

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

= = = = =

IN THE MATTER OF THE FILING
FOR APPROVAL OF AN INTERCONNECTION
AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIDCONTINENT
COMMUNICATIONS AND INTERSTATE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE, INC.

TC03-192

= = = = =

Transcript of Proceedings
April 6, 2004

ORIGINAL

= = = = =

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
ROBERT SAHR, CHAIRMAN
GARY HANSON, VICE CHAIRMAN
JIM BURG, COMMISSIONER

COMMISSION STAFF

Rolayne Ailts Wiest
John Smith
Karen Cremer
Greg Rislov
Harlan Best
Jim Mehlhaff
Steve Wegman
Tina Douglas
Dave Jacobson
Michele Farris
Sue Schaefer
Pam Bonrud

RECEIVED
APR 19 2004
SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

APPEARANCES

Darla Pollman Rogers
Rich Coit
David Gerdes
Jeff Larson

ALSO PRESENT: Rod Bowar

Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR

PRECISION REPORTING
L I M I T E D

1 THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
2 OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
3 =====
4 IN THE MATTER OF THE FILING
5 FOR APPROVAL OF AN INTERCONNECTION TC03-192
6 AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIDCONTINENT
7 COMMUNICATIONS AND INTERSTATE
8 TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE, INC.
9 =====
10 Transcript of Proceedings
11 April 6, 2004
12 =====
13 BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
14 ROBERT SAHR, CHAIRMAN
15 GARY HANSON, VICE CHAIRMAN
16 JIM BURG, COMMISSIONER
17
18 COMMISSION STAFF
19 Rolayne Ailts Wiest
20 John Smith
21 Karen Cremer
22 Greg Rislov
23 Harlan Best
24 Jim Mehlhaff
25 Steve Wegman
26 Tina Douglas
27 Dave Jacobson
28 Michele Farris
29 Sue Schaefer
30 Pam Bonrud
31
32 APPEARANCES
33 Darla Pollman Rogers
34 Rich Coit
35 David Gerdes
36 Jeff Larson
37
38 ALSO PRESENT: Rod Bowar
39
40 Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR
41
42

3
1 CHAIRMAN SAHR: TC03-192, In the
2 Matter of the Filing For Approval of an
3 Interconnection Agreement Between Midcontinent
4 Communications and Interstate Telecommunications
5 Cooperative, Inc.
6 And the question today is how shall the
7 Commission proceed.
8 And, Mr. Gerdes, are you representing
9 Midcontinent in this matter?
10 MR. GERDES: Mr. Chairman, members
11 of the Commission, yes, I'm Dave Gerdes, and I
12 represent Midcontinent in this proceeding.
13 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Interstate
14 Communications? Ms. Rogers, it might just be
15 easiest if we ask you both to come forward.
16 MS. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 I'm Darla Rogers appearing for Interstate and also
18 on line is Mary Sisak and Ben Dickens, and they are
19 co-counsel in this case.
20 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. I'm
21 going to go ahead and turn it over to Mr. Smith, I
22 believe, and ask him to talk a little bit about the
23 procedural aspects and try to flush out where we
24 think we need to go from here on this case.
25 MR. SMITH: I think what I'd like

2
1 APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE
2 Mary Sisak
3 Ben Dickens
4 Talbot Wieczorek
5 Dan Wall
6 Dan Davis
7 Mary Lohnes
8 Nancy Vogel
9 Colleen Sevold
10 Melissa Thompson
11 Pamela Harrington
12 JoAnne Hohnman
13 Warren Vandestadt
14 Rich Helsper
15 Wayne Akland
16 Todd Hansen
17
18 =====
19 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the
20 above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State
21 Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota,
22 on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at
23 9:30 a.m.
24
25

4
1 first to do, would the parties please address the
2 relationship between this docket and TC04-054,
3 which is the petition that has been filed by
4 Interstate to suspend local number portability
5 obligations?
6 MR. GERDES: I guess since we were
7 the first to file, I'll go first for no other
8 reason. The distinction that I see is at least
9 two-fold.
10 First, the motion was made in advance of the
11 filing in the other docket, not knowing whether ITC
12 would or would not make such a filing.
13 Secondly, it's founded upon an interconnection
14 agreement in which ITC agreed to negotiate in good
15 faith. Ms. Rogers has filed with the Commission an
16 opposition to the position that we've taken, which,
17 of course, she and ITC are entitled to do.
18 We take issue with the position taken there.
19 It's our position that we entered into the contract
20 in good faith, that it calls for good-faith
21 negotiations, and we've yet to be furnished any
22 information as to why ITC didn't want to talk to
23 us.
24 The filing suggests that there's nothing wrong
25 with what was done. We think there was. And I

<p>5</p> <p>1 won't go into a lot of detail except to say that we</p> <p>2 think there's an independent basis for what we're</p> <p>3 asking for to the extent that we ask for an order</p> <p>4 requiring intersection -- or, excuse me, that we</p> <p>5 ask for an order requiring LNP.</p> <p>6 That would probably be the same as the second</p> <p>7 docket that you mentioned in the sense that it's</p> <p>8 our position that this is a request for wireline to</p> <p>9 wireline LNP, different from all the other</p> <p>10 suspensions that are requested.</p> <p>11 To my knowledge there's no order from the FCC</p> <p>12 specifically affecting that subject as it's dealt</p> <p>13 with in the Federal Act. And the Federal Act is</p> <p>14 unequivocal in saying there is an obligation to</p> <p>15 provide LNP, other than the fact that a person can</p> <p>16 apply for suspensions.</p> <p>17 So we think that there's an independent basis</p> <p>18 in the sense that we've never had any negotiations.</p> <p>19 We're certainly entitled to negotiations on that</p> <p>20 subject.</p> <p>21 And the only other thing I'll say, neither the</p> <p>22 temporary suspension nor the so-called six-month</p> <p>23 suspension is mandatory under 251(f)(2). It's</p> <p>24 totally discretionary with this Commission. And we</p> <p>25 believe that there are substantial factual</p>	<p>7</p> <p>1 that Midco was not satisfied with these</p> <p>2 communications, and we did try to keep them</p> <p>3 informed of our progress, and we did, in fact,</p> <p>4 notify them before they filed their motion to</p> <p>5 compel that we were going to file a suspension</p> <p>6 petition, as we believe is our right pursuant to</p> <p>7 the interconnection agreement and clearly is our</p> <p>8 right pursuant to the Communications Act.</p> <p>9 So, obviously, the Commission can look at the</p> <p>10 facts of whether or not the communications were</p> <p>11 negotiations. We believe they were. It appears</p> <p>12 that possibly Midco doesn't think they were. But,</p> <p>13 in any event, in terms of the final resolution, our</p> <p>14 position is we clearly have the right to request</p> <p>15 suspension of the LNP requirement, and if the</p> <p>16 Commission grants that suspension, then there would</p> <p>17 seem to be no reason at this time to go forward</p> <p>18 with trying to implement LNP.</p> <p>19 CHAIRMAN SAHR: The question that I</p> <p>20 would have for both of the parties is -- and I can</p> <p>21 understand the suspension argument that ITC is</p> <p>22 making. When we get to the actual hearing on the</p> <p>23 merits of the issue of whether or not LNP should be</p> <p>24 going forward, at that point it does seem like</p> <p>25 there are some significant differences or some</p>
<p>6</p> <p>1 differences between wireline to wireline LNP and</p> <p>2 wireline to wireless LNP, and we wish to explore</p> <p>3 those and we wish to receive LNP.</p> <p>4 MS. ROGERS: I would defer to Ben or</p> <p>5 Mary if they want to address your question.</p> <p>6 MS. SISA: Yes. Actually I think</p> <p>7 that there's a great deal of relationship between</p> <p>8 this case and the petition for suspension.</p> <p>9 Obviously, if the petition for suspension is</p> <p>10 granted and Interstate is not required to provide</p> <p>11 LNP for some period of time, it would seem to be a</p> <p>12 waste of everyone's effort to at this point engage</p> <p>13 in further negotiation on LNP.</p> <p>14 So we would suggest that at a minimum it would</p> <p>15 seem to be more administratively efficient to not</p> <p>16 even address the question of the motion to compel</p> <p>17 until the suspension petition is resolved.</p> <p>18 However, we did present evidence -- we dispute</p> <p>19 the characterization of bad-faith negotiation. And</p> <p>20 it seems to me that we might have a difference of</p> <p>21 opinion of perspective. We clearly had</p> <p>22 communications between the parties. We've attached</p> <p>23 to our opposition the various e-mail messages, and</p> <p>24 there were some phone calls as well.</p> <p>25 And from our perspective we had no indication</p>	<p>8</p> <p>1 substantially different issues that are going to</p> <p>2 come in that are involved in a wireline to wireline</p> <p>3 or, in this case, wireline to cable, however you</p> <p>4 want to characterize it, that may be different than</p> <p>5 what we would see in all of the other dockets that</p> <p>6 are before the Commission right now that I could</p> <p>7 see very likely could be handled in one large case.</p> <p>8 And I was wondering if we could kind of move</p> <p>9 past the suspension issue and discuss whether or</p> <p>10 not once we think we're going to hearing on the</p> <p>11 merits, whether or not we think the cases are</p> <p>12 sufficiently similar to the other LNP cases to be</p> <p>13 heard at the same time or if we should be looking</p> <p>14 at a separate proceeding.</p> <p>15 MR. GERDES: Mr. Chairman, on behalf</p> <p>16 of Midcontinent, that's precisely what I perhaps</p> <p>17 didn't -- what I was trying to say but didn't say,</p> <p>18 and that is that there is a significant difference,</p> <p>19 we believe, between wireline to wireline LNP and</p> <p>20 wireline to wireless LNP.</p> <p>21 And the other distinction is that we have and</p> <p>22 have had since last December an interconnection</p> <p>23 agreement approved by the Commission, and we want</p> <p>24 to do business. And we think it's unfair to</p> <p>25 Midcontinent which has this interconnection</p>

<p>1 agreement and which can't effectively do business 2 without LNP to wait until the question of wireless 3 to wireline is decided. 4 Because we see this as something that 5 immediately affects our business, and it's 6 something that is significantly different. 7 Now most of the petitions that I've read not 8 only from ITC -- I mean, ITC's petition focuses on 9 the same things the other petitions do, and that is 10 as to wireline to wireless that they have these 11 significant problems because there's no point of 12 presence in the call center under the wireless 13 situation that would require transport, all of 14 those problems. 15 Those problems are not present, as I 16 understand it, in wireline to wireline. We have a 17 point of presence right now in their call center. 18 So that certainly isn't a problem. 19 And on the technical side I certainly am not 20 well versed on the technical side, but I would 21 submit that we're entitled to have this heard as 22 expeditiously as possible, and that's why the 23 motion asked for that, in order to get on with it 24 as it relates to wireline to wireline. 25 We have no interest in the wireless side of</p>	9	<p>1 the same cost information in two separate 2 proceedings. And that is why we filed as one 3 all-encompassing petition. Because the very 4 important aspect of the request for suspension is 5 focused on the cost of implementing LNP and that 6 cost is -- was the cost associated with 7 implementing LNP are largely the same. 8 And if they are incurred for the purposes of 9 LNP for Midco, there are some differences, but to a 10 large extent it would be the same cost that would 11 be incurred for the purposes of LNP for wireless 12 carriers. And we've provided exhibits to show the 13 difference, but the basic question is the same. 14 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. Staff. 15 MS. CREMER: Thank you. This is 16 Karen Cremer. Midcontinent has asked for -- has 17 requested four things. One is to establish a 18 procedural schedule with discovery and hearing 19 dates. I think the Commission should grant that. 20 Secondly, they have asked to hold an 21 evidentiary hearing. Mr. Gerdes might. I don't 22 know enough about how the network works necessarily 23 to know there is a huge difference between wireline 24 to wireline and wireline to wireless. 25 But I believe he does make a point that they</p>	11
<p>1 this issue, but because it's in their petition -- 2 they want both. Most of the other petitions only 3 deal with wireless of the however many we have 4 pending now, 10 or 12. I think there's only two 5 that deal with wireline. 6 So that's what we see. We see two basic 7 differences. Number one, we have an 8 interconnection agreement that's not worth anything 9 right now to us as a business matter, and, number 10 two, there's a significant difference between the 11 two kinds of LNP that we're looking for and, 12 therefore, we believe that we're entitled to be a 13 different procedural track than the wireless. 14 MS. SISAK: If I may respond to 15 that, we really don't view the petition as two 16 separate petitions, and that's why we filed as one. 17 And the one thing that is in common -- actually two 18 things. One is that it is ITC that has to 19 potentially implement LNP, and the cost of 20 implementation, there are some differences between 21 wireline to wireless, but many of the costs are 22 essentially the same. 23 So if we were to proceed on two separate 24 tracks, ITC and this Commission and the Commission 25 staff would essentially have to look at a lot of</p>	10	<p>1 are working under a interconnection agreement. I 2 believe facts and circumstances here are different 3 that would require this to be on a separate track, 4 and I don't believe there's any harm in holding 5 this separate from the other LNP hearings. 6 As to ordering them to engage in good-faith 7 negotiations in the next month and to order them to 8 provide wire to wire porting by May 4, I would not 9 recommend granting those because of my belief that 10 we should hold a hearing on this matter. 11 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. Any 12 questions? 13 COMMISSIONER BURG: Yeah. I have a 14 couple just for clarification. 15 The interconnection agreement encompasses muc 16 more than this porting; right? Has all the rest of 17 the agreement been satisfactory? 18 MR. GERDES: Yes, Commissioner. As 19 far as I know, the rest of the agreement is 20 satisfactory, but the problem is people want to 21 keep their same numbers and you can't sign up 22 customers. 23 COMMISSIONER BURG: And is there any 24 difference between wireline to cable than there is 25 wireline to another wireline -- typical wireline, I</p>	12

<p>13</p> <p>1 want to call it.</p> <p>2 MR. GERDES: My understanding is</p> <p>3 there is not.</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER BURG: Darla?</p> <p>5 MS. ROGERS: I don't know of any</p> <p>6 particular, you know, distinction between those.</p> <p>7 There may be some technical issues, but I can't</p> <p>8 address that.</p> <p>9 COMMISSIONER BURG: And it seems</p> <p>10 like I've gathered that one of the questions on LNP</p> <p>11 is the switch update; is that correct?</p> <p>12 MS. ROGERS: That's correct.</p> <p>13 COMMISSIONER BURG: So you would</p> <p>14 still need the switch update to do wireline to</p> <p>15 wireline so you're looking at that expense at the</p> <p>16 least; is that correct?</p> <p>17 MS. ROGERS: I guess that was our</p> <p>18 point here. Our petition for suspension of LNP is</p> <p>19 it encompasses all local number portability, not</p> <p>20 just wireline to wireless. So that's why it seems</p> <p>21 to me that you are going to be addressing the same</p> <p>22 issues, and there's no need to keep this</p> <p>23 necessarily on a separate track.</p> <p>24 MR. GERDES: My perspective on this,</p> <p>25 Commissioner, would be my understanding is there</p>	<p>15</p> <p>1 of density of the particular companies and cost</p> <p>2 sharing and those types of things. So I can see</p> <p>3 some great advantages to having one hearing on</p> <p>4 those type of issues.</p> <p>5 My concern is if we start bringing in this</p> <p>6 particular matter into those hearings, although</p> <p>7 there is some overlap, suddenly we're going to</p> <p>8 start talking about an interconnection agreement,</p> <p>9 we're going to start talking about good-faith</p> <p>10 negotiations and bringing in a number of other</p> <p>11 issues that I think may begin to make it a little</p> <p>12 bit unwieldy to go forward in an orderly fashion</p> <p>13 because we're going to have a number of dockets</p> <p>14 we're going to be hearing at the exact same time.</p> <p>15 And there may be some challenges where we</p> <p>16 start bringing in some issues from the wireline to</p> <p>17 wireline or wireline to cable side of things that</p> <p>18 may make it more challenging to hold an orderly</p> <p>19 hearing on all of those other others matters.</p> <p>20 And, Ms. Rogers, you're kind of indicating you</p> <p>21 don't think that is going to be the case?</p> <p>22 MS. ROGERS: I think the evidentiary</p> <p>23 questions that you would be exploring in the course</p> <p>24 of the suspension petitions are going to encompass</p> <p>25 both. They're going to encompass wireline to</p>
<p>14</p> <p>1 are some intermediate measures that can be taken</p> <p>2 technically short of replacing the switch as to</p> <p>3 address that.</p> <p>4 And I'm not a technician so that's why we'd</p> <p>5 need a hearing to tell you about it. We have some</p> <p>6 people that will address it. They've told me there</p> <p>7 are some intermediate measures that can be taken</p> <p>8 without replacing the switch.</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN SAHR: You know, in my</p> <p>10 mind, looking at all of these dockets, the great</p> <p>11 gain that could be made is by attempting to have</p> <p>12 the ones that are most similar, if we can, and</p> <p>13 we'll talk about this in a few minutes, heard at</p> <p>14 the same time.</p> <p>15 Likely, we're going to have the same expert</p> <p>16 witnesses. The factors outside of the cost to the</p> <p>17 individual companies are going to be very, very</p> <p>18 similar, especially if we're talking about wireline</p> <p>19 to wireless.</p> <p>20 You're going to have -- you know, if we look</p> <p>21 at 3, 4, 5 factors, whatever it is under the test,</p> <p>22 those factors are going to be very, very similar</p> <p>23 for each of the cases and really the individual</p> <p>24 costs, though, from the initial filings and through</p> <p>25 common sense are going to vary, primarily because</p>	<p>16</p> <p>1 wireline, and they're going to encompass wireline</p> <p>2 to wireless.</p> <p>3 And I think it would probably be more unwieldy</p> <p>4 to have a separate docket going on at the same</p> <p>5 time.</p> <p>6 MS. SISA: If I may interject, if I</p> <p>7 understood your point correctly, you were asking</p> <p>8 whether combining case 192 and combining case --</p> <p>9 I'm losing my number of the suspension petition</p> <p>10 case. Combining case 054 should be done.</p> <p>11 And we do not think those two cases should be</p> <p>12 combined. But case 192 is really not a case about</p> <p>13 whether or not LNP suspension should be granted.</p> <p>14 Case 192 is about whether or not we engaged in</p> <p>15 good-faith negotiation or whether we violated the</p> <p>16 interconnection agreement by not engaging in</p> <p>17 good-faith negotiation. And that issue is -- that</p> <p>18 discrete issue is separate from the suspension</p> <p>19 petition.</p> <p>20 Where they become interconnected is the relief</p> <p>21 that Midcontinent requests in the motion to compel</p> <p>22 proceeding is that you were -- the Commission</p> <p>23 required us to implement LNP. So they're</p> <p>24 interconnected in the requested release from</p> <p>25 Midcontinent, but they really should be handled</p>

17

1 separately.

2 And that's why we're suggesting you really

3 shouldn't even look at the motion to compel, which

4 ultimately requests that you order us to provide

5 LNP, until you resolve our separate suspension

6 petition.

7 MR. SMITH: I know too -- and I just

8 bring this up, Dave -- is the LNP -- the

9 negotiation paragraph in the interconnection

10 agreement itself contains a savings provision that

11 seems to -- and I don't say that's dispositive here

12 in any way.

13 At least its interpretation might be at issue

14 in terms of what rights that paragraph was meant to

15 preserve in terms of things like requesting

16 suspension and so on.

17 MR. GERDES: I have no doubt that it

18 was the intent of ITC that that savings provision

19 in the paragraph that you're referring to refers to

20 this -- the 054 proceeding.

21 But the point that we make in the 192

22 proceeding, which is the motion to compel, is that

23 we believe that we were basically stone-walled for

24 about four months, and then all of a sudden they

25 drop this petition on us. We kept asking for a

18

1 meeting and never got it.

2 And so I disagree with Ms. Sisak when she says

3 that the petition, the 054 petition, is somehow

4 exclusive of the issues presented in the 192

5 motion. They both encompass the same thing, and

6 that is getting us to an LNP proceeding.

7 Again, I'll go back to my original comments,

8 and that is it's manifestly unfair for us with an

9 interconnection agreement to sit here and wait for

10 all of these 10 or 12 or 14 petitions to go through

11 what I would call a probably ponderous process.

12 Again, we think that the question of LNP as it

13 relates to wireless to wireline is significantly

14 different. All you have to do is read the

15 petitions. They say that. Every one of these

16 carriers that are asking for the relief are talking

17 about the fact that there's no presence in the call

18 center and that that's a big problem for them.

19 Okay. That's fine. I'll accept that. But we

20 don't have that problem. There's a big difference

21 right there based on what the petitions say. And

22 that's all of them, not just ITC. ITC says it.

23 And then they say, oh, by the way we want wireline

24 to wireline suspension as well.

25 I mean, if you read the context of the

19

1 petitions, it's almost like somebody stuck it in

2 there into a preprogrammed petition.

3 And so, again, what we're talking about here

4 is dealing with a different situation and dealing

5 with it in a -- on a separate track in a more

6 expeditious matter. We do have a significantly

7 different situation here where we do have an

8 interconnection agreement. I'm not aware of any of

9 these other petitioners that have interconnection

10 agreements going. And I would say it's just a

11 matter of common fairness as far as Midcontinent is

12 concerned.

13 They are related. I mean, you can't say

14 they're not related.

15 COMMISSIONER BURG: I was just going

16 to ask do you believe that the law allows them to

17 ask for suspension for wireline to wireline?

18 MR. GERDES: Yes, it does. But it

19 also says -- the law also says you don't have to

20 give them an extra day and you don't have to give

21 them a suspension.

22 COMMISSIONER BURG: No. I

23 understand that. But what would be the effect if

24 we held this hearing and granted the compelling you

25 asked for and then turned around and found through

20

1 the case that we should allow suspension of both

2 wireline to wireline and wireline to wireless?

3 What would be the effect of the decision we

4 made?

5 MR. GERDES: Well, I guess, what I'm

6 saying is that the Commission should separate out

7 that portion of the 054 docket that relates to

8 their request for a suspension as to wireline to

9 wireline, and then the 054 petition would proceed

10 in this omnibus proceeding as it relates to

11 wireline to wireless.

12 I believe that what we have said in the

13 192 motion asking for immediate interconnection is

14 sufficient to place that question before the

15 Commission and that that -- that the 192 motion

16 should go forward along with that portion of the

17 054 petition that relates to wireline to wireline

18 and that the wireline to wireless would proceed on

19 with the other.

20 Because we're only talking about, as I

21 remember it, two of all of these carriers that have

22 petitioned. And I think that I know that ITC is

23 the only one with an interconnection agreement.

24 COMMISSIONER BURG: I was going to

25 ask that. You said there was two of them that have

<p>21</p> <p>1 wireline to wireline suspension requests.</p> <p>2 MR. GERDES: I think Santel asked</p> <p>3 for it too.</p> <p>4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.</p> <p>5 MR. GERDES: Did you not?</p> <p>6 COMMISSIONER BURG: Maybe for a</p> <p>7 question I'd have too. I'm looking at timing. How</p> <p>8 much timing difference would there be between</p> <p>9 hearing this one and hearing the others? Do we</p> <p>10 have any idea?</p> <p>11 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Those are good</p> <p>12 questions, but what I was thinking, we have staff</p> <p>13 attorney and we have, I think, General Counsel</p> <p>14 leaning towards saying these are separate matters.</p> <p>15 We have obviously a difference of -- disagreement</p> <p>16 between the parties on that. But certainly they've</p> <p>17 acknowledged there are differences between the</p> <p>18 wireless and the wireline issues.</p> <p>19 My inclination would be to get the ball</p> <p>20 rolling on this particular one, and have them</p> <p>21 separate it, look at setting a procedural schedule.</p> <p>22 There's a lot different evidentiary issues that are</p> <p>23 going to come forward in this, and I think both</p> <p>24 parties need to do some discovery.</p> <p>25 We're dealing with contract issues and</p>	<p>23</p> <p>1 have it move forward on its own procedural schedule</p> <p>2 with the idea that it could eventually come back</p> <p>3 and be heard at the same time if everything worked</p> <p>4 out.</p> <p>5 MR. SMITH: Neither party is arguing</p> <p>6 that there are not issues of fact in the 192</p> <p>7 docket, are they?</p> <p>8 MR. GERDES: No. I don't believe</p> <p>9 so.</p> <p>10 MR. SMITH: So no matter what we do,</p> <p>11 we're going to have to go through discovery and a</p> <p>12 hearing.</p> <p>13 MR. GERDES: Yeah.</p> <p>14 MR. SMITH: I think the practical</p> <p>15 reality too is that the first of the suspension</p> <p>16 proceedings under the 180-day time limit under the</p> <p>17 federal law, I believe that deadline is going to</p> <p>18 mature at, you know, within the first two weeks of</p> <p>19 August.</p> <p>20 So as a practical matter, we'll be lucky to be</p> <p>21 much ahead of that no matter what we do here,</p> <p>22 truthfully. I mean, because of all of the things</p> <p>23 we've got on the schedule, it's going to be</p> <p>24 difficult to get much ahead of that. I think</p> <p>25 that's just the reality of it no matter what we try</p>
<p>22</p> <p>1 agreement, those type of things. Let that get set</p> <p>2 as a separate docketed item and move it along in a</p> <p>3 separate track with the proviso, though, I mean, if</p> <p>4 we're sitting here and we end up one hearing's</p> <p>5 going to be on June 1 and the other June 2 and the</p> <p>6 parties come back and say, well, we've kind of</p> <p>7 looked at this and we're sufficiently close, we</p> <p>8 think we could gain something by having this part</p> <p>9 of the omnibus hearing, if that's the route we go,</p> <p>10 then we at least get the ball rolling, start it as</p> <p>11 a track and acknowledge, though, if these things</p> <p>12 are all kind of converging all at the same time,</p> <p>13 which they may be doing, there may be some gains to</p> <p>14 having them all heard at the same hearing.</p> <p>15 At the same time I've got to be mindful this</p> <p>16 omnibus hearing, all of these parties coming in at</p> <p>17 once, it's going to get a little -- I don't know if</p> <p>18 I should say confusing, but it's going to be a</p> <p>19 challenge to keep that proceeding moving along</p> <p>20 orderly without bringing in some interconnection</p> <p>21 agreement issues, some contract issues, some</p> <p>22 good-faith type issues that just don't exist in all</p> <p>23 of those other cases.</p> <p>24 So that would be my inclination is to go</p> <p>25 forward and have this be separately docketed and</p>	<p>24</p> <p>1 to do differently.</p> <p>2 I mean, we can try to expedite it and move it</p> <p>3 along, but I don't know that it will be possible to</p> <p>4 even schedule anything before late July anyway.</p> <p>5 MR. GERDES: We'd like to try.</p> <p>6 MR. SMITH: Well, Heather isn't</p> <p>7 here, unfortunately, today or she could maybe</p> <p>8 address that, but having tried recently to get</p> <p>9 dates, it's not easy to get them until mid to late</p> <p>10 July.</p> <p>11 CHAIRMAN SAHR: That's where I think</p> <p>12 we could look and see if we're roughly along the</p> <p>13 same track and the parties narrow the issues, it</p> <p>14 may make sense to have this part of the omnibus.</p> <p>15 At this point in time I think we should let this go</p> <p>16 as the only separate docketed item and move forward</p> <p>17 that way.</p> <p>18 Ms. Rogers.</p> <p>19 MS. ROGERS: I was just going to</p> <p>20 point out it appears too we're going to be looking</p> <p>21 at the same expert witnesses and a lot of the same</p> <p>22 issues in both dockets. Maybe at that point it</p> <p>23 would make sense to consolidate it into one</p> <p>24 hearing.</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Well, that's really</p>

<p>25</p> <p>1 where I think the discovery may show something 2 along those lines. Is this going to be more of an 3 agreement contract type dispute, or is this going 4 to be a cost dispute? 5 I would urge the parties if this is going to 6 be more of a cost type dispute, while there are 7 differences, then I would tend to lump it in with 8 the LNP hearings. If it's going to be more of an 9 interconnection type agreement, dispute and 10 good-faith and those type of things, I would lean 11 toward keeping it separate. 12 But I think we can start on a separate track 13 with the proviso that it may end up having to -- or 14 may end up coming to make more sense to have it 15 heard at the exact same time as the other cases. 16 So I will move that we instruct parties and 17 staff to come up with a separate procedural 18 schedule on this matter and that this would be a 19 separate docketed item and we move to being a 20 separate evidentiary hearing with the proviso, 21 though, that if any of the parties feel that it is 22 appropriate to hear it together with the other LNP 23 cases, that they certainly could petition the 24 Commission at a later point in time, and we 25 definitely would consider that.</p>	<p>27</p> <p>1 the issues are going to be so -- in some sense 2 they're going to be so inextricably tied up. I 3 don't know how as a practical matter they can not 4 be considered. 5 MR. GERDES: I want to make sure for 6 discovery purposes so we don't get into some kind 7 of fight. 8 MR. SMITH: Over what's relevant? I 9 don't know how they can be separated. 10 MS. SISA: May I ask the Commission 11 to reconsider that last comment? It seems to me 12 that Petitioner, Midcontinent, in their motion to 13 compel outlined the limits of the 192 proceeding 14 and the cost support data and other issues 15 concerning local number portability were not part 16 of their motion. 17 The only thing that they brought into their 18 motion was their argument that what ITC did was not 19 in good faith in accordance with the paragraph in 20 the interconnection agreement. And I would 21 respectfully request that that should be the 22 limitation of 192 in the procedural schedule set 23 forth. 24 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Midcontinent, do you 25 have a response?</p>
<p>26</p> <p>1 MR. SMITH: Can I ask one clarifying 2 question? 3 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Yes. 4 MR. SMITH: You're talking about 5 considering both dockets 192 and 054 as a separate 6 track? 7 CHAIRMAN SAHR: I was just thinking. 8 MR. SMITH: Or just 192? 9 CHAIRMAN SAHR: 192. 10 VICE CHAIR HANSON: Second. 11 COMMISSIONER BURG: I am going to 12 concur. I'm a little reluctant because I believe 13 we are going to run a lot of parallel tracking, 14 especially if you're talking about switch changes 15 and that, but I think with the proviso we put in we 16 could do that. 17 I'll concur. 18 MR. GERDES: Could I ask a 19 clarifying question? 20 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. Yes. 21 MR. GERDES: When we say 054, I 22 mean, that we're just taking 192, we're also taking 23 that portion of 054 that relates to wireline to 24 wireline; right? I mean, that's -- 25 MR. SMITH: Well, you know, to me</p>	<p>28</p> <p>1 MR. GERDES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I 2 disagree with that, and, again, as I mentioned 3 before, that portion of our motion that asks for 4 LNP by May 24-2004, I believe, complicates the 5 wireline to wireline issue that I just mentioned. 6 And there's no practical -- I mean, if we 7 can't go into that, we're going to end up getting 8 bogged down in procedural and more importantly 9 discovery disputes. I mean, we've got to be able 10 to discover the factual issues as they come along. 11 That's why I asked the question. 12 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Staff. 13 MS. CREMER: I was just going to say 14 why don't we see if we can work it out before we go 15 down this path of arguing what should and shouldn't 16 be. Let's just, you know, try to work it out, and 17 if it becomes an issue, then you can bring it 18 before the Commission. If they ask something that 19 you feel is absolutely outrageous and crosses the 20 line too much in 054 and 192, then you can make a 21 motion. 22 MR. GERDES: We're trying to 23 expedite this, and it seems to me that wireline to 24 wireline should be a part of what we're talking 25 about, and we ought to be able to ask about that.</p>

<p>29</p> <p>1 MS. CREMER: And I agree. I agree</p> <p>2 with you.</p> <p>3 MR. GERDES: All right.</p> <p>4 MS. CREMER: I just think that ITC</p> <p>5 just needs to wait and see what you're going to ask</p> <p>6 before they get --</p> <p>7 COMMISSIONER BURG: I need a</p> <p>8 clarification. Is this the only one -- is ITC the</p> <p>9 only one that has wireline to wireline, or is there</p> <p>10 another one? Because I certainly don't want to</p> <p>11 exclude the wireline to wireline of a separate one</p> <p>12 and have to do that in a different hearing.</p> <p>13 MS. CREMER: You know, I -- Dave</p> <p>14 thought there was two, but they're saying there was</p> <p>15 one.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER BURG: To me, this</p> <p>17 particular hearing, if we do it separately, if we</p> <p>18 do it separately, which I think we will probably</p> <p>19 merge at some point, but if we do it separately, it</p> <p>20 should address all the issues with wireline to</p> <p>21 wireline and not leave one hanging out here we've</p> <p>22 got to deal with otherwise.</p> <p>23 So I'd like to see that at least clarified.</p> <p>24 Has anybody else filed wireline to wireline</p> <p>25 suspensions?</p>	<p>31</p> <p>1 connection between 054 and this particular</p> <p>2 proceeding from the standpoint that if the</p> <p>3 Commission were to decide to grant you the relief</p> <p>4 that you asked for in 054, it effectively renders</p> <p>5 moot what happens in this case.</p> <p>6 MS. SISAK: That is correct. And</p> <p>7 that is why we suggest that, at a minimum, 192</p> <p>8 should be deferred until 054 is resolved.</p> <p>9 MR. SMITH: Well, is there a reason</p> <p>10 that the proceedings, the discovery, et cetera,</p> <p>11 can't be proceeding? I mean, I would think that --</p> <p>12 are you arguing that the existence of that</p> <p>13 interconnection agreement and the discussions that</p> <p>14 led up to the signing of that agreement and the</p> <p>15 subsequent discussions relating to LNP</p> <p>16 implementation pursuant to that agreement are</p> <p>17 completely irrelevant to the 054 proceeding?</p> <p>18 MS. SISAK: No. But I'm suggesting</p> <p>19 that they are dependant upon -- the ultimate relief</p> <p>20 requested by Midco is that you order us to provide</p> <p>21 LNP. And the purpose of any further negotiations</p> <p>22 that Midco would want would be for the purposes of</p> <p>23 implementing LNP.</p> <p>24 And if you grant our request in 054 and we</p> <p>25 don't have to implement LNP, then all of those</p>
<p>30</p> <p>1 MS. ROGERS: The petitions as we</p> <p>2 filed them are broad enough -- they cover all LNP.</p> <p>3 Okay. Now the question becomes are there other</p> <p>4 instances of wireline to wireline out there right</p> <p>5 now?</p> <p>6 And, Mary, maybe you can help me on that. I'm</p> <p>7 not sure that there are. But, nevertheless, our</p> <p>8 petitions were filed in such a manner as we are</p> <p>9 asking for suspension of LNP requirement at least</p> <p>10 in most of them.</p> <p>11 COMMISSIONER BURG: What I think is</p> <p>12 if we end up having two separate tracks, that</p> <p>13 everything that deals wireline to wireline should</p> <p>14 be handled in one and the other in the other, not</p> <p>15 only this particular -- of course, maybe we're</p> <p>16 limited by the docket.</p> <p>17 MS. CREMER: Yeah.</p> <p>18 MR. SMITH: Well, the other thing,</p> <p>19 as I think the Chairman just said a minute ago, is</p> <p>20 his motion was limited to just 192 which deals with</p> <p>21 a specific interconnection agreement, you know, and</p> <p>22 setting a procedural schedule and expediting that.</p> <p>23 I think the confusion in my mind, and,</p> <p>24 Ms. Sisak, maybe you can clarify it for me, is I</p> <p>25 thought I recalled you specifically making the</p>	<p>32</p> <p>1 efforts would be wasted. And that's why we are</p> <p>2 suggesting that you should consider the end</p> <p>3 question, whether or not Interstate must provide</p> <p>4 LNP before you consider the motion to compel</p> <p>5 negotiation of LNP.</p> <p>6 CHAIRMAN SAHR: I think we're</p> <p>7 probably going to end up in the same spot anyway.</p> <p>8 That's just my gut feeling.</p> <p>9 I would -- I think my motion -- original</p> <p>10 motion should be fine. I would add the provision,</p> <p>11 though, if during the discovery process I would</p> <p>12 give a little bit of leeway on dipping the toe a</p> <p>13 little bit into 054 and that -- or related issues</p> <p>14 and that if we're going to be making discovery</p> <p>15 requests, doing those sort of things, we are</p> <p>16 clearly acknowledging this case may end up merging</p> <p>17 with the other one.</p> <p>18 So I would ask the parties to please, you</p> <p>19 know, indulge us and realize that there may be a</p> <p>20 little bit of overlap between 192 and 054, and,</p> <p>21 frankly, I think most of us are saying that there's</p> <p>22 a good chance these cases will merge.</p> <p>23 At the same time we have separate issues. I</p> <p>24 think through the discovery process at the very</p> <p>25 least we should see how this case gets flushed out.</p>

1 We can always revisit. We can always consolidate.
 2 And I would urge the parties, though, to be a
 3 little bit lenient when it comes to discovery and
 4 the overlap between 192 and 054.

5 But at this point in time I think we're fine
 6 with keeping them on separate tracks and eventually
 7 looking at whether or not they should all be
 8 consolidated in part of the very large LNP case
 9 that we're kind of foreseeing.

10 MR. SMITH: I note that the next
 11 Commission meeting isn't until May 11. I mean, can
 12 we wait that long before getting the schedules
 13 resolved on this and all of these other things?

14 We can't do it today.

15 CHAIRMAN SAHR: We could have an
 16 ad hoc.

17 MR. GERDES: We can sit down with
 18 staff and opposing counsel, and, I mean, we can do
 19 that tomorrow or the next day, I would expect, get
 20 on a conference call.

21 CHAIRMAN SAHR: I don't think it
 22 would be a big deal to have an ad hoc meeting
 23 sometime in the next week or so and get that
 24 flushed out.
 25

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 took in shorthand the proceedings
 10 had in the above-entitled matter on the 6th day of
 11 April 2004, and that the attached is a true and
 12 correct transcription of the proceedings so taken.

13 Dated at Pierre, South Dakota this 19th day
 14 of April 2004.
 15
 16

17 
 18 Cheri McComsey Wittler,
 19 Notary Public and
 20 Registered Professional Reporter
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Word Index

0	0	0	0	
054	[18] 16:10 17:20 18:3 20:7 20:9 20:17 26:5 26:21 26:23 28:20 31:1 31:4 31: 8 31:17 31:24 32:13 32:20 33:4	[1] 21:17 Acknowledging [1] 32:16 Act [3] 5:13 5:13 7:8 Actual [1] 7:22 Ad [2] 33:16 33:22 Add [1] 32:10 Address [8] 4:1 6:5 6:16 13:8 14:3 14:6 24:8 29:20 Addressing [1] 13:21 Administratively [1] 6:15 Advance [1] 4:10 Advantages [1] 15:3 Affecting [1] 5:12 Affects [1] 9:5 Ago [1] 30:19 Agree [2] 29:1 29:1 Agreed [1] 4:14 Agreement [26] 1:5 3:3 4:14 7:7 8:23 9:1 10:8 12: 1 12:15 12:17 12:19 15:8 16:16 17:10 18:9 19:8 20:23 22:1 22:21 25:3 25:9 27:20 30:21 31:13 31:14 31:16 Agreements [1] 19:10 Ahead [3] 3:21 23:21 23:24 Ailts [1] 1:13 Akland [1] 2:8 All-encompassing [1] 11:3 Allow [1] 20:1 Allows [1] 19:16 Almost [1] 19:1 Anyway [2] 24:4 32:7 APPEARANCES [2] 1:20 2:1 Appearing [1] 3:17 Apply [1] 5:16 Appropriate [1] 25:22 Approval [2] 1:4 3:2 Approved [1] 8:23 April [4] 1:8 2:14 34:11 34:14 Arguing [3] 23:5 28:15 31:12 Argument [2] 7:21 27:18 Aspect [1] 11:4 Aspects [1] 3:23 Associated [1] 11:6 Attached [2] 6:22 34:11	Attempting [1] 14:11 Attorney [1] 21:13 August [1] 23:19 Avenue [1] 2:13 Aware [1] 19:8	Center [3] 9:12 9:17 18:18 Certainly [6] 5:19 9:18 9:19 21:16 25:23 29:10 CERTIFICATE [1] 34:2 CERTIFY [1] 34:8 Cetera [1] 31:10 Chair [2] 3:16 26:10 Chairman [25] 1:11 1:11 3:1 3:10 3:13 3:20 7: 19 8:15 11:14 12:11 14:9 21:11 24:11 24:25 26:3 26:7 26:9 26:20 27:24 28: 1 28:12 30:19 32:6 33:15 33:21 Challenge [1] 22:19 Challenges [1] 15:15 Challenging [1] 15:18 Chance [1] 32:22 Changes [1] 26:14 Characterization [1] 6:19 Characterize [1] 8:4 Cheri [3] 1:24 34:5 34:18 Circumstances [1] 12:2 Clarification [2] 12:14 29:8 Clarified [1] 29:23 Clarify [1] 30:24 Clarifying [2] 26:1 26:19 Clearly [4] 6:21 7:7 7:14 32:16 Close [1] 22:7 Co-counsel [1] 3:19 Coit [1] 1:21 Colleen [1] 2:5 Combined [1] 16:12 Combining [3] 16:8 16:8 16:10 Coming [1] 22:16 Commencing [1] 2:14 Comment [1] 27:11 Comments [1] 18:7 Commission [22] 1:1 1:10 1:13 3:7 3:11 4:15 5:24 7:9 7:16 8:6 8:23 10:24 10:24 11:19 16:22 20:6 20:15 25:24 27:10 28:18 31:3 33:11 Commissioner [16] 1:12 12:13 12:18 12:23 13:4 13:9 13:13 13:25 19:15 19:22 20:24 21:6 26:11 29:7 29:16 30:11 Common [3] 10:17 14:25 19:11 Communications [7] 1:5 3:4 3:14 6:22 7:2 7:8 7:10 Companies [2] 14:17 15:1 Compel
1	1	B	B	
1	[1] 22:5	Bad [1] 6:19 Bad-faith [1] 6:19 Ball [2] 21:19 22:10 Based [1] 18:21 Basic [2] 10:6 11:13 Basis [2] 5:2 5:17 Become [1] 16:20 Becomes [2] 28:17 30:3 Begin [1] 15:11 Behalf [1] 8:15 Belief [1] 12:9 Ben [3] 2:2 3:18 6:4 Best [1] 1:15 Between [18] 1:5 3:3 4:2 6:1 6:7 6:22 8:19 10: 10 10:20 11:23 12:24 13:6 21:8 21:16 21:17 31:1 32:20 33:4 Big [3] 18:18 18:20 33:22 Bit [6] 3:22 15:12 32:12 32:13 32:20 33:3 Bogged [1] 28:8 Bonrud [1] 1:19 Bowar [1] 1:23 Bring [2] 17:8 28:17 Bringing [4] 15:5 15:10 15:16 22:20 Broad [1] 30:2 Brought [1] 27:17 BURG [14] 1:12 12:13 12:23 13:4 13:9 13:13 19:15 19:22 20:24 21:6 26:11 29:7 29: 16 30:11 Business [4] 8:24 9:1 9:5 10:9	Center [3] 9:12 9:17 18:18 Certainly [6] 5:19 9:18 9:19 21:16 25:23 29:10 CERTIFICATE [1] 34:2 CERTIFY [1] 34:8 Cetera [1] 31:10 Chair [2] 3:16 26:10 Chairman [25] 1:11 1:11 3:1 3:10 3:13 3:20 7: 19 8:15 11:14 12:11 14:9 21:11 24:11 24:25 26:3 26:7 26:9 26:20 27:24 28: 1 28:12 30:19 32:6 33:15 33:21 Challenge [1] 22:19 Challenges [1] 15:15 Challenging [1] 15:18 Chance [1] 32:22 Changes [1] 26:14 Characterization [1] 6:19 Characterize [1] 8:4 Cheri [3] 1:24 34:5 34:18 Circumstances [1] 12:2 Clarification [2] 12:14 29:8 Clarified [1] 29:23 Clarify [1] 30:24 Clarifying [2] 26:1 26:19 Clearly [4] 6:21 7:7 7:14 32:16 Close [1] 22:7 Co-counsel [1] 3:19 Coit [1] 1:21 Colleen [1] 2:5 Combined [1] 16:12 Combining [3] 16:8 16:8 16:10 Coming [1] 22:16 Commencing [1] 2:14 Comment [1] 27:11 Comments [1] 18:7 Commission [22] 1:1 1:10 1:13 3:7 3:11 4:15 5:24 7:9 7:16 8:6 8:23 10:24 10:24 11:19 16:22 20:6 20:15 25:24 27:10 28:18 31:3 33:11 Commissioner [16] 1:12 12:13 12:18 12:23 13:4 13:9 13:13 13:25 19:15 19:22 20:24 21:6 26:11 29:7 29:16 30:11 Common [3] 10:17 14:25 19:11 Communications [7] 1:5 3:4 3:14 6:22 7:2 7:8 7:10 Companies [2] 14:17 15:1 Compel	
2	2	C	C	
2	[1] 22:5	Cable [3] 8:3 12:24 15:17 Capitol [2] 2:13 2:13 Carriers [3] 11:12 18:16 20:21 Case [18] 3:19 3:24 6:8 8:3 8:7 15:21 16:8 16:8 16:10 16:10 16:12 16:12 16:14 20:1 31:5 32:16 32:25 33:8 Cases [8] 8:11 8:12 14:23 16:11 22:23 25:15 25:23 32:22	Center [3] 9:12 9:17 18:18 Certainly [6] 5:19 9:18 9:19 21:16 25:23 29:10 CERTIFICATE [1] 34:2 CERTIFY [1] 34:8 Cetera [1] 31:10 Chair [2] 3:16 26:10 Chairman [25] 1:11 1:11 3:1 3:10 3:13 3:20 7: 19 8:15 11:14 12:11 14:9 21:11 24:11 24:25 26:3 26:7 26:9 26:20 27:24 28: 1 28:12 30:19 32:6 33:15 33:21 Challenge [1] 22:19 Challenges [1] 15:15 Challenging [1] 15:18 Chance [1] 32:22 Changes [1] 26:14 Characterization [1] 6:19 Characterize [1] 8:4 Cheri [3] 1:24 34:5 34:18 Circumstances [1] 12:2 Clarification [2] 12:14 29:8 Clarified [1] 29:23 Clarify [1] 30:24 Clarifying [2] 26:1 26:19 Clearly [4] 6:21 7:7 7:14 32:16 Close [1] 22:7 Co-counsel [1] 3:19 Coit [1] 1:21 Colleen [1] 2:5 Combined [1] 16:12 Combining [3] 16:8 16:8 16:10 Coming [1] 22:16 Commencing [1] 2:14 Comment [1] 27:11 Comments [1] 18:7 Commission [22] 1:1 1:10 1:13 3:7 3:11 4:15 5:24 7:9 7:16 8:6 8:23 10:24 10:24 11:19 16:22 20:6 20:15 25:24 27:10 28:18 31:3 33:11 Commissioner [16] 1:12 12:13 12:18 12:23 13:4 13:9 13:13 13:25 19:15 19:22 20:24 21:6 26:11 29:7 29:16 30:11 Common [3] 10:17 14:25 19:11 Communications [7] 1:5 3:4 3:14 6:22 7:2 7:8 7:10 Companies [2] 14:17 15:1 Compel	
2004	[4] 1:8 2:14 34:11 34:14			
24-2004	[1] 28:4			
251 (f) (2)	[1] 5:23			
3	3			
3	[1] 14:21			
4	4			
4	[2] 12:8 14:21			
5	5			
5	[1] 14:21			
500	[1] 2:13			
6	6			
6	[1] 1:8			
6th	[2] 2:14 34:10			
9	9			
9:30	[1] 2:15			
A	A			
A.m.	[1] 2:15			
Able	[2] 28:9 28:25			
Above-entitled	[2] 2:12 34:10			
Absolutely	[1] 28:19			
Accept	[1] 18:19			
Accordance	[1] 27:19			
Acknowledge	[1] 22:11			
Acknowledged				

Word Index

<p>[7] 6:16 7:5 16:21 17:3 17:22 27:13 32:4</p> <p>Compelling [1] 19:24</p> <p>Completely [1] 31:17</p> <p>Complicates [1] 28:4</p> <p>Concern [1] 15:5</p> <p>Concerned [1] 19:12</p> <p>Concerning [1] 27:15</p> <p>Concur [2] 26:12 26:17</p> <p>Conference [1] 33:20</p> <p>Confusing [1] 22:18</p> <p>Confusion [1] 30:23</p> <p>Connection [1] 31:1</p> <p>Consider [3] 25:25 32:2 32:4</p> <p>Considered [1] 27:4</p> <p>Considering [1] 26:5</p> <p>Consolidate [2] 24:23 33:1</p> <p>Consolidated [1] 33:8</p> <p>Contains [1] 17:10</p> <p>Context [1] 18:25</p> <p>Contract [4] 4:19 21:25 22:21 25:3</p> <p>Converging [1] 22:12</p> <p>Cooperative [2] 1:6 3:5</p> <p>Correct [5] 13:11 13:12 13:16 31:6 34:12</p> <p>Correctly [1] 16:7</p> <p>Cost [11] 10:19 11:1 11:5 11:6 11:6 11:10 14:16 15:1 25:4 25:6 27:14</p> <p>Costs [2] 10:21 14:24</p> <p>Counsel [2] 21:13 33:18</p> <p>COUNTY [1] 34:3</p> <p>Couple [1] 12:14</p> <p>Course [3] 4:17 15:23 30:15</p> <p>Cover [1] 30:2</p> <p>Cremer [8] 1:14 11:15 11:16 28:13 29:1 29:4 29:13 30:17</p> <p>Crosses [1] 28:19</p> <p>Customers [1] 12:22</p>	<p>[1] 34:13</p> <p>Dates [2] 11:19 24:9</p> <p>Dave [4] 1:17 3:11 17:8 29:13</p> <p>David [1] 1:21</p> <p>Davis [1] 2:3</p> <p>Deadline [1] 23:17</p> <p>Deal [5] 6:7 10:3 10:5 29:22 33:22</p> <p>Dealing [3] 19:4 19:4 21:25</p> <p>Deals [2] 30:13 30:20</p> <p>Dealt [1] 5:12</p> <p>December [1] 8:22</p> <p>Decide [1] 31:3</p> <p>Decided [1] 9:3</p> <p>Decision [1] 20:3</p> <p>Defer [1] 6:4</p> <p>Deferred [1] 31:8</p> <p>Definitely [1] 25:25</p> <p>Density [1] 15:1</p> <p>Dependant [1] 31:19</p> <p>Detail [1] 5:1</p> <p>Dickens [2] 2:2 3:18</p> <p>Difference [9] 6:20 8:18 10:10 11:13 11:23 12:24 18:20 21:8 21:15</p> <p>Differences [7] 6:1 7:25 10:7 10:20 11:9 21:17 25:7</p> <p>Different [11] 5:9 8:1 8:4 9:6 10:13 12:2 18:14 19:4 19:7 21:22 29:12</p> <p>Differently [1] 24:1</p> <p>Difficult [1] 23:24</p> <p>Dipping [1] 32:12</p> <p>Disagree [2] 18:2 28:2</p> <p>Disagreement [1] 21:15</p> <p>Discover [1] 28:10</p> <p>Discovery [11] 11:18 21:24 23:11 25:1 27:6 28:9 31:10 32:11 32:14 32:24 33:3</p> <p>Discrete [1] 16:18</p> <p>Discretionary [1] 5:24</p> <p>Discuss [1] 8:9</p> <p>Discussions [2] 31:13 31:15</p> <p>Dispositive [1] 17:11</p> <p>Dispute [5] 6:18 25:3 25:4 25:6 25:9</p> <p>Disputes [1] 28:9</p> <p>Distinction [3] 4:8 8:21 13:6</p>	<p>Docket [7] 4:2 4:11 5:7 16:4 20:7 23:7 30:16</p> <p>Docketed [4] 22:2 22:25 24:16 25:19</p> <p>Dockets [5] 8:5 14:10 15:13 24:22 26:5</p> <p>Done [2] 4:25 16:10</p> <p>Doubt [1] 17:17</p> <p>Douglas [1] 1:17</p> <p>Down [3] 28:8 28:15 33:17</p> <p>Drop [1] 17:25</p> <p>Duly-appointed [1] 34:8</p> <p>During [1] 32:11</p>	<p>[1] 29:11</p> <p>Exclusive [1] 18:4</p> <p>Excuse [1] 5:4</p> <p>Exhibits [1] 11:12</p> <p>Exist [1] 22:22</p> <p>Existence [1] 31:12</p> <p>Expect [1] 33:19</p> <p>Expedite [2] 24:2 28:23</p> <p>Expediting [1] 30:22</p> <p>Expeditious [1] 19:6</p> <p>Expeditionously [1] 9:22</p> <p>Expense [1] 13:15</p> <p>Expert [2] 14:15 24:21</p> <p>Explore [1] 6:2</p> <p>Exploring [1] 15:23</p> <p>Extent [2] 5:3 11:10</p> <p>Extra [1] 19:20</p>
<p>D</p> <p>Dakota [6] 1:2 2:12 2:13 34:1 34:7 34:13</p> <p>Dan [2] 2:3 2:3</p> <p>Darla [3] 1:20 3:17 13:4</p> <p>Data [1] 27:14</p> <p>Dated</p>	<p>E</p> <p>E-mail [1] 6:23</p> <p>Easiest [1] 3:15</p> <p>East [1] 2:13</p> <p>Easy [1] 24:9</p> <p>Effect [2] 19:23 20:3</p> <p>Effectively [2] 9:1 31:4</p> <p>Efficient [1] 6:15</p> <p>Effort [1] 6:12</p> <p>Efforts [1] 32:1</p> <p>Encompass [4] 15:24 15:25 16:1 18:5</p> <p>Encompasses [2] 12:15 13:19</p> <p>Encompassing [1] 11:3</p> <p>End [8] 22:4 25:13 25:14 28:7 30:12 32:2 32:7 32:16</p> <p>Engage [2] 6:12 12:6</p> <p>Engaged [1] 16:14</p> <p>Engaging [1] 16:16</p> <p>Entered [1] 4:19</p> <p>Entitled [4] 4:17 5:19 9:21 10:12</p> <p>Especially [2] 14:18 26:14</p> <p>Essentially [2] 10:22 10:25</p> <p>Establish [1] 11:17</p> <p>Et [1] 31:10</p> <p>Event [1] 7:13</p> <p>Eventually [2] 23:2 33:6</p> <p>Evidence [1] 6:18</p> <p>Evidentiary [4] 11:21 15:22 21:22 25:20</p> <p>Exact [2] 15:14 25:15</p> <p>Except [1] 5:1</p> <p>Exclude</p>	<p>F</p> <p>Fact [4] 5:15 7:3 18:17 23:6</p> <p>Factors [3] 14:16 14:21 14:22</p> <p>Facts [2] 7:10 12:2</p> <p>Factual [2] 5:25 28:10</p> <p>Fairness [1] 19:11</p> <p>Faith [11] 4:15 4:20 4:20 6:19 12:6 15:9 16:15 16:17 22:22 25:10 27:19</p> <p>Far [2] 12:19 19:11</p> <p>Farris [1] 1:18</p> <p>Fashion [1] 15:12</p> <p>FCC [1] 5:11</p> <p>Federal [3] 5:13 5:13 23:17</p> <p>Few [1] 14:13</p> <p>Fight [1] 27:7</p> <p>File [2] 4:7 7:5</p> <p>Filed [8] 4:3 4:15 7:4 10:16 11:2 29:24 30:2 30:8</p> <p>Filing [5] 1:4 3:2 4:11 4:12 4:24</p> <p>Filings [1] 14:24</p> <p>Final [1] 7:13</p> <p>Fine [3] 18:19 32:10 33:5</p> <p>First [6] 4:1 4:7 4:7 4:10 23:15 23:18</p> <p>Flush [1] 3:23</p> <p>Flushed</p>	

Word Index

<p>[2] 32:25 33:24 Focused [1] 11:5 Focuses [1] 9:8 Fold [1] 4:9 Foreseeing [1] 33:9 Forth [1] 27:23 Forward [9] 3:15 7:17 7:24 15:12 20:16 21:23 22:25 23:1 24:16 Founded [1] 4:13 Four [2] 11:17 17:24 Frankly [1] 32:21 Furnished [1] 4:21</p>	<p>9 22:14 22:16 23:12 24:24 25:20 29: 12 29:17 Hearing's [1] 22:4 Hearings [3] 12:5 15:6 25:8 Heather [1] 24:6 Held [2] 2:11 19:24 Help [1] 30:6 Helsper [1] 2:7 HEREBY [1] 34:8 Hoc [2] 33:16 33:22 Hohrman [1] 2:6 Hold [3] 11:20 12:10 15:18 Holding [1] 12:4 Huge [1] 11:23 HUGHES [1] 34:3</p>	<p>12:1 12:15 15:8 16:16 17:9 18:9 19:8 19:9 20:13 20:23 22:20 25:9 27:20 30: 21 31:13 Interest [1] 9:25 Interject [1] 16:6 Intermediate [2] 14:1 14:7 Interpretation [1] 17:13 Intersection [1] 5:4 Interstate [7] 1:5 3:4 3:13 3:17 4:4 6:10 32:3 Involved [1] 8:2 Irrelevant [1] 31:17 Issue [9] 4:18 7:23 8:9 10:1 16:17 16:18 17: 13 28:5 28:17 Issues [22] 8:1 13:7 13:22 15:4 15:11 15:16 18:4 21:18 21:22 21:25 22:21 22:21 22:22 23:6 24:13 24:22 27:1 27:14 28: 10 29:20 32:13 32:23 ITC [15] 4:11 4:14 4:17 4:22 7:21 9:8 10: 18 10:24 17:18 18:22 18:22 20:22 27: 18 29:4 29:8 ITC's [1] 9:8 Item [3] 22:2 24:16 25:19 Itself [1] 17:10</p>	<p>[2] 8:22 27:11 Late [2] 24:4 24:9 Law [3] 19:16 19:19 23:17 Lean [1] 25:10 Leaning [1] 21:14 Least [7] 4:8 13:16 17:13 22:10 29:23 30:9 32:25 Leave [1] 29:21 Led [1] 31:14 Leeway [1] 32:12 Lenient [1] 33:3 Likely [2] 8:7 14:15 Limit [1] 23:16 Limitation [1] 27:22 Limited [2] 30:16 30:20 Limits [1] 27:13 Line [2] 3:18 28:20 Lines [1] 25:2 LNP [42] 5:5 5:9 5:15 6:1 6:2 6:3 6:11 6: 13 7:15 7:18 7:23 8:12 8:19 8:20 9:2 10:11 10:19 11:5 11:7 11:9 11:11 12: 5 13:10 13:18 16:13 16:23 17:5 17:8 18:6 18:12 25:8 25:22 28:4 30:2 30:9 31:15 31:21 31:23 31:25 32:4 32:5 33: 8 Local [3] 4:4 13:19 27:15 Lohnes [1] 2:4 Look [6] 7:9 10:25 14:20 17:3 21:21 24:12 Looked [1] 22:7 Looking [7] 8:13 10:11 13:15 14:10 21:7 24:20 33:7 Losing [1] 16:9 Lucky [1] 23:20 Lump [1] 25:7</p>	
G				
<p>Gain [2] 14:11 22:8 Gains [1] 22:13 GARY [1] 1:11 Gathered [1] 13:10 General [1] 21:13 Gerdes [25] 1:21 3:8 3:10 3:11 4:6 8:15 11: 21 12:18 13:2 13:24 17:17 19:18 20:5 21:2 21:5 23:8 23:13 24:5 26:18 26: 21 27:5 28:1 28:22 29:3 33:17 Good-faith [7] 4:20 12:6 15:9 16:15 16:17 22:22 25:10 Grant [3] 11:19 31:3 31:24 Granted [3] 6:10 16:13 19:24 Granting [1] 12:9 Grants [1] 7:16 Great [3] 6:7 14:10 15:3 Greg [1] 1:15 Guess [3] 4:6 13:17 20:5 Gut [1] 32:8</p>	I			
	<p>Idea [2] 21:10 23:2 Immediate [1] 20:13 Immediately [1] 9:5 Implement [4] 7:18 10:19 16:23 31:25 Implementation [2] 10:20 31:16 Implementing [3] 11:5 11:7 31:23 Important [1] 11:4 Importantly [1] 28:8 Inc [2] 1:6 3:5 Inclination [2] 21:19 22:24 Incurred [2] 11:8 11:11 Independent [2] 5:2 5:17 Indicating [1] 15:20 Indication [1] 6:25 Individual [2] 14:17 14:23 Indulge [1] 32:19 Inextricably [1] 27:2 Information [2] 4:22 11:1 Informed [1] 7:3 Initial [1] 14:24 Instances [1] 30:4 Instruct [1] 25:16 Intent [1] 17:18 Interconnected [2] 16:20 16:24 Interconnection [22] 1:4 3:3 4:13 7:7 8:22 8:25 10:8</p>	J		
		<p>Jacobson [1] 1:17 Jeff [1] 1:22 Jim [2] 1:12 1:16 JoAnne [1] 2:6 John [1] 1:14 July [2] 24:4 24:10 June [2] 22:5 22:5</p>	K	
		<p>Karen [2] 1:14 11:16 Keep [4] 7:2 12:21 13:22 22:19 Keeping [2] 25:11 33:6 Kept [1] 17:25 Kind [6] 8:8 15:20 22:6 22:12 27:6 33:9 Kinds [1] 10:11 Knowing [1] 4:11 Knowledge [1] 5:11</p>	L	
		<p>Large [3] 8:7 11:10 33:8 Largely [1] 11:7 Larson [1] 1:22 Last</p>	M	
H				
<p>Handled [3] 8:7 16:25 30:14 Hanging [1] 29:21 Hansen [1] 2:8 HANSON [2] 1:11 26:10 Harlan [1] 1:15 Harm [1] 12:4 Harrington [1] 2:6 Hear [1] 25:22 Heard [6] 8:13 9:21 14:13 22:14 23:3 25:15 Hearing [20] 7:22 8:10 11:18 11:21 12:10 14:5 15:3 15:14 15:19 19:24 21:9 21:9 22:</p>	<p>Mandatory [1] 5:23 Manifestly [1] 18:8 Manner [1] 30:8 Mary [5] 2:1 2:4 3:18 6:5 30:6 Matter [16] 1:4 2:12 3:2 3:9 10:9 12:10 15:6 19:6 19:11 23:10 23:20 23:21 23:25 25:18 27:3 34:10 Matters [2] 15:19 21:14 Mature [1] 23:18 McComsey [3] 1:24 34:5 34:18 Mean [13] 9:8 18:25 19:13 22:3 23:22 24:2</p>			

Word Index

26:22 26:24 28:6 28:9 31:11 33:11 33:18 Meant [1] 17:14 Measures [2] 14:1 14:7 Meeting [3] 18:1 33:11 33:22 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [1] 3:10 Mentioned [3] 5:7 28:2 28:5 Merge [2] 29:19 32:22 Merging [1] 32:16 Merits [2] 7:23 8:11 Messages [1] 6:23 Michele [1] 1:18 Mid [1] 24:9 Midco [5] 7:1 7:12 11:9 31:20 31:22 Midcontinent [12] 1:5 3:3 3:9 3:12 8:16 8:25 11:16 16:21 16:25 19:11 27:12 27:24 Might [4] 3:14 6:20 11:21 17:13 Mind [2] 14:10 30:23 Mindful [1] 22:15 Minimum [2] 6:14 31:7 Minute [1] 30:19 Minutes [1] 14:13 Month [1] 12:7 Months [1] 17:24 Moot [1] 31:5 Most [5] 9:7 10:2 14:12 30:10 32:21 Motion [19] 4:10 6:16 7:4 9:23 16:21 17:3 17:22 18:5 20:13 20:15 27:12 27:16 27:18 28:3 28:21 30:20 32:4 32:9 32:10 Move [7] 8:8 22:2 23:1 24:2 24:16 25:16 25:19 Moving [1] 22:19 Must [1] 32:3	[7] 4:21 5:18 5:19 7:11 12:7 15:10 31:21 Network [1] 11:22 Never [2] 5:18 18:1 Nevertheless [1] 30:7 Next [4] 12:7 33:10 33:19 33:23 Notary [2] 34:6 34:18 Note [1] 33:10 Nothing [1] 4:24 Notify [1] 7:4 Number [8] 4:4 10:7 10:9 13:19 15:10 15:13 16:9 27:15 Numbers [1] 12:21	[5] 22:8 24:14 27:15 28:24 33:8 Particular [7] 13:6 15:1 15:6 21:20 29:17 30:15 31:1 Parties [13] 4:1 6:22 7:20 21:16 21:24 22:6 22:16 24:13 25:5 25:16 25:21 32:18 33:2 Party [1] 23:5 Past [1] 8:9 Path [1] 28:15 Pending [1] 10:4 People [2] 12:20 14:6 Perhaps [1] 8:16 Period [1] 6:11 Person [1] 5:15 Perspective [3] 6:21 6:25 13:24 Petition [20] 4:3 6:8 6:9 6:17 7:6 9:8 10:1 10:15 11:3 13:18 16:9 16:19 17:6 17:25 18:3 18:3 19:2 20:9 20:17 25:23 Petitioned [1] 20:22 Petitioner [1] 27:12 Petitioners [1] 19:9 Petitions [11] 9:7 9:9 10:2 10:16 15:24 18:10 18:15 18:21 19:1 30:1 30:8 Phone [1] 6:24 Pierre [2] 2:13 34:13 Place [1] 20:14 Point [14] 6:12 7:24 9:11 9:17 11:25 13:18 16:7 17:21 24:15 24:20 24:22 25:24 29:19 33:5 Pollman [1] 1:20 Ponderous [1] 18:11 Portability [3] 4:4 13:19 27:15 Porting [2] 12:8 12:16 Portion [4] 20:7 20:16 26:23 28:3 Position [5] 4:16 4:18 4:19 5:8 7:14 Possible [2] 9:22 24:3 Possibly [1] 7:12 Potentially [1] 10:19 Practical [4] 23:14 23:20 27:3 28:6 Precisely [1] 8:16 Preprogrammed [1] 19:2 Presence [3] 9:12 9:17 18:17 Present [3] 1:23 6:18 9:15 Presented [1] 18:4 Preserve [1] 17:15	[1] 14:25 Problem [4] 9:18 12:20 18:18 18:20 Problems [3] 9:11 9:14 9:15 Procedural [9] 3:23 10:13 11:18 21:21 23:1 25:17 27:22 28:8 30:22 Proceed [4] 3:7 10:23 20:9 20:18 Proceeding [12] 3:12 8:14 16:22 17:20 17:22 18:6 20:10 22:19 27:13 31:2 31:11 31:17 Proceedings [7] 1:8 2:11 11:2 23:16 31:10 34:9 34:12 Process [3] 18:11 32:11 32:24 Professional [2] 34:6 34:19 Progress [1] 7:3 Provide [6] 5:15 6:10 12:8 17:4 31:20 32:3 Provided [1] 11:12 Provision [3] 17:10 17:18 32:10 Proviso [4] 22:3 25:13 25:20 26:15 Public [4] 1:1 1:10 34:6 34:18 Purpose [1] 31:21 Purposes [4] 11:8 11:11 27:6 31:22 Pursuant [3] 7:6 7:8 31:16 Put [1] 26:15
O			
	Obligation [1] 5:14 Obligations [1] 4:5 Obviously [3] 6:9 7:9 21:15 Omnibus [4] 20:10 22:9 22:16 24:14 Once [2] 8:10 22:17 One [24] 8:7 10:7 10:16 10:17 10:18 11:2 11:17 13:10 15:3 18:15 20:23 21:9 21:20 22:4 24:23 26:1 29:8 29:9 29:10 29:11 29:15 29:21 30:14 32:17 Ones [1] 14:12 Opinion [1] 6:21 Opposing [1] 33:18 Opposition [2] 4:16 6:23 Order [7] 5:3 5:5 5:11 9:23 12:7 17:4 31:20 Ordering [1] 12:6 Orderly [3] 15:12 15:18 22:20 Original [2] 18:7 32:9 Otherwise [1] 29:22 Ought [1] 28:25 Outlined [1] 27:13 Outrageous [1] 28:19 Outside [1] 14:16 Overlap [3] 15:7 32:20 33:4 Own [1] 23:1		
P			
Nancy [1] 2:4 Narrow [1] 24:13 Necessarily [2] 11:22 13:23 Need [6] 3:24 13:14 13:22 14:5 21:24 29:7 Needs [1] 29:5 Negotiate [1] 4:14 Negotiation [6] 6:13 6:19 16:15 16:17 17:9 32:5 Negotiations	Pam [1] 1:19 Pamela [1] 2:6 Paragraph [4] 17:9 17:14 17:19 27:19 Parallel [1] 26:13 Part		Read [3] 9:7 18:14 18:25 Reality [2] 23:15 23:25 Realize [1] 32:19 Really [6] 10:15 14:23 16:12 16:25 17:2 24:25 Reason [3] 4:8 7:17 31:9 Recalled [1] 30:25 Receive [1] 6:3 Recently [1] 24:8 Recommend [1] 12:9 Reconsider [1] 27:11 Referring [1] 17:19 Refers [1] 17:19 Registered [2] 34:5 34:19 Related [3] 19:13 19:14 32:13 Relates [6] 9:24 18:13 20:7 20:10 20:17 26:23 Relating [1] 31:15

Word Index

Relationship [2] 4:2 6:7	[1] 26:13	[3] 9:13 19:4 19:7	Switch [5] 13:11 13:14 14:2 14:8 26:14
Release [1] 16:24	S	Six-month [1] 5:22	T
Relevant [1] 27:8	SAHR [20] 1:11 3:1 3:13 3:20 7:19 11:14 12:11 14:9 21:11 24:11 24:25 26:3 26:7 26:9 26:20 27:24 28:12 32:6 33:15 33:21	Smith [16] 1:14 3:21 3:25 17:7 23:5 23:10 23:14 24:6 26:1 26:4 26:8 26:25 27:8 30:18 31:9 33:10	Talbot [1] 2:2
Relief [4] 16:20 18:16 31:3 31:19	Santel [1] 21:2	So-called [1] 5:22	TC03-192 [2] 1:5 3:1
Reluctant [1] 26:12	Satisfactory [2] 12:17 12:20	Sometime [1] 33:23	TC04-054 [1] 4:2
Remember [1] 20:21	Satisfied [1] 7:1	Sort [1] 32:15	Technical [3] 9:19 9:20 13:7
Renders [1] 31:4	Savings [2] 17:10 17:18	South [6] 1:2 2:12 2:13 34:1 34:7 34:13	Technically [1] 14:2
Replacing [2] 14:2 14:8	Schaefer [1] 1:18	SPEAKER [1] 21:4	Technician [1] 14:4
Reported [1] 1:24	Schedule [8] 11:18 21:21 23:1 23:23 24:4 25:18 27:22 30:22	Specific [1] 30:21	Telecommunications [2] 1:6 3:4
Reporter [3] 34:6 34:9 34:19	Schedules [1] 33:12	Specifically [2] 5:12 30:25	TELEPHONE [1] 2:1
Represent [1] 3:12	Second [2] 5:6 26:10	Spot [1] 32:7	Temporary [1] 5:22
Representing [1] 3:8	Secondly [2] 4:13 11:20	SS [1] 34:2	Tend [1] 25:7
Request [6] 5:8 7:14 11:4 20:8 27:21 31:24	See [12] 4:8 8:5 8:7 9:4 10:6 10:6 15:2 24:12 28:14 29:5 29:23 32:25	Staff [7] 1:13 10:25 11:14 21:12 25:17 28:12 33:18	Terms [3] 7:13 17:14 17:15
Requested [4] 5:10 11:17 16:24 31:20	Seem [4] 6:11 6:15 7:17 7:24	Standpoint [1] 31:2	Test [1] 14:21
Requesting [1] 17:15	Sense [7] 5:7 5:18 14:25 24:14 24:23 25:14 27:1	Start [6] 15:5 15:8 15:9 15:16 22:10 25:12	Therefore [1] 10:12
Requests [4] 16:21 17:4 21:1 32:15	Separate [27] 8:14 10:16 10:23 11:1 12:3 12:5 13:23 16:4 16:18 17:5 19:5 20:6 21:14 21:21 22:2 22:3 24:16 25:11 25:12 25:17 25:19 25:20 26:5 29:11 30:12 32:23 33:6	State [4] 1:2 2:12 34:1 34:7	They've [2] 14:6 21:16
Require [2] 9:13 12:3	Separated [1] 27:9	Steve [1] 1:16	Thinking [2] 21:12 26:7
Required [2] 6:10 16:23	Separately [5] 17:1 22:25 29:17 29:18 29:19	Still [1] 13:14	Thompson [1] 2:5
Requirement [2] 7:15 30:9	Set [2] 22:1 27:22	Stone [1] 17:23	Tied [1] 27:2
Requiring [2] 5:4 5:5	Setting [2] 21:21 30:22	Stone-walled [1] 17:23	Timing [2] 21:7 21:8
Resolution [1] 7:13	Sevold [1] 2:5	Stuck [1] 19:1	Tina [1] 1:17
Resolve [1] 17:5	Shall [1] 3:6	Subject [2] 5:12 5:20	Today [3] 3:6 24:7 33:14
Resolved [3] 6:17 31:8 33:13	Sharing [1] 15:2	Submit [1] 9:21	Todd [1] 2:8
Respectfully [1] 27:21	Short [1] 14:2	Subsequent [1] 31:15	Toe [1] 32:12
Respond [1] 10:14	Shorthand [2] 34:9 34:9	Substantial [1] 5:25	Together [1] 25:22
Response [1] 27:25	Show [2] 11:12 25:1	Substantially [1] 8:1	Tomorrow [1] 33:19
Rest [2] 12:16 12:19	Side [4] 9:19 9:20 9:25 15:17	Sudden [1] 17:24	Took [1] 34:9
Revisit [1] 33:1	Sign [1] 12:21	Suddenly [1] 15:7	Totally [1] 5:24
Rich [2] 1:21 2:7	Significant [4] 7:25 8:18 9:11 10:10	Sue [1] 1:18	Toward [1] 25:11
Rights [1] 17:14	Significantly [3] 9:6 18:13 19:6	Sufficient [1] 20:14	Towards [1] 21:14
Rislov [1] 1:15	Signing [1] 31:14	Sufficiently [2] 8:12 22:7	Track [9] 10:13 12:3 13:23 19:5 22:3 22:11 24:13 25:12 26:6
ROBERT [1] 1:11	Similar [4] 8:12 14:12 14:18 14:22	Suggest [2] 6:14 31:7	Tracking [1] 26:13
Rod [1] 1:23	Sisak [10] 2:1 3:18 6:6 10:14 16:6 18:2 27:10 30:24 31:6 31:18	Suggesting [3] 17:2 31:18 32:2	Tracks [3] 10:24 30:12 33:6
Rogers [14] 1:20 3:14 3:16 3:17 4:15 6:4 13:5 13:12 13:17 15:20 15:22 24:18 24:19 30:1	Sit [2] 18:9 33:17	Suggests [1] 4:24	Transcript [2] 1:8 2:11
Rolayne [1] 1:13	Sitting [1] 22:4	Support [1] 27:14	Transcription [1] 34:12
Rolling [2] 21:20 22:10	Situation	Suspend [1] 4:4	Transport [1] 9:13
Roughly [1] 24:12		Suspension [26] 5:22 5:23 6:8 6:9 6:17 7:5 7:15 7:16 7:21 8:9 11:4 13:18 15:24 16:9 16:13 16:18 17:5 17:16 18:24 19:17 19:21 20:1 20:8 21:1 23:15 30:9	Tried [1] 24:8
Route [1] 22:9		Suspensions [3] 5:10 5:16 29:25	True [1] 34:11
RPR [1] 1:24			Truthfully [1] 23:22
Run			Try

Word Index

<p>[6] 3:23 7:2 23:25 24:2 24:5 28:16 Trying [3] 7:18 8:17 28:22 Turn [1] 3:21 Turned [1] 19:25 Two [15] 4:9 10:4 10:6 10:10 10:11 10:15 10:17 10:23 11:1 16:11 20:21 20:25 23:18 29:14 30:12 Two-fold [1] 4:9 Type [7] 15:4 22:1 22:22 25:3 25:6 25:9 25: 10 Types [1] 15:2 Typical [1] 12:25</p>	<p>[1] 6:12 Wasted [1] 32:1 Wayne [1] 2:8 Week [1] 33:23 Weeks [1] 23:18 Wegman [1] 1:16 Wieczorek [1] 2:2 Wiest [1] 1:13 Wire [2] 12:8 12:8 Wireless [19] 6:2 8:20 9:2 9:10 9:12 9:25 10:3 10:13 10:21 11:11 11:24 13:20 14:19 16:2 18:13 20:2 20:11 20:18 21:18 Wireline [71] 5:8 5:9 6:1 6:1 6:2 8:2 8:2 8:3 8: 19 8:19 8:20 9:3 9:10 9:16 9:16 9:24 9:24 10:5 10:21 11:23 11:24 11:24 12: 24 12:25 12:25 12:25 13:14 13:15 13: 20 14:18 15:16 15:17 15:17 15:25 16: 1 16:1 18:13 18:23 18:24 19:17 19:17 20:2 20:2 20:2 20:8 20:9 20:11 20:17 20:17 20:18 21:1 21:1 21:18 26:23 26: 24 28:5 28:5 28:23 28:24 29:9 29:9 29:11 29:11 29:20 29:21 29:24 29:24 30:4 30:4 30:13 30:13 Wish [2] 6:2 6:3 Witnesses [2] 14:16 24:21 Wittler [3] 1:24 34:5 34:18 Wondering [1] 8:8 Works [1] 11:22 Worth [1] 10:8</p>
U	
<p>Ultimate [1] 31:19 Ultimately [1] 17:4 Under [6] 5:23 9:12 12:1 14:21 23:16 23:16 Understood [1] 16:7 Unequivocal [1] 5:14 Unfair [2] 8:24 18:8 Unfortunately [1] 24:7 UNIDENTIFIED [1] 21:4 Unwieldy [2] 15:12 16:3 Up [11] 12:21 17:8 22:4 25:13 25:17 27:2 28:7 30:12 31:14 32:7 32:16 Upcoming [1] 25:14 Update [2] 13:11 13:14 Urge [2] 25:5 33:2 UTILITIES [2] 1:1 1:10</p>	
V	
<p>Vandestadt [1] 2:7 Various [1] 6:23 Vary [1] 14:25 Versed [1] 9:20 VICE [2] 1:11 26:10 View [1] 10:15 Violated [1] 16:15 Vogel [1] 2:4</p>	
W	
<p>Wait [4] 9:2 18:9 29:5 33:12 Wall [1] 2:3 Walled [1] 17:23 Warren [1] 2:7 Waste</p>	