C C	15-15-5		5545 (BH)	200	257.0	۸
上海海	4.4	10年1月27日	mar blice	383 32	137	ł.
100	香油	350	715 C 27	61.2	1.00	
IV. D. P.	接纳的唯	3 1 Table 2	用写到的		理學	ŝ
4	北海流		A115	T = TL	中心处计	Š
		4年/一种	12.	1.39	****	ŝ
7	100					•

建筑是到1988年6年	IN THE MATTER OF THE FILMS BY	
Martin and the state of the sta	SCUTH DANCEY INDEPENDENT	والمراوية والمراورة والمراورة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراورة والمراجعة والمراورة والمرا
Control of the state of the sta	THE PORT OF FUR	はないできないできないできないできないできないというとは、これのないというないというないできないというないできないできないできないできないというないというないできないというないというないというないできないできないできないというというないというというというというというというというというというというというというという
mer i felandimedi. de pasiti i minimidade i tendenci i tendenci mendi cribitaccia i i i i de	APPROVAL OF RECIPEOCAL TRANSPORT AND TERMINATION	
in the second control of the tips in the second of the sec	AGREEMENT BETWEEN GCC	the same of the sa
	LICENSE LLC. AND ROBERTS	A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE
Saliton with the Seal Seal Liberty of Military and the contrast of the contras	COUNTY TELEPHONE GOOPERATIVE	
	ASSOCIATION	and the second s

Public Littlities Commission of the State of South Daliota

PARK	SHESHIPANISA
3/2/00	Flila a Clarketil
375 00	Allel Files
2/30/00	Stablemouther and buren our O. F. day
414 00	Upperal of SOTTE
4/7/20	Stalle Heletal to 10170's Deramas
5/23/00	audulundument:
1/33/20	Market Clarel

South Dakota Independent Telephone Capillian, Inc.

RICHARD Code Language Dispersor reconstruction for

March 2, 2006

Mr. Bill Bulland, Executive Director Scale Dakets Public Utilities Commission 500 East Capitol Ave. State Capitol Building

制造 首文 200

SOUTH DAYOTA PUBLIC UTLITTES DOMMISSION

Here, 3D 37501

RE: Reciprocal Transport and Tormination Agreements

Dear Bill:

Enclosed for Commission review pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(c) are true and correct copies of Reciprocal Transport and Tennination Agreements" negetiated and entered between GCC License L.L.C. (an affiliate of Western Wireless Corporation) and the independent local exchange carriers listed below:

Accent Communications Inc. Amour Independent Telephone Company **Bakic Telecom Cooperative** Beresford Municipal Telephone Company Bridgewater-Canistota Independent Telephone Company City of Faith Telephone Bost Plains Telecom, Inc. Fort Raudall Telephone Company Golden West Telecommunications Cooperative, Inc. Hanson Communications. Inc. Hanson County Telephone Company Heartland Communications, Inc. Interstate Telecommunications Cooperative, Inc. James Valley Cooperative Telephone Company Jefferson Telephone Company, Inc. Kadoka Telephone Company Kennebec Telephone Company, Inc. McCook Cooperative Telephone Company Midstate Telephone Company Mt Rushmore Telephone Company

Lines Control of the run Louis d'Estelle Consultations, les Verna Bolling Chinary West King Television States (2004) Western Telephone Springer

SIGIAC, an initially of the morest lined commonly, and littly divence i.e. at apprecion to their permits and conditions, and the regarded approximates. All of the appreciates as incursed each agreement. The appreciation date directly been a successful and their permits as a property of the perfect of the perfect and the control of their appreciations.

新柏林村

Richard & Est

President and County County

HIN Page

cc: Gene Delordy, Western Wireless Corporation



SEATH CARCTA PLOUG | Market Transport and Torontaling Agreement Williams Commission | Market and Transport and Torontaling Agreement

This Assistant Transport and Terranation Agreement (the "Agreement") is entered into by and between G.C. L. Lucius L.L.C. ("Collic Provider") with offices at 1636 131st Ave. S.E. Bellevin, Washington Stills and Roberths. Combit. Lalambone ("Carrier") with offices at leav Effication. South Delights.
ChiRC Provider and Carrier are each individually a "Party" and are ingress the "Party" to this Agreement. The "officeies date" of this Agreement is larmary 1, 1989.

CMPS Provider is becaused by the Federal Communications Communication (FCC) as a Communical Media Radio Service provider. Comics and CMRS Provides agree to exchange wireline to wireless and wireless to wireless tradition for the bounds of the Parties. Services provided by Carrier to CMRS Provider mader this Agreement are provided parament to the receiving Party's mater as a CMRS Provider.

WHEREAS, the Parties currently extend arrangements to one medics allowing for the transport and termination of wireless to wireless to wireless to wireless to wireless to wireless to over each other's network facilities, between each other's subscribers; and

WHEREAS, the Parties with to put in place an arrangement for the manual exchange and reciprocal compensation of local telecommunications traffic in accord with the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and which is intended to supercode any previous arrangements between the parties relating to such traffic:

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual provisions contained herein and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, CMRS Provider and Carrier hereby agree as follows:

- I Scope This Agreement addresses the parties' reciprocal compensation obligations as described in § 251(b)(5) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Act") By this Agreement, neither Party wasves may other rights it may have under the Act or rules of the FCC, under state statute, or pursuant to rules of the State Public Utilities Commission ("Commission"). Such rights may include CMRS Provider's right to request unbundled network elements and a review of Carrier's rural telephone company exemption provided for under § 251(f)(1)(A) of the Act and Carrier's right to seek to maintain the rural exemption.
- Interpretation and Construction. The terms and conditions of this Agreement shall be subject to any and all applicable laws, rules, regulations or guidelines that subsequently may be prescribed by any federal, state of local government authority. To the extent required by any such subsequently prescribed law, rule, regulation or guideline, the Parties agree to modify, in writing the affected termis) and condition(s) of this Agreement to bring them into compliance with such law rule, regulation or guideline.

The Furties source and and expensive that causes provide an as the Appropriate and another for the form and coulds. In the character of the Appropriate Country I and the Coun

The Parties farther agreed to, is an farth in Exhibit A horsto, have not been distributed based on a specific costing medicalely or company specific cost methodology or company specific cost methodology or company specific cost methodology committed with § 254(4)(2) of the Telephonometers are appropriate costing established and actual cost information or an acceptable cost process the actual cost of previous as appropriate cost process are actual cost of previous as a process which is cost process and acceptable cost process and acceptable cost process and acceptable cost process and acceptable cost process and acceptable.

The Parties enter and this agreement without prejudice to any position they may take with respect to annular fining agreements between the Parties or future in any legislative, regulatory or other public forms withressing any take in the including matters related to the rates to be charged for transport and termination of local traffic or the types of arrangements prescrated by this agreement

i Defeuces

- 31 "Act" means the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 of seq.1, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and as from time to time interpreted in the duly authorized rules and regulations of the FCC or the Commission within its state of jurisdiction
- 3.2 "CMRS" or "Commercial Mobile Radio Service" is as defined in the Communications Act of 1934 as amended by the Telecommunications Act
- Fig. Commission Tricans the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission.
- Local Calling Area (LCA) for purposes of this Agreement, is a congrupose area defined by the Major Trading Area (MTA) within which CMRS provides provides CMRS services where local transport and

services on the supply as not forth in PCC Lat Coder and 47 CFR 51.791042)

- 3.5 "Local Trollis" for purposes of the Agreement course trollic which originalis and terminalis, based on the localist of the working subscriber and localists and user, while the cases CARS LCA.
- 3.6 "Major Trading Asta (MTA) is a gaugephic area established in Band Medicily's Commercial Alba and Medicily Cando and used by the FCC in defining CMRS license beneder or for CMRS provides for purposes of Sections 251 and 252 of the Communications for of 1934 as assented.
- 3.7 Thin-Local Traffle" is the complemen of untribit's cults bened on the focusions of the writing subscriber and the hard line and user on t the completion of that counting traffic, as defined in FCC In Only, par 1643, to which countries access charges are applicable.
- 3.8 Reciprecal Companion Creda" for purposes of this Agreement and based on current traffic treads in a monetary capital for wireless to wireless traffic which is originated by a landline subscriber of Carrier and terminates to a subscriber of CMRS Provides within the LCA. Should traffic patterns change so that more western traffic is terminated by CMRS Provider than Carrier within a prescribed billing period, the reciprocal compensation credit shall be changed to reflect such difference.
- 39 "Fransit Traffic" is traffic that originates from one provider's network, transits another telecommunication carrier's network, substantially unchanged, and terminates to yet another provider's network.
- 3 10 "Wireless Traffic" for purposes of this Agreement, means all calls in either direction between a user of ("MRS Provider's CMRS (where CMRS Provider provides the wireless equivalent of dial time to the user) and an end user served by Carrier
- 4 Reciprocal Italias Exchange Each Party shall reciprocally terminate wireless local traffic originating on each other's network. Reciprocal traffic exchange addresses the exchange of wireless traffic between CMRS Provider subscribers and Carrier end users. Consistent with Carrier's current practice with CMRS Provider, either Party's wireless local traffic may be routed through an intermediary for interconnection with the other Party's system. Any such arrangement may be modified by a separate agreement if both Parties wish to provide for two-way direct interconnection. Reciprocal traffic exchange per this Agreement covers only transport and termination services provided for CMRS providers only to association with CMRS services. Other services, including any direct interconnect arrangement established between the parties, shall be covered by a separate contract turtifier price list. The transport and termination services

provided barrander are expected for explane to weeking or winding to weeking, but the course of expected post experience will not the course to receive a state types of earlier on Course a state to expect to weeking a state of expected post as received as a received of expected the formal and a state of the Agreement. In addition to any other remoding particular, the flowy where convices have been improperly used shall be explicitly by expected the observe applicable to each traffic for the entire period of expect. Any inclinate attacks for the entire period of expect, the belief of the alreaders must be the expected to the entire period.

I have been and temperature of local warrant traffic because the Parties. Local wireless traffic is subject to only the local warrant and minimization charged out forth below and is not subject to existed access charges. Non-local tentile a subject to either interested or increases switched access charges, whethever is applicable.

Ascillary traffic which includes wireless malific that is drawed for ancillary services including, but not housed to, directory assistance, \$21/2911, operator call terminates (bus) line interrupt and verify), \$60/888, LEOE, and information services requiring special billing will be enchanged and charged in accordance with the appropriate tariffs, local or switched accords.

CMRS Provider agrees that it shall not use the narrices provided by Carrier under this Agreement for the transport and termination of non-local wireless traffic. Any use of the services for new-local traffic shall constants a breach of this Agreement and, with respect to such improper use, in addition to any other remedies available. Carrier shall be extilled to recover the charges applicable to such traffic for the entire period of masses.

For billing purposes, if either Party is upable to classify on an automized basis traffic the local wireless traffic delivered by CMRS Provider as intrastate or interstate, CMRS Provider will provide Carrier with a Percent Individue Use (PIU) factor, which represents the estimated interstate portion of intrabel? A traffic delivered by CMRS Provider. The PIU factor will be provided and updated on a semi-annual basis to commence six (6) months after Commission approval of this (Agreement

6 Local Transport and Termination Rate CMRS Provider and Carrier shall reciprocally and symmetrically compensate one another for wireless local traffic terminated to their end users. The rate(s) for the termination and transport of such traffic are as set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto. Carrier will be responsible for measuring the total monthly minutes of use terminating into its network from CMRS Provider's network. Measured usage begins when CMRS Provider's mobile another coffice is signated by the terminating end office that the call has been president. Measured usage ends upon recognition by the mobile

switching office of disconnection by the earlier of the Carrier's customer or the disconnection signal from the terminating end office. Carrier will only charge CMRS Provider for actual minutes of use and/or fractions thereof of completed calls. Minutes of use will be aggregated at the end of the billing cycle and rounded to the nearest whole minute.

- 7. <u>Transit Traffic Rates</u> For transiting local traffic, the applicable local transit rate applies to the originating Party per Exhibit A attached.
- 8. <u>Reciprocal Compensation Credit</u>. The monthly minutes of use terminated into CMRS Provider's network from Carrier's network for purposes of this Agreement, which will determine the reciprocal compensation credit due CMRS Provider, will be calculated using the formula set forth in Exhibit A.

The resulting number shall be multiplied by the local transport and termination rate to determine the monthly reciprocal compensation credit. The reciprocal compensation credit for the local transport and termination will appear on the monthly bill as a credit against amounts due and payable from CMRS Provider to Carrier.

- 9 Billing and Collection Fees. CMRS Provider will only bear the portion of billing and collecting fees that are associated with wireless traffic transport and termination to its subscribers. This will apply to billing and collection costs incurred by the Carrier directly or indirectly. For the purpose of this Agreement, CMRS Provider will bear cost for billing and collection services in order for the Carrier to render an accurate bill in an amount not to exceed the percentage used to calculate the reciprocal compensation credit to CMRS Provider per Exhibit A of total direct or indirect billing and collection costs incurred by the Carrier. Billing and collection arrangements entered into by CMRS Provider or the Carrier with any intermedianes will be addressed separately and are not part of this Agreement.
- Agreement, the term of this Agreement shall be one (1) year from the effective date and shall continue in effect for consecutive one (1) year terms until either Party gives the other Party at least sixty (60) days written notice of termination, which termination shall be effective at the end of the notice period.
- Agreement in whole or in part in the event of a default by the other Party, provided however, that the non-defaulting Party notifies the defaulting Party in writing of the alleged default and that the defaulting Party does not cure the alleged default within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of written notice thereof

- 12. <u>Liability Upon Termination</u>. Termination of this Agreement, or any part hereof, for any cause shall not release either Party from any liability which at the time of termination had already accrued to the other Party or which thereafter accrues in any respect for any act or omission occurring prior to the termination relating to an obligation which is expressly stated in this Agreement. The Parties' obligations under this Agreement which by their nature are intended to continue beyond the termination or expiration of this Agreement shall survive the termination of this Agreement.
- 13. General Responsibilities of Parties. Each Party is responsible to provide facilities within its network which are necessary for routing and terminating traffic from the other Party's network.
- 14. Assignments, Successors and Assignees. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained herein, this Agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the Parties hereto, and their successors and assignees.
- 15. Force Maieure. Neither Party shall be liable for any delay or failure in performance of any part of this Agreement from any cause beyond its control, including, without limitation, acts of nature, acts of civil or military authority, government regulations, embargoes, epidemics, terrorist acts, riots, insurrections, fires, explosions, earthquakes, nuclear accidents, floods, power blackouts, other major environmental disturbances or unusually severe weather conditions (collectively, a "Force Majeure Event")
- 16. No Third Party Beneficiaries. This Agreement does not provide and shall not be construed to provide third parties with any remedy, claim, liability, reimbursement, cause of action, or other privilege.
- 17. Notices. Notices given by one Party to the other Party under this Agreement shall be in writing to the addresses of the Parties set forth above and shall be (i) delivered personally; (ii) delivered by express delivery service; (iii) mailed, certified mail or first class U.S. mail postage prepaid, return receipt requested; or (iv) delivered by telecopy.
- 18. Governing Law. For all claims under this Agreement that are based upon issues within the jurisdiction of the FCC, the Parties agree that remedies for such claims shall be governed by the FCC and the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. For all claims under this Agreement that are based upon issues within the jurisdiction of the State Public Utilities Commission, the parties agree that the jurisdiction for all such claims shall be with such Commission, and the remedy for such claims shall be as provided for by such Commission. In all other respects, this Agreement shall be governed by the domestic laws of the state of South Dakota without reference to conflict of law provisions

10 Entre Agreement. This Agreement constitutes the entre agreement between the Parties and supersedes all prior oral or writen agreements representations. Statements, negotiations understandings, propositis and undertakings with respect to the subject maner hereof.

IN WITH TESS WITEREOF, the Parties hereto have caused his Agreement to be executed as of this fifty driver [522112412], 1999.

"INTES Provider" (EELSCOSE LLL.

Airos company mune;

10

"Child"

Boyetta County Telephone Cooperative Association

(Lyne company name)

静始

Constal Manager

	草を開発げる。 Exchange Lines	THE T
Accent Louvementations	1.923	
Armour Telegoone Company Ballic Telegons Cooperative	2023	
Beresloid Municipal Telephone Company		\$0.02
Pulled at set Capatota Independent	1.19h 953	
Brookings Telechane Chevenne River Sloux Tube Tele. Authority	14.424	\$11.02 30.02
Last Plains Leiecomm. Inc		
Forth Niunicipal Taleofiche	4, 127 332	10.00
©t Rancall Telephoné	5 10 5	\$0.021
Golden West Telecom. Coophrative, Inc. Harson Communications, inc	14.402	
Tanson County Telephone Company	1072	10.113
tearliand Communications	5/9 71.510	
iterstate l'elecommunications Cooperative	14.784	\$0.02 \$0.02
dmes Valley Comperative Telephone Ellerson Telephone Company	2 125	50.522
aduka Telguhona Company	525	\$0.03
emeter Telephone Company	600 750	\$0.03
CC 90° Leogiciative Telephone Commany	675	\$6.031 \$9.032
licstate Telephone Company	2.051	\$0.0Z
lobilities Teleconomications Company 11. Rushinsre Telephone Company	2,482	\$0.020
overts County Telephone Coop.	548	\$0.038
A TUTUTA TOTA	443 1.428	SO/OSO
Bitam Telephone Cooperative	2,613	\$0,0113 \$0.028
Trough inc	2,449	\$0.028
Colo Valley Telephone Company	5,586	80 <u>úže</u>
diffock Telecom Cooperative, Inc. Diffock Properites, Inc.		\$0.028
Selles Téléconn., loc.	1.560 2.301	\$0.022
ocknown Strandburg Telephone Company	714	\$0.028 \$0.038
W Buttes Telephone Cooperative, Inc.	4,082	50,028
i County Mutual Telephone Company Non Telephone Company	443	\$0.0EQ
May Telecommunications Coop. Assn.	1.575	\$0.028
Illey Cable & Satellite	1,995 1,601	\$0,028
meure Communications, Inc.	7,106	\$0.028 \$0,028
Vias Telephone Company	17,919	50.028
est filver Cooperative-Bison est filver Telecom-Hazen	1,839	\$0.028
ssi mver i elecom-razen ssiem Telephone Company	724	90.008
THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O	1.102	\$0.033

: : : :

"Exhibit A" Page 2

-TRANSIT TRAFFIC RATE
50,0005 per MOU per route mile

- RECIPROCAL COMPENSATION CREDIT - CALCULATION

Multiply the total monthly local minutes of use of wireless traffic delivered from CMRS Provider's network for termination into Cartler's network by a factor of 0.17

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission WEEKLY FILINGS

For the Period of March 2, 2000 through March 8, 2000

If you need a complete copy of a filing faxed, overnight expressed, or mailed to you, please contact

Delaine Kolbo within five business days of this filing.

Phone: 605-773-3705 Fax: 605-773-3809

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS

CT00-045 In the Matter of the Complaint filed by Ralph C. Campbell, Watertown, South Dakota, against OLS, Inc. Regarding Switching Telecommunications Services Through Deceptive Tactics.

On February 22, 2000, a formal complaint was received from Ralph C. Campbell indicating that he received a deceptive telemarketing call. As a result of this call, the Complainant's telecommunications service was switched to OLS. As a resolution the Complainant is seeking \$1000 on behalf of all parties who were slammed.

Staff Analyst: Leni Healy Staff Attorney: Karen Cremer Date Docketed: 03/07/00 Intervention Date: NA

ELECTRIC

EL00-006 In the Matter of the Application of MidAmerican Energy Company for Determinations Pursuant to Section 32(k)(2)(A) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

Under Section 32(k)(1) of Public Utilities Holding Company Act, an electric utility may not enter into a contract to purchase electric energy at wholesale from an exempt wholesale generator if that exempt wholesale generator is an affiliate or associated company of the electric utility unless the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission makes certain determinations as required by the Act. MidAmerican Energy Company seeks such a determination from the Commission with regard to its proposal to purchase power from Cordova Energy Center, an affiliate of MidAmerican.

Staff Analyst: Michele Farris Staff Attorney: Camron Hoseck Date Docketed: 03/02/00

Intervention deadline: 03/24/00

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

- In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone TC00-020 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Accent Communications, Inc. TC00-021 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Armour Independent Telephone Company. In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone TC00-022 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Baltic Telecom Cooperative. TC00-023 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Beresford Municipal Telephone Company. TC00-024 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Bridgewater-Canistota Independent Telephone Company. TC00-025 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and City of Faith Telephone Company. TC00-026 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and East Plains Telecom, Inc. TC00-027 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 - TC00-028 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Golden West Telecommunications Cooperative, Inc.

Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement

between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Fort Randall Telephone Company.

TC00-029 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Hanson Communications, Inc.

- TC00-030 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Hanson County Telephone Company.
- TC00-031 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Heartland Communications, Inc.
- TC00-032 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Interstate Telecommunications
 Cooperative, Inc.
- TC00-033 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and James Valley Cooperative Telephone
 Company.
 - TC00-034 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Jefferson Telephone Company.
 - TC00-035 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Kadoka Telephone Company.
 - TC00-036 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Kennebec Telephone Company.
 - TC00-037 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and McCook Cooperative Telephone Company.
 - TC00-038 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Midstate Telephone Company.
 - TC00-039 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Mount Rushmore Telephone Company.

- TC00-040 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and RC Communications, Inc.
- TC00-041 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Roberts County Telephone Cooperative
 Association.
- TC00-042 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Sanborn Telephone Cooperative.
- TC00-043 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Sancom, Inc.
- TC00-044 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Sioux Valley Telephone Company.
- TC00-045 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Splitrock Properties, Inc.
- TC00-046 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Splitrock Telecom Cooperative, Inc.
- TC00-047 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Stateline Telecommunications, Inc.
- TC00-048 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Stockholm-Strandburg Telephone Company.
- TC00-049 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Sully Buttes Telephone Cooperative, Inc.

- TC00-050 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Union Telephone Company.
- TC00-051 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Valley Cable & Satellite
 Communications, Inc.
- TC00-052 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Valley Telecommunications
 Cooperative Association.
- TC00-053 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Venture Communications, Inc.
- TC00-054 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Vivian Telephone Company d/b/a
 Golden West Communications, Inc.
- TC00-055 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and West River Cooperative Telephone Company.
- TC00-056 In the Matter of the Filing by South Dakota Independent Telephone
 Coalition for Approval of Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreement
 between G.C.C. License L.L.C. and Western Telephone Company

Description for TC00-020 thru TC00-056

The above companies have each filed a reciprocal transport and termination agreement which was negotiated and entered into between them and GCC License L.L.C. which is an affiliate of Western Wireless Corporation. Commission approval is sought pursuant to 46 U.S.C. Section 252(e).

Staff Attorney: Camron Hoseck

Date Filed: 03/02/00

Intervention Deadline: 03/24/00

You may receive this listing and other PUC publications via our website or via internet e-mail. You may subscribe or unsubscribe to the PUC mailing lists at http://www.state.sd.us/puc/



Capital Curred Temphone (525) 773-0261 PSE (605) 773-3869

Tenasperation/ Mechanic lapana Sephon (201)774-5280 Texasisty 12-3225

Committee Hother 1-801-132-1782

TTY Through Relay South Dakets 1-800-877-1113

internet Webuite www.state.sd.us/puc/

Jun Burg Chairman Pana Nelsun Vio-Chairman Laska Schnenfelder Commissioner

William Bullard Jr Executive Director

Harian Best Mortin C. Betterand Suc Ciches Keren E. Cremer Terry Engerson Michele M. Prerte Martone Fischbech Beather K Formey Shirizon Pagin Mary Giddings Levis Harmond Lari Booly Mary Henry Commen Hosack Lina Healt Dave Incobson herender Kirk Bote Knadle Delegas Kolleo Charlette Lund Cregary A. Rislow Keith Senger Rollyne Ailts Wicon

State Capital Building, 500 East Capital Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070



March 30, 2000

William Bullard, Jr. Executive Director Public Utilities Commission 500 E. Capitol Avenue Pierre, SD 57501

RE: In the Matter of the Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreements TC00-020 through TC00-056, Inclusive

Dear Mr. Bullard:

Please consider this to be the Staff analysis and recommendation in the filing of these reciprocal transport and termination agreements.

Based upon the representation of Richard Colt on behalf of SDITC, that all the agreements are identical in their terms and conditions, I will therefore direct my comments to these agreements in such a manner.

It is to be noted that the effective date of the agreement is January 1, 1999. These were not tendered to this Commission until March 2, 2000, approximately a year, and two months after the effective date. It is submitted that giving the agreements a retroactive effect would be contrary to the public interest for a couple of reasons. First, under the provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 252 (e) (1) the agreement is subject to approval or rejection by this Commission. Therefore, it carnot have any effect until this Commission approves it. Secondly, the agreements themselves bear signature dates of September, October, November or December 1999. On page 2, the second full paragraph, the agreement recites that exhibit A sets the rates for the local transport and termination. To adopt the agreements whether effective on the "effective date" of January 1, 1999, or the signature date of either September or December of 1999, would be to effect retroactive rate making. The public interest is not served when parties enter into agreements that seek to impose rates during a time period in which a valid contract setting those rates does not exist.

It should further be pointed out that the agreement with Ft. Randall Telephone Company, TC00-027, is incomplete and appears to have a copying error. My position is based upon the assumption that a valid contract exists here and that it is the same as the others which were filed.

Yallian Bullard, Jr. Watch 30, 2000 Page 2

Accordingly, Staff would make the following recommendation. I would recommend that the agreements be approved in their totality but that there be an effective date as of the date of the order approving them pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 (s) (1).

Please be advised, the standard of care exercised in reviewing these agreements is that, from this point of view, they are entered into by two parties who are amply equipped to took out to their own interests and enter into arms-langur transactions.

Very may yours a

Campan Hoseck Staff Attorney

CHIM

cc: Rich Coll, SDITC

Gene DeJordy, Western Wireless Corporation





Rubert D. Cult Executive Director codic Raicheon ac

April 4, 2000

APR 6 4 2000

William Bullard, Jr., Executive Director South Dakota Public Utilities Commission 500 East Capitol Ave. State Capitol Building Pierre, SD 57501

SOUTH DAKOTAPUBLIC UTLITIES COMMISSION

RE: In the Matter of the Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreements
Dockets TC00-020 through TC00-056

Dear Mr. Bullard:

This letter is filed by SDITC on behalf of its member companies as a response to the letter of Staff Attorney Cameron Hoseck filed in this matter, dated March 30, 2000.

Mr. Hoseck first raises as a concern the fact that the Reciprocal Transport and Termination Agreements as filed reference an effective date of January 1, 1999. In response, SDITC notes that this is merely considered the effective date agreed upon between the parties and should not be interpreted to mean that the parties at this time consider the agreements legally effective and binding, prior to PUC approval. The parties understand that these agreements are subject to the Commis... review and approval process prescribed under 47 U.S.C. § 252(e).

SDITC does not agree with Mr. Hoseck's claim that the Commission cannot permit the parties to make these agreements effective, upon approval, back to January 1, 1999. The earlier effective date is necessary because for several years no reciprocal compensation agreements have been in place to allow for any compensation between the parties relating to terminated wireless traffic. The earlier date allows for payment of at least a portion of the compensation due for past terminated traffic. It should also be noted that the parties actually commenced the negotiations leading to these filed agreements in the spring of 1998. The parties were unable to resolve all issues until the fall of 1999. These prolonged negotiations also made it necessary to pre-date the agreements.

Mr. Hoseck suggests that if the Commission approves these agreements with the effective date of January 1, 1999, that it will engage itself in retroactive ratemaking. SDITC disagrees. The Commission is charged under 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(A) with reviewing negotiated agreements only to determine whether they are nondiscriminatory and whether they are consistent with the

public interest, convenience and necessity. The review process established for state some same snow under this section closs not rise to the level of an actual rate making proceeding and accordingly, there should be no concerns about retreactive ratemaking. Contrary to what is suggested by Mr. Hoseek, the Commission is enter no legal obligation to reject the effective date of fanuary 1, 1949.

The parties have agreed between themselves for compensation purposes to consider the agreements effective as of an earlier date than they were signed. Why should the Carimission be prevented from kionoring this understanding between the parties. SDITC member companies consider the January 1, 1899 effective date to be no important issue and disapproval or such effective date by trus Commission will throw the agreements back into the negotiation process SDITC prices the Commission to accept the effective date established by the parties.

In his letter, Mr. Floseck also references the agreement filed in Docket ICOO-027, favelying It. Pandail Telephone Company, notine that it is incomplete and contains a copying error. To address these concerns, a new copy that is true and correct is enclosed herewith.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Coll

Executive Director and Emeral Counsel

ce: Staff Assorney Cameron Hoseck

RDC/ms



Capitis Citice Telephonomical 52713-5201 FAX 16865773-3459

Transpertation Verchouse Reciden Telephonogeosyr73, 5200 EAX (ADS)/T3, 2025

> Consider Holling 1-669-122-1792

TTT Turnigh Rolay Sands Dalaux 1-898-877-5813

intract Walshi wherefole of he per-

Jup Burg Chairman Pam Nelson Vice Chairman Laska Schusafehler Commissioner

William Ballard is Executive Diseasor

Harlan Beer Martin C. Benmann Sus Carisos Laten E Cremen Terry Esternen Michele M. Farres Marlette Feschbach Heather K. Forcey Shirlesa Fugus Mary Giddings Lewis Harancard Lens Heary Mary Healt Campon Hoseof Loss Hall Dave Jecobson longsfer kink Bob Kandle Delate Labo Chartese Land Gregory & Restor Leak Senger Relative filts Wines

State Capital Building 200 East Capital Avenue, Proves South Tables 57531-5620

April 7, 2000

Mr William Bullard, Jr Executive Director South Dakota Public Utilities Commission 500 East Capitol Pierre, SD 57501

Re In the Matter of the Reciprocal Transport and Terminetion Agreements Dockets TC00-020 through TC00-055, inclusive

Dear Mr. Bullerd

Please consider this to be Staff's Rebuttal to SDITC's response of April 4, 2000, to the Staff Analysis and Recommendation in these dockets

SOITC takes the position with regard to the retroactive rate making objection that:

The earlier date allows for payment of at least a portion of the compensation due for past terminated traffic " (emphasis supplied).

This rationale falls within the classic definition of retroactive rate making:

Generally, retroactive rate making occurs when a utility is permitted to recover an additional charge for past losses, or when a utility is required to refund revenues collected pursuent to its lawfully established rates.

South Central Bell Telephone Company v. Louisiana Public Service Commission, 585 So.2d 1258 (LA 1992) (decision without published opinions) CCH Utilities Law Reports - State ¶ 26, 169

By approving the agreements, the Commission is permitting the implementation of rates and in that sense is involved in the rate making process. The corollary is that without Commission approval of the agreed-upon rates, they would not be charged.

revosulos eno maioro a sol consident por los paricarenes. A conselhat teleps, ambios una composis acis, discompation and a fratator of les basic maior inquisments of disprecess of law.

Staff additions to its position in this malter and its suggested effective data for the appealant and

Very fire years.

Canton Hosack Slaff Attorrey

Chin

at We

Mr. Richard D. Coit Mr. Gene DeJordy

REFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE FILING BY SOUTH DAKOTA INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE COALITION FOR APPROVAL OF A RECIPHOCAL TRANSPORT AND TERMINATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN G.C. LICENSE LL.C. AND FOBERTS COUNTY TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

OHDER APPROVING ACREEMENT

TODAY

On March 2, 2000, the South Dakota Independent Telephone Coalition on behalf of Roberts County Telephone Cooperative Association (Roberts) filed for approval by the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) is reciprocal transport and termination agreement between G.C.C. Liverse L.C. (GCC) and Roberts. The agreement had an effective date of January 1, 1999.

On March 9, 2000, the Commission electronically transmitted notice of this filing to interested individuals and entities. The notice stated that any person wishing to intervene had with March 24, 2000, to do so. No intervention was sought. Commission Staff filed comments.

At its duly noticed May 17, 2000, meeting, the Commission considered whether to approve the agreement between GCC and Roberts. Commission Staff recommended approved with an effective date as of the date of an Order approving the agreement.

The Commission has prisdiction over this matter pursuant to SCCL Chapter 49-31, and the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. In accordance with 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2), the Commission found that the agreement does not discriminate applies a telecommunications carrier that is not a party to the agreement and the agreement is consistent with the public interest convenience, and necessity. The Commission unanimously voted to approve the agreement with an effective date as of the date of this Order. It is therefore

ORDERED, that the Commission approves the agreement effective as of the date of this Order.

Dated at Pierre, South Dakota, this _____day of May, 2000.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned heraby conflies that this document has been served today upon all parties of record in the docket as listed on the docket service list by facethile or by first class mail in properly addressed envelopes, with charges prepaid thereon.

on Allague Lalbe

OFFICIAL SEAL

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

MMESA BURG, Chayman,

- LUM / LOG

PAM NEKSON. Commissioner

LASKA SCHÖENFELDER COMMISSIONER