

# **EXHIBIT C**



2200 IDS Center  
80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis MN 55402-2157  
tel 612.977.8400  
fax 612.977.8650

February 5, 2013

**Philip R. Schenkenberg**  
(612) 977-8246  
pschenkenberg@briggs.com

**VIA EMAIL**

Scott R. Swier  
Swier Law Firm, Prof. LLC  
PO Box 256  
Avon, SD 57315

**Re: 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. SDPUC Docket No. TC11-087**

Dear Scott:

We have reviewed the supplemental discovery responses you served by mail on January 18, 2013. There are three issues we wish to follow up on.

**First**, there are three interrogatories and one document request included within Sprint's motion to compel (which was granted in full) that were not addressed in NAT's supplemental responses. They are as follows:

**INTERROGATORY NO. 9:** With respect to the voice services you have been providing, identify the taxes, assessments and surcharges that apply, including USF surcharges, TRS, and 911 assessments. Has NAT been collecting and/or remitting such amounts? If so, explain how amounts have been calculated, if not, why not? In doing so you should explain the calculations that resulted in NAT's remittance of \$10,665 to USAC for the 2012 calendar year.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 33:** If NAT's revenues do not exceed expenses, where will NAT obtain the necessary resources to continue to provide high quality telecommunication services to its customers?

**INTERROGATORY NO. 36:** Please describe and identify, in detail, all cash transactions and payments from NAT to NAT Enterprise in 2010 and 2011. This should include, but not limited to, professional or consulting fees, interest payments, shareholder distributions, and percent of gross revenues per Section 6.06 of the Joint Venture Agreement.

Scott R. Swier  
February 5, 2013  
Page 2

**DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 5:** Produce all documents that reflect NAT's Board of Directors' minutes, meetings, and resolutions, and NAT's bylaws.

Sprint respectfully requests that NAT supplement these responses.

**Second**, in response to Interrogatory No. 6, NAT produced a diagram that was stamped as document number 00005. It appears that the diagram has color coding, but we were not provided a color copy. Please provide a color copy of document 00005.

**Third**, in response to Interrogatory No 7, NAT produced an RF feasibility study. The feasibility study shows proposed locations and technology, but Interrogatory No. 7 asked for actual cell tower locations and equipment. Please supplement NAT's response to provide "as-constructed," rather than proposed, information. In addition, the RF map on page 2 of the feasibility study is not readable in the form produced. Please produce a readable copy.

Given the time frame we are working on, we request these supplementations be provided within seven days.

Very truly yours,



Philip R. Schenkenberg

PRS/smo

cc: Counsel of Record (w/enc.)