

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 August 16, 2005 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. J. Peter Lark, Chairman
Hon. Laura Chappelle, Commissioner
Hon. Monica Martinez, Commissioner

ORDER

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

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Case No. U-12454 | SBC Michigan and CoreComm Michigan, Inc.
Application filed July 6, 2005, for approval of the second
amendment (revised pricing schedule per TELRIC). |
| Case No. U-12798 | SBC Michigan and Focal Communications Corporation of Michigan
Application filed July 6, 2005, for approval of the eighth amendment
(extends the term of the amendment superseding certain intervening
law, compensation, interconnection, and trunking provisions until
12-31-06). |
| Case No. U-12927 | SBC Michigan and DIECA Communications, Inc., d/b/a Covad
Communications Company
Application filed December 1, 2004, for approval of the tenth
amendment (Exhibit A). |

- Case No. U-12927 SBC Michigan and DIECA Communications, Inc., d/b/a Covad Communications Company
Applications filed July 8, 2005, for approval of the eleventh (revised pricing schedule per TELRIC), twelfth (TRO), and thirteenth (TRO) amendments (Exhibit A).
- Case No. U-13801 SBC Michigan and Access One, Inc.
Application filed July 11, 2005, for approval of the first amendment (revised pricing schedule per TELRIC).
- Case No. U-13805 SBC Michigan and grid 4 Communications, Inc.
Application filed July 6, 2005, for approval of the first amendment (revised pricing schedule per TELRIC).
- Case No. U-14278 SBC Michigan and KMC Telecom III LLC
Applications filed July 8, 2005, for approval of a thirteenth amendment (establishes a name change to CenturyTel Acquisition LLC, d/b/a KMC Telecom III LLC, into the agreement).
- Case No. U-14585 Bloomingdale Telephone Company, Inc., and Michiana Metronet, Inc., d/b/a Centennial Wireless
Application filed July 6, 2005, for approval of an interconnection agreement and reciprocal compensation.
- Case No. U-14589 TDS Metrocom, LLC, and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC
Application filed July 7, 2005, for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-14590 TDS Metrocom, LLC, and Sprint Spectrum L.P.
Application filed July 7, 2005, for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-14592 SBC Michigan and Phone Co, L.P.
Application filed July 19, 2005, for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption of the agreement approved in Case No. U-13758, including third (generic reciprocal/intercarrier compensation) and fourth (conforming post-TRRO remand) amendments.
- Case No. U-14595 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Trans National Communications International, Inc.
Application filed July 21, 2005, for approval of an interconnection agreement.

- Case No. U-14596 Pigeon Telephone Company and Michiana Metronet, Inc., d/b/a Centennial Wireless
Application filed July 20, 2005, for approval of an interconnection agreement and reciprocal compensation agreement.
- Case No. U-14597 Chapin Telephone Company and Michiana Metronet, Inc., d/b/a Centennial Wireless
Application filed July 20, 2005, for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-14598 TDS Metrocom, LLC, and US Xchange of Michigan, L.L.C., d/b/a Choice One
Application filed July 21, 2005, for approval of an interconnection agreement (reciprocal compensation and traffic exchange agreement).
- Case No. U-14599 TDS Metrocom, LLC, and Verizon Wireless Personal Communications Limited Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless
Application filed July 21, 2005, for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-14602 TDS Metrocom, LLC, and Nextel West Corp.
Application filed July 25, 2005, for approval of an interconnection 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
Chairman

(S E A L)

/s/ Laura Chappelle
Commissioner

/s/ Monica Martinez
Commissioner

By its action of August 16, 2005.

/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

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of August 16, 2005.

Its Executive Secretary