

**In this issue . . .**

page no.

<b>2</b>	<b>Features</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <i>MCI law suit claims Ameritech's new slamming protection plan is "anticompetitive"</i></li> <li>■ <i>Michigan COA dismisses Ameritech appeals in reciprocal compensation proceedings</i></li> <li>■ <i>Universal Service Fund opens window for applications</i></li> <li>■ <i>AT&amp;T "delighted" with PFD recommending implementation of statewide dialing parity</i></li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>Pending Legislation</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Public Acts</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Orders</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Proposals for Decision</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Notices of Hearing</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>PSC Hearings</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Applications and Complaints</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Opportunities for Comment</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>PSC Meetings</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>MTR Subscription Information</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>Status of Selected PSC Cases</b>

**MICHIGAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS REPORT** (ISSN 08980357) is published every other week by Clark Hill P.L.C., 2455 Woodlake Circle, Okemos, Michigan 48864-5941. Although considerable care is exercised in reporting critical information (filing and hearing dates, etc.), such information should be confirmed with the original source. This newsletter should not be construed as legal advice or legal opinion on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general informational purposes only, and you are urged to consult a lawyer concerning your own situation and any specific legal questions you may have. Editor, Roderick S. Coy; Assistant Editor, Kristine M. Clements; Circulation and Business Manager, Julie A. Wood. Annual Subscription \$375.00.

**Index of cases highlighted**

Orders  
**U-11700:** Reconex; amended license  
**U-11736:** Ballinger v Ameritech & AT&T: consumer complaint  
**U-11775:** MichTel/Ameritech: interconnection  
**U-11787:** DIECA: license application  
**U-11809:** Tel Com Plus: license application  
**U-11827:** MediaOne: amended license  
**U-11849:** US Xchange: petition for approval for tariff

Proposals for Decision  
**U-11743:** MCI v Ameritech: dialing parity

Notices of Hearing  
**U-11872:** Allegiance: license application  
**U-11873:** CoreComm: license application

Applications and Complaints  
**U-11168:** MCI/Ameritech: interconnection  
**U-11857:** Ameritech/GTE: boundary alterations  
**U-11868:** Crescent Continental: consumer complaint  
**U-11872:** Allegiance: license application  
**U-11873:** CoreComm: license application

Notice of Opportunity to Comment - rescinded  
**U-11851:** Ameritech/GTE: boundary alterations  
**U-11857:** Ameritech/GTE: boundary alterations

\*MR. COY IS A MEMBER  
 IN THE CLARK HILL P.L.C. LAW FIRM  
 DETROIT \* BIRMINGHAM \* LANSING

CLARK HILL P.L.C.  
 2455 WOODLAKE CIRCLE  
 OKEMOS, MICHIGAN 48864-5941  
 (517) 381-9193

## **FEATURES**

### ***MCI LAW SUIT IN INGHAM CIRCUIT COURT CLAIMS AMERITECH'S NEW SLAMMING PROTECTION PLAN IS "ANTICOMPETITIVE"***

MCI Telecommunications Corp. ("MCI"), on December 15, 1998, filed a law suit in Ingham Circuit Court against Ameritech Michigan "for intentionally violating a Michigan Public Service Commission ("MPSC") order rejecting the monopoly's anticompetitive 'PIC Protection Program', which prevents Ameritech customers from changing to another local toll service provider--even when they clearly confirm their wishes to do so through an independent third party process approved by the MPSC." Although Ameritech claims to have developed its new Slamming Protection Plan with the assistance of the MPSC, MCI says "Ameritech's latest violation of the MPSC's order (dated May 11, 1998) shows just how far the company is willing to go to protect its monopoly hold over the lucrative local toll market in Michigan." MCI claims that since November 18, 1998, Ameritech has used its protection program to reject more than 300 orders from Ameritech customers who requested service from MCI, even though every order was verified by an independent third party. According to Joan Campion, MCI WorldCom's regional director of public policy, "Rather than protecting customers, Ameritech is really only interested in protecting its bottom line." MCI asks the Court to compel Ameritech Michigan to implement PIC change requests that have been verified through any of the four MPSC-approved processes, including third-party verification. (See also Features, **MTR**, Vol. 14, No. 25, December 11, 1998).

### ***MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS DISMISSES TWO AMERITECH APPEALS RELATING TO MPSC ORDER THAT AMERITECH PAY RECIPROCAL COMPENSATION FOR ISP TRAFFIC***

The Michigan Court of Appeals recently dismissed two separate appeals by Ameritech Michigan relating to the Michigan Public Service Commission's ("MPSC") Order that Ameritech pay reciprocal compensation to CLECs for ISP traffic terminating on their networks. That MPSC Order was issued January 28, 1998 (MPSC Case Nos. U-11178, U-11502, U-11522, U-11553 and U-11554). Ameritech had appealed the MPSC Reciprocal Compensation Order directly to the Michigan Court of Appeals in Ameritech Michigan v MPSC (Docket No. 209829). That case had been consolidated with another Ameritech appeal, TCG Detroit v Michigan Bell Telephone Co (Docket No. 214876), which was Ameritech Michigan's appeal of a Circuit Court Order of Mandamus obtained by TCG Detroit to enforce the MPSC Reciprocal Compensation Order. By Order dated

December 8, 1998, the Court of Appeals granted previously filed Motions to Dismiss Docket No. 209829, stating that the federal court has exclusive jurisdiction. In the same Order, the Court of Appeals denied Ameritech Michigan's request that the appeal be held in abeyance.

In a related matter, by Order dated December 17, 1998, the Court of Appeals dismissed Ameritech Michigan's second appeal of the Circuit Court Mandamus case (Docket No. 215650), which involved Ameritech's appeal of an Order Denying its Motion for Summary Disposition. The Court of Appeals denied the Order for lack of jurisdiction, stating that the final Order in the case was the Order of Mandamus for which an appeal (Docket No. 214876) was already pending.

The effect of the Court of Appeals' actions is that the only cases remaining open concerning Ameritech's appeals relating to the MPSC Reciprocal Compensation Order are the appeal of the Order of Mandamus requiring Ameritech to comply with the MPSC Reciprocal Compensation Order, and Ameritech's appeal to the Federal District Court for the Western District of Michigan (Docket No. 5: 98-CV-18) which has been stayed pending a decision by the FCC in pending proceedings concerning reciprocal compensation for ISP traffic.

### ***1999 TO 2000 APPLICATION PERIOD FOR SCHOOLS AND LIBRARIES TO APPLY FOR UNIVERSAL SERVICE FUND DISCOUNTS OPENED DECEMBER 1***

On December 1, 1998, a 100-day period opened, during which all schools and libraries may apply for 1999 to 2000 Universal Service Fund ("USF") discounts on eligible telecommunication services. All eligible applications received by the Schools and Libraries Corporation ("SLC") during these 100 days, will be treated as if they had arrived on the same day. Applications received outside the 100-day window will be considered on a first come first served basis as funds remain available.

Within the window period schools, libraries and consortia requesting USF discounts must first file a form 470 application, a description of services requested, and a certification form for discounts on services that will run from July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000. Following a 28-day waiting period, during which time the SLC will post the form 470 and request bids on services, the applicant must file form 471 to accept a bid or to notify the SLC of a pre-existing contract. Both forms must be submitted during the window which will close on March 11, 1999 at 11:59 p.m. E.T. As with last years' Schools and Libraries Universal Service Fund Program, eligibility for certain discounts will be based upon the percentage of reduced and free lunch students in their district and whether their district is considered rural or urban.

Additional information about the schools and libraries discount program is available at the schools and libraries' website <<http://www.slcfund.org/>> or from the Merit Network Universal Service Fund web page <<http://www.merit.edu/k12.michigan/usf/>>. Assistance in complying with program requirements is also available from Clark Hill P.L.C. For additional information, call Haran Rashes or Rick Coy at Clark Hill's Lansing Office, 517-381-9193 <<http://www.clarkhill.com/>>.

### ***AT&T "DELIGHTED" WITH PFD RECOMMENDING***

## ***AMERITECH IMPLEMENT STATEWIDE DIALING PARITY***

AT&T, in a December 14, 1998 press release, said it was “delighted” that the Proposal for Decision issued December 11 by Administrative Law Judge Daniel E. Nickerson, Jr. recommends that the Michigan Public Service Commission (“MPSC”) require Ameritech to open the remaining 30 percent off its exchanges to local toll dialing parity. AT&T, an intervenor in the matter of MCI’s dialing parity complaint against Ameritech Michigan, Case No. U-11743, states that “For the last six years, AT&T, MCI and others, on behalf of Michigan consumers, have fought for implementation of local toll dialing parity before several different regulatory and judicial bodies. . . . For too long, 30 percent of Michigan’s telephone customers were missing out on the benefits of competition enjoyed by customers in the rest of the state” while Ameritech “fought to keep competitors out of the local toll market.” AT&T says it is confident that the MPSC will adopt the proposed order in its entirety because “it’s the right thing to do.” (See also Proposals for Decision, **MTR**, page 10, this issue).

\* \* \*

### **PENDING LEGISLATION**

The following is a list of active telecommunications bills that have been introduced during the current legislative session. Copies of bills and public acts referred to in this column may be obtained by contacting your state senator or representative or from the Legislative Service Bureau Document Room at (517) 373-0169.

<b>Bill No. Sponsor</b>	<b>Date Introduced</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Status</b>
SR 004 Dunaskiss	01/08/97	Senate resolution to request FCC to authorize Ameritech Michigan to provide interLATA long distance	To Senate Technology & Energy Committee
SB 24 Vaughn	01/28/97	Creates the Michigan Distance Learning Consortium Act	To Senate Education Committee
HB 4128 Dobb	01/28/97	Telecommunications Act - Amends codification statute relating to telecommunications; tie bar w/HB 4126	To House Public Utilities Committee

HB 4132 Dobb	01/28/97	Telecommunications Act - Amends codification statute relating to telecommunications; tie bar w/HB 4126	To House Public Utilities Committee
HB 4509 Dobb	03/13/97	Provides for uncollectible account exemption for telecommunication service	Vetoed by Gov. 12/1/97
SB 641 Byrum	07/01/97	Establishes educational institutional discounts	To Senate Technology & Energy Committee
HB 5283 DeHart	10/15/97	Requires notification of long distance charges to customer using a pay telephone	Passed House 2/17/98; to Senate Technology & Energy Committee
SB 762 Rogers	10/21/97	Requires consent of customer for telephone companies switching local or long distance services	To Senate Technology & Energy Committee
HB 5322 Brater	10/29/97	Requires notification to customers that a regulated service cannot be discontinued for failure to pay charges for a nonregulated service	To House Public Utilities Committee
SB 823 Hoffman	12/02/97	Requires adequate service area for residents' local exchange	To Senate Technology & Energy Committee
HB 5440 Scranton	01/14/98	Prohibits charge for payphone directory assistance calls or residential phone calls for in state out of local calling area directory assistance	To House Public Utilities Committee
SB 1009 Dingell	03/11/98	Emergency Telephone Service Enabling Act--includes wireless emergency telephone service; tie bar w/SB 1010	Sub (S-3) +amendments passed Senate 6/11; to House Judiciary Comm
SB 1010 Van Regenmorter	03/11/98	Emergency Telephone Service Enabling Act--establishes training standards for emergency telephone services; tie bar w/SB 1009	Sub (S-3) +amendments passed Senate 6/11; to House Judiciary Comm
HB 5653 Scranton	03/11/98	Emergency Telephone Service Enabling Act--includes wireless emergency telephone service	To House Public Utilities Committee

HB 5770 Stallworth	04/23/98	Provides for 5-member public utility commission and prohibits more than 3 from same political party	To House Public Utilities Committee
HB 5970 Brater	06/25/98	Prohibits employer monitoring of employee communications without monitoring policy and disclosure Tie bar w/ HB 5971	To House Committee on Labor and Occupational Safety
HB 5971 Hanley	06/25/98	Provides for regulation of employer monitoring of employee communications Tie bar w/ HB 5970	To House Committee on Labor and Occupational Safety
SB 1233 Van Regenmorter	06/30/98	Provides for elimination of exemption for telecommunications providers under the Michigan Antitrust Reform Act	To Senate Comm on Economic Dev., Int'l Trade and Reg. Affairs
HB 5988 Gubow	07/02/98	Telephone; complaint process and interconnection disputes; revise	To House Comm on Public Utilities
SB 1344 Rogers	09/24/98	Prohibits telephone companies from charging for certain services without customer consent	To Senate Comm on Technology & Energy
HB 6207 Dobronski	09/24/98	Prohibits certain telecom providers from billing for services or products unrelated to telecommunications	To House Comm on Public Utilities

**PUBLIC ACTS OF 1997**

PA No.	Date Effective	Description	Bill Number Sponsor
PA 95	09/23/97	Allows certain rates for Public Service Commission to opt in to the federal telecommunications K-12 program	SB 637 Stille
PA 96	09/23/97	Allows certain rates for Public Service Commission to opt in to the federal telecommunications K-12 program	HB 4997 Schauer

PA 183	12/30/97	Amends lifeline services and provides for the pole attachments of telecommunications systems established by education institutions	SB 788 Dunaskiss
--------	----------	--	---------------------

**PUBLIC ACTS OF 1998**

PA No.	Date Effective	Description	Bill Number Sponsor
PA 234		Requires message to terminate when consumer hangs up telephone for automated tape recorded messages	HB 4694 DeHart
PA 253		Prohibits businesses blocking their telephone number when soliciting a product or service during certain hours	HB 5387 Crissman
PA 259	10/01/98	Requires consent of customer for telephone companies switching local or long distance services	SB 837 tie bar with HB 5280 Rogers
PA 260	10/01/98	Requires customer consent for telephone companies switching local or long distance service	HB 5280 tie bar with SB 837 Dobronski

\* \* \*

**ORDERS**

**Case No. U-11700**

**Sterling International Funding Inc. d/b/a Reconex  
(amended license)**

The Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”), on December 21, 1998, granted the request of Sterling International Funding, Inc., d/b/a Reconex, (“Reconex”) to amend its license to provide basic local exchange service by eliminating authority to provide service in the exchanges of GTE North Incorporated. Reconex wishes to provide service only in the exchanges of Ameritech Michigan. The Commission directed Reconex to submit, prior to commencing service, its tariff reflecting the services to be offered and legible maps identifying its service area.

**Case No. U-11736**

**Ballinger v Ameritech Michigan and AT&T Communications  
(consumer complaint: phone rental)**

On December 21, 1998, the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) ordered that the settlement agreement, recommended by the mediator, in the matter of the complaint of Terry Ballinger (“Complainant”) against Ameritech Michigan and AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. (“AT&T”) be adopted. Complainant asserted that Ameritech and AT&T had failed to refund the \$50 deposit he paid to Michigan Bell in 1980 for a leased phone, and had even disconnected his telephone service when he stopped making the quarterly lease payments in 1996 when the phone quit working. Complainant stated that despite his efforts to either return the phone or have it repaired, neither Ameritech nor AT&T were of any assistance and he was forced to purchase his own phone.

**Case No. U-11775**

**MichTel Inc and Ameritech Michigan  
(interconnection agreement)**

On December 21, 1998, the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) issued an order approving the interconnection agreement filed jointly by MichTel, Inc. (“MichTel”) and Ameritech Michigan. MichTel is licensed to provide basic local exchange service in the Detroit and Pontiac District Exchanges served by Ameritech Michigan. The Commission finds that the interconnection agreement, which expires on April 10, 2001, is consistent with federal and state law and is in the public interest.

**Case No. U-11787**

**DIECA Communications Inc  
(license application)**

The Michigan Public Service Commission on December 21, 1998, granted to DIECA Communications, Inc. (“DIECA”) a license to provide basic local exchange service on both a resale and facilities basis within the following exchange areas: Ann Arbor, Armada, Auburn Hill, Belleville, Birmingham, Carleton, Center Line, Clarkston, Commerce, Detroit, Drayton Plains, Farmington, Flat Rock, Holly, Lake Orion, Livonia, Milan, Monroe, Mt. Clemens, New Baltimore, New Boston, New Haven, Northville, oxford, Plymouth, Pontiac, Rochester, Rockwood, Romeo, Romulus, Roseville, Royal Oak, Southfield, South Lyon, Trenton, Troy, Utica, Walled Lake, Warren, Washington, Wayne, West Bloomfield, Willis, Wyandotte and Ypsilanti, as well as any exchange area that is or becomes subject to the provisions of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Commission determined that DIECA possesses sufficient technical, financial, and managerial resources and abilities to provide the proposed services. DIECA, headquartered in McLean, Virginia, is a Virginia corporation and a wholly-owned subsidiary of Covad Communications Group, Inc.

**Case No. U-11809**

**United States Telecommunications Inc,  
d/b/a Tel Com Plus  
(license application)**

The Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) on December 21, 1998, approved the application of United States Telecommunications, Inc., d/b/a Tel Com Plus, (“Tel Com Plus”) for a license to provide basic local exchange service as a reseller in the areas of Michigan currently served by Ameritech Michigan and GTE North Incorporated. The Commission determined that Tel Com Plus has the requisite technical, financial, and managerial resources and abilities to provide the proposed service. Tel Com Plus is a Florida corporation, whose Michigan office is located in Bingham Farms. Tel Com Plus intends to market its services to “persons who are unable to obtain or qualify for service from the traditional local exchange service providers due to poor payment histories, credit problems or other reasons.” Tel Com Plus will offer a single flat rate plan service and allow unlimited calls, however, due the risks involved, its local service will be priced higher than the service offered by other providers and direct-dial long distance, collect and third-number billed calls will be blocked.

**Case No. U-11827**

**MediaOne Telecommunications of Michigan Inc  
(amended license)**

On December 21, 1998, the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) issued an order approving the application of MediaOne Telecommunications of Michigan (“MediaOne”) to amend the geographic service area of its existing license to provide basic local exchange service by adding the following communities: Beverly Hills Village, Bingham Farms, Birmingham, Bloomfield Township, Bloomfield Hills, Dearborn, Franklin Village, Roseville, Saline (City and Township), and Wayne (City), and by removing the following communities: Blackman Township, Delhi Township, Eaton Rapids (City and Township), Jackson (City), Lansing (City and Township). MediaOne is directed to submit, prior to commencing service, its tariff reflecting the services to be offered and legible maps identifying its service area.

**Case No. U-11849**

**US Xchange of Michigan LLC  
(petition for approval of tariff and temporary waiver)**

The Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”), on December 21, 1998, dismissed without prejudice the emergency petition of US Xchange of Michigan, L.L.C. (“US Xchange”) seeking approval of its initial tariff to provide competitive local exchange and interexchange telecommunication services and a temporary waiver of any applicable map filing requirements for GTE North, Incorporated’s service area. US Xchange requested to withdraw the petition on December 4, 1998.

\* \* \*

## PROPOSALS FOR DECISION

**Case No. U-11743**

**MCI Telecommunications Corp v Ameritech Michigan  
(access service)**

On December 11, 1998, Administrative Law Judge Daniel E. Nickerson, Jr. ("ALJ") issued his proposal for decision in the matter of the application and complaint of MCI Telecommunications Corporation ("MCI") against Ameritech Michigan recommending that Ameritech be ordered to immediately implement statewide dialing parity and to keep the 55% discount in place in those areas not converted to 1+ dialing until such time as they are converted or until the disposition of the appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court.

Previously, on May 19, 1998, the Michigan Court of Appeals issued an opinion overturning two earlier Commission orders which directed Ameritech Michigan to provide intraLATA toll dialing parity across the state and reduce its access charges by 55 percent. The Court found that the Commission orders were rendered void by the Michigan Telecommunications Act ("MTA"), which it said links the actual implementation of intraLATA toll dialing parity to the removal of interLATA prohibitions contained in the AT&T consent decree. Further, the Court said that the MPSC's imposition of a 55 percent discount on access charges because of Ameritech's failure to comply with the voided implementation schedule was unlawful or unreasonable. MCI and AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc., the Commission, and the Attorney General all filed applications for leave to appeal the Court's opinion to the Michigan Supreme Court.

In the instant case, which was filed on July 23, 1998, Ameritech argues that MCI's complaint should be dismissed because the Commission is bound by the Court of Appeals opinion and does not have the authority or jurisdiction to overrule the Court's published decision. However, MCI argues that Ameritech has previously admitted that after July 1, 1997, the Commission would have authority to implement dialing parity and further insisted that the Court's opinion was based on provisions of the MTA prior to the July 1, 1997 repeal of Section 312b and did not address the Commission's authority to order dialing parity after July 1, 1997.

The ALJ finds that the Commission has authority under the provision of the MTA "to order dialing parity in the remaining non-converted 30% of Ameritech's access routes upon a finding that to do so is in the public interest. He asserts that statewide dialing parity is in the public interest because the alternative, dial around service, is an offering inferior to 1+ dialing, since the caller must also dial the carrier's access code-- an addition seven digits. He points out that Ameritech "itself has recognized on numerous occasions that offerings involving dialing extra digits are perceived by the customer to be inferior or deteriorated service." He also finds that Ameritech's retention of a competitive advantage in the non-converted area is a harm to the public interest. The ALJ rejects Ameritech's argument that dialing parity should be linked with authority to provide interLATA authority, and states that the MTA in its current form provides for no such linkage. He recommends that the Commission grant MCI's requested 55% discount, an amount which he finds reasonable, in

those areas not converted to 1+ dialing access, and “recommends that the Commission order Ameritech to provide 100% dialing parity to 100% of its customers immediately.”

\* \* \*

### NOTICES OF HEARING

**Case No. U-11872**

**Allegiance Telecom of Michigan Inc  
(license application)**

A prehearing conference in the matter of the application of Allegiance Telecom of Michigan, Inc. for a license to provide basic local exchange service on a resold and facilities-basis in the Detroit LATA Zones and Exchanges served by Ameritech Michigan will be held on January 7, 1999, at 9:00 a.m., in the offices of the Michigan Public Service Commission, 6545 Mercantile Way, Lansing, Michigan. Petitions to intervene are due on January 5, 1999. (See also Applications and Complaints, this issue).

**Case No. U-11873**

**CoreComm Michigan Inc  
(license application)**

A prehearing conference in the matter of the application of CoreComm Michigan, Inc. for a license to provide basic local exchange service on a resold and facilities-basis throughout the state of Michigan in areas currently served by Ameritech Michigan and GTE North Incorporated will be held on December 30, 1998, at 9:00 a.m., in the offices of the Michigan Public Service Commission, 6545 Mercantile Way, Lansing, Michigan. Petitions to intervene are due on December 28, 1998. (See also Applications and Complaints, this issue).

\* \* \*

### PSC HEARINGS

<b>Hearings Scheduled for Last Week (week ending December 18, 1998)</b>
Dec. 14, 1998, 9:00 a.m. Case No. U-11817 Bilan Communications (license application) Cross-exam
Dec. 15, 1998 Case No. U-11783 JAS (license application) Cross-exam

**Hearings Scheduled for Last Week** (week ending December 18, 1998) *(continued)*

Dec. 17-18, 1998, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-11759  
AT&T Communications v GTE North (access charges)  
Cross-exam

**Hearings Scheduled for This Week** (week ending December 25, 1998)

Dec. 21, 1998, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-11759  
AT&T v GTE North and Contel (access charges)  
Cross-exam all parties

Dec. 21, 1998, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-11855  
NOS Communications (license application)  
Prehearing conference

**Future Hearings Scheduled**

Dec. 30, 1998, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-11873  
CoreComm Michigan (license application)  
Prehearing conference

Jan. 7, 1998, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-11872  
Allegiance Telecom of Michigan Inc (license application)  
Prehearing conference

Jan. 21, 1998  
Case No. U-11757  
Commission's Own Motion (procedures to prohibit slamming)  
Cross-exam

## APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

**Case No. U-11168**

**MCI Telecommunications Corporation and Ameritech Michigan  
(interconnection agreement)**

On December 16, 1998, Ameritech Michigan and MCI Telecommunications Corporation (“MCI”), (collectively, “Applicants”), applied jointly to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the First Amendment to their existing Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”). Applicants state that each has commenced cases for judicial review of the Commission’s order pertaining to the initial approval of the Agreement, but that each has engaged in good faith negotiations regarding certain matters involving interconnection of their respective networks and related matters not addressed in detail in the approved Agreement. The resulting First Amendment provides that, “Ameritech shall grant to MCI the right to use certain Listing Information” used to create and maintain Ameritech’s Directory Assistance database. MCI states that its interest in this information is for the sole purpose of providing Directory Assistance.

**Case No. U-11857**

**Ameritech Michigan and GTE North Incorporated  
(boundary alterations)**

On December 2, 1998, Ameritech Michigan and GTE North Incorporated (“GTE”) filed a joint application with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for authority to alter the geographic areas of their licenses to provide basic local exchange service by transferring certain territory from Ameritech’s Flint Exchange to GTE’s Rankin Exchange. Applicants indicate that a portion of a new subdivision, Deer Creek, under construction in the Rankin Exchange spills over into the Flint Exchange, and that the transfer is necessary in order to provide service to this new development in the most economical and uniform manner. Applicants represent that the proposed boundary alteration does not involve a sale of lines or facilities and will not increase rates or charges to existing customers. Applicants request that the Commission issue an order, without hearing.

**Case No. U-11868**

**Crescent Continental Inc v Ameritech  
(consumer complaint)**

On December 11, 1998, Crescent Continental, Inc. (“Complainant”) filed a complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) against Ameritech Michigan for “erroneously” charging Complainant \$380.00 for the installation of telephone service which Complainant neither authorized nor ever used. Complainant states that Ameritech’s offer to split the bill with him is not acceptable and that his civil rights have been violated because his credit record has now been adversely affected.

**Case No. U-11872**

**Allegiance Telecom of Michigan Inc  
(license application)**

Allegiance Telecom of Michigan, Inc. (“Allegiance”) filed an application with the Michigan Public Service Commission on December 21, 1998 requesting a license to provide basic local exchange service in the Detroit LATA Zones and Exchanges served by Ameritech Michigan, including: Algonac, Ann Arbor, Applegate, Armada, Auburn Heights, Belleville, Birmingham,

Brighton, Byron, Carleton, Carsonville, Center Line, Chelsea, Clarkston, Clio-Mt. Morris, Commerce, Crosswell, Detroit, Dexter, Drayton Plains, Farmington, Fenton, Flat Rock, Flint, Flushing, Grand Blanc, Hartland, Holly, Howell, Lake Orion, Lapeer, Lexington, Livonia, Mt. Clemens, Manchester, Marine City, Milan, Monroe, New Baltimore, New Boston, New Haven, Northville, Oxford, Peck, Pinckney, Plymouth, Pontiac, Port Huron, Port Sanilac, Rochester, Rockwood, Romeo, Romulus, Royal Oak, Roseville, St. Clair, Sandusky, Snover, Southfield, South Lyon, Trenton, Troy, Utica, Walled Lake, Warren, Wayne, Washington, West Bloomfield, Whitmore Lake, Willis, Wyandotte, and Ypsilanti. Allegiance, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Allegiance Telecom, Inc., is a Delaware corporation with offices in Dallas, Texas. Allegiance purports to have the requisite managerial, technical and financial resources and abilities to provide “all forms of resold and facilities-based local exchange telecommunications services”. Allegiance is currently authorized to provide local exchange service in California, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Texas, and is currently in the process of obtaining local exchange authority in other states. (See also Notices of Hearing, **MTR**, this issue).

**Case No. U-11873**

**CoreComm Michigan Inc  
(license application)**

CoreComm Michigan, Inc. (“CoreComm”) filed an application with the Michigan Public Service Commission on December 18, 1998 requesting a license to provide resold and facilities-based basic local exchange service throughout the state of Michigan in the exchange areas served by Ameritech Michigan and GTE North, Incorporated. CoreComm, a Delaware corporation located in New York City, claims to have the necessary technical, managerial and financial resources and abilities to provide the proposed services. CoreComm’s affiliate, CoreComm Newco, Inc., is certified as a local exchange carrier in Ohio and is the first company to provide competition in the residential marketplace in that state. CoreComm Newco, Inc. also provides interexchange service in several states. (See also Notices of Hearing, **MTR**, this issue).

\* \* \*

### **NOTICES OF OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT**

**Case No. U-11851**

**Ameritech Michigan and GTE North Inc  
(boundary alterations)**

On December 15, 1998, the Michigan Public Service Commission notified Ameritech Michigan and GTE North Incorporated that the requirement for publication of a Notice of Opportunity to Comment by December 20, 1998 in newspapers of general circulation in Ameritech and GTE proposed service areas is rescinded.

Case No. U-11857

**Ameritech Michigan and GTE North Inc  
(boundary alterations)**

On December 15, 1998, the Michigan Public Service Commission notified Ameritech Michigan and GTE North Incorporated that the requirement for publication of a Notice of Opportunity to Comment by December 20, 1998 in newspapers of general circulation in Ameritech and GTE proposed service areas is rescinded. (See Applications and Complaints, above).

\* \* \*

**SCHEDULED PSC MEETINGS**

January 6, 1999	Wednesday	4:00 p.m.
January 19, 1999	Tuesday	4:00 p.m.

**SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION**

Mail to Circulation Mgr., Clark Hill, PLC, 2455 Woodlake Circle, Okemos, MI 48864-5941 or phone (517) 381-9193.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
TITLE \_\_\_\_\_  
FIRM \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_  
STATE \_\_\_\_\_  
ZIP \_\_\_\_\_  
TELEPHONE \_\_\_\_\_

Subscription Rates    \$375 per year (U.S. Currency)  
                                  \$175 per year (each additional subscription within the same firm)

AMOUNT ENCLOSED (Payable to Clark Hill P.L.C.) \_\_\_\_\_

## STATUS OF SELECTED TELECOMMUNICATIONS CASES BEFORE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Case No.	MPSC or Utility	Description	Application or Complaint	Hearing	Briefs or Comments	Reply Brief or Comments	ALJ or Staff Report	Report or Order	Request for Rehearing or Appeal
U-11700	Reconex	Application: amend geographic service area of license	10/19					●	
U-11743	MCI	Complaint v Ameritech: access service	8/18	●	●	●	●		
U-11755	Mid-American	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	8/19	●				11/18	
U-11756	MPTA	Complaint v Ameritech: payphone rates and services	8/10	●	12/9	12/23			
U-11757	Commission	Procedures to prohibit slamming (Public Acts 259 & 260)	8/20	1/21 x-exam	2/12	3/5			
U-11759	AT&T	Complaint v GTE: access charges	8/13	12/17 x-exam	12/29	1/5			
U-11783	JAS	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	9/28	12/15 x-exam	1/6	1/18			
U-11787	DIECA	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	9/22	12/9 x-exam				●	
U-11809	UST	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	10/6	12/8 x-exam				●	
U-11810	CallUP	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	10/6	1/5 x-exam	1/19	1/26			
U-11815	TDS	Application: for TSLRIC study	10/8						
U-11817	BILAN	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	10/12	12/14 x-exam	1/20	1/27			
U-11821	Bierman	Complaint v CenturyTel re toll charges	10/16	1/19 x-exam	2/2	2/16			
U-11825	NEXTLINK	Complaint v Ameritech: reciprocal compensation	10/29	12/3					
U-11827	MediaOne	Application: amend geographic service area of license	10/22					●	
U-11828	Lucre	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	11/4	1/26 x-exam	2/18	2/25			
U-11830	Ameritech	Proposal on performance measurements	11/2						
U-11831	MPSC	Review of Ameritech's January 1999 biennial cost study	11/5	2/4 x-exam					
U-11832	MPSC	Review of GTE North's January 1999 biennial cost study	11/5	2/4 x-exam					
U-11838	LDM	Application: licenses to provide basic local exchange service	11/6	1/28 x-exam	2/11	2/18			

U-11839	NEXTLINK	Petition: arbitration of interconnection agreement w/Ameritech	11/6	12/17 x-exam					
U-11840	Prein & Newhof	Complaint v Business Discount Plan: slamming	11/10						
U-11841	Accelerated Connections	Joint Application: interconnection agreement w/Ameritech	11/12						
U-11845	Pigeon Telco	Application: rate restructuring	11/24						
U-11848	Navigator	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	11/20	2/8 x-exam	2/28	3/8			
U-11849	US Xchange	Petition for approval of tariff and temporary waiver	11/24					●	
U-11850	Ameritech	Notice: rate increase	11/16						
U-11851	Ameritech & GTE North	Joint application: boundary alterations	11/25						
U-11855	NOS	Application: to provider basic local exchange service	12/3	12/21					
U-11857	Ameritech & GTE North	Joint application: boundary alteration	12/2						
U-11859	USXchange	Application: to hold certification in abeyance	12/4						
U-11872	Allegiance	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	12/21	1/7					
U-11873	CoreComm	Application: license to provide basic local exchange service	12/18	12/30					