

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 February 21, 2006 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-11596 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Qwest Communications Corporation, f/k/a LCI International Telecom Corporation
Application filed January 30, 2006 for approval of a second amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO). |
| Case No. U-12627 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and New Edge Network, Inc.
Application filed January 27, 2006 for an eighth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO). |
| Case No. U-13801 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Access One Inc.
Application filed February 1, 2006 for approval of a second amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO). |
| Case No. U-13805 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and grid4 Communications, Inc.
Application filed February 7, 2006 for approval of the third amendment to an interconnection agreement (optional advanced services). |

- Case No. U-14003 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Waypoint Telecommunications, LLC, d/b/a Waypoint Fiber Networks Application filed February 3, 2006 for an eighth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).
- Case No. U-14058 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and CAT Communications International, Inc. Application filed February 1, 2006 for approval of a tenth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).
- Case No. U-14176 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Cinergy Communications Company Application filed February 3, 2006 for approval of a third amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).
- Case No. U-14640 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC Application filed January 27, 2006 for a second amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).
- Case No. U-14741 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Navigator Telecommunications, L.L.C. Application filed January 5, 2006 for approval of an interconnection agreement and first and second amendments.
- Case No. U-14755 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Pac-West Telecomm, Inc. Application filed January 17, 2006 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-14768 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Osirus Communications, Inc. Application filed January 30, 2006 for an interconnection agreement (adoption pursuant to 47 USC 252(i) of the agreement approved on December 3, 2003 in Case No. U-13758).
- Case No. U-14770 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Pac-West Telecomm, Inc. Application filed January 31, 2006 for an interconnection agreement (adoption pursuant to 47 USC 252(i) of the agreement approved on February 24, 2005 in Case No. U-14413).

- Case No. U-14774 France Telecom Corporate Solutions, L.L.C., and Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems
Application filed February 2, 2006 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-14775 Covista, Inc., and Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems
Application filed February 2, 2006 for approval of an interconnection agreement and first and second amendments (TRO/TRRO).

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 by the filing of a claim of appeal in the Michigan Court of Appeals within 30 days of the issuance of this order, pursuant to MCL 484.2203(12).

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 February 21, 2006.

/s/ Mary Jo Kunkle

Its Executive Secretary

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so by the filing of a claim of appeal in the Michigan Court of Appeals within 30 days of the issuance of this order, pursuant to MCL 484.2203(12).

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of February 21, 2006.

Its Executive Secretary