RESOLUTION OF THE PAPAGO COUNCIL (Reservation Telephone Services)

RES. NO. 156-84

1	10 St 30	RES. NO. <u>156-84</u>
2	WHEREAS,	the Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Company
3	1	("Mountain Bell") did by Agreement ("Agreement") exe-
4	Sec.	cuted on October 10, 1960, purchase and acquire from the
5	1.5.1	U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Af-
6	-USCA	fairs ("BIA") most of the telephone facilities ("Tele-
7	CON	phone Plant") of the BIA located on the Papago Sells
8	a National Sal	Reservation ("Reservation"), including the toll line from
9	35.0	Tucson to the eastern boundary of the Reservation and
10		telephone lines to the communities of Vaya Chin and Gu
11	a and	Vo; and
12	WHEREAS,	the Agreement provided for a purchase price of \$40,000
13		for the Telephone Plant and for the payment to the
14		Papago Tribe of a one dollar per pole right-of-way charge
15		for every pole located on the Reservation; and
16	WHEREAS,	upon representations of Mountain Bell and/or the BIA
17		that Mountain Bell's operation and rates were subject to
18		the jurisdiction and regulations of the Arizona Public
19		Service Commission, the Papago Council did on September
20	A. Same	2, 1960, by Resolution No. 1127, go on record as favor-
21		ing the acquisition of the Telephone Plant by Mountain
22	a seco	Bell and did approve the grant by the BIA of a right-of-
23		way of a reasonable width for lands covered by the
24	Sec. 1	Plant; and
25	WHEREAS,	the Papago Council finds (1) that Mountain Bell's ac-
26		quisition of the Reservation Plant was effected upon the
27		mistaken assumption and representation that utility serv-
28		ices on the Reservation are subject to the jurisdiction
29		and regulation of the State of Arizona and the Arizona
30		Corporation Commission (see section 8 of the Agreement
31	S. Antika	and the fourth paragraph of Resolution No. 1127);
32		(2) that Mountain Bells' acquisition of the Plant was
1000	Contraction of the second	

1pursuant to the Agreement between Mountain Bell and the2BIA, and without consideration to the Papago Tribe (see3Pennsylvania R. Co. v. Bowers, 124 Pa. 183, 16 A.836);4(3) that Mountain Bell is in fact operating the Plant5without benefit of a franchise or contract from the Papago Tribe since the Tribe was not a party to the Agreement between the BIA and Mountain Bell, and since Mountain Bell has failed to comply with 25 U.S.C. §31 (see9United States v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co.,10543 F.2d 676, 697); (4) that Mountain Bell is consequently operating the Plant without express or implied12legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an13informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5)14that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary15sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council16to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to17issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefore18States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and20WHEREAS, the Papago Council has determined that Mountain Bell has
<ul> <li>Pennsylvania R. Co. v. Bowers, 124 Pa. 183, 16 A.836);</li> <li>(3) that Mountain Bell is in fact operating the Plant</li> <li>without benefit of a franchise or contract from the Papago Tribe since the Tribe was not a party to the Agreement between the BIA and Mountain Bell, and since Mountain Bell has failed to comply with 25 U.S.C. §81 (see</li> <li><u>United States v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co.</u>,</li> <li>543 F.2d 676, 697); (4) that Mountain Bell is consequently operating the Plant without express or implied</li> <li>legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an</li> <li>informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5)</li> <li>that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary</li> <li>sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council</li> <li>to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to</li> <li>issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefore</li> <li>(see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United</li> <li>States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>without benefit of a franchise or contract from the Papago Tribe since the Tribe was not a party to the Agreed ment between the BIA and Mountain Bell, and since Mountain Bell has failed to comply with 25 U.S.C. §81 (see</li> <li><u>United States v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co.</u>,</li> <li>543 F.2d 676, 697); (4) that Mountain Bell is consequently operating the Plant without express or implied</li> <li>legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an</li> <li>informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5)</li> <li>that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary</li> <li>sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council</li> <li>to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to</li> <li>issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefore</li> <li>(see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United</li> <li>States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and</li> </ul>
6 pago Tribe since the Tribe was not a party to the Agree- 7 ment between the BIA and Mountain Bell, and since Moun- 8 tain Bell has failed to comply with 25 U.S.C. §81 (see 9 United States v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co., 10 543 F.2d 676, 697); (4) that Mountain Bell is conse- 11 quently operating the Plant without express or implied 12 legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an 13 informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5) 14 that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary 15 sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council 16 to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to 17 issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor 18 (see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United 19 States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
7 ment between the BIA and Mountain Bell, and since Moun- tain Bell has failed to comply with 25 U.S.C. §31 (see 9 United States v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co., 543 F.2d 676, 697); (4) that Mountain Bell is conse- quently operating the Plant without express or implied legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5) that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefore (see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
<ul> <li>tain Bell has failed to comply with 25 U.S.C. §81 (see</li> <li>United States v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co.,</li> <li>543 F.2d 676, 697); (4) that Mountain Bell is conse-</li> <li>quently operating the Plant without express or implied</li> <li>legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an</li> <li>informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5)</li> <li>that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary</li> <li>sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council</li> <li>to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to</li> <li>issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor</li> <li>(see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United</li> <li>States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>tain Bell has failed to comply with 25 U.S.C. §81 (see</li> <li>United States v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co.,</li> <li>543 F.2d 676, 697); (4) that Mountain Bell is consequently operating the Plant without express or implied</li> <li>legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an</li> <li>informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5)</li> <li>that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary</li> <li>sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council</li> <li>to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to</li> <li>issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor</li> <li>(see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United</li> <li>States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and</li> </ul>
9United States v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co.,10543 F.2d 676, 697); (4) that Mountain Bell is consequently operating the Plant without express or implied12legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an13informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5)14that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary15sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council16to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to17issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefore18(see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United19States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
10543 F.2d 676, 697); (4) that Mountain Bell is consequently operating the Plant without express or implied12legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an13informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5)14that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary15sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council16to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to17issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor18(see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United19States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
11quently operating the Plant without express or implied12legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an13informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5)14that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary15sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council16to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to17issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor18(see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United19States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
12 legislative grant from the Tribe and pursuant to an 13 informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5) 14 that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary 15 sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council 16 to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to 17 issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor 18 (see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United 19 States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
13 informal, noncontractual and revocable consent; and (5) 14 that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary 15 sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council 16 to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to 17 issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor 18 (see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United 19 States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
14 that Mountain Bell is subject to the inherent, plenary 15 sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council 16 to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to 17 issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor 18 (see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United 19 States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
15 sovereign power and jurisdiction of the Papago Council 16 to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to 17 issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor 18 (see <u>Bryan v. Itasca County</u> , 426 U.S. 373, 376; <u>United</u> 19 <u>States v. Wheeler</u> , 435 U.S. 313); and
16 to regulate utility services on the Reservation and to 17 issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor 18 (see <u>Bryan v. Itasca County</u> , 426 U.S. 373, 376; <u>United</u> 19 <u>States v. Wheeler</u> , 435 U.S. 313); and
<ul> <li>17 issue certificates of convenience and necessity therefor</li> <li>18 (see <u>Bryan v. Itasca County</u>, 426 U.S. 373, 376; <u>United</u></li> <li>19 <u>States v. Wheeler</u>, 435 U.S. 313); and</li> </ul>
18         (see Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373, 376; United           19         States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
19 States v. Wheeler, 435 U.S. 313); and
A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
21 failed and continues to fail to meet the public conveni-
22 ence and necessity of the Papago Tribe because, inter-
23 alia, it has, in violation of section 214 of the Federal
24 Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §214, discontinued
25 telephone services originally provided by the BIA to
26 the communities of Vaya Chin and Gu Vo without certifi-
27 cates from the Federal Communications Commission that
28 neither the present nor future convenience and necessity
29 of these communities will be adversely affected thereby
30 and
31 WHEREAS, the Papago Council is advised that the Telephone Plant
32 owned by Mountain Bell is in poor condition, still

-2-

	1 1 4 4 5 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
1		utilizes outside plant facilities some of which date
2		back to the 1930's and is capable of providing adequate
3	1004062	telephone service only to Kitt Peak and the community
4	1.300	of Sells; that telephone service to the communities of
5		Vaya Chin and Gu Vo can be re-established by use of the
6		existing Telephone Plant and without affecting existing
7		subscribers only through a different toll exchange;
8		that in order to meet the present and future convenience
9		and necessity of the communities of Vaya Chin and Gu Vo,
10	a share	and of other communities presently enjoying electric
11		services, it will be necessary to replace most of the
12		existing Telephone Plant, including a majority of the
13		open wire and central office plants; and
14	WHEREAS,	the Papago Council has been further advised that Mountain
15		Bell has not adequately maintained the Telephone Facili-
16	1	ties, allowing for the deterioration and cessation of
17		services in some locations; is no longer even maintain-
18		ing records of its operating system; is unwilling to
19		make the substantial system improvements necessary to
20		meet the needs of existing and potential subscribers;
21		and has stated its willingness to transfer ownership of
22		the Telephone Plant to the Papago Tribe or to another
23		company having or experiencing lower construction costs,
24	pag 1 m Sala	greater experience of service to rural areas and reduced
25	No. 1	tax exposure; and
26	WHEREAS,	the Papago Council did by Resolutions No. 65-83 and
27		200-83 authorize and direct the Papago Tribal Utility
28	121.25	Authority ("PTUA"), on behalf of PTUA or the Papago
29		Tribe, (1) to file an application for a loan with the
30		Rural Electrification Administration ("REA"), pursuant
31		to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, in
32		order to acquire, develop, extend and finance telephone
1.1.1	PRE-121011-1444	

-3-

1		services on the Reservation; (2) to negotiate with Moun-
2		tain Bell for the acquisition of the existing Telephone
3		Plant; and (3) to engage engineers and consultants to
4		assist in such filings and negotiations; and
5	WHEREAS,	the firm of Hicks & Ragland Engineering Company, Inc.
6		has prepared a Telephone System Feasibility Study which,
7		based on Area Coverage Surveys and System Design,
8		recommends that the Papago Tribe, acting through PTUA,
9		provide telephone service to the Reservation by means of
10		facilities ("Telephone Facilities") which would retire
11	1 mal	most of the existing Telephone Plant of Mountain Bell
12		due to obsolescence; would serve subscribers (projected
13		to increase from 399 to 1,376 in 1990) by electronic
14		subscriber plant and physical cable into digital central
15		offices in Sells, Santa Rosa and Kerwo, utilizing 2GHz
16	No.	digital microwave long distance (toll) facilities and
17		buried cable plant facilities; and would provide reason-
18	1.1	able rates, provided toll revenues remain constant and
19		the Tribe receives a discretionary loan from REA; and
20	WHEREAS,	PTUA did, pursuant to the directions contained in Reso-
21		lution No. 200-83, accept and submit to REA an Area
22		Coverage Design (Arizona 510-A-Papago) prepared by Hicks
23		& Ragland Engineering Company, Inc. for review and to
24	1.4-15	determine feasibility of a loan from REA; and
25	WHEREAS,	PTUA has continued its negotiations on behalf of the
26		Tribe for the acquisition of Mountain Bell's Telephone
27		Plant and, by letter to Dabney R. Altaffer dated June
28	a are	28, 1984, was advised that Mountain Bell would not re-
29	1316/34	duce its proposed sales price of \$1,253,843.62, based
30	LITTLESS.	on its book value plus five percent, unless the Tribe
31		was willing to negotiate enforceable concessions on the
32	126 01	amounts payable to PTUA via the separation process; and
	Carl State	

UTH VORTH CONULSA. 26 COTTOR ELPER

1 WHEREAS, PTUA has advised the Papago Council that the proposed sales price of \$1,253,843.62 is based on a book value 2 which fails to properly recognize actual retirements 3 from or depreciation of Mountain Bell's inventories; 4 that a justifiable price might be in the area of 5 \$400,000; and that the Tribe cannot consequently acquire 6 the Telephone Plant under the terms proposed by Mountain 7 Bell since they would not be consistent with REA loan 8 requirements. 9 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Papago Council does hereby 10 find and order as follows: 11 1) Mountain Bell fails to meet the present 12 and future convenience and necessity in providing telephone 13 service to the Reservation. Mountain Bell may and shall 14 15 continue to provide telephone service to the Reservation in accordance with federal and state laws and regulations 16 until the Papago Tribal Utility starts providing the 17 service as hereinafter directed, at which time Mountain 18 Bell shall have one year to remove all of the Telephone 19 Plant owned by Mountain Bell which serve the Sells Ex-20 change (including the facilities on Kitt Peak) from the 21 Reservation, and any parts or portions of such plant 22 which have not been removed within the year may be re-23 24 moved or disposed of by or at the request of PTUA, and the reasonable cost of such removal or disposal shall be 25 26 charged to Mountain Bell. 2) Because of the rural nature of the Reservation, 27

2) Because of the rural hature of the Reservation, only the Papago Tribe, acting by and through PTUA, can meet the present and future convenience and necessity in providing telephone service to the Reservation since it is exempt from all forms of taxation, qualifies for REA and other kinds of low interest loans or grants, and

28

29

30

31

32

-5-

does not require a profit from its utility investments.

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

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

 PTUA is authorized and directed to continue its application for a loan from REA, substantially in form and substance of the Area Coverage Design (Arizona 510-A-Papago).

4) Upon a determination by REA that the loan is feasible, PTUA is authorized and directed to enter into the loan and to execute all instruments necessary or incidental thereto, and

a) shall have a certificate of convenience and necessity to construct, operate and maintain Telephone Facilities on the Reservation and, upon completion thereof or of a functional portion thereof, provide telephone services to the Reservation in accordance with its Plan of Operation.

b) the Papago Tribe shall, by its proper officers, execute a lease to PTUA, in form and substance similar to the Lease executed by the Papago Tribe to PTUA covering the Tribe's electrial facilities and dated March 27, 1975, under the terms of which all of the Telephone Facilities acquired by PTUA in the name of the Tribe shall be leased to PTUA, with the right and power of PTUA to encumber its leasehold interest in the lease and leased properties to the United States of America pursuant to the REA loan.

5) At least 180 days before completion of the Telephone Facilities, or such functional portion thereof as encompasses the Sells Exchange operated by Mountain Bell, PTUA shall advise Mountain Bell of the day and time PTUA will start telephone service, and both Mountain Bell and PTUA shall co-operate in order to permit the take-over

## of the service by PTUA with a minimum of inconvenience

## 2

1

## to telephone subscribers.

The foregoing Resolution was duly enacted by the Papago Council on 3 the 13th day of July ,1984, at a meeting at which a quorum was present with a vote of 1440.0 for; -0- against; 4 not voting; and 1 -0absent, pursuant to the authority vested in the Council by Section 2 (a), (c) and (e) and 5 Section 3 (a), (e), (g) and (h) of Article V of the Constitution and By-laws of the Papago Tribe as amended, ratified by the 6 Papago Tribe on December 12, 1936, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior on January 6, 1937, pursuant to Section 16 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 934). Said Resolution is effective as of the date of its approval by the Superintendent of the Papago 7 8 Agency and is subject to review by the Secretary of Interior. 9 THE PAPAGO COUNCIL 10 11 MOORE, Chairman 12 JOSIAH ATTEST: 13 14 15 Secretary RESOLUTION APPROVED this 18 day of JULY, 1984. 16 17 18 19 Raymond Wolf, Accting Superintendent 20 Papago Agency 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

SECOND: H	enry Ramon					
DATE:	RESOLUTION or OROROXIXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX					
DISTRICTS	REPRESENTATIVES	# OF VOTES	FOR	AGAINST	NOT VOTING	ABSENT
SIF OIDAK 105	<ol> <li>Nicklos Jose (Alice Norris)</li> <li>Elliott Lewis (Eugene F. Jose)</li> </ol>	52.5 52.5	X X			
SELLS 235	<ol> <li>Andrew M. Patricio (Nora Alvarez)</li> <li>Fred Stevens (Dennis Jose)</li> </ol>	117.5 117.5	X X			
SCHUK ТОАК 103	<ol> <li>Jo Ann Francisco (Priscilla G. Domingo)</li> <li>Ramon Campillo, Jr. (Joseph Juan)</li> </ol>	51.5 51.5	X X			
SAN XAVIER 121	<ol> <li>Carmelita Mattias         (         )         2. John B. Narcho         (Austin Nunez)         )         </li> </ol>	60.5 60.5	X			X
BABOQUIVARI 203	<ol> <li>Kenneth Chico, Sr. (Donald Harvey)</li> <li>Joann Garcia (Edward N. Kisto)</li> </ol>	101.5 101.5	X X			
GU ACHI 150	<ol> <li>Angelo J. Joaquin, Sr. (Jonas R. Robles)</li> <li>Fernando Joaquin (Fred Adams, Jr.)</li> </ol>	75.0 75.0	X X			
PISINEMO 105	<ol> <li>Johnson Jose (Frank Garcia)</li> <li>Lamando Francisco (Chester Antone)</li> </ol>	52.5	X X			
SAN LUCY 51	<ol> <li>John Reno (Max P. Jose)</li> <li>Albert Gomez (Jeannie Morris)</li> </ol>	25.5 25.5	X X			
GU VO 107	<ol> <li>Virgil Lewis (Henry F. Manuel)</li> <li>Cross Antone (Fern E. Salcido)</li> </ol>	53.5 53.5	X X			
HICKIWAN 122	<ol> <li>Henry A. Ramon (Pablo Baptisto)</li> <li>Delma Garcia (Archie Pilone)</li> </ol>	61.0 61.0	X X			
СНИКИТ КИК 138	<ol> <li>Harriet Toro (Lawrence Jose)</li> <li>Rosemary Lopez (Anita C. Clark)</li> </ol>	69.0 69.0	X X			
TOTALS		1440.0	1440.0	-0-	-0-	1