

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

June 10, 2010

IN RE:)	
)	
PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF MASTER RESALE)	
AGREEMENT BETWEEN CENTURYTEL OF)	
CLAIBORNE, INC. D/B/A CENTURYLINK CLAIBORNE;)	DOCKET NO.
CENTURYTEL OF ADAMSVILLE, INC. D/B/A)	10-00066
CENTURYLINK ADAMSVILLE; AND CENTURYTEL)	
OF OOLTEWAH-COLLEGE DALE, INC. D/B/A)	
CENTURYLINK OOLTEWAH-COLLEGE DALE AND)	
BULLSEYE TELECOM, INC.)	

ORDER APPROVING THE MASTER RESALE AGREEMENT

This matter came before Chairman Sara Kyle, Director Kenneth C. Hill and Director Mary W. Freeman of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority (the "Authority"), the voting panel assigned to this docket, at a regularly scheduled Authority Conference held on May 24, 2010, to consider, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252, the Petition for approval of the Master Resale Agreement negotiated between CenturyTel of Claiborne, Inc. d/b/a CenturyLink Claiborne, CenturyTel of Adamsville, Inc. d/b/a CenturyLink Adamsville and CenturyTel of Ooltewah-Collegedale, Inc. d/b/a CenturyLink Ooltewah-Collegedale (collectively "CenturyLink") and BullsEye Telecom, Inc. filed on April 20, 2010.

Based upon a review of the agreement, the record in this matter, and the standards for review set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 252, the Directors unanimously granted the Petition and made the following findings and conclusions:

1) The Authority has jurisdiction over public utilities pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-4-104 (2004) and over interconnections between telecommunications service providers under Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-4-124(a) and (b) (2004).

2) The agreement is in the public interest as it provides consumers with alternative sources of telecommunications services within CenturyLink's service area.

3) The agreement is not discriminatory to telecommunications service providers that are not parties thereto.


4) 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(A) provides that a state commission may reject a negotiated agreement only if it “discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement” or if the implementation of the agreement “is not consistent with the public interest, convenience or necessity.” Unlike arbitrated agreements, a state commission may not reject a negotiated agreement on the grounds that the agreement fails to meet the requirements of 47 U.S.C. §§ 251 or 252(d).¹ Thus, although the Authority finds that neither ground for rejection of a negotiated agreement exists, this finding should not be construed to mean that the agreement is consistent with §§ 251 or 252(d) or, for that matter, previous Authority decisions.


5) No person or entity has sought to intervene in this docket.


6) The agreement is reviewable by the Authority pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 and Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 65-4-104 (2004) and 65-4-124(a) and (b) (2004), or in the alternative, under Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-5-109(m) (2009).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

The Petition is granted, and the Master Resale Agreement negotiated between CenturyTel of Claiborne, Inc. d/b/a CenturyLink Claiborne, CenturyTel of Adamsville, Inc. d/b/a CenturyLink Adamsville and CenturyTel of Ooltewah-Collegedale, Inc. d/b/a CenturyLink Ooltewah-Collegedale and BullsEye Telecom, Inc. is approved and is subject to the review of the Authority as provided herein.


Sara Kyle, Chairman


Kenneth C. Hill, Director


Mary W. Freeman, Director

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(B).