

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 June 21, 2002 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. Laura Chappelle, Chairman
Hon. David A. Svanda, Commissioner
Hon. Robert B. Nelson, Commissioner

OPINION AND ORDER

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

- | | |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Case No. U-12711 | Essex Communications, Inc., d/b/a eLEC Communications, and Ameritech Michigan
Application filed May 30, 2002 for approval of the first amendment (rates, prices, and charges approved by the Commission in Cases Nos. U-11831 and U-12696). |
| Case No. U-12773 | Navigator Telecommunications, LLC, and Ameritech Michigan
Application filed May 31, 2002 for approval of the second amendment (rates and charges approved by the Commission in Case No. U-11831). |
| Case No. U-13124 | Ameritech Michigan and McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc.
Application filed May 30, 2002 for approval of the first amendment (collocation). |

Case No. U-13433 Ameritech Michigan and Waypoint Telecommunications, LLC Applications filed May 28, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i), of the agreement approved on October 24, 2000 in Case No. U-12382 for Coast to Coast Telecommunications, LLC, including the Mi2A amendment) including a negotiated reciprocal compensation appendix and the first amendment (pricing).

Case No. U-13434 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Level 3 Communications LLC Application filed May 31, 2002 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i), of the agreement approved on November 20, 2001 in Case No. U-13144 for Ciera Network Systems, Inc.).

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, 1992 AACS, 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.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

/s/ Laura Chappelle

Chairman

(S E A L)

/s/ David A. Svanda

Commissioner

/s/ Robert B. Nelson

Commissioner

By its action of June 21, 2002.

/s/ Dorothy Wideman

Its Executive Secretary

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

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of June 21, 2002.

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 June 21, 2002 approving interconnection agreements and amendments, as set forth in the order.”