1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
2	
	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
3	
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT FILED TC10-026 BY SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, LP
5	AGAINST NATIVE AMERICAN TELECOM, LLC REGARDING TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES
6	
7	Transgript of Dragoodings, win the Internet
8	Transcript of Proceedings, via the Internet April 9, 2013
9	
10	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, GARY HANSON, CHAIRMAN
11	CHRIS NELSON, CHAIRMAN KRISTIE FIEGEN, COMMISSIONER
12	
13	COMMISSION STAFF Rolayne Ailts Wiest
14	Karen Cremer
15	APPEARANCES
16	Scott Swier, Native American Telecom Scott Knudson, Sprint Communications
17	Tom Tobin, Sprint Communications Margo Northrup, South Dakota Network
18	William Van Camp, AT&T
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR
25	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, via the internet, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol Building, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of April, 2013, commencing at 9:30 a.m.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: The item is TC10-026, In the matter of a Complaint filed by Sprint Communications

Company, LP, against Native American Telecom. And it regards telecommunications services.

2.3

The question before the Commission is shall the Commission grant Native American Telecom's continuance of the hearing request? Or shall the Commission hear argument on Sprint's Motion for Summary Judgment?

Obviously, we'll first hear from Native American Telecom regarding their request for a continuance of the hearing.

Excuse me. Ms. Wiest has something to say before I go to Mr. Swier.

MS. AILTS WIEST: Before we -- just a note to anyone who is speaking is that our court reporter,

Cheri Wittler, was unable to make it to the meeting due to the road conditions. She is listening over the internet.

What I would ask the parties is that they identify themselves prior to the time that they're speaking. I don't believe that we would be getting into any confidential information. If so, I guess, we can handle that, but then we'll have to turn the internet off, of course. But just be cognisant of that.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. And we are at this

juncture just addressing the Native American Telecom's request for a continuance of the hearing.

Mr. Swier.

2.3

MR. SWIER: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner.

Scott Swier appearing on behalf of Native American

Telecom this morning. I think you'll be pleased to know hopefully this will be about a 30-second issue. I think we reached a resolution.

Just a little background. Late last week I received a supplemental filing from Sprint. Didn't have an opportunity to review any of those documents until Thursday of last week. So originally we requested a continuance to give NAT a fair opportunity to respond to that supplemental authority.

Ms. Cremer and I got together along with Sprint's counsel, and I think what we've agreed today is we are going to go forward with all the issues that were already kind of teed up for today, that the Commission, of course, would not be making any decision today, and that NAT would have a full and fair opportunity to respond to those supplemental filings.

I think that's where we're at today. But we're prepared to go forward with that caveat that, of course, no decision is going to be made today and we be given a fair opportunity to respond to those late filings.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Swier. And I don't see anyone else moving to the podium to -- I do.

I'm going to assume that we just dispense of it immediately. Go ahead.

MR. KNUDSON: (Inaudible).

2.3

The Motion for continuance has been deemed withdrawn. We offered to continue the hearing on our Motion yesterday and were refused. Therefore, I think one can conclude that any claim of prejudice on the part of NAT must be deemed waived.

We'd simply also point out that Sprint found itself in a similar situation in the SDN case versus Sprint where Northern Valley filed the Connect America Decision shortly before the hearing on that case.

That was an Order of several hundred pages.

That was filed six days before the hearings, responded to that filing within two days. I think appropriate for NAT to do the same during the same time frame. But, nonetheless, we're willing to allow NAT to file a supplemental response to our additional authority.

Finally, I just want to point out that yesterday

NAT filed an Affidavit in this proceeding, and I find it

strange that we would be accused of bad faith in our

filing of supplemental authority for the Federal

Communications Commission when NAT files a Affidavit of

```
1
     somebody that purports to have knowledge of what's
 2
     happening on the reservation.
              With that, I think you can conclude that the
 3
 4
     Motion For Continuance is over and we move to the merits
 5
     of Sprint's Motion.
 6
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Chairman.
7
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Yes, Commissioner Fiegen.
8
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: We did not hear the first
     15 seconds so I didn't hear who was speaking.
10
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                That was Mr. Scott Knudson
11
     with Sprint.
12
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you.
13
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: And I would -- I don't believe
14
     I need to speak on behalf of anyone, but perhaps NAT
15
     would state that they don't have quite the number of
16
     counsel that Sprint does in order to come back with an
17
     answer quite as quickly as that.
18
              We don't need to take shots at each other just
19
     yet on some of these things. We appreciate your
20
     comments, though.
21
              Staff, did you have something to add?
22
              MS. CREMER: Staff does not.
                                             Thank you.
2.3
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.
                                             Then we will
24
     consider that the Request For Continuance has been
```

withdrawn unless -- I'm not seeing any objection to that

25

- whatsoever. We will consider that withdrawn. And we 2 will go to hear arguments on Sprint's Motion for Summary 3 Judgment.
- 4 And I believe that means Sprint is up.
- 5 Mr. Knudson and Mr. Tobin, I believe.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

- MR. KNUDSON: Again, Mr. Chairman, Scott Knudson for Sprint, and with me is Tom Tobin from his firm in Winner, South Dakota.
- We appreciate the opportunity to appear before I notice outside that the weather is you today. presenting some issues as to whether any of us will get home tonight, but, nonetheless, I welcome the opportunity. And if I have to spend another night in Pierre, I'll find a restaurant where I can enjoy the food.
- CHAIRMAN HANSON: It's a chamber of commerce day. We bring people in and don't let them leave.
- MR. KNUDSON: That's right. A little fiscal 19 stimulus for the local economy.
 - Before the Commission is Sprint's Motion For Summary Judgment seeking a declaratory judgment that, one, NAT cannot provide telecommunication services anywhere in South Dakota without a Certificate of Authority; two, that NAT cannot invoice Sprint for intrastate services without a Certificate of Authority;

three, that NAT's invoices to Sprint for intrastate services are void; and, finally, only the Commission can regulate Sprint within the state -- the provision of intrastate services.

2.3

2.4

We bring this Motion based on certain undisputed facts. There are a number of facts in our briefs. I think what really are the key ones for the purposes of this Motion, and they're not disputed, first, NAT was organized by nontribal members under the laws of the State of South Dakota. It's a limited liability company.

NAT is purporting to operate as a CLEC in South Dakota providing local exchange services to, among others, Free Conferencing Corporation, an entity this Commission is familiar with through the Sancom case. It is undisputed that NAT does not have a Certificate of Authority from the Commission.

It's also undisputed that under state law a

Certificate of Authority is required before a

telecommunication services provider can begin offering
intrastate services.

And, finally, NAT's provision of local exchange services without a Certificate of Authority is a violation of state law.

So as to the first and second of these

declarations we seek, there should be no dispute at all. The legislature has enunciated in 49-31-3 that this Certificate of Authority is mandatory before any services can be provided and that providing those services without a Certificate of Authority is a Class 1 Misdemeanor.

2.3

Moreover, with respect to the third request that NAT's invoices are void, should not be open to any serious dispute, nor does NAT appear to argue otherwise.

We cited a number of cases to the Commission that establish that in these circumstances NAT's failure to get a Certificate of Authority renders its invoices under its tariffs, whatever form, void.

For example, the <u>Nature's 10</u> case was a franchise issue. The franchisor had had its registration with the State lapse. It was held that the arbitration provision in the franchise agreement was unenforceable, and the franchisee proceeded directly to Circuit Court to bring an action.

We cite a couple of beverage or liquor cases where it was held by the State Supreme Court that the sale of alcoholic beverages as a violation of state law rendered the sales contracts or in one case it was a chattel mortgage void as a matter of law, and even the borrower or purchaser who had gotten the benefits of the

bargain was not obligated to repay the balance due on the purchase order or chattel mortgage.

2.3

There was another one on a railroad case where the railroad hired a developer with a sweetheart deal to develop the properties along the line the railroad proposed to build. And the developer was supposed to split the profits on this transaction. The court held that the contract was void as a matter of public policy and the railroad cannot sue to enforce that contract, and the developer did not have to return the benefits of the bargain.

Now the first three points under declaratory judgment I think are pretty much beyond dispute. But what NAT says in response to -- instead of stopping its illegal and contumacious conduct, says there's nothing this Commission can do about it.

Now the first argument they advanced for that proposition is that NAT is no longer billing Sprint and has tendered a refund for what Sprint paid to NAT for intrastate services. That, NAT argues, means this case is moot.

It also says that the Commission has already granted what we sought in our declaratory relief. But as -- we've been through this issue before. As we've said before and I think as the Commission has concluded,

this case is not moot.

2.3

Mootness, first of all, we point out in our briefs, and I won't dwell on this, is that it's not necessarily applicable to an administrative agency that this doctrine is developed by federal courts to avoid issuing advisory opinions, but the circumstances of applying it to an administrative agency are different, and it doesn't necessarily apply in full force or at all.

But let's assume for the sake of argument we don't need to make law on that particular area, that the Mootness Doctrine does apply. But under the standards by which mootness is judged, I don't think you can conclude that this case meets a mootness determination.

And the seminal case in this area that I think is applicable to the Commission on our Motion is a case from the United States Supreme Court called Friends of the Earth v. Laidlaw Environmental Services.

Well, that was a citizen's suit brought under the Clean Water Act to stop <u>Laidlaw</u>, which was operating some kind of incinerator, from violating the terms of its permit issued under the Clean Water Act. The citizen's suit was successful in the District Court. <u>Laidlaw</u> was found to have violated the terms of its discharge permit and was assessed substantial penalties.

The case went up to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. Between the time the District Court ruled and when the Court of Appeals took the case, <u>Laidlaw</u> had closed that plant and begun dismantling it and put the property up for sale.

2.3

The Fourth Circuit said, well, in that case there's no longer an act of controversy here, the violations of the permits have ceased, the case is moot. The case went on to the United States Supreme Court.

The United States Supreme Court said, no, the case is not moot, that the Defendant had not established that there was no possibility that these violations would not recur.

In our circumstances, we've got a situation where NAT, which bill the services -- for its services to Sprint when this case was initiated, which persisted in billing for several months, is still operating in the State of South Dakota, is still billing for intrastate services. They're simply not billing Sprint.

So one cannot conclude under the standards established by the United States Supreme Court, which would establish what the Doctrine of Mootness means in this case, that NAT can meet that high burden to show that it's unlikely that its violations would recur because they're occurring right now.

So, consequently, NAT cannot divest the Commission of its jurisdiction or Sprint's Complaint by simply saying we're sorry to Sprint.

2.3

Further, ruling on Sprint's request is not an idle exercise by the Commission. Before the Commission on Sprint's Motion and its Complaint are important state interests to be determined. The State Legislature has articulated through the scope and authority of this Commission to regulate telecommunications services within this state in 49-31-3.

A ruling in Sprint's favor holding that NAT is in violation of the state law would cut off any right of NAT to bill Sprint in the future or to seek collection on its prior invoices. That is still subject to NAT's counterclaims in the Federal District Court, which has currently been referred to the Federal Communications Commission for disposition.

It is also -- those invoices are subject to a still outstanding Tribal Utility Authority ordered to pay, which has been stayed by the Federal District Court. It also is involved in NAT's Motion to Dismiss this case, which is still pending before the Commission to dismiss this case in deference to the Tribal Utility Authority.

A decision from this Commission on our Motion will establish clear precedent for future CLEC

applications and operations. And I'd note that in the related telecom proceeding, 11-87, which is NAT's application for a Certificate of Authority, NAT has admitted that it's providing local exchange services to Free Conferencing Corporation. That's the entity that generates all the traffic to NAT and it's providing local exchange services to that entity.

2.3

This Free Conferencing Corporation is not a tribal entity. It's not providing any tribal services at all. It's simply providing conference bridge services, and it's getting paid out of what it hopes to collect from access charges.

And then I note also that AT&T is an Intervener in this case. It filed a Brief in support of our Motion, and in particular has an interest in the outcome and determination by the Commission, and so it is a party in this case and supports our position on what the Commission can do to implement further relief with respect to the parties.

Then I would note -- and this is subject to our supplemental authority, which is probably why it was so strenuously objected to -- the FCC ruled recently in a case brought by AT&T -- which we can call <u>All American</u>, which was the primary Defendant.

In that FCC Order it looked to the proceedings

of the Utah Public Service Commission where the Utah
Public Service Commission was proceeding against a couple
of CLECS which were providing services to traffic access
stimulators, much like Free Conferencing Corporation, and
these CLECS were doing so in violation of their
Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity and that
the Utah Public Service Commission was bringing an
enforcement action against them for violating the terms
of their certificate or operating without a certificate
at one point in time.

2.3

The significance of that is that the Federal Communications Commission in ruling on AT&T's Complaint found that these <u>All American</u> and the other Defendants had violated Section 201(b) and 203 of the Telecommunications Act with unjust and unreasonable practices.

A determination here by this Commission that NAT is in violation of state law, is operating without a Certificate of Authority in violation of state law, would be something very relevant to Sprint's action against NAT before the Federal Communications Commission.

In particular, I point to Paragraph 39 of that FCC Order where the Defendants were saying that the determination or the actions of the Utah Public Service Commission were irrelevant to what was going on before

the FCC.

2.3

The FCC specifically rejected that argument.

And so this supplemental authority bears directly on the issue of whether or not proceeding further in Sprint's case in this docket has effective legal significance.

We would submit simply that the Commission in ruling in Sprint's favor can effectively grant Sprint ongoing future relief as well as to other IXCs who may be faced with a similar situation.

And, finally, I want to say that contrary to what NAT is suggesting, the Commission should definitely declare that it's a sole regulator of Sprint's intrastate activities.

Now I believe NAT's second argument for the Commission to stay its hand is premised on Federal Indian Law. And I think this argument has no place before the Commission on this proceeding.

I'd like to clarify something that NAT suggests in its Response Brief, that somehow we're trying to urge the Commission to regulate interstate traffic. That's not true. Nothing that we're seeking from the Commission is an attempt to have the Commission interfere with the jurisdiction of the FCC. We're mindful of the dichotomy Congress drew between federal and state regulatory structures.

Further, nothing that Sprint is seeking in its

Motion or its Complaint would interfere with what NAT

calls the unique federal relationship with Indian tribes.

I think if the Commission were to look at the Cheyenne

River Decision by the South Dakota Supreme Court,

arguments like this were articulated by US West.

2.3

2.4

But there was a litany of federal initiatives in the area of telecommunications law that would benefit Indian tribes and that somehow the Commission's assertion of jurisdiction on Cheyenne River, which was over the regulation of the sale of telephone exchange would impede or interfere with those policies.

First, the Supreme Court said there's no preemptive effect from those policies. And, second, nothing that was being articulated by US West in that case -- and I want to point you to paragraph 27 of that decision -- really implicated any of those initiatives. I think the same conclusion holds here.

Certainly there would be some federal initiatives to promote the build-out of infrastructure on reservations, but that doesn't change the issue before the Commission, which is what is your authority to regulate Sprint's intrastate activities under state and federal law?

So I would just say that the State has an

important role. South Dakota has been at the forefront of this in terms of delineating what powers the states have to regulate commercial relations on Indian reservations. And I think the Congress has not stepped in here to take away any of the State's authority to do so.

2.3

Finally, I'd like to point out with respect to another argument that's advanced under this Indian law ed note is that somehow NAT is a tribal entity and it's cloaked with the sovereign immunity of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe. I think that argument's not been made before, and this newly minted argument must be rejected.

First, I'd point out that NAT has pending before the Commission an application for a Certificate of Authority in TC11-087. To us that seems to be a concession or a waiver that, in fact, it's required to get a Certificate of Authority from the Commission before it can operate. Also I would point out that we cite a number of authorities here.

There is the case from the South Dakota Supreme Court, <u>Wright v. Prairie Chicken</u>, which states that the place of incorporation or the laws under which the entity is formed is significant in the determination on whether or not the entity is cloaked with tribal immunity.

Now in that case they went on to hold that they could sue the individual board members of an organization providing or regulating health services on reservations individually because it didn't mean you were suing the tribe directly.

2.3

But that case, <u>Wright v. Prairie Chicken</u>, has been cited favorably by a couple of other State Courts.

One we site is this <u>American Property Management</u>, a

California case. And then we've got the <u>Airvator</u> case from North Dakota. And both of those hold it's dispositive if the entity's form under the laws of the state, then it's not a tribal entity entitled to tribal sovereign immunity.

It's undisputed that NAT was formed by two nontribal members under the laws of the State of South Dakota as a state LLC, limited liability company. To Sprint that means that there should be no further analysis necessary to conclude that NAT is not entitled to any assertion of sovereign immunity.

But one could also look at some of the factors that the <u>Wright</u> case cites. And, for example, NAT is managed by nontribal members. NAT is part of a joint venture with Free Conferencing Corporation and Wide Voice. That's the real entity that's running this program. That's controlled by nonmembers.

The books and records, the finances, the flow of funds, they're all in the hands of nontribal members.

The Tribe simply doesn't control this operation. And if we have a judgment against NAT, we will not be looking for the Tribe for anything to satisfy that judgment.

2.3

2.4

Further, if the Commission moves forward here, anything it articulates will not offend tribal sovereignty. In other words, the interest of the -- as tribe will not be offended or affected by the Commission's ruling.

I think I can cite a couple of cases here just for that general proposition. First of all, I think the State Supreme Court very clearly articulated that in the Cheyenne River Decision where it was asserted that somehow this would -- if the Commission asserted the right to regulate the sale of a telephone exchange on the reservation, it would impede tribal sovereign interests. And the Supreme Court said no to that argument.

And, further, in the Western Wireless Decision from the FCC, this same issue was addressed as to what the tribal sovereign interests were on whether or not the FCC's authorization in that area would impede tribal sovereign interest. Again, the FCC concluded that that would not be the case.

So I think then one can conclude that both on

the state and federal level that two interests are the same in concluding what the Commission's authorization of power to regulate in this area for intrastate services will not impede or affect negatively the sovereign interests of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe.

2.3

So we're seeking a declaration that the Commission has the authority to regulate intrastate services with its respect to Sprint. Conversely, that the Crow Creek Tribal Utility Authority does not have that power.

This ruling would vindicate an important state interest. The Commission has an important role in defining what the State's authority is in the telecommunications area. And this is consistent with the dichotomy, the power, that Congress implemented in the 1934 Telecommunications Act, that on the one hand interstate regulation is reserved to the Federal Communications Commission, but on the other hand the balance of the regulatory power was reserved to the states.

This came before the United States Supreme Court in a case we cite to the Commission, Louisiana Public

Services Commission v. FCC. And the narrow issue in that case was the FCC had one depreciation schedule for telecommunications equipment. The Louisiana Public

Services Commission had another.

2.3

And when it got to the United States Supreme

Court, the Supreme Court said give them what Congress has said. Not withstanding that the FCC has ruled in the interstate area, Congress reserved to the states the power to regulate intrastate services. That power was not preempted by the Federal Communications regulations in this area.

But it's also significant, if you look at the reading of the statute, it says federal, state. It doesn't say anything about tribal authority. If Congress chooses to grant tribal authority to regulate, it knows how to do so. It amended the '34 Act in 1996 and didn't change that dichotomy.

I would like to point out another case we cite in our Brief, which I think is interesting, is the Otter Tail Power case, which is the North Dakota Supreme Court. In that case, the Tribe authorized Otter Tail Power to provide services to a tribal manufacturing company, tribally owned manufacturing company. Under the Public Service Commission's allocation of service territories, that right belonged to another power company.

And it goes to the North Dakota Supreme Court, and it upholds the right of the Public Service

Commission to determine which of the two power companies can serve this tribally owned business on the reservation and that the Public Service Commission could bring an enforcement action against Otter Tail Power for violating the authority granted it by the PSC.

2.3

And so it's a situation where again the State

Supreme Court says under the regulatory scheme system

that PSC has the whole authority to determine who gets to
serve this entity. And so that's an important case that

comes to bearing here.

I think if you conclude -- if you'd look again at the Montana case we cite, which is the one talking about tribal sovereign interests and what the power to regulate nonmembers is, the Montana case pretty much says efforts to regulate nontribal members are presumptively invalid. There were a couple of narrow exceptions. And they were addressed in Cheyenne River and Western Wireless and said, no, those don't apply.

We cite a case from the South Dakota Federal
District Court involving Progressive Special Insurance.
Pretty much there it says here their presumptively
invalid, efforts to regulate nontribal members.

And if you look at the case of <u>Strate v. A-1</u>

<u>Contractors</u>, that's a state -- excuse me. United States

Supreme Court case that says absolute Congressional

authorization, the Tribe has presumptively no power to regulate nonmembers.

2.3

On this particular point I'd like to just conclude with a couple three quotations from the Cheyenne River case because I think they bear very much on the policy implications of our Motion.

In paragraph 21 the Supreme Court says "The regulatory scheme of telecommunications services specifically grants PUC authority and jurisdiction over intrastate facilities. The authority of PUC is extensive and crucial to the overall regulatory scheme. Among other things, it has general supervision and control of all telecommunications companies offering common carrier services within the state to the extent such business is not otherwise regulated by federal law or regulation."

In paragraph 22 the court says "Clearly this extensive Congressional and legislative authority authorizes PUC to regulate the activities of US West in the sale of telephone exchanges whether on or off the reservation. Accordingly, PUC's regulation of US West is not an improper infringement upon the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe's right to self-Government."

Then there's an important paragraph in that decision that gets to the heart of this. Paragraph 29
"The primary purposes and objectives of Congress in

regulating telecommunications are to protect
telecommunications consumers. Consumers are ensured
through its regulation adequate facilities and reasonable
rates. This protection applies to all consumers, whether
they reside on or off of an Indian reservation. Such
regulation is an important Government function, and PUC's
regulatory authority furthers its objectives and
purposes. It does not interfere with them."

2.3

2.4

I think that's crucial the State Supreme Court has unequivocally articulated your authority in this area.

There's just a Brief comment on argument made by South Dakota Network about the Commission should not decide its case. We agree. But the Commission could determine in the SDN case any implications of a decision it makes in this case when that arises in the docket before the Commission involving the South Dakota Network.

It need not address the issues. I think they should just say right now those arguments are premature.

In sum, we urge the Commission to grant Sprint's Motion. The Commission can establish what the rules are in this area. We think that the State's role in intrastate regulation is paramount and the Commission

should say so. With that certainty the industry can move forward knowing what the roles are for the various parties.

Thank you.

2.3

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. I'm debating whether we should go to questions as each party makes presentations.

I think what we'll do is we'll let the other parties make presentations, and then we'll ask questions. Unless one of the Commissioners feels compelled to ask questions at this juncture.

Do you feel you need to fill in some merits? I do.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: If I could, Mr. Chairman, and it might help the other side fill in as they make a presentation.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Let me ask a couple of questions I'm concerned with as well.

Thank you very much for the presentations. We appreciate the briefs and the tremendous amount of work that each of you do in preparing for your presentations.

Mr. Knudson, can you help me just a little bit with I'm -- the original Complaint had three items on it, and then the subsequent initial Brief had four items on it. Your Motion for Summary Judgment and your Amended --

then your Amended Complaint, which I'm struggling if we're on the Amended Complaint now with five different items on it. And they tend to deal with somewhat the same items, but they phrase them a little bit differently as we go through it.

2.3

What is the -- what are the actual items that we should be looking at at this juncture? What do we actually have before us on the Complaint?

MR. KNUDSON: Well, it would be the Amended Complaint, Mr. Chairman. The Amended Complaint was filed shortly after the first one to correct a couple of basically typographical errors.

What we have -- how we have stated the issues in our Motion papers, I think, are fairly encompassed in what is in the Amended Complaint. And we've tried to characterize them or cast them in a way that you could follow them one, two, three, four, you know, a more organized fashion as we've thought through what it is that's going on here, what our Amended Complaint requested, and how should we rephrase what the Commission should rule when ultimately issues in the Order in this case.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. So it is the -it's the five items in your Amended Complaint at this
juncture?

1 MR. KNUDSON: That is correct.

2.3

CHAIRMAN HANSON: I have a few other questions, but I'll let the other Commissioners key up theirs to see what -- see if they bring in the pieces of mine.

Commissioner Nelson.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Just a couple. And the first might be a little bit of a hypothetical. But if NAT -- if the only type of telecommunications service that they were engaged in was interstate long distance that terminated to Free Conferencing, that was it, would this Commission have authority over that?

MR. KNUDSON: I think yes. First of all, let's take it on the circumstances that are before the Commission that are not hypothetical.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I understand that the evidence shows that they're involved in more than what I've laid out, but I'd really like to peel it back to what my question is, if you can.

MR. KNUDSON: Yes. Okay. Let me -- the reason why I say it's not hypothetical is let's just eliminate all the other window dressing around what NAT is doing with Free Conferencing Corporation.

The real business model here is to provide a place to host this bridge. And they've parked it in Fort Thompson. And they say they are providing local

exchange services to Free Conferencing Corporation.

2.3

In our Reply Brief I provided an Affidavit with the discovery responses germane to that point from 11-87 which is, one, there's a Request For Admission to admit that NAT is providing local exchange services to Free Conferencing Corporation. Admit.

And then there was a document provided from their tariff. The tariff lists the kinds of local exchange services that NAT is providing. And that would include providing services to Free Conferencing Corporation.

So you can clear away everything else. They're still providing local exchange services to Free Conferencing Corporation. Yes, you have jurisdiction to address that issue.

Too I would point out the analogy to the case we cited in our supplemental authority, which was this is a very hypothetical you're postulating here, you're posing, which was the only user was a conference calling company.

And, finally, I don't think in the regulatory scheme you can have a purely intrastate service. You have to have some kind of local terminating access. And so it's got to be located somewhere. And the way Congress has set up the regulatory scheme, that somewhere

is a state and under what terms and conditions the state allows that to be there will be regulated by the state.

2.3

And so I think ultimately, yes, even under your situation this Commission would have a jurisdiction to regulate.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. That's helpful. And I'm going to apologize for this next question. I am struggling to see the connection between your supplemental filing in the <u>All American</u> case and what we're dealing with here today.

And part of the reason I may be struggling is because I haven't had a chance to hear Mr. Swier's side of the story. And, obviously, when you hear the other side it begins to gel.

Could you just step through with me again, how you feel that case -- and as I look at that, the circumstances of that are quite different than what we're dealing with here in NAT. And so if you could just help me see the connection between that and what we're asked to rule on here today. Thank you.

MR. KNUDSON: Yes. The connection comes in a couple of ways. What we have is before the Federal Communications Commission in the <u>All American</u> case, supplemental authority, was a referral to decide whether or not the practices of the CLEC in invoicing the IXCs

for local terminating accesses service was an unreasonable and unjust practice under federal law.

2.3

And the Federal Communications Commission looked to the status of the CLECS under state law and what terms and conditions they were permitted to operate.

The Utah Public Service Commission was -- had determined that the CLECS had operated outside the authority granted them in their certificate of public convenience and necessity or had ignored whatever limitations. They had operated without it at some point in time.

The FCC took that to mean that what the CLECS were doing in invoicing for these conference bridge services was an unjust and unreasonable practice.

Therefore, what is happening here in South Dakota is germane to what's before the Federal Communications

Commission on the referral Judge Schreier made of Sprint's Complaint against NAT in Federal District Court.

There may be some factual distinctions, but we don't believe that they're necessarily of any moment.

What factual distinctions there are, are ultimately for the FCC to decide whether that makes a difference. But a determination that NAT is operating in violation of State law would be analogous to the determination the Utah Public Service Commission was making with respect to

```
the CLECS in that case, in the All American case.
2
              So I think the analogy is a strong one, the
 3
     significance of that determination, if you make that
     determination, which I think is self-evident given the
 4
     statutory scheme the legislature has enunciated. And the
 6
     FCC can determine whether or not that is an unjust and
7
     unreasonable practice under federal law. The foundation
8
     for that finding -- here's what the -- the CLECS are
     saying it's not relevant.
10
              But the FCC very specifically said what the
     Utah Public Service Commission did was relevant to what
11
     the FCC was determining. And, therefore, that's the
12
13
     connection. And that's why we brought it to your
14
     attention. We think it's very germane to what's before
15
     you today.
16
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. That was
17
    helpful.
18
              No further questions at this time.
19
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                Thank you.
20
              Commissioner Fiegen, do you have any questions
21
     at this time?
22
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: No questions at this time.
2.3
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Does Staff have any questions?
2.4
              Please go ahead, Ms. Wiest.
```

MS. AILTS WIEST:

If, for example, the

25

Commission decides the issues presented -- the fourth issue in your Amended Complaint was awarding of money damages, to be determined at a hearing.

2.3

I guess my question is by dividing this Motion for Summary Judgment is there still an outstanding issue of awarding money damages?

MR. KNUDSON: Well, I think it was a live issue at the time the Complaint was drafted. It is a live issue in this regard in terms of NAT's right to seek money damages -- or to sue for enforcement of invoices or to sue for breach of contract, or to pursue its counterclaim in Federal District Court. But still the question of dollars is a live one.

What I'm trying to draw here is a crucial distinction in terms of the mootness analysis. The fact that NAT tendered a refund of the amounts due under the State invoices does not change, I think, the calculation or ultimate conclusion on mootness.

As I pointed out in our discussion on Friends of the Earth v. Laidlaw Environmental Services, voluntary cessation of illegal conduct does not moot a case. So I don't think we'd have to have a hearing on money damages in terms of the invoices that were paid, but would we essentially flush away the other invoices and also obviate any right to pursue any action in any forum on

```
1
     those invoices for intrastate services. So that
     distinction is a very important one.
2
 3
              MS. AILTS WIEST: But Sprint is not contending
 4
    at this point that there would be any awarding of money
 5
    damages yet to happen?
 6
              MR. KNUDSON: Well, I think as I sit here right
7
    now, I think if we get a ruling in favor of our
8
    declaratory relief, the need for a money damages
    determination would probably go away.
10
              MS. AILTS WIEST: And then if you -- do you have
11
    a copy of your statement of undisputed facts?
              MR. KNUDSON: I do, if you'll give me a minute.
12
13
              MS. AILTS WIEST: I'm looking at the
14
    confidential version.
15
              MR. KNUDSON:
                            Okay.
16
              MS. AILTS WIEST: I was just wondering if you
17
    have a typo there. You have 51 percent, 26, and 24.
18
              MR. KNUDSON: I do. And it's been pointed out
19
     to me by NAT as well. It's 51 for the Tribe, 25 by the
20
     entity controlled by the founders of NAT, and 24 percent
21
    to Wide Voice Communications.
22
              MS. AILTS WIEST: Okay. Thank you. That's all
2.3
    I have at this time.
24
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. We will now hear
```

25

from Native American Telecom.

Cheri, how are you doing? She's not on the line. She's listening. Okay.

Please, go ahead.

MR. SWIER: First of all, Chair, I want to thank you for your prior comments. I think it's pretty clear that the Commission is dealing with some difficult issues. And the parties' representation on both sides has tried to, I think, set out the issues as good as possible. And I do appreciate the accommodation that the Chair made to both Sprint and NAT. I think both parties are very well represented. They're tough issues.

What I would like to do before we start today is I do have some individuals here who I would like to have introduce themselves. Unfortunately, we had some more folks who were going to be here this morning from the Crow Creek Tribe, but, of course, because of the weather they started out, and it just wasn't humanly possible for them to be here.

But if you would grant me the permission to allow me the introduction of our guests today. Because I think these folks can maybe answer some of your questions also.

MR. JACK: My name is Lyle Jack. I'm from the -- (Inaudible).

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Please, because we have a

```
1
     court reporter, I'm going to ask that you step over to --
    Mr. Jack, if you would step over to a microphone and --
2
 3
                        Good morning. My name is Lyle Jack.
              MR. JACK:
 4
     I'm a member of the Oglala Sioux Tribe.
                                              I work for the
5
    Office of Economic Development for the Tribe, and I'm
 6
    also a board member for NAT.
7
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                Thank you very much.
8
              MR. RED CLOUD: Good morning. My name is
     Joe Read Cloud.
                      I'm from the Pine Ridge Indian
10
    Reservation. I also work for the Office of Economic
11
    Development, and I am currently the Interim Chairman of
12
    the Tribe's Public Utilities Commission.
13
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                Thank you. Welcome to both of
14
     you.
15
              COMMISSIONER NELSON:
                                    If I might ask a question,
16
    Mr. Chairman.
17
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Go ahead.
18
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: Mr. Jack, you indicated
19
    you're a board member of NAT. Is that NAT on Crow Creek
20
     or NAT on Pine Ridge?
21
              MR. JACK: That's NAT Pine Ridge.
22
              COMMISSIONER NELSON:
                                    Thank you. And my name
2.3
     is Jeff Holoubek.
                        I'm acting president of Native
    American Telecom.
                        I'm also director of legal and finance
24
25
     for Free Conferencing Corporation.
```

I'm probably the person with the most answers in this room regarding what's going on here. I really appreciate the opportunity to address this Commission, and I am only sorry that I didn't come in sooner.

2.3

In listening to what Mr. Knudson was saying, there were a couple of things that stood out. One is that, gosh, it seems a lot more complicated to me than what Mr. Knudson makes it seem. Some of the things he said are true, and some of them simply aren't. But I think that it's just a mistake of facts, and I'm here to clear anything up that I can.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: All right. If we have some questions, I believe you're represented by counsel, and counsel will be making the presentation. And then if for some reason there's questions that cannot be answered, we might ask. But this is for argument for --

Excuse me. It looks like Mr. Peterson -- excuse me. Knudson has something that he would -- you'll need to step to at least a microphone over there.

The purpose of today's hearing is to hear arguments, and we're not going into additional evidence and things of that nature.

MR. SWIER: Mr. Chair, I guess I would respectfully request Mr. Knudson's been given an opportunity to address the Commission. I guess I would

- ask that we be allowed to make our presentation, and,

 obviously, both parties will have an opportunity later to

 answer any further questions.

 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Absolutely. You're -- that's
 - the purpose of you being here today, Mr. Swier, is to make your argument on this issue that's specifically before us.
 - MR. KNUDSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order on this issue.
- 10 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Please, go ahead.

- 11 MR. KNUDSON: This hasn't been set up for a

 12 hearing. Argument of counsel. The record has been

 13 submitted to Commission. I would object to any effort by

 14 NAT to supplement the record.
 - This is not a live testimonial hearing. Those are different animals altogether. I have no discovery of any of these people. They would be testifying. They're arguing to the Commission and enhancing the record, prejudicing Sprint.
 - So, again, I appreciate your admonition to

 Mr. Swier. Let's restrict this to argument of counsel,

 please.
 - CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. Your point of order is dually noted and accepted.
- 25 This is, as I stated -- we're at the juncture of

hearing arguments, specifically on the Motion for Summary
Judgment, and that's what we're going to stick with.

MR. SWIER: Thank you.

2.3

CHAIRMAN HANSON: So, Mr. Swier, your comments, please.

MR. SWIER: Thank you. As we know, NAT was served with a supplemental authority late last week by Sprint. What we did is we never accused Sprint of bad faith. We simply asked them, look, you've known about this supplemental authority for months and you decide to spring it on us at the last minute.

We asked for a continuance, and we were told no so we -- the agreement, of course, was that we would appear today and be able to submit filings later, which I think is just fair.

What we've done here is the letter that I have provided from Senator Lederman, from Majority Whip Lederman, is our response to some of the supplemental authority. I think it's only fair that if Sprint is allowed to present and talk about their supplemental authority, that we should at least have the opportunity to not only brief the issue but also bring up some of the points.

And I think Senator Lederman's letter, at least a portion of it, which again we'll file with the

Commission, we're last minute stuff here because of the supplemental filings, we're simply trying to have an opportunity.

2.3

And I guess I would like to submit Senator

Lederman's letter. I'd also like the privilege of maybe

pointing out part of Senator Lederman's letter because it

is responsive to the arguments that Mr. Knudson just

made. And I'd ask for a little leeway based on their

late filing.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Well, you can make any presentation that you wish in respect to the issue that is before us at the present time. We're not regurgitating the entire process here. We're looking at whether or not we should direct summary judgment based on the five items that were presented.

MR. SWIER: I understand that. So I -CHAIRMAN HANSON: And this is your argument,
counsel's argument, that we're looking for.

MR. SWIER: What I'd like to do then is very quickly -- because I think it does set the stage. And there's been a lot of things that were filed regarding this Summary Judgment Motion that I think should be cleared up.

And if you would look at Senator Lederman's submission on page 3, starting on page 3 -- because I

think Senator Lederman does as good of a job as anyone in setting the stage here for what's before the Commission today and what's really going on here.

2.3

And I'd start with the paragraph "In reviewing this docket proceeding." And again this is a letter from Senator Lederman that I am authorized to present on his behalf today.

"In reviewing this docket proceeding, I also note that NAT's opponents have rebuked its association with Free Conferencing Corporation. As you may know, Free Conferencing is the world's largest privately held conferencing company. Free Conferencing serves upwards of 20 million users each month from approximately 186 countries and has international installations in 38 countries. Free Conferencing services are used by many of the major corporations in the United States, by almost every office of Congress, including both Republican and Democratic presidential campaign offices, nonprofits, religious organizations, colleges and universities, and my office," meaning Senator Lederman's office, "just to name a few."

"Free Conferencing has been in discussions with South Dakota's economic development leaders regarding a possible expansion of its business to South Dakota. In fact, state and local economic development offices have

invited Free Conferencing to events designed to entice 2 Free Conferencing to expand its business to South Dakota, 3 bringing with it excellent employment opportunities. 4 Unfortunately, the mistruths perpetrated by its 5 competitors in this docket have brought Free 6 Conferencing's South Dakota expansion to a standstill. 7 Free Conferencing has recently conveyed to me that it 8 believes the Commission does not want Free Conferencing or its business potential to expand to South Dakota. 10 This is unfortunate to say the least as a cursory review 11 of its history and business model reveals that Free 12 Conferencing is clearly not the bad guy its opponents 13 have made it out to be. In fact, Free Conferencing is 14 the type of technologically savvy company that we as 15 state officials should attempt to bring to our 16 South Dakota. 17 "Finally, in 2008 the South Dakota Legislature 18 considered House Bill 1097, which attempted to prohibit access stimulation activities. This bill was soundly 19 20 defeated in the House of Representatives. In 2010 the 21 South Dakota Legislature considered Senate Bill 87, which 22 again attempted to prohibit access stimulation

activities. This bill was soundly defeated by the

Senate. Since that time the Federal Communications

25 Commission has" --

2.3

24

```
1
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Just when you're reading
2
     you --
              MR. SWIER: Little slower?
 3
 4
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Please. We have a court
5
    reporter, and she doesn't have the ability to communicate
 6
    with us.
7
              MR. SWIER: I will.
8
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: I imagine her fingers are
9
     falling off her hands right now.
10
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Chairman Hanson --
11
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Excuse me. Cheri, you're
12
    online now?
13
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN:
                                    No. This is Kristie
14
             Is this online, or do we have access to it?
    Fiegen.
15
              MS. AILTS WIEST: Yeah. You haven't filed this
16
     yet? Is that correct?
17
              MR. SWIER: We're just filing it right now.
18
              MS. AILTS WIEST: Is somebody downstairs filing
19
     it? Can you check on that? We'll get it filed as soon
20
     as possible, Commissioner Fiegen, and post it on the web.
21
              MR. SWIER: Chairman, may I continue?
22
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Yes. And I hate to say it,
2.3
    but a little slower, please.
24
              MR. SWIER: Yeah. "Since that time the Federal
25
     Communications Commission has provided new guidelines for
```

companies that wish to engage in access stimulation activities. I have been assured that NAT is following these new guidelines. It is apparent that NAT's opponents are using this Commission's docket" -- to access stimulation activities. Again, this bill was -- excuse me. "It is apparent that NAT's opponents are using this Commission's docket to take another run at an issue that the legislature has overwhelmingly defeated on two separate occasions.

2.3

"During my time in the legislature I have enjoyed a strong working relationship with the tribes in South Dakota and look forward to continuing that relationship. Unfortunately, American-Indian tribes in South Dakota continue to face significant challenges, including staggering unemployment rates, inadequate health care, high crime rates, and educational inequalities.

"NAT provides the Tribe with an opportunity to enhance its telecommunications services. It is simply astonishing to me that the nation's largest telecommunication companies are attempting to stifle or even stop NAT's efforts on the Crow Creek Reservation. These companies have had decades to bring these type of telecommunication services to the reservation. None of them have ever done so.

"I would ask the Commission to recognize

Sprint's efforts in this docket proceeding for what they

are -- an unfortunate and misguided attempt to suppress

competition in the conference calling industry and shut

down one of the Crow Creek Reservation's most successful

development efforts in history."

2.3

So, again, we would, of course, provide Sprint with any opportunity they would like to respond to that.

But I only thought that was fair in light of their last-minute filings.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: They will be given an opportunity to address the Commission after the Interveners. And the Interveners will follow you.

MR. SWIER: Thank you. Let's talk now about the practical effects if Sprint gets what they're asking for today. Here are the practical effects:

Number one, what they're really asking you to do is they're asking you to shut down the phone company at Crow Creek. I mean, we can sit here and talk about the Supreme Court cases, and we've done that in the Briefs. I mean, that's pretty straightforward lawyering. But let's look at the practical implications of what Sprint's trying to do.

So, number one, you shut down a tribally owned phone company. And the fact that it's tribally owned is

not disputed.

2.3

Number two, 152 customers on the Crow Creek
Reservation are going to lose their phone service. 152
customers on the reservation are going to lose their
internet services. 152 customers on the reservation are
going to lose their access to emergency response.
Because NAT's the only one that provides this out there.
So if Sprint gets what they want, those are a couple of
practical implications right off the bat.

Another practical implication is what the Tribe loses. The Tribe loses their internet library, which the Pleadings that we've submitted set forth what that's done for the reservation. The Tribe loses their brand new Learning Center, which as Commissioner Hanson knows, the grand opening just happened a couple of weeks ago. We thank you for the nice e-mails that you sent regarding that. Would have loved to have had you there, but we understand your schedule.

The Learning Center, which again NAT has put the money into this, nothing like this has ever been seen on the reservation, that closes.

The Tribe also loses a public/private partnership, which is really the first public/private partnership that that Tribe has had in 106 years. So when Sprint talks about the public ramifications of why

it needs to shut this tribal telephone company down, it's interesting that they failed to talk about the practical significance.

2.3

2.4

They're good in theory that this is all theory in how it should happen. They don't want to talk with you about the practical significance of what they're really asking you to do here.

Now let's talk about the practical implications on Free Conferencing Corporation who has been made out to be kind of the bogeyman here. And, again, I think Senator Lederman letter sets out what Free Conferencing is actually about.

Free Conferencing has 20 million users a month worldwide. It's the largest privately held conferencing company in the world. It's in 186 countries throughout the world. This is not a company that's working out of somebody's basement. This is a worldwide company.

It generates half a billion minutes of traffic every month. And as Senator Lederman's letter said, it's used by everyone from Fortune 500 companies to Congressional offices to state offices.

So the practical implications on Free Conferencing Corporation are this: NAT's minutes are minimal. The minutes that Free Conferencing sends to NAT is 3 percent of its worldwide minutes. It's so

minuscule that it's really not even worth talking about
from Free Conferencing's perspective.

2.3

Within the scope of its worldwide business, they send minutes -- 97 percent of its minutes go elsewhere.

Including South Dakota, those minutes can go anywhere they want in the world. Free Conferencing can send them wherever they want.

They've decided to help and form an agreement, again a public/private partnership with Native American Telecom. So the implications on Free Conferencing are really nothing. If you -- if the Commission shuts down NAT, that traffic from Free Conferencing is going to go somewhere else. It's going to go to Montana. It's going to go to Nebraska, California.

Some of it will probably continue to go to

Northern Valley in Aberdeen where part of it goes. So

those conferencing minutes are going to go wherever Free

Conferencing wants them to go.

And, in fact, Free Conferencing gets paid more by putting their traffic elsewhere. They get paid -- they have no advantage from a numerical standpoint of taking their access stimulation traffic and putting it into the Crow Creek Native American Telecom. They lose money on the deal.

They do it because they made -- three or four

years ago they made a commitment to the Tribe. And you may say, well, from a business perspective why would they do that?

2.3

2.4

Well, of course, as we all know, when this started three or four years ago terminating the access fees at Crow Creek was worth more money than an urban location. So yeah. I mean, originally that agreement made Free Conferencing more money.

Today it makes them less money based on the FCC's new order. So they're not doing it for any type of financial purpose to run a scam or anything like that. They're doing it because they made a commitment. They could easily pull out of that agreement because they're not making as much money as they could elsewhere.

They've decided to go through this process, to stick with this company that they've made a promise to. So, again, Free Conferencing gets paid more if they put this traffic somewhere else.

Also it's interesting Sprint already pays

Northern Valley up in Aberdeen for the traffic it

receives from Free Conferencing. So the traffic that

Free Conferencing sends up to Aberdeen to Northern

Valley, Sprint gladly pays on that. They won't pay the

Tribe.

And, in fact, Northern Valley's rate is

- probably -- well, let me talk about that in a second.

 But what's different about the traffic that Free

 Conferencing sends to NAT as opposed to the traffic it
- 4 sends to Northern Valley?

2.3

Nothing. It's the same traffic from all over the world. It's just that Free Conferencing has agreed to live up to its promise with NAT. It's the same traffic. It's the same phone calls.

In fact, this is the most interesting. The Northern Valley tariff, which again Sprint gladly pays

Northern Valley for this traffic from Free Conferencing,
their tariff rate is .008. And I get trouble with these
decimals too, but it's .008 per minute is what the tariff
rate is for Northern Valley.

Do you know what Crow Creek's tariff rate is?

It's .006327 cents a minute. Which means that the rate that Free Conferencing receives at Native American

Telecom is 25 percent less than what Sprint already voluntarily pays at Northern Valley.

So from Sprint's perspective -- that's why this is so confusing. They're fine with paying that rate to Northern Valley for the same exact traffic, but they don't want to pay a lower rate because it goes to NAT?

As a practical matter, which is really what this Commission deals with, that doesn't seem to make any

sense. So what are we really fighting about here? I still don't know. I still don't know what we're fighting about.

2.3

The FCC's new access stimulation order, which we've all gone through and I'm sure have by our bedside at night because it's so thrilling, we all know that NAT has a short window to continue to accept access stimulation traffic. We're going to go to bill and keep on a sliding scale. We know that.

This access stimulation traffic, though, again, proceeding with the FCC's guidelines -- which is undisputed, NAT is. I mean, we're in compliance with the new guidelines. That access stimulation traffic can, number one, help pay for NAT's telephone company.

So for the next few years they can take that access stimulation, legal traffic, and for any business that we've all owned to be able to do that and have that capital to pay off a very capital intensive industry, NAT would be able to do that.

Also using that money from the access stimulation traffic, NAT can go ahead and bid and obtain Government contracts, you know, through the Buy Indian program, those other special programs.

So really we have Sprint paying Northern Valley for the same exact traffic, paying a higher tariff rate

at Northern Valley, and refusing to pay NAT when Sprint would actually pay less if NAT were up and running.

2.3

So, again, we have a very short window under the FCC's order. And Sprint knows that, and they're trying to, of course, run out the clock, for lack of a better word.

The issue came up in the briefs, I believe, well, what's NAT going to do once bill and keep comes into play in a few years? They aren't even going to be able to survive.

Absolutely not true. As you heard before, there are 152 people out on the reservation that would not have telecom access if it wasn't for NAT. Those end users, those customers, are going to survive. They're going to be there. NAT is going to continue to collect end user fees from its companies.

NAT actually has already turned down an opportunity to bring in more customers. And it did that in respect to this Commission. Because NAT did not believe since all of this was going on in front of the Commission that it should continue to go out and to seek additional outside-the-reservation customers.

It could grow immensely. That opportunity is there. In deference to this Commission NAT has said we don't want to accept anymore customers until we are

through with the State PUC proceeding. It could have easily done that. It did not, in deference to the Commission. So NAT is going to be in business long after the bill and keep order comes into play.

2.3

Also Sprint makes the argument in its submissions that Free Conferencing and NAT are somehow cheating. Okay. Sprint knows it's undisputed that NAT's federal tariff complies perfectly with the new FCC Order. It complies perfectly. They've never said anything that it hasn't. They know it complies.

It makes no sense for NAT not to comply with the Order. You know, we went from having a decade of really everybody not knowing quite sure how we treat access stimulation to now we have an order. And the FCC says you'll do one, two, and three.

NAT even before the order came out had its ducks in a row. It did one, two, and three. Their tariff was challenged at the FCC level, and the FCC said to Sprint and the IXCs, no. Take your ball and go home. This tariff is fine. We are rejecting your complaint.

So, again, as a practical matter it makes no sense for NAT or Free Conferencing to try to cheat the system. It's very simple what we need to do. We're doing it. Northern Valley's getting paid by Sprint.

Does Sprint have trouble because it's a Native

American owned company? I don't know. I think that would be a really good question to ask, why it wouldn't seem to be a better business deal for Sprint to actually encourage that traffic to go to NAT because NAT's tariff is lower. But, again, that's a question I can't answer.

2.3

I think it's also important to realize that this

Motion that Sprint has brought is limited to this

Commission's jurisdictional authority over intrastate

interexchange service of South Dakota -- in South Dakota.

Again, as a practical matter what are the repercussions if the Commission grants what Sprint's really asking you to do? I mean, let's be very simple on what they're asking to you do here. What are those repercussions?

The first repercussion is this, is ask Sprint, does Sprint want the Commission to make a decision that impacts NAT's interstate interexchange services? Because I think that when you look at what they're trying to do here, they want this Commission to make a vast ruling that's going to impact NAT's interstate interexchange service.

And, as we all know, the Commission has the authority to rule on intrastate traffic. It does not have the authority to rule on interstate traffic. And,

in fact, it's interesting that in a recent case from the FCC it says that -- in fact, it was a Sprint case from the Seventh Circuit in 1998. The case is Cahnmann
C-A-H-N-M-A-N-N v. Sprint Corporation. Again, it's a Seventh Circuit Case, 1998.

2.3

That case held that the Federal Communications

Act extinguishes a right of a party to bring suit for

breach of contract under state law when the effect of the

suit would be to challenge a federal tariff.

Sprint's well-aware of that case because they were a named party. I find it ironic that they didn't bring that particular case to the Commission's attention.

So, again, does Sprint want the Commission to make a decision that impacts interstate interexchange service? We feel, I think as you do, that that's an FCC matter.

Number two, does Sprint want the Commission to make a decision that impacts local telecommunications service? There is a sliver of sovereignty that the Tribe has on the reservation. And we'll talk about that later. I think it's very clear from the federal authorities that if you make a call from the east part of the reservation to the west part of the reservation, that the Tribe retains that sliver of sovereignty. They have that local ability. And we're going to talk about that in a minute

to back that up. But I think it's pretty clear.

2.3

So Sprint wants you to make an all encompassing decision that impacts NAT's interstate interexchange service. They want you to make a decision that impacts NAT's local telecommunication services.

What they're asking for, they're also asking the Commission to impact international telecommunication services. Again, Free Conferencing Corporation is in 196 countries throughout the world. I don't know for sure, but I'm guessing part of that international traffic comes to Crow Creek. I think we can all agree that the Commission doesn't have jurisdiction over that international activity. That's the FCC.

Sprint also wants the Commission to decide that it can make a decision that impacts broadband and VoIP activities, voice over internet protocol. We know for sure that broadband and VoIP is within the purview of the FCC. It's not subject to state entry or rate regulation.

And, finally, fifth, if Sprint wants this

Commission to make an all encompassing decision that

impacts mobile wireless service, again, I think we can

all agree that mobile wireless service is not subject to

any state entry or rate regulation.

So what we have here is we have an all

encompassing Motion from Sprint -- and this is what they're trying to do. They are trying to have this Commission enter an all encompassing order that not only impacts intrastate activities of NAT but also interstate, local, international, broadband, VoIP, and mobile wireless. And it's very clear, I think -- I think we can all agree that the Commission does not have the authority over those type of telecommunications services.

2.3

So what is at issue here? What does NAT believe that the Commission has before it today? We don't believe it's that all encompassing issue that we just talked about. We think that's very clear.

We're talking about intrastate interexchange service. Not interstate, not local, not VoIP, none of these others. We're talking about intrastate telecommunications services.

In other words, NAT believes that the Commission's jurisdiction that it can address today is -- that it can't address are, number one, NAT's lawful operation as a CLEC on the Crow Creek Reservation.

As we know, NAT originally applied and received authority from the Tribal Utility Commission to provide interstate services. We had that issue decided by the Commission and later the Circuit Court on appeal that the Commission has jurisdiction over certain intrastate

- 1 telecommunication matters. That was part of this docket.
- 2 Very complex area of the law we can all agree. But
- 3 | that's the decision that's on the book from the
- 4 Commission right now in this case.
- Okay. Sprint also wants you to make a decision
- on NAT's right to collect access fees from interstate
- 7 services. As I said before, Free Conferencing can take
- 8 | this traffic anywhere. There's no reason for them to do
- 9 a scam or to cheat like they're being accused of.
- 10 So, again, I think it's important for the
- 11 | Commission to keep in mind what we're actually dealing
- 12 | with here as a practical standpoint. It's that very
- 13 | small sliver of certain intrastate interexchange
- 14 | services. And I think it's disingenuous for Sprint to
- 15 say, well, that's all we're here for. If you read their
- 16 briefs, that's not what they're here for.
- 17 They want this Commission to enter an order that
- 18 is groundbreaking in the telecommunications industry.
- 19 That's what they're asking you to do.
- Now a key issue is that they -- that Sprint
- 21 | brought up is does NAT need a Certificate of Authority
- 22 from this Commission to provide or bill for intrastate
- 23 interexchange service?
- 24 As soon as the Commission and the Circuit Court
- 25 made that jurisdictional ruling back a couple of years

ago now what did NAT do? They immediately applied for a Certificate of Authority with this Commission. They didn't thumb -- NAT didn't thumb its nose at this Commission. It did exactly what the Commission said.

2.3

The Commission said we believe we have jurisdiction over this intrastate service. Okay. Then NAT applied for a Certificate of Authority. As we know, though, certificate of authorities are usually 60-day perfunctory proceedings. They're pretty quick.

Why doesn't NAT have a Certificate of
Authority? Because Sprint has led the charge against NAT
obtaining that Certificate of Authority. So it's the
chicken and the egg. We're trying to do everything under
South Dakota Law to comply what you've told us to do.

We've applied for a Certificate of Authority, which is pretty standard, pretty straightforward and a pretty short process. We're now 18 months into that Certificate of Authority proceeding because of the games that are being played by Sprint.

You would think that Sprint wants NAT to have a Certificate of Authority because then it can be rest assured that this Commission can keep its eye on NAT. So on one hand they're saying they're bad because they don't have a Certificate of Authority. We're saying we're doing our darnedest, and we're battling these large

1 telephone companies.

2.3

And that's fine. We'll fight it out, and eventually I think we'll get our Certificate of Authority. In fact, I know we will. But the reason we don't have one is because what's going on in docket 11-087.

So for again -- I just -- I don't want to say

I'm offended, but somewhat I am. Throughout their briefs

they made it sound like we're just -- NAT is thumbing

their nose at you three Commissioners.

I don't know what else NAT could do in this case other than what they've done. And as soon as that complex jurisdictional decision was made -- and that's a complex decision. We can all agree on that. Those are tough jurisdictional issues.

As soon as that decision was made NAT applied for the Certificate of Authority, and they're doing their darnedest to get it. And you're familiar with that docket, and you know why NAT hasn't received that certificate yet.

By granting what Sprint is asking for as a practical matter, isn't this Commission then rendering a decision really on NAT's CLEC application? Aren't you saying that we're going to shut NAT down right now, despite the fact that NAT has been nothing but incredibly

positive for that Tribe? Aren't you really saying that we're going to shut you down? That's a precursor to the CLEC decision.

2.3

Also if this Commission grants what Sprint's asking for, won't the impact also be to decide the Federal Court case that's pending before the FCC now?

We already know that NAT's FCC tariff is proper. It's been challenged and upheld. We have a lawsuit with Sprint going on in Federal Court that's referred now to the FCC.

Sprint doesn't want the FCC to make a decision. The FCC upheld access stimulation, which they fought tooth and nail. Now they did it on a sliding scale where it would eventually be bill and keep. But they said access stimulation is fine, and here is how it's fine. If you follow Rule 1, 2, and 3, we're fine with that. It's undisputed that NAT follows those new FCC guidelines.

So, again, I think it's so important when you look at the record, what does Sprint want? And what are the practical implications of what they're really asking you to do today?

Because if a decision gets made like Sprint wants, you don't think that they're going to take that to every Public Utilities Commission in the country?

Absolutely, they are. And there's going to be stuff that happens after that obviously.

2.3

Because what they want you to do as a fundamental matter is shut down, for whatever reason, this telephone company that's doing everything it can to help those people on the reservation. And they get beat on and they get beat on.

And I think when you read letters like from
Senator Lederman and our Pleadings what Sprint has
presented to you from the beginning about how nefarious
NAT is and how nefarious Free Conferencing is, if you
really take a look at that and look at it objectively, I
think you've got to ask Sprint what are you talking
about?

And it was done for a purpose. And we understand that. That's part of it. But take a close look at that.

Finally, Commissioner Hanson brought this up previously. We believe as a procedural matter that this Motion is not proper. It's not properly before you.

Sprint filed its Amended Complaint on May 5 of 2010, and their Prayer For Relief had those very specific items, which we've already gone through. Their Summary Judgment Motion is asking for relief that was never requested in its Amended Complaint. In other words,

they're making it up as they go.

Here's a practical example: Let's say,

Commissioner Nelson, I'm going to pick on you for a second. Let's say you were in a car accident and you injured your arm and you injured your back, and you had to bring a lawsuit against the individual who hit you.

Okay?

And in your Complaint you say I have to bring this lawsuit because you injured my arm and you injured my back. Okay. That's what your lawsuit is about.

Now Sprint is saying, no, this lawsuit now is about my head injuries, and it's about a broken leg, and it's about a broken ankle. So they've taken what is a very specific pleading in their Amended Complaint -- and that's what we ought to work off here -- and they have taken that -- they haven't gone to the trouble of requesting that they could file an Amended Complaint.

They've simply said we're just going to go ahead and do this. Even though it really doesn't comport with our Amended Complaint, that's a technicality. Nobody's going to realize that. It's a big deal. It's a big deal.

So these issues were never procedurally brought properly before this court.

As our Motion for mootness -- our Motion to

Dismiss based on mootness months ago indicated, Sprint has gotten everything it has requested under its Amended Complaint. It got that two years ago when we went through the jurisdictional decisions. Everything under their Amended Complaint they already got.

2.3

The issue has been decided for the Commission.

The Commission has said that you have jurisdiction over intrastate telecommunication services. We respected that decision. We immediately applied for a Certificate of Authority trying to comply with your decision.

The question was asked of Sprint earlier are we fighting about money here? Okay. Sprint's Amended Complaint value asked for damages. Do you know what the damages are here? \$281, which we have already provided that to Sprint months ago. You know what they do? They won't cash our check. It's sitting in somebody's drawer somewhere collecting dust.

We have said now that the Commission has made its decision. We are not going to bill for intrastate activity until the CLEC application is completed. NAT has done that. It hasn't billed. The \$281 that you are claiming in your damages in your Amended Complaint, okay, the Commission has ruled that they -- that they have jurisdiction over this. Here is your \$281.

NAT has spent over \$150,000 to battle these

companies, to have its reputation smeared, to have untruths that, again, as you look at this docket you will see exactly where they have gone with this. And we're fighting about \$280, which we gave to them back, and they won't cash the check.

2.3

So I think that there's a lot of questions that this Commission at this point now that you've got this case in front of you -- there's a lot of questions that need to be asked of Sprint. And what are the practical implications of what Sprint is asking for here?

They've gotten everything possible under their Amended Complaint. There's nothing else the Commission can give. So they ignore their Amended Complaint and now are asking for this broad declaratory judgment.

What is Sprint trying to win? There's nothing else to decide in this docket. Is this about whether the Tribe should have a telephone company? That's what it seems to be. This traffic is fine at Northern Valley, but, boy, it's not fine at NAT, even though it's at a cheaper rate. It's still not fine at NAT. What are we fighting about here? I truly believe that's a question the Commission has to ask.

Who's going to provide those services for those 152 tribal members? Sprint has had decades to do it.

Never been done. Can't make money out there. Not as

much as you want anyway.

2.3

Who's going to provide those services? NAT. If the Commission grants the all encompassing declaration that Sprint requests, look at the practical ramifications that we've already gone through. Look at those practical ramifications.

If NAT would just say after that jurisdictional decision we're going to ignore the PUC, we're going to thumb our nose, we're not going to apply for a Certificate of Authority, we're just going to thumb our nose at them, I think we'd have a different story.

That's not what happened here. That's not what happened here.

One more quick thing. And I know I've gone on a long time here, but as you can tell, these are incredibly important issues for everyone involved.

Mr. Knudson made the comment that the FCC and Congress have made clear that there is no tribal jurisdiction in the rubric of telecommunications. Okay. That's wrong, and it's wrong for these reasons.

Number one is that the FCC approved NAT's federal tariff. We went through a whole formal challenge of that, and the FCC said, Sprint, you're wrong. NAT's tariff complies with what we have told you you need to do for access stim.

The FCC recognizes tribal jurisdiction when they approve eligible telecommunications carrier status. A tribe can only go to the FCC and get -- and get that ETC status. In other words, the FCC realizes if you have a tribally owned telephone company, that we, the FCC, will provide you ETC status. It recognizes that little sliver of sovereignty.

2.3

And that's the North American Numbering Plan Administration, NANPA apparently is what it's called. They've provided the local telephone numbers to NAT based upon NAT's tribal CLEC order. So the National Numbering Plan Administration said, yeah, you have authority from the Tribal Utility Authority. We'll give you numbers based on that.

And they did. That's how NAT got its numbers. There was no question about the fact that we didn't have PUC authority at that time.

And, finally, MidState here in South Dakota, they entered into an Interconnection Agreement with NAT. And, again, that was based on NAT's tribal CLEC authority and its federal tariff.

So, again, I just don't see what this company could do that it hasn't been trying to do. And when you look at the practical ramifications of what would happen if Sprint's all encompassing request is granted, I think

we can see what's trying to be done here and what those ramifications would be.

And, again, I thank you for your time this morning. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. This is very tedious, technical information. We realize that. But it's also important.

Thank you.

2.3

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Swier.

You said that Sprint is doing everything they can to keep you from getting a Certificate of Authority, and yet you filed a -- on September 8, 2008, you filed an application for a COA, and on December 2008 you moved to dismiss your application before the Commission; isn't that correct?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SWIER: Could I have Mr. Holoubek answer that question?

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Well, I'm curious if --

MR. SWIER: I think he can give a better background as to why that was done if you --

CHAIRMAN HANSON: No. The question is as a matter of fact. You claim that Sprint is doing everything they can to keep you from getting a COA, and yet you are the ones who made the Motion to withdraw it.

MR. SWIER: It's my understanding in I believe it was 2008 that the CLEC application was filed. And at

that time the NAT folks thought that it was valid to simply move forward and obtain a Tribal Certificate of Authority along with a Federal Communications tariff.

2.3

2.4

It's my understanding, yes, that's why they decided to pull back that certificate, and it's my understanding -- again, that was before I came on the case, but that Motion to Dismiss was filed, and that was granted by the Commission. So, yes, they did do that back in '08, I believe.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: So how is it that Sprint is keeping you from making application for a COA?

MR. SWIER: Well, as soon as that jurisdictional decision was made by the Commission and later affirmed by the court, we immediately then did apply for a Certificate of Authority once that complex jurisdictional issue was decided.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: So we have an application for a COA before us at the present time?

MR. SWIER: Oh, absolutely. That was filed back in October. Over 18 months ago. Back in October of 2011 as soon as the Commission and court made that decision NAT said, okay, we recognize that decision. We will file it. So that CLEC application has been pending for 18 months.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: I thought that had been

withdrawn.

2.3

2 MR. SWIER: No.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.

I'm curious. I don't know that I want you to regurgitate your entire presentation, but you stated numerous times that Sprint has received everything under their Amended Complaint.

If they've received everything under their

Amended Complaint, then why would you object to summary
judgment providing them with those items?

You say they have them. You say they've received them. And yet you're opposing what they're -- what they are asking for.

MR. SWIER: They have received everything that they have asked for under their Amended Complaint. They have then decided to take matters beyond their Amended Complaint and then have the Commission rule on this.

So what we're saying is what's properly before this Commission is what's in through their Amended Complaint. Those decisions have already been made. It's the jurisdictional issues and the money issue. The jurisdictional issues the Commission made a ruling on, and it was affirmed by the Circuit Court. The money damages that they're requesting are the \$281. That's been provided back to them.

```
1
              So that's what this case is about. The case is
2
     about what's in their Amended Complaint, which is what
 3
     they have received everything from. So procedurally, and
 4
     this is a legal issue, but they can go beyond their
     Complaint and request relief from the Commission beyond
 6
    that.
7
                                What they're asking for is
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
8
     specified in their Amended Complaint. And your
     contention is they've received all of that.
10
                          They have received all of that.
              MR. SWIER:
11
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: So if we provide summary
12
     judgment, then we're providing them with everything
13
     they've already received.
14
              MR. SWIER: You're providing them with more than
15
    what they've asked for in their Complaint.
16
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Not if we provide what is
17
     specified in the Amended Complaint.
18
              MR. SWIER: With all due respect, I think you
19
    have to be very careful. The Amended Complaint asks for
20
     four things.
21
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Five actually, I believe it
22
     is.
2.3
              MR. SWIER: That relief -- it's the
24
     jurisdictional issues. That relief has already been
25
     granted by the Commission and affirmed by the Circuit
```

```
Court.
2
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                There are five items.
 3
                          Okay. In the Amended Complaint they
              MR. SWIER:
 4
     ask for, number one, a declaration --
 5
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                I know what they're asking
 6
     for. What your contention is is that they've already
7
     received it.
              MR. SWIER:
                          They have already received it.
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                What in the five items have
10
     they not received?
11
                          They have received everything that
              MR. SWIER:
12
     they are requesting already.
13
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. Thank you.
14
              MR. SWIER: Months ago.
15
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                Thank you.
16
              We'll continue with questions here. I do intend
17
     to have Staff provide their information after we've heard
18
     from the Interveners and then the -- and then Sprint a
     second time and then Staff.
19
20
              And it's getting a little bit late here.
21
     assume we're in communication with Cheri to make certain
22
     that she's okay and if she needs a break, we'll be
2.3
     informed of that.
2.4
              MR. SWIER: And we thank the Commission for
25
     allowing us to submit later supplementation authority
```

- also. Thank you for that courtesy.
- CHAIRMAN HANSON: And we'll probably take a
- 3 | break after the Commissioner questions just to make sure
- 4 | everyone's still able. We're not done yet with
- 5 Commissioner questions.
- 6 Commissioner Nelson.
- 7 COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. I do have some
- 8 questions.
- And I want to follow up on Commissioner Hanson's
- 10 | last set of questions. Of the five issues Sprint had in
- 11 their Amended Complaint, the last two deal with awarding
- 12 money damages or other relief that the Commission might
- 13 find.
- So the first three of those issues you would
- 15 have no opposition to our granting summary judgment on
- 16 those; is that correct?
- MR. SWIER: Commissioner Nelson, may I have
- 18 Mr. Holoubek respond to that as the attorney for Free
- 19 Conferencing?
- CHAIRMAN HANSON: He can tell you yes or no, and
- 21 you can answer the question.
- MR. SWIER: First of all, we would say that we
- 23 | agree that the Commission's earlier decisions that were
- 24 affirmed by the Circuit Court, we don't necessarily agree
- 25 | with those but those have been decided. Those first two

- 1 issues regarding the Commission's sole authority to regulate Sprint's interexchange service, that was decided 2 in the earlier decision when the Commission and the court 3 4 said we have jurisdiction over intrastate telecommunications activities. 6 COMMISSIONER NELSON: So, therefore, you would 7 have no objection to our issuing a summary judgment on 8 that question. MR. SWIER: Well, we don't agree with it, but we 10 think you've already done it. 11
 - COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

MR. SWIER: Number two, declaring that the Tribal Utility Authority lacks jurisdiction over Sprint. Again, we don't necessarily agree with the decision, but your previous decision was that that was the jurisdictional call you made.

Number three, that declaring that NAT must seek a Certificate of Authority. As we just indicated, 18 months ago we filed for a Certificate of Authority, and that docket's still before the Commission.

And, number four, money damages. We're here for We've returned that after the Commission's \$281. decision.

So, yes, the Commission has already decided those four issues that were requested in their

Complaint.

2.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. Do you agree that NAT is providing local exchange service to Free Conferencing?

MR. SWIER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Do you agree that the Commission has the authority to require NAT to have a COA in order to provide local exchange service?

MR. SWIER: If the activity is strictly within the bounds of the reservation, I believe that particular sliver the Tribe retains sovereignty over.

So according to the Commission's last decision, if it's intrastate, if it goes off the reservation, then, yes, this Commission has already found that you have jurisdiction over that. That's why NAT applied for a Certificate of Authority with you so you could -- so you could give that authority.

So that was done 18 months ago. If NAT didn't think it needed to do that, it wouldn't have. It abided by the Court's and the Commission's decision and applied for the COA. That's why we did it.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: So if you could answer the question that I asked you, do you believe this Commission has the authority to require NAT to obtain a Certificate of Authority to provide local exchange

```
1
     service to Free Conferencing?
2
              MR. SWIER: I'd say no.
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: On October 28, 2008, the
 3
 4
     Tribal Utility Authority granted a Certificate of
 5
     Authority -- Tribal Certificate of Authority to NAT.
 6
     That certificate was signed by the tribal chairman.
7
     is majority owned by the Tribe. So, essentially, the
8
     Tribe was issuing itself a certificate; is that correct?
              MR. SWIER: I think those facts would be
10
     correct. The Tribe set up a tribally owned telephone
     company, and the tribal authority gave them permission to
11
12
     operate, yes.
13
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so the Chairman
14
     essentially gave himself on behalf of a tribe a
15
     certificate; correct?
              MR. SWIER: The Chairman gave NAT, a tribally
16
17
     owned company, a certificate.
18
              COMMISSIONER NELSON:
                                    Okay. When you talked
19
     about the practical effects if we grant Sprint's Motion
20
     today, you talked about the Tribe losing an internet
21
     library and Learning Center.
              But isn't it true that there is no legal effect
22
2.3
     on what we do today in regard to broadband or internet
2.4
     access?
```

MR. SWIER:

Well, I agree with you. I don't

think the Commission has authority over those two things.

2.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Correct. And so nothing we would do here today would impact internet access or internet provision by NAT; correct?

MR. SWIER: It depends on how far the Commission goes with its decision.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: If we grant the summary judgment requested here today --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me. I think that's the point of confusion we were drawing earlier with Commission Hanson as well. And that is what the Motion asks for is NAT's not allowed to do business anywhere in the state.

And that goes far beyond what the initial Complaint stated. And I think that's where we're running into a little bit of -- I don't think we disagree with you necessarily, but there is a nuance there that we have to recognize.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Excuse me. I believe there's a point of order. Please step to the microphone if you're going to -- I'm allowing him to answer the question since it was posed by Commissioner Nelson and Mr. Swier was unable to answer the question and it was a matter of fact.

1 Go ahead. 2 I believe Sprint objects to MR. KNUDSON: Yes. anybody but Mr. Swier presenting on behalf of NAT. 3 4 That's the normal protocol. He's the counsel of record in this case. Mr. Holoubek, he is then testifying 6 instead of simply responding to questions. So we'd renew 7 our objection we made earlier. 8 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Knudson. allowing it in the interest of time so it didn't have to 10 be regurgitated, but I appreciate the admonition. 11 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I going to need to follow 12 up on that statement but I'll ask Mr. Swier the question 13 and then hopefully you can connect the dots. 14 Mr. Holoubek said that what granting this 15 Summary Judgment Motion would do -- and he's indicated 16 that one of the questions is to prevent NAT from doing 17 business in the state. 18 Well, that's not what it asks. It says NAT 19 cannot provide telecommunications service in the state. 20 So is it your contention that internet service is a 21 telecommunications service? 22 CHAIRMAN HANSON: No. Don't look to --2.3 Mr. Swier, you need to -- you're the --

MR. SWIER: Well, with all due respect, if we're

here to get answers and I don't know the answers to those

2.4

```
questions, couldn't Mr. Holoubek answer your questions
2
     for you?
 3
              I mean, there are certain things that I don't
 4
            So, I mean, we can either come back and provide
 5
     written testimony to that, or we could have Mr. Holoubek
 6
     answer who knows the answers to the question.
7
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: It's a legal question.
8
              MR. SWIER:
                          Then my answer is I don't know.
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                Thank you.
10
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: You indicated in the area
11
     of practical effects that 152 customers would lose phone
12
     service and internet service and have no opportunity, but
13
     is there not an ILEC there that provides those services?
14
              MR. SWIER: The ILEC provides services.
15
     fact of the matter is is because of the economic
16
     situation on the reservation, those folks can't afford
17
     telephone service. And NAT subsidizes that telephone
18
     service for those customers.
19
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: So, in fact, service is,
20
     in fact, available from the ILEC.
21
              MR. SWIER: Service as a technical matter may be
22
     available. As a practical matter, folks can't afford it
2.3
     out there.
2.4
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: You indicated another
```

practical effect was that Free Conferencing is losing

money by doing business on Crow Creek so we would be
doing them a favor by granting this Motion for Summary
Judgment; is that correct?

2.3

MR. SWIER: No. I don't think I said that. I don't think I said they're losing money. I think I said --

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yes, you did.

MR. SWIER: What I meant is they could make more money by sending traffic elsewhere because of the tariff rates. So Free Conferencing could send the traffic elsewhere, and they could get a higher tariff rate.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: So, in fact, we would be doing them a favor from a business perspective by granting this Motion for Summary Judgment.

MR. SWIER: No. I don't think so. Because

Free Conferencing made a promise and a commitment to NAT

and to the Tribe that this is what they would do. And,

sure, could they pull out of there and send that traffic
elsewhere? Yeah.

But you wouldn't be doing us a favor because this company has decided to stick it out and actually not break their promise to the folks.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: You spent a lot of time talking about the fact that Sprint is making payments to Northern Valley but they're not making payments to NAT

and the fact that -- and you raised some suspicions as to why that was.

And but isn't it true that the biggest difference is the fact that Northern Valley has a Certificate of Authority and NAT does not?

2.3

MR. SWIER: I don't know why. I can't speak for Sprint on why they may do that. I can tell you Northern Valley does have a Certificate of Authority. NAT is trying its darnedest to get a Certificate of Authority.

And, of course, if I may add, Sprint, of course, went years without paying Northern Valley for that access stimulation traffic too as the Commission's aware of.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Certainly. I don't think
I have any other questions other than I do need to make a
statement regarding I think the -- about the very last
comment that you made that in your mind our ruling on
this is a -- basically a ruling that is a precursor to
the CLEC application.

And I want to make it very clear to everybody that's listening to this that in my mind these two are not related at all. And my judgment on when we ultimately get to the point of ruling on your CLEC application will not be colored at all by whatever happens in this particular docket. I want to make that very clear to everybody.

```
1
              MR. SWIER: Thank you.
2
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: No further questions.
 3
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                Thank you, Commissioner
 4
     Nelson.
 5
              And I think it goes without saying, but I
 6
     appreciate you saying it that, yes, the two are not
7
     related to one another.
8
              Commissioner Fiegen, do you have anything that
     you'd like to query at this point -- juncture?
10
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Chairman Hanson, my
11
     questions were very similar to Commissioner Nelson with
     losing money, Certificate of Authority in Northern Valley
12
13
     and the internet and VoIP services and also there's an
14
     additional telecom. So all of those have been answered.
15
              Thank you.
16
                                Thank you, Commissioner
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
17
     Fiegen.
18
              And, Ms. Wiest, do you have something?
19
              MS. AILTS WIEST: Yes. I just had a couple of
20
     questions. This is Rolayne Wiest.
21
              I was looking at your statement for -- with
     respect to the material facts. And my question for you
22
2.3
     is are there material facts that NAT contends a genuine
24
     issue exists to be tried before the Commission can make a
25
     ruling on these summary judgment?
```

I know you denied some statements in Sprint's statement of material facts, but I was confused as to what you were actually contending there are material facts for a genuine issue needs to be tried.

2.3

MR. SWIER: I don't have those in front of me. Are there some in particular, Ms. Wiest? And I can certainly respond to those after I take a look.

MS. AILTS WIEST: Well, if you look at Sprint's statement of material facts in No. 3, I believe -- no.

In No. 5 I think you denied the third sentence, but I didn't know why you denied it, if you had a basis for it, or if you thought that was a material fact that the Commission needed to determine prior to making a ruling on the summary -- on this case -- on the issues in this case.

MR. SWIER: I think there are genuine issues of material fact, including the fact that Sprint, of course, has alleged that NAT is a sham entity. And I can certainly go back and look at those. I don't have them in front of me. But we can certainly go back.

I know that there are genuine issues that we have denied which puts those facts in dispute. And, again, I don't have those in front of me, but I'd be happy to file a supplement with you if you'd like. But I think we've made it pretty clear that there are factual

1 disputes there. 2 MS. AILTS WIEST: Is NAT asserting that it 3 has -- it's subject to tribal sovereignty as an arm of the Tribe? 4 I know you made a statement about tribal 6 sovereignty in your Brief. 7 MR. SWIER: We made a statement about tribal 8 sovereignty in the Brief. It's an issue that obviously could be brought up. 10 Obviously, tribal sovereignty is an issue that's 11 determined from subject matter and that can be brought up 12 at any time in a proceeding. 13 Right now we did not focus on that particular 14 issue, but we do feel that we do have potentially some 15 strong arguments regarding tribal sovereignty but that's 16 not the issue before the Commission today. MS. AILTS WIEST: And I know when you were 17 18 talking about the provisioning of different types of 19 services that you talked about our jurisdiction, and you 20 mentioned broadband and international traffic, mobile 21 wireless. 22 When you mentioned mobile wireless, NAT isn't

MR. SWIER: Not in a traditional sense, no.

MS. AILTS WIEST: Okay. That's all I have at

providing mobile wireless, are they?

2.3

2.4

```
this time.
2
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. Before we go to
    the rest of the folks, we're going to take a 10-minute
 3
 4
    break. So we will -- according to this clock it is
    20 minutes to. We will resume at 10 minutes to 1:00.
5
 6
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Chairman.
7
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Yes.
8
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Just a quick question.
     it my understanding we are not ruling today? We're just
10
    hearing oral arguments?
11
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                That is correct.
12
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Good. I just wanted to
13
    clarify that.
14
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: All right. We'll take a
15
     10-minute recess and resume with Interveners, and we'll
16
     start with SDN.
17
                     (A short recess is taken)
18
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: The Commission will come back
19
    to order. We will now hear from Interveners.
20
              And I see Margo Northrup. I assume you're here
    to chat with us.
21
22
              MS. NORTHRUP: I am. Good afternoon.
2.3
    Margo Northrup. I'm an attorney here in Pierre, and I'm
2.4
    here on behalf of South Dakota Network, LLC.
```

Very briefly, I just want to agree -- I think

- 1 that SDN and Sprint agree that the issues in 09-98, which is SDN's docket against Sprint, are not teed up in this 2 3 issue. 4 And our filing was merely to remind the 5 Commission that we haven't had the opportunity to brief 6 those issues. It appears these are complex 7 jurisdictional and factual issues, and we just want to 8 determine that anything that's decided here is not going to negatively impact in any way in our docket. 10 And that's all the comments that I have. 11 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you very much. 12 appreciate your brevity. 13 AT&T, Mr. Van Camp. 14 MR. VAN CAMP: Good afternoon. Earlier it was 15 good morning, and now it's good afternoon. Thank you, 16 Mr. Chairman. 17 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Is that what you've been 18 practicing?
- 19 MR. VAN CAMP: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20

21

22

2.3

24

- Bill Van Camp on behalf of AT&T.
 - AT&T did file in response a Motion in support of Sprint's Summary Judgment. And without belaboring any of the arguments that have been made, I think it's important to point out that the -- and I'll let Sprint speak for itself in its Amended Complaint, but it certainly would

be my position and that of AT&T that the Prayer For
Relief is broad enough in its nature that it encompasses
the declaratory actions and rulings that Sprint is
seeking here on summary judgment.

This is not, I believe, a groundbreaking case as was characterized, and it is neither that nor an all-encompassing proceeding. It's simply an action brought by Sprint that AT&T has joined in that seeks a declaratory ruling on what the rules are before the Commission.

And the statute that we need to talk about that seems to have been lost I think in some of the discussions is 49-31-3 that says no one can provide local exchange services without being certified first by the Commission.

Sprint has asked for declaratory ruling on that fact. They've come before the Commission, as the rules allow them to do, seeking the Commission to stand for what the statute says. And I think that's the long and the short of this matter.

Thank you.

2.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Van Camp. We will -- prior to hearing from Staff then, we will listen to rebuttal from Mr. Knudson.

MR. KNUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I

appreciate the opportunity to respond to what's been asserted earlier.

2.3

2.4

Just to preface my remarks, we're only asking the Commission to rule on its authority under state law to regulate intrastate service. Whether there are consequences that NAT is afraid of as a result of this Commission asserting its lawful jurisdiction, that follows from the fact that your role in the regulatory process in the overall telecommunications system is important.

I do need to address an accusation that suggests that somehow I misrepresented what was told to me by counsel for NAT. And I don't want to wade into all of this, but on Friday Mr. Swier sent an e-mail to Mr. Schenkenberg, my colleague, Karen Cremer, to myself, and number of other attorneys of record in this case that says "I will be presenting arguments that Sprint's last-minute submissions were made in bad faith and without consideration of either the Commission or NAT's ability to respond."

And that was my reference to bad faith. It is a matter of fact that I was accused of bad faith. I resent that very much, attacking my personal integrity, and I feel obligated to respond to set the record straight.

I appreciate what AT&T just said. Let's not

lose sight of what is involved here. The legislature has very clearly said that a Certificate of Authority is needed before you begin providing telecommunication services within the State of South Dakota. And we've heard in the questioning of Mr. Swier that that's not been the case now for a number of years, but NAT has continued to provide local exchange services in the State of South Dakota.

2.3

What we hear from NAT isn't a legal response to that argument but saying if you rule that's what the law is because that's what the legislature has said it is, what do you do about NAT? Can it continue to operate?

Well, it can continue to operate, I suppose, if it's not providing local exchange services, which would be the internet library or something on that nature.

The 152 customers who he said they would lose service, well, I'm sorry for the customers. Sprint isn't out to try to keep them from getting service. But there is an issue here with respect to IXC relationships with local exchange carriers and how the legal structure works.

And you can't say I'm doing a good deed but I'm violating the law at the same time. And so the legislature and the South Dakota Supreme Court's made clear that these kinds of arrangements are illegal and

unenforceable.

2.3

Now on the equities here, what we know is that MidState Communications is the principal ILEC. Venture Cooperative also apparently covers part of that area, has a service area that covers part of the reservation.

There are universal service funds. There are subsidiaries available through that process for people who are of low income to obtain subsidized or lower rate service.

I get an argument of counsel, but I have no evidence in the record that, in fact, that 152 people can't get their own service. So I don't think that's a dispositive issue. It's certainly not a fact established in the record.

Then what about Free Conferencing? Somehow they would have to port their business somewhere else. Well, and it's only 3 percent of their total business. We realize Free Conferencing is pretty big animal.

Now we're in open session so we're not going to go into the dollars involved, but it's a very significant amount of money that Free Conferencing has been able to pull out of NAT through its revenue sharing agreement it has with NAT.

Now it's pulling money out of it. It's not losing money. So contrary to what counsel said earlier,

this isn't a losing proposition for Free Conferencing.

If it were, I seriously doubt that they would be subsidizing this litigation.

2.3

Two, if they're able to do business with

Northern Valley, I object to any reference to that

settlement. First of all, it's irrelevant to the

proceedings in this docket. Two, to the extent that

Mr. Swier is asserting it's cheaper to do business with

NAT than it is with Northern Valley, I don't know how he knows that.

The settlement was not matter of public record.

It's confidential. So I just say we object to any reference to it on the grounds of relevancy at all.

There's a point here about bill and keep and what that regime will mean for NAT and others who depend on this kind of arrangement to exist. I think that issue really -- although we've referenced it in our briefs, just to point out where this is going, the viability of NAT's business plan is at issue in 11-87. It will be decided there.

Mr. Swier says that the FCC has approved NAT's tariff. Well, the FCC did say that the tariff to which the IXCs objected, including Sprint, was not facially unreasonable. It wasn't -- so it could go into force and effect before being challenged, but that's as far as it's

gone there.

2.3

Now with respect to the Lederman letter that we saw just this morning, Sprint objects to its being part of the record. First of all, it's an unsworn statement. At least the other filing that we saw yesterday was a declaration under oath.

Two, it's apparent on its face that Mr. Lederman lacks foundation for many of the assertions of fact that he makes in there. Then he talks about conversations with Free Conferencing. Obviously, both the statement and that reference is hearsay. So it's objectionable on that ground. Finally, it's really irrelevant to the issues at hand before the Commission on Sprint's Motion.

And I think if you want to take another look at that letter and take a look at the part where the reference was Free Conferencing is threatening to pull its business out of South Dakota.

So basically now you have a multimillion dollar corporation based in Long Beach, California. This big corporation is going to a politician and threatening to pull business. That's an implicit threat to you. And I am just appalled that they would play this kind of game, play this kind of card in an effort to influence the decision and decision-making process of the

1 Public Utilities Commission of the State of South Dakota.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Do you have an objection?

2.3

MR. SWIER: I do. I object, first of all, on the foundation of what our Senate Majority Whip knows or does not know as far as the foundation.

It's very clear that the Commission's docket is wholly available on the Commission's website. It's also -- the fact that Mr. Knudson would pretty much come in and say that anything that any public person, including our Senate Majority Whip, would say about this to try to inform the Commission, the implication is he doesn't know what he's talking about.

And, personally, I think we as citizens and this Commission should be offended by the statements made regarding our Senate Majority Whip. That's my point of order.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: You don't have a point of order as such. You have an opinion about what is being stated.

Mr. Knudson has a point, however, Mr. Swier, that this has not been sworn to, and from the standpoint of being a piece of evidence, we will not admit it as evidence.

However, since communications that are made to the PUC are placed on the -- in the information, it will

- be a part of the information as all letters and communications, whether they're e-mails or whatever that we receive pertaining to dockets. And we will receive it and keep it as a -- memorial state from that standpoint.

 MR. SWIER: Thank you. And it's our
 - MR. SWIER: Thank you. And it's our expectation -- again, because of time constraints, we didn't have a chance to prepare an Affidavit, but it would be my --

2.3

- CHAIRMAN HANSON: Well, it would not have been appropriate anyway because we are in a -- this is a Motion for Summary Judgment. It's not an evidentiary hearing. And so from the standpoint I'm giving you that leeway to have it provided in the website, as with any communication.
- MR. SWIER: I understand. So you're saying that if I submit that with an Affidavit, that your ruling is that this Commission will not consider an Affidavit in the summary judgment proceedings? I just want to make -- so the record's clear.
- CHAIRMAN HANSON: Any -- any evidence -- we're still open to receiving evidence certainly.
- MR. SWIER: That's what we plan to do. And that was based on the fact that, again, we had to get this together so late in response --

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Right. But not in a decision process right now for summary judgment.

MR. SWIER: Well, but any Affidavit that would be filed would be considered in the summary judgment decision as a procedural matter.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: There's a Catch-22 for you at this juncture. We're not open to new evidence during a summary judgment. We are here listening to attorneys give their final arguments for summary judgment based upon the evidence that had been presented up to that point. We're not opening this up to a whole new process of information being presented from the standpoint of evidence.

If I'm going to do that with you, I have to do that with everyone else and they get to start submitting new evidence and we're just going through a -- we've had nearly three years in this process at this point.

Mr. Knudson.

2.3

MR. KNUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I need to also respond to the implications that NAT's counsel has raised that somehow there's something untoward to Sprint's opposition to NAT's operations, that somehow that it's based on the fact that NAT purports to be a tribally owned entity. That is simply not the case.

I recall that this case began in the context of a significant issue facing IXCs around the country with respect to these access stimulators, and this was a matter of major significance to Sprint. A lot of that issue has been resolved.

2.3

Nonetheless, we're engaged in litigation here that was legitimately started, legitimately continued, and is certainly distinguishable from the Northern Valley situation, which at least had a Certificate of Authority, therefore, it is lawful for it to operate.

The precedent being established by NAT is very significant and very detrimental. And if you're not willing to take action to determine it's unlawful to operate without a Certificate of Authority, what value is 49-31-3 in terms of preventing others from doing so as well?

So Mr. Swier says that somehow Sprint's had decades to bring in a local exchange service to the reservation. Sprint is generally an interexchange carrier and that the local exchange carriers like MidState and Venture are those entities that are there to provide the local service.

Sprint is the one that connects the local exchange carrier. So to say somehow Sprint has not done its job is simply incorrect.

There's a reference to the Seventh Circuit

Decision, <u>Cahnmann v. Sprint</u>. I simply cannot respond to it since I have not read that case. It was not cited in NAT's responsive briefs so I have not had an opportunity to brief it or review it myself.

2.3

2.4

Then the argument that somehow we are procedurally improper in terms of the request for relief. I think this is an argument that's never been made before by NAT in its briefs. It addressed the question that Commissioner Hanson raised about it. Again, I would reiterate my answer, which I believe is what we're asking for in our Motion is fairly encompassed within what we asked for in our Amended Complaint.

I would like to respond to a couple of points that Ms. Wiest raised in her questions here with respect to the factual record before the Commission and whether there's anything left to try.

Again, for example, in Paragraph 5 of our undisputed facts we make a statement that Sprint has no physical presence on the reservation. That is the position we have taken in all the litigation all along. It's never been disputed. They offer nothing to dispute that fact.

That statement comes from an Affidavit of one of Sprint's employees. And under the Pleading rules,

Rule 56, a mere denial is not adequate to rebut a well founded assertion of fact. The fact that NAT might deny that fact doesn't make it a material fact in dispute.

2.3

And so I think with respect to the material facts that we've asserted in our Briefs and in our undisputed material of facts statement, we feel we are on solid ground and the Commission would be on solid ground in relying on those.

Then I heard a question related to the tribal sovereignty issue, and the answer was to the effect, well, we really haven't focused on that at this stage. And then I think that's simply a concession that, indeed, under the law and the facts that NAT is not a tribal entity entitled to assert tribal sovereign immunity.

And that concludes my rebuttal remarks, unless you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Are there any questions by the Commission?

Commissioner Fiegen, do you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Not at this time.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. And the reason I ask each time is just in case you are speaking and you have it on mute or for some reason we've lost the

```
1
     connection. I just want to make sure each time that we
2
     still have you with us.
 3
              I'll turn to Staff then at this juncture.
 4
     Ms. Cremer.
5
              MS. CREMER: Thank you. This is Karen Cremer of
 6
     Staff. Similar to SDN and MidState and SDTA, Staff
7
     does not take a position on this Motion for Summary
8
     Judgment.
              Thank you.
10
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                Thank you.
11
              Ms. Wiest, do you have anything at this point
12
     that you wish to ask?
13
              MS. AILTS WIEST: No.
14
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: All right. If there are no
15
     further questions by the Commissioners, then I will deem
16
     that this hearing is concluded.
17
              We will look forward to the supplemental
18
     information that is going to be provided to us by NAT.
19
              Did you have something?
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, do we need to
20
21
     talk about the schedule for that supplemental
22
     information?
2.3
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: I guess I shouldn't assume
24
    that it was forthcoming.
```

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Maybe -- yeah. Rolayne,

```
do we need to talk about that or not?
2
              MS. AILTS WIEST: Yeah. Either Staff can work
    with them or we can try to set it here. I think the
 3
 4
     question is NAT would be responding to Sprint's
 5
    supplemental authority.
 6
              Did you have a time line for that, Mr. Swier?
7
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: He's requesting two weeks.
8
     Since this is a brand new docket, I don't see any reason
    why we can't extend that for two weeks.
10
              Two weeks.
11
              Excuse me. Mr. Knudson, did you have a --
12
              MR. KNUDSON: Would Sprint be allowed to
13
     respond? We can do so in one week.
14
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Isn't this from NAT a response
15
    to your response?
16
              MR. KNUDSON: Response to our supplemental --
17
     (Inaudible).
18
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: I'm wondering who gets to
19
     respond last.
20
              MR. KNUDSON: (Inaudible).
21
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                Yes. I quess -- yes. You are
22
     the moving party so you would have that privilege. Yes.
2.3
    We'll allow you seven days after their response.
2.4
              MR. KNUDSON: Thank you.
25
                                Okay. Anything further to
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
```

```
come before us at this juncture?
 1
               If not, we'll conclude with this portion of the
 2
 3
     meeting. The hearing is concluded.
              (The hearing is concluded at 1:15 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
2	:SS CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF SULLY)
4	
5	I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered
6	Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and
7	Notary 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, via the
LO	internet, the proceedings had in the above-entitled
L1	matter on the 9th day of April, 2013, and that the
L2	attached is a true and correct transcription of the
L3	proceedings so taken.
L 4	Dated at Onida, South Dakota this 19th day
L 5	of April, 2013.
L 6	
L 7	
L 8	
L 9	Cheri McComsey Wittler,
20	Notary Public and Registered Professional Reporter
21	Certified Realtime Reporter
22	
23	
24	
25	

	T	<u> </u>	1	T
\$	2013 [4] - 1:8, 2:4,	abided [1] - 75:19	addressing [1] - 4:1	- 87:7 1
<u> </u>	102:11, 102:15	ability [3] - 43:5,	adequate [2] - 25:3,	alleged [1] - 83:18
	203 [1] - 15:14	55:25, 88:20	98:1	allocation [1] - 22:21
\$150,000 [1] - 64:25	21 [1] - 24:7	able [7] - 39:14, 51:17,	administration [2] -	allow [4] - 5:19, 35:20,
\$280 [1] - 65:4	22 [1] - 24:16	51:19, 52:10, 73:4,	67:9, 67:12	87:18, 100:23
\$281 [5] - 64:14,	24 [2] - 34:17, 34:20	90:21, 91:4	administrative [2] -	allowed [4] - 38:1,
64:21, 64:24, 70:24,	25 [2] - 34:19, 50:18	above-entitled [2] -	11:4, 11:7	39:20, 77:13, 100:12
74:22	26 [1] - 34:17	2:2, 102:10	Admission [1] - 29:4	allowing [3] - 72:25,
	27 [1] - 17:16	absolute [1] - 23:25	admit [3] - 29:4, 29:6,	77:22, 78:9
•	28 [1] - 76:3	absolutely [4] - 38:4,	93:22	allows [1] - 30:2
	29 [1] - 24:24	52:11, 62:1, 69:19	admitted [1] - 14:4	almost [1] - 41:17
100		accept [2] - 51:7,	admonition [2] -	altogether [1] - 38:16
'08 [1] - 69:9	3	52:25	38:20, 78:10	Amended [32] - 27:1,
'34 [1] - 22:13	3	accepted [1] - 38:24	advanced [2] - 10:17,	27:2, 27:9, 27:10,
		access [27] - 14:12,	18:8	27:15, 27:19, 27:24,
0	3 [6] - 40:25, 47:25,	15:3, 29:23, 42:19,	advantage [1] - 48:21	33:2, 62:21, 62:25,
	61:16, 83:9, 90:17	42:22, 43:14, 44:1,	advisory [1] - 11:6	63:14, 63:17, 63:20,
006327 [1] - 50:16	30-second [1] - 4:7	44:5, 46:6, 48:22,	affect [1] - 21:4	64:2, 64:5, 64:12,
008 [2] - 50:12, 50:13	38 [1] - 41:15	49:5, 51:4, 51:7,	affected [1] - 20:9	64:22, 65:12, 65:13,
09-98 [1] - 86:1	39 [1] - 15:22	51:10, 51:13, 51:16,	Affidavit [8] - 5:22,	70:7, 70:9, 70:15,
00-30 [i] - 00. I		51:20, 52:13, 53:13,	5:25, 29:2, 94:8,	70:16, 70:19, 71:2,
1	4	58:6, 61:12, 61:15,	94:17, 94:18, 95:3,	71:8, 71:17, 71:19,
I	<u> </u>	66:25, 76:24, 77:4,	97:24	72:3, 73:11, 86:25,
		81:11, 96:3	affirmed [4] - 69:13,	97:13
1 [2] - 9:5, 61:16	49-31-3 [4] - 9:2,	accesses [1] - 31:1	70:23, 71:25, 73:24	amended [2] - 22:13,
10 [2] - 9:14, 85:5	13:10, 87:13, 96:15	accident [1] - 63:4	afford [2] - 79:16,	26:25
10-minute [2] - 85:3,	_	accommodation [1] -	79:22	America [1] - 5:13
85:15	5	35:9	afraid [1] - 88:6	AMERICAN [1] - 1:5
106 [1] - 46:24		according [2] - 75:12,	afternoon [3] - 85:22,	American [20] - 1:16,
1097 [1] - 42:18	5 [3] - 62:21, 83:10,	85:4	86:14, 86:15	3:3, 3:6, 3:9, 4:1,
11-087 [1] - 60:6	97:18	accordingly [1] -	AGAINST [1] - 1:5	4:5, 14:23, 15:13,
11-87 [3] - 14:2, 29:3,	500 [2] - 2:3, 47:20	24:20		19:8, 30:9, 30:23,
91:19	51 [2] - 34:17, 34:19	accusation [1] - 88:11	agency [2] - 11:4, 11:7	32:1, 34:25, 36:24,
15 [1] - 6:9	56 [1] - 98:1	accused [4] - 5:23,	ago [11] - 46:15, 49:1,	44:13, 48:9, 48:23,
152 [8] - 46:2, 46:3,	30 [1] - 3 0.1	39:8, 58:9, 88:22	49:5, 59:1, 64:1,	50:17, 54:1, 67:8
46:5, 52:12, 65:24,	6	Act [5] - 11:20, 11:22,	64:3, 64:15, 69:20, 72:14, 74:19, 75:18	American-Indian [1] -
79:11, 89:16, 90:11	0	15:15, 21:16, 55:7	agree [15] - 25:14,	44:13
18 [5] - 59:17, 69:20,		act [2] - 12:7, 22:13	_	amount [2] - 26:20,
69:24, 74:19, 75:18	60-day [1] - 59:8	acting [1] - 36:23	56:11, 56:23, 57:7, 58:2, 60:14, 73:23,	90:21
186 [2] - 41:14, 47:15	•	action [7] - 9:19, 15:8,	73:24, 74:9, 74:14,	amounts [1] - 33:16
1934 [1] - 21:16	8	15:20, 23:4, 33:25,		analogous [1] - 31:24
196 [1] - 56:9		87:7, 96:13	75:2, 75:6, 76:25, 85:25, 86:1	analogy [2] - 29:16,
1996 [1] - 22:13		actions [2] - 15:24,	·	32:2
1998 [2] - 55:3, 55:5	8 [1] - 68:11	87:3	agreed [2] - 4:16, 50:6 Agreement [1] - 67:19	analysis [2] - 19:18,
19th [1] - 102:14	87 [1] - 42:21	activities [10] - 16:13,	_	33:15
1:00 [1] - 85:5		17:23, 24:18, 42:19,	agreement [6] - 9:17,	animal [1] - 90:18
1:15 [1] - 101:4	9	42:23, 44:2, 44:5,	39:13, 48:8, 49:7,	animals [1] - 38:16
		56:16, 57:4, 74:5	49:13, 90:22	ankle [1] - 63:13
2	9 _[1] - 1:8	activity [3] - 56:13,	ahead [8] - 5:4, 32:24,	answer [15] - 6:17,
4	97 [1] - 48:4	64:20, 75:9	35:3, 36:17, 38:10, 51:21, 63:18, 78:1	35:21, 38:3, 54:6,
	9:30 [1] - 46.4 9:30 [1] - 2:5	actual [1] - 27:6	AILTS [16] - 3:14,	68:4, 68:15, 73:21,
2 [1] - 61:16	9.30 [1] - 2.5 9th [2] - 2:4, 102:11	add [2] - 6:21, 81:10	32:25, 34:3, 34:10,	75:22, 77:22, 77:24,
20 [3] - 41:13, 47:13,	Jul [2] - 2.7, 102.11	additional [4] - 5:20,	34:13, 34:16, 34:22,	79:1, 79:6, 79:8,
85:5	Λ	37:21, 52:22, 82:14		97:11, 98:11
2008 [5] - 42:17,	Α	address [8] - 25:19,	43:15, 43:18, 82:19,	answered [2] - 37:15,
68:11, 68:12, 68:25,		29:15, 37:3, 37:25,	83:8, 84:2, 84:17, 84:25, 99:13, 100:2	82:14
76:3	A-1 [1] - 23:23	45:12, 57:18, 57:19,		answers [4] - 37:1,
201(b [1] - 15:14	a.m [1] - 2:5	88:11	Ailts [1] - 1:13	78:25, 79:6
2010 [2] - 42:20, 62:22	Aberdeen [3] - 48:16,	addressed [3] - 20:20,	Airvator [1] - 19:9 alcoholic [1] - 9:22	anyway [2] - 66:1,
2011 [1] - 69:21	49:20, 49:22	23:17, 97:9	1	94:11
		20.11, 31.3	all-encompassing [1]	J-7.11
		•		

100:8

apologize [1] - 30:7 appalled [1] - 92:23 apparent [3] - 44:3,
44:6, 92:7
appeal [1] - 57:24
Appeals [2] - 12:2, 12:3
appear [3] - 7:9, 9:8, 39:14
APPEARANCES [1] - 1:15
appearing [1] - 4:5 applicable [2] - 11:4, 11:16
application [12] -
14:3, 18:15, 60:23,
64:20, 68:12, 68:13,
68:25, 69:11, 69:17,
69:23, 81:18, 81:23
applications [1] - 14:1
applied [8] - 57:21,
59:1, 59:7, 59:15,
60:16, 64:9, 75:15,
75:20
applies [1] - 25:4
apply [5] - 11:8, 11:12,
23:18, 66:9, 69:14
applying [1] - 11:7
appointed [1] - 102:8
appreciate [11] - 6:19,
7:9, 26:20, 35:9,
37:3, 38:20, 78:10,
82:6, 86:12, 88:1,
88:25
appropriate [2] - 5:17,
94:11
approve [1] - 67:2
approved [2] - 66:21,
91:21
April [4] - 1:8, 2:4,
102:11, 102:15
arbitration [1] - 9:16
area [14] - 11:11,
11:15, 17:8, 20:22,
21:3, 21:14, 22:5,
22:8, 25:11, 25:24,
58:2, 79:10, 90:4,
90:5
argue [1] - 9:8
argues [1] - 10:20
arguing [1] - 38:18
argument [21] - 3:8,
10:17, 11:10, 16:2,
16:14, 16:16, 18:8,
18:12, 20:18, 25:12,
37:16, 38:6, 38:12,
38:21, 40:17, 40:18,
53:5, 89:10, 90:10,
97:6, 97:8
argument's [1] - 18:11

39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22 astonishing [1] - 44:20 AT&T [9] - 1:18, 14:13, 14:23, 86:13, 86:20, 86:21, 87:1, 87:8, 88:25	background [2] - 4:9,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assersed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22 astonishing [1] - 44:20 AT&T [9] - 1:18, 14:13, 14:23, 86:13, 86:20, 86:21, 87:1, 87:8, 88:25 AT&T's [1] - 15:12	В
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assersed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22 astonishing [1] - 44:20 AT&T [9] - 1:18, 14:13, 14:23, 86:13, 86:20, 86:21, 87:1, 87:8, 88:25	
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22 astonishing [1] - 44:20 AT&T [9] - 1:18, 14:13, 14:23, 86:13, 86:20, 86:21, 87:1, 87:8, 88:25	81:12
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22 astonishing [1] - 44:20 AT&T [9] - 1:18, 14:13, 14:23, 86:13, 86:20, 86:21, 87:1, 87:8,	aware [2] - 55:10,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22 astonishing [1] - 44:20 AT&T [9] - 1:18, 14:13, 14:23, 86:13, 86:20,	33:6, 34:4, 73:11
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22 astonishing [1] - 44:20 AT&T [9] - 1:18, 14:13, 4:13,	awarding [4] - 33:2,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22 astonishing [1] - 44:20	avoid [1] - 11:5
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22 astonishing [1] -	Avenue [1] - 2:3
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2, 59:22	79:22, 90:7, 93:7
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23 assured [2] - 44:2.	available [4] - 79:20,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20, 99:23	authorizes [1] - 24:18
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3, 11:10, 72:21, 85:20,	41:6
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9 assume [5] - 5:3,	authorized [2] - 22:18,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8 assessed [1] - 11:25 association [1] - 41:9	20:22, 21:2, 24:1
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2 assertions [1] - 92:8	authorization [3] -
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2	100:5
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9, 19:19, 98:2	76:11, 77:1, 88:4,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8 assertion [3] - 17:9,	75:7, 75:17, 75:24,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2, 88:7, 91:8	67:20, 72:25, 74:1,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6 asserting [3] - 84:2,	57:22, 67:12, 67:17,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14, 20:15, 88:2, 98:6	54:24, 54:25, 57:7,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7 assert [1] - 98:15 asserted [4] - 20:14,	39:19, 39:21, 54:9,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10 articulates [1] - 20:7	31:8, 39:7, 39:10,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13, 25:10	28:11, 29:17, 30:24,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8, 17:6, 17:15, 20:13,	24:17, 25:7, 25:10,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25 articulated [5] - 13:8,	23:8, 24:9, 24:10,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] - 89:25	22:11, 22:12, 23:5,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16 arrangements [1] -	18:5, 21:7, 21:13,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] - 91:16	14:21, 16:3, 17:22,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3 arrangement [1] -	5:20, 5:24, 13:8,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9, 84:3	authority [44] - 4:14,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16 arm [3] - 63:5, 63:9,	96:9, 96:14
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9 arises [1] - 25:16	81:9, 82:12, 89:2,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17, 95:9	76:5, 81:5, 81:8,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15, 85:10, 86:23, 88:17,	75:16, 75:25, 76:4,
39:1, 40:7, 84:15,	68:10, 69:3, 69:15, 74:13, 74:18, 74:19,
47.0 00.00 07:04	
arguments [11] - 7:2,	
arguments [11] - 7:2,	59:15, 59:18, 59:21, 59:24, 60:4, 60:17, 64:10, 66:10, 67:13,

42.22

55:12

85:23

95:8

attempted [2] - 42:18,

attempting [1] - 44:21

attention [2] - 32:14,

attorney [2] - 73:18,

attorneys [2] - 88:16,

authorities [3] - 18:20,

Authority [47] - 7:24,

8:23, 9:3, 9:5, 9:12,

13:19. 13:23. 14:3.

21:9, 58:21, 59:2,

59:7, 59:11, 59:12,

15:19, 18:16, 18:18,

7:25, 8:17, 8:19,

55:21, 59:8

background [2] - 4:9, 68:19 bad [7] - 5:23, 39:8, 42:12, 59:23, 88:18, 88:21, 88:22 balance [2] - 10:1, 21:19 ball [1] - 53:19 bargain [2] - 10:1, 10:11 based [12] - 8:5, 40:8, 40:14, 49:9, 64:1, 67:10, 67:14, 67:20, 92:20, 94:24, 95:9, 95.23 basement [1] - 47:17

basis [1] - 83:11

bat [1] - 46:9

Beach [1] - 92:20 bear [1] - 24:5 bearing [1] - 23:10 bears [1] - 16:3 beat [3] - 62:6, 62:7 bedside [1] - 51:5 **BEFORE** [1] - 1:10 began [1] - 96:1 begin [2] - 8:20, 89:3 beginning [1] - 62:10 begins [1] - 30:14 begun [1] - 12:4 behalf [7] - 4:5, 6:14, 41:7, 76:14, 78:3, 85:24, 86:20 belaboring [1] - 86:22 believes [2] - 42:8, 57:17 belonged [1] - 22:22 benefit [1] - 17:8 benefits [2] - 9:25, 10:10 better [3] - 52:5, 54:3, 68:18 between [4] - 12:2, 16:24, 30:8, 30:19 beverage [1] - 9:20 beverages [1] - 9:22 beyond [5] - 10:13, 70:16, 71:4, 71:5, 77:15 bid [1] - 51:21 big [4] - 63:21, 90:18, 92:20 biggest [1] - 81:3 Bill [3] - 42:18, 42:21, 86:20 bill [12] - 12:15, 13:13, 42:19, 42:23, 44:5, 51:8, 52:8, 53:4, 58:22, 61:14, 64:19, 91:14 billed [1] - 64:21 billing [4] - 10:18, 12:17, 12:18, 12:19 **billion** [1] - 47:18 bit [5] - 26:22, 27:4, 28:7, 72:20, 77:17 board [3] - 19:2, 36:6, 36:19 bogeyman [1] - 47:10 book [1] - 58:3 books [1] - 20:1 borrower [1] - 9:25

bounds [1] - 75:10

boy [1] - 65:19

brand [2] - 46:13,

battle [1] - 64:25

battling [1] - 59:25

breach [2] - 33:11, 55:8 break [4] - 72:22, 73:3, 80:22, 85:4 brevity [1] - 86:12 bridge [3] - 14:10, 28:24, 31:13 brief [3] - 39:22, 86:5, 97.5 Brief [8] - 14:14, 16:19, 22:16, 25:12, 26:24, 29:2, 84:6, 84:8 briefly [1] - 85:25 briefs [11] - 8:7, 11:3, 26:20, 45:20, 52:7, 58:16, 60:8, 91:17, 97:4, 97:9, 98:6 bring [14] - 7:17, 8:5, 9:19, 23:3, 28:4, 39:22, 42:15, 44:23, 52:18, 55:7, 55:12, 63:6, 63:8, 96:18 bringing [2] - 15:7, 42:3 broad [2] - 65:14, 87:2 broadband [5] -56:15, 56:17, 57:5, 76:23, 84:20 broken [2] - 63:12, 63:13 brought [11] - 11:19, 14:23, 32:13, 42:5, 54:8, 58:21, 62:18, 63:23, 84:9, 84:11, 87:8 build [2] - 10:6, 17:20 build-out [1] - 17:20 **Building** [1] - 2:3 burden [1] - 12:23 business [23] - 23:2, 24:14, 28:23, 41:24, 42:2, 42:9, 42:11, 48:3, 49:2, 51:16, 53:3, 54:3, 77:13, 78:17, 80:1, 80:13, 90:16, 90:17, 91:4, 91:8, 91:19, 92:18, 92:22 Buy [1] - 51:22 **BY** [1] - 1:4

C

Cahnmann [2] - 55:3, 97:2 **CAHNMANN** [1] - 55:4 calculation [1] - 33:17

California [3] - 19:9, 48:14, 92:20 **CAMP** [2] - 86:14, 86.19 Camp [4] - 1:18, 86:13, 86:20, 87:22 campaign [1] - 41:18 cannot [8] - 7:22, 7:24, 10:9, 12:20, 13:1, 37:15, 78:19, 97:2 capital [2] - 51:18 Capitol [2] - 2:3 car[1] - 63:4 card [1] - 92:24 care [1] - 44:16 careful [1] - 71:19 carrier [4] - 24:13, 67:2, 96:20, 96:24 carriers [2] - 89:20, 96:20 case [80] - 5:12, 5:14, 8:15, 9:14, 9:23, 10:3, 10:20, 11:1, 11:14, 11:15, 11:16, 12:1, 12:3, 12:6, 12:8, 12:9, 12:11, 12:16, 12:23, 13:21, 13:23, 14:14, 14:17, 14:23, 16:5, 17:16, 18:21, 19:1, 19:6, 19:9. 19:21. 20:24. 21:22, 21:24, 22:15, 22:17, 22:18, 23:9, 23:12, 23:14, 23:19, 23:23, 23:25, 24:5, 25:14, 25:15, 25:16, 27:22, 29:16, 30:9, 30:16, 30:23, 32:1, 33:21, 55:1, 55:2, 55:3, 55:5, 55:6, 55:10, 55:12, 58:4, 60:11, 61:6, 65:8, 69:7, 71:1, 78:5, 83:14, 83:15, 87:5, 88:16, 89:6, 95:25, 96:1, 97:3, 98:24 cases [4] - 9:10, 9:20, 20:11, 45:20 cash [2] - 64:16, 65:5 cast [1] - 27:16 Catch-22 [1] - 95:6 caveat [1] - 4:23 ceased [1] - 12:8 center [2] - 46:14, 76:21 Center [1] - 46:19 cents [1] - 50:16 certain [5] - 8:5, 57:25, 58:13, 72:21,

79:3 certainly [9] - 17:19, 81:13, 83:7, 83:19, 83:20, 86:25, 90:13, 94:22, 96:8 certainty [1] - 26:1 Certificate [41] - 7:23, 7:25, 8:16, 8:19, 8:23, 9:3, 9:5, 9:12, 14:3, 15:19, 18:15, 18:18, 58:21, 59:2, 59:7, 59:10, 59:12, 59:15, 59:18, 59:21, 59:24, 60:3, 60:17, 64:9, 66:10, 68:10, 69:2, 69:15, 74:18, 74:19, 75:16, 75:25, 76:4, 76:5, 81:5, 81:8, 81:9, 82:12, 89:2, 96:9, 96:14 certificate [11] - 15:6, 15:9, 31:8, 59:8, 60:20, 69:5, 76:6, 76:8, 76:15, 76:17 CERTIFICATE [1] -102:2 certified [1] - 87:14 Certified [2] - 102:6, 102:20 **CERTIFY** [1] - 102:8 cessation [1] - 33:21 chair [3] - 35:4, 35:10, 37:23 CHAIRMAN [83] -1:10, 1:11, 3:1, 3:25, 5:1, 6:7, 6:10, 6:13, 6:23, 7:16, 26:5, 26:17, 27:23, 28:2, 32:19, 32:23, 34:24, 35:25, 36:7, 36:13, 36:17, 37:12, 38:4, 38:10, 38:23, 39:4, 40:10, 40:17, 43:1, 43:4, 43:8, 43:11, 43:22, 45:11, 68:8, 68:17, 68:20, 69:10, 69:17, 69:25, 70:3, 71:7, 71:11, 71:16, 71:21, 72:2, 72:5, 72:9, 72:13, 72:15, 73:2, 73:20, 77:20, 78:8, 78:22, 79:7, 79:9, 82:3, 82:16, 85:2, 85:7, 85:11, 85:14, 85:18, 86:11, 86:17, 87:22, 93:2, 93:17. 94:10. 94:21. 95:1. 95:6. 98:19. 98:23, 99:10, 99:14, 99:23, 100:7,

100:14, 100:18, 100:21, 100:25 chairman [18] - 6:6, 7:6, 26:14, 27:10, 36:11, 36:16, 38:8, 43:10, 43:21, 76:6, 76:13. 76:16. 82:10. 85:6, 86:16, 86:19, 87:25, 95:19 challenge [2] - 55:9, 66:22 challenged [3] -53:18, 61:8, 91:25 **challenges** [1] - 44:14 chamber [1] - 7:16 chance [2] - 30:12, 94:8 change [3] - 17:21, 22:14, 33:17 characterize [1] -27:16 characterized [1] -87:6 charge [1] - 59:11 charges [1] - 14:12 chat [1] - 85:21 chattel [2] - 9:24, 10:2 cheaper [2] - 65:20, 91.8 cheat [2] - 53:22, 58:9 cheating [1] - 53:7 check [3] - 43:19, 64:16, 65:5 Cheri [6] - 1:24, 3:16, 35:1, 43:11, 72:21, 102:19 CHERI [1] - 102:5 Cheyenne [6] - 17:4, 17:10, 20:14, 23:17, 24:4, 24:21 chicken [3] - 18:22, 19:6, 59:13 chooses [1] - 22:12 CHRIS [1] - 1:11 Circuit [11] - 9:18, 12:1, 12:6, 55:3, 55:5, 57:24, 58:24, 70:23, 71:25, 73:24, 97:1 circumstances [5] -9:11, 11:6, 12:14, 28:13, 30:17 cite [7] - 9:20, 18:19, 20:11, 21:22, 22:15, 23:12, 23:19 cited [4] - 9:10, 19:7, 29:17, 97:3 cites [1] - 19:21 citizen's [2] - 11:19, 11:22

claim [2] - 5:9, 68:21 claiming [1] - 64:22 **clarify** [2] - 16:18, 85:13 Class [1] - 9:5 Clean [2] - 11:20, 11:22 clear [15] - 13:25, 29:12, 35:5, 37:11, 55:21, 56:1, 57:6, 57:12, 66:18, 81:19, 81:25, 83:25, 89:25, 93:6, 94:20 cleared [1] - 40:23 clearly [4] - 20:13, 24:16, 42:12, 89:2 **CLEC** [13] - 8:12, 13:25, 30:25, 57:20, 60:23, 61:3, 64:20, 67:11, 67:20, 68:25, 69:23, 81:18, 81:22 **CLECS** [7] - 15:3, 15:5, 31:4, 31:7, 31:12, 32:1, 32:8 cloaked [2] - 18:10, 18:25 clock [2] - 52:5, 85:4 close [1] - 62:16 closed [1] - 12:4 closes [1] - 46:21 **CLOUD** [1] - 36:8 **cloud** [1] - 36:9 COA [6] - 68:12, 68:22, 69:11, 69:18, 75:7, 75:21 cognisant [1] - 3:24 colleague [1] - 88:15 collect [3] - 14:11, 52:15, 58:6 collecting [1] - 64:17 collection [1] - 13:13 colleges [1] - 41:19 colored [1] - 81:23 commencing [1] - 2:4 comment [3] - 25:12, 66:17, 81:16 comments [4] - 6:20, 35:5, 39:4, 86:10 commerce [1] - 7:16 commercial [1] - 18:3 Commission [163] -3:5, 3:6, 3:7, 4:18, 5:25, 7:20, 8:2, 8:15, 8:17, 9:10, 10:16, 10:22, 10:25, 11:16, 13:2, 13:5, 13:9, 13:17, 13:22, 13:24, 14:16, 14:18, 15:1, 15:2, 15:7, 15:12,

citizens [1] - 93:13

15:17, **15:21**, **15:25**, 3 16:6, 16:11, 16:15, 16:17, 16:20, 16:21, 16:22, 17:4, 17:22, 18:15, 18:18, 20:6, 20:15, 21:7, 21:12, 21:18, 21:22, 21:23, 22:1. 23:1. 23:3. 25:13, 25:14, 25:17, 25:22, 25:23, 25:25, 27:20, 28:11, 28:14, 30:4, 30:23, 31:3, 31:6, 31:17, 31:25, 32:11, 33:1, 36:12, 37:3, 37:25, 38:13, 38:18, 40:1, 41:2, 42:8, 42:25, 43:25, 45:1, 45:12, 48:11, 50:25, 52:19, 52:21, 52:24, 53:3, 54:12, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:13, 55:17, 56:7, 56:12, 56:14, 56:21, 57:3, 57:7, 57:10, 57:22, 57:24, 57:25, 58:4, 58:11, 58:17, 58:22, 58:24, 59:2, 59:4, 59:5, 59:22, 60:22, 61:4, 61:25, 64:6, 64:7, 64:18, 64:23, 65:7, 65:12, 65:22, 66:3, 68:13, 69:8, 69:13, 69:21, 70:17, 70:19, 70:22, 71:5, 71:25, 72:24, 73:12, 74:3, 74:20, 74:24, 75:7, 75:14, 75:24, 77:1, 77:6, 77:12, 82:24, 83:13, 84:16, 85:18, 86:5, 87:10, 87:15, 87:17, 87:18, 88:4, 88:7, 88:19, 92:13, 93:1, 93:11, 93:14, 94:18, 97:16, 98:8, 98:20 commission [1] - 35:6 COMMISSION [3] -1:1, 1:10, 1:12 Commission's [17] -17:9, 20:10, 21:2, 22:21, 44:4, 44:7. 54:9. 55:12. 57:18. 73:23, 74:1, 74:22, 75:12, 75:20, 81:12, 93:6, 93:7 Commissioner [20] -4:4, 6:7, 28:5, 32:20, 43:20, 46:14, 62:18, 63:3, 73:3, 73:5, 73:6, 73:9, 73:17,

77:23, 82:3, 82:8,

82:11, 82:16, 97:10, 27:15, 27:19, 27:24, 50:3, 50:6, 50:11, 4:19, 4:23, 35:16, contract [4] - 10:8, 98.21 31:18, 33:2, 33:8, 50:17, 53:6, 53:22, 10:9, 33:11, 55:8 39:13, 45:7, 49:4, 52:5, 81:10, 83:17 COMMISSIONER [42] 62:21, 62:25, 63:8, 56:8, 58:7, 62:11, Contractors [1] -- 1:11, 6:6, 6:8, 63:14, 63:17, 63:20, 73:19, 75:4, 76:1, 23:24 Court [37] - 9:18, 9:21, 6:12, 26:14, 28:6, 64:3, 64:5, 64:13, 79:25, 80:16, 90:21, contracts [2] - 9:23, 11:17, 11:23, 12:1, 12:2, 12:3, 12:9, 28:15. 30:6. 32:16. 64:22, 65:12, 65:13, 91:1, 92:10, 92:17 51.22 32:22, 36:15, 36:18, 70:7, 70:9, 70:15, conferencing [7] -12:10, 12:21, 13:15, contrary [2] - 16:10, 36:22, 43:10, 43:13, 70:17. 70:20. 71:2. 41:12, 42:7, 47:14, 13:20, 17:5, 17:13, 90:25 71:5, 71:8, 71:15, 48:17, 80:10, 90:15, 73:7, 74:6, 74:11, 18:22, 20:13, 20:18, control [2] - 20:3, 71:17, 71:19, 72:3, 21:21, 22:3, 22:18, 75:2, 75:6, 75:22, 90:18 24:12 76:3, 76:13, 76:18, 22:24, 23:7, 23:20, 73:11, 75:1, 77:16, Conferencing's [2] controlled [2] - 19:25, 77:3, 77:8, 78:11, 86:25, 97:13 42:6, 48:2 23:25, 24:7, 25:9, 34:20 79:10, 79:19, 79:24, complaint [1] - 53:20 31:18, 33:12, 45:20, confidential [3] - 3:22, controversy [1] - 12:7 **COMPLAINT** [1] - 1:4 57:24, 58:24, 61:6, 80:7, 80:12, 80:23, 34:14, 91:12 contumacious [1] -61:9, 70:23, 72:1, 81:13, 82:2, 82:10, completed [1] - 64:20 confused [1] - 83:2 10:15 73:24 85:6, 85:8, 85:12, complex [5] - 58:2, confusing [1] - 50:21 convenience [2] -98:22, 99:20, 99:25 court [9] - 3:15, 10:7, 60:13, 60:14, 69:15, confusion [1] - 77:11 15:6, 31:9 Commissioners [4] -86:6 24:16, 36:1, 43:4, Congress [10] - 16:24, conversations [1] -26:10, 28:3, 60:10, compliance [1] -18:4, 21:15, 22:3, 63:24, 69:14, 69:21, 92:9 99:15 74:3 51:12 22:5, 22:11, 24:25, conversely [1] - 21:8 commitment [3] complicated [1] - 37:7 Court's [1] - 75:20 29:25, 41:17, 66:18 conveyed [1] - 42:7 49:1, 49:12, 80:16 complies [4] - 53:8, court's [1] - 89:24 Congressional [3] cooperative [1] - 90:4 common [1] - 24:13 53:9, 53:10, 66:24 courtesy [1] - 73:1 23:25, 24:17, 47:21 copy [1] - 34:11 communicate [1] comply [3] - 53:11, courts [1] - 11:5 connect [1] - 78:13 Corporation [15] -Courts [1] - 19:7 59:14, 64:10 Connect [1] - 5:13 8:14, 14:5, 14:8, communication [2] comport [1] - 63:19 covers [2] - 90:4, 90:5 connection [5] - 30:8, 15:4, 19:23, 28:22, 72:21. 94:15 concerned [1] - 26:18 30:19, 30:21, 32:13, Creek [14] - 18:10, 29:1, 29:6, 29:11, communications [7] concession [2] -99:1 29:14, 36:25, 41:10, 21:5, 21:9, 35:16, 5:25, 22:7, 34:21, 18:17, 98:13 connects [1] - 96:23 47:9, 47:23, 56:8 36:19, 44:22, 45:5, 69:3, 90:3, 93:24, conclude [9] - 5:9, 45:19, 46:2, 48:23, consequences [1] corporation [3] - 55:4, 94.2 6:3, 11:13, 12:20, 49:6, 56:11, 57:20, 88:6 92:20, 92:21 COMMUNICATIONS 19:18, 20:25, 23:11, 80:1 consequently [1] corporations [1] -[1] - 1:4 Creek's [1] - 50:15 24:4, 101:2 13:1 41.16 Communications [13] concluded [5] - 10:25, consider [3] - 6:24, Cremer [5] - 1:13, correct [13] - 27:11, - 1:16, 1:17, 3:2, 4:15, 88:15, 99:4, 20:23, 99:16, 101:3, 7:1, 94:18 28:1, 43:16, 68:14, 13:16, 15:12, 15:21, consideration [1] -101:4 99:5 73:16, 76:8, 76:10, 21:18, 30:23, 31:3, CREMER [2] - 6:22, concludes [1] - 98:17 88:19 76:15, 77:3, 77:5, 31:16, 42:24, 43:25, 99:5 concluding [1] - 21:2 considered [3] -80:3, 85:11, 102:12 55:6 crime [1] - 44:16 conclusion [2] -42:18, 42:21, 95:4 counsel [11] - 4:16, companies [9] - 23:1, Crow [15] - 18:10, 17:18, 33:18 consistent [1] - 21:14 6:16, 37:13, 37:14, 24:13, 44:1, 44:21, 21:5, 21:9, 35:16, **conditions** [3] - 3:17, constraints [1] - 94:7 38:12, 38:21, 78:4, 44:23, 47:20, 52:16, 36:19, 44:22, 45:5, 30:1, 31:5 consumers [3] - 25:2, 88:13, 90:10, 90:25, 60:1, 65:1 45:19, 46:2, 48:23, conduct [2] - 10:15, 95:21 **COMPANY** [1] - 1:4 49:6, 50:15, 56:11, 33:21 counsel's [1] - 40:18 contending [2] - 34:3, company [25] - 3:3, 57:20. 80:1 conference [4] counterclaim [1] -83:3 8:11, 19:16, 22:20, 14:10, 29:19, 31:13, CRR [1] - 1:24 contends [1] - 82:23 33:12 22:23, 29:20, 41:12, crucial [3] - 24:11, contention [3] - 71:9, counterclaims [1] -42:14, 45:18, 45:25, Conferencing [54] -25:9, 33:14 72:6, 78:20 13:15 47:1, 47:15, 47:16, 8:14, 14:5, 14:8, countries [4] - 41:14, curious [2] - 68:17, context [1] - 96:1 47:17, 49:16, 51:14, 70:4 15:4, 19:23, 28:10, 41:15, 47:15, 56:9 Continuance [1] - 6:4 54:1, 62:5, 65:17, cursory [1] - 42:10 28:22, 29:1, 29:6, continuance [7] - 3:6, country [2] - 61:25, 67:5, 67:22, 76:11, customers [11] - 46:2, 29:10, 29:14, 36:25, 3:10, 4:2, 4:13, 5:6, 96:2 76:17, 80:21 41:10, 41:11, 41:12, 46:4, 46:5, 52:14, 6:24, 39:12 **COUNTY** [1] - 102:3 compelled [1] - 26:10 41:15, 41:22, 42:1, 52:18, 52:22, 52:25, continue [10] - 5:7, couple [16] - 9:20, competition [1] - 45:4 42:2, 42:8, 42:12, 79:11, 79:18, 89:16, 43:21, 44:14, 48:15, 15:2, 19:7, 20:11, competitors [1] - 42:5 42:13, 47:9, 47:11, 89:17 51:7, 52:15, 52:21, 23:16, 24:4, 26:17, Complaint [46] - 3:2, 47:13, 47:23, 47:24, cut [1] - 13:12 72:16, 89:12, 89:13 27:11, 28:6, 30:22, 13:2, 13:6, 15:12, 48:6, 48:10, 48:12, continued [2] - 89:7, 37:6, 46:8, 46:15, 17:2, 26:23, 27:1, 48:18, 48:19, 49:8, 58:25, 82:19, 97:14 96.7 27:2, 27:8, 27:10, 49:17, 49:21, 49:22, course [11] - 3:24, continuing [1] - 44:12

DAKOTA [2] - 1:2, 102:1 Dakota [41] - 1:17, 2:2, 2:4, 7:8, 7:23, 8:10, 8:13, 12:18, 17:5, 18:1, 18:21, 19:10, 19:16, 22:17, 22:24, 23:19, 25:13, 25:17, 31:15, 41:24, 42:2, 42:6, 42:9, 42:16, 42:17, 42:21, 44:12, 44:14, 48:5, 54:10, 59:14, 67:18, 85:24, 89:4, 89:8, 89:24, 92:18, 93:1, 102:7, 102:14 Dakota's [1] - 41:23 damages [12] - 33:3. 33:6, 33:10, 33:22, 34:5, 34:8, 64:13, 64:14, 64:22, 70:24, 73:12, 74:21 darnedest [3] - 59:25, 60:18, 81:9 Dated [1] - 102:14 days [3] - 5:16, 5:17, 100:23 deal [7] - 10:4, 27:3, 48:24, 54:3, 63:21, 63:22, 73:11 dealing [4] - 30:10, 30:18, 35:6, 58:11 deals [1] - 50:25 debating [1] - 26:5 decade [1] - 53:12 decades [3] - 44:23, 65:24, 96:18 **December** [1] - 68:12 decide [7] - 25:14, 30:24, 31:22, 39:10, 56:14, 61:5, 65:16 decided [13] - 48:8, 49:15, 57:23, 64:6, 69:5, 69:16, 70:16, 73:25, 74:2, 74:24, 80:21, 86:8, 91:20 decides [1] - 33:1 decimals [1] - 50:13 **Decision** [1] - 97:2 decision [44] - 4:19, 4:24, 5:14, 13:24, 17:5, 17:17, 20:14, 20:19, 24:24, 25:15, 54:17, 55:14, 55:18, 56:3, 56:4, 56:15, 56:21, 58:3, 58:5,

60:13, 60:14, 60:16,

60:23, 61:3, 61:11, 61:23, 64:9, 64:10, 64:19, 66:8, 69:13, 69:22, 74:3, 74:14, 74:15, 74:23, 75:12, 75:20, 77:7, 92:25, 95:1, 95:5 decision-making [1] -92:25 decisions [3] - 64:4, 70:20, 73:23 declaration [4] - 21:6, 66:3, 72:4, 92:6 declarations [1] - 9:1 declaratory [8] - 7:21, 10:12, 10:23, 34:8, 65:14, 87:3, 87:9, 87:16 declare [1] - 16:12 declaring [2] - 74:12, 74:17 deed [1] - 89:22 deem [1] - 99:15 deemed [2] - 5:6, 5:10 defeated [3] - 42:20, 42:23, 44:8 Defendant [2] - 12:11, 14:24 defendants [2] -15:13, 15:23 deference [3] - 13:23, 52:24. 53:2 defining [1] - 21:13 definitely [1] - 16:11 delineating [1] - 18:2 democratic [1] - 41:18 denial [1] - 98:1 denied [4] - 83:1, 83:10, 83:11, 83:22 deny [1] - 98:3 depreciation [1] -21:24 designed [1] - 42:1 despite [1] - 60:25 determination [10] -11:14, 14:16, 15:17, 15:24, 18:24, 31:23, 31:24, 32:3, 32:4, 34:9 determine [7] - 23:1, 23:8, 25:15, 32:6, 83:13, 86:8, 96:13 determined [4] - 13:7, 31:7, 33:3, 84:11 determining [1] -32:12 detrimental [1] - 96:12

develop [1] - 10:5

developed [1] - 11:5

developer [3] - 10:4,

10:6, 10:10 Development [2] -36:5, 36:11 development [3] -41:23, 41:25, 45:6 dichotomy [3] - 16:23, 21:15, 22:14 difference [2] - 31:22, 81:4 different [7] - 11:7, 27:2, 30:17, 38:16, 50:2, 66:11, 84:18 differently [1] - 27:4 difficult [1] - 35:6 direct [1] - 40:14 directly [3] - 9:18, 16:3, 19:5 director [1] - 36:24 disagree [1] - 77:17 discharge [1] - 11:24 discovery [2] - 29:3, 38:16 discussion [1] - 33:19 discussions [2] -41:22, 87:13 disingenuous [1] -58:14 dismantling [1] - 12:4 dismiss [2] - 13:22, 68:13 **Dismiss** [3] - 13:21, 64:1, 69:7 dispense [1] - 5:3 disposition [1] - 13:17 dispositive [2] -19:11, 90:13 dispute [6] - 9:1, 9:8, 10:13, 83:22, 97:22, 98:4 disputed [3] - 8:8, 46:1, 97:22 disputes [1] - 84:1 distance [1] - 28:9 distinction [2] - 33:15, 34:2 distinctions [2] -31:19, 31:21 distinguishable [1] -96:8 District [7] - 11:23, 12:2, 13:15, 13:20, 23:20, 31:18, 33:12 divest [1] - 13:1 dividing [1] - 33:4 **DO**[1] - 102:8 docket [19] - 16:5,

25:16, 41:5, 41:8,

42:5, 44:4, 44:7,

45:2, 58:1, 60:5,

60:19, 65:2, 65:16,

81:24, 86:2, 86:9, 91:7, 93:6, 100:8 docket's [1] - 74:20 dockets [1] - 94:3 doctrine [1] - 11:5 Doctrine [2] - 11:12, 12:22 document [1] - 29:7 documents [1] - 4:11 dollar [1] - 92:19 dollars [2] - 33:13, 90:20 done [15] - 39:16, 44:25, 45:20, 46:12, 53:2, 60:12, 62:15, 64:21, 65:25, 68:1, 68:19, 73:4, 74:10, 75:18, 96:24 dots [1] - 78:13 doubt [1] - 91:2 down [9] - 45:5, 45:18, 45:24, 47:1, 48:11, 52:17, 60:24, 61:2, 62:4 downstairs [1] - 43:18 drafted [1] - 33:8 draw [1] - 33:14 drawer [1] - 64:16 drawing [1] - 77:11 dressing [1] - 28:21 drew [1] - 16:24 dually [1] - 38:24 ducks [1] - 53:16 due [5] - 3:16, 10:1, 33:16, 71:18, 78:24 duly [1] - 102:8 duly-appointed [1] -102:8 during [3] - 5:18, 44:10, 95:7 dust [1] - 64:17 dwell [1] - 11:3 Ε

e-mail [1] - 88:14
e-mails [2] - 46:16,
94:2
Earth [2] - 11:18,
33:20
easily [2] - 49:13, 53:2
east [1] - 55:22
East [1] - 2:3
economic [3] - 41:23,
41:25, 79:15
Economic [2] - 36:5,
36:10
economy [1] - 7:19
ed [1] - 18:8

educational [1] -44:16 effect [6] - 17:14, 55:8, 76:22, 79:25, 91:25, 98:11 effective [1] - 16:5 effectively [1] - 16:7 effects [4] - 45:15, 45:16, 76:19, 79:11 effort [2] - 38:13, 92:24 efforts [5] - 23:15, 23:22, 44:22, 45:2, 45:6 egg [1] - 59:13 either [3] - 79:4, 88:19, 100:2 eligible [1] - 67:2 eliminate [1] - 28:20 **elsewhere** [6] - 48:4, 48:20, 49:14, 80:9, 80:11, 80:19 **emergency** [1] - 46:6 employees [1] - 97:25 **employment** [1] - 42:3 encompassed [2] -27:14, 97:12 encompasses [1] -87:2 encompassing [8] -56:2, 56:21, 57:1, 57:3, 57:11, 66:3, 67:25, 87:7 encourage [1] - 54:4 end [2] - 52:13, 52:15 enforce [1] - 10:9 enforcement [3] -15:8, 23:4, 33:10 engage [1] - 44:1 engaged [2] - 28:9, 96:6 enhance [1] - 44:19 enhancing [1] - 38:18 enjoy [1] - 7:14 enjoyed [1] - 44:11 ensured [1] - 25:2 enter [2] - 57:3, 58:17 entered [1] - 67:19 entice [1] - 42:1 entire [2] - 40:13, 70:5 entities [1] - 96:21 entitled [5] - 2:2, 19:12, 19:18, 98:15, 102:10 entity [14] - 8:14, 14:5,

14:7, 14:9, 18:9,

18:23, 18:25, 19:12,

19:24, 23:9, 34:20,

83:18, 95:24, 98:15

entity's [1] - 19:11

entry [2] - 56:18, 56:24 enunciated [2] - 9:2, 32:5 environmental [2] -11:18, 33:20 equipment [1] - 21:25 equities [1] - 90:2 errors [1] - 27:12 essentially [3] - 33:24, 76:7, 76:14 establish [4] - 9:11, 12:22, 13:25, 25:23 established [4] -12:11, 12:21, 90:13, 96:11 **ETC** [2] - 67:3, 67:6 events [1] - 42:1 eventually [2] - 60:3, 61:14 evidence [11] - 28:16, 37:21, 90:11, 93:22, 93:23, 94:21, 94:22, 95:7, 95:10, 95:13, 95:16 evident [1] - 32:4 evidentiary [1] - 94:12 exact [2] - 50:22, 51.25 exactly [2] - 59:4, 65:3 example [5] - 9:14, 19:21, 32:25, 63:2, 97:18 **excellent** [1] - 42:3 **exceptions** [1] - 23:16 exchange [20] - 8:13, 8:22, 14:4, 14:7, 17:11, 20:16, 29:1, 29:5, 29:9, 29:13, 75:3, 75:8, 75:25, 87:14, 89:7, 89:14, 89:20, 96:18, 96:20, 96:24 exchanges [1] - 24:19 Excuse [1] - 43:11 excuse [8] - 3:12, 23:24, 37:17, 44:6, 77:10, 77:20, 100:11 **exercise** [1] - 13:5 exist [1] - 91:16 exists [1] - 82:24 expand [2] - 42:2, 42.9 expansion [2] - 41:24, 42:6 expectation [1] - 94:7 extend [1] - 100:9 extensive [2] - 24:10, 24:17 extent [2] - 24:14,

91:7 extinguishes [1] -55:7 eye [1] - 59:22

F

face [2] - 44:14, 92:7 faced [1] - 16:9 facially [1] - 91:23 facilities [2] - 24:10, 25:3 facing [1] - 96:2 fact [39] - 18:17, 33:15, 41:25, 42:13, 45:25, 48:19, 49:25, 50:9, 55:1, 55:2, 60:4, 60:25, 67:16, 68:21, 77:25, 79:15, 79:19, 79:20, 80:12, 80:24, 81:1, 81:4, 83:12, 83:17, 87:17, 88:8, 88:22, 90:11, 90:13, 92:8, 93:8, 94:24, 95:23, 97:23, 98:2, 98:3 factors [1] - 19:20 facts [15] - 8:6, 34:11, 37:10, 76:9, 82:22, 82:23, 83:2, 83:4, 83:9, 83:22, 97:19, 98:6, 98:7, 98:14 factual [5] - 31:19, 31:21, 83:25, 86:7, 97:16 failed [1] - 47:2 failure [1] - 9:11 fair [6] - 4:13, 4:20, 4:25, 39:15, 39:19, fairly [2] - 27:14, 97:12 faith [5] - 5:23, 39:9, 88:18, 88:21, 88:22 **falling** [1] - 43:9 familiar [2] - 8:15, 60:18 **far** [4] - 77:6, 77:15, 91:25, 93:5 fashion [1] - 27:18 favor [6] - 13:11, 16:7, 34:7, 80:2, 80:13, 80:20 favorably [1] - 19:7 FCC [39] - 14:22, 14:25, 15:23, 16:1, 16:2. 16:23. 20:20.

20:23. 21:23. 21:24.

22:4, 31:12, 31:22,

32:6, 32:10, 32:12,

53:8, 53:14, 53:18, 55:2, 55:15, 56:13, 56:18, 61:6, 61:7, 61:10, 61:11, 61:12, 61:17, 66:17, 66:21, 66:23, 67:1, 67:3, 67:4, 67:5, 91:21, 91:22 FCC's [5] - 20:22, 49:10, 51:4, 51:11, 52:4 federal [20] - 5:24, 11:5, 16:15, 16:24, 17:3, 17:7, 17:19, 17:24, 21:1, 22:7, 22:10, 24:15, 31:2, 32:7, 53:8, 55:9, 55:21, 66:22, 67:21, 69:3 Federal [17] - 13:15, 13:16, 13:20, 15:11, 15:21, 21:17, 23:19, 30:22, 31:3, 31:16, 31:18, 33:12, 42:24, 43:24, 55:6, 61:6, 61:9 fees [3] - 49:6, 52:16, few [4] - 28:2, 41:21, 51:15, 52:9 Fiegen [7] - 6:7, 32:20, 43:14, 43:20, 82:8, 82:17, 98:21 FIEGEN [12] - 1:11, 6:6, 6:8, 6:12, 32:22, 43:10, 43:13, 82:10, 85:6, 85:8, 85:12, 98:22 **fifth** [1] - 56:20 fight [1] - 60:2 fighting [5] - 51:1, 51:2, 64:12, 65:4, 65:21 file [6] - 5:19, 39:25, 63:17, 69:23, 83:24, 86:21 **FILED** [1] - 1:4 filed [17] - 3:2, 5:13, 5:16, 5:22, 14:14, 27:10, 40:21, 43:15, 43:19, 62:21, 68:11, 68:25, 69:7, 69:19, 74:19, 95:4 files [1] - 5:25 filing [9] - 4:10, 5:17, 5:24, 30:9, 40:9, 43:17, 43:18, 86:4, 92.5 filings [5] - 4:21, 4:25, 39:14, 40:2, 45:10

fill [2] - 26:12, 26:15 final [1] - 95:9 finally [11] - 5:21, 8:2, 8:22, 16:10, 18:7, 29:21, 42:17, 56:20, 62:18, 67:18, 92:12 finance [1] - 36:24 finances [1] - 20:1 financial [1] - 49:11 fine [9] - 50:21, 53:20, 60:2, 61:15, 61:16, 65:18, 65:19, 65:20 fingers [1] - 43:8 firm [1] - 7:7 first [23] - 3:9, 6:8, 8:8, 8:25, 10:12, 10:17, 11:2, 17:13, 18:14, 20:12, 27:11, 28:7, 28:12, 35:4, 46:23, 54:16, 73:14, 73:22, 73:25, 87:14, 91:6, 92:4, 93:3 fiscal [1] - 7:18 five [7] - 27:2, 27:24, 40:15, 71:21, 72:2, 72:9, 73:10 flow [1] - 20:1 flush [1] - 33:24 focus [1] - 84:13 focused [1] - 98:12 folks [7] - 35:15, 35:21, 69:1, 79:16, 79:22, 80:22, 85:3 follow [5] - 27:17, 45:13, 61:16, 73:9, 78:11 following [1] - 44:2 follows [2] - 61:17, 88:8 food [1] - 7:15 force [2] - 11:8, 91:24 forefront [1] - 18:1 form [3] - 9:13, 19:11, 48:8 formal [1] - 66:22 formed [2] - 18:24, 19:14 Fort [1] - 28:25 forth [1] - 46:12

forthcoming [1] -

Fortune [1] - 47:20

forum [1] - 33:25

forward [7] - 4:17,

fought[1] - 61:12

4:23, 20:6, 26:2,

44:12, 69:2, 99:17

foundation [4] - 32:7,

92:8, 93:4, 93:5

founded [1] - 98:2

99:24

founders [1] - 34:20 four [7] - 26:24, 27:17, 48:25, 49:5, 71:20, 74:21, 74:25 fourth [2] - 12:1, 33:1 Fourth [1] - 12:6 frame [1] - 5:18 franchise [2] - 9:15, 9:17 franchisee [1] - 9:18 **franchisor** [1] - 9:15 free [3] - 42:7, 80:10, 90:18 Free [57] - 8:14, 14:5, 14:8. 15:4. 19:23. 28:10, 28:22, 29:1, 29:5, 29:10, 29:13, 36:25, 41:10, 41:11, 41:12, 41:15, 41:22, 42:1, 42:2, 42:5, 42:8, 42:11, 42:13, 47:9, 47:11, 47:13, 47:22, 47:24, 48:2, 48:6, 48:10, 48:12, 48:17, 48:19, 49:8, 49:17, 49:21, 49:22, 50:2, 50:6, 50:11, 50:17, 53:6, 53:22, 56:8, 58:7, 62:11, 73:18, 75:3, 76:1, 79:25, 80:16, 90:15, 90:21, 91:1, 92:10, 92:17 Friday [1] - 88:14 Friends [2] - 11:17, 33:19 front [5] - 52:20, 65:8, 83:5, 83:20, 83:23 full [2] - 4:20, 11:8 function [1] - 25:6 fundamental [1] - 62:4 funds [2] - 20:2, 90:6 furthers [1] - 25:7 future [3] - 13:13, 13:25, 16:8

G

game [1] - 92:24 games [1] - 59:18 GARY [1] - 1:10 gel [1] - 30:14 general [2] - 20:12, 24:12 generally [1] - 96:19 generates [2] - 14:6, 47:18 genuine [4] - 82:23, 83:4, 83:16, 83:21 germane [3] - 29:3, 31:16, 32:14 given [4] - 4:24, 32:4, 37:24, 45:11 gladly [2] - 49:23, 50:10 gosh [1] - 37:7 Government [3] -24:22, 25:6, 51:22 grand [1] - 46:15 grant [7] - 3:6, 16:7, 22:12, 25:22, 35:19, 76:19, 77:8 granted [7] - 10:23, 23:5. 31:8. 67:25. 69:8, 71:25, 76:4 granting [5] - 60:21, 73:15, 78:14, 80:2, 80:14 grants [4] - 24:9,

54:12, 61:4, 66:3 ground [3] - 92:12, 98:8 groundbreaking [2] -

58:18, 87:5 grounds [1] - 91:13

grow [1] - 52:23 **guess** [7] - 3:22, 33:4, 37:23, 37:25, 40:4,

99:23, 100:21 guessing [1] - 56:10 guests [1] - 35:20

guidelines [5] - 43:25, 44:3, 51:11, 51:13, 61:18

guy [1] - 42:12

Н

half [1] - 47:18 hand [5] - 16:15, 21:16, 21:18, 59:23, 92:13 handle [1] - 3:23 hands [2] - 20:2, 43:9 **HANSON** [82] - 1:10, 3:1, 3:25, 5:1, 6:7, 6:10, 6:13, 6:23, 7:16, 26:5, 26:17, 27:23, 28:2, 32:19, 32:23, 34:24, 35:25, 36:7, 36:13, 36:17, 37:12, 38:4, 38:10, 38:23, 39:4, 40:10, 40:17, 43:1, 43:4, 43:8, 43:11, 43:22, 45:11, 68:8, 68:17, 68:20, 69:10, 69:17, 69:25, 70:3, 71:7,

71:11, 71:16, 71:21, 72:2, 72:5, 72:9, 72:13, 72:15, 73:2, 73:20, 77:20, 78:8, 78:22, 79:7, 79:9, 82:3, 82:16, 85:2, 85:7, 85:11, 85:14, 85:18, 86:11, 86:17, 87:22, 93:2, 93:17, 94:10, 94:21, 95:1, 95:6, 98:19, 98:23, 99:10, 99:14, 99:23, 100:7, 100:14, 100:18, 100:21, 100:25

Hanson [6] - 43:10, 46:14, 62:18, 77:12, 82:10, 97:10

Hanson's [1] - 73:9 happy [2] - 68:4, 83:24 hate [1] - 43:22 head [1] - 63:12

health [2] - 19:3, 44:16

hear [11] - 3:7, 3:9, 6:8, 6:9, 7:2, 30:12, 30:13, 34:24, 37:20, 85:19, 89:9

heard [4] - 52:11, 72:17, 89:5, 98:10

hearing [17] - 3:7, 3:11, 4:2, 5:7, 5:14, 33:3, 33:22, 37:20, 38:12, 38:15, 39:1, 85:10, 87:23, 94:13, 99:16, 101:3, 101:4

hearings [1] - 5:16 hearsay [1] - 92:11 heart [1] - 24:24

held [7] - 2:2, 9:16, 9:21, 10:7, 41:11, 47:14, 55:6

help [6] - 26:15, 26:22, 30:18, 48:8, 51:14,

62:6 **helpful** [2] - 30:7, 32:17

HEREBY [1] - 102:8 high [2] - 12:23, 44:1

high [2] - 12:23, 44:16 **higher** [2] - 51:25, 80:11

himself [1] - 76:14 hired [1] - 10:4 history [2] - 42:11,

45:6 hit [1] - 63:6 hold [2] - 19:1, 19:10 holding [1] - 13:11

holds [1] - 17:18 Holoubek [7] - 36:23, 68:15, 73:18, 78:5, 78:14, 79:1, 79:5 home [2] - 7:12, 53:19 hopefully [2] - 4:7, 78:13 hopes [1] - 14:11

host [1] - 28:24 House [2] - 42:18, 42:20

humanly [1] - 35:17 hundred [1] - 5:15 hypothetical [4] -28:7, 28:14, 28:20, 29:18

-

identify [1] - 3:20 idle [1] - 13:5 ignore [2] - 65:13, 66:8 ignored [1] - 31:9 ILEC [4] - 79:13, 79:14, 79:20, 90:3 illegal [3] - 10:15, 33:21, 89:25

imagine [1] - 43:8 immediately [4] - 5:4, 59:1, 64:9, 69:14 immensely [1] - 52:23

immunity [5] - 18:10, 18:25, 19:13, 19:19, 98:16

impact [5] - 54:21, 56:7, 61:5, 77:4, 86:9

impacts [8] - 54:18, 55:14, 55:18, 56:3, 56:4, 56:15, 56:22,

57:4 impede [4] - 17:11, 20:17, 20:22, 21:4

implement [1] - 14:18 implemented [1] -

21:15 implicated [1] - 17:17 implication [2] -46:10, 93:11

implications [10] -24:6, 25:15, 45:22, 46:9, 47:8, 47:22, 48:10, 61:21, 65:10,

implicit [1] - 92:22 important [15] - 13:6, 18:1, 21:11, 21:12, 23:9, 24:23, 25:6,

95:20

23:9, 24:23, 25:6, 34:2, 54:7, 58:10, 61:19, 66:16, 68:6, 86:23, 88:10 **improper** [2] - 24:21, 97:7

IN [1] - 1:4 inadequate [1] - 44:15 Inaudible) [4] - 5:5, 35:24, 100:17, 100:20

incinerator [1] - 11:21 include [1] - 29:10 including [6] - 41:17, 44:15, 48:5, 83:17, 91:23, 93:10 income [1] - 90:8

incorporation [1] -18:23

incorrect [1] - 96:25 incredibly [2] - 60:25, 66:15

indeed [1] - 98:14 Indian [9] - 16:15, 17:3, 17:9, 18:3, 18:8, 25:5, 36:9, 44:13, 51:22

indicated [6] - 36:18, 64:1, 74:18, 78:15, 79:10, 79:24

individual [2] - 19:2, 63:6

individually [1] - 19:4 individuals [1] - 35:13 industry [4] - 26:1, 45:4, 51:18, 58:18

45.4, 51.16, 56. inequalities [1] - 44:17

inform [1] - 93:11 **information** [8] - 3:22, 68:5, 72:17, 93:25, 94:1, 95:12, 99:18,

influence [1] - 92:24

99:22 informed [1] - 72:23 infrastructure [1] -

17:20 infringement [1] -24:21

initial [2] - 26:24, 77:15

initiated [1] - 12:16 initiatives [3] - 17:7, 17:17, 17:20

injured [4] - 63:5, 63:9 injuries [1] - 63:12 installations [1] -

41:14 instead [2] - 10:14, 78:6

insurance [1] - 23:20 integrity [1] - 88:23 intend [1] - 72:16 intensive [1] - 51:18 Interconnection [1] -67:19

interest [5] - 14:15, 20:8, 20:23, 21:12, 78:9

interesting [5] - 22:16, 47:2, 49:19, 50:9, 55:1

interests [6] - 13:7, 20:17, 20:21, 21:1, 21:5, 23:13

interexchange [10] - 54:10, 54:18, 54:21, 55:14, 56:3, 57:13, 58:13, 58:23, 74:2, 96:19

interfere [4] - 16:22, 17:2, 17:12, 25:8 interim [1] - 36:11

international [6] -41:14, 56:7, 56:10, 56:13, 57:5, 84:20

internet [15] - 2:1, 3:18, 3:23, 46:5, 46:11, 56:16, 76:20, 76:23, 77:4, 77:5,

76:23, 77:4, 77:5, 78:20, 79:12, 82:13, 89:15, 102:10 Internet [1] - 1:7

interstate [13] - 16:20, 21:17, 22:5, 28:9, 54:18, 54:21, 54:25,

55:14, 56:3, 57:4, 57:14, 57:23, 58:6 **Intervener** [1] - 14:13

Interveners [5] - 45:13, 72:18, 85:15, 85:19

intrastate [29] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:4, 8:21, 10:20, 12:18, 16:12, 17:23, 21:3, 21:7, 22:6, 24:10, 25:25, 29:22, 34:1, 54:9, 54:24, 57:4, 57:13, 57:15, 57:25, 58:13, 58:22,

59:6, 64:8, 64:19, 74:4, 75:13, 88:5

introduce [1] - 35:14 introduction [1] -35:20

invalid [2] - 23:16, 23:22

invited [1] - 42:1 invoice [1] - 7:24 invoices [10] - 8:1, 9:7, 9:12, 13:14, 13:18, 33:10, 33:

13:18, 33:10, 33:17, 33:23, 33:24, 34:1

invoicing [2] - 30:25, 31:13 involved [5] - 13:21, 28:16, 66:16, 89:1, 90.20 involving [2] - 23:20, 25:17 ironic [1] - 55:11 irrelevant [3] - 15:25, 91:6, 92:12 issue [40] - 4:7, 9:15, 10:24, 16:4, 17:21, 20:20, 21:23, 29:15, 33:2, 33:5, 33:7, 33:9, 38:6, 38:9, 39:22, 40:11, 44:8, 52:7, 57:9, 57:11, 57:23, 58:20, 64:6, 69:16, 70:21, 71:4, 82:24, 83:4, 84:8, 84:10, 84:14, 84:16, 86:3, 89:19, 90:13, 91:16, 91:19, 96:2, 96:5, 98:11 issued [1] - 11:22 issues [26] - 4:17, 7:11, 25:19, 27:13, 27:21, 33:1, 35:7, 35:8, 35:11, 60:15, 63:23, 66:16, 70:21, 70:22, 71:24, 73:10, 73:14, 74:1, 74:25, 83:14, 83:16, 83:21, 86:1, 86:6, 86:7, 92:13 issuing [3] - 11:6, 74:7, 76:8 item [1] - 3:1 items [11] - 26:23, 26:24, 27:3, 27:4, 27:6, 27:24, 40:15, 62:23, 70:10, 72:2, 72:9 itself [3] - 5:12, 76:8, 86:25 IXC [1] - 89:19

J

IXCs [5] - 16:8, 30:25,

53:19, 91:23, 96:2

JACK [3] - 35:23, 36:3, 36:21 Jack [4] - 35:23, 36:2, 36:3, 36:18 Jeff [1] - 36:23 job [2] - 41:1, 96:25 Joe [1] - 36:9 joined [1] - 87:8

Judge [1] - 31:17 judged [1] - 11:13 judgment [23] - 7:21, 10:13, 20:4, 20:5, 40:14, 40:22, 62:24, 65:14, 70:10, 71:12, 73:15, 74:7, 77:9, 78:15, 81:21, 82:25, 87:4, 94:19, 95:2, 95:4, 95:8, 95:9 Judgment [10] - 3:8, 7:3, 26:25, 33:5, 39:2, 80:3, 80:14, 86:22, 94:12, 99:8 juncture [9] - 4:1, 26:11, 27:7, 27:25, 38:25, 82:9, 95:7, 99:3, 101:1 jurisdiction [19] -13:2, 16:23, 17:10, 24:9, 29:14, 30:4, 56:12, 57:18, 57:25, 59:6, 64:7, 64:24, 66:19. 67:1. 74:4. 74:13, 75:15, 84:19, jurisdictional [13] -54:9, 58:25, 60:13, 60:15, 64:4, 66:7, 69:12, 69:15, 70:21, 70:22, 71:24, 74:16, 86:7

joint [1] - 19:22

K

Karen [3] - 1:13,

88:15, 99:5 keep [11] - 51:8, 52:8, 53:4, 58:11, 59:22, 61:14, 68:10, 68:22, 89:18, 91:14, 94:4 keeping [1] - 69:11 key [3] - 8:7, 28:3, 58:20 kind [7] - 4:18, 11:21, 29:23, 47:10, 91:16, 92:23, 92:24 kinds [2] - 29:8, 89:25 knowing [2] - 26:2, 53:13 knowledge [1] - 6:1 known [1] - 39:9 knows [7] - 22:12, 46:14, 52:4, 53:7, 79:6, 91:10, 93:4 Knudson [16] - 1:16, 6:10, 7:5, 7:6, 26:22, 37:5, 37:8, 37:18,

40:7, 66:17, 78:8, 87:24, 93:8, 93:20, 95:18, 100:11

KNUDSON [22] - 5:5, 7:6, 7:18, 27:9, 28:1, 28:12, 28:19, 30:21, 33:7, 34:6, 34:12, 34:15, 34:18, 38:8, 38:11, 78:2, 87:25, 95:19, 100:12, 100:16, 100:20, 100:24

Knudson's [1] - 37:24

Kristie [1] - 43:13

L

lacks [2] - 74:13, 92:8

Laidlaw [5] - 11:18,

11:20, 11:23, 12:3,

KRISTIE [1] - 1:11

lack [1] - 52:5

laid [1] - 28:17

lapse [1] - 9:16

large [1] - 59:25

44:20, 47:14

largest [3] - 41:11,

33:20

last [12] - 4:9, 4:12, 39:7, 39:11, 40:1, 45:10, 73:10, 73:11, 75:12, 81:15, 88:18, 100:19 last-minute [2] -45:10, 88:18 late [6] - 4:9, 4:25, 39:7, 40:9, 72:20, 94:25 Law [1] - 59:14 law [23] - 8:18, 8:24, 9:22, 9:24, 11:11, 13:12, 15:18, 15:19, 16:16, 17:8, 17:24, 18:8, 24:15, 31:2, 31:4, 31:24, 32:7, 55:8, 58:2, 88:4, 89:10, 89:23, 98:14 lawful [3] - 57:19, 88:7, 96:10 laws [4] - 8:9, 18:23, 19:11, 19:15 lawsuit [5] - 61:8, 63:6, 63:9, 63:10, 63:11 lawyering [1] - 45:21 leaders [1] - 41:23 learning [3] - 46:14, 46:19, 76:21 least [6] - 37:19,

39:21, 39:24, 42:10, 92:5, 96:9 leave [1] - 7:17 led [1] - 59:11 Lederman [8] - 39:17, 39:18, 41:1, 41:6, 47:11, 62:9, 92:2, 92:7 Lederman's [6] -39:24, 40:5, 40:6, 40:24, 41:20, 47:19 leeway [2] - 40:8, 94:14 left [1] - 97:17 leg [1] - 63:12 legal [8] - 16:5, 36:24, 51:16, 71:4, 76:22, 79:7, 89:9, 89:20 legislative [1] - 24:17 Legislature [2] -42:17, 42:21 legislature [8] - 9:2, 13:7, 32:5, 44:8, 44:10, 89:1, 89:11, 89:24 legitimately [2] - 96:7 less [3] - 49:9, 50:18, 52:2 letter [9] - 39:16, 39:24, 40:5, 40:6, 41:5, 47:11, 47:19, 92:2. 92:16 letters [2] - 62:8, 94:1 level [2] - 21:1, 53:18 liability [2] - 8:10, 19:16 **library** [3] - 46:11, 76:21, 89:15 light [1] - 45:9 **limitations** [1] - 31:10 limited [3] - 8:10, 19:16, 54:8 line [3] - 10:5, 35:2, 100:6

line [3] - 10:5, 35:2, 100:6 liquor [1] - 9:20 listen [1] - 87:23 listening [5] - 3:17, 35:2, 37:5, 81:20, 95:8 lists [1] - 29:8 litany [1] - 17:7 litigation [3] - 91:3, 96:6, 97:21 live [5] - 33:7, 33:8, 33:13, 38:15, 50:7 LLC [3] - 1:5, 19:16, 85:24 local [29] - 7:19, 8:13, 8:22, 14:4, 14:6,

28:25, 29:5, 29:8,

29:13, 29:23, 31:1, 41:25, 55:18, 55:24, 56:5, 57:5, 57:14, 67:10, 75:3, 75:8, 75:25, 87:13, 89:7, 89:14, 89:20, 96:18, 96:20, 96:22, 96:23 located [1] - 29:24 location [1] - 49:7 look [26] - 17:4, 19:20, 22:9, 23:11, 23:23, 30:16, 39:9, 40:24, 44:12, 45:22, 54:19, 61:20, 62:12, 62:17, 65:2, 66:4, 66:5, 67:24, 78:22, 83:7, 83:8, 83:19, 92:15, 92:16, 99:17 looked [2] - 14:25, 31:3 looking [6] - 20:4, 27:7, 34:13, 40:13, 40:18, 82:21 looks [1] - 37:17 lose [7] - 46:3, 46:4, 46:6. 48:23. 79:11. 89:1. 89:16 loses [4] - 46:11, 46:13, 46:22 losing [6] - 76:20, 79:25, 80:5, 82:12, 90:25, 91:1 lost [2] - 87:12, 98:25 Louisiana [2] - 21:22, 21:25 loved [1] - 46:17 low [1] - 90:8 lower [3] - 50:23, 54:5, 90:8 **LP** [2] - 1:4, 3:3 Lyle [2] - 35:23, 36:3

М

mail [1] - 88:14
mails [2] - 46:16, 94:2
major [2] - 41:16, 96:4
Majority [4] - 39:17,
93:4, 93:10, 93:15
majority [1] - 76:7
managed [1] - 19:22
management [1] 19:8
mandatory [1] - 9:3
manufacturing [2] 22:19, 22:20
Margo [3] - 1:17,
85:20, 85:23
material [10] - 82:22,

82:23, 83:2, 83:3, 83:9, 83:12, 83:17, 98:3, 98:5, 98:7 matter [23] - 2:2, 3:2, 9:24. 10:8. 50:24. 53:21, 54:11, 55:16, 60:22. 62:4. 62:19. 68:21, 77:25, 79:15, 79:21, 79:22, 84:11, 87:20, 88:22, 91:11, 95:5, 96:4, 102:11 **MATTER** [1] - 1:4 matters [2] - 58:1, 70:16 MCCOMSEY [1] -102:5 McComsey [2] - 1:24, 102:19 mean [10] - 19:4, 31:12, 45:19, 45:21, 49:7, 51:12, 54:13, 79:3, 79:4, 91:15 meaning [1] - 41:20 means [5] - 7:4, 10:20, 12:22, 19:17, 50:16 meant [1] - 80:8 meet [1] - 12:23 meeting [2] - 3:16, 101:3 meets [1] - 11:14 member [3] - 36:4, 36:6, 36:19 members [8] - 8:9, 19:2, 19:15, 19:22, 20:2, 23:15, 23:22, 65:24 memorial [1] - 94:4 mentioned [2] - 84:20, 84:22 mere [1] - 98:1 merely [1] - 86:4 merits [2] - 6:4, 26:12 microphone [3] -36:2, 37:19, 77:21 MidState [4] - 67:18, 90:3, 96:21, 99:6 might [6] - 26:15, 28:7, 36:15, 37:16, 73:12, 98:2 million [2] - 41:13, 47.13 mind [3] - 58:11, 81:16, 81:20 mindful [1] - 16:23 mine [1] - 28:4 minimal [1] - 47:24 minted [1] - 18:12 minuscule [1] - 48:1 minute [8] - 34:12,

39:11, 40:1, 45:10,

50:13, 50:16, 55:25, 88.18 minutes [10] - 47:18, 47:23, 47:24, 47:25, 48:4, 48:5, 48:17, 85:5 Misdemeanor [1] - 9:5 misguided [1] - 45:3 misrepresented [1] -88:12 mistake [1] - 37:10 mistruths [1] - 42:4 mobile [6] - 56:22, 56:23, 57:5, 84:20, 84:22, 84:23 model [2] - 28:23, 42:11 moment [1] - 31:20 money [26] - 33:2, 33:6, 33:10, 33:22, 34:4, 34:8, 46:20, 48:24, 49:6, 49:8, 49:9, 49:14, 51:20, 64:12, 65:25, 70:21, 70:23, 73:12, 74:21, 80:1, 80:5, 80:9, 82:12, 90:21, 90:24, 90:25 Montana [3] - 23:12, 23:14, 48:13 month [3] - 41:13, 47:13, 47:19 months [10] - 12:17, 39:10, 59:17, 64:1, 64:15, 69:20, 69:24, 72:14, 74:19, 75:18 moot [5] - 10:21, 11:1, 12:8, 12:11, 33:21 mootness [7] - 11:2, 11:13, 11:14, 33:15, 33:18, 63:25, 64:1 Mootness [2] - 11:12, 12.22 moreover [1] - 9:6 morning [8] - 4:4, 4:6, 35:15, 36:3, 36:8, 68:4, 86:15, 92:3 mortgage [2] - 9:24, 10:2 most [3] - 37:1, 45:5, 50:9 Motion [40] - 3:8, 5:6, 5:8, 6:4, 6:5, 7:2, 7:20, 8:5, 8:8, 11:16, 13:6, 13:21, 13:24, 14:14, 17:2, 24:6, 25:23, 26:25, 27:14,

33:4, 39:1, 40:22,

54:8, 57:1, 62:20,

62:24, 63:25, 68:23,

69:7, 76:19, 77:13, 78:15, 80:2, 80:14, 86:21, 92:14, 94:12, 97:12, 99:7 move [3] - 6:4, 26:1, 69:2 moved [1] - 68:12 moves [1] - 20:6 moving [2] - 5:2, 100:22 MR [86] - 4:4, 5:5, 7:6, 7:18, 27:9, 28:1, 28:12, 28:19, 30:21, 33:7, 34:6, 34:12, 34:15, 34:18, 35:4, 35:23, 36:3, 36:8, 36:21, 37:23, 38:8, 38:11, 39:3, 39:6, 40:16, 40:19, 43:3, 43:7, 43:17, 43:21, 43:24, 45:14, 68:15, 68:18, 68:24, 69:12, 69:19, 70:2, 70:14, 71:10, 71:14, 71:18, 71:23, 72:3, 72:8, 72:11, 72:14, 72:24, 73:17, 73:22, 74:9, 74:12, 75:5, 75:9, 76:2, 76:9, 76:16, 76:25, 77:6, 78:2, 78:24, 79:8, 79:14, 79:21, 80:4, 80:8, 80:15, 81:6, 82:1, 83:5, 83:16, 84:7, 84:24, 86:14, 86:19, 87:25, 93:3, 94:6, 94:16, 94:23, 95:3, 95:19, 100:12, 100:16. 100:20. 100:24 MS [19] - 3:14, 6:22, 32:25, 34:3, 34:10, 34:13, 34:16, 34:22, 43:15, 43:18, 82:19, 83:8, 84:2, 84:17, 84:25, 85:22, 99:5, 99:13, 100:2 multimillion [1] -92:19 must [3] - 5:10, 18:12,

N

mute [1] - 98:25

74:17

nail [1] - 61:13 name [5] - 35:23, 36:3, 36:8, 36:22, 41:21 named [1] - 55:11 NANPA [1] - 67:9 narrow [2] - 21:23, 23:16 NAT [151] - 4:13, 4:20, 5:10, 5:17, 5:19, 5:22, 5:25, 6:14, 7:22, 7:24, 8:9, 8:12, 8:16, 9:8, 10:14, 10:18, 10:19, 10:20, 12:15, 12:23, 13:1, 13:11, 13:13, 14:3, 14:6, 15:17, 15:20, 16:11, 16:18, 17:2, 18:9, 18:14, 19:14, 19:18, 19:21, 19:22, 20:4, 28:8, 28:21, 29:5, 29:9, 30:18, 31:18, 31:23, 33:16, 34:19, 34:20, 35:10, 36:6, 36:19, 36:20, 36:21, 38:14, 39:6, 44:2, 44:18, 46:19, 47:24, 48:12, 50:3, 50:7, 50:23, 51:6, 51:12, 51:18, 51:21, 52:1, 52:2, 52:8, 52:13, 52:15, 52:17, 52:19, 52:24, 53:3, 53:6, 53:11, 53:16, 53:22, 54:4, 57:4, 57:9, 57:17, 57:21, 58:21, 59:1, 59:3, 59:7, 59:10, 59:11, 59:20, 59:22, 60:9, 60:11, 60:16, 60:19, 60:24, 60:25, 61:17, 62:11, 64:20, 64:25, 65:19, 65:20, 66:2, 66:7, 67:10, 67:15, 67:19, 69:1, 69:22, 74:17, 75:3, 75:7, 75:15, 75:18, 75:24, 76:5, 76:6, 76:16, 77:5, 78:3, 78:16, 78:18, 79:17, 80:16, 80:25, 81:5, 81:8, 82:23, 83:18, 84:2, 84:22, 88:6, 88:13, 89:6, 89:9, 89:12, 90:22, 90:23, 91:9, 91:15, 95:23, 96:11, 97:9, 98:2, 98:14, 99:18, 100:4, 100:14 NAT's [37] - 8:1, 8:22, 9:7, 9:11, 13:14, 13:21, 14:2, 16:14, 33:9, 41:9, 44:3, 44:6, 44:22, 46:7, 47:23, 51:14, 53:7, 54:4, 54:18, 54:21, 56:3, 56:5, 57:19,

58:6, 60:23, 61:7,

66:21, 66:23, 67:11, 9 67:20, 77:13, 88:19, 91:19, 91:21, 95:21, 95:22, 97:4 nation's [1] - 44:20 National [1] - 67:11 **NATIVE** [1] - 1:5 **Native** [12] - 1:16, 3:3, 3:6, 3:9, 4:1, 4:5, 34:25, 36:23, 48:9, 48:23, 50:17, 53:25 nature [3] - 37:22, 87:2, 89:15 Nature's [1] - 9:14 nearly [1] - 95:17 Nebraska [1] - 48:14 necessarily [6] - 11:4, 11:8, 31:20, 73:24, 74:14, 77:18 necessary [1] - 19:18 necessity [2] - 15:6, 31:9 need [19] - 6:14, 6:18, 11:11, 25:19, 26:12, 34:8, 37:18, 53:23, 58:21, 65:9, 66:24, 78:11, 78:23, 81:14, 87:11, 88:11, 95:20, 99:20, 100:1 needed [3] - 75:19, 83:13, 89:3 needs [3] - 47:1, 72:22. 83:4 nefarious [2] - 62:10, 62:11 negatively [2] - 21:4, 86:9 **Nelson** [7] - 28:5, 63:3, 73:6, 73:17, 77:23, 82:4, 82:11 **NELSON** [31] - 1:11, 26:14, 28:6, 28:15, 30:6, 32:16, 36:15, 36:18, 36:22, 73:7, 74:6, 74:11, 75:2, 75:6, 75:22, 76:3, 76:13, 76:18, 77:3, 77:8, 78:11, 79:10, 79:19, 79:24, 80:7, 80:12, 80:23, 81:13, 82:2, 99:20, 99:25 Network [4] - 1:17, 25:13, 25:18, 85:24 never [7] - 39:8, 53:9, 62:24, 63:23, 65:25, 97:8, 97:22 new [12] - 43:25, 44:3, 46:13, 49:10, 51:4, 51:13, 53:8, 61:17,

95:7, 95:11, 95:16,

100:8 newly [1] - 18:12 next [2] - 30:7, 51:15 nice [1] - 46:16 night [2] - 7:13, 51:6 nobody's [1] - 63:20 none [2] - 44:24, 57:14 nonetheless [3] -5:19, 7:12, 96:6 nonmembers [3] -19:25, 23:14, 24:2 nonprofits [1] - 41:19 nontribal [6] - 8:9, 19:15, 19:22, 20:2, 23:15, 23:22 normal [1] - 78:4 North [4] - 19:10, 22:17, 22:24, 67:8 Northern [23] - 5:13, 48:16, 49:20, 49:22, 49:25, 50:4, 50:10, 50:11, 50:14, 50:19, 50:22, 51:24, 52:1, 53:24, 65:18, 80:25, 81:4, 81:7, 81:11, 82:12, 91:5, 91:9, 96.8 NORTHRUP [1] -85:22 Northrup [3] - 1:17, 85:20. 85:23 **nose** [4] - 59:3, 60:10, 66:9, 66:11 **Notary** [2] - 102:7, 102:19 note [6] - 3:14, 14:1, 14:13, 14:20, 18:9, 41:9 noted [1] - 38:24 nothing [12] - 10:15, 16:21, 17:1, 17:15, 46:20, 48:11, 50:5, 60:25, 65:12, 65:15, 77:3, 97:22 notice [1] - 7:10 nuance [1] - 77:18 number [17] - 6:15, 8:6, 9:10, 18:20, 45:17, 45:24, 46:2, 51:14, 55:17, 57:19, 66:21, 72:4, 74:12, 74:17, 74:21, 88:16, 89:6 numbering [2] - 67:8, 67:11 **numbers** [3] - 67:10, 67:13, 67:15 numerical [1] - 48:21 numerous [1] - 70:6

0

ones [2] - 8:7, 68:23 oath [1] - 92:6 ongoing [1] - 16:8 object [5] - 38:13, 70:9, 91:5, 91:12, 93:3 objected [2] - 14:22, 91:23 objection [4] - 6:25, 74:7, 78:7, 93:2 objectionable [1] -92:11 objectively [1] - 62:12 objectives [2] - 24:25, 25.7 objects [2] - 78:2, 92.3 obligated [2] - 10:1, 88:24 obtain [4] - 51:21, 69:2, 75:24, 90:8 obtaining [1] - 59:12 obviate [1] - 33:25 obviously [7] - 3:9, 30:13, 38:2, 62:2, 84:8, 84:10, 92:10 occasions [1] - 44:9 occurring [1] - 12:25 October [3] - 69:20, 76:3 **OF** [6] - 1:2, 1:4, 2:1, 102:1, 102:3 offend [1] - 20:7 offended [3] - 20:9, 60:8, 93:14 offer [1] - 97:22 offered [1] - 5:7 offering [2] - 8:20, 24:13 Office [2] - 36:5, 36:10 office [3] - 41:17, 41:20, 41:21 offices [4] - 41:18, 41:25, 47:21 officials [1] - 42:15 Oglala [1] - 36:4 once [2] - 52:8, 69:15 one [39] - 5:9, 7:22, 9:23, 10:3, 12:20, 15:10, 19:8, 19:20, 20:25, 21:16, 21:24, 23:12, 26:10, 27:11, 27:17, 29:4, 32:2, 33:13, 34:2, 37:6, 45:5, 45:17, 45:24, 46:7, 51:14, 53:15,

53:17, 57:19, 59:23,

60:5, 66:14, 66:21,

72:4, 78:16, 82:7,

Onida [1] - 102:14 online [2] - 43:12, 43:14 open [4] - 9:7, 90:19, 94:22, 95:7 opening [2] - 46:15, 95:11 operate [8] - 8:12, 18:19, 31:5, 76:12, 89:12, 89:13, 96:10, 96:14 operated [2] - 31:7, 31:10 operating [5] - 11:20, 12:17, 15:9, 15:18, 31:23 operation [2] - 20:3, 57:20 operations [2] - 14:1, 95:22 opinion [1] - 93:18 opinions [1] - 11:6 opponents [4] - 41:9, 42:12, 44:4, 44:6 opportunities [1] -42:3 opportunity [20] -4:11, 4:13, 4:20, 4:25, 7:9, 7:13, 37:3, 37:25, 38:2, 39:21, 40:3, 44:18, 45:8, 45:12, 52:18, 52:23, 79:12, 86:5, 88:1, 97:4 opposed [1] - 50:3 opposing [1] - 70:12 opposition [2] - 73:15, 95:22 oral [1] - 85:10 order [24] - 5:15, 6:16, 10:2, 14:25, 15:23, 27:21, 38:9, 38:24, 49:10, 51:4, 52:4, 53:4, 53:8, 53:12, 53:14, 53:16, 57:3, 58:17, 67:11, 75:8, 77:21. 85:19. 93:16. 93:18 ordered [1] - 13:19 organization [1] - 19:2 organizations [1] -41:19 organized [2] - 8:9, 27:18

original [1] - 26:23

originally [3] - 4:12,

87:13, 96:23, 97:24,

100.13

49:7, 57:21 otherwise [2] - 9:9, 24:15 Otter [3] - 22:17, 22:18. 23:4 ought[1] - 63:15 outcome [1] - 14:15 outside [3] - 7:10, 31:7, 52:22 outside-thereservation [1] -52:22 outstanding [2] -13:19. 33:5 overall [2] - 24:11, 88:9 overwhelmingly [1] -44:8 own [1] - 90:12 owned [11] - 22:20, 23:2, 45:24, 45:25, 51:17, 54:1, 67:5, 76:7, 76:10, 76:17, 95:24

Ρ

p.m [1] - 101:4 page [2] - 40:25 pages [1] - 5:15 paid [7] - 10:19, 14:11, 33:23, 48:19, 48:20, 49:17, 53:24 papers [1] - 27:14 paragraph [8] - 15:22, 17:16, 24:7, 24:16, 24:23, 24:24, 41:4, 97:18 paramount [1] - 25:25 parked [1] - 28:24 part [15] - 5:9, 19:22, 30:11, 40:6, 48:16, 55:22, 55:23, 56:10, 58:1, 62:16, 90:4, 90:5, 92:3, 92:16, 94:1 particular [9] - 11:11, 14:15, 15:22, 24:3, 55:12, 75:10, 81:24, 83:6, 84:13 parties [6] - 3:19, 14:19, 26:3, 26:9, 35:10, 38:2 parties' [1] - 35:7 partnership [3] -46:23, 46:24, 48:9 party [5] - 14:16, 26:6, 55:7, 55:11, 100:22 pay [7] - 13:20, 49:23,

50:23, 51:14, 51:18, 10 52:1, 52:2 paying [4] - 50:21, 51:24, 51:25, 81:11 payments [2] - 80:24, 80:25 pays [4] - 49:19, 49:23, 50:10, 50:19 peel [1] - 28:17 penalties [1] - 11:25 pending [4] - 13:22, 18:14, 61:6, 69:23 people [6] - 7:17, 38:17, 52:12, 62:6, 90:7, 90:11 per[1] - 50:13 percent [6] - 34:17, 34:20, 47:25, 48:4, 50:18, 90:17 perfectly [2] - 53:8, 53:9 perfunctory [1] - 59:9 perhaps [1] - 6:14 permission [2] -35:19, 76:11 permit [2] - 11:22, 11:24 permits [1] - 12:8 permitted [1] - 31:5 perpetrated [1] - 42:4 persisted [1] - 12:16 person [2] - 37:1, 93:9 personal [1] - 88:23 personally [1] - 93:13 perspective [4] - 48:2, 49:2, 50:20, 80:13 pertaining [1] - 94:3 Peterson [1] - 37:17 **phone** [5] - 45:18, 45:25, 46:3, 50:8, 79:11 phrase [1] - 27:4 physical [1] - 97:20 pick [1] - 63:3 piece [1] - 93:22 pieces [1] - 28:4 Pierre [3] - 2:3, 7:14, 85:23 Pine [3] - 36:9, 36:20, 36:21 place [3] - 16:16, 18:23, 28:24 placed [1] - 93:25 plan [4] - 67:8, 67:12, 91:19, 94:23

plant [1] - 12:4

92:23, 92:24

played [1] - 59:19

play [4] - 52:9, 53:4,

Pleading [1] - 97:25

pleading [1] - 63:14 Pleadings [2] - 46:12, 62:9 pleased [1] - 4:6 **podium** [1] - 5:2 point [31] - 5:11, 5:21, 11:2, 15:10, 15:22, 17:16, 18:7, 18:14, 18:19, 22:15, 24:3, 29:3, 29:16, 31:10, 34:4, 38:8, 38:23, 65:7, 77:11, 77:21, 81:22, 82:9, 86:24, 91:14, 91:18, 93:15, 93:17, 93:20, 95:11, 95:17, 99:11 pointed [2] - 33:19, 34:18 pointing [1] - 40:6 points [3] - 10:12, 39:23, 97:14 policies [2] - 17:12, 17:14 policy [2] - 10:8, 24:6 politician [1] - 92:21 port [1] - 90:16 portion [2] - 39:25, 101.2 posed [1] - 77:23 posing [1] - 29:19 position [4] - 14:17, 87:1, 97:21, 99:7 positive [1] - 61:1 possibility [1] - 12:12 possible [5] - 35:9, 35:17, 41:24, 43:20, 65:11 post [1] - 43:20 postulating [1] - 29:18 potential [1] - 42:9 potentially [1] - 84:14 power [10] - 21:3, 21:10, 21:15, 21:19, 22:6, 22:22, 23:1, 23:13, 24:1 Power [3] - 22:17, 22:19, 23:4 powers [1] - 18:2 practical [24] - 45:15, 45:16, 45:22, 46:9, 46:10, 47:2, 47:6, 47:8, 47:22, 50:24, 53:21, 54:11, 58:12, 60:22, 61:21, 63:2, 65:9, 66:4, 66:5, 67:24, 76:19, 79:11, 79:22, 79:25 practice [3] - 31:2, 31:14, 32:7 practices [2] - 15:16,

30:25 practicing [1] - 86:18 prairie [2] - 18:22, 19.6 prayer [2] - 62:22, 87:1 precedent [2] - 13:25, 96:11 precursor [2] - 61:2, 81.17 preempted [1] - 22:7 preemptive [1] - 17:14 preface [1] - 88:3 prejudice [1] - 5:9 prejudicing [1] - 38:19 premature [1] - 25:21 premised [1] - 16:15 prepare [1] - 94:8 prepared [1] - 4:23 preparing [1] - 26:21 presence [1] - 97:20 present [4] - 39:20, 40:12, 41:6, 69:18 presentation [5] -26:16, 37:14, 38:1, 40:11, 70:5 presentations [4] -26:7, 26:9, 26:19, 26:21 presented [5] - 33:1, 40:15, 62:10, 95:10, 95:12 presenting [3] - 7:11, 78:3, 88:17 president [1] - 36:23 presidential [1] -41:18 presumptively [3] -23:15, 23:21, 24:1 pretty [13] - 10:13, 23:14, 23:21, 35:5, 45:21, 56:1, 59:9, 59:16, 59:17, 83:25, 90:18, 93:8 prevent [1] - 78:16 preventing [1] - 96:15 previous [1] - 74:15 previously [1] - 62:19 primary [2] - 14:24, 24:25 principal [1] - 90:3 privately [2] - 41:11, 47.14 privilege [2] - 40:5, 100.22 procedural [2] -62:19, 95:5 procedurally [3] -63:23, 71:3, 97:7 **proceeded** [1] - 9:18

proceeding [13] -5:22, 14:2, 15:2, 16:4, 16:17, 41:5, 41:8, 45:2, 51:11, 53:1, 59:18, 84:12, 87:7 proceedings [6] -14:25, 59:9, 91:7, 94:19, 102:10, 102.13 PROCEEDINGS [1] -2:1 Proceedings [1] - 1:7 process [9] - 40:13, 49:15, 59:17, 88:9, 90:7, 92:25, 95:2, 95:11, 95:17 Professional [2] -102:6, 102:20 profits [1] - 10:7 program [2] - 19:25, 51:23 **programs** [1] - 51:23 progressive [1] -23:20 prohibit [2] - 42:18, 42:22 **promise** [4] - 49:16, 50:7, 80:16, 80:22 **promote** [1] - 17:20 proper [2] - 61:7, 62:20 properly [3] - 62:20, 63:24, 70:18 **properties** [1] - 10:5 property [2] - 12:5, 19:8 proposed [1] - 10:6 proposition [3] -10:18, 20:12, 91:1 protect [1] - 25:1 protection [1] - 25:4 protocol [2] - 56:16, 78:4 provide [19] - 7:22, 22:19, 28:23, 45:7, 57:22, 58:22, 65:23, 66:2, 67:6, 71:11, 71:16, 72:17, 75:8, 75:25, 78:19, 79:4, 87:13, 89:7, 96:22 provided [10] - 9:4, 29:2, 29:7, 39:17, 43:25, 64:14, 67:10, 70:25, 94:14, 99:18 provider [1] - 8:20 provides [4] - 44:18, 46:7, 79:13, 79:14 providing [20] - 8:13,

9:4, 14:4, 14:6, 14:9,

28:25, 29:5, 29:9, 29:10, 29:13, 70:10, 71:12, 71:14, 75:3, 84:23, 89:3, 89:14 provision [4] - 8:3, 8:22, 9:17, 77:5 provisioning [1] -84:18 **PSC** [2] - 23:5, 23:8 Public [15] - 15:1, 15:2, 15:24, 21:25, 22:21, 22:25, 23:3, 31:6, 31:25, 32:11, 36:12, 61:25, 93:1, 102:7, 102:19 PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:10 public [8] - 10:8, 15:6, 15:7, 21:22, 31:8, 46:25, 91:11, 93:9 public/private [3] -46:22, 46:23, 48:9 PUC [7] - 24:9, 24:10, 24:18, 53:1, 66:8, 67:17, 93:25 **PUC's** [2] - 24:20, 25:6 **pull** [6] - 49:13, 69:5, 80:18, 90:22, 92:17, 92:22 pulling [1] - 90:24 purchase [1] - 10:2 purchaser [1] - 9:25 purely [1] - 29:22 purporting [1] - 8:12 purports [2] - 6:1, 95.23 purpose [4] - 37:20, 38:5, 49:11, 62:15 purposes [3] - 8:8, 24:25, 25:8 pursue [2] - 33:11, 33:25 purview [1] - 56:17 put [3] - 12:4, 46:19, 49:17 puts [1] - 83:22 putting [2] - 48:20, 48:22 Q

14:10, 15:3, 19:3,

query [1] - 82:9 questioning [1] - 89:5 questions [34] - 26:6, 26:9, 26:11, 26:18, 28:2, 32:18, 32:20, 32:22, 32:23, 35:21, 37:13, 37:15, 38:3, 65:6, 65:8, 68:4, 72:16, 73:3, 73:5, 11
73:8, 73:10, 78:6,
78:16, 79:1, 81:14,
82:2, 82:11, 82:20,
97:15, 98:18, 98:19,
98:21, 99:15
quick [3] - 59:9, 66:14,
85:8
quickly [2] - 6:17,
40:20
quite [4] - 6:15, 6:17,
30:17, 53:13
quotations [1] - 24:4

R

railroad [4] - 10:3, 10:4, 10:5, 10:9 raised [4] - 81:1, 95:21, 97:10, 97:15 ramifications [5] -46:25, 66:4, 66:6, 67:24, 68:2 rate [13] - 49:25, 50:12, 50:14, 50:15, 50:16, 50:21, 50:23, 51:25, 56:18, 56:24, 65:20, 80:11, 90:8 rates [4] - 25:4, 44:15, 44:16.80:10 reached [1] - 4:8 read [4] - 36:9, 58:15, 62:8, 97:3 reading [2] - 22:10, 43:1 real [2] - 19:24, 28:23 realize [4] - 54:7, 63:21, 68:6, 90:18 realizes [1] - 67:4 really [24] - 8:7, 17:17, 28:17, 37:2, 41:3, 45:17, 46:23, 47:7, 48:1, 48:11, 50:24, 51:1, 51:24, 53:12, 54:2, 54:13, 60:23, 61:1, 61:21, 62:12, 63:19, 91:17, 92:12, 98:12 Realtime [2] - 102:6, 102:20 reason [9] - 28:19, 30:11, 37:15, 58:8, 60:4, 62:4, 98:23, 98:25, 100:8 reasonable [1] - 25:3

reasons [1] - 66:20

rebuttal [2] - 87:24,

rebuked [1] - 41:9

rebut [1] - 98:1

98:17 receive [2] - 94:3 received [15] - 4:10, 57:21, 60:19, 70:6, 70:8, 70:12, 70:14, 71:3, 71:9, 71:10, 71:13, 72:7, 72:8, 72:10, 72:11 receives [2] - 49:21, 50:17 receiving [1] - 94:22 recent [1] - 55:1 recently [2] - 14:22, 42:7 recess [2] - 85:15, 85:17 recognize [3] - 45:1, 69:22, 77:19 recognizes [2] - 67:1, 67:6 record [12] - 38:12, 38:14, 38:18, 61:20, 78:4, 88:16, 88:24, 90:11, 90:14, 91:11, 92:4, 97:16 record's [1] - 94:20 records [1] - 20:1 recur [2] - 12:13, 12:24 **RED** [1] - 36:8 reference [6] - 88:21, 91:5, 91:13, 92:11, 92:17. 97:1 referenced [1] - 91:17 referral [2] - 30:24, 31:17 referred [2] - 13:16, 61:9 refund [2] - 10:19, 33:16 refused [1] - 5:8 refusing [1] - 52:1 regard [2] - 33:9, 76:23 regarding [9] - 3:10, 37:2, 40:21, 41:23, 46:16, 74:1, 81:15, 84:15, 93:15 **REGARDING** [1] - 1:5 regards [1] - 3:4 regime [1] - 91:15 Registered [2] -102:5, 102:20 registration [1] - 9:15 regulate [18] - 8:3, 13:9, 16:20, 17:23, 18:3. 20:16. 21:3. 21:7, 22:6, 22:12, 23:14, 23:15, 23:22, 24:2, 24:18, 30:5,

74:2. 88:5 regulated [2] - 24:15, 30:2 regulating [2] - 19:3, 25:1 regulation [9] - 17:11, 21:17, 24:15, 24:20, 25:3, 25:6, 25:25, 56:19, 56:24 regulations [1] - 22:7 regulator [1] - 16:12 regulatory [9] - 16:24, 21:19, 23:7, 24:8, 24:11, 25:7, 29:21, 29:25, 88:8 regurgitate [1] - 70:5 regurgitated [1] -78:10 regurgitating [1] -40.13 reiterate [1] - 97:11 rejected [2] - 16:2, 18:13 rejecting [1] - 53:20 related [4] - 14:2, 81:21, 82:7, 98:10 relations [1] - 18:3 relationship [3] - 17:3, 44:11, 44:13 relationships [1] -89.19 relevancy [1] - 91:13 relevant [3] - 15:20, 32:9, 32:11 relief [12] - 10:23, 14:18, 16:8, 34:8, 62:22, 62:24, 71:5, 71:23, 71:24, 73:12, 87:2, 97:7 religious [1] - 41:19 relying [1] - 98:9 remarks [2] - 88:3, 98:17 remind [1] - 86:4 rendered [1] - 9:23 rendering [1] - 60:22 renders [1] - 9:12 renew [1] - 78:6 repay [1] - 10:1 repercussion [1] -54:16 repercussions [2] -54:12. 54:15 rephrase [1] - 27:20 Reply [1] - 29:2 Reported [1] - 1:24 Reporter [4] - 102:6, 102:20, 102:20 reporter [4] - 3:15,

36:1, 43:5, 102:9

representation [1] -35:7 Representatives [1] -42:20 represented [2] -35:11, 37:13 republican [1] - 41:18 reputation [1] - 65:1 Request [1] - 29:4 request [10] - 3:7, 3:10, 4:2, 6:24, 9:6, 13:4, 37:24, 67:25, 71:5, 97:7 requested [6] - 4:12. 27:20, 62:25, 64:2, 74:25, 77:9 requesting [4] - 63:17, 70:24, 72:12, 100:7 requests [1] - 66:4 require [2] - 75:7, 75:24 required [2] - 8:19, 18:17 resent [1] - 88:22 reservation [22] - 6:2, 20:17, 23:2, 24:20, 25:5, 44:24, 46:4, 46:5, 46:13, 46:21, 52:12, 52:22, 55:20, 55:22, 55:23, 62:6, 75:10, 75:13, 79:16, 90:5. 96:19. 97:20 Reservation [4] -36:10, 44:22, 46:3, 57:20 Reservation's [1] -45.5 reservations [3] -17:21, 18:4, 19:3 reserved [3] - 21:17, 21:19, 22:5 reside [1] - 25:5 resolution [1] - 4:8 resolved [1] - 96:5 respect [15] - 9:6, 14:19, 18:7, 21:8, 31:25, 40:11, 52:19, 71:18, 78:24, 82:22, 89:19, 92:2, 96:3, 97:15, 98:5 respected [1] - 64:8 respectfully [1] -37:24 respond [14] - 4:13, 4:21, 4:25, 45:8, 73:18, 83:7, 88:1, 88:20, 88:24, 95:20, 97:2, 97:14, 100:13,

100:19

responded [1] - 5:16

52:5

100:4 Response [1] - 16:19 response [11] - 5:20, 10:14, 39:18, 46:6, 86:21, 89:9, 94:25, 100:14, 100:15, 100:16, 100:23 responses [1] - 29:3 responsive [2] - 40:7, 97:4 rest [2] - 59:21, 85:3 restaurant [1] - 7:14 restrict [1] - 38:21 result [1] - 88:6 resume [2] - 85:5, 85:15 retains [2] - 55:24, 75:11 return [1] - 10:10 returned [1] - 74:22 reveals [1] - 42:11 revenue [1] - 90:22 review [3] - 4:11, 42:10, 97:5 reviewing [2] - 41:4, 41.8 Ridge [3] - 36:9, 36:20, 36:21 river [1] - 24:21 River [5] - 17:5, 17:10, 20:14, 23:17, 24:5 road [1] - 3:17 Rolayne [3] - 1:13, 82:20, 99:25 role [4] - 18:1, 21:12, 25:24. 88:8 roles [1] - 26:2 room [1] - 37:2 row [1] - 53:17 **RPR** [1] - 1:24 rubric [1] - 66:19 Rule [1] - 98:1 rule [8] - 27:21, 30:20, 54:24, 54:25, 61:16, 70:17, 88:4, 89:10 ruled [4] - 12:2, 14:22, 22:4, 64:23 rules [4] - 25:23, 87:9, 87:17, 97:25 ruling [19] - 13:4, 13:11, 15:12, 16:7, 20:10, 21:11, 34:7, 54:20, 58:25, 70:22, 81:16, 81:17, 81:22, 82:25, 83:14, 85:9, 87:9, 87:16, 94:17 rulings [1] - 87:3 run [3] - 44:7, 49:11,

responding [2] - 78:6,

running [3] - 19:24, 12 52:2, 77:16

S

sake [1] - 11:10 sale [5] - 9:22, 12:5, 17:11, 20:16, 24:19 sales [1] - 9:23 Sancom [1] - 8:15 satisfy [1] - 20:5 savvy [1] - 42:14 saw [2] - 92:3, 92:5 scale [2] - 51:9, 61:13 scam [2] - 49:11, 58:9 schedule [3] - 21:24, 46:18. 99:21 scheme [6] - 23:7, 24:8, 24:11, 29:22, 29:25, 32:5 Schenkenberg [1] -88:15 Schreier [1] - 31:17 **scope** [2] - 13:8, 48:3 Scott [5] - 1:16, 1:16, 4:5, 6:10, 7:6 **SDN** [5] - 5:12, 25:15, 85:16, 86:1, 99:6 SDN's [1] - 86:2 **SDTA**[1] - 99:6 second [6] - 8:25, 16:14, 17:14, 50:1, 63:4, 72:19 **seconds** [1] - 6:9 Section [1] - 15:14 see [10] - 5:2, 28:3, 28:4, 30:8, 30:19, 65:3, 67:22, 68:1, 85:20, 100:8 seeing [1] - 6:25 seek [5] - 9:1, 13:13, 33:9, 52:21, 74:18 seeking [6] - 7:21, 16:21, 17:1, 21:6, 87:4, 87:18 seeks [1] - 87:8 seem [3] - 37:8, 50:25, 54:3 self [2] - 24:22, 32:4 self-evident [1] - 32:4 self-Government [1] -24:22 seminal [1] - 11:15 senate [4] - 42:24, 93:4, 93:10, 93:15 Senate [1] - 42:21 Senator [11] - 39:17, 39:24, 40:4, 40:6, 40:24, 41:1, 41:6,

	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
41:20, 47:11, 47:19,	73:10, 76:10, 88:24,	55:24, 58:13, 67:6,	spent [2] - 64:25,	98:12 13
62:9	100:3	75:11	80:23	staggering [1] - 44:15
send [4] - 48:4, 48:6,	sets [1] - 47:11	slower [2] - 43:3,	split [1] - 10:7	stand [1] - 87:18
80:10, 80:18	setting [1] - 41:2	43:23	spring [1] - 39:11	standard [1] - 59:16
sending [1] - 80:9	settlement [2] - 91:6,	small [1] - 58:13	SPRINT [1] - 1:4	standards [2] - 11:12,
sends [4] - 47:24,	91:11	smeared [1] - 65:1	Sprint [109] - 1:16,	12:20
49:22, 50:3, 50:4	seven [1] - 100:23	sole [2] - 16:12, 74:1	1:17, 3:2, 4:10, 5:11,	standpoint [6] - 48:21,
sense [4] - 51:1,	Seventh [3] - 55:3,	solid [2] - 98:8	5:13, 6:11, 6:16, 7:4,	58:12, 93:21, 94:5,
53:11, 53:22, 84:24	55:5, 97:1	somewhat [2] - 27:3,	7:7, 7:24, 8:1, 8:3,	94:13, 95:12
sent [2] - 46:16, 88:14	several [2] - 5:15,	60:8	10:18, 10:19, 12:16,	standstill [1] - 42:6
sentence [1] - 83:10	12:17	somewhere [6] -	12:19, 13:3, 13:13,	start [4] - 35:12, 41:4,
separate [1] - 44:9	shall [2] - 3:5, 3:7	29:24, 29:25, 48:13,	16:7, 17:1, 19:17,	85:16, 95:15
September [1] - 68:11	sham [1] - 83:18	49:18, 64:17, 90:16	21:8, 34:3, 35:10,	started [3] - 35:17,
serious [1] - 9:8	sharing [1] - 90:22	soon [6] - 43:19,	38:19, 39:8, 39:19,	49:5, 96:7
seriously [1] - 91:2	short [5] - 51:7, 52:3,	58:24, 60:12, 60:16,	45:7, 45:15, 46:8,	starting [1] - 40:25
serve [2] - 23:2, 23:9	59:17, 85:17, 87:20	69:12, 69:21	46:25, 49:19, 49:23,	STATE [2] - 1:2, 102:1
served [1] - 39:7	shorthand [2] - 102:9	sooner [1] - 37:4	50:10, 50:18, 51:24,	state [35] - 6:15, 8:3,
serves [1] - 41:12	shortly [2] - 5:14,	sorry [3] - 13:3, 37:4,	52:1, 52:4, 53:5,	8:18, 8:24, 9:22,
Service [9] - 15:1,	27:11	89:17	53:7, 53:18, 53:24,	13:6, 13:7, 13:10,
15:2, 15:24, 22:21,	shots [1] - 6:18	sought [1] - 10:23	53:25, 54:3, 54:8,	13:12, 15:18, 15:19,
22:25, 23:3, 31:6,	show [1] - 12:23	sound [1] - 60:9	54:16, 54:17, 55:2,	16:24, 17:23, 19:12,
31:25, 32:11	shows [1] - 28:16	soundly [2] - 42:19,	55:4, 55:13, 55:17,	19:16, 21:1, 21:11,
service [38] - 15:7,	shut [7] - 45:4, 45:18,	42:23	56:2, 56:14, 56:20,	22:10, 23:24, 24:14,
22:21, 28:8, 29:22,	45:24, 47:1, 60:24,	SOUTH [2] - 1:2,	57:1, 58:5, 58:14,	30:1, 30:2, 31:4,
31:1, 46:3, 54:10,	61:2, 62:4	102:1	58:20, 59:11, 59:19,	41:25, 42:15, 47:21,
54:22, 55:15, 55:19,	shuts [1] - 48:11	South [39] - 1:17, 2:2,	59:20, 60:21, 61:9, 61:11, 61:20, 61:23,	55:8, 56:18, 56:24,
56:4, 56:22, 56:23,	side [3] - 26:15, 30:12,	2:4, 7:8, 7:23, 8:10,	62:9, 62:13, 62:21,	77:14, 78:17, 78:19,
57:14, 58:23, 59:6,	30:14	8:13, 12:18, 17:5,	63:11, 64:1, 64:11,	88:4, 94:4
74:2, 75:3, 75:8,	sides [1] - 35:7	18:1, 18:21, 19:15,	64:15, 65:9, 65:10,	State [18] - 2:3, 8:10,
76:1, 78:19, 78:20,	sight [1] - 89:1	23:19, 25:13, 25:17,	65:15, 65:24, 66:4,	9:16, 9:21, 12:18, 17:25, 19:7, 19:15,
78:21, 79:12, 79:17,	signed [1] - 76:6	31:15, 41:23, 41:24,	66:23, 68:9, 68:21,	
79:18, 79:19, 79:21,	significance [6] -	42:2, 42:6, 42:9,	69:10, 70:6, 72:18,	20:13, 23:6, 25:9, 31:24, 33:17, 53:1,
88:5, 89:17, 89:18, 90:5, 90:6, 90:9,	15:11, 16:5, 32:3,	42:16, 42:17, 42:21, 44:12, 44:14, 48:5,	73:10, 74:13, 78:2,	89:4, 89:7, 93:1,
90:12, 96:18, 96:22	47:3, 47:6, 96:4	54:10, 59:14, 67:18,	80:24, 81:7, 81:10,	102:7
SERVICES [1] - 1:5	significant [6] - 18:24,	85:24, 89:4, 89:8,	83:17, 86:1, 86:2,	State's [2] - 21:13,
services [61] - 3:4,	22:9, 44:14, 90:20,	89:24, 92:18, 93:1,	86:24, 87:3, 87:8,	25:24
7:22, 7:25, 8:2, 8:4,	96:2, 96:12	102:7, 102:14	87:16, 89:17, 91:23,	state's [1] - 18:5
8:13, 8:20, 8:21,	similar [4] - 5:12,	sovereign [9] - 18:10,	92:3, 96:4, 96:19,	statement [13] - 34:11,
8:23, 9:3, 9:4, 10:20,	16:9, 82:11, 99:6 simple [2] - 53:23,	19:13, 19:19, 20:17,	96:23, 96:24, 97:2,	78:12, 81:15, 82:21,
11:18, 12:15, 12:19,		20:21, 20:23, 21:4,	97:19, 100:12	83:2, 83:9, 84:5,
13:9, 14:4, 14:7,	54:13 simply [18] - 5:11,	23:13, 98:15	Sprint's [35] - 3:8,	84:7, 92:4, 92:10,
14:9, 14:10, 15:3,	12:19, 13:3, 14:10,	sovereignty [11] -	4:16, 6:5, 7:2, 7:20,	97:19, 97:24, 98:7
19:3, 21:3, 21:8,	16:6, 20:3, 37:9,	20:8, 55:19, 55:24,	13:2, 13:4, 13:6,	statements [2] - 83:1,
21:23, 22:6, 22:19,	39:9, 40:2, 44:19,	67:7, 75:11, 84:3,	13:11, 15:20, 16:4,	93:14
24:8, 24:14, 29:1,	63:18, 69:2, 78:6,	84:6, 84:8, 84:10,	16:7, 16:12, 17:23,	states [4] - 18:2,
29:5, 29:9, 29:10,	87:7, 95:24, 96:25,	84:15, 98:11	25:22, 31:18, 45:2,	18:22, 21:20, 22:5
29:13, 31:14, 33:20,	97:2, 98:13	SPEAKER [1] - 77:10	45:22, 50:20, 54:12,	States [8] - 11:17,
34:1, 41:15, 44:19,	Sioux [4] - 18:11,	speaking [4] - 3:15,	55:10, 61:4, 64:12,	12:9, 12:10, 12:21,
44:24, 46:5, 54:18,	21:5, 24:22, 36:4	3:21, 6:9, 98:24	67:25, 74:2, 76:19, 83:1, 83:8, 86:22,	21:21, 22:2, 23:24,
56:5, 56:8, 57:8,	sit [2] - 34:6, 45:19	special [2] - 23:20,	88:17, 92:13, 95:22,	41:16
57:16, 57:23, 58:7,	site [1] - 19:8	51:23	96:17, 97:25, 100:4	status [4] - 31:4, 67:2,
58:14, 64:8, 65:23,	sitting [1] - 64:16	specific [2] - 62:22,	SS [1] - 102:2	67:4, 67:6
66:2, 79:13, 79:14,	situation [7] - 5:12,	63:14	Staff [10] - 6:21, 6:22,	statute [3] - 22:10,
82:13, 84:19, 87:14,	12:14, 16:9, 23:6,	specifically [5] - 16:2,	32:23, 72:17, 72:19,	87:11, 87:19
89:4, 89:7, 89:14	30:4, 79:16, 96:9	24:9, 32:10, 38:6,	87:23, 99:3, 99:6,	statutory [1] - 32:5
Services [1] - 22:1	six [1] - 5:16	39:1	100:2	stay [1] - 16:15
session [1] - 90:19	sliding [2] - 51:9,	specified [2] - 71:8,	STAFF [1] - 1:12	stayed [1] - 13:20
set [9] - 29:25, 35:8,	61:13	71:17	stage [3] - 40:20, 41:2,	step [5] - 30:15, 36:1,
38:11, 40:20, 46:12,	sliver [5] - 55:19,	spend [1] - 7:13	, ,	36:2, 37:19, 77:21
	I	1		1

stepped [1] - 18:4
stick [3] - 39:2, 49:16,
80:21
stifle [1] - 44:21 still [15] - 12:17,
12:18, 13:14, 13:19,
13:22, 29:13, 33:5,
33:12, 51:2, 65:20,
73:4, 74:20, 94:22,
99:2
stim [1] - 66:25
stimulation [15] -
42:19, 42:22, 44:1,
44:5, 48:22, 51:4,
51:8, 51:10, 51:13,
51:16, 51:21, 53:14,
61:12, 61:15, 81:12
stimulators [2] - 15:4,
96:3
stimulus [1] - 7:19
stood [1] - 37:6
stop [2] - 11:20, 44:22
• • •
stopping [1] - 10:14
story [2] - 30:13,
66:11
straight [1] - 88:24
straightforward [2] -
45:21, 59:16
strange [1] - 5:23
Strate [1] - 23:23
strenuously [1] -
14:22
strictly [1] - 75:9
strong [3] - 32:2,
44:11, 84:15
structure [1] - 89:20
structures [1] - 16:25
struggling [3] - 27:1,
30:8, 30:11
stuff [2] - 40:1, 62:1
subject [7] - 13:14,
13:18, 14:20, 56:18,
56:23, 84:3, 84:11
submission [1] -
40:25
submissions [2] -
53:6, 88:18
submit [5] - 16:6,
39:14, 40:4, 72:25,
94:17
submitted [2] - 38:13,
46:12
submitting [1] - 95:15
subsequent [1] -
26:24
subsidiaries [1] - 90:7
subsidized [1] - 90:8
subsidizes [1] - 79:17
subsidizing [1] - 91:3
substantial [1] - 11:25

successful [2] -11:23, 45:5 sue [4] - 10:9, 19:2, 33:10, 33:11 suggesting [1] - 16:11 suggests [2] - 16:18, 88:11 suing [1] - 19:4 suit [4] - 11:19, 11:23, 55:7, 55:9 **SULLY**[1] - 102:3 sum [1] - 25:22 **Summary** [10] - 3:8, 7:2, 26:25, 33:5, 39:1, 80:2, 80:14, 86:22, 94:12, 99:7 summary [18] - 7:21, 40:14, 40:22, 62:23, 70:9, 71:11, 73:15, 74:7, 77:8, 78:15, 82:25, 83:14, 87:4, 94:19, 95:2, 95:4, 95:8, 95:9 supervision [1] -24:12 supplement [2] -53:23, 88:9 38:14, 83:24 supplemental [19] -4:10, 4:14, 4:21, 5:20, 5:24, 14:21, 16:3, 29:17, 30:9, 30:24, 39:7, 39:10, 39:18, 39:20, 40:2, 99:17, 99:21, 100:5, 100:16 supplementation [1] -72:25 support [2] - 14:14, 86:21 supports [1] - 14:17 **suppose** [1] - 89:13 supposed [1] - 10:6 suppress [1] - 45:3 supreme [1] - 89:24 Supreme [20] - 9:21, 11:17, 12:9, 12:10, 12:21, 17:5, 17:13, 18:21, 20:13, 20:18, 21:21, 22:2, 22:3, 22:17, 22:24, 23:7, 23:25, 24:7, 25:9, 45:20 survive [2] - 52:10, 52:14 suspicions [1] - 81:1

sweetheart [1] - 10:4

4:3, 4:5, 5:1, 38:5,

38:21, 39:4, 68:8,

77:24, 78:3, 78:12,

Swier [20] - 1:16, 3:13,

78:23, 88:14, 89:5, 91:8, 91:21, 93:20, 96:17, 100:6 SWIER [58] - 4:4, 35:4, 37:23, 39:3, 39:6. 40:16. 40:19. 43:3. 43:7. 43:17. 43:21. 43:24, 45:14, 68:15, 68:18, 68:24, 69:12, 69:19, 70:2, 70:14, 71:10, 71:14, 71:18, 71:23, 72:3, 72:8, 72:11, 72:14, 72:24, 73:17, 73:22, 74:9, 74:12, 75:5, 75:9, 76:2, 76:9, 76:16, 76:25, 77:6, 78:24, 79:8, 79:14, 79:21, 80:4, 80:8, 80:15, 81:6, 82:1, 83:5, 83:16, 84:7, 84:24, 93:3, 94:6, 94:16, 94:23, 95:3 **Swier's** [1] - 30:12 **sworn** [1] - 93:21 system [3] - 23:7,

Т

Tail [3] - 22:17, 22:18, 23:4 talks [2] - 46:25, 92:9 97:7 tariff [21] - 29:8, 50:10, 50:12, 50:13, 50:15, 51:25, 53:8, 53:17, 78:5 53:20, 54:5, 55:9, 61:7, 66:22, 66:24, 67:21, 69:3, 80:9, 80:11, 91:22 1:10 tariffs [1] - 9:13 TC10-026 [2] - 1:4, 3:1 TC11-087 [1] - 18:16 35:14 technical [2] - 68:5, 79.21 technicality [1] -63:20 96:10 technologically [1] -42:14 tedious [1] - 68:5 teed [2] - 4:18, 86:2 telecom [3] - 14:2, 52:13, 82:14 **TELECOM** [1] - 1:5 87:17 **Telecom** [9] - 1:16, 3:3, 3:10, 4:6, 34:25, 36:24, 48:10, 48:23, 50:18

Telecom's [2] - 3:6,

92:17, 92:21

4.1 telecommunication [9] - 7:22, 8:20, 44:21, 44:24, 56:5, 56:7, 58:1, 64:8, 89.3 TELECOMMUNICATI **ONS** [1] - 1:5 telecommunications [21] - 3:4, 13:9, 17:8, 21:14, 21:25, 24:8, 24:13, 25:1, 25:2, 28:8, 44:19, 55:18, 57:8, 57:16, 58:18, 66:19, 67:2, 74:5, 78:19, 78:21, 88:9 Telecommunication **s** [2] - 15:15, 21:16 telephone [13] - 17:11, 20:16, 24:19, 47:1, 51:14, 60:1, 62:5, 65:17, 67:5, 67:10, 76:10, 79:17 tend [1] - 27:3 tendered [2] - 10:19, 33:16 terminated [1] - 28:10 terminating [3] -29:23, 31:1, 49:5 terms [11] - 11:21, 11:24, 15:8, 18:2, 30:1, 31:4, 33:9, 33:15, 33:23, 96:15, territories [1] - 22:22 testifying [2] - 38:17, testimonial [1] - 38:15 testimony [1] - 79:5 **THE** [5] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4, theirs [1] - 28:3 themselves [2] - 3:20, theory [2] - 47:4 therefore [5] - 5:8, 31:15, 32:12, 74:6, they've [17] - 28:24, 48:8, 49:15, 49:16, 53:9, 60:12, 63:13, 63:18, 65:11, 67:10, 70:8, 70:11, 71:9, 71:13, 71:15, 72:6, third [2] - 9:6, 83:10 **Thompson** [1] - 28:25 threat [1] - 92:22 threatening [2] -

three [13] - 8:1, 10:12, 14 24:4, 26:23, 27:17, 48:25, 49:5, 53:15, 53:17, 60:10, 73:14, 74:17, 95:17 thrilling [1] - 51:6 throughout [3] -47:15, 56:9, 60:8 thumb [4] - 59:3, 66:9, 66:10 thumbing [1] - 60:9 Thursday [1] - 4:12 **Tobin** [3] - 1:17, 7:5, 7:7 today [26] - 4:16, 4:18, 4:19, 4:22, 4:24, 7:10, 30:10, 30:20, 32:15, 35:12, 35:20, 38:5, 39:14, 41:3, 41:7, 45:16, 49:9, 57:10, 57:18, 61:22, 76:20, 76:23, 77:4, 77:9, 84:16, 85:9 today's [1] - 37:20 together [2] - 4:15, 94:25 Tom [2] - 1:17, 7:7 tonight [1] - 7:12 took [3] - 12:3, 31:12, 102.9 tooth [1] - 61:13 total [1] - 90:17 tough [2] - 35:11, 60:15 traditional [1] - 84:24 traffic [33] - 14:6, 15:3, 16:20, 47:18, 48:12, 48:20, 48:22, 49:18, 49:20, 49:21, 50:2, 50:3, 50:5, 50:8, 50:11, 50:22, 51:8, 51:10, 51:13, 51:16, 51:21, 51:25, 54:4, 54:24, 54:25, 56:10, 58:8, 65:18, 80:9, 80:10, 80:18, 81:12, 84:20 transaction [1] - 10:7 Transcript [1] - 1:7 **TRANSCRIPT** [1] - 2:1 transcription [1] -102:12 treat [1] - 53:13 tremendous [1] -26:20 **Tribal** [6] - 13:19, 13:23, 21:9, 67:13, 74:13, 76:4 tribal [33] - 14:9, 18:9, 18:25, 19:12, 20:7,

20:17, 20:21, 20:22, 22:11, 22:12, 22:19, 23:13, 47:1, 57:22, 65:24, 66:18, 67:1, 67:11, 67:20, 69:2, 76:5, 76:6, 76:11, 84:3, 84:5, 84:7, 84:10. 84:15. 98:10. 98:15 tribally [8] - 22:20, 23:2, 45:24, 45:25, 67:5, 76:10, 76:16, 95:24 Tribe [20] - 18:11, 20:3, 20:5, 21:5, 22:18, 24:1, 34:19, 35:16, 36:4, 36:5, 44:18, 46:11, 46:13, 46:22, 49:24, 65:17, 75:11, 76:8, 76:10, 76:20 tribe [13] - 19:5, 20:9, 46:10, 46:24, 49:1, 55:19, 55:23, 61:1, 67:3, 76:7, 76:14, 80:17, 84:4 tribe's [2] - 24:22, 36:12 tribes [4] - 17:3, 17:9, 44:11, 44:13 tried [4] - 27:15, 35:8, 82:24, 83:4 trouble [3] - 50:12, 53:25, 63:16 true [6] - 16:21, 37:9, 52:11, 76:22, 81:3, 102:12 truly [1] - 65:21 try [5] - 53:22, 89:18, 93:11, 97:17, 100:3 trying [14] - 16:19, 33:14, 40:2, 45:23, 52:4, 54:19, 57:2, 59:13, 64:10, 65:15, 67:23, 68:1, 81:9 turn [2] - 3:23, 99:3 turned [1] - 52:17 two [24] - 5:17, 7:24, 19:14, 21:1, 23:1, 27:17, 44:9, 46:2, 53:15, 53:17, 55:17, 64:3, 73:11, 73:25, 74:12, 77:1, 81:20, 82:6, 91:4, 91:7, 92:7, 100:7, 100:9, 100:10 type [5] - 28:8, 42:14, 44:23, 49:10, 57:8 types [1] - 84:18 typo [1] - 34:17

typographical [1] -27:12

U

ultimate [1] - 33:18

ultimately [4] - 27:21,

30:3, 31:21, 81:22

under [34] - 8:9, 8:18,

9:13, 10:12, 11:12,

unable [2] - 3:16,

77:24

11:19, 11:22, 12:20, 17:23, 18:8, 18:23, 19:11, 19:15, 22:20, 23:7, 30:1, 30:3, 31:2, 31:4, 32:7, 33:16, 52:3, 55:8, 59:13, 64:2, 64:4, 65:11, 70:6, 70:8, 70:15, 88:4, 92:6, 97:25, 98:14 undisputed [10] - 8:6, 8:16, 8:18, 19:14, 34:11, 51:12, 53:7, 61:17, 97:19, 98:7 unemployment [1] -44:15 unenforceable [2] -9:17, 90:1 unequivocally [1] -25:10 unfortunate [2] -42:10, 45:3 unfortunately [3] -35:14, 42:4, 44:13 UNIDENTIFIED [1] -77:10 unique [1] - 17:3 United [8] - 11:17, 12:9, 12:10, 12:21, 21:21, 22:2, 23:24, 41:16 universal [1] - 90:6 universities [1] -41.20 unjust [4] - 15:15, 31:2, 31:14, 32:6 unlawful [1] - 96:13 unless [3] - 6:25, 26:10, 98:17 unlikely [1] - 12:24 unreasonable [5] -15:15, 31:2, 31:14, 32:7, 91:24 unsworn [1] - 92:4 untoward [1] - 95:22 untruths [1] - 65:2 up [27] - 4:18, 7:4,

12:1, 12:5, 28:3, 29:25, 37:11, 38:11, 39:22, 40:23, 49:20, 49:22, 50:7, 52:2, 52:7, 56:1, 58:21, 62:18, 63:1, 73:9, 76:10, 78:12, 84:9, 84:11, 86:2, 95:10, 95:11 upheld [2] - 61:8, 61:12 upholds [1] - 22:25 **upwards** [1] - 41:13 **urban** [1] - 49:6 urge [2] - 16:19, 25:22 **US** [4] - 17:6, 17:15, 24:18, 24:20 user [2] - 29:19, 52:15 users [3] - 41:13, 47:13, 52:13 Utah [7] - 15:1, 15:7, 15:24, 31:6, 31:25, 32:11 **Utilities** [3] - 36:12, wade [1] - 88:13 61:25, 93:1 waived [1] - 5:10 **UTILITIES** [2] - 1:1, waiver [1] - 18:17 1:10 wants [7] - 48:18, **Utility** [6] - 13:19, 13:23, 21:9, 67:13, 74:13, 76:4

V

utility [1] - 57:22

weather [2] - 7:10, 35:16 valid [1] - 69:1 web [1] - 43:20 Valley [21] - 5:13, website [2] - 93:7, 48:16, 49:20, 49:23, 94:14 50:4, 50:10, 50:11, week [4] - 4:9, 4:12, 50:14, 50:19, 50:22, 39:7, 100:13 51:24, 52:1, 65:18, weeks [4] - 46:15, 80:25, 81:4, 81:8, 100:7, 100:9, 100:10 81:11, 82:12, 91:5, welcome [2] - 7:12, 91:9, 96:8 36:13 Valley's [2] - 49:25, well-aware [1] - 55:10 53:24 West [4] - 17:6, 17:15, value [2] - 64:13, 24:18, 24:20 96:14 west [1] - 55:23 VAN [2] - 86:14, 86:19 Western [2] - 20:19, **Van** [4] - 1:18, 86:13, 23:17 86:20, 87:22 whatsoever [1] - 7:1 various [1] - 26:2 Whip [4] - 39:17, 93:4, vast [1] - 54:20 93:10, 93:15 venture [3] - 19:23, whole [3] - 23:8, 90:3, 96:21 66:22, 95:11 version [1] - 34:14 wholly [1] - 93:7 versus [1] - 5:12 Wide [2] - 19:23, via [3] - 1:7, 2:1, 102:9 34:21 **viability** [1] - 91:18 Wiest [8] - 1:13, 3:12, VICE [1] - 1:11 32:24, 82:18, 82:20,

vindicate [1] - 21:11 violated [2] - 11:24, 15:14 violating [4] - 11:21, 15:8, 23:4, 89:23 violation [7] - 8:24, 9:22, 13:12, 15:5, 15:18, 15:19, 31:23 violations [3] - 12:8, 12:12, 12:24 Voice [2] - 19:24, 34:21 voice [1] - 56:16 void [5] - 8:2, 9:7, 9:13, 9:24, 10:8 VoIP [5] - 56:15, 56:17, 57:5, 57:14, 82:13 voluntarily [1] - 50:19 voluntary [1] - 33:20

W

Water [2] - 11:20,

ways [1] - 30:22

11:22

99:12 22:4 56:2, 56:14, 56:20, 102:19 58:5, 59:20, 61:24 100:18 57:17, 62:25, 67:4 works [1] - 89:21 world [5] - 47:15, 47:16, 48:6, 50:6, 56:9 world's [1] - 41:11 worldwide [4] - 47:14, 47:17, 47:25, 48:3 worth [2] - 48:1, 49:6 Wright [3] - 18:22, 19:6, 19:21 written [1] - 79:5

34:13, 34:16, 34:22, 43:15. 43:18. 82:19. 83:8, 84:2, 84:17, 84:25, 99:13, 100:2 William [1] - 1:18 willing [2] - 5:19, 96:13 win [1] - 65:15 window [3] - 28:21, 51:7, 52:3 Winner [1] - 7:8 wireless [6] - 56:22, 56:23, 57:6, 84:21, 84:22, 84:23 Wireless [2] - 20:19, 23:18 wish [3] - 40:11, 44:1, withdraw [1] - 68:23 withdrawn [4] - 5:7, 6:25, 7:1, 70:1 withstanding [1] -WITTLER [1] - 102:5 Wittler [3] - 1:24, 3:16, wondering [2] - 34:16, word [1] - 52:6 words [4] - 20:8,

83:6, 97:15, 99:11 15

WIEST [16] - 3:14,

32:25, 34:3, 34:10,

Υ

years [10] - 46:24, 49:1, 49:5, 51:15, 52:9, 58:25, 64:3, 81:11, 89:6, 95:17 yesterday [3] - 5:8, 5:21, 92:5