

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF) | ORDER ASSESSING FILING |
| SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.) | FEE |
| FOR ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO THE) | |
| TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 TO) | TC06-176 |
| RESOLVE ISSUES RELATING TO AN) | |
| INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH) | |
| BROOKINGS MUNICIPAL UTILITIES D/B/A) | |
| SWIFTEL COMMUNICATIONS) | |

On October 16, 2006, Sprint Communications Company L.P. (Sprint) filed a petition to arbitrate, pursuant to SDCL 49-31-81 and ARSD 20:10:32:29-32, and Section 252(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996), certain terms and conditions of a proposed Interconnection Agreement between Sprint and Brookings Municipal Utilities d/b/a Swiftel Communications (Swiftel). Sprint filed a list of unresolved issues consisting of: (1) Should the definition of End User in this Agreement include end users of a service provider for which Sprint provides interconnection, telecommunications services or other telephone exchange services? (2) Does the Telecommunications Act authorize the Commission to arbitrate terms and conditions for interconnection obtained under Section 251(a) of the Telecommunications Act? If yes, what terms and conditions should the Commission impose on the parties in this proceeding? (3) Should the Interconnection Agreement permit the parties to combine wireless and wireline traffic on interconnection trunks? (4) Should the Interconnection Agreement permit the parties to combine all traffic subject to reciprocal compensation charges and traffic subject to access charges onto the interconnection trunks? (5) What is the appropriate reciprocal compensation rate for the termination of telecommunications traffic? (6) Should Sprint's proposed language regarding Local Number Portability be adopted and incorporated into the Interconnection Agreement? (7) Should the ILEC-proposed Directory Listing provisions, as modified by Sprint, be adopted and incorporated into the Interconnection Agreement? (8) Termination: A) Should the termination provision of the Interconnection Agreement permit the existing Interconnection Agreement to remain in effect while the parties are in the process of negotiating and/or arbitrating a replacement Interconnection Agreement? B) Should the Interconnection Agreement contain provisions that allow the parties to terminate the Agreement for: 1) a material breach; 2) if either party's authority to provide service is revoked or terminated; or, 3) if either party becomes insolvent or files for bankruptcy? (9) What 911 liability terms should be included in the Interconnection Agreement? (10) What Force Majeure terms should be included in the Interconnection Agreement? Sprint respectfully requests the Commission to arbitrate each of the remaining disputes between Sprint and Swiftel, to find in Sprint's favor and to adopt Sprint's proposed contract language. In accordance with ARSD 20:10:32:30, a non-petitioning party may respond to the petition for arbitration and provide additional information within 25 days after the Commission receives the petition.

On October 30, 2006, the Commission received a Joint Motion of Interstate Telecommunications Cooperative, Inc. and Brookings Municipal Utilities d/b/a Swiftel Communications for Deferral of Hearing on Sprint Communications Company's Request for Consolidation.

At its October 31, 2006, meeting, the Commission considered the assessment of filing fees and the request to consolidate Dockets TC06-175 and TC06-176. The Commission voted to require

the parties to make a deposit not to exceed \$75,000.00, pursuant to SDCL 49-31-44. SDCL 49-31-44 authorizes the Commission to require a deposit of up to seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000) in the telecommunications investigation fund to defray Commission expenses incident to analyzing and ruling upon this type of filing. The request to consolidate Dockets TC06-175 and TC06-176 was deferred.

The Commission has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to SDCL Chapters 1-26 and 49-31, and 47 U.S.C. section 252. The Commission may rely upon any or all of these or other laws of this state in making its determination. It is therefore

ORDERED, that each of the parties shall deposit an initial assessment of \$2,500.00 in the telecommunications investigation fund and shall deposit any additional amounts as requested by the Deputy Executive Director up to the statutory limit of \$75,000.00.

Dated at Pierre, South Dakota, this 17th day of November, 2006.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE | |
| The undersigned hereby certifies that this document has been served today upon all parties of record in this docket, as listed on the docket service list, by facsimile or by first class mail, in properly addressed envelopes, with charges prepaid thereon. | |
| By: | <u><i>Melaine Kalbo</i></u> |
| Date: | <u>11/21/06</u> |
| (OFFICIAL SEAL) | |

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

Robert K. Sahr
ROBERT K. SAHR, Chairman

Dustin M. Johnson
DUSTIN M. JOHNSON, Commissioner

Gary Hanson
GARY HANSON, Commissioner