

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

=====

IN THE MATTER OF PETITIONS FOR
SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF
47 U.S.C. SECTION 251(b)(2) OF THE
COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 AS
AMENDED IN DOCKETS TC04-038, TC04-044,
TC04-045, TC04-046, TC04-047, TC04-048
TC04-049, TC04-050, TC04-052, TC04-054,
TC04-055, TC04-056, TC04-060, TC04-061

=====

Transcript of Proceedings
December 14, 2004

ORIGINAL

=====

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
ROBERT SAHR, CHAIRMAN (by telephone)
GARY HANSON, VICE CHAIRMAN
JIM BURG, COMMISSIONER (not present)

COMMISSION STAFF
Rolayne Ailts Wiest
John Smith
Karen Cremer
Sara Harens
Greg Rislov
Harlan Best
Keith Senger
Dave Jacobson
Michele Farris
Jim Mehlhaff
Tina Douglas
Pam Bonrud

APPEARANCES

Darla Rogers
Talbot Wieczorek

Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR

PRECISION REPORTING
L I M I T E D

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE

- Colleen Sevold
- Suzan Stewart
- Marv Sorenson
- Jean Calligan
- Larry Hettinger
- Bill Heaston
- Jeff Larson
- Corey Kasuski
- Mary Lohnes
- Doug Eidahl
- Mark Ayotte
- Melissa Thompson
- Melanie Acord
- Steve Wegman
- Kae Ann Kelsch

= = = = =

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the
 above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State
 Capitol, Room 412, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre,
 South Dakota, on the 14th day of December 2004,
 commencing at 9:30 a.m.

1 VICE CHAIR HANSON: In the matter
2 of petitions for suspension or modification of
3 47 U.S.C. Section 251(b)(2) of the Communications
4 Act of 1934 as amended in dockets TC04-038, 044,
5 045, 046, 047, 048, 049, 050, 052, 054, 055, 056,
6 060, and 061, the petition of communications
7 companies for suspension of intermodal LNP
8 obligations.

9 Harlan, are you presenting this? Rolayne, are
10 you in charge?

11 MS. AILTS WIEST: I think we would
12 start with Western Wireless.

13 MR. SMITH: Western Wireless is the
14 mover in the Docket so they have the burden.

15 VICE CHAIR HANSON: Talbot.

16 MR. WIECZOREK: Thank you,
17 Commissioner. We have filed a Motion to reconsider
18 a number of the LNP dockets but not all of them.
19 And I'm not here to reiterate or go through our
20 brief again because there is several cites to the
21 findings that we think are incorrect in these
22 dockets that we have sought reconsideration on.
23 But there are a couple of points given that after
24 the ILECs filed their response brief that came up
25 that I'd like to address and just a couple of items

1 I'd like to hit upon.

2 The primary center around a couple of things.
3 First is the test under the statute, that's
4 47 U.S.C. 251(f)(2). There has been and I think
5 our brief goes through it where we think the
6 Commission made mistakes in these dockets by
7 intermingling its tests.

8 The ILECs take the position that because the
9 test -- there's no guidance in the statute of what
10 should be the test, that it's okay to intermingle
11 the analysis between these elements.

12 However, the statute clearly provides for a
13 two-part test. The first part really centers
14 around economic question. And the second part is
15 more of a public interest analysis. However, the
16 Commission in its findings and conclusions
17 essentially did a cost benefit analysis in reaching
18 both of those analysis. It is our position that
19 that is an inappropriate way to approach this.

20 The other really troubling aspect by these
21 decisions is the fact that the Commission grouped
22 these companies providing the exact same relief and
23 almost identical findings, even though these
24 companies are widely divergent on economic issues,
25 on the actual physical structure of the companies,

1 on whether they need switch upgrades or substantial
2 switch upgrades. And in doing so we essentially
3 looked at this analysis and believe it's incorrect.

4 In making its analysis and setting forth its
5 decisions this Commission has essentially said that
6 the economic impact to the Golden West Companies
7 which the Commission included was approximately
8 37 cents per line is identical to the impact of a
9 company that the projections are at \$5 a line.

10 That analysis was just broad based without any
11 findings that these people are the same, that the
12 companies are the same because they -- and you
13 couldn't find that. They simply are not the same.
14 For example, Golden West, as was obvious from
15 settlement with James Valley, the application of a
16 dedicated service line into an ILEC's area resolves
17 a number of problems. It resolves absolutely the
18 transport problem and allows LNP to be far easier
19 to accomplish.

20 Well, in those Golden West Companies we have
21 issues that they grouped the Golden West Companies,
22 and I'll touch base on that a little later, but
23 Golden West has direct interconnect with Western
24 Wireless. Vivian has two direct interconnects with
25 Western Wireless. Those eliminate those transport

1 issues. So essentially this Commission -- the
2 signal this Commission has given is that 37 cents
3 per line is too onerous and thus becomes a
4 significant economic burden to either the consumers
5 or an adverse economic impact on the company.

6 That threshold is less than half of what
7 current wireless customers pay Western Wireless for
8 the exact same type of technology. It is -- it's
9 not sustainable, frankly, Commission.

10 The other companies that we run into the same
11 problem with is ITC. We have three direct
12 interconnects with ITC. It eliminates the
13 transport issue. Yet the Commission spends as many
14 as 10 Findings of Fact on the transport issue. The
15 other company Venture we have three direct
16 interconnection with. Again, eliminates that
17 transport issue. And you're looking again at
18 Venture, which on their own per line projections if
19 you eliminate transport, was approximately 55 cents
20 per user. And yet you treat it like the same
21 companies it would cost \$5 per user in identical
22 treatment, almost identical findings and
23 conclusions.

24 Other problematic results, if you look at it,
25 you've treated the City of Brookings identical to

1 how you've treated the City of Faith. The City of
2 Brookings, the cost by their own projections is
3 approximately 74 cents. The City of Faith was
4 approximately \$2.50. We have not sought
5 reconsideration on your decision on the City of
6 Faith. They also had a substantial switch upgrade
7 issue, the City of Faith. Brookings not only has a
8 low cost, but they have their own wireless company
9 that's already LNP compliant. So they have all the
10 knowledge. They have all the experience right
11 there within the company, yet you have treated
12 these companies the same. I submit to you that
13 there is no economic reason why the City of
14 Brookings should be granted this stay.

15 The same applies for the Golden West
16 Companies, ITC, Venture, Alliance, Santel, and
17 Sioux Valley, and the other companies. Now the
18 one -- in our motions the one -- or in our brief
19 the one distinguishment we made is that we could
20 understand where we differ substantially but the
21 only company the staff projection that we differed
22 substantially with was granting any type of
23 extension to Sioux Valley. We could understand
24 granting a somewhat longer extension to the Santel,
25 Midstate, Valley, West River, McCook, Beresford,

1 Roberts and Aurora but not the year that -- they've
2 already gotten seven, eight months. They shouldn't
3 be entitled to the end of this next year.

4 Midstate's an interesting company too. Again,
5 you spend 10, 11, 12 Findings of Fact on the
6 transport issue. We have a direct interconnect
7 with Midstate. Midstate is also -- if I remember
8 the testimony correctly, is a CLEC already doing
9 competition and being LNP compliant in the
10 Chamberlain area, required to be that. So they
11 have the exact same experience and technology.
12 There's nothing holding them back except that cost
13 which is approximately 92 cents is what they
14 projected. 54 cents is what we projected. I
15 believe staff concluded in their brief it was
16 somewhere probably in between. And these are not
17 outrageous costs.

18 Again, that puts them right in line with what
19 wireless consumers have to pay with Western
20 Wireless. There's no analysis of the economic
21 burden as to any of these individuals.

22 Looking at these tests, the economic tests
23 being the threshold tests required under the
24 statute where you must find that it's necessary to
25 grant the suspension to avoid economic impact

1 besides just general testimony about, well, you
2 know, people in my community they don't have much
3 money so I bet you they won't like the extra
4 charge, you have nothing to go on. So essentially
5 the guidance this Commission, if you do not
6 reconsider and change your opinions is that you
7 know what, that's all it takes, if it's 37 cents,
8 that's an adverse economic impact.

9 And so I'm concerned. I don't believe that's
10 an adverse economic impact but for those companies
11 that it's a dollar now, well, heck they got plenty
12 of time to put this off. They can come back to the
13 Commission at the end of this year, the only
14 guidance you can give them is 37 cents is too much.

15 In doing this analysis you could -- don't even
16 get to the public interest aspect if the economic
17 aspect has not been met. And the record is not
18 there for any of these companies to meet the
19 economic impact aspect. They showed cost. They
20 didn't show any impact. They didn't show they
21 couldn't afford it.

22 I will give the ILECs one position they had in
23 their brief, and I believe the Commission has the
24 power to look at the first threshold test, the
25 economic test where it talks about significant

1 impact of the consumer or adverse economic impact
2 to the companies, and you can mingle those slightly
3 only because it's a little bit difficult as to tell
4 how much one company might have to spend versus how
5 much the customers are going to pick up on the line
6 on the line cost.

7 But the general testimony -- well, all the
8 testimony has been these line costs that were
9 estimated that you adopted were essentially going
10 to be about all the costs except for those few
11 companies that had actual physical switch necessary
12 upgrades. And these costs range easily within the
13 very costs that the consumers for cell companies
14 pay right now. And you have absolutely no
15 additional testimony that shows that these
16 individuals and these communities economically are
17 substantially different from the consumers that pay
18 for the wireless today.

19 Second, the use of demand in public interest I
20 can understand. But the use of demand to show
21 economic -- whether it's economic impact to
22 individuals simply cannot stand, and that's what
23 you did here. You used demand to justify your
24 decisions for the first element of the test and the
25 second element of the test. Your findings set that

1 forth, but you cannot use the same factual basis to
2 reach two elements of the test. The statute
3 clearly establishes separate tests.

4 That's all I'd have for you today unless you
5 had questions, Commissioners.

6 VICE CHAIR HANSON: Thank you,
7 Talbot. Don't both tests need to be met?

8 MR. WIECZOREK: Both elements of the
9 test need to be met. The statutes establish that
10 you have to find that it's necessary to avoid an
11 economic harm, whether it be as to the standard to
12 the individual business and only then do you go to
13 the second essentially public interest test --
14 second part of the test.

15 VICE CHAIR HANSON: So I'm curious.
16 Wouldn't the burden of proof rest on your shoulders
17 to show that there is a demand -- that there would
18 be a demand?

19 MR. WIECZOREK: Well, first, we
20 don't believe that the ILECs in this situation met
21 the first part of the test. Second, as to the
22 public interest test, I believe that that -- and
23 it's set forth in our brief that the Commission
24 erred in that area too. There was essentially
25 testimony and surveys that showed probably about a

1 15 percent migration over five years. That's
2 demand.

3 This migration actually fit pretty well with
4 the one -- the only ILEC that submitted any kind of
5 survey was Kennebec, and Kennebec's not on appeal
6 here -- or on reconsideration, excuse me. Elevate
7 you to a judge. But in that situation they had
8 people willing to pay a buck a month, about
9 12 percent of their people willing to pay a buck a
10 month to have this option.

11 And this tracks pretty close where you're
12 talking about 15 percent migration over five years,
13 12 percent from the get-go saying, yeah, I'll get
14 that because I want that option out there. I think
15 those numbers are pretty close. Kennebec,
16 according to the testimony submitted, was one of
17 the worst economically of all of the companies.
18 It's a smaller company, few lines.

19 Does that answer your question, Commissioner?

20 VICE CHAIR HANSON: It does. Thank
21 you very much.

22 Bob, do you have any questions?

23 CHAIRMAN SAHR: No, I don't.

24 VICE CHAIR HANSON: Thank you,
25 Talbot. Darla. Excuse me. Mrs. Rogers.

1 MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: Thank you.

2 Darla Rogers appearing on behalf of the Petitioners
3 in this Docket.

4 We disagree with the points made by Western
5 Wireless in this case. We believe that with the
6 possible exception of two of the orders which need
7 some further clarification with regard to the cost
8 that the Commission did a very careful and thorough
9 and proper analysis of the petition, all of the
10 petitions under the guidelines set forth in the
11 statutes.

12 First of all, Western Wireless argues that
13 there was an improper blending, so to speak, of the
14 public interest and economic elements. We believe
15 that that's incorrect. Section 251 does not
16 require any specific analysis or process of
17 analysis in determining if the elements are met.
18 So, as a matter of fact, blending of the elements
19 or not is not outside of the jurisdiction and
20 authority of this Commission.

21 I believe furthermore that the orders clearly
22 show that each element was considered. Within each
23 order this Commission found that there was
24 significant adverse impact on users. You found and
25 considered the range for each Petitioner with

1 regard to costs, and, again, the exceptions there
2 would be Venture and ITC, and those particular cost
3 figures were not included in the orders. And you
4 found that those costs for each Petitioner's case
5 were significant.

6 When you looked at, in addition, demand, that
7 was an additional element that the Commission
8 looked at, but that does not take away the analysis
9 that you did on the financial impact or the
10 economic burden. That was just an additional
11 factor you looked at. And there's nothing improper
12 in taking that action.

13 So, in fact, the tests that you applied are
14 even more stringent than are specifically required
15 by the statute.

16 Now you also used the demand in the cost
17 benefit analysis, which is the public interest part
18 of it, but other factors were used there as well.
19 You did talk about and consider the uncertainties
20 of the transport obligations. You considered the
21 porting interval. You considered the duty to
22 provide and preserve universal service. So you
23 didn't utilize the same test for both of the
24 economic factors and the public interest. You had
25 several factors for both tests, and the Petitioners

1 clearly met those costs.

2 With regard to the test of unduly economically
3 burdensome on both company and users, you did find
4 that that was your standard, but that was also
5 adequately addressed in your orders. You said that
6 LNP would require significant costs, and you looked
7 at the absence of customer requests, the
8 applicant's low demand of LNP, and the absence of
9 alternative wireless services.

10 All of those supported your findings that LNP
11 is unduly economically burdensome both to the
12 customers and to the companies.

13 I further disagree with Western Wireless that
14 there was an improper grouping of any of the
15 applicants. The evidence plainly supported your
16 findings in each of the cases. There was also no
17 improper shifting of the burden of proof. Each
18 Petitioner presented evidence of demand. Each
19 Petitioner presented evidence of cost. And, in
20 fact, the Commission found that the demand was
21 probably in between what the Petitioners estimated
22 and what Western Wireless estimated. That clearly
23 shows that you considered the evidence there. You
24 didn't shift the burden of proof, and the resulting
25 orders were the result of a proper viewing of the

1 evidence.

2 Joint filings, I don't believe that there is
3 any improper action by the Commission in that
4 regard. The evidence of the hearing clearly
5 supported the finding of the Commission with regard
6 to each filing, whether it was a joint filing or
7 not, and that is not -- joint filings are certainly
8 not prohibited by the statute.

9 With regard to transport costs, what you found
10 was the range of costs was significant. But you
11 found the significance without considering
12 transport. And then your finding was transport
13 could raise those costs substantially. So I don't
14 believe that any modification or further finding is
15 necessary in that regard.

16 I disagree with the arguments of Western
17 Wireless that whether or not a wireless company has
18 a direct connect within an exchange absolutely
19 resolves the transport issue. That is quite
20 frankly not the case. Just because there is a
21 direct connect in one particular exchange or
22 portion of an exchange of an entire company does
23 not resolve the transport issue, and that also does
24 not resolve what about other wireless carriers that
25 don't have direct connects. I think this

1 Commission recognized that there needs to be
2 further clarification at the FCC level on the
3 transport issue and that your findings in the order
4 with regard to transport are clearly correct.

5 With regard to the public interest findings, I
6 think your findings again were very, very
7 sufficient. You found -- you did a proper
8 balancing, and I think that that finding is
9 separate and apart from your economic findings.

10 So in conclusion I believe that the orders
11 should not be modified. My only suggestion would
12 be that you modify the two companies -- the orders
13 of the two companies where the cost information was
14 not included in the order for whatever reason.
15 That would be Venture and ITC. I would recommend
16 that you modify those two orders to include that
17 information and that the rest of the orders not be
18 modified and that Western Wireless's petition for
19 reconsideration in all of the other cases be
20 denied.

21 VICE CHAIR HANSON: Thank you. Bob,
22 do you have any questions of Ms. Rogers?

23 CHAIRMAN SAHR: No, I don't.

24 VICE CHAIR HANSON: Thank you.
25 Rolayne, it seems that there are some suggestions

1 on clarifications on Venture and ITC, and I
2 understand that we do need to make those. Do you
3 have anything to add?

4 MS. AILTS WIEST: I was just going
5 to state that staff's recommendation -- we did put
6 the companies into three different groups, and we
7 continue to believe it was a reasonable approach,
8 but staff also recognizes that under the facts of
9 these cases there are a number of reasonable
10 approaches that can be taken. And, thus, we did
11 not join in Western Wireless's request for
12 reconsideration, and we'd just like to address a
13 couple of Western Wireless's arguments.

14 With respect to the issue of whether the
15 Commission inappropriately combined the public
16 interest standard with economic standards, staff
17 believes that some overlap of what could be
18 considered within those standards is pretty much
19 inevitable.

20 Whenever you look at the public interest
21 standard it's a very broad standard, and I think
22 it's highly unlikely this broad standard would not
23 take into consideration some of the facts that were
24 found affect the other standards. For example,
25 Western Wireless takes issue with using a cost

1 benefit analysis when analyzing the public interest
2 standards as well as the economic standards. But
3 when you look at the language of the economic
4 standards I think it would be difficult to leave
5 out some type of cost benefit analysis.

6 Just look at the unduly economically
7 burdensome standard. It just seems logical to me
8 that when looking at whether something is unduly
9 economically burdensome that potential benefits or
10 lack thereof should be considered. Moreover, I
11 think looking at benefits in relation to this
12 standard can also work in favor of
13 implementation -- of finding that implementation is
14 necessary because it is not unduly economically
15 burdensome.

16 For example, if there was a finding there was
17 significant demand for LNP but costs were also
18 significant, the Commission could find that
19 implementation was not unduly economically
20 burdensome when the significant demand for LNP was
21 taken into consideration or in other words the
22 costs may be economically burdensome but given
23 demand for LNP it would not be unduly economically
24 burdensome to implement it.

25 And going on to the next issue is with respect

1 to combining some of the companies, staff looked
2 into that issue prior to the hearing and, as
3 mentioned by the Petitioners, we did look at the
4 individual company numbers that were provided
5 pursuant to data requests and reviewed them.

6 Staff determined that combining the companies
7 generally resulted in lower costs so staff did not
8 object to that combining of the companies. And
9 also we would just point out that Western Wireless
10 made the initial request for separate costs, but I
11 don't believe they objected to the combining of the
12 companies at the hearing. And I think that they
13 would have had the individual companies cost
14 pursuant to discovery requests so if they were
15 concerned that the combining was detrimental to
16 their position they could have objected or put it
17 into the record the individual company cost
18 studies.

19 So for these reasons staff would not be
20 joining in the request for reconsideration.

21 VICE CHAIR HANSON: Thank you,
22 Rolayne. Bob, did you have any questions at this
23 juncture?

24 CHAIRMAN SAHR: No.

25 VICE CHAIR HANSON: The question

1 before the Commission is shall the Commission grant
2 Western Wireless petitions to reconsider final
3 decision and order. There's also a concern that
4 has been brought up that there needs to be some
5 clarification on the Venture and ITC. How should
6 the Commission proceed?

7 Yes, John, I would like to know how you'd like
8 those amended.

9 MR. SMITH: Well, one I think I just
10 want to say is the missing cost findings in Venture
11 and ITC were a John Smith computer incompetence
12 problem. I did them and somehow they disappeared
13 before I got them transmitted over to Delayne. And
14 in the process I noted in each of those too there
15 was an odd appearance of the word "both" in the
16 middle of that paragraph, which I think had
17 something to do with the cutting and pasting I was
18 doing at the time. So those two were just plain --
19 have a clerical error that I did in them. And they
20 should be corrected by adding in those specific
21 findings. And I actually have those. I had them a
22 month and a half ago and somehow just managed to
23 delete them out.

24 So I would recommend the Commission do
25 reincorporate a specific finding with respect to

1 cost in those two orders. That was inadvertently
2 left out.

3 And also I would note, and it might be
4 something the Commission might want to consider but
5 whether you're ready to do it today or not, I don't
6 know, in both Western Wireless's brief and in the
7 responsive brief from the RLECs they pointed out
8 what I would call an extremely technical criticism
9 of the finding with respect to one of the economic
10 findings. And I'm not looking at it right now so I
11 can't remember the exact one. Undue economic
12 burden, I think.

13 And the Commission did not in its final
14 conclusory finding, even though in a couple of
15 paragraphs before it explained it was looking at
16 both company and customer effects, when it made the
17 final conclusory finding it made it strictly with
18 reference to the company name and did not include
19 any reference to and its customers, and I might at
20 least throw out to the Commission whether they
21 might want to clarify that to match up with the
22 earlier finding the Commission made that that whole
23 analysis relates to both impacts on customers and
24 the company.

25 VICE CHAIR HANSON: I'd like to give

1 Talbot an opportunity to respond to what John just
2 presented, and I'm looking to see whether it's
3 proper or not to have him respond to other
4 statements that have been made after his.

5 Talbot.

6 MR. WIECZOREK: Well, if you grant
7 my Motion to reconsider, you won't have to redraft
8 those findings John's recommending.

9 VICE CHAIR HANSON: Thank you for
10 trying to save us.

11 MR. WIECZOREK: As to any of the
12 comments made, the one I guess that I would address
13 was made by both staff and Ms. Rogers. And that's
14 the blending of those two elements of the test.

15 I believe that the adverse economic impact and
16 the unduly economically burdensome are solely
17 economic questions, essentially can this company
18 afford to do this or will it cost so much that it's
19 just going to be a crushing cost to the consumers.

20 And I don't believe -- and I believe the
21 staff's analysis is wrong as to pulling the public
22 interest back in because of the way the statute is
23 drafted where it says is it an adverse economic
24 impact and then the second -- to transition to the
25 second element it says and is it consistent with

1 public interest. That is where the analysis is
2 done say, well, yeah, it looks like an adverse
3 economic impact, and the second part of that test
4 by the way the statute is written then you get to,
5 well, is it still in the public interest.

6 So it's still our position and I think a clear
7 reading of the statute is that you cannot blend the
8 elements as has been acknowledged that you did by
9 both Ms. Rogers and I believe staff.

10 Short of that, unless you had specific
11 questions and the comments that you wanted me to
12 address.

13 VICE CHAIR HANSON: John is anxious
14 to ask you a question.

15 MR. SMITH: Just with respect to the
16 one statement, and I just want to make sure I got
17 this right in reviewing the record. On the
18 15 percent -- and I'm not talking about
19 Mr. Williams' verbal testimony where he opined
20 thusly, but with respect to the exhibits that you
21 introduced at least I understood those exhibits in
22 reviewing them to be strictly looking at migration
23 of wireless traffic, period, without reference to
24 LNP.

25 Am I wrong when I looked at that evidence?

1 MR. WIECZOREK: Mr. Williams'
2 testimony was specific as to the landline, if I
3 recall correctly. The information -- one of the
4 exhibits on the surveys conducted by Western
5 Wireless specifically looked to if you could take
6 your local number with you, would you be more
7 likely? And that was specifically as to if you can
8 take a landline. Those were not specific to
9 wireline. That survey was not specific to wireline
10 to wireline, if that --

11 MR. SMITH: Wireless to wireless.

12 MR. WIECZOREK: Yes. Wireless to
13 wireless. If that's the exhibit you're thinking
14 of.

15 MR. SMITH: I think so. One of
16 those, if I recall, it turned out the first page of
17 the exhibit ended up getting admitted and the
18 second page did not based on some kind of a
19 foundation objection. And so I just -- I mean, I
20 remember poring over that at the time reviewing the
21 evidence, and I could not discern where it tied
22 those numbers to LNP in any way.

23 It appeared to be demographically based, based
24 on age and various other factors as to whether or
25 not people would transition fully over to wireless

1 service. And I just wondered if I misunderstood
2 the exhibit.

3 MR. WIECZOREK: And you are correct.
4 The second page did not get into evidence. I
5 believe there was some discussion that came into
6 the record on the second page. There was also an
7 addition to -- which I believe was our Exhibit 9.
8 An additional exhibit on that rural NECA testing
9 that had talked about migration also.

10 MR. SMITH: I recall that. Thank
11 you.

12 VICE CHAIR HANSON: Thank you,
13 Talbot. Any further questions at this time?

14 I would like to -- because there are questions
15 about clarification and I think that the Commission
16 needs to have the opportunity to sit down and look
17 at the suggested drafting of changes that have been
18 presented verbally here, I think that it would do
19 us well to defer this item so that we could review
20 those in writing -- those potential changes in
21 writing.

22 Bob, did you have anything?

23 CHAIRMAN SAHR: I will second.

24 VICE CHAIR HANSON: All right. This
25 item is deferred.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)

:SS

CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF HUGHES)

I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of South Dakota:

DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed shorthand reporter, I took in shorthand the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter on the 14th day of December 2004, and that the attached is a true and correct transcription of the proceedings so taken.

Dated at Pierre, South Dakota this 20th day of December 2004.

Cheri M. Wittler

Cheri McComsey Wittler,
Notary Public and
Registered Professional Reporter

Word Index

[2] 3:10 9:4
Cheri
 [3] 1:24 27:5 27:18
Cites
 [1] 3:20
City
 [7] 6:25 7:1 7:1 7:3 7:5 7:7 7:13
Clarification
 [4] 13:7 17:2 21:5 26:15
Clarifications
 [1] 18:1
Clarify
 [1] 22:21
Clear
 [1] 24:6
Clearly
 [7] 4:12 11:3 13:21 15:1 15:22 16:4 17:4
CLEC
 [1] 8:8
Clerical
 [1] 21:19
Close
 [2] 12:11 12:15
Colleen
 [1] 2:2
Combined
 [1] 18:15
Combining
 [5] 20:1 20:6 20:8 20:11 20:15
Commencing
 [1] 2:15
Comments
 [2] 23:12 24:11
Commission
 [35] 1:1 1:12 1:14 4:6 4:16 4:21 5:5 5:7 6:1 6:2 6:9 6:13 9:5 9:13 9:23 11:23 13:8 13:20 13:23 14:7 15:20 16:3 16:5 17:1 18:15 19:18 21:1 21:1 21:6 21:24 22:4 22:13 22:20 22:22 26:15
Commissioner
 [3] 1:13 3:17 12:19
Commissioners
 [1] 11:5
Communications
 [3] 1:5 3:3 3:6
Communities
 [1] 10:16
Community
 [1] 9:2
Companies
 [28] 3:7 4:22 4:24 4:25 5:6 5:12 5:20 5:21 6:10 6:21 7:12 7:16 7:17 9:10 9:18 10:2 10:11 10:13 12:17 15:12 17:12 17:13 18:6 20:1 20:6 20:8 20:12 20:13
Company
 [18] 5:9 6:5 6:15 7:8 7:11 7:21 8:4 10:4 12:18 15:3 16:17 16:22 20:4 20:17 22:16 22:18 22:24 23:17
Competition
 [1] 8:9
Compliant
 [2] 7:9 8:9
Computer
 [1] 21:11
Concern
 [1] 21:3
Concerned
 [2] 9:9 20:15
Concluded
 [1] 8:15
Conclusion
 [1] 17:10
Conclusions
 [2] 4:16 6:23
Conclusory
 [2] 22:14 22:17
Conducted
 [1] 25:4
Connect
 [2] 16:18 16:21

Connects
 [1] 16:25
Consider
 [2] 14:19 22:4
Consideration
 [2] 18:23 19:21
Considered
 [7] 13:22 13:25 14:20 14:21 15:23 18:18 19:10
Considering
 [1] 16:11
Consistent
 [1] 23:25
Consumer
 [1] 10:1
Consumers
 [5] 6:4 8:19 10:13 10:17 23:19
Continue
 [1] 18:7
Corey
 [1] 2:5
Correct
 [3] 17:4 26:3 27:12
Corrected
 [1] 21:20
Correctly
 [2] 8:8 25:3
Cost
 [20] 4:17 6:21 7:2 7:8 8:12 9:19 10:6 13:7 14:2 14:16 15:19 17:13 18:25 19:5 20:13 20:17 21:10 22:1 23:18 23:19
Costs
 [16] 8:17 10:8 10:10 10:12 10:13 14:14 14:4 15:1 15:6 16:9 16:10 16:13 19:17 19:22 20:7 20:10
COUNTY
 [1] 27:3
Couple
 [5] 3:23 3:25 4:2 18:13 22:14
Cremer
 [1] 1:16
Criticism
 [1] 22:8
Crushing
 [1] 23:19
Curious
 [1] 11:15
Current
 [1] 6:7
Customer
 [2] 15:7 22:16
Customers
 [5] 6:7 10:5 15:12 22:19 22:23
Cutting
 [1] 21:17

D

Dakota
 [6] 1:2 2:12 2:14 27:1 27:7 27:13
Darla
 [3] 1:22 12:25 13:2
Data
 [1] 20:5
Dated
 [1] 27:13
Dave
 [1] 1:18
December
 [4] 1:10 2:14 27:11 27:14
Decision
 [2] 7:5 21:3
Decisions
 [3] 4:21 5:5 10:24
Dedicated
 [1] 5:16
Defer
 [1] 26:19
Deferred
 [1] 26:25
Delayne
 [1] 21:13

Delete
 [1] 21:23
Demand
 [14] 10:19 10:20 10:23 11:17 11:18 12:2 14:6 14:16 15:8 15:18 15:20 19:17 19:20 19:23
Demographically
 [1] 25:23
Denied
 [1] 17:20
Determined
 [1] 20:6
Determining
 [1] 13:17
Detrimental
 [1] 20:15
Differ
 [1] 7:20
Differed
 [1] 7:21
Different
 [2] 10:17 18:6
Difficult
 [2] 10:3 19:4
Direct
 [8] 5:23 5:24 6:11 6:15 8:6 16:18 16:21 16:25
Disagree
 [3] 13:4 15:13 16:16
Disappeared
 [1] 21:12
Discern
 [1] 25:21
Discovery
 [1] 20:14
Discussion
 [1] 26:5
Distinguishment
 [1] 7:19
Divergent
 [1] 4:24
Docket
 [2] 3:14 13:3
Dockets
 [5] 1:6 3:4 3:18 3:22 4:6
Dollar
 [1] 9:11
Done
 [1] 24:2
Doug
 [1] 2:6
Douglas
 [1] 1:20
Down
 [1] 26:16
Drafted
 [1] 23:23
Drafting
 [1] 26:17
Duly-appointed
 [1] 27:8
Duty
 [1] 14:21

E

Easier
 [1] 5:18
Easily
 [1] 10:12
East
 [1] 2:13
Economic
 [31] 4:14 4:24 5:6 6:4 6:5 7:13 8:20 8:22 8:25 9:8 9:10 9:16 9:19 9:25 10:10 10:21 10:21 11:11 13:14 14:10 14:24 17:9 18:16 19:2 19:3 22:9 22:11 23:15 23:17 23:23 24:3
Economically
 [11] 10:16 12:17 15:2 15:11 19:6 19:9 19:14 19:19 19:22 19:23 23:16
Effects

[1] 22:16
Eidahl
 [1] 2:6
Eight
 [1] 8:2
Either
 [1] 6:4
Element
 [5] 10:24 10:25 13:22 14:7 23:25
Elements
 [8] 4:11 11:2 11:8 13:14 13:17 13:18 23:14 24:8
Elevate
 [1] 12:6
Eliminate
 [2] 5:25 6:19
Eliminates
 [2] 6:12 6:16
End
 [2] 8:3 9:13
Ended
 [1] 25:17
Entire
 [1] 16:22
Entitled
 [1] 8:3
Erred
 [1] 11:24
Error
 [1] 21:19
Essentially
 [9] 4:17 5:2 5:5 6:1 9:4 10:9 11:13 11:24 23:17
Establish
 [1] 11:9
Establishes
 [1] 11:3
Estimated
 [3] 10:9 15:21 15:22
Evidence
 [9] 15:15 15:18 15:19 15:23 16:1 16:4 24:25 25:21 26:4
Exact
 [4] 4:22 6:8 8:11 22:11
Example
 [3] 5:14 18:24 19:16
Except
 [2] 8:12 10:10
Exception
 [1] 13:6
Exceptions
 [1] 14:1
Exchange
 [3] 16:18 16:21 16:22
Excuse
 [2] 12:6 12:25
Exhibit
 [5] 25:13 25:17 26:2 26:7 26:8
Exhibits
 [3] 24:20 24:21 25:4
Experience
 [2] 7:10 8:11
Explained
 [1] 22:15
Extension
 [2] 7:23 7:24
Extra
 [1] 9:3
Extremely
 [1] 22:8

F

Fact
 [6] 4:21 6:14 8:5 13:18 14:13 15:20
Factor
 [1] 14:11
Factors
 [4] 14:18 14:24 14:25 25:24
Facts
 [2] 18:8 18:23
Factual

Word Index

<p>[1] 11:1 Faith [4] 7:1 7:3 7:6 7:7 Far [1] 5:18 Farris [1] 1:19 Favor [1] 19:12 FCC [1] 17:2 Few [2] 10:10 12:18 Figures [1] 14:3 Filed [2] 3:17 3:24 Filing [2] 16:6 16:6 Filings [2] 16:2 16:7 Final [3] 21:2 22:13 22:17 Financial [1] 14:9 Findings [18] 3:21 4:16 4:23 5:11 6:14 6:22 8:5 10:25 15:10 15:16 17:3 17:5 17:6 17:9 21:10 21:21 22:10 23:8 First [8] 4:3 4:13 9:24 10:24 11:19 11:21 13:12 25:16 Fit [1] 12:3 Five [2] 12:1 12:12 Forth [4] 5:4 11:1 11:23 13:10 Foundation [1] 25:19 Frankly [2] 6:9 16:20 Fully [1] 25:25 Furthermore [1] 13:21</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <p>Half [2] 6:6 21:22 HANSON [16] 1:13 3:1 3:15 11:6 11:15 12:20 12:24 17:21 17:24 20:21 20:25 22:25 23:9 24:13 26:12 26:24 Harens [1] 1:16 Harlan [2] 1:17 3:9 Harm [1] 11:11 Hearing [3] 16:4 20:2 20:12 Heaston [1] 2:4 Heck [1] 9:11 Held [1] 2:11 HEREBY [1] 27:8 Hettinger [1] 2:4 Highly [1] 18:22 Hit [1] 4:1 Holding [1] 8:12 HUGHES [1] 27:3</p>	<p>Interconnect [2] 5:23 8:6 Interconnection [1] 6:16 Interconnects [2] 5:24 6:12 Interest [15] 4:15 9:16 10:19 11:13 11:22 13:14 14:17 14:24 17:5 18:16 18:20 19:1 23:22 24:1 24:5 Interesting [1] 8:4 Intermingle [1] 4:10 Intermingling [1] 4:7 Intermodal [1] 3:7 Interval [1] 14:21 Introduced [1] 24:21 Issue [12] 6:13 6:14 6:17 7:7 8:6 16:19 16:23 17:3 18:14 18:25 19:25 20:2 Issues [3] 4:24 5:21 6:1 ITC [8] 6:11 6:12 7:16 14:2 17:15 18:1 21:5 21:11 Item [2] 26:19 26:25 Items [1] 3:25</p>	<p>Kind [2] 12:4 25:18 Knowledge [1] 7:10</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">G</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">I</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">J</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">L</p>
<p>GARY [1] 1:13 General [2] 9:1 10:7 Generally [1] 20:7 Get-go [1] 12:13 Given [3] 3:23 6:2 19:22 Golden [6] 5:6 5:14 5:20 5:21 5:23 7:15 Grant [3] 8:25 21:1 23:6 Granted [1] 7:14 Granting [2] 7:22 7:24 Greg [1] 1:17 Grouped [2] 4:21 5:21 Grouping [1] 15:14 Groups [1] 18:6 Guess [1] 23:12 Guidance [3] 4:9 9:5 9:14 Guidelines [1] 13:10</p>	<p>Identical [5] 4:23 5:8 6:21 6:22 6:25 ILEC [1] 12:4 ILEC's [1] 5:16 ILECs [4] 3:24 4:8 9:22 11:20 Impact [16] 5:6 5:8 6:5 8:25 9:8 9:10 9:19 9:20 10:1 10:1 10:21 13:24 14:9 23:15 23:24 24:3 Impacts [1] 22:23 Implement [1] 19:24 Implementation [3] 19:13 19:13 19:19 Improper [5] 13:13 14:11 15:14 15:17 16:3 Inadvertently [1] 22:1 Inappropriate [1] 4:19 Inappropriately [1] 18:15 Include [2] 17:16 22:18 Included [3] 5:7 14:3 17:14 Incompetence [1] 21:11 Incorrect [3] 3:21 5:3 13:15 Individual [4] 11:12 20:4 20:13 20:17 Individuals [3] 8:21 10:16 10:22 Inevitable [1] 18:19 Information [3] 17:13 17:17 25:3 Initial [1] 20:10</p>	<p>Jacobson [1] 1:18 James [1] 5:15 Jean [1] 2:3 Jeff [1] 2:5 Jim [2] 1:13 1:19 John [5] 1:15 21:7 21:11 23:1 24:13 John's [1] 23:8 Join [1] 18:11 Joining [1] 20:20 Joint [3] 16:2 16:6 16:7 Judge [1] 12:7 Juncture [1] 20:23 Jurisdiction [1] 13:19 Justify [1] 10:23</p>	<p>Lack [1] 19:10 Landline [2] 25:2 25:8 Language [1] 19:3 Larry [1] 2:4 Larson [1] 2:5 Least [2] 22:20 24:21 Leave [1] 19:4 Left [1] 22:2 Less [1] 6:6 Level [1] 17:2 Likely [1] 25:7 Line [9] 5:8 5:9 5:16 6:3 6:18 8:18 10:5 10:6 10:8 Lines [1] 12:18 LNP [13] 3:7 3:18 5:18 7:9 8:9 15:6 15:8 15:10 19:17 19:20 19:23 24:24 25:22 Local [1] 25:6 Logical [1] 19:7 Lohnes [1] 2:6 Look [7] 6:24 9:24 18:20 19:3 19:6 20:3 26:16 Looked [8] 5:3 14:6 14:8 14:11 15:6 20:1 24:25 25:5 Looking [8] 6:17 8:22 19:8 19:11 22:10 22:15 23:2 24:22 Looks [1] 24:2 Low [2] 7:8 15:8 Lower [1] 20:7</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">K</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">K</p>	<p>Kae [1] 2:9 Karen [1] 1:16 Kasuski [1] 2:5 Keith [1] 1:18 Kelsch [1] 2:9 Kennebec [2] 12:5 12:15 Kennebec's [1] 12:5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p>
<p>PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.</p>			<p>Managed [1] 21:22 Mark [1] 2:7 Marv [1] 2:3 Mary [1] 2:6 Match [1] 22:21 Matter [5] 1:4 2:12 3:1 13:18 27:10 McComsey [3] 1:24 27:5 27:18 McCook [1] 7:25 Mean [1] 25:19 Meet [1] 9:18 Mehlhaff</p>

Word Index

[1] 1:19
Melanie
 [1] 2:8
Melissa
 [1] 2:7
Mentioned
 [1] 20:3
Met
 [6] 9:17 11:7 11:9 11:20 13:17 15:1
Michele
 [1] 1:19
Middle
 [1] 21:16
Midstate
 [3] 7:25 8:7 8:7
Midstate's
 [1] 8:4
Might
 [5] 10:4 22:3 22:4 22:19 22:21
Migration
 [5] 12:1 12:3 12:12 24:22 26:9
Mingle
 [1] 10:2
Missing
 [1] 21:10
Mistakes
 [1] 4:6
Misunderstood
 [1] 26:1
Modification
 [3] 1:4 3:2 16:14
Modified
 [2] 17:11 17:18
Modify
 [2] 17:12 17:16
Money
 [1] 9:3
Month
 [3] 12:8 12:10 21:22
Months
 [1] 8:2
Moreover
 [1] 19:10
Motion
 [2] 3:17 23:7
Motions
 [1] 7:18
Mover
 [1] 3:14
Must
 [1] 8:24

N

Name
 [1] 22:18
NECA
 [1] 26:8
Necessary
 [5] 8:24 10:11 11:10 16:15 19:14
Need
 [5] 5:1 11:7 11:9 13:6 18:2
Needs
 [3] 17:1 21:4 26:16
Next
 [2] 8:3 19:25
Notary
 [2] 27:6 27:18
Note
 [1] 22:3
Noted
 [1] 21:14
Nothing
 [3] 8:12 9:4 14:11
Number
 [4] 3:18 5:17 18:9 25:6
Numbers
 [3] 12:15 20:4 25:22

O

Object

[1] 20:8
Objected
 [2] 20:11 20:16
Objection
 [1] 25:19
Obligations
 [2] 3:8 14:20
Obvious
 [1] 5:14
Odd
 [1] 21:15
One
 [15] 7:18 7:18 7:19 9:22 10:4 12:4 12:16 16:21 21:9 22:9 22:11 23:12 24:16 25:3 25:15
Onerous
 [1] 6:3
Opined
 [1] 24:19
Opinions
 [1] 9:6
Opportunity
 [2] 23:1 26:16
Option
 [2] 12:10 12:14
Order
 [4] 13:23 17:3 17:14 21:3
Orders
 [10] 13:6 13:21 14:3 15:5 15:25 17:10 17:12 17:16 17:17 22:1
Outrageous
 [1] 8:17
Outside
 [1] 13:19
Overlap
 [1] 18:17
Own
 [3] 6:18 7:2 7:8

P

Page
 [4] 25:16 25:18 26:4 26:6
Pam
 [1] 1:20
Paragraph
 [1] 21:16
Paragraphs
 [1] 22:15
Part
 [7] 4:13 4:13 4:14 11:14 11:21 14:17 24:3
Particular
 [2] 14:2 16:21
Pasting
 [1] 21:17
Pay
 [6] 6:7 8:19 10:14 10:17 12:8 12:9
People
 [5] 5:11 9:2 12:8 12:9 25:25
Per
 [5] 5:8 6:3 6:18 6:20 6:21
Percent
 [5] 12:1 12:9 12:12 12:13 24:18
Period
 [1] 24:23
Petition
 [3] 3:6 13:9 17:18
Petitioner
 [3] 13:25 15:18 15:19
Petitioner's
 [1] 14:4
Petitioners
 [4] 13:2 14:25 15:21 20:3
Petitions
 [4] 1:4 3:2 13:10 21:2
Physical
 [2] 4:25 10:11
Pick
 [1] 10:5
Pierre
 [2] 2:13 27:13

Plain
 [1] 21:18
Plainly
 [1] 15:15
Plenty
 [1] 9:11
Point
 [1] 20:9
Pointed
 [1] 22:7
Points
 [2] 3:23 13:4
POLLMAN
 [1] 13:1
Poring
 [1] 25:20
Porting
 [1] 14:21
Portion
 [1] 16:22
Position
 [5] 4:8 4:18 9:22 20:16 24:6
Possible
 [1] 13:6
Potential
 [2] 19:9 26:20
Power
 [1] 9:24
Present
 [1] 1:13
Presented
 [4] 15:18 15:19 23:2 26:18
Presenting
 [1] 3:9
Preserve
 [1] 14:22
Pretty
 [4] 12:3 12:11 12:15 18:18
Primary
 [1] 4:2
Problem
 [3] 5:18 6:11 21:12
Problematic
 [1] 6:24
Problems
 [1] 5:17
Proceed
 [1] 21:6
Proceedings
 [4] 1:9 2:11 27:9 27:12
Process
 [2] 13:16 21:14
Professional
 [2] 27:6 27:19
Prohibited
 [1] 16:8
Projected
 [2] 8:14 8:14
Projection
 [1] 7:21
Projections
 [3] 5:9 6:18 7:2
Proof
 [3] 11:16 15:17 15:24
Proper
 [4] 13:9 15:25 17:7 23:3
Provide
 [1] 14:22
Provided
 [1] 20:4
Provides
 [1] 4:12
Providing
 [1] 4:22
Public
 [19] 1:1 1:12 4:15 9:16 10:19 11:13 11:22 13:14 14:17 14:24 17:5 18:15 18:20 19:1 23:21 24:1 24:5 27:6 27:18
Pulling
 [1] 23:21
Pursuant

[2] 20:5 20:14
Put
 [3] 9:12 18:5 20:16
Puts
 [1] 8:18

Q

Questions
 [8] 11:5 12:22 17:22 20:22 23:17 24:11 26:13 26:14
Quite
 [1] 16:19

R

Raise
 [1] 16:13
Range
 [3] 10:12 13:25 16:10
Reach
 [1] 11:2
Reaching
 [1] 4:17
Reading
 [1] 24:7
Ready
 [1] 22:5
Really
 [2] 4:13 4:20
Reason
 [2] 7:13 17:14
Reasonable
 [2] 18:7 18:9
Reasons
 [1] 20:19
Recognized
 [1] 17:1
Recognizes
 [1] 18:8
Recommend
 [2] 17:15 21:24
Recommendation
 [1] 18:5
Recommending
 [1] 23:8
Reconsider
 [4] 3:17 9:6 21:2 23:7
Reconsideration
 [6] 3:22 7:5 12:6 17:19 18:12 20:20
Record
 [4] 9:17 20:17 24:17 26:6
Redraft
 [1] 23:7
Reference
 [3] 22:18 22:19 24:23
Regard
 [9] 13:7 14:1 15:2 16:4 16:5 16:9 16:15 17:4 17:5
Registered
 [2] 27:5 27:19
Reincorporate
 [1] 21:25
Reiterate
 [1] 3:19
Relates
 [1] 22:23
Relation
 [1] 19:11
Relief
 [1] 4:22
Remember
 [3] 8:7 22:11 25:20
Reported
 [1] 1:24
Reporter
 [3] 27:6 27:9 27:19
Request
 [3] 18:11 20:10 20:20
Requests
 [3] 15:7 20:5 20:14
Require

Word Index

[2] 13:16 15:6
Required
 [3] 8:10 8:23 14:14
Resolve
 [2] 16:23 16:24
Resolves
 [3] 5:16 5:17 16:19
Respect
 [6] 18:14 19:25 21:25 22:9 24:15 24:20
Respond
 [2] 23:1 23:3
Response
 [1] 3:24
Responsive
 [1] 22:7
Rest
 [2] 11:16 17:17
Result
 [1] 15:25
Resulted
 [1] 20:7
Resulting
 [1] 15:24
Results
 [1] 6:24
Review
 [1] 26:19
Reviewed
 [1] 20:5
Reviewing
 [3] 24:17 24:22 25:20
Rislov
 [1] 1:17
River
 [1] 7:25
RLECs
 [1] 22:7
ROBERT
 [1] 1:12
Roberts
 [1] 8:1
Rogers
 [7] 1:22 12:25 13:1 13:2 17:22 23:13 24:9
Rolayne
 [4] 1:15 3:9 17:25 20:22
Room
 [1] 2:13
RPR
 [1] 1:24
Run
 [1] 6:10
Rural
 [1] 26:8

S

SAHR
 [5] 1:12 12:23 17:23 20:24 26:23
Santel
 [2] 7:16 7:24
Sara
 [1] 1:16
Save
 [1] 23:10
Second
 [13] 4:14 10:19 10:25 11:13 11:14 11:21 23:24 23:25 24:3 25:18 26:4 26:6 26:23
Section
 [3] 1:5 3:3 13:15
See
 [1] 23:2
Senger
 [1] 1:18
Separate
 [3] 11:3 17:9 20:10
Service
 [3] 5:16 14:22 26:1
Services
 [1] 15:9

Set
 [3] 10:25 11:23 13:10
Setting
 [1] 5:4
Settlement
 [1] 5:15
Seven
 [1] 8:2
Several
 [2] 3:20 14:25
Sevold
 [1] 2:2
Shall
 [1] 21:1
Shift
 [1] 15:24
Shifting
 [1] 15:17
Short
 [1] 24:10
Shorthand
 [2] 27:9 27:9
Shoulders
 [1] 11:16
Show
 [5] 9:20 9:20 10:20 11:17 13:22
Showed
 [2] 9:19 11:25
Shows
 [2] 10:15 15:23
Signal
 [1] 6:2
Significance
 [1] 16:11
Significant
 [9] 6:4 9:25 13:24 14:5 15:6 16:10 19:17 19:18 19:20
Simply
 [2] 5:13 10:22
Sioux
 [2] 7:17 7:23
Sit
 [1] 26:16
Situation
 [2] 11:20 12:7
Slightly
 [1] 10:2
Smaller
 [1] 12:18
Smith
 [8] 1:15 3:13 21:9 21:11 24:15 25:11 25:15 26:10
Solely
 [1] 23:16
Somewhat
 [1] 7:24
Somewhere
 [1] 8:16
Sorenson
 [1] 2:3
Sought
 [2] 3:22 7:4
South
 [6] 1:2 2:12 2:14 27:1 27:7 27:13
Specific
 [7] 13:16 21:20 21:25 24:10 25:2 25:8 25:9
Specifically
 [3] 14:14 25:5 25:7
Spend
 [2] 8:5 10:4
Spends
 [1] 6:13
SS
 [1] 27:2
Staff
 [11] 1:14 7:21 8:15 18:8 18:16 20:1 20:6 20:7 20:19 23:13 24:9
Staff's
 [2] 18:5 23:21
Stand

[1] 10:22
Standard
 [8] 11:11 15:4 18:16 18:21 18:21 18:22 19:7 19:12
Standards
 [6] 18:16 18:18 18:24 19:2 19:2 19:4
Start
 [1] 3:12
State
 [5] 1:2 2:12 18:5 27:1 27:7
Statement
 [1] 24:16
Statements
 [1] 23:4
Statute
 [10] 4:3 4:9 4:12 8:24 11:2 14:15 16:8 23:22 24:4 24:7
Statutes
 [2] 11:9 13:11
Stay
 [1] 7:14
Steve
 [1] 2:8
Stewart
 [1] 2:2
Still
 [2] 24:5 24:6
Strictly
 [2] 22:17 24:22
Stringent
 [1] 14:14
Structure
 [1] 4:25
Studies
 [1] 20:18
Submit
 [1] 7:12
Submitted
 [2] 12:4 12:16
Substantial
 [2] 5:1 7:6
Substantially
 [4] 7:20 7:22 10:17 16:13
Sufficient
 [1] 17:7
Suggested
 [1] 26:17
Suggestion
 [1] 17:11
Suggestions
 [1] 17:25
Supported
 [3] 15:10 15:15 16:5
Survey
 [2] 12:5 25:9
Surveys
 [2] 11:25 25:4
Suspension
 [4] 1:4 3:2 3:7 8:25
Sustainable
 [1] 6:9
Suzan
 [1] 2:2
Switch
 [4] 5:1 5:2 7:6 10:11

T

Talbot
 [7] 1:23 3:15 11:7 12:25 23:1 23:5 26:13
Talks
 [1] 9:25
TC04-038
 [2] 1:6 3:4
TC04-044
 [1] 1:6
TC04-045
 [1] 1:6
TC04-046
 [1] 1:6
TC04-047

[1] 1:6
TC04-048
 [1] 1:6
TC04-049
 [1] 1:7
TC04-050
 [1] 1:7
TC04-052
 [1] 1:7
TC04-054
 [1] 1:7
TC04-055
 [1] 1:7
TC04-056
 [1] 1:7
TC04-060
 [1] 1:7
TC04-061
 [1] 1:7
Technical
 [1] 22:8
Technology
 [2] 6:8 8:11
Telephone
 [2] 1:12 2:1
Test
 [18] 4:3 4:9 4:10 4:13 9:24 9:25 10:24 10:25 11:2 11:9 11:13 11:14 11:21 11:22 14:23 15:2 23:14 24:3
Testimony
 [9] 8:8 9:1 10:7 10:8 10:15 11:25 12:16 24:19 25:2
Testing
 [1] 26:8
Tests
 [8] 4:7 8:22 8:22 8:23 11:3 11:7 14:13 14:25
Thereof
 [1] 19:10
They've
 [1] 8:1
Thinking
 [1] 25:13
Thompson
 [1] 2:7
Thorough
 [1] 13:8
Three
 [3] 6:11 6:15 18:6
Threshold
 [3] 6:6 8:23 9:24
Throw
 [1] 22:20
Thusly
 [1] 24:20
Tied
 [1] 25:21
Tina
 [1] 1:20
Today
 [3] 10:18 11:4 22:5
Took
 [1] 27:9
Touch
 [1] 5:22
Tracks
 [1] 12:11
Traffic
 [1] 24:23
Transcript
 [2] 1:9 2:11
Transcription
 [1] 27:12
Transition
 [2] 23:24 25:25
Transmitted
 [1] 21:13
Transport
 [15] 5:18 5:25 6:13 6:14 6:17 6:19 8:6 14:20 16:9 16:12 16:12 16:19 16:23 17:3 17:4

Word Index

<p>Treat [1] 6:20</p> <p>Treated [3] 6:25 7:1 7:11</p> <p>Treatment [1] 6:22</p> <p>Troubling [1] 4:20</p> <p>True [1] 27:11</p> <p>Trying [1] 23:10</p> <p>Turned [1] 25:16</p> <p>Two [10] 4:13 5:24 11:2 13:6 17:12 17:13 17:16 21:18 22:1 23:14</p> <p>Two-part [1] 4:13</p> <p>Type [3] 6:8 7:22 19:5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>Wegman [1] 2:8</p> <p>West [7] 5:6 5:14 5:20 5:21 5:23 7:15 7:25</p> <p>Western [19] 3:12 3:13 5:23 5:25 6:7 8:19 13:4 13:12 15:13 15:22 16:16 17:18 18:11 18:13 18:25 20:9 21:2 22:6 25:4</p> <p>Whole [1] 22:22</p> <p>Widely [1] 4:24</p> <p>Wieczorek [9] 1:23 3:16 11:8 11:19 23:6 23:11 25:1 25:12 26:3</p> <p>Wiest [3] 1:15 3:11 18:4</p> <p>Williams' [2] 24:19 25:1</p> <p>Willing [2] 12:8 12:9</p> <p>Wireless [28] 3:12 3:13 5:24 5:25 6:7 6:7 7:8 8:19 8:20 10:18 13:5 13:12 15:9 15:13 15:22 16:17 16:17 16:24 18:25 20:9 21:2 24:23 25:5 25:11 25:11 25:12 25:13 25:25</p> <p>Wireless's [4] 17:18 18:11 18:13 22:6</p> <p>Wireline [3] 25:9 25:9 25:10</p> <p>Wittler [3] 1:24 27:5 27:18</p> <p>Wondered [1] 26:1</p> <p>Word [1] 21:15</p> <p>Words [1] 19:21</p> <p>Worst [1] 12:17</p> <p>Writing [2] 26:20 26:21</p> <p>Written [1] 24:4</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">U</p>	
<p>U.S.C. [3] 1:5 3:3 4:4</p> <p>Uncertainties [1] 14:19</p> <p>Under [4] 4:3 8:23 13:10 18:8</p> <p>Understood [1] 24:21</p> <p>Undue [1] 22:11</p> <p>Unduly [8] 15:2 15:11 19:6 19:8 19:14 19:19 19:23 23:16</p> <p>Universal [1] 14:22</p> <p>Unless [2] 11:4 24:10</p> <p>Unlikely [1] 18:22</p> <p>Up [5] 3:24 10:5 21:4 22:21 25:17</p> <p>Upgrade [1] 7:6</p> <p>Upgrades [3] 5:1 5:2 10:12</p> <p>User [2] 6:20 6:21</p> <p>Users [2] 13:24 15:3</p> <p>UTILITIES [2] 1:1 1:12</p> <p>Utilize [1] 14:23</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">V</p>	
<p>Valley [4] 5:15 7:17 7:23 7:25</p> <p>Various [1] 25:24</p> <p>Venture [8] 6:15 6:18 7:16 14:2 17:15 18:1 21:5 21:10</p> <p>Verbal [1] 24:19</p> <p>Verbally [1] 26:18</p> <p>Versus [1] 10:4</p> <p>VICE [16] 1:13 3:1 3:15 11:6 11:15 12:20 12:24 17:21 17:24 20:21 20:25 22:25 23:9 24:13 26:12 26:24</p> <p>Viewing [1] 15:25</p> <p>Vivian [1] 5:24</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>Year [3] 8:1 8:3 9:13</p> <p>Years [2] 12:1 12:12</p>