

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

PETITION OF BALLARD RURAL)	
TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE CORPORATION,)	CASE NO.
INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS)	2006-00215
AND CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)	
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)	
AMERICAN CELLULAR F/K/A ACC KENTUCKY)	
LICENSE LLC, PURSUANT TO THE)	
COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS)	
AMENDED BY THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS)	
ACT OF 1996)	
)	
PETITION OF DUO COUNTY TELEPHONE)	
COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC. FOR)	CASE NO.
ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS AND)	2006-00217
CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)	
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)	
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON)	
WIRELESS, GTE WIRELESS OF THE)	
MIDWEST INCORPORATED D/B/A VERIZON)	
WIRELESS, AND KENTUCKY RSA NO. 1)	
PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,)	
PURSUANT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT)	
OF 1934, AS AMENDED BY THE)	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996)	
)	
PETITION OF LOGAN TELEPHONE)	
COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF)	CASE NO.
CERTAIN TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF)	2006-00218
PROPOSED INTERCONNECTION)	
AGREEMENT WITH AMERICAN CELLULAR)	
CORPORATION F/K/A ACC KENTUCKY)	
LICENSE LLC, PURSUANT TO THE)	
COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS)	
AMENDED BY THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS)	
ACT OF 1996)	

PETITION OF WEST KENTUCKY RURAL)
TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE CORPORATION,)
INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS)
AND CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)
AMERICAN CELLULAR CORPORATION F/K/A)
ACC KENTUCKY LICENSE LLC, PURSUANT)
TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS)
AMENDED BY THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
ACT OF 1996)

CASE NO.
2006-00220

PETITION OF NORTH CENTRAL TELEPHONE)
COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, FOR)
ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS AND)
CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)
AMERICAN CELLULAR CORPORATION)
F/K/A ACC KENTUCKY LICENSE LLC,)
PURSUANT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT)
OF 1934, AS AMENDED BY THE)
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996)

CASE NO.
2006-00252

PETITION OF SOUTH CENTRAL RURAL)
TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE CORPORATION,)
INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS)
AND CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON)
WIRELESS, GTE WIRELESS OF THE)
MIDWEST INCORPORATED D/B/A VERIZON)
WIRELESS, AND KENTUCKY RSA NO. 1)
PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,)
PURSUANT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT)
OF 1934, AS AMENDED BY THE)
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996)

CASE NO.
2006-00255

PETITION OF BRANDENBURG TELEPHONE)
COMPANY FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN)
TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON)
WIRELESS, GTE WIRELESS OF THE MIDWEST)
INCORPORATED D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,)
AND KENTUCKY RSA NO. 1 PARTNERSHIP)
D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS, PURSUANT TO)
THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS)
AMENDED BY THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
ACT OF 1996)

CASE NO.
2006-00288

PETITION OF FOOTHILLS RURAL)
TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE CORPORATION,)
INC., FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS)
AND CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON)
WIRELESS, GTE WIRELESS OF THE)
MIDWEST INCORPORATED D/B/A VERIZON)
WIRELESS, AND KENTUCKY RSA NO. 1)
PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,)
PURSUANT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT)
OF 1934, AS AMENDED BY THE)
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996)

CASE NO.
2006-00292

PETITION OF GEARHEART)
COMMUNICATIONS INC. D/B/A COALFIELDS)
TELEPHONE COMPANY, FOR ARBITRATION)
OF CERTAIN TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF)
PROPOSED INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT)
WITH CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON)
WIRELESS, GTE WIRELESS OF THE MIDWEST)
INCORPORATED D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,)
AND KENTUCKY RSA NO. 1 PARTNERSHIP)
D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS, PURSUANT TO)
THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS)
AMENDED BY THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
ACT OF 1996)

CASE NO.
2006-00294

PETITION OF MOUNTAIN RURAL)
TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE CORPORATION,)
INC., FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS)
AND CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON)
WIRELESS, GTE WIRELESS OF THE MIDWEST)
INCORPORATED D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,)
AND KENTUCKY RSA NO 1 PARTNERSHIP)
D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS, PURSUANT TO)
THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS)
AMENDED BY THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
ACT OF 1996)

CASE NO.
2006-00296

PETITION OF PEOPLES RURAL TELEPHONE)
 COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC., FOR)
 ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS AND)
 CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)
 INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)
 CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON)
 WIRELESS, GTE WIRELESS OF THE)
 MIDWEST INCORPORATED D/B/A VERIZON)
 WIRELESS, AND KENTUCKY RSA NO. 1)
 PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,)
 PURSUANT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT)
 OF 1934, AS AMENDED BY THE)
 TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996)

CASE NO.
 2006-00298

PETITION OF THACKER-GRIGSBY)
 TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC., FOR)
 ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS AND)
 CONDITIONS OF PROPOSED)
 INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)
 CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON)
 WIRELESS, GTE WIRELESS OF THE)
 MIDWEST INCORPORATED D/B/A VERIZON)
 WIRELESS, AND KENTUCKY RSA NO. 1)
 PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,)
 PURSUANT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS)
 ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED BY THE)
 TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996)

CASE NO.
 2006-00300

O R D E R

ALLTEL Communications, Inc., New Cingular Wireless PCS, d/b/a Cingular Wireless, Sprint Spectrum LP, d/b/a Sprint PCS, T-Mobile USA, Inc. and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (hereinafter "CMRS Providers") have moved to

compel the 12 rural local exchange carriers (“RLEC”)¹ to respond to two groups of data requests.

The CMRS Providers have moved to compel responses to the first set of requests, to Requests 1.8, 1.13 and 1.15, information related to current interconnection between RLECs and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (“BellSouth”). The CMRS Providers contend that the RLECs information was non-responsive. The RLECs failed to provide all the information requested regarding the tandems of BellSouth including the types of trunks and the types of traffic exchanged over the trunks. Moreover, the CMRS Providers assert that they need this information because it relates to whether current indirect interconnection arrangements are technically feasible and whether they create any undue burden or hardship upon the RLECs.

Additionally, the CMRS Providers seek to compel responses to Requests 1.11, 1.44 and 1.48 relating to local calling information and dialing parity. The CMRS Providers assert that the information supplied by the RLECs is incomplete. Though the RLECs identify companies that have EAS arrangements, they have not identified the rate centers that have local calling from each of their own rate centers. Moreover, the RLECs have not identified their own local NPA-NXX codes and other local NPA-NXX codes that can be dialed on a local basis. The CMRS Providers assert that whether the

¹ The RLECs consist of Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc.; Duo County Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc.; Logan Telephone Cooperative, Inc.; West Kentucky Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc.; North Central Telephone Cooperative Corporation; South Central Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc.; Brandenburg Telephone Company; Foothills Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc.; Gearheart Communications, Inc. d/b/a Coalfields Telephone Company; Mountain Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc.; Peoples Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc.; and Thacker-Grigsby Telephone Company, Inc.

RLECs will allow them to dial local numbers in the absence of direct interconnection trunks and whether the RLECs intend to block traffic to or from CMRS Providers are relevant to this proceeding.

On October 3, 2006, the RLECs responded to the CMRS Providers' motion to compel. The RLECs assert that they fully responded by providing relevant information in the forms in which the RLECs currently maintain the requested data. The RLECs contend that they are not required to compile new forms of data or create new documents.

According to the RLECs information requested by the CMRS Providers must be relevant to the subject matter involved in this pending action and must be information which appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The RLECs assert that the questions which are the subject of the motion to compel are neither. However, the RLECs did supply supplemental information which may assist the CMRS Providers in preparation for this public hearing.

The Commission, having reviewed the motion to compel and the response thereto, finds that the information sought by the CMRS Providers is relevant and should be provided by the RLECs. However, the Commission also finds that the production of new forms of data where the creation of documents or information not currently in the control of the RLECs is not required.


Accordingly, the Commission HEREBY ORDERS that the CMRS Providers' motion to compel is granted but only to the extent that the RLECs must furnish information in the format in which it is currently maintained by the RLECs. The RLECs

shall comply with this Order by no later than 1:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, on October 13, 2006, and shall serve its answers electronically.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 11th day of October, 2006.

By the Commission

ATTEST:


Executive Director *for Beth O'Donnell*