

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

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

At the April 30, 2009 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 an interconnection
agreement or an amendment to an interconnection agreement:

Case No. U-15946 PaeTec Communications, Inc., and AT&T Michigan
Application filed April 14, 2009 for approval of an interconnection
agreement (adoption of the agreement approved on April 8, 2002, in
Case No. U-13124, including the first amendment (replace physical
collocation provisions), fourth amendment (intraLATA access rates),
seventh amendment (rates approved in Case No. U-13531), eighth
amendment (TRRO terms and conditions), ninth amendment
(extends reciprocal compensation terms), eleventh amendment
(extends the term of the agreement), thirteenth amendment (adds
post-TRO remand provisions), fourteenth amendment (revises the
Midwest Performance Measurements Appendix), fifteenth
amendment (revises rates, terms, and conditions related to DS-1
cross connects), and a negotiated sixteenth amendment (adds a new
Superseding Reciprocal Compensation Amendment).

Case No. U-15948 AT&T Michigan and CloseCall America, Inc.
Application filed April 14, 2009 for approval of an interconnection agreement (the existing agreement approved on August 20, 2002, in Case No. U-13492 terminates upon approval of this agreement).

Case No. U-15954 AT&T Michigan and BCN Telecom, Inc.
Application filed on April 22, 2009 for approval of an interconnection agreement.

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 and amendments, the Commission finds that they should be approved. 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 April 30, 2009.

Mary Jo Kunkle, Executive Secretary