

**Docket Number:** TC20-021  
**Subject Matter:** First Data Request  
**Request to:** Citizens Telecommunications Company of Minnesota, LLC (Citizens or Company)  
**Request from:** South Dakota Public Utilities Commission Staff  
**Date of Request:** June 30, 2020  
**Responses Due:** July 14, 2020

1-1. At last year's July 9, 2019 Commission meeting, Scott Bohler indicated that the Company would have to reassess in 2020 if its 15 CAF II eligible census blocks in the South Dakota portion of the Jasper exchange would be built out. Did Citizens decide to build out any of these census blocks in 2020? If so, provide the dates each census block is scheduled to be complete. If not, provide an explanation of how Citizens was able to satisfy its CAF II requirements and the dates Citizens plans to ultimately build out to its South Dakota census blocks.

Answer)

No CAF II projects were undertaken during 2019 in the South Dakota portion of the Jasper exchange. The South Dakota portion of the Jasper exchange is part of Citizens' Minnesota study areas. Citizens' CAF II deployment requirements are based on state-wide deployment numbers in those Minnesota study areas, encompassing all the CAF II eligible census blocks within those study areas. Deployment to the South Dakota census blocks may not be necessary in order to satisfy the overall deployment requirements.

1-2. In response to Staff Data Request 1-6 in last year's docket TC19-013, Citizens committed to providing a copy of the Minnesota PUC ETC designation when it was available. Did Citizens receive certification from the Minnesota PUC last year? If so, provide a copy of the ETC designation.

Answer)

Citizens did receive certification from the Minnesota PUC in 2019. Please see attached file, "*Oct 17 2019 order designating ETCs.pdf*".

1-3. Confirm that any and all benefits gained by Citizens' Minnesota customers through the settlement reached in Minnesota PUC docket 18-122 will also be provided to Citizens' South Dakota customers. Explain in detail the benefits Citizens' South Dakota customers would have realized thus far.

Answer)

The settlement reached in Minnesota PUC docket 18-122 included a number of items that were intended to improve the service quality experienced by Citizens customers. These included several service quality metrics with standards exceeding those of relevant Minnesota rules. To achieve compliance with these enhanced requirements, Citizens has made a number of changes in both its practices and processes used to assign technicians to effect timely repairs or installations of service. These changes have been incorporated across Citizens' entire footprint, and South Dakota customers are included in the improvements achieved through those changes. In addition, the settlement provided for enhancements in Frontier's processes regarding monitoring and remediation of damaged or worn plant. These enhancements are being incorporated throughout Citizen's service area and will benefit South Dakota customers.

1-4. Noting the decrease in South Dakota access lines from 37 reported in last year's docket TC19-013 to the 19 reported in this docket, what did the customers provide for reasons for leaving this past year? Were they able to find adequate service elsewhere?

Answer)

Citizens does not have information regarding the reasons that customers had for terminating service. Of the customers that terminated service, ten ported out to another carrier. Citizens does not have any information regarding whether the other eight customers took service from some other provider.

1-5. Provide the broadband speeds currently available to each of Citizens' South Dakota customers.

Answer)

Broadband speeds of approximately 1Mbps are available to Citizens' South Dakota customers.

1-6. In Minnesota PUC docket 18-122, Citizens agreed to upgrade Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexers (DSLAMs) to provide internet speeds up to 40 megabits per second in several exchanges. Was this option considered for the South Dakota portion of the Jasper exchange? Explain.

Answer)

Citizens did not agree to upgrade any Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexers (DSLAMs) as part of Minnesota PUC docket 18-122. Rather, as part of docket 18-122, Citizens agreed to share additional information regarding past DSLAM upgrades it had previously undertaken in Minnesota.