STATE OF ILLINOIS

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

Joint Petition for Approval of Amendment to the Interconnection Agreement pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252. : 13-0109

ORDER

By the Commission:

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On February 6, 2013, pursuant to 83 Illinois Administrative Code Part 763, Mid Century Telephone Co-operative ("Mid Century") and SprintCom, Inc., WirelessCo, L.P. through their agent Sprint Spectrum L.P., NPCR, Inc. and Nextel West Corp. ("SprintCom"), filed a joint petition for approval of the Amendment to the Interconnection Agreement dated February 6, 2013, under Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. §§ 151 et seq.) ("the Act"). The Amendment was submitted with the petition. A statement in support of the petition was filed along with a verifications sworn to by Joseph Murphy on behalf of Mid Century and Kenneth Schifman on behalf of SprintCom stating that the facts contained in the petition are true and correct to the best of their knowledge, information, and belief. A hearing was held in this matter on April 15, 2013 at the Commission office in Chicago, Illinois. At the close of this hearing the record was marked "heard and taken".

II. SECTION 252 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

Section 252(a)(1) of the Act allows parties to enter into negotiated agreements regarding requests for interconnection services or network elements, as well as amendments to those agreements. Mid Century and SprintCom have negotiated such an Amendment to their Agreement and submitted it for approval in this proceeding.

Section 252(e)(1) of the Act provides, in part, that "[a]ny interconnection agreement adopted by negotiation...shall be submitted for approval to the State Commission." This Section further provides that a State Commission to which such an agreement is submitted "shall approve or reject the
agreement, with written findings as to any deficiencies." Section 252(e)(2) provides that the State Commission may only reject the negotiated agreement if it finds that "the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement" or that "the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity."

Section 252(e)(4) provides that the agreement shall be deemed approved if the State Commission fails to act within 90 days after submission by the parties. This provision further states that "(n)o State court shall have jurisdiction to review the action of a State Commission in approving or rejecting an agreement under this section". Section 252(e)(5) provides for preemption by the Federal Communications Commission if a State Commission fails to carry out its responsibility, and Section 252(e)(6) provides that any party aggrieved by a State Commission’s determination on a negotiated agreement may bring an action in the appropriate Federal District Court.

Section 252(h) requires a State Commission to make a copy of each agreement approved under subsection (3) "available for public inspection and copying within 10 days after the agreement or statement is approved." Section 252(i) requires a local exchange carrier to "make available any interconnection, service, or network element provided under an agreement approved under this section to which it is a party to any other requesting telecommunications carrier upon the same terms and conditions as those provided in the agreement."

III. THE AGREEMENT

Effective July 1, 2012 compensation for the exchange of Local Traffic between the Parties will be bill and keep. Specifically, each Party will bill its end users Local Traffic it originates and will be entitled to retain all revenues from such Local Traffic without payment of further compensation to the other Party. All other terms and conditions of the underlying Agreement shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

IV. POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

No party contended that the Amendment is discriminatory or contrary to the public interest. Staff reviewed the Amendment in the context of the criteria contained in Section 252(e)(2)(A) of the Act and determined that it met the necessary requirements. Under this Section, the Commission may reject an agreement, or any portion thereof, adopted by negotiation under Subsection (a) only if it finds that (i) the agreement, or a portion thereof, discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or (ii) the implementation of such an agreement, or a portion thereof, is not consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity.

Mr. Omoniyi stated that the Amendment meets the standards set forth in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and is consistent with the public interest, convenience and
necessity. There are no contested issues in this docket. Staff recommended that the Commission approve the Amendment for the reasons set forth in the Verified Statement of Mr. Omoniyi. Staff also recommended that, as McDonough is a cooperative that does not have tariffs on file with the Commission, it should, within five (5) days for the date this Amendment is approved, file an amended “Current List of Valid Interconnection Agreements”. Staff further recommended that, the Commission require Illinois Mid Century to file with the Office of the Chief Clerk, within five (5) days from the date upon which the Amendment is approved, a verified statement that the approved Agreement is the same as the Amendment filed in this Docket with the Verified Petition.

V. FINDINGS AND ORDERING PARAGRAPHS

The Commission, having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, is of the opinion and finds that:

(1) Mid Century and SprintCom are telecommunications carriers as defined in Section 13-202 of the Public Utilities Act;

(2) Mid Century and SprintCom have entered into an Amendment to the Interconnection Agreement which has been submitted to the Commission for approval under Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996;

(3) the Commission has jurisdiction of the parties hereto and the subject matter hereof;

(4) the recitals of fact and conclusions reached in the prefatory portion of this Order are supported by the record and are hereby adopted as findings of fact;

(5) the Amendment between Mid Century and SprintCom does not discriminate against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the Amendment;

(6) in order to assure that the Amendment is in the public interest, Mid Century should implement the Amendment by filing a verified statement with the Chief Clerk of the Commission, within five (5) days of approval by the Commission, that the approved Amendment is the same as the Amendment filed in this docket with the verified petition. The Chief Clerk shall place the Amendment on the Commission’s website under Interconnection Agreements;
as Mid Century is a cooperative that does not have tariffs on file with the Commission, it should, within five (5) days from the date this Amendment is approved, file an amended “Current List of Valid Interconnection Agreements”. The amended list should be filed in the Docket and should reference the instant Amendment as well as all other currently effective interconnection agreements into which Mid Century has entered;

the Amendment should be approved as hereinafter set forth;

approval of the Amendment does not have any precedential effect on any future negotiated agreements or Commission Orders.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Illinois Commerce Commission that the Amendment to the Interconnection Agreement between Mid Century Telephone Cooperative and SprintCom, Inc., WirelessCo, L.P. through their agent Sprint Spectrum L.P., NPCR, Inc. and Nextel West Corp. is approved pursuant to Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Mid Century shall comply with findings (6) and (7) of this Order within five days of the date of this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order is final; it is not subject to the Administrative Review Law.

By Order of the Commission this 1st day of May, 2013.

(SIGNED) DOUGLAS P. SCOTT

CHAIRMAN