

**STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
JEFFERSON CITY**

October 2, 2001

CASE NO: TO-2002-72

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

Paul S. DeFord, Esq.
Lathrop & Gage, L.C.
2345 Grand Boulevard, Suite 2800
Kansas City, MO 64108

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

Legal Department
TDS Telecommunications Corporation
P. O. Box 22995
9737 Cogdill Road, Suite 230
Knoxville, TN 37933-0995

Enclosed find certified copy of an ORDER in the above-numbered case(s).

Sincerely,



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

Uncertified Copies:

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

Application of AT&T Wireless Services, Inc.)
for Approval of Interconnection Agreement)

Case No. TO-2002-72

ORDER APPROVING INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT

This order approves the proposed interconnection agreement between the parties.

On August 15, 2001, AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., filed an application with the Missouri Public Service Commission for approval of a wireless interconnection agreement with the following incumbent local exchange telephone companies: TDS Telecommunications Corporation, individually and as agent for its parent and affiliate companies, i.e., New London Telephone Company, Orchard Farm Telephone Company, and The Stoutland Telephone Company. AT&T Wireless filed supplemental information about its application on September 14, 2001, and on September 21, 2001. The Agreement was filed under Section 252(e)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.¹ The Agreement would permit interconnection on an indirect basis for the purpose of exchanging traffic between the parties' customers.

Although TDS is a party to the Agreement, it did not join in the application. On August 22, 2001, the Commission issued an order making TDS a party in this case and

¹ See 47 U.S.C. Section 251, *et seq.*

directing any party wishing to request a hearing to do so no later than September 11, 2001. No requests for hearing were filed.

The *Deffenderfer* case held that 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.² Since no one has requested a hearing, the Commission may grant the relief requested based on the application.

The Staff of the Commission filed a memorandum and recommendation on September 19, 2001, recommending that the Agreement be approved.

Discussion

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

The Staff memorandum recommends that the Agreement be approved, and notes 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 recommends that the Commission direct the parties to submit any further modifications or amendments to the Commission for approval.

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.

² *State ex rel. Rex Deffenderfer Enterprises, Inc. v. Public Service Commission*, 776 S.W.2d 494, 496 (Mo. App. 1989).

The Commission has considered the application, the supporting documentation, and Staff's recommendation. Based upon that review, the Commission concludes that the 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 under the procedure set out below.

Modification Procedure

The Commission has a duty to review all resale and interconnection agreements, whether arrived at through negotiation or arbitration, as mandated by the Act.³ In order for the Commission's role of review and approval to be effective, the Commission must also review and approve or recognize modifications to these agreements. The Commission has a further duty to make a copy of every resale and interconnection agreement available for public inspection.⁴ 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 under Commission Rule 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 or recognition, whether the modification arises through negotiation, arbitration, or by means of alternative dispute resolution procedures.

³ 47 U.S.C. Section 252.

⁴ 47 U.S.C. Section 252(h).

Modifications to an agreement must be submitted to the Staff for review. If approved or recognized, 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. When a proposed modification is identical to a provision that has been approved by the Commission in another agreement, the Commission will take notice of the modification once Staff has verified that the provision is an approved provision and prepared a recommendation. When 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 reject a negotiated agreement only 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 Agreement between AT&T Wireless and TDS 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 interconnection agreement between AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., and TDS Telecommunications Corporation, individually and as agent for its parent and affiliate companies, i.e., New London Telephone Company, Orchard Farm Telephone Company, and The Stoutland Telephone Company, filed on August 15, 2001, is approved.
2. That any changes or modifications to this Agreement must be filed with the Commission under the procedure outlined in this order.
3. That this order will become effective on October 12, 2001.
4. That this case may be closed on October 13, 2001.

BY THE COMMISSION



Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Bill Hopkins, Senior Regulatory Law Judge,
by delegation of authority under
Section 386.240, RSMo 2000.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 2nd day of October, 2001.

FYI: To Be Issued By Delegation

ALJ/Secretary: Hopkins/He

Date Circulated 9-28 Return by 10-3
10am

CASE NO. TD-2002-72

KS
Simmons, Chair

CM
Murray, Commissioner

JS
Lumpe, Commissioner

Advent
Gaw, Commissioner

C
Commissioner

STATE OF MISSOURI

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I have compared the preceding copy with the original on file in this office and

I do hereby certify the same to be a true copy therefrom and the whole thereof.

WITNESS my hand and seal of the Public Service Commission, at Jefferson City,

Missouri, this 2nd day of Oct. 2001.

Dale Hardy Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts

Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

