

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 9, 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-13258 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Zenk Group, Ltd., d/b/a Planet Access
Application filed January 24, 2006 for approval of a fourth amendment to an interconnection agreement (hot cut process). |
| Case No. U-13492 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and C.L.Y.K. Inc.
Application filed January 19, 2006 for approval of a fifth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO). |
| Case No. U-13580 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and Sprint Communications Company Limited Partnership
Application filed January 19, 2006 for approval of an eighth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO). |
| Case No. U-13788 | AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and CloseCall America, Inc.
Application filed January 19, 2006 for approval of a fifth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO). |

- Case No. U-14412 AT&T Michigan, f/k/a SBC Michigan, and CenturyTel Fiber Company II, LLC, d/b/a Lightcore
Application filed January 20, 2006 for approval of a fourth amendment to an interconnection agreement (TRO/TRRO).
- Case No. U-14765 Chatham Telephone Company, Communication Corporation of Michigan, Island Telephone Company, Shiawassee Telephone Company, and Wolverine Telephone Company and T-Mobile USA, Inc.
Application filed January 24, 2006 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 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 9, 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 9, 2006.

Its Executive Secretary

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

Suggested Minute:

“Adopt and issue order dated February 9, 2006 approving interconnection agreements and amendments, as set forth in the order.”