RECEIVED

AUG 1 3 2008

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
FOR AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE LOCAL EXCHANGE
SERVICES IN CERTAIN RURAL AREAS SERVED BY
BROOKINGS MUNICIPAL UTILITIES D/B/A
SWIFTEL COMMUNICATIONS

TC06-178

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF MCC TELEPHONY OF THE MIDWEST, INC. D/B/A MEDIACOM FOR A CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE INTEREXCHANGE AND LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES IN THE BROOKINGS EXCHANGE TC06-188

ORIGINAL

Transcript of Proceedings (Continuation)
August 6, 2008

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, GARY HANSON, CHAIRMAN STEVE KOLBECK, VICE CHAIRMAN DUSTY JOHNSON, COMMISSIONER

COMMISSION STAFF

Rolayne Ailts Wiest Karen Cremer Kara Semmler Greg Rislov Harlan Best Terri LaBrie Baker

APPEARANCES

Talbot Wieczorek (by telephone) Mary Sisak (by telephone) Brett Koenecke

PRECISION REPORTING

Cheri Wittler, RPR, CRR

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the State Capitol Building, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of August 2008, commencing at 9:30 a.m.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Ladies and gentlemen, this is

Gary Hanson. With me are my fellow Commissioners, Dusty Johnson and Steve Kolbeck. We are resuming the meeting that we started this morning. And we are going to begin with the two items that were consolidated toward the beginning of the agenda which were moved to the end of the agenda.

Those are Dockets TC06-178, In the Matter of the Application of Sprint Communications Company, LP For Authority to Provide Local Exchange Services in Certain Rural Areas Served by Brookings Municipal Utilities Doing Business as Swiftel Communications.

The question is shall the Commission grant the Motion to Compel?

And TCO6-188, In the Matter of the Application by MCC Telephone of the Midwest, Incorporated Doing Business as Mediacom for a COA to Provide Interexchange and Local Exchange Services in the Brookings Exchange.

And, again, the question for the Commission is shall the Commission grant the Motion to Compel?

Mr. Koenecke, are you the first to chat on this, or is --

MR. KOENECKE: It's Ms. Sisak's motion, Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: That's what I was trying to find

out. By Mediacom.

Ms. Sisak, are you with us?

1.8

MS. SISAK: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Who else is on the phone with us right now?

MR. WIECZOREK: Talbot Wieczorek, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Mr. Wieczorek. Anyone else?

Ms. Sisak, we'll start with you then.

MS. SISAK: Thank you. The issue really being presented here is whether or not Sprint and Mediacom need to provide additional provisions of the agreement that governs the relationship between Sprint and Mediacom. Sprint and Mediacom have provided an agreement, but they've redacted a number of provisions in that agreement.

I believe it was last week immediately before our last motion hearing that Sprint and Mediacom provided a new version of the agreement where they provided some of the previously redacted information but not all of it.

Last -- I believe it was -- I could get this wrong.

It was either last week or Monday I provided additional information -- actually it might even have been tomorrow, I'm sorry. Time is kind of running together. But in any event, I was asked whether Swiftel still was seeking some of the information that was redacted. I responded that we were but I further limited the redacted information that we are seeking.

And so I just give you that history to show that we did try to make some efforts to reduce the issues, and I think

we've done that. However, some issues still remain.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: We appreciate that very much.

MS. SISAK: Currently the items that have been redacted that Swiftel is seeking concern the term and the termination of the agreement, transport for commercial business, and service quality. And also we seek not all of the information in the agreement identifying new markets or initial markets, but we do seek information as to whether the Brookings market is a new market or initial market.

These proceedings are a Certificate of Authority proceeding where Mediacom and Sprint have subjected themselves to the Commission's rules and South Dakota Law, seek the benefit of being designated as a carrier entitled to all of the rights of a carrier but also all of the duties of a carrier. And in South Dakota Law and the Commission's rules, the burden is on Mediacom and Sprint to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that they, in fact, meet all of the requirements in South Dakota Law and in the Commission's rules.

The law and rules also have some guidance to the Commission as to what it should do in terms of looking at an application for Certificate of Authority. And the law and rules specify that the Commission should examine all aspects of the nature, quality, timing of service to determine whether a Certificate of Authority should be granted or whether conditions should be imposed.

So, for example, South Dakota Law 49-31-71 states that the Commission may impose terms and conditions consistent with preserving and advancing universal service, protecting public safety and welfare, ensuring continued quality of service, and safeguarding the rights of consumers.

MR. KOENECKE: She's entitled to write a brief on this stuff.

MS. SISAK: If you look at each one of those categories it becomes clear that the information that the Petitioners need to present and which the Commission needs to consider is extremely broad and goes to all of these various aspects of what service ultimately might be provided by the Petitioners.

I would also point out that Sprint and Mediacom have both acknowledged on many occasions that neither one of them is able to provide service independent of the other. And, in fact, they are dependent upon each other for various services and facilities to meet the requirements of the Commission's rules to demonstrate that they are, in fact, qualified to receive a Certificate of Authority.

They also have admitted that the agreement, which is the subject of this motion, is the document that governs their relationship. And, in fact, Mediacom argued that the terms of the agreement are central to the business arrangement between Sprint and Mediacom.

1	I would like to now specifically address the
2	information that Swiftel seeks.
3	MS. AILTS WIEST: This is Rolayne Wiest. Is this
4	confidential, and was any of the preceding remarks confidential?
5	MS. SISAK: I don't think any of the preceding remarks
6	were confidential, but I do believe that any discussion of the
7	agreement the entire agreement has been marked as
8	confidential by Sprint and Mediacom, so I believe any discussion
9	of the specific provisions of the agreement would be
10	confidential.
11	MS. AILTS WIEST: And is that what you're going to go
12	into right now?
13	MS. SISAK: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN HANSON: We will turn off the web.
15	The web's turned off.
16	(The following portion of the transcript is
17	confidential)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Out of the confidential meeting. We have -- at this time I will, as Chairman, defer the two items that are before us. Those dockets being TC06-178 and TC06-188, and we will request staff to have an in-camera session to discuss some of the issues and make certain that all of the relevant issues that are necessary to come before the Commission for making a decision are available to us and to set a future date for a hearing on those two dockets.

Commissioner Kolbeck.

1.5

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I just have a question. In that in-camera is Mr. Koenecke and then the four of us or -- is that how that is going to -- is that how that would work?

CHAIRMAN HANSON: The Commissioners would not be a part of that.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Oh, we won't be a part of the in-camera. I was thinking --

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN HANSON: Excuse me. I was misunderstanding.}$ What is your --

MS. AILTS WIEST: I believe it would be the Commissioners and myself would be part of the in-camera proceeding.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Okay. So it would just be a scheduling between the four of us and that's all we need to include to get a date to get this done?

1 MS. AILTS WIEST: Right. We can set the in-camera 2 proceeding, and then the Commission can decide if they want to 3 go into the public meeting directly after that. I mean, I don't think there's any real time -- I don't know if it matters if 4 5 they're back to back is my point. COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Okay. I was just wondering to 6 7 help us schedule when we can get this done. If we're going to 8 have an in-camera and five days later is when the hearing's 9 going to be. We could do the in-camera and then head right into 1.0 this matter again, another hearing? Is that what you're saying? 11 MS. AILTS WIEST: Yeah. Either way I think you could 12 Whatever your preference is. 13 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Mr. Koenecke, did you have 14 something? 15 MR. KOENECKE: No. 16 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. Thank you. Questions 1.7 answered? Is there a motion to adjourn? 18 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Motion. 19 CHAIRMAN HANSON: All those in favor please signify by 20 saying yes. 21 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Yes. 23 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Those opposed? Motion carries. 24 are adjourned.

(The proceedings are concluded at 2:30 p.m.)

25

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
2	:SS CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF HUGHES)
4	
5	I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered
6	Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and Notary
7	Public in and for the State of South Dakota:
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed
9	shorthand reporter, I took in shorthand the proceedings had in
10	the above-entitled matter on the 6th day of August, 2008, and
11	that the attached is a true and correct transcription of the
12	proceedings so taken.
13	Dated at Pierre, South Dakota this 13th day of
14	August, 2008.
15	
16	
17	Che i'M. Com 100
18	Cheri McComsey Wittler, Notary Public and
19	Registered Professional Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter
20	Certified Kealtime Keporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	