

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 7, 2005 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. J. Peter Lark, Chairman
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-13137 | SBC Michigan and Local Exchange Carriers of Michigan, Inc.
Application filed May 16, 2005 for approval of the first amendment to an interconnection agreement (revise pricing schedule per TELRIC). |
| Case No. U-13175 | SBC Michigan and XO Communications Services, Inc., f/k/a XO Michigan, Inc.
Application filed May 11, 2005 for approval of the ninth amendment to an interconnection agreement (revise pricing schedule per TELRIC). |
| Case No. U-13212 | SBC Michigan and Preferred Carrier Services, Inc.
Application filed May 16, 2005 for approval of the third amendment to an interconnection agreement (revise pricing schedule per TELRIC). |
| Case No. U-13328 | SBC Michigan and RVP Fiber Company, L.L.C.
Application filed May 17, 2005 for approval of the sixth amendment to an interconnection agreement (incorporates certain rates, terms, and conditions pertaining to loop and transport rate increases and |

embedded base transition pursuant to the FCC's March 11, 2005 TRO Remand Order).

- Case No. U-13328 SBC Michigan and RVP Fiber Company, L.L.C.
Application filed May 17, 2005 for approval of the seventh amendment to an interconnection agreement (incorporates certain rates, terms, and conditions pertaining to mass market unbundled local switching rate increases and embedded base transition pursuant to the FCC's March 11, 2005 TRO Remand Order).
- Case No. U-13513 SBC Michigan and Sage Telecom, Inc.
Application filed May 16, 2005 for approval of the twelfth amendment to an interconnection agreement (revise pricing schedule per TELRIC).
- Case No. U-13569 SBC Michigan and Talk America Inc.
Application filed May 26, 2005 for approval of the fourth amendment to an interconnection agreement (all day hot cut process appendix).
- Case No. U-13986 Coast to Coast Telecommunications, Inc., and SBC Michigan
Application filed May 13, 2005 for approval of the eighth amendment to an interconnection agreement (revise pricing schedule per TELRIC).
- Case No. U-14029 SBC Michigan and Essex Acquisition Corporation
Application filed May 26, 2005 for approval of the second amendment to an interconnection agreement (revise pricing schedule per TELRIC).
- Case No. U-14030 SBC Michigan and CMC Telecom, Inc.
Application filed May 10, 2005 for approval of the sixth amendment to an interconnection agreement (replaces methodology for charging for collocation DC Power).
- Case No. U-14176 SBC Michigan and Cinergy Communications Company
Application filed May 27, 2005 for approval of the second amendment to an interconnection agreement (revise pricing schedule per TELRIC).
- Case No. U-14524 SBC Michigan and OnFiber Carrier Services, Inc.
Application filed May 11, 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 E A L)

/s/ J. Peter Lark
Chairman

By its action of June 7, 2005.

/s/ Robert B. Nelson
Commissioner

/s/ Mary Jo Kunkle
Its Executive Secretary

/s/ Laura Chappelle
Commissioner

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

Chairman

By its action of June 7, 2005.

Commissioner

Its Executive Secretary

Commissioner