

Commissioners

SHEILA LUMPE Chair

M. DIANNE DRAINER Vice Chair

CONNIE MURRAY

ROBERT G. SCHEMENAUER

KELVIN L. SIMMONS

Missouri Public Service Commission

POST OFFICE BOX 360 JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102 573-751-3234 573-751-1847 (Fax Number) http://www.psc.state.mo.us

July 17, 2000

BRIAN D. KINKADE Executive Director

GORDON L. PERSINGER Director, Research and Public Affairs

> WESS A. HENDERSON Director, Utility Operations

ROBERT SCHALLENBERG Director, Utility Services

DONNA M. KOLILIS Director, Administration

DALE HARDY ROBERTS Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

> DANA K. JOYCE General Counsel

FILED3
JUL 1 7 2000 1

Mr. Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge Missouri Public Service Commission P. O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

RE: Case No. TA-2000-607

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Enclosed for filing in the above-captioned case are an original and eight (8) conformed copies of SUGGESTIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE UNANIMOUS STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT.

This filing has been mailed or hand-delivered this date to all counsel of record.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce H. Bates

Assistant General Counsel

(573) 751-7434

(573) 751-9285 (Fax)

BB/df Enclosure

cc: Counsel of Record

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

	FILED	3
N	JUL 1 7 2000 L	,
Se ^{\(\)}	lissouri Public ice Commission	
	" nission)

In the Matter of the Application of Advanced
TelCom Group, Inc. for a Certificate of
Service Authority to Provide Basic Local
Telecommunications Service in Portions of
the State of Missouri and to Classify Said
Service as Competitive.

Case No. TA-2000-607

SUGGESTIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE UNANIMOUS STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT

Comes now the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Staff") and in support of the *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement* filed in this matter states as follows:

- 1. Advanced TelCom Group, Inc. ("ATG" or "Applicant") agreed in the *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement*, Paragraph 5, that its *Application* may be granted on condition that its tariffs become effective. Applicant also agrees to file a list of its interconnection or resale agreements or explain why the Applicant does not need an interconnection or resale agreement in order to begin business.¹
- 2. The application process envisioned in the *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement* requires that Applicant: a) file a complete application, including such undertakings as the Parties have deemed essential; b) enter into an interconnection or resale agreement and file it for approval (except as discussed in Paragraph 1); and c) file tariffs for approval. Staff believes this three-step process provides the necessary protections without unduly burdening or delaying certification.

The Parties were reluctant to completely rule out the possibility that an applicant could do business in a way that would not require an interconnection agreement, although no one could imagine such a scenario at this time; this provision would afford incumbent LECs the opportunity to challenge the feasibility of an assertion that no interconnection agreements were necessary.

- As indicated in Paragraph 10 of the Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement, all 3. parties to this docket agreed that the Applicant should be classified as a competitive telecommunications company, and all of the telecommunications services it offers should be classified as competitive. However, the Staff and other parties expressed concern about classifying exchange access service as competitive. The end user, not the access customer (presently the interexchange carrier [IXC]), determines whose services will be used. Accordingly, an IXC does not have the option to avoid a certain LEC because its access charges are too high; if the IXC's customer is served by that LEC, the IXC will have to buy access from that LEC. To address this concern, the Parties devised an access rate "cap" that places an upper limit on access rates at the lowest level charged by the LECs in whose service territories the Applicant will be initially certificated. This access rate cap is discussed and stipulated to in Paragraph 4. Although access services would technically be classified as competitive, the Applicant may not avail itself of the near automatic rate changes normally afforded to competitive services in Sections 392.500 and .510, RSMo. (1994). Instead, any increases in switched access service rates above the cap shall be made pursuant to Sections 392.220, RSMo. (Cum.Supp. 1999), and 392.230, RSMo. (1994). Such a mechanism is permissible because Sections 392.361.5 and .6, RSMo (1994) authorize the Commission to impose conditions on competitive classification rate changes that are reasonably necessary to protect the public interest.
- 4. The *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement* provides, in Paragraph 4, that the Applicant will adhere to the same quality of service and billing standards as those to which the incumbent LECs must adhere. The requested waivers in the *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement* include the waivers listed in the *Notice of Applications* except Subsection 392.240(1)

is omitted from the *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement* at the request of intervenor Southwestern Bell Telephone Company. Because the Applicant was willing to sign the *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement* that did not include this waiver, Staff was willing to do likewise rather than potentially delaying Applicant's certification.

- 5. Applicant agrees, in Paragraph 4 of the *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement*, that it will provide equitable access, as determined by the Commission, to all Missourians. Staff believes that such an affirmative statement is not necessarily required, as the statutory section in question is couched in terms of a Commission finding rather than an affirmative undertaking.² However, Staff can see a potential benefit in such an undertaking, so it does not object to including equitable access as an affirmative statement in the *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement*.³
- 6. The Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement was specifically designed to address the five criteria set out in Section 392.455 RSMo (Cum.Supp. 1999), which the Commission must address in the process of certificating new basic local telecommunications service providers.

Applicant possesses sufficient technical, financial and managerial resources and abilities to provide basic local telecommunications service. In Exhibit II of its Application, Applicant demonstrates its managerial and technical abilities. In Exhibit III of its Application, Applicant demonstrates its financial resources and abilities.

Applicant has demonstrated that the services it proposes to offer satisfy the minimum standards established by the Commission. Staff has reviewed the

Section 392.455 RSMo (Cum.Supp. 1999).

As equitable access is a concern, the Commission must address in the certification process. The Parties wanted to bring it to the Commission's attention and assert their belief that this application is in no way inconsistent with equitable access.

Applicant's services and has concluded that the Applicant satisfies the minimum standards established by the Commission.

Applicant has set forth the geographic area in which it proposes to offer service and has demonstrated that such area follows exchange boundaries of the incumbent local exchange telecommunications company and is no smaller than an exchange. Staff has concluded that the geographic area in which the Applicant proposes to offer service follows exchange boundaries and is no smaller than an exchange.

Applicant will offer basic local telecommunications service as a separate and distinct service. Staff has concluded that Applicant will offer basic local telecommunications service as a separate and distinct service.

Applicant has agreed to provide equitable access to affordable telecommunications services for all Missourians, regardless of where they live or their income. Staff has concluded that Applicant will provide equitable access to affordable telecommunications services for all Missourians, regardless of where they live or their income.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Staff believes the *Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement* has adequately addressed the relevant issues and should be approved by the Commission. Staff thereby prays the Commission approve the *Application* of Advanced TelCom Group, Inc. for a certificate of authority to provide basic local telecommunications services and to classify those services as competitive in those exchanges listed in its *Application*.

Respectfully submitted,

DANA K. JOYCE General Counsel

Bruce H. Battes

Assistant General Counsel Missouri Bar No. 35442

Attorneys for the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission P. O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
573-751-7434
573-751-9285 (Fax)
bbates@mail.state.mo.us (E-Mail)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been mailed or hand-delivered to all counsel of record as shown on the service list below this 17th day of July 2000.

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

Judith Rau Rau & Rau 119 E. Mill St. Waterloo, IL 62298

Lance J.M. Steinhart 6455 E. Johns Crossing, Ste. 285 Duluth, GA 30097 Mimi B. MacDonald Southwestern Bell Telephone Company One Bell Center, Room 3510 St. Louis, MO 63101 Service List for Case No. TA-2000-607 July 17, 2000

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

Lance J.M. Steinhart 6455 East Johns Crossing, Ste. 285 Duluth, GA 30155 Paul G. Lane/Mimi B. MacDonald Anthony Conroy/Leo J. Bub Southwestern Bell Telephone Company One Bell Center, Rm. 3520 St. Louis, MO 63101

Judith A. Rau Rau & Rau 119 E. Mill Waterloo, IL 62298