

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

In the Matter of the Adoption of an Interconnection)
Agreement with Spectra Communications Group,) **Case No. LO-2004-0448**
LLC, by Big River Telephone Company, LLC.)

**SPECTRA COMMUNICATIONS GROUP, LLC'S
RESPONSE TO STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

COMES NOW Spectra Communications Group, LLC ("Spectra"), pursuant to Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") Rule 4 CSR 240-2.080(15), and for its Response to the Staff Recommendation filed in this matter on April 12, 2004, respectfully states as follows:

1. In its Recommendation, the Staff acknowledges Spectra's previously filed *Comments in Opposition to the Notice of Adoption of Interconnection Agreement* ("Comments in Opposition"), wherein Spectra stated that Big River had never responded to a formal Section 252(i) Adoption Letter sent by Spectra to Big River on February 6, 2004. Referencing the grounds for refusal set out in 47 CFR 51.809(b) (an Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier ("ILEC") is not required to provide a particular interconnection, service, or element where the costs of providing it would be greater than the cost of providing it to the carrier that originally negotiated the agreement, or where it would not be technically feasible), the Staff notes:

Staff believes that until such time as Big River requests a particular interconnection, service, or element, Spectra will not be able to determine if the costs are greater or if the provision is technically infeasible. Therefore, Staff believes that Spectra should wait to make its objections, if any, at that time. In the meantime, Staff believes that no grounds exist for the Commission to refuse to take notice of the adoption of the interconnection agreement. (Paragraph 5 of Staff Recommendation).

2. Spectra respectfully states that, while Staff suggests that Spectra should “wait to make its objections” until such time as a particular request by Big River is made, Spectra’s Comments in Opposition raised the positive public policy considerations of utilizing a Section 252(i) Adoption Letter process, whereby the two parties’ signatures place the Commission on notice that both parties have been involved in the adoption process (as opposed to allowing a party to unilaterally set an adoption in motion without establishing any dialogue with the other party).

WHEREFORE, Spectra Communications Group, LLC respectfully submits its Response to the Staff Recommendation previously filed in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Larry W. Dority

James M. Fischer MBE #27543
Larry W. Dority MBE #25617
Fischer & Dority, P.C.
101 Madison, Suite 400
Jefferson City, MO 65101
Telephone: (573) 636-6758
Fax: (573) 636-0383
Email: lw Dority@sprintmail.com

Attorneys for Spectra Communications
Group, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been hand-delivered, transmitted by e-mail or mailed, First Class, postage prepaid, this 22nd day of April, 2004, to:

Office of the Public Counsel
P.O. Box 7800
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Dana K. Joyce
General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Carl J. Lumley
Leland B. Curtis
Curtis, Oetting, Heinz, Garrett & O'Keefe, PC
130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Bruce H. Bates
Associate General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102

/s/ Larry W. Dority

Larry W. Dority