

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Application of New London Telephone Company,	)	
Orchard Farm Telephone Company, and	)	
Stoutland Telephone Company for Approval	)	Case No. _____
of a Wireless Traffic Exchange Agreement	)	
under the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	

**APPLICATION OF NEW LONDON TELEPHONE COMPANY, ORCHARD FARM
TELEPHONE COMPANY, AND STOUTLAND TELEPHONE COMPANY
FOR APPROVAL OF WIRELESS TRAFFIC EXCHANGE AGREEMENT
UNDER THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996**

COME NOW New London Telephone Company, Orchard Farm Telephone Company, and Stoutland Telephone Company, wholly owned subsidiaries of TDS Telecommunications Corporation (hereinafter "TDS", "TDS Telecom", or "Applicant"), and hereby file this Application for Approval of a Wireless Traffic Exchange Agreement with TMP Corp. ("TMP") under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("the Act"). In support of this Application, Applicant states to the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") as follows:

I. INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT REACHED

TMP is a commercial mobile radio service ("CMRS") provider operating in Missouri. New London Telephone Company, Orchard Farm Telephone Company, and Stoutland Telephone Company are local exchange carriers and wholly owned subsidiaries of TDS Telecom. In Case No. TO-2004-0370, New London, Orchard Farm, and Stoutland filed Certificates of Good Standing from the Missouri Secretary of State which TDS Telecom requests be incorporated by reference in this case. TDS Telecom is not aware of any pending action or final unsatisfied judgments or decisions against

them from any state or federal agency or court which involve customer service or rates, and its annual reports and assessment fees are not overdue. This information is still current and correct, as evidenced by the notarized affidavit of Ms. Linda Lowrance (Attachment I).

After good faith negotiations, TMP and TDS executed a traffic exchange agreement ("the Agreement") for the state of Missouri pursuant to the terms of the Federal Act (see Agreement, Attachment II). Pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the Act, Applicant hereby submits this Agreement for approval by the Commission. The agreement complies fully with Section 252(e) of the Federal Act because the Agreement is consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity and does not discriminate against any telecommunications carrier. The Agreement consists of fourteen (14) pages including a two-page appendix. There are no outstanding issues between TMP and TDS that need the assistance of mediation or arbitration.

II. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL

Applicant seeks the Commission's approval of the Agreement, consistent with the provisions of the Federal Act and Missouri law. Applicant represents that the implementation of this negotiated and executed Agreement complies fully with both Missouri law and Section 252(e) of the Federal Act because the Agreement is consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity and does not discriminate against any telecommunications carrier. Applicant respectfully requests that the Commission grant expeditious approval of this Agreement, without change, suspension or delay in its implementation. This is a bilateral agreement, reached as a result of

negotiations and compromise between the parties. Correspondence, orders and decisions in this matter should be addressed to:

Linda Lowrance
TDS Telecom, Inc.
P.O. Box 22995
Knoxville, TN 37933-0995
linda.lowrance@tdstelecom.com

Craig Freeman
TMP Corp.
P.O. Box 128
Golden, IL 62339

Paul Pederson
TDS Telecom, Inc.
P.O. Box 5158
Madison, WI 53717
paul.pederson@tdstelecom.com

Brian T. McCartney
Brydon, Swearengen & England P.C.
P.O. Box 456
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456
bmccartney@brydonlaw.com

III. COMMISSION AUTHORITY

Under the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (“the Act”), the Commission has the authority to review the terms and conditions of the interconnection of telecommunications carriers’ networks within the state of Missouri, including voluntarily negotiated agreements for transport and termination of traffic. The Commission has the authority to grant the relief requested by the Applicant. Specifically, Section 252(a) of the Act provides:

(a) AGREEMENTS ARRIVED AT THROUGH NEGOTIATION

(1) **VOLUNTARY NEGOTIATIONS.** -- Upon receiving a request for interconnection, services, or network elements pursuant to section 251, an incumbent local exchange carrier may negotiate and enter into a binding agreement with the requesting telecommunications carrier or carriers without regard to the standards set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 251. The agreement shall include a detailed schedule of itemized charges for interconnection and each service or network element included in the agreement. The agreement, including any interconnection agreement negotiated before the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, shall be submitted to the State commission under subsection (e) of this section.

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

Under Section 252 of the Act, the Commission has the authority to approve an interconnection agreement negotiated between an incumbent local exchange company (ILEC) and other telecommunications carriers. The Commission may only reject an interconnection agreement if the agreement is discriminatory to a nonparty or is inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. Section 252 of the Act provides as follows:

(e) APPROVAL BY STATE COMMISSION

- (1) APPROVAL REQUIRED.— Any Interconnection Agreement adopted by negotiation or arbitration shall be submitted for approval to the State commission. A State commission to which an agreement is submitted to shall approve or reject the agreement, with written findings as to any deficiencies.
- (2) GROUNDS FOR REJECTION.-- The State Commission may only reject –
 - (1) an agreement (or any portion thereof) adopted by negotiation under subsection (a) if it finds that –
 - (1) the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or
 - (2) the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity; or

The affidavit of Linda Lowrance, Manager – Interconnection for TDS establishes that the Agreement submitted herein satisfies these standards.
(Affidavit, Attachment I)

IV. EXEMPTIONS

Section 251(f)(1) of the Act exempts certain rural telephone companies from the additional interconnection requirements contained in Section 251(c). Thus, although all ILECs, as telecommunications carriers, have the duty to interconnect, not all ILECs have to meet the additional interconnection requirements imposed by Section 251(c) of the Act.¹ As a rural carrier, TDS is not required to meet the additional interconnection requirements of Section 251(c). TDS and TMP sought to highlight in Section XIX of their Agreement that, while they are submitting a Section 251 Interconnection Agreement to this Commission for approval, it is not an interconnection agreement under Section 251(c), and TDS has not waived its Section 251(f)(1) rural exemption.

V. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Applicant respectfully requests that the Commission issue an Order that: (1) approves expeditiously the Wireless Traffic Exchange Agreement between TDS Telecom and TMP, and (2) grants such other relief as is reasonable in the circumstances.

¹ Section XIX of the Agreement states: "This Agreement is not an interconnection agreement under 47 USC 251(c). The parties acknowledge that TDS TELECOM may be entitled to a rural exemption as provided by 47 USC 251(f) and TDS TELECOM does not waive such exemption."

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By /s/ Brian T. McCartney
Brian T. McCartney Mo. #47788
BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND P.C.
312 East Capitol Avenue, P.O. Box 456
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456
bmccartney@brydonlaw.com
(573) 635-7166
(573) 634-7431 (FAX)

Attorneys for TDS TELECOM

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was sent by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, or electronic mail, or hand-delivered on this 26th of January, 2007, to the following parties:

General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
gencounsel@psc.mo.gov

Michael F. Dandino
Office of the Public Counsel
P.O. Box 7800
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
opcservice@ded.mo.gov
mike.dandino@ded.mo.gov

Craig Freeman
TMP Corp.
P.O. Box 128
Golden, IL 62339

/s/ Brian T. McCartney

Brian T. McCartney