

# MICHIGAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS REPORT™

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

Vol. 17, No. 18, August 31, 2001

In this issue . . .

page no.

2 Features

- Ameritech proposes broadband summit
- MichTel charges Ameritech is anti-competitive in withholding payments
- 810 area code split coming September 22; permissive dialing in new 586 area code

- 4 Pending Legislation
- 5 Orders
- 5 Notices of Hearing
- 7 PSC Hearings Schedule
- 8 Applications and Complaints
- 13 Opportunities for Comment
- 13 PSC Meetings
- 13 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:

*No orders have been issued since August 16, 2001. The next regular meeting of the MPSC is scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on September 7, 2001.*

### Applications and Complaints:

- U-11989:** CenturyTel Wireless and Thumb Cellular: arbitration of interconnection agreement w/Ameritech
- U-12320:** Commission's Own Motion: Ameritech competitive checklist
- U-12989:** Ludington v MCI WorldCom: slamming
- U-13019:** Shipp v AmeriVoice: quality of service
- U-13038:** McLeodUSA: amended application: rate restructuring
- U-13055:** Verizon North: amended license: boundary alteration
- U-13057:** Joy Lines: license
- U-13058:** Guzniczak v AT&T: unauthorized charges
- U-13059:** Arnold v Talk.com: slamming
- U-13062:** Wofford v Ameritech: cramming
- U-13063:** Ma v MCI Local Services: slamming
- U-13064:** Mason v MCI WorldCom: slamming
- U-13065:** Weingarden v AT&T and Ameritech: unauthorized charges and slamming
- U-13066:** Roberts v LDMI: slamming
- U-13067:** Cooper v Talk America: slamming
- U-13068:** Bierlein v Ameritech: unauthorized charges
- U-13073:** MichTel v Ameritech: reciprocal compensation 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

### **AMERITECH PROPOSES “BROADBAND SUMMIT”**

Ameritech Michigan President Gail Torreano says it's time for the cable and telecommunications providers "to step forward in support" of Governor Engler's call for the expeditious deployment of statewide high-speed Internet access. According to an Ameritech press release issued August 30, 2001, Torreano proposes a "Michigan Broadband Summit" on September 27, 2001 and invites cable and telecommunications providers to attend to "develop a set of industry recommendations to open the way for effective and efficient deployment of broadband capabilities throughout Michigan." Torreano also hopes the group will "tackle the tug-of-war between municipalities and providers over the occupation of right-of-ways." Those invited to the summit include: the Telecommunications Association of Michigan, the Cable Association of Michigan, and the Competitive Local Exchange Carriers Association of Michigan. Torreano acknowledges that "there are many issues that separate the providers of broadband", but believes these organizations will "come together to do what's best for Michigan by developing industry positions on the following issues that we can recommend to Governor Engler, the Michigan Economic Development Corporation and the Legislature."

- I      Right-of-Way
  - How to reimburse municipalities for the actual, direct expenses they incur as a result of providers' use and occupation of right-of-ways.
  - How to assess providers in an equitable fashion designed to lessen the total burden that providers face in paying municipalities.
  - Reducing the non-financial, regulatory burdens that providers face, as there would be a presumption that a provider could operate in a given right-of-way without the need to obtain a permit, and any regulations would have to conform to a model ordinance.
  - Inclusion of not just providers, but all occupiers of municipal right-of-ways.
  
- II     Broadband Technology and Regulation
  - Recognition of all broadband technologies—DSL, cable modem, satellite, and elimination of any state-based regulation of such services and providers.
  
- III    Tax Incentives to deploy broadband
  - Should tax incentives be provided to encourage investment in broadband deployment?

## **MICHTEL CHARGES AMERITECH IS ANTI-COMPETITIVE IN WITHHOLDING PAYMENTS**

MichTel, Inc. (“MichTel”) filed a Complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”), in Case No. U-13073, on August 30, 2001, alleging that Ameritech Michigan has engaged in anti-competitive practices by withholding reciprocal compensation payments from competitors.

The Complaint notes that under the terms of the April 10, 1998 Interconnection Agreement between Ameritech and MichTel, each party to the Interconnection Agreement must pay reciprocal compensation to the other on a minute-of-use basis for calls that are terminated on the billing party’s network at a rate of \$.00453 per minute. Ameritech disputes \$111,561.21 of reciprocal compensation for the month of June 2001, because MichTel did not bifurcate minutes of local traffic into setup minutes and subsequent minutes “in accordance with the new Commission Order rate structure” provided for in Case No. U-12696. Ameritech explained, in a letter to MichTel, that “Ameritech has validated the local minutes at the appropriate duration rates as outlined in the Commission’s Order and [MichTel’s] Interconnection Agreement.” According to the complaint, MichTel believes that Ameritech cannot unilaterally apply new rates or a new rate structure to its Interconnection Agreement pursuant to the Recommended Settlement adopted by the Commission on February 22, 2001, in Case No. U-12756. Case No. U-12756 also dealt with an attempt by Ameritech to unilaterally replace the rates contained in MichTel’s Interconnection Agreement.

Because Section 251(c)(2)(D) of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 creates a duty for a telecommunications carrier to provide interconnection “on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and non-discriminatory in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement,” MichTel alleges that Ameritech’s unilateral refusal to pay reciprocal compensation in accordance with the terms and conditions of its Interconnection Agreement with MichTel violates Section 251(c)(2)(D) and renders Ameritech in non-compliance with the Section 271 Competitive Checklist. MichTel has also filed its complaint in the Commission’s 271 proceeding, MPSC Case No. U-12320.

MichTel characterizes Ameritech’s actions as arbitrary, capricious, and anti-competitive. According to the Direct Testimony of Jonathan R. Lodden, MichTel’s Vice President of Operations, “the amounts that Ameritech are withholding are significant. These amounts impact our bottom line and our cash flow. Without the withheld amounts, it is difficult for MichTel to expand our business, to market to and add new and prospective customers, to respond to market changes, and to compete . . . basically our hands are tied by our main competitors’ action.”

Among the relief that MichTel requests from the Commission is an Order compelling Ameritech to pay all past due invoices in their entirety; a finding that Ameritech is in violation of

previous Commission Orders and the Michigan Telecommunications Act; an order imposing fines against Ameritech; an order awarding attorneys fees; and, a Cease and Desist Order ordering Ameritech to cease and desist from the unilateral imposition of new pricing schedules in violation of interconnection agreements.

**810 AREA CODE SPLIT COMING SEPTEMBER 22;**  
**PERMISSIVE DIALING IN NEW 586 AREA CODE**

The 810 area code relief plan that geographically splits the existing 810 area code and assigns telephone customers in Macomb County the new 586 area code designation will begin on September 22, 2001 when permissive dialing is implemented. Mandatory dialing becomes effective March 23, 2002. . Brighton, Flint, Lapeer and Port Huron will retain use of the 810 area code. The split was approved by the Michigan Public Service Commission on December 11, 2000 in Case No. U-12588.

Prior to issuing its December 11, 2000 order implementing the split, the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) provided the public with the opportunity to comment at public hearings on November 9, 2000 in Flint and November 20, 2000 in Mount Clemens and through written comments to the Commission. More than 30 persons attended the two public hearings and almost 100 written comments were submitted to the Commission. The overwhelming majority of comments indicated a preference for a geographic split rather than the initial area-wide overlay proposal.

\* \* \*

**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 280 Dunaskiss	03/07/01	Creates new act; provides for definition of public utilities	To Senate Committee on Technology/Energy

SB 446 Dunaskiss	05/01/01	Provides for the clarification of the definition of public utilities	Passed Senate Committee 24-1; 06/28/2001 placed on third reading in House
---------------------	----------	--	---

House Bill # Representative	Date Introduced	Description	Status
HB 4219 Mortimer	02/13/01	Creates new Cellular Tower Attachment Act to require approval of MPSC regarding construction of cellular communication towers	To House Committee on Energy/Technology
HB 4220 Mortimer	02/13/01	Amends MTA to establish MPSC authority regarding proposed Cellular Tower Attachment Act. Tie Bar with HB 4219	To House Committee on Energy/Technology
HB 4307 Anderson	02/20/01	Amends MTA by adding section 312c to require notification of long-distance charges to a customer using a pay telephone	To House Committee on Energy/Technology
HB 4764 Neumann	05/15/01	Amends MTA to provide for the structural separation of local exchange companies with more than 250,000 users	To House Committee on Energy/Technology

### ORDERS

Note: No MPSC orders have been issued since August 16, 2001. Orders issued on August 16, 2001 were summarized in the August 17, 2001, Vol. 17, No. 17 issue of the **MTR**.

\* \* \*

### NOTICES OF HEARING

#### **Case No. U-12991**

#### **Focal Communications Corporation v Ameritech Michigan (interconnection agreement)**

On June 22, 2001 Focal Communications Corporation of Michigan filed a formal complaint against Ameritech Michigan alleging violations of the Michigan Telecommunications Act, the federal Telecommunications Act, and Michigan Public Service Commission order dated October 6,

2000 in Case No. U-12473. A public hearing in this matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. on September 12, 2001.

**Case No. U-12993**  
**Ernest Communications Inc**  
**(license)**

The June 26, 2001 application of Ernest Communications, Inc. for a license to provide telecommunication services in the exchange areas presently served by Ameritech Michigan, Verizon North, Inc., Verizon North Systems, CenturyTel of Michigan, Inc., CenturyTel of Northern Michigan, Inc., CenturyTel Midwest, Inc. and CenturyTel of the Upper Peninsula, Inc. is set for an evidentiary hearing at 9:00 a.m. on September 11, 2001. Interventions are due on or before September 7, 2001.

**Case No. U-13008**  
**TruComm Corporation**  
**(license)**

The July 9, 2001 application of TruComm Corporation for a license to provide telecommunications services in the exchange areas presently served by Ameritech Michigan is set for a evidentiary hearing at 9:00 a.m. on September 12, 2001. Interventions are due on or before September 10, 2001.

**Case No. U-13021**  
**Dominion Telecom Inc**  
**(license)**

The July 16, 2001 application of Dominion Telecom, Inc. for a license to provide local exchanges services in the exchanges currently served by Ameritech Michigan, Verizon North, Inc. and Verizon North Systems is set for an evidentiary hearing at 9:00 a.m. on October 9, 2001. Interventions are due on or before October 5, 2001.

\* \* \*

## **PSC HEARINGS**

Note: *Unless indicated otherwise, hearings are held in the offices of the Commission, 6545 Mercantile Way, Suite 7, Lansing.*

### **Hearings Scheduled for Last Week (August 20 - 24, 2001)**

August 20, 2001, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12969/evidentiary hearing  
KMC Data LLC (license)

August 22, 2001, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-13007/prehearing conference  
Ameritech Michigan (directory assistance services)

### **Hearings Scheduled for This Week (August 29 - 31, 2001)**

August 28, 2001, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12996/evidentiary hearing  
Devic v AT&T (unauthorized charges)

August 31, 2001, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-13019/public hearing  
Shipp v AmeriVoice Telecom (quality of service)

August 28, 2001, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12997/evidentiary hearing  
Woods v AT&T (unauthorized charges)

### **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 5, 2001, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-13007/motion hearing  
Ameritech Michigan (directory assistance services )

September 12, 2001, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-13008/evidentiary hearing  
TruComm Corporation (license)

September 11, 2001, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-12993/evidentiary hearing  
Ernest Communications (license)

October 9, 2001, 9:00 a.m.  
Case No. U-13021/evidentiary hearing  
Dominion Telecom (license)

## **APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS**

### **Case No. U-11989**

#### **CenturyTel Wireless Inc and Thumb Cellular (arbitration of interconnection agreements with Ameritech Michigan)**

On August 27, 2001 Ameritech Michigan filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) the revised Pricing Schedule to the Interconnection agreement between Ameritech and Thumb Cellular. Ameritech states that the Pricing Schedule was revised to include the new rates as approved by the Commission in Case No. U-11831.

### **Case No. U-12320**

#### **Commission’s Own Motion (Ameritech: compliance with competitive checklist)**

On August 30, 2001 MichTel, Inc. (“MichTel”) filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) a Complaint and Motion for Summary Disposition on Ameritech’s Anti-Competitive Practices and Request for Commission Investigation of Ameritech’s Anti-Competitive Practice of Withholding Payments From Competitors. The formal complaint asks the Commission to compel Ameritech Michigan to cease and desist from intentional anti-competitive conduct, pay MichTel reciprocal compensation pursuant to the terms of its Interconnection Agreement with Ameritech and the Commission’s order in Case No. 12756, enter a finding of same in Ameritech Michigan’s Section 271 Compliance Checklist docket, and grant summary determination. MichTel alleges that on August 8, 2001 Ameritech refused to pay MichTel \$116,067.98, the amount of reciprocal compensation due for end office local termination. MichTel asserts that the unlawful withholding of this significant amount of compensation “is significant to MichTel and places MichTel, a competitor of Ameritech, at a competitive disadvantage, under which it is suffering irreparable harm in its ability to serve customers, develop its position in the marketplace, and pay its bills. Further, MichTel states that Ameritech’s position results in MichTel having to provide termination services at MichTel’s expense for Ameritech’s customers. (See also **Features**, this issue.)

### **Case No. U-12989**

#### **Earl Ludington v MCI WorldCom (consumer complaint: slamming)**

On August 16, 2001 Earl E. Ludington requested that the Michigan Public Service Commission dismiss with prejudice his complaint against MCI WorldCom alleging the unauthorized switch of his telephone service.

**Case No. U-13019**

**Yaseka and Rashaan Shipp v AmeriVoice Telecommunications  
(consumer complaint: quality of service)**

On August 29, 2001 Yaseka and Rashaan Shipp notified the Michigan Public Service Commission of their request to withdraw their formal complaint against AmeriVoice Telecommunications alleging poor quality of service.

**Case No. U-13038**

**McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services Inc  
(rate restructuring)**

On August 24, 2001 McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. filed an amended application with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval to alter and restructure certain of its rates, to recommend how the Commission should address the proposed rate restructuring of its Directory Assistance services.

**Case No. U-13055**

**Contel of the South, d/b/a Verizon North Systems  
(amended license)**

On August 22, 2001 Contel of the South, d/b/a Verizon North Systems (“Verizon”) applied to the Michigan Public Service (“Commission”) for authority to alter the geographic area of its license to allow additional provisioning of basic local exchange service. Specifically, Verizon seeks to alter the current boundary between its Fitchburg Exchange and Ameritech Michigan’s Leslie Exchange. Verizon states that the proposed alteration: 1) is in the public interest; 2) does not involve a sale of lines or facilities, and, 3) will not result in a rate increase or charge to existing customers. Verizon requests that the Commission issue an order without a hearing.

**Case No. U-13057**

**Joy Lines Inc  
(license)**

On August 17, 2001 Joy Lines, Inc. (“Joy Lines”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for a license to provide basic local exchange service within all zones and exchanges currently served by Ameritech Michigan, Verizon North, and Verizon Systems. Joy Lines, located in Detroit, states that it is a Michigan corporation and a start-up company funded by its affiliate, T. Toles Enterprises.

**Case No. U-13058**  
**Kevin Guzniczak v AT&T**  
**(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)**

On August 17, 2001 Kevin Guzniczak (“Complainant”), of Grand Rapids, filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission a complaint against AT&T alleging that his telephone service was assessed unauthorized charges. Complainant states that the charges are for local calls to his Internet Service Provider. He indicates that his ISP’s local number has a 980 prefix , which is new in the area, and that “Ameritech was misdirecting” calls to that prefix to his long distance carrier, AT&T. Complainant states that although Ameritech has corrected the mistake, AT&T refuses to credit his account for the calls.

**Case No. U-13059**  
**Laurie Arnold v Talk.com**  
**(consumer complaint: slamming)**

On August 24, 2001 Laurie Arnold (“Complainant”), of Harrison Township, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Talk.com switched her local and long distance telephone services without her authorization and provided her with false information regarding its services. Complainant requests reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against Talk.com.

**Case No. U-13062**  
**Dale F. Wofford v Ameritech Michigan**  
**(consumer complaint: cramming)**

On August 27, 2001 Dale F. Wofford (“Complainant”), of Westland, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that for several months Ameritech Michigan improperly charged him \$16.35 for “services” billed by Integretel Inc. Complainant states he did not order this service and withheld payment while he made attempts to notify Ameritech that the charge did not belong on his bill. Complainant further states that Ameritech reported his account to a collection agency and that he was subsequently denied credit because the disputed charges appeared on his credit report as delinquent debt. Complainant requests reimbursement for out-of-pocket expense, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against Ameritech.

**Case No. U-13063**  
**Hongyi Ma v MCI Local Services**  
**(consumer complaint: slamming)**

On August 27, 2001 Hongyi Ma (“Complainant”), of Belding, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging the unauthorized switch by MCI Local Services

of Complainant's long distance service. Complainant requests reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against MCI Local Services.

**Case No. U-13064**  
**Carol F. Mason v MCI WorldCom**  
**(consumer complaint: slamming)**

On August 27, 2001 Carol F. Mason ("Complainant"), of Saginaw, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that MCI WorldCom switched her long distance service without authorization. Complainant requests reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against MCI WorldCom.

**Case No. U-13065**  
**Michael & Susan Weingarden v AT&T Communications and Ameritech Michigan**  
**(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges and slamming)**

On August 28, 2001 Michael and Susan Weingarden ("Complainants"), of Farmington Hills, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that for four months they were assessed unauthorized long distance charges by AT&T Communications ("AT&T") and Ameritech Michigan for a telephone number they had relinquished upon moving. Complainants state that despite their efforts to correct the problem and the phone companies' determination that their former telephone number was reassigned but still on their account in error, they continued to receive bills for that number and Ameritech threatened to turn their account over to collections. Complainants state that AT&T also switched their local toll service without their permission.

**Case No. U-13066**  
**William J. Roberts v LDMI Telecommunications**  
**(consumer complaint: slamming)**

On August 28, 2001 William J. Roberts ("Complainant"), of Royal Oak, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that LDMI Telecommunications ("LDMI") switched his long distance telephone service without authorization. Complainant states that he switched his long distance service from LDMI to AT&T, but that LDMI, through its "re-pic procedure" switched him back to LDMI services on three occasions. Complainant requests reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against LDMI.

**Case No. U-13067**  
**Douglas A. Cooper v Talk America, f/k/a Talk.com**  
**(consumer complaint: slamming)**

On August 28, 2001 Douglas A. Cooper (“Complainant”), of West Bloomfield, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Talk America switched his long distance service without his authorization. Complainant requests reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against Talk America.

**Case No. U-13068**  
**Evelyn and Paul Bierlein v Ameritech Michigan**  
**(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)**

On August 29, 2001 Evelyn and Paul Bierlein (“Complainants”), of Wyoming, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Ameritech Michigan has improperly charged them for inside repair service calls although the company has not been inside their home. Further, Complainants assert that they were home at the time of their service appointment but that the Ameritech technician simply left a note in the mailbox stating that inside access was necessary in order to complete the repair. Complainants are requesting reimbursement for their out-of-pocket expenses, including a credit to their account, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against Ameritech.

**Case No. U-13073**  
**MichTel Inc v Ameritech Michigan**  
**(interconnection agreement: reciprocal compensation dispute)**

On August 30, 2001 MichTel, Inc. (“MichTel”) filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) a Complaint and Motion for Summary Disposition on Ameritech’s Anti-Competitive Practices and Request for Commission Investigation of Ameritech’s Anti-Competitive Practice of Withholding Payments From Competitors. The formal complaint asks the Commission to compel Ameritech Michigan to cease and desist from intentional anti-competitive conduct, pay MichTel reciprocal compensation pursuant to the terms of its Interconnection Agreement with Ameritech and the Commission’s order in Case No. 12756, enter a finding of same in Ameritech Michigan’s Section 271 Compliance Checklist docket, and grant summary determination. MichTel alleges that on August 8, 2001 Ameritech refused to pay MichTel \$116,067.98, the amount of reciprocal compensation due for end office local termination. MichTel asserts that the unlawful withholding of this significant amount of compensation “is significant to MichTel and places MichTel, a competitor of Ameritech, at a competitive disadvantage, under which it is suffering irreparable harm in its ability to serve customers, develop its position in the marketplace, and pay its bills. Further, MichTel states that Ameritech’s position results in MichTel

having to provide termination services at MichTel's expense for Ameritech's customers. (See also **Features**, this issue.)

**PSC NOTICES OF OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT**

**Case No. U-13020**  
**Winn Telephone Company**  
**(amended license)**

On July 25, 2001 Winn Telephone Company ("Winn") filed an application with the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") to amend the geographic service area of its license to provide basic local exchange service to certain Ameritech Michigan and Verizon North Inc. exchanges. On August 2, 2001 the Commission directed Winn to issue a notice of opportunity to comment to cover the proposed service area by August 22, 2001. Written comments are due on or before September 12, 2001.

\* \* \*

**SCHEDULED MPSC MEETINGS FOR SEPTEMBER 2001**

September 7, 2001	Friday	10:00 a.m.
September 27, 2001	Thursday	10:00 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.

\* \* \*