Bob Barfield in his observation
2	that since we don't know when it's going to happen,
3	that's why we wouldn't want a time limit on it, but we
4	are willing to accept the one year with the
5	understanding that if there is not the ability to
6	implement it or if the ability is too expensive to
7	implement, that we would be able to come back to this
8	Commission and seek further waiver of that, of
9	implementing toll control with part of the essential
10	telecommunications carrier obligation.
11	MS. WIEST: Okay. Would the Commissioners
12	CHAIRMAN BURG: Did we admit the exhibits?
13	MS. WIEST: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'll move that we waive toll
15	control for TC97-163 for one year.
16	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, I'm going to
17	second it, but I heard an expansion of what we've been
18	waiving in the past from giving them one year with the
19	idea we're going to renew it. And the reason I was
20	willing to grant it is because technology is not out
21	there. Now, the Act requires that it be there and it
22	didn't say anything about how much it cost. So I
23	didn't hear anything about one of the reasons we were
24	waiving it in the past was because that it might be
25	cost prohibitive as much as because technology wasn't

there. I can understand why technology wasn't there, 1 but I didn't -- I wasn't in Congress when they voted 2 that was part of the Act. 3 MR. HEASTON: It's not part of the Act. I 4 5 guess that's the first thing. It's an FCC --COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's a rule. 6 7 MR. HEASTON: It's an FCC dictate. COMMISSIONER NELSON: But it has the same 8 weight as the rules and statute unless it's changed in 9 10 court; right? 11 MR. HEASTON: That's true. But unless the 12 FCC changes, as we've urged them to 'o. 13 COMMISSIONER NELSON: Right. So I'm 14 seconding your motion with the understanding it's 15 exactly as we had stated it originally; is that 16 correct? 17 (HAIRMAN BURG: I mean the motion was for one 18 year. 19 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I believe the motion was for one year, a waiver for one year, and I 20 didn't know that the motion had anything more than 21 22 that, than just a waiver from toll control for one 23 year. 24 CHAIRMAN BURG: It doesn't. 25 COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Then I'll concur

1 2	COMMISSIONER NELSON: All I'm saying, though,
2	
-	is I voted for it and there will be a record that I
3	voted for it; and the reason I voted for it was the
4	technology wasn't available. And that's a lot
5	different in my mind than it's cost prohibitive.
6	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I think
7	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Not that that wouldn't
8	be an issue in my mind that you could debate. I don't
9	want a record that I'm supporting something for a
10	different reason than I did.
11	CHAIRMAN BURG: Just a comment that I'd make
12	on it, I guess. If there isn't a technology, I really
13	hate to see all 50 or 75 filings just for an
14	extension. If there is some way we could certify there
15	is no technology and extend it as we come up towards
16	that year, I'd welcome that solution rather than go
17	through this with this many of them. I, personally, in
18	my own mind, cannot see a solution when we're going to
19	have multiple companies in number portability. It
20	boggles my mind to see how that's even going to happen
21	that you could end up with any kind of toll
22	limitation. So I'm guessing when we come up to the
23	year, we're still not going to have a solution, and I'm
24	not looking toward to requiring all of you I mean
25	that's the name of a bureaucrat to file that many

1	pieces of paper. So if we can find a way to
2	consolidate it at that time, I would welcome any
3	suggestions. That's all I have.
4	MR. HEASTON: I have Mr. Lehner available
5	here, and we do have a couple questions to ask him.
6	JON LEHNER,
7	called as a witness, being first duly sworn,
8	was examined and testified as follows:
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. HEASTON:
11	Q. Mr. Lehner, in our application we described
12	the issue of eliminating multi-party services and going
13	to single party service throughout U S West service
14	areas. Can you update the Commission on the status of
15	that consistent with what we've already put in the
16	application?
17	A. Yes. As of October 31 of this year the
18	number of multi-party or two- and four-party customers
19	in U S West's territory is 612. 612.
20	CHAIRMAN BURG: What was the date on that,
21	Jon?
22	A. As of 10-31-97.
23	Q. And what can you tell the Commission about
24	our continuing effort to eliminate the multi-party
25	service?

A. The plan right now is to eliminate all of 1 those 612 except for 52 of them. And the time frame 2 for that will be by the end of the second quarter, 3 which I suppose we could put for a date of 6-30 of 4 '98. So all but 52 of those will be completed by 6-30 5 of '98. 6 Q. And what about the remaining 52? 7 A. The remaining 52 are extremely high cost 8 upgrades. And until other technology or other means. 9 become available, there are no plans right now. We 10 have no plans to move ahead with those 52. 11 Q. With that we still believe that it is 12 appropriate for us to -- we still believe the waiver is 13 appropriate in this case; is that correct? 14 15 A. That is correct. MR. HEASTON: That's all the questions I 16 17 have. 18 MS. WIEST: Ms. Cremer? 1.9 CROSS-EXAMINATION 20 BY MS. CREMER: Q. Mr. Lehner, where are those 52 located? Are 21 they spread throughout, or are they in a specific area, 22 23 do you know? A. I could read them off for you. There's about 24 a dozen exchanges. Or I could give you a late-filed 25

	69
1	exhibit. Let me just read them off. Arlington is
2	four; Belle Fourche, six; De Smet, four; Huron, three;
3	Lake Preston, one.
4	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Do you want to start
5	over?
6	A. Arlington, four; Belle Fourche, six; De Smet,
7	four; Huron, three; Lake Preston, one; Madison, two;
8	Milbank, four; Pierre, two; Redfield, two; Sisseton,
9	six; Spearfish, two; Volga, five; Watertown, ten;
10	Yankton, one.
11	Q. Is there a particular reason? Is it like
12	Anaconda line or something?
13	A. It's a combination of many factors, but you
14	mean as far as the 52 are concerned?
15	Q. Yes.
16	A. It's a combination of many factors. We're
17	talking about feeder distribution, we're talking about
18	in some cases a PAIR GAIN systems like Anaconda that
19	would need to be replaced.
20	MS. CREMER: Okay. That's all the questions
21	I have.
22	CHAIRMAN BURG: Have you investigated any
23	other technical solutions other than to a single party
24	other than line extension?
25	A. You mean in order to provide a single party

1	service to these customers?
2	CHAIRMAN BURG: Yes.
3	A. Yes. I think the answer is we are constantly
4	looking for a cheaper way to do this because in some
5	cases, Commissioner, we're talking about over \$100,000
6	to upgrade a single customer, and it just doesn't make
7	sense to do that. And the answer would seem to lie
8	probably in some form of wireless, but so far the
9	wireless technologies, whether then satellite or fixed
0	wireless, are still pretty expensive. I see that as
11	the ultimate solution, though, to some of these.
2	CHAIRMAN BURG: I'm going to move to grant
13	the waiver.
4	MS. WIEST: Just a second. Do the
.5	Commissioners have any other questions? As opposed to
6	the other ones, I'm going to have to ask you some
7	questions to verify things that were in the application
8	because that was signed by Mr. Heaston. It wasn't
9	signed by a witness with an affidavit, as all the
20	others were. So bear with me for a second.
21	A. I've never trusted his signature either.
22	MS. WIEST: First one, does U S West provide
3	voice grade access to the public switched network to
4	all in its service area?
5	A. Yes.

MS. WIEST: And does it provide local usage? 1 2 A. Yes. MS. WIEST: Do you provide dual tone 3 multi-frequency signalling or its functional 4 equivalent? 5 6 A. Yes. 7 MS. WIEST: Do you provide access to your 8 emergency services? 9 A . Yes. 10 MS. WIEST: Do you provide access to operator 11 services? 12 Α. Yes. MS. WIEST: Do you provide access to 13 14 interexchange service? Α. 15 Yes. MS. WIEST: And do you provide access to 16 17 directory assistance? 18 Α. Yes. MS. WIEST: And you've already talked about 19 toll control and the waiver. Do you provide or are you 20 able to provide toll blocking? 21 22 A. Yes. MS. WIEST: Then getting back to your request 23 for the waiver on single party service, I know in your 24 application you talked about the ones that you have no 25

	72
1	plans, you know, of providing service due to the cost
2	and everything. My problem, I guess, is that I don't
3	see that there is any de minimus exception within the
4	FCC rules with respect to single party service. Have
5	you been granted any of this type of de minimus
6	exception to that requirement, do you know, in any of
7	the other states?
8	A. I am not aware.
9	MS. WIEST: And what I'm getting at is that
10	it appears, according to the FCC rules and I'm
11	looking at 47 54.101(c), that in order to grant any
12	additional time to complete network upgrades for single
13	party or enhanced 911 or toll limitation, that the
14	Commission does in fact have to set a time period for
15	you to complete those network upgrades. Is your
16	contention that we do not?
17	A. I would not make that contention. I'm going
18	to let my attorney argue with you about that.
19	MS. WIEST: Well, then, I do have a couple
2.0	other questions. My other question is on service
21	area. And it is also a requirement of the state
22	Commission to designate service areas as opposed to
23	study areas for nonrural telecommunications companies.
24	First of all, you would agree that you are a nonrural
25	telecommunications company?

1	A. Yes.
2	MS. WIEST: And in the FCC's public notice
3	96-45 issued 9-29-97, it does state that we must send
4	to USAC the names of the ETC's and the designated
5	service areas for nonrural carriers no later than
6	December 31st, 1997. And I know you made some
7	reference to these things in your application, but I
8	don't think you really told us what you want your
9	service area to be. Because the FCC has told us that
10	we better not adopt your study area as your service
11	area for large ILEC's. Do you have service areas for
12	your company that you want the Commission to adopt at
13	this time?
14	A. Well, I suppose that and, Bill, jump in
15	here, I guess, to help me with this. But I suppose
16	that our service area ought to be our exchanges in the
17	state of South Dakota. Now, the study area is a
18	different issue and that has not been determined yet.
19	But I would think that our service area would be our
20	exchanges that we serve in the state of South Dakota.
21	MR. HEASTON: If I may from a legal
22	standpoint, there is no definition yet; and certainly
23	our service area would be those areas within which we
24	are authorized to provide the supported services.
25	MS. WIEST: Right. And that's my question.

1	MR. HEASTON: From a general perspective, I
2	guess, if that's what you're looking for is what you
3	would designate to the FCC would not be anything
4	outside the area where we're authorized or certified to
5	provide service. When it comes to where the areas are
6	going to be that would be where the services would be
7	supported by a universal service fund, whether it's
8	high cost or low income or libraries or whatever it
9	happens to be, you know, that's an area that's
10	currently under debate depending upon which proxy cost
11	model is going to be accepted. And so that's why we
12	are somewhat vague on that term because what this
13	Commission has not done and nor has the FCC come out
14	with any final decision as to what model it is going to
15	accept. So I think if we're required to take a look at
16	a "service area," I would do it from the standpoint of
17	what Jon to comply with the law. If that's what
18	we're looking for, to comply with the FCC requirement.
19	I think that's what we would look at is an area,
20	though, no larger than an exchange area, which we would
21	equate to a wire center or an exchange area. And we
22	have however many are on that.
23	MS. WIEST: He how many exchanges do you
24	still have?
25	MR. HEASTON: It's on the list we submitted.

75 I can't answer that exactly. It's 1 A . approximately 35. 2 MS. WIEST: It would be attached? 3 4 MR. HEASTON: It's on our exhibit to our 5 application. MS. WIEST: So however many with the 6 amendment the three that were missed. That's how many 7 service areas you would like the Commission to 8 designate for U S West at this time? 9 A. I guess I'm not sure whether we would want to 10 11 designate each exchange. MS. WIEST: My problem is we are supposed to 12 tell the FCC by December 31st what your designated 13 service area is. 14 A. Then I suppose we ought to do it exchange by 15 16 exchange. 17 MS. WIEST: If you want more time to think 18 about it --MR. HEASTON: Yes, I think I would. I mean 19 this is not something that's come up in the other two 20 states that I've done this in, and I had the same basic 21 application. I will have to -- I will do a late-filed 22 exhibit on that if I could with an affidavit from Jon. 23 24 MS. WIEST: Okay. 25 MR. HEASTON: What are you relying on again,

Rolayne? 1 MS. WIEST: Actually what as far as the FCC's 2 public notice, that was docket 96-45 DA 97-1892 issued 3 4 9-29-97. MR. HEASTON: 1892. 5 MS. WIEST: And I'm also relying on 6 paragraphs 185, 192, 193 of the FCC's universal service 7 order. 8 MR. HEASTON: 197, 175. 9 MS. WIEST: 157 or --10 11 MS. CREMER: 185, 192. MS. WIEST: The docket number for the FCC 12 universal service. 13 MR. HEASTON: Not the docket number but the 14 order number, the order number. 15 MS. WIEST: Okay. I was looking at 185, 192 16 and paragraph --17 MR. HEASTON: I got those. Was it FCC 18 97-157? 19 MS. WIEST: 157, right. And the other thing 20 you might want to address in paragraph 185, for 21 example, it does say if a state PUC adopts its existing 22 service areas for large ILEC's, their study area, this 23 would erect significant barriers to entry. We are also 24 25 encouraged to consider designating service areas that

	77
1	require an ILEC to serve areas other than they have not
2	traditionally served.
3	MR. HEASTON: Yes. And, see, this what
4	the problem this causes is where you have not
5	considered and have left to the FCC to determine how
6	that's going to be modeled from a proxy standpoint.
7	And, yes, we are advocating smaller geographic elements
8	than the wire center for universal high cost support
9	but I do not have a South Dakota specific look because
10	this Commission decided not to do their own earlier
11	this a couple months ago, as opposed to Wyoming and
12	North Dakota where I do have that because those two are
13	looking at doing their own, or suggesting their own
14	cost study. So I do have the small grids, as we call
15	it, and I could identify that for you. I cannot
16	identify anything smaller than right now than a wire
17	center.
18	MS. WIEST: Okay.
19	MR. COIT: Excuse me, may I comment briefly
20	on this? And I understand that I'm not a party but I
21	do believe it was my understanding today that the whole
22	issue of disaggregated service areas for U S West or
23	any other company may come up. But I would like to say
24	we certainly have an interest in the issue. And I
25	think that the FCC rules indicate that the orders

ŝ

1	and the rules indicate that before changing an existing
2	service area, that the Commission at the state level
3	needs to find that it's consistent with universal
4	service requirements. So I think it's a really
5	involved involves a lot more than the review of
6	actually looking at ETC service obligations. You're
7	talking about making changes in a U S West service area
8	that could significantly change the level of support it
9	might receive under a federal universal service fund.
.0	Decisions on U S West service area disaggregation and
1	so forth could certainly impact rural telephone
2	companies as well. And I guess going into this
3	proceeding it was our understanding that there are
4	certain established incumbent LEC service areas, and we
5	didn't understand, I guess, that we that the issue
. 6	in this U S West docket or any of the other ones would
7	be with regard to disaggregating service areas.
8	MS. WIEST: I'm not talking about
9	disaggregating service areas. And I think you have to
0 9	recognize the distinction that was made between
1	nonrurals and rural companies with respect to service
2	area. If we want to look at doing anything to rural
3	companies with respect to disaggregation, we have to
4	specifically petition the FCC. That's all I'm talking
15	about, and that's the reason why I only brought up this

	79
1	issue with respect to U S West. And it's just my
2	understanding the Commission does have to do the
3	service area in order for U S West to get your
4	universal service money.
5	MR. HEASTON: If I could have until whatever
6	date was suggested earlier on getting the additional
7	affidavits in, I'll have a recommendation for you from
8	U S West on that.
9	MS. WIEST: Okay. Are there any other
10	questions of this witness? One more question,
11	Mr. Lehner. Do you have any observation to what
12	Mr. Best suggested as advertising requirements for your
13	company?
14	A. I'm not sure that I understood exactly what
15	he was requiring. If the requirement is to advertise
16	it once a year in the newspaper, I don't think we have
17	a problem with that.
18	MS. WIEST: And getting back to single party
19	service is high cost, the only barrier is to provide
20	single party service to those 52 customers?
21	A. Yes.
22	MS. WIEST: Is it also U S West's position
23	that the settlement agreement that you've stated is
24	suspended concerning single party service no longer
25	applies where I believe you stated you would have
ALC: NOT THE REAL PROPERTY OF	

8-47 .45 .40

	80
1	single party service to all customers by the year 2000?
2	A. Had the 121 investment program continued, I
3	would have been out here talking to the staff and to
4	you about these anyway, because as we honed down to
5	some to the last few on some of these exchanges, it
6	became obvious that this was this is foolish to
7	spend that kind of money with the current technology.
8	Just doesn't make any sense.
9	MS. WIEST: That's all I have. Mr. Heaston,
10	you might also want to address the question of whether
11	the Commission has the authority to provide any de
12	minimus exception to the single party without putting
13	the time line on it.
14	MR. HEASTON: I don't know that de minimus is
15	the issue, but I do think that you could put a time
16	line on it and make it renewable that we would have to
17	come in. I think what the rule would allow you to do
18	is require us to come in on a regularly-scheduled
19	basis, maybe annually, maybe semi-annually, to update
20	the Commission of where we are technologywise in taking
21	care of these last 52. That would be my position on
22	this is that that puts a time limit on and it makes it
23	driven by the technology and the affordability of it.
24	MS. WIEST: Okay. Any other questions?
25	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I have a question

	01
1	of Mr. Lehner. And the reason I have a question is
2	because in your amended application you might have
3	addressed it, however, I don't have a copy of that and
4	I apologize. But you addressed in here and you have an
5	exhibit on your original application that regards
6	Lifeline, Link Up. And basically what it is it's your
7	tariff, or a page that looks like a tariff page to me.
8	Now, U S West really intends to comply with the
9	Commission order in Lifeline, Link Up?
10	A. Absolutely.
11	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: I need to know
12	that.
13	A. And that page doesn't apply any more.
14	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: Thank you.
15	MS. WIEST: Any other questions? Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I guess I have a
17	question. You know, you when you were talking about
18	why you shouldn't have to provide this single party
19	systems for these areas that you listed like Spearfish
20	and Pierre and all the list that you went through
21	A. Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Why would it it just
23	seems weird to me that it would be that expensive to
24	provide those services in some areas. Like Pierre and
25	Huron, those are pretty I mean can you explain that

1	to me a little bit because I find that a little odd.
2	A. The high cost we're talking about in many
3	cases, not only replacing, we're talking about
4	customers that were engineered probably back in the
5	sixties and seventies to multi-party service with no
6	intention of having single party service. So we're
7	talking in many cases miles and miles of distribution
8	cable, some cases six pair, 11 pair, maybe even greater
9	pair. So we're talking about now having to replace
10	that cable with probably 50 pair or a hundred pair
11	cable. And we're also talking about many cases where
12	at the end of that cable we have to extend what some
13	people will call a drop, what I call a pair of wires,
14	sometimes several miles. And in order to provide
15	single party service well, I take that back in that
16	case. The drop piece of that will be okay. I was
17	thinking of if they have more than one line. But we're
18	talking about distribution cable, we're talking about
19	feeder, and we're talking in some cases about PAIR GAIN
20	systems that are just plain full. I'm talking about
21	systems that you've heard like Anaconda that are going
22	to need to be replaced. It's expensive.
23	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I guess in my mind it
24	seems to me that cost prohibitive I didn't exactly
25	envision exactly what you were just explaining to me

because I was thinking maybe these lines had to be run 1 out miles and miles and miles and there's nobody out 2 there or something. But if this is in a fairly 3 populated area, and it doesn't seem to me that these 4 people should have to live with just two party 5 telephone system when most of the world doesn't, as we 6 know it in South Dakota, doesn't have to do that 7 because the lines are all filled up. I mean I'm 8 9 looking for some reason why that's acceptable, 10 especially when some of those little companies are 11 saying that they got maybe three or four people left 12 that they don't have that service for and they've made every effort to say, well, we want a waiver but we will 13 14 do it by the end of the year or whatever.

DU. UA. UA-D

A. I think that most of the companies you've 15 been listening to up until now -- and I obviously can't 16 speak for them, but I think you're talking about 17 engineering that was done probably 15, 20 years ago in 18 most of these companies' cases where they at the time 19 spent the money to do that. We did not do that. We 20 provided distribution systems that were literally 21 designed not to provide single party service. There 22 are different funding mechanisms and different 23 requirements that we've had. They've had the ability 24 to spend that kind of money and recover it. Now, I can 25

spend \$100,000 or \$150,000 or 50,000, whatever it is, to do these, but somewhere that has to be recovered and it isn't going to be recovered from a customer. That customer isn't going to pay for that.

5 COMMISSIONER NELSON: It seems to me this 6 flies in the face of what the governor's bill said last 7 year. I mean here we're talking making available high 8 technology to everybody in South Dakota. Basically 9 that's what the bill says. And we're talking here some 10 people that aren't even going to have single party 11 telecommunication in this state.

A. Commissioner, all I can tell you is what the cost is. And I think that's -- I think that's, unless there's a recovery mechanism, it would make no sense to spend that kind of money. And I certainly wouldn't recommend it.

17 CHAIRMAN BURG: The question I have in the LEC industry when we have these kind of situations once 18 19 in a while there's another provider that is closer that can do it. Would that be the case to any of these? 20 Would that be a reasonable solution ever? 21 A. Yes, it would. And, Commissioner, if there 22 is any company in this room that would like to serve 23 any of these 52, I would be happy to negotiate. 24 25 CHAIRMAN BURG: I think maybe when we're down

	85
1	to 52, we ought to get a list of those names and see if
2	we could work it out. I share what Counsel has said.
3	I'm not sure we can make the exception. I know that
4	U S West's counsel has given us what I call a short
5	term one, that in other words, we could give the waiver
6	for a limited period of time, but I don't know that's
7	an indefinite solution and we probably ought to work
8	look at working together to meet and find the solution
9	to meet the FCC rules I think if we can. But so many
10	maybe, I guess, what I would lik; to request is the
11	actual name and location of those 52 filed at some
12	time. I don't care whether it's part of this docket or
13	not.
14	A. I think that can be provided.
15	MS. WIEST: Any other questions? If not,
16	thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN BURG: I suppose we do need some
18	type of waiver in order to grant them an ETC status.
19	MS. WIEST: Sorry, for which now?
20	CHAIRMAN BURG: For single party.
21	MS. WIEST: At this time staff has a witness
22	on this case first.
23	MS. CREMER: Staff would call Harlan Best.
24	HARLAN BEST,
25	called as a witness, being previously sworn,

BLAD .40 .01

		86
1		was examined and testified as follows:
2		DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MS. CRE	MER:
4	Q.	Harlan, were you the analyst assigned to
5	TC97-163,	U S West's application?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	٥.	And have you reviewed that application by U S
8	West?	
9	Α.	Yes.
.0	۵.	And would you agree with Mr. Lehner when he
1	testified	earlier that they met all the requirements of
2	47 CFR 54-	101?
3	Α.	That they have met those?
4	۵.	Yes.
5	Α.	Yes, with the discussion that we've had on
6	single par	ty.
7	٥.	Right. Okay. And at your recommendation for
8	advertisin	g, would that be the same for U S West as it
9	was for th	e others?
0.5	Α.	Yes.
1	٥.	And what would your recommendation be for the
22	Commission	in defining a service area for U S West?
23	Α.	It would be the wire center.
4		MS. CREMER: That's all the questions I would
5	have.	

	87
1	MS. WIEST: Any questions, Ms. Wilka?
2	MS. WILKA: No questions.
3	MS. WIEST: Commissioners?
4	CHAIRMAN BURG: The question I'd have is
5	based on that, should we not I mean is this what
6	do I call it? Is this a document that is filed in
7	these hearings?
8	MS. CREMER: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN BURG: I guess I think we ought to
10	correct that exhibit to put no on each of those that
11	we've made a waiver for on the single party because I
12	believe the answer is no and we've made a waiver to
13	satisfy that.
14	MS. CREMER: Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN BURG: Since that's filed.
16	COMMISSIONER SCHOENFELDER: We have not moved
17	for a waiver in that area, have we?
18	CHAIRMAN BURG: Yes, for six months on one
19	other company.
20	MS. WIEST: We have two single party waivers
21	so far, but U S West we haven't moved yet; right?
22	CHAIRMAN BURG: But if we do and for any we
23	do, since he's a witness on the stand and this is his
24	document, I think that this document should be
25	corrected to reflect, no, they do not meet that to

coincide with the waivers we've given. 1 MS. CREMER: Okay. 2 CHAIRMAN BURG: I guess I don't know. 3 What do we need to do to make sure that correction is made? 4 MS. WIEST: I believe there are three 5 companies that do not at this time provide single party 6 service, so all they would have to do is change that 7 yes to no for those Stateline, Venture, and U S West; 8 9 right? CHAIRMAN BURG: And the testimony on the 10 record is adequate to accomplish that? 11 12 MS. WIEST: Yes. 13 CHAIRMAN BURG: Okay, That's all I 14 wondered. 15 MS. WIEST: So how many wire centers does U S West have? 16 17 Α. 38. MS. WIEST: 38. Thank you. Any other 18 questions of this witness? 19 20 MS. CREMER: No. MS. WIEST: Would you like to admit this 21 docket for the purposes of this docket? Before I only 22 admitted it for the other dockets. 23 24 MS. CREMER: Actually I wasn't going to move it into this one because people testified to it, so I 25

89 didn't really need it in mine. But I can certainly 1 2 move it. 3 MS. WIEST: It's up to you. MS. CREMER: We don't need it in this docket. 4 5 MS. WIEST: Any other questions of this witness? Thank you. Anything else from any of the 6 parties? At this time I believe the Commission will 7 take these matters under advisement. We are waiting 8 9 for some late-filed exhibits in some dockets, and it 10 will be possible that perhaps the Commission will make the decisions either at a Commission meeting or at the 11 12 December 2nd hearing on some other related ETC dockets. Are there any questions from anybody or any 13 14 comments? MR. COIT: I would just, for the record, like 15 to formally request that the Commission designate each 16 of the -- based upon the record, the affidavits yet to 17 be submitted, that the Commission designate each of the 18 rural telephone companies, SDITC member companies, as 19 ETC's and that their study areas be designated as their 20 21 service area. That's all I have. 22 MS. WIEST: Thank you. That will close the 23 hearing. 24 (THE HEARING CONCLUDED AT 3:50 P.M.) 25

0-40.40.00

	90
1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
2	COUNTY OF HUGHES
3	
	I, Lori J. Grode, RMR, Notary Public, in and
5	for the State of South Dakota, do hereby certify that
5	the above hearing, pages 1 through 89, inclusive, was
7	recorded stenographically by me and reduced to
8	typewriting.
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing
0	transcript of the said hearing is a true and correct
1	transcript of the stenographic notes at the time and
2	place specified hereinbefore.
3	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or
	employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties,
5	nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel,
5	or financially interested directly or indirectly in
7	this action.
8	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
9	hand and seal of office at Pierre, South Dakota, this
0	lst day of December, 1997.
L	
2	
3	Lori J. Grode, RMR
5	

AU. U.A. UALO

P 4 N 10000

Cath by J. Brown

cath by J. Brown

response 10/9/07 cell by D. Outschrick

response 10/647 oath by D. Questinioth

response 10/14/97 beth by P. Rasmusson

cam by 8 Hanson

outh by B. Hanson

10157 Meter response due 10157 Meter response

10/142 weber, response due 10/142 weber, response due by 10/14/97 by 10/14/97

47.U.S.C. 214(e)(3) despites service area (by NOC)

Yes South Bonessee, ME South Device, ME South Ceregony, ME

Yan South Anteniore, NE Wast Estylemont, NY South Delettin, NE White Clay, NE

ž

ź

í

i

Lase Andes 491 ME 7

AT 50 7

AT U.S.C. Therewith(0) and a set of the second success with

will do so pany forward in accord with any streams advertising standards that the Commission may

will so so pony forward in accord with why specific advertising standards that the Commission may develop develop

will do to pany forward m accord with any specific advertising standards that the Commission may density

will do so na gong Tevandrall do te or a gong Tevandrall do teora tevano any secondra camerataro any cevero comercia on may devero comercia on terma devero comerca devero comerco comercia o

Constant

2533

10 ٠ ** 1.0 84 * 1-15

,

2*

	ELIGIBLE TELEC	ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER REQUEST	CARRIER REQUE	IST			
17 C F R 54 101(0)	Visuan Company Company Children	Guiden View Telecommunications Cooperative TCart data CH	Valley Cable & Satellie Communications TC97-070 CH	Valey Tescommunication Cooperation Again, line TC97-071 CH	Sour Valey Teaptone Congany TCBT 013 NC	Maant Rusineer Teleptore Conquery TC\$1-074 CH	For Randal Teephone Company ICat dis CH
which prate excess to public television	1	1	1	í	i	YE	1
i uccal usage	1	1	:	1	i	i	1
1 dual time multi-frequency signaling a its functional equal	1	1	1	1	1	:	1
L single party service or its functiones		101497	Yes to business and residence customers 10/97	Yes to business and residence customers sores?	V.8. 10/1497	YM 11307	VM 11097
eccess to emergency services	1	1	:	i	í	1	1
ACCESS IS OPPORTUNISTICS	i	1	i	1	1	1	1
eccess to intersectionups services	i	1	í	i	i	1	-
Access to deviduely assistance	i	:	1	1	i	i	1
 tot uniation for qualitying ow-income consumers 	as becary	Accesses	Arcost st-	furned pr-	harond str-	furged pre-	Portoon la
	And control not provided requesting a warver for one press	And control not provided, respectively a warver for one year	Ad control not provided. Ad control not provided requesting a warve for one requesting a warve for one real.	auti control not provided, requesting a warver for one	Add control not provided, requesting a warver hit one year	And strength of index and index where the case index and have a set of the se	-tol cantor not provided. Requesting a waver for one year
IT C F R S4 405 and S4 411 CR44 Enables Unable and Link (U) and the statistic to second containers	a offered in purchased USAVC exchanges, not offered autrevely, but with critics in accord were 17 CFR 54 4000 - 54 417 and any SCIPUC decisions 10/14/97	CiviCoop down not currently citize within to service arrest trink with the change under demas of 41° CFR 54 400 - 41°, 10° 140°	OVC.cog does not currently VCSC currently often were Visiting Coop does not often were bit seves analy its tervice sease. In St were currently offer were hit amount of CFR 54.400 - and CFR 54.400 - 417 and any SCPFUC sections. CFR 54.400 - 417 10	Valley Coop Steel not barrowshy offer works at barrowshy offer works at commend under terms of 47 CPR 54 400 - 417 - 10469	Visitery Coop dates not currently utility action of surrantly utility action of the action of a sector of surrantly action action of actional under thems of all the action of actions action of the action of all the action of all the action of action CFR 54 400 - 417, 105492, 417, 1074597, CFR 54 400 - 417, 110	274	F1 Randal Currently offers within its service areas for an annual to disard under new service at COR 54 400 A17 and any SDRUC A17 and any SDRUC decisions, 11/2017

and DTS - 7/20/07

10114/07

		er u.s.c. zradjoji (jili) benetisi bencel kodunge ude	47.U.S.C. 214(e)(3) designate serves area (by NOX)	47 C.F.R. SA 405 and SA 411 mater trainable (Dirack and Dis Up services to qualitying low-eccome consumers		 tol lensation for qualifying low-excent contumers 	E access to directory essistance	7. ACCESS 10 INTERNATION OF HERVILLE	5 ACCESS IS OPPORTUNING MENORS	5. access to emergency services	4 single party service or its functional equivalent	3. Qual long multi-tequency signaling or its functional equal	2 local unique	1. voice prace eccess to public swelched nativo?	47 C F R 54 101(4)
osth by D. Anderson	101757 letter response due by 1011447	will do no policy forward in second with any specific secondary standards that the Commission may seeling	1	TTC currently offers within its TTC does not currently offer services areas, 11/10 will be within its service areas, offered under new items 47 11/1748 will be offered under offered under new items 47 11/1748 will be offered under SDPUC decisions, 10/697 417, 10/697	tall control not provided requesting a waiver for over year	And Second	1	1	1	1	par and 10007	1	1	1	Version Tempton Convery TC91017 KC
sets by D. Anderson	10/1/07 adder, response due by 10/14/97	will do to good Soward In accord with any specific activitizing standards that be Commission may deneral	1	117 does not currently the turber its served areas 11758 will be disard under serve of 47 C/R 54 400 - 417, 109497	tal control not provided	Arrest pa		1		1	to an any say and have	1	1	1	Telecommunications Cooperations TCST-078 KC
response 10/14/97 cell by D. Henderson	101107 latter reasonse due	vili da La gong forward in accord with any specific accord with any specific the Commassion may develop	Yes West Camp Cross, WY	WECoop date not currently offer within its service arrest times of 47 CPR 54.400 417, 101487	repuested and provided	furned re-	1	1		1		1	1	1	Consents Testing Consent TOTTON
response 10/15/97 cell by D. Henderson	101.97 leder, response due by 101440	will be ap pany forward in social with any specific extension standards that the Commission may stready	Yes North Lemman, ND	Supplex constry offer when its serves area in 1988 will be offered under in a large state of the serve A17 and any SDFUC decision. 1011397	-tal sorres not provided requesting a server for one year	-tal boom	1	1	-	1.1	Ten al but 10 Request of	1	i	1	Teamoretan ICBI-CBI ICBI-CBI
nearconse 10/6/97 oath by president of ACI	10157 where response the by 101447	well do te goorg lowerd in social with any specific advantary standards that the Commission may otherway	Yee North Haudia, ND	AC surrey sites with a server were trivel with a criterial work raw terms of criterial work raw terms of criterial work raw to be SDPUC decisions 108/01	-of control not privated in the second secon	Autors pr-	1	1		1		1	:	1	Comparation IN TCH-000 CH
response 10/597 cath by president of Coop.	10197 later response the by 1014.97	elit da to gong forwerd in accord with any teesofic accord with any teesofic according teesofic for terretage	1	ACI currently offers within the AVC does not currently offer service areas 11/100 will be within its service areas Critical doctor on a terms of 11/100 will be offered under Critical doctor on the service of the offered under SDPUC decisions 10/8/07 417 11/08/97	all convert not prevaled requesting a wave for one for one for the one of the one one of the one of	fuend pr	í	1	*	i	i	1	i	-	Cooperative Cooperative TC07-ON Cr
nesponse 101047 net by 4 Senior	101/07 latter response due by 101/497	will be as pany toward in accord with any specific animiting standards that the Commission may develop	1	I heartend currently offers within its service even in the service even in the service even at the service even at the service even decision. 10/1057	-od control not provided requesting a warver for one year	for process par	i	i	1	1	TACING MY	í	Local exchange service	18	Heated Comparison In: TCH ats CH

ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER REQUEST

atchirm wat 4

ĩ

ŝ

ŝ

	3.2	of U.S.C. 274 and 100 and a loss	or U.S.C. Zriegový, desegnés serves area (by NOX) Ves	AT C / R SH 400 and SH 411 Hard Pressent Diseas and Chi Up the services is quarking Swencome to consumer	144	 tal limitation for pushing low-income consumers 	I scass to directory association	7 access to internationarge services. Yes	1 HOURS IN SPENDY HEAVEN YOU	5 access to emergency services Visi	 sugge party serves or its functional. Yo equivalent 	2. Qual tane multi-briquency signaling or its functional inpusi	2 Notal unage 10	1 visca grade eccess to public Yes	47 C F R 54 101(4)
101057	101197 ledar, response due by 1011497	wit to is pore forward in second with any topologic accentant standards that the Commission may denated		Matabas daes not currently offer within 15 benues areas 101964 will be delivers under terra of 47 CFR 54.400 - 417 101097	tal control not previded requesting a values for one rear	the pooting	-		-		Y 10/10/07	•	Local endlange service		Topose Correst
TWOTON MOTORT	101.07 later response du	will do to going forward in acco d with any specific performance standards that the Commission may denetic	í	Basic does not currently offer witten its service area turned by offered under terms of 47 CFR 54 400 - 417 10/16/57	not control not provided, requesting a warver for one year	for process (i	ĩ	1	i	TH 101697	i	Local exchange service	1	Balk Tascan Cooperative TCBT-087 KC
78400nae 10/1/197	10/157 laber, response due by 10/1497	will do to gotty forward in accord with any specific tactorizing standards that the Commission may density	Yes East Puctors, M	Last Plants currently offer offer its service artes (17.50 vit and offered under service arts of CCR 54 4000 (17.50 vit any SDPUC Art and any SDPUC Secretaria (10.1547)	Les control not provided integration of a second by one of the second by a second by one of the second by t	And particular	1	i	1	i	Y 101657	1	Local sechange service	1	Tourna M
nangona 10/21/97	10197 later response the by 101457		1	Vestion like offer server in extracted purchase from USINC but does not currently offer setting to the currently offer setting of the offered under terms of the OFR 54 ADC 5417 1071107	nd arrest not provided requesting a manual for one real	tol backing	1	1		i	V. 107187	1	i	i	Valuen Tesphore Company TCB1-088 KC
maponae 10/24/07	101157 laber response due by 101457	will de to gang forward in seit de to gong forward in accordance with any specific possible and any specific accordance same and any specific possible and any specific the Commutation may densition densit	i	Biochoim does offer in all of its exchange Unifile all be offered unified all CFR S4 a 417 U021497	And control not provided, year	-tof bocard	1	ĩ	Yes 102497	1	Ves 102407	i	1	1	Telephone Company Telephone Company TODT-000
naponse 10/10/97 oeth by D. Johnstone	101197 alter response for by 1011497	val do se poro forward a accordance with any sonch atvantary standarch fiel fre Commission may develop	î	service Kannaber daes offer service Jefferson does not currently server, a mark to offer any service area to one daes not currently offer in the service area to server, 1/178 will be offered art? 10/10/87 server, 1/178 will be offered art? 10/10/87 sets, 1/178 will be offered art? 10/10/87 sets, 1/178 will be offered art? 10/10/87 sets, 1/178 will be offered art? 10/10/87	tal control not provided, requesting a worker for (me year	-tel bocarry	i	i	i	1	Sergis party in Preate and Kannebec areas 10/10/97	1	1	1	Kannabec Teaplore Cd., Inc TC81-042 CH
Carrier Nortown	10:107 lener, response the by 10/1497	will do se pany forward in will so so pany forward in accordance with any solution accordance with any specific advertising transition may develop the Commission may develop develop	1	Lateration data not currently offer anglen its service strats in risk and the development server of 47 C/FR 54 400 -) 417 10/1087	-set control has provided, requesting a warver for one year	Pressed re-	-	Ĩ	1	1	YM 101067	1	í		Tesphone Co. Mc TCHT-080 CH

AV UNDIA

ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER REQUEST

.

	47.U.S.C. 21449/17/81 Adversite NewSont Rockarder wite	47 U.S.C. 314(4)(5) designate service area (by NOVI)	47 CFR 34 405 and 54 411 mask revealed there and the Up server to qualitying the income consumers		 ad imitation for qualifying qualification consumers 	A scens to directory answards	7 scores to interestinge services	6 NOTE OF STREET, STREET	5 access to emergency services	 under beitt service in its functions 		2. local usage	1 vice grade access to public switched retwork	
10/10/2 latter, response the by 10/1407 response 10/15/97 oath by R. Houdes	wil de to gening forward in accord with same viewone activersang statewards the one Commission may obviewe	î	Sury Bulles does not curvely offer within th served ender Triffe within been within the served of the CFR 54 400 - 417 10/15/97	tal control not provided, requesting a water for one	and becamp	1	1	i	•	Yes 101592	:	1	1	Suly Buter Teagtore Cooperative, Int TCU1-004 CH
Nacional States, Income das Nacionas 10/1897	will be to party thread in accord with any steads, donating standards that the Commission may develop	Yea North Bellane, ND	Verture currently offen within its service even in the service even with the service in the service with and any SDPUC decision, 10/15/97	-tal control not provided requesting a warmer for one	Autors pa-	1	:	1	1	Yes 101597	1	1	ĩ	Venture Communications, Inc. 1C91-085 CH
101107 water response due by 1021467 response 1021097 sett by R. Jahreson	will do to an e pony towardwill do to an e pony basis in eccontance with anybesis in eccontance specific enverteiny standards may tenesis Commission may develop Commission may develop	ſ	SAVICON currently offer within its service area in 100 and to offered under arts and any SDEUC declares. 10/10/97	had control not provided, requesting a waiver for one year.	An and an	1	:	1	1	Y 10/10/97	1	1	1	SANCON NS TOPTOM
ton 57 year meaners due (1010) where by 101497 weponer 101097 weponer 101097 weponer 101097 weponer 101097	died to to at party free relation in according of the second constant subjects free the Constants may develop	1	Sanborn Geel not currently offar within 18 service errest of 17.0% with 6 offered under herres of 47.0% 54.400 417, 10/10/97	and control and provided	tot becary	1	1	i	í	*** 101047	1	i	1	Santom Temphone Cooperative TCUT-007 KC
25 8	Investigation to party forward in with any constance with why topol any source with the standards that the Conversion may breakly breakly	1	Benaford Sciences offer within its serve UTING will be offer annu of 47 CFR 54 417 10/14/97	-tal control not provided. requesting a market for one year	And becamy	í	1	í	i	*** 101407	1	i	1	Company Company ICallons KC
nas das 101/07 ladar, magomas das by 101/07 nasponas 100/07 oah by P. Hannyben	will to an place timest in tractorisera with any speci- smestary standarts that the Commission may density	Van North News Ellengen, NO	aurentig RC Coop date not currently a wreat offer within its service wreat doubler (1156 with a different under 400, items at 2010 FR 34 400, 417, 109467	and covers not provided requesting a water for one year	furgering pro-	ĩ		1	1	Yes 10667	1	i	1	Roberts County Temphase Cooperative Association TCHT-ONP KC
10137 later response due by 101437 response 10597 aan by P. Hannydon	and in lives do to grave forward in lives do so pony forward in Hapolity accordance with any specific protocordance with any Newson to but accentation may be contrary Mandaert Part of Commission may be commission may develop	VIII North Vielann, NO	W RC currently offers within the standard under mit the task of RM 4000 - A17 and same 47 C/R 54 4000 - A17 and same SDPUC decisions - 105497	-tal control not provided requesting a value for one year	for the set of the set	1	í	i	1	AND 10001	i	1	1	RC Comparison Mt TC07.100 KC

exclorem.me44

ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER REQUEST

.

		47 U S.C. Zranovyky November nervicele andrenove wole	47 U S.C. 214(6)(S) designate service area (by NOO)	ALCER SHAD we share the Up mate memory barries and Line Up barries to quantyry barries consumer		 tot invitation for qualifying itise income consumers 	I access to directory assistance	7 ACCRN IS INTERESTING HERVICES	A ROBER & GREENE REPORT	5. Access to emergency services	 ungle party service or its functional equivalent 	3 dust fore multi-frequency signaling or its functional equal	2 local unlegal.	selligial release	ATCER MININ
seth by D. Sunders	101107 letter, response due by 1011497	will do se gang towerd in accord with any specific altertang standards that the Commission may develop	1	Splitted Preserves currently Splitted does not currently offer wetter its envice offer wetter its envice ereas ereas 11/68 well to diverse 11/58 well to diverse wetter whete new terms 47 CFR sent of 47 CFR 54.400 - 54.400 - 417 erea any 417 10/14/97 54.400 - SDPUC decisions, 10/14/97	-od control not provided requesting a waver for one rear	tor booting	ĩ	i	i	i	Ves 107442	1	i	1	Spillings Properties, Inc. TC47-101 NC
negonee 10/14/07 ceth by D. Snyden	10157 MERC PROVING ON by 1014-97	will do to pools toward in accord with any specific activitizity standards that the Commission may stream	Yes East Genesion, MN	Selection does not currently table workin its service weak to first will be otherwork under service of 2019 54 400 - 417 101407	tod control not provided. requestiong a warver for one year	-tol biooung	1	1	1	:	Y 101497	i	í	1	Spitrus Teacon Cooperative, Inc. TC07.102 KC
response 101497 oath by J. Easterd	101.97 leter response due by 101.497	will de te gong tinweid in accord with any specific anvertaing standards flat the Commasion may denalog	1	Tri-County and not company of a within its service area. UTX9 address code terms of CFR 54.402 - 417 101447	-ad control not provided. Integrating a warver for one year	-of booting	í		1	í	Yes 101451		í	i	Telecon, Ve Tolar-108 CH
mapones 10/14/97	101197 latter, maporae due by 1011497	will die is georg forwer excertaires wich any w advertaire standards is the Commission may denetag	1	Faith does not currently stark and the 17.60 will be observed worker to any of all CAR S4 400	-tol control not provided. -repositing a wave for one year	-to boost	1	1	i	1	Yes 101457	1	ĩ	1	Faith Municipal Telephone Company TC97-108 XC
response 10/6/97 oath by B. Haugen, Sr. Pres	101107 woter magor	will be to party for decorations with any scheering standard the Commission me denoting	i	Managur Biges and Lumweity online webs in a service areas 101748 web on a strand uncess areas of 47 CPRI 54 400 - 417, 104927	-tal control not provided. Instructional events for one	-tot becarry	1	:	1	i	AND 10881	1	1	1	Armour Independent Temphone Company TCB7.113 DH
nuponus 10/047	No due 101/87 lader: response due 101/87 later: response due by 101/497 by 101/497	ert in well do iso parry toward in well do iso parry toward in teached accordance, with any teached accordance with any teached that according teached that the Controllation may theread the teached teached the controllation may theread	1	B.C Durning (Mar) within a server areas. 117,94 with different under mis form a CFR 54.400 - 417 and any CFR 54.400 - 417 and any SDPUC sections 100407	-tal control not provided	Pressed pa-	1	1	:	1	1000	1	1	1	Topportune Topportune TCRF114 CH
Pres cells by B. Haugen, Sr. Pres cells by B. Haugen, Sr. Pres	10197 sear, response due by 101407	en da la parg la vers in accordance ven an Leonite altreatang tandesta that altreatang tandesta that the Committion may thereage	1	BC Durately (Ren within B) block data not durately served areas. 11/20 will be offer within its served areas offered under hims of 11/200 will be offered under CPR 54.400.417 and any larens of 47/278 54.400. SDPUC deceasions. 10/697 417. 10/697	-sal control not provided. Instructing a warver for one	to becard	1	1	1	1	Ven 10945	1	1	1	Lunar Temptore Company TOPI-115 CH

1

elutorm with

0243 40 .00

11/14/07

		47 U.S.C. 214460/13/21 Adventise Nervices and args wide	47 U.S.C. 214(6)(5) Designation between areas (by NCC)	47 C/P M 54 600 and 54 411 Instat Research Classe and Cive Up services to qualityed tex-income containent		S tol instant to quarking the encome consumers	A scores to descloy assessment	7 scient to interescharge services	4. ACCENT IS OPERATOR MEMORY	5 access to emergency services	 single party serves or its functional equivalent 	3 due tone multi-trequency signaling or its functional equal	2. local usage	suided release	AT C.F.R. M. 101(N)
response 10/14/57 oath by president	10107 Miler response due by 101407	will be to pany forward to eccord with any toecold advertary standards that the Commission may breakly	1	AuCost does not currently one when it is served anest time of all CPI 34 400. All 101407	replaced a warver for one	And and and	i	1	1	1		1	1	:	McCool Cooperative Temphone Company TC97-117 CH
response 10/2007 celt by P. Morte	101.97 when response the	with the spong thread in anominana with any spond anominany sectors that the Commasion may develop	1	Kadala does not currently other works its exceed area turned as offered under turned of 70 FER 54.400 - 417, 10/28/57	-tail control not provided. requesting a velocit for one year	herong pa-	1	1	1	1	Y-** 102892	1	1	1	Tanna Canan I Tana Canan I Canan Gal
mapone 102947 call by C. Caveg	10187 letter metoonee due by 101487	will co to port lower! In decord with the port port environ with and which has not command in the fee Command in the density	1	Broakrys daes not currently h offer writen its ennes and lemme of at 254 March and A17 1025697	and content out provided.	bettong pa-	i	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Managas Talaphore TCP-123
response 10/14/97 seth by L. Johnson	10147 Mar	ell de te pony tinseet in socore with an specific servet se an specific en Connesson may dreating	1	Annual Courty data not currently data wellon 3. Served ansat 1/176 well data used ansat 1/176 well control used and an CFR 54.400 - 417. 101407	ad control not provided.	heroog pa-	1	í	1	1	Yes 101497	1		1	inc. dibiti Hanson County Talaphone Ca TCAT-130 CH
response 10/14/97 outh by president	10157 when response due by 101427	will be to grow brown in score was say book advertising start pools advertising start the Commission may dream	1	Hanson Communication currently offer vertex its service event. 11702 will be offered under vertex will be CPR 54.400 - 417 and an SCPPUC because 4.107140	-tel control not provided. Inspectify a waiver for one year	Arcost pr-	1	1	1	1	VM 101497	1	1	1	INC. 6544 MeCost Teacon TC97-131 CH
response 10/16/97 celh by president	10137 letter mapones des	will de iet prog tonward in sociale with any straethe whething strategies the Convession may develop	1	Morn Vitel River currently offers in 15 veltex is several event and by the first several event and any unit and any SciPeuc 1014457 decision 11071697		tol blocking tol scottes had provided, requesting a waiver	î	1	1	1	Ym 101697	1	1	1	Courses and a
response 10/16/97 celh by president	10187 inter response due 10187 inter response due by 101497 by 101497	will do so going forward in accord with why statedity accord with why statedity the according to the state of the the Commission may denote	Ĩ	Autorolyse Telecommunications Commonly others write at all and under new terms 47 CFR 34 400 - 471 terms 47 SOPUC accurate 1071687		-tal booking and contrast not provided	í	1	1	f	Yes 101507	i	î	1	Maandys Teecommunications Co TC27-155 CH

ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER REQUEST

atdom with

11/14.97

ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER REQUEST

47 U.S.C. 2144047120 Reserve Investor Industry web	47 U.S.C. 714(9)(5) desegnate service area (by NCC)	47 C/ R SLADD wei SLATT has a reason there and List Up services is qualifying low-broave consumer	 Val inviation for pushing benchments consumer 	1. Access to directory essentance	7. access to interaction persons		A scant to several provides	A support server a la fordate	3. And long multi-trepuncy septem or its functional squar	2 Incid unique	47 C.F.H. M. 101(a) 1. veces prede access to public sentitive measure
reachy shurtes exhibitiy of serious trapped is certical writery	ť	"Provide both plane to appear autocolory. Programs is be differed an included in application]	1	1	1	1	ì	1	1	TE TOP IS
val do so poling bravant in accordances with any specific according and active train the Commission may density	Yes North Name, 50	Currently provided LINE Up annual. National Lines on annual by 41 Oct. Lines on 417 Suppring 1788	- Ad backing - Ad backing represented in the provided, represented in waters for one year	1	1	1	1	ĩ	1	ſ	Town Flow Town TCHING TO

sidem.at4

TC97-090

RECEIVED

JUN 1 7 1997

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST OF STOCKHOLM-STRANDBURG TELEPHONE COMPANY FOR DESIGNATION AS AN ELI-GIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER

Docket No.

REQUEST FOR ETC DESIGNATION

Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company ("Stockholm"), pursuant to 47 United States Code Section 214(e) and 47 Code of Federal Regulations Section 54.201, hereby seeks from the Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") designation as an "eligible telecommunications carrier" within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area in South Dakota. In support of this request, Stockhol, a offers the following:

1. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e), it is the Commission's responsibility to designate local exchange carriers ("LECs") as "eligible telecommunications carriers" ("ETCs"), or in other words, to determine which LECs have assumed universal service obligations consistent with the federal law and should be deemed eligible to receive federal universal service support. At least one eligible telecommunications carrier is to be designated by the Commission for each service area in the State. However, in the case of areas served by "rural telephone companies," the Commission may not designate more than one LEC as an ETC without first finding that such additional designation would be in the public interest. Under 47 CFR § 54.201, beginning January 1, 1998, only tele-



an eligible telecommunications carrier within its service area will be eligible to receive federal universal service support.

 Stockholm is the facilities-based local exchange carrier presently providing local exchange telecommunications services in the following exchanges in South Dakota:

Stockholm-Strandburg	676
Revillo	623
South Shore	756

Stockholm, to its knowledge, is the only carrier today providing local exchange telecommunications services in the above-identified exchange areas.

 Stockholm, in accord with 47 CRF § 54.101, offers the following local exchange telecommunications services to all consumers throughout its service area:

Voice grade access to the public switched network;

- Local exchange service, including an amount of local usage free of per-minute charges under a flat-rated local service package and as part of a measured local service offering;
- Dual-tone multi-frequency signaling;
- Access to emergency services such as 911 or enhanced 911 public services;
- Access to interexchange service;
- Access to directory assistance; and
- Toll-blocking service to qualified low-income consumers.

As noted above, Stockholm does provide toll limitation service in the form of toll blocking to qualifying consumers; however, the additional toll limitation service of "toll control" as defined in the new FCC universal service rules (47 CFR § 54.400(3)) is not provided. Stockholm is not aware that any local exchange carrier in South Dakota has a current capability to provide such service. The FCC gave no indication prior to the release of its universal service order (FCC 97-157) that toll control would be imposed as an ETC service requirement, and, to our information and belief, as a result, LECs nationwide are not positioned to make the service immediately available. In order for Stockholm to provide the service, additional usage tracking and storage capabilities will have to be installed in its local switching equipment. At minimum, the service requires a switching software upgrade, and at this time, Stockholm is investigating and attempting to determine whether the necessary software has been developed and when it might become available.

8143 . FD .0D

.....

Accordingly, Stockholm is faced with exceptional c cumstances concerning its ability to make the toll control service available as set forth in the FCC's universal service rules, and must request a waiver from the requirement to provide such service. At this time, a waiver for a period of one year is requested. Prior to the end of the one-year period, Stock holm will report back to the Commission with specific information indicating when the necessary network upgrades can be made and the service can be made available to assist low-income customers. The Commission may properly grant a waiver from the "toll control" requirement pursuant to 47 CFR 54.101(c).

 Stockholm has previously advertised, and will continue to advertise the availability of its local exchange services in media of general distribution throughout the

3

exchange areas served. Prior to this filing, Stockholm has not generally advertised the prices charged for all of the above-identified services. It will do so, going forward in accord with any specific advertising standards that the Commission may develop.

 Based on the foregoing, Stockholm respectfully requests that the Commission:

- Grant a temporary waiver of the requirement to provide "toll control" service; and
- (b) Grant an ETC designation to Stockholm covering all of the local exchange areas that constitute its present service area in the State.

Dated this 10 th day of June, 1997.

STOCKHOLM-STRANDBURG TELEPHONE COMPANY:

By

Haro'd Nowick, President

STOCKHOLM & STRANDBURG TELEPHONE CO. Main Street - Box 20 STOCKHOLM, SOUTH DAKOTA 57264 605-676-2311

October 23, 1997

RECEIVED

090

Karen Cremer, Staff Attorney PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION State Capitol Building 500 East Capitol Avenue Pierre, South Dakota 57501 OCT 2 4 1997

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Re: ETC Application of Stockholm Telephone

Dear Karen:

0-47 .45 .00

Please be advised that I am the president of Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company, of Stockholm, South Dakota. In my capacity as such officer, I would advise you as follows:

- Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. 54.101(a)(4), Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company does provide single-party service to all customers in its service areas, including the newly-purchased exchanges.
- Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. 54.101(a)(6), Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company provides to each of its customers access to operator services.
- Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company currently offers Lifeline and Link Up local service discounts in all of its exchange areas. Beginning January 1, 1998, the rograms will be offered under new terms in accord with the FCC rules, 47 CFR §§ 54.400 - 54.417, and any PUC decisions concerning implementation of the expanded programs.

Please let me know if you need any further information.

Sincerely yours,

Thard Tourd

Harold Nowick, President Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company



STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA))SS. COUNTY OF GRANT)

VERIFICATION

Harold Nowick, being first duly sworn, on his oath, deposes and says that he is the president of Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company, that he has read the initial ETC Application of Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company and the foregoing letter, and knows the contents thereof; that the same are true to his own knowledge, information and belief.

erchen

Harold Nowick, President Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Co.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this twenty-third day of October, 1997.

Notary Public P Jag

My Commission Expires: \$3/3/001

(SEAL)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE FILING BY STOCKHOLM-STRANDBURG TELEPHONE COMPANY FOR DESIGNATION AS AN ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER

0143 .45 .67

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, ORDER AND NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER TC97-090

On June 17, 1997, the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) received a request for designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) from Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company (Stockholm). Stockholm requested designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area.

The Commission electronically transmitted notice of the filing and the intervention deadline to interested individuals and entities. No person or entity filed to intervene. By order dated November 7, 1997, the Commission set the hearing for this matter for 1:30 p.m. on November 19, 1997, in Room 412, State Capitol, Pierre, South Dakota.

The hearing was held as scheduled. At the hearing, the Commission granted Stockholm a one year waiver of the requirement to provide toll control service with hits service area. At its December 11, 1997, meeting, the Commission granted ETC designation to Stockholm and designated its study area as its service area.

Based on the evidence of record, the Commission enters the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

FINDINGS OF FACT

On June 17, 1997, the Commission received a request for designation as an ETC from Stockholm. Stockholm requested designation as an ETC within the local exchange areas that constitute its service area. Stockholm serves the following exchanges: Stockholm-Strandburg (676); Revillo (623) and South Shore (756). Exhibit 1.

Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2), the Commission is required to designate a common carrier that meets the requirements of section 214(e)(1) as an ETC for a service area designated by the Commission.

11

111

Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1), a common carrier that is designated as an ETC is eligible to receive universal service support and shall, throughout its service area, offer the services that are supported by federal universal service support mechanisms either using its own facilities or a combination of its own facilities and resale of another carrier's services. The carrier must also advertise the availability of such services and the rates for the services using media of general distribution.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has designated the following services or functionalities as those supported by federal universal service support mechanisms: (1) voice grade access to the public switched network; (2) local usage; (3) dual tone multi-frequency signaling or its functional equal; (4) single party service or its functional equivalent; (5) access to emergency services; (6) access to operator services; (7) access to interexchange service; (8) access to directory assistance; and (9) toll limitation for qualifying low-income consumers. 47 C.F.R. § 54.101(a).

As part of its obligations as an ETC, an ETC is required to make available Lifeline and Link. Up services to qualifying low-income consumers. 47 C.F.R. § 54.405; 47 C.F.R. § 54.411.

VI

V

Stockholm offers voice grade access to the public switched network to all consumers throughout its service area. Exhibit 1.

Stockholm offers local exchange service including an amount of local usage free of perminute charges to all consumers throughout its service area. Id.

VII

Stockholm offers dual tone multi-frequency signaling to all consumers throughout its service area. Id.

VIII

IX

Stockholm offers single party service to all consumers throughout its service area. Exhibit 2.

х

Stockholm offers access to emergency services to all consumers throughout its service area. Exhibit 1.

XI

Stockholm offers access to operator services to all consumers throughout its service area. Exhibit 2

XII

Stockholm offers access to interexchange services to all consumers throughout its service area. Exhibit 1.

Stockholm offers access to directory assistance to all consumers throughout its service area.

Id.

XIII

XIV

One of the services required to be provided by an ETC to qualifying low-income consumers is toll limitation. 47 C.F.R. § 54.101(a)(9). Toll limitation consists of both toll blocking and toll control. 47 C.F.R. § 54.400(d). Toll control is a service that allows consumers to specify a certain amount of toll usage that may be incurred per month or per billing cycle. 47 C.F.R. § 54.400(c). Toll blocking is a service that lets consumers elect not to allow the completion of outgoing toll calls. 47 C.F.R. § 54.400(b).

XV

Stockholm offers toll blocking to all consumers throughout its service area. Exhibit 1.

XVI

Stockholm does not currently offer toll control. Id. In order for Stockholm to provide toll control, additional usage tracking and storage capabilities will have to be installed in its local switching equipment. Stockholm is attempting to determine whether the necessary software has been developed and when it might become available. Id.

XVII

Stockholm stated that it is faced with exceptional circumstances concerning its ability to make toll control service available and requested a one year waiver from the requirement to provide such service. [d. Prior to the end of the one year period, Stockholm will report back to the Commission with specific information indicating when the network upgrades can be made in order to provide toll control. [d.

XVIII

With respect to the obligation to advertise the availability of services supported by the federal universal service support mechanism and the charges for those services using media of general distribution, Stockholm stated that it advertises the availability of its local exchange services in media of general distribution throughout its service area. However, Stockholm has not generally advertised the prices for these services. Id. Stockholm stated its intention to comply with any advertising standards developed by the Commission. Id.

XIX

Stockholm currently offers Lifeline and Link Up service discounts in its exchanges. Exhibit 2. Stockholm will offer the Lifeline and Link Up service discounts in all of its service area beginning January 1, 1998, in accordance with 47 C.F.R. §§ 54.400 to 54.417, inclusive, and any Commission imposed requirements. Exhibit 2.

XX

The Commission finds that Stockholm currently provides and will continue to provide the following services or functionalities throughout its service area: (1) voice grade access to the public switched network; (2) local usage; (3) dual tone multi-frequency signaling; (4) single-party service; (5) access to emergency services; (6) access to operator services: (7) access to interexchange service; (8) access to directory assistance; and (9) toll blocking for qualifying low-income consumers.

0-43 45 -28

The Commission finds that pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 54.101(c) it will grant Stockholm a waiver of the requirement to offer toll control services until December 31, 1998. The Commission finds that exceptional circumstances prevent Stockholm from providing toll control at this time due to the difficulty in obtaining the necessary software upgrades to provide the service.

XXII

The Commission finds that Stockholm intends to provide Lifeline and Link Up programs to qualifying customers throughout its service area consistent with state and federal rules and orders.

XXIII

The Commission finds that Stockholm shall advertise the availability of the services supported by the federal universal service support mechanism and the charges therefor throughout its service area using media of general distribution once each year. The Commission further finds that if the rate for any of the services supported by the federal universal service support mechanism changes, the new rate must be advertised using media of general distribution.

XXIV

Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(5), the Commission designates Stockholm's current study area as its service area.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

.

The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to SDCL Chapters 1-26, 49-31, and 47 U.S.C. § 214.

11

Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2), the Commission is required to designate a common carrier that meets the requirements of section 214(e)(1) as an ETC for a service area designated by the Commission.

III

Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1), a common carrier that is designated as an ETC is eligible to receive universal service support and shall, throughout its service area, offer the services that are supported by federal universal service support mechanisms either using its own facilities or a combination of its own facilities and resale of another carrier's services. The carrier must also advertise the availability of such services and the rates for the services using media of general distribution.

IV

The FCC has designated the following services or functionalities as those supported by federal universal service support mechanisms: (1) voice grade alcess to the public switched network; (2) local usage; (3) dual tone multi-frequency signaling or its functional equal; (4) single party service or its functional equivalent; (5) access to emergency services; (6) access to operator

services; (7) access to interexchange service; (8) access to directory assistance; and (9) toll limitation for qualifying low-income consumers. 47 C.F.R. § 54.101(a).

٧

As part of its obligations as an ETC, an ETC is required to make available Lifeline and Link Up services to qualifying low-income consumers. 47 C.F.R. § 54.405; 47 C.F.R. § 54.411.

VI

Stockholm has met the requirements of 47 C.F.R. § 54.101(a) with the exception of the ability to offer toll control. Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 54.101(c), the Commission concludes that Stockholm has demonstrated exceptional circumstances that justify granting it a waiver of the requirement to offer toll control until December 31, 1998.

Stockholm shall provide Lifeline and Link Up programs to qualifying customers throughout its service area consistent with state and federal rules and orders.

VII

VIII

Stockholm shall advertise the availability of the services supported by the federal universal service support mechanism and the charges therefor using media of general distribution once each year. If the rate for any of the services supported by the federal universal service support mechanism changes, the new rate shall be advertised using media of general distribution.

IX

Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(5), the Commission designates Stockholm's current study area as its service area.

х

The Commission designates Stockholm as an eligible telecommunications carrier for its service area.

It is therefore

ORDERED, that Sluckholm's current study area is designated as its service area; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that Stockholm shall be granted a waiver of the requirement to offer toll control services until December 31, 1998; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that Stockholm shall follow the advertising requirements as listed above; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED, that Stockholm is designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier for its service area.

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that this Order was duly entered on the 12% day of December, 1997. Pursuant to SDCL 1-26-32, this Order will take effect 10 days after the date of receipt or failure to accept delivery of the decision by the parties.

Dated at Pierre, South Dakota, this 17th day of December, 1997.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION. The undersigned hereby certifies that this document has been served today upon all parties of record in this docket, as listed on the docket service list, by facsimile or by first class mail, in properly JAMES A. BURG, Chairman addressed envelopes, with charges prepaid thereon θv PAM NELSON/Commissioner Dat la LASKA SCHOENFELDER, Commissioner (OFFICIAL SEAL)

TC97-090 RECEIVED

LIFELINE AND LINK UP PLAN DEC 1 8 1997 OF STOCKHOLM-STRANDBURG TELEPHONE COMPANY TH DAKOTA PUBLIC

UTILITIES COMMISSION

The Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company submits this plan pursuant to 47 CFR § 54.401(d). Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company has been designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier by the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission ("Commission"), and as such, must make Lifeline and Link Up service available to qualifying low-income consumers as set forth in the Commission's *Final Order and Decision; Notice of Entry of Decision* dated November 18, 1997, issued in Docket TC97-150 (In the Matter of the Investigation into the Lifeline and Link Up Programs), which is attached as Exhibit A, and consistent with the criteria established under 47 CFR §§ 54.400 to 54.417, inclusive.

General

- The Lifeline and Link Up programs assist qualified low-income consumers by providing for reduced monthly charges and reduced connection charges for local telephone service. The assistance applies to a single telephone line at a qualified consumer's principal place of residence.
- A qualified low-income consumer is a telephone subscriber who participates in at least one of the following public assistance programs:
 - A. Medicaid
 - B. Food Stamps
 - C. Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
 - D. Federal Public Housing Assistance
 - E. Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LHEAP)
- A qualified low-income consumer is eligible to receive either or both Lifeline and Link Up assistance.
- 4. Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company will advertise the availability of Lifeline and Link Up services and the charges therefor, using media of general distribution and in accord with any rules that may be developed by the Commission for application to eligible telecommunications carriers.
- 5. In addition, Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company, as required by the Final Order and Decision; Notice of Entry of Decision of the Commission (Exhibit A), will indicate in its annual report to the Commission the number of subscribers within its service area receiving Lifeline and/or Link Up assistance. In addition, this information will be provided to the Universal Service Administrative Company ("USAC").
- Information as to the number of consumers qualifying for Lifeline and/or Link Up assistance cannot currently be provided by Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company because it has no access to the government information neces-

sary to determine how many of its telephone subscribers are participating in the above-referenced public assistance programs. Without this information, Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company cannot provide at this time even a reasonable estimate of the number of its subscribers who will, after January 1, 1998, be receiving Lifeline and/or Link Up service. Information as to the number of its low-income subscribers qualifying for Lifeline and/or Link Up can be provided after applications for Lifeline and Link Up assistance have been received by Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company.

7. In accord with the Commission's Final Order and Decision; Notice of Entry of Decision, Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company will make application forms available to all of its existing residential customers, to all new customers when they apply for residential local telephone service, and to other persons or entities upon their request.

Lifeline

- Lifeline service means a retail local service offering for which qualified lowincome consumers pay reduced charges.
- Lifeline service includes voice grade access to the public switched network, local usage, dual tone multi-frequency signaling or its functional equivalent, single-party service or its functional equivalent, access to emergency services, access to operator services, access to interexchange service, access to directory assistance, and toll limitation.
- 3. Qualified low-income subscribers are required to submit an application form in order to receive Lifeline service. In applying for Lifeline assistance, the subscriber must certify under penalty of perjury that he/she is currently participating in at least one of the qualifying public assistance programs listed in Section A.2 above. In addition, the subscriber must agree to notify Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company when he/she ceases participating in the qualifying public assistance program(s).
- 4. The total monthly Lifeline credit available to qualified consumers is \$5.25. Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company shall provide the credit to qualified consumers by applying the federal baseline support amount of \$3.50 to waive the consumer's federal End-User Common Line charge and applying the additional authorized federal support amount of \$1.75 as a credit to the consumer's intrastate local service rate. The federal baseline support amount and additional support available, totaling \$5.25, shall reduce Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company's lowest tariffed (or otherwise generally available) residential rate for the services listed above in Section B.3. Per the attached Commission *Final Order and Decision; Notice of Entry of Decision*, the Commission has authorized intrastate rate reductions for eligible telecommunications carriers making the additional federal support amount of \$1.75 available. The Commission did not establish a state Lifeline program to fund

any further rate reductions. (Exhibit A, Findings of Fact VII and VIII; and Conclusions of Law II and III.)

- Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company will not disconnect subscribers from their Lifeline service for non-payment of toll charges unless the Commission, pursuant to 47 CFR § 54.401(b)(1), has granted the company a waiver from the non-disconnect requirement.
- 6. Except to the extent that Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company has obtained a waiver from the Commission pursuant to 47 CFR § 54.101(c), the company shall offer toll limitation to all qualifying low-income consumers when they subscribe to Lifeline service. If a subscriber elects to receive toll limitation, that service shall become part of that subscriber's Lifeline service.
- Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company will not collect a service deposit in order to initiate Lifeline service if the qualifying low-income consumer voluntarily elects toll blocking on his/her telephone line. However, one month's local service charges may be required as an advance page ment.

Link Up

0-43 .45 .25

- Link Up means a reduction in the customary charge for commencing telecommunications service for a single telecommunications connection at a consumer's principal place of residence. The reductions shall be 50 percent of the customary charge or \$30.00, whichever is less.
- 2. Link Up also means a deferred schedule for payment of the charges assessed for commencing service, for which the consumer does not pay interest. The interest charges not assessed to the consumer shall be for connection charges of up to \$200.00 that are deferred to a period not to exceed one year.
- Charges assessed for commencing service include any charges that are customarily assessed for connecting subscribers to the network. These charges do not include any permissible security deposit requirements.
- 4. The Link Up program shall allow a consumer to receive the benefit of the Link Up program for a second or subsequent time only for a principal place of residence with an address different from the residence address at which the Link Up assistance was previously provided.

Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company Stockholm, South Dakota 57264 Telephone 605-676-2311

By Harold Found

PRESIDENT

Position

101025

3