

# **EXHIBIT I**

## Carter, David

---

**From:** Carter, David  
**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2011 9:36 AM  
**To:** 'Schenkenberg, Philip'; Buntrock, Ross; 'Talbot J. Wiczorek'; 'Meredith Moore'; 'jcremer@bantzlaw.com'; 'Margo Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'; 'Darla Rogers'  
**Cc:** 'Lawson, William [GA]'; 'Browning, Diane C [GA]'  
**Subject:** RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

Phil - If you believe it is inaccurate in any way, I would encourage you to point out those inaccuracies now so that we may correct them. We intended for that section to set forth the issues referred by the court in the FCC referral, modified only to reflect what is intended to be address by the PUC. If we have inadvertently changed something that you believe materially alters what was intended, please let us know that and we will work with you to make the correction. Before Northern Valley or Sancom agrees to move forward with voluntarily withdrawing any of its claims, however, we deserve to have clarity about Sprint's position on what issues are encompassed by the referral order and will be before the PUC for decision. Accordingly, I believe that this provision is very much necessary and would request that you provide a redline with suggested changes to any portion that contains the inaccuracies to which you refer.

I am available for a call this afternoon after 2:30 ET if you would like to discuss.

Thank you,  
David

David Carter  
Attorney

Arent Fox LLP | Attorneys at Law  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
202.857.8972 Direct | 202.857.6395 Fax  
carter.david@arentfox.com | [www.arentfox.com](http://www.arentfox.com)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you received this in error, please do not read, distribute, or take action in reliance upon this message. Instead, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Schenkenberg, Philip [mailto:PSchenkenberg@Briggs.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2011 9:23 AM  
**To:** Carter, David; Buntrock, Ross; 'Talbot J. Wiczorek'; 'Meredith Moore'; 'jcremer@bantzlaw.com'; 'Margo Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'; 'Darla Rogers'  
**Cc:** 'Lawson, William [GA]'; 'Browning, Diane C [GA]'  
**Subject:** RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

I don't think it's necessary, and it makes it look like it's a quote out of the referral order when it is not. In addition I don't think it is completely accurate.

Phil Schenkenberg  
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.

Direct 612.977.8246  
Fax 612.977.8650  
pschenkenberg@briggs.com  
2200 IDS Center  
80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

-----Original Message-----

From: Carter, David [mailto:Carter.David@ARENTFOX.COM]  
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2011 8:20 AM  
To: Schenkenberg, Philip; Buntrock, Ross; 'Talbot J. Wieczorek'; 'Meredith Moore';  
'jcremer@bantzlzlaw.com'; 'Margo Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'; 'Darla Rogers'  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; 'Browning, Diane C [GA]'  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

Phil: Thanks for sending this revised draft. We are still reviewing, but I would like to understand your reason for removing the issue list set forth in paragraph 12 of our draft. Do you disagree that these issues are before the Commission for resolution with regard to the intrastate traffic?

Thank you,  
David

David Carter  
Attorney

Arent Fox LLP | Attorneys at Law  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
202.857.8972 Direct | 202.857.6395 Fax  
carter.david@arentfox.com | www.arentfox.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you received this in error, please do not read, distribute, or take action in reliance upon this message. Instead, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

-----Original Message-----

From: Schenkenberg, Philip [mailto:PSchenkenberg@Briggs.com]  
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2011 8:33 AM  
To: Buntrock, Ross; 'Talbot J. Wieczorek'; Carter, David; 'Meredith Moore';  
'jcremer@bantzlzlaw.com'; 'Margo Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'; 'Darla Rogers'  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; 'Browning, Diane C [GA]'  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

Ross,

Darla and I have talked and I was anticipating that Darla would provide revised dates (including hearing dates for her motion and final hearing dates that would accommodate the legislative session) to me that we would then get back to the group. I think it makes sense to allow Darla to weigh in before taking up the staff and commission's time with a motion.

I have attached our proposed edits to the stipulation, and have plugged in most of the dates, which I think are close to what Darla and I discussed.

I am available to discuss any of these proposed changes.

Phil

Phil Schenkenberg  
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.  
Direct 612.977.8246  
Fax 612.977.8650  
pschenkenberg@briggs.com  
2200 IDS Center  
80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

-----Original Message-----

From: Buntrock, Ross [mailto:Buntrock.Ross@ARENTFOX.COM]  
Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2011 10:44 AM  
To: Schenkenberg, Philip; 'Talbot J. Wieczorek'; Carter, David; 'Meredith Moore';  
'jcremer@bantzlzlaw.com'; 'Margo Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'; 'Darla Rogers'  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; 'Browning, Diane C [GA]'  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

Counsel:

Significant time has again passed since counsel for SDN and Sprint indicated that they would confer about the matters unique to their clients and get back to the rest of the group about finalizing the schedule. We have heard no response.

While we appreciate that the parties may be busy with a variety of conflicting obligations, as we have explained repeatedly, our client feels compelled to move this case along so that the issues can be resolved and the PUC's guidance provided to the federal court expeditiously. Accordingly, unless we receive prompt input and consensus to a proposed schedule from the other parties, we intend to file on Friday a motion asking the PUC to establish a procedural schedule.

For ease of reference, attached is the most recent draft of the materials that we have circulated.

Respectfully,  
Ross

Ross Buntrock  
Partner

Arent Fox LLP | Attorneys at Law  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
202.775.5734 Direct | 202.857.6395 Fax  
buntrock.ross@arentfox.com | www.arentfox.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you received this in error, please do not read, distribute, or take action in reliance upon this message. Instead, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

-----Original Message-----

From: Buntrock, Ross  
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2011 11:07 AM  
To: Schenkenberg, Philip; Talbot J. Wieczorek; Carter, David; Meredith Moore; jcremer@bantzlzlaw.com; Margo Northrup; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'; Darla Rogers  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; Browning, Diane C [GA]  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

Phil:

As follow up to the call last week, we have made some additional suggested edits to the language that you included in the most recently proposed procedural schedule. A clean version of the current proposed draft and a document highlighting those changes are attached. We hope that these edits will be acceptable to Sprint and the other parties, and also provide clarity to the Commission.

We understand from that call that SDN and Sprint intended to have further conversations about scheduling before the end of last week. Please let us know the results of that conversation and any consensus that has been reached regarding scheduling for the SDN Summary Judgment motion.

Please let us have everyone's final thoughts about the schedule before close of business tomorrow so that we may proceed with filing this on Wednesday.

Thanks,  
Ross

Ross Buntrock  
Partner

Arent Fox LLP | Attorneys at Law  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
202.775.5734 Direct | 202.857.6395 Fax  
buntrock.ross@arentfox.com | www.arentfox.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you received this in error, please do not read, distribute, or take action in reliance upon this message. Instead, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

-----Original Message-----

From: Darla Rogers [mailto:DPRogers@riterlaw.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 5:39 PM  
To: Schenkenberg, Philip; Talbot J. Wieczorek; Carter, David; Buntrock, Ross; Meredith Moore; jcremer@bantzlzlaw.com; Margo Northrup; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; Browning, Diane C [GA]  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

I am available for a call tomorrow morning at 10:00 central time. Is there a bridge?

Darla

-----Original Message-----

From: Schenkenberg, Philip [mailto:PSchenkenberg@Briggs.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 1:38 PM  
To: Talbot J. Wieczorek; Carter, David; Buntrock, Ross; Meredith Moore; jcremer@bantzlzlaw.com; Darla Rogers; Margo Northrup; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; Browning, Diane C [GA]  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

If it works for the rest of the group we'll go ahead without Talbot.

Phil Schenkenberg  
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.  
Direct 612.977.8246  
Fax 612.977.8650  
pschenkenberg@briggs.com  
2200 IDS Center  
80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

-----Original Message-----

From: Talbot J. Wieczorek [mailto:TJW@gpnlaw.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 1:36 PM  
To: Schenkenberg, Philip; Carter, David; Buntrock, Ross; Meredith Moore; jcremer@bantzlzlaw.com; 'Darla Pollman Rogers'; 'Margo D. Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; Browning, Diane C [GA]  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

I am unavailable tomorrow morning.

Talbot

-----Original Message-----

From: Schenkenberg, Philip [mailto:PSchenkenberg@Briggs.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 12:10 PM  
To: Carter, David; Buntrock, Ross; Meredith Moore; jcremer@bantzlzlaw.com; Talbot J. Wieczorek; 'Darla Pollman Rogers'; 'Margo D. Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; Browning, Diane C [GA]  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

David, I think you are overstating things. I told you guys on Wednesday I need to talk to Sprint's FCC counsel about the interplay between these two proceedings, and wasn't able to do so until Friday afternoon. I was prepared to address that on the group call, and my email was a good faith attempt to move the ball forward. In case I wasn't clear enough, I think you are right - there isn't anything else for us to talk about substantively. We have a dispute about whether the unjust enrichment discovery is discoverable. You will file a motion to compel. We will oppose it. Our concern is that the parties clearly tell the Commission what it is being asked to do to the extent we are combining federal and state discovery. That's an issue for the group to weigh in on because it's going to need to be addressed in the procedural order. Given your statement that the Commission would not be asked to address federal issues, I will suggest some language that may accomplish that.

I can talk at 10 central tomorrow if that works for the group. I will get comments out today if I can, but don't think that is necessary for us to have a productive conversation. I also think it was reasonable for us to get some depo dates on the calendar now as we negotiate testimony and hearing dates, and would hope that will be part of the conversation.

Phil

Phil Schenkenberg  
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.  
Direct 612.977.8246  
Fax 612.977.8650  
pschenkenberg@briggs.com  
2200 IDS Center  
80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

-----Original Message-----

From: Carter, David [mailto:Carter.David@ARENTFOX.COM]  
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 12:24 PM  
To: Schenkenberg, Philip; Buntrock, Ross; Meredith Moore; jcremer@bantzlaw.com; 'Talbot J. Wiczorek'; 'Darla Pollman Rogers'; 'Margo D. Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; Browning, Diane C [GA]  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

Phil:

In light of your representation that you have a lot of available the first half of this week, we are puzzled as to why you continue to refuse our request to confer with you regarding Sprint's objections to Northern Valley's discovery requests. We have requested such a conference with you for several weeks now. And, as we stated in our previous emails, which you have apparently chosen to ignore, we do not believe that this discussion is one which necessitates the involvement of the larger group.

Nevertheless, to the extent that Spiltrock and SDN also desire discovery regarding Sprint's revenues from the traffic on their networks for which Sprint is not paying, then certainly we are happy to discuss that issue briefly on our scheduling call. And, we say briefly, because it seems that Sprint is unwilling to engage in a conversation regarding the substance of its objections, such that the discussion will be one only about the logistics of our motion. In that regard, we again feel obliged to point out that we are not suggesting that "the SDPUC should or can decide what should be available for purposes of the FCC referral," but rather that the issues before the SDPUC are the same as those before the FCC (with the difference being interstate vs. intrastate), and that the information that we seek in this regard will be useful and relevant to both. Moreover, as you note, the parties have already agreed to the sound and reasonable principle that we should consolidate discovery, rather than unnecessarily increasing time and expense by proceeding through multiple rounds of discovery. As such, we believe that getting this issue to the PUC sooner rather than later is the appropriate course of action for all parties.

Further, when we spoke briefly with Bret on Friday, we asked that Sprint provide any proposed edits to the current draft of the procedural schedule to the group in advance of any call that we may reconvene. We believe that those written edits will allow the parties to have the most productive conversation. (And, in that regard, I understand that Darla will soon be circulating minor proposed edits in order to adjust the hearing date to not coincide with the legislative session in South Dakota.) Bret agreed to discuss this request with you and assured us that Sprint would work to promptly reschedule the call. Can we expect to receive your written comments by the end of the day? If so, I would propose having the call tomorrow morning at 11 ET/10 CT, since I will be out of the office on a variety of business matter for the remainder of the week.

Thanks,  
David

David Carter

Attorney

Arent Fox LLP | Attorneys at Law  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
202.857.8972 Direct | 202.857.6395 Fax  
carter.david@arentfox.com | www.arentfox.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you received this in error, please do not read, distribute, or take action in reliance upon this message. Instead, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

-----Original Message-----

From: Schenkenberg, Philip [mailto:PSchenkenberg@Briggs.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 7:59 AM  
To: Buntrock, Ross; Meredith Moore; jcremer@bantzlaw.com; 'Talbot J. Wiczorek'; Carter, David; 'Darla Pollman Rogers'; 'Margo D. Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'  
Cc: 'Lawson, William [GA]'; Browning, Diane C [GA]  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

My apologies for the cancellation on Friday.

I've got a lot of availability the first half of the week if we want to try to reschedule. I think what we want to do is make sure we have time to complete discovery before testimony is due, so we don't end up having to come back to the Commission to move dates. In order to further that goal, it would probably make sense to start getting some depositions on the calendar. We just got a second round of discovery responses from Splitrock, and while I haven't looked at them yet it seems to me we could get Splitrock and SDN depositions on the calendar for 2-3 days in late May or early June. We're still trying to catalog the Northern Valley information and supplemental responses, so those depositions will need to wait a bit farther. With respect to non-parties, those discussions are moving forward as well.

There are a few things to discuss with respect to the language of the procedural order. The group knows that Sprint and the 3rd party defendants had discussed combining SDPUC and FCC discovery here, but we have a disagreement about whether there are any issues before the SDPUC or the FCC that would allow Northern Valley and Sancom to obtain information regarding Sprint's revenues and other information they would use to pursue an unjust enrichment type claim. Sprint is not going to agree that the SDPUC should or can decide what should be available for purposes of the FCC referral. It is probably worth talking through how we are going to get that dispute resolved in conjunction with setting dates. I also think the current draft has a lack of clarity with respect to the time periods involved. This only involves Northern Valley, but is complicated by the fact that Northern Valley had a new FCC tariff filed in 2010, and then filed a new lawsuit against Sprint recently seeking to enforce that tariff.

As I said, I'm generally available this week.

Phil

-----Original Message-----

From: Buntrock, Ross [mailto:Buntrock.Ross@ARENTFOX.COM]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2011 12:09 PM



To: Meredith Moore; jcremer@bantzlaw.com; 'Talbot J. Wieczorek'; Schenkenberg, Philip; Carter, David; 'Darla Pollman Rogers'; 'Margo D. Northrup'; 'Jeffrey D. Larson'  
Subject: RE: SDN v. Sprint Scheduling Order

Let's plan on 11 AM Central/12 PM Eastern on Friday. David Carter will circulate a conference bridge number to use.

Thanks,  
Ross

Ross Buntrock  
Partner

Arent Fox LLP | Attorneys at Law  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
202.775.5734 Direct | 202.857.6395 Fax  
buntrock.ross@arentfox.com | www.arentfox.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you received this in error, please do not read, distribute, or take action in reliance upon this message. Instead, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

---

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this e-mail communication and any attached documentation may be privileged, confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure and is intended only for the use of the designated recipient(s). It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any unauthorized person. The use, distribution, transmittal or re-transmittal by an unintended recipient of this communication is strictly prohibited without our express approval in writing or by e-mail. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please delete it from your system without copying it and notify the above sender so that our e-mail address may be corrected. Receipt by anyone other than the intended recipient is not a waiver of any attorney-client or work-product privilege.

---

This email has been scanned for all viruses by the MessageLabs SkyScan service.  
(<http://www.messagelabs.com>)

---

IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that, unless expressly stated otherwise, any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

---

This email has been scanned for all viruses by the MessageLabs SkyScan service.  
(<http://www.messagelabs.com>)

---