

Dinsmore & Shohl LLP
ATTORNEYS

Edward T. Depp
(502) 540-2347 (Direct Dial)
tip.depp@dinslaw.com

RECEIVED

AUG 04 2006

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

August 4, 2006

RECEIVED

AUG 04 2006

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Beth O'Donnell
Executive Director
Public Service Commission
211 Sower Blvd.
Frankfort, KY 40601


Re: Motion of Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. to Approve Interconnection Agreement with American Cellular Corporation f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC; Case No. 2006-00220

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

I have enclosed for filing in the above-styled case the original and eleven (11) copies each of: (i) the Motion of Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. ("Ballard") to Approve Interconnection Agreement with ComScape; and (ii) Motion of Ballard to Approve Interconnection Agreement with NTCH in the above-referenced matter. Please file stamp one (1) copy of each motion and return them to our deliveryperson.

Thank you, and if you have any questions, please contact me at (502) 540-2300.

Sincerely,



Edward T. Depp

ETD/lb
Enclosures

cc: Harlon Parker(w/encl.)

Ms. Beth O'Donnell
August 4, 2006
Page 2 of 2

Steven E. Watkins (w/o encl.)
John E. Selent, Esq. (w/o encl.)
Holly C. Wallace, Esq. (w/o encl.)

112381v1

**COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

RECEIVED

In the Matter of:

AUG 04 2006

Petition of Ballard Rural Telephone)
Cooperative Corporation, Inc. for)
Arbitration of Certain Terms 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)

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

Case No. 2006-00215

**MOTION OF BALLARD RURAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE
CORPORATION, INC. TO APPROVE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT**

Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. ("Ballard Rural"), by counsel, pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("the Act"), KRS Chapter 278.040, and 807 KAR 5:001, hereby moves the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the "Commission") to approve the interconnection agreement Ballard Rural submitted to the Commission in this arbitration proceeding against ComScape Telecommunications, Inc. ("ComScape"). In support of its motion, Ballard Rural states as follows.

INTRODUCTION

This arbitration proceeding arises from the impending termination of an agreement ("the CMRS Agreement") between CMRS providers, rural independent local exchange carriers ("Rural ILECs"), and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth"), effective May 1, 2004, and terminating on December 31, 2006. The CMRS Agreement required the signatory CMRS providers to commence interconnection negotiations with the Rural ILECs if they wished for their Rural-ILEC-destined traffic to continue to be delivered to the Rural ILECs after that date. ComScape is a CMRS provider, and Ballard Rural a Rural ILEC, under the Agreement.

Pursuant to Section 3.01 of the CMRS Agreement, interconnection negotiations between Ballard Rural and ComScape were deemed to commence on January 1, 2006, regardless of whether an actual request for negotiation was received by that date.¹ Throughout the “negotiation” process, ComScape has failed to negotiate in good faith with Ballard Rural. Despite Ballard Rural's repeated attempts to correspond, negotiate, and exchange draft interconnection agreements, ComScape has failed to respond in any meaningful way. Because of ComScape’s failure to respond meaningfully to Ballard Rural's attempts to negotiate, Ballard Rural filed an arbitration petition against ComScape on May 31, 2006. Ballard Rural attached its proposed interconnection agreement to that petition.

Because ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith as required by 47 U.S.C. 251(c) and regulations promulgated thereunder, the Commission should approve the proposed interconnection agreement Ballard Rural has submitted to the Commission in this proceeding.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Ballard Rural's attempts to negotiate with ComScape began on February 3, 2006, when Ballard Rural sent a letter to ComScape advising it of Ballard Rural's desire to negotiate an interconnection agreement pursuant to Section 3.01 of the CMRS Agreement of May 2004. Ballard Rural enclosed with that letter a copy of the template interconnection agreement from which negotiations would proceed.²

ComScape made no effort to propose changes to the template agreement it had received from Ballard Rural. Therefore, on March 14, 2006, Ballard Rural sent another letter advising ComScape of Ballard Rural's desire to negotiate and enclosing another template interconnection agreement, this

¹ Thus, the statutory window for arbitration in this matter opened on May 16, 2006 and closed on June 10, 2006.

² See February 3, 2006 letter from John E. Selent to Bhogin M. Modi, attached as Exhibit 2 to Ballard Rural's Petition for Arbitration (the "Petition").

time with the proposed traffic exchange splits, proposed reciprocal compensation rates, and proposed point of interconnection.³

Because ComScape proposed no specific changes to the template interconnection agreement, Ballard Rural sent yet another letter to ComScape on May 15, 2006 regarding the status of ComScape's review of the proposed interconnection agreement.⁴

As of this date, ComScape still has not provided Ballard Rural with any proposed changes to the interconnection agreement. Accordingly, Ballard Rural filed its arbitration petition against ComScape on May 31, 2006.

ARGUMENT

The Commission should approve the interconnection agreement Ballard Rural submitted with its arbitration petition against ComScape because ComScape failed to comply with its statutory duty to negotiate in good faith. ComScape's failure to negotiate in good faith means that any agreement proposed by ComScape, by definition, would not comply with Section 251 of the Act. As such, the Commission should reject any agreement proposed by ComScape and should approve Ballard Rural's agreement in full.

I. Statutory and regulatory law requires ComScape to negotiate in good faith.

A requesting telecommunications carrier such as ComScape has a duty to negotiate with Ballard Rural in good faith. 47 U.S.C. 251(c)(1) ("The requesting telecommunications carrier also has the duty to negotiate in good faith the terms and conditions of such agreements.") Section 252 (b)(5) of the Act defines certain conduct that constitutes a failure to negotiate in good faith:

The refusal of any other party to the negotiation to participate further
in the negotiations, to cooperate with the State commission in

³ See March 14, 2006 letter from John E. Selent to Bhogin M. Modi, attached as Exhibit 3 to the Petition.

⁴ See May 15, 2006 letter from John E. Selent to Bhogin M. Modi, attached as Exhibit 4 to the Petition.

carrying out its function as an arbitrator, or to continue to negotiate in good faith in the presence, or with the assistance, of the State commission shall be considered a failure to negotiate in good faith.

Regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") define certain additional conduct that violates the duty to negotiate in good faith:

(c) If proven to the Commission, an appropriate state commission, or a court of competent jurisdiction, the following actions or practices, among others, violate the duty to negotiate in good faith:

(6) Intentionally obstructing or delaying negotiations or resolutions of disputes;

(7) Refusing throughout the negotiation process to designate a representative with authority to make binding representations, if such refusal significantly delays resolution of issues; and

(8) Refusing to provide information necessary to reach agreement. . . .

47 CFR 51.301. These controlling provisions set forth at least four situations in which a carrier violates its duty to negotiate in good faith: (1) the complete refusal to negotiate, (2) the intentional delay of negotiations, (3) causing delay by refusing to designate a representative to negotiate, and (4) refusing to provide necessary information.

Critically, this Commission has authority to conclude that ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith with Ballard Rural. *See In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, First Report and Order, FCC 96-325 at ¶ 143 ("First Report and Order") ("state commissions have authority, under section 252(b)(5), to consider allegations that a party has failed to negotiate in good faith.") In fact, it is precisely this power of review by state commissions that ensures the effectiveness of the good faith requirement of the Act.

[P]arties seeking to avoid a legitimate accusation of breach of the duty of good faith in negotiation will work to provide their negotiating adversary all relevant information -- given that section

252(b)(4)(B) authorizes the state commission to require the parties "to provide such information as may be necessary for the State commission to reach a decision on the unresolved issues." That provision also states that, if either party "fails unreasonably to respond on a timely basis to any reasonable request from the State commission, then the State commission may proceed on the basis of the best information available to it from whatever source derived." **The likelihood that an arbitrator will review the positions taken by the parties during negotiations also should discourage parties from refusing unreasonably to provide relevant information to each other or to delay negotiations.**

Id. at ¶ 149 (emphasis added). As the FCC has explained, the power of review by state commissions gives the good faith requirement its teeth. Thus, this Commission has the power to decide that ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith with Ballard Rural. Exercising that power will further the purposes of the Act.

II. ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith by failing to propose revisions to Ballard Rural's template interconnection agreement.

ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith with Ballard Rural. Ballard Rural contacted ComScape at the beginning of the negotiation window and, over the course of months, sent ComScape multiple letters and copies of a proposed interconnection agreement. ComScape, however, never responded meaningfully to these negotiation overtures. At no time from the beginning of the negotiation window through the beginning of the arbitration window did ComScape make any effort to propose definitive changes to Ballard Rural's template agreement.

ComScape's delay deprived Ballard Rural of many valuable months in which the parties could have been negotiating any unresolved issues as envisioned and required by 47 U.S.C. 251-52. Well into the arbitration window and faced with no meaningful response to its proposed interconnection agreement, Ballard Rural had no choice but to initiate arbitration. The failure by ComScape to respond meaningfully constitutes a "refusal of any other party to the negotiation to participate further in the negotiations," an automatic violation of the duty of good faith. 47 U.S.C.

252(b)(5). Further, the failure to provide meaningful response can only be interpreted as an intentional delay and a failure to provide necessary information, each of which constitutes a violation of the duty of good faith as defined by the FCC in 47 CFR 51.301.

III. The Commission should approve the interconnection agreement submitted by Ballard Rural.

Because of the failure of ComScape to negotiate in good faith, the Commission should approve the interconnection agreement submitted by Ballard Rural in this proceeding. In arbitrating interconnection agreements under Section 252(b) of the Act, a state commission must primarily ensure that its resolution of the arbitration comports with the requirements of Section 251 and regulations promulgated thereunder, including, of course, the duty to negotiate in good faith. 47 U.S.C. 252(c)(1). A state commission may reject an agreement that does not meet those statutory and regulatory requirements, including the duty to negotiate in good faith. 47 U.S.C. 252(e)(2)(B). In making its determination, the state commission has broad discretion to reject an agreement that does not comport with the duties imposed in Section 251. *Bell Atlantic-Delaware, Inc. v. McMahon*, 80 F.Supp.2d 218, 224 (D. Del. 2000) (“The Act provides a disincentive to state commission mediation by allowing the commission to reject agreements that do not “meet the requirements of section 251” of the Act. This grants a state commission broader discretion to reject agreements (in whole or in part) that do not comport with the duties imposed in 251.”)

Here, ComScape violated its statutory duty to negotiate in good faith. (*See supra*, pages 2-3.) For that reason, any agreement proposed by ComScape would not, by definition, comport with the duties imposed by Section 251. 47 U.S.C. 251(c)(1) (“The requesting telecommunications carrier also has the duty to negotiate in good faith . . .”) Therefore, in order to ensure that any interconnection agreement between Ballard Rural and ComScape complies with Section 251 (*see* 47 U.S.C. 252(c)(1)), and pursuant to its power to reject an agreement that does not comply with

Section 251 (*see* 47 U.S.C. 252(e)(2)(B)), the Commission should reject any agreement proposed by ComScape.

Given any agreement that ComScape might propose cannot, by definition, comply with the Act, the Commission should approve Ballard Rural's proposed agreement in full. The Commission has previously demonstrated that it will approve one party's proposed interconnection agreement in full where the other party to arbitration has engaged in stalling and delay. *See In the Matter of: Petition of Brandenburg Telecom, LLC for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Agreement with Verizon South Inc. Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Case No. 2001-224 (hereafter, "*Brandenburg Telecom*").


In *Brandenburg Telecom*, Brandenburg Telecom LLC ("Brandenburg") requested interconnection with Verizon. After the Commission ordered the parties to submit an executed agreement complying with the Commission's post-hearing order, Verizon refused to execute the compliant agreement. Brandenburg moved the Commission for an order approving Brandenburg's proposed interconnection agreement in full, arguing that Verizon's delay justified such a remedy. Verizon responded and the issue was fully briefed. Thereafter, the Commission ordered that unless the parties submitted an executed agreement within one week, Brandenburg's proposed agreement "shall become immediately effective and enforceable with or without the signature of Verizon." *See* January 8, 2002 Order, *Brandenburg Telecom*. Thus, the Commission demonstrated its power to approve one party's interconnection agreement in full with or without agreement of the other party.

The Commission should exercise that power here because of ComScape's failure to negotiate in good faith as required by Section 251 of the Act.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should approve the interconnection agreement submitted by Ballard Rural in this proceeding. As demonstrated above, ComScape has thoroughly failed to negotiate in good faith. Accordingly, the Commission should reject any agreement proposed by ComScape and approve in full the agreement tendered by Ballard Rural.

Respectfully submitted,



John E. Selent
Holly C. Wallace
Edward T. Depp
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
1400 PNC Plaza
500 W. Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
(502) 540-2300 (telephone)
(502) 585-2207 (fax)

**COUNSEL TO BALLARD RURAL
TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE
CORPORATION, INC.**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served by Federal Express on this 4th day of August, 2006, to the following individual(s):

Kendrick R. Riggs, Esq.
Douglas F. Brent, Esq.
Stoll Keenon Ogden PLLC
2000 PNC Plaza
500 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
kendrick.riggs@skofirm.com
douglas.brent@skofirm.com

Counsel to T-Mobile and Counsel to Verizon

Mark R. Overstreet
Stites & Harbison PLLC
421 West Main Street
P.O. Box 634
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0634
moverstreet@stites.com

Counsel to AllTel

John N. Hughes, Esq.
Attorney at Law
124 West Todd Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
jnhughes@fewpb.net


Counsel to Sprint PCS

Holland N. McTyeire
Greenbaum Doll & McDonald PLLC
3500 National City Tower
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
HNM@gdm.com

Counsel to ACC

Tom Sams
NTCH-West, Inc.
1600 Ute Avenue, Suite 10
Grand Junction, CO 81501

Bhogin M. Modi
ComScape Telecommunications, Inc.
1926 10th Avenue North
Suite 305
West Palm Beach, FL 33461



**COUNSEL TO BALLARD RURAL
TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE
CORPORATION, INC.**

**COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

RECEIVED

AUG 04 2006

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

Petition of Logan Telephone Cooperative, Inc.)	
for Arbitration of Certain Terms and)	
Conditions of Proposed Interconnection)	
Agreement with American Cellular Corporation)	Case No. 2006-00218
f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to)	
the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended)	
by the Telecommunications Act of 1996)	

**MOTION OF LOGAN TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC.
TO APPROVE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT**

Logan Telephone Cooperative, Inc. ("Logan"), by counsel, pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("the Act"), KRS Chapter 278.040, and 807 KAR 5:001, hereby moves the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the "Commission") to approve the interconnection agreement Logan submitted to the Commission in this arbitration proceeding against ComScape Telecommunications, Inc. ("ComScape"). In support of its motion, Logan states as follows.

INTRODUCTION

This arbitration proceeding arises from the impending termination of an agreement ("the CMRS Agreement") between CMRS providers, rural independent local exchange carriers ("Rural ILECs"), and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth"), effective May 1, 2004, and terminating on December 31, 2006. The CMRS Agreement required the signatory CMRS providers to commence interconnection negotiations with the Rural ILECs if they wished for their Rural-ILEC-destined traffic to continue to be delivered to the Rural ILECs after that date. ComScape is a CMRS provider, and Logan a Rural ILEC, under the Agreement.

Pursuant to Section 3.01 of the CMRS Agreement, interconnection negotiations between Logan and ComScape were deemed to commence on January 1, 2006, regardless of whether an actual request for negotiation was received by that date.¹ Throughout the “negotiation” process, ComScape has failed to negotiate in good faith with Logan. Despite Logan's repeated attempts to correspond, negotiate, and exchange draft interconnection agreements, ComScape has failed to respond in any meaningful way. Because of ComScape’s failure to respond meaningfully to Logan's attempts to negotiate, Logan filed an arbitration petition against ComScape on May 31, 2006. Logan attached its proposed interconnection agreement to that petition.

Because ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith as required by 47 U.S.C. 251(c) and regulations promulgated thereunder, the Commission should approve the proposed interconnection agreement Logan has submitted to the Commission in this proceeding.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Logan's attempts to negotiate with ComScape began on February 2, 2006, when Logan sent a letter to ComScape advising it of Logan's desire to negotiate an interconnection agreement pursuant to Section 3.01 of the CMRS Agreement of May 2004. Logan enclosed with that letter a copy of the template interconnection agreement from which negotiations would proceed.²

ComScape made no effort to propose changes to the template agreement it had received from Logan. Therefore, on March 17, 2006, Logan sent another letter advising ComScape of Logan's desire to negotiate and enclosing another template interconnection agreement, this time with the

¹ Thus, the statutory window for arbitration in this matter opened on May 16, 2006 and closed on June 10, 2006.

² See February 2, 2006 letter from John E. Selent to Bhogin M. Modi, attached as Exhibit 2 to Logan's Petition for Arbitration (the "Petition").

proposed traffic exchange splits, proposed reciprocal compensation rates, and proposed point of interconnection.³

Because ComScape proposed no specific changes to the template interconnection agreement, Logan sent yet another letter to ComScape on May 16, 2006 regarding the status of ComScape's review of the proposed interconnection agreement.⁴

As of this date, ComScape still has not provided Logan with any proposed changes to the interconnection agreement. Accordingly, Logan filed its arbitration petition against ComScape on May 31, 2006.

ARGUMENT

The Commission should approve the interconnection agreement Logan submitted with its arbitration petition against ComScape because ComScape failed to comply with its statutory duty to negotiate in good faith. ComScape's failure to negotiate in good faith means that any agreement proposed by ComScape, by definition, would not comply with Section 251 of the Act. As such, the Commission should reject any agreement proposed by ComScape and should approve Logan's agreement in full.

I. Statutory and regulatory law requires ComScape to negotiate in good faith.

A requesting telecommunications carrier such as ComScape has a duty to negotiate with Logan in good faith. 47 U.S.C. 251(c)(1) ("The requesting telecommunications carrier also has the duty to negotiate in good faith the terms and conditions of such agreements.") Section 252 (b)(5) of the Act defines certain conduct that constitutes a failure to negotiate in good faith:

The refusal of any other party to the negotiation to participate further in the negotiations, to cooperate with the State commission in

³ See March 17, 2006 letter from John E. Selent to Bhogin M. Modi, attached as Exhibit 3 to the Petition.

⁴ See May 16, 2006 letter from John E. Selent to Bhogin M. Modi, attached as Exhibit 4 to the Petition.

carrying out its function as an arbitrator, or to continue to negotiate in good faith in the presence, or with the assistance, of the State commission shall be considered a failure to negotiate in good faith.

Regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") define certain additional conduct that violates the duty to negotiate in good faith:

(c) If proven to the Commission, an appropriate state commission, or a court of competent jurisdiction, the following actions or practices, among others, violate the duty to negotiate in good faith:

(6) Intentionally obstructing or delaying negotiations or resolutions of disputes;

(7) Refusing throughout the negotiation process to designate a representative with authority to make binding representations, if such refusal significantly delays resolution of issues; and

(8) Refusing to provide information necessary to reach agreement. . . .

47 CFR 51.301. These controlling provisions set forth at least four situations in which a carrier violates its duty to negotiate in good faith: (1) the complete refusal to negotiate, (2) the intentional delay of negotiations, (3) causing delay by refusing to designate a representative to negotiate, and (4) refusing to provide necessary information.

Critically, this Commission has authority to conclude that ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith with Logan. *See In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, First Report and Order, FCC 96-325 at ¶ 143 ("First Report and Order") ("state commissions have authority, under section 252(b)(5), to consider allegations that a party has failed to negotiate in good faith.") In fact, it is precisely this power of review by state commissions that ensures the effectiveness of the good faith requirement of the Act.

[P]arties seeking to avoid a legitimate accusation of breach of the duty of good faith in negotiation will work to provide their negotiating adversary all relevant information -- given that section

252(b)(4)(B) authorizes the state commission to require the parties "to provide such information as may be necessary for the State commission to reach a decision on the unresolved issues." That provision also states that, if either party "fails unreasonably to respond on a timely basis to any reasonable request from the State commission, then the State commission may proceed on the basis of the best information available to it from whatever source derived." **The likelihood that an arbitrator will review the positions taken by the parties during negotiations also should discourage parties from refusing unreasonably to provide relevant information to each other or to delay negotiations.**

Id. at ¶ 149 (emphasis added). As the FCC has explained, the power of review by state commissions gives the good faith requirement its teeth. Thus, this Commission has the power to decide that ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith with Logan. Exercising that power will further the purposes of the Act.

II. ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith by failing to propose revisions to Logan's template interconnection agreement.

ComScape failed to negotiate in good faith with Logan. Logan contacted ComScape at the beginning of the negotiation window and, over the course of months, sent ComScape multiple letters and copies of a proposed interconnection agreement. ComScape, however, never responded meaningfully to these negotiation overtures. At no time from the beginning of the negotiation window through the beginning of the arbitration window did ComScape make any effort to propose definitive changes to Logan's template agreement.

ComScape's delay deprived Logan of many valuable months in which the parties could have been negotiating any unresolved issues as envisioned and required by 47 U.S.C. 251-52. Well into the arbitration window and faced with no meaningful response to its proposed interconnection agreement, Logan had no choice but to initiate arbitration. The failure by ComScape to respond meaningfully constitutes a "refusal of any other party to the negotiation to participate further in the negotiations," an automatic violation of the duty of good faith. 47 U.S.C. 252(b)(5). Further, the

failure to provide meaningful response can only be interpreted as an intentional delay and a failure to provide necessary information, each of which constitutes a violation of the duty of good faith as defined by the FCC in 47 CFR 51.301.

III. The Commission should approve the interconnection agreement submitted by Logan.

Because of the failure of ComScape to negotiate in good faith, the Commission should approve the interconnection agreement submitted by Logan in this proceeding. In arbitrating interconnection agreements under Section 252(b) of the Act, a state commission must primarily ensure that its resolution of the arbitration comports with the requirements of Section 251 and regulations promulgated thereunder, including, of course, the duty to negotiate in good faith. 47 U.S.C. 252(c)(1). A state commission may reject an agreement that does not meet those statutory and regulatory requirements, including the duty to negotiate in good faith. 47 U.S.C. 252(e)(2)(B). In making its determination, the state commission has broad discretion to reject an agreement that does not comport with the duties imposed in Section 251. *Bell Atlantic-Delaware, Inc. v. McMahon*, 80 F.Supp.2d 218, 224 (D. Del. 2000) (“The Act provides a disincentive to state commission mediation by allowing the commission to reject agreements that do not “meet the requirements of section 251” of the Act. This grants a state commission broader discretion to reject agreements (in whole or in part) that do not comport with the duties imposed in 251.”)

Here, ComScape violated its statutory duty to negotiate in good faith. (*See supra*, pages 2-3.) For that reason, any agreement proposed by ComScape would not, by definition, comport with the duties imposed by Section 251. 47 U.S.C. 251(c)(1) (“The requesting telecommunications carrier also has the duty to negotiate in good faith”) Therefore, in order to ensure that any interconnection agreement between Logan and ComScape complies with Section 251 (*see* 47 U.S.C.

252(c)(1)), and pursuant to its power to reject an agreement that does not comply with Section 251 (see 47 U.S.C. 252(e)(2)(B)), the Commission should reject any agreement proposed by ComScape.

Given any agreement that ComScape might propose cannot, by definition, comply with the Act, the Commission should approve Logan's proposed agreement in full. The Commission has previously demonstrated that it will approve one party's proposed interconnection agreement in full where the other party to arbitration has engaged in stalling and delay. See *In the Matter of: Petition of Brandenburg Telecom, LLC for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Agreement with Verizon South Inc. Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Case No. 2001-224 (hereafter, "*Brandenburg Telecom*").


In *Brandenburg Telecom*, Brandenburg Telecom LLC ("Brandenburg") requested interconnection with Verizon. After the Commission ordered the parties to submit an executed agreement complying with the Commission's post-hearing order, Verizon refused to execute the compliant agreement. Brandenburg moved the Commission for an order approving Brandenburg's proposed interconnection agreement in full, arguing that Verizon's delay justified such a remedy. Verizon responded and the issue was fully briefed. Thereafter, the Commission ordered that unless the parties submitted an executed agreement within one week, Brandenburg's proposed agreement "shall become immediately effective and enforceable with or without the signature of Verizon." See January 8, 2002 Order, *Brandenburg Telecom*. Thus, the Commission demonstrated its power to approve one party's interconnection agreement in full with or without agreement of the other party.

The Commission should exercise that power here because of ComScape's failure to negotiate in good faith as required by Section 251 of the Act.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should approve the interconnection agreement submitted by Logan in this proceeding. As demonstrated above, ComScape has thoroughly failed to negotiate in good faith. Accordingly, the Commission should reject any agreement proposed by ComScape and approve in full the agreement tendered by Logan.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John E. Selent', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and cursive.

John E. Selent

Holly C. Wallace

Edward T. Depp

DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP

1400 PNC Plaza

500 W. Jefferson Street

Louisville, Kentucky 40202

(502) 540-2300 (telephone)

(502) 585-2207 (fax)

COUNSEL TO LOGAN

TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served by Federal Express on this 4th day of August, 2006, to the following individual(s):

Kendrick R. Riggs, Esq.
Douglas F. Brent, Esq.
Stoll Keenon Ogden PLLC
2000 PNC Plaza
500 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
kendrick.riggs@skofirm.com
douglas.brent@skofirm.com

Counsel to T-Mobile and Counsel to Verizon

Mark R. Overstreet
Stites & Harbison PLLC
421 West Main Street
P.O. Box 634
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0634
moverstreet@stites.com

Counsel to AllTel

John N. Hughes, Esq.
Attorney at Law
124 West Todd Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
jnhughes@fewpb.net

Counsel to Sprint PCS

Holland N. McTyeire
Greenbaum Doll & McDonald PLLC
3500 National City Tower
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
HNM@gdm.com

Counsel to ACC

Tom Sams
NTCH-West, Inc.
1600 UTE Avenue, Suite 10
Grand Junction, CO 81501

Bhagin M. Modi
ComScape Telecommunications, Inc.
1926 10th Avenue North
Suite 305
Wet Palm Beach, FL 33461



**COUNSEL TO LOGAN TELEPHONE
COOPERATIVE, INC.**