

M ICHIGAN T ELECOMMUNICATIONS R EPORT™

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

Vol. 17, No. 1, January 5, 2001

In this issue . . .

- 2 Features**
 - P MPSC delay 248 area code changes
 - P MPSC, CLECs and KPMG to discuss Ameritech OSS testing
 - P TDS Metrocom wants MPSC to allow appointment of neutral, 3rd party arbitrator
 - P Chairman Strand leaves MPSC

- 4 Public Acts of 1999/2000**
- 5 Orders**
- 9 Notices of Hearing**
- 10 PSC Hearings**
- 10 Applications and Complaints**
- 15 Opportunities for Comment**
- 16 PSC Meetings**
- 16 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; Contributors, Haran C. Rashes and Leland R. Rosier; Annual Subscription \$375.00 (US).

INDEX OF CASES HIGHLIGHTED

Orders

- U-12320:** Commission's Own Motion: Ameritech: compliance with competitive checklist
- U-12532:** Roberts v Ameritech: quality of service
- U-12589:** FairPoint: license
- U-12622:** Ameritech: shared transport cost study: leave to appeal
- U-12625:** Waldorf Floors: slamming
- U-12682:** Verizon: rate restructuring
- U-12721:** Commission's Own Motion: 248 area code relief plan

Applications and Complaints

- U-12444:** MPSC Staff v Vista: slamming: petition for rehearing
- U-12465:** AT&T/TCG Detroit: arbitration of interconnection with Ameritech: petition for rehearing
- U-12754:** Mallela v Ameritech: billing dispute
- U-12756:** Ameritech v MichTel: reciprocal compensation
- U-12770:** TC3: amended license
- U-12772:** AccuTel of Texas: license
- U-12773:** Navigator/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12774:** PaeTec/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12775:** eVulkan: license
- U-12776:** Morrow v United Service Telephone Co: billing dispute
- U-12777:** Ameritech: CPI-1% rate alteration
- U-12778:** Best Computer v Sprint: billing dispute
- U-12779:** Jordan v Ameritech: billing dispute

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

COPYRIGHT © 2001

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

FEATURES

MPSC DELAYS 248 AREA CODE CHANGES

The Michigan Public Service Commission announced on January 4 that it has delayed changes in the 248 area code and has begun an inquiry into the implementation of a relief plan for the 248 area code. Previously, NeuStar, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator, and members of the telecommunications industry declared the 248 area code's numbering plan to be in jeopardy, based upon the projected exhaustion date of NXX codes within the 248 area code and an unanticipated increase in the demand for these numbers. The Commission held a public hearing on the 248 area code relief plan on December 19, 2000 in Pontiac. Additionally, the Commission sought written comments on the 248 area code relief plan. Comments submitted by Ameritech Michigan and Verizon recommend a significant delay for implementing the 248 area code relief plan, predicated upon first completing work on the recently-ordered 517 and 810 area code relief plans.

In its January 4, 2001 order, the Commission states that it is “extremely concerned about Ameritech Michigan and Verizon’s assertion that no relief plan can be implemented until mid to late 2002, which is at least one year after the predicted NXX code exhaustion date”, and has ordered the two companies to answer specific questions, by January 24, to support their allegations.

“The Commission does not believe that it should proceed with a relief plan for the 248 area code until additional questions are answered,” said Chairman John Strand in a press release issued January 4. “If the relief plan cannot be implemented for 18 months, maybe we will have time to consider other options. In any case, it does not make sense for the Commission to proceed until it gets all the facts.”

Interested parties may file replies to the comments with the MPSC by February 2, 2001.

(See also, **Orders**, this issue).

MPSC , CLECS AND KPMG CONSULTING TO DISCUSS AMERITECH OSS TESTING

In conjunction with Ameritech Michigan’s next anticipated Section 271 filing with the Federal Communications Commission, KPMG Consulting (“KPMG”) has scheduled a meeting at 10:00 a.m. on January 9, 2001 with the Michigan Public Service Commission Staff (“Staff”) and interested competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs). The meeting is intended to allow the KPMG OSS testing team to discuss the tests in the Michigan Master Test Plan with CLEC participants and other interested parties.

Additionally, Staff and KPMG Consulting will be available to answer questions concerning the execution of the Master Test Plan, which may occur as early as February. KPMG intends to have available a more detailed agenda prior to the meeting, but it is expected that the meeting will explain and share the testing project plan and explore areas where CLECs can participate, such as observing operations during the tests and volunteering for KPMG to observe provisioning of actual CLEC orders, especially those relating to advanced services. For more information, call William Ralls at Clark Hill PLC.

**TDS METROCOM WANTS MPSC TO ALLOW
APPOINTMENT OF NEUTRAL, THIRD PARTY ARBITRATOR**

On December 28, 2000 TDS Metrocom, Inc. (“TDS Metrocom” or “TDS”) filed a motion with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“MPSC” or “Commission”) for an order to allow for appointing a neutral, third party arbitrator to hear the arbitration of the interconnection agreement between TDS Metrocom and Ameritech Michigan. TDS Metrocom states that it is a licensed competitive local exchange carrier, licensed in Michigan in Case No. U-12554. TDS Metrocom urges the MPSC to amend its order in Case No. U-11134, issued July 16, 1996, which established a procedure for arbitration under the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 to provide for the appointment of an outside arbitrator for the following reasons:

- a) The issues involved in arbitration proceedings related to interconnection agreements, especially with Ameritech, are exceedingly numerous and complex, and will require an extensive time commitment from the arbitrator;
- b) Given the complexity of the arbitration proceeding and the time required to deal with the issues, TDS Metrocom is concerned that, in light of the Commission’s already extensive workload regarding important telecommunications proceedings, there are insufficient staff available during the arbitration period to conduct the arbitration; and
- c) The appointment of an outside arbitrator may bring efficiency to the arbitration process for TDS Metrocom by decreasing the number of arbitration proceedings in the Ameritech region in which TDS Metrocom will be required to participate.

TDS states that although it has conducted negotiations with Ameritech for interconnection agreements in all five states in the Ameritech region, the immediate concern of its motion is the Michigan agreement. Negotiations were commenced on August 31, 2000, and the arbitration window opens on

January 12, 2001. TDS asserts that the “issues in negotiating with Ameritech are exceedingly complex, beginning with the SBC-13 State agreement and the Terms and Conditions of the Agreement between Ameritech’s affiliate SBC and AT&T for Texas, both documents over 500 pages in length with more than 30 appendices. TDS states because of the voluminous nature of the documents and the number of changes in the industry since TDS negotiated in initial agreement with Ameritech, there are so many issues to resolve that the parties conducted more than 20 teleconferences and exchanged dozens of pieces of correspondence just between August and November 2000. TDS claims that SBC-Ameritech, a company so much larger than TDS, has greater resources and can afford to engage in five separate arbitration proceedings, but that a consolidation of several proceedings before an outside arbitrator would neutralized Ameritech’s advantage. TDS says both efficiency and fairness would be served as a result of appointing an outside arbitrator and that other states, including Indiana, have already done so.

CHAIRMAN STRAND LEAVES MPSC

Michigan Public Service Commission John Strand has reportedly chaired his last Michigan Public Service Commission meeting and on Monday, January 8, will begin his new position as Legislative Council Administrator. Strand’s appointment expires July 2, 2001. Governor Engler has not yet indicated when he will name a replacement.

* * *

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 us 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)

ORDERS

Case No. U-12320

**Commission's Own Motion
(Ameritech Michigan: compliance with competitive checklist)**

On January 4, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") ordered Ameritech Michigan to proceed to implement its proposed Michigan 271 Amendment and provide new and existing unbundled network element (UNE) combinations in accordance with the Commission's provisions. The Michigan 271 Amendment (or M2A) is Ameritech's proposal to offer, on an entirely voluntary basis, new

UNE-Ps in the form of a standard contractual amendment to its existing interconnection agreements with CLECs. The proposal was set forth during a collaborative process commenced by the Commission to establish a procedural framework for determining Ameritech's compliance with the competitive checklist set forth in Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("FTA"). Included among the checklist requirements is that Ameritech provide or generally offer "[n]ondiscriminatory access to network elements in accordance with the requirements of the FTA. The Commission states that it "has reviewed Ameritech Michigan's proposal as a whole and has determined that its immediate benefits favor accepting it largely as it is . . . and outweigh a more time-consuming effort to resolve each disputed issue. Although the M2A proposal is not perfectly suited to advance all of the CLECs' goal, the Commission is concerned that rejecting a proposal that is less than perfect by finding it to be wholly inadequate would forgo the present opportunity to make Michigan a more competitive market for local exchange service." However, the Commission "does not agree that it should at this time grant Ameritech Michigan's request for a finding that the M2A meets the UNE checklist requirement in Section 271 of the FTA" and states that "[i]t would be difficult to make this finding on the basis of an amendment to the interconnection agreement that has yet to be implemented in Michigan." The Commission further notes Ameritech has not offered to file tariffs for new combinations and that "a prospective failure to make new combinations freely available to potential competitors may impede or preclude a favorable Section 271 recommendation."

Case No. U-12532

**Chris Roberts v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: quality of service)**

On January 4, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") dismissed with prejudice the complaint of Chris Roberts ("Complainant") against Ameritech Michigan. On November 8, 2000 the Commission issued an order addressing issues raised by the complaint and remanded it for further proceedings, however, on November 20 the Complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint because he had settled with Ameritech.

Case No. U-12589

**FairPoint Communications Solutions Corp
(license)**

On January 4, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission granted to FairPoint Communications Solutions Corp. a license to provide basic local exchange service in all exchanges currently served by Ameritech Michigan, Verizon North Inc., and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems. FairPoint's offices are located in Troy, New York.

Case No. U-12622

**Ameritech Michigan
(shared transport cost study)**

On January 4, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission granted the motion of CoreComm Michigan, Inc. (“CoreComm”) to file supplemental testimony and directed the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) to reopen the record for the limited purpose of admitting the supplemental testimony and exhibit and conducting appropriate cross-examination. On September 18, 2000 Ameritech Michigan filed an application in this docket to resolve disputed issues related to the rates, terms, and conditions that it will offer in providing shared transport as an unbundled network element. On December 6, 2000, two days after the deadline for filing rebuttal testimony, but one day prior to the scheduled date for conducting cross-examination, CoreComm, an intervenor in this proceeding, filed a motion to submit supplemental testimony indicating that an employee from Ameritech made a representation to CoreComm that, according to the Commission, “tends to contradict positions taken by Ameritech Michigan on the record.” Although the ALJ denied the motion because, among other things, it was untimely, the Commission finds that because CoreComm “could not have introduced it sooner than it did, and “[i]n view of the potential probative value of this evidence in resolving major issues in this case, . . . addressing CoreComm’s appeal prior to submission of the case for a final decision will materially advance a timely resolution based on a complete record.”

Case No. U-12625

**Waldorf Floors LLC v Advantage Telecommunications Corp
(slamming)**

On January 4, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) dismissed without prejudice the complaint of Waldorf Floors L.L.C. (“Complainant”) alleging that its telephone service provider was slammed by Advantage Telecommunications Corp. On December 8, 2000 the Complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint.

Case No. U-12682

**Verizon North Inc and Contel of the South Inc,
d/b/a Verizon North Systems
(rate restructuring)**

On January 4, 2001, after reviewing the application of Verizon North, Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems for approval to restructure its rates, the Michigan Public Service Commission concludes that a filing under section 203 of the Michigan Telecommunications Act is necessary to review the request to increase rates.

Case No. U-12721

Commission’s Own Motion

(248 area code relief plan)

After holding a public hearing and reviewing written comments which were filed concerning the implementation of a 248 area code relief plan, the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”), in its order issued January 4, 2001, states that it is “extremely concerned about [Ameritech Michigan and Verizon’s] assertion that no relief plan can be implemented until mid to late 2002, which is at least one year after the predicted NXX code exhaustion date.” Consequently, the Commission orders that on or before January 24, 2001, Ameritech Michigan and Verizon North, Inc. must file written answers to the following questions which are contained in the order. Other interested parties shall have until February 2, 2001 to submit responses to those answers.

4. What is the basis for their claims that all work must be completed on the 517 and 810 area code relief plans before commencing implementation of a relief plan covering the 248 area code? Why can’t work proceed concurrently on implementing three or more relief plans?
5. What justification exists for delaying the implementation of permissive dialing until well after the projected exhaustion of all available NXX codes in the 248 area code?
6. Based on information available to these two ILECs, what is their best current estimate of when available NXX codes will be exhausted in the 248 area code? Also based on the best information available to these ILECs, how many NXX codes are currently available in the 248 area code and which service providers are controlling them?
7. Can these two ILECs hire contractors to perform some of the functions associated with the implementation of relief plans for the 248, 810, 517, or other area codes?
8. What would be the effect of using rate center consolidation as either an alternative or supplement to the implementation of a 248 area code relief plan? Likewise, what would be the effect of using thousand block number pooling as an alternative or supplement to the relief plan for the 248 area code? What would be the cost to Ameritech Michigan and Verizon of each of these measures?
9. Beyond rate center consolidation and number pooling, do any other options exist for affecting the timetable for implementation of a relief plan for the 248 area code?

According to the Commission, “[a] delay of the magnitude proposed by Ameritech Michigan and Verizon has the potential to greatly inconvenience customers seeking additional telecommunications services. Furthermore, by making it impossible for cellular phone companies and competitive local exchange carriers to obtain the phone numbers necessary for their entry into the market, the delay could have a chilling effect on emerging competition.”

* * *

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-12711

**Five Star Mortgage Inc
(consumer complaint: billing dispute)**

On November 16, 2000 Five Star Mortgage, Inc. filed a formal complaint against Allegiance Telecom of Michigan, Inc. alleging that they were being fraudulently overcharged for telephone service. A public hearing in this matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. on January 10, 2001.

Case No. U-12743

**Commission’s Own Motion
(734 area code relief plan)**

The Michigan Public Service Commission will hold a public hearing on a proposal to implement an all-services distributed overlay for the 734 area code at 1:00 p.m., January 9, 2001 in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 100 North Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Case No. U-12772

**AccuTel of Texas Inc
(license)**

The December 21, 2000 application of AccuTel of Texas, Inc. for a license to provide telecommunications services in the exchange areas presently served by Verizon North, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan is set for a prehearing conference at 9:00 a.m. on January 11, 2001. Interventions are due on or before January 9, 2001.

* * *

PSC HEARINGS

Hearings Scheduled for Last Week (ending December 29, 2000)

December 27, 2000, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-12749/prehearing
Trans National Communications (license)

December 27, 2000, 9:30 a.m.
Case No. U-12753/prehearing conference
Dynamic Telcom Engineering (license)

Hearings Scheduled for This Week (ending January 5, 2001)

January 3, 2001, 10:00 a.m.
Case No. U-12676/public hearing
Kersh v AT&T Communications (slamming)

January 4, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-12673/cross-exam all parties
Pathnet Operating Inc (license)

January 4, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-12644/public hearing
Jarvis v Ameritech Michigan (slamming)

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.

January 9, 2001, 1:00 p.m.
Case No. U-12743/public hearing
Commission's Own Motion (734 area code relief plan)
Location: City Council Chambers
City Hall
100 North Fifth Avenue
Ann Arbor, Michigan

January 10, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-12717/public hearing
Five Star Mortgage v Allegiance Telecom (billing dispute)

January 11, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-12772/prehearing conference
AccuTel of Texas (license)

APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Case No. U-12444

**Michigan Public Service Commission Staff v
Vista Communications/Vista Group International
(slamming)**

On December 20, 2000 Vista Communications/Vista Group International (“Vista”) filed a petition for rehearing in the matter of the complaint of the Michigan Public Service Commission Staff, Communications Staff, Communications Division, Service Quality Section alleging that Vista violated sections 505 and 502(b) of the Michigan Telecommunications Act (“MTA”) by improperly switching the telecommunications service of Lakeview Family Practice, P.C. (“Lakeview”) to a new provider without authorization and improperly charged Lakeview for subscribed services that Lakeview did not order. On November 20, 2000 the Commission ordered Vista to pay a fine of \$85,000 in 30 days for four violations of the MTA with 80% of the fine, or \$68,000, payable to the State of Michigan and 20%, \$17,000, payable to Lakeview, and restitution to Lakeview of an additional sum of \$7,230. Vista’s petition claims that both “the Commission and the Administrative Law Judge committed an error of law and of fact by not giving deference to the statutory exception . . . to ‘strict liability’”, section 506(3) of the MTA, which Vista asserts “is afforded to a carrier who causes an unauthorized change in a customer’s service by ‘error.’” Vista states that it “clearly established that the change in service in question in this proceeding was the result of a data error, was not intentional and was in fact bona fide, i.e. an error made in good faith.” Vista argues that “it was an error of fact and of law for the Commission to determine that because it was possible for Vista to later adopt corrective measures so as not to make a similar computer error when relying on CARE reports, Vista’s previous reliance on CARE reports was unreasonable and the statutory exception of section 206(3) did not apply. . . . Using Vista’s corrective measures to establish that Vista’s previous practices were unreasonable is unfair to Vista, discourages carriers from adopting corrective measures to avoid computer and other errors and has the practical effect of reading the statutory exception for computer error out of the Telecommunications Act.”

Case No. U-12465

**AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc and TCG Detroit
(petition for rehearing: arbitration of interconnection with Ameritech Michigan)**

On December 20, 2000 AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. and TCG Detroit (collectively, “AT&T”) filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) a petition for rehearing of the Commission’s November 20, 2000 order. AT&T seeks rehearing on three issues. First, because of a recent decision issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan in *Verizon North, Inc. v Strand*, AT&T “suggests that a new fact or circumstance has occurred that requires the Commission to grant rehearing on its decision to defer several arbitration disputes to other dockets involving Ameritech Michigan’s submission of tariffs on similar matters.” AT&T argues that the federal district court’s holding that the Commission’s requirement that Verizon file public tariffs offering its network

elements “to be inconsistent with and preempted by the federal [Telecommunications] Act [of 1996]” may be used by Ameritech in an attempt to void any decision in the various generic tariff dockets ongoing before the Commission, particularly if the Commission sides with those parties who recommend that Ameritech Michigan must modify their proposed tariffs to comply with the Commission’s prior orders.” Second, AT&T requests rehearing on Arbitration Issues 10 and 20 (limitation on the use of UNEs) “because the Commission’s decision on these issues conflicts with its decision” in Case No. U-12460, the arbitration case between Level 3 Communications LLC and Ameritech Michigan, issued one month prior. Third, AT&T requests rehearing on Issues 48 and 49 (limitation on liability for LIDB and CNAM and limitation on recoverable damages) “because the Commission’s decision on these issues is inconsistent with its decision on Issue 11 (fraud liability for AT&T’s End-User Accounts).”

Case No. U-12754

**Reddy K. Mallela v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: billing dispute)**

On December 11, 2000 Reddy K. Mallela (“Complainant”), of Westland, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Ameritech Michigan improperly assessed him charges, which had been credited to his account by AT&T, on a final bill, and that he was subsequently denied credit, vehicle insurance, and employment after Ameritech turned the matter over to a collection agency. Complainant states that after he spent many months attempting to resolve the problem, Ameritech finally agreed to reimburse him the total amount in dispute, \$1,098.30. Complainant, however, seeks relief in addition to the refund for his time and out-of-pocket expenses necessary to resolve this matter.

Case No. U-12756

**Ameritech Michigan v MichTel Inc
(reciprocal compensation)**

On December 21, 2000 Ameritech Michigan filed a complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission against MichTel, Inc. (“MichTel”) alleging that MichTel has breached their Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) by filing an incorrect pricing schedule with the Commission and by refusing to recognize Ameritech Michigan’s right to require that the Agreement be amended to reflect the Commission’s Modifying Orders in Case No. U-11831, which approved Ameritech’s new TSLRIC studies and established new reciprocal compensation rates. Ameritech further asserts that “MichTel has no rights to the \$99,951.10” which it has billed Ameritech for reciprocal compensation.

Case No. U-12770

**TC3 Telecom Inc
(amended license)**

On December 18, 2000, TC3 Telecom, Inc. (“TC3”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval to amend the geographic service area of its existing license to

provide basic local exchange service. TC3's license, granted by the Commission in its August 20, 1999 order in Case No. U-11992, authorizes TC3 to provide basic local exchange service in the following exchanges: Addison, Adrian, Blissfield, Britton, Clinton, Hillsdale, Hudson, Morenci, Ogden Center, Onsted, Sand Creek, Tecumseh, and Tipton. TC3 proposes to add to its service area all of the remaining zones and exchanges presently served by Ameritech Michigan, Verizon North, and Verizon Systems.

Case No. U-12772

**AccuTel of Texas Inc
(license)**

On December 21, 2000 AccuTel of Texas, Inc. ("AccuTel") applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for a license to provide basic local exchange service on a resold basis and facilities-based/UNE-P type-basis, as well as long distance service on a resale business, in the exchange areas of Ameritech Michigan and Verizon (formerly GTE). AccuTel states that it is a privately-held Texas corporation doing business as 1-800-4-A- PHONE, and that its offices are located in Dallas, Texas.

Case No U-12773

**Navigator Telecommunications LLC and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On December 21, 2000 Navigator Telecommunications ("Navigator") and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") for approval of their multi-state Interconnection Agreement ("Agreement") executed as of October 20, 2000. The application states that Navigator is an Arkansas limited liability company with offices located in North Little Rock, Arkansas. The Commission granted Navigator a license to provide basic local exchange service in an order issued March 8, 1999 in Case No. U-11848, and amended the geographic service area on October 6, 2000 in U-12557. The Agreement has an initial term that expires on December 20, 2001.

Case No U-12774

**PaeTec Communications and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On December 21, 2000 PaeTec Communications ("PaeTec") and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") for approval of their multi-state Interconnection Agreement ("Agreement") executed as of November 13, 2000. The application states that PaeTec is a Delaware corporation with offices located in Fairport, New York. PaeTec was granted a license to provide basic local exchange service by the Commission in an order issued January 19, 2000 in Case No. U-12165. The Agreement has an initial term that expires on August 9, 2001.

Case No. U-12775

**eVulkan Inc
(license)**

On January 2, 2001 eVulkan, Inc. (“eVulkan”) 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, Verizon North, Inc. an Verizon North Systems, Inc. eVulkan states that it is a privately-held Delaware corporation which is authorized to utilize the assumed name “beMANY!” Its offices are located in New York City.

Case No. U-12776

**Samuel Morrow v United Service Telephone Co
(consumer complaint: billing dispute)**

On December 20, 2000 Samuel Morrow, on behalf of his wife Nora J. Morrow, (“Complainant”), of Battle Creek, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that United Service Telephone Company (“USTC”), through Ameritech Michigan, billed and collected from Mrs. Morrow \$16.35 each month from April 1997 until October 1998 for unauthorized services. Complainant states that although USTC admitted a mistake and refunded the payments totaling \$304.96, he believes that the unauthorized billing violates provisions of the Michigan Telecommunications Act.

Case No. U-12777

**Ameritech Michigan
(rate alteration)**

On December 28, 2000 Ameritech Michigan provided notice to the Michigan Public Service Commission of a rate increase in certain of its basic local exchange services in an amount not to exceed the Consumer Price Index (CPI), minus 1% (“CPI-1%”), as defined in Section 304(2)(6) of the Michigan Telecommunications Act. Ameritech asserts that CPI-1 equals 2.62%. The rate increase applies to the following seven services:

Business 1 party or Trunk-Measured Service	Access Area A Access Area B Access Area C
Independent Payphone Provider (IPP) Service (formerly COCOTS) Access Line and IPP Coin Line	Access Area A Access Area B Access Area C
Business Centrex Loops	Access Area A Access Area B Access Area C

Residence Call Plan 50 Service

Access Area A
Access Area B
Access Area C

Residence Call Plan 400 Service

Access Area A
Access Area B
Access Area C

Residence Local Message Charge

Business Local Message Charge

Ameritech states that notice will be provided to each affected customer before the effective date of the rate increases, and that unless the Commission determines that the amount of increase exceeds CPI-1%, Ameritech will implement the rate increases 90 days from notice to customers.

Case No. U-12778

**Best Computer Consulting Inc v Sprint
(consumer complaint: billing dispute)**

On December 26, 2000 Best Computer Consulting, Inc. (“Complainant”), of Southfield, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Sprint misrepresented and omitted “material information regarding the rates, terms or conditions” of the contract under which the Complainant purchased intraLATA and intrastate telecommunications services. Complainant requests “reimbursement for a minimum economic loss of \$8,600 and an apology letter from the president of Sprint.”

Case No. U-12779

**Donald D. Jordan and Kimberly K. Jordan v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: billing dispute)**

On December 28, 2000 Donald D. Jordan and Kimberly K. Jordan (“Complainants”) filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission against Ameritech Michigan alleging that Ameritech is accessing toll charges on calls to their Internet Service Provider, even though Ameritech had previously advised Complainants that calls to that specific number would be considered local. Complainants are seeking to be relieved of charges totaling \$1,141.72, including Ameritech’s “25% courtesy adjustment” and out-of-pocket expenses necessary to pursue this complaint.

* * *

NOTICES OF OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT

Case No. U-12743

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

Written comments on the proposal to implement an all-services distributed overlay for the 734 area code are due on or before 5:00 p.m. on January 10, 2001, and must be filed with both NeuStar, Inc. and the Michigan Public Service Commission.

* * *

SCHEDULED PSC MEETINGS FOR JANUARY 2001

January 4, 2001: regular meeting	Thursday	9:00 a.m.
January 23, 2001: regular meeting	Tuesday	9:00 a.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 (U.S. currency): single subscription: \$375; each additional subscription within the same firm: \$175. Please make checks payable to Clark Hill PLC.