

LAW OFFICES
RITER, ROGERS, WATTIER & BROWN, LLP

Professional & Executive Building
319 South Coteau Street
P.O. Box 280
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-0280
www.riterlaw.com

TELEPHONE
605-224-5825
FAX
605-224-7102

OF COUNSEL:
Robert D. Hofer
E. D. Mayer

ROBERT C. RITER, Jr.
DARLA POLLMAN ROGERS
JERRY L. WATTIER
JOHN L. BROWN

MARGO D. NORTHRUP, Associate

RECEIVED
MAY 09 2007
OFFICE OF
HEARING EXAMINERS

May 8, 2007

Ms. Julie Johnson
Office of Hearing Examiners
210 E. 4th Street
Pierre, SD 57501

Re: In the Matter of the Petition of Venture
Communications Cooperative for Suspension
or Modification of Local Dialing Parity
Reciprocal Compensation Obligations
PUC 7-01

Dear Hearing Officer Johnson:

Enclosed herewith please find original and one copy of
Venture Communication's Motion to Compel (Rural Cellular
Corporation) with attached Certificate of Service.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

RITER, ROGERS, WATTIER &
BROWN, LLP

By: *Darla Pollman Rogers*
Darla Pollman Rogers

DPR-wb

Enclosures

LAW OFFICES
RITER, ROGERS, WATTIER & BROWN, LLP

Professional & Executive Building
319 South Coteau Street
P.O. Box 280
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-0280
www.riterlaw.com

TELEPHONE
605-224-5825
FAX
605-224-7102

OF COUNSEL:
Robert D. Hofer
E. D. Mayer

ROBERT C. RITER, Jr.
DARLA POLLMAN ROGERS
JERRY L. WATTIER
JOHN L. BROWN

MARGO D. NORTHRUP, Associate

May 8, 2007

To All Parties of Interest

Re: In the Matter of the Petition of Venture Communications
Cooperative for Suspension or Modification of Local
Dialing Parity Reciprocal Compensation Obligations
Docket TC06-181
PUC 7-01

Enclosed by electronic service is copy of Venture Communication's Motion to Compel
(Rural Cellular Corporation). This is intended as service upon you.

Very truly yours,

RITER, ROGERS, WATTIER & BROWN, LLP

By: 
Darla Pollman Rogers

DPR-wb

Enclosures

Cc: Julie Johnson, Hearing Officer - with original and one copy of Exhibits

SOUTH DAKOTA
OFFICE OF HEARING EXAMINERS

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF) PUC 7-01
VENTURE COMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE) VENTURE COMMUNI-
FOR SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION) CATION'S MOTION TO
OF LOCAL DIALING PARITY RECIPROCAL) COMPEL (RURAL
COMPENSATION OBLIGATIONS.) CELLULAR
) CORPORATION)

Venture Communications ("Venture"), by and through its undersigned attorneys, pursuant to ARSD 20:10:01:22:01, hereby moves for an Order compelling Rural Cellular Corporation ("RCC") to respond to certain Interrogatories and Document Requests identified below.

BACKGROUND

Venture filed a Petition for Suspension or Modification of Local Dialing Parity and Reciprocal Compensation Obligations with the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §251(f)(2) and SDCL §49-31-80, on or about October 24, 2006. Petitions to Intervene were filed by the South Dakota Telecommunications Association ("SDTA") (November 6, 2006); Alltel (November 13, 2006) and Rural Cellular Corporation (November 15, 2006), all of which Petitions were granted by the Commission. On January 12, 2007, Alltel requested that the case be transferred to the Office of Hearing Examiners ("OHE"), which request was granted by the Commission on February 6, 2007.

Venture submitted its first set of Interrogatories and Document Requests for Production on RCC on March 20, 2007. RCC responded to very few of Venture's Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents on April 23, 2007. The parties have attempted to resolve discovery disputes, but to date, nothing has been resolved between the parties. Venture files this Motion to Compel, so that all unresolved

discovery issues with all parties are before the OHE and ready for hearing on May 17, 2007.

DISCOVERY AT ISSUE

1. Venture moves the Hearing Examiner to enter an Order compelling RCC to fully and accurately respond to Interrogatories 9 through 41, copies of which, with the answers submitted, are attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

2. Venture further moves the Hearing Examiner to enter an Order compelling RCC to fully and accurately respond to Requests for Production ("RFP") 2, 5 and 16; and to provide a complete response to RFP 1 and RFP 4. Copies of these RFP's and RCC's responses are attached as Exhibit 2.

3. RCC objects to providing any information concerning affiliates of RCC, exchange of traffic with affiliates, and ownership structure of RCC and its affiliates, other than very broad information contained in its Annual Report. Venture has reviewed the information provided, and it does not answer the questions asked in Interrogatory No. 9. RCC's objection is based on relevancy, "in that RCC's costs are not at issue and reciprocal compensation rates are not being set in this proceeding." (RCC Response to Interrogatory No. 9). RCC's relevancy objection on the grounds stated above must fail.

Venture requested the information concerning Affiliates in order to have a complete picture of RCC's overall network. This information is relevant to Venture's request for suspension or modification of the dialing parity and reciprocal compensation obligations in Section 251(b).

In its Suspension Petition, Venture has asked for modification of the dialing parity requirement such that Venture is not required to transport traffic beyond the local calling area. In support of its request, Venture has demonstrated the cost to transport traffic beyond the local calling area. Venture noted in its Petition for Suspension that it could “expect to receive requests for dialing parity from the three (3) wireless carriers (Verizon Wireless, Alltel and RCC Wireless) currently operating within its service territory . . .” (Petition, at p. 6) RCC confirmed this in its Petition to Intervene. Information concerning RCC’s affiliates and how traffic is exchanged with its affiliates will demonstrate the likely points to which RCC would request Venture to transport traffic. This information is relevant to determine the cost of transporting traffic to RCC outside of the local calling area.

The requested information also is relevant in connection with Venture’s request for suspension or modification of the symmetrical reciprocal compensation requirement. In its Petition, Venture claims that the costs of transport and termination for wireless carriers such as RCC are different, and lower, than Venture’s costs to terminate calls. A complete picture of RCC’s network, including its Affiliates, will support Venture’s claim.

In its Petition to Intervene, RCC noted that it “had been attempting to obtain number blocks from Venture in at least one wire center to resolve dialing parity issues,” which remain unresolved, and that the “Commission’s decision on Venture’s petition would favorably or adversely bind and affect RCC and RCC’s ability to serve its current and future customers in the Venture wire centers where it does business.” (See Petition to Intervene, ¶¶ 3 and 4, emphasis added). RCC was granted intervention or

party status as a result of its claims. RCC cannot now claim that its costs and information relevant to dialing parity, including arrangements with its affiliates, are not appropriate and relevant issues subject to discovery.

4. In RCC's Responses to Venture's First Set of Interrogatories, RCC refused or failed to respond to questions that Venture posed concerning RCC's costs to terminate Venture's calls. A complete response to the discovery requests set forth above is relevant to Venture's claim that the costs of transport and termination for wireless carriers such as RCC are different, and lower, than Venture's costs to terminate calls. Venture has appropriately applied for a suspension of its obligation of symmetrical reciprocal compensation. The FCC requires reciprocal compensation to be determined by a forward looking economic cost study ("FLEC" study). Once a local exchange carrier such as Venture has completed a FLEC study, the LEC and the requesting interconnecting carrier (i.e. RCC) must compensate each other for reciprocal compensation based upon Venture's FLEC study. That is one of the requirements from which Venture is requesting relief in this docket.

5. It is Venture's position, as stated in its Petition, that for purposes of reciprocal compensation, wireline networks and wireless networks are different. RCC's network allows for economies of scale that it is impossible for a rural carrier such as Venture to achieve. Therefore, forward looking costs for Venture are different, and higher, than forward looking costs of a wireless network such as RCC's. Venture has alleged that in its Petition for Suspension (see page 14 of the Petition). Thus, the data requested in Venture's Interrogatories is relevant to Venture's claim that the costs of

transport and termination for wireless carriers such as RCC are different than Venture's costs, and under applicable discovery laws, is discoverable.

6. Contrary to assertions made by Alltel and joined by RCC, (Motion to Dismiss, pp. 3, 9, 10), Venture is not asking the OHE to order RCC to perform a FLEC study. Nor is Venture asking the OHE to determine a reciprocal compensation rate for Alltel or RCC in this proceeding. Venture simply is seeking information to support its position that the transport and termination costs of a wireless carrier are different than those of Venture. In its discovery, Venture requested RCC to provide information and data on its costs of transport and termination of Venture's calls. With this information, Venture can do its own analysis to support the allegations in its Petition that Venture's costs to transport and terminate calls are higher than RCC's, and thus symmetrical reciprocal compensation is unduly economically burdensome for Venture and ultimately for its subscribers.¹

7. RCC objects to responding to Venture's discovery requests on the ground that "specific RCC cost information is premature," and that to be relevant, such cost information would only be necessary in the context of reciprocal compensation calculations in an arbitration under 47 U.S.C. §§251 and 252. (See Response to Interrogatory 10, repeated thereafter). The fact that reciprocal compensation rates are not being set in this proceeding is not a reason to sustain RCC's objection to Interrogatory 10 and other cost-related interrogatories. Venture's suspension petition was filed pursuant to § 251 (f)(2), and such a petition can be filed by a carrier at any time, independent of any other proceeding. Nowhere in § 251(f)(2) is there a requirement that a suspension

¹ In its discovery, Venture has requested existing data from RCC. Venture will analyze this data to determine RCC's forward looking costs.

petition can be filed only in the context of setting reciprocal compensation rates or in conjunction with an arbitration proceeding. Venture has availed itself of that process. Adverse economic impact on users of telecommunications services generally and imposition of unduly economically burdensome requirements are some of the criteria that the State commission considers in granting of such a petition. Any evidence that is introduced in the docket relating to those factors can be considered by the commission, regardless of the source of said evidence.

That interpretation is also consistent with the general discovery rules in South Dakota. Under SDCL 15-6-26 (b)(1) a party may obtain discovery of anything relevant to the subject matter “whether it relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery”. The language authorizing discovery is therefore very broad. One of the subject matters of the Petition is relief from the requirement of symmetrical compensation. The information requested above is relevant to that matter, as it will allow Venture to support its claim that the costs of a wireless carrier, such as RCC, to transport and terminate Venture’s traffic are less than Venture’s costs to transport and terminate local traffic. The information sought is discoverable under South Dakota’s discovery rules.

SDCL 15-6-11(b)(3) states generally that when a party files pleadings with the Court that it is representing to the best of the person’s knowledge, formed after inquiry reasonable under the circumstances, that the allegations and factual contentions have evidentiary support or are likely to have that support “after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery.” Hence, it is clear that South Dakota rules anticipate that for purposes of pleading, a person need only have facts developed upon

inquiry reasonable under the circumstances before commencement of the case, but can thereafter utilize the discovery process to obtain the information necessary to prove the claim.

Conclusion

Venture respectfully requests an order compelling complete responses to the above Interrogatories and data requests, for all of the reasons set forth herein.

Respectfully submitted this 8th day of May, 2007.

Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Brown, L. L. P.
Attorneys at Law

By : Darla Pollman Rogers
Darla Pollman Rogers

319 S. Coteau
P. O. Box 280
Pierre, SD 57501
Tel: 605-224-5825
Fax. 605-224-7102

**Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens,
Duffy & Prendergast, LLP**

Benjamin H. Dickens, Jr.
Mary J. Sisak
2120 L St., NW Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20037
Tel. 202-659-0830
Fax. 202-828-5568

Attorneys for Venture Communications
Cooperative, Inc.

Certificate of Service

The undersigned, attorney for Venture Communications, Inc., hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Venture Communication's Motion to Compel was sent electronically on this 8th day of May, 2007, upon:

Talbot J. Wieczorek
Gunderson, Palmer, Goodsell
& Nelson
P. O. Box 8045
Rapid City, SD 57709
E-mail: tjw@gpagnlaw.com

Richard Coit
SDTA
320 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501
E-mail: richcoit@sdtaonline.com

Kara Van Bockern, Staff Attorney
Public Utilities Commission
State of South Dakota
500 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501
E-mail: kara.vanbockern@state.sd.us

Ben H. Dickens, Jr.
Mary J. Sisak
Blooston, Mordkofsky,
Dickens, Duffy & Pendergast
2120 L Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037
E-mail: bhd@bloostonlaw.com
E-mail: mjs@bloostonlaw.com

Harlan Best, Staff Analyst
Public Utilities Commission
500 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501
E-mail: harlan.best@state.sd.us

Rolayne Ailts Wiest
Commission Counsel
Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501
E-mail: rolayne.wiest@state.sd.us

Ms. Patricia Van Gerpen
Executive Director
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol
Pierre, SD 57501
E-mail: patty.vangerpen@state.sd.us

Mr. Stephen B. Rowell
Alltel
P. O. Box 2177
Little Rock, AR 72202
E-mail: stephen.b.rowell@alltel.com

Sean R. Simpson
Alltel Communications
2000 Technology Drive
Mankato, MN 56001
E-mail: sean.simpson@alltel.com


Darla Pollman Rogers

Exhibit 1

Responses to Interrogatories 9 through 41

Response: Objection, this interrogatory requests information not subject to discovery.

5. Identify each person you intend to utilize as an expert witness in this proceeding, together with the subject matter on which the expert is expected to testify, the substance of the facts and opinions to which the expert is expected to testify, and a summary of the grounds for each opinion; and whether you have received a written report from any such expert witness. Further, provide the full professional curriculum vitae for any expert mentioned in the answers to these interrogatories.

Response: RCC has not yet determined who it will use as an expert witness in this proceeding. Such information will be provided when a determination is made.

6. State the custodian of each written report mentioned in your answer to the preceding two interrogatories, and if you will do so without a motion to produce, attach to the answer to these interrogatories copies of such reports.

Response: Not applicable at this time.

7. Identify each witness you intend to call at the hearing on the merits of the proceeding not otherwise mentioned in your answer to these interrogatories.

Response: RCC has not yet determined who it will call as a witness in this proceeding.

8. Identify, and produce if not otherwise produced, each document, memorandum, or other writing in your possession relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding that you intend to use as an exhibit at the hearing on the merits of this proceeding.

Response: RCC has not yet determined what exhibits it will use at hearing and will provide such in accordance with the procedural obligations determined by the Hearing Examiner.

9. Identify any and all Affiliates of RCC, and explain the terms and conditions on which you exchange traffic with each such Affiliate and describe the ownership structure of RCC and each of its Affiliates.

Response: RCC objects to this request as the information requested seeks information that is not relevant or likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding the instant suspension proceeding in that RCC's costs are not at issue and reciprocal compensation rates are not being set in this proceeding. Moreover, the interrogatory is objected to as being overly broad and unduly burdensome as RCC owns various cellular operations in a number of states in the United States. A number of these cellular operations are free-standing and not directly connected to other RCC operations and, therefore, the information requested of these operations would be extremely difficult and prohibitively costly to obtain and not relevant to these proceedings. Without waiving said objections, Rural Cellular Corporation is a publicly traded company on the

NASDAQ Exchange. RCC's operations are generally described in its Annual Report for 2005, issued in 2006, which is attached.

10. For each wireless site tower or other structure owned by RCC within the MTA, provide a detailed description for the following items:

- a. Latitude and longitude of tower or other structure
- b. Type of tower or other structure
- c. Height of tower or other structure
- d. Height and quantity of antennas used by RCC
- e. Actual costs for the tower or other structure materials, including, but not limited to tower steel and appurtenances, plus any internal costs incurred by RCC for miscellaneous materials and overheads
- f. Tower or other structure space leased to other entities
 - i. Height of antennas for which space is leased on the tower
 - ii. Number of antennas for which space is leased
 - iii. Monthly lease revenue for each antenna
 - iv. Monthly lease revenue for waveguide, coaxial cable or other feedline
 - v. Terms of lease including, but not limited to, effective date, number of years, monthly lease rate per antenna, monthly lease rate per lineal foot, antennas for renewal

Response: RCC objects to the request as unduly burdensome, onerous, wholly irrelevant and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence within the instant suspension proceeding.

The requested information is unnecessary for the proceeding as any reciprocal compensation calculations would have to be determined in an arbitration under 47 U.S.C. §§ 251 and 252. Thus, Venture's request for specific RCC cost information is premature. The interrogatory is also overly broad and unduly burdensome in that it requests information that is not tracked by RCC or that the accumulation of information due to the fact that RCC has acquired various towers and tower locations from other companies making it impossible or cost prohibitive to produce.

Without waiving said objections, attached are the cell site names, latitude and longitude of those cell sites RCC has in its area licenses in South Dakota that overlap some service areas of Venture. This list includes antennas that may be on other company's towers.

11. For each wireless site that contains antenna space leased by RCC within the MTA, provide a detailed description for the following items:

- a. Latitude and longitude of tower
- b. Height of wireless access antennas and/or microwave antennas on the tower
- c. Number of wireless access antennas and/or microwave antennas
- d. Monthly lease expense for each wireless access antenna and/or microwave antenna
- e. Monthly lease expense for waveguide, coaxial cable or other feedline

- f. Terms of lease including, but not limited to, effective date, number of years, monthly lease rate per wireless access antenna and/or microwave antenna, monthly lease rate per lineal foot, terms for renewal

Response: See response to DR 10.

12. Identify the actual construction costs including, but not limited to, any contractor costs, any subcontractor costs, any internal labor costs incurred by an RCC employee, any material costs incurred by RCC, and any miscellaneous overhead costs incurred by RCC at each owned wireless site within the MTA for the following items:

- a. Dirt work, site preparation
- b. Foundations
- c. Anchor points
- d. Exterior ground system
- e. Access road
- f. Fence
- g. Landscaping
- h. Tower erection

Response: See response to DR 10. As an additional objection, the request is overly board and unduly burdensome.

13. For each wireless site owned by RCC within the MTA and at each wireless tower site that contains antenna space leased by RCC within the MT A, identify the following information:

- a. Type of waveguide, coax or other feedline
- b. Diameter of the feedline
- c. Length of the feedline
- d. Number of feedline runs
- e. Total actual cost of the feedline including any internal costs incurred by RCC for labor, materials and miscellaneous overheads

Response: See response to DR 10.

14. Identify the site acquisition costs including any internal costs incurred by RCC for labor, materials and miscellaneous overheads at each wireless tower site owned by RCC within the MTA, including but not limited to:

- a. Actual cost of RF (Radio Frequencies) study
- b. Actual cost of environmental studies
- c. Actual cost of engineering including, but not limited to, search ring, regulation compliance, lease negotiation, etc.

Response: See response to DR 10. As an additional objection, the request is overly board and unduly burdensome as numerous tower sites have been acquired by RCC in various buyouts and the information either no longer exists or would require significant costs to retrieve.

15. For each wireless site owned by RCC within the MTA, identify the following for the land on which the tower or other structure resides:

- a. Owned or leased
- b. Purchase information including original purchase price, number of square footage and/or acres owned, or
- c. Terms of lease including, but not limited to, effective date, number of years, price per square foot or acre(s), number of square footage and/or acres, terms for renewal

Response: See response to DR 10.

16. For each wireless site owned by RCC and each wireless site that contains antenna space leased by RCC within the MTA, provide the following information:

- a. Type of wireless access antenna
- b. Technology used (CDMA, GSM, AMPS, other)
- c. Height of wireless access antennas
- d. Number of wireless access antennas
- e. Actual cost of wireless access antennas including material, installation and mounting hardware

Response: See response to DR 10.

17. For each wireless site owned by RCC and each wireless site that contains space leased by Alltel within the MTA, provide the following information:

- a. Number of microwave antennas
- b. Type of each microwave antenna
- c. Size of each microwave antenna (2', 4', 6', etc.)
- d. Technology used
- e. Height of each microwave antenna
- f. Cost of each microwave antenna including material, installation and mounting hardware

Response: See response to DR 10.

18. For the transport between each wireless site owned by RCC and/or each wireless site leased by RCC within the MTA to the MTSO, provide the following:

- a. Identify the type of transport (including, but not limited to, microwave, leased facilities from other telecommunication carriers, transiting via interexchange carriers, fiber, and copper)
- b. Detailed description of the circuit routing for all types of transport from the site to the MTSO
- c. Quantity and type of circuits (TIs, DSIs, DS3s, etc.)

- d. Identify usage of circuit (voice, data, etc.)
- e. Miles for each circuit
- f. Monthly lease expense, if applicable
- g. Terms of lease including, but not limited to, effective date, number of years, price per circuit, number of circuits, terms for renewal, if applicable
- h. Detailed description of the circuit routing to the transiting carrier and identification of the actual point of meet with the transiting carrier, if applicable
- i. Mont, Wy transiting costs, if applicable
- j. Transiting rate per minute of use, if applicable
- k. Monthly minutes of use transited and identify whether they are actual or estimated, if applicable
- l. Size of fiber and/or copper, if applicable
- m. Length of fiber and/or copper, if applicable
- n. Actual cost of fiber and/or copper (including material, installation, and any internal costs incurred by RCC for labor, materials and miscellaneous overheads), if applicable

Response: With respect to subparts b, c, d, e, f, g, i, k, l, m, and n, see response to DR 10. With respect to subpart a, RCC objects to the relevancy of the request to the extent it pertains to each site within the MTA and the request is unduly burdensome. Attachment RCC Response DR 18 identifies RCC cell sites and switch locations within the state of South Dakota. All cell sites within South Dakota are connected to RCC's switch in Alexandria, Minnesota either via an RCC owned microwave route or via leased electrical and/or optical facilities. See also the response to Request for Production 1.

With respect to subpart h, RCC routes traffic from its serving mobile telephone switching office in Alexandria, MN (ALXNMNAFCM0) to Venture via direct connections with Qwest's Sioux Falls tandem.

With respect to subpart j, RCC pays Qwest a transit rate of \$.003123 per minute of use to 'transit' the traffic to Venture.

19. For transport between MTSO to MTSO within the MTA, provide the following:
- a. Identify the type of transport (including, but not limited to, microwave, leased facilities from other telecommunication carriers, transiting via interexchange carriers, fiber, and copper)
 - b. Detailed description of the circuit routing for all types of transport from the tower to the MTSO
 - c. Quantity of circuits (TIs, DS1s, DS3s, etc.)
 - d. Identify usage of circuit (voice, data, etc.)
 - e. Miles for each circuit
 - f. Monthly lease expense, if applicable
 - g. Terms of lease including, but not limited to, effective date, number of years, price per circuit, number of circuits, terms for renewal, if applicable
 - h. Detailed description of the circuit routing to the transiting carrier and identification of the actual point of meet with the transiting carrier, if applicable

- i. Monthly transiting costs, if applicable
- j. Transiting rate per minute of use, if applicable
- k. Monthly minutes of use transited and identify whether they are actual or estimated, if applicable
- l. Size of fiber and/or copper, if applicable
- m. Length of fiber and/or copper, if applicable
- n. Actual cost of fiber and/or copper (including material, installation, and any internal costs incurred by RCC for labor, materials and miscellaneous overheads), if applicable

Response: See response to DR 10. As an additional objection, the request is overly board and unduly burdensome. Subject to, and without waiving said objections, see response to RFP 1.

20. For transport between each wireless site owned by RCC and/or each wireless site leased by RCC within the MTA to a wireline switch, provide the following:

- a. Identify all direct and indirect connections with wire line service providers
- b. Identify the type of transport (including, but not limited to, leased facilities from other telecommunication carriers, transiting via interexchange carriers, fiber and copper)
- c. Detailed description of the circuits routing for all types of transport from the wireless site to the point of meet with the wireline service provider or the point of meet with the transiting carrier. Identify the actual point of meet with the wireline service provider or the transiting carrier.
- d. Quantity of circuits (T1s, DS1s, DS3s, etc.)
- e. Identify usage of circuit (voice, data, etc.)
- f. Miles for each circuit
- g. Monthly lease expense, if applicable
- h. Terms of lease including, but not limited to, effective date, number of years, price per circuit, number of circuits, terms for renewal, if applicable
- i. Monthly transiting costs, if applicable
- j. Transiting rate per minute of use, if applicable
- k. Monthly minutes of use transited and identify whether they are actual or estimated, if applicable
- l. Size of fiber and/or copper, if applicable
- m. Length of fiber and/or copper, if applicable
- n. Cost of fiber and/or copper including material, installation, and any internal costs incurred by RCC for labor, materials and miscellaneous overheads, if applicable

Response: See response to DR 10. As an additional objection, the request is overly board and unduly burdensome. Subject to, and without waiving said objections, see response to RFP 1.

21. Identify the actual costs for the switching equipment including, but not limited to, any contractor costs, any subcontractor costs, any internal labor costs incurred by an RCC employee, any material costs incurred by RCC, and any miscellaneous overhead costs

incurred by RCC at each MTSO within the MTA for the following items:

- a. Base station controller(s)
- b. Mobile Switching Center Equipment
- c. DC Power Supply
- d. DC to DC Converters, if applicable
- e. Backup Batteries
- f. Backup Generator
- g. Microwave radios
- h. SNMP Equipment (hubs, etc.)
- i. Transport Equipment (multiplexers, cross connect panels, etc.)
- j. Dehydrators, if applicable
- k. Front end processors (OTAP, SMS, MMS, etc.)
- l. Voice mail system
- m. Ancillary and miscellaneous equipment, terminals, relay racks, etc.

Response: See response to DR 10.

22. Identify the actual costs for the shelter equipment including, but not limited to, any contractor costs, any subcontractor costs, any internal labor costs incurred by an RCC employee, any material costs incurred by RCC, and any miscellaneous overhead costs incurred by RCC at each wireless site owned by RCC and/or each wireless site leased by RCC within the MTA for the following items:

- a. Base Station Equipment
- b. DC Power Supply
- c. DC to DC Converters, if applicable
- d. Backup Batteries
- e. Backup Generator
- f. Microwave radios
- g. SNMP Equipment (hubs, etc.)
- h. Transport Equipment (multiplexers, cross connect panels, etc.)
- i. Dehydrators, if applicable
- j. Tower lighting system
- k. Cross connect panels
- l. Multiplexers
- m. Ancillary and miscellaneous equipment, terminals, relay racks, etc.

Response: See response to DR 10. As an additional objection, the request is overly board and unduly burdensome.

23. For the structures within the MTA including, but not limited to, building at MTSO locations, shelters at wireless sites, warehouses, identify the following:

- a. Square footage or dimensions of the structure
- b. Actual cost of the structure including material, transportation, installation and placement, and any internal costs incurred by RCC for labor, materials and

miscellaneous overheads

- c. Identify any floor space and power that is leased to other entities
 - i. Leased square footage
 - ii. Monthly lease revenue
 - iii. Terms of lease including, but not limited to, effective date, number of years, monthly lease rate per square foot, number of square feet, terms for renewal

Response: See response to DR 10. As an additional objection, the request is overly board and unduly burdensome.

24. For the owned spectrum licenses within the MTA, identify the following:

- a. Type of FCC licenses
- b. Number of FCC licenses
- c. Portion of spectrum licensed, in MHz
- d. Portion of spectrum unused at this time, in MHz
- e. Actual costs for the FCC licenses

Response: See response to DR 10.

25. If any RCC Affiliate or any RCC unregulated service or enterprise is occupying any building space, land or is utilizing any equipment or power, identify the Affiliate, the specific RCC resource occupied and/or utilized, the amount of costs allocated among the entities, services or enterprises.

Response: See response to DR 10.

26. Identify any detailed cost information for each transmission network project undertaken in the past five years and for each project identify if it was performed jointly with another company or an Affiliate. Include all information associated with new facility placements over the past five years.

Response: See response to DR 10.

27. Provide the information requested on the form attached as Discovery Template 1 (Network data), for each wireless site owned by RCC, wireless site leased by RCC and MTSO owned by RCC within the MTA. Provide your response in electronic form.

Response: See response to DR 10.

28. Identify RCC's wireless site electronic equipment, switches, transmission add/drop nodes and/or multiplexers, interoffice routes, intra-company and inter-company transmission facilities, and call record data collection points. Identify capacity and in-service plant associated with each switch, node, route, and/or facility. This includes any routes and/or facilities between every wireless site owned by RCC to the MTSO in the MTA, between every wireless site leased by RCC to the MTSO within the MTA, and

between MTSO to MTSO within the MTA.

Response: See response to DR 10.

29. Identify any overlap routes and interface points between the wireless sites owned by RCC and the MTSO within the MTA, between the wireless sites leased by RCC and the MTSO within the MTA, and between MTSO and MTSO within the MTA. To the extent that RCC utilizes any ILEC facilities or owned facilities, identify facilities associated with such usage and the purpose of any such utilization.

Response: See response to DR 10.

30. Provide a network diagram of the MTA and identify where all section 251 (b)(5) reciprocal compensation calls are received, the transport required to terminate the call, and where call termination occurs.

Response: RCC objects to the relevancy of the request as it pertains to each site within the MTA and the request is unlikely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The request is also unduly burdensome. Without waiving said objection, See RCC's response to Request for Production 6. RCC receives 251(b)(5) traffic at all points noted on the diagrams.

31. With respect to RCC's present network and traffic routing, for each of RCC's wireless sites, describe in detail how a call originating from a customer served by each of the wireless access sites to a landline customer in each of Venture's rate centers.

Response: RCC routes traffic from its cell site to the MTSO serving the cell site and from the MTSO to an intermediate carrier (an IXC or a transit provider) for delivery to Venture.

32. Identify the actual costs for general support assets (vehicles, furniture, office equipment, computers, billing system, etc.) allocated to every wireless site owned by RCC, every wireless site leased by RCC and the MTSO within the MTA.

Response: See response to DR 10

33. What are the annual economic depreciation rates for all the assets including, but not limited to, towers, wireless access antennas, microwave antennas, feedline, structures, electronics, power, etc.?

Response: See response to DR 10

34. Identify the current cost of capital for all elements of the network including, but not limited to, switching and transport equipment.

Response: See response to DR 10. As an additional objection, the request is overly board and unduly burdensome.

35. Identify the annual maintenance expense directly related to each wireless site owned by RCC, each wireless site leased by RCC, and the MTSO within the MTA.

Response: See response to DR 10

36. Identify the annual overhead expenses (network operations, corporate operations, operating taxes, etc.) that will be attributed to each wireless site owned by RCC, each wireless site leased by RCC, and the MTSO within the MTA.

Response: See response to DR 10

37. For each MTSO providing switching services within the MTSO, provide the following:

- a. Volume of total minutes being switched in 2006
- b. Volume of total Venture-originated minutes switched in 2006
- c. Identify what portion of the minutes above are toll (both state and interstate) and what portion are local
- d. Identify whether the reported minutes are actual measured or estimated
- e. Identify the records that support the minutes

Response: With respect to traffic that does involve originating or termination to Venture, RCC objects to this request as the information requested seeks information that is not relevant to the instant suspension proceeding or likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. With respect to subpart b, RCC does not track such minutes in the normal course of business.

38. How many minutes are terminated to an RCC customer served by each wireless access site owned by RCC and each wireless access site leased by RCC within the Venture service territory and within the MTA?

Response: RCC objects to the relevancy of the request as it pertains to each site within the MTA and the information is not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The request is also unduly burdensome. Without waiving said objection, RCC has not created and does not otherwise maintain information as requested.

39. Provide the information requested in the form attached as Discovery Template 2 (MOU data) by providing 2006 minute of use data, indicate whether the reported data are actual measured or estimated, and identify the records that support the responses. Provide your response in electronic form.

Response: See response to DR 10

40. Identify the volume of access minutes, messages, and revenue by month by jurisdiction for each wireless access site owned by RCC, each wireless access leased by RCC and MTSO within the Venture service territory and within the MTA for the period January 2005 through December 2006.

Response: RCC objects to the relevancy of the request as it pertains to each site within the MTA and the information is not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The request is also unduly burdensome.

41. Identify the volume of toll minutes, messages, revenue, and lines served by month by jurisdiction for each wireless access site owned by RCC, each wireless access site leased by RCC and the MTSO within the Venture territory and MTSO for RCC's retail long distance for the period January 2005 through December 2006.

Response: RCC objects to the relevancy of the request as it pertains to each site within the MTA and the information is not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The request is also unduly burdensome. RCC does not currently offer 'retail long distance' service in South Dakota.

42. Identify the number of wireless customers for each year from 2005 through 2006.

Response: RCC had approximately 706 thousand wireless customers at year end 2005 and approximately 706 thousand wireless customers at year end 2006.

43. Identify the names and Operating Company Numbers (OCN) of all carriers with which you currently exchange any traffic and describe the terms of the arrangement, the nature of the traffic exchanged, how such traffic is routed, whether such traffic is recorded, and how such traffic is rated.

Response: RCC believes it exchanges traffic with all carriers operating in South Dakota. Traffic is either exchanged directly or via an indirect interconnection. RCC does not maintain carrier access billing records in the normal course of business.

44. Identify the rate for service charged to RCC customers with a billing address in Venture's service territory.

Response: RCC objects to this request as the information requested seeks information that is not relevant to the instant suspension proceeding and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waving such objection, RCC's current rate offerings in South Dakota are available via the web at <http://www.unicel.com/shop/plans/>.

RCC'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION

1. Admit that RCC currently provides basic services at less than the costs of those services as reflected on the books of RCC. If you deny this request in whole or in part, explain in detail the basis of that denial.

Response: This request is objected to as vague, ambiguous and as seeking information not relevant, or not likely lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in the current suspension proceeding. Subject to, and without waiving said objection, denied.

Exhibit 2

Responses to Requests for Production 1,2,4,5 and 16

2. Admit that RCC subsidizes its basic service offering by the receipt of toll revenues and roaming charges that exceed the costs of those services and from universal service funds.

Response: This request is objected to as vague, ambiguous and as seeking information not relevant to, or not likely lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in the current suspension proceeding. Subject to, and without waving said objection, RCC admits to being a recipient of federal Universal Service Funds otherwise denied.

RCC'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION

1. Provide a network diagram for your network within the MTA identifying wireless sites owned by RCC, wireless sites leased by RCC, switches, transmission add/drop nodes and/or multiplexers, interoffice routes, intra-company and inter-company transmission lines, and call record data collection points.

Response: See attachments 'RCC Response RFP 1 – MTA which shows RCC cell site locations within the MTA, 'RCC Response RFP 1 – Venture Area which shows RCC cell site locations within the same counties as Venture wire centers and 'RCC Response RFP 1 – Cell Site Data which provides further detail for RCC cell site locations within the same counties as Venture wire centers.

2. Provide an RF profile map showing RF signal levels from each of the RCC wireless site locations in the MT A.

Response: RCC objects to this request as the information requested seeks information that is not relevant to the instant suspension proceeding and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3. Provide a diagram of any overlap routes and interface points within the MTA between RCC's network and the Qwest network.

Response: RCC objects to this request as the information requested seeks information that is not relevant to the instant suspension proceeding and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waving said objection, RCC interface points with Qwest tandems in the MTA and within the state of South Dakota are depicted in attachment "RCC Response RFP 6."

4. Provide a diagram of any overlap routes and interface points between the wireless sites owned by RCC and the MTSO within the MTA, between the wireless sites leased by RCC and the MTSO within the MTA, and between MTSO and MTSO within the MTA

Response: RCC objects to this request as the information requested seeks information that is not relevant to the instant suspension proceeding and not likely to lead

to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waving said objection, RCC's Alexandria, MN MTSO is the only MTSO within the MTA.

5. Provide a diagram showing the circuit routing between each wireless site owned or leased to the MTSO and the circuit routing between MTSO to MTSO within the MTA. Identify whether the circuits are routed over microwave, leased facilities, transited via IXC, fiber, copper, etc.

Response: See attachment "RCC Response DR 18."

6. Provide a network diagram of the MTA and identifying where all 251 (b)(5) reciprocal compensation calls are received, the transport facilities used to terminate the call, and where the call termination occurs.

Response: RCC objects to the relevancy of the request as it pertains to each site within the MTA and it is not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The request is also unduly burdensome. Without waving said objection, see attachment "RCC Response RFP 6."

7. Provide a copy of any traffic study (and all associated work papers, support, computations data, and other documentation) prepared by or on behalf of RCC subsequent to January 2002. If this data is stored and/or was developed with the aid of a computerized spreadsheet or other electronic application, provide an electronic copy of the spreadsheet and electronic means including data and computational algorithms.

Response: RCC objects to this request as the information requested seeks information that is overly broad and not relevant to the instant suspension proceeding or likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waving said objection, RCC has no such traffic studies."

8. Provide copies of all documents upon which you rely to support your answers to any interrogatories.

Response: Provided as per attached.

9. Provide any agreements (or the terms of any business arrangements) RCC has with other entities in South Dakota.

Response: Interconnection agreements are on file with the Public Service Commission. To the extent the request seeks agreements beyond filed interconnection agreements, the request is objected to as overly broad and unduly burdensome and information irrelevant and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence as it seeks agreements subject to confidentiality agreements and any business agreement RCC may have with any business in South Dakota.

10. Provide any documents exchanged between RCC and other entities relating to the