THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE TELEPHONE AUTHORITY FOR SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF 47 U.S.C. SECTION 251(B)(2) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 AS AMENDED

TC04-085

Transcript of Proceedings
August 17, 2004



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
Keith Senger
Dave Jacobson
Michele Farris
Jim Mehlhaff
Tina Douglas
Heather Forney
Pam Bonrud

SEP 0 8 2004
SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR

PRECISION REPORTING L I M I T E D

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE TELEPHONE AUTHORITY FOR SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION TC04-085 OF 47 U.S.C. SECTION 251(B)(2) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 AS AMENDED

Transcript of Proceedings August 17, 2004

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 Keith Senger Dave Jacobson Michele Farris Jim Mehlhaff Tina Douglas Heather Forney Pam Bonrud

1	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE
2	Rachel Torrence Mark Meierhenry
3	Karen Huizenga Mark Rodvolt
4	Marv Truhe Larry Hettinger
5	Talbot Wieczorek Jeff Carmen
6	Marlene Bennett Mark Ayotte
7	Jim Blundell Doug Eidahl
8	Wendy Harper Chris Clark
9	Mary Lohnes Tom Burns
10	Pat Mastel Gene Ward
11	Jeff Heig Dan Larson
12	James Cremer
13	
14	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the
15	above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State
16	Capitol, Room 412, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre,
	capacitation, recommendation and capacitation and capacit
17	South Dakota, on the 17th day of August 2004,
17 18	
	South Dakota, on the 17th day of August 2004,
18	South Dakota, on the 17th day of August 2004,
18 19	South Dakota, on the 17th day of August 2004,
18 19 20	South Dakota, on the 17th day of August 2004,
18 19 20 21	South Dakota, on the 17th day of August 2004,
18 19 20 21 22	South Dakota, on the 17th day of August 2004, commencing at 9:30 a.m.

Communications Act of 1934 as amended.

And the question today is shall the Commission

Modification of 47 U.S.C. Section 251(b)(2) of the

And the question today is shall the Commission approve the stipulation and enter a decision incorporating its terms, and if this matter is resolved, shall the Commission close the Docket.

Ms. Rogers.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you. I'm appearing on behalf of CRST. It has taken us a little bit longer to reach a signed stipulation and file it with the Commission. The stipulation that has been crafted here is very similar to that, to the one in the previous case. The facts are just a little bit different.

What we have here is a company that CRST agrees to be LNP compliant or capable by October 1 of 2004. Currently Western Wireless does have a direct connection with CRST at Eagle Butte, and so they've agreed then pursuant to the stipulation that they will provide LNP. With regard to the issue of non-Interveners or other parties, which was the big question in this case, the provision of paragraph 4 of the agreement provides that should another wireless carrier come to CRST and request LNP, that they will make the

same offer as contained in paragraph 2 of this stipulation which, of course, includes the direct connection.

If either the other wireless carrier or

CRST -- if that's rejected, then either party can

come back to the Commission and the Commission can

enter an order of finding, modifying, or approving

the request or modifying the requirement to provide

LNP.

And I did also -- I would advise you that it appears to me that key to this agreement working with regard to non-intervening parties would be the Order that is issued in this case. And I think the language that we are looking at with regard to the order would be that CRST's obligation to provide LNP is hereby modified consistent with the terms and conditions of this stipulation.

So I think while we don't have an order yet, I have discussed this with the Commission and -- or Commission counsel so I believe we're on the same wavelength with regard to this stipulation.

It has been signed both by myself on behalf of CRST and by Mr. Wieczorek on behalf of Western Wireless. I would ask for it's approval.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

1	Mr. Wieczorek.
2	MR. WIECZOREK: I concur and all
3	set.
4	CHAIRMAN SAHR: SDTA.
5	MR. COIT: No objection.
6	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you.
7	Midcontinent, were you a party on this one?
8	MR. GERDES: We withdrew from that
9	docket.
10	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Staff.
11	MS. AILTS WIEST: We don't object to
12	the stipulation. We would just note a difference
13	from the James Valley, there is no ending date, I
14	believe, and wireline carriers are not mentioned,
15	which is probably irrelevant in Cheyenne River's
16	case.
17	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. Any
18	questions or comments from advisers or
19	Commissioners?
20	MR. SMITH: Can I ask one? Since
21	there's no time deadline or anything, I mean, what
22	would happen, Mr. Wieczorek, if the Commission were
23	to authorize the use of tandem transport in the
24	rest of the Dockets?
25	Is that something that the parties are

cognizant of and willing to live with going on and on with the DS-1 connection?

MR. WIECZOREK: On behalf of Western Wireless, that would not be a problem if you authorized that, given the fact that we have the preexisting DS-1 and there's no reason for us to get rid of that line for various reasons. I don't see that would impact the stipulation as drafted.

MS. ROGERS: I would also note that there is a paragraph in the stipulation that states that should CRST and Western Wireless in the future determine to route traffic in a different manner, they can modify the agreement at that point in time so it would be up to the parties.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. Any other questions?

Seeing none, I would -- in this Docket and the last one I thank the parties for coming together and doing quite a bit of work to get this resolved and applaud those efforts. I would move that we approve the stipulation and enter a decision incorporating its term and also that we move to close the Docket.

VICE CHAIR HANSON: Second.

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 17th day of
11	August 2004, and that the attached is a true and
12	correct transcription of the proceedings so taken.
13	Dated at Pierre, South Dakota this 7th day
14	of September 2004.
15	
16	
17	Chuim water
18	Cheri McComsey Wittler, Notary Public and
19	Registered Professional Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	