

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 January 11, 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-13758 AT&T Michigan and MCImetro Access Transmission Services,
LLC
Application filed on February 19, 2009 for approval of an eleventh
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-14795 AT&T Michigan and CMC Telecom, Inc.
Application filed on December 23, 2009 for approval of a twenty-
second amendment to an interconnection agreement (adds
CompleteLink 2.0 Win/Winback Pricing application).
- Case No. U-15069 AT&T Michigan and Superior Spectrum Telephone and Data, LLC
Application filed on December 11, 2009 for approval of an eighth
amendment to an interconnection agreement (revises the
Interconnection and Trunking Provisions).

Case No. U-16143 Pigeon Telephone Company and TelNet Worldwide, Inc.
Application filed on December 1, 2009 for approval of a reciprocal compensation agreement (establishes an Interconnection and Reciprocal Compensation arrangement for the termination of telecommunications traffic that originates on the other party's network).

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

By its action of January 11, 2010.

Monica Martinez, Commissioner

Mary Jo Kunkle, Executive Secretary

Greg R. White, Commissioner