

**CRAW-KAN ET AL**

**Exh No. 4 NP**

Exhibit No.:

Issues: Blocking of Traffic

Witness: Jack Jones

Type of Exhibit: Direct

Sponsoring Party: Iamo

Telephone Corporation

Case No.: TC-2012-0331

FILED  
July 10, 2012  
Data Center  
Missouri Public  
Service Commission

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

**Case No. TC-2012-0331**

**Direct Testimony of Jack Jones**

**On Behalf of Iamo Telephone Corporation**

**June 4, 2012**

*Craw-Kan*  
Exhibit No. 4 NP  
Date 6-26-12 Reporter PF  
File No. TC-2012-0331

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
STATE OF MISSOURI

HALO WIRELESS, INC., )

Complainant, )

v. )

Case No. TC-2012-0331

CRAW-KAN TELEPHONE )  
COOPERATIVE, INC., et al., )

Respondents. )

STATE OF IOWA )


COUNTY OF )

Page )

AFFIDAVIT OF JACK JONES

Jack Jones, of lawful age, being duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

1. My name is Jack Jones. I am employed as General Manager and Chief Executive Officer with Iamo Telephone Corporation, and am authorized to testify on behalf of Iamo Telephone Corporation in this proceeding.
2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my direct testimony.
3. I hereby affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.



Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1 day of June, 2012.

Tamara LePorte Notary Public

My Commission expires: 7-20-2014



**DIRECT TESTIMONY  
OF  
JACK JONES**

Q. **State your name and business address.**

A. My name is Jack Jones. My business address is 104 Crook Street, Coin, Iowa 51636.

Q. **By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

A. I am employed by Iamo Telephone Corporation (Company) as General Manager and Chief Executive Officer.

Q. **Please describe the nature of your duties and responsibilities as General Manager and CEO of Iamo Telephone Corporation (Company).**

A. As General Manager and CEO, I am responsible for managing all aspects of the Company's operations. Working under the supervision of a nine (9) member board, I am responsible for carrying out their policy directives. I also design and plan corporate strategy and present such plans to the Board for their review and approval. Additional major job responsibilities include: review of financial statements and sales reports, manage and direct the work of the various personnel, determine staffing requirements including interviewing and hiring, and coordinating operations to maximize customer service and efficiency.

Q. **Would please briefly describe your education and work experience?**

A. I began my career in the telecommunications industry in the United States Air National Guard with 7 months of telephone switching training between May and November of 1976. In December of 1976, I began work with Chickasaw Telephone Company in Sulphur, Oklahoma. I began work primarily in residential and business installation and repair, and subsequently began primarily working with key systems and PBX equipment.

1 After divestiture occurred in 1984, my role changed and I became responsible for local  
2 sales, service, and engineering of enterprise, equipment for the geographical area of  
3 Oklahoma including contracts for the State Of Oklahoma and federal contract at military  
4 facilities in Oklahoma. I was supervisor of the enterprise and interconnect operations  
5 with oversight of as many as 13 technicians. In March 2005, I began work at my current  
6 position as GM and CEO of Iamo Telephone Corporation.

7 Q. **Are you authorized to testify on behalf of the Company in this matter?**

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. **Please describe your Company and the nature of its business.**

10 A. The Company is an Iowa corporation, with its office and principal place of business  
11 located in Coin, Iowa. The Company is an incumbent local exchange carrier providing  
12 local exchange and exchange access services to approximately 1000 access lines in and  
13 around the communities of Burlington Junction, Elmo, Claremont, Westboro, and  
14 Quitman, Missouri.

15 Q. **What is the purpose of your testimony?**

16 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain and support the Company's request to AT&T  
17 Missouri (AT&) to block the traffic terminating from Halo Wireless Inc. (Halo) in  
18 accordance with the Missouri Public Service Commission's (Commission) Enhanced  
19 Record Exchange (ERE) Rules.

20 Q. **Is Halo delivering traffic to your Company for termination to your customers?**

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. **How do you know Halo is delivering traffic to your Company?**

1 A. Each month we receive records from AT&T Missouri that identify the amount of traffic  
2 (i.e., Minutes of Use or MOU) that transits the AT&T tandem switch and is delivered to  
3 our Company for termination to our customers.

4 Q. **How is Halo's traffic delivered to your Company?**

5 A. It is my understanding that Halo has a direct interconnection with AT&T at its tandem  
6 switch in St. Joseph, Missouri. AT&T then sends that traffic, along with other wireless,  
7 CLEC and intraLATA toll traffic, over common trunk groups through the CenturyLink  
8 tandem in Maryville, Missouri, to our Company. This jointly owned network of common  
9 trunks that exists between our Company, CenturyLink and the AT&T tandem is  
10 sometimes referred to as the "LEC-to-LEC Network" or the "Feature Group C Network".

11 Q. **Did Halo or AT&T notify your Company, in advance, that Halo would be delivering**  
12 **wireless traffic to it?**

13 A. No. The only way that we knew we were receiving Halo traffic was after-the-fact when  
14 we began receiving records of that traffic from AT&T.

15 Q. **Has Halo ever requested permission or an agreement with your Company to**  
16 **terminate its traffic on your local exchange network?**

17 A. No.

18 Q. **Once you became aware of the fact that Halo was terminating traffic to your**  
19 **Company, did you request to begin negotiations with Halo to establish an agreement**  
20 **for the termination of this traffic?**

21 A. Yes. Our attorneys sent correspondence to Halo requesting to begin negotiations toward  
22 a traffic termination agreement. Copies of the request are attached to my testimony as  
23 Exhibit 1.

1 Q. **Did Halo agree to negotiate a traffic termination agreement with your Company?**

2 A. No. It is my understanding that Halo refused to negotiate primarily because our  
3 Company did not specifically “request interconnection” with Halo.

4 Q. **What compensation does your Company receive when it terminates traffic from  
5 other carriers?**

6 A. Our Company receives either access charges (intrastate or interstate) for terminating  
7 interexchange traffic or reciprocal compensation rates for terminating local wireless  
8 traffic.

9 Q. **How are your Company’s access charges and reciprocal compensation rates set?**

10 A. Our access charges are contained in tariffs that are filed with and approved by the FCC  
11 (for interstate traffic) and the Missouri Public Service Commission (for intrastate traffic).  
12 Our reciprocal compensation rates are set forth in the traffic termination agreements we  
13 have with wireless carriers and which are filed with and approved by the Missouri Public  
14 Service Commission.

15 Q. **Have you invoiced Halo for the traffic it is terminating to you?**

16 A. Yes. While we do not agree that Halo’s traffic is wireless, we have sent invoices to Halo  
17 each month for the traffic it terminates to our Company based upon our reciprocal  
18 compensation rates for “local” wireless traffic. Copies of those invoices are attached as  
19 “PROPRIETARY” Exhibit 2.

20 Q. **Has Halo paid any of your invoices?**

21 A. No, Halo has not paid for any of the traffic it has delivered to our Company.

22 Q. **Are you receiving traffic from other wireless carriers via the LEC-to-LEC  
23 Network?**

1 A. Yes, we receive wireless traffic from most, if not all, of the national wireless carriers such  
2 as AT&T Mobility, Verizon Wireless, Sprint/Nextel, T-Mobile and US Cellular.

3 Q. **Do you have traffic termination agreements with those carriers for the termination**  
4 **of their wireless traffic?**

5 A. Yes, we have traffic termination agreements with those carriers and those agreements  
6 have been filed with and approved by the Commission. A Summary of those agreements  
7 and the case numbers in which they were approved by the Commission is set forth on  
8 Exhibit 3 attached hereto.

9 Q. **Did any of the other wireless carriers who terminate traffic to your Company refuse**  
10 **to negotiate a traffic termination agreement?**

11 A. No.

12 Q. **Did any of the other wireless carriers insist on your Company requesting**  
13 **interconnection before beginning negotiations?**

14 A. No.

15 Q. **Do those agreements with the other wireless carriers provide for your Company to**  
16 **be paid for the traffic that is terminated to your Company?**

17 A. Yes. The agreements generally provide that local or intraMTA wireless traffic will be  
18 billed at reciprocal compensation rates and that any non-local or interMTA traffic will be  
19 billed at our Company's access rates.

20 Q. **How were the reciprocal compensation rates established for your Company?**

21 A. For most of the wireless carriers, our reciprocal compensation rates were established in  
22 the context of an arbitration case between our Company and Cingular Wireless and T-  
23 Mobile (MoPSC Cases No. TO-2006-0147 and TO-2006-0151). In a couple of instances,

1 the reciprocal compensation rate was negotiated between our Company and the wireless  
2 carrier.

3 Q. **Have the other wireless carriers paid your invoices?**

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. **Did you offer to make these reciprocal compensation rates available to Halo for the  
6 local or intraMTA wireless traffic it terminated to you?**

7 A. Yes. Our attorneys forwarded copies of a traffic termination agreement with Cingular  
8 and T-Mobile to Halo and offered to use the rates, terms and conditions contained in  
9 those Agreements as a starting point for purposes of negotiations. Please see Exhibit 4  
10 attached to this testimony.

11 Q. **You mentioned earlier that you don't agree that the traffic Halo is terminating to  
12 you is wireless traffic. On what do you base that position?**

13 A. The amount of traffic Halo is terminating to our Company is fairly substantial relative to  
14 the amount of wireless traffic we receive from other, national wireless carriers. Given the  
15 fact that we have never heard of Halo Wireless, nor have we seen any advertisements or  
16 marketing material offering Halo's wireless services in our area, I was skeptical that Halo  
17 would be terminating that much wireless traffic to our Company. In addition, we learned  
18 from industry meetings and discussions that other local exchange carriers were  
19 questioning the nature of Halo's traffic.

20 Q. **Do you have any evidence that Halo's traffic is not wireless?**

21 A. Yes. We requested information from AT&T regarding any traffic studies it has  
22 performed on Halo traffic terminating to our Company. Based upon the information we  
23 received from AT&T, we learned that only 9% to 13% of the amount of Halo traffic



1 terminating to us was local or intraMTA wireless traffic (and I understand that this was  
2 actually wireless traffic that was originated by customers of other wireless carriers). The  
3 rest of Halo's traffic was either interMTA wireless traffic or landline interexchange  
4 traffic. The information AT&T has provided us is included in "PROPRIETARY"  
5 Exhibit 5 attached to this testimony.

6 Q. **Are you able to tell whether Halo is providing your Company with originating  
7 Caller Identification when it terminates traffic to your Company?**

8 A. No. Because Halo's traffic is comingled with other wireless traffic, CLEC traffic and  
9 intraLATA toll traffic that comes to our Company over these common trunks, it is not  
10 possible to identify a Halo call when it hits our local switch.

11 Q. **Do the AT&T records of Halo's terminating traffic provide originating Caller  
12 Identification?**

13 A. No, the AT&T records simply provide a "billing number" which is assigned to Halo, but  
14 it does not identify or reveal the telephone number of the party placing the call.

15 Q. **Given the fact that Halo has not been willing to pay for the traffic it terminates to  
16 your Company and that AT&T's traffic studies reveal that a substantial portion of  
17 this traffic is actually traffic subject to access charges, what did you do?**

18 A. We authorized our attorneys to pursue blocking of Halo's traffic coming over the LEC-  
19 to-LEC network in accordance with the Commission's ERE Rules. Copies of the  
20 correspondence that was sent to AT&T and Halo are attached as Exhibit 6.

21 Q. **Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

22 A. Yes.

LAW OFFICES  
**BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND**

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DAVID V.G. BRYDON, Retired  
JAMES C. SWEARENGEN  
WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III  
JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON  
GARY W. DUFFY  
PAUL A. BOUDREAU  
CHARLES E. SMARR  
DEAN L. COOPER

312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 456  
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456  
TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166  
FACSIMILE (573) 634-7431

BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY  
DIANA C. CARTER  
SCOTT A. HAMBLIN  
JAMIE J. COX  
L. RUSSELL MITTEN  
ERIN L. WISEMAN  
JOHN D. BORGMAYER

COUNSEL  
GREGORY C. MITCHELL

February 17, 2011

**VIA EMAIL & FEDERAL EXPRESS**

Mr. John Marks  
General Counsel  
Halo Wireless  
3437 W. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 127  
Forth Worth, TX 76107

Re: Request for Interconnection & Compensation Arrangements

Dear Mr. Marks:

Previously we have sent you requests on behalf of the following Local Exchange Companies (LECs) to begin negotiations with Halo Wireless (Halo) toward an Interconnection Agreement pursuant to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996:

Citizens Telephone Company  
Green Hills Telephone Corporation  
Green Hills Telecommunication Services

**Letter Sent**  
December 30, 2010

Goodman Telephone Company  
Granby Telephone Company  
Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation  
Lathrop Telephone Company  
McDonald County Telephone Company  
Oregon Farmers Mutual Telephone Company  
Ozark Telephone Company  
Seneca Telephone Company

January 26, 2011

Rock Port Telephone Company

January 27, 2011

Page 2 of 2  
February 17, 2011

In addition to the above, several other LECs that we represent have recently received billing records from their tandem provider, AT&T Missouri, indicating that Halo is sending traffic to the AT&T tandems in Missouri over the LEC-to-LEC (or Feature Group C) network for ultimate termination to customers served by these LECs. Currently, Halo has no agreement with any of these LECs to terminate this traffic.


Accordingly, the following LECs request that Halo begin negotiations, pursuant to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, to establish appropriate interconnection agreements (including reciprocal compensation) for the local (i.e., intraMTA) wireless traffic that Halo Wireless is terminating to them.

Ellington Telephone Company  
Farber Telephone Company  
Fidelity Telephone Company  
Fidelity Communications Services I  
Fidelity Communications Services II  
Holway Telephone Company  
Iamo Telephone Corporation  
Kingdom Telephone Company  
KLM Telephone Company  
Le-Ru Telephone Company  
Mark Twain Rural Telephone Company  
Mark Twain Communications Company  
New Florence Telephone Company  
Steelville Telephone Exchange, Inc.

In response to our earlier correspondence, you have questioned the procedures that these LECs are pursuing to request negotiations. Accordingly, let me make it clear that these LECs seek to initiate negotiations toward an interconnection agreement pursuant to Sections 251 and 252, as envisioned by the FCC in its 2005 T-Mobile decision. Therefore, if voluntary negotiations are unsuccessful, these LECs are willing to submit to arbitration before the Missouri Public Service Commission.

Accordingly, please acknowledge receipt of this letter and indicate Halo Wireless' willingness to begin negotiations towards an interconnection agreement for the exchange of, and compensation for, local (intraMTA) wireless traffic. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,



W.R. England, III

WRE/da

LAW OFFICES  
**BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND**  
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DAVID V.G. BRYDON, Retired  
JAMES C. SWEARENGEN  
WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III  
JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON  
GARY W. DUFFY  
PAUL A. BOUDREAU  
CHARLES E. SMARR  
DEAN L. COOPER

312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 456  
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456  
TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166  
FACSIMILE (573) 634-7431

BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY  
DIANA C. CARTER  
SCOTT A. HAMBLIN  
JAMIE J. COX  
L. RUSSELL MITTEN  
ERIN L. WISEMAN  
JOHN D. BORGMEYER

COUNSEL  
GREGORY C. MITCHELL

February 25, 2011

**VIA EMAIL & FEDERAL EXPRESS**

**REC - 1 2011**

Mr. John Marks  
General Counsel  
Halo Wireless  
3437 W. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 127  
Forth Worth, TX 76107

Re: Request for Interconnection & Compensation Arrangements

Dear Mr. Marks:

Previously we have sent you requests on behalf of the following Local Exchange Companies (LECs) to begin negotiations with Halo Wireless (Halo) toward an Interconnection Agreement pursuant to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996:

Citizens Telephone Company  
Green Hills Telephone Corporation  
Green Hills Telecommunication Services

**Letter Sent**  
December 30, 2010

Goodman Telephone Company  
Granby Telephone Company  
Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation  
Lathrop Telephone Company  
McDonald County Telephone Company  
Oregon Farmers Mutual Telephone Company  
Ozark Telephone Company  
Seneca Telephone Company

January 26, 2011

Rock Port Telephone Company

January 27, 2011

Ellington Telephone Company  
Farber Telephone Company  
Fidelity Telephone Company  
Fidelity Communications Services I  
Fidelity Communications Services II  
Holway Telephone Company  
Iamo Telephone Corporation  
Kingdom Telephone Company  
KLM Telephone Company  
Le-Ru Telephone Company  
Mark Twain Rural Telephone Company  
Mark Twain Communications Company  
New Florence Telephone Company  
Steelville Telephone Exchange, Inc.

February 17, 2011

In addition to the above, several other LECs that we represent have recently received billing records from their tandem provider, AT&T Missouri, indicating that Halo is sending traffic to the AT&T tandems in Missouri over the LEC-to-LEC (or Feature Group C) network for ultimate termination to customers served by these LECs. Currently, Halo has no agreement with any of these LECs to terminate this traffic.

Accordingly, the following LECs request that Halo begin negotiations, pursuant to Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, to establish appropriate interconnection agreements (including reciprocal compensation) for the local (i.e., intraMTA) wireless traffic that Halo Wireless is terminating to them.

BPS Telephone Company  
Craw-Kan Telephone Cooperative, Inc.  
Miller Telephone Company  
New London Telephone Company  
Orchard Farm Telephone Company  
Peace Valley Telephone Company, Inc.  
Stoutland Telephone Company

In response to our earlier correspondence, you have questioned the procedures that these LECs are pursuing to request negotiations. Accordingly, let me make it clear that these LECs seek to initiate negotiations toward an interconnection agreement pursuant to Sections 251 and 252, as envisioned by the FCC in its 2005 T-Mobile decision. Therefore, if voluntary negotiations are unsuccessful, these LECs are willing to submit to arbitration before the Missouri Public Service Commission.

Page 3 of 3  
February 25, 2011

Accordingly, please acknowledge receipt of this letter and indicate Halo Wireless' willingness to begin negotiations towards an interconnection agreement for the exchange of, and compensation for, local (intraMTA) wireless traffic. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

WRENGWYDIP by BTM

W.R. England, III

WRE/da

**EXHIBIT 2**  
**PROPRIETARY**

**Summary Approved Traffic Termination Agreements  
between Iamo and CMRS Providers**

<b>LEC</b>	<b>CMRS Provider</b>	<b>Docket #</b>	<b>IntraMTA Rate</b>	<b>Effective Date</b>
Iamo	Northwest MO Cellular	TK-2007-0329	0.0273	3/1/2007
Iamo	Dobson	TK-2007-0230	0.041	10/1/2006
Iamo	Verizon	IO-2003-0209	0.035	12/12/2002
Iamo	Sprint PCS	TK-2003-0536	0.035	5/23/2003
Iamo	Cingular	TK-2006-0526	0.041	4/29/2005
Iamo	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0512	0.041	4/29/2005
Iamo	Nextel	TK-2007-0059	0.035	4/29/2005
Iamo	ALLTEL	TK-2007-0120	0.041	4/29/2005



-----Original Message-----

From: Trip England

Sent: Friday, March 11, 2011 1:35 PM

To: 'jmarks@halowireless.com'

Subject: Summary of RLEC Agreements with Cingular and T-Mobile

Attached per our telephone discussion is a summary of indirect interconnection Traffic Termination Agreements between our Missouri rural local exchange carrier (RLEC) clients and Cingular and/or T-Mobile. This summary was compiled some time ago, and we have not reviewed it recently. Of course, the executed agreements will control if there is any difference between this summary and the actual agreements.

Also enclosed are copies of the Agreements between Citizens Telephone Company and Cingular and T-Mobile. With the exception of the rates, traffic factors and the provision for transit traffic to Alma Telephone Company, the terms and conditions of these agreements are very similar, if not identical, to those with the other RLECs listed on the summary.

Trip

**Summary of Indirect Interconnection Traffic Termination Agreements  
between Missouri Small Rural LECs and Cingular/T-Mobile**

LEC	CMRS Provider	Docket #	IntraMTA Rate	Traffic Factor	InterMTA Factor
BPS	Cingular	TK-2006-0513	0.0093	76/24% (MTL/LTM)	32%
BPS	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0503	0.0093	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	52%
Citizens	Cingular	TK-2006-0520	0.0073 Transit Rate 0.01	69/11% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Citizens	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0505	0.0073	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Craw Kan	Cingular	TK-2007-0484	0.0257	79/21% (MTL/LTM)	7%
Craw Kan	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0506	0.0267	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	7%
Ellington	Cingular	TK-2006-0521	0.0277	82/18% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Ellington	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0507	0.0277	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Ferber	Cingular	TK-2006-0522	0.018	86/14% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Ferber	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0545	0.018	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Fidelity	Cingular	TO-2004-0445	0.035	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	None
Fidelity I (CLEC)	Cingular	TO-2004-0446	0.035	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	None
Fidelity II (CLEC)	Cingular	TO-2004-0447	0.035	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	None
Goodman	Cingular	TK-2007-0014	0.0168	78/22% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Goodman	T-Mobile	TO-2007-0224	0.0168	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Granby	Cingular	TK-2007-0011	0.0054	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Granby	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0508	0.0054	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Grand River	Cingular	TK-2006-0523	0.0209	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Grand River	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0509	0.0209	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Green Hills	Cingular	TK-2006-0514	0.0269	87/13% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Green Hills	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0510	0.0269	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Green Hills (CLEC)	T-Mobile		Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
Holway	Cingular	TK-2006-0525	0.0383	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Holway	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0511	0.0383	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Iamo	Cingular	TK-2006-0526	0.041	88/12% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Iamo	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0512	0.041	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Kingdom	Cingular	TK-2006-0515	0.023	73/27% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Kingdom	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0534	0.023	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
KLM	Cingular	TK-2006-0527	0.0212	87/13% (MTL/LTM)	0%
KLM	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0535	0.0212	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Lathrop	Cingular	TK-2006-0528	0.0069	72/28% (MTL/LTM)	0%

Lathrop	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0536	0.0069	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Le-Ru	Cingular	TK-2006-0529	0.0166	78/22% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Le-Ru	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0537	0.0166	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Mark Twain Rural	Cingular	TK-2007-0463	0.0289	90/10% (MTL/LTM)	32%
Mark Twain Rural	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0538	0.0289	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	70%
Mark Twain (CLEC)	T-Mobile		Confidential	Confidential	Confidential
McDonald County	Cingular	TK-2006-0517	0.0083	80/20% (MTL/LTM)	0%
McDonald County	T-Mobile	TK-2007-0009	0.0083	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Miller	Cingular	TK-2006-0518	0.0072	80/20% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Miller	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0546	0.0072	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
New Florence	Cingular	TK-2006-0519	0.0079	82/18% (MTL/LTM)	2%
New Florence	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0539	0.0079	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	2%
New London	Cingular	TK-2006-0154	0.01954	None	0%
New London	T-Mobile	TO-2006-0324	0.0175	65/35% (MTL/LTM)	2%
Orchard Farm	Cingular	TK-2006-0154	0.019855	None	0%
Orchard Farm	T-Mobile	TO-2006-0324	0.0175	65/35% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Oregon Farmers	Cingular	TK-2007-0012	0.0108	85/15% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Oregon Farmers	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0540	0.0108	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Ozark	Cingular	TK-2006-0532	0.0179	85/15% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Ozark	T-Mobile	TO-2007-0223	0.0179	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Peace Valley	Cingular	TK-2006-0530	0.0166	91/9% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Peace Valley	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0542	0.0166	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Rock Port	Cingular	TK-2006-0531	0.0273	78/22% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Rock Port	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0543	0.0273	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Seneca	Cingular	TK-2006-0533	0.0073	80/20% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Seneca	T-Mobile	TO-2007-0225	0.0073	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Steelville	Cingular	TK-2007-0013	0.0095	77/23% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Steelville	T-Mobile	TK-2006-0544	0.0095	84/16% (MTL/LTM)	0%
Stoutland	Cingular	TK-2006-0154	0.01476	None	0%
Stoutland	T-Mobile	TO-2006-0324	0.0175	65/35% (MTL/LTM)	2%

**EXHIBIT 5**

**PROPRIETARY**

LAW OFFICES  
**BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND**  
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DAVID V.G. BRYDON, Retired  
JAMES C. SWEARENGEN  
WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III  
JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON  
GARY W. DUFFY  
PAUL A. BOUDREAU  
CHARLES E. SMARR  
DEAN L. COOPER

312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 456  
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456  
TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166  
FACSIMILE (573) 634-7431

BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY  
DIANA C. CARTER  
SCOTT A. HAMBLIN  
JAMIE J. COX  
L. RUSSELL MITTEN  
ERIN L. WISEMAN

COUNSEL  
GREGORY C. MITCHELL

March 9, 2012

**VIA EMAIL & CERTIFIED MAIL**

Mr. Russell Wiseman  
President  
Halo Wireless  
2351 West Northwest Hwy., Suite 1204  
Dallas, TX 75220

**Re:   Blocking of Terminating Traffic from Halo Wireless, Inc.  
      Iamo Telephone Company**

Dear Mr. Wiseman:

This notice to commence blocking the telecommunications traffic that Halo Wireless, Inc. (Halo) is terminating to Iamo Telephone Company (Iamo) is made pursuant to the Missouri Public Service Commission (MoPSC) Enhanced Record Exchange (ERE) Rule, 4 CSR 240, Chapter 29. Under the ERE Rule, a terminating carrier may request that the tandem carrier (in this case, AT&T Missouri) block the traffic of an originating carrier and/or traffic aggregator that has failed to fully compensate the terminating carrier for terminating compensable traffic. In addition, the MoPSC's ERE rules provide that "InterLATA Wireline Telecommunications traffic shall not be transmitted over the LEC-to-LEC network . . . ." A review of Halo's traffic reveals that a significant amount of traffic terminating from Halo is InterLATA wireline originated traffic. Also, the MoPSC's ERE rules require the originating carrier to deliver originating caller identification with each call. A review of Halo's traffic reveals that a majority, if not all, of traffic terminating from Halo lacks the correct originating caller identification.


**Reasons for Blocking:** Halo Wireless has failed to fully compensate Iamo for the traffic Halo is terminating to it after Halo's filing for Bankruptcy protection (post-bankruptcy traffic) in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.130(2); Halo is transmitting InterLATA wireline telecommunications traffic over the LEC-to-LEC network in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.010(1); and/or Halo is failing to deliver correct originating caller identification with each call it is terminating to Iamo in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.130(2).

**Date for Blocking to Begin:** April 12, 2012.

**Actions Necessary to Prevent Blocking.** In order for Halo Wireless to avoid having its traffic blocked on the LEC-to-LEC Network beginning on April 12, 2012, Halo must: 1) compensate Iamo for the post-bankruptcy traffic Halo is terminating to Iamo at the appropriate access rate for interexchange traffic (including interMTA wireless traffic) and the reciprocal compensation rate for intraMTA wireless traffic; 2) immediately cease and desist from transmitting InterLATA wireline telecommunications traffic over the LEC-to-LEC network that terminates to Iamo; and 3) immediately begin providing correct originating caller identification information for each call Halo terminates to Iamo. These actions must be taken on or before April 10, 2012. Alternatively, Halo can use other means to terminate its traffic (other than the Missouri LEC-to-LEC network) or file a formal complaint with the MoPSC as permitted by 4 CSR 240-29.130(9).

**Contact Person for Further Information.** Iamo has designated W.R. England, III and Brian McCartney as contact persons for further correspondence or information regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W.R. England, III", with a stylized flourish at the end.

W.R. England, III

WRE/da

cc: Mr. John VanEschen, Missouri Public Service Commission (via email)  
Mr. Leo Bub, AT&T Missouri (via email)

LAW OFFICES  
**BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND**  
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DAVID V.G. BRYDON, Retired  
JAMES C. SWEARENGEN  
WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III  
JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON  
GARY W. DUFFY  
PAUL A. BOUDREAU  
CHARLES E. SMARR  
DEAN L. COOPER

312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 456  
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0456  
TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166  
FACSIMILE (573) 635-0427

BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY  
DIANA C. CARTER  
SCOTT A. HAMBLIN  
JAMIE J. COX  
L. RUSSELL MITTEN  
ERIN L. WISEMAN  
JOHN D. BORGMAYER

COUNSEL  
GREGORY C. MITCHELL

March 9, 2012

**VIA EMAIL & CERTIFIED MAIL**

Mr. Leo Bub  
AT&T Missouri  
One Bell Center, Room 3520  
St. Louis, MO 63101

**Re: Blocking of Terminating Traffic from Halo Wireless, Inc.**  
**- Iamo Telephone Company**

Dear Leo:

I am writing on behalf of Iamo Telephone Company to request the assistance of AT&T Missouri (AT&T) in blocking traffic from Halo Wireless, Inc. (Halo) OCN 429F, as Halo has failed to: 1) compensate Iamo for traffic Halo is terminating to it after Halo's filing for bankruptcy protection (post-bankruptcy traffic) and 2) comply with the Missouri Public Service Commission's (MoPSC) Enhanced Record Exchange (ERE) rules by (a) transmitting InterLATA wireline telecommunications traffic over the LEC-to-LEC network and/or (b) failing to provide, or altering, originating caller identification for this traffic.

As you are aware, terminating carriers, such as Iamo, may request the tandem carrier, in this case AT&T, to block traffic over the LEC-to-LEC network where the originating carrier: 1) has failed to fully compensate the terminating carrier for terminating compensable traffic (*see* 4 CSR 240-29.130(2)); 2) is transmitting InterLATA wireline telecommunications over the LEC-to-LEC network in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.010(1); and/or 3) is failing to deliver the correct originating caller identification in violation of 4 CSR 240-29.130(2).


Therefore, Iamo requests that AT&T take the necessary steps to block Halo's traffic from terminating over the LEC-to-LEC network to the following exchanges and telephone (NPA/NXX) or local routing numbers:

Company Name	Exchange(s)	Local Routing Number or NPA NXX
Iamo Telephone Company	Burlington Junction	660-725
	Clearmont	660-729
	Elmo	660-742
	Westboro	660-984

Iamo requests that AT&T implement blocking of Halo traffic on April 12, 2012. Please let me know whether AT&T will be able to block traffic on the date requested. If you have any questions regarding this request or require additional information, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Thank you in advance for your attention to and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,



W.R. England, III

WRE/da

cc: Mr. Russell Wiseman (via email and certified mail)  
Mr. John VanEschen (via email)