

S T A T E O F M I C H I G A N
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

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

At the February 14, 2007 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. J. Peter Lark, Chairman
 Hon. Laura Chappelle, Commissioner
 Hon. Monica Martinez, Commissioner

ORDER

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

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Case No. U-11340 | AT&T Michigan and Climax Telephone Company
Application filed January 31, 2007 for approval of an eighth
amendment to an interconnection agreement (establishes a new rate
for DS1 cross connect and clarifies definitions). |
| Case No. U-12952 | AT&T Michigan and TDS Metrocom, LLC
Application filed January 30, 2007 for approval of a tenth amend-
ment to an interconnection agreement (establishes a new rate for
DS1 cross connect and clarifies definitions). |
| Case No. U-12988 | AT&T SBC Michigan, and ACD Telecom, Inc.
Application filed January 30, 2007 for approval of the fifth
amendment (establishes a new rate for the DS1 cross connect and
definitions of DS1 cross connect and 4 wires cross connect). |

- Case No. U-13124 AT&T Michigan and McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc.
Application filed January 31, 2007 for approval of a tenth amendment to an interconnection agreement (establishes a new rate for DS1 cross connect and clarifies definitions).
- Case No. U-13175 AT&T Michigan and XO Communications Services, Inc.
Application filed January 30, 2007 for approval of a fourteenth amendment to an interconnection agreement (establishes a new rate for DS1 cross connect and clarifies definitions).
- Case No. U-13725 AT&T Michigan and LDMI Telecommunications, Inc.
Application filed February 1, 2007 for approval of an eleventh amendment to an interconnection agreement (establishes a new rate for DS1 cross connect and clarifies definitions).
- Case No. U-14413 AT&T Michigan and TelNet Worldwide, Inc.
Application filed January 31, 2007 for approval of a ninth amendment to an interconnection agreement (establishes a new rate for DS1 cross connect and clarifies definitions).
- Case No. U-14783 AT&T Michigan and B&S Telecom, Inc.
Application filed January 22, 2007 for approval of a fifth amendment to an interconnection agreement (adds rates, terms and conditions of the interim ISP terminating compensation plan for the exchange of ISP-Bound Traffic).
- Case No. U-14792 AT&T Michigan and JAS Networks, Inc.
Application filed January 30, 2007 for approval of an eighteenth amendment to an interconnection agreement (establishes a new rate for DS1 cross connect and clarifies definitions).
- Case No. U-15133 Verizon North Inc., Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a VerizonNorth Systems, and Globetel, Inc.
Application filed November 27, 2006 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-15134 Verizon North Inc., Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Ygnition Networks, Inc.
Application filed November 27, 2006 for approval of an interconnection agreement.
- Case No. U-15179 Frontier Communications of Michigan, Inc. and TelNet Worldwide, Inc.
Application filed on January 31, 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) 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.

47 USC 252(e)(2) and (3).

The Commission concludes, after reviewing the applications, agreements, and amendments, 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/ J. Peter Lark
Chairman

(S E A L)

/s/ Laura Chappelle
Commissioner

/s/ Monica Martinez
Commissioner

By its action of February 14, 2007.

/s/ Mary Jo Kunkle
Its Executive Secretary

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

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of February 14, 2007.

Its Executive Secretary

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

Case No. U-12988

County of Ingham)

April M. Arman, being duly sworn, deposes and says that on February 14, 2007, A.D. she served a copy of the attached Commission Order by first class mail, postage prepaid, or by inter-departmental mail, to the persons as shown on the attached service lists.

April M. Arman

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 14th day of February, 2007.

Gloria Pearl Jones
Notary Public, Eaton County, MI
Acting in Ingham County, MI
My commission expires June 5, 2007

SERVICE LIST FOR DOCKET # U – 12988

CASE #

DATE OF PREPARATION: 2/13/2007

MR. KEVIN SCHOEN
ACD TELECOM, INC.
4980 NORTHWIND DR.
EAST LANSING , MI 48823-5089

MS. ROBIN GLEASON
SBC MICHIGAN
221 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE
FIRST FLOOR
LANSING, MI 48933

MR. CRAIG A. ANDERSON
AT&T MICHIGAN
444 MICHIGAN AVE., ROOM 1750
DETROIT, MI 48226-2517

SUBSCRIPTION LIST
ALL COMMUNICATION ORDERS

MR. DON EITNIEAR
DIT – TELECOMMUNICATIONS DIV.
HANNA BUILDING, FIRST FLOOR
LANSING MI **ID MAIL**

MR. MICHAEL BYRNE
SENATE DEMOCRATIC STAFF
ROMNEY BUILDING
LANSING MI **ID MAIL**

.