

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Application of New London Telephone Company)
for Approval of a Traffic Exchange Agreement) Case No. _____
under the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

**APPLICATION OF NEW LONDON TELEPHONE COMPANY
FOR APPROVAL OF A TRAFFIC EXCHANGE AGREEMENT
UNDER THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996**

COMES NOW New London Telephone Company (“New London”) and hereby files this Application for Approval of a Traffic Exchange Agreement between New London and Level 3 Communications, LLC (“Level 3”) under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (“the Act”). In support of this Application, New London states to the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) as follows:

I. AGREEMENT REACHED

New London is a local exchange carrier operating in Missouri. New London is a Missouri corporation in good standing with the Missouri Secretary of State. In Case No. TO-2004-0370, New London filed a Certificate of Good Standing from the Missouri Secretary of State which New London requests be incorporated by reference in this case. New London is not aware of any pending action or final unsatisfied judgments or decisions against them from any state or federal agency or court which involve customer service or rates. New London’s annual reports and assessment fees are not overdue. This information is still current and correct, as evidenced by the notarized affidavit of Ms. Linda Lowrance (Attachment I).

Level 3 is a competitive local exchange carrier operating in Missouri.

On August 1, 2006, after good faith negotiations, New London and Level 3 executed a Mutual Traffic Exchange Agreement (“the Agreement”) for the state of Missouri pursuant to the terms of the Federal Act (see Agreement, Attachment II). Pursuant to the Act, New London hereby submits this Agreement for approval by the Commission. The Agreement complies fully with Section 252(e) of the Federal Act because the Agreement is consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity and does not discriminate against any telecommunications carrier. The Agreement consists of fifteen (15) pages including two (2) schedules. There are no outstanding issues between the New London and Level 3 that need the assistance of mediation or arbitration.

II. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL

New London seeks the Commission’s approval of the Agreement, consistent with the provisions of the Federal Act and Missouri law. New London represents that the implementation of this negotiated and executed Agreement complies fully with both Missouri law and Section 252(e) of the Federal Act because the Agreement is consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity and does not discriminate against any telecommunications carrier. New London respectfully requests that the Commission grant expeditious approval of this Agreement, without change, suspension or delay in its implementation. This is a bilateral agreement, reached as a result of negotiations and compromise between the parties. Correspondence, orders and decisions in this matter should be addressed to:

John Zeiler
TDS Telecom
2495 N. Main Street
P.O. Box 220
Choctaw, OK 73020-0220

Brian T. McCartney
Brydon, Swearingen & England P.C.
P.O. Box 456
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456
bmccartney@brydonlaw.com

Linda Lowrance
TDS Telecom
9737 Cogdill Rd
Box 22995
Knoxville, TX 37933

Aimee Lee
Manager, Interconnection Services
Level 3 Communications, LLC
1025 Eldorado Blvd.
Broomfield, CO 80021

III. COMMISSION AUTHORITY

Under the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (“the Act”), the Commission has the authority to grant the relief requested by New London. Specifically, Section 252(a) of the Act provides:

(a) AGREEMENTS ARRIVED AT THROUGH NEGOTIATION

- (1) **VOLUNTARY NEGOTIATIONS.** -- Upon receiving a request for interconnection, services, or network elements pursuant to section 251, an incumbent local exchange carrier may negotiate and enter into a binding agreement with the requesting telecommunications carrier or carriers without regard to the standards set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 251. The agreement shall include a detailed schedule of itemized charges for interconnection and each service or network element included in the agreement. The agreement, including any interconnection agreement negotiated before the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, shall be submitted to the State commission under subsection (e) of this section.

IV. STANDARD OF REVIEW

Under Section 252 of the Act, the Commission has the authority to approve an agreement negotiated between an incumbent local exchange company (ILEC) and

other telecommunications carriers. The Commission may only reject an agreement if the agreement is discriminatory to a nonparty or is inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. Section 252(e)(2) of the Act provides as follows:

GROUND FOR REJECTION.-- The State Commission may only reject --

- (A) an agreement (or any portion thereof) adopted by negotiation under subsection (a) if it finds that --
 - (i) the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or
 - (ii) the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity;

The affidavit of Ms. Linda Lowrance, Manager-Interconnection for New London, establishes that the Agreement satisfies these standards. (Affidavit, Attachment I)

V. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, New London respectfully requests that the Commission issue an Order that: (1) approves expeditiously the Mutual Traffic Exchange Agreement between New London and Level 3, and (2) grants such other relief as is reasonable in the circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Brian T. McCartney

Brian T. McCartney Mo. #47788
BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND P.C.
312 East Capitol Avenue, P.O. Box 456
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456
bmccartney@brydonlaw.com
(573) 635-7166
(573) 634-7431 (FAX)

Attorneys for New London Telephone Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document this 15th day of August, 2006, to the following parties:

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

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

Linda Lowrance
TDS Telecom
9737 Cogdill Rd
Box 22995
Knoxville, TX 37933

Aimee Lee
Manager, Interconnection Services
Level 3 Communications, LLC
1025 Eldorado Blvd.
Broomfield, CO 80021

/s/ Brian T. McCartney

Brian T. McCartney