BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Joint Application of Sage)	
Telecom, Inc. and SP Sage, LLC, for Approval of a)	Case No. TM-2007-0288
Transfer of Control of Sage Telecom, Inc.)	

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

COMES NOW the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission and for its recommendation for approval of a proposed merger states:

- 1. The Commission granted Sage Telecom, Inc., a certificate of service authority to provide basic local telecommunications service in Case No. TA-2002-29 and a certificate of service authority to provide interexchange telecommunications service in Case No. TA-2002-30.
- 2. Sage Telecom and SP Sage LLC filed an application pursuant to Section 392.300 RSMo requesting Commission approval of a proposed transaction to transfer control of Sage Telecom from its multiple shareholders to SP Sage. The proposed transaction calls for a subsidiary of SP Sage to merge with and into Sage Telecom with Sage Telecom surviving the merger.
- 3. Section 392.300 recognizes two types of transaction to transfer control of a telecommunications company: (1) a stock purchase and (2) a merger or consolidation.

Subsection 2 of 392.300 generally provides that no stock corporation shall, without the consent of the Commission, purchase or acquire, take or hold more than ten percent of the total capital stock issued by any telecommunications company organized or existing under or by virtue of the laws of this state.

This subsection is not applicable to the proposed transaction because the Commission waived this subsection in Sage Telecom's certificate cases and because Sage Telecom is a Texas corporation.¹

Subsection 1 of 392.300 generally provides that no telecommunications company shall sell, assign, lease, transfer, mortgage or otherwise dispose of or encumber the whole or any part of its franchise, facilities or system, necessary or useful in the performance of its duties to the public, nor by any means, direct or indirect, *merge or consolidate* such line or system, or franchises, or any part thereof, with any other corporation, person or public utility, without having first secured from the Commission an order authorizing it so to do.

This subsection is applicable to the proposed merger because the certificated telecommunications company, Sage Telecom, is a party to the merger.²

4. The standard for approval of a merger is the same as for the sale of assets: that the transaction will not be detrimental to the public interest. See, *In the Matter of the Application of Computer Network Technology Corporation for Authority to Enter into a Merger and Transfer of Control Transaction with Condor Acquisition, Inc., and McDATA Corporation, and Their Respective Shareholders, Order Approving Merger And Directing Filing, Case XM-2005-0283 (March 29, 2005) (citing <i>State ex rel. Fee Fee Trunk Sewer, Inc. v. Litz*, 596 S.W. 2d 466, 468 (Mo. App. E.D. 1980)).

¹ See, In re the Joint Application of Integra Telecom Holdings, Inc., and Electric Lightwave, LLC for Approval of a Transfer of Control of Electric Lightwave, LLC, Order Dismissing Joint Application, Case No. TM-2006-0362 (May 12, 2006) (citing Public Service Commission v. Union Pacific RR Co., 197 S.W. 39 (Mo. banc 1917)).

² In contrast, the Commission has dismissed for lack of jurisdiction an application for approval of a merger at the parent company level. *In the Matter of the Joint Application of Talk America Holdings, Inc., Talk America, Inc., LDMI Telecommunications, Inc., and Cavalier Telephone Company for Approval of an Indirect Transfer of Control and Related Financing Transactions, Order Dismissing Joint Application, Case No. TM-2007-0140 (October 19, 2006).*

5. In the attached Memorandum, labeled as Appendix A, the Staff states its opinion that the merger will not be detrimental to the public interest because the transaction will be transparent Sage Telecom's customers.

WHEREFORE, the Staff recommends that the Commission conclude that it has jurisdiction pursuant to subsection 392.300.1 RSMo to review the proposed merger, find that the merger will not be detrimental to the public interest, and approve the merger.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William K. Haas

William K. Haas Deputy General Counsel Missouri Bar No. 28701

Attorney for the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission P. O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-7510 (Telephone)
(573) 751-9285 (Fax)
william.haas@psc.mo.gov

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been mailed, hand-delivered, transmitted by facsimile or electronically mailed to all counsel of record this 27th day of February 2007.

/s/ William K. Haas

Memorandum

To:	Missouri Public Service Commission Official Case File Case No. TM-2007-0288 Sage Telecom, Inc. and SP Sage, LLC					
From:	rom: Sherri Kohly, Telecommunications Department William L. Voight 02/21/07 /s/ William K. Haas 02/21/07 Utility Operations Division/Date General Counsel's Office/Date					
Subjec	t: Staff Recommendation for Application Seeking Commission Approval of Competitive Company Transaction					
Date:	February 21, 2007					
The To	elecommunications Department Staff (Staff) recommends the Commission (check, as applicable):					
	prove Merger Approve Consolidation Approve Sale of Assets 4 CSR 240-3.525 4 CSR 240-3.525					
	Approve Name Change 4 CSR 240-3.545(20)					
	ncel Certificate(s) & Tariff(s) 2.410.5 RSMo Approve Certificate(s) & Tariff(s) 4 CSR 240-3.510					
According to Commission rule 4 CSR 240-2.060 and the rule(s) specifically cited above, competitively classified companies are required to provide information in applications to merge, consolidate or sell/transfer assets. Based on the information provided to Staff, Staff does not believe this particular transaction will be detrimental to the public interest for the following reason(s) (check all that apply):						
Cus Cus Cus	s transaction solely involves a competitively classified company. stomers have/will receive advance notice. stomers can switch to another provider. stomers will continue to receive service at the same rates, terms and conditions. ter: Customers will continue to receive service from the same provider. This merger results in a					
transfer of control and will be transparent to the customers.						

The following chart summarizes this transaction.

Custo	mer	Sale of	f Assets	Certificates*		Tariffs*		
Serve	d By	("X	?", if	(If applicable, indicate			(If applicable,	
("X'	', if	appli	applicable) "C" to cancel, indicate		"C" to cancel,		Tariff PSC	
applicable)				"A" to approve)		MO	Nos.)	
Before	After	Seller	Buyer	IXC	Local	Basic	Cancel	Approve
						Local		
X	X							
	Serve ("X" applic Before	Before After	Served By ("X", if appli applicable) Before After Seller	Served By ("X", if applicable) Before After Seller Buyer	Served By ("X", if applicable) applicable) Before After Seller Buyer IXC	Served By ("X", if applicable)("X", if applicable)(If applicable, "C" to car "A" to appBeforeAfterSellerBuyerIXCLocal	Served By ("X", if applicable)("X", if applicable)(If applicable, indicate "C" to cancel, "A" to approve)BeforeAfterSellerBuyerIXCLocalBasic Local	Served By ("X", if applicable)("X", if applicable)(If applicable, indicate "C" to cancel, "A" to approve)(If applicable, indicate indicate "A" to approve)BeforeAfterSellerBuyerIXCLocalBasic LocalCancel

*See attachment to Staff recommendation for further details associated with approving certificates or tariffs.						
Merg	er, Consolidation, Sell or Transfer Assets					
Will a	ffected customers be switched to a different company?	No No	Yes			
	stomers have been notified.	nt aammany				
	stomers will be notified at least 30 days prior to being switched to a different CSR 240-3.525)	it company.				
	551(210 5.525)					
			-			
Comp	any Name Change Notification					
	Company has notified its customers of the name change.					
	Staff recommends the Commission order the Company to notify its custor	ners at or hef	ore the next			
	billing cycle of the name change and file a copy of the notice with the Commission.					
	<i>S</i> 13					
	his transaction involve a company in bankruptcy? Yes No					
If yes,	a copy of the bankruptcy order is attached.					
	Competitive Company Transaction Devices Home					
Admi	Competitive Company Transaction Review Items nistrative:					
	Application solely involves a competitively classified company.					
$\overline{\boxtimes}$	No applications to intervene filed.					
3. 7	1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ID 040 0 505				
	worthy Transaction Application Requirements of 4 CSR 240-3.520 and					
	Will have no impact on tax revenues pursuant to 4 CSR 240-3.520(F) or 4 Appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization has been submitted for any appropriate Secretary of State authorization for the Secretary of State authorization for the Secretary of Secreta		` /			
	submitted, reference to prior case number). Case No.	ppiicant (or n	picviously			
	Missouri corporations: A Certificate of Good Standing.					
	Foreign corporations: Authorization to do business in Missouri.					
	If business conducted under a fictitious name: A copy of registration	on of the fict	itious name.			
	No pending or final judgments/decisions described in 4 CSR 240-2.060(1))(K).				

A statement that no annual report or assessment fees are overdue for any applicant.					
Are there additional recommendations or special considerations?	⊠ No	Yes			
If yes, explain in an attachment.					
The Company is not delinquent in filing an annual report and paying the	e PSC assessment.				
The Company is delinquent. Staff recommends the Commission grant the requested relief/action on the					
condition the applicant corrects the delinquency. The applicant should be	instructed to make t	the appropriate			
filing in this case after it has corrected the delinquency.					
(No annual report Unpaid PSC assessment. Amount owed:)					

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Joint Sage Telecom, Inc. and S Approval of a Transfer o Telecom, Inc.	SP Sage, LLC, for))	Case No.	TM-2007-0288
	AFFIDAVIT OF	SHERRI I	L. KOHLY	
STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss:			
COUNTY OF COLE)			
Sherri L. Kohly, employed age and after being duly accompanying Memoran her knowledge and belief	sworn, states that sh dum, and that the fa	e has partici	pated in prepre true and co	aring the
Subscribed and affir I am commissioned State of Missouri an	as a notary public w	rithin the Co	day of unty of _ <i>[a1</i> 9-21-10	-
MOTARY My	AN L. SUNDERMEYER Commission Expires September 21, 2010 Callaway County mmission #06942086	NOTARY	All PUBLIC	indermeyer_