

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 May 22, 2007 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-13227 AT&T Michigan and Verizon Wireless
Application filed April 16, 2007 for approval of the fourth
amendment to an interconnection agreement (adds the wireless
collocation appendix and associated rates).

Case No. U-15262 Barry County Telephone Company and Southern Michigan Cellular
Company
Application filed March 29, 2007 for approval of an interconnection
agreement.

Case No. U-15295 CenturyTel and 1-800-RECONEX, Inc.
Application filed May 3, 2007 for approval of a resale agreement
(adoption pursuant to 47 USC 252(i) of the agreement approved on
April 24, 2007 in Case No. U-15101 between CenturyTel and
Universal Telecom, Inc.).

Case No. U-15302 AT&T Michigan and Kentucky Data Link, Inc.
Application filed May 9, 2007 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption pursuant to 47 USC 252(i) of the agreement approved on July 22, 2004 in Case No. U-14176 between AT&T Michigan and Cinergy Communications Company, the first and second amendments (rates), and the third amendment (adds TRO/TRRO)).

Case No. U-15303 AT&T Michigan and Birch Telecom of the Great Lakes, Inc.
Application filed May 9, 2007 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption pursuant to 47 USC 252(i) of the agreement approved on August 18, 2003 in Case No. U-13758 between AT&T Michigan and MCImetro Access Transmission Services LLC, the third through eighth amendments thereto (concerning rates, pricing, trunking, and TRO/TRRO terms), and the ninth amendment (collectively “the MFN 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 aggrieved by this order may file an action in the appropriate federal District Court pursuant to 47 USC 252(e)(6).

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 May 22, 2007.

/s/ Mary Jo Kunkle
Its Executive Secretary

Any party aggrieved by this order may file an action in the appropriate federal District Court pursuant to 47 USC 252(e)(6).

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of May 22, 2007.

Its Executive Secretary