

MP

**STATE OF MISSOURI  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

At a Session of the Public Service  
Commission held at its office  
in Jefferson City on the 17th  
day of November, 1998.

In the Matter of the Master Resale Agreement    )  
of Sprint Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Sprint and        )  
Green Hills Telecommunications Services.        )    **Case No. TO-99-75**

**ORDER APPROVING INTERCONNECTION AND RESALE AGREEMENT**

Sprint Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Sprint (Sprint) and Green Hills Telecommunications Services (Green Hills) filed a Joint Application with the Commission on August 21, 1998, for approval of a master interconnection and resale agreement (Agreement) under the provisions of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act). The Agreement was filed pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act). See 47 U.S.C. § 251, *et seq.* Green Hills wants to resell basic local exchange service to residential and business end users. The parties stated that there are no unresolved issues, the Agreement is in compliance with Section 252(e) of the Act and with Missouri Senate Bill No. 507, effective August 28, 1996, is not discriminatory, and is consistent with the public interest. The joint applicants requested expeditious approval of the Agreement.

On August 28, 1998, the Commission issued its Order and Notice regarding this joint application notifying any interested parties of the September 17, 1998 deadline date for filing a request for intervention. No interventions were filed. No comments or requests for hearing were

filed. The Commission Staff (Staff) filed a Memorandum on October 21, recommending that the Agreement be approved.

The requirement for a hearing is met when the opportunity for hearing has been provided and no proper party has requested the opportunity to present evidence. State ex rel. Rex Deffenderfer Enterprises, Inc. v. Public Service Commission, 776 S.W.2d 494, 496 (Mo. App. 1989). Since no one has asked permission to participate or requested a hearing in this case, the Commission may grant the relief requested based on the verified application.

### **Discussion**

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e) of the Act, has authority to approve an interconnection agreement negotiated between an incumbent local exchange company (LEC) and a new provider of basic local exchange service. The Commission may reject an interconnection agreement only if the agreement is discriminatory or is inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity.

Staff stated in its recommendation that the terms of this Agreement are similar to another master interconnection and resale agreement previously approved by the Commission, between Sprint and Digital Teleport, Inc. in Case No. TO-98-145 on December 31, 1997. The Master Interconnection and Resale Agreement between Sprint and Green Hills will become effective on the date of its approval, and the interconnection agreement will become effective by operation of law on November 19, 1998. The initial term of the contract will extend until June 1999. After the initial term of the contract, the agreement will be subject to renegotiation. The Agreement may be terminated by either party subject to rules for notice, default, mediation, and continuation

of service as established in the Agreement. The Staff stated in its recommendation that the Agreement meets the limited requirements of the Act in that it does not appear to be discriminatory toward nonparties, and does not appear to be against the public interest. Staff recommended approval of the Agreement provided that all modifications to the Agreement be submitted to the Commission for approval. This condition has been applied in prior cases where the Commission has approved similar agreements.

### **Findings of Fact**

The Missouri Public Service Commission, having considered all of the competent and substantial evidence upon the whole record, makes the following findings of fact.

The Commission has considered the application, the supporting documentation, and Staff's recommendation. Based upon that review the Commission has reached the conclusion that the resale Agreement meets the requirements of the Act in that it does not unduly discriminate against a nonparty carrier, and implementation of the Agreement is not inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity. The Commission finds that approval of the Agreement should be conditioned upon the parties submitting any modifications or amendments to the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure set out below.

### **Modification Procedure**

This Commission's first duty is to review all resale and interconnection agreements, whether arrived at through negotiation or arbitration, as mandated by the Act. 47 U.S.C. § 252. In order for the Commission's role of review and approval to be effective, the Commission

must also review and approve modifications to these agreements. The Commission has a further duty to make a copy of every resale and interconnection agreement available for public inspection. 47 U.S.C. § 252(h). This duty is in keeping with the Commission's practice under its own rules of requiring telecommunications companies to keep their rate schedules on file with the Commission. 4 CSR 240-30.010.

The parties to each resale or interconnection agreement must maintain a complete and current copy of the agreement, together with all modifications, in the Commission's offices. Any proposed modification must be submitted for Commission approval, whether the modification arises through negotiation, arbitration, or by means of alternative dispute resolution procedures.

The parties shall provide the Telecommunications Staff with a copy of the resale or interconnection agreement with the pages numbered consecutively in the lower right-hand corner. Modifications to an agreement must be submitted to the Staff for review. When approved the modified pages will be substituted in the agreement which should contain the number of the page being replaced in the lower right-hand corner. Staff will date-stamp the pages when they are inserted into the Agreement. The official record of the original agreement and all the modifications made will be maintained by the Telecommunications Staff in the Commission's tariff room.

The Commission does not intend to conduct a full proceeding each time the parties agree to a modification. Where a proposed modification is identical to a provision that has been approved by the Commission in another agreement, the modification will be approved once Staff has verified that the provision is an approved provision, and prepared a

recommendation advising approval. Where a proposed modification is not contained in another approved agreement, Staff will review the modification and its effects and prepare a recommendation advising the Commission whether the modification should be approved. The Commission may approve the modification based on the Staff recommendation. If the Commission chooses not to approve the modification, the Commission will establish a case, give notice to interested parties and permit responses. The Commission may conduct a hearing if it is deemed necessary.

### **Conclusions of Law**

The Missouri Public Service Commission has arrived at the following conclusions of law.

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e)(1) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C. 252(e)(1), is required to review negotiated resale agreements. It may only reject a negotiated agreement upon a finding that its implementation would be discriminatory to a nonparty or inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity under Section 252(e)(2)(A). Based upon its review of the Master Interconnection and Resale Agreement between Sprint and Green Hills and its findings of fact, the Commission concludes that the Agreement is neither discriminatory nor inconsistent with the public interest and should be approved.

### **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

1. That the Master Interconnection and Resale Agreement between Sprint Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Sprint and Green Hills Telecommunications Services filed on August 21, 1998, is approved.

2. That Sprint Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Sprint and Green Hills Telecommunications Services shall file a copy of this Agreement with the

Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, with the pages numbered seriatim in the lower right-hand corner no later than November 27, 1998. The parties shall file on the same date a notice in the official case file advising the Commission that the Agreement has been submitted to Staff as required.

3. That any changes or modifications to this Agreement shall be filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure outlined in this order.

4. That the Commission, by approving this Agreement, makes no finding on the completion by Sprint Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Sprint or Green Hills Telecommunications Services of any of the requirements of the competitive checklist found in 47 U.S.C. § 271.

5. That this order shall become effective on November 27, 1998.

**BY THE COMMISSION**



**Dale Hardy Roberts**  
**Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge**

( S E A L )

Lumpe, Ch., Crumpton, Murray,  
and Drainer, CC., concur.  
Schemenauer, C., absent.

Register, Regulatory Law Judge

