STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
JEFFERSON CITY
January 3, 2002

CASE NO: TO-99-593

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

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

Thomas Parker
Verizon
601 Monroe Street, Suite 304
Jefferson City, MO 65101

James M. Fischer/Larry Dority
Fischer & Dority, P.C.
101 Madison Street, Suite 400
Jefferson City, MO 65101

W. R. England, III/Brian T. McCartney
Brydon, Swearengen & England P.C.
312 E. Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Paul S. DeFord/Kurt U. Schaefer
Lathrop & Gage L. C.
2345 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, MO 64108

Paul H. Gardner
Goller, Gardner & Feather
131 East High Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Paul G. Lane/Leo J. Bub
Anthony K. Conroy/Mimi B. MacDonald
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company
One Bell Center, Rm 3518
St. Louis, MO 63101

Craig S. Johnson
Andereck, Evans, Milne Peace & Baumhoer
PO Box 1438
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Lisa Creighton Hendricks
Sprint
5454 W. 110th Street
Overland Park, KS 66211

Carol Keith
NuVox Communications
16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Suite 500
Chesterfield, MO 63017

Carl J. Lumley
Curtis, Oetting, Heinz, Garrett & Soule, P.C.
130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200
St. Louis, MO 63105

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

Sincerely,

Dale Hardy Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

Uncertified copies :

STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

At a Session of the Public Service Commission held at its office in Jefferson City on the 3rd day of January, 2002.

In the Matter of the Investigation into Signaling Protocols, Call Records, Trunking Arrangements, and Traffic Measurement	))))	**Case No. TO-99-593**

ORDER DENYING REHEARING

On December 21, the MITG filed a "Motion for Ruling on Unresolved Issue and/or Motion for Rehearing." In it, the MITG asks the Commission to make a determination that the Feature Group C signaling protocol is no longer to be provided. Specifically, the MITG's prayer for relief asks the Commission to grant rehearing and direct that its member companies are entitled to no longer make Feature Group C available to any interexchange carrier.

This case was established to investigate certain technical issues not fully developed in Case Number TO-99-254. It was created "to investigate the issues of signaling protocols, call records, trunking arrangements, and traffic measurement." (Order Directing Notice, issued June 15, 1999). Specifically, it was created: 1) to investigate the cost of converting Feature Group C traffic to Feature Group D, and to determine if there would be benefits commensurate with the cost; 2) to determine whether there were additional types of call records (either existing or to be created) that would enhance the exchange of information between companies; 3) to investigate the cost of placing Metropolitan Calling Area traffic (and perhaps other types of traffic) on separate trunks,

and to determine if there would be benefits commensurate with the cost; and 4) to determine if changes were warranted in the way calls are measured and the way information about calls is recorded. Most of the issues for which this case was established were not addressed by the parties. Instead, the attention of the parties was diverted from the purposes for which this case was established in order to deal with the "business relationship" issue raised by the Small Telephone Company Group[1] and the Missouri Independent Telephone Company Group.[2]

At the time the issues in this case were being framed for presentation to the Commission, all parties agreed that there was no issue for the Commission to resolve with respect to signaling protocols. In fact, in its statement of position filed on January 19, 2001, the MITG stated: "[I]t is not necessary at this time for the Commission to make any decision as to what signaling protocols should be used...."

In its December 21 motion, the MITG asks the Commission to make a determination that Feature Group C signaling protocol is no longer to be provided. Not only did the

---

1 The Small Telephone Company Group, or STCG, consists of BPS Telephone Company, Cass County Telephone Company, Citizens Telephone Company of Higginsville, Missouri, Inc., Craw-Kan Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Ellington Telephone Company, Farber Telephone Company, Fidelity Telephone Company, Goodman Telephone Company, Inc., Granby Telephone Company, Grand River Mutual Telephone Corporation, Green Hills Telephone Corporation, Holway Telephone Company, Iamo Telephone Company, KLM Telephone Company, Kingdom Telephone Company, Lathrop Telephone Company, Le-Ru Telephone Company, Mark Twain Rural Telephone Company, McDonald County Telephone Company, Miller Telephone Company, New Florence Telephone Company, Oregon Farmers Mutual Telephone Company, Ozark Telephone Company, Peace Valley Telephone Company, Rock Port Telephone Company, Seneca Telephone Company, Spectra Communications Group, Inc., and Steelville Telephone Exchange, Inc.

2 The Missouri Independent Telephone Company Group, or MITG, consists of Alma Telephone Company, Chariton Valley Telephone Corporation, Choctaw Telephone Company, Mid-Missouri Telephone Company, MoKan Dial, Inc., Modern Telecommunications Company, Northeast Missouri Rural Telephone Company.

MITG never present this issue for decision, it expressly stated that it was not necessary for the Commission to decide it.

On December 21, the STCG filed an application for rehearing. The STCG mistakenly states that this case was "opened to address the small companies' concerns about missing records and unidentified traffic." In fact, it was created to investigate the issues of signaling protocols, call records, trunking arrangements, and traffic measurement, as discussed above. Adoption of Issue 2056 and its enhanced records exchange features is entirely consistent with the purposes for which this case was established. Its adoption is arguably the only proposal of the parties that is consistent with these purposes.

Pursuant to Section 386.500, RSMo 2000, the Commission shall grant a rehearing if in its judgment there is sufficient reason to do so. Neither the MITG nor the STCG has provided sufficient reason for the Commission to grant a rehearing, and the Commission will deny the applications.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That the Motion for Ruling on Unresolved Issue and/or Motion for Rehearing filed by the Missouri Independent Telephone Company Group is denied.

2. That the Application for Rehearing filed by the Small Telephone Company Group is denied.

3. That this order shall become effective on January 3, 2002.

BY THE COMMISSION

Dale Hardy Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Simmons, Ch., Murray, Lumpe, Gaw and Forbis, CC., concur

Mills, Deputy Chief Regulatory Law Judge

ALJ/Secretary: Mills/KB for

Date Circulated 12-31

CASE NO. TD-99-593

Simmons, Chair KS

Murray, Commissioner

Lumpe, Commissioner

Gaw, Commissioner

Forbis, Commissioner

Agenda Date 1-3

Action taken: 5-0 AS

Must Vote Not Later Than

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 3rd day of Jan. 2002 .

Dale Hardy Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge