

**STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
JEFFERSON CITY
January 22, 2001**

CASE NO: TO-2001-360

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


General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102

**Christopher C. Swenson/Thomas P. Berra,
Jr.**
Lewis, Rice & Fingersh, L.C.
500 North Broadway, Suite 2000
St. Louis, MO 63102-2147

**ALLTEL Communications Services
Corporation**
One Allied Drive
Little Rock, AR 72202

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

Sincerely,



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

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Universal Telecom, Inc., for Approval of)	<u>Case No. TO-2001-360</u>
an Interconnection Agreement with ALLTEL)	
Communications Service Corporation)	

ORDER APPROVING INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT

On December 11, 2000, Universal Telecom, Inc. (Universal) filed an application with the Commission for approval of an interconnection agreement (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 Universal to resell local telecommunications services.

Although ALLTEL is a party to the Agreement, it did not join in the application. On December 13, 2000, the Commission issued an order making ALLTEL a party in this case and directing any party wishing to request a hearing to do so no later than January 2, 2001. No 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 requested a hearing, the Commission may grant the relief requested based on the application.

The Staff of the Commission (Staff) filed a memorandum and recommendation on January 18, 2001, recommending that the Agreement be approved.

Discussion

The Commission, under the provisions of Section 252(e) of the Act, has authority to approve an interconnection or resale agreement negotiated between an incumbent local exchange company and a new provider of basic local exchange service. The Commission may reject an interconnection or resale 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. Staff also recommends that the parties be directed to submit a copy of the executed Agreement with the pages numbered seriatim.

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 concludes 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 or recognize 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 or recognition, whether the modification arises through negotiation, arbitration, or by means of alternative dispute resolution procedures.

The parties are required to provide the Telecommunications Staff with a copy of the resale or interconnection agreement with the pages numbered consecutively in the lower right-hand corner. The copy of the resale agreement submitted with the application does not meet this requirement. Therefore, the parties will be ordered to submit an appropriate copy of the resale agreement to the Staff.

Modifications to an agreement must be submitted to the Staff for review. When approved or recognized, 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 Commission will take notice of the modification once Staff has verified that the provision is an approved provision and prepared a recommendation. 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 Universal 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 Universal Telecom, Inc. and ALLTEL Communications Service Corporation, filed on December 11, 2000, is approved.

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

3. That, no later than February 13, 2001, Universal Telecom, Inc., shall submit a copy of the executed resale agreement with the pages numbered serialim.

4. That this order shall become effective on February 1, 2001.

BY THE COMMISSION



Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Morris L. Woodruff, Senior Regulatory Law Judge, by delegation of authority pursuant to Section 386.240, RSMo 1994.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 22nd day of January, 2001.

FYI: To Be Issued By Delegation

AL/Sec'y: Woodruff/Ryce

Date Circulated 1-18

Return by 1-23
3 pm
100m

TD-2001-360
CASE NO.

JS
Lumpe, Chair

me
Drainer, Vice Chair

MM
Murray, Commissioner

KS
Schemenauer, Commissioner

KS
Simmons, Commissioner

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 22nd day of Jan. 2001.

Dale Hardy Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

