

**Exhibit 4**

**Information Required by ARSD 20:10:32:29**

### **Information Required by ARSD 20:10:32:29**

The following is the information required by ARSD 20:10:32:29:

- (1) The identity of each party to the negotiation, including the name, address, and telephone and facsimile numbers of each party or the party's representative**

*Petitioner:*

Midcontinent Communications  
3901 N. Louise Avenue  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57107  
Phone: 605-271-0594  
Facsimile: 605-330-4083  
Email address: pat.mastel@Midco.com

The contacts for Midco are Patrick Mastel, the senior vice president and general counsel of the company, and J.G. Harrington, outside federal telecommunications counsel. Mr. Harrington's contact information is as follows:

J.G. Harrington  
Cooley LLP  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20004  
Phone: 202-776-2818  
Facsimile: 202-842-7899  
Email address: jgharrington@cooley.com

*Responding Party:*

James Valley Cooperative Telephone Company  
234 E 1st Ave  
PO Box 260  
Groton, South Dakota 57445  
Phone: 605-397-2323  
Facsimile: Unknown  
Email address: James.Groft@corp.nvc.net

Midco does not have information on a specific representative of James Valley, but the contact for Midcontinent's interactions with James Valley was James Groft, Chief Executive Officer of James Valley.

**(2) The date of the initial request for negotiation**

Midcontinent first contacted James Valley concerning a potential interconnection agreement by letter from Andi Livingston of Midcontinent to James Groft of James Valley on June 3, 2021. A formal request for interconnection and negotiation was made via a letter from J.G. Harrington, outside federal telecommunications counsel to Midcontinent, to Mr. Groft on July 16, 2021.

**(3) A detailed list of all the unresolved issues the party or parties want the commission to arbitrate and the position of each party on those issues**

As described above, there have been no negotiations between the parties, as James Valley took the position that it was not required to provide interconnection to Midcontinent. Consequently, all issues that could be subject to an interconnection negotiation remain unresolved. The following are significant issues known to Midco to be resolved in the arbitration:

- (a) Method of interconnection and points where interconnection will occur.
- (b) Compensation between the parties for services provided under the interconnection agreement.
- (c) Terms for transfer of customers between Midco and James Valley.
- (d) Terms for billing and collection of amounts due under the agreement.
- (e) Term of the agreement, including renewal and termination provisions.

Midco's positions on each of these issues, and all other issues in this arbitration, are reflected in the draft interconnection agreement attached to this petition as Exhibit 1, which was provided to James Valley in a letter dated August 17, 2021.

James Valley has expressed no position on any issue that will be considered in this arbitration in its contacts with Midcontinent. As a consequence, some of the issues identified by Midco may not require arbitration if James Valley does not dispute Midco's position and James Valley may raise issues in the arbitration that are unknown to Midco at this time.

**(4) A list of the issues resolved by the parties or a copy of any proposed contract language that reflects the resolution of those issues**

As described in response to item (3), no issues have been resolved because James Valley took the position that it was not required to provide interconnection to Midco.

**(5) A list of the unresolved issues, if any, that are not being submitted for arbitration**

None.

**(6) Any proposed contract language reflecting each party's position.**

The proposed interconnection agreement attached to this petition as Exhibit 1 contains contract language reflecting Midcontinent's position on all issues known to Midco at this time.

James Valley has not provided any contract language to Midco at this time.

**(7) All documentation in the petitioner's possession or control that is relevant to the dispute**

Copies of all correspondence between Midco and James Valley are provided in Exhibit 2, and Midco's proposed interconnection agreement, which was included in the August 6 letter to Mr. Groft, is provided in Exhibit 1.

**(8) A request for a protective order, if needed**

Midco does not request a protective order at this time, but reserves the right to do so if necessary to protect proprietary information.

**(9) A proposed procedural schedule**

Midco proposes the following procedural schedule:

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date</b>
James Valley response to petition	January 3, 2021, per SDLRC 20:10:32:30
Pre-hearing conference (via video conference)	January 8, 2021, per SDLRC 20:10:32:31
James Valley to provide list of disputed agreement provisions, if such a list is not included in the response to the petition.	January 10, 2022
Discovery requests due	January 15, 2022
Midco response to James Valley list of disputed agreement provisions due	January 31, 2022
Discovery responses due	January 31, 2022
Submission of prefiled testimony and proposed terms for interconnection agreement	February 24, 2022
Hearing	March 3, 2022 (continuing to March 4, 2022 if necessary)
Initial post-hearing briefs	March 11, 2022
Reply briefs and final proposed terms for interconnection agreement	March 18, 2022
Commission decision on arbitration issues	April 18, 2022, per SDLRC 20:10:32:32
Submission of arbitrated agreement for approval	May 18, 2022, per SDLRC 20:10:32:33
Submission of comments on arbitrated agreement	May 25, 2022, per SDLRC 20:10:32:34
Submission of reply comments on arbitrated agreement	June 1, 2022, per SDLRC 20:10:32:34
Commission decision approving arbitrated agreement	June 17, 2022, per SDLRC 20:10:32:35