

BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of Grand River)
Mutual Telephone Corp. for Suspension and)
Modification of the FCC's Requirement)
to Implement Number Portability) Case No. TO-2004-0456

**GRAND RIVER MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY'S
RESPONSE TO ORDER DIRECTING FILING**

COMES NOW Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation ("Grand River"), and
for its Response to the Commission's February 3, 2011 Order Directing Grand River to
Respond, states to the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") as follows:

Local Number Portability and PSC Modification

1. In 2004, the Commission issued an order in this case modifying Grand
River's intermodal (*i.e.* wireline-to-wireless) local number portability (LNP) requirements
established by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) as follows:

[The FCC's] local number portability requirements are modified to provide that if
wireline-to-wireless local number portability is requested after Grand River
Mutual Telephone Corporation has become fully LNP-capable, then Grand River
shall notify the wireless carrier that it is not the responsibility of Grand River to
establish facilities or arrangements with third-party carriers to transport calls on a
local basis to a point outside of Grand River's local service area. This also
applies to a situation where a wireless carrier that has established facilities or
arrangements, or both, with third-party carriers to transport calls to a point
outside of the Petitioner's local service area is requested to port numbers to
another wireless carrier that has not established such facilities or arrangements.

[And further,] while this modification is in effect, neither Grand River Mutual
Telephone Corporation, nor its wireline customers, will be responsible for any
transport or long distance charges associated with porting numbers and any
associated calls outside Grand River's local service area.

In the Matter of the Petition of Grand River Mutual Telephone Corp., Case No. TO-
2004-0456, *Report and Order*, issued August 26, 2004, ¶¶ 3-4.

2. Currently, Grand River has direct interconnection with two wireless carriers: Alltel Wireless (now Verizon Wireless or “Verizon”) and Dobson Wireless (now AT&T Wireless or “AT&T”). As a result, if a Grand River customer chooses to discontinue service with Grand River, establish service with one of these two wireless carriers, and port their existing telephone number, then Grand River can and will complete the port. Other Grand River customers will be able to call this “new” Verizon or AT&T customer by dialing seven digits or making a “local call” (as they did before the port). Additionally, if a Verizon customer chooses to discontinue service with Verizon, establish service with AT&T and port their number, Grand River will acknowledge the port and the dialing pattern for Grand River customers seeking to call the “new” AT&T customer will remain the same as it was when the customer was served by Verizon.

Response to Order Directing Filing

3. **Description of Number Port.** On September 22, 2010, Grand River received a request for local number portability (LNP) to port a wireless number from Verizon Wireless to Sprint PCS (“Sprint”). The port was completed on December 15, 2010. However, since Sprint has no direct connection with Grand River or any other facilities or arrangements with third party carriers to transport calls from Grand River to Sprint, existing Grand River customers attempting to dial the Sprint customer on a seven digit or “locally” dialed basis will have their call intercepted and told that they need to dial 1+ the area code + the number in order to complete the call.

4. **Intercept Message Language.** This intercept is consistent with Ordered Paragraph 5 of the August 26, 2004 *Report and Order* in this case, where the Commission directed Grand River to “establish an intercept message for seven-digit

dialed calls to ported numbers where the required facilities or appropriate third-party arrangements have not been established. The intercept message will inform subscribers that the call cannot be completed as dialed and to the extent possible, provide information about how to complete the call and whether long distance charges will apply.” Earlier in the case, the Commission directed Grand River to submit anticipated intercept language, and Grand River filed the following intercept language:

This call cannot be completed as dialed. You are calling a local number that has been ported to a wireless carrier that does not have local facilities in Grand River's area. To complete this call, you must dial it as a long distance call using 1+ the Area Code + the Number. You will incur a toll charge for this call until the wireless carrier establishes a local connection for their ported customers.

See Post-Hearing Exhibit 26, filed in this case on July 15, 2004. Grand River is using the same intercept language for the ported Sprint number.

5. **Expected Methods of Indirect Interconnection.** If Sprint wants Grand River customers to be able to contact Sprint's customer by dialing seven digits (rather than 1+ the area code + the number), it will either need to establish a direct connection with Grand River (as Verizon and AT&T have done) or establish facilities or make arrangements with third-party carriers to transport calls from Grand River to Sprint.

6. **Compensation for Traffic To or From the Ported Number.** Although Grand River customers calling Sprint customers must make a long distance call to do so, Grand River is nevertheless compensating Sprint for terminating that call if it is within the Major Trading Area (MTA) as provided in its Commission-approved reciprocal compensation agreement with Sprint. See Case No. IK-2009-0220. This compensation arrangement is consistent with the Commission's decisions in various arbitration cases

with wireless carriers. See e.g. *Petition of Alma Telephone Company for Arbitration of Unresolved Issues Pertaining to a Section 251(b)(5) Agreement with T-Mobile USA, Inc.*, Case No. IO-2005-0468, *Arbitration Order*, issued October 6, 2005; *affirmed* by the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in *Alma v. Missouri Public Service Commission*, 490 F.3d 619 (8th Cir. 2007).

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian McCartney

W.R. England, III Mo. #23975
Brian T. McCartney Mo. #47788
BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND P.C.
312 East Capitol Avenue, P.O. Box 456
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456
trip@brydonlaw.com
bmccartney@brydonlaw.com
(573) 635-7166
(573) 634-7431 (FAX)
Attorneys for Grand River

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was sent by electronic mail, U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, or hand-delivered on this 18th day of February, 2011, to the following parties:

General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

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

/s/ Brian McCartney

Brian T. McCartney