REGENER

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

JUL 2 1 2003

OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC = = = = UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF QWEST CORPORATION TO RECLASSIFY LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES AS FULLY COMPETITIVE

TC03-057



Transcript of Tape-recorded Proceedings July 7, 2003

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,

ROBERT SAHR, CHAIRMAN

GARY HANSON, VICE CHAIRMAN (by telephone)

JIM BURG, COMMISSIONER

COMMISSION STAFF

Rolayne Ailts Wiest
John J. Smith
Kelly Frazier
Jim Mehlhaff
Greg Rislov
Harlan Best
Keith Senger
Dave Jacobson
Michele Farris
Tina Douglas
Bonnie Bjork
Heather Forney
Pam Bonrud

APPEARANCES

David Gerdes Darla Rogers

Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR

PRECISION REPORTING

L I M I T E D

APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE

Gary Jensen
Bill Heaston
Matt McCaulley
Mary Lohnes
Tom Simmons
Tom Welk
Colleen Sevold
Larry Toll
Tim Goodwin

Joe Schuele

The following is a TRANSCRIPT OF

TAPE-RECORDED PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 412, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 7th day of July 2003.

1	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Bill Heaston and
2	Matt McCaulley?
3	MR. HEASTON: We're still here.
4	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Mary Lohnes and
5	Tom Simmons?
6	MS. LOHNES: Mary Lohnes is here.
7	Tom Simmons is joining shortly.
8	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you.
9	Joe Schuele?
10	MR. SCHUELE: Here, sir.
11	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Colleen Sevold?
12	MS. SEVOLD: Here, Mr. Chairman.
13	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Larry Toll?
14	MR. TOLL: Here, Mr. Chair.
15	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Tim Goodwin?
16	MR. GOODWIN: Here, Mr. Chair.
17	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Tom Welk?
18	MR. WELK: Here, Mr. Chairman.
19	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Okay. Great. And
20	then we have everybody on the line that was there
21	before, and as soon as Commissioner Hanson gets
22	moved in, we'll go ahead and start.
23	(Discussion off the record)
24	CHAIRMAN SAHR: (Inaudible)
25	driven off the road?

1 VICE CHAIR HANSON: I drove into 2 Kennebec real quick. 3 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Intentionally or 4 unintentionally? 5 VICE CHAIR HANSON: I was not airborne. 6 7 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Good. Well, let's go ahead and get started with the ad hoc meeting. 8 9 And I guess the first question I would ask is 10 the Commission has requested that the parties try 11 to come up with some type of acceptable agreement, 12 and I'm wondering did that happen and were there 13 any of the issues narrowed or resolved? 14 MR. WELK: Mr. Chairman, this is 15 Tom Welk. At the Commissioners' suggestion I wrote 16 a letter after our last meeting and asked all 17 counsel if they have alternatives to call me and to 18 discuss it. We were willing to do that. 19 I received one telephone call from Dave Gerdes 20 who had a proposal but said it was conditioned upon 21 everybody else agreeing to it, and no one else 22 called me. 23 CHAIRMAN SAHR: All right. Thank 24 you. So I don't think we have anything resolved 25 among the parties themselves, which is always

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

unfortunate because it makes it a lot easier if you all can figure out what works best for everyone.

But that happens, and today we're dealing with three separate questions, one, shall the Commission grant Qwest's motion to compel discovery, two, shall the Commission grant any or all motions for protective order filed by Prairie Wave, Black Hills Fibercom, Midcontinent Communications, MidState Telecom, and Northern Valley Communications, and, three, shall the Commission grant Prairie Wave's motion to dismiss.

And with the third question I believe Prairie Wave said that was filed July 3; is that correct?

MR. MCCAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is Matt McCaulley. Yes. That was filed. It was mailed on the 2nd of July, I believe, and didn't get placed in the mailbox -- (Inaudible) -- picked it up. So I e-mailed it out on the 3rd then. It probably would have got in people's mail boxes today.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: All right. you. And I think due to the fact that people may not have received that even today, I don't know if it's appropriate to handle it at this particular

meeting.

And, Mr. Welk, do you have any comment? Do you want to respond? Do you want time to respond?

MR. WELK: We would like to file a formal response. And I don't know when the next Commission meeting -- is it the 15th, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Yes, it is.

MR. WELK: I'm assuming we would just have it deferred to the 15th, and we would make a written response between now and then.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. And I think that makes a lot of sense. So let's dispose of the third item, and we'll just anticipate Qwest's brief coming in.

And, Mr. Welk, and I'm sure you'll do this, but it would be helpful if we had it before the 15th so we have a chance to review it. And then we'll go ahead and put that on the agenda for the 15th.

With that in mind then, the question becomes -- well, the questions become the first two about Qwest's motion to compel discovery and the other parties' motion for protective order.

Mr. Welk, do you want to start off?

MR. WELK: Well, I can.

(605) 945-0573

Mr. Chairman, without repeating what I said last time, as I anticipated, nothing new was filed since we last met. There were motions filed by Midco, MidState, and Northern Valley, all essentially making — although Midco's is somewhat different because they did produce — as Mr. Gerdes indicated, is filing some documents, have agreed to produce others, and then decided to adopt the arguments of other counsel.

MidState's and Northern Valley's arguments are basically to deny the request for information and to enter a protective order. But the essential legal arguments, there's nothing new that's being argued by anybody today or in those additional filings that was not argued before. Essentially the Commission has to look at the statutory criteria that it needs to consider to reclassify a service. Those are in our papers we've set forth.

We believe that the information regarding facilities, customers, forecasts, market studies are clearly relevant for the Commission to know about the market that we seek to reclassify to fully competitive. So we don't believe that there's been any questions raised about relevancy. The only question has to deal with the

confidentiality of the information.

And one point that I'd like to make that wasn't made last time is that merely because we believe as the others — the competitors do, that the information is confidential. Just merely because information is treated confidential, does not make that information a trade secret.

There is a particular meeting -- and this is not the time and the place to adjudicate what is or is not a trade secret, but the Commission should know that our Supreme Court and our South Dakota statutes treat information as a trade secret with defined specificity. And it's required, among other things, to have the information be kept with reasonable secrecy and needs to be information that has economic value.

And what we're saying is we don't need to get into that argument. We understand that the information that these parties don't want to produce is confidential, and we're willing to have a protective order entered.

As I said before, the issue should be how do we get the information to produce -- to our side of the case because we have the burden, and we believe this information is relevant and how to restrict

its authorization and disclosure in the case.

And we believe that the Commission could enter a protective order. We believe that all the people that are participating in the docket are honorable. You enter an order saying that use of this information should be produced to Qwest, that it's information that's limited to this docket, and we're not authorized to use it in any other manner, and that your order should be submission for everyone on notice, including attorneys, that this is the way the information should be used and this is the way that the case should proceed.

It's the way we proceed every day in commercial litigation when there's sensitive confidential information.

And with that we respectfully request that our motion to compel be granted subject to the entry of a protective order limiting its use to that of the docket and also require that it not be disclosed outside of the docket. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. Do we want to -- who should we have lead off for the interveners? Any particular order you want to follow?

MS. CREMER: (Inaudible).

1 CHAIRMAN SAHR: And what was that? Is Prairie Wave first? 2 3 MS. CREMER: Prairie Wave. CHAIRMAN SAHR: Why don't we go 5 ahead then and start off with Prairie Wave and, Mr. McCaulley, if you want to proceed. MR. MCCAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the chance to address 8 the Commission on this issue. And I am sorry that 9 this matter has come before the Commission. 10 11 Prairie Wave and Qwest were in contact before 12 the -- (Inaudible) -- to compel was filed, had 13 intended to resolve this difference. 14 We were unable to resolve it due to the nature 15 of information they sought and would disagree with 16 Mr. Welk. This is not just confidential 17 information Prairie Wave is maintaining, and it is, 18 in fact, trade secret information. 19 The Supreme Court definition and Mr. Welk 20 talks about is referred to in affidavit of 21 Mr. Anderson in paragraph 2 in which we set forth 22 the fact that the information being sought by Qwest 23 in the motion to compel is not only confidential 24 information but also trade secret information.

And trade secrets are just that, they're trade

25

1.4

secrets. It's a secret because Qwest doesn't know what that information is. And we're asking the Commission to protect the sensitive nature -- to protect this information from disclosure from Qwest. And that's as such we appear here before you today, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

I might also add -- I don't want to repeat the argument that we had at the prior Commission hearing, but I also want to set forth that in the event that the Commission deems that this trade secret information is relevant, the question isn't whether it's relevant or whether it should be disclosed or not but to whom it should be disclosed.

And Prairie Wave has a possible resolution,
Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, which
suggests that in lieu of granting the Qwest's
motion to compel or the Prairie Wave protective
order that the Commission could simply require this
information be turned over to the Commission under
confidentiality for inspection by the Commission.
I believe that would satisfy the requirements of
SDCL 49-31-3.2, which says the Commission shall
consider this information.

And it's sensitive here that Qwest and

1 Prairie Wave are at an impasse, Owest insisting on 2 the motion to compel being granted and our 3 maintaining that this information is trade secret when, in fact, it is a trade secret. That might be 5 a viable alternative for the Commission to consider 6 that requiring -- we would agree to turn this 7 information over to the Commission for their inspection only, subject to the protections that 8 the Commission might in its judgment deem fit to 9 10 protect the nature of this information. 11 So with that, Mr. Chairman, I'd yield the rest 12 of my time to the other interveners in this matter. 13 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. And, 14 let's see, who's up next then? 15 MS. CREMER: Black Hills. 16 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Black Hills? 17 Gary Jensen, would you like to proceed on behalf of 18 Black Hills? 19 MR. JENSEN: Well, my understanding 20 is that you heard from Linn at the last hearing, 21 and so I'm sitting in for him today because he had 22 to be gone. And perhaps I would be better served 23 by coming in at the end if there's something that 24 nobody else has said. Because I think we're 25 basically all in agreement, and I am certainly in

agreement with what was just said, that this information is fundamental.

There is a trade secret in this business.

This is the information that that constitutes.

It's the very basis upon which these businesses

were began and continue. I can't think of anything
that's more sensitive than this information.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: And that's fine. I can appreciate your situation there, and certainly Mr. Evans provided ample justification in his briefs and argument.

So we'll move along. Who is next? Is it Midcontinent?

MR. GERDES: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

I'll be brief because I did make an argument at the last meeting. To just recap our contention or our arguments, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, essentially we want the Commission to remember that Qwest is one of our competitors for both local service and long distance.

And the information that has been filed with the Commission would indicate that the information that Mr. Teitzel used could only have come about had there been communication between the retail and wholesale sides of Qwest. And that's exactly what

we're complaining about, and that is why should the retail side of Qwest know information that the wholesale side of Qwest don't.

And so we would emphasize the disclosure to whom part of this question. And we believe that -- and we mentioned it at the last hearing, that I think there's a total of six or seven different Qwest people that have signed the confidentiality agreement, and their job titles at least would indicate that some have roles with reference to both retail and wholesale functions of Qwest.

So we believe that as presently configured, the suppositions behind the confidentiality agreement are flawed. And just as an aside,
Mr. Chairman, the proposal we made to Qwest was that if Qwest would limit the number of people that could see this information on the one hand, and on the other hand because Midcontinent is a small company and under the definitions in the confidentiality agreement literally no one in Midcontinent can see Qwest's information.

If we could agree on a designation of a person within Midcontinent that could see Qwest's information and make decisions, then we would have no objection to going forward.

But we believe that right now the configuration, if you will, of the exchange of information is such that there's just too great of a likelihood that Qwest's retail side would have access to the information as well. And so that is our primary objection.

We do agree with the points that are made with the other -- or by the other interveners in this matter, Mr. Chairman, but we believe that something has to be done in the way -- if the Commission is considering granting any part of the motion to compel, then I think the Commission has to give some attention to the manner in which the information is going to be handled beyond what the current protective order contemplates. Because we think there's just too many ears involved if there's -- if that's the way to say it.

So for that reason, Mr. Chairman, based on the record at this point we would urge that the motion to compel from Qwest be denied and the motion for protective order filed by Midcontinent be granted.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you.

Ms. Rogers.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you, Commission.

I would note that I did have a chance to discuss

this issue after -- or subsequent to your last hearing with Tim Goodwin and then again with my clients. And I think where we are is basically, as I set forth in my motion, number one, we concur with Prairie Wave's position that, in fact, information sought is trade secret information.

With regard to the issue of to whom should it be disclosed, if at all, my clients did not have any level of comfort with disclosing any of the information to Qwest's people. And so we are still opposed to disclosing the information at all.

Furthermore, with regard to especially
MidState to where, you know, we're a really, really
small company and the only CLEC in the area, I
believe that Qwest would be able to ascertain a lot
of this information on its own without requiring us
to disclose protected trade secrets.

So we would stand by our position as enunciated in our motion for a protective order and request the Commission not to compel either MidState or Northern Valley to turn over this information.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. Staff, any comments?

MS. CREMER: Staff really has no

opinion. It is a legal question that doesn't involve us. The only question, I guess, I had, though, was as to Prairie Wave's suggestion that it's turned over to the Commission. Did any of the other parties think they wanted to do that?

And then my other problem -- or concern with that would be I'm not sure how that gets in the record. And, you know, if it comes in and the Commission sees it, do they make assumptions about what that information means, and how would you base your decision on something no one could ask any questions about or talk about, or how would you get your questions answered if you did have some regarding the information?

I just am not sure how valuable that information would become if nobody can see it or discuss it or -- like I said, I don't even know how you'd move it into the record. And that's really all staff has.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. And counsel or analysts, any questions? Any comments or questions? John?

MR. SMITH: Well, I guess, maybe,
Tom, for you in terms of the individuals to whom
disclosure will be made, who are those people?

MR. WELK: Mr. Smith, I've had -Larry Toll is here and I have in front of me a list
of the people who have signed this and Mr. Toll has
gone back and he was in a position to tell you what
positions they really are as far as the policy law
department.

There's been a lot of misinformation probably innocently put in the record because of job titles. But Mr. Toll will list to you who the people are.

MR. TOLL: There are eight people from Qwest who have signed the protective order agreement and understand that Qwest -- obviously the 14 states where we are have a significant local exchange business.

We have regulatory groups in all of those states. We have regulatory issues outside the 14 states where we do business in other states. And so we have a policy in law organization that deals with all the regulatory issues that come before the company.

Six of the eight people that have signed that, including Dave Teitzel, who I think his title causes the most concern, work in the policy and law organization. None of these people work with any retail determination of services or rates.

They are strictly in the policy and law. They do this for a living to try to collect the information and gather it and put it in a form so that we can respond to interrogatories, put testimony together, and prepare for hearings like we're about to come on in this instance.

Two of the other people are Marsha (sic) Gude and Brad Yerger are finance people. You'll recognize Marsha's name. She's a witness in this case. And Bradley's is her support person in preparing for the case. So it's all policy and law and finance people, and it's all geared towards this case.

One of the other issues that I heard is the fact that Mr. Teitzel has access to wholesale data. He does. That wholesale data, however, is on an aggregate level. He does not disclose anything publicly and doesn't have information on a specific customer-by-customer basis, but we can share information that is public knowledge when you have a wholesale data.

MR. WELK: Do you want the names,
Mr. Smith, of those people that have signed?

MR. SMITH: I mean, at some point
here we might have to match that up. Let me read

you this from a case that was cited by Mr. Evans and it's quoting the judge in the case and this is the Brown Bag case.

And he's referencing a U.S. Supreme Court case involving disclosure to in-house personnel. And basically here's what it says. "A crucial factor in the U.S. Steel case was whether the in-house personnel was involved in 'competitive decision-making,' that is advising on decisions about pricing or design, 'made in light of similar or corresponding information about a competitor.'"

Can you maybe address the relationship of the individuals involved to that kind of a standard?

Is this person involved in competitive decision-making for Qwest?

MR. TOLL: This is Larry again,

John. No. None of these people are involved in
any of the retail decision-making or competitive
decisions. They're strictly in policy and law
supporting our public policy objectives.

MR. SMITH: Are they physically separated from the competitive people?

MR. TOLL: Yes. Most of these people -- one of them, Dave Teitzel, lives in Seattle. His support person is in Phoenix. But

all the rest of the people on this with the exception of the two finance people are based in Denver. They're on the 47th floor of the 1801 California building.

The other two, the finance people, are in Omaha, and they are in the finance organization there. All of our marketing people are located in other locations.

MR. SMITH: Is that large a group of people required to see this information? Again, don't get the feeling here that I'm presuming that it would be disclosed, but I just want to know the facts.

MR. TOLL: Part of the agreement, I believe, that Mr. Gerdes offered was to limit it and we were more than willing to accept that but it had to be on the basis that it was an all or nothing, all parties had to agree to that. We'd certainly look at the limits as to the critical people as part of this case.

MR. SMITH: Well, I think right now the Commission states with this in that cases that I've seen make it pretty clear that the Commission is to utilize basically a balancing type of analysis here. But based upon what I've seen, that

balancing doesn't just involve putting the two sides on a teeter-totter and seeing which one sinks to the bottom. It's also seeing whether you can fashion a protective order which permits the disclosure to occur but does so in a way that provides the necessary protection to a party.

And the cases I've looked at, they involve everything from limiting the people, sometimes limiting them to only outside personnel, a third party, a consultant, all the way to requiring significant monetary sureties so that if there is a disclosure that's wrongful, there's a hammer on the end of it.

And I'm not suggesting any of those things here. I'm just saying I think that's the nature of this.

So, I don't know, I mean, from Qwest's standpoint, I mean, what do you really need, Tom, at a minimum in terms of to whom -- who's the minimum number of people that this would need to be reviewed by in order to do what you think you need to do to put on a case?

MR. WELK: The two witnesses that are identified right now, Marti Gude who is the financial witness and Dave Teitzel, and their two

support people, Bradley Yerger and Starla Rook would be the people -- the people people that would be at the hearing are -- Marti and Dave will be at the hearing, and their support people will be helping with the information that was received.

And a person probably just to -- Randy Kim.

All what he does is help coordinate, you know, the dissemination of information. All he does is we send it to him, and he distributes it to the people who should get it. He does not -- all he does is process information.

MR. SMITH: Tom, okay, now I've got Marti.

MR. WELK: Marti Gude, G-U-D-E and that's M-A-R-T-I, and then Bradley Yerger, Y-E-R-G-E-R. Bradley is Marti's support person and Dave Teitzel is a named witness and Starla Rook, R-O-O-K, is his support person, and then Randy Kim would be someone who would be the person who would receive the information and disseminate to those people.

MR. SMITH: Is Kim K-Y-M?

MR. WELK: Yes.

MR. TOLL: K-I-M.

MR. WELK: K-I-M, Randy Kim.

1 MR. SMITH: Oh, K-I-M. Okay. 2 MR. JENSEN: Mr. Smith, could we ask 3 one question? This is Gary Jensen in Rapid. 4 MR. SMITH: Please do, yeah. 5 MR. JENSEN: We were wondering if 6 any of these individuals that Tom has now listed 7 were involved in the decision to bring on this 8 docket number, to bring this matter to a hearing, 9 given that seems to be a competitive move or 10 decision, if you will, in and of itself. 11 MR. TOLL: No, they were not. This 12 is Larry Toll. 13 MR. GERDES: Just one other thing 14 that I'd like to reiterate that seems to be getting 15 lost here. There's another side to the problem, 16 and that is the problem that the small companies 17 have under the way that the -- that the protective 18 order is now -- or the protective order -- the 19 agreement is now constituted, and we don't have 20 anybody in our companies that can review Qwest's 21 information on the other side. 22 And I think that if the Commission is 23 considering trying to fashion a protective order, I 24 would submit that we've got to figure out a way to 25 identify somebody within the companies, the

intervener companies, as well to be fair to both sides.

MR. WELK: This is Mr. Welk. I agree with Mr. Gerdes. In fact, that offer has been out to Prairie Wave. It's been out to anybody to talk to me about it. And in so far as Mr. Gerdes and my discussion, I mean, he did designate Mr. Simmons as a potential, even though it hasn't been agreed to. And we have no objection.

And the integrity of Qwest's witnesses are no better or worse than others. We assume that the Commission enters an order and Mr. Simmons is a designated person and he will abide by the order just as the Qwest people will.

So each party -- I understand the significance of the size of the organizations, but nobody but Mr. Gerdes even proffered anybody.

MR. SMITH: Tom, this is John Smith again. Could you -- the various of the motions have argued that the information that you would obtain through this method in terms of what it shows in terms of Qwest's competitive position -- and that's really the issue, I think, is obtainable through other means that don't involve these

parties having to disclose specific what they consider to be proprietary information.

Could you address that, please.

MR. WELK: It's the most interesting argument of all. All of them have argued it's trade secrets and they protect it, and we can't get it, yet we're supposed to manufacture it. I mean, think about that. The argument is nonsense. If it's truly a trade secret, it can't by law be available to anybody else, unless they're not making their case appropriately.

So if it's such a trade secret, we can't get to it. So how could we put it together?

MR. SMITH: Well, let me ask you this, Tom. In terms of like, for example, the percentage of service of a particular class in a particular location, is not — without reference to a particular other company out there, is that not — information not, I guess, producible through a sort of reverse logic, in other words, everybody out there that's not a Qwest customer is somebody else's customer?

MR. WELK: Well, some issues you might be able to do that, but that doesn't tell you what the market is, John. I mean, we could produce

2

4

3

5

6

7

9

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

our data, but we don't have control of some of this other data that they have. I mean, where facilities are located, the type of customers, the number of customers that are out there, we can

quess at some of this.

And then on the other hand, if we come in with quesses, then we're liable for you didn't make your burden of proof, you don't have the quality of information. So we're between the proverbial rock and a hard spot. The information lies in their We can make suppositions about it, but then we're subject to conjecture.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: And that's one of the questions that I wanted to ask the various parties here today was the one thing we really haven't gotten into at least orally is the specific information being requested.

And I guess I would have a question, first of all, for Owest and then one for the interveners. The question I'd have for Qwest is when we get into information like marketing information, surveys, and those types of things, why is that necessary to put forward your case here, as opposed to the other information that's maybe related more towards market share and the number of lines and ability to

those type of things?

Mr. Welk.

MR. WELK: There are other factors other than the market share. If you look at the factors, Mr. Chairman, and the statute, if you read it carefully, it all talks about market power, and it also talks about the ability to make functionally equivalent or substitute services at competitive rates and terms, and it also states to an extent the services are available for alternative providers in the relevant market in the number and size.

compete with, you know, location of facilities and

All of the facilities, the forecast, the marketing show that the market -- their ability to make functionally equivalent services, the extent that they're available, and their ability to influence market power.

If you look at number four, it talks about the market share, the ability to hold prices to costs, and other economic measures of market power. That is the ability to look at market power is to know how can they get in and out of a market, what's the forecast, and all of those factors are subsumed in the market power issues as well as factors two,

three in the statute.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. And the -- I guess the flip side to the interveners, I'll get to it in just a little bit. Mr. Welk, another question I had was with Mr. Teitzel.

MR. WELK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Prairie Wave has included some information about some prior statements from him about his particular role within the Qwest organization, and how would you respond to that?

Is he somebody that, although by job title and organization appears to be somebody that you're making argument that's not going to be working the retail side of things, but what about Prairie Wave's argument?

MR. WELK: I don't understand their argument, where they're getting their basis.

Mr. Toll's here. If you'd like to put him under oath or Mr. Teitzel, I'll be glad to put them under oath and represent what he's done.

I mean, most of this is taking things out of context and making arguments. The bottom line is he is not in the provisioning of services, he doesn't make price decisions, he doesn't do

1	anything but accumulate data and talk about
2	products and markets.
3	MR. TOLL: For the last two years,
4	Mr. Chair, he has been on the 271 group and
5	testifying through the various state 271 procedure
6	meetings and then submitting affidavits, obviously,
7	to the FCC for the application.
8	That's part of the reason this docket I
9	would have liked this docket to come before this
10	Commission earlier but because of Mr. Teitzel being
11	tied up in other things, the delay
12	CHAIRMAN BURG: Who is this speaking
13	now?
14	MR. TOLL: This is Larry Toll.
15	Pardon me.
16	CHAIRMAN BURG: Okay, Larry. I
17	didn't
18	MR. TOLL: So Mr. Teitzel has been a
19	policy and law witness for as long as I can
20	remember. And he deals with marketing issues,
21	however.
22	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. And then
23	the, I guess, flip question I have for the other
24	parties is when you're dealing with information
25	like location of facilities, numbers of lines, and

that type of information what is the -- what is your response to the argument that Qwest needs that information to put on their case, especially when they're dealing with things like market share and market power, that snapshot in time type of information?

And I guess I'd open that up first to Prairie Wave.

MR. HEASTON: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. This is Bill Heaston. The arguments

to the questions they filed -- or the

interrogatories that they posed that they want a

response to or at least part of their motion to

compel, the exact location and nature of our

facilities we just don't understand -- to us it

seems proprietary information, how we build our

network, what our business plans are, that sort of

things.

That's very trade secret, and we don't understand what that has to do with Qwest's ability to determine whether or not they've lost some market share or meet -- or can meet these standards in 49-31-3.2.

Same thing with number nine. I mean, number nine, the interrogatory there is looking for

)

numbers of line. We provided an annual report to the Commission with the aggregate numbers of lines that -- (Inaudible) -- DSS, Mr. Dave Teitzel deals with when he goes over and looks at what's on the wholesale side of Qwest's business, then this ought to be enough for him on this side and he can look at a South Dakota annual report for all the companies involved here and get what they report. We report ILEC and CLEC, what our aggregate lines are in South Dakota. That information's available.

Why do they have to have it for each exchange? Why do they have to have it for all of those years? You know, this goes to us beyond what they need to make a case. It goes into trying to delve into our secret plans to learn about their competitor and to fashion competitive responses.

And I think I heard Mr. Toll say that
Mr. Teitzel is involved in the marketing side of
the house. And if that's true, then this gives him
a great insight into how we operate our company and
how we can respond and advise Qwest to respond in a
competitive market going forward knowing what they
know about our networks, about our facilities, how
we operate our facilities, how we set up our plant,
and what the potential customer base is out there

2

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

as we see it from our side of the fence.

And also in number nine they talked about market share. And I'm not sure, as I -- if you've had a chance to look at the response to this, this question is -- I'm not sure this is what is meant by market share here.

Owest has not volunteered to further define that term. They've filed in that attachment one to Mr. Teitzel's testimony a whole bunch of things that they want deregulated, and I'm not sure what -- when you talk about market share what we're referring to there.

Are you talking market share by customers? Are we talking about market share by access lines? Are we talking market share by revenues? Are we talking market share -- sometimes the way we might look at it is market share by the number of homes passed, which would not necessarily be the same number of customers that Qwest has in any particular area.

And so it is very difficult to determine, from our perspective, and to reveal this sort of information without knowing a little bit more, number one. And, number two, it's something that we take -- again, it gets into our deepest secrets

1 and considerations when it comes to deciding how 2 we're going to compete with Qwest in a particular 3 market, where we're going to go with our facilities, where we're going to go with our 5 customer efforts, and this sort of thing. And the same thing, with any surveys and this 6 7 sort of stuff, both give you the more protected to the extent that we have these sorts of things. 8 9 That really gets into deeply how we plan. 10 And I don't think that's what was the intent 11 of this legislation is to give Qwest or any other 12 incumbent company, monopoly, an opportunity to 13 completely learn about its competitor and then have 14 that advantage or at least completely -- or 15 undermine whatever competitive advantage a company 16 like Prairie Wave might have in a Qwest market. 17 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. 18 Mr. Gerdes. 19 MR. HEASTON: This is Mr. Heaston. 20 CHAIRMAN SAHR: No. That was thank 21 you, period. Mr. Gerdes dot, dot, dot. 22 MR. GERDES: He was looking at me 23 when he said that. 24 CHAIRMAN SAHR: I'm not thanking 25 him, Bill. I thank you.

MR. GERDES: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just set the stage and then ask Mr. Simmons if he has any comments. He's on the line.

Basically our objection is to number nine. We either responded partially to some of the other questions, or the questions weren't applicable. So if we were asked to go further in some of those responses to the other questions, we might have further objections. But our question is — our objection is primarily to number nine.

And it really gets down to the guts. They
list I think it's like six or eight years. They
want number of customers in both business and
residential categories. They want number of lines.
They want market share. And all they have to do is
look at a map and they can put our business plan,
and for those reasons we think that's confidential
business-related information.

And if Mr. Simmons has further insights, I'd ask him to speak up.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Dave. The only thing I might add is that when we see a list that's as long as this one, we're very concerned about its relevance to this particular case.

Because any time we disclose this information once

1 it's out there, it's out there among all the 2 parties. 3 I understand that we're looking at it now as 4 it impacts this particular case, but it has a life 5 beyond all of that, especially when you look at the survey information. And while the survey 6 7 information that we're offering might, in fact, be 8 dated information, just this year, in fact, that we 9 asked these particular questions, means we have 10 interest in certain areas which could give rise to 11 what our business plans might be looking at. 12 So it is very sensitive information, and we 13 regard it as trade secret. 14 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. 15 MR. SMITH: Well, Dave, let me ask 16 you something just on that. Do you have your code 17 book over there? 18 MR. GERDES: I don't have -- I was 19 reading another statute. 20 MR. SMITH: Oh. 21 MR. GERDES: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. 22 I'm just looking here. MR. SMITH: 23 Let's take a look at -- well, let's take any of the 24 top three. Let's take number three, the ability of 25 alternative providers to make functionally

equivalent or substitute services readily available.

Can you just give me your take on how Qwest does that without being -- without having accurate information on what the other providers have in the way of functional ability?

MR. GERDES: Well, number one, I think that what the other providers provide publicly as to their capabilities technically certainly tells something about the type of equipment that they have.

And so then, you know, do you have a type A widget or a type B widget. That I think is confidential to the company. The question is can they perform the service -- or can they sell the service, can they provide the service that's provided by a widget of whatever kind, not type A, B, C, or D.

So then we get to the level of detail, and, again, when you go back -- as I said, I'm talking strictly about the answers to number nine in terms of our position, and those are very detailed questions. It's the level of detail.

MR. SMITH: One last question, and maybe this is for all of the interveners. Is there

anything that can be done here in the way of like requests for admission and dealing with it that way, if there's some summary way of dealing with this to -- if the issue isn't resolvable, then obviously not, but --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ GERDES: Are you posing that question to me?

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. GERDES: I think abstractly as an abstract thought, yes, I think there's something that can be done by Qwest for admission. But you're going to have a hit and miss proposition that will take forever, you know, and you may have to redraft the request periodically -- or, I mean, several times and things like that.

I still think the best way to do it is for all of us to sit down and decide who concedes what and how we're going to do it.

And maybe that won't work. But that -- that's really the easiest way to do it. And maybe Qwest is going to have to back off on the type of information they want a little bit too. I mean, that's another thing that we might want to think about.

But I'm probably the wrong person to ask

because we probably went the farthest in terms of suggesting how to solve this problem.

MR. HEASTON: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. HEASTON: This is Bill Heaston.

If you look at Interrogatory No. 10, and we did

file our responses to Qwest with the Commission,

and our response to that -- Qwest's question was at

least in our first set of interrogatories is that

able to provide local exchange services or

functionally equivalent or substitute services at

competitive rates, terms, and conditions of service

compared to Qwest within Qwest's service area in

South Dakota. And if not, briefly explain why not.

And our answer was yes, to the extent that Prairie Wave uses its own facilities.

MR. SMITH: Well, then doesn't that beg the issue, though, that from Qwest's standpoint is do they need to know what facilities you have in order to get to the next step?

MR. HEASTON: How do they know by looking at our website, which Mr. Teitzel needs to update looking at our website since we became Prairie Wave, but to that extent that pretty well tells you we have a brochure out that shows you,

2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2.4

25

you know, a generalized look at the network.

It doesn't list all the facilities. doesn't list every repeater and every -- designate what type of remote or anything like that we may have in a particular area, but it certainly, you know -- and it gives aggregate numbers.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: We haven't heard yet from Ms. Rogers.

MS. ROGERS: Well, I'm not sure I have a lot to add. I concur with what's been stated, but I might suggest that maybe one size doesn't fit all in this case.

You know, I mentioned that I had had some discussions with Mr. Goodwin with regard to my client -- or with regard to my client. You know, my clients are here asking this Commission for some protection from things that we believe are clearly trade secret and are integral to our business. On the other hand, this is a hard docket because of what Qwest is seeking here.

I'm thinking that perhaps instead of, you know, everybody agreeing or one size fitting all with regard to the different types of players that are here, you know, maybe there is, you know, more negotiation.

2.0

If I tell my small companies that, well, even narrowed down as far as possible Qwest at a minimum needs to have five or six or seven people see this information, I mean, that's not going to offer any level of comfort at all to my clients with regard to who can view this particular information.

And on the other hand, if Qwest would be willing to back off a little on exactly what they need, is there more general things we can give them that would satisfy what they need to look at in this docket and can we further narrow the scope down -- you know, maybe there are some possibilities for resolving it that way, request for admission or something like that.

But I'm concerned that perhaps some of us are coming from a little different perspective, especially from the perspective of my very small company.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Vice Chairman Hanson, do you have any questions?

VICE CHAIR HANSON: No. I just look at this as a Catch-22 for Qwest. They certainly should have their right to their day in court. At the same time, other companies should not be required to disclose confidential information to a

1 cor

competitor.

So I'm interested in how we untie the -(Inaudible) -- knot here and allow the judicial
process to go through.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Amen. Commissioner Burg.

that occurs to me -- and I can understand Qwest's desire to put on the best case to make sure that they can have the reclassification that they're requesting, but how much of their request could be attested to by some of the parties?

And as Mr. Heaston just mentioned, we've answered yes. Okay. You need to pursue that farther. If they say yes, you know, that particular checklist item is met, how much of that can occur?

It looks to me like, you know, this may not be as difficult of decision as to whether the things have actually occurred. What the problem is is that as people are getting into the competitive nature, now they're saying we don't want to share that information and probably could prove that it's competitive, otherwise, you wouldn't even have the information in the first place.

All right. The thing that I would seek would be what part of that request -- how many parties would be willing to attest to and thus avoid giving that information and probably pass the necessity of having the information for Qwest to include?

Because that's what I heard Mr. Heaston say, we agree.

MR. WELK: This is Tom Welk. We asked that question in the interrogatories, whether you post it. And everyone answered it differently. Mr. Heaston, he answered it one way. Others said yes, see the testimony of the witnesses.

And that's precisely your thinking is what I thought about when we rolled the question. If there isn't an opposition to some of these factors in the statute, then there's no reason to have this information. But the companies have said no. Some of them have said yes, kind of yes, like Mr. Heaston. Others have said no, see the testimony of our witnesses.

So here we're sitting with, you know, five or six different people opposing the reclassification, not wanting to give the information that's required by the statute.

And I am sensitive to the issue, but we deal

with this every day in commercial litigation, and you have to enter an order as the Commissioner of courts and expect people to abide by it, and if they don't, there are consequences.

And as Mr. Smith indicated, the courts deal with this every day. You have to fashion a remedy. We all have honorable people here. Have somebody designated from the companies to receive the information, enter an order that they can't disclose it, and if it's ever disclosed, we'll be back in front of you and people will have to answer if they disclosed it or not.

CHAIRMAN BURG: Mr. Welk, along the lines of Ms. Rogers' question, if -- not everybody's treated the same. If you got a agreement from somebody that, yes, that's competitive now, we agree as Mr. Heaston has indicated, would you be willing to treat each company separately?

MR. WELK: Well, if they've conceded that. But we still at the end of the day if we have people that are refusing that and the information is still required to show the market, we still have to prove it.

If Ms. Rogers' client says, you know, we agree

that there's a function that -- that wireless service is a functional equivalent, which all of them haven't agreed, by the way, then that's one party. But we have to have it for the rest of them.

Why does one company think that wireless is a functional equivalent and others do not? You've got varying answers, Commissioner, by everybody.

CHAIRMAN BURG: And that was my question. If you have one company that agrees, can you bypass the information from that company and only go to those that don't agree and say show us why not?

MR. WELK: Yeah. If they've admitted the fact, that's true. If they have said there's no issue with us, those that contest it should have to do it.

CHAIRMAN BURG: But I also have an additional question. And maybe it goes to the law. Why do you need the information on the futures?

For example, marketing surveys, which I think would reflect on what could happen in the future or a forecast of new customers, forecast indicating in the future. Is not your burden of proof to show whether that's occurring today?

2

3

4

6

7

5

9

10

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. WELK: Well, it also has to show the extent to which they're available and they may be available in the future and the ability of them to provide functionally equivalent service.

So maybe they can say we could go into another area if we want to, we just decided not to do it, but physically they have the ability to do that.

So if someone says, well, this market's limited to this or this area but they've got a survey that says we could go there but they just chose not to do that, that's part of our case to say it's there, you just chose as a business decision not to do it. It doesn't mean it shouldn't be classified. It's just you as a company chose not to do that.

MR. JENSEN: This is Gary Jensen again in Rapid City. Could I ask another question? Would that be appropriate?

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Absolutely. I only took you last because you asked to go last.

MR. JENSEN: And I appreciate that very much. I'm trying to understand -- everybody on the phone as much more familiar with it than I, but my understanding is that all of these other companies have intervened, and that's how come we

get into the discovery issue.

go about proving your case?

What would have happened -- how would Qwest now be proving its case if these interveners weren't here and you couldn't get discovery? It seems to me that you may very well really kill the incentive that people have to intervene and all the good that comes from that if they're going to be subjected to having to turn over documents, especially if they're sensitive.

MR. WELK: First of all, it's got nothing to do, Gary, with the statutory requirements. If they had not intervened, we would seek third party discovery, just like you do in every other lawsuit.

So if they chose to intervene, they're a party and their obligations are greater. If they are not a party, then there's third party discovery. And then we would have the same issues we do in any other case. We'd have to make market share.

You either produce it by a consultant with other information that's available -- and this information, as everybody said, is a trade secret. We can't get to it.

MR. JENSEN: So then how would you

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

105 S. Euclid Ave., Suite E, Pierre, SD 57501

(605) 945-0573

1 MR. WELK: We would go just as we're doing right now. Except your company has said they 2 won't produce anything. They've taken the worst 3 4 position of everything and said, no, you're not 5 entitled to anything. So we have a statutory 6 dictate to prove this, but the people who are there 7 opposing this refuse to give us this information. 8 MR. JENSEN: I'm just trying to 9 understand. I mean, the basis that you had or 10 Qwest must have had to proceed, there must be 11 something there, otherwise, you wouldn't have 12 started this proceeding. MR. WELK: Well, if you've read the 13 14 docket, read the testimony, Gary, you'll see it. 15 MR. JENSEN: I've read it. 16 MR. WELK: That's not complete. 17 MR. SMITH: Tom, this is John Smith. 18 Yes, sir. MR. WELK: 19 MR. SMITH: Do five people need to 20 see this stuff? 21 MR. WELK: Well, you mean, 22 Randy Kim? I mean, I can take care of 23 disseminating it so he doesn't have to see it. 2.4 mean, Marti Gude is a support person, and 25 Starla Rook and Dave Teitzel are the people that

1 |

need to see it.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Any other questions? Well, I think we certainly have gone a long way flushing out the issues. I think the Commission, though, considering the diversity of the parties, considering the different objections that have been raised and certainly considering Qwest's position on these issues, I think it's pretty impractical to expect us to be able to rule on the seat of our pants on these issues.

So what I would propose is that the Commission will schedule another ad hoc hearing, and at that point in time actually come forward with the ruling -- or at least certainly with some type of action on the pending motions. And I think that's probably the most appropriate way to sort through this.

Because, frankly, there's a lot of us that could be -- (Inaudible) -- and to try to do that orally without having to consider the issues raised today and try and do that at this point in time I think is going to be very, very difficult.

So what the parties should expect is that the Commission will issue a notice of a hearing, some type of ad hoc meeting, that will be scheduled

within the next couple of days. I hope everyone's still mindful that we do have a July 14 discovery deadline and that is still looming and at this point in time that is still the deadline.

One last thing that I would like to ask Qwest is your deadline is the 28th to produce documents; is that correct?

MR. WELK: It's to produce rebuttal testimony, Mr. Chairperson.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you very much. I appreciate the clarification. On that issue it sounds like you're working with Midco on whether or not Mr. Simmons can look at the information and so on and so forth.

I would encourage the parties, if we could, let's propose names and let's get people either -- let's take care of that issue if at all possible you can without the Commission having to take action. Because that seems like to me to be hopefully a fairly simple issue of to whom the information can be given.

So I would suggest that the interveners get the names that they intend to -- or that they would like to have or give the information to Qwest and, Mr. Welk, if you and Qwest would review those and

6.

work with the interveners to see if we can get those done without having to do something formally, I think that would make a lot more sense.

So I would encourage the parties to do that.

Otherwise, just everything else that we're talking over today just we'll take that under advisement.

And I appreciate everyone coming back for a second day on this.

MR. HEASTON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Yes.

MR. HEASTON: This is Bill Heaston.

Not to complicate this any more than we need to,
but we've been served with a second set of
interrogatories, which are in some ways much more
onerous in seeking competitive information than the
first set.

They're looking for average revenue per service, per customer, which really gets into some trade secret stuff. Revenue — there's subelements, revenue, they're wanting value, average inter and intraLATA toll revenue per customer, proportionate intrastate and interstate toll generated by a residential customer.

This isn't going to go away with this first set, I'm afraid. So I just wanted to make you

1 aware of that. 2 CHAIRMAN SAHR: When did you receive 3 that request? MR. HEASTON: I think it was dated 4 the 1st or 2nd of July. 5 6 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Okav. And that's 7 something certainly where when we're looking at a July 14 deadline we certainly will take into 9 consideration when the parties were served a particular request --10 MR. WELK: Wait a second. 11 That was the motion to shorten time that was served that was 12 13 already decided by the Commission, which as the Commission nobody objected to shortening the time 14 15 and nobody's filed an objection. CHAIRMAN SAHR: And if I would have 16 been able to finish my sentence, the parties 17 18 certainly have the ability to file any appropriate 19 motions if they have a problem with a particular 20 request for discovery, otherwise, we proceed on. So, Mr. Heaston, if there's a problem out 21 22 there, in your opinion, then I would go ahead and 23 file the appropriate documents with the Commission, 24 give Mr. Welk a chance to respond, and we'll go 25 forward when that comes forward. But right now

we're just dealing with what is before us today. But I appreciate the heads-up on that. And certainly there is nothing preventing you from filing a motion regarding that request for discovery. MR. HEASTON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. And with that, we will be adjourned.

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
2	:SS CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF HUGHES)
4	
5	I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered
6	Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the
7	State of South Dakota:
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed
9	shorthand reporter, I transcribed, to the best of my
10	ability, the cassette tape of the foregoing
11	proceedings.
12	Dated at Pierre, South Dakota this 21st day
13	of July 2003.
14	
15	
16	
17	Chi: MCConstitutes
18	Cheri McComsey Wittler, Notary Public and
19	Registered Professional Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Word Index		150100	
1	Access [3] 15:5 19:15 33:14	[2] 39:15 44:11 Answered	[5] 13:5 19:19 21:17 29:18 48:9 Became
'competitive	Accumulate	[4] 17:13 42:14 43:10 43:11	[1] 39:23
[1] 20:8	[1] 30:1	Answers	Become
'made	Accurate	[2] 37:21 45:8	[2] 6:21 17:16
[1] 20:10	[1] 37:4	Anticipate	Becomes
1	Action [2] 49:15 50:19	[1] 6:13 Anticipated	[1] 6:21
	Ad	[1] 7:2	Beg [1] 39:18
10	[3] 4:8 49:12 49:25	Appear	Began
[1] 39:6 14	Add	[1] 11:5	[1] 13:6
[4] 18:13 18:16 50:2 52:8	[3] 11:7 35:22 40:10	APPEARANCES [2] 1:22 2:2	Behalf
15th	Additional [2] 7:14 45:19	Applicable	[1] 12:17
[4] 6:6 6:9 6:17 6:19	Address	[1] 35:6	Behind
1801	[3] 10:8 20:12 26:3	Application	[1] 14:13 Best
[1] 21:4 1st	Adjourned	[2] 1:5 30:7	[5] 1:17 5:2 38:16 42:9 54:9
[1] 52:5	[1] 53:8	Appreciate [6] 10:8 13:9 46:21 50:11 51:7 53:2	Better
	Adjudicate [1] 8:9	Appropriate	[2] 12:22 25:12
2	Admission	[5] 5:25 46:18 49:16 52:18 52:23	Between
2	[3] 38:2 38:11 41:14	Appropriately	[3] 6:10 13:24 27:9
[1] 10:21	Admitted	[1] 26:11	Beyond [3] 15:14 32:13 36:5
2003	[1] 45:15	Area	Bill
[3] 1:10 2:14 54:13	Adopt	[6] 16:14 33:20 39:13 40:5 46:6 46:9 Areas	[6] 2:3 3:1 31:10 34:25 39:5 51:11
21st [1] 54:12	[1] 7:8 Advantage	Areas [1] 36:10	Bit
271	[2] 34:14 34:15	Argued	[3] 29:4 33:23 38:22
[2] 30:4 30:5	Advise	[4] 7:14 7:15 25:21 26:5	Bjork
28th	[1] 32:21	Argument	[1] 1:20
[1] 50:6	Advisement	[10] 8:18 11:8 13:11 13:15 26:5 26:8 29:14 29:16 29:18 31:2	Black [4] 5:7 12:15 12:16 12:18
2nd	[1]51:6 Advising	Arguments	Bonnie
[2] 5:17 52:5	[1] 20:9	[6] 7:9 7:10 7:13 13:17 29:23 31:10	[1] 1:20
3	Affidavit	Ascertain	Bonrud
3	[1] 10:20	[1] 16:15	[1] 1:21
[1] 5:13	Affidavits	Aside	Book
3rd	[1] 30:6	[1] 14:14 Assume	[1] 36:17
[1] 5:19	Afraid [1] 51:25	[1] 25:12	Bottom [2] 22:3 29:23
4	Agenda	Assuming	Boxes
_	[1] 6:18	[1] 6:8	[1] 5:20
412	Aggregate	Assumptions	Brad
[1] 2:12	[4] 19:17 32:2 32:9 40:6	[1] 17:9 Attachment	[1] 19:8
47th [1] 21:3	Agree [9] 12:6 14:22 15:7 21:18 25:4 43:7	[1] 33:8	Bradley
49-31-3.2	44:17 44:25 45:12	Attention	[3] 23:1 23:15 23:16
[2] 11:23 31:23	Agreed	[1] 15:13	Bradley's [1] 19:10
5	[3] 7:7 25:9 45:3	Attest	Brief
5	Agreeing	[1] 43:3	[2] 6:14 13:15
500	[2] 4:21 40:22 Agreement	Attested [1] 42:12	Briefly
[1] 2:13	[10] 4:11 12:25 13:1 14:9 14:14 14:20	Attornevs	[1] 39:14
7	18:12 21:14 24:19 44:16	[1] 9:10	Briefs
-	Agrees	Authorization	[1] 13:11
7	[1] 45:10	[1] 9:1	Bring [2] 24:7 24:8
[1] 1:10 7th	Ahead	Authorized	Brochure
7th [1] 2:14	[5] 3:22 4:8 6:18 10:5 52:22 Ailts	[1] 9:8 Available	[1] 39:25
	[1] 1:15	[8] 26:10 28:11 28:17 32:10 37:2 46:2	Brown
\mathbf{A}			[1] 20:3
/1 i	Airborne	46:3 47:21	
	[1] 4:6	Avenue	Build
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3	[1] 4:6 Allow	Avenue [1] 2:13	Build [1] 31:16
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability	[1] 4:6 Allow [1] 42:3	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average	Build [1] 31:16 Building
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28:	[1]4:6 Allow [1]42:3 Alternative	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability	[1] 4:6 Allow [1] 42:3	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average	Build [1] 31:16 Building
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18	[1] 4:6 Allow [1] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17	[1] 4:6 Allow [I] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled	[1] 4:6 Allow [I] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware [1] 52:1	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled [1] 2:11	[1] 4:6 Allow [1] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5 Ample	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg [8] 1:13 30:12 30:16 42:6 42:7 44:1
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled [1] 2:11 Absolutely	[1] 4:6 Allow [1] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5 Ample [1] 13:10	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware [1] 52:1 B	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg [8] 1:13 30:12 30:16 42:6 42:7 44:1 45:9 45:18
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled [1] 2:11 Absolutely [1] 46:19	[1] 4:6 Allow [1] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5 Ample	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware [1] 52:1 B Bag [1] 20:3	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg [8] 1:13 30:12 30:16 42:6 42:7 44:1 45:9 45:18 Business
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled [1] 2:11 Absolutely [1] 46:19	[1] 4:6 Allow [1] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5 Ample [1] 13:10 Analysis [1] 21:25 Analysts	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware [1] 52:1 B Bag [1] 20:3 Balancing	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg [8] 1:13 30:12 30:16 42:6 42:7 44:1 45:9 45:18 Business [11] 13:3 18:14 18:17 31:17 32:5 33:13 35:16 35:18 36:11 40:18 46:12
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled [1] 2:11 Absolutely [1] 46:19 Abstract [1] 38:10 Abstractly	[1] 4:6 Allow [1] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5 Ample [1] 13:10 Analysis [1] 21:25 Analysts [1] 17:21	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware [1] 52:1 B Bag [1] 20:3 Balancing [2] 21:24 22:1	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg [8] 1:13 30:12 30:16 42:6 42:7 44:1 45:9 45:18 Business [11] 13:3 18:14 18:17 31:17 32:5 33:13 35:16 35:18 36:11 40:18 46:12 Business-related
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled [1] 2:11 Absolutely [1] 46:19 Abstract [1] 38:10 Abstractly [1] 38:9	[1] 4:6 Allow [I] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5 Ample [1] I3:10 Analysis [1] 21:25 Analysts [1] 17:21 Anderson	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware [1] 52:1 B Bag [1] 20:3 Balancing [2] 21:24 22:1 Base	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg [8] 1:13 30:12 30:16 42:6 42:7 44:1 45:9 45:18 Business [11] 13:3 18:14 18:17 31:17 32:5 35 13 35:16 35:18 36:11 40:18 46:12 Business-related [1] 35:18
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled [1] 2:11 Absolutely [1] 46:19 Abstract [1] 38:10 Abstractly [1] 38:9 Accept	[1] 4:6 Allow [I] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5 Ample [1] 13:10 Analysis [1] 21:25 Analysts [1] 17:21 Anderson [1] 10:21	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware [1] 52:1 B Bag [1] 20:3 Balancing [2] 21:24 22:1 Base [2] 17:10 32:25 Based	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg [8] 1:13 30:12 30:16 42:6 42:7 44:1 45:9 45:18 Business [11] 13:3 18:14 18:17 31:17 32:5 35 13 35:16 35:18 36:11 40:18 46:12 Business-related [1] 35:18 Businesses
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled [1] 2:11 Absolutely [1] 46:19 Abstract [1] 38:10 Abstract[1] 38:10 Abstractly [1] 38:9 Accept [1] 21:16	[1] 4:6 Allow [1] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5 Ample [1] 13:10 Analysis [1] 21:25 Analysts [1] 17:21 Anderson [1] 10:21 Annual	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware [1] 52:1 B Bag [1] 20:3 Balancing [2] 21:24 22:1 Base [2] 17:10 32:25 Based [3] 15:18 21:2 21:25	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg [8] 1:13 30:12 30:16 42:6 42:7 44:1 45:9 45:18 Business [11] 13:3 18:14 18:17 31:17 32:5 35:13 35:16 35:18 36:11 40:18 46:12 Business-related [1] 35:18 Businesses [1] 13:5
Abide [2] 25:14 44:3 Ability [13] 27:25 28:8 28:15 28:17 28:20 28: 22 31:20 36:24 37:6 46:3 46:7 52:18 54:10 Able [5] 16:15 26:24 39:10 49:9 52:17 Above-entitled [1] 2:11 Absolutely [1] 46:19 Abstract [1] 38:10 Abstractly [1] 38:9 Accept	[1] 4:6 Allow [I] 42:3 Alternative [3] 12:5 28:12 36:25 Alternatives [1] 4:17 Amen [1] 42:5 Ample [1] 13:10 Analysis [1] 21:25 Analysts [1] 17:21 Anderson [1] 10:21	Avenue [1] 2:13 Average [2] 51:17 51:21 Avoid [1] 43:3 Aware [1] 52:1 B Bag [1] 20:3 Balancing [2] 21:24 22:1 Base [2] 17:10 32:25 Based	Build [1] 31:16 Building [1] 21:4 Bunch [1] 33:9 Burden [3] 8:24 27:8 45:24 Burg [8] 1:13 30:12 30:16 42:6 42:7 44:12 45:9 45:18 Business [11] 13:3 18:14 18:17 31:17 32:5 35 13 35:16 35:18 36:11 40:18 46:12 Business-related [1] 35:18 Businesses

C	[1] 36:16 Collect	[1] 15:2 Configured	[6] 19:15 19:16 19:21 27:1 27:2 30:: Dated
California	[1] 19:2	[1] 14:12	[3] 36:8 52:4 54:12
] 21:4	Colleen	Conjecture	Dave
apabilities	[2] 2:6 3:11 Comfort	[1] 27:12	[11] 1:18 4:19 18:22 20:24 22:25 23
] 37:9	[2] 16:9 41:5	Consequences [1] 44:4	23:17 32:3 35:21 36:15 48:25 David
apitol]2:122:13	Coming	Consider	[1] 1:23
are	[4] 6:14 12:23 41:16 51:7	[5] 7:17 11:24 12:5 26:2 49:20	Days
] 48:22 50:17	Comment [1] 6:2	Consideration	[1] 50:1
arefully	Comments	[1] 52:9 Considerations	Deadline [4] 50:3 50:4 50:6 52:8
l] 28:7 ase	[3] 16:24 17:21 35:3	[1] 34:1	Deal
	Commercial	Considering	[3] 7:25 43:25 44:5
25] 8:24 9:1 9:12 19:10 19:11 19:13 0:1 20:2 20:3 20:4 20:7 21:20 22:22	[2] 9:14 44:1 Commission	[5] 15:11 24:23 49:5 49:6 49:7	Dealing
6:11 27:23 31:3 32:14 35:24 36:4 40: 2 42:9 46:11 47:3 47:19 47:25	[50] 1:2 1:12 1:14 4:10 5:4 5:6 5:10 6:	Constituted [1] 24:19	[6] 5:3 30:24 31:4 38:2 38:3 53:1 Deals
ases	6 7:16 7:21 8:10 9:2 10:9 10:10 11:3	Constitutes	[3] 18:18 30:20 32:3
2] 21:22 22:7	11:611:811:1011:1611:1911:2011:	[1] 13:4	Decide
assette	21 11:23 12:5 12:7 12:9 13:17 13:18 13:22 15:10 15:12 15:24 16:20 17:4	Consultant	[1] 38:17
l] 54:10 atch-22	17:9 21:22 21:23 24:22 25:13 30:10	[2] 22:10 47:20	Decided
[] 41:22	32:2 39:7 40:16 49:4 49:11 49:24 50: 18 52:13 52:14 52:23	Contact [1] 10:11	[3] 7:8 46:6 52:13 Deciding
ategories	Commissioner	Contemplates	[1] 34:1
1] 35:14	[5] 1:13 3:21 42:5 44:2 45:8	[1] 15:15	Decision
auses	Commissioners'	Contention	[6] 17:11 20:9 24:7 24:10 42:19 46:1
l] 18:23 ertain	[1] 4:15	[1] 13:16	Decision-making
[] 36:10	Communication [1] 13:24	Contest [1] 45:16	[3] 20:9 20:15 20:18 Decisions
ertainly	Communications	Context	[4] 14:24 20:9 20:19 29:25
13] 12:25 13:9 21:19 37:10 40:5 41:	[2] 5:8 5:9	[1] 29:23	Deem
2 49:3 49:7 49:14 52:7 52:8 52:18 3:3	Companies	Continue	[1] 12:9
ERTIFICATE	[10] 24:16 24:20 24:25 25:1 32:8 41:1 41:24 43:17 44:8 46:25	[1] 13:6 Control	Deems [1] 11:10
1] 54:2	Company	[1] 27:1	Deepest
ERTIFY	[15] 14:19 16:14 18:20 26:18 32:20 34:12 34:15 37:14 41:18 44:19 45:6	Coordinate	[1] 33:25
1] 54:8 !hair	34:12 34:15 37:14 41:18 44:19 45:6	[1] 23:7	Deeply
6] 3:14 3:16 4:1 4:5 30:4 41:21	45:10 45:11 46:15 48:2 Compared	CORPORATION [1] 1:6	[1] 34:9
hairman	[1] 39:13	Correct	Deferred [1] 6:9
71] 1:12 1:13 3:1 3:4 3:8 3:11 3:12 3:	Compel	[2] 5:14 50:7	Define
3 3:15 3:17 3:18 3:19 3:24 4:3 4:7 4: 4 4:23 5:15 5:22 6:6 6:7 6:11 7:1 9:	[11] 5:5 6:22 9:17 10:12 10:23 11:18	Corresponding	[1] 33:7
1 10:1 10:4 10:8 11:6 11:16 12:11	12:2 15:12 15:20 16:20 31:14 Compete	[1] 20:11	Defined
2:13 12:16 13:8 13:14 13:17 14:15	[2] 28:1 34:2	Costs [1] 28:20	[1] 8:13 Definition
5:9 15:18 15:22 16:23 17:20 27:13 8:6 29:2 29:7 30:12 30:16 30:22 31:	Competitive	Counsel	[1] 10:19
0 34:17 34:20 34:24 35:1 36:14 40:7	[16] 1:77:23 20:14 20:18 20:22 24:9	[3] 4:17 7:9 17:21	Definitions
1:19 41:19 42:5 42:7 44:13 45:9 45: 8 46:19 49:2 50:10 51:9 51:10 52:2	25:23 28:10 32:16 32:22 34:15 39:12 42:21 42:24 44:17 51:15	COUNTY	[1] 14:19
2:6 52:16 53:7	Competitor	[1] 54:3	Delay
hairperson	[4] 20:11 32:15 34:13 42:1	Couple [1] 50:1	[1] 30:11 Delve
l] 50:9	Competitors	Court	[1] 32:14
hance 5] 6:17 10:8 15:25 33:4 52:24	[2] 8:4 13:19 Complaining	[4] 8:11 10:19 20:4 41:23	Denied
hecklist	[1] 14:1	Courts	[1] 15:20
[] 42:16	Complete	[2] 44:3 44:5	Denver
heri	[1] 48:16	CREMER [4] 9:25 10:3 12:15 16:25	[1] 21:3 Deny
3] 1:24 54:5 54:18	Completely	Criteria	[1] 7:11
hose	[2] 34:13 34:14 Complicate	[1] 7:17	Department
1] 46:11 46:12 46:15 47:15 ited	[1] 51:12	Critical	[1] 18:6
I] 20:1	Conceded	[1] 21:19	Deregulated
lity	[1] 44:20	Crucial [1] 20:6	[1] 33:10 Design
1] 46:17	Concedes	Current	[1] 20:10
larification	[1] 38:17 Concern	[1] 15:15	Designate
lass	[2] 17:6 18:23	Customer	[2] 25:8 40:3
1] 26:16	Concerned	[9] 19:19 19:19 26:21 26:22 32:25 34: 5 51:18 51:22 51:23	
lassified	[2] 35:23 41:15	Customer-by-customer	[2] 25:14 44:8 Designation
l <u>]</u> 46:14	Concur	[1] 19:19	[1] 14:22
lear	[2] 16:4 40:10 Conditioned	Customers	Desire
[] 21:23 learly	Conditioned [1] 4:20	[7] 7:20 27:3 27:4 33:13 33:19 35:13	[1] 42:9
2] 7:21 40:17	Conditions	45:23	Detail
LEC	[1] 39:12	D	[2] 37:19 37:23
] 16:14 32:9	Confidential		Detailed [1]37:22
lient	[9] 8:5 8:6 8:20 9:15 10:16 10:23 35: 17 37:14 41:25	Dakota [10] 1:3 2:12 2:13 8:11 32:7 32:10 39:	Determination
] 40:15 40:15 44:25 lients	Confidentiality	14 54:1 54:7 54:12	[1] 18:25
11 16:3 16:8 40:16 41:5	[5] 8:1 11:21 14:8 14:13 14:20	Darla	Determine
		[1] 1:23	[2] 31:21 33:21
ode	Configuration	Data	Dictate

Word Index			
[1] 48:6	[1] 2:13	[3] 18:5 25:6 41:2	[2] 18:2 44:11
Difference	Economic	Farris	Fully
[1] 10:13	[2] 8:16 28:21	[1] 1:19	[2] 1:6 7:23
Different	Efforts	Farthest	Function
[6] 7:5 14:7 40:23 41:16 43:22 49:6 Differently	[1] 34:5	[1] 39:1	[1] 45:1
[1] 43:10	Eight [3] 18:10 18:21 35:12	Fashion	Functional
Difficult	Either	[4] 22:4 24:23 32:16 44:6 FCC	[3] 37:6 45:2 45:7
[3] 33:21 42:19 49:22	[4] 16:20 35:5 47:20 50:16	[1] 30:7	Functionally [5] 28:9 28:16 36:25 39:11 46:4
Disagree	Emphasize	Fence	Functions
[1] 10:15	[1] 14:4	[1] 33:1	[1] 14:11
Disclose	Encourage	Fibercom	Fundamental
[6] 16:17 19:17 26:1 35:25 41:25 44:	[2] 50:15 51:4 End	[1] 5:8	[1] 13:2
Disclosed	[3] 12:23 22:13 44:21	Figure	Furthermore
[7] 9:19 11:13 11:14 16:8 21:12 44:10	Enter	[2] 5:2 24:24 File	[1] 16:12
44:12	[5] 7:12 9:2 9:5 44:2 44:9	[4] 6:4 39:7 52:18 52:23	Future [3] 45:22 45:24 46:3
Disclosing	Entered	Filed	[3] 43:22 43:24 40:3 Futures
[2] 16:9 16:11	[1] 8:21	[11] 5:7 5:13 5:16 7:2 7:3 10:12 13:	[1] 45:20
Disclosure [7] 9:1 11:4 14:4 17:25 20:5 22:5 22:	Enters	21 15:21 31:11 33:8 52:15	[2] 10.00
12	[1] 25:13	Filing	\mathbf{G}
Discovery	Entitled	[2] 7:7 53:4	
[9] 5:5 6:22 47:1 47:4 47:13 47:17 50·	[1] 48:5 Entry	Filings	Gary [7] 1:13 2:3 12:17 24:3 46:16 47:11
2 52:20 53:5	[1] 9:17	Finance	48:14
Discuss	Enunciated	[5] 19:8 19:12 21:2 21:5 21:6	Gather
[3] 4:18 15:25 17:17 Discussion	[1] 16:19	Financial	[1] 19:3
[2] 3:23 25:7	Equipment	[1] 22:25	Geared
Discussions	[1] 37:11	Fine	[1] 19:12
[1] 40:14	Equivalent	[1] 13:8	General
Dismiss	[7] 28:9 28:16 37:1 39:11 45:2 45:7 46:4	Finish	[1] 41:9 Generalized
[1] 5:11	Especially	[1] 52:17 First	[1] 40:1
Dispose	[5] 16:12 31:3 36:5 41:17 47:9	[10] 4:9 6:21 10:2 27:18 31:7 39:9 42:	1
[1] 6:12	Essential	25 47:10 51:16 51:24	[1] 51:23
Disseminate [1] 23:20	[1] 7:12	Fit	Gerdes
Disseminating	Essentially	[2] 12:9 40:12	[18] 1:23 4:19 7:6 13:14 21:15 24:13
[1] 48:23	[3] 7:4 7:15 13:18	Fitting	25:4 25:7 25:18 34:18 34:21 34:22 35 1 36:18 36:21 37:7 38:6 38:9
Dissemination	Evans [2] 13:10 20:1	[1] 40:22 Five	Given
[1] 23:8	Event	[3] 41:3 43:21 48:19	[2] 24:9 50:21
Distance	[1] 11:10	[5] 41.5 45.21 46:19 Flawed	Glad
[1] 13:20	Exact	[1] 14:14	[1] 29:20
Distributes	[1] 31:14	Flip	Goodwin
[1] 23:9 Diversity	Exactly	[2] 29:3 30:23	[5] 2:7 3:15 3:16 16:2 40:14
[1] 49:5	[2] 13:25 41:8	Floor	Grant
Docket	Example	[1] 21:3	[3] 5:5 5:6 5:10 Granted
[10] 9:4 9:7 9:19 9:20 24:8 30:8 30:9	[2] 26:15 45:21 Except	Flushing	[3] 9:17 12:2 15:21
40:19 41:11 48:14	[1] 48:2	[1] 49:4 Follow	Granting
Documents	Exception	[1] 9:24	[2] 11:17 15:11
[4] 7:7 47:8 50:6 52:23	[1] 21:2	Following	Great
Done [5] 15:10 29:21 38:1 38:11 51:2	Exchange	[1] 2:10	[3] 3:19 15:3 32:20
Dot	[5] 1:6 15:2 18:14 32:11 39:10	Forecast	Greater
[3] 34:21 34:21 34:21	Expect	[4] 28:14 28:24 45:23 45:23	[1] 47:16
Douglas	[3] 44:3 49:9 49:23	Forecasts	Greg [1] 1:17
[1] 1:19	Explain [1] 39:14	[1] 7:20 Foregoing	Group
Down	Extent	[1] 54:10	[2] 21:9 30:4
[4] 35:11 38:17 41:2 41:12 Driven	[6] 28:11 28:16 34:8 39:15 39:24 46:2	Forever	Groups
[1] 3:25		[1] 38:13	[1] 18:15
Drove	\mathbf{F}	Form	Gude
[1] 4:1	Facilities	[1] 19:3	[5] 19:7 22:24 23:14 23:14 48:24 Guess
DSS	[12] 7:20 27:3 28:1 28:14 30:25 31:15	Formal	[9] 4:9 17:2 17:23 26:19 27:5 27:18
[1] 32:3	32:23 32:24 34:4 39:16 39:19 40:2	[1] 6:5 Formally	29:3 30:23 31:7
Due	Fact	[1] 51:2	Guesses
[2] 5:23 10:14	[10] 5:23 10:18 10:22 12:4 16:5 19:15 25:4 36:7 36:8 45:15	Forney	[1] 27:7
Duly-appointed [1] 54:8	Factor	[1] 1:20	Guts
[-] OTIO	[1] 20:6	Forth	[1] 35:11
${f E}$	Factors	[5] 7:18 10:21 11:9 16:4 50:14	Н
The state of the s	[5] 28:4 28:6 28:24 28:25 43:15	Forward	
E-mailed	Facts	[6] 14:25 27:23 32:22 49:13 52:25 52: 25	Hammer
[1] 5:19 Ears	[1] 21:13	Four	[1] 22:12
[1] 15:16	Fair [1] 25:1	[1] 28:19	Hand [5] 14:17 14:18 27:6 40:10 41:7
Easier	Fairly	Frankly	[5] 14:17 14:18 27:6 40:19 41:7 Handle
[1] 5:1	[1] 50:20	[1] 49:18	[1] 5:25
Easiest	Familiar	Frazier	Handled
[1] 38:20	[1] 46:23	[1] 1:16	[1] 15:14
East	Far	Front	Hands
DDEOLON DEDODERN			

Word Index [1] 27:11 [2] 9:10 18:22 [1] 51:21 [1] 21:9 Hanson Incumbent Intrastate Larry [6] 1:13 3:21 4:1 4:5 41:20 41:21 [1] 34:12 [1] 51:22 [7] 2:6 3:13 18:2 20:16 24:12 30:14 Hard Indicate Involve 30:16 [2] 27:10 40:19 [2] 13:22 14:10 [4] 17:2 22:1 22:7 25:25 Last Harlan Indicated Involved **[13]** 4:16 7:1 7:3 8:3 12:20 13:16 14: [1] 1:17 [3] 7:7 44:5 44:18 6 16:1 30:3 37:24 46:20 46:20 50:5 [8] 15:16 20:8 20:13 20:14 20:17 24:7 Heads Indicating 32:8 32:18 Law [1] 53:2 T17 45:23 Involving [9] 18:5 18:18 18:23 19:1 19:11 20:19 26:9 30:19 45:19 Heads-up Individuals [1] 20:5 [1] 53:2 [3] 17:24 20:13 24:6 Lawsuit Issue Heard [14] 8:22 10:9 16:1 16:7 25:24 38:4 [1] 47:14 Influence 39:18 43:25 45:16 47:1 49:24 50:11 [5] 12:20 19:14 32:17 40:7 43:6 Lead **[1]** 28:18 Hearing 50:17 50:20 [1] 9:22 Information [9] 11:9 12:20 14:6 16:2 23:3 23:4 24: [105] 7:11 7:19 8:1 8:5 8:6 8:7 8:12 8: Issues Learn 14 8:15 8:19 8:23 8:25 9:6 9:7 9:11 9: 8 49:12 49:24 [12] 4:13 18:16 18:19 19:14 26:23 28: [2] 32:15 34:13 15 10:15 10:17 10:18 10:22 10:24 10: 25 30:20 47:18 49:4 49:8 49:10 49:20 Hearings Least 24 11:2 11:4 11:11 11:20 11:24 12:3 Item [1] 19:5 [6] 14:9 27:16 31:13 34:14 39:9 49:14 12:7 12:10 13:2 13:4 13:7 13:21 13: Heaston [2] 6:13 42:16 Legal 22 14:2 14:17 14:21 14:24 15:3 15:5 Itself [**22**] 2:3 3:1 3:3 31:9 31:10 34:19 34: 19 39:3 39:5 39:5 39:21 42:13 43:6 [2] 7:13 17:1 15:14 16:6 16:6 16:10 16:11 16:16 16: [1] 24:10 Legislation 22 17:10 17:14 17:16 19:3 19:18 19: 43:11 43:19 44:17 51:9 51:11 51:11 [1] 34:11 20 20:11 21:10 23:5 23:8 23:11 23:20 52:4 52:21 53:6 J. 24:21 25:21 26:2 26:19 27:9 27:10 27: Letter Heather 17 27:21 27:21 27:24 29:8 30:24 31:1 [1] 4:16 Jacobson [1] 1:20 31:3 31:6 31:16 33:23 35:18 35:25 36: Level 6 36:7 36:8 36:12 37:5 38:22 41:4 41: 6 41:25 42:23 42:25 43:4 43:5 43:17 Held [1] 1:18 [5] 16:9 19:17 37:19 37:23 41:5 [1] 2:11 Jensen Liable [12] 2:3 12:17 12:19 24:2 24:3 24:5 43:23 44:9 44:23 45:11 45:20 47:21 Help [1] 27:7 46:16 46:16 46:21 47:24 48:8 48:15 [1] 23:7 47:22 48:7 50:13 50:21 50:24 51:15 Lies Jim Information's Helpful [1] 27:10 [2] 1:13 1:16 [1] 32:10 [1] 6:16 Lieu Innocently Job Helping [1] 11:17 [3] 14:9 18:8 29:12 [1] 18:8 [1] 23:5 Life Joe Insight HEREBY [1] 36:4 [2] 2:7 3:9 [1] 32:20 [1] 54:8 Light John Insights Hills [1] 20:10 [6] 1:15 17:22 20:17 25:19 26:25 48: [4] 5:7 12:15 12:16 12:18 [1] 35:19 Likelihood Insisting Hit [1] 15:4 Joining [1] 12:1 [1] 38:12 Limit [1] 3:7 Inspection Hoc [2] 14:16 21:15 Judge [2] 11:21 12:8 [3] 4:8 49:12 49:25 Limited [1] 20:2 Hold Instance [2] 9:7 46:9 Judgment [1] 19:6 [1] 28:20 Limiting [1] 12:9 Instead Homes [3] 9:18 22:8 22:9 Judicial [1] 40:21 [1] 33:17 [1] 42:3 Limits Integral Honorable [1] 21:19 July [1] 40:18 [2] 9:4 44:7 [8] 1:10 2:14 5:13 5:17 50:2 52:5 52: Line Integrity Hope [4] 3:20 29:23 32:1 35:3 8 54:13 [1] 25:11 [1] 50:1 Justification Lines Intend Hopefully [1] 13:10 [7] 27:25 30:25 32:2 32:9 33:14 35:14 [1] 50:20 [1] 50:23 44:14 Intended House Linn K [1] 10:13 [1] 32:19 [1] 12:20 HUGHES Intent K-I-M List [1] 54:3 [1] 34:10 [1] 23:24 [6] 18:2 18:9 35:12 35:22 40:2 40:3 Intentionally Keith Listed [1] 4:3 [1] 1:18 [1] 24:6 Inter Kelly Literally Identified [1] 51:21 [1] 1:16 [1] 14:20 [1] 22:24 Interest Litigation Kennebec Identify [1] 36:10 [1] 4:2 [2] 9:14 44:1 [1] 24:25 Interested Kept Lives ILEC [1] 42:2 [1] 8:14 [1] 20:24 [1] 32:9 Interesting Kill Living Impacts **[1]** 26:4 [1] 47:5 [1] 19:2 [1] $\overline{3}6:4$ Interrogatories Kim Local Impasse [5] 19:4 31:12 39:9 43:9 51:14 [7] 23:6 23:18 23:22 23:25 23:25 24:1 [4] 1:6 13:19 18:13 39:10 [1] 12:1 Interrogatory 48:22 Located Impractical [2] 31:25 39:6 Kind [2] 21:7 27:3 [1] 49:8 Interstate [3] 20:13 37:17 43:18 Location In-house [1] 51:22 Knot [4] 26:17 28:1 30:25 31:14 [2] 20:5 20:7 Intervene [1] 42:3 Locations Inaudible [2] 47:6 47:15 Knowing [7] 3:24 5:18 9:25 10:12 32:3 42:3 49: [1] 21:8 Intervened [2] 32:22 33:23 Logic [2] 46:25 47:12 Knowledge [1] 26:20 Incentive Intervener [1] 19:20 Lohnes [1] 47:6 [1] 25:1 KYM [4] 2:4 3:4 3:6 3:6 Include Interveners [1] 23:22

[9] 9:23 12:12 15:8 27:19 29:3 37:25

47:3 50:22 51:1

IntraLATA

[1] 43:5

[1] 29:8

Included

Including

[16] 7:16 21:19 28:5 28:19 28:22 32:6

33:4 33:17 35:16 36:5 36:23 39:6 40:

Look

1 41:10 41:21 50:13

 \mathbf{L}

Large

Word Index Looked Mentioned Network Open [1] 22:7 [3] 14:6 40:13 42:13 [2] 31:17 40:1 [1] 31:7 Looking Merely Networks Operate [9] 31:25 34:22 36:3 36:11 36:22 39: 121 8:3 8:5 [1] 32:23 [2] 32:20 32:24 22 39:23 51:17 52:7 Met New Opinion Looks [2] 7:3 42:16 [3] 7:2 7:13 45:23 [2] 17:1 52:22 [2] 32:4 42:18 Method Next Opportunity Looming [1] 25:22 [5] 6:5 12:14 13:12 39:20 50:1 [1] 34:12 [1] 50:3 Michele Nine Opposed Lost [1] 1:19 [6] 31:24 31:25 33:2 35:4 35:10 37:21 [2] 16:11 27:23 [2] 24:15 31:21 Midco Nobody Opposing [2] 7:3 50:12 [4] 12:24 17:16 25:17 52:14 [2] 43:22 48:7 \mathbf{M} Midco's Nobody's Opposition [1] 7:5 [1] 52:15 [1] 43:15 Mail Midcontinent None Orally [1] 5:20 [6] 5:8 13:13 14:18 14:21 14:23 15:21 [2] 18:24 20:17 [2] 27:16 49:20 Mailbox MidState Nonsense Order [1] 5:18 [4] 5:8 7:4 16:13 16:21 [1] 26:8 [24] 5:7 6:23 7:12 8:21 9:3 9:5 9:9 9: Mailed MidState's 18 9:23 11:19 15:15 15:21 16:19 18: Northern [1] 5:17 11 22:4 22:21 24:18 24:18 24:23 25: [1] 7:10 [4] 5:9 7:4 7:10 16:21 Maintaining 13 25:14 39:20 44:2 44:9 Notary Might [2] 10:17 12:3 Organization [13] 11:7 12:4 12:9 19:25 26:24 33:16 [2] 54:6 54:18 Manner [5] 18:18 18:24 21:6 29:10 29:13 34:16 35:8 35:22 36:7 36:11 38:23 40: Note [2] 9:8 15:13 11 Organizations [1] 15:25 Manufacture Mind [1] 25:17 Nothing [1] 26:7 [1] 6:20 Otherwise [5] 7:2 7:13 21:18 47:11 53:3 Map Mindful [4] 42:24 48:11 51:5 52:20 Notice [1] 35:16 [1] 50:2 Ought [2] 9:10 49:24 Market Minimum [1] 32:5 Number [31] 7:20 7:22 26:25 27:25 28:5 28:7 [3] 22:19 22:20 41:2 Outside [22] 14:16 16:4 22:20 24:8 27:4 27:25 28:12 28:15 28:18 28:20 28:21 28:22 [3] 9:20 18:16 22:9 Misinformation 28:13 28:19 31:24 31:24 33:2 33:17 28:23 28:25 31:4 31:5 31:22 32:22 33: [1] 18:7 33:19 33:24 33:24 35:4 35:10 35:13 Own 3 33:6 33:11 33:13 33:14 33:15 33:16 35:14 36:24 37:7 37:21 Miss [2] 16:16 39:16 33:17 34:3 34:16 35:15 44:23 47:19 Numbers [1] 38:12 Market's Monetary [4] 30:25 32:1 32:2 40:6 P [1] 46:8 [1] 22:11 Marketing Pam O [6] 21:7 27:21 28:15 30:20 32:18 45: Monopoly [1] 1:21 [1] 34:12 Oath Pants Most. Markets [2] 29:20 29:21 [1] 49:10 [5] 18:23 20:23 26:4 29:22 49:16 [1] 30:2 Objected Papers Motion Marsha [1] 52:14 [1] 7:18 [16] 5:5 5:11 6:22 6:23 9:17 10:23 11: [1] 19:7 Paragraph Objection 18 12:2 15:11 15:19 15:20 16:4 16:19 Marsha's [6] 14:25 15:6 25:10 35:4 35:10 52:15 [1] 10:21 31:13 52:12 53:4 [1] 19:9 Objections Pardon Motions Marti [2] 35:9 49:6 [5] 5:6 7:3 25:20 49:15 52:19 [1] 30:15 [6] 22:24 23:3 23:13 23:14 23:15 48: Objectives Move Part. [3] 13:12 17:18 24:9 [1] 20:20 [8] 14:5 15:11 21:14 21:20 30:8 31:13 Marti's 43:2 46:11 Obligations Moved [1] 23:16 Partially **[1]** 3:22 [1] 47:16 Mary [3] 2:4 3:4 3:6 Obtain [1] 35:5 Must Participating [1] 25:22 [2] 48:10 48:10 Match Obtainable [1] 9:4 [1] 19:25 N [1] 25:24 Particular Matt Obviously [17] 5:25 8:8 9:23 26:16 26:17 26:18 [3] 2:4 3:2 5:16 29:9 33:20 34:2 35:24 36:4 36:9 40:5 Name [3] 18:12 30:6 38:5 Matter 41:6 42:16 52:10 52:19 [1] 19:9 Occur [6] 1:5 2:12 10:10 12:12 15:9 24:8 Named Parties [2] 22:5 42:17 McCaulley [6] 2:4 3:2 5:15 5:16 10:6 10:7 [17] 4:10 4:25 8:19 17:5 21:18 26:1 [1] 23:17 Occurred. 27:15 30:24 36:2 42:12 43:2 49:5 49: Names [**1**] 42:20 23 50:15 51:4 52:9 52:17 McComsey [3] 19:22 50:16 50:23 Occurring [3] 1:24 54:5 54:18 Parties' Narrow [1] 45:25 Mean [1] 6:23 [1] 41:11 Occurs [17] 19:24 22:17 22:18 25:7 26:7 26: Party Narrowed [1] 42:8 25 27:2 29:22 31:24 38:14 38:22 41:4 [8] 22:6 22:10 25:16 45:4 47:13 47:15 [2] 4:13 41:2 Offer 46:13 48:9 48:21 48:22 48:24 47:17 47:17 Nature [2] 25:4 41:4 Means Pass [6] 10:14 11:3 12:10 22:15 31:14 42: Offered [3] 17:10 25:25 36:9 [1] 43:4 [1] 21:15 Meant Passed Necessarily Offering [1] 33:5 [1] 33:18 [1] 33:18 [1] 36:7 Measures Pending Necessary Omaha [1] 28:21 [1] 49:15 [2] 22:6 27:22 [1] 21:6 Meet People Necessity Once [2] 31:22 31:22 **[46]** 5:23 9:3 14:8 14:16 16:10 17:25 [1] 43:4 [1] 35:25 18:3 18:9 18:10 18:21 18:24 19:7 19: Meeting Need 8 19:12 19:23 20:17 20:22 20:24 21:1 One [7] 4:8 4:16 6:1 6:6 8:8 13:16 49:25 [13] 8:17 22:18 22:20 22:21 32:13 39: [30] 4:19 4:21 5:4 8:2 13:19 14:17 14: 20 16:4 17:11 19:14 20:24 22:2 24:3 21:2 21:5 21:7 21:10 21:20 22:8 22: Meetings 19 41:9 41:10 42:14 45:20 48:19 49:1 $20\ 23:1\ 23:2\ 23:2\ 23:2\ 23:4\ 23:9\ 23:$ [1] 30:6 51:12 24:13 27:13 27:15 27:19 33:8 33:24 21 25:15 41:3 42:21 43:22 44:3 44:7 Mehlhaff Needs 35:23 37:7 37:24 40:11 40:22 42:7 43: 44:11 44:22 47:6 48:6 48:19 48:25 50: [1] 1:16 [5] 7:17 8:15 31:2 39:22 41:3 11 45:3 45:6 45:10 50:5 Members Negotiation Onerous People's [3] 11:6 11:16 13:17 [1] 40:25 [1] 51:15 [1] 5:20

Per **[1]** 14:12 [5] 3:23 15:19 17:8 17:18 18:8 Provisioning [1] 29:24 [3] 51:17 51:18 51:21 Presuming Redraft Percentage [1] 21:11 Public [1] 38:14 Pretty [1] 26:16 Reference [6] 1:2 1:12 19:20 20:20 54:6 54:18 [3] 21:23 39:24 49:8 Perform Publicly [2] 14:10 26:17 [1] 37:15 Preventing Referencing [2] 19:18 37:9 Perhaps [1] 53:3 [1] 20:4 Pursue [3] 12:22 40:21 41:15 Price [1] 42:14 Referred Period [1] 29:25 [1] 10:20 Put [1] 34:21 Prices Referring [12] 6:18 18:8 19:3 19:4 22:22 26:13 27:23 29:19 29:20 31:3 35:16 42:9 Periodically [1] 28:20 [1] 33:12 Pricing Putting [1] 38:14 Reflect [1] 45:22 [1] 20:10 Permits [1] 22:1 Primarily [1] 22:4 Refuse [1] 35:10 Person О [1] 48:7 [11] 14:22 19:10 20:14 20:25 23:6 23: Primary Refusing Quality [1] 27:8 16 23:18 23:19 25:14 38:25 48:24 [1] 15:6 [1] 44:22 Personnel Problem Regard Questions [3] 20:5 20:8 22:9 [7] 17:6 24:15 24:16 39:2 42:20 52:19 [7] 16:7 16:12 36:13 40:14 40:15 40: 23 41:5 [16] 5:4 6:21 7:24 17:12 17:13 17:21 17:22 27:14 31:11 35:6 35:6 35:8 36: 52:21 Perspective Procedure [3] 33:22 41:16 41:17 Regarding 9 37:23 41:20 49:2 Phoenix [1] 30:5 [3] 7:19 17:14 53:4 Quick [1] 20:25 Proceed Registered [1] 4:2 Phone [6] 9:12 9:13 10:6 12:17 48:10 52:20 [2] 54:5 54:19 Quoting Proceeding [1] 46:23 Regulatory [1] 20:2 Physically [1] 48:12 [3] 18:15 18:16 18:19 Qwest [2] 20:21 46:7 Proceedings Reiterate [48] 1:6 9:6 10:11 10:22 11:1 11:5 11: Picked [3] 1:9 2:11 54:11 [1] 24:14 25 12:1 13:19 13:25 14:2 14:3 14:8 [1] 5:18 Process Related 14:11 14:15 14:16 15:20 16:15 18:11 [2] 23:11 42:4 Pierre [2] 27:24 35:18 18:12 20:15 25:15 26:21 27:19 27:20 [2] 2:13 54:12 Produce Relationship 29:10 31:2 32:21 33:7 33:19 34:2 34: [9] 7:6 7:8 8:20 8:23 26:25 47:20 48: Place 11 34:16 37:3 38:11 38:20 39:7 39:13 [1] 20:12 [2] 8:9 42:25 3 50:6 50:8 40:20 41:2 41:7 41:22 43:5 47:2 48: Relevance Produced 10 50:5 50:24 50:25 Placed [1] 35:24 [1] 9:6 Qwest's [1] 5:18 Relevancy Producible [19] 5:5 6:14 6:22 11:17 14:21 14:23 Plan [1] 7:24 15:4 16:10 22:17 24:20 25:11 25:23 [1] 26:19 [**2**] 34:9 35:16 Relevant 31:20 32:5 39:8 39:13 39:18 42:8 49:7 Products Plans [5] 7:21 8:25 11:11 11:12 28:12 [1] 30:2 [3] 31:17 32:15 36:11 Remedy R Professional Plant [1] 44:6 [2] 54:6 54:19 [1] 32:24 Remember Raised Proffered Players [2] 13:18 30:20 [3] 7:24 49:7 49:20 [1] 25:18 [1] 40:23 Remote Randy Point Proof [1] 40:4 [4] 23:6 23:18 23:25 48:22 [2] 27:8 45:24 [6] 8:2 15:19 19:24 49:13 49:21 50:4 Repeat Rapid Proportionate Points [1] 11:7 [2] 24:3 46:17 [1] 51:22 [1] 15:7 Repeater Rates Proposal Policy [1] 40:3 [3] 18:25 28:10 39:12 [2] 4:20 14:15 [8] 18:5 18:18 18:23 19:1 19:11 20:19 Repeating Read Propose 20:20 30:19 [1] 7:1 [5] 19:25 28:6 48:13 48:14 48:15 [2] 49:11 50:16 Posed Report Readily Proposition [1] 31:12 [4] 32:1 32:7 32:8 32:9 [1] 37:1 [1] 38:12 Posing Reported Reading [1] 38:6 Proprietary [1] 1:24 [1] 36:19 [2] 26:2 31:16 Position Reporter Real [7] 16:5 16:18 18:4 25:23 37:22 48:4 Protect [3] 54:6 54:9 54:19 [1] 4:2 [4] 11:3 11:4 12:10 26:6 Represent Really Positions Protected $[1] \overline{29:21}$ [13] 16:13 16:13 16:25 17:18 18:5 22: [1] 18:5 [2] 16:17 34:7 Request 18 25:24 27:15 34:9 35:11 38:20 47:5 Possibilities Protection [11] 7:11 9:16 16:20 38:14 41:13 42: 51:18 [1] 41:13 [2] 22:6 40:17 Reason 11 43:2 52:3 52:10 52:20 53:4 Possible Protections [3] 15:18 30:8 43:16 Requested [3] 11:15 41:2 50:17 [1] 12:8 [2] $\bar{4}$:10 27:17 Reasonable Post Protective Requesting [1] 8:15 [1] 43:10 [15] 5:7 6:23 7:12 8:21 9:3 9:18 11: [1] $\overline{42}$:11 Reasons 18 15:15 15:21 16:19 18:11 22:4 24: Potential Requests [1] 35:17 17 24:18 24:23 [2] 25:8 32:25 [1] 38:2 Rebuttal Prove Power Require [1] 50:8 [3] 42:23 44:24 48:6 [6] 28:7 28:18 28:21 28:22 28:25 31:5 Recap [2] 9:19 11:19 Proverbial Prairie Required [1] 13:16 [20] 5:7 5:10 5:13 10:2 10:3 10:5 10: [1] 27:9 [5] 8:13 21:10 41:25 43:23 44:23 Receive 11 10:17 11:15 11:18 12:1 16:5 17:3 Provide Requirements [3] 23:20 44:8 52:2 25:5 29:7 29:15 31:8 34:16 39:16 39: [4] 37:8 37:16 39:10 46:4 [2] 11:22 47:12 Received Provided [3] 4:19 5:24 23:5 Requiring Precisely [3] 13:10 32:1 37:17 [3] 12:6 16:16 22:10 Reclassification [1] 43:13 Providers Residential [2] 42:10 43:22 Prepare [4] 28:12 36:25 37:5 37:8 [2] 35:14 51:23 Reclassify [1] 19:5 Provides [3] 1:6 7:17 7:22 Resolution Preparing [1] 22:6 Recognize [1] 11:15 [1] 19:11 Proving [1] 19:9 Resolvable Presently [2] 47:3 47:25 [1] 38:4 Record

Word Index

[1] 49:12 Resolve [1] 54:9 [2] 10:13 10:14 Scheduled Shortly SS [1] 49:25 Resolved [1] 3:7 [1] 54:2 Schuele [2] 4:13 4:24 Show [3] 2:7 3:9 3:10 [5] 28:15 44:23 45:12 45:24 46:1 Resolving Scope [1] 41:13 Shows [2] 25:23 39:25 [1] $4\bar{1}:11$ Respectfully [1] 35:2 [1] 9:16 SDCL Sic [1] 11:23 [1] 19:7 Respond [7] 6:3 6:3 19:4 29:11 32:21 32:21 52: Seat Side [1] 49:9 [12] 8:23 14:2 14:3 15:4 24:15 24:21 29:3 29:15 32:5 32:6 32:18 33:1 Responded Seattle [1] 35:5 [1] 20:25 Sides [3] 13:25 22:2 25:2 Response Second [6] 6:5 6:10 31:2 31:13 33:4 39:8 [3] 51:7 51:13 52:11 Signed Secrecy **[5]** 14:8 18:3 18:11 18:21 19:23 Responses [3] 32:16 35:8 39:7 [1] 8:15 Significance Rest Secret [1] 25:16 [3] 12:11 21:1 45:4 [19] 8:7 8:10 8:12 10:18 10:24 11:1 Significant 11:11 12:3 12:4 13:3 16:6 26:9 26:12 [2] 18:13 22:11 Restrict 31:19 32:15 36:13 40:18 47:22 51:19 Similar [1] 8:25 Secrets [1] 20:10 Retail [5] 10:25 11:1 16:17 26:6 33:25 [7] 13:24 14:2 14:11 15:4 18:25 20:18 Simmons 29:15 See [9] 2:5 3:5 3:7 25:8 25:13 35:2 35:19 35:21 50:13 [16] 12:14 14:17 14:21 14:23 17:16 Reveal [1] 29:9 21:10 33:1 35:22 41:3 43:12 43:19 48: [1] 33:22 Simple 14 48:20 48:23 49:1 51:1 Revenue [1] 50:20 Seeing [4] 51:17 51:19 51:20 51:21 Simply [2] 22:2 22:3 [1] 11:19 Revenues Seek [1] 33:15 Sinks [3] 7:22 43:1 47:13 [1] 22:2 Reverse Seeking [1] 26:20 Sit [1] 8:12 [2] 40:20 51:15 Review [1] 38:17 Sees [3] 6:17 24:20 50:25 Sitting [1] 17:9 [2] 12:21 43:21 Reviewed Sell [1] 22:21 Situation [1] 20:7 [1] 37:15 [1] 13:9 Rise Step Send [1] 36:10 Six [1] 23:9 [5] 14:7 18:21 35:12 41:3 43:22 Rislov Senger [1] 1:17 Size [1] 1:18 [4] 25:17 28:13 40:11 40:22 Road Sense [1] 3:25 Small [2] 6:12 51:3 ROBERT [5] 14:18 16:14 24:16 41:1 41:17 Sensitive [1] 1:12 Smith [7] 9:14 11:3 11:25 13:7 36:12 43:25 [28] 1:15 17:23 18:1 19:23 19:24 20: Rock [1] 7:20 47.9 21 21:9 21:21 23:12 23:22 24:1 24:2 [1] 27:9 Sentence 24:4 25:19 25:19 26:14 36:15 36:20 Rogers [1] 52:17 36:22 37:24 38:8 39:3 39:4 39:17 44: [6] 1:23 15:23 15:24 36:21 40:8 40:9 5 48:17 48:17 48:19 Separate Rogers' Snapshot $[1] \bar{5}:4$ [2] 44:14 44:25 [1] 31:5 Separated Rolayne Solve [1] 20:22 [1] 1:15 [1] 39:2 Separately Role [1] 47:8 Someone [1] 44:19 [1] 29:9 [2] 23:19 46:8 Served Roles [1] 9:9 [4] 12:22 51:13 52:9 52:12 Sometimes [1] 14:10 [2] 22:8 33:16 Service Rolled [11] 7:18 13:20 26:16 37:15 37:16 37: Somewhat [1] 43:14 16 39:12 39:13 45:2 46:4 51:18 [1] 7:5 Rook [1] 30:6 Services Soon [4] 23:1 23:17 23:18 48:25 [9] 1:6 18:25 28:9 28:11 28:16 29:24 [1] 3:21 Room [1] 16:1 37:1 39:10 39:11 Sorry [1] 2:12 [1] 10:9 RPR [10] 7:18 10:21 11:9 16:4 32:24 35:2 Sort [1] 1:24 39:9 51:13 51:16 51:25 [6] 26:20 31:17 33:22 34:5 34:7 49:16 Rule Seven Sorts [1] 49:9 [2] 14:7 41:3 [1] 34:8 Ruling Several Sought [1] 49:14 [1] 38:15 [3] 10:15 10:22 16:6 Sevold Sounds S [3] 2:6 3:11 3:12 [1] 50:12 Shall SAHR [4] 5:4 5:6 5:10 11:23 [10] 1:3 2:12 2:13 8:11 32:7 32:10 39: [44] 1:12 3:1 3:4 3:8 3:11 3:13 3:15 3: Share

17 3:19 3:24 4:3 4:7 4:23 5:22 6:7 6: 11 9:21 10:1 10:4 12:13 12:16 13:8 15:22 16:23 17:20 27:13 29:2 29:7 30: 22 34:17 34:20 34:24 36:14 40:7 41: 19 42:5 46:19 49:2 50:10 51:10 52:2 52:6 52:16 53:7 Satisfy [2] 11:22 41:10

Schedule

[17] 19:19 27:25 28:5 28:20 31:4 31: 22 33:3 33:6 33:11 33:13 33:14 33:15 33:16 33:17 35:15 42:22 47:19 Shorten [1] 52:12 Shortening [1] 52:14 Shorthand

14 54:1 54:7 54:12 Speaking [1] 30:12 Specific [3] 19:18 26:1 27:16 Specificity [1] 8:13 Spot

[1] 27:10 Staff [4] 1:14 16:23 16:25 17:19 Stage Stand [1] 16:18 Standard [1] 20:13 Standards [1] 31:22 Standpoint [2] 22:18 39:18 Starla [3] 23:1 23:17 48:25 Start [3] 3:22 6:24 10:5 Started [2] 4:8 48:12 State [5] 1:3 2:12 30:5 54:1 54:7 Statements States [6] 18:13 18:16 18:17 18:17 21:22 28: [5] 28:6 29:1 36:19 43:16 43:24 Statutes Statutory [3] 7:16 47:11 48:5 Steel [1] 39:20 Still **[9]** 3:3 16:10 38:16 44:21 44:23 44:24 50:2 50:3 50:4 Strictly [3] 19:1 20:19 37:21 Studies Stuff [3] 34:7 48:20 51:19 Subelements [1] 51:20 Subject [3] 9:17 12:8 27:12 Subjected Submission Submit [1] 24:24 Submitting Subsequent Substitute [3] 28:9 37:1 39:11 Subsumed [1] 28:24 Suggest [2] 40:11 50:22 Suggesting [2] 22:14 39:2 Suggestion [2] 4:15 17:3 Suggests [1] 11:17 Summary [1] 38:3 Support [7] 19:10 20:25 23:1 23:4 23:16 23:18 Supporting [1] 20:20 Supposed

	Word Index			
	[1] 26:7 Suppositions	[14] 2:5 2:5 3:5 3:7 3:17 4:15 17:24 22:18 23:12 24:6 25:19 26:15 43:8 48:	${f V}$	Y
1	[2] 14:13 27:11	17	Valley	
-	Supreme [3] 8:11 10:19 20:4	Took [1] 46:20	[3] 5:9 7:4 16:21	Year [1] 36:8
	Sureties	Top	Valley's [1]7:10	Years
	[1] 22:11 Survey	[1] 36:24 Total	Valuable	[3] 30:3 32:12 35:12
ı	[3] 36:6 36:6 46:10	[1] 14:7	[1] 17:15 Value	Yerger
	Surveys [3] 27:21 34:6 45:21	Totter [1] 22:2	[2] 8:16 51:20	[4] 19:8 23:1 23:15 23:16
		Towards	Various [3] 25:20 27:14 30:5	Yield
	T	[2] 19:12 27:24 Trade	Varying	[1] 12:11
	Talks [4] 10:20 28:7 28:8 28:19	[21] 8:7 8:10 8:12 10:18 10:24 10:25	[1] 45:8 Viable	
	Tape	10:25 11:10 12:3 12:4 13:3 16:6 16: 17 26:6 26:9 26:12 31:19 36:13 40:18	[1] 12:5	-
	[1] 54:10 Tape-recorded	47:22 51:19 Transcribed	Vice [5] 1:13 4:1 4:5 41:19 41:21	
	[2] 1:9 2:11	[1] 54:9	View	
	TC03-057 [1] 1:6	Transcript [2] 1:9 2:10	[1] 41:6 Volunteered	
	Technically	Treat	[1] 33:7	
	[1] 37:9 Teeter	[2] 8:12 44:18 Treated	W	
	[1] 22:2	[2] 8:6 44:15	Wait	
	Teeter-totter [1] 22:2	True [2] 32:19 45:15	[1] 52:11	
	Teitzel [14] 13:23 18:22 19:15 20:24 22:25	Truly	Wave [16] 5:7 5:13 10:2 10:3 10:5 10:11 10:	
	23:17 29:5 29:20 30:10 30:18 32:3 32:	[1] 26:9	17 11:15 11:18 12:1 25:5 29:7 31:8	
	18 39:22 48:25 Teitzel's	Try [4] 4:10 19:2 49:19 49:21	34:16 39:16 39:24 Wave's	
	[1] 33:9	Trying	[4] 5:10 16:5 17:3 29:16	
	Telecom [1] 5:9	[4] 24:23 32:14 46:22 48:8 Turn	Ways [1] 51:14	
	Telephone	[3] 12:6 16:21 47:8	Website	
	[3] 1:13 2:2 4:19 Term	Turned [2] 11:20 17:4	[2] 39:22 39:23 Welk	
	[1] 33:8	Two	[44] 2:5 3:17 3:18 4:14 4:15 6:2 6:4 6:	
	Terms [9] 17:24 22:19 25:22 25:23 26:15 28:	[11] 5:5 6:21 19:7 21:2 21:5 22:1 22: 23 22:25 28:25 30:3 33:24	8 6:15 6:24 6:25 10:16 10:19 18:1 19: 22 22:23 23:14 23:23 23:25 25:3 25:3	
1	10 37:21 39:1 39:12 Testifying	Type	26:4 26:23 28:3 28:4 29:4 29:6 29:17 43:8 43:8 44:13 44:20 45:14 46:1 47:	
	[1] 30:5	[14] 4:11 21:24 27:3 28:2 31:1 31:5 37:10 37:12 37:13 37:17 38:21 40:4	10 48:1 48:13 48:16 48:18 48:21 50:8	
	Testimony [6] 19:5 33:9 43:12 43:20 48:14 50:9	49:14 49:25 Types	50:25 52:11 52:24 Whole	
	Thanking	[2] 27:22 40:23	[1] 33:9	
	[1] 34:24 Themselves	T T	Wholesale [7] 13:25 14:3 14:11 19:15 19:16 19:	
	[1] 4:25	U.S.	21 32:5	
	They've [6] 31:21 33:8 44:20 45:14 46:9 48:3	[2] 20:4 20:7	Widget [3] 37:13 37:13 37:17	
	Thinking	Unable [1] 10:14	Wiest	
	[2] 40:21 43:13 Third	Under	[1] 1:15 Willing	
	[5] 5:12 6:13 22:9 47:13 47:17	[6] 11:20 14:19 24:17 29:19 29:20 51:	[6] 4:18 8:20 21:16 41:8 43:3 44:18 Wireless	
	Three [5] 5:4 5:10 29:1 36:24 36:24	Undermine	[2] 45:1 45:6	
	Tied [1] 30:11	[1] 34:15 Unfortunate	Witness [4] 19:9 22:25 23:17 30:19	
	Tim	[1] 5:1	[4] 19:9 22:25 23:17 30:19 Witnesses	
	[3] 2:7 3:15 16:2 Tina	Unintentionally	[4] 22:23 25:11 43:12 43:20	
	[1] 1:19	Unless	Wittler [3] 1:24 54:5 54:18	
	Title [2] 18:22 29:12	[1] 26:10 Untie	Wondering	
	Titles	[1] 42:2	[2] 4:12 24:5 Words	
	[2] 14:9 18:8 Today	Up	[1] 26:20	
	[11] 5:3 5:21 5:24 7:14 11:6 12:21 27:		Works [1] 5:2	
	15 45:25 49:21 51:6 53:1 Together	Update [1] 39:23	Worse	
	[2] 19:5 26:13	Urge	[1] 25:12 Worst	
	Toll [20] 2:6 3:13 3:14 18:2 18:3 18:9 18:	[1] 15:19 Uses	[1] 48:3	
1	10 20:16 20:23 21:14 23:24 24:11 24: 12 30:3 30:14 30:14 30:18 32:17 51:	[1] 39:16	Written [1]6:10	
	21 51:23	UTILITIES [2] 1:2 1:12	Wrongful	
	Toll's [1] 29:19	Utilize	[1] 22:12 Wrote	
	Tom	[1] 21:24	[1] 4:15	