

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

In the Matter of the Petition for	)	
Arbitration of Unresolved Issues	)	Case No. TO-2006-0147
in a Section 251(b)(5) Agreement	)	Consolidated with TO-2006-0151
with T-Mobile USA, Inc.	)	

PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO ORDER DIRECTING FILING

On February 16, 2006, the Commission issued its Order Directing Filing in the above-referenced matter requiring, among other things, that Petitioners "re-run their cost studies using the inputs and assumptions described in Issues 3 through 13 of the Preliminary Arbitrator's Report and to file the results no later than February 24, 2006". Attached hereto are summary results for two (2) cost studies showing individual and composite costs for Petitioners: (1) Assuming that Petitioners will be responsible for transport from their host/stand-alone switch(es) to the nearest large LEC switch or end office and (2) Assuming Petitioners are responsible for transport from their host/stand-alone switch(es) to the nearest large LEC tandem.¹ (The reason for these two scenarios is more fully addressed in Issue No. 7 below). The underlying documentation supporting these revised cost studies is being provided to Respondents and the Arbitration Panel under separate cover. The attached revised cost studies reflect the inputs and assumptions described in Issues 3 through 13 of the Preliminary Arbitration Report and those inputs and assumptions are more specifically described as follows:

¹ Petitioners are providing these revised cost studies at the direction of the Commission. Accordingly, Petitioners do not necessarily concur with or accept the inputs and assumptions contained in the Preliminary Arbitration Report or the resulting costs.

Issue No. 3. What are Petitioners' forward-looking costs to purchase and install new switches?

Although the Arbitrator adopted the T-Mobile/Cingular position on this issue, by virtue of the Preliminary Arbitration Report Finding on Issue No. 4, the revised cost studies reflect a per line switch cost of only \$18.33 per line.

Issue No. 4. What is the appropriate value for the usage-sensitive portion of Petitioners' forward-looking and office switching costs?

The Preliminary Arbitration Report adopted the T-Mobile/Cingular position on this issue. Accordingly, Petitioners' cost studies have been re-run with Respondents' traffic sensitive switch value input of \$18.33 per line.

Issue No. 5. What is the appropriate floor space attributable to switching?

The Preliminary Arbitration Report adopted T-Mobile/Cingular's position. Respondents' position allowed for two hundred (200) square feet for a stand alone/host switch and one hundred (100) square feet for a remote switch. Because the HAI model cannot distinguish the switch room size based on whether the switch is a host or remote office, Petitioners have revised the cost study using one hundred (100) square feet for both host and remote offices². Accordingly, this will understate Petitioners' switch costs attributable to floor space.

² Petitioners' revised costs studies differ from its Response to Respondents' Motion for Expedited Clarification, wherein Petitioners indicated they would re-run the costs studies using two hundred (200) square feet for both host and remote offices).

Issue No. 6. What is the appropriate minute of use (MOU) forward looking and office switching costs for all Petitioners?

Petitioners' forward looking switch costs given the inputs and assumptions contained in the Preliminary Arbitration Report are shown on the attached revised cost studies on the line identified as "end office switching."

Issue No. 7. What are Petitioners' appropriate, forward looking interoffice cable links?

The Preliminary Arbitration Report adopted T-Mobile's position; however, this decision was conditioned "on cables going to the nearest switch; not necessarily the nearest SBC switch, but the nearest large LEC tandem switch." Because it is not clear to Petitioners whether the Arbitrator intended for the Petitioners to calculate cable lengths to the nearest large LEC switch (i.e. end office) or the nearest large LEC tandem switch, Petitioners have prepared two revised cost studies for each scenario. The first scenario (i.e. end office scenario) calculates transport costs to the nearest large LEC switch or end office (using mileages calculated by Petitioners' cost consultant based on switch locations (V and H coordinates) in the HAI model). The second scenario (i.e. tandem scenario) calculates transport costs to the nearest large LEC tandem switch (using mileages calculated by Petitioners' cost consultant based on switch locations (V and H coordinates) in the HAI model). Petitioners do not believe that either scenario is totally realistic or appropriate, but nevertheless produce both because one, or the other, directly responds to the Preliminary Arbitration Report finding. It is Petitioners' belief that the more realistic and appropriate assumption for interoffice cable length is to assume that Petitioners will extend their facilities to the

nearest large LEC host or standalone switch, and Petitioners are willing to re-run their cost studies under this assumption if the Commission agrees. (This issue is also discussed in Petitioners' Comments in Response to the Preliminary Arbitration Report).

Issue No. 8. What are the appropriate cable sizes?

The Preliminary Arbitration Report adopted Petitioners' position. Accordingly, Petitioners' revised cost studies utilize the HAI input value of 24 fiber cable.

Issue No. 9. What is the appropriate amount of sharing of Petitioners' interoffice cabling in order to reflect sharing with services other than transport and termination?

The Preliminary Arbitration Report adopted Petitioners' position. Accordingly, the revised cost study incorporates the HAI input value which recognizes the sharing of interoffice facilities for uses other than for IXC/wireless transport and termination.

Issue No. 10. What is the appropriate sizing of Petitioners' forward looking, interoffice transmission equipment?

The Preliminary Arbitration Report adopts Petitioners' position. Accordingly, Petitioners' revised cost studies include the HAI input value for interoffice transmission equipment (including OC48 transmission equipment).

Issue No. 11. What are the appropriate forward looking common transport costs for each Petitioner?

Petitioners' forward looking transport costs, given the inputs and assumptions contained in the Preliminary Arbitration Report, are shown on the revised cost studies on the line identified as "common transport."

Issue No. 12. Should any of the costs identified in HAI as dedicated transport be included in Petitioners' transport and termination rates?

The Preliminary Arbitration Report recited Petitioners' concern with the way in which the HAI model identifies common and dedicated transport. The Preliminary Arbitration Report then concludes that only common transport should be included in this cost. Accordingly, Petitioners have excluded any costs for the direct transport element from their revised cost studies. It was necessary, however, for Petitioners to correct the formula in cell AC2 of the "wire center investment" worksheet of the HAI switching model so that the tandem routed access trunks will be counted as common trunks only, not as both common trunks and direct or dedicated trunks.

Issue No. 13. What is the appropriate value of Petitioners forward looking signaling costs?

The Preliminary Arbitration Report adopted Petitioners' position, but further directed that the distance for the signaling links should be consistent with the distances established in Issue No. 7. Accordingly, Petitioners have used the HAI model calculation for signaling link costs adjusted to reflect the mileage utilized for purposes of Issue No. 7.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ W.R. England, III

W.R. England, III Mo #23975
BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND, P.C.
312 East Capitol Avenue
P.O. Box 456
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 635-7166 Phone
(573) 635-0427 Fax
Trip@brydonlaw.com

Attorneys for Petitioners'

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was delivered by first class mail, electronic mail or hand delivery, on this 24th day of February, 2006 to the following:

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

Office of the Public Counsel
P.O. Box 2230
Jefferson City, MO 65102

/s/ W.R. England, III

Prelim. Arbitrator Order-Cingular/T-Mobile
End Office Scenario
Reciprocal Compensation Cost Summary

Company Name	Bps Tel Co	Cass County Tel Co	Citizens Telephone Co - Missouri	Craw - Kan Telephone Cooperative Inc - Missouri	Ellington Telephone Company	Farber Telephone Co	Goodman Tel Co
Reciprocal Compensation-End Office Scenario							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0012	\$ 0.0013	\$ 0.0017	\$ 0.0009
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0009	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0024	\$ 0.0039	\$ 0.0054	\$ 0.0012
Dedicated Transport	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Common Transport	\$ 0.0150	\$ 0.0168	\$ 0.0121	\$ 0.0418	\$ 0.0477	\$ 0.0670	\$ 0.0219
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0166	\$ 0.0185	\$ 0.0136	\$ 0.0454	\$ 0.0528	\$ 0.0741	\$ 0.0239
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filing							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0096	\$ 0.0091	\$ 0.0089	\$ 0.0106	\$ 0.0108	\$ 0.0131	\$ 0.0099
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0011	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0053	\$ 0.0156	\$ 0.0105	\$ 0.0020
Dedicated Transport	\$ 0.0061	\$ 0.0094	\$ 0.0097	\$ 0.0295	\$ 0.0719	\$ 0.0472	\$ 0.0153
Common Transport	\$ 0.0106	\$ 0.0163	\$ 0.0181	\$ 0.0626	\$ 0.1478	\$ 0.1147	\$ 0.0280
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0269	\$ 0.0358	\$ 0.0381	\$ 0.1080	\$ 0.2461	\$ 0.1854	\$ 0.0552
Difference - End Office Scenario to Original							
End Office Switching	\$ (0.0088)	\$ (0.0083)	\$ (0.0082)	\$ (0.0094)	\$ (0.0096)	\$ (0.0113)	\$ (0.0091)
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0001	\$ (0.0002)	\$ (0.0006)	\$ (0.0029)	\$ (0.0117)	\$ (0.0051)	\$ (0.0008)
Dedicated Transport	\$ (0.0061)	\$ (0.0094)	\$ (0.0097)	\$ (0.0295)	\$ (0.0719)	\$ (0.0472)	\$ (0.0153)
Common Transport	\$ 0.0043	\$ 0.0005	\$ (0.0060)	\$ (0.0208)	\$ (0.1001)	\$ (0.0477)	\$ (0.0060)
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ (0.0104)	\$ (0.0173)	\$ (0.0244)	\$ (0.0626)	\$ (0.1932)	\$ (0.1113)	\$ (0.0312)

Company Name	Granby Tel Co - Missouri	Grand River Mutual Tel Corp - Mo	Green Hills Telephone Corp	Holway Telephone Company	Iamo Telephone Company - Mo	Kingdom Telephone Company	Klm Tel Co
Reciprocal Compensation-End Office Scenario							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0011	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0009	\$ 0.0012
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0005	\$ 0.0029	\$ 0.0039	\$ 0.0039	\$ 0.0085	\$ 0.0020	\$ 0.0036
Dedicated Transport	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Common Transport	\$ 0.0122	\$ 0.0398	\$ 0.0454	\$ 0.0648	\$ 0.0860	\$ 0.0315	\$ 0.0438
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0135	\$ 0.0438	\$ 0.0507	\$ 0.0701	\$ 0.0960	\$ 0.0344	\$ 0.0487
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filings							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0096	\$ 0.0103	\$ 0.0117	\$ 0.0115	\$ 0.0114	\$ 0.0098	\$ 0.0115
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0066	\$ 0.0068	\$ 0.0059	\$ 0.0137	\$ 0.0193	\$ 0.0021	\$ 0.0056
Dedicated Transport	\$ 0.0067	\$ 0.0262	\$ 0.0229	\$ 0.0762	\$ 0.0766	\$ 0.0131	\$ 0.0254
Common Transport	\$ 0.0099	\$ 0.0695	\$ 0.0628	\$ 0.1598	\$ 0.1876	\$ 0.0297	\$ 0.0564
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0268	\$ 0.1128	\$ 0.1033	\$ 0.2613	\$ 0.2949	\$ 0.0547	\$ 0.0988
Difference - End Office Scenario to Original Filings							
End Office Switching	\$ (0.0088)	\$ (0.0092)	\$ (0.0103)	\$ (0.0101)	\$ (0.0100)	\$ (0.0089)	\$ (0.0102)
ISUP Signaling	\$ (0.0000)	\$ (0.0039)	\$ (0.0020)	\$ (0.0098)	\$ (0.0107)	\$ (0.0001)	\$ (0.0020)
Dedicated Transport	\$ (0.0067)	\$ (0.0262)	\$ (0.0229)	\$ (0.0762)	\$ (0.0766)	\$ (0.0131)	\$ (0.0254)
Common Transport	\$ 0.0023	\$ (0.0297)	\$ (0.0174)	\$ (0.0951)	\$ (0.1016)	\$ 0.0018	\$ (0.0126)
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ (0.0133)	\$ (0.0691)	\$ (0.0526)	\$ (0.1912)	\$ (0.1989)	\$ (0.0202)	\$ (0.0502)

Prelim. Arbitrator Order-Cingular/T-Mobile
End Office Scenario
Reciprocal Compensation Cost Summary

Company Name	Lathrop Telephone Company	Le-Ru Telephone Company	Mark Twain Rural Telephone Co	Mcdonald County Telephone Co	Miller Telephone Company - Mo	New Florence Telephone Co	Oregon Farmers Mutual Tel Co
Reciprocal Compensation-End Office Sc							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0009	\$ 0.0013	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0011	\$ 0.0007
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0015	\$ 0.0045	\$ 0.0011	\$ 0.0010	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0009
Dedicated Transport	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Common Transport	\$ 0.0129	\$ 0.0358	\$ 0.0551	\$ 0.0251	\$ 0.0215	\$ 0.0230	\$ 0.0194
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0143	\$ 0.0382	\$ 0.0610	\$ 0.0270	\$ 0.0233	\$ 0.0255	\$ 0.0211
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filin							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0099	\$ 0.0094	\$ 0.0115	\$ 0.0094	\$ 0.0100	\$ 0.0102	\$ 0.0096
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0009	\$ 0.0024	\$ 0.0036	\$ 0.0019	\$ 0.0011	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0012
Dedicated Transport	\$ 0.0155	\$ 0.0227	\$ 0.0139	\$ 0.0151	\$ 0.0160	\$ 0.0102	\$ 0.0195
Common Transport	\$ 0.0204	\$ 0.0392	\$ 0.0397	\$ 0.0290	\$ 0.0226	\$ 0.0212	\$ 0.0258
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0466	\$ 0.0738	\$ 0.0686	\$ 0.0554	\$ 0.0497	\$ 0.0430	\$ 0.0561
Difference - End Office Scenario to Origir							
End Office Switching	\$ (0.0091)	\$ (0.0085)	\$ (0.0102)	\$ (0.0087)	\$ (0.0092)	\$ (0.0091)	\$ (0.0089)
ISUP Signaling	\$ (0.0003)	\$ (0.0009)	\$ 0.0010	\$ (0.0008)	\$ (0.0001)	\$ 0.0000	\$ (0.0002)
Dedicated Transport	\$ (0.0155)	\$ (0.0227)	\$ (0.0139)	\$ (0.0151)	\$ (0.0160)	\$ (0.0102)	\$ (0.0195)
Common Transport	\$ (0.0075)	\$ (0.0035)	\$ 0.0154	\$ (0.0039)	\$ (0.0010)	\$ 0.0018	\$ (0.0064)
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ (0.0323)	\$ (0.0356)	\$ (0.0077)	\$ (0.0284)	\$ (0.0264)	\$ (0.0175)	\$ (0.0350)

Prelim. Arbitrator Order-CingularT-Mobile
End Office Scenario
Reciprocal Compensation Cost Summary

Company Name	Ozark Tel Co	Peace Valley Telephone Co	Rock Port Tel Co	Seneca Tel Co	Steelville Tel Exch Inc
Reciprocal Compensation-End Office Scenario					
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0011	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0008
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0009	\$ 0.0038	\$ 0.0012	\$ 0.0009	\$ 0.0011
Dedicated Transport	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Common Transport	\$ 0.0261	\$ 0.0553	\$ 0.0151	\$ 0.0176	\$ 0.0178
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0278	\$ 0.0603	\$ 0.0171	\$ 0.0192	\$ 0.0196
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filing					
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0094	\$ 0.0103	\$ 0.0093	\$ 0.0089	\$ 0.0089
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0015	\$ 0.0196	\$ 0.0088	\$ 0.0013	\$ 0.0009
Dedicated Transport	\$ 0.0246	\$ 0.1581	\$ 0.0437	\$ 0.0116	\$ 0.0047
Common Transport	\$ 0.0327	\$ 0.2716	\$ 0.0850	\$ 0.0200	\$ 0.0117
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0681	\$ 0.4596	\$ 0.1469	\$ 0.0418	\$ 0.0263
Difference - End Office Scenario to Original					
End Office Switching	\$ (0.0086)	\$ (0.0092)	\$ (0.0085)	\$ (0.0082)	\$ (0.0082)
ISUP Signaling	\$ (0.0006)	\$ (0.0158)	\$ (0.0076)	\$ (0.0004)	\$ 0.0002
Dedicated Transport	\$ (0.0246)	\$ (0.1581)	\$ (0.0437)	\$ (0.0116)	\$ (0.0047)
Common Transport	\$ (0.0066)	\$ (0.2163)	\$ (0.0700)	\$ (0.0024)	\$ 0.0060
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ (0.0403)	\$ (0.3993)	\$ (0.1298)	\$ (0.0226)	\$ (0.0067)

Prelim. Arbitrator Order-Cingular/T-Mobile
End Office Scenario
Reciprocal Compensation Cost Summary
Composite of Companies

	Cingular Petitioners			T-Mobile Petitioners		
	Total Cost	Billing Units	Composite Rate	Total Cost	Billing Units	Composite Rate
Reciprocal Compensation						
End Office Switching	\$ 776,705	816,771,749	\$ 0.0010	\$ 719,042	741,760,257	\$ 0.0010
ISUP Signaling	\$ 1,694,978	816,771,749	\$ 0.0021	\$ 1,623,107	741,760,257	\$ 0.0022
Dedicated Transport	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -
Common Transport	\$ 10,753,860	353,965,162	\$ 0.0304	\$ 10,061,486	321,457,967	\$ 0.0313
Tandem Switching	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation			\$ 0.0334			\$ 0.0345
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filing						
End Office Switching	\$ 8,126,937	816,771,749	\$ 0.0100	\$ 7,429,761	741,760,257	\$ 0.0100
ISUP Signaling	\$ 3,249,561	816,771,749	\$ 0.0040	\$ 3,133,230	741,760,257	\$ 0.0042
Dedicated Transport	\$ 8,463,450	336,767,805	\$ 0.0251	\$ 7,957,448	309,768,525	\$ 0.0257
Common Transport	\$ 15,996,460	353,965,162	\$ 0.0452	\$ 15,154,597	321,457,967	\$ 0.0471
Tandem Switching	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation			\$ 0.0843			\$ 0.0871
Difference - End Office Scenario to Original						
End Office Switching	\$ (7,350,233)	-	\$ (0.0090)	\$ (6,710,719)	-	\$ (0.0090)
ISUP Signaling	\$ (1,554,583)	-	\$ (0.0019)	\$ (1,510,123)	-	\$ (0.0020)
Dedicated Transport	\$ (8,463,450)	(336,767,805)	\$ (0.0251)	\$ (7,957,448)	(309,768,525)	\$ (0.0257)
Common Transport	\$ (5,242,599)	-	\$ (0.0148)	\$ (5,093,110)	-	\$ (0.0158)
Tandem Switching	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation			\$ (0.0508)			\$ (0.0526)

Note: Petitioners Goodman, Seneca, and Ozark were not Petitioners in the T-Mobile Arbitration

Prelim. Arbitrator Order-Cingular/T-Mobile
Tandem Scenario
Reciprocal Compensation Cost Summary

Company Name	Cass County Tel Co		Citizens Telephone Co - Missouri		Cooperative Inc - Missouri		Ellington Telephone Company	Farber Telephone Co	Goodman Tel Co			
	Bps Tel Co											
Reciprocal Compensation-End Office Scenario												
End Office Switching	\$	0.0007	\$	0.0007	\$	0.0011	\$	0.0012	\$	0.0017	\$	0.0008
ISUP Signaling	\$	0.0016	\$	0.0009	\$	0.0008	\$	0.0060	\$	0.0047	\$	0.0030
Dedicated Transport	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Common Transport	\$	0.0489	\$	0.0221	\$	0.0165	\$	0.1465	\$	0.0755	\$	0.0943
Tandem Switching	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$	0.0512	\$	0.0237	\$	0.0181	\$	0.1537	\$	0.0814	\$	0.0981
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filing												
End Office Switching	\$	0.0096	\$	0.0091	\$	0.0089	\$	0.0106	\$	0.0108	\$	0.0099
ISUP Signaling	\$	0.0007	\$	0.0011	\$	0.0014	\$	0.0053	\$	0.0156	\$	0.0020
Dedicated Transport	\$	0.0061	\$	0.0094	\$	0.0097	\$	0.0295	\$	0.0719	\$	0.0153
Common Transport	\$	0.0106	\$	0.0163	\$	0.0181	\$	0.0626	\$	0.1478	\$	0.0280
Tandem Switching	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$	0.0269	\$	0.0358	\$	0.0381	\$	0.1080	\$	0.2461	\$	0.0552
Difference - Tandem Scenario to Original												
End Office Switching	\$	(0.0088)	\$	(0.0083)	\$	(0.0082)	\$	(0.0095)	\$	(0.0096)	\$	(0.0091)
ISUP Signaling	\$	0.0009	\$	(0.0001)	\$	(0.0006)	\$	0.0007	\$	(0.0109)	\$	0.0010
Dedicated Transport	\$	(0.0061)	\$	(0.0094)	\$	(0.0097)	\$	(0.0295)	\$	(0.0719)	\$	(0.0153)
Common Transport	\$	0.0382	\$	0.0057	\$	(0.0015)	\$	0.0839	\$	(0.0723)	\$	0.0664
Tandem Switching	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$	0.0243	\$	(0.0121)	\$	(0.0200)	\$	0.0457	\$	(0.1646)	\$	0.0429

Prelim. Arbitrator Order-Cingular/T-Mobile
Tandem Scenario
Reciprocal Compensation Cost Summary

Company Name	Granby Tel Co - Missouri	Grand River Mutual Tel Corp - Mo	Green Hills Telephone Corp	Holway Telephone Company	Iamo Telephone Company - Mo	Kingdom Telephone Company	Klm Tel Co
Reciprocal Compensation-End Office Sc							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0011	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0009	\$ 0.0012
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0010	\$ 0.0030	\$ 0.0040	\$ 0.0041	\$ 0.0133	\$ 0.0051	\$ 0.0064
Dedicated Transport	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Common Transport	\$ 0.0435	\$ 0.0462	\$ 0.0575	\$ 0.0674	\$ 0.1307	\$ 0.0752	\$ 0.1416
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0452	\$ 0.0502	\$ 0.0630	\$ 0.0729	\$ 0.1454	\$ 0.0813	\$ 0.1492
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filin							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0096	\$ 0.0103	\$ 0.0117	\$ 0.0115	\$ 0.0114	\$ 0.0098	\$ 0.0115
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0006	\$ 0.0068	\$ 0.0059	\$ 0.0137	\$ 0.0193	\$ 0.0021	\$ 0.0056
Dedicated Transport	\$ 0.0067	\$ 0.0262	\$ 0.0229	\$ 0.0762	\$ 0.0766	\$ 0.0131	\$ 0.0254
Common Transport	\$ 0.0099	\$ 0.0695	\$ 0.0628	\$ 0.1598	\$ 0.1876	\$ 0.0297	\$ 0.0564
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0268	\$ 0.1128	\$ 0.1033	\$ 0.2613	\$ 0.2949	\$ 0.0547	\$ 0.0988
Difference - Tandem Scenario to Original							
End Office Switching	\$ (0.0088)	\$ (0.0093)	\$ (0.0103)	\$ (0.0101)	\$ (0.0100)	\$ (0.0089)	\$ (0.0103)
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0005	\$ (0.0039)	\$ (0.0019)	\$ (0.0097)	\$ (0.0060)	\$ 0.0030	\$ 0.0008
Dedicated Transport	\$ (0.0067)	\$ (0.0262)	\$ (0.0229)	\$ (0.0762)	\$ (0.0766)	\$ (0.0131)	\$ (0.0254)
Common Transport	\$ 0.0336	\$ (0.0233)	\$ (0.0052)	\$ (0.0924)	\$ (0.0569)	\$ 0.0455	\$ 0.0853
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0184	\$ (0.0626)	\$ (0.0403)	\$ (0.1884)	\$ (0.1495)	\$ 0.0266	\$ 0.0504

Prelim. Arbitrator Order-Cingular/T-Mobile
Tandem Scenario
Reciprocal Compensation Cost Summary

Company Name	Lathrop Telephone Company	Le-Ru Telephone Company	Mark Twain Rural Telephone Co	Mcdonald County Telephone Co	Miller Telephone Company - Mo	New Florence Telephone Co	Oregon Farmers Mutual Tel Co
Reciprocal Compensation-End Office Set							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0009	\$ 0.0013	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0010	\$ 0.0007
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0016	\$ 0.0037	\$ 0.0046	\$ 0.0034	\$ 0.0027	\$ 0.0069	\$ 0.0016
Dedicated Transport	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Common Transport	\$ 0.0402	\$ 0.1056	\$ 0.0583	\$ 0.0991	\$ 0.0640	\$ 0.1100	\$ 0.0373
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0425	\$ 0.1101	\$ 0.0642	\$ 0.1031	\$ 0.0674	\$ 0.1179	\$ 0.0396
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filin							
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0099	\$ 0.0094	\$ 0.0115	\$ 0.0094	\$ 0.0100	\$ 0.0102	\$ 0.0096
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0009	\$ 0.0024	\$ 0.0036	\$ 0.0019	\$ 0.0011	\$ 0.0014	\$ 0.0012
Dedicated Transport	\$ 0.0155	\$ 0.0227	\$ 0.0139	\$ 0.0151	\$ 0.0160	\$ 0.0102	\$ 0.0195
Common Transport	\$ 0.0204	\$ 0.0392	\$ 0.0397	\$ 0.0290	\$ 0.0226	\$ 0.0212	\$ 0.0258
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0466	\$ 0.0738	\$ 0.0686	\$ 0.0554	\$ 0.0497	\$ 0.0430	\$ 0.0561
Difference - Tandem Scenario to Original							
End Office Switching	\$ (0.0092)	\$ (0.0086)	\$ (0.0102)	\$ (0.0087)	\$ (0.0092)	\$ (0.0092)	\$ (0.0089)
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0006	\$ 0.0013	\$ 0.0010	\$ 0.0015	\$ 0.0016	\$ 0.0055	\$ 0.0004
Dedicated Transport	\$ (0.0155)	\$ (0.0227)	\$ (0.0139)	\$ (0.0151)	\$ (0.0160)	\$ (0.0102)	\$ (0.0195)
Common Transport	\$ 0.0199	\$ 0.0663	\$ 0.0186	\$ 0.0701	\$ 0.0415	\$ 0.0887	\$ 0.0115
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ (0.0041)	\$ 0.0363	\$ (0.0044)	\$ 0.0477	\$ 0.0178	\$ 0.0749	\$ (0.0165)

Prelim. Arbitrator Order-Cingular/T-Mobile
Tandem Scenario
Reciprocal Compensation Cost Summary

Company Name	Ozark Tel Co	Peace Valley Telephone Co	Rock Port Tel Co	Seneca Tel Co	Steelville Tel Exch Inc
Reciprocal Compensation-End Office Sc					
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0011	\$ 0.0008	\$ 0.0007	\$ 0.0007
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0020	\$ 0.0312	\$ 0.0017	\$ 0.0015	\$ 0.0012
Dedicated Transport	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Common Transport	\$ 0.0770	\$ 0.4394	\$ 0.0372	\$ 0.0575	\$ 0.0242
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0797	\$ 0.4717	\$ 0.0398	\$ 0.0596	\$ 0.0262
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filin					
End Office Switching	\$ 0.0094	\$ 0.0103	\$ 0.0093	\$ 0.0089	\$ 0.0089
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0015	\$ 0.0196	\$ 0.0088	\$ 0.0013	\$ 0.0009
Dedicated Transport	\$ 0.0246	\$ 0.1581	\$ 0.0437	\$ 0.0116	\$ 0.0047
Common Transport	\$ 0.0327	\$ 0.2716	\$ 0.0850	\$ 0.0200	\$ 0.0117
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0681	\$ 0.4596	\$ 0.1469	\$ 0.0418	\$ 0.0263
Difference - Tandem Scenario to Original					
End Office Switching	\$ (0.0086)	\$ (0.0092)	\$ (0.0085)	\$ (0.0082)	\$ (0.0082)
ISUP Signaling	\$ 0.0005	\$ 0.0115	\$ (0.0071)	\$ 0.0001	\$ 0.0003
Dedicated Transport	\$ (0.0246)	\$ (0.1581)	\$ (0.0437)	\$ (0.0116)	\$ (0.0047)
Common Transport	\$ 0.0443	\$ 0.1678	\$ (0.0478)	\$ 0.0375	\$ 0.0125
Tandem Switching	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation	\$ 0.0116	\$ 0.0121	\$ (0.1071)	\$ 0.0178	\$ (0.0002)

Prelim. Arbitrator Order-Cingular/T-Mobile
Tandem Scenario
Reciprocal Compensation Cost Summary
Composite of Companies

	Cingular Petitioners			T-Mobile Petitioners		
	Total Cost	Billing Units	Composite Rate	Total Cost	Billing Units	Composite Rate
Reciprocal Compensation						
End Office Switching	\$ 757,774	816,771,749	\$ 0.0009	\$ 703,281	741,760,257	\$ 0.0009
ISUP Signaling	\$ 2,574,665	816,771,749	\$ 0.0032	\$ 2,423,239	741,760,257	\$ 0.0033
Dedicated Transport	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -
Common Transport	\$ 21,263,088	353,965,162	\$ 0.0601	\$ 18,893,074	321,457,967	\$ 0.0588
Tandem Switching	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation			\$ 0.0642			\$ 0.0630
Reciprocal Compensation - Original Filing						
End Office Switching	\$ 8,126,937	816,771,749	\$ 0.0100	\$ 7,429,761	741,760,257	\$ 0.0100
ISUP Signaling	\$ 3,249,561	816,771,749	\$ 0.0040	\$ 3,133,230	741,760,257	\$ 0.0042
Dedicated Transport	\$ 8,463,450	336,767,805	\$ 0.0251	\$ 7,957,448	309,768,525	\$ 0.0257
Common Transport	\$ 15,996,460	353,965,162	\$ 0.0452	\$ 15,154,597	321,457,967	\$ 0.0471
Tandem Switching	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation			\$ 0.0843			\$ 0.0871
Difference - Tandem Scenario to Original						
End Office Switching	\$ (7,369,163)	-	\$ (0.0090)	\$ (6,726,480)	-	\$ (0.0091)
ISUP Signaling	\$ (674,895)	-	\$ (0.0008)	\$ (709,990)	-	\$ (0.0010)
Dedicated Transport	\$ (8,463,450)	(336,767,805)	\$ (0.0251)	\$ (7,957,448)	(309,768,525)	\$ (0.0257)
Common Transport	\$ 5,266,629	-	\$ 0.0149	\$ 3,738,477	-	\$ 0.0116
Tandem Switching	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -
Total Reciprocal Compensation			\$ (0.0201)			\$ (0.0241)

Note: Petitioners Goodman, Seneca, and Ozark were not Petitioners in the T-Mobile Arbitration