

EXHIBIT A

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

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF NATIVE AMERICAN TELECOM, LLC
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY TO
PROVIDE LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE
WITHIN THE STUDY AREA OF
MIDSTATE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Docket No. TC11-087

**NATIVE AMERICAN TELECOM, LLC'S
FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES
TO SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.'S
DISCOVERY REQUESTS**

Native American Telecom, LLC ("NAT") hereby submits its ***FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL*** objections and responses to Sprint Communications Company L.P.'s ("Sprint") Discovery Requests.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

NAT incorporates the following objections into each of its specific objections below.

1. NAT objects generally to each discovery request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product doctrine, common interest doctrine, joint defense privilege, or any other applicable privilege or right.
2. NAT objects generally to each discovery request to the extent it is overbroad and seeks information not relevant to the subject matter of this action or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible

evidence, and to the extent that the requests are vague and ambiguous or unduly burdensome.

3. NAT objects generally to each discovery request insofar as it purports to require NAT to inquire of all of its current and former employees, agents and representatives to determine whether information responsive to the question exists on the grounds that such an inquiry would be unduly burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. NAT will therefore limit its inquiry to the appropriate employees currently employed by NAT that have or have had responsibility for matters to which the discovery request relates.

4. NAT objects generally to each discovery request to the extent that the information requested is known to Sprint or its counsel, or to the extent they require disclosure of information, documents, writings, records or publications in the public domain, or to the extent the information requested is equally available to Sprint from sources other than NAT.

Please see NAT's specific objections and responses attached hereto.

Dated this 18th day of January, 2013.

SWIER LAW FIRM, PROF. LLC

/s/ Scott R. Swier

Scott R. Swier

202 N. Main Street

P.O. Box 256

Avon, South Dakota 57315

Telephone: (605) 286-3218

Facsimile: (605) 286-3219

scott@swierlaw.com

Attorneys for NAT

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Identify and describe the services, goods, or products you have provided to Free Conferencing Corporation, including all features and practices associated with the provision of each service, the specific tariff or contract provision(s) pursuant to which each service, good, or product has been provided.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, NAT also objects that the terms in this interrogatory (“services,” “goods,” “product”) are vague, overbroad, and ambiguous. Moreover, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *The services provided to Free Conferencing Corporation are described in NAT’s South Dakota Tariff No. 1 (Section 5.1, Page 1), and NAT’s Tariff FCC No. 3. (Section 4.1, Page 89). See “NAT’s Response to Sprint’s Interrogatory No. 2” (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: In the federal court case between NAT and Sprint, Mr. Keith Williams testified on October 14, 2010 that calls to NAT numbers were switched by a Widevoice switch in Los Angeles, before being routed in IP back to NAT router in Ft. Thompson. October 14 Hearing Tr. Pp. 18-19. Is that true today? If so, where is that reflected in NAT's response to Staff Request 1-2. Regardless of switch location, provide detail (make, model, capacity, cost, date of purchase, ownership information, location) with respect to the switch now being used.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *No, that is not true today.*

(LAX) – Los Angeles

Taqua

T8000

12 DS3

Leased

In-Service 9/1/2009

Leased

Los Angeles

IVS SBC

Dell Blade Server Chassis and Blades – approximately \$50,000 - hardware only.

GenBandC3 – approximately \$250,000 - hardware only.

GenbandG9

36 DS3

In-Service 6/1/2010

(SDN) – Sioux Falls

GenbandG9 – approximately \$128,000 – hardware only.

12 DS3 In-Service 11/30/2010

IVS SBC

Dell Blade Server Chassis and Blades – approximately \$30,000 – hardware only.

In-Service 6/18/2011

(FTT) - Fort Thompson

IVS SBC

Dell Blade Server Chassis and Blades – approximately \$30,000 – hardware only.

In-Service

GenbandG2 \$12,000

In-Service 4/20/2012

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: Describe the equipment to be used to provide NAT's Inbound Calling Service to those receiving it.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 6" (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Identify the location of the cell towers and WiMax equipment you claim allows you to provide service throughout the reservation. Provide coverage maps that demonstrate the signals being generated can reach throughout the reservation.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 7" (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: You list “Wi-Max Equipment” as an asset valued at \$216,086.81 on December 31 2011 Balance Sheet. What makes up that category, how did you determine the value of that asset, and what is its depreciation rate?

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See “NAT’s Response to Sprint’s Interrogatory No. 11” (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: With respect to the “Marketing Expense” of \$170,097.75 listed on your 2011 Profit and Loss statement, please identify all of the expenses included in this line item, including amounts NAT paid to Free Conferencing Corporation.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See “NAT’s Response to Sprint’s Interrogatory No. 12” (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 13: With respect to the “Telephone and Circuit Expenses” of \$132,101 listed on your 2011 Profit and Loss, please identify the facilities covered by this line item, and identify the parties to whom you paid this expense and the amount paid to each party.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See “NAT’s Response to Sprint’s Interrogatory No. 13” (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: With respect to the “Professional Fees” of \$87,710 listed on your 2011 Profit and Loss, please identify the parties to whom you paid this expense, the services they provided, and the amount paid to each party.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See “NAT’s Response to Sprint’s Interrogatory No. 14” (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 15: With respect to the “End User Fee Income” of \$166,629 listed on your 2011 Profit and Loss, please describe all of the expenses included in this line item, identify the payment dates and amounts, and identify the payor(s).

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See “NAT’s Response to Sprint’s Interrogatory No. 15” (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 16: With respect to the “Access Termination Fee Income” of \$91,814 listed on your 2011 Profit and Loss, please describe the sources of revenue within this account, and identify the payor(s) including the amount paid by each payor(s).

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See “NAT’s Response to Sprint’s Interrogatory No. 16” (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 17: With respect to the “CABS Collection Fee Income” of \$157,983 listed on your 2011 Profit and Loss, please describe the sources of revenue within this account, and identify the payor(s) including the amount paid by each payor(s).

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter. Such information also constitutes confidential financial information and trade secrets.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See “NAT’s Response to Sprint’s Interrogatory No. 17” (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 18: Explain from a technical standpoint how NAT proposes to provide intrastate interexchange service. Identify the rates and terms that will apply to the intrastate interexchange service NAT proposes to provide.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter. Without waiving said objection, a copy of NAT's tariff can be found at <http://nativeamericantelecom.com>. NAT's intrastate rates mirror interstate rates (even though NAT could legally charge more for intrastate service).*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *All inter-exchange traffic is routed via dedicated, private transport to the NAT "regional hub" in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, for exchange by NAT's chosen, intrastate or interstate, long distance provider via dedicated connectivity. The proposed intrastate interexchange services, rates, and terms are described in the proposed tariff in Section 5.1. See "NAT's Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 18" (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 19: Identify any factual information provided to Mr. Roesel by NAT or its representatives.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter. This interrogatory is also vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and constitutes confidential financial and proprietary information and trade secrets.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Mr. Roesel has provided regulatory consulting services to NAT for several years and, as a result, has been provided much factual information by NAT during that time in a variety of contexts. Regarding NAT's South Dakota Application and Tariffs, NAT provided all of the substantive information to Mr. Roesel that makes those documents specific to NAT. While Mr. Roesel started with his existing application and tariff templates, he relied on NAT or its representatives to describe NAT's technical, managerial, and financial competence, and to establish rates, terms, and conditions for service, which mirror the tariff of the lowest price-capped LEC in the State of South Dakota, Qwest. See "NAT's Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 19" (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 20: Identify the cases in which Mr. Roesel has testified or prefiled testimony over the last four years.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 20" (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 21: What documents has Mr. Roesel relied on to conclude NAT has the financial capability to provide the services covered by its application?

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter. This interrogatory is also vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and constitutes confidential financial and proprietary information, and trade secrets.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Mr. Roesel reviewed NAT's 2010 financials.*

INTERROGATORY NO. 22: Identify by name the members of the Tribal Utility Authority who voted to approve NAT's application for authority to provide service on the Reservation.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Brandon Sazue, Crow Creek Tribal Chairman, signed the "Order Granting Approval to Provide Telecommunications Service" on October 28, 2008.*

INTERROGATORY NO. 23: What carriers besides MidState has NAT interconnected with for the exchange of telecommunications?

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter. This interrogatory is also vague and ambiguous as to "interconnected with for the exchange of telecommunications" and requests proprietary information.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *There are no other carriers for Local Access in FTT. The tandem traffic is connected to SDN.*

INTERROGATORY NO. 24: Identify the manufacturer(s) of the WiMax technology NAT uses, including the model and serial numbers of each piece of technology (hardware) NAT proposes to use to provide services under its Application.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 7" (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 27: Who maintains NAT's financial records?

Where are NAT's financial records kept?

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Carlos Cestero
4300 E. Pacific Coast Hwy., Long Beach, California 90804*

INTERROGATORY NO. 28: Identify all of NAT's bank accounts.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Wells Fargo #5526
First Dakota National Bank #7119*

INTERROGATORY NO. 29: Identify by name the employees and work locations of all of NAT's employees.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS:

1. Cole Reiman – Computer and Network support (remote and onsite support to residents of reservation)
2. Ronda Hawk – Communications Center
3. Wanda Wells – Communications Center
4. Evan Hawk – Communications Center
5. Kenisha Kirkie – Communications Center
6. Kasie Kirkie – Communications Center
7. Keshia Kirkie – Communications Center
8. Thomas Howell – Communications Center
9. Tom Reiman – On-Sight Coordinator
10. Farley Hawk – Contactor - Communications Center
11. Larry Wormer – Construction - Communications Center
12. Weston Big Eagle – Construction - Communications Center
13. Todd World Turner – Construction - Communications Center
14. Rodney Swinton – Construction - Communications Center
15. Roger Bishop – Construction - Communications Center
16. John St.John – Construction - Communications Center
17. Chris Big Eagle – Construction - Communications Center
18. Frank Attikai – Construction - Communications Center
19. Derick Ziepher – Construction - Communications Center
20. Terry McBride – Construction - Communications Center
21. Lester McBride – Construction - Communications Center
22. Albert – Construction - Communications Center

INTERROGATORY NO. 30: Identify the employees and officers of Free Conferencing who provide services to NAT or perform functions for NAT.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Jeff Holoubek, David Erickson, Tara Odenthal, Carlos Cestero, Hector DeLatore*

INTERROGATORY NO. 31: When did NAT first approach Free Conferencing to enter into a contract with NAT?

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Approximately January 2009.*

INTERROGATORY NO. 38: Please describe and identify, in detail, all cash transactions and payments from NAT to Wide Voice in 2010 and 2011. This should include, but not limited to, professional or consulting fees, interest payment, shareholder distributions, and percent of gross revenues per Section 6.06 of the Joint Venture Agreement.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 38" (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 41: Please provide the number of NAT employees as of year-end 2010 and 2011.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: 2010 – 8

Employees, 2011 – 6 Employees

INTERROGATORY NO. 42: Please provide an organization chart showing all NAT employees as of year-end 2011.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS:

Tom Reiman

Cole Reiman + Evan Hawk + Kenisha Kirkie + Kehia Kirkie + Thomas Howell

INTERROGATORY NO. 43: Please provide a detailed diagram showing the call path through NAT-owned or controlled equipment for traffic terminating to any and all Conference Call Company-owned or controlled conference bridge equipment.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 43" (attached).*

INTERROGATORY NO. 44: Please provide a detailed diagram showing the call path through NAT-owned or controlled equipment for traffic terminating to a traditional residential or business end-user (non-Conference Call Company).

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See “NAT’s Response to Sprint’s Interrogatory No. 44” (attached).*

DOCUMENT REQUESTS

DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 1: Provide all documentation, including general ledger journal entries or other accounting records of NAT reflecting NAT's long term liabilities to Widevoice as listed on your December 31, 2011 Balance Sheet.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's RFPD No. 1" (attached).*

DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 2: Provide any documents that evidence commitments for future financing of NAT's operations.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *None, as NAT is not in need of additional financing.*

DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 3: Provide 2011 bank statements, general ledger and journal entries and any other financial records that identify the detail for NAT's income and expenses.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's RFPD No. 3" (attached).*

DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 4: Provide any documents (other than what was attached to the application, amended application, or responses to staff discovery requests) that were provided to Mr. Roesel.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's Interrogatory No. 19, No. 20, and No. 21."*

DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 7: Provide all general ledger journal entries or other accounting records of NAT that support NAT's balance sheets and profit and loss statements for 2009, 2010 and 2011.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's RFPD No. 7" (attached).*

DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 8: Provide all documents reflecting NAT's loan from Widevoice.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *See "NAT's Response to Sprint's RFPD No. 7" (attached).*

DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 9: Please provide any cost studies or similar analyses that you have performed or had prepared on your behalf by any consultant or other third party for access services and high volume access services.

RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *Subject to and notwithstanding the aforementioned general objections, such information is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this Certificate for Authority matter.*

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE/OBJECTIONS: *NAT has not conducted any such cost studies or similar analyses.*

VERIFICATION

I, *Jeff Holoubek*, state that I have first-hand knowledge of the matters set forth above and hereby verify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the allegations and statements contained herein are true and correct.

Dated this 16TH day of January, 2013.



NATIVE AMERICAN TELECOM, LLC


By: Jeff Holoubek

Its: Acting President

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)


COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

Subscribed and sworn to before
me this 16TH day of January, 2013.


Notary Public

My Commission Expires: SEPTEMBER 12, 2013

(SEAL)



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of *NATIVE AMERICAN TELECOM, LLC'S **FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL** OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.'S DISCOVERY REQUESTS* was delivered *via United States Mail* on this 18th day of January, 2013, to the following parties:

Service List (SDPUC TC 11-087)

/s/ Scott R. Swier

Scott R. Swier