

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of ALLTEL Missouri, )  
Inc., for Approval of its Commercial Mobile Radio )  
Services Interconnection Agreement with Cellco ) **Case No. TK-2006-0004**  
Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, and Verizon )  
Wireless (VAW) LLC, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, Under )  
47 U.S.C. Section 252. )

### **ORDER APPROVING INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT**

Issue Date: August 10, 2005

Effective Date: August 20, 2005

This order approves the Interconnection Agreement executed by the parties and filed by ALLTEL Missouri, Inc.

On July 6, 2005, ALLTEL filed an application with the Commission for approval of a Commercial Mobile Radio Services Interconnection Agreement with Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, and Verizon Wireless (VAW), LLC, d/b/a Verizon Wireless. The Agreement was filed pursuant to Section 252(e)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.<sup>1</sup> ALLTEL holds a certificate of service authority to provide basic local exchange telecommunications services in Missouri.

Although Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, and Verizon Wireless (VAW), LLC, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, are parties to the Agreement, they did not join in the application. On July 8, 2005, the Commission issued an order making these companies parties in this case and directing any party wishing to request a hearing to do so no later than July 28, 2005. No requests for hearing were filed.

---

<sup>1</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 251, *et seq.*

The Staff of the Commission filed a memorandum and recommendation on August 4, 2005, recommending that the Agreement be approved.

### **Discussion**

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.

The Staff memorandum recommends that 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 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 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 amendments to the Commission for approval pursuant to the procedure set out below.

### **Amendment 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.<sup>2</sup> 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 resale and interconnection agreement available for public inspection.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

The parties to each resale or 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 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,<sup>5</sup> 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, convenience

---

<sup>2</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 252.

<sup>3</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 252(h).

<sup>4</sup> 4 CSR 240-3.545.

<sup>5</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(1).

and necessity.<sup>6</sup> Based upon its review of the Agreement between ALLTEL and Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, and Verizon Wireless (VAW), LLC, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, and its findings of fact, the Commission concludes that the Agreement is neither discriminatory nor inconsistent with the public interest and should 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.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

1. That the Interconnection Agreement between ALLTEL Missouri, Inc., and Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, and Verizon Wireless (VAW), LLC, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, filed on July 6, 2005, is approved.

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

---

<sup>6</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(A).

3. That this order shall become effective on August 20, 2005.
4. That this case may be closed on August 21, 2005.

**BY THE COMMISSION**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Colleen M. Dale', written over a horizontal line.

Colleen M. Dale  
Secretary

( S E A L )

Vicky Ruth, Senior Regulatory Law  
Judge, by delegation of authority pursuant  
to Section 386.240, RSMo 2000.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,  
on this 10th day of August, 2005.