

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 September 11, 2003 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-12258 | SBC Ameritech Michigan and Detroit SMSA Limited Partnership<br>Application filed August 22, 2003 for approval of the third<br>amendment (updated the Reciprocal Compensation provisions).  |
| Case No. U-12465 | SBC Ameritech Michigan and AT&T Communications of<br>Michigan, Inc.<br>Application filed August 5, 2003 for approval of the third and<br>fourth amendments (add Michigan Reverse Directory Assistance<br>and clarify the meet point trunk group transmission and routing<br>language). |
| Case No. U-12465 | SBC Ameritech Michigan and TCG Detroit Edison<br>Application filed August 5, 2003 for approval of third amendment<br>(add Michigan Reverse Directory Assistance).  |

- Case No. U-12535 SBC Ameritech Michigan and American Fiber Network, Inc.  
Application filed August 7, 2003 for approval of the sixth amendment (reciprocal compensation provisions in the interconnection agreement).
- Case No. U-12758 T-Mobile USA, Inc., f/k/a Voicestream Wireless Corp., and SBC Ameritech Michigan  
Application filed August 20, 2003 for approval of the fourth amendment (reciprocal compensation update).
- Case No. U-13056 Cricket Communications, Inc. and SBC Ameritech Michigan  
Application filed August 20, 2003 for approval of the first amendment (reciprocal compensation update).
- Case No. U-13201 SBC Ameritech Michigan and American Cellular Corporation and Dobson Communications Corp (American Cellular)  
Application filed August 12, 2003 for approval of the first amendment (reciprocal compensation provisions).
- Case No. U-13211 SBC Ameritech Michigan and Ameritech Advanced Data Services of Michigan  
Applications for the ninth amendment filed August 26, 2003 and the tenth amendment filed August 27, 2003 (updated the reciprocal compensation provisions and added the telephone number report attachment).
- Case No. U-13378 Comcast Telecommunications, Inc. and SBC Ameritech Michigan  
Application filed August 13, 2003 for approval of the first amendment (reciprocal compensation update).
- Case No. U-13576 Easton Telecom Services, LLC and SBC Ameritech Michigan  
Application filed August 27, 2003 for approval of the first amendment (reciprocal compensation update).
- Case No. U-13687 Excel Telecommunications, Inc. and SBC Ameritech Michigan  
Application filed August 14, 2003 for approval of the fourth amendment (reciprocal compensation update).
- Case No. U-13833 SBC Ameritech Michigan and AT&T Wireless Services, Inc.  
Application filed July 11, 2003 for approval of a wireless E-911 interconnection agreement.

Case No. U-13853            Century Tel Systems and DayStarr Communications  
Application filed August 7, 2003 for approval of an intercon-  
nection agreement (adoption of terms and conditions of the  
interconnection agreement dated October 4, 2002, between  
CenturyTel and ICG Telecom, Inc., which was approved by the  
Commission in order issued on December 20, 2002 in Case  
No. U-13649).

Case No. U-13856            Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon  
North Systems and TC3 Telecom, Inc.  
Application filed August 12, 2003 for approval of an intercon-  
nection agreement.

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 September 11, 2003.

/s/ Robert W. Kehres  
Its Acting 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 September 11, 2003.

---

Its Acting Executive Secretary

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

Suggested Minute:

“Adopt and issue order dated September 11, 2003 approving interconnection agreements and amendments, as set forth in the order.”