

Exhibit WRE-8

From: Topp, Jason D
Sent: Wednesday, June 05, 2013 9:24 AM
To: 'scott@swierlaw.com'
Cc: 'Cremer, Karen'
Subject: FW: NAT AMERICAN TELECOM, LLC -- RESPONSIVE EMAIL

Scott:

I have not been able to locate a response to this email from Todd Lundy last summer. Could you forward any follow up communications you have?

From: Lundy, Todd
Sent: Monday, August 27, 2012 9:25 AM
To: 'scott@swierlaw.com'
Cc: Karen Cremer
Subject: RE: NAT AMERICAN TELECOM, LLC -- RESPONSIVE EMAIL

Mr. Swier:

In response to NAT's message of August 8, it's our view that an in-person meeting is not necessary and is otherwise an unneeded expense. We believe the parties should be able to negotiate settlement terms through email or, if more efficient, a phone call to address a specific issue.

Qwest is negotiating the resolution of only the certification docket before the South Dakota Commission that is also currently on appeal to South Dakota state court. We are not including in these settlement discussions issues regarding any invoices that NAT has or will send to Qwest for delivery of calls to free service calling companies, and Qwest reserves all rights, claims, and defenses to any and all invoices and for all such calls. For example, Qwest reserves all rights and defenses granted by the FCC in its orders defining the requisite elements to a tariffed switched access service and the necessity for a compliant "end user." See, [Farmers II](#), and [Northern Valley](#).

Thus, as we stated before, Qwest is not willing to consider, let alone agree to, any payments for calls to free service calling companies to resolve the South Dakota Commission certification issue.

The crux of our position to resolve the certification issue, and the conditions that should attach to any such certification, is to be able to establish direct trunked transport (DTT) from Qwest's point of presence to the office where the conferencing equipment is located benchmarked to the rates that Qwest as an ILEC otherwise would charge to an IXC. And that, apart from the DTT, the rates for delivery to the free service calling companies must be benchmarked to the price cap carrier termination rate for the elements provided, which is .001974, subject to decreases under the [Connect America](#) order.

I hope we can communicate better regarding the rates that would be charged by NAT for DTT from Qwest's point of presence to NAT's offices. This is the centerpiece of any resolution to the certification docket. References to tariffs can be ambiguous and unclear. What we need is an itemized list of charges to get the calls

from Qwest's point of presence to the conferencing equipment.

It is my understanding that the closest Qwest point of presence is SXFLSDCO, and that it is another 17.58 miles to get to the Mid State end office in Ft Thompson, but we still don't have sufficient information of the distance and charges from the Mid State office in Ft. Thompson to the NAT location. Would Qwest have to pay NAT the DTT tariff rate it has filed for the 17.58 miles from Qwest's point of presence to the Mid State location, and then what if any would be the charge from the Mid State location to the NAT end office?

You quote the rate of \$.006327 per minute. Does this include DTT or not? If DTT is not purchased by Qwest, is the \$.006327 per minute rate a composite, total rate that would be charged by NAT for transport and termination? If DTT is not purchased by Qwest, what will be the other charges from either NAT or other carriers for delivery of traffic from Qwest's point of presence to NAT's central office?

Again, an itemization of charges from Qwest's point of presence through to the conferencing equipment would be best.

In the interest of attempting to make progress in our discussions, I'll refrain from responding to the adversarial comments contained in the message. Rather, the exchange of information as requested above would be far more productive to advance our settlement discussions. It would also be helpful if any position you perceive from Sprint is not automatically associated with CenturyLink; CenturyLink has been quite focused in its litigation of the South Dakota certification matter.

Thank you.

Todd Lundy
CenturyLink Law Department
1801 California, #1000
Denver, CO 80202
Work: 303-992-2510
Fax: 303-295-7069
Cell: 303-587-4820
Email: todd.lundy@qwest.com
