

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter of the joint requests for Commission)
approval of interconnection agreements and)
amendments.)
_____)

At the February 12, 2004 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. J. Peter Lark, Chair
Hon. Robert B. Nelson, Commissioner
Hon. Laura Chappelle, Commissioner

ORDER

The following parties have filed joint applications for approval of interconnection agreements
and amendments:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Case No. U-11989 | CenturyTel Wireless, Inc., and SBC Michigan
Application filed January 7, 2004 for approval of a first amendment
(FCC Docket Nos. 96-98 and 99-68, order on remand). |
| Case No. U-12258 | SBC Michigan and Detroit SMSA Limited Partnership,
by Ameritech Mobile Communications, LLC, d/b/a Cingular
Wireless
Application filed January 8, 2004 for approval of the fourth
amendment (name change). |
| Case No. U-12460 | SBC Michigan and Level 3 Communications, LLC
Application filed January 22, 2004 for approval of an eighth
amendment (adds structure access appendix). |
| Case No. U-13032 | B & S Telecom, Inc., and SBC Michigan
Application filed January 8, 2004, for approval of a fifth amendment
(FCC Docket Nos. 96-98 and 99-68, order on remand). |

- Case No. U-13493 Navigator Telecommunications, L.L.C., and SBC Michigan Application filed January 12, 2004 for approval of the second amendment (FCC Docket Nos. 96-98 and 99-68, order on remand).
- Case No. U-13513 Sage Telecom, Inc., and SBC Michigan Application filed January 7, 2004, for approval of a seventh amendment (FCC Docket Nos. 96-98 and 99-68, order on remand).
- Case No. U-13677 SBC Michigan and Line 1 Communications, LLC, d/b/a Direct Line Application filed January 9, 2004 for approval of the second amendment (reciprocal compensation).
- Case No. U-13725 SBC Michigan and LDMI Telecommunications, Inc. Application filed January 7, 2004 for approval of the fifth amendment (adds DSL/RABT using modified maintenance process to the DSL appendix).
- Case No. U-13888 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and MCI metro Access Transmission Services LLC Application filed January 23, 2004 for approval of the first amendment (unitary intercarrier compensation).
- Case No. U-13889 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Brooks Fiber Communications of Michigan, Inc. Application filed January 23, 2004 for approval of the first amendment (unitary intercarrier compensation).
- Case No. U-13890 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and MCI WORLDCOM Communications, Inc. Application filed January 22, 2004 for approval of a first amendment (unitary intercarrier compensation).
- Case No. U-13997 Granite Telecommunications, LLC, and Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems Application filed on December 30, 2003 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-13998 CenturyTel and TelNet Worldwide, Inc. Application filed January 6, 2004 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-14001 ATI Networks, Inc., and SBC Michigan Application filed January 8, 2004 for approval of an interconnection agreement and fifth and sixth amendments (reciprocal compensation).

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Case No. U-14003 | Waypoint Telecommunications, LLC, d/b/a Waypoint Fiber Networks, and SBC Michigan
Application filed January 9, 2004 for approval of an interconnection agreement and fifth and sixth amendments (reciprocal compensation). |
| Case No. U-14006 | SBC Michigan and MichTel Communications, L.L.C.
Application filed January 15, 2004 for approval of an interconnection agreement. |
| Case No. U-14008 | Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and OnePoint Communications-Illinois, LLC
Application filed January 16, 2004 for approval of the first amendment (TRO implementation). |

Section 252 of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 252, requires that any interconnection agreement that is adopted by negotiation be submitted to the Commission for approval. 47 USC 252(e) provides in part:

- (2) The State commission may only reject
 - (A) an agreement (or any portion thereof) adopted by negotiation under subsection (a) of this section if it finds that--
 - (i) the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or
 - (ii) the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity;

- (3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), but subject to section 253 of this title, nothing in this section shall prohibit a State commission from establishing or enforcing other requirements of State law in its review of an agreement, including requiring compliance with intrastate telecommunications service quality standards or requirements.

47 USC 252(e)(2) and (3).

The Commission concludes, after reviewing the applications, agreements, and amendments, that it should approve the applications. The Commission finds that the agreements and amendments are consistent with federal and state law and are in the public interest. Under

47 USC 252(i) and MCL 484.2359(2), the services provided under the agreements, as amended, must be made available to other telecommunications carriers upon the same terms and conditions.

The Commission FINDS that:

a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1991 PA 179, as amended, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 151 et seq.; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201 et seq.; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as amended, 1999 AC, R 460.17101 et seq.

b. The interconnection agreements and amendments listed above should be approved.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

A. The interconnection agreements and amendments listed above are approved.

B. Approval of the interconnection agreements and amendments does not alter the duty of the parties to comply with relevant federal and state law and past and future Commission orders and rules.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

/s/ J. Peter Lark
Chair

(S E A L)

/s/ Robert B. Nelson
Commissioner

/s/ Laura Chappelle
Commissioner

By its action of February 12, 2004.

/s/ Mary Jo Kunkle
Its Executive Secretary

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chair

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of February 12, 2004.

Its Executive Secretary

In the matter of the joint requests for Commission)
approval of interconnection agreements and)
amendments.)
_____)

Suggested Minute:

“Adopt and issue order dated February 12, 2004 approving interconnection agreements and amendments, as set forth in the order.”