

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 21, 2008 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-12627 AT&T Michigan and New Edge Network, Inc.  
Application filed September 26, 2008 for approval of a ninth  
amendment to an interconnection agreement (revises definition of  
“business lines” to comply with U.S. District Court, Eastern District  
of Michigan, order reversing in part the MPSC’s TRO/TRRO order  
in Case No. U-14447).
- Case No. U-13805 AT&T Michigan and grid4 Communications, Inc.  
Application filed October 9, 2008 for approval of a seventh  
amendment to an interconnection agreement (revises definition of  
“business lines” to comply with U.S. District Court, Eastern District  
of Michigan, order reversing in part the MPSC’S TRO/TRRO order  
in Case No. U-14447).
- Case No. U-13805 AT&T Michigan and grid4 Communications, Inc.  
Application filed October 9, 2008 for approval of an eighth  
amendment to an interconnection agreement (incorporates the ISP

Reciprocal Compensation Termination Plan and extends the term of the agreement to January 14, 2011).

Case No. U-15314 AT&T Michigan and Bright House Networks Information Services (Michigan), LLC  
Application filed October 8, 2008 for approval of a tenth amendment to an interconnection agreement (extends reciprocal compensation).

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 shall be made available to other telecommunications carriers upon the same terms and conditions.

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

---

Orjiakor N. Isiogu, Chairman

---

Monica Martinez, Commissioner

---

Steven A. Transeth, Commissioner

By its action of October 21, 2008.

---

Mary Jo Kunkle, Executive Secretary