

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

In the Matter of the Application of Granby)	
Telephone Company for Approval of a Traffic)	
Termination Agreement under the)	Case No. TO-2005-0339
Telecommunications Act of 1996)	

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

COMES NOW the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff) and for its recommendation respectfully states:

1. In the attached Memorandum, labeled Appendix A, the Staff recommends that the Missouri Public Service Commission grant approval of the Agreement characterized as a “Traffic Termination Agreement” between Granby Telephone Company and Sprint Spectrum L.P., as agent for and general partner of Wireless Co., L.P. d/b/a Sprint PCS (the “Agreement”), filed by Granby Telephone Company under the provisions of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996.

2. The terms of the Agreement do not discriminate against telecommunications carriers not a party to the Agreement and are not against the public interest, convenience or necessity. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §252(e), the Commission is to approve a negotiated interconnection agreement unless the terms of the agreement discriminate against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement, or implementation of the agreement or any portion thereof is inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, or necessity.

3. Staff further states that Granby Telephone Company submitted this negotiated Agreement pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and characterized the Agreement as a “Traffic Termination Agreement.” Staff can find no reference in Section 252

to “Traffic Termination Agreement.” Consequently, Staff recommends the Commission issue an Order approving a wireless “interconnection agreement” and not an Order approving “Traffic Termination Agreement.” The Commission has addressed this topic in a series of proceedings, consolidated for argument with the lead case of *Application of Kingdom Telephone Company for Approval of a Traffic Termination Agreement under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Case No. IO-2003-0201, and found the classification of “traffic termination agreement” to be nonexistent. *See, e.g.*, Order Denying Motion for Correction, *In the Matter of the Application of Craw-Kan Telephone Cooperative for Approval of a Traffic Termination Agreement Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Case No. IK-2003-0245 (Sept. 25, 2003).

WHEREFORE, because the terms of the Agreement satisfy the standard set forth in 47 U.S.C. §252(e), Staff recommends the Commission approve the Agreement as a Wireless Interconnection Agreement and direct the parties to submit any future modifications or amendments to the Agreement to the Commission for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

DANA K. JOYCE
General Counsel

/s/ David A. Meyer

David A. Meyer
Senior Counsel
Missouri Bar No. 46620

Attorney for the Staff of the
Missouri Public Service Commission
P. O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-8706 (Telephone)
(573) 751-9285 (Fax)
david.meyer@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 April 2005.

/s/ David A. Meyer_____