

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 December 20, 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-13467 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and NOS Communications, Inc.
Application filed November 28, 2005 for approval of a sixth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO). |
| Case No. U-13513 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Sage Telecom, Inc.
Application filed November 28, 2005 for approval of a thirteenth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO). |
| Case No. U-13541 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Nexus Communications, Inc.
Application filed November 15, 2005 for approval of a fifth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO). |

- Case No. U-13791 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and The Winn Telephone Company, d/b/a Winn Telecom
Application filed December 6, 2005 for approval of a second amendment to an interconnection agreement (mid-span fiber meet).
- Case No. U-13943 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and T2 Communications, L.L.C.
Application filed November 21, 2005 for approval of a sixth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).
- Case No. U-13980 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Granite Telecommunications, LLC
Application filed December 8, 2005 for approval of a third amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).
- Case No. U-14082 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Dobson Cellular Systems, Inc.
Application filed November 15, 2005 for approval of a first amendment to an interconnection agreement (amends terms and conditions with respect to E911).
- Case No. U-14152 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Level 3 Communications, LLC
Application filed November 30, 2005 for approval of a third amendment to an interconnection agreement (adds 911 waiver language).
- Case No. U-14166 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Neutral Tandem-Michigan, LLC
Application filed November 17, 2005 for approval of a twelfth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).
- Case No. U-14177 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Trans National Communications International, Inc.
Application filed November 28, 2005 for approval of a second amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).
- Case No. U-14628 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Osirus Communications, Inc.
Application filed November 28, 2005 for approval of a first amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).

- Case No. U-14688 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Allband Communications Cooperative Application filed November 15, 2005 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i), of the agreement approved on November 2, 2000 in Case No. U-12683).
- Case No. U-14689 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and LDMI Telecommunications, Inc. Application filed November 18, 2005 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i), of the agreement approved on July 19, 2005 in Case No. U-13931).
- Case No. U-14690 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Talk America Inc. Application filed November 18, 2005 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i), of the agreement approved on July 19, 2005 in Case No. U-13931).
- Case No. U-14695 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Spectrotel, Inc. Application filed November 21, 2005 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-14699 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and MetroPCS Michigan, Inc. Application filed November 30, 2005 for approval of an interconnection agreement with first, second and third amendments (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i), of the agreement, with amendments, approved on October 7, 2003 in Case No. U-13879).
- Case No. U-14723 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Carr Telephone Company Application filed November 30, 2005 for approval of an interconnection agreement with first, second, third, fourth, and fifth amendments (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i), of the agreement, with amendments, approved on September 21, 2004 in Case No. U- 14238).
- Case No.U-14730 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and IBFA Acquisition Company, LLC Application filed on December 6, 2005 for approval of an interconnection agreement and amendments one through sixteen (adoption, pursuant to 47 USC 252(i) adoption of the agreement, with amendments, approved on March 21, 2002 in Case No. U-12465).

- Case No. U-14733 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and United Telecom, Inc. d/b/a UTMI.net Application filed December 7, 2005 for approval of an interconnection agreement and first amendment (47 USC 252(i) adoption of the agreement, with amendment, approved on July 19, 2005 in Case No. U-13931).
- Case No. U-14735 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and VCI Company, d/b/a Vilaire Communications Application filed December 8, 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 December 20, 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 December 20, 2005.

Its Executive Secretary