

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter of the application of competitive local exchange carriers to initiate a Commission investigation of issues related to the obligation of incumbent local exchange carriers in Michigan to maintain terms and conditions for access to unbundled network elements or other facilities used to provide basic local exchange and other telecommunications services in tariffs and interconnection agreements approved by the Commission, pursuant to the Michigan Telecommunications Act, the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and other relevant authority.	)	
_____	)	Case No. U-14303
In the matter of the application of SBC MICHIGAN for a consolidated change of law proceeding to conform 251/252 interconnection agreements to governing law pursuant to Section 252 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.	)	Case No. U-14305
_____	)	
In the matter of the application of VERIZON NORTH INC. and CONTEL OF THE SOUTH, INC., d/b/a VERIZON NORTH SYSTEMS , for a consolidated change-of-law proceeding to conform interconnection agreements to governing law.	)	Case No. U-14327
_____	)	
In the matter on the Commission's own motion, to resolve certain issues regarding hot cuts.	)	Case No. U-14463
_____	)	

At the March 29, 2005 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. J. Peter Lark, Chairman
Hon. Robert B. Nelson, Commissioner
Hon. Laura Chappelle, Commissioner

ORDER

On September 30, 2004, the Competitive Local Exchange Carriers Association of Michigan (CLEC Association), LDMI Telecommunications, Inc. (LDMI), MCImetro Access Transmission Services LLC (MCI), XO Michigan, Inc. (XO), AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. (AT&T), TCG Detroit, TDS Metrocom, LLC (TDS), Talk America Inc., TelNet Worldwide, Inc., Quick Communications, Inc., d/b/a Quick Connect USA, Superior Technologies, Inc., d/b/a Superior Spectrum, Inc., Grid 4 Communications, Inc., CMC Telecom, Inc., C.L.Y.K. Inc., d/b/a Affinity Telecom, Inc., JAS Networks, Inc., Climax Telephone Company, and ACD Telecom, Inc. (ACD), (collectively, the CLEC coalition), petitioned the Commission to conduct an investigation pursuant to its authority under the Michigan Telecommunications Act (MTA), 1991 PA 179, as amended, MCL 484.2101 *et seq.*, to investigate the effect, if any, in Michigan of the *vacatur* of the rules promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in its Triennial Review Order¹ and the effect of the FCC's August 20, 2004 interim order on remand.² To the extent that these developments are determined by the Commission to constitute a change of law, the CLEC coalition seeks a decision from the Commission on the appropriate procedures for modification of the terms in current tariffs and interconnection agreements. The CLEC coalition also requests the Commission to order SBC Michigan (SBC) and Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems (Verizon), to show cause why the Commission should not order

¹Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, 98-147, Report and Order and Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 18 FCC Rcd. 16978, 16984 (2003) (*TRO*), vacated in part, *United States Telecom Assn v FCC*, 359 F3d 554 (DC Cir 2004) (*USTA II*).

²In the Matter of Unbundled Access to Network Elements, Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, WC Docket No. 04-313, CC Docket No. 01-338, FCC 04-179 (rel'd August 20, 2004).

them to continue to provide competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) with nondiscriminatory access to network elements and facilities as currently required by tariffs and interconnection agreements approved by the Commission pursuant to the MTA and Sections 251 and 252 of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (FTA), 47 USC 251 *et seq.*, at cost-based rates.

On the same day, SBC filed an application requesting that the Commission convene a proceeding to ensure that SBC's interconnection agreements adopted under Sections 251 and 252 of the FTA remain consistent with federal law. In so doing, SBC alleged that its existing interconnection agreements continue to include network elements that the FCC previously required incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) to provide on an unbundled basis, but which are no longer required to be unbundled by FCC order or judicial decision. SBC asserted that, by addressing all out-of-compliance interconnection agreements in a single proceeding, the Commission could fulfill the FCC's goal of a speedy transition, while preserving the scarce resources of the Commission, SBC, and the CLECs.

On October 26, 2004, Verizon petitioned the Commission to approve amendments to the interconnection agreements between itself and certain CLECs. According to Verizon, the agreements of these CLECs could be interpreted to require amendment before Verizon may cease providing unbundled network elements (UNEs) eliminated by the TRO or *USTA II*. Verizon insisted that absent the Commission's intervention, "the CLECs will not conform their agreements to governing law, despite the FCC's directives to do so and contractual requirements to undertake good faith negotiation of contract amendments." Verizon application, ¶ 16, p. 7. Verizon also maintained that a number of CLECs have sought to impede and delay the process by asking this Commission to investigate the legal effect of the *USTA II* mandate and the FCC's interim order. Verizon contended that its proposed interconnection amendment makes clear that Verizon's

unbundling obligations will be governed exclusively by Section 251(c)(3) of the FTA, 47 CFR Part 51, and the FCC's interim order. Further, the proposed language indicates that, when federal law no longer requires unbundled access to particular elements, Verizon may cease providing such access upon appropriate notice.

Given the commonality of the issues raised by these three applications, in an order dated November 9, 2004, the Commission consolidated these matters and set a schedule for the filing of comments and reply comments by December 22, 2004 and January 18, 2005, respectively.

On December 22, 2004, the Commission received initial comments from SBC, Sprint Communications Company, L.P., Allegiance Telecom of Michigan, Inc., MCI, the CLEC Association, ACD Telecom, Inc., Talk America, TDS and XO, the Commission Staff (Staff), and Verizon.

On January 18, 2005, the Commission received reply comments from SBC, Verizon, the CLEC Coalition, Talk America, TDS, and XO, and the Staff.

On February 4, 2005, the FCC issued its order on remand³ adopting new rules governing the network unbundling obligations of ILECs in response to *USTA II*, which overturned portions of the FCC's UNE rules announced in the *TRO*. Because the new rules issued by the FCC in the *TRRO* appeared to significantly affect the outcome of this proceeding, the Commission provided that all interested persons should be given an additional opportunity to submit comments and reply comments by February 24, 2005 and March 3, 2005, respectively. Those parties filing such additional comments or replies include: SBC, Verizon, the CLEC Coalition, MCI, AT&T and TCG Detroit, Clear Rate Communications, Inc., and the Staff.

³In the Matter of Unbundled Access to Network Elements, WC Docket No. 04-313 and Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, CC Docket No. 01-338, rel'd February 4, 2005. (*TRRO*)

Thereafter, the Commission determined in an order dated February 24, 2005, that the parties should be given an opportunity to present oral argument directly before the Commission. It therefore scheduled a public hearing for March 17, 2005, at which the parties were invited to present their positions and respond to questions posed by the Commission. The Commission stated its intent to issue an order in these proceedings by March 29, 2005.

On March 15, 2005, Attorney General Michael A. Cox (Attorney General) filed comments.⁴

On March 17, 2005, the Commission was present for a public hearing during which the following parties acted on the opportunity to present oral argument and to respond to the Commission's questions: SBC, Verizon, the CLEC Coalition, LDMI, Talk America, TDS and XO, the CLEC Association, MCI, AT&T, CIMCO Communications, Inc., CoreComm Michigan, Inc., and PNG Telecommunications Inc., and the Attorney General.

Discussion

Certain critical issues arise in these proceedings. First, the parties dispute whether the Commission may or should require the ILECs to continue providing unbundled network element platform (UNE-P) or other elements for which the FCC has found no impairment. A finding of impairment is necessary to require provision of any UNE pursuant to Sections 251 and 252 of the FTA. Second, they do not agree on the appropriate method for transitioning ILEC/CLEC contractual relations from where the Michigan industry is now and where it must be by the FCC's deadline of March 11, 2006. Third, MCI raises issues regarding the availability and process of hot cuts to transition UNE-P customers to other service platforms.

⁴SBC initially objected to the filing of those comments as untimely, but withdrew the objection at the March 17, 2005 public hearing.

Provision of UNEs

The CLECs argue that the Commission has the authority and the responsibility to require that the ILECs continue to provide UNEs pursuant to state law, which authority, they argue, is expressly preserved by the FTA. They argue that, pursuant to Section 355 of the MTA, MCL 484.2355, at a minimum, the ILECs must unbundle the loop and the port of all telecommunications services. The Commission's authority to require this unbundling, they argue, is preserved by §§251(d)(3), 252(e)(3), and 261(c) of the FTA. They quote the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (Sixth Circuit), as follows:

When Congress enacted the federal Act, it did not expressly preempt state regulation of interconnection. In fact, it expressly *preserved* existing state laws that furthered Congress's goals and authorized states to implement additional requirements that would foster local interconnection and competition, stating that the Act does not prohibit state commission regulations "if such regulations are not inconsistent with the provisions of the [FTA]." 47 USC 261. Additionally, Section 251(d)(3) of the Act states that the [FCC] shall not preclude enforcement of state regulations that establish interconnection and are consistent with the Act.

The Act permits a great deal of state commission involvement in the new regime it sets up for the operation of local telecommunications markets, "as long as state commission regulations are consistent with the Act."

Michigan Bell v. MCIMetro Access Transmission Services Inc., 323 F3d 348, 358 (CA 6, 2003).

Further, they argue, the Sixth Circuit expressly rejected SBC's argument that a requirement would be inconsistent with federal law if it merely were different. They state that the Court determined that a state commission may enforce state law regulations "even where those regulations differ from the terms of the Act." *Id.* at 359. The CLECs take the position that as long as the disputed state regulation promotes competition, it is not inconsistent with the federal Act. Therefore, they argue, the Commission is not preempted by the FCC's orders from requiring the ILECs to provision UNEs pursuant to the terms and conditions in the Commission-approved interconnection agreements. They urge the Commission to take prompt action to prevent SBC

from acting unilaterally to either withdraw its wholesale tariffs for UNEs or to alter the interconnection agreements to exclude these UNEs.

Moreover, the CLECs argue, SBC has a duty to provide unbundled loops, transport, and switching pursuant to Section 271 of the FTA. MCI and AT&T agree and argue that irrespective of the ILECs' duties under Section 251, SBC must comply with the conditions required for the FCC's approval of its application pursuant to Section 271. Thus, these parties argue, SBC may not unilaterally remove local switching, loops, or transport from its interconnection agreements or its tariffs. Rather, it must negotiate pursuant to the provisions of its interconnection agreements any amendments, including pricing. Although the FCC provided a procedure for SBC to request forbearance from enforcement of its Section 271 obligations, MCI argues, SBC has not yet taken any of the steps laid out to obtain such a ruling.

Further, MCI argues, if a carrier believes a state law requirement is inconsistent with the federal Act, it must seek a declaratory ruling to that effect from the FCC. It argues that the FCC's brief to the United States Supreme Court in opposition to the petitions for *certiorari* from *USTA II* reflects that the FCC has not preempted any state law on unbundling. In that brief, the FCC denied that it had preempted any state unbundling rule, and stated that it "is uncertain whether the FCC ever will issue a preemptive order of this sort in response to a request for declaratory ruling." Brief at 20.

Verizon and SBC argue that the Commission is preempted from requiring the ILECs to provide any UNE for which the FCC has found there is no impairment. They argue that the Commission should promptly approve their respective proposed amendments to bring interconnection agreements into conformity with the FCC's *TRO* and *TRRO*. Because the FCC's orders preempt the Commission, they argue, there is no reason to waste time considering whether the

Commission may re-impose unbundling obligations that the FCC has eliminated. Therefore, they argue, the Commission should dismiss the CLECs' application and approve the ILECs' proposed amendments.

SBC and Verizon further argue that the Commission's authority under state law may be lawfully exercised only in a manner that is consistent with the federal Act and FCC rules and regulations. MCL 484.2201. In their view, the Commission may not require the ILECs to provide UNEs that the FCC has found are not required to alleviate impairment.

SBC adds that the FCC is the sole enforcer of any obligations pursuant to Section 271 of the federal Act. Thus, it argues, this proceeding is not an appropriate forum for a Commission determination as to whether SBC is required to provide certain UNEs solely under Section 271, without reference to the duties imposed under Sections 251 and 252 of the FTA.

The Commission is not persuaded that it is preempted by either the federal Act or the FCC's orders from requiring the ILECs to provide UNEs under authority granted by the MTA and preserved in the FTA. The Commission's authority to impose requirements on telecommunications carriers in addition to, but consistent with, those prescribed by the FCC is preserved in the FTA sections cited by the CLECs. Moreover, that authority has been affirmed by the Sixth Circuit as argued by the CLECs. Thus, the Commission finds that it also possesses the authority necessary to appropriately direct the resolution of the method of industry transition as addressed in the following section. However, the Commission notes that Section 201(2) of the MTA, MCL 484.2201(2), requires Commission action to be consistent with the FTA and the FCC's rules and orders. Requiring the continued provision of UNE-P would be inconsistent with the FCC's detailed findings and plan for transition in the *TRO* and *TRRO*.

Moreover, at this time, the Commission is not persuaded that competition would be advanced by exercising its authority to require the provision of UNEs in addition to those that the FCC has found must be provided pursuant to 47 USC 251(c)(3). Such a finding likely would lead to further litigation and promote confusion rather than competition, which would be inconsistent with the intent of the MTA as well as the FTA. If a CLEC believes that the FCC has erroneously found no impairment on a particular UNE, it may take steps provided by law to seek a change in that ruling.

The *TRRO* provides a period of transition to the UNEs available under its new final rules from the UNEs now available pursuant to the current interconnection agreements, which were negotiated and arbitrated under previous determinations concerning what elements must be provided by the ILECs pursuant to Section 251(c)(3) of the FTA. For most of the UNEs that were available, but are no longer under that subsection, the *TRRO* provides a 12-month transition period. For dark fiber related elements, the FCC provided 18 months. During the transition, the FCC directed that ILECs must permit CLECs to serve their embedded customer base with UNEs available under their interconnection agreements, but with an increased price. However, the FCC stated that CLECs would not be permitted to expand the use of UNE-P or the use of other UNEs no longer required to be made available pursuant to Section 251(c)(3).

In the March 9, 2005 order in Case No. U-14447, the Commission found that ILECs must honor new orders to serve a CLEC's embedded customer base. The Commission stopped short of stating that CLECs were not entitled to new orders of UNEs for new customers. At this time, the Commission affirmatively finds that the CLECs no longer have a right under Section 251(c)(3) to order UNE-P and other UNEs that have been removed from the list that must be offered to serve new customers. This does not, however, foreclose any right that may exist pursuant to Section 271 for a CLEC to order these UNEs. Moreover, the Commission notes that although certain UNEs

are no longer required to be provided pursuant to Section 251(c)(3), parties may negotiate for provision of those same facilities and functions on a commercial market basis.

Transition

SBC and Verizon propose that the Commission review and approve their respective proposed amendments to the interconnection agreements and then impose those amendments on the CLECs where necessary.⁵ These parties point to the provisions in the *TRO* and *TRRO* that indicate the FCC's intent that the transition away from the provision of the elements no longer required should be swift.

Verizon notes that the Commission has already initiated a collaborative to address the transition issues concerning the amendments of interconnection agreements to conform to federal law. It argues that the Commission need not consider those same transitional questions here.

In its reply comments, Verizon recognizes that many of the changes wrought by the *TRO* and the *TRRO* require the parties to negotiate amendments, which are being addressed in the Case No. U-14447 collaborative process. However, it argues, the prohibition on CLECs obtaining new UNE-Ps or high-capacity facilities no longer subject to unbundling does not depend on the particular terms of any interconnection agreement and should be implemented immediately. Verizon argues that the transition rules bar CLECs from ordering new UNEs that are no longer subject to unbundling under section 251(c)(3), without regard to the terms of any agreement.

SBC argues that the Commission is legally bound to implement the FCC's determinations, consistent with the pertinent court rulings including *USTA II* for all ILECs and CLECs. It argues that the Commission should move quickly to ensure that the unbundling rights and obligations of

⁵Verizon asserts that only the interconnection agreements with the CLECs named in Verizon's application are at issue here. The remaining agreements, according to Verizon, need no amendment to comply with federal law.

all carriers operating in Michigan comport with governing law and mandates of the FCC. It argues that it is appropriate for the Commission to ensure compliance with the federal unbundling regime in a single consolidated proceeding, pursuant to Section 252(g) of the FTA, 47 USC 252(g), instead of on a carrier-by-carrier basis.

The CLECs argue that the FCC explicitly contemplated that parties would negotiate amendments to their interconnection agreements pursuant to their change of law or dispute resolution provisions. They argue that the FCC could not and did not order a unilateral change to contracts that the parties currently have in place. They argue that the Commission should dismiss the applications by SBC and Verizon to approve their proposed amendments, and require instead that the parties negotiate in good faith in light of the change in law that the *TRO* and *TRRO* represent. The CLECs propose that the Commission adopt a process that allows parties initially to attempt to negotiate implementation of the *TRRO* and the resulting new unbundling rules. However, if negotiations fail on some issues, consistent with the terms and conditions for dispute resolution, the Commission should resolve disputes that arise in the most efficient manner available.

AT&T recommends the following steps to preserve the CLEC's right to negotiate under the FTA, and to promote uniformity and efficiency:

1. Consistent with the terms of their respective interconnection agreements, following the effective date of the FCC's rules (March 11, 2005) carriers shall attempt to negotiate any required changes to their interconnection agreements. As required by the *TRRO*, these negotiations should proceed without "unreasonable delay."⁶
2. At the end of such negotiations, the parties should submit amendments to their interconnection agreements for Commission approval or file petitions identifying their individual dispute. To the extent necessary, and consistent with any notice and due process requirements, the Commission may entertain any filed disputes in party-to-party and or consolidated proceedings.

⁶*TRRO*, ¶ 233.

3. To the extent the Commission believes necessary, it should schedule collaboratives to identify the common and unique issues in the individual petitions for dispute resolutions. At that time, the Commission should also establish an efficient framework for resolving the identified issues.
4. Nothing in this proposal should be construed to prohibit individual parties from requiring that the individual terms and conditions of the change of law and/or dispute resolution provisions of their respective interconnection agreements continue to apply, including any right to seek bilateral arbitration of disputes by the Commission. Similarly, nothing in this proposal should be construed to prohibit individual parties from negotiating amendments to an interconnection agreement in a time frame shorter than what is proposed herein, and the Commission should make this statement in any order issued.

AT&T Supplemental Comments, pp. 7-8.

In its initial comments, the CLEC coalition proposed a framework that contemplated significantly more time. It argued that the CLECs should be given 45 days after March 11, 2005 to study the new rules and prepare proposed amendments to their interconnection agreements. Thereafter, the CLEC coalition noted that most interconnection agreements have a 60- or 90-day time frame for negotiations before dispute resolution procedures begin. Then, according to the CLEC coalition, the parties should have a two-week window to either submit an amendment or file petitions identifying their individual disputes. Finally, the CLEC coalition proposed that the Commission should entertain any filed disputes in a consolidated docket, with time limits for submitting those disputes.

The Commission finds that the most appropriate process for moving the industry through the transition period provided in the *TRRO* is to close these three cases and open up the interconnection agreements for negotiation, within the collaborative initiated in Case No. U-14447. The parties will be provided 60 days from the date of this order⁷ to complete the requirements of their change of law and dispute resolution provisions, and to negotiate for and submit a joint application

⁷The 45-day period established for the collaborative is, therefore, extended.

for approval of an amendment to their interconnection agreements to bring their contracts into compliance with the requirements of the *TRO* and the *TRRO*. During that same 60-day period, the parties in the collaborative shall work to establish no more than four versions of an amendment to the interconnection agreements. All parties to the collaborative that have not otherwise agreed to an amendment, must agree to one of the four or fewer versions established in the collaborative. If the parties to a single contract do not agree which of the versions should be included in the interconnection agreement, the parties shall submit that disagreement to the Commission, which will determine the appropriate amendment through baseball-style arbitration.

Hot Cuts

MCI argues that in the *TRRO*, the FCC ruled that for purposes of Section 251, there is no impairment without unbundled local switching. That ruling, according to MCI, was based on the availability of batch hot cut processes. See, *TRRO*, ¶¶ 211, 217. Thus, MCI argues, batch hot cuts must be included in any amendments to the interconnection agreement to comply with the FCC's recent rulings. Moreover, MCI argues, the FCC explicitly indicated that forums to address concerns about the sufficiency of batch hot cut processes include state commission enforcement processes and Section 208, 47 USC 208, complaints to the FCC.

MCI acknowledges the January 6, 2005 order in *Michigan Bell v Lark et al.* (ED MI, Southern Division, Case No. 04-60128, Hon Marianne O. Battanni) prevents the Commission from enforcing the Commission's June 28, 2004 order in Case No. U-13891 regarding batch hot cuts. However, it insists that Judge Battanni's order does not prevent the Commission from addressing and resolving disputes about batch hot cuts as part of the amendment process to interconnection agreements. It says that the basis of Judge Battanni's ruling was that the Commission was acting on unlawfully delegated authority from the FCC in determining whether impairment existed with

respect to unbundled switching. Because the FCC has now made its determination concerning impairment, the Commission is free to act on batch hot cut issues. It says that the exact process to be used and the rates will need to be addressed in the interconnection agreement amendments.

SBC responds that, in the *TRRO*, the FCC approved the hot cut processes presented by SBC as adequate to avoid a finding of impairment. It argues that parties are free to negotiate mutually acceptable “refinements” in batch hot cut processes. However, SBC argues, batch hot cut processes have nothing to do with conforming the parties’ interconnection agreements to the requirements of federal law.

Verizon responds that it has not named MCI as a party to its application to conform its contracts to federal law, and MCI does not mention Verizon in its hot cuts discussion. However, Verizon argues that the FCC did not instruct states to address hot cuts in *TRRO* amendments (or elsewhere). It argues that the FCC expressly found that the ILECs’ hot cut processes—pointing in particular to Verizon’s—were sufficient and that the concerns about the ILECs’ ability to convert the embedded base of UNE-P customers in a timely manner are rendered moot by the transition period. *TRRO* ¶ 216. Verizon argues that no authority cited by MCI permits the Commission to ignore a federal court decision forbidding it to pursue adoption of batch hot cut processes.

The Commission is persuaded that it should promote settlement of hot cut process issues and doing so does not contravene Judge Battani’s order. To that end, the Commission opens a new docket for resolving those issues, Case No. U-14463, in which all filings and actions related to hot cuts will be determined. The Commission finds that within 14 days of the date of this order, the CLECs shall submit to the ILECs the number of lines that need to be moved via hot cut and a plan for those moves, i.e., from and to what configuration and the process desired. Within 14 days after receipt of the plan, if the parties cannot agree on the process or price, they shall submit their last

best offer to Orjiakor Isiogu, Director of the Commission's Telecommunications Division, who will act as mediator. Within 30 days of receipt of those last best offers, Mr. Isiogu shall submit his recommended plan to the Commission. The parties will have seven days to object. However, any objection must in good faith assert that the recommendation is technically infeasible or unlawful. Without timely objections, the mediator's recommendation will be final. If the parties are able to agree, no filing need be made.

The Commission has selected Case No. U-14463 for participation in its Electronic Filings Program. The Commission recognizes that all filers may not have the computer equipment or access to the Internet necessary to submit documents electronically. Therefore, filers may submit documents in the traditional paper format and mail them to the: Executive Secretary, Michigan Public Service Commission, 6545 Mercantile Way, P.O. Box 30221, Lansing, Michigan 48909. Otherwise, all documents filed in this case must be submitted in both paper and electronic versions. An original and four paper copies and an electronic copy in the portable document format (PDF) should be filed with the Commission. Requirements and instructions for filing electronic documents can be found in the Electronic Filings Users Manual at: <http://efile.mpsc.cis.state.mi.us/efile/usersmanual.pdf>. The application for account and letter of assurance are located at <http://efile.mpsc.cis.state.mi.us/efile/help>. You may contact Commission staff at (517) 241-6170 or by e-mail at mpscefilecases@michigan.gov with questions and to obtain access privileges prior to filing.

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. Case No. U-14303, Case No. U-14305, and Case No. U-14327 should be closed.
- c. The parties should be directed to negotiate amendments to their interconnection agreements consistent with the discussion in this order, within the Commission-initiated collaborative proceeding in Case No. U-14447.
- d. Case No. U-14463 should be opened for the purpose of resolving issues concerning hot cuts.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

- A. Case No. U-14303, Case No. U-14305, and Case No. U-14327 are closed.
- B. The parties are directed to negotiate amendments to their interconnection agreements consistent with the discussion in this order, within the Commission-initiated collaborative proceeding in Case No. U-14447.
- C. Case No. U-14463 is opened for the purpose of resolving issues concerning hot cuts, as discussed in this order.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

/s/ J. Peter Lark
Chairman

(S E A L)

/s/ Robert B. Nelson
Commissioner

/s/ Laura Chappelle
Commissioner

By its action of March 29, 2005.

/s/ Mary Jo Kunkle
Its Executive Secretary

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of March 29, 2005.

Its Executive Secretary

P R O O F O F S E R V I C E

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

Case No. U-14463

County of Ingham)

Patricia A. Fronta being duly sworn, deposes and says that on March 29th, 2005, 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 list.

Patricia Fronta

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 29th day of March 2005

Notary Public, Ingham, County, Michigan
My Commission expires June 5, 2007

**SUBSCRIPTION LIST
ALL COMMUNICATION ORDERS**

Mr. Don Eitnienar
DIT – Telecommunications Div.
Hanna Building, First Floor
Lansing, MI ID MAIL

Mr. Phillip Cross
Public Utilities Reports, Inc.
8229 Boone Blvd., Ste. 401
Vienna, VA 22182

Mr. John Pestle
Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett
Bridgewater Place
P.O. Box 352
Grand Rapids, MI 49501-0352

Mr. Agris Pavlovsiks
Michigan Exchange Carriers Assoc
P.O. Box 20025
Lansing, MI 48901-0025

Ms. Monica Martinez
Senate Democratic Staff
Romney Bldg.
Lansing, MI ID MAIL

.

P R O O F O F S E R V I C E

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

Case No. U-14463

County of Ingham)

Anita M. Castilla being duly sworn, deposes and says that on March 29th, 2005, A.D. she served a copy of the attached Commission orders via E-Mail, to the persons as shown on the attached service list.

Anita M. Castilla

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 29th day of March 2005

Gloria Pearl Jones
Notary Public, Eaton County, MI
My Commission expires June 5, 2007

COMMUNICATIONS

aamores@MICHIGAN.GOV	(No Name Available)
cforst@360.NET	cforst - 360networks (USA), Inc.
bshires@LDMI.COM	Ldmi -
jfinefro@LDMI.COM	Ldmi -
bkerkes@PLANETACCESS.TV	Planet Access
kkaiser@PLANETACCESS.TV	Planet Access
mzengerle@PLANETACCESS.TV	Planet Access
jim.cornblatt@ALTICOMM.COM	Alticomm, Inc.
dbronson@BLANCHARDEL.COM	Blanchard Telephone Association, Inc.
francesbrown@ATT.COM	AT&T Communications of MI
jsnyder@BTC-BCI.COM	Bloomington Telephone Co., Inc.
tholeman@CASS.NET	Deerfield Farmers Telephone Co.
bboshoven@USSIGNALCOM.COM	US Signal Co., LLC
tnamy@CLEARRATE.COM	Clear Rate Comm, Inc.
jdelahanty@TELEPACIFIC.COM	Telepacific Comm
sclay@NEWACCESS.CC	Emergent Communications LLC and New
Access Comm.	
border@NETNET.NET	Borderland Communications
emcdonald@CHOICEONECOM.COM	Choice One Communications
cjr@DAYSTARR.NET	DayStarr Communications
bcobb@COVAD.COM	DIECA Communications, Inc.
jmorris@FIRSTCOMM.COM	First Communications, LCC
mcegeliski@FIRSTCOMM.COM	First Communications, LCC
stalley@FOCAL.COM	Focal Communications
prebey@FOCAL.NET	Focal Communications
clockett@INTRADO.COM	Intrado Communications, Inc.
lindah@LIGHTYEARCOM.COM	Lightyear Communications, Inc.
mark@NOMADINTER.NET	Media Gate Communications, Inc.
sfenker1@EARTHLINK.NET	Nexus Communications
Rvalle@NOS.COM	NOS Communications
wwright@NOS.COM	NOS Communications
judy.messeng@PAETEC.COM	PaeTec Communications, Inc.
JBrown@QUANTUMSHIFT.COM	Quantum Shift Communications
aharris@800GOQUICK.COM	Quick Communications
erobinson@TNCII.COM	TransNational Communications
tseat@Z-TEL.COM	Z-Tel Communications, Inc.
springle@COMMSOUTH.NET	Comm South Companies, Inc.
abender@METROTELCO.COM	Metro Teleconnect Companies
ealicea@METROTELCO.COM	Metro Teleconnect Companies
tgregson@METROTELCO.COM	Metro Teleconnect Companies
mike.osborne@ALLCOM.CC	Allendale Telephone Company
pwstark@UP.NET	Baraga Telephone Company
refisher@MEI.NET	Barry County Telephone Company
teri@CARRINTER.NET	Carr Telephone Company
chapintel@POWER-NET.NET	Chapin Telephone Company
jbrogan3@JAMADOTS.COM	Chippewa County Telephone Company
gcollver@CTSTELECOM.COM	Climax Telephone Company
pubsercomm@CTSTELECOM.COM	Climax Telephone Company
drenthe@DRENTHE.NET	Drenthe Telephone Company
wayne@DRENTHE.NET	Drenthe Telephone Company
jcibbs@KALTELNET.NET	Kaleva Telephone Company
pbowman@POWER-NET.NET	Lennon Telephone Company
linda@CASS.NET	Ogden Telephone Company
jack@PENTEL.NET	Peninsula Telephone Company
ehe@AVCI.NET	Pigeon Telephone Company

marge@CASS.NET	Sand Creek Telephone Company
Janet@SPRINGCOM.COM	Springport Telephone Company
wfh@SPRINGCOM.COM	Springport Telephone Company
bdcobra@ALPHACOMM.NET	Upper Peninsula Telephone Company
mark@WALDRONTEL.COM	Waldron Telephone Company
dfox@POWER-NET.NET	Westphalia Telephone Company
ljenkins@POWER-NET.NET	Winn Telephone Company
wminella@NEWROCTEL.COM	New Rochelle Telephone Corp.
crystal.herbertson@QWEST.COM	Qwest Communications Corp.
pati@RANGETELE.COM	Range Corporation
edkilb@TRUCOMM.NET	Tru Comm Corporation
dchoover@CORVUSINC.COM	Corvus, Inc.
diane.peters@GLOBALCROSSING.COM	Global Crossing
dave@NETEXP.COM	Net Express d/b/a Advent Telecom
reg@ONESTARLD.COM	OneStar Long Distance, Inc.
dave@CASS.NET	Deerfield Farmers' Telephone Co.
lkfelic@MICHIGAN.GOV	Lisa Felice
chopkins@GRID4.COM	Grid4 Communications Inc.
regulatory@GRID4.COM	Grid4 Communications, Inc.
prountree@DUNDEE.NET	Bilan Communications Inc.
regulatory@BULLSEYETELECOM.COM	Bulls Eye Telecom Inc.
slondon@BULLSEYETELECOM.COM	Bulls Eye Telecom Inc.
puc@CIMCO.NET	CIMCO Communications Inc.
bruce.bennett@CORECOMM.COM	CoreComm Michigan Inc.
regulatory@INTRADO.COM	Intrado Communications Inc.
jmertz@KMCTELECOM.COM	KMC Telecom II Inc.
klawrence@PRIMUSTEL.COM	Primus Telecommunications Inc.
sthomas@TALK.COM	Talk America Inc.
tweiksnar@UNIVERSALACCESS.NET	Universal Access Inc.
Gregg.diamond@VERIZON.COM	Verizon North Inc.
jswift@CI2.COM	Computer Intelligence 2 Inc. (CI2)
bfillinger@BIRCH.COM	Birch Telecom of the Great Lakes
greg.rogers@LEVEL3.COM	Level 3
ron.p.johnson@CENTURYTEL.COM	Century Tel Solutions LLC
shobbs@DSL.NET	DSLnet Communications LLC
byuille@800GOQUICK.COM	Atlas Communications LTD.
anne.lynch@RECONEX.COM	Anne lynch 1-800-Reconex
mitchell.proctor@TDSTELECOM.COM	TDS MetroCom, Inc.
info@COGENTCO.COM	Cogent Comm of MI
Richard_Wolfe@CABLE.COMCAST.COM	Comcast Telecommunications of MI
ron.williams@FRONTIERCORP.COM	Frontier Comm. of MI, Inc.
glen@LECMI.COM	Local Exchange Carriers of MI
aeconomou@METTEL.NET	Metropolitan Telecomm of MI
daronow@METTEL.NET	Metropolitan Telecomm of MI
dschroeder@ACEGROUP.CC	Ace Telephone Company of Michigan, Inc.
stephanie.kurlan@ALGX.COM	Allegiance Telecom of Michigan
vickie.norris@CENTURYTEL.COM	Century Tel of Michigan, Inc.
shamula@WVFIBERNET.NET	Fivernet of Michigan
rg1467@SBC.COM	SBC Ameritech Michigan
tpowell@XO.COM	XO Michigan, Inc.
acasti@MICHIGAN.GOV	Anita Castilla - MPSC
amarman@MICHIGAN.GOV	April Arman - MPSC
mjkunkl@MICHIGAN.GOV	Mary Jo Kunkle - MPSC
camurray@ESCHELON.COM	Catherine Murray
toddg@ISERV.NET	Eagle Net, Inc.
bob.baranek@AFNLTD.COM	American Fiber Network, Inc.
rob.heath@AFNLTD.COM	American Fiber Network, Inc.

kathy.hough@WILTEL.COM	WilTel Local Network, LLC
pbullock@INFOHIGHWAY.COM	A.R.C. Networks, Inc.
sbogdan@BROADVIEWNET.COM	Broadview Networks
bseely@JASNETWORKS.NET	JAS Networks, Inc.
david.vehslage@VERIZON.COM	Verizon North
nelson.patty@VERIZON.COM	Verizon North
Paul.fuglie@VERIZON.COM	Verizon North, Inc.
markj@ACCESSONEINC.COM	Access One, Inc.
cfoster@CALLONE.NET	Call One
rlambert@CALLONE.NET	Call One
amagee@BUDGETPHONE.COM	Budget Phone, Inc.
amy@EZPHONEUSA.COM	EZ Phone
dgonos@ACNINC.COM	AVN Comm. Services, Inc.
jkolezynski@EASTONTELECOM.COM	Easton Telecom Services, Inc.
james.denniston@MCI.COM	MCI Metro Access Services, Inc.
dana.fassbinder@ONFIBER.COM	OnFiber Carrier Services
jbooth@ONFIBER.COM	OnFiber Carrier Services
alex.valencia@PHONESFORALL.COM	Perferred Carriers Services
jennifer.martin@TELEGENT.COM	Teligent Services, Inc.
terry.romine@TELCOVE.COM	Adelphia Business Solutions
charles.hartman@FTNA.COM	France Telecom Corp. Solutions, LLC
dpuskala@SUPERIORSPECTRUM.COM	Superior Spectrum, Inc.
tfriley@SURETEL.NET	Suretel, Inc.
jet@T2COMM.NET	T2 Communications, LLC
joe@TC3TELECOM.COM	TC3 Telecom Inc.
schoen.kevin@ACDTELECOM.NET	ACD Telecom, Inc.
Djoseph@SSI-INC.COM	Affinity Telecom
allen_dole@DOM.COM	Dominion Telecom, Inc.
amercer@SAGETELECOM.NET	Sage Telecom, Inc.
scott@UNITEDTELECOM.ORG	United Telecom, Inc.
jenniferh@UNIVERSALTELECOM.COM	Universal Telecom, Inc.
ecbolles@VARTEC.NET	VarTec Telecom, Inc.
arlee.holt@MIDWESTERN.NET	Midwestern Telecommunications, Inc.
mikem@NAVTEL.COM	Navigator Telecommunications
ranthony@JAMADOTS.COM	Chippewa County Telephone
sctelco@CASS.NET	Sand Creek Telephone
askus@BUCKEYE-TELESYSTEM.COM	Buckeye Telesystem, Inc.
kitm@ACCUTEL.NET	Accu Tel of Texas, Inc.
whaas@MCLEODUSA.COM	McLeod USA
lcox@MUNI.CBPU.COM	Coldwater Telecomm Utility

*

* Total number of users subscribed to the list: 151

* Total number of local host users on the list: 0

*