

Missouri Public Service Commission

Center

Box 360

Person City, Missouri 65102-0360

9-2651 (9-10)

FILED³

APR 5 2013

Missouri Public
Service Commission

Cricket Communications, Inc.
Legal Department
10307 Pacific Center Court
San Diego, CA 92121



NIXIE 918 FEB 1 00 03/27/13
RETURN TO SENDER
ATTEMPTED - NOT KNOWN
UNABLE TO FORWARD
BC: 65102036060 *2864-05500-20-35

921214340 60360

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

In Re: Amendment No. 1 to the CMRS	)	
Interconnection Agreement between Embarq	)	
Missouri, Inc., d/b/a CenturyLink and Cricket	)	<u>File No. TK-2013-0408</u>
Communications, Inc. Pursuant to Sections 251	)	
and 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	

**ORDER APPROVING AMENDMENTS
TO INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT**

Issue Date: March 19, 2013

Effective Date: March 29, 2013

This order approves the amendments to the Commercial Mobile Radio Services interconnection agreement between the parties filed by Embarq Missouri, Inc., d/b/a CenturyLink.

On March 1, 2013, CenturyLink filed an application with the Commission for approval of amendments to its Commercial Mobile Radio Services interconnection agreement with Cricket Communications, Inc. (Cricket). CenturyLink and Cricket currently have a Commission-approved interconnection agreement between them. In the current application, the parties have agreed to amend the interconnection agreement. The amendments were filed pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.¹ The amendments would promote diversity in providers, provide interconnectivity, and increase customer choices for telecommunications services. CenturyLink holds a certificate of service authority to provide basic local exchange telecommunications services

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 251, *et seq.*

in Missouri. Cricket is a wireless communications company not regulated by the Commission.

Although Cricket is a party to the agreement, it did not join in the application. On March 1, 2013, the Commission issued an order making Cricket a party in this case and directing any party wishing to request a hearing to do so no later than March 18, 2013.

Under Section 252(e) of the Act, any interconnection agreement adopted by negotiation must be submitted to the Commission for approval. The Commission may reject an agreement if it finds that the agreement is discriminatory or that it is not consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity.

On March 11, 2013, the Staff of the Commission filed a memorandum and recommendation. The Staff memorandum recommends that the amendments to the agreement be approved and notes that the agreement meets the limited requirements of the Act in that it is not discriminatory toward nonparties and is not against the public interest. Staff recommends that the Commission direct the parties to submit any further amendments to the Commission for approval.

Findings of Fact

The Commission has considered the application, the supporting documentation, and Staff's verified recommendation. Based upon that review, the Commission finds that the agreement as amended meets the requirements of the Act in that it does not discriminate against a nonparty carrier and implementation of the agreement as amended is not inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity. The Commission finds that approval of the agreement as amended shall be conditioned upon the parties

submitting any further amendments to the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure set out below.

Amendment Procedure

The Commission has a duty to review all interconnection agreements, whether arrived at through negotiation or arbitration, as mandated by the Act.² In order for the Commission's role of review and approval to be effective, the Commission must also review and approve or recognize amendments to these agreements. The Commission has a further duty to make a copy of every interconnection agreement available for public inspection.³ 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.⁴

The parties to each interconnection agreement must maintain a complete and current copy of the agreement, together with all amendments, in the Commission's offices. Any proposed amendment must be submitted pursuant to Commission rule 4 CSR 240-3.513(6).

Conclusions of Law

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e)(1) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996,⁵ is required to review negotiated interconnection agreements. It may only reject a negotiated agreement upon a finding that its implementation would be discriminatory to a nonparty or inconsistent with the public interest, conven-

² 47 U.S.C. § 252.

³ 47 U.S.C. § 252(h).

⁴ 4 CSR 240-3.545.

⁵ 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(1).

ience and necessity.⁶ Based upon its review of the amendments to the agreement between AT&T Missouri and USCC and its findings of fact, the Commission concludes that the agreement as amended is neither discriminatory nor inconsistent with the public interest and shall be approved.

The Commission notes that prior to providing telecommunications services in Missouri, a party shall possess the following: (1) an interconnection agreement approved by the Commission; (2) except for wireless providers, a certificate of service authority from the Commission to provide interexchange or basic local telecommunications services; and (3) except for wireless providers, a tariff approved by the Commission.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:


1. The amendments to the Commercial Mobile Radio Services interconnection agreement between Embarras Missouri, Inc., d/b/a CenturyLink and Cricket Communications, Inc., filed on March 1, 2013, are approved.

2. Any changes or amendments to this agreement shall be submitted in compliance with 4 CSR 240-3.513(6).

⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(A).

3. This order shall become effective on March 29, 2013.
4. This file may be closed on March 30, 2013.

BY THE COMMISSION



Shelley Brueggemann
Acting Secretary

Harold Stearley, Deputy Chief Regulatory
Law Judge, by delegation of authority
pursuant to Section 386.240, RSMo 2000.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 19th day of March, 2013.

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

March 19, 2013

File/Case No. TK-2013-0408

**Missouri Public Service
Commission**
Cully Dale
200 Madison Street, Suite 800
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
cully.dale@psc.mo.gov

**Missouri Public Service
Commission**
Office General Counsel
200 Madison Street, Suite 800
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
staffcounsel@psc.mo.gov

Office of the Public Counsel
Lewis Mills
200 Madison Street, Suite 650
P.O. Box 2230
Jefferson City, MO 65102
opc@ded.mo.gov

CenturyLink (Embarq Missouri)
Becky O Kilpatrick
319 Madison Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101
becky.kilpatrick@centurylink.com

Cricket Communications, Inc.
Legal Department
10307 Pacific Center Court
San Diego, CA 92121

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

Sincerely,



**Shelley Brueggemann
Acting Secretary**

Individuals listed above with a valid e-mail address will receive electronic service. Individuals listed above without a valid e-mail address will receive paper service.