

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 February 8, 2010 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. Orjiakor N. Isiogu, Chairman
Hon. Monica Martinez, Commissioner
Hon. Greg R. White, Commissioner

ORDER

The following parties have filed joint applications for approval of interconnection agreements
or amendments to an interconnection agreement:

Case No. U-13328 AT&T Michigan and RVP Fiber Company, LLC
Application filed on January 5, 2010 for approval of a tenth
amendment to an interconnection agreement (establishes a new rate
for DS1 cross connects and clarifies the definition of DS1 cross
connects and 4-wire cross connects).

Case No. U-16170 AT&T Michigan and Tennessee Telephone Service, LLC d/b/a
Freedom Communications USA, LLC
Application filed on December 23, 2009 for approval of an
interconnection agreement (adopts the interconnection agreement
dated November 5, 2008 between AT&T Michigan and Budget
Prepay, Inc. d/b/a Budget Phone, approved by the Commission in an
order issued on December 4, 2008 in Case No. U-15732, including
the first through seventh amendments, known collectively as the
MFN Agreement).

Case No. U-16173 AT&T Michigan and Zayo Bandwidth, LLC
Application filed on December 23, 2009 for approval of an interconnection agreement (adopts the interconnection agreement dated May 15, 2005, between AT&T Michigan and Metropolitan Telecommunications of Michigan, Inc. d/b/a MetTel DE, approved by the Commission in an order issued on June 30, 2005, in Case No. U-14553, including the first through third amendments, known collectively as the MFN 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, 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 under 47 USC 252(e)(6).

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Orjiakor N. Isiogu, Chairman

Monica Martinez, Commissioner

Greg R. White, Commissioner

By its action of February 8, 2010.

Mary Jo Kunkle, Executive Secretary