GUNDERSON, PALMER, GOODSELL & NELSON, LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

J. CRISMAN PALMER G. VERNE GOODSELL JAMES S. NELSON DANIEL E. ASHMORE TERENCE R. QUINN DONALD P. KNUDSEN PATRICK G. GOETZINGER TALBOT J. WIECZOREK JENNIFER K. TRUCANO DAVID E. LUST THOMAS E. SIMMONS

ASSURANT BUILDING
440 MT. RUSHMORE ROAD
POST OFFICE BOX 8045
RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA 57709-8045

TELEPHONE (605) 342-1078 • FAX (605) 342-0480 www.gundersonpalmer.com

ATTORNEYS LICENSED TO PRACTICE IN SOUTH DAKOTA, NORTH DAKOTA, NEBRASKA COLORADO, CALIFORNIA, WYOMING & MINNESOTA SARA FRANKENSTEIN
AMY K. KOENIG
JASON M. SMILEY
SHANE C. PENFIELD
JONATHAN M. OOSTRA
MATTHEW E. NAASZ
MATTHEW R. NAGOVERN
Of Counsel

MAY 0 9 2007

OFFICE OF HEARING EXAMINERS

TERRITEF WILLIAMS

May 8, 2007

Julie Johnson
Office of Hearing Examiners
210 East 4th Street
Pierre SD 57501

RE: IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF VENTURE COMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE FOR SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF LOCAL DIALING PARITY RECIPROCAL COMPENSATION OBLIGATIONS SDPUC Docket File Number TC 06-181 (PUC07-01) GPGN File No. 5925.060651

Dear Ms. Johnson:

Enclosed for filing please find the <u>original</u> Affidavit of Sean R. Simpson in support of Alltel's Response to Venture's Motion to Compel in the above-entitled matter. This document was filed on May 2, 2007, at which time a copy of the Affidavit was provided to you and all parties.

Sincerely,

Talbot J. Wieczorek

TJW:klw Enclosure

c: w/o enclosure:

Patricia Van Gerpen via email

Kara Van Bockern/Harlan Best/Rolayne Wiest via email

Darla Rogers via email

Mary Sisak/Ben Dickens via email

Rich Coit via email Steve Rowell via email Sean Simpson via email Elizabeth Kohler via email

SOUTH DAKOTA

OFFICE OF HEARING EXAMINERS

In	the	Matter	of	the	Petition	of	Ven	ture)	
Con	nmuni	cations	Coo	perative	for	susp	ension	or)	PUC 7-01
mod	lificati	on of	local	dialing	parity	and	recipro	ocal)	Docket No. TC06-181
con	pensa	tion obl	igation	ıs.)	

AFFIDAVIT OF SEAN R. SIMPSON

STATE OF MINNESOTA)	
) 5	SS
COUNTY OF BLUE EARTH)	

Sean R. Simpson, being first duly sworn, states as follows:

- 1. I am currently the Senior Counsel for Alltel Communications, Inc. ("Alltel").
- 2. I submit this Affidavit on behalf of Alltel in support of its Response to Venture Communications' Motion to Compel.
- 3. I was involved in and have personal knowledge with respect to the negotiations/discussions regarding the Scheduling Order in this proceeding as well as the discovery issues between the parties.
- 4. On April 2, 2007, the parties (Venture and Alltel) agreed to the Scheduling Order which included a deadline for submission of Motions to Compel by April 13, 2006.
- 5. Subsequent to the parties' agreement to the Scheduling Order, Commission staff requested that the final ruling be moved to late October. The parties' agreement to move the date for final ruling to November 1, 2007. The other dates previously agreed to remain the same.
- 6. Attached as Exhibit 1, is a true and correct copy of an email string beginning on April 2, 2007, that demonstrates the parties agreement on the Scheduling Order.
- 7. On April 3, 2007, Venture counsel sent a copy of the revised Scheduling Order to me for execution and ultimate filing with the OHE.
- 8. Local counsel Talbot Wieczorek executed the Scheduling Order on behalf of Alltel, and sent to Venture for filing with the OHE.
- 9. On April 9, 2007, I contacted counsel for Venture inquiring on whether or not it was more efficient to have the hearings on the Motion to Compel and Motion for Dismissal

on one day rather than 2 days, as provided for in the agreed upon Scheduling Order. I did not revoke my prior agreement on the dates identified in the Scheduling Order. I simply inquired as to the need for one hearing date instead of two separate dates.

- 10. Consistent with the parties' agreement on the Scheduling Order, Venture served and filed its Response to the Alltel Motion to Dismiss on April 6, 2007.
- 11. At no point in time prior to the April 13, 2007, deadline for Motions to Compel, did Venture identify the specific discovery requests that it sought additional information on over the previously stated Alltel objections.
- 12. Venture did not identify the specific discovery requests it sought additional information on until April 14, 2007 one day after the agreed upon deadline for the filing of a Motion to Compel.
- 13. Attached as Exhibit 2, is a true and correct copy of the email string on April 13, 2007, between myself and Venture counsel on the issue of adhering to the previously agreed upon Scheduling Order.
- 14. Prior to the Motion to Compel deadline of April 13, 2007, I made several inquiries on behalf of Alltel attempting to gain additional discovery responses from Venture. At no time during those conversations did Venture seek similar information with respect to the Alltel responses.

FURTHER YOUR AFFIANT SAITH NAUGHT.

Sean R. Simpson

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 2 day of May . 2007.

OMKATA

Notary Public

JOY R. HANSEN
Notary Public-Minnesota
My Commission Expires Jan 31, 2010