

MICHIGAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS REPORT™

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

Vol. 17, No. 19, September 14, 2001

In this issue . . .

page no.

2 Features

- **MPSC approves single overlay area code relief plan for both 313 and 734**
- **MPSC schedules Consumer Forums**
- **MPSC seeks comments on number pooling**

6 Pending Legislation

7 Orders

16 Notices of Hearing

17 PSC Hearings Schedule

18 Applications and Complaints

21 Opportunities for Comment

22 PSC Meetings

22 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-11326: McLeodUSA/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-11839: NEXTLINK/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-12382: Coast to Coast/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-12743: Commission's Own Motion: 734 area code relief plan
U-12880: Commission's Own Motion: 313 area code relief plan
U-12952: TDS Metrocom: interconnection arbitration w/Ameritech
U-12975: MagnaCare Group v MCI: slamming
U-12987: Allegiance Telecom/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-12988: ACD Telecom/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-13003: US Xchange/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-13027: Quick/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-13031: NOS/Verizon: interconnection agreement
U-13032: B & S Telecom/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-13037: Alpine-Michigan E/Verizon: interconnection agreement
U-13039: Alpine PSC/Verizon: interconnection agreement
U-13040: RFB/Verizon: interconnection agreement
U-13041: Alpine-Michigan F/Verizon: interconnection agreement
U-13044: Ameritech: amended license
U-13049: Alpine PSC/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-13056: Cricket/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-13086: Commission's Own Motion: number pooling trials

Applications and Complaints:

U-12798: Focal/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-12991: Focal v American: interconnection agreement
U-12997: Woods v AT&T: unauthorized charges
U-13042: Blick v MCI WorldCom: slamming
U-13066: Roberts v LDML: slamming
U-13069: AmeriVoice/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-13081: NTERA: license
U-13090: Waypoint: license
U-13072: Borderland v Ameritech: interconnection agreement dispute
U-13074: Khayre v Ameritech: unauthorized charges
U-13076: Paris v Ameritech: unauthorized charges
U-13080: Mavis v LDML: slamming
U-13082: AT&T v Ameritech: interconnection agreement

*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 APPROVES SINGLE OVERLAY AREA CODE RELIEF PLAN FOR BOTH 313 AND 734

The Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”), on September 7, 2001 issued a press release outlining the relief plans as approved for both the 313 and 734 area codes.

In two related orders issued today, the Commission approved area code relief plans for the 734 and 313 area codes. The Commission concluded, in each case, that the best course of action will be to implement an all-services overlay over both the 734 and 313 area codes. NeuStar, Inc., the North American Numbering Plan Administrator, and members of the telecommunications industry, proposed several alternatives for relief in both the 313 and the 734 area codes, including an overlay that would simultaneously cover more than one area code. The Commission determined that establishing a multiple-region area code will allow for the most efficient use of numbering resources, and allow the NXX codes from the new area code to be assigned to the areas of greatest need without being constrained by the boundary that currently separates the 734 and the 313 area codes. NXX codes are the first three digits of a telephone number.

Under the approved plan, all existing customers in the 313 and 734 area codes will retain their telephone numbers. Once all NXX codes in either the 313 or 734 area codes are exhausted, new customers in the triggering area code requesting new telephone service will be assigned the new area code. When the overlay is implemented, 10-digit dialing for local calls placed both within and between the existing area codes and the new area code will help make clear to customers that they will not be assessed toll charges unless they dial 1+ 10 digits.

Unlike previous Commission orders addressing area code relief, the Commission did not establish a firm implementation schedule for 734 or 313 area code relief. Instead, it concluded that if and when NeuStar determines that either the 313 or the 734 area code is within 12 months of actual NXX code exhaust, NeuStar should notify the Commission and meet with telecommunications industry members to establish an implementation schedule for relief. The Commission further directed NeuStar to ensure that the subsequent implementation of permissive dialing would begin six months prior to the NXX code exhaust. In no event, would the implementation of permissive dialing begin before September 7, 2002. The telecommunications industry will then be required to file monthly progress reports with the Commission. Within 30 days of today's order, the telecommunications industry must file comprehensive consumer education plans with the MPSC,

addressing items such as bill inserts, press kits, public service announcements, and training materials to educate company personnel involved in customer relations.

Based on the facts of these cases, the Commission approved the overlay plan covering more than one area code for the following reasons:

Customers have already had their area code changed, at least once, as a result of an area code split, and forcing them to change their telephone numbers again should be avoided if at all possible.

The previous geographic splits in the 313 and 734 area code have already separated them into the smallest practical areas without dividing communities of interest.

Research indicates that overlays have recently become much more accepted throughout the country, with nearly 75% of the area code relief plans approved by state commissions being in the form of overlays.

Overlays can accentuate the benefits resulting from various numbering resource optimization programs, with numbers freed-up through either NXX code reclamation or thousands-block number pooling used throughout a much larger area.

In 1999, NeuStar declared the 313 and 734 area codes numbering plans to be in jeopardy, based upon the projected exhaustion date of NXX codes within the 313 and 734 area codes and unanticipated increases in the demand for these numbers. The Commission held public hearings on the 313 relief plan on April 30, 2001 in Detroit and on May 31, 2001 in Grosse Pointe. The Commission held a public hearing on the 734 relief plan on January 9, 2001 in Ann Arbor. The Commission also provided an opportunity for written comment. Telecommunications industry members expressed strong support for implementing an all-services industry overlay. Comments from other parties ran the gamut from supporting splits to recommending the implementation of a technology-specific overlay (currently barred by Federal Communications Commission regulation) to rejecting all overlay and split proposals in favor of relying solely on such things as number pooling and rate center consolidation.

"We are keenly aware of the inconvenience and confusion that area code relief can entail," said Chairman Laura Chappelle. "While the Commission continues to aggressively exercise its legislative authority to minimize the need for area code relief and implement as expeditiously as possible a pooling trial in the 313 and 734

area codes, the FCC has clearly stated that these efforts can not substitute for timely area code relief."

MPSC SCHEDULES CONSUMER FORUMS

On August 31, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission announced that five statewide Consumer Forums have been scheduled and encouraged Michigan ratepayers to attend a Consumer Forum to learn how they may be affected by changes that have occurred in the natural gas, electric and telephone industries.

Legislation signed into law last year by Governor John Engler reduced electric rates for many Michigan residents and opened the door for customers to choose their electric generation supplier. Customer choice is also available to natural gas customers. The telephone industry is changing as well - continually introducing new services and features. Consumers will hear about these changes at the forums. They will also be able to discuss concerns they may have on utility service or billing issues.

The five Consumer Forums are scheduled for:

~ Marquette ~ Tuesday, September 11, 2001 at 6:00 p.m.
Marquette Senior Center, 300 West Spring Street

~ Warren ~ Tuesday, September 18, 2001 at 6:00 p.m.
Courtroom No. 1, 37th District Court, 8300 Common Road

~ Redford Township ~ Thursday, September 20, 2001 at 6:00 p.m.
Redford Community Center Gym, 12121 Hemingway

~ Gaylord ~ Tuesday, September 25, 2001 at 6:00 p.m.
Gaylord Holiday Inn - Alpine Room 833, West Main Street (M-32)

~ Battle Creek ~ Thursday, September 27, 2001 at 6:00 p.m.
City Hall - Commission Chambers (3rd Floor), 10 North Division Street

"Fundamental changes have occurred in the telephone, natural gas, and electric industries," said Chairman Laura Chappelle. "My colleagues and I welcome the opportunity to discuss these significant changes with area residents, businesses and interested groups, and to hear their concerns regarding utility issues."

MPSC SEEKS COMMENTS ON NUMBER POOLING

In a news release issued September 7, 2001, the Michigan Public Service Commission ("MPSC") announced that it is seeking comments by September 21, 2001, on instituting thousands-block number pooling trials in Michigan as authorized by a recent Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") order, and how to use the preparation for those trials to facilitate Michigan's participation in the national rollout of number pooling in March 2002. The MPSC is also seeking comments by September 28, 2001, on a cost recovery mechanism for number pooling trials. In an order issued the same day, the MPSC also designated NeuStar, Inc. as the interim pooling administrator.

On August 24, 2001, the FCC granted the MPSC conditional authority to institute thousands-block number pooling trials in five area codes: 248, 313, 616, 734, and 810 area codes. The FCC order grants the MPSC authority to implement pooling trials that conform to the national framework until national pooling commences in March 2002, at which time the national program will preempt any trials in Michigan.

On January 30, 2001, the MPSC requested delegated authority from the FCC to initiate 1,000 block number pooling trials in Michigan as one tool to more effectively deal with the escalating demand for telephone numbers. Under a 1,000 block number pooling trial, the pooling administrator will issue telephone numbers to telephone service providers in a designated area in a block of 1,000 numbers rather than in 10,000 block increments.

The FCC order places several conditions on the MPSC in instituting thousands-block number pooling trial in Michigan, including:

Implementing pooling in a single metropolitan statistical area (MSA) after providing adequate time for carriers to adjust their switches and administrative systems;

Pooling may be expanded to another MSA only after pooling has been fully implemented in the initial MSA and carriers have had sufficient time to make the necessary adjustments for pooling, such as modifying their data base and upgrading their switch software;

A pooling trial may commence for a Number Planning Administrator only after an area code relief plan has been approved;

Only those telephone providers that have implemented permanent local number portability can be required to participate in the trials;

Cost recovery must be addressed by the MPSC.

"We are pleased that the FCC has agreed that the MPSC needs additional number conservation authority to effectively deal with the projected demand for telephone numbers," said Chairman Laura Chappelle. "We anxiously await comments to determine how to begin number pooling trials before the national rollout of number pooling in March, given the time and resources available." Comments should be sent to: Executive Secretary, Michigan Public Service Commission, P.O. Box 30221, Lansing, Michigan 48909.

* * *

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

Case No. U-11326

BRE Communications LLC d/b/a Phone Michigan and Ameritech Michigan (interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Fifth Amendment to the Interconnection Agreement between McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services on behalf of itself and its subsidiary BRE Communications, L.L.C., d/b/a Phone Michigan, and Ameritech Michigan. The Fifth Amendment incorporates into the agreement Schedule 9.5.3., Switching Capability, including Exhibit A and the related pricing schedule.

Case No. U-11839

NEXTLINK Michigan Inc, d/b/a XO Michigan, Inc (arbitration of interconnection agreement with Ameritech Michigan)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) issued an order approving the Mi2A amendment to the Interconnection Agreement between NEXTLINK Michigan, Inc., d/b/a XO Michigan, Inc. (“NEXTLINK”) and Ameritech Michigan. In accordance with the Commission’s March 19, 2001 order in Case No. 12320, as part of the collaborative process in Michigan, Ameritech will make available, and NEXTLINK has elected to purchase, certain new combinations of unbundled network elements at the prices, terms, and conditions set forth in the Mi2A amendment.

Case No. U-12382

Coast to Coast Telecommunications Inc (arbitration of interconnection agreement with Ameritech Michigan)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Mi2A amendment to the Interconnection Agreement between Coast to Coast Telecommunications, Inc. (“Coast”) and Ameritech Michigan. In accordance with the Commission’s March 19, 2001 order in Case No. 12320, as part of the collaborative process in Michigan, Ameritech will make available, and Coast has elected to purchase, certain new

combinations of unbundled network elements at the prices, terms, and conditions set forth in the Mi2A amendment.

Case No. U-12743
Commission's Own Motion
(734 area code relief plan)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") issued an order approving the implementation of a multiple-area all-services distributed overlay relief plan for area code 734, with certain restrictions and requirements, including the removal of the 248 area code from the region covered by the multiple-area overlay. (The Commission's April 17, 2001 order in Case No. U-12721 subsequently established a separate overlay for the 248 area code.) Under the approved plan, all existing customers in the 734 and 313 area codes will retain their telephone numbers. Once all NXX codes in either the 734 and 313 area codes are exhausted, new customers in the triggering area code requesting new telephone service will be assigned the new area code. When the overlay is implemented, 10-digit dialing for local calls placed both within and between the existing area codes and the new area code will help make clear to customers that they will not be assessed toll charges unless they dial 1+ 10 digits.

Rather than establish a firm implementation schedule for 734 and 313 area code relief as it has in prior orders addressing area code relief, the Commission instead concluded that "[i]f and when NeuStar, Inc. determines that the 734 area code is within 12 months of actual central office code exhaust, it shall notify the Commission of the fact and meet with relevant members of the industry to establish a schedule for the implementation of permissive and mandatory dialing." The Commission also directed that "[a]ny implementation schedule established by NeuStar, Inc., the current North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator, and the industry shall provide for the activation of the new overlay and the commencement of permissive dialing in the 734 area code six months prior to central office code exhaust. Absent a future Commission order setting specific implementation dates, that schedule shall neither initiate permissive dialing before September 7, 2002 nor commence mandatory dialing prior to March 8, 2003." Further, the Commission ordered the industry to "file monthly progress reports from the time that the implementation schedule is established until the date upon which the area code relief plan is fully implemented . . .", and "within 30 days, a comprehensive plan for customer education consistent with this order, and shall further provide updates to that plan as necessary." Finally, telecommunications service providers within the 734 area code shall enter into informal discussions with all alarm service providers and emergency dispatch operators with which they do business, and shall attempt to resolve any unique concerns or problems that may arise for those customers due to the potential implementation of the area code relief plan approved in this order."

Case No. U-12880
Commission's Own Motion
(313 area code relief plan)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") approved the implementation of a multiple-area all-services distributed overlay relief plan for area code 313, with certain restrictions and requirements, including the removal of the 248 area code from the region covered by the multiple-area overlay. (The Commission's April 17, 2001 order in Case No. U-12721 subsequently established a separate overlay for the 248 area code.) Under the approved plan, all existing customers in the 313 and 734 area codes will retain their telephone numbers. Once all NXX codes in either the 313 and 734 area codes are exhausted, new customers in the triggering area code requesting new telephone service will be assigned the new area code. When the overlay is implemented, 10-digit dialing for local calls placed both within and between the existing area codes and the new area code will help make clear to customers that they will not be assessed toll charges unless they dial 1+ 10 digits.

Rather than establish a firm implementation schedule for 313 and 734 area code relief as it has in prior orders addressing area code relief, the Commission instead concluded that "[i]f and when NeuStar, Inc. determines that the 313 area code is within 12 months of actual central office code exhaust, it shall notify the Commission of the fact and meet with relevant members of the industry to establish a schedule for the implementation of permissive and mandatory dialing." The Commission also directed that "[a]ny implementation schedule established by NeuStar, Inc., the current North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator, and the industry shall provide for the activation of the new overlay and the commencement of permissive dialing in the 313 area code six months prior to central office code exhaust. Absent a future Commission order setting specific implementation dates, that schedule shall neither initiate permissive dialing before September 7, 2002 nor commence mandatory dialing prior to March 8, 2003." Further, the Commission ordered the industry to "file monthly progress reports from the time that the implementation schedule is established until the date upon which the area code relief plan is fully implemented . . .", and "within 30 days, a comprehensive plan for customer education consistent with this order, and shall further provide updates to that plan as necessary." Finally, telecommunications service providers within the 313 area code shall enter into informal discussions with all alarm service providers and emergency dispatch operators with which they do business, and shall attempt to resolve any unique concerns or problems that may arise for those customers due to the potential implementation of the area code relief plan approved in this order."

Case No. U-12592
TDS Metrocom Inc
(arbitration of interconnection agreement with Ameritech)

On September 7, 2001, the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") issued its Opinion and Order in the matter of the petition of TDS Metrocom, Inc. ("TDS") for arbitration

to establish an Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) with Ameritech Michigan. The Commission noted that in Ameritech’s objections to the Decision of the Arbitration Panel (“DAP”), issued on August 6, 2001, (“DAP”), see MTR Vol. 17, No. XX, Ameritech asserted that “that the percentage of issues decided in favor of TDS should lead the Commission to suspect bias against the incumbent local exchange carrier.” The Commission rejected Ameritech’s argument that the DAP was “discriminatory and unfair” and noted that the DAP is “generally founded on, and consistent with, principles established in prior Commission orders and on sound reasoning.”

The Commission addressed the remaining issues disputed by TDS and Ameritech, among which, were the following:

Notice of tariff changes: The Commission adopted the DAP’s recommendation requiring Ameritech to give TDS two weeks notice of tariff filings, which would affect the Agreement. The Commission noted that such a recommendation would not place any undue burden on Ameritech nor would it be discriminatory. The Commission found that two weeks notice of tariff changes will “provide sufficient notice to TDS of coming changes so that it will have an opportunity to deal with them.”

Provision of unbundled network elements: The Commission noted that Ameritech acknowledged that the DAP’s ruling rejecting Ameritech’s proposed language that would have limited the provision of unbundled network elements (“UNEs”) to UNEs where Ameritech has facilities and equipment available, and that have been specifically defined by the Commission or the Federal Communications Commission, “is consistent with Commission precedent.” The Commission affirmed the DAP’s finding noting that “Ameritech was on notice of the Commission’s prior decisions on this issue,” yet still arbitrated the issue.

Collocation: The Commission affirmed the DAP’s finding and adopted language that allows TDS to obtain adjacent off site collocation access, pursuant to Ameritech’s tariff. The Commission noted that the Panel had specifically found that Ameritech’s representation that offsite adjacent collocation was available only in California was a false representation in light of similar provisions in Ameritech’s Michigan tariff. The Commission specifically made a finding that Ameritech had “exhibited bad faith in its negotiations on this issue,” by refusing to provide services in its tariff. Further the Commission noted that Ameritech’s “argument that it should not be required to incorporate the terms of an unlawful tariff is frivolous” since the tariff is on file, and “valid until found not to be so in an appropriate forum.”

The Commission further upheld the Panel’s rejection of Ameritech’s proposed language that would have shifted the burden of proving that each piece of collocation equipment meets the requirement of the Federal Telecommunications Act to TDS; such a burden was, therefore, placed on Ameritech. The Commission also upheld the Panel’s recommendation that grants Ameritech 180 days to fulfill collocation requests when power is unavailable in the collocation area. The Commission also upheld the Panel’s recommendation rejecting Ameritech’s language that “would

have absolved it of liability ‘regardless of the degree of culpability of ...SBC-Ameritech’” if TDS’s collocated equipment were damaged.

Operator services: The Commission upheld the Panel’s adoption of language proposed by TDS that will allow it to terminate the operator services appendix, upon reasonable notice, if it chooses to receive operator services from another provider.

Use of Joint SONET for TDS’ Signaling Links: The Commission reversed the Panel on the issue of language proposed by TDS that would have permitted TDS to provide its portion of the signaling links using the joint SONET when it purchases SS7 services from Ameritech.” The Commission found that inclusion of TDS’s proposed language would have created a contradiction within the Interconnection Agreement between various provisions contained in the agreed to Appendix NIM and the proposed Appendix SS7. The parties had previously agreed to “the only two permissible uses for the joint SONET,” signaling links not among them.

The Commission further affirmed the DAP, except as modified in the Commission’s Order. The Commission gave the parties 60 days to file a signed agreement conforming to its Order.

Case No. U-12975

**MagnaCare Group Inc v MCI WorldCom Communications Inc
(slamming)**

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order dismissing with prejudice the June 6, 2001 complaint of MagnaCare Group, Inc. alleging that MCI WorldCom switched its service providers without authorization. On August 9, 2001, the complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint.

Case No. U-12987

**Allegiance Telecom of Michigan Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”), including the First Amendment (“Amendment”), between Allegiance Telecom of Michigan, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan. The Agreement results from the decision of Allegiance to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement (including Appendix DSL for line sharing) between Ameritech Michigan and Coast to Coast Telecommunications, Inc., that was approved on October 24, 2000 in Case No. U-12382. The Amendment incorporates into the agreement Appendix Structure Access and the related pricing table.

Case No. U-12988

**ACD Telecom Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between ACD Telecom, Inc. (“ACD”) and Ameritech Michigan. The Agreement results from the decision of ACD to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement (including Appendix DSL for line sharing) between Ameritech Michigan and Coast to Coast Telecommunications, Inc. that was approved on October 24, 2000 in Case No. U-12382.

Case No. U-13003
US Xchange of Michigan LLC and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between US Xchange of Michigan, LLC (“US Xchange”) and Ameritech Michigan. The Agreement results from the decision of US Xchange to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement, with all existing amendments (including Appendix DSL for line sharing) between Ameritech Michigan and Coast to Coast Telecommunications, Inc. that was approved on October 24, 2000 in Case No. U-12382.

Case No. U-13027
Quick Communications Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”), including the First Amendment (“Amendment”), between Quick Communications, Inc. (“Quick”) and Ameritech Michigan. The Agreement results from the decision of Quick to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement (including Appendix DSL for line sharing) between Ameritech Michigan and Coast to Coast Telecommunications, Inc. that was approved on October 24, 2000 in Case No. U-12382 and the revised rates that were approved in Cases Nos. U-11831 and U-12969. Additionally, the parties negotiated a reciprocal compensation appendix to replace the reciprocal compensation section of the Coast agreement.

Case No. U-13031
NOS Communications Inc and Verizon North Inc and
Contel of the South Inc, d/b/a Verizon North Systems
(interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement between NOS Communications, Inc. (“NOS”) and Verizon North, Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems.

Case No. U-13032
B&S Telecom Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between B & S Telecom, Inc. (“B & S”) and Ameritech Michigan. The Agreement results from the decision of B & S to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement between Ameritech Michigan and Coast to Coast Telecommunications, Inc. (including Appendix DSL for line sharing) that was approved on October 24, 2000 in Case No. U-12382 and the revised rates that were approved in Cases Nos. U-11831 and U-12696.

Case No. U-13037
Alpine-Michigan E Inc and Verizon North Inc and
Contel of the South Inc d/b/a Verizon North Systems
(interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between Alpine-Michigan E, Inc. (“Alpine”) and Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South Inc, d/b/a Verizon North Systems (collectively, “Verizon”). The Agreement results from the decision of Alpine to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement between Verizon and AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. that was approved on December 6, 1999 in Case No. U-12178.

Case No. U-13039
Alpine PSC Inc and Verizon North Inc and
Contel of the South Inc d/b/a Verizon North Systems
(interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between Alpine PCS, Inc. (“Alpine”) and Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South Inc, d/b/a Verizon North Systems (collectively, “Verizon”). The Agreement results from the decision of Alpine to adopt the terms and conditions of the

interconnection agreement between Verizon and AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. that was approved on December 6, 1999 in Case No. U-12178.

Case No. U-13040

**RFB Cellular Inc and Verizon North Inc and
Contel of the South Inc d/b/a Verizon North Systems
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between RFB Cellular, Inc. (“RFB”) and Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South Inc, d/b/a Verizon North Systems (collectively, “Verizon”). The Agreement results from the decision of RFB to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement between Verizon and AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. that was approved on December 6, 1999 in Case No. U-12178.

Case No. U-13037

**Alpine-Michigan F Inc and Verizon North Inc and
Contel of the South Inc d/b/a Verizon North Systems
(interconnection agreement)**

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between Alpine-Michigan F, Inc. (“Alpine”) and Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South Inc, d/b/a Verizon North Systems (collectively, “Verizon”). The Agreement results from the decision of Alpine to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement between Verizon and AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. that was approved on December 6, 1999 in Case No. U-12178.

Case No. 13044

**Ameritech Michigan
(amended license)**

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the request of Ameritech Michigan to alter the geographic area of its license to provide basic local exchange service by extending the boundary of its Lansing Exchange to include a portion of Verizon North Inc.’s Grand Ledge Exchange.

Case No. U-13049
Alpine PSC and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between Alpine PSC, Inc. (“Alpine”) and Ameritech Michigan. The Agreement results from the decision of Alpine to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement between Ameritech Michigan and CenturyTel Wireless, Inc., that was approved on January 10, 2000 in Case No. U-11989.

Case No. U-13056
Cricket Communications Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission issued an order approving the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between Cricket Communications, Inc. (“Cricket”) and various SBC Communications, Inc. owned companies, including Ameritech Michigan.

Case No. U-13086
Commission’s Own Motion
(number pooling trials)

On September 7, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) issued an order concluding that interested parties should have an opportunity to comment on the implementation of number pooling trials. The Commission requests that all comments on instituting number pooling trials in Michigan be filed by filed by September 21, 2001; and that comments on a cost recovery mechanism for number pooling trials be filed by September 28, 2001. To facilitate the implementation of number pooling, the Commission designated NeuStar, Inc. as the interim pooling administrator. The Commission’s order results from the August 24, 2001 decision of the Federal Communications Commission which granted the Commission conditional authority to institute thousands-block number pooling trials in five area codes: the 248, 313, 616, 734 and 810 NPAs. The Commission, committed to exercising that authority, therefore “seeks comments from the industry on how best to conduct the number pooling trials and to use the preparation for those trials to facilitate Michigan’s participation in the national rollout of number pooling.” The Commission “also seeks comment in this docket on a mechanism for recovering the joint and carrier-specific costs of implementing and administering the pooling trials in a competitively neutral manner.”

* * *

NOTICES OF HEARING

Case No. U-13016
Motema Security Services v America Net
(consumer complaint: slamming)

On July 11, 2001 Motema Security Services filed a formal complaint against America Net alleging that its telephone service had been slammed. A public hearing in this matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. on September 14, 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.

Case No. U-13025
Barry N. Tilds v AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc
(consumer complaint: billing dispute)

On July 18, 2001 Barry N. Tilds filed a formal complaint against AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. alleging that he had been overcharged for service and that AT&T had misrepresented to him their service offerings. A public hearing in this matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. on September 19, 2001.

Case No. U-13057
Joy Lines Inc
(license)

The August 17, 2001 application of Joy Lines, Inc. for a license to provide basic local exchange service in the exchange areas presently served by Ameritech Michigan , Verizon North Inc. and Verizon North Systems is set for a evidentiary hearing at 9:00 a.m. on October 10, 2001. Interventions are due on or before October 8, 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 (September 3 - 7, 2001)

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

Hearings Scheduled for This Week (September 10 - 14, 2001)

September 10, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13016/public hearing
Motema Security Services v America Net (slamming)

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)

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 19, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13025/public hearing
Barry Tilds v AT&T (billing dispute)

October 10, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13057/evidentiary hearing
Joy Lines (license)

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

APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Case No. U-12798

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

On August 31, 2001 Focal Communications Corporation of Michigan and Ameritech Michigan filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission a joint application requesting approval of the First Amendment to their Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”). The First Amendment, executed as of August 27, 2001, incorporates in the Agreement certain rates, terms and conditions pertaining to the payment of reciprocal compensation, interconnection, and trunking.

Case No. U-12991

Focal Communications Corporation of Michigan v Ameritech Michigan (interconnection agreement)

On September 5, 2001 Focal Communications Corporation of Michigan advised the Michigan Public Service Commission that it seeks to voluntarily dismiss without prejudice its Application and Complaint against Ameritech.

Case No. U-12997

Karen Woods v AT&T Communications of Michigan (consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)

On September 10, 2001 Karen Woods advised the Michigan Public Service Commission that she wished to withdraw with prejudice her complaint against AT&T Communications of Michigan.

Case No. U-13042

Therese Blick v MCI WorldCom (consumer complaint: slamming)

On September 10, 2001 Therese Blick notified the Michigan Public Service Commission of her intention to withdraw with prejudice her complaint against MCI WorldCom alleging that her telephone service was slammed.

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 service without his authorization on three different occasions

in 2001. Complainant requests reimbursement for his out-of-pocket expenses, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against LDMI.

Case No. U-13069

**AmeriVoice Telecommunications Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On August 30, 2001 AmeriVoice Telecommunications, Inc. (“AmeriVoice”) and Ameritech Michigan filed a joint application with the Michigan Public Service Commission requesting approval of the Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) between AmeriVoice and various SBC Communications, Inc. owned companies, including Ameritech. The companies also submitted for approval the First Amendment to the Agreement, which removes the Resale Performance Measurements Appendix and substitutes the Interconnection Performance Measurements Appendix in its place.

Case No. U-13081

**NTERA Inc
(license)**

On September 6, 2001 NTERA, Inc. (“NTERA”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for a license to provide basic local exchange service in the zone and exchange areas in which Verizon North Incorporated, Verizon North Systems, and Ameritech Michigan are the incumbent local exchange carriers. NTERA states that it is a Florida corporation with offices located in Miami, Florida.

Case No. U-13090

**Waypoint Telecommunications LLC
(license)**

On September 10, 2001 Waypoint Telecommunications, LLC (“Waypoint”) 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. Waypoint states that it is a limited liability company existing under the law of the State of Delaware and that its offices are located in Okemos, Michigan.

Case No. U-13072

**Borderland Communications LLC v Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement dispute)**

On August 31, 2001 Borderland Communications, LLC (“Borderland”) filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission against Ameritech Michigan for violation of the interconnection requirements of the state and federal telecommunications acts. Borderland

asserts that it is ready to offer service but has unsuccessfully been seeking interconnection and an interconnection agreement with Ameritech since June 27, 2000, shortly after Borderland was granted its license to provide basic local exchange service in the Upper Peninsula. Borderland states that although it has offered to opt into the Michigan interconnection agreement between Ameritech Michigan and Level 3, and although Ameritech provided Borderland with a “signature ready” agreement that Borderland signed and returned to Ameritech, there is still no agreement nor a physical interconnection in place. Borderland claims that Ameritech’s “actions have unreasonably delayed its entry into the local exchange market and have prevented Borderland from providing service to customers who are ready and willing to have Borderland as their local service provider.” Further, Borderland claims that Ameritech’s actions “have resulted in economic losses to Borderland totaling approximately \$53,000 or more in lost revenues through August 31, 2001, plus ongoing losses, and \$210,000 or more in damage to its market share.” Borderland requests that the Commission enter an emergency relief order requiring Ameritech to interconnect with and terminate local traffic to and from Borderland as soon as possible, and to enter a final order directing Ameritech to execute the interconnection agreement signed by Borderland, impose fines upon Ameritech, and award to Borderland monetary relief to make it whole and attorney fees and actual costs.

Case No. U-13074

**Murio M Khayre v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)**

On August 31, 2001 Murio M. Khayre (“Complainant”), of Lansing, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Ameritech Michigan is charging him \$320.17 for services he did not order. Complainant requests that Ameritech either prove that he used these services or credit his account and have the outstanding balance removed from his credit report.

Case No. U-13076

**S. William Paris v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)**

On September 4, 2001 S. William Paris (“Complainant”), of Farmington Hills, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Ameritech Michigan is charging him for \$297.83 for services he did not order. Complainant states that Ameritech has continued to bill him for a phone number he requested be disconnected 13 months ago. Complainant requests reimbursement for his out-of-pocket expenses, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against Ameritech.

Case No. U-13080
Brian Mavis v LDMI Telecommunications
(consumer complaint: slamming)

On September 5, 2001 Brian Mavis (“Complainant”), of Lansing, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that LDMI Telecommunications (“LDMI”) switched his long distance service on three occasions without his authorization. Complainant requests reimbursement for his economic loss, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against LDMI.

Case No. U-13082
AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc v Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On September 7, 2001 AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. (“AT&T”) filed an Application and Complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) against Ameritech Michigan seeking “relief on a narrow question involving a term contained in Ameritech Michigan’s Mi2A amendment” and requests relief be granted in an emergency relief order. AT&T requests that the Commission: 1) enter an order clarifying that it did not intend by its March 19, 2001 order on rehearing to require AT&T (or CLECs generally) to waive the right to challenge the sufficiency of the Mi2A under the relevant legal standards; 2) require Ameritech to immediately execute an Mi2A amendment in which the portions that require AT&T to waive its right to challenge the terms of the Mi2A in an judicial, dispute resolution or regulatory proceeding as being inconsistent with the product offering requirements of Section 271 of the Mi2A for the purpose of providing combinations of network elements are removed; 3) grant AT&T its relief on an emergency basis; and 4) find that these extraordinary circumstances warrant expedited review before the issuance of a final order and set a schedule in this case providing for the issuance of a partial final order as to all or part of the issues for which emergency relief is granted within 90 days of issuance of the emergency relief order.

* * *

PSC NOTICES OF OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT

Case No. U-13038
McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services Inc
(rate restructuring)

On August 1, 2001 McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. (“McLeodUSA”) filed an application with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) to restructure certain rates for basic local exchange service. McLeodUSA filed an amended application on August 24,

2001. The Commission has directed McLeodUSA to issue a notice of opportunity to comment by September 25, 2001, and written comments shall be filed with the Commission no later than 5:00 p.m. on October 9, 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.

* * *