

GUNDERSON, PALMER, GOODSSELL & NELSON, LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

J. CRISMAN PALMER
 G. VERNE GOODSSELL
 JAMES S. NELSON
 DANIEL E. ASHMORE
 TERENCE R. QUINN
 DONALD P. KNUDSEN
 PATRICK G. GOETZINGER
 TALBOT J. WIECZORSKI
 MARK J. CONNOT
 JENNIFER K. TRUCIANO
 DAVID E. LUST

ASSURANT BUILDING
 440 MT. RUSHMORE ROAD
 POST OFFICE BOX 8045
 RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA 57709-8045
 TELEPHONE (605) 342-1078 • FAX (605) 342-0480
 www.gundersonpalmer.com

THOMAS E. SIMMONS
 TERRI LEE WILLIAMS
 PAMELA SNYDER-VARNS
 SARA FRANKENSTEIN
 AMY K. KOENIG
 JASON M. SMILEY
 SHANE C. PENFIELD
 JONATHAN M. COSTRA

WYNN A. GUNDERSON
Of Counsel

ATTORNEYS LICENSED TO PRACTICE IN
 SOUTH DAKOTA, NORTH DAKOTA, IOWA, NEBRASKA
 COLORADO, MONTANA, WYOMING & MINNESOTA

September 11, 2006

FAX Received SEP 11 2006

VIA FAX: 1-605-773-3809

Patricia Van Gerpen
 Executive Director
 South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
 500 East Capitol Avenue
 Pierre, SD 57501

RE: In the Matter of the Request of RCC Minnesota, Inc. for Certification Regarding Use of
 Federal Universal Service Support TC 06-100

In the Matter of the Request of Wireless Alliance, LLC (WALLC) for Certification
 Regarding Use of Federal Universal Service Support TC 06-101

GPGN File No. 7401.040099

Dear Ms. Van Gerpen:

On Friday, I was informed by Staff Counsel Karen Cremer that the Commission is requesting that materials provided to Staff be provided by the Commission, either through a confidential filing or a direct filing in the ETC Request for Certification filings. In compliance with this request, enclosed you will find two responses the above companies made to Staff questions. The original plus ten copies will follow via U.S. Mail.

One is entitled "RCC Minnesota, Inc." and is to be filed in Docket TC06-100. The other is entitled "WALLC" and is to be filed in Docket TC06-101.

You will note the documents refer to exhibits. These exhibits were provided with either the initial filing by the companies, or in a supplement filing that was made on August 16, 2006. It is not our intent to refile the exhibits that were marked "Confidential." To avoid confusion, where citations to an exhibit have been made, I have noted when the exhibit was originally filed with the Commission.

GUNDERSON, PALMER, GOODSSELL & NELSON, LLP

Patricia Van Gerpen
September 11, 2006
Page 2

The responses to these questions are not being deemed confidential, but the original exhibits were confidential and were filed as confidential with the Commission. RCC Minnesota and WALLC wish to maintain the confidentiality of those exhibits.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Talbot J. Wiczorek

TJW:klw

Enclosures

c: Steve Otto w/ enclosures
Elizabeth Koehler w/ enclosures

RESPONSES PROVIDED TO STAFF ON AUGUST 16, 2006

RCC MINNESOTA, INC. (RCC)

1. Please provide an estimated Service Improvement Plan for Calendar Year 2008.

See attached file (2006-2007-2008 SIP) CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS FILED WITH THE COMMISSION AS EITHER PART OF THE ORIGINAL FILING OR AS PART OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL FILING MADE ON 8/16/06

2. Please provide an explanation of any service improvements not fulfilled in 2006 that were projected to take place in last year's certification filing. See Exhibit B and response to question 3 in last year's filing.

See attached file (YTD 2006 RCC Ex. B). Please keep in mind that we are only partially through the 2006 year and additional changes may occur prior to the end of the year. EXHIBIT PROVIDED TO THE COMMISSION AS A CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL FILING MADE ON 8/16/06

3. Were the cell sites for the Willow Lake and Toronto areas built?

At the time of last years filing, RCC was awaiting FCC concurrence in the Willow Lake and Toronto areas (among others). This concurrence was granted on November 14, 2005 and RCC received its first USF support in February 2006. In RCC's February 27, 2006 filing with the Commission, we reported our intent to construct new sites in Willow Lake and Toronto in calendar year 2006. We are currently reviewing leasing agreements for both of these sites. Building permits and the site equipment has been received. Both sites are estimated to be completed in the 4th quarter of 2006.

4. Please identify any 2006 service improvements that took place that were not on the 2006 projected list. (Sisseton is new from the sites proposed in the TC03-193 hearing explaining why.)

As explained in RCC's February 27, 2006 filing with the Commission, the Sisseton site replaces the Baltic ETC site commitment for WALLC. The sites proposed in TC03-193 were based on a joint designation. However, RCC and WALLC were granted separate designations by the Commission. Without the joint designation, the amount of support received in the WALLC market did not support the construction of two sites, thus one of the WALLC site commitments was replaced by the Sisseton site in the RCC market as the support received in the RCC market supported an additional site.

The 2006 SIP included in item #1 provided the latest information regarding our planned service improvements for 2006. An updated 2006 SIP was also filed with the Commission on February 27, 2006 providing anticipated changes for the 2006 year. Service improvements planned for 2006 that were not included in the SIP filed in 2005 include:

- Willow Lake repeater (see response to item #3)
- Toronto repeater (see response to item #3)
- Clear Lake site upgrade from a repeater to full cell site
- Simultaneous Call Completion
- BSC Hardware upgrade
- OC3 upgrade

5. Please provide the project start date and completion date of each improvement on Exhibit B in the present filing.

Included in response to item #1.