

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

| | | |
|--|---|--------------------|
| In the Matter of In Re: Sprint |) | |
| Communications Company L.P., |) | |
| Complainant, v. Native American Telecom, |) | Docket No. TC10-26 |
| LLC, Respondent. |) | |
| |) | |

**PETITION FOR INTERVENTION BY AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE
MIDWEST, INC., IN THE MATTER OF IN RE: SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS
COMPANY L.P., (“SPRINT”) v. NATIVE AMERICAN TELECOM, LLC**

Pursuant to ARSD Sec. 20:10:01:15.02, AT&T Communications of the Midwest, Inc., (“AT&T”) petitions to intervene in the above captioned proceeding. In its complaint filed May 4, 2010, as amended May 5, 2010, Sprint asserts that Native American Telecom, LLC (“NAT”) has engaged in efforts to establish traffic pumping operations in South Dakota. Sprint seeks declaratory relief establishing that the Commission has sole authority to regulate Sprint’s intrastate interexchange services in South Dakota and that, conversely, the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe Utility Authority lacks jurisdiction over Sprint; that NAT must seek a Certificate of Authority from the Commission and file a lawful tariff with the Commission before it can assess charges for intrastate switched access service; and further seeks money damages and such other relief as the Commission deems just and reasonable.

AT&T seeks intervention in this proceeding because the Commission has granted it a certificate of authority to provide intrastate interexchange service within the State of South Dakota, and, like Sprint, AT&T purchases intrastate switched access service from carriers operating within South Dakota including NAT. The outcome of this proceeding

could have an affect on the intrastate switched access charges billed by NAT to AT&T in the State of South Dakota and could have an immediate affect on services provided by AT&T in the state of South Dakota. As a result, AT&T believes it has a material interest in the issues of concern in this proceeding and has timely filed this Petition for Intervention.

WHEREFORE AT&T requests that it be granted intervention status in this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted this 21st day of MAY, 2010.

OLINGER, LOVALD, MCCAHERN & REIMERS, PC
/s/ filed electronically
William M. Van Camp
PO Box 66
Pierre, SD 57501
Telephone: (605) 224-8851
Attorneys for AT&T Communications of the Midwest, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

William M. Van Camp hereby certifies that on the 21st day of May 2010, he filed the foregoing Petition for Intervention by AT&T Communications of the Midwest, Inc., In the Matter of In Re: Sprint Communications Company, L.P., v. Native American Telecom, LLC electronically with the Public Utilities Commission and served by United States mail, first class postage thereon prepaid, a true and correct copy of the Petition for Intervention by AT&T Communications Of The Midwest, Inc., In The Matter Of In Re: Sprint Communications Company L.P., v. Native American Telecom, LLC to the following persons:

Thomas J. Reiman
Native American Telecom, LLC
6710 E Split Rock Circle
Sioux Falls SD 57110
Attorney for Native American
Telecom, LLC

Kathryn E. Ford
Davenport Evans Hurwitz & Smith LLP
PO Box 1030
Sioux Falls SD 57104
Attorney for Sprint Communications Co., LP

Richard D. Coit
SDTA Executive Director
PO Box 57
Pierre SD 57501

Darla Pollman Rogers
Riter Rogers Law Office
PO Box 280
Pierre SD 57501
Attorney for SDN, LLC
And MidState Communications

Gene DeJordy, Esq.
Native American Telecom, LLC
A6710 E. Split Rock Circle
Sioux Falls SD 57110

/s/ filed electronically
William M. Van Camp
Olinger, Lovald, McCahren, and Reimers P.C.
PO Box 66
Pierre, South Dakota 57501