#### THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF KENNEBEC TELEPHONE COMPANY FOR SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF TC04-025 47 U.S.C. SECTION 251(b)(2) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 AS AMENDED \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ RIGINAL Transcript of Proceedings April 6, 2004 BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, ROBERT SAHR, CHAIRMAN GARY HANSON, VICE CHAIRMAN JIM BURG, COMMISSIONER RECEIVED COMMISSION STAFF APR 1 9 2004 Rolayne Ailts Wiest SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC John Smith UTILITIES COMMISSION Karen Cremer Greg Rislov Harlan Best Jim Mehlhaff Steve Wegman Tina Douglas Dave Jacobson Michele Farris Sue Schaefer Pam Bonrud APPEARANCES Darla Pollman Rogers Rich Coit David Gerdes Jeff Larson ALSO PRESENT: Rod Bowar Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR



105 S. EUCLID AVENUE, SUITE E • PIERRE, SOUTH DAKOTA 57501 • (605) 945-0573

Case Compress

Case C	Compress		
1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION		3
2	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA		-
		1	CHAIRMAN SAHR: TC04-025, In the
3		2	Matter of the Petition of Kennebec Telephone
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF	3	Company for Suspension or Modification of 47 U.S.C.
5	KENNEBEC TELEPHONE COMPANY FOR SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF TC04-025		
	47 U.S.C. SECTION 251(b) (2) OF THE	4	Section 251(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934
6	COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 AS AMENDED	5	as Amended.
7	AMENDED	6	And the question today is how shall the
8			· ·
0	Transcript of Proceedings	(	Commission proceed. And this one is also on the
9	April 6, 2004	8	addendum as item No. 3, and the question under that
10		9	is shall the Commission grant the petition for an
11	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,		- ,
	ROBERT SAHR, CHAIRMAN GARY HANSON, VICE CHAIRMAN	10	interim suspension of any obligation that may exist
12	JIM BURG, COMMISSIONER	11	for a petitioner to provide LNP until six months
13	COMMISSION STAFF	12	after entry of a final order.
	Rolayne Ailts Wiest		-
14	John Smith Karen Cremer	13	With that, I would ask the attorney for
15	Greg Rislov	14	Kennebec to come forward. Thank you.
16	Harlan Best Jim Mehlhaff	15	MS. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
	Steve Wegman		
17	Tina Douglas Dave Jacobson	16	members of the Commission.
18	Michele Farris	17	l thought it might be helpful to just review a
19	Sue Schaefer Pam Bonrud	18	little bit the background of how we came to the
		1	-
20	APPEARANCES Darla Pollman Rogers	19	point we're at today and that is for a review and
21	Rich Coit	20	ultimately a decision on a temporary suspension
22	David Gerdes Jeff Larson	21	request of Kennebec.
		22	
23	ALSO PRESENT: Rod Bowar		Of course, the original obligation of number
24	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR	23	portability is found in Section 251(b)(2) of the
25		24	Act, but that requirement back in 1996 was
		25	contingent upon technical feasibility, number one,
		20	contingent upon technical leasibility, number one,
	2		Δ
1	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE	4	4
1	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens	1	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the
	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek	1 2	•
2 3	APFEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis		, and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission.
2	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes	1 2 3 4	, and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements
2 3	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold		, and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated
2 3 4	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melisa Thompson		, and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements
2 3 4 5 6	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Diokens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman	3 4 5	, and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required
2 3 4 5	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt		and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100
2 3 4 5 6	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Diokens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland	3 4 5 6 7	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications
2 3 4 5 6 7	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper	3 4 5 6 7 8	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Diokens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland	3 4 5 6 7	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Diokens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Diokens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington JoAnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone Company, and that's the docket before you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone Company, and that's the docket before you. Kennebec has two exchanges. It has 766 access
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone Company, and that's the docket before you. Kennebec has two exchanges. It has 766 access lines. Its received LNP requests from two CMRS
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone Company, and that's the docket before you. Kennebec has two exchanges. It has 766 access
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone Company, and that's the docket before you. Kennebec has two exchanges. It has 766 access lines. Its received LNP requests from two CMRS providers, Western Wireless and Verizon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone Company, and that's the docket before you. Kennebec has two exchanges. It has 766 access lines. Its received LNP requests from two CMRS providers, Western Wireless and Verizon. Kennebec, once the Order was handed down by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone Company, and that's the docket before you. Kennebec has two exchanges. It has 766 access lines. Its received LNP requests from two CMRS providers, Western Wireless and Verizon. Kennebec, once the Order was handed down by the FCC, looked at the costs for this small
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone Company, and that's the docket before you. Kennebec has two exchanges. It has 766 access lines. Its received LNP requests from two CMRS providers, Western Wireless and Verizon. Kennebec, once the Order was handed down by the FCC, looked at the costs for this small company. They studied the implementation issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE Mary Sisak Ben Dickens Talbot Wieczorek Dan Wall Dan Davis Mary Lohnes Nancy Vogel Colleen Sevold Melissa Thompson Pamela Harrington Johnne Hohrman Warren Vandestadt Rich Helsper Wayne Akland Todd Hansen TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 6th day of April 2004, commencing at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and, number two, requirements prescribed by the Commission. Well, as you are aware, those requirements came in the form of an FCC order, and it was dated November 10, 2003. In that order the FCC required local exchange carriers in the nation's top 100 MSAs to provide LNP to all telecommunications carriers including CMRS carriers or wireless carriers, and that deadline was May 24, 2003. At that time, though, the FCC did recognize that small LECs in rural areas would face technical, financial, operational, and other difficulties by implementing LNP so they gave them until May 24, 2004 to comply with the LNP requirement. So with that background, which is the big picture, basic, let's look at Kennebec Telephone Company, and that's the docket before you. Kennebec has two exchanges. It has 766 access lines. Its received LNP requests from two CMRS providers, Western Wireless and Verizon. Kennebec, once the Order was handed down by the FCC, looked at the costs for this small

С	ase Compress		
	5		7
1	yet been addressed or at least definitively by the	1	carrier for LNP. These are for the consideration
2	FCC and they ultimately looked at their legal	2	on the actual merits of the case, i.e., is the
3	options. And that led them to file a petition for	3	Commission going to suspend or modify the
4	suspension or modification of the LNP requirement,	4	requirements for these particular carriers.
5	and they did this on February 12 of 2004.	5	Then the Act provides pending such action the
6	Included in that petition was a request for	6	state Commission may suspend enforcement of the
7	temporary suspension of the LNP requirement or a	7	requirement or requirements to which the petition
8	relief from the May 24, 2004 implementation	8	applies with respect to the petitioning carrier or
9	deadline.	9	
1(		10	
11	<b>J</b> (	11	
12		12	
13		13	
14	1 0	14	
1		15	
		16	
1(		10	5
1	5	18	
19	<b>e i i i i</b>	19	
2		20	
2		21	3
2		22	5
2		23	
2		24	
2	5 to granting interim suspension.	25	Congress or our State Legislature wanted to impose
	6	-	8
1	-	1	standards or additional guidelines to you as a
		2	
3		3	
		4	the Act is clear on its face.
5		5	
le		6	
		7	days, six months, to decide the ultimate question,
	5		
8		8	
	3	9	5
1			0
1		11	
1		12	
1		13	
1		14	
1		15	5
1		16	
1	•	17	5
1	1	18	1 5
1		19	
2		20	D maintained while the petition for suspension is
2	1 251. And, of course, that would include the number	21	pending. It would ensure that the Petitioner is
2		22	
/2		23	
2	<b>U</b> 1 <b>U</b> 1 <b>U</b> 1	24	5 0 1
	5 modifying the requirements of the carrier, a rural	25	
Ľ		<u>`</u>	

C	ase Co	ompress		
		9	10	11
	1	you're going to either suspend or modify the	1	stated the case very well in terms of why an
	2	requirements for Kennebec.	2	interim suspension should be granted.
	3	Furthermore, if the interim suspension	3	l would like to offer just a couple of
	4	petition is not granted, Petitioner would incur	4	comments. We disagree as well with the argument
1	5	costs to begin implementing LNP. They may not be	5	that the preliminary injunction standard should
	6	recoverable. So it's Petitioner that's going to	6	apply in regards to deciding the request for
	7	be or could potentially be irreparably harmed if	7	interim suspension.
	8	this suspension is not granted on the interim.	8	And I think it's helpful to just ask the
	9	In addition, if the interim suspension is not	9	question why did Congress include in the Federal
	10	granted and the Petitioner does not implement LNP	10	Act the language that specifically allows for an
	11	by May 24, a formal Complaint could be filed	11	interim suspension?
	12	against the Petitioner in front of the FCC and	12	And I would say they did that for two reasons.
	13	there could be fines levied or forfeitures imposed	13	They recognize, number one, that the process of
	14	there.	14	reviewing a petition for suspension or modification
	15	There is also a question of whether or not if	15	on the merits may take some time. And they also
	16	Kennebec would have filed a petition for suspension	16	recognize that if a decision if no interim
	17	earlier, would we still be here requesting an	17	suspension is permitted and the deadline passes and
	18	interim suspension? And the answer is yes. It is,	18	the company is required to, as a result, implement
	19	as you've pointed out, unlikely that these cases	19	the requirement or obligation that's being debated,
	20	can be physically, realistically heard and	20	effectively the case is moot at that point.
	21	completed and the Petitioners implement LNP by	21	You can't take it back. You don't implement
	22	May 24. It's just probably, frankly, impossible.	22	LNP and then later say, well, we don't need to
	23	And what happens under the Act, and again	23	implement LNP so we're going to take it out of our
	24	looking at the Act in our statute, there are two	24	switch and we're going to get our money back. It
	25	six-month periods here. The Petitioners have six	25	doesn't work that way.
				12
		10	4	
	1	months or the companies have six months to		So I think, you know, those are the two basic
	2	implement LNP, and you as a Commission have six	2	reasons. They understood the process was going to
	3	months to decide a petition or application for	3	take some time, and they also understood that
	4	modification or suspension.	4	without an interim suspension you may force
	5	So those six-month periods cannot	5	companies prematurely before you can actually
	6	necessarily they can't run simultaneously. If a	6	look at the case and decide the case on the merits,
	1	company exercises its option to file for a		you may prematurely decide that they're subject to
	8	petition, you've got six months. We need the	8	the requirement or obligation.
	9	interim suspension so that we don't have to incur	9	There are due process concerns with respect to
	10	costs ahead of time in case the ultimate outcome is	10	not granting the interim suspension. And it's been
	11	a modification or suspension of the requirement.	11	noted a couple of times this morning, you know, how
	12	Finally, I would also point out that an	12	much time is it going to take to complete these
	13	interim suspension would maintain the status quo	13	cases?
	14	between the Petitioners and the Interveners, and	14	Realistically, I don't think anybody can say
	15	the Interveners in this case are not harmed. It's	15	we can complete all of these cases by May 24. It's
	16	going to be business as usual.	16	not going to happen. And if that's something that
	17	So for those reasons we respectfully request	17	could happen, we wouldn't be here today. But
	18	the Commission to grant Kennebec's petition for	18	that's not something that can happen, to my
	19	temporary suspension.	19	understanding.
	20	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you.	20	Western Wireless has submitted a letter dated
	21	Mr. Coit.	21	April 5 that references an FCC case that I would
	22	Mr. Coit: Thank you. My name is	22	just like to comment on. There are certain
	23	Richard Coit. I'm here today representing SDTA.	23	standards in that FCC case that deal with a request
	24	Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and staff, I don't	24	for a stay. That decision deals with something
	25	think I need to add too much. I think Ms. Rogers	25	different than what we're dealing with here.

Ĺ

Ć

Case Compress				
	13		15	
1	We're asking for relief that is specifically	1	the big question and the big problem we were having	
2	provided for under the federal statute and under	2	in how to exactly do a procedural schedule on the	
3	the state statute. That case dealt with a	3	interim relief question was what standard did the	
4	challenge to the FCC's underlying order that has	4	Commission wish to use in making the interim relief	
5	led to all of this, and the question of whether	5	determination.	
6	there should be some stay of that order pending the	6	It's true Western Wireless has said this is	
7	review of the petition that was filed by USDA and	7	akin to a preliminary injunction. Though, in	
8	Century Tel and others.	8	conversation with counsel and staff I've always	
9	And we don't have that situation here. It's	9	admitted under the statute, the federal statute and	
ſ		10		
10	just not the same situation. So I don't believe	11	the state statute, they don't specifically set	
11	that that decision really offers much here in terms		forth a standard. Neither the federal government	
12	of deciding what the standard should be on the	12	nor the state government. The legislative branches	
13	interim suspension.	13	did not specify to the Commission this is the	
14	We believe that the Commission can grant this	14	standard you should use.	
15	interim suspension based on the petitions	15	So essentially the question that is my	
16	themselves. There's plenty of information in those	16	understanding that is going to be posed today is	
17	petitions. And, as I indicated, without granting	17	what standard do you want to use.	
18	interim suspensions you're effectively deciding the	18	Now, as I understand it, Commissioners, based	
19	case before you have an opportunity to sit back and	19	on Ms. Rogers argument her argument is, look, there	
20	look at all of the evidence and evaluate it and	20	is no you're almost obligated as long as we file	
21	determine whether it really does make sense and	21	a petition to grant this.	
22	whether it's in the public interest to implement	22	I disagree. I think there has to be some kind	
22	LNP or not.	23	of showing. I don't think it's disputed that they	
		23		
24	The other thing that I would like to comment	1	have the burden to show why they should get interim	
25	on is harm. Ms. Rogers mentioned the potential	25	suspension and the suspension at the full hearing.	
	14		16	
1	harm to Kennebec. And I think it's worthwhile to	1	And that burden then needs to be met at some level	
2	look at, you know, harm on both sides. What's the	2	by Kennebec.	
3	harm to the other parties. We're facing a	3	I think that level, a reasonable level, is	
4	situation here where the Commission has to get this	4	some type of analogy to the preliminary injunction	
5	done in 180 days. You don't have any choice but to	5	standard. It doesn't say that you have to show you	
6	do that.	6	can win, but it requires them to put on some	
7	And in addition to that, does Western Wireless	7	factual information, factual information supported	
8	have information that there are a bunch of	8	by not just a petition, not verified petitions, but	
9	customers in Kennebec requesting LNP right now that	9	by some sort of testimony or at a minimum	
	want it tomorrow? I don't believe that's the case	10	affidavits setting forth these are our numbers,	
10			0	
11	either.	11	this is why we can't meet it.	
12	So I think that, you know, it is also helpful	12	Now the second problem I have with this is	
13	to look at the harm and who would be harmed by not	13	they keep talking about having a decision within	
14	granting interim suspension.	14	180 days. But Ms. Rogers seems to argue that, hey,	
15	That's all I have. Thank you.	15	if you give us this interim suspension, it requires	
16	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you.	16	you have to order that we don't have to comply with	
17	Mr. Wieczorek.	17	LNP until six months after your final decision.	
18	MR. WIECZOREK: Mr. Chairman?	18	So if that's the approach, then you're talking	
19	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Yes. Do you have	19	about an additional six months past your final	
20	any comments?	20	decision. You know, Kennebec is one of the smaller	
21	MR, WIECZOREK: Yes. First on a	21	companies that have filed for suspension. But if	
22	couple of issues. We did work in good faith.	22	the there are a number of other companies here,	
23	think all counsel got together and tried to figure	23	and if the standard's simply going to be all you	
23		23	have to do is file and you get it, what happens if	
	out the best way to deal with this interim relief	24	• • •	
25	request. As I understood it when we went apart,	20	we get to that full hearing and it's obvious some	

Case Co	npress		
	17		19
1	other company could have complied by May or very	1	heard.
2	soon thereafter and they just get an additional	2	The first point I'd like to make, to the
3	10 months then to not comply?	3	extent that the Commission would or would not grant
4	Finally, as to harm, you know, it's an impact	4	a temporary suspension to wireline to wireline LNP,
5	of human nature that people don't call to ask for	5	that would be very significant to us.
6	things until you can advertise it and let them know	6	For instance, if the Commission was just going
7	it's available. And, frankly, we're not	7	to enter an order ordering a temporary suspension
8	advertising line number portability because we	8	as it related to wireline to wireless, we have no
9	don't know when we're going to get it.	9	dog in that fight and we would have no objection
10	And once we have that, that's when the people	10	whatsoever.
11	will come, and that's when the people will want to	11	However, to the extent that the Commission is
12	switch over. So the longer that line number	12	considering granting temporary suspensions as it
13	portability is pushed out, the greater that	13	relates to wireline to wireline, then we are
14	inherent harm is to us to our customer base.	14	interested. So I want to make that point here,
15	Finally, addressing something that Mr. Coit	15	first of all.
16	said, I believe my letter was clear, I was not	16	Secondly, Mr. Chairman, members of the
17	trying to imply the FCC decision set forth a	10	Commission, I do disagree with Ms. Rogers as it
18	standard for this question. I was analogizing to	18	relates to the standard she suggests for the
19	that, that's a different standard or that the	19	granting of an interim suspension.
20	FCC has used an injunctive type relief standard in	20	If you look at the Federal Act and
20	making determinations in certain issues. And	21	specifically 251(f)(2), which we've been talking
22	Mr. Coit is correct that was a question of a stay	22	about here, there really is no standard. All it
22	on appeal. It was not a request for interim relief	23	says is if you've filed if someone has filed a
23	at this level.	23	petition, "The State Commission shall grant the
24	But, again, frankly if the FCC had made that	25	petition to the extent that and for such duration
20			•
	18		20
1	decision, that would probably provide a little bit	1	the State Commission determines that such
2	more guidance to the Commission as to what the	2	suspension or modification is necessary to avoid a
3	standard should be, but, you know, frankly,	3	significant adverse economic impact, to avoid
4	statutes don't set forth the standards. I don't	4	imposing a requirement that is unduly economically
5	believe it's simply filed and you get it.	5	burdensome or to avoid imposing a requirement that
6	believe there's something more, and I believe the	6	is technically infeasible and is consistent with
7	preliminary injunction standard is the standard the	7	the public interest."
8	Commission should use.	8	Now I would submit to you that that is the
9	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Mr. Wieczorek, you	9	standard upon which you also must grant temporary
10	were cutting out at the end, but I think the court	10	suspensions. Because they have placed no other
11	reporter picked it all up. Although Midcontinent	11	burden upon you. And I would submit that that
12	is not a party to this case, I think it is	12	is in other words, there has to be a showing
13	appropriate because the decision we may make may	13	beyond the mere allegations of a petition that the
14	affect the case and it is involved and I'd ask	14	applicant has the ability to prove these items, I
15	Mr. Gerdes if he has any comments to make.	15	would submit.
16	MR. GERDES: Mr. Chairman, thank	16	There is nothing in subparagraph 2 here that
17	you. I was counting during the interim between the	17	places any requirement that the Commission do or
18	last time I talked and this time, and I think there	18	don't that the Commission does or does not grant
19	are 18 dockets and we've intervened in eight of	19	a temporary suspension. And, therefore, your
20	them, that is Midcontinent has intervened in eight	20	discretion is free. Given the fact that you have
21	of them. And I appreciate being able to address	21	discretion, you have to look somewhere for
22	the Commission on this issue.	22	guidance, I think, as to what the standard is.
23	Because if the Commission is going to decide	23	And I would point to the South Dakota case of
24	on what standard it will follow in granting	24	Daisy vs. Gors, 471 N.W.2d 576 in which the
25	temporary suspensions, then we certainly seek to be	25	South Dakota Supreme Court embraced the standard of
		45.0570	Page 17 to Dogo 20

C	Case C	Compress		
		21		23
	1	the Data Phase case handed down by the Eighth	1	take that one separate because it's next but if you
	2	Circuit Court of Appeals. It's a very well-known	2	wanted to listen to them all at one time
	3	case to anybody dealing with temporary injunctions	3	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Why don't we go
	4	and temporary restraining orders wherein the court	4	ahead since we've opened it up to Midcontinent,
	5	adopted the four standards that must be proven in	5	let's open it up to anyone else who's a party in
	6	order to grant a temporary restraining order.	6	any of the other cases as well. We'd be more than
	7	And that is, number one, whether or not there	7	happy to have him testify.
	8	is a threat of irreparable harm to the movement,	8	MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm
	9	that is irreparable harm to the Petitioner in this	9	Jeff Larson, attorney for Santel. I'm not going to
	10	case. Number two, you then balance the harm	10	tell you everything that you've just been told, but
	11	between the Petitioner on the one hand and the	11	I think we agree with Ms. Rogers. By anybody's
	12	other litigants. In other words, who's going to be	12	definition Santel is certainly a rural telephone
	13	hurt the worst. Thirdly, what is the probability	13	company. We have less than 5,000 lines, and we fit
	14	of the Petitioner's success on the merits and,	14	the requirements of the Federal Act.
}	15	fourthly, the public interest.	15	And I would like to point out that the
	16	And the public interest here is in LNP, is in	16	requirements there that ultimately the Commission
	17	implementing LNP. The public interest is in	17	is going to be making their decision on are, in
	18	implementing the LNP. That is what the	18	fact, leaning on our side based on the petition,
	19	Telecommunications Act says. That's what	19	and I believe Mr. Wieczorek indicated that perhaps
ŕ	20	South Dakota statutes says. It has been decided it	20	to satisfy him all we would basically need to do is
	21	is in the public interest for people to have local	21	verify our petitions.
	22	number portability.	22	It's obvious, I think, from everyone's
	23	So we believe that based on those standards	23	perspective we can't put together an evidentiary
	24	that there must be an evidentiary showing beyond	24	hearing to have all of these things decided by
	25	the mere allegations of a Complaint as to whether	25	May 24, but any significant economic impact on
1 1		22	<u></u>	24
3 .	1	or not a temporary suspension is in order.	1	consumers is going to occur to the consumers in our
	2	Mr. Coit said in Kennebec there's no bunch of	2	part of South Dakota and certainly Kennebec and the
	3	customers out requesting LNP. That is true, but	3	others by the requirement, if they had to, of
	4	there are customers wanting LNP in other exchanges	4	spending significant amounts of money in order to
	5	as we talked about a little bit earlier.	5	prepare for this.
	6	The final point I'd make is that the	6	There is also in our situation, Santel's, we
1	7	Commission orders that the the FCC orders that	7	have zero requests at this point in time for the
	8	were mentioned talking about the May 24 deadline,	8	wireline to wireless portability. I'm advised by
	9	those, as I read them, apply to wireline to	9	our general manager that we do business part of
	10	wireless. There are no orders that apply to	10	our territory is Hutchinson County, South Dakota,
1	11	wireline to wireline, which means the statute is in	11	which has the United States' largest percentage of
	12	place and that is and is operative and that is	12	people over 85 years of age, and I can tell you
	13	that LNP as it relates to wireline to wireline is	13	that they are not terribly interested in wireline
	14	supposed to be permitted now, last week, whenever.	14	to wireless portability.
	15	I mean, it's due now subject to the proof of	15	And the economic impact would be severe to our
	16	temporary or subject to the proof of suspensions	16	company. We meet the standards of the Federal Act.
	17	or modifications as is in the Act.	17	We meet the standards of the State Act, and we
	18		18	certainly would very respectfully request the
		But, nonetheless, if those things do not	19	
	19 20	exist, then LNP is in order. That's why we believe	20	Commission to grant the interim suspension so this matter can be dealt with in an orderly fashion.
		that there has to be a showing, a factual showing,	20	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. Is there
,	21	that would support a temporary suspension. And I	21	•
	22	probably talked too long, and I apologize.	22	anyone else wishing to appear? Anyone else on the
	23	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. Staff.		phone that would like to appear at this point in
	24	MS. CREMER: I believe Mr. Larson is	24	time?
	25	here for Santel and I don't know if you want to	25	I'll go back to staff then. Thank you.

Case Co	mpress		
<b></b>	25		27
1	MS. CREMER; Thank you. This is	1	that today I believe that you can grant the interim
2	Karen Cremer from staff. The Commission has	2	relief until such time as you make a final
3	180 days to act on these petitions, and those dates	3	determination on the petitions.
4	will begin to run your first decision is due	4	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. I'll
5	August 10. So, I mean, we've all looked at the	5	give Ms. Rogers a chance to respond if she'd like
6	calendar. It's all going to have to be wrapped up	6	it.
7	here. We're going to be starting hearings here in	7	MS. ROGERS: Thank you. I have just
8	June.	8	a few points to make briefly in response to a
9	I checked with Mr. Coit, and I believe that	9	couple of the other things that were mentioned
10	most everyone that is going to filed has filed. He	10	here
11	was going to check to be sure. So we will be done	11	First of all, Mr. Wieczorek talked about the
12	with all of these by the middle of September.	12	standards that are set forth in the Act, and
13	According to 49-31-80 the Commission may	13	Mr. Gerdes did too. And when he alluded to the
14	suspend enforcement of the requirements pending	14	avoid significant adverse economic impact and those
15	final action on the suspension or the modification.	15	standards that are set forth in 251(f)(2) of the
16	And that is what those hearings in June will be	16	Act, it's very specific in the Act that those are
10	about will be do you want to implement LNP, and if	17	the considerations and the standards for the State
18	you do, when will be the date? Will you do it	18	Commission upon deciding whether or not to grant
19	immediately as of the date of the hearing or, you	19	such petition. Okay. Such petition refers back to
20	know, when their hearing runs in September or	20	the first part of that Act, which is the petition
21	August, or will you give them a longer period of	21	for a suspension or modification of the requirement
22	time?	22	of the Act.
23	And I think all of that evidence will come out	23	And then when you keep reading at the very end
23	during the hearing.	24	it's the last sentence that specifically says,
24	Staff's opinion is that the Commission may	25	"Pending such action the State Commission may
20		20	
	26		28
1	grant the interim relief during these 180 days.	1	suspend enforcement."
2	And if during the hearing the Commission wants to	2	And that's what we're asking for. So what
3	hear evidence during those summer hearings, like l	3	we're saying is we have met the standards and
4	said before, that you want to give them an	4	burdens that are in the Act. We have fewer than
5	additional period of time now I think the	5	2 percent of the nation's subscriber lines, and we
6	petitions have all said six months. It doesn't	6	have pending petitions.
7	have to be six months just because that's what they	7	And to say, well, because there isn't those
8	asked for. It could be 90 days. Or if Mr. Gerdes	8	are the only standards in there, we have to leap
9	said, you know, it appears that they could do it	9	over or look at other areas of law is asking for
10	and they could do it immediately, then it could be,	10	something that's not required here at all. We
11	you know, a few days thereafter or whatever. But	11	don't agree that preliminary injunction standards
12	that will all come out in your final order.	12	are applicable here, and we don't believe that they
13	I think today we are merely talking about an	13	should be applied by the Commission.
14	interim suspension from May 24 through the middle	14	l think that it's also helpful to look at what
15	of September or whatever would be the 180th day. I	15	some of the other State Commissions have done. And
16	believe that the harm to the Interveners is	16	I've reviewed decisions, and I think maybe the
17	insignificant during this time period. The public	17	Commission has too from both the Utah State
18	interest would suffer a greater prejudicial effect	18	Commission and also Nebraska. And Nebraska has
19	than that imposed on the Interveners if the	19	said that they granted a petition for interim
20	Commission were to deny the interim relief.	20	relief from the obligation to implement local
21	I believe the Commission can base its decision	21	number portability, and they held that it should be
22	on the pleadings filed by all the parties and the	22	granted, again, pending the review of this
23	oral arguments that have been made by the parties	23	application.
24	today.	24	So the interim relief gives you as a
25	So, bottom line, staff's recommendation is	25	Commission the time that you need to orderly decide

Case Cor	mpress		
	29		31
1	the cases. It prevents the companies and the	1	bell's rung, once it's being provided, they're not
2	subscribers from incurring costs that they may not	2	going to go back on it or they're not well, they
3	have to incur later. And, as Mr. Coit said, you	3	could maybe go back to a certain degree, but they
4	can't undo it. Once we spend the money, you can't	4	obviously can't send equipment back from who they
5	roll back the hand of time and stop it.	5	purchased it from and get their money back.
6	And I think that with regard to the 60-day	6	The problem is that you have all of these
7	period or the six-month period we asked for we	7	filed fairly close to the deadline. Some of the
8	asked for that because that's what we were given	8	filings even group companies together, small
9	under the Act to implement it. I do not have a	9	companies with larger companies.
10	problem with Nebraska's approach and what staff	10	I think the Act was designed in such a way
11	recommends, leaving it in your discretion. You go	11	companies should make some showing this is a
12	ahead, make the findings, let's go through the	12	legitimate filing and not simply a filing to put
13	hearings, and as the evidence comes in then I think	13	off potentially offering their customers an
14	that you will fairly treat us as to what we have to	14	alternative.
15	comply with and when.	15	And that's why we advocated a standard where
16	So we would urge you again to grant the	16	they have to actually show here's where we're
17	temporary suspensions today.	17	coming from, here's some evidence, and this is why
18	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you. And I	18	we think we can prevail rather than simply filing a
19	appreciate everyone sticking on point and sticking	19	petition which is fairly cookie-cutter. They are
20	to the merits of the question about the suspension.	20	very similar, all the petitions, no matter the size
21	Mr. Wieczorek, I do have a question, and I	21	of the companies here.
22	look at the Federal Act and state law, and to me it	22	So I agree that once the equipment's in place
23	gives the Commission quite a bit of discretion in	23	it would be unlikely that you would undo that, but
24	this matter.	24	at the same time, there are likely some companies
25	And, frankly, I also come back to some common	25	out there that should be able to do this by
	30		32
1	sense. Clearly if we don't grant a suspension, the	1	March 24 (sic) without a real hardship but have
2	companies are going to have to undergo significant	2	simply put this Commission in the position that
3	cost. It is going to be whether it's, you know,	3	decision's impossible to make and it's
4	11 to \$12 a month for Kennebec or some different	4	impossible or are advocating the Commission
5	figure for any of the other cooperatives out there,	5	shouldn't look beyond just their mere pleadings to
6	it's going to be significant. It's going to run to	6	see if they can accomplish this.
7	the customers ultimately, and you get to the basic	7	I believe I went beyond your question,
8	question of, you know, once the bell is rung, once	8	Mr. Chairman. I apologize for that. I hope I
9	the work is done, then there really wouldn't be any	9	answered it.
10	sense going forward with the question of whether or	10	CHAIRMAN SAHR: I think that was
11	not to suspend these things in the first place	11	just fine. And I think when you referred to
12	because if they're going to have to go forward with	12	March 24 you meant May 24; is that correct?
13	it and we don't grant the interim suspension, then,	13	MR. WIECZOREK: That's correct. I'm
14	you know, what is the point of having the	- 14	sorry.
15	proceeding in the first place.	15	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Mr. Smith.
16	And I guess I would ask you that common sense	16	(Pause)
17	question. It seems to me to be a very compelling	17	MR. WIECZOREK: I'm sorry,
18	argument. How can we not grant suspension when	18	Mr. Chair. I don't believe Mr. Smith's mike's on.
19	clearly there is a cost and clearly if the	19	l can't hear him.
20	companies had to go forward and offer this, there	20	MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. I think one
21	really isn't any sense then to look at the issue at	21	of the comments in one of the documents that we got
22	all because that's exactly what they are fighting	22	from the Petitioners, Talbot, was to the effect
23	with the petitions.	23	that one of the reasons why the companies didn't
24	MR. WIECZOREK: Mr. Chairman, I	24	just jump on this right away with the leading up
25	think you're right in your analysis that once that	25	to or following the November 10 decision was that
L			

.

33         34         all wird doing is basically a number of many         35           1         the FCC in the welke of that seemed to - received a number of filings from around the country and was made avaro of these issues related to out of rate         3         all wird doing is basically a number of many           3         and rankly, if rather see the time and         4         And, frankly, if rather see the time and           4         conter requests and the maybe cent         5         And, frankly, if rather see the time and           5         access charges that fing it accompany that and just         5         hearings, the ultimately hearings, more quickly and           6         some complexities that they may hear nay event         7         wore approaching the 180 day, weld, staying boused in           9         And is fin to at least possible that one of         9         that regard         10           10         the reasons the companies cident just immediately         10         COMMISSIONER BURG: thad one just in the rula areas?           11         had reason         MR WIECZDEK. Well, that seems to         11         supersion of any objection that may exist for           12         MR WIECZOEK. Well, that seems to         16         What's the final order thy's taking about?           13         any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?         17         CHARMAN SAHR: Think key meand <th>C</th> <th>Case Compr</th> <th>ress</th> <th></th> <th></th>	C	Case Compr	ress		
2       number of things from aroun the country and was       2       hearings         3       made aware of these issues related to out of rate       3         4       center requests and the transport and maybe wan       5         6       some complexities that they may not have looked at       7         7       really that carefully before rendering the       6         8       decision.       7         9       And is it not at lesst possible that one of       7         10       the reasons the companies diarch just immediately       10         11       have had a reasonable expectation that the YCC       12         12       MK WECZOREK: Well, that seems to       14         14       areas?       14         15       MK WECZOREK: Well, that seems to       16         16       be the position they taking. That's hard       17         17       for me to accept, their mind set, because - 1       17         18       belewer that the position they taking. The Yea taking around the well set and on and so to they taking about 20         21       and consideration.       22         22       readering the WECOREK: Well, that seem for the Well set ason and so to they taking the set and the they and the they reaction they taking the set and the tand the they reactin they taking they about 20 </td <th>Γ</th> <td></td> <td>33</td> <td></td> <td>35</td>	Γ		33		35
3       made aver of these issues related to out of rate oenter requests and the transport and maybe even scoss charges that might accompany that and just of some complexities that they may not have looked at of some complexities that they may not have looked at decision.       3       And, frankly, if rather set the time and effort be out towards getting prepared for hearings, the ultimately hearings, more cuickly and to try to do so five can before the 180-day areas?         10       the reasons the companies didn't just immediately bot out and spend the money is that they right the reasons the companies didn't just immediately the had a reasonable expectation that the FCC making should be stayed prending the FCC making tome to acceed, there way to that that might even a consideration that that might even the even the standard, and think might reason to any theorem to a superstand that that might even that the to constand that that might even that the standard secsentially was to follow the standard, and think might may a low to follow the standard and that that might even that the standard secsentially use the advertain that that might even that the standard secsentially use might a dub theo to misant that might even that the t		1	the FCC in the wake of that seemed to received a	•	
4     oenter requests and the transport and maybe event access charges that might accompany that and just 6     4     effor the out towards getting prepared for hearings, the ultimately hearings, more quickly and 6       5     access charges that they mg pht hearings, the ultimately hearings, more quickly and 6     5       6     some complexite table may be hearings, the ultimately hearings, more quickly and 6     6       7     really that carefully before rendering the 8     7       8     decision.     7       9     And is in not at least possible that one of 10     7       10     the reasons the companies didn't just immediately 11     10       11     maybe read reasonable expectation that the PCC 12     10       12     have had a reasonable expectation that the PCC 13     12       13     maybe reading. That's hard 14     15       14     areas?     16       15     MR. WIECZOREK: Weil, that seems to 15       16     be the position they taken because 19     17       17     for me to accept, their mind-set, because - 1     17       18     believe that the osoliton they taken because 19     17       21     they exclually argued at some point in this this 19     18       23     CHAIRMAN SAHR. Any other questions 10     24       24     or comment from Commissioners?     24       25     <			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		5
5         access charges that might accompany that and just 6         5         hearings, the utimately hearings, more quickly and to five to do so if we can before the 180-day – to five to do so if we can before the 180-day – to the tax approaching the 180-day deadline. I think fit will serve excludively that carefully before and refine the reasons the companies dicrit just immediately 10         6         the reasons the companies dicrit just immediately 11           10         the reasons the companies dicrit just immediately 12         hearings, the utimately hearings, more quickly and 13           11         bots out and spend the money is that they might 12         hearings, the utimately hearings, more quickly and 14           12         have had a reasonable expectation that the FCC 13         COMMISSIONER BURS. That one just 14           14         areas?         The position they retaing 15         MR. WECZOREK: Well, that seems to 16           15         be the position they retaing about?         The the position they be taken 15         CMAIRMAN SAHR: Any other questions 26           21         some direction there. So cartainly Lincerstand 21         the taken approximation 22         The the taken approximately the information 23           22         have for the Webraska case 23         CHAIRMAN SAHR: Any other questions 24         And I think K''' Weiczrek makes, a pretty good 25           24         any comment on the Nebraska case 24         And I think K''' Weiczrek makes, a pretty good 25         The take stake the position they obay					
6         some complexities that they may not have looked at really that carefully before randering the 8         6         to try fod so if we can betome the 180-day deadline. I think we're approaching the 180-day deadline. I think that will serve everybody well, staying focused in that regard.           1         And is not at least possible they teak interim they're taking. That's hard for me to accept, their mind set, because in they're actually argued at some point in this this is proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making is one direction there. So certainly i understand is not mether to follow the standard, and 1 think certainly were avere to follow the standard and 1 think certainly were avere to follow the standard on is start the stay well as a with the well stay. Not well well is solution that hey're taking about?           2         MR SMITH: Just one. Do you have is going to wait for a full hearing interim relief.         2         For Withe stay the saverybole is solut or a full hearing is minifer by ted					· • • • · ·
7       really that carefully before rendering the decision.       7       we're approaching the 180-day deadline. I think that decision.         9       And is if not at least possible that one of the reasons the companies didn't just immediately bolit out and speen the money is that the yright that they that the yright that they that they that they that the yright that they the they that they that they that they the they that they the they that they the they that they that they the they the they that they that they the they that they tha					
8       decision.       8         9       And is it not at least possible that nee of 10       the reasons the companies didn't just immediately 11         10       the reasons the companies didn't just immediately 12       the reasons the companies didn't just immediately 13         11       bot out and spend the money is that they might 14       areas?       COMMISSIONER BURG: 1 had one just real small question about today shall the commission grant the petition for an interim supension of any obligation that may exist for Petitioner to provide LIVP until six months after entry of a final order.         15       MR WIECZOREK: Well, that seems to 15       the well star because 16       16         16       be the position they't taking mout?       17         17       for me to accept, their mind-set, because -1       18         18       beliew that't hence. So certainly tudnestand 19       18         20       proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making 21       18         23       craft maker. So certainly tudnestand 12       11         24       that that might be a consideration.       22         25       MR SMITH: Just one. Do you have       23         26       may comment on the Nebraska case, 10       14         26       Frankly, I don't think' there are 17       54         36       required to go forward while othere and my opinion.					· · · · · ·
9     And is it not at least possible that one of the reasons the companies dicrit just immediately to du and spend the money is that they might areas?     9     that regard.       12     have had a reasonable expectation that the PCC might revisit some of those things in the rural areas?     11     commission grant the pattion for an interim supersion of any obligation that may exist for Petitioner to provide LNP until six months after entry of a final order.       15     MR. WIECZOREK: Well, that seems to be the position that they're taken because - 1     17       16     be the position that've taken because - 1     17       17     for me to accept, their mind-set, because - 1     17       18     believe that's the position they've taken because 9     20       21     some direction there. So certainly 1 understand 22     1       22     proceeding should be stay dending the FCC making 23     20       24     or comments form Commissioners?     24       25     or comment on the Nebraska case, Tai? 24     1       26     MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have     25       36     FaraNky, I don't think - 1 think there are 7     1       26     FaraNky, I don't think - 1 think there are 7     1       36     FaraNky, I don't think - 1 think there are 7     1       36     FaraNky, I don't think - 1 think there are 7     1       36     Faranky, I don't think - 1 think there 8 <tr< td=""><th></th><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr<>					
10         the reasons the companies didn't just immediately         10         COMMISSIONER BURG: I had one just           11         bott out and speed the money is that they might         11         real small question about today shall the           12         have had a reasonable expectation that the FOC         12         commission grant the petition for a in intrim           13         might revisit some of those things in the rural         13         supension of any obligation that may exist for           14         areas?         14         Petitioner to provide LNP until six months after           15         MR. WIECZOREK: Well, that seems to         15         entry of indi order.           16         betieve that's the position they've taking. That's hard         16         what's the final order.           17         for me to accept, their mind set, because - 1         17         or order on whether or not supension should be           20         proceeding should be stayde ponding the FCC making         20         receitarinity we may be - we'ne looking at           21         some direction there. So certainly 1 understand         21         think certainly we may be - we'ne looking at           22         that that might be a consideration.         22         Petitioners that heave alt of differences in their           23         essemitality, as I read it, seems to say, look, we					
11       bolt out and spend the money is that they might       11       real small question about today shall the         12       have had a reasonable expoctation that the FCC       12       Commission grant the pation for an interim as supension of any obligation that may exist for         14       areas?       14       suspension of any obligation that may exist for         15       MR.WIECZOREK: Well, that seems to       15       The pation of any obligation that may exist for         16       be the position that they're taking reacuse - i       17       The the accept, their mind-set, because - i       17         17       for me to accept, their mind-set, because - i       17       What's the final order.       What's the final order.         18       believe that's the position they're taking reacuse - i       17       Our order on whether on ro: suspension should be granted. Staft has made the argument that we don't necessarily have to follow the standard, and I       11       think certainly the maps be - we're looking at         20       proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making       21       think certainly the maps be - we're looking at         21       some direction the Nebraska case, Tal?       23       And I think Mr. Weiczorek makes a pretty good argument that we don't need as exidences in their         22       MR.WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case, Tal?       1       required to go forward while others are not. That could poten			•		<b>.</b>
12       have had a reasonable expectation that the FCC       12       Commission grant the petition for an interim supersion of any obligation that may exist for a minterim supersion of any obligation that may exist for a minterim supersion of any obligation that may exist for a minterim supersion of any obligation that may exist for a minterim supersion of any obligation that may exist for a minterim supersion for an interim supersion for any interim of a supersion for any interim or a supersion should be any obligation they've taking about?         16       be the position that they very taking the secures in they very a staff and some of the supersion should be any obligation.       16       What's the final order.         17       for ma to accept they very taking about?       17       CHAIRMAN SAHE: think they mean our order on whether on ont supersion should be granted. Staff has made the argument that we don't necessarily have to follow the standard, and 1         18       believe that's the position they. So certainly Luncerstand       22       24       And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good argument that it could shake down where one is         23       comments from Commissioners?       24       And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good argument that it could be disclined to look at just going cart blanche six       36         34       any comment on the Nebraska case.       2       1       any comment on the Nebraska case.       2         35       esesthally, as 1 readit, seemesto suy, look, we					•
13       might revisit some of those things in the rural       13       suspension of any obligation that may exist for         14       areas?       14       Petitioner to provide LNP until six months after         16       be the position that they're taking. That's hard       16       entry of a final order.         17       for me to accept, their mind-set, because       16       our order on whether on to suspension should be         19       they've actually argued at some point in this this       19       creating have to follow the standard, and I         20       proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making       20       mecresarily have to rollow the standard, and I         21       some direction there. So certainly Linderstand       21       think new for Oominisioners?       24         23       or comments from Commissioners?       24       And I think Nr. Wieczoner Make a perty good         25       MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have       25       argument that it could shake down where one is         34       any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?       1       required to go forward while others are not. That         26       MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case       2       1       could pertend while others are not. That         36       essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we       3       disinclined to look at just going cart blanc					
14       areas?       14       Petitioner to provide LNP until six months after         15       MR. WIECZOREK: Well, that seems to       15       entry of a final order.         16       be the position that they're taking. That's hard       16       What's the final order.         17       tor me to accept, their mind-set, because - 1       17       What's the final order.         18       believe that's the position they to the position they to accept, their mind-set, because - 1       17       CHAIRMAN SAHR. 1 think they mean         19       they're actually argued at some point in this this       19       granted. Staff has made the argument that we don't necessarily have to follow the standard, and 1         20       proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making       21       think certainly and the may be - we're looking at         21       some direction there. So certainly 1 understand       22       Petitioners that have a lot of differences in their         22       can't pert this yes on Commissioners?       24       And 1 think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good         24       any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?       2       required to go forward while others are not. That         2       MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case       34       required to go forward while others are not. That         2       MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case       34       required					<b>e</b> ,
15       MR. WIECZOREK: Well, that seems to       15       entry of a final order.         16       be the position that they're taking. That's hard       16       What's the final order.         17       for me to accept, their mid.set, because.       17       What's the final order.         18       believe that's the position they've taken because       18       our order on whether or not suspension should be         19       they've atually argued at some point in this this       19       granted. Staff has made the argument that we don't         21       some direction there. So certainty I understand       21       think at might be a consideration.       22         23       CHAIRMAN SAHR. Any other questions       23       service territories and s on and so forth.         24       or comments from Commissioners?       24       And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good         25       MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have       25       argument on the Nebraska case, Tal?       1         2       MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case       2       could potentially happened. So I would be         36       any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?       1       required to go forward while others are not. That         3       essentially, as I readi i, seems to say, look, we       3       disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six			might revisit some of those things in the rural		
16       be the position that they're taking. That's hard       16       What's the final order they're talking about?         17       for me to accept, their mind-set, because       17       CHARMAN SAHE. Think they mean         18       believe that's the position they've taken because       17       CHARMAN SAHE. Think they mean         20       proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making       20       granted. Staff has made the argument that we don't mecessarily have to follow the standard, and 1         21       some direction there. So certainly lunderstand       21       Petitioners that have a lot of differences in their service territories and so on and so forth         23       CHARMAN SAHE. Any other questions       23       argument that it could shake down where one is service territories and so on and so forth         24       or comments from Commissioners?       24       And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good argument that it could shake down where one is service territories and so forth       36         2       MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have       34       1       any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?       1       Could potentially happened. So I would be disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six month issue? This is just me and my opinion.         34       fit is sortally as their is sour obligation, we       6       MR.SUTH: May I address the six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.					
17       for me to accept, their mind-set, because ·· I       17       CHAIRMAN SAHR: I think they mean         18       believe that's the position they've taken because       18       our order on whether or not suspension should be         19       they've actually argued at some point in this this       19       granted. Staff has made the argument that we don't         20       proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making       21       necessarily have to follow the standard, and I         21       some direction there. So certainly lunderstand       21       think certainly we may be - we're looking at         23       CHAIRMAN SAHR: Any other questions       certainty we may be - we're looking at       Petitioners that have a lot of differences in their         24       or comments from Commissioners?       24       And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good         25       MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have       25       argument that it could shake down where one is         36       essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we       3       cill of potentially happened. So I would be         4       can't get this work done before May 24 so we're       5       going to wait for a full hearing       5         6       Franky, I don't think + I think there are       6       MR. SMITH: May I address the       six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.         7			•		5
18       believe that's the position they've taken because       18       our order on whether or not suspension should be granted. Staff has made the argument that we don't necessarily have to follow the standard, and 1         20       proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making 20       20       granted. Staff has made the argument that we don't necessarily have to follow the standard, and 1         21       some direction there. So certainly 1 understand 21       11 hink certainly we may be - we're looking at Petitioners and so on and so forth.         22       chAIRMAN SAHR: Any other questions 24       And I think // Wieczorek makes a pretty good argument that it could shake down where one is         24       any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?       1         2       MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case 2       34       required to go forward while others are not. That could potentially happened. So I would be 31 weich a full hearing.       36         2       Go it is actually say this is our obligation, we 3       distinclined to look at just going cart blanche six month is use?       36         3       Go it is actually say this is our obligation, we 3       newidentiary hearing and that the Commission has 1       37         3       CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I       11       Sub look and see if they're entitled to the 30       37         4       can't get this work done before May 24 so we're 3       file an evidentiary hearing and that the commission has 30       38			, , ,		, ,
19they've actually argued at some point in this this proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making 2119granted. Staff has made the argument that we don't necessarily have to follow the standard, and I think certainly have to follow the standard, and I think certainly we may be we're looking at think certainly we may be we're looking at thick certainly we may be we're looking at the statute at the statute the could potentially happend. So I would be disincilende to look at just going cart bianche six month issue? This is just me and my opinion. The dual sea if the serve way to to it is actually say this is our obligation, we to it is actually say this is our obligation, we to it is actually say this is our obligation, we to it is actually s					-
20         proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making some direction there. So certainly lunderstand 22         20         necessarily have to follow the standard, and I think certainly we may be we're looking at 22           21         that that might be a consideration. 23         21         think certainly we may be we're looking at 24           23         CHAIRMAN SAHR: Any other questions 24         22         Petitioners that have a lot of differences in their 23           24         or comments from Commissioners? 24         24         And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good argument that it could shake down where one is           25         MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have         25         arguined to the standard, and I think certainly we may be we're looking at 24           2         MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case 2         1         required to go forward while others are not. That could potentially happened. So I would be disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six months afterward.           36         Frankly, I don't think I think there are 3         5         MR. SMITH: May I address the 3           6         Frankly, I don't think I think there are 4         5         MR. SMITH: May I address the 3           7         better ways to do it, and I think the better way to 4         6         size- ronth issue? This is just me and my opinion.           8         do it is actually say this is our obligation, we 9         9         need to look			• •	1	,
21       some direction there. So certainly 1 understand that that might be a consideration.       21       think certainly we may be we're looking at that that might be a consideration.         23       CHAIRMAN SAHR: Any other questions or comments from Commissioners?       23         25       MR SMITH: Just one. Do you have       25         34       any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?       1         2       MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case       2         36       essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we can't get this work done before May 24 so we're going to wait for a full hearing.       5         6       Frankly, I don't think - I think there are for third we stot od it, and I think the better way to do it is actually say this is our obligation, we a need to look and see if they're entitled to the interim relief.       5         9       need to look and see if they're entitled to the interim relief.       10       MR. SMITH: May I address the six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.         11       CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I follow the preliminary injunction standard or interim relief.       10       MR. SMITH: May I address the six-month issue? This is purption.         12       think we should consider is I realize we could interim relief.       11       CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I follow the preliminary injunction standard or interim relief.       13       14       follow the preliminary injunction standard or interim relief.       15       That					
22that that might be a consideration.2222Petitioners that have a lot of differences in their service territories and so on and so forth.24or comments from Commissioners?24And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good argument that it could shake down where one is25MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have25argument that it could shake down where one is26MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have34argument that it could potentially happened. So I would be disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six month issue? This is just me and my opinion.27better ways to do it, and I think there are going to wilt for a full hearing.5MR. SMITH: May I address the six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.28do it is actually say this is our obligation, we 98an eidentiary hearing and that the commission has broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand your argument, and I think it's what the statute say, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.29The other thing is what everyone's 1616New in terms of the temporary suspension, that's one thing. But this particular provision is an interim suspension during the pendency of the proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the commission to grant an interim suspension like that to the pendency of the proceeding is limited by the statut the there are cost involved an optioniny is that the commission to grant an interim suspension like that to nucle any hearing and there is going to bindicate there are cost involved an eight going is indicat there are solw, you34The other thing is what everyone's a concluded within the 180-day period.Now in			proceeding should be stayed pending the FCC making	1	necessarily have to follow the standard, and I
23CHAIRMAN SAHR: Any other questions or comments from Commissioners?23 24service territories and so on and so forth. And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good argument that it could shake down where one is24any comment on the Nebraska case, any comment on the Nebraska case, a essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we signing to wait for a full hearing.34 and think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good argument that it could shake down where one is25MR. WIECZOREK: more and it, seems to say, look, we a can't get this work done before May 24 so we're going to wait for a full hearing.1 required to go forward while others are not. That could potentially happened. So I would be disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six months afterward.7better ways to do it, and I think there are 6 more to look and see if they're entitted to the 9 need to look and see if they're entitted to the 9 need to look and see if they're entitted to the 9 need to look and see if they're entitted to the 9 need to look and see if they're entitted to the 9 need to look and see if they're entitted to the 9 need to look and see if they're entitted to the 9 need to look and see if they're entitted to the 11 12 13 14 1510 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 12 14 14 1511 14 14 14 15 16 17 18 14 16 10 16 1611 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 12 14 15 16 16 17 14 16 16 16 1612 16 17 18 14 15 16 17 14 16 16 16 17 17 18 16 17 14 16 17 16 17 18 16 17 1			some direction there. So certainly I understand		
24       or comments from Commissioners?       24       And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good argument that it could shake down where one is         36       37       38       36         1       any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?       1       7         2       MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case       2       could potentially happened. So I would be         3       essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we       3       disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six         5       going to wait for a full hearing.       5       MR. SMITH: May I address the         6       Frankly, I don't think - I think there are       6       Six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.         7       better ways to doit, and I think the better way to       7       But I think, picking up on Ms. Rogers' argument, arguing if we take the position that we don't need an evidentiary hearing and that the Commission has broad discretion, at an evidentiary hearing and that the Commission has broad discretion, at I understand your argument, and I think it's what the statute says, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.         11       CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I       11         12       think we should consider is I realize we could       12         13       follow some other standard. I don't think that's       14         14       follow some other standard. I don't think that's       17 </td <th>1</th> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td>	1		-		
25       MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have       25       argument that it could shake down where one is         1       any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?       1       36         2       MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case       2       36         3       essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we       3       required to go forward while others are not. That could potentially happened. So I would be         4       can't get this work done before May 24 so we're       3       moths afterward.         5       going to wait for a full hearing.       5       moths afterward.         6       Frankly, I don't think -I think there are       6       six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.         7       better ways to do it, and I think the better way to       7       But I think, picking up on Ms. Rogers' argument, and my opinion.         8       do it is actually say this is our obligation, we       9       need to look and see if they're entitled to the       9         9       need to look and see if they're entitled to the       10       interim relief.       10         11       CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I       11       your argument, and I think it's what the statute         13       follow the preliminary injunction standard or       13       13       The other thing is what everyone's       16					service territories and so on and so forth.
34361any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?12MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case23essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we34can't get this work done before May 24 so we're45going to wait for a full hearing.56Frankly, I don't think I think there are67better ways to do it, and I think the better way to78do it is actually say this is our obligation, we89need to look and see if they're entitled to the99need to look and see if they're entitled to the910interim relief.1112think we should consider is I realize we could1213follow the preliminary injunction standard or1314follow some other standard. I don't think that's1415required by federal or state law.1516The other thing is A, we're under a short time1717acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time1718for the pendency of the proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,2020obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown2021hearing. And if we start at the time setting up are just going to indicate there are costs involved2122are just going to be a burden that will support2424and there is going to be a burden that will support24			or comments from Commissioners?		And I think Mr. Wieczorek makes a pretty good
1any comment on the Nebraska case, Tal?1required to go forward while others are not. That2MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case2could potentially happened. So I would be3essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we3disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six4can't get this work done before May 24 so we're4months afterward.5going to wait for a full hearing.5MR. SMITH: May I address the6Frankly, I don't think the better way to7But I think, picking up on Ms. Rogers' argument,7better ways to do it, and I think the better way to8arguing if we take the position that we don't need9need to look and see if they're entitled to the9an evidentiary hearing and that the Commission has10interim relief.10broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand11CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I11your argument, and I think it's what the statute12think we should consider is I realize we could12say, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.13follow the preliminary injunction standard or13That pendency by federal law it must be14follow some other standard. I don't think that's14concluded within the 180-day period.17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rat		25	MR. SMITH: Just one. Do you have	25	argument that it could shake down where one is
2MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case2could potentially happened. So I would be3essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we3disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six4can't get this work done before May 24 so we're4MR. SMITH: May I address the5going to wait for a full hearing.5MR. SMITH: May I address the6Frankly, I don't think '	ľ		34		36
2MR. WIECZOREK: The Nebraska case2could potentially happened. So I would be3essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we3disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six4can't get this work done before May 24 so we're4MR. SMITH: May I address the5going to wait for a full hearing.5MR. SMITH: May I address the6Frankly, I don't think '		1	any comment on the Nebraska case. Tal?	1	required to go forward while others are not. That
3essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we can't get this work done before May 24 so we're going to wait for a full hearing.3disinclined to look at just going cart blanche six months afterward.5going to wait for a full hearing.5MR. SMITH: May I address the six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.7better ways to do it, and I think the better way to better ways to do it, and I think the better way to o it is actually say this is our obligation, we 98months afterward.8do it is actually say this is our obligation, we 99an evidentiary hearing and that we don't need an evidentiary hearing and that the Commission has 1010Interim relief.10broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand your argument, and I think it's what the statute says, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.13follow the preliminary injunction standard or follow some other standard. I don't think that's required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension, that's one thing. But this particular provision is an interim suspension during the pendency of the proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the to obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown 2010Now in terms of the proceeding is linked by the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I don't think they can under this particular statute go byoind that.20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown 21 hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a 22 series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly 23 are just going to indicate there are costs involved 23 are just going to be a burden that will support </td <th></th> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> <td></td>		2		2	
4can't get this work done before May 24 so we're going to wait for a full hearing.4months afterward.5going to wait for a full hearing.5MR. SMITH: May I address the six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.7better ways to do it, and I think the better way to better ways to do it, and I think the better way to 			essentially, as I read it, seems to say, look, we		
5going to wait for a full hearing.5MR. SMITH: May I address the6Frankly, I don't think I think there are6six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.7better ways to do it, and I think the better way to7But I think, picking up on Ms. Rogers' argument,8do it is actually say this is our obligation, we8arguing if we take the position that we don't need9need to look and see if they're entitled to the9an evidentiary hearing and that the Commission has10interim relief.10broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand11CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I11your argument, and I think it's what the statute12think we should consider is I realize we could12says, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.13follow the preliminary injunction standard or13That pendency by federal law it must be14follow some other standard. I don't think that's14concluded within the 180-day period.15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension,16The other thing is what everyone's16that's one thing. But this particular provision is an interim suspension during the pendency of the proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at th		4	•		
6Frankly, I don't think ··· I think there are better ways to do it, and I think the better way to 86six-month issue? This is just me and my opinion.7better ways to do it, and I think the better way to 87But I think, picking up on Ms. Rogers' argument, arguing if we take the position that we don't need 98do it is actually say this is our obligation, we 98arguing if we take the position that we don't need 99need to look and see if they're entitled to the 99an evidentiary hearing and that the Commission has 1010interim relief.10broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand your argument, and I think it's what the statute 1212think we should consider is I realize we could 1212says, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.13follow the preliminary injunction standard or 1413That pendency by federal law it must be concluded within the 180-day period.15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension, 1616The other thing is what everyone's 1716that's one thing. But this particular provision is an interim suspension during the pendency of the proceeding. And liguess my own opinion is that the 2020obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown 2120for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by 2121hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a 2221the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I 2222series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly 2322 <t< td=""><th></th><td>5</td><td></td><td>5</td><td>MR. SMITH: May   address the</td></t<>		5		5	MR. SMITH: May   address the
7better ways to do it, and I think the better way to do it is actually say this is our obligation, we 97But I think, picking up on Ms. Rogers' argument, arguing if we take the position that we don't need 99need to look and see if they're entitled to the 99an evidentiary hearing and that the Commission has broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand your argument, and I think it's what the statute10interim relief.10broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand your argument, and I think it's what the statute12think we should consider is I realize we could 1312says, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.13follow the preliminary injunction standard or 1413That pendency by federal law it must be concluded within the 180-day period.16The other thing is what everyone's 1716Now in terms of the temporary suspension, that's one thing. But this particular provision is an interim suspension during the pendency of the proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the 1919move along more quickly rather than more slowly, 2019Commission to grant an interim suspension like that for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I gue beyond that.22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly 2322don't think they can under this particular statute go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the			• •		-
8do it is actually say this is our obligation, we8arguing if we take the position that we don't need9need to look and see if they're entitled to the9an evidentiary hearing and that the Commission has10interim relief.10broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand11CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I11your argument, and I think it's what the statute12think we should consider is I realize we could12says, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.13follow the preliminary injunction standard or13That pendency by federal law it must be14follow some other standard. I don't think that's14concluded within the 180-day period.15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension,16The other thing is what everyone's16that's one thing. But this particular provision is17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond th		7			But   think, picking up on Ms. Rogers' argument,
9need to look and see if they're entitled to the interim relief.9an evidentiary hearing and that the Commission has broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand your argument, and I think it's what the statute10interim relief.10broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand your argument, and I think it's what the statute12think we should consider is I realize we could 1311your argument, and I think it's what the statute13follow the preliminary injunction standard or 1413That pendency by federal law it must be concluded within the 180-day period.15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension, that's one thing. But this particular provision is a cknowledging is, A, we're under a short time 1717an interim suspension during the pendency of the proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the 1919move along more quickly rather than more slowly, 2019Commission to grant an interim suspension like that 2021hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a 2221the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I go byiously, so they can get this to the full-blown 232223are just going to indicate there are costs involved 2323go byond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the		8	· · · · ·		
10interim relief.10broad discretion, that discretion, as I understand11CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I11your argument, and I think it's what the statute12think we should consider is I realize we could12says, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.13follow the preliminary injunction standard or13That pendency by federal law it must be14follow some other standard. I don't think that's14concluded within the 180-day period.15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension,16The other thing is what everyone's16that's one thing. But this particular provision is17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to					
11CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I11your argument, and I think it's what the statute12think we should consider is I realize we could12says, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.13follow the preliminary injunction standard or13That pendency by federal law it must be14follow some other standard. I don't think that's14concluded within the 180-day period.15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension,16The other thing is what everyone's16that's one thing. But this particular provision is17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the			-		
12think we should consider is I realize we could12says, is based upon the pendency of a proceeding.13follow the preliminary injunction standard or13That pendency by federal law it must be14follow some other standard. I don't think that's14concluded within the 180-day period.15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension,16The other thing is what everyone's16that's one thing. But this particular provision is17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the			CHAIRMAN SAHR: One of the things I	11	
13follow the preliminary injunction standard or13That pendency by federal law it must be14follow some other standard. I don't think that's14concluded within the 180-day period.15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension,16The other thing is what everyone's16that's one thing. But this particular provision is17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22go beyond that.23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the			•		
14follow some other standard. I don't think that's14concluded within the 180-day period.15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension,16The other thing is what everyone's16that's one thing. But this particular provision is17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly23go beyond that.23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the					
15required by federal or state law.15Now in terms of the temporary suspension,16The other thing is what everyone's16that's one thing. But this particular provision is17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the					
16The other thing is what everyone's16that's one thing. But this particular provision is17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the					
17acknowledging is, A, we're under a short time17an interim suspension during the pendency of the18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the			· · ·	1	
18frame. And the Interveners would like to see this18proceeding. And I guess my own opinion is that the19move along more quickly rather than more slowly,19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that20obviously, so they can get this to the full blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the			<b>c</b>	1	- · ·
19move along more quickly rather than more slowly, obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I earing are just going to indicate there are costs involved19Commission to grant an interim suspension like that for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I don't think they can under this particular statute go beyond that.23are just going to indicate there are costs involved and there is going to be a burden that will support23go beyond that.				1	, – , ,
20obviously, so they can get this to the full-blown20for the pendency of the proceeding is limited by21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the					
21hearing. And if we start at the time setting up a21the statute to at least the 180-day period. And I22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the		1			-
22series of evidentiary hearings, which quite frankly22don't think they can under this particular statute23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the		1			
23are just going to indicate there are costs involved23go beyond that.24and there is going to be a burden that will support24And I would appreciate any argument to the					÷ ,
24 and there is going to be a burden that will support 24 And I would appreciate any argument to the	. 1				
		1			- · ·

"Nearer"

Case Co	ompress		
	37		39
1	a temporary suspension of any obligation under 251	1	The FCC also noted in their order that there
2	does require a full factual hearing. That's what I	2	are other issues that have not been addressed yet
3	am going to advise the Commission anyway, if you do	3	and there are pending actions in front of the FCC
4	determine to go forward with the interim suspension	4	that hopefully would address some of those issues,
5	today that it be limited to the period within which	5	like, for example, the Sprint petition.
6	you must make a decision.	6	And I think perhaps the FCC was acknowledging
	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Ms. Rogers, do you	7	maybe there would be more guidance from those
0	want to comment?	8	•
8			decisions during that six-month period. Because
9	MS. ROGERS: I think that you would	9	those things really do affect small carriers even
10	also have discretion if you order a company	10	more significantly than larger carriers.
11	after viewing the facts and circumstances of that	11	That's my understanding. Did that answer your
12	particular company if you as a Commission believe	12	question?
13	that it's going to take them so many weeks or so	13	VICE CHAIR HANSON: Yes, it did.
14	many months to implement LNP, if you order them to	14	But with that in mind, why then would you not
15	do so, I think you have the discretion to do that.	15	accept the argument that there needs to be
16	MR. SMITH: But that's after an	16	something substantive to cause the PUC to add an
17	evidentiary hearing, after we've heard the facts.	17	additional six months? Why should we just grant it
18	MS. ROGERS: Right.	18	because Kennebec qualifies?
19	MR. SMITH: And right now we're just	10	MS. ROGERS: Well, you're asking me
20		20	why you should
	talking about the pendency suspension.	20	
21	MS. ROGERS: That's correct. And I		VICE CHAIR HANSON: Why shouldn't
22	believe that's the approach that Nebraska took is	22	there be some evidence I'm not a fan of having
23	that then the Commission would have discretion to	23	more hearings, but why shouldn't there be some
24	determine, A, what's required of the company and,	24	evidence presented to us to show a reason for
25	B, if something is required, when it would be need	25	that there is an economic challenge to Kennebec?
	38		40
1	to be implemented.	1	I'm buying into some of the arguments that
2	I would also point out one other thing that	2	have been presented here, that there needs to be
		3	some reason for the Commission to extend and
3	was addressed by Mr. Gerdes. He was trying to draw	4	
4	a distinction, I believe, between types of LNP.	-	provide the additional six-month period. If it's
5	And as I read Section 251 of the Act, it's number	5	just because someone qualifies, just because they
6	portability, is whether it's wireline to wireline	6	have under there's no point in us even meeting.
7	or wireline to wireless, and it's just defined as	7	You just send your certificate that says we
8	number portability in accordance with the	8	qualify, therefore, it's done.
9	requirements prescribed by the Commission.	9	MS. ROGERS: Number one,
10	So I don't think that there's that distinction	10	Commissioner Hanson, I think that we have made a
11	in the Act.	11	showing within our petitions. We've provided you
12	VICE CHAIR HANSON: Darla, what's	12	with numbers for every company that's filed a
13	the purpose of the May 24 deadline? If we're	13	petition today.
14	talking about having an additional six months, what	14	Number two, I don't believe that you need to
15	was the purpose of delaying having a May 24 in the	15	have an evidentiary hearing before granting the
		16	relief that we're requesting here because I don't
16	first place?	17	· -
17	MS. ROGERS: My understanding of the		believe that that's required under the Act. I
18	Commission's order was that giving the smaller	18	think you specifically have the authority and the
19	companies, the rural telcos, more of an opportunity	19	discretion to do what we're asking.
20	or longer opportunity, a six-month window in which	20	And, number three, I believe an interim
21	to implement LNP $\cdot\cdot$ that's my understanding of why	21	suspension is appropriate today because, as has
22	they extended that deadline from November 24 to May	22	been said, as a practical matter I don't think
23	24 for the smaller companies. There are just	23	everything can be completed by May 24. And our
24	bigger issues for companies in rural areas. And I	24	companies and our the customers of our companies
25	think the FCC acknowledged that.	25	are the ones that are going to suffer irreparable
	anin alo i oo asialomoagoa alaa.	1	

C	ase Compress		
	41		43
	1 harm if, indeed, we have to start incurring the	1	CHAIRMAN SAHR: And I think we could
ł	2 costs and then you in your discretion after a full	2	have evidentiary hearings and we could argue about
	3 hearing determine, in fact, we don't have to meet	3	that, but clearly there's a cost to putting in new
	4 those requirements, you can't undo what's been	4	equipment and into providing a new service. So I
	5 done.	5	think to a certain extent we may argue over the
	6 So for those reasons I think that you have the	6	exact dollars, but to me that's what the ultimate
	7 authority under the Act, under the state statute to	7	hearing is going to be largely about is how much is
	8 act on what we've presented to you at this point.	8	this going to cost plus the other factors we have
	9 MR. LARSON: Commissioner, if I	9	to consider. So
	10 could speak to that just a minute.	10	VICE CHAIR HANSON: Exactly.
	11 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Please.	11	Mr. Chairman, if I could continue, that's something
1	12 MR. LARSON: Because part of	12	that I was hoping that they would present here
	13 Talbot's argument is we didn't do much after	13	today is at least state their numbers.
	14 November. But, you know, a company of Santel's	14	CHAIRMAN SAHR: And I think they
	15 anyway, of our size, they spent from November to	15	can. I think, you know, it's in the Kennebec
	about January getting some of this information,	16	case Ms. Rogers, can you pull that information
	17 analyzing it, doing a number of different things.	17	or Mr. Bowar, I'm sure, probably knows it off the
	18 We aren't Western Wireless. We're a small	18	top of his head.
1	19 company. It took until January, first of February	19	MS. ROGERS: 11.43 per line is what
	20 to get that stuff done, and in February we filed a	20	we've estimated the cost.
	21 petition. And it is now just a matter simply of	21	VICE CHAIR HANSON: That is on a
	22 timing. There is no other way to have a good and	22 23	monthly basis?
	<ul> <li>sufficient evidentiary hearing that's going to get</li> <li>us a decision by May 24.</li> </ul>	23	MS. ROGERS: Yes.
		24	VICE CHAIR HANSON: Thank you. I've looked at the numbers. I just think that it's
		25	·
. (	42		44
	1 not a chaotic one, and I think that's the only way		important in a hearing process of this nature that
	2 to do that.	2	since there are arguments that are being brought
	3 VICE CHAIR HANSON: I believe you	3	out on one side that those instead of simply
	<ul> <li>4 said you have less than 5,000 customers.</li> <li>5 MR. LARSON: Yes.</li> </ul>	5	stating it's going to present an economic hardship, I think since the numbers are well developed at
ĺ	6 VICE CHAIR HANSON: When you say	6	this juncture, it would be important to at least
	7 5,000 customers, I know sometimes people I know		present those.
	8 when I was in charge of a utility occasionally we	8	MS. ROGERS: I understand your
	9 were talking about we had perhaps 35,000 meters,	9	point, Commissioner, but if we proceed down that
	10 but then we talked about having 100,000 customers	10	path then
	11 because there are obviously more than one person	11	VICE CHAIR HANSON: I know. I'm
	12 living there.	12	aware of that.
	13 Are you saying that you have in that	13	MS. ROGERS: we're going to
	14 particular example you have less than 5,000 actual	14	certainly have some Interveners that would probably
	15 hookups or	15	contest our numbers or question them as well as
	16 MR. LARSON: We have less than 5,000	16	staff. And I think that that's going to be
	17 service lines.	17	explored and carefully reviewed in the final
	18 VICE CHAIR HANSON; Okay. Thank	18	hearing.
	19 you.	19	VICE CHAIR HANSON: Thank you.
	20 CHAIRMAN SAHR: And I do think, and	20	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
	21 I can't remember the exact number for Kennebec but	21	CHAIRMAN SAHR: Any further
	22 in the back of my mind it's 11 or \$12, somewhere in	22	questions?
	23 that per customer, per line, per month that they	23	Seeing none, then I would move that we grant
	24 have alleged there will be cost.	24	interim suspension in TC04-025 for Kennebec
	25 MR. LARSON: Ours is 8 to 9.	25	Telephone Company until the final decision is
L.,		1	

( \_\_\_\_\_

Case C	ompress
--------	---------

ĺ

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	45 reached by the Commission. And I will state that at the hearing I would expect arguments as to how long would be appropriate after the final decision to require LNP if the Commission decides it is appropriate to require LNP to go forward. So I think that's something we can argue at the hearing and certainly, you know, you can expect the Commission would not expect it the next day. You would be required if you were to use the argument to have LNP available. VICE CHAIR HANSON: Second. COMMISSIONER BURG: Concur.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	46 STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA ) SS CERTIFICATE COUNTY OF HUGHES ) I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of South Dakota: DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed shorthand reporter, I took in shorthand the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter on the 6th day of April 2004, and that the attached is a true and correct transcription of the proceedings so taken. Dated at Pierre, South Dakota this 19th day of April 2004. Cheri McComsey Wittler, Notary Public and Registered Professional Reporter
20 21	

 $( \ \ )$ 

(\_\_\_\_\_

Word Index			
\$	6	[1] 17:15 Admitted	Applicable [1] 28:12
φ \$12	6	[1] 15:9	Applicant
[2] 30:4 42:22	<b>o</b> [1] 1:9	Adopted	[ <b>1</b> ] <b>2</b> 0:14
	60-day	[1] 21:5	Application
1	[1] 29:6 - 6th	Adverse [2] 20:3 27:14	[3] 8:13 10:3 28:23 Applied
10	6th [2] 2:14 46:10	Advertise	<b>[1]</b> 28:13
[4] 4:5 17:3 25:5 32:25		[1] 17:6	Applies
100 [1] 4:6	7	Advertising [1] 17:8	[1] 7:8
100,000	766	Advise	Apply [4] 5:12 11:6 22:9 22:10
[1] 42:10	[2] 4:19 7:22	[1] 37:3	Appreciate
11	8	Advised	[3] 18:21 29:19 36:24
[2] 30:4 42:22 11.43		[1] 24:8 Advocated	Approach [3] 16:18 29:10 37:22
[1] 43:19	8 [1] 42:25	[1] 31:15	Approaching
12	85	Advocating	[1] 35:7
[1] 5:5 18	[1] 24:12	[1] 32:4 Affect	Appropriate [7] 5:11 5:22 8:16 18:13 40:21 45:4
[1] 18:19	9	[2] 18:14 39:9	45:5
180		Affidavits	April
[5] 8:6 14:5 16:14 25:3 26:1	9 [1] 42:25	[1] 16:10 Age	<b>[5]</b> 1:9 2:14 12:21 46:11 46:14
<b>180-day</b> [4] 35:6 35:7 36:14 36:21	90	[1] 24:12	Area [1] 6:16
180th	[1] 26:8	Aggregate	Areas
[1] 26:15	9:30 [1] 2:15	[2] 6:19 7:13	[6] 4:11 5:21 6:9 28:9 33:14 38:24
1934		Agree [5] 5:15 5:19 23:11 28:11 31:22	Argue [4] 16:14 43:2 43:5 45:7
[2] 1:6 3:4 1996	A	Ahead	Argued
[1] 3:24	A.m.	[3] 10:10 23:4 29:12	[1] 33:19
l9th	[1] 2:15	Ailts [1] 1:13	Argues [1] 5:20
[1] 46:13	Ability [1] 20:14	Akin	Arguing
2	Able	[1] 15:7	[1] 36:8
2	[2] 18:21 31:25	Akland [1] 2:8	Argument
<b>[4]</b> 6:18 7:12 20:16 28:5	Above-entitled	Allegations	<b>[12]</b> 11:4 15:19 15:19 30:18 35:19 35: 25 36:7 36:11 36:24 39:15 41:13 45:
2003	[2] 2:12 46:10 Accept	[2] 20:13 21:25	11
[2] 4:5 4:9	[ <b>2</b> ] 33:17 39:15	Alleged	Arguments [6] 7:16 7:16 26:23 40:1 44:2 45:3
<b>2004</b> [8] 1:9 2:14 4:14 5:5 5:8 5:14 46:11	Access	[1] 42:24 Allow	Attached
46:14	[2] 4:19 33:5 Accompany	[1] 8:19	[1] 46:11
23	[1] 33:5	Allows	Attorney [2] 3:13:23:0
[1] 5:14 24	Accomplish	[1] 11:10 Alluded	[2] 3:13 23:9 August
<b>[19]</b> 4:9 4:14 5:8 9:11 9:22 12:15 22:	[1] 32:6 Accordance	[1] 27:13	[2] 25:5 25:21
8 23:25 26:14 32:1 32:12 32:12 34:4	[1] 38:8	Almost	Authority
38:13 38:15 38:22 38:23 40:23 41:24 251	According	[1] 15:20 Alternative	[2] 40:18 41:7 Authorized
[3] 6:21 37:1 38:5	[1] 25:13	[1] 31:14	[1] 6:6
251(b)(2	Acknowledged [1] 38:25	Amended	Available
[3] 1:5 3:4 3:23	Acknowledging	[2] 1:6 3:5	[2] 17:7 45:11 Avenue
<b>251(f)(2</b> [2] 19:21 27:15	[2] 34:17 39:6	Amounts [1] 24:4	[1] 2:13
	Act [38] 1:6 3:4 3:24 6:7 6:11 6:13 6:17 6:	Analogizing	Avoid
3	23 7:5 7:11 7:20 8:3 8:4 8:16 9:23 9:	[1] 17:18	[4] 20:2 20:3 20:5 27:14 Aware
3	24 11:10 19:20 21:19 22:17 23:14 24: 16 24:17 25:3 27:12 27:16 27:16 27:	Analogy [1] 16:4	<b>Aware</b> [3] 4:3 33:3 44:12
	20 27:22 28:4 29:9 29:22 31:10 38:5	Analysis	
<b>35,000</b> [1] 42:9	38:11 40:17 41:7 41:8	[1] 30:25	В
	Action [3] 7:5 25:15 27:25	Analyzing [1] 41:17	Background
4	Actions	Answer	[2] 3:18 4:16
47	[1] 39:3	[ <b>2</b> ] 9:18 39:11	Balance [1] 21:10
[2] 1:5 3:3	Actual [3] 7:2 7:10 42:14	Answered [1] 32:9	Bar
<b>471</b> [1] 20:24	Add	Anyway	[1] 8:11
49-31-80	[2] 10:25 39:16	[ <b>2</b> ] 37:3 41:15	Base [2] 17:14 26:21
[3] 6:8 6:14 25:13	Addendum	Apart	[2] 17:14 20:21 Based
5	[1] 3:8 Addition	[1] 14:25 Apologize	[5] 13:15 15:18 21:23 23:18 36:12
	[3] 8:5 9:9 14:7	[2] 22:22 32:8	Basic
5 [1] 12:21	Additional	Appeal	[3] 4:17 12:1 30:7 Basis
5,000	[7] 8:1 16:19 17:2 26:5 38:14 39:17 40:4	[1] 17:23	[1] 43:22
[5] 23:13 42:4 42:7 42:14 42:16	Address	Appeals [1] 21:2	Begin
500	[3] 18:21 36:5 39:4	Appear	[2] 9:5 25:4 Bell
[1] 2:13 576	Addressed [3] 5:1 38:3 39:2	[ <b>2</b> ] 24:22 24:23	[1] 30:8
[1] 20:24	Addressing	APPEARANCES [2] 1:20 2:1	Bell's
· · · · · · ·		[-] 1.00 0.1	

Word Index					
[1] 31:1	Certain	Commissions	Couple		
Ben	[4] 12:22 17:21 31:3 43:5	[1] 28:15	<b>[4]</b> 11:3 12:11 14:22 27:9		
[1] 2:2 Best	Certainly [8] 18:25 23:12 24:2 24:18 33:21 35:	Common [2] 29:25 30:16	Course [2] 3:22 6:21		
[2] 1:15 14:24	21 44:14 45:8	Communications	Court		
Better	Certificate	<b>[2]</b> 1:6 3:4	[4] 18:10 20:25 21:2 21:4		
[2] 34:7 34:7	[ <b>2</b> ] 40:7 46:2	Companies	Cremer		
Between [4] 10:14 18:17 21:11 38:4	CERTIFY [1] 46:8	<b>[20]</b> 10:1 12:5 16:21 16:22 29:1 30:2 30:20 31:8 31:9 31:9 31:11 31:21 31:	[4] 1:14 22:24 25:1 25:2 Customer		
Bevond	Chair	24 32:23 33:10 38:19 38:23 38:24 40:	[2] 17:14 42:23		
<b>[6]</b> 20:13 21:24 32:5 32:7 36:23 36:25	[14] 3:15 32:18 38:12 39:13 39:21 42:	24 40:24	Customers		
Big	3 42:6 42:18 43:10 43:21 43:24 44:11 44:19 45:12	Company [16] 1:4 3:3 4:18 4:24 10:7 11:18 17:	<b>[9]</b> 14:9 22:3 22:4 30:7 31:13 40:24		
[3] 4:16 15:1 15:1 Bi 7707	Chairman	1 23:13 24:16 37:10 37:12 37:24 40:	42:4 42:7 42:10 Cutter		
Bigger [1] 38:24	[32] 1:11 1:11 3:1 10:20 10:24 14:16	12 41:14 41:19 44:25	[1] 31:19		
Bit	14:18 14:19 18:9 18:16 19:16 22:23 23:3 23:8 24:21 27:4 29:18 30:24 32:	Compelling [1] 30:17	Cutting		
[4] 3:18 18:1 22:5 29:23	8 32:10 32:15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7	Complaint	[1] 18:10		
Blanche	41:11 42:20 43:1 43:11 43:14 44:20	[2] 9:11 21:25	D		
[1] 36:3 Blown	44:21 Challenge	Complete			
[1] 34:20	[ <b>2</b> ] 13:4 39:25	[2] 12:12 12:15	Daisy [1] 20:24		
Bodies	Chance	Completed [2] 9:21 40:23	Dakota		
[1] 6:10	[1] 27:5	Complexities	[11] 1:2 2:12 2:13 20:23 20:25 21:20		
Bolt [1] 33:11	Chaotic	[1] 33.6	24:2 24:10 46:1 46:7 46:13		
Bonrud	[1] 42:1 Charge	Complied	Dan [2] 2:3 2:3		
[1] 1:19	[1] 42:8	[1] 17:1 Comply	[2] 2:3 2:3 Darla		
Bottom	Charges	[4] 4:14 16:16 17:3 29:15	[2] 1:20 38:12		
[2] 5:11 26:25 Bowar	[1] 33:5	Concerns	Data		
<b>Bowar</b> [2] 1:23 43:17	Check [1] 25:11	[1] 12:9	[1] 21:1		
Branches	Checked	Conclude [1] 7:24	Date [2] 25:18 25:19		
[1] 15:12	[1] 25:9	Concluded	Dated		
Briefly	Cheri	[1] 36:14	[3] 4:4 12:20 46:13		
[1] 27:8 Broad	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18	Concur	Dates		
[1] 36:10	Choice [1] 14:5	[1] 45:13	[1] 25:3		
Brought	Circuit	Congress [2] 7:25 11:9	Dave [1] 1:17		
[1] 44:2	[1] 21:2	Consider	David		
Bunch [2] 14:8 22:2	Circumstances	[3] 6:24 34:12 43:9	[1] 1:21		
Burden	[1] 37:11 Clear	Consideration	Davis		
[5] 8:17 15:24 16:1 20:11 34:24	[2] 8:4 17:16	[2] 7:1 33:22 Considerations	[1] 2:3 Days		
Burdens	Clearly	[1] 27:17	[7] 8:7 14:5 16:14 25:3 26:1 26:8 26:		
[1] 28:4	<b>[6]</b> 7:22 8:15 30:1 30:19 30:19 43:3	Considering	11		
Burdensome [1] 20:5	Close [1] 31:7	[2] 5:12 19:12	Deadline [8] 4:9 5:9 11:17 22:8 31:7 35:7 38:		
BURG	CMRS	Consistent [1] 20:6	<b>[8]</b> 4:9 5:9 11:17 22:8 51:7 55:7 58: 13 38:22		
[3] 1:12 35:10 45:13	[2] 4:8 4:20	Consumers	Deal		
Business	Coit	[2] 24:1 24:1	[2] 12:23 14:24		
[2] 10:16 24:9 Buying	<b>[9]</b> 1:21 10:21 10:22 10:23 17:15 17: 22 22:2 25:9 29:3	Contest	Dealing [2] 12:25 21:3		
<b>[1]</b> 40:1	Colleen	[1] 44:15	Deals		
	[1] 2:5	Contingent [1] 3:25	[1] 12:24		
C	Coming	Continue	Dealt		
Calendar		[1] 43:11	[ <b>2</b> ] 13:3 24:20		
[1] 25:6	Commencing [1] 2:14	Contrary	Debated [1] 11:19		
Cannot	Comment	[1] 36:25 Conversation	Decide		
[1] 10:5 Capitol	[4] 12:22 13:24 34:1 37:8		[7] 8:7 8:25 10:3 12:6 12:7 18:23 28:		
[ <b>2</b> ] 2:13 2:13	Comments	Cookie	25 Desided		
Carefully	[5] 11:4 14:20 18:15 32:21 33:24 Commission	[1] 31:19	Decided [2] 21:20 23:24		
[2] 33:7 44:17	[64] 1:1 1:10 1:13 3:7 3:9 3:16 4:2 5:	Cookie-cutter	Decides		
Carrier [5] 6:15 6:25 7:1 7:8 7:12	20 5:23 6:6 6:19 7:3 7:6 7:15 8:2 8:6	[1] 31:19 Cooperatives	[1] 45:5		
Carriers	8:25 10:2 10:18 13:14 14:4 15:4 15: 13 18:2 18:8 18:22 18:23 19:3 19:6	[1] 30:5	Deciding		
[9] 4:6 4:8 4:8 4:9 6:14 7:4 7:9 39:9	19:11 19:17 19:24 20:1 20:17 20:18	Correct	[4] 11:6 13:12 13:18 27:18 Decision		
39:10	22:7 23:16 24:19 25:2 25:13 25:25 26		<b>[19]</b> 3:20 11:16 12:24 13:11 16:13 16:		
Cart	2 26:20 26:21 27:18 27:25 28:13 28: 17 28:18 28:25 29:23 32:2 32:4 35:12	Cost [6] 30:3 30:19 42:24 43:3 43:8 43:20	17 16:20 17:17 18:1 18:13 23:17 25:4		
[1] 36:3 Case	36:9 36:19 37:3 37:12 37:23 38:9 40:	Costs	26:21 32:25 33:8 37:6 41:24 44:25 45: 4		
[23] 7:2 7:9 8:12 10:10 10:15 11:1 11	: 3 45:1 45:5 45:9	[6] 4:23 9:5 10:10 29:2 34:23 41:2	4 Decision's		
20 12:6 12:6 12:21 12:23 13:3 13:19	COMMISSION'S	Counsel	[1] 32:3		
14:10 18:12 18:14 20:23 21:1 21:3 2 10 34:1 34:2 43:16	Commissioner	[2] 14:23 15:8	Decisions		
Cases	[6] 1:12 35:10 40:10 41:9 44:9 45:13	Counting [1] 18:17	[2] 28:16 39:8		
<b>[6]</b> 8:10 9:19 12:13 12:15 23:6 29:1	Commissioner's	Country	Defined [1] 38:7		
Center		[1] 33:2	Definition		
[1] 33:4 Century	Commissioners [3] 10:24 15:18 33:24	County	[1] 23:12		
[1] 13:8		[2] 24:10 46:3	Definitively		

(

## From Bell's to Definitively

Word Index

## [14] 1:11 38:12 39:13 39:21 40:10 42: From Definitively to Hanson

[1] 5:1	[1] 20:4	[1] 43:8	[1] 8:11
Degree	Effect	Facts	Forfeitures
[1] 31:3	[2] 26:18 32:22	[ <b>2</b> ] 37:11 37:17	[1] 9:13
Delaying	Effectively	Factual	Form
[1] 38:15	[2] 11:20 13:18	[4] 16:7 16:7 22:20 37:2	[1] 4:4
Deny	Effort	Fair	Formal
[1] 26:20	[3] 5:17 5:18 35:4	[1] 7:24	<b>[1]</b> 9:11
Designed	Eight	Fairly	Forth
[1] 31:10	[2] 18:19 18:20	<b>[3]</b> 29:14 31:7 31:19	<b>[7]</b> 15:11 16:10 17:17 18:4 27:12 27:
Determination	Eighth	Faith	15 35:23
[2] 15:5 27:3	[1] 21:1	[2] 5:18 14:22	Forward
Determinations	Either	Fan	[7] 3:14 30:10 30:12 30:20 36:1 37:4
[ <b>1</b> ] 17:21	[ <b>2</b> ] 9:1 14:11	[1] 39:22	45:6
			Four
Determine	Embraced	Farris	
[5] 6:11 13:21 37:4 37:24 41:3	[1] 20:25	[1] 1:18	[1] 21:5
Determined	End	Fashion	Fourthly
[1] 5:18	[2] 18:10 27:23	[1] 24:20	[1] 21:15
Determines	Enforcement	FCC	Frame
[1] 20:1	[3] 7:6 25:14 28:1	<b>[19]</b> 4:4 4:5 4:10 4:23 5:2 9:12 12:21	[1] 34:18
Developed	Ensure	12:23 17:17 17:20 17:25 22:7 33:1 33:	Frankly
[1] 44:5	[1] 8:21	12 33:20 38:25 39:1 39:3 39:6	[8] 9:22 17:7 17:25 18:3 29:25 34:6
	1	FCC's	34:22 35:3
Dickens	Enter		Free
[1] 2:2	[1] 19:7	[1] 13:4	
Differences	Entitled	Feasibility	[1] 20:20
[1] 35:22	<b>[3]</b> 6:13 6:15 34:9	[1] 3:25	Front
Different	Entry	February	[2] 9:12 39:3
[4] 12:25 17:19 30:4 41:17	[2] 3:12 35:15	[3] 5:5 41:19 41:20	Full
Difficulties	Equipment	Federal	<b>[6]</b> 15:25 16:25 34:5 34:20 37:2 41:2
	191 21 4 42 4	<b>[11]</b> 6:7 11:9 13:2 15:9 15:11 19:20	Full-blown
[1] 4:13	[2] 31:4 43:4	23:14 24:16 29:22 34:15 36:13	[1] 34:20
Directed	Equipment's		
[1] 5:14	[1] 31:22	Few March 11 of a	Furthermore
Direction	Essentially	[2] 26:11 27:8	[1] 9:3
[1] 33:21	[2] 15:15 34:3	Fewer	~
Disagree	Estimated	[2] 6:17 28:4	G
[4] 7:18 11:4 15:22 19:17	[1] 43:20	Fight	<b>C1 D11</b>
Discretion	Evaluate	[1] 19:9	GARY
		Fighting	[1] 1:11
[11] 20:20 20:21 29:11 29:23 36:10	[1] 13:20	[1] 30:22	General
36:10 37:10 37:15 37:23 40:19 41:2	Evidence		[1] 24:9
Disinclined	[7] 13:20 25:23 26:3 29:13 31:17 39:	Figure	Gerdes
[1] 36:3	22 39:24	<b>[2]</b> 14:23 30:5	<b>[6]</b> 1:21 18:15 18:16 26:8 27:13 38:3
Disputed	Evidentiary	File	
[1] 15:23	[9] 5:24 21:24 23:23 34:22 36:9 37:17	[4] 5:3 10:7 15:20 16:24	Given
Distinction	40:15 41:23 43:2	Filed	[2] 20:20 29:8
[2] 38:4 38:10	Exact	[14] 7:21 9:11 9:16 13:7 16:21 18:5	Good-faith
		19:23 19:23 25:10 25:10 26:22 31:7	[1] 5:18
Docket	[2] 42:21 43:6	40:12 41:20	Gors
[1] 4:18	Exactly	Filing	[1] 20:24
Dockets	<b>[3]</b> 15:2 30:22 43:10		Government
[1] 18:19	Example	[3] 31:12 31:12 31:18	[2] 15:11 15:12
Documents	[2] 39:5 42:14	Filings	
[1] 32:21	Exchange	[2] 31:8 33:2	Grant
Dog	[1] 4:6	Final	[24] 3:9 6:7 8:18 10:18 13:14 15:21
[1] 19:9	Exchanges	<b>[12]</b> 3:12 16:17 16:19 22:6 25:15 26:	19:3 19:24 20:9 20:18 21:6 24:19 26:
		12 27:2 35:15 35:16 44:17 44:25 45:4	1 27:1 27:18 29:16 30:1 30:13 30:18
Dollars	[2] 4:19 22:4	Finally	35:12 36:19 36:25 39:17 44:23
[1] 43:6	Exercises	<b>[3]</b> 10:12 17:4 17:15	Granted
Done	[1] 10:7	Financial	[7] 9:4 9:8 9:10 11:2 28:19 28:22 35:
<b>[8]</b> 14:5 25:11 28:15 30:9 34:4 40:8	Exist		19
41:5 41:20	[3] 3:10 22:19 35:13		Granting
Douglas	Expect	Findings	<b>[8]</b> 5:25 12:10 13:17 14:14 18:24 19:
[1] 1:17	[3] 45:3 45:8 45:9	[1] 29:12	12 19:19 40:15
Down	Expectation	Fine	Greater
[4] 4:22 21:1 35:25 44:9	[1] 33:12	[1] 32:11	[2] 17:13 26:18
		Fines	
Drag	Expend	[1] 9:13	Greg
[1] 8:10	[1] 8:22	First	[1] 1:15
Draw	Explored		Group
[1] 38:3	[1] 44:17	<b>[10]</b> 14:21 19:2 19:15 25:4 27:11 27:	[ <b>1</b> ] 31:8
Due	Extend	20 30:11 30:15 38:16 41:19	Guess
[3] 12:9 22:15 25:4	[1] 40:3	Fit	[2] 30:16 36:18
	Extended	[1] 23:13	Guidance
Duly-appointed		Focus	
[1] 46:8	[1] 38:22	[1] 6:10	[3] 18:2 20:22 39:7
Duration	Extent	Focused	Guidelines
[1] 19:25	[4] 19:3 19:11 19:25 43:5	[1] 35:8	[2] 6:23 8:1
During			
<b>[8]</b> 18:17 25:24 26:1 26:2 26:3 26:17	F	Follow	
36:17 39:8		[4] 18:24 34:13 34:14 35:20	
	Face	Followed	Hand
E	[2] 4:11 8:4	[1] 6:4	[2] 21:11 29:5
<u>11</u>	Facing	Following	Handed
East		[1] 32:25	[2] 4:22 21:1
[1] 2:13	[1] 14:3	Force	
Economic	Fact		Hansen
[6] 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 39:25 44:4	<b>[3]</b> 20:20 23:18 41:3	[1] 12:4	[1] 2:8
- 1 181 71114 740 15 7A0 18 7701A 20075 AA0		1 77	
Economically	Factors	Forever	Hanson [14] 1:11 38:12 39:13 39:21 40:10 42:

3 42:6 42:18 43:10 43:21 43:24 44:11	[2] 9:13 26:19	Jim	<b>[1]</b> 31:24
44:19 45:12	Imposing	[2] 1:12 1:16	Limited
Happy	[2] 20:4 20:5	JoAnne	[2] 36:20 37:5
[1] 23:7	Impossible	[1] 2:6	Line
Hard	<b>[3]</b> 9:22 32:3 32:4	John	[7] 5:11 7:12 17:8 17:12 26:25 42::
[1] 33:16	Include		43:19
Hardship	[2] 6:21 11:9	[1] 1:14	Lines
[2] 32:1 44:4	Included	Jump	
Harlan		[1] 32:24	[6] 4:20 6:18 7:22 23:13 28:5 42:1
[1] 1:15	[1] 5:6	Juncture	Listen
Harm	Including	[1] 44:6	[1] 23:2
Harm	[1] 4:8	June	Litigants
<b>[12]</b> 13:25 14:1 14:2 14:3 14:13 17:4	Incur	[2] 25:8 25:16	[1] 21:12
17:14 21:8 21:9 21:10 26:16 41:1	[3] 9:4 10:9 29:3		Living
Harmed	Incurring	V	[1] 42:12
[3] 9:7 10:15 14:13	[2] 29:2 41:1	K	
Harrington	Indeed	Karen	
[1] 2:6	[1] 41:1	[2] 1:14 25:2	[35] 3:11 4:7 4:13 4:14 4:20 5:4 5:
Head		Keep	1 8:9 8:22 9:5 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:2
[1] 43:18	Indicate		11:23 13:23 14:9 16:17 19:4 21:16
Hear	[1] 34:23	[2] 16:13 27:23	17 21:18 22:3 22:4 22:13 22:19 25
[2] 26:3 32:19	Indicated	Kennebec	35:14 37:14 38:4 38:21 45:4 45:6 4
	<b>[2]</b> 13:17 23:19	<b>[26]</b> 1:4 3:2 3:14 3:21 4:17 4:19 4:22	
Heard	Infeasible	1 7:9 7:21 7:22 8:13 8:15 9:2 9:16 14 1	Local
[3] 9:20 19:1 37:17	[1] 20:6	14:9 16:2 16:20 22:2 24:2 30:4 39:18	[3] 4:6 21:21 28:20
Hearing	Information	39:25 42:21 43:15 44:24	Lohnes
[23] 5:24 5:24 8:25 15:25 16:25 23:24		Kennebec's	[1] 2:4
25:19 25:20 25:24 26:2 34:5 34:21 36:	[6] 13:16 14:8 16:7 16:7 41:16 43:16	[1] 10:18	Look
9 37:2 37:17 40:15 41:3 41:23 43:7	Inherent	Kind	
44:1 44:18 45:2 45:8	<b>[1]</b> 17:14		<b>[18]</b> 4:17 5:10 5:21 12:6 13:20 14:2
Hearings	Injunction	[1] 15:22	14:13 15:19 19:20 20:21 28:9 28:1
	[8] 5:22 6:3 11:5 15:7 16:4 18:7 28:	Knows	29:22 30:21 32:5 34:3 34:9 36:3
[10] 25:7 25:16 26:3 29:13 34:22 35:2	11 34:13	[1] 43:17	Looked
35:5 35:5 39:23 43:2	Injunctions		[6] 4:23 4:25 5:2 25:5 33:6 43:25
Held			Looking
[2] 2:11 28:21	[1] 21:3	L/	[4] 6:9 6:24 9:24 35:21
Helpful	Injunctive	Language	Low
[4] 3:17 11:8 14:12 28:14	[1] 17:20	[1] 11:10	[1] 8:11
Helsper	Insignificant	Largely	[1] 0.11
[1] 2:7	[1] 26:17	[1] 43:7	7.6
	Instance		M
HEREBY	[1] 19:6	Larger	
[1] 46:8		[2] 31:9 39:10	Maintain
Hohrman	Instead	Largest	[1] 10:13
[1] 2:6	[2] 6:9 44:3	[1] 24:11	Maintained
Hold	Interest	Larson	[1] 8:20
[1] 5:23	[7] 13:22 20:7 21:15 21:16 21:17 21:		Manager
	21 26:18	<b>[9]</b> 1:22 22:24 23:8 23:9 41:9 41:12	[1] 24:9
Hookups	Interested	42:5 42:16 42:25	
[1] 42:15	[2] 19:14 24:13	Last	March
Hope		[4] 5:13 18:18 22:14 27:24	<b>[2]</b> 32:1 32:12
[1] 32:8	Interim	Law	Mary
Hopefully	<b>[43]</b> 3:10 5:12 5:25 8:19 9:3 9:8 9:9 9:	<b>[9]</b> 5:21 6:8 6:10 6:10 6:11 28:9 29:	[2] 2:1 2:4
[1] 39:4	18 10:9 10:13 11:2 11:7 11:11 11:16	22 34:15 36:13	Matter
	12:4 12:10 13:13 13:15 13:18 14:14	Leading	[9] 1:4 2:12 3:2 24:20 29:24 31:20
Hoping	14:24 15:3 15:4 15:24 16:15 17:23 18:	[1] 32:24	22 41:21 46:10
[1] 43:12	17 19:19 24:19 26:1 26:14 26:20 27:1		McComsey
HUGHES			
[1] 46:3	28:19 28:24 30:13 34:10 35:12 36:17	Leaning	
	28:19 28:24 30:13 34:10 35:12 36:17 36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24	[1] 23:18	<b>[3]</b> 1:24 46:5 46:18
Human	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24		[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean
Human [1] 17:5	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened	[1] 23:18	<b>[3]</b> 1:24 46:5 46:18
[1] 17:5	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean
[1] 17:5 Hurt	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 <b>Intervened</b> [2] 18:19 18:20 <b>Interveners</b> [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44:	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 <b>Intervened</b> [2] 18:19 18:20 <b>Interveners</b> [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 <b>Intervened</b> [2] 18:19 18:20 <b>Interveners</b> [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 <b>Involved</b>	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 <b>Intervened</b> [2] 18:19 18:20 <b>Interveners</b> [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 <b>Involved</b> [2] 18:14 34:23	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 <b>Intervened</b> [2] 18:19 18:20 <b>Interveners</b> [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 <b>Involved</b> [2] 18:14 34:23	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 I Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 I Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 I Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 I Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 I Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 I Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 I Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8	[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8 Items	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1 Implementing	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8 Items [1] 20:14	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8 Items [1] 20:14	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12 Less</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 22:11 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5 Merely
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1 Implementing [4] 4:13 9:5 21:17 21:18	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8 Items	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12 Less [5] 7:12 23:13 42:4 42:14 42:16</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 22:11 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5 Merely [1] 26:13
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1 Implementing [4] 4:13 9:5 21:17 21:18 Imply	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8 Items [1] 20:14 J	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12 Less [5] 7:12 23:13 42:4 42:14 42:16 Letter</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5 Merely [1] 26:13 Merits
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1 Implementing [4] 4:13 9:5 21:17 21:18 Imply [1] 17:17	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8 Items [1] 20:14 Jacobson	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12 Less [5] 7:12 23:13 42:4 42:14 42:16 Letter [2] 12:20 17:16</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 22:11 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5 Merely [1] 20:13 Merits [6] 7:2 8:25 11:15 12:6 21:14 29:20
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1 Implementing [4] 4:13 9:5 21:17 21:18 Imply [1] 17:17 Important	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8 Items [1] 20:14 Jacobson [1] 1:17	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12 Less [5] 7:12 23:13 42:4 42:14 42:16 Letter</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5 Merely [1] 26:13 Merits [6] 7:2 8:25 11:15 12:6 21:14 29:20 Met
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1 Implementing [4] 4:13 9:5 21:17 21:18 Imply [1] 17:17 Important [2] 44:1 44:6	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Items [1] 3:8 Items [1] 20:14 Jacobson [1] 1:17 January	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12 Less [5] 7:12 23:13 42:4 42:14 42:16 Letter [2] 12:20 17:16</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 22:11 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5 Merely [1] 20:13 Merits [6] 7:2 8:25 11:15 12:6 21:14 29:20
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1 Implementing [4] 4:13 9:5 21:17 21:18 Imply [1] 17:17 Important	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Items [1] 3:8 Items [1] 20:14 Jacobson [1] 1:17 January [2] 41:16 41:19	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12 Less [5] 7:12 23:13 42:4 42:14 42:16 Letter [2] 12:20 17:16 Level [4] 16:1 16:3 16:3 17:24</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5 Merely [1] 26:13 Merits [6] 7:2 8:25 11:15 12:6 21:14 29:20 Met [4] 7:22 8:17 16:1 28:3
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1 Implementing [4] 4:13 9:5 21:17 21:18 Imply [1] 17:17 Important [2] 4:1 44:6 Impose	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Item [1] 3:8 Items [1] 20:14 J Jacobson [1] 1:17 January [2] 41:16 41:19 Jeff	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 15:12 Legislature [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12 Less [5] 7:12 23:13 42:4 42:14 42:16 Letter [2] 12:20 17:16 Level [4] 16:1 16:3 16:3 17:24 Levied</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5 Merely [1] 26:13 Merits [6] 7:2 8:25 11:15 12:6 21:14 29:20 Met [4] 7:22 8:17 16:1 28:3 Meters
[1] 17:5 Hurt [1] 21:13 Hutchinson [1] 24:10 Immediately [3] 25:19 26:10 33:10 Impact [5] 17:4 20:3 23:25 24:15 27:14 Implement [12] 9:10 9:21 10:2 11:18 11:21 11:23 13:22 25:17 28:20 29:9 37:14 38:21 Implementation [2] 4:24 5:8 Implemented [1] 38:1 Implementing [4] 4:13 9:5 21:17 21:18 Imply [1] 17:17 Important [2] 44:1 44:6	36:19 37:4 40:20 44:24 Intervened [2] 18:19 18:20 Interveners [6] 10:14 10:15 26:16 26:19 34:18 44: 14 Involved [2] 18:14 34:23 Irreparable [3] 21:8 21:9 40:25 Irreparably [1] 9:7 Issue [3] 18:22 30:21 36:6 Issues [8] 4:24 4:25 14:22 17:21 33:3 38:24 39:2 39:4 Items [1] 3:8 Items [1] 20:14 Jacobson [1] 1:17 January [2] 41:16 41:19	<pre>[1] 23:18 Leap [1] 28:8 Least [5] 5:1 33:9 36:21 43:13 44:6 Leaving [1] 29:11 LEC [1] 6:17 LECs [1] 4:11 Led [2] 5:3 13:5 Legal [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 5:2 Legislative [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 7:25 Legitimate [1] 31:12 Less [5] 7:12 23:13 42:4 42:14 42:16 Letter [2] 12:20 17:16 Level [4] 16:1 16:3 16:3 17:24</pre>	[3] 1:24 46:5 46:18 Mean [3] 22:15 25:5 35:17 Means [1] 22:11 Meant [1] 32:12 Meet [4] 16:11 24:16 24:17 41:3 Meeting [2] 5:13 40:6 Mehlhaff [1] 1:16 Melissa [1] 2:5 Members [2] 3:16 19:16 Mentioned [3] 13:25 22:8 27:9 Mere [3] 20:13 21:25 32:5 Merely [1] 26:13 Merits [6] 7:2 8:25 11:15 12:6 21:14 29:20 Met [4] 7:22 8:17 16:1 28:3

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

# From Hanson to Michele

	Word Index			
	[1] 1:18	Next	[3] 24:20 28:25 41:25	Picked
	Midcontinent [3] 18:11 18:20 23:4	[2] 23:1 45:9	Orders	[1] 18:11
	Middle	None	[4] 21:4 22:7 22:7 22:10	Picking
	[2] 25:12 26:14	[1] 44:23 Nonetheless	Original	[1] 36:7
	Might	[1] 22:18	Outcome	Picture   [1] 4:17
m.	<b>[5]</b> 3:17 33:5 33:11 33:13 33:22	Notary	[1] 10:10	Pierre
( ;	Mike's [1] 32:18	[2] 46:6 46:18	Own	[2] 2:13 46:13
	Mind	Noted [2] 12:11 39:1	[1] 36:18	Place
	[3] 33:17 39:14 42:22	Nothing	Р	[5] 22:12 30:11 30:15 31:22 38:16
	Mind-set	[1] 20:16		Placed [1] 20:10
	[1] 33:17 Minimum	November	Pam [1] 1:19	Places
	[1] 16:9	[5] 4:5 32:25 38:22 41:14 41:15	Pamela	[1] 20:17
	Minute	Number [23] 3:22 3:25 4:1 6:21 7:11 7:13 11:	[1] 2:6	Pleadings
	[1] 41:10	13 16:22 17:8 17:12 21:7 21:10 21:22	Part	[2] 26:22 32:5 Plenty
	Modification	28:21 33:2 35:1 38:5 38:8 40:9 40:14 40:20 41:17 42:21	[4] 24:2 24:9 27:20 41:12	[1] 13:16
	<b>[11]</b> 1:5 3:3 5:4 6:15 6:20 10:4 10:11 11:14 20:2 25:15 27:21	Numbers	Particular [5] 7:4 36:16 36:22 37:12 42:14	Plus
	Modifications	<b>[6]</b> 16:10 40:12 43:13 43:25 44:5 44;	Parties	[1] 43:8
	[2] 6:14 22:17	15	[4] 5:14 14:3 26:22 26:23	Point
	Modify [3] 7:3 8:9 9:1		Party	<b>[18]</b> 3:19 8:18 10:12 11:20 19:2 19:14 20:23 22:6 23:15 24:7 24:23 29:19 30:
	Modifying	0	[2] 18:12 23:5 Passes	14 33:19 38:2 40:6 41:8 44:9
	[1] 6:25	Objection	[1] 11:17	Pointed
	Money	[1] 19:9 Obligated	Past	[1] 9:19 Points
	[5] 11:24 24:4 29:4 31:5 33:11	[1] 15:20	[1] 16:19	[1] 27:8
	Month [4] 29:7 30:4 36:6 42:23	Obligation	Path [1] 44:10	Pollman
	Monthly	<b>[8]</b> 3:10 3:22 11:19 12:8 28:20 34:8	Pause	[1] 1:20
	[1] 43:22	35:13 37:1 Obvious	[1] 32:16	Portability [10] 3:23 6:22 17:8 17:13 21:22 24:8
	Months	[2] 16:25 23:22	Pendency	24:14 28:21 38:6 38:8
	<b>[16]</b> 3:11 8:7 10:1 10:1 10:3 10:8 16: 17 16:19 17:3 26:6 26:7 35:14 36:4	Obviously	[5] 36:12 36:13 36:17 36:20 37:20 Pending	Posed
	37:14 38:14 39:17	[3] 31:4 34:20 42:11	<b>[12]</b> 7:5 7:14 7:20 8:13 8:21 13:6 25:	[1] 15:16 Position
	Moot	Occasionally	<b>[12]</b> 7:5 7:14 7:20 8:13 8:21 13:6 25: 14 27:25 28:6 28:22 33:20 39:3	<b>[5]</b> 32:2 33:16 33:18 34:25 36:8
	[1] 11:20 Morning	Occur	People	Possible
	[1] 12:11	[1] 24:1	[6] 17:5 17:10 17:11 21:21 24:12 42:7 Per	[1] 33:9
	Most	Offer	[4] 42:23 42:23 42:23 43:19	Potential [1] 13:25
100	[1] 25:10	[2] 11:3 30:20 Offering	Percent	Potentially
\	Move [2] 34:19 44:23	[1] 31:13	[3] 6:18 7:12 28:5	<b>[3]</b> 9:7 31:13 36:2
	Movement	Offers	Percentage [1] 24:11	Practical
	[1] 21:8	[1] 13:11 Once	Perhaps	[1]40:22 Prejudicial
	MSAs [1] 4:7		[3] 23:19 39:6 42:9	[1] 26:18
	Must	31:1 31:22	Period [10] 25:21 26:5 26:17 29:7 29:7 36:14	Preliminary
	[6] 7:13 20:9 21:5 21:24 36:13 37:6	One	36:21 37:5 39:8 40:4	<b>[8]</b> 5:22 6:2 11:5 15:7 16:4 18:7 28:
		<b>[24]</b> 3:7 3:25 7:11 8:14 11:13 16:20 21:7 21:11 23:1 23:2 32:20 32:21 32:	Periods	Prematurely
	Ν	23 33:9 33:25 34:11 35:10 35:25 36:	[2] 9:25 10:5	[2] 12:5 12:7
	N.W.2d	16 38:2 40:9 42:1 42:11 44:3 Ones	Permitted [2] 11:17 22:14	Prepare
	[1] 20:24	[1] 40:25	Person	[1] 24:5 Prepared
	Name [1] 10:22	Open	<b>[1]</b> 42:11	[1] 35:4
	Nancy	[1] 23:5	Perspective	Prescribed
	[1] 2:4	Opened [1] 23:4	[1] 23:23 Petition	[2] 4:1 38:9
	Nation's	Operational	[33] 1:4 3:2 3:9 5:3 5:6 6:19 7:7 7:14	Present [4] 1:23 43:12 44:4 44:7
	[3] 4:6 6:18 28:5 Nationwide	[1] 4:12	7:20 7:21 8:20 9:4 9:16 10:3 10:8 10:	Presented
	[1] 7:13	Operative	18 11:14 13:7 15:21 16:8 19:24 19:25 20:13 23:18 27:19 27:19 27:20 28:19	[3] 39:24 40:2 41:8
	Nature	[1] 22:12 Opinion	31:19 35:12 39:5 40:13 41:21	Pretty
	[2] 17:5 44:1	[3] 25:25 36:6 36:18	Petitioner [9] 3:11 8:21 9:4 9:6 9:10 9:12 21:9	[1] 35:24 Prevail
	Nebraska [5] 28:18 28:18 34:1 34:2 37:22	Opportunity	21:11 35:14	[1] 31:18
	Nebraska's	[3] 13:19 38:19 38:20	Petitioner's	Prevents
	[1] 29:10	Option [1] 10:7	[2] 21:14 34:25	[1] 29:1
	Necessarily	Options	Petitioners [5] 9:21 9:25 10:14 32:22 35:22	Probability [1]21:13
	[2] 10:6 35:20 Necessary	[1] 5:3	Petitioning	Problem
	[ <b>2</b> ] 6:2 20:2	Oral	[1] 7:8	[4] 15:1 16:12 29:10 31:6
	Need	[1] 26:23 Order	Petitions	Procedural
	[10] 5:10 10:8 10:25 11:22 23:20 28: 25 34:9 36:8 37:25 40:14		[11] 13:15 13:17 16:8 23:21 25:3 26:6 27:3 28:6 30:23 31:20 40:11	[3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 Procedure
	Needs	16 19:7 21:6 21:6 22:1 22:19 24:4 26:	Phase	[2] 5:22 6:3
	[5] 5:21 5:23 16:1 39:15 40:2	12 35:15 35:16 35:18 37:10 37:14 38: 18 39:1	[1] 21:1	Proceed
	Net	Ordering	Phone	[2] 3:7 44:9
	[1] 8:6 New	[3] 8:23 8:23 19:7	[1] 24:23 Physically	Proceeding [5] 30:15 33:20 36:12 36:18 36:20
	[ <b>3</b> ] 8:23 43:3 43:4	Orderly	[1] 9:20	Proceedings
I '	PRECISION REPORTING			

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

From Michele to Proceedings

Word Index			
[4] 1:8 2:11 46:9 46:12	[2] 16:3 33:12	[2] 28:16 44:17	[1] 27:24
Process	Reasons	Reviewing	Separate
[5] 11:13 12:2 12:9 41:25 44:1	<b>[6]</b> 10:17 11:12 12:2 32:23 33:10 41:6	[1] 11:14	[1] 23:1
Professional [2] 46:6 46:19	Received	Revisit	September
Proof	[2] 4:20 33:1 Recognize	[1] 33:13 Rich	[3] 25:12 25:20 26:15 Series
[2] 22:15 22:16	[ <b>3</b> ] 4:10 11:13 11:16	[2] 1:21 2:7	[1] 34:22
Proper	Recommendation	Richard	Serve
[2] 5:19 6:12	[1] 26:25	[1] 10:23	[1] 35:8
Prove	Recommends	Rislov	Service
[1] 20:14 Proven	[1] 29:11 Recoverable	[1] 1:15	[4] 6:16 35:23 42:17 43:4
[1] 21:5		ROBERT [1] 1:11	Set [6] 15:10 17:17 18:4 27:12 27:15 33:
Provide	References	Rod	17
[5] 3:11 4:7 18:1 35:14 40:4	[1] 12:21	[1] 1:23	Setting
Provided	Referred	Rogers	[2] 16:10 34:21
[3] 13:2 31:1 40:11 Providers	[1] 32:11 Refers	<b>[22]</b> 1:20 3:15 10:25 13:25 15:19 16: 14 19:17 23:11 27:5 27:7 37:7 37:9	Severe [1] 24:15
[1] 4:21	[1] 27:19	37:18 37:21 38:17 39:19 40:9 43:16	Sevold
Provides	Regard	43:19 43:23 44:8 44:13	[1] 2:5
[1] 7:5	[2] 29:6 35:9	Rogers'	Shake
Providing	Regards	[1] 36:7	[1] 35:25
[1] 43:4	[1] 11:6	Rolayne	Shall
Provision [1] 36:16	Registered	Roll	[4] 3:6 3:9 19:24 35:11
Public	[2] 46:5 46:19 Related	[1] 29:5	Short [1] 34:17
<b>[11]</b> 1:1 1:10 13:22 20:7 21:15 21:16	[2] 19:8 33:3	Routing	Shorthand
21:17 21:21 26:17 46:6 46:18	Relates	[1] 4:25	[2] 46:9 46:9
PUC	[3] 19:13 19:18 22:13	RPR	Show
[1] 39:16	Relief	[1] 1:24	[5] 8:12 15:24 16:5 31:16 39:24
Pull [1] 43:16	<b>[14]</b> 5:8 13:1 14:24 15:3 15:4 17:20	Run [3] 10:6 25:4 30:6	Showing
Purchased	17:23 26:1 26:20 27:2 28:20 28:24 34: 10 40:16	Rung	[7] 15:23 20:12 21:24 22:20 22:20 31: 11 40:11
[1] 31:5	Remember	[2] 30:8 31:1	Shown
Purpose	[2] 8:5 42:21	Runs	[1] 8:15
[2] 38:13 38:15	Rendering	[1] 25:20	Sic
Pushed	[1] 33:7	Rural	[1] 32:1
[1] 17:13 Put	Reported	[7] 4:11 6:14 6:25 23:12 33:13 38:19 38:24	Side
[5] 16:6 23:23 31:12 32:2 35:4	Reporter		[2] 23:18 44:3 Sides
Putting	[4] 18:11 46:6 46:9 46:19	S	[1] 14:2
		E E	
[1] 43:3	Representing	Cofeke	Significant
	[1] 10:23	Safety	Significant [7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2
	[1] 10:23 Request	[1] 8:6	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6
Q	[1] Î0:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly
	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32:	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify	[1] Î0:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42:	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42:	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [I] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's	<pre>[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3</pre>
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14	<pre>[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously</pre>
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [I] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy	<pre>[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6</pre>
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20	<pre>[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1</pre>
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10:	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2	<pre>[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation</pre>
Q Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 R	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA	<pre>[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sitt [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6</pre>
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 R Rate	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9:	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23	<pre>[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six</pre>
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 R Rate [1] 33:3	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second	<pre>[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3</pre>
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 Rate [1] 33:3 Rather	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 R Rate [1] 33:3	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Situ [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 Rate [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 SecondLy [1] 19:16 Section	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 Rate [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Section [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40:
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>Rate</b> [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Section [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5 Sections	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>R</b> Rate [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respectfully	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Section [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5 Sections [1] 6:20	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>R</b> Rate [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respectfully [3] 7:18 10:17 24:18	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Section [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5 Sections	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>Rate</b> [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23 Real	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 10:17 24:18 Respond	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Section [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19 Small
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>R</b> Rate [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respectfully [3] 7:18 10:17 24:18 Respond [1] 27:5	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Section [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3 Seeing [1] 44:23	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>Rate</b> [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23 Real [2] 32:1 35:11 Realistically [2] 9:20 12:14	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respond [1] 27:5 Response [1] 27:8	<pre>[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 SecondLy [1] 19:16 Section [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3 Seek</pre>	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19 Small [7] 4:11 4:23 6:16 31:8 35:11 39:9 41: 18
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>Rate</b> [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23 Real [2] 32:1 35:11 Realistically [2] 9:20 12:14 Realize	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respectfully [3] 7:18 10:17 24:18 Respond [1] 27:8 Restraining	[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3 Seeing [1] 44:23 Seek [1] 18:25	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19 Small [7] 4:11 4:23 6:16 31:8 35:11 39:9 41: 18
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>Rate</b> [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23 Real [2] 32:1 35:11 Realistically [2] 9:20 12:14 Realize [1] 34:12	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respond [1] 27:5 Response [1] 27:8 Restraining [2] 21:4 21:6	<pre>[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [4] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Sections [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3 Seeing [1] 44:23 Seek [1] 18:25 Seeking</pre>	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19 Small [7] 4:11 4:23 6:16 31:8 35:11 39:9 41: 18 Smaller [3] 16:20 38:18 38:23 Smith
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>Rate</b> [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23 Real [2] 32:1 35:11 Realistically [2] 9:20 12:14 Realize [1] 34:12 Really	[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requists [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respectfully [3] 7:18 10:17 24:18 Respond [1] 27:5 Response [1] 27:7 Restraining [2] 21:4 21:6 Result	<pre>[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3 Seekng [1] 14:23 Seek [1] 18:25 Seeking [2] 6:2 6:5</pre>	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19 Small [7] 4:11 4:23 6:16 31:8 35:11 39:9 41: 18 Smaller [3] 16:20 38:18 38:23 Smith [7] 1:14 32:15 32:20 33:25 36:5 37:16
Q Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>Rate</b> [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reached [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23 Real [2] 32:1 35:11 Realistically [2] 9:20 12:14 Realize [1] 34:12 Really [7] 13:11 13:21 19:22 30:9 30:21 33:7	<pre>[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requists [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respectfully [3] 7:18 10:17 24:18 Respond [1] 27:5 Response [1] 27:8 Restraining [2] 21:4 21:6 Result [1] 11:18</pre>	<pre>[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3 Seeing [1] 44:23 Seek [1] 18:25 Seeking [2] 6:2 6:5 Send</pre>	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:9 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19 Small [7] 4:11 4:23 6:16 31:8 35:11 39:9 41: 18 Smaller [3] 16:20 38:18 38:23 Smith [7] 1:14 32:15 32:20 33:25 36:5 37:16 37:19
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>Rate</b> [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23 Real [2] 32:1 35:11 Realistically [2] 9:20 12:14 Realize [1] 34:12 Really	<pre>[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 10:17 24:18 Respond [1] 27:5 Response [1] 27:8 Restraining [2] 21:4 21:6 Result [1] 11:18 Review</pre>	<pre>[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel 's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3 Seekng [1] 14:23 Seek [1] 18:25 Seeking [2] 6:2 6:5</pre>	<pre>[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19 Small [7] 4:11 4:23 6:16 31:8 35:11 39:9 41: 18 Smaller [3] 16:20 38:18 38:23 Smith [7] 1:14 32:15 32:20 33:25 36:5 37:16 37:19</pre>
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 <b>Rate</b> [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23 Real [2] 32:1 35:11 Realistically [2] 9:20 12:14 Realistically [2] 9:20 12:14 Realize [1] 34:12 Really [7] 13:11 13:21 19:22 30:9 30:21 33:7 39:9 Reason [4] 8:3 8:11 39:24 40:3	<pre>[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requists [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [2] 16:6 16:15 Resources [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respectfully [3] 7:18 10:17 24:18 Respond [1] 27:5 Response [1] 27:8 Restraining [2] 21:4 21:6 Result [1] 11:18</pre>	<pre>[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Section [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3 Seeing [1] 44:23 Seek [1] 18:25 Seeking [2] 6:2 6:5 Send [2] 31:4 40:7 Sense [5] 13:21 30:1 30:10 30:16 30:21</pre>	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:9 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19 Small [7] 4:11 4:23 6:16 31:8 35:11 39:9 41: 18 Smaller [3] 16:20 38:18 38:23 Smith [7] 1:14 32:15 32:20 33:25 36:5 37:16 37:19
Qualifies [2] 39:18 40:5 Qualify [1] 40:8 Questions [2] 33:23 44:22 Quickly [2] 34:19 35:5 Quite [2] 29:23 34:22 Quo [2] 8:19 10:13 Rate [1] 33:3 Rather [3] 31:18 34:19 35:3 Reached [1] 45:1 Read [3] 22:9 34:3 38:5 Reading [1] 27:23 Real [2] 32:1 35:11 Realistically [2] 9:20 12:14 Realize [1] 34:12 Really [7] 13:11 13:21 19:22 30:9 30:21 33:7 39:9 Reason	<pre>[1] 10:23 Request [8] 3:21 5:6 10:17 11:6 12:23 14:25 17:23 24:18 Requesting [4] 9:17 14:9 22:3 40:16 Requests [3] 4:20 24:7 33:4 Require [3] 37:2 45:4 45:6 Required [10] 4:5 8:22 11:18 28:10 34:15 36:1 37:24 37:25 40:17 45:10 Requirement [15] 3:24 4:15 5:4 5:7 6:22 7:7 8:9 10: 11 11:19 12:8 20:4 20:5 20:17 24:3 27:21 Requirements [13] 4:1 4:3 6:25 7:4 7:7 7:10 7:11 9: 2 23:14 23:16 25:14 38:9 41:4 Requires [1] 8:22 Respect [2] 7:8 12:9 Respectfully [3] 7:18 10:17 24:18 Respond [1] 27:5 Response [1] 27:8 Restraining [2] 21:4 21:6 Result [1] 11:18 Review [4] 3:17 3:19 13:7 28:22</pre>	<pre>[1] 8:6 SAHR [22] 1:11 3:1 10:20 14:16 14:19 18:9 22:23 23:3 24:21 27:4 29:18 32:10 32: 15 33:23 34:11 35:17 37:7 41:11 42: 20 43:1 43:14 44:21 Santel [3] 22:25 23:9 23:12 Santel's [2] 24:6 41:14 Satisfy [1] 23:20 Schaefer [1] 1:18 Schedule [3] 5:16 5:19 15:2 SDTA [1] 10:23 Second [2] 16:12 45:12 Secondly [1] 19:16 Section [4] 1:5 3:4 3:23 38:5 Sections [1] 6:20 See [5] 5:15 32:6 34:9 34:18 35:3 Seeing [1] 44:23 Seek [1] 18:25 Seeking [2] 6:2 6:5 Send [2] 31:4 40:7 Sense</pre>	[7] 19:5 20:3 23:25 24:4 27:14 30:2 30:6 Significantly [1] 39:10 Similar [1] 31:20 Simply [7] 16:23 18:5 31:12 31:18 32:2 41:21 44:3 Simultaneously [1] 10:6 Sisak [1] 2:1 Sit [1] 13:19 Situation [4] 13:9 13:10 14:4 24:6 Six [16] 3:11 8:7 9:25 10:1 10:2 10:8 16: 17 16:19 26:6 26:7 29:7 35:14 36:3 36:6 38:14 39:17 Six-month [7] 9:25 10:5 29:7 36:6 38:20 39:8 40: 4 Size [3] 7:23 31:20 41:15 Slowly [1] 34:19 Small [7] 4:11 4:23 6:16 31:8 35:11 39:9 41: 18 Smaller [3] 16:20 38:18 38:23 Smith [7] 1:14 32:15 32:20 33:25 36:5 37:16 37:19 Smith's [1] 32:18

(

From Proceedings to Software

Word Index			
[1] 8:23	Stop	[2] 4:7 21:19	
Someone [2] 19:23 40:5	[1] 29:5	Telephone	U
Sometimes	Studied [1] 4:24	[6] 1:4 2:1 3:2 4:17 23:12 44:25	U.S.C.
[1] 42:7	Stuff	<b>Temporary</b> [21] 3:20 5:7 5:12 6:5 8:2 10:19 18:	[2] 1:5 3:3
Somewhere	[1] 41:20	25 19:4 19:7 19:12 20:9 20:19 21:3	Ultimate [3] 8:7 10:10 43:6
[2] 20:21 42:22 Soon	Subject	21:4 21:6 22:1 22:16 22:21 29:17 36: 15 37:1	Ultimately
[1] 17:2	[3] 12:7 22:15 22:16 Submit	Terms	[7] 3:20 5:2 5:18 8:24 23:16 30:7 35:5
Sorry	[3] 20:8 20:11 20:15	[ <b>3</b> ] 11:1 13:11 36:15	Under
[3] 32:14 32:17 32:20	Submitted	Terribly	<b>[17]</b> 3:8 6:7 6:7 7:10 8:16 9:23 13:2 13:2 15:9 29:9 34:17 36:22 37:1 40:6
Sort [1] 16:9	[1] 12:20	[1]24:13 Territories	40:17 41:7 41:7
South	Subparagraph [1] 20:16	[1] 35:23	Undergo
[11] 1:2 2:12 2:13 20:23 20:25 21:20	Subscriber	Territory	[1] 30:2 Underlying
24:2 24:10 46:1 46:7 46:13 Specific	[2] 6:18 28:5	[1] 24:10	[1] 13:4
[1] 27:16	Subscribers	Testify	Understood
Specifically	Substantive	[1] 23:7 Testimony	[3] 12:2 12:3 14:25 Undo
[7] 6:23 11:10 13:1 15:10 19:21 27:24	[1] 39:16	[1] 16:9	<b>[3]</b> 29:4 31:23 41:4
40:18 Specify	Success	Themselves	Unduly
[1] 15:13	[1] 21:14	[1] 13:16	[1] 20:4
Spend	Sue [1] 1:18	Thereafter [2] 17:2 26:11	
[2] 29:4 33:11	Suffer	Therefore	[1]24:11 Unlikely
Spending [1] 24:4	[2] 26:18 40:25	[2] 20:19 40:8	[2] 9:19 31:23
Spent	Sufficient [1] 41:23	They've	Unnecessary
[1] 41:15	Suggest	[3] 8:17 33:18 33:19	[1] 8:24
Sprint	[ <b>2</b> ] 6:1 6:10	Thirdly [1] 21:13	<b>Up</b> [7] 18:11 23:4 23:5 25:6 32:24 34:21
[1] 39:5 SS	Suggests	Thompson	36:7
[1] 46:2	[1] 19:18 Common and	[1] 2:5	Urge
Staff	Summer [1] 26:3	Threat	[1] 29:16 USDA
<b>[10]</b> 1:13 5:15 10:24 15:8 22:23 24:25	Support	[1] 21:8	[1] 13:7
25:229:1035:1944:16 Staff's	[2] 22:21 34:24	Three [1] 40:20	Usual
[2] 25:25 26:25	Supported	Timing	[1] 10:16
Standard	[1] 16:7 Supposed	[1] 41:22	Utah
<b>[29]</b> 5:11 5:23 6:12 7:18 7:19 7:23 11:	[1] 22:14	Tina	[1] 28:17 UTILITIES
5 13:12 15:3 15:11 15:14 15:17 16:5 17:18 17:19 17:20 18:3 18:7 18:7 18:	Supreme	[1] 1:17	[2] 1:1 1:10
24 19:18 19:22 20:9 20:22 20:25 31:	[1] 20:25	Today [15] 3:6 3:19 5:10 10:23 12:17 15:16	Utility
15 34:13 34:14 35:20 Standard's	<b>Suspend</b> [7] 7:3 7:6 8:8 9:1 25:14 28:1 30:11	26:13 26:24 27:1 29:17 35:11 37:5 40:	[1] 42:8
[1] 16:23	Suspending	13 40:21 43:13	V
Standards	[1] 6:24	Todd	•
<b>[14]</b> 7:19 8:1 12:23 18:4 21:5 21:23	Suspension	[1] 2:8 Together	Vandestadt [1]2:7
24:16 24:17 27:12 27:15 27:17 28:3 28:8 28:11	<b>[65]</b> 1:5 3:3 3:10 3:20 5:4 5:7 5:13 5: 25 6:5 6:15 6:20 7:14 8:2 8:16 8:19 8:	F41 E 15 14 00 00 00 01 0	Verified
Start	20 9:3 9:8 9:9 9:16 9:18 10:4 10:9 10:	Tomorrow	[1] 16:8
<b>[2]</b> 34:21 41:1	11 10:13 10:19 11:2 11:7 11:11 11:14 11:17 12:4 12:10 13:13 13:15 14:14		Verify
Starting	15:25 15:25 16:15 16:21 19:4 19:7 19:	Took	[1] 23:21 Verizon
[1] 25:7 State	19 20:2 20:19 22:1 22:21 24:19 25:15	[3] 37:22 41:19 46:9 <b>Top</b>	[1] 4:21
[27] 1:2 2:12 6:6 6:8 6:11 6:19 6:24 7:	26:14 27:21 29:20 30:1 30:13 30:18 35:13 35:18 36:15 36:17 36:19 37:1	[2] 4:6 43:18	VICE
6 7:25 8:2 13:3 15:10 15:12 19:24 20:	37:4 37:20 40:21 44:24	Towards	<b>[13]</b> 1:11 38:12 39:13 39:21 42:3 42:6
1 24:17 27:17 27:25 28:15 28:17 29: 22 34:15 41:7 43:13 45:2 46:1 46:7	Suspensions	[1] 35:4	42:18 43:10 43:21 43:24 44:11 44:19 45:12
States'	[7] 6:13 13:18 18:25 19:12 20:10 22: 16 29:17	Transcript [2] 1:8 2:11	Viewing
[1] 24:11	Switch	Transcription	[1] 37:11
Stating [1] 44:4	[3] 8:23 11:24 17:12	[1] 46:12	Vogel [1] 2:4
[1] 44:4 Status		Transport	[1] 2.4 Vs
[2] 8:19 10:13	T	[1] 33:4 <b>-</b>	[1] 20:24
Statute	Tal	<b>Treat</b> [1] 29:14	<b>TX</b> 7
[11] 9:24 13:2 13:3 15:9 15:9 15:10 22:11 36:11 36:21 36:22 41:7		Tried	W
Statutes	Talbot [2] 2:2 32:22	[1] 14:23	Wait
<b>[2]</b> 18:4 21:20	Talbot's	True	[1] 34:5 <b>Wake</b>
Stay	[1] 41:13	[3] 15:6 22:3 46:11	[1] 33:1
[3] 12:24 13:6 17:22 Stayed	TC04-025	<b>Try</b> [1] 35:6	Wall
[1] 33:20	[3] 1:5 3:1 44:24 Technical	Trying	[1] 2:3
Staying	[2] 3:25 4:12	[2] 17:17 38:3	Wants
[1] 35:8	Technically	Two	[1] 26:2 Warren
Steve	[1] 20:6	[10] 4:1 4:19 4:20 7:13 7:19 9:24 11: 12 12:1 21:10 40:14	[1] 2:7
[1] 1:16 Sticking	Tel [1] 13:8	12 12:1 21:10 40:14 Туре	Wayne
[2] 29:19 29:19		[ <b>3</b> ] 5:24 16:4 17:20	[1] 2:8
[2] 29:19 29:19			
Still	[1] 38:19	Types	<b>Ways</b> [1] 34·7
		<b>Types</b> [1] 38:4	ways [1]34:7 Week

Ĩ

From Software to Week

Weeks [1] 37:13

Wegman [1] 1:16

Well-known

[1]21:2 Western

[7] 4:21 5:20 7:17 12:20 14:7 15:6 41: 18

Whatsoever [1] 19:10

Wherein [1]21:4

Wieczorek

[14] 2:2 14:17 14:18 14:21 18:9 23:19 27:11 29:21 30:24 32:13 32:17 33:15 34:2 35:24

Wiest

[1] 1:13

Win [1] 16:6

Window

[1]38:20 Wireless

**[13]** 4:8 4:21 5:20 7:17 12:20 14:7 15: 6 19:8 22:10 24:8 24:14 38:7 41:18

Wireline

[15] 19:4 19:4 19:8 19:13 19:13 22:9 22:11 22:11 22:13 22:13 24:8 24:13 38:6 38:6 38:7

Wish [1] 15:4

í

Wishing [1]24:22

Wittler [3] 1:24 46:5 46:18

Words
[2] 20:12 21:12

Worst [1]21:13

Worthwhile

**[1]** 14:1

Wrapped [1]25:6

[x] 25.0

....

Y

Ζ

Years [1]24:12

[-] = .....

**Zero** [1] 24:7