

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

<b>IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF )</b>	<b>ORDER APPROVING JOINT</b>
<b>CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE TELEPHONE )</b>	<b>PROPOSED PROCEDURAL</b>
<b>AUTHORITY FOR ARBITRATION PURSUANT )</b>	<b>SCHEDULE</b>
<b>TO THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF )</b>	
<b>1996 TO RESOLVE ISSUES RELATING TO AN )</b>	<b>TC08-122</b>
<b>INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH )</b>	
<b>ALLTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC. )</b>	

On October 21, 2008, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Telephone Authority (CRST) filed a petition for arbitration of certain unresolved terms and conditions of a proposed Interconnection and Reciprocal Compensation Agreement (Agreement) between CRST and Alltel Communications, Inc. (Alltel), pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, SDCL 49-31-81, and ARSD 20:10:32:29. CRST filed a list of unresolved issues consisting of:

- (1) What are the appropriate definitions to be included in the Agreement between the Parties?
  - (a) The definition of InterMTA traffic.
  - (b) The definition of Local Traffic, Telecommunications Traffic, and Third Party Provider.
  - (c) The definition of Wireline Local Calling Area.
  - (d) Other definition differences.
- (2) What is the appropriate scope of Reciprocal Compensation Traffic?
- (3) What is the appropriate treatment of ISP bound traffic?
- (4) What are the appropriate interconnection facilities between the Parties?
- (5) Is the inclusion of SS7 messages appropriate?
- (6) What is the obligation of the parties with respect to dialing parity?
- (7) Should compensation for Telecommunications Traffic be symmetrical?
- (8) What is the appropriate compensation rate for InterMTA traffic?
- (9) What is the appropriate manner by which the minutes of use of IntraMTA Traffic terminated by the parties, one to the other, should be calculated and billed?
- (10) Are the reciprocal compensation rates for IntraMTA Traffic and the Traffic Factors proposed by CRST appropriate pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252(d)(2)?
- (11) What is the appropriate time frame for bringing claims for disputes arising under the Agreement?
- (12) What is the appropriate effective date and term of the Agreement?

CRST requests the following relief:

- A. Issuance of an Order requiring arbitration of any and all unresolved issues between CRST and Alltel;
- B. Issuance of an Order directing CRST and Alltel to submit to this Commission for approval of an interconnection agreement reflecting:
  - (i) the agreed-upon issues between the parties to be included in the language of Exhibit B; and
  - (ii) the resolution of any unresolved issues in accordance with the positions and recommendations made by CRST as set forth herein at the arbitration hearing to be scheduled by this Commission;
- C. Issuance of an Order directing the parties to pay interim compensation for transport and termination of telecommunications traffic from January 1, 2007 (the Effective Date agreed to by the Parties) to the date on which the Commission approves the parties' executed interconnection agreement in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act;

D. Issuance of an Order asserting this Commission retain jurisdiction over this arbitration until the parties have submitted an executed interconnection agreement for approval by this Commission in accordance with Section 252(e);

E. Any other, further and different relief as the nature of this matter may require or as may be just, equitable and proper to this Commission.

In accordance with ARSD 20:10:32:30, a non-petitioning party may respond to the petition for arbitration and provide additional information within 25 days after the commission receives the petition.

On November 14, 2008, the Commission received a Response of Alltel Communications, Inc. to Petition for Arbitration of Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Telephone Authority. On December 4, 2008, the Commission received a Joint Proposed Procedural Schedule. At its meeting of December 9, 2008, the Commission voted to assess CRST a filing fee not to exceed \$75,000.

At its regularly scheduled meeting of January 27, 2009, the Commission considered the Joint Proposed Procedural Schedule. Commission Staff stated that there had been three changes made to the dates since it had been filed. In paragraph 2, January 15, 2009, was changed to January 25, 2009, in paragraph 3, January 29, 2009, was changed to February 9, 2009, and February 13, 2009, was changed to February 23, 2009. Commission Staff recommended approval. The Commission unanimously voted to approve the Joint Proposed Procedural Schedule.

The Commission has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to SDCL Chapters 1-26 and 49-31, and 47 U.S.C. section 252. The Commission may rely upon any or all of these or other laws of this state in making its determination. It is therefore

ORDERED, that the Joint Proposed Procedural Schedule is hereby approved.

Dated at Pierre, South Dakota, this 5<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2009.

<b>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</b>	
The undersigned hereby certifies that this document has been served today upon all parties of record in this docket, as listed on the docket service list, electronically.	
By:	<u>Heldine Kolbo</u>
Date:	<u>2/5/09</u>
(OFFICIAL SEAL)	

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

Dustin M. Johnson  
DUSTIN M. JOHNSON, Chairman

Steve Kolbeck  
STEVE KOLBECK, Commissioner

Gary Hanson  
GARY HANSON, Commissioner