

**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)	TC06-175
RESOLVE ISSUES RELATING TO AN)	
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT WITH)	
INTERSTATE TELECOMMUNICATIONS)	
COOPERATIVE, INC.)	

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 Interstate Telecommunications Cooperative, Inc. (ITC). 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) Should the Interconnection Agreement permit the parties to combine wireless and wireline traffic on interconnection trunks? (3) Should the Interconnection Agreement permit the parties to combine all traffic subject to reciprocal compensation charges and traffic subject to access charges onto interconnection trunks? (4) Should the Interconnection Agreement contain provisions for indirect interconnection consistent with Section 251(a) of the Act? (5) In an indirect interconnection scenario, is the ILEC responsible for any facility or transit charges related to delivering its originating traffic to Sprint outside of its exchange boundaries? (6) What direct interconnection terms should be contained in the Interconnection Agreement? (7) What are the appropriate rates for direct interconnection facilities? (8) When a two-way interconnection facility is used, should Sprint and Interstate share the cost of the interconnection facility between their networks based on their respective percentages of originated traffic? (9) What is the appropriate reciprocal compensation rate for the termination of telecommunications traffic, as defined by Sprint in the Agreement? (10) Should Sprint's proposed language regarding Local Number Portability be adopted and incorporated into the Interconnection Agreement? (11) Should the Interstate-proposed Directory Listing provisions, as modified by Sprint, be adopted and incorporated into the Interconnection Agreement? Sprint respectfully requests the Commission to arbitrate each of the remaining disputes between Sprint and Interstate, 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