

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 October 9, 2007 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. Orjiakor N. Isiogu, Chairman
Hon. Monica Martinez, Commissioner
Hon. Steven A. Transeth, Commissioner

ORDER

The following parties have filed joint applications for approval of interconnection agreements
and amendments:

- Case No. U-13569 AT&T Michigan and Talk America, Inc., d/b/a Cavalier Telephone
Application filed September 27, 2007 for approval of a sixth
amendment to an interconnection agreement (replaces one way
trunking with two way).
- Case No. U-14045 AT&T Michigan and United Telecom, Inc.
Application filed September 19, 2007 for approval of a sixth
amendment to an interconnection agreement (extends contract term
to January 1, 2010).
- Case No. U-14768 AT&T Michigan and Osirus Communications, Inc.
Application filed September 19, 2007 for approval of a tenth
amendment to an interconnection agreement (extends contract term
to January 1, 2010).
- Case No. U-15418 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon
North Systems, and Southwest Michigan Communications, Inc.

Application filed September 14, 2007 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adoption pursuant to 47 USC 252(i) of the agreement approved on July 23, 2003 in Case No. U-13791 between Verizon North Systems and Winn Telephone Company).

Case No. U-15421 Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Telrite Corporation
Application filed September 18, 2007 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)(2) and (3) 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.

After reviewing the applications, agreements, and amendments, the Commission finds 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/ Orjiakor N. Isiogu
Chairman

(S E A L)

/s/ Monica Martinez
Commissioner

/s/ Steven A. Transeth
Commissioner

By its action of October 9, 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 October 9, 2007.

Its Executive Secretary