

# MICHIGAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS REPORT™

A CLARK HILL P.L.C. Publication, Roderick S. Coy\*, Editor

Vol. 16, No. 19, September 15, 2000

## In this issue . . .

### 2 Features

- P MPSC opens hearings on Ameritech's service quality
- P MPSC approves 517 area code split
- P Public hearings on 810 area code relief
- P CLEC Association schedules conference
- P MPSC holds statewide forums

### 5 Public Acts of 1999

### 6 Pending Legislation

### 8 Orders

### 10 Notices of Hearing

### 12 PSC Hearings

### 13 Applications and Complaints

### 18 Slamming Complaints

### 19 Opportunities for Comment

### 19 PSC Meetings

### 19 MTR Subscription Information

MICHIGAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS REPORT (ISSN 08980357) is published every other week by Clark Hill PLC., 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; Contributor, Haran C. Rashes; Circulation Manager, Julie A. Wood. Annual Subscription \$375.00.

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

COPYRIGHT © 2000

## INDEX OF CASES HIGHLIGHTED

### Orders

- U-12598:** Commission's Own Motion: Ameritech service quality standards
- U-12599:** Commission's Own Motion: Ameritech treatment of customers
- U-12552:** Commission's Own Motion: 517 area code relief plan

### Applications and Complaints

- U-11933:** Focal/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12282:** @Link/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12473:** ICG/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12589:** FairPoint: license
- U-12590:** Williams Local Network: license
- U-12592:** Kaylor and Fonda v Ameritech: quality of service
- U-12593:** Carter v Ameritech: quality of service
- U-12594:** Brunson v Ameritech: quality of service
- U-12596:** MCImetro et al.: determination of competitive services
- U-12597:** MCImetro: rate increase
- U-12600:** Maverix.net/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12601:** CenturyTel/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12602:** BullsEye/Ameritech: interconnection agreement

CLARK HILL P.L.C.  
2455 WOODLAKE CIRCLE  
OKEMOS, MICHIGAN 48864-5941  
(517) 381-9193  
<http://www.clarkhill.com>

## FEATURES

### ***MPSC OPENS HEARINGS ON AMERITECH'S SERVICE QUALITY***

The following press release was issued by the Michigan Public Service Commission on September 7, 2000

In response to growing concern about Ameritech Michigan's quality of service and the escalating number of consumer complaints, the Michigan Public Service Commission today issued two orders to address these concerns. First, the Commission opened a contested case proceeding to establish enhanced standards and enforcement provisions for the company's service quality. The Commission set an expedited schedule for this proceeding, directing the company to file its proposed service quality standards and enforcement provisions by September 28, 2000. Interested parties may file to participate (intervene) in the proceeding by October 3, 2000 and a prehearing conference will be held on October 5, 2000 at 9:00 a.m. at the Commission's office at 6545 Mercantile Way, Lansing. The Commission has designated this case for participation in its Electronic Filings program to allow immediate public access to all filings.

In a related order, the Commission directed Ameritech Michigan to explain how its handling of bill credits during service outages comply with the Commission's rules and the Michigan Telecommunications Act. Ameritech Michigan must file, by September 21, 2000, an explanation of how it is providing the credits required by the rules and the MTA, and identify any charges or conditions it imposes on requests for repair service and how these charges and conditions comply with the rules, its tariffs and the MTA. The company is also being asked to explain how it does or does not manage service requests that should be of a high priority, such as medical emergencies and other public health, safety and welfare matters. On August 17, 2000, the Commission began a legislative-type inquiry into Ameritech Michigan's quality of service, directing the company to file a detailed business plan, by August 31, 2000, with explicit commitments to take action within a specific time frame. Interested parties may access Ameritech Michigan's business plan at <http://cis.state.mi.us/mpsc>. "We are aware that nearly 2,000 Ameritech Michigan customers contacted our office in August to voice their frustration with the company's quality of service," said Chairman John Strand. "We have taken action today to ensure Michigan consumers that we take very seriously our duty to establish and enforce quality standards for telecommunications service in Michigan." For filing information contact the MPSC staff at 800.292.9555 or by E-mail at [efile@ermisbbs.cis.state.mi.us](mailto:efile@ermisbbs.cis.state.mi.us).

\* \* \*

**MPSC APPROVES 517 AREA CODE SPLIT–  
NEW 989 AREA CODE DESIGNATED FOR SAGINAW LATA**

In an order issued at a special meeting on September 15, 2000, the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) approved a geographic split of the 517 area code to provide numbering relief, as recommended by members of the industry and NeuStar, Inc., the North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator. The Lansing LATA, the southern portion of the 517 area code, will retain that designation and the Saginaw LATA, the northern portion of the 517 area code, will become the new 989 area code. Permissive dialing will be implemented by January 1, 2001, and required dialing will commence on July 1, 2001. The Commission also ordered the industry to file within thirty (30) days a plan for customer education consistent with the order.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED  
ON PROPOSED 810 AREA CODE OVERLAY PLAN**

The Michigan Public Service Commission has scheduled two public hearings to consider the proposed 810 area code overlay plan. The hearings are scheduled for **1:00 p.m. on November 9, 2000** in the Council Chambers, 1101 South Saginaw Street, Flint, Michigan; and **1:30 p.m. on November 20, 2000** in the Mt. Clemens Community Center, 300 North Groesbeck, Mt. Clemens, Michigan. Representatives of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NeuStar, Inc.) and the industry committee that developed the proposed relief plan, and representatives of the Commission will be available at the hearings to explain the area code relief process and the recommended relief plan. Written comments may also be submitted to both the Commission and NeuStar on or before November 21, 2000.

Ms. Dorothy Wideman  
Executive Secretary  
Michigan Public Service Commission  
6545 Mercantile Way  
Lansing MI 48909

Mr. Frank Colaco  
NeuStar Inc  
8 Stratford Drive  
Livingston NJ 07039

\* \* \*

**CLEC ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN**  
**SCHEDULES FALL CONFERENCE**

The Competitive Local Exchange Carriers Association of Michigan will hold its Fall 2000 General Membership Meeting at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 28, 2000 at the Holiday Inn Express Conference Center in Okemos. MPSC Commissioner David Svanda will provide a Commissioner's view of CLECs and competition and Communications Division Director Tom Lonergan will present a summary of new MPSC cases affecting CLECs. Other topics of discussion will include right-of-way issues, ILEC performance standards, and the new provisions of the Michigan Telecommunications Act. Prior to the conference, the Association will convene for a business meeting at 10:00 a.m.. Registration forms are available by calling (517) 381-2128 or via e-mail request to kclements@clarkhill.com.

\* \* \*

**MPSC HOLDS STATEWIDE FORUMS FOR CONSUMERS**

Utility customers can learn more about Michigan's new telecommunications and electric laws and other recent changes in the telephone, electric, and natural gas industries by attending five statewide Consumer Forums presented by the Michigan Public Service Commission. Discussion topics will include: Experiences of telephone deregulation -- the benefits and difficulties; and electric and natural gas customer choice--what it is, why we have gone in this direction, and what you can expect.

The forums will also serve as public hearings and provide interested persons an opportunity to comment on the quality of telecommunications service provided by Ameritech Michigan. On August 17, 2000, the Commission began an inquiry into Ameritech Michigan's service quality. As part of the inquiry, the Commission directed Ameritech to file an explanation on how its service quality problems developed and how it plans to address them.. Ameritech Michigan's response is available on the MPSC Web site at <<http://cis.state.mi.us/mpsc/>>. Consumers will also be able to discuss other concerns about utility service or billing issues.

The remaining four Consumer Forums are scheduled as follows:

~ Tawas City ~

Thursday, September 21, 2000 at 6:00 p.m.

Community Center/Library

208 North Street

~ Cadillac ~

Tuesday, September 26, 2000 at 6:00 p.m.

City of Cadillac Municipal Complex - Council Chambers

200 North Lake Street

~ Wyandotte ~

Tuesday, October 3, 2000 at 6:00 p.m.  
City Hall - Council Chambers (2nd Floor)  
3131 Biddle Avenue

~ Royal Oak ~

Thursday, October 5, 2000 at 6:00 p.m.  
Royal Oak Senior/Community Center - Room 6  
3500 Marais Avenue

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC ACTS OF 1999/2000**

Public Act #	Effective Date	Description	Bill Number and Sponsor
PA 31 (immediate effect)	05/28/99	Amends Section 316 of the Michigan Telecommunications Act (1991 PA 179, as amended by 1997 PA 183) by repealing the June 1, 1999 sunset on lifeline services	Enrolled HB 4418 Gilbert II (R-Algonac)
PA 32 (immediate effect)	08/01/99	Provides for increased penalties for use of Internet to commit or attempt certain crimes against minors	Enrolled SB 7 Rogers (R-26, Brighton)
PA 33 (immediate effect)	08/01/99	Prohibits sexually explicit material furnished to children over the Internet	Enrolled SB 117 Hammerstrom (R-17, Temperance)
PA 37 (immediate effect)	08/01/99	Provides for restricting certain Internet access to persons under 18 years of age	Enrolled HB 4191 Cassis (R-38, Novi)
PA 39 (immediate effect)	08/01/99	Includes in sentencing guidelines, felony of using the Internet to commit or attempt to commit certain crimes against minors	Enrolled HB 4345; Tie- barred with SB 7 (PA 32) Howell (R-94, St. Charles)
PA 78 (immediate effect)	06/28/99	Emergency Telephone Service Enabling Act; includes wireless emergency telephone service	Enrolled HB 4658; Tie- barred with HB 4659, SB 492, SB 493. Scranton (R-66, Brighton)

PA 79 (immediate effect)	06/28/99	Emergency Telephone Service Enabling Act; authorizes and regulates membership in a 9-1-1 emergency service district	Enrolled HB 4659; Tie-barred with HB 4658, SB 492, SB 493. Middaugh (R-80, Paw Paw)
PA 80 (immediate effect)	06/28/99	Emergency Telephone Service Enabling Act; Establishes training standards for emergency telephone services	Enrolled SB 492; Tie-barred with HB 4658, HB 4659, SB 493. Van Regenmorter (R-22, Hudsonville)
PA 81 (immediate effect)	06/28/99	Emergency Telephone Service Enabling Act; Includes wireless emergency telephone service	Enrolled SB 493; Tie-barred with HB 4658, HB 4659, SB 492. Goschka (R-33, Brant)
PA 295 (immediate effect)	07/17/00	Rewrites Michigan Telecommunications Act effective July 17, 2000	Enrolled HB 5721 Middaugh (R-80, Paw Paw)

### 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, on the Michigan Legislature Web site, <<http://www.michiganlegislature.org/>> or from the Legislative Service Bureau Document Room at (517) 373-0169.

Senate Bill # Senator	Date Introduced	Description	Status
SB 1015 Hart	02/16/00	Amends Michigan vehicle code to prohibit the use of handheld cellular telephones that cause the careless or negligent operation of a vehicle	To Senate Committee on Transportation and Tourism
SB 1193	03/03/00	Repeals Michigan Telecommunications Act; provides for availability of communication services	To Senate Committee on Technology/Energy

House Bill # Representative	Date Introduced	Description	Status
HB 5324 Vear	02/08/00	Amends the MTA to require that an end user of a telecommunications provider not be switched to another provider without the end user's written authorization	To House Committee on Energy/Technology
HB 5474 Kowall	03/02/00	Prohibits telephone providers from charging for certain service without customer consent and authorizes MPSC to order remedies and penalties including fines, refunds, and cease and desist orders	To House Committee on Energy/Technology
HB 5563 Mortimer	04/11/00	Cellular tower attachment act; establishes MPSC authority over construction and certain use of cellular communications towers	To House Committee on Energy/Technology
HB 5564 Mortimer	04/11/00	Amends MTA to provide for MPSC for construction of cellular communication towers	To House Committee on Energy/Technology
HB 5567 Patterson	04/11/00	Provides for points to be added to driver license record when determined that use of a cellular telephone contributed to cause of traffic violation	To House Committee on Family and Civil Law
HB 5666 Bisbee	04/20/00	Amends section 604 of the MTA to extend the MTA sunset to July 1, 2001	To House Committee on Family and Civil Law
HB 5726 Thomas	05/03/00	Amends various sections of the MTA	To House Committee on Energy/Technology
HB 5734 Woronchak	05/04/00	Requires disclosure of fees or access costs on phone cards	To House Committee on Energy/Technology
HB 5735 Rackowski	05/04/00	Requires registration for providers of prepaid calling cards	To House Committee on Energy/Technology

## ORDERS

**Case No. U-12598**

**Commission's Own Motion  
(Ameritech Michigan: service quality standards  
and enforcement provisions)**

At a special meeting held on September 7, 2000 the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") issued an order concerning Ameritech Michigan's business plan to address its service quality problems, which was submitted on August 31, 2000. The Commission states that in response to growing concern about Ameritech Michigan's quality of service and the escalating number of consumer complaints, a contested case proceeding should be commenced to fulfill the Commission's duty to establish

and enforce quality standards for the provision of telecommunications services in Michigan and to preserve the provision of high quality basic local exchange service. The Commission points out that Ameritech's August 31 filing notes that the likely monthly average time to complete repairs during August will exceed 115 hours--300% above the standard that triggers corrective action pursuant to the Commission's quality of service rules. Furthermore, the Commission states that it has received about 2000 such complaints in August alone. The Commission will also continue its legislative-type inquiry into Ameritech's service quality problems, with public comment opportunities available through October 9, 2000.

Although the proceeding will be focused on Ameritech, the Commission "anticipates that the standards and enforcement provisions adopted in this case will form the basis of similar future proceedings for other basic local exchange providers." The Commission directs Ameritech to file no later than September 28, 2000 its proposed service quality standards and enforcement provisions, with supporting testimony. Ameritech is also ordered to "demonstrate that its proposed standards, and the means by which it intends to achieve those standards, are consistent with the competitive policies of the Michigan Telecommunications Act and do not confer an anti-competitive advantage on Ameritech Michigan." For example, the Commission points out that although Ameritech has identified Project Pronto as an important component of its plan to improve the quality of its service, some competing local exchange providers have indicated that the technology is not one that they can use.

Petitions to intervene in the proceeding are due no later than October 3, 2000, and the prehearing will be held at 9:00 a.m. on October 5, 2000. Intervening parties may also file their proposed service quality standards and enforcement provision no later than October 19, 2000. To allow for an expeditious resolution of the issues, the Commission directs the presiding administrative law judge to set a schedule whereby briefs and reply briefs, if any, will be submitted to the Commission no later than November 1, 2000, at which point the Commission will read the record.

**Case No. U-12599**

**Commission's Own Motion  
(Ameritech Michigan: treatment of customers)**

At a special meeting held September 7, 2000, the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order directing Ameritech Michigan to file, within 14 days of the order,

- 1) an explanation of how it is providing the bill credits required by Rule 32 of the Commission's Telecommunications Services rules and how its procedures comply with the rule and the Michigan Telecommunications Act;
- 2) an identification of any charges or conditions it imposes on requests for

repair service and an explanation of how any charges and conditions comply with its tariffs, the rules, and the Michigan Telecommunications Act; and

3) an explanation as to whether it assigns a priority to any requests for repair service and the reasons for its policy.

The Commission states that it has been notified by the Commission Staff, who has recently answered thousands of calls about Ameritech failure to provide timely repair service, that Ameritech has also failed to provide the bill credits required by the Commission's rules for the time when a telephone is not in service. According to Staff, there are reports that Ameritech has sent shut-off notices to customers who failed to pay for an entire billing month because they had no phone service due to Ameritech's failure to make timely repairs. Further, the Commission has also received notification from Staff of reports that Ameritech will not schedule a requested repair unless the customer agrees in advance to pay a charge of \$51 if, when the service technician finally arrives, the technician determines that the trouble may be caused by equipment on the customer's side of the network interface. The Commission notes that "[i]t is not immediately obvious that such a charge is appropriate or lawful", but finds Ameritech "should be required to identify any charges or conditions imposed on requests for repair service and to explain how any charges and conditions comply with its tariffs, the rules, and the Michigan Telecommunications Act. Finally, the Commission states that it has been notified by Staff of incidents that raise questions about whether Ameritech is prioritizing repair requests. Rule 82 of the Commission's Billing Standards for Basic Residential Telecommunications Service requires a provider to delay a shut-off of service notice upon proof of a medical emergency and suggests that customers with medical emergencies be given a priority for repair service.

**Case No. U-12552**

**Commission's Own Motion  
(517 area code relief plan)**

The Michigan Public Service Commission held a special meeting on September 15, 2000 approving the 517 area code relief plan filed by NeuStar on behalf of the telecommunications industry. NeuStar, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator declared the 517 area code numbering plan in jeopardy in May 1999 based upon a projection that still-available NXX codes in the 517 area code could be exhausted by the third quarter of 2000. NeuStar and other members of the industry recommended that a geographic split was the preferred means of relief. The Lansing LATA, would retain the 517 area code, while the Saginaw LATA would become the 989 area code. The Commission then held a public hearing on the matter and received written comments from seven customers. The Telephone Association of Michigan ("TAM") supported the proposed split, as did Verizon Wireless if cellular customers would have

the option of retaining the 517 area code and if a six-month permissive dialing period were allowed. Verizon North Incorporated and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, (collectively, “Verizon”) favored an overlay but would accept the consensus. Both TAM and Verizon agreed that it is not technically feasible to conform the split to county lines because the required construction of their networks would delay the split for two years. The Commission, in its order, concludes that the 517 area code overlay relief plan is reasonable and in the public interest “because the 517 area code (1) covers a large geographic area, (2) has not previously been subject to a geographic split, and (3) is composed of two LATAs that provide a natural dividing line for the implementation of a geographic split without separating communities of interest.” The Commission agrees with TAM and Verizon that it is “neither technically nor economically feasible to split the area code along county lines.” Permissive dialing under the plan will commence by January 1, 2001 and required dialing on July 1, 2001. The Commission also ordered the industry to file monthly progress reports until the area code relief plan is fully implemented, and, within 30 days, to file a plan for customer education.

\* \* \*

### NOTICES OF HEARING

**Note:** The following Notices of Hearing have been issued by the Executive Secretary Division of the Michigan Public Service Commission. The hearings will be held in the offices of the Commission, 6545 Mercantile Way, Suite 7, Lansing.

**Case No. U-12461**

**Matthews & Nelhiebel Co v American Nortel L.D.  
(slamming)**

On June 6, 2000 Matthews & Nelhiebel Company filed a formal complaint against American Nortel L.D. alleging that their telephone service had been “slammed.” A public hearing in this matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. on September 13, 2000.

**Case No. U-12516**

**P. Monet Conner v L.D. Services Inc  
(slamming)**

On July 5, 2000 P. Monet Conner filed a formal complaint against L.D. Services, Inc. alleging that her telephone service had been “slammed.” A public hearing in this matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. September 21, 2000.

**Case No. U-12545**

**Michigan Public Service Commission Staff v  
Accutel Communications Inc, Advantage Plus, Sprint,  
RSL Com USA, f/k/a One Step Billing, and Vista Communications/Vista Group**

On August 1, 2000 the Michigan Public Service Commission Staff filed a formal complaint against Accutel Communications, Inc., Advantage Plus, Sprint, RSLCom U.S.A., f/k/a One Step Billing, and Vista Communications/Vista Group alleging that each of these companies has charged end users for a subscribed service for which the end users did not affirmatively order (slamming). A public hearing in this matter will be held at 9:00 on September 12, 2000.

**Case No. U-12577**

**Looking Glass Networks Inc  
(license)**

The August 18, 2000 application of Looking Glass Networks, Inc. for a license to provide basic local exchange service in the zones and exchanges presently served by Verizon North, Inc., f/k/a GTE North, Inc., Verizon North Systems, f/k/a Contel of the South, d/b/a GTE Systems, and Ameritech Michigan is set for a prehearing conference at 9:00 a.m. on September 21, 2000. Interventions are due on or before September 19, 2000.

**Case No. U-12589**

**FairPoint Communications Solutions Corp  
(license)**

The September 1, 2000 application of FairPoint Communications Solutions Corp. for a license to provide resold and facilities-based basic local exchange service in the zones and exchanges presently served by Verizon North, Inc., f/k/a GTE North Inc., Verizon North Systems, f/k/a Contel of the South, d/b/a GTE Systems, and Ameritech Michigan is set for a prehearing conference at 10:30 a.m. on September 18, 2000. Interventions are due on or before September 14, 2000.

**Case No. U-12590**

**Williams Local Network Inc  
(license)**

The September 1, 2000 application of Williams Local Network, Inc. for a license to provide resold and facilities-based local exchange service in the zones and exchanges presently served by Verizon North Inc., f/k/a GTE North, Inc., Verizon North Systems, f/k/a Contel of the South, d/b/a GTE Systems, and Ameritech Michigan is set for a prehearing conference at 10:00 a.m. on September 18, 2000. Interventions are due on or before September 14, 2000.

**Case No. U-12603**

**Telera Communications Inc  
(license)**

The September 8, 2000 Telera Communications, Inc. ("Telera") application for a license to provide basic local exchange service on both a reseller and facilities-based basis in the zone and exchange areas currently served by Verizon North Incorporated, Verizon North Systems, and Ameritech Michigan is set for a prehearing conference at 9:00 a.m. on September 25, 2000. Interventions are due September 21,

2000.

\* \* \*

### PSC HEARINGS

#### **Hearings Scheduled for Last Week (ending September 8, 2000)**

September 5-6 and 8, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12462/cross-exam all parties  
Coast to Coast v City of Rochester

September 5, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12540/motion hearing  
Ameritech (cost studies, UNE offerings)

September 5, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12547/public hearing  
Clawson Container Company, et al. v Ameritech Michigan  
(quality of service dispute)

September 7, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12532/public hearing  
Chris D. Roberts v Ameritech Michigan (quality of service  
dispute)

September 7, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12575/prehearing conference  
EagleNet (license)

September 7, 2000, 9:30 a.m.  
Case No. U-12576/prehearing conference  
Mission Networks (license)

#### **Hearings Scheduled for This Week (ending September 15, 2000)**

September 11, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12503/cross-exam all parties  
Everest Connections (license)

September 11, 2000, 10:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12516/motion hearing  
P. Monet Conner v L.D. Services (slamming)

September 12, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12545/public hearing  
MPSC Staff v Accutel et al. (slamming)

September 13, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12461/public hearing  
Matthews & Nelhiebel Co. v American Nortel LD  
(slamming)

September 14, 2000, 10:30 a.m.  
Case No. U-12547/motion hearing  
Clawson Container et al. v Ameritech (quality of service)

September 14, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U- 12487/cross-exam all parties  
City of Hillsdale Advanced Communications Utility of the  
Board of Public Utilities (license)

### **Future Hearings Scheduled**

*The Michigan Public Service Commission hearings listed below are subject to cancellation. Interested persons should confirm with the Commission all hearing information on the day before the hearing. Additional hearings not listed here may also be scheduled.*

September 18, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12571/public hearing  
Commission's Own Motion (inquiry into Ameritech Michigan's quality of telecommunication services)

September 18, 2000, 10:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12590/prehearing conference  
Williams Local Network (license)

September 18, 2000, 10:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12528/hearing on Focal's Intervention  
Commission's Own Motion (local calling areas)

September 18, 2000, 10:30 a.m.  
Case No. U-12589/prehearing conference  
FairPointe Communications Solutions Corp (license)

September 21, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12577/prehearing conference  
Looking Glass Networks (license)

September 21, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12516/public hearing  
P. Monet Conner v L.D. Services Inc (slamming)

September 25, 2000, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12603/prehearing conference  
Telera Communications Inc (license)

\* \* \*

### **APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS**

**Case No. U-11933**

**Focal Communications Corporation of Michigan and  
Ameritech Michigan  
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 1, 2000 Focal Communications Corporation of Michigan ("Focal") and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") for approval of an amendment to their Interconnection Agreement ("Agreement"). The amendment, dated May 24, 2000, incorporates into the Agreement the Anti-Slamming Procedures specified in the Commission's January 10, 2000 in Case No. U-11900. Although the Agreement, by its terms, terminated on January 29, 2000, the parties state that they "continue to operate under the terms of the Agreement while negotiations are ongoing until a successor agreement can be reached."

**Case No. U-12282**

**@Link Networks Inc and Ameritech Michigan  
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 12, 2000 @Link Networks, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the Second Amendment dated as of August 23, 2000 (“Amendment”) to their Interconnection Agreement approved by the Commission on May 3, 2000 (“Agreement”). The parties state that the Amendment incorporates into the Agreement the rates, terms, and conditions relating to the provision of digital subscriber line (DSL), including High Frequency Portion of the Loop (HFPL) or line sharing.

**Case No. U-12473**

**ICG Telecom Group Inc and Ameritech Michigan  
(interconnection agreement)**

On August 31, 2000 ICG Telecom Group, Inc. (“ICG Telecom”) and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for a approval of the First Amendment (“Amendment”) to their Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) executed as of April 30, 2000 and approved by the Commission on July 6, 2000. The Amendment is dated August 29, 2000 and sets forth the terms, upon which the parties have agreed, relating to the payment of reciprocal compensation, points of interconnections, trunking, and identifying minutes of use subject to local reciprocal compensation. The parties state that although the Agreement, by its terms, terminated on July 16, 2000, they “continue to operate under the terms of the Agreement while negotiations are ongoing until a successor agreement can be reached.”

**Case No. U-12589**

**FairPoint Communications Solutions Corp  
(license)**

On September 1, 2000 FairPoint Communications Solutions Corp. (“FairPoint”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for a license to provide basic local exchange service, initially on a resold basis and in the future facilities-based, in the exchange areas of Ameritech Michigan and GTE North, Inc. FairPoint states that it is wholly-owned by FairPoint Communications Inc. (f/k/a MJD Communications, Inc.). Its principal offices are located in Charlotte, North Carolina.

**Case No. U-12590**

**Williams Local Network Inc  
(license)**

On September 1, 2000 Williams Local Network, Inc. (“WLNI”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for a license to provide resold and facilities-based local exchange service in the zones and exchanges presently served by Ameritech Michigan and GTE North, Inc. WLNI states that it is a wholly-owned corporate subsidiary of Williams Communications, Inc., which in turn is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Williams Communications Group, Inc., which in turn is controlled by the Williams Companies, Inc., “a solidly profitable Fortune 500 Company.” All are Delaware corporations. WLNI’s offices are located in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

**Case No. U-12592****Charles H. Kaylor and Stephanie J. Fonda v  
Ameritech Michigan  
(consumer complaint: quality of service)**

On September 5, 2000 Charles H. Kaylor and Stephanie J. Fonda (“Complainants”), of Ann Arbor, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) against Ameritech Michigan alleging that they were without phone service for 48 days and were assessed unauthorized charges. Complainants state that the lack of telephone service has caused them undue hardship and the extra cost for the use of alternative telecommunications devices. Further, Ameritech charged them for service while their phone service was inoperative. Complainants request reimbursement for their economic loss of over \$1,700.00, credit for the days they were without service, the imposition of fines, a cease and desist order against Ameritech and a contested case proceeding. Complainants also request that the Commission’s quality of service rules be amended to require prompt repair and service, more expeditious crediting of customer accounts for disrupted service, a referral to the State Attorney General’s office regarding laws that Ameritech may have violated, and “a referral to the appropriate federal and state authorities for an investigation into possible criminal wrongdoing on the part of Ameritech Michigan.”

**Case No. U-12593****Harold Carter v Ameritech Michigan  
(consumer complaint: quality of service)**

On September 5, 2000 Harold Carter (“Complainant”), of Southfield, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that he was without phone service for eleven days and, as an alternative, purchased several calling cards. Complainant requests reimbursement for his out-of-pocket expenses due to the outage, the imposition of fines, and a cease and desist order against Ameritech.

**Case No. U-12594****Jane L. Brunson v Ameritech Michigan  
(consumer complaint: quality of service)**

On September 5, 2000 Jane L. Brunson (“Complainant”), of Grand Rapids, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) alleging that Ameritech Michigan is billing her for the nineteen days she was without phone service to her business and without voice mail, Caller ID, and the benefit of her answering machine. Complainant states that when Ameritech indicated that they could not repair her phone line for nearly three weeks, she purchased two cell phones and had incoming calls forwarded to the cell phones in order to maintain her business. Complainant claims that Ameritech refuses to credit her bill for the nineteen days she was without phone service because she was using call forwarding and because the cause of her service problem was in her inside wiring, even though she had Linebacker service. Complainant requests reimbursement of \$4,947.00 for her economic loss, the imposition of fines, and the entry of a cease and desist order against Ameritech. Complainant also asks that the Commission amend its quality of service rules in Case No. U-11040 to require basic local exchange providers to answer their phones within three

(3) minutes and repair out of service lines within 24 hours.

**Case No. U-12596**

**MCImetro Access Transmission Services Inc,  
Brooks Fiber Communication of Michigan Inc, MCI World Com  
Communications Inc, Teleconnect Long Distance Services & Systems Co,  
Touch 1 Long Distance Inc, TTI National Inc, and BLT Technologies Inc  
(determination of competitive (non-dominant) services)**

On September 7, 2000 MCImetro Access Transmission Services Inc. (“MCImetro”), Brooks Fiber Communication of Michigan, Inc. (“Brooks”), MCI World Com Communications, Inc. (“MCIW”), Teleconnect Long Distance Services & Systems Co., Touch 1 Long Distance, Inc., TTI National, Inc., and BLT Technologies, Inc. (collectively, “WorldCom”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for a determination that the telecommunication services offered by WorldCom are competitive (non-dominant) services pursuant to Sections 701(3), 701(4), 207 and 208 of the Michigan Telecommunications Act. (“MTA”). WorldCom states that all of the companies are subsidiaries of WorldCom and are either competitive local exchange providers or interexchange carriers providing intraLATA toll and interexchange services in Michigan. WorldCom states that the MTA provides for a filing by local exchange carriers with the Commission to classify local services as competitive for “an identifiable class or group of customers in an exchange, group of exchanges, or other clearly defined geographic area . . .” if local service is available from more than 1 unaffiliated provider and if other conditions pertaining to the existence of competition exist. WorldCom asserts that it meets these requirements and notes that the Commission must make a determination as to whether a service is competitive within 60 days of this filing.

**Case No. U-12597**

**MCImetro Access Transmission Services Inc  
(rate increase)**

On September 7, 2000 MCImetro Access Transmission Services, Inc. (“MCImetro”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for approval to increase its residential local rates pursuant to Section 304 of the Michigan Telecommunications Act. MCImetro states that it is a competitive local exchange carrier licensed throughout the exchanges served by GTE and Ameritech Michigan. MCImetro states that it now has two tariffs applicable to residential customers: a facilities-based tariff and a resale tariff. For residential service, MCImetro only has resale customers, but because its “experience with providing resold local service has been totally unacceptable”, it no longer accepts resale local customers. Instead, MCImetro intends to provide service to residential local customers through UNE-Platform and will provide this facilities’ based product as soon as possible. MCImetro contends that first, however, it’s facilities-based tariff must be updated, as those rates were first set in February 1996 without any factoring of the TSLRIC study results. MCImetro also points out that there are no customers being served presently under the current facilities-based tariff. MCImetro states that the new proposed rates are rate ceilings and not necessarily the actual rates which will be in the tariff as filed. Additionally, the residential resale tariff must be adjusted to match the facilities-based

tariff, until such time as the resale customers could be transitioned to facilities-based customers.

**Case No. U-12600**

**Maverix.net Inc and Ameritech Michigan  
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 12, 2000 Maverix.net, Inc. (Maverix.net”) and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of a multi-state Interconnection Agreement executed as of June 15, 2000 (“Agreement”) between Maverix.net and various SBC Communications, Inc. owned companies, including Ameritech, and the First Amendment to the Agreement dated as of June 20, 2000. The Agreement has an initial term that expires on August 13, 2001. The First Amendment incorporates the Commission’s anti-slamming procedures specified in its January 10, 2000 order in Case No. U-11900. Maverix.net is a Delaware corporation with offices located in Chicago.

**Case No. U-12601**

**CenturyTel Solutions LLC and Ameritech Michigan  
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 8, 2000 CenturyTel Solutions, LLC (“CenturyTel”) and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of an Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) dated as of June 1, 2000. CenturyTel is a Louisiana corporation with offices located in Monroe, Louisiana. Its application to provide basic local exchange service was approved by the Commission on July 6, 2000 in Case No. U-12328. The Agreement results from CenturyTel’s request to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement dated August 18, 1998 between Accelerated Connections, Inc. (now doing business as Rhythms Links, Inc.) and Ameritech Michigan, approved by the Commission on February 2, 1999 in Case No. U-11841. The Agreement has an initial term that expires on August 17, 2001.

**Case No. U-12602**

**BullsEye Telecom and Ameritech Michigan  
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 8, 2000 BullsEye Telecom (“BullsEye”) and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of a multi-state Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) executed as of April 20, 2000 between BullsEye and various SBC Communications, Inc. owned companies, including Ameritech Michigan. BullsEye, a Michigan corporation with offices located in Oak Park, Michigan, was granted a license to provide basic local exchange service in a Commission order issued August 17, 1999 in Case No. U-11942. The Agreement has an initial term that expires on July 17, 2001.

**Case No. U-12603**

**Telera Communications Inc  
(license)**

On September 8, 2000 Telera Communications, Inc. (“Telera”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for a license to provide basic local exchange service on both a reseller and facilities-based basis in the zone and exchange areas in which Verizon North Incorporated, Verizon North Systems, and Ameritech Michigan are the incumbent local exchange carriers. Telera, with offices located in Campbell, California, is a Delaware corporation and is a wholly-owned operating subsidiary of Telera, Inc., a privately-held Delaware corporation.

**Case No. U-12620**

**Bilan Communications Inc and Ameritech Michigan  
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 13, 2000 Bilan Communications, Inc., (“Bilan”) and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of their Interconnection Agreement dated as of November 29, 1999 (“Agreement”) and the First Amendment executed as of May 1, 2000 (First Amendment). Bilan is a Michigan corporation with office located in Monroe, Michigan, and was granted a license to provide basic local exchange service by the Commission on January 6, 1999 in Case No. U-11817. The Agreement has an initial three-year term that expires on November 28, 2000. The First Amendment includes into the Agreement certain provision of the Commission’s anti-slamming rules, as adopted in the Commission’s order issued January 10, 2000.

\* \* \*

### **SLAMMING COMPLAINTS**

**Case No. U-12572**

**Ronald and Elaine Pung v Qwest  
(slamming)**

On September 11, 2000 Ronald and Elaine Pung (“Complaints”) notified the Michigan Public Service Commission that they had resolved and settled the matter of their complaint alleging that Qwest had switched their long distance telephone service provider without their authorization. Complainants asked to have the action dismissed with prejudice.

\* \* \*

### **NOTICES OF OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT**

**Case No. U-12544**

**Long Distance of Michigan Inc**

**(amended license: expanded geographic service area)**

On August 2, 2000 Long Distance of Michigan, Inc. (“LDMI”) filed an application with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) to expand its geographic service area to encompass all of the zones and exchanges served by Ameritech Michigan, Verizon North, Inc., f/k/a GTE North, Inc., and Verizon North Systems, f/k/a Contel of the South, d/b/a GTE Systems. The Commission has directed LDMI to issue a notice of opportunity to comment by September 5, 2000. Written comments are due on or before September 26, 2000.

**Case No. U-12557**

**Navigator Telecommunications LLC  
(amended license: expanded geographic service area)**

On August 8, 2000 Navigator Telecommunications L.L.C. (“Navigator”) filed an application with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) to expand its geographic service area to encompass additional exchanges served by Verizon North, Inc., f/k/a GTE North, Inc., Verizon North Systems, f/k/a Contel of the South, d/b/a GTE Systems, and Ameritech Michigan. The Commission directs Navigator to issue a notice of opportunity to comment by September 5, 2000. Written comments are due on or before September 26, 2000.

\* \* \*

**SCHEDULED PSC MEETINGS**

September 15, 2000: special meeting	Friday	8:30 a.m.
September 18, 2000: regular meeting	Monday	4:00 p.m.

\* \* \*

**SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION**

Mail orders to Circulation Mgr., Clark Hill, PLC, 2455 Woodlake Circle, Okemos, MI 48864-5941 or phone (517) 381-9193. Annual subscription rates: single subscription: \$375 (U.S. currency). \$175 (each additional subscription within the same firm). Please make checks payable to Clark Hill PLC.