

**STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
JEFFERSON CITY
April 24, 2000**

CASE NO: TO-2000-469

Office of the Public Counsel
P.O. Box 7800
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Harry L. Thielepape
804 Elkins Lake
Huntsville, TX 77340

James M. Fischer, Esq.
FISCHER & DORITY, P.C.
101 West McCarty Street, Suite 215
Jefferson City, MO 65101

General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
**ALLTEL Communications Telephone
Company**
One Allied Drive
Little Rock, AR 72202

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dale Hardy Roberts". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Missouri)
State Discount Telephone for Approval of Inter-)
connection Agreement With ALLTEL Communications) **Case No. TO-2000-469**
Service Corporation Pursuant to Section 252(e))
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.)

ORDER APPROVING INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT

On February 1, 2000, Missouri State Discount Telephone (MSDT) filed an application with the Commission for approval of an Interconnection Agreement (the Agreement) with ALLTEL Communications Service Corporation (ALLTEL). The Agreement was filed pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act). See 47 U.S.C. § 251, *et seq.* The Agreement would permit MSDT to resell local telecommunications services. Although ALLTEL is a party to the Agreement, it did not join in the application. On February 16, 2000, the Commission issued an order making ALLTEL a party in this case and directing any party wishing to request a hearing or to participate without intervention to do so no later than March 7, 2000. No applications to participate or requests for hearing were filed.

The requirement for a hearing is met when the opportunity for hearing has been provided and no proper party has requested the opportunity to present evidence. State ex rel. Rex Deffenderfer Enterprises, Inc. v. Public Service Commission, 776 S.W.2d 494, 496 (Mo. App. 1989). Since

no one has asked permission to participate or requested a hearing, the Commission may grant the relief requested based on the application.

The Staff of the Commission (Staff) filed a memorandum on March 9, 2000, recommending that the Agreement be approved.

On April 13, 2000, the Commission issued an Order Directing Filing, noting two areas of concern. First, MSDT's application for approval of an interconnection agreement is unclear as to the proper name of the party which MSDT wishes to enter into the interconnection agreement with. ALLTEL was directed to file a pleading clarifying its correct and complete name. Second, the Notice states that it appears that ALLTEL was not added to the service list. The Commission directed that ALLTEL be added to the service list and that a copy of the February 16, 2000, Order Directing Notice and Adding a party and a copy of the Staff Recommendation and memorandum filed March 9, 2000, be sent to ALLTEL. Any responses to these documents were to be filed by 12:00 p.m. on April 20, 2000.

On April 19, 2000, ALLTEL filed a response clarifying that its proper name is ALLTEL Communications Service Corporation. The Interconnection Agreement was executed by ALLTEL Communications Service Corporation on behalf of its affiliated local exchange carrier, ALLTEL Missouri, Inc.

Discussion

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e) of the Act, has authority to approve an interconnection agreement negotiated between an incumbent local exchange company and a new provider of basic local exchange service. The Commission may reject an interconnection agreement

only if the agreement is discriminatory or is inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity.

The Staff memorandum recommends that the Agreement be approved, and notes that the Agreement meets the limited requirements of the Act in that it does not appear to be discriminatory toward nonparties, and does not appear to be against the public interest. Staff recommends that the Commission direct the parties to submit any further modifications or amendments to the Commission for approval.

Findings of Fact

The Missouri Public Service Commission, having considered all of the competent and substantial evidence upon the whole record, makes the following findings of fact.

The Commission has considered the application, the supporting documentation, and Staff's recommendation. Based upon that review, the Commission has reached the conclusion that the Agreement meets the requirements of the Act in that it does not unduly discriminate against a nonparty carrier, and implementation of the Agreement is not inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity. The Commission finds that approval of the Agreement should be conditioned upon the parties submitting any modifications or amendments to the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure set out below.

Modification Procedure

The Commission has a duty to review all resale and interconnection agreements, whether arrived at through negotiation or arbitration, as

mandated by the Act. 47 U.S.C. § 252. In order for the Commission's role of review and approval to be effective, the Commission must also review and approve modifications to these agreements. The Commission has a further duty to make a copy of every resale and interconnection agreement available for public inspection. 47 U.S.C. § 252(h). 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 CSR 240-30.010.

The parties to each resale or interconnection agreement must maintain a complete and current copy of the agreement, together with all modifications, in the Commission's offices. Any proposed modification must be submitted for Commission approval, whether the modification arises through negotiation, arbitration, or by means of alternative dispute resolution procedures.

Modifications to an agreement must be submitted to the Staff for review. When approved, the modified pages will be substituted in the agreement, which should contain the number of the page being replaced in the lower right-hand corner. Staff will date-stamp the pages when they are inserted into the Agreement. The official record of the original agreement and all the modifications made will be maintained by the Telecommunications Staff in the Commission's tariff room.

The Commission does not intend to conduct a full proceeding each time the parties agree to a modification. Where a proposed modification is identical to a provision that has been approved by the Commission in another agreement, the modification will be approved once Staff has

verified that the provision is an approved provision, and prepared a recommendation advising approval. Where a proposed modification is not contained in another approved agreement, Staff will review the modification and its effects, and prepare a recommendation advising the Commission whether the modification should be approved. The Commission may approve the modification based on the Staff recommendation. If the Commission chooses not to approve the modification, the Commission will establish a case, give notice to interested parties and permit responses. The Commission may conduct a hearing if it is deemed necessary.

Conclusions of Law

The Missouri Public Service Commission has arrived at the following conclusions of law.

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e)(1) of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C. 252(e)(1), is required to review negotiated resale 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, convenience and necessity under Section 252(e)(2)(A). Based upon its review of the Agreement between MSDT and ALLTEL and its findings of fact, the Commission concludes that the Agreement is neither discriminatory nor inconsistent with the public interest and should be approved.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That the interconnection agreement between Missouri State Discount Telephone and ALLTEL Communications Service Corporation, filed on February 1, 2000, is approved.


2. That any changes or modifications to this Agreement shall be filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure outlined in this order.

3. That the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission is directed to place an executed copy of the Agreement, with the pages numbered seriatim at the bottom of the pages, in the Commission's tariff room.

4. That this order shall become effective on May 1, 2000.

5. That this case may be closed on May 2, 2000.

BY THE COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Dale Hardy Roberts". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line above it.

**Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge**

(S E A L)

Vicky Ruth, Regulatory Law Judge,
by delegation of authority pursuant
to 4 CSR 240-2.120(1) (November 30,
1995) and Section 386.240, RSMo 1994.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 24th day of April, 2000.

FYI: To Be Issued By Delegation

ALJ/Sec'y: Ruth Pope

4-20 4-25*

Date Circulated

Return by 3 p.m.

10 a.m.

10-2000-469

CASE NO.

SL
Lumpé, Chair

absent
Crumpton, Commissioner

CM
Murray, Commissioner

DS
Schemenauer, Commissioner

ad
Drainer, Vice-Chair

* or earlier, if possible. (The operation of law date for this case is May 1.)


STATE OF MISSOURI

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I have compared the preceding copy with the original on file in this office and

I do hereby certify the same to be a true copy therefrom and the whole thereof.

WITNESS my hand and seal of the Public Service Commission, at Jefferson City, Missouri, this 24th day of April 2000.



Dale Hardy Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts

Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge