

Larry D. Callison
State Manager
Regulatory Affairs & Tariffs



Dougherty

GTE Service
Corporation

KY10H072
150 Rojay Drive
Lexington, KY 40503
606 245-1389
Fax: 606 245-1721

6-21-99 JK

RECEIVED

JUN 14 1999

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

June 14, 1999

Ms. Helen Helton
Executive Director
Public Service Commission
730 Schenkel Lane
Post Office Box 615
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602

RECEIVED

JUN 18 1999

GENERAL COUNSEL

RE: 252(i) Adoption Letter Between GTE South Incorporated and
Intermountain Cable, Inc., d/b/a Mikrotec Communications
("Mikrotec")

case 99-249

Dear Ms. Helton:

Enclosed for joint filing by the parties with the Kentucky Public Service Commission (Commission) are six copies of an executed 252(i) Adoption Letter recently executed between GTE South Incorporated and Intermountain Cable, Inc., d/b/a Mikrotec Communications ("Mikrotec").

This Adoption Letter is being provided to the Commission for its review and approval.

Please bring this filing to the attention of the Commission, and if there are any questions, please contact me at your convenience.

Yours truly,

Larry D. Callison

Enclosures

c: Mr. James Campbell - Intermountain Cable, Inc., d/b/a Mikrotec Communications

Connie Nicholas
Assistant Vice President
Wholesale Markets-Interconnection



GTE Network
Services

HOF03828
600 Hidden Ridge
P.O. Box 152092
Irving, TX 75038
972/718-4586
FAX 972/719-1523

May 25, 1999

Eileen M. Bodamer
Consultant to Intermountain Cable, Inc.
Cronin Communications Consultants
415 Hepplewhite Drive
Alpharetta, GA 30022

Dear Ms. Bodamer:

GTE has received your letter stating that, under Section 252(i) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Intermountain Cable, Inc. d/b/a Mikrotec Communications ("Mikrotec") wishes to adopt the terms of the Interconnection Agreement between SouthEast Telephone, Inc. ("SouthEast") and GTE that was approved by the Commission as an effective agreement in the State of Kentucky in Case No. 98-557 ("Terms")¹. I understand Mikrotec has a copy of the Terms.

Please be advised that our position regarding the adoption of The Terms is as follows.

On January 25, 1999, the Supreme Court of the United States ("Court") Issued its decision on the appeals of the Eighth Circuit's decision in *Iowa Utilities Board*. Specifically, the Supreme Court vacated Rule 51.319 of the FCC's First Report and Order, FCC 96-325, 61 Fed. Reg. 45476 (1996) and modified several of the FCC's and the Eighth Circuit's rulings regarding unbundled network elements and pricing requirements under the Act. *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board*, No. 97-826, 1999 U.S. LEXIS 903 (1999).

Three aspects of the Court's decision are worth noting. First, the Court upheld on statutory grounds the FCC's jurisdiction to establish rules implementing the pricing provisions of the Act. The Court, though, did not address the substantive validity of the FCC's pricing rules. This issue will be decided by the Eighth Circuit on remand.

¹ *These "agreements" are not agreements in the generally accepted understanding of that term. GTE was required to accept these agreements, which were required to reflect the then-effective FCC rules.

Second, the Court held that the FCC, in requiring ILECs to make available all UNEs, had failed to implement section 251(d)(2) of the Act, which requires the FCC to apply a "necessary" or "impair" standard in determining the network elements ILECs must unbundle. The Court ruled that the FCC had improperly failed to consider the availability of alternatives outside the ILEC's network and had improperly assumed that a mere increase in cost or decrease in quality would suffice to require that the ILEC provide the UNE. The Court therefore vacated in its entirety the FCC rule setting forth the UNEs that the ILEC is to provide. The FCC must now promulgate new UNE rules that comply with the Act. As a result, any provisions in the Terms requiring GTE to provide UNEs are nullified.

Third, the Court upheld the FCC rule forbidding ILECs from separating elements that are already combined (Rule 315(b)), but explained that its remand of Rule 319 "may render the incumbents' concern on [sham unbundling] academic." In other words, the Court recognized that ILEC concerns over UNE platforms could be mooted if ILECs are not required to provide all network elements: "If the FCC on remand makes fewer network elements unconditionally available through the unbundling requirement, an entrant will no longer be able to lease every component of the network."

The Terms which Mikrotec seeks to adopt does not reflect the Court's decision, and any provision in the Terms that is inconsistent with the decision is nullified.

GTE anticipates that after the FCC issues new final rules on UNEs, this matter may be resolved. In the interim, GTE would prefer not to engage in the arduous task of reforming agreements to properly reflect the current status of the law and then to repeat the same process later after the new FCC rules are in place. Without waiving any rights, GTE proposes that the parties agree to hold off amending (or incorporating the impact of the decision into) the Terms and let the section 252(l) adoption proceed by maintaining the status quo until final new FCC rules are implemented (the "New Rules"), subject to the following package of interdependent terms:

1. GTE will continue to provide all UNEs called for under the Terms until the FCC issues the New Rules even though it is not legally obligated to do so.
2. Likewise, Mikrotec agrees not to seek UNE "platforms," or "already bundled" combinations of UNEs.
3. If the FCC does not issue New Rules prior to the expiration of the initial term of the Terms, GTE will agree to extend any new interconnection arrangement between the parties to the terms of this proposal until the FCC issues its New Rules.

4. By making this proposal (and by agreeing to any settlement or contract modifications that reflect this proposal), GTE does not waive any of its rights, including its rights to seek recovery of its actual costs and a sufficient, explicit universal service fund. Nor does GTE waive its position that, under the Court's decision, it is not required to provide UNEs unconditionally. Moreover, GTE does not agree that the UNE rates set forth in any agreement are just and reasonable and in accordance with the requirements of sections 251 and 252 of Title 47 of the United States Code.
5. The provisions of the contract that might be interpreted to require reciprocal compensation or payment as local traffic from GTE to the CLEC for the delivery of traffic to the Internet are not available for adoption and are not a part of the 252(i) agreement pursuant to FCC Rule 809 and paragraphs 1317 and 1318 of the First Report and Order.

GTE believes that the first four conditions above are adequately explained by the first part of this letter. The reason for the last condition is the FCC gave the ILECs the ability to except 252(i) adoptions in those instances where the cost of providing the service to the requesting carrier is higher than that incurred to serve the initial carrier or there is a technical incompatibility issue. The issue of reciprocal compensation for traffic destined for the Internet falls within FCC Rule 809. GTE never intended for Internet traffic passing through a CLEC to be included within the definition of local traffic and the corresponding obligation of reciprocal compensation. Despite the foregoing, some forums have interpreted the issue to require reciprocal compensation to be paid. This produces the situation where the cost of providing the service is not cost based under Rule 809 or paragraph 1318 of the First report and Order. As a result, that portion of the contract pertaining to reciprocal compensation is not available under this 252(i) adoption. In its place are provisions that exclude ISP Traffic from reciprocal compensation. Specifically, the definition of "Local Traffic" includes this provision: "Local Traffic excludes information service provider ("ISP") traffic (i.e., Internet, 900 - 976, etc)".

In sum, GTE's proposal as described above would maintain the status quo until the legal landscape is settled.

Mikrotec's adoption of the SouthEast Terms shall become effective upon filing of this letter with the Kentucky Public Service Commission and remain in effect no longer than the date the SouthEast Terms are terminated.

Eileen Bodamer
May 25, 1999
Page 4

As these Terms are being adopted by you pursuant to your statutory rights under section 252(i), GTE does not provide the Terms to you as either a voluntary or negotiated agreement. The filing and performance by GTE of the Terms does not in any way constitute a waiver by GTE of any claim it may have with respect to the 252(i) process, nor does it constitute a waiver of GTE's right to seek review of any Terms that are interpreted contrary to the law.

GTE contends that certain provisions of the Terms may be void or unenforceable as a result of the Court's decision of January 25, 1999 and the remand of the pricing rules to the United States Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Should Mikrotec attempt to apply such conflicting provisions, GTE reserves its rights to seek appropriate legal and/or equitable relief. Should any provision of the Terms be modified, such modification would likewise automatically apply to this 252(i) adoption.

Please indicate by your countersignature on this letter your understanding of and commitment to the following three points:

- (A) Mikrotec adopts the Terms of the SouthEast agreement for interconnection with GTE and in applying the Terms, agrees that Mikrotec be substituted in place of SouthEast in the Terms wherever appropriate.
- (B) Mikrotec requests that notice to Mikrotec as may be required under the Terms shall be provided as follows.

To: Intermountain Cable, Inc.
d/b/a Mikrotec Communications
James Campbell
5 Laynesville Road
Harold, KY 41635
Telephone number: 606/678-9401, ext. 207
FAX number: 606/478-3650

98-557

Eileen Bodamer
May 25, 1999
Page 5

- (C) Mikrotec represents and warrants that it is a certified provider of local dialtone service in the State of Kentucky and that its adoption of the Terms will cover services in the State of Kentucky only.

Sincerely,

GTE South Incorporated

Connie Nicholas
Connie Nicholas
Assistant Vice President
Wholesale Markets-Interconnection

Reviewed and countersigned as to points A, B, and C:

Intermountain Cable, Inc., d/b/a Mikrotec Communications

Paul R. Gearheart
Paul Gearheart, President
For Intermountain Cable, Inc., d/b/a Mikrotec Communications

- c: R. Ragsdale - HQE03B75 - Irving, TX
R. Vogelzang - HQE03J41 - Irving, TX
A. Lowery - NC999142 - Durham, NC