

Exhibit C

Arent Fox

March 19, 2012

VIA EMAIL

Philip R. Schenkenberg
Briggs and Morgan
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
pschenkenberg@briggs.com

G. David Carter

Attorney
202.857.8972 DIRECT
202.857.6395 FAX
carter.david@arentfox.com

**Re: In the Matter of the Complaint of South Dakota Network, LLC Against
Sprint Communications Company, LP, Docket No. TC-09-098**

Dear Phil:

This letter responds to your letter of March 6, 2012 regarding the topics identified by Northern Valley on October 31, 2011 for Sprint's 30(b)(6) deposition. Your letter follows a request you made on February 14, 2012 for a "meet and confer on [Sprint's] objections to [Northern Valley's Rule 30(b)(6) deposition topics] [to] see if we can minimize disputes." In response to this request, I asked you whether you believed a meet and confer would be productive in light of the motions to compel currently pending before the Commission, to which you responded in a February 14, 2012 email: "We would need to file a motion for protective order on any topics we don't agree on. I thought these should be dealt with in one hearing rather than two. Doing them separately would push everything back a couple more months."

Based on Sprint's representation that it intended to proceed with addressing any issues involving the 30(b)(6) deposition in conjunction with the pending motion to compel, and our agreement that we should avoid further delay in obtaining responsive discovery from Sprint, we scheduled and held a call on February 17, 2012, in which you and Bret Lawson represented Sprint. At the beginning of the call, I noted that I had unsuccessfully sought to locate a document articulating Sprint's objections in preparation for the call. You confirmed that Sprint had not prepared or sent any such document and would be articulating its objections for the first time on the call. As we discussed at that time, I believed such a process to be inconsistent with a good faith meet and confer effort because it is exceedingly difficult to analyze objections on the fly and without the benefit of being able to carefully consider and, as necessary, research the basis for such objections in advance. I specifically noted that Northern Valley had prepared written objections and responses to Sprint's 30(b)(6) notice, which allowed the deposition to proceed without any notable problems. Accordingly, though we discussed Sprint's objections for nearly an hour, I repeatedly requested that you set forth your concerns in writing so that we could have a more productive discussion in the future. Your March 6, 2012 responds to those repeated requests.

Arent Fox

Northern Valley intended to respond to your March 6, 2012 letter on the merits and to work cooperatively with you to minimize areas of disagreement, as you had requested. On February 15, 2012, however, you, Ross Buntrock, and I were in Kentucky for matters related to another case. At that time, you told us that Sprint no longer intended to file a motion for protective order with regard to the 30(b)(6) deposition topics at this time, but rather was changing course and would not file its motion until after other pending motions have been resolved. As we stated in response to this declaration, it appears that Sprint now wants to do exactly what you said you intended to avoid when requesting the meet and confer: "push everything back a couple more months." Sprint apparently wants to await resolution of the pending motions and, if dissatisfied with the outcome, take another bite at the apple by filing a motion for protective order that will thereafter require further briefing and argument before the Commission.

As it currently stands then, Sprint has abandoned any efforts to confer with Northern Valley in good faith about the pending 30(b)(6) notice and is not pursuing a motion for protective order. We see no reason, therefore, to waste the time and resources to respond to the substance of your letter.¹ Further, because you are no longer intending to seek a protective order, and we have no intent to retract our long-standing notice of deposition, Northern Valley is ready to proceed with scheduling the deposition. **Accordingly, by no later than Friday, March 23, 2012, please provide me with dates in April when Sprint's designated witnesses are available for the 30(b)(6) deposition.** If we do not hear from you within that time period, we will proceed to set the date unilaterally and will expect Sprint's witnesses to be fully prepared to testify regarding each and every topic identified in the notice.

If you have any questions, or desire to reconsider your position, then please do not hesitate to contact me. Northern Valley remains amenable to engaging in a good faith meet and confer as soon as it is clear that Sprint is also willing to do so.

Sincerely,



G. David Carter

¹ By not responding to the substance of your letter, I do not intend to suggest that I agree with any of its content, including your characterizations of our conversation or matters that you believe I may have "clarified or limited."