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

In the Matter of the Request for Approval of	)
Interconnection Agreement between	)
Chariton Valley Telephone Corporation and	
Missouri RSA No. 5 Partnership d/b/a	) Case No. TK-2002-1121
Chariton Valley Wireless pursuant to	
Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications	
Act of 1996.	)

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

- 1. On April 6, 2005, Chariton Valley Telephone Corporation filed a request for the Commission to take notice of a modification to the Agreement for Interconnection and Reciprocal Compensation between Chariton Valley Telephone Corporation and Missouri RSA No. 5 Partnership d/b/a Chariton Valley Wireless ("Interconnection Agreement") filed by both Chariton Valley Telephone Corporation and Missouri RSA No. 5 Partnership d/b/a Chariton Valley Wireless Corporation under the provisions of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Commission has previously approved this agreement in this case.
- 2. The Commission directed its Staff to file a status report containing a date certain when Staff will file its recommendation. In lieu of that status report, Staff files its Recommendation herein.
- 3. Staff has verified, as directed by the Commission, that the 3.5 cent intraMTA rate provision is the same as that contained in other approved agreements.
- 4. The terms of modification to the Interconnection Agreement do not discriminate against telecommunications carriers not party to the Interconnection 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.

WHEREFORE, because the terms of modification to the agreement satisfy the standard set forth in 47 U.S.C. §252(e), in that they do not discriminate against telecommunications carriers not a party to the Interconnection Agreement and are not against the public interest, convenience and necessity, Staff recommends that the Commission approve the modification.

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 31<sup>st</sup> day of May 2005.

/s/ David A. Meyer

## **MEMORANDUM**

То:	Missouri Public Service Commission Official Case File Case No. TK-2002-1121  Sara Buyak Telecommunications Department					
From:						
	WLV Utility Operation	5-26-05 as Division/Date	WKH General Coun	5-26-05 sel's Office/Date		
Subject:	Staff Recommendation to Modifications to the Interconnection Agreement					
Date:	May 25, 2005					
On April 6, 2005, Chariton Valley Telephone Corporation (Chariton), an Incumbent Local Exchange Telecommunications Carrier, filed a Request for Notice of Modification of its Interconnection Agreement. Chariton requested the Staff of the Commission verify that the modification of its Interconnection Agreement with Chariton Valley Wireless of 3.5 cents per minute for intraMTA wireless to landline traffic is the same as contained in the Traffic Termination Agreements approved between Chariton and Sprint PCS in Case No. TK-2004-0543, Cingular in Case No. TK-2004-0518, and Alltel in Case TK-2005-0189.  The Staff reviewed Sprint PCS in Case No. TK-2004-0543, Cingular in Case No. TK-2004-0518, and Alltel in Case TK-2005-0189 and found the rates were \$.035 per minute.						
limited recinterconners agreement no objecti	quirements of the ection agreement of and is not agains	Telecommunications A loes not discriminate ag the public interest, con	ct of 1996. The progainst telecommunication of the communication of the	oposed amendment meets the oposed modification to the cations carriers not party to the ssity. Therefore, the Staff has filing that may affect, or be		
The Company is not delinquent in filing an annual report and paying the 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 the appropriate filing in this case after it has corrected the delinquency.  The applicant should be instructed to make the appropriate filing in this case after it has corrected the delinquency.  The applicant should be instructed to make the appropriate filing in this case after it has corrected the delinquency.						