

MICHIGAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS REPORT™

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

Vol. 17, No. 21, October 12, 2001

In this issue . . .
page no.

2 Features

- CLEC Association of Michigan to hold Fall Conference on Oct. 16
- Ameritech study claims CLECs control 18% of local telephone market
- SBC petitions FCC for non-dominate carrier status for advanced services

3 Pending Legislation

4 Orders

11 Notices of Hearing

12 PSC Hearings Schedule

13 Applications and Complaints

17 Opportunities for Comment

17 PSC Meetings

17 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).

*MR. COY IS A MEMBER

CLARK
HILL
P.L.C.

IN THE CLARK HILL PLC LAW FIRM
DETROIT * BIRMINGHAM * LANSING

COPYRIGHT © 2001

INDEX OF CASES HIGHLIGHTED

Orders:

- U-13082: AT&T v Ameritech: interconnection agreement dispute
- U-11326: BRE Communications/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-11962: Frontier Telemanagement/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12535: American Fiber Network/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12794: NOW Communications/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12798: Focal Communications/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-12850: Commission's Own Motion: 616 area code relief plan
- U-12981: East Lansing Orthopedic v MCI WorldCom: quality of service
- U-12992: XO: arbitration of interconnect agreement w/Ameritech
- U-12996: Devic v AT&T: unauthorized charges
- U-12997: Woods v AT&T: unauthorized charges
- U-13008: TruComm: license
- U-13015: Marhofer v Ameritech: unauthorized charges
- U-13020: Winn Telco: license amendment
- U-13034: Lucre v Ameritech: interconnection agreement dispute
- U-13036: Greenberg v Ameritech: billing dispute
- U-13042: Blick v MCI WorldCom: slamming
- U-13083: Alpine-Michigan E/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-13084: Alpine-Michigan F/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-13086: Commission's Own Motion: number pooling trials
- U-13091: US Xchange: exemption
- U-13096: Ciera/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-13117: Verizon: intrastate access rates
- U-13118: Borderland/Ameritech: interconnection agreement

Applications and Complaints:

- U-13122: Uniland Corp v Ameritech: unauthorized charges
- U-13124: McLeodUSA: arbitration of interconnection w/Ameritech
- U-13127: Lansing Art Gallery v Ameritech: unauthorized charges
- U-13128: VarTec: license
- U-13130: Ciera: license
- U-13131: YogaWorks v Choice One: quality of service
- U-13132: LaRocca v Webnet: slamming
- U-13134: X Michigan: directory assistance services
- U-13135: KMC Telecom V/Verizon: interconnection agreement
- U-13137: Local Exchange Carriers of MI/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
- U-13138: EagleNet/Ameritech: interconnection agreement

2455 WOODLAKE CIRCLE
OKEMOS, MICHIGAN 48864-5941
(517) 381-9193

<http://www.clarkhill.com>

FEATURES

THE CLEC ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN TO HOLD FALL CONFERENCE ON OCT. 16

The CLEC Association of Michigan will hold its semi-annual General Membership Meeting on Tuesday, October 16, 2001 at the Holiday Inn Express and Conference Center in Okemos. MPSC Commissioner Robert Nelson will present “A Regulator’s Perspective on Local Competition”, and Tom Lonergan, Director of the MPSC’s Communications Division will report on “Cases Affecting CLECs.” Also on the agenda are presentations focusing on “Accessing Public Rights of Way, “Progress on the UNE Platform in Michigan”, “CompleteLink Contracts”, and a “CLEC’s View of Ameritech’s Section 271 Request.” For more information and to register for the meeting, please contact kclements@clarkhill.com.

AMERITECH STUDY CLAIMS CLECS CONTROL 18% OF LOCAL TELEPHONE MARKET

Announcing that the local market is open to competition, Ameritech says its new study discloses that “significant and growing” competition exists at the local level. In a press release issued September 20, 2001, Ameritech states that its new report, entitled “Local Telephone Competition: The Choice Is Yours”, indicates that competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) now operate more than one million telephone lines and have 18 percent of the residential and business customer lines in large and small cities across Michigan. Ameritech says its report estimates that CLECs control a total of one million lines: 27 percent (693,205) of the business lines and 11 percent (400,005) of the residential lines across the state. Ameritech claims that the number of residential lines has tripled during the last one and one-half years, while the business lines have increased by 45 percent. According the Ameritech president Gail Torreano, “Local telephone competition is exploding, but unfortunately it is stagnant in the long distance market . . . and consumers are paying too much. Ameritech’s entry into long distance will give consumers more choices and will mean more competitive long distance rates.”

SBC SEEKS NON-DOMINATE CARRIER STATUS FOR ADVANCED SERVICES

SBC, on October 3, 2001 asked the Federal Communications Commission to confirm that SBC and its subsidiaries remain classified as non-dominant providers of advanced services. In a press release issued October 3, 2001 SBC said it makes the move “to encourage deployment of

advanced services capability in the United States.” SBC states that the FCC has previously found SBC to be a non-dominant provider of advanced services, including high-speed Internet access, through a separate affiliate created in its 1999 SBC/Ameritech Merger Order, but some have recently argued that SBC affiliates should now be treated as “dominant” carriers when they provide advanced services. SBC states that its petition is necessary to clarify what rules will apply to SBC when it invests and competes in the advanced services market and to remove any uncertainty regarding SBC’s non-dominant status in the provision of advanced services. SBC’s senior vice president Priscilla Hill Ardoin stated, “Given the evidence, we urge the FCC to take action now to remove disincentives to aggressive investment in broadband infrastructure. There is no question of SBC’s non-dominant status in the advanced services market, two-thirds of which is controlled by the cable industry. Yet the growth and availability of these services have the potential to be undermined by the growing and unjustified regulatory disparity between providers of such competitive services.”

* * *

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

Order issued October 2, 2001

Case No. U-13082

**AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc v Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement: Mi2A amendment)**

On October 2, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission scheduled a hearing at 9:00 a.m. on October 8, 2001 on the request of AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. for emergency relief in the matter of its application and complaint on a narrow issue that arose as a result of the Commission's January 4, 2001 and March 19, 2001 orders in Case No. U-12320. AT&T asked the Commission to clarify "that it did not intend by its March 19, 2001 Order on Rehearing to require AT&T . . . to waive the right to challenge the sufficiency of the Mi2A under relevant legal standards" The Commission also ordered the Administrative Law Judge assigned to the case to set an expedited schedule for the request for emergency relief. A prehearing conference on AT&T's application and complaint was also scheduled to be held on October 8, 2001.

Orders issued October 11, 2001

Case No. U-11326
BRE Communications LLC and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission approved the sixth amendment to the interconnection agreement between McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc., on behalf of itself and its subsidiary BRE Communications, L.L.C., d/b/a Phone Michigan, and Ameritech Michigan. The amendment incorporates into the agreement Appendix Performance Measurements.

Case No. U-11962
Frontier Telemanagement Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission approved the first amendment to the interconnection agreement between Frontier Telemanagement, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan. The amendment changes the name of the corporation from Frontier Telemanagement, Inc. to Global Crossing Telemanagement, Inc.

Case No. U-12535
American Fiber Network Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission approved the third amendment to the multi-state interconnection agreement between American Fiber Network, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan. The amendment incorporates into the agreement the reciprocal compensation rates and rate structure approved by the Commission in Case No. U-12696.

Case No. U-12794
NOW Communications Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission approved the second amendment to the multi-state interconnection agreement between NOW Communications, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan. The amendment incorporates into the agreement rates and charges approved by the Commission in Case No. U-11831

Case No. U-12798
Focal Communications Corporation of Michigan and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission approved the first and second amendments to the interconnection agreement between Focal Communications of Michigan and Ameritech Michigan. The first amendment incorporates into the agreement certain rates, terms, and conditions pertaining to the payment of reciprocal compensation, interconnection, and trunking. The second amendment incorporates into the agreement Appendix Performance Measurements.

Case No. U-12850
Commission's Own Motion
(616 area code relief plan)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission ("Commission") denied the petition for rehearing filed by Verizon Wireless on July 5, 2001, and rejected Verizon Wireless's request to shorten, by over five months, the implementation schedule for 616 area code relief. Verizon Wireless claims that the 616 area code may run out of available NXX codes approximately three months before mandatory dialing is scheduled to take effect and new NXX codes are made available for use. It claims that the Commission must accelerate its established schedule, which sets July 13, 2002 and February 15, 2003 as the dates for commencing permissive and mandatory dialing, respectively, so that full implementation will be completed and NXX codes can be assigned prior to September 1, 2002. The Commission, however, concludes that: 1) the amount of work required to implement the relief plan necessitates waiting until February 15, 2003 to begin mandatory dialing and that Verizon Wireless's proposed date is simply not feasible; 2) a shorter period will not provide adequate time for customers ranging from alarm service providers to 9-1-1 emergency dispatch operators to fully prepare for the start of mandatory dialing, and 3) it is increasing unlikely that NXX code exhaust will occur prior to the second quarter of 2003, especially in light of the Federal Communication's Commission's recent approval of the Commission's request to implement thousands-block number pooling in the Grand Rapids area, and that Verizon Wireless fails to note that the industry retains the option of adjusting the monthly code rationing figure if it appears that all NXX codes will be exhausted prior to February 15, 2003.

Case No. U-12981
East Lansing Orthopedic Association PC v MCI WorldCom
(consumer complaint: quality of service)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission dismissed with prejudice the complaint of East Lansing Orthopedic Association PC against MCI WorldCom (Brooks Fiber Communications of Michigan, Inc.), regarding quality of service. On September 14, 2001, the parties filed a stipulation for dismissal.

Case No. U-12992
XO Michigan Inc
(arbitration of interconnection agreement with Ameritech Michigan)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission ordered that the application for arbitration of an interconnection agreement between XO Michigan, Inc. (“XO”) and Ameritech Michigan is dismissed with prejudice. On October 1, 2001 XO and Ameritech filed a joint motion to dismiss the application, because the parties have reached a settlement. The joint motion states that, by November 1, 2001, the parties will submit an interconnection agreement for Commission approval.

Case No. U-12996
Suzanne K. Devic v AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc
(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission dismissed without prejudice the complaint of Suzanne K. Devic against AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. On September 13, 2001, the complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint.

Case No. U-12997
Karen M. Woods v AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc
(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission dismissed with prejudice the complaint of Karen M. Woods against AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc., regarding unauthorized charges. On September 10, 2001 the complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint.

Case No. U-13008
TruComm Corporation
(license)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission granted to TruComm Corporation a license to provide basic local exchange service in all exchanges currently served by Ameritech Michigan.

Case No. U-13015
Joyce Marhofer v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission dismissed with prejudice the complaint of Joyce Marhofer against Ameritech Michigan regarding unauthorized charges. On

August 15, 2001 the complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint.

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

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission granted the request of Winn Telephone Company to amend its license to provide basic local exchange service to include the following additional exchanges: Alger, Alpena, Ashley, Atlanta, Bancroft, Barryton, Breckenridge, Carson City, Caseville, Cass City, Clifford, Durand, Edmore, Elkton, Elsie, Fairview, Fenwick, Fowler-Pewamo Gaylord, Grayling, Harbor Beach, Harrisville, Hemlock, Higgins Lake, Hillman, Houghton Lake, Hubbard Lake, Hubbardston, Kingston, Lachine, Lakeview, Lewiston, Lincoln, Long Lake, Lupton, Maple Rapids, McBride, Merrill, Middleton, Minden City, Mio, Muir, Onaway, Ossineke, Ovid, Owosso, Palo, Pompeii, Posen, Prescott, Remus, Riverdale, Rogers City, Roscommon, Rose City, Sheridan, Sidney, Six Lakes, St. Johns, Stanton, Sterling and Vanderbilt Exchanges served by Verizon North, Inc., and in the Akron, Auburn, Bad Axe, Bay City, Bayport, Beaverton, Birch Run, Clare, Coleman, East Tawas, Fairgrove, Farwell, Frankenmuth, Freeland, Gagetown, Gladwin, Harrison, Linwood, Mayville, Midland, Oscoda, Owendale, Reese, Rosebush, Saginaw, Sebewaing, St. Helen, St. Charles, Standish, Ubly, Unionville, Vassar and West Branch Exchanges served by Ameritech Michigan.

Case No. U-13034
Lucre Inc v Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement dispute)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission dismissed with prejudice the complaint of Lucre, Inc. against Ameritech Michigan regarding disputed charges under an interconnection agreement. On September 14, 2001 the complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint.

Case No. U-13036
Alan G. Greenberg v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: billing dispute)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission dismissed the complaint of Alan G. Greenberg against Ameritech Michigan regarding a billing dispute. On September 17, 2001 the complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint.

Case No. U-13042
Therese Blick v MCI WorldCom Communications Inc
(consumer complaint: slamming)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission dismissed the complaint of Therese Blick against MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. regarding an unauthorized switch of service providers. On September 10, 2001 the complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint.

Case No. U-13083
Alpine-Michigan E Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission approved the interconnection agreement between Alpine-Michigan E, Inc. (“Alpine”) and Ameritech Michigan. The agreement results from the decision of Alpine to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement between CenturyTel Wireless, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan that was approved on January 20, 2000 in Case No. U-11989, including the rates approved in Case No. U-11831.

Case No. U-13084
Alpine-Michigan F, LLC and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission approved the interconnection agreement between Alpine-Michigan F, LLC (“Alpine”) and Ameritech Michigan. The agreement results from the decision of Alpine to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement between CenturyTel Wireless, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan that was approved on January 20, 2000 in Case No. U-11989, including the rates approved in Case No. U-11831.

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

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) ordered NeuStar, Inc., the interim pooling administrator, and the industry to take the necessary steps to implement number pooling in the 313 NPA no later than February 24, 2002 and in the 734 NPA no later than July 1, 2002. On August 24, 2001, the Federal Communications Commission granted the Commission conditional authority to institute number pooling trials in five area codes, which must begin prior to the national number pooling rollout scheduled for March 2002. On September 7, 2001 the Commission requested that comments on instituting number pooling trials and on cost recovery mechanisms be filed by September 21, 2001 and September 28, 2001, respectively. Ameritech Michigan, Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, WorldCom, AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. and TCG Detroit, Sprint Communications

Company L.P., and Oakland County filed comments.

The Commission states that those companies opposed to conducting a trial in Michigan have not provided sufficient reason not to proceed at this time. Further, the Commission states that, “As for the claim that it would be better to wait for the expected federal implementation of number pooling in March 2002, there is adequate time to begin a state trial and it is possible that the national pooling trial may be delayed.” The Commission finds that the 313 and the 734 NPA are best suited to number pooling.

Further, the Commission notes that number pooling trials will cause carriers to incur various costs, some carrier specific and some shared, and states that it will address the issue of cost recovery in another order to be issued soon.

Case No. U-13091
US Xchange of Michigan LLC
(section 304(10) exemption)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission found that US Xchange of Michigan, L.L.C. (“US Xchange”) meets the requirements for an exemption pursuant to section 304(10) of the Michigan Telecommunications Act and granted the requested exemption.

Case No. U-13096
Ciera Network Systems Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission approved the interconnection agreement between Ciera Network Systems, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan.

Case No. U-13117
Verizon North Inc and Contel of the South Inc, d/b/a Verizon North Systems
(intrastate access rates)

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission ordered that the request for declaratory ruling filed by Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems (collectively, “Verizon”), is denied without prejudice to raising the issues in a contested case proceeding “where all parties can be heard.” The Commission concludes that, “in light of the importance and complexity of the issues, that the questions raised by the request would be better addressed in a contested case proceeding, such as the complaint and application filed by AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. against Verizon in Case No. U-13125 or a contested case that Verizon commences by the filing of an application or complaint.

Case No. U-13118

**Borderland Communications LLC and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On October 11, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission approved the interconnection agreement between Borderland Communications, LLC and Ameritech Michigan.

* * *

NOTICES OF HEARING

Case No. U-12985

**City of Benton Harbor v AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc
(consumer complaint: billing dispute)**

On July 16, 2001 the City of Benton Harbor filed a formal complaint against AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. ("AT&T") disputing the toll charges from AT&T that appeared on monthly bills its received from Ameritech Michigan. A public hearing in this matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. on October 17, 2001. 1

Case No. U-13072

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

On August 31, 2001 Borderland Communications, LLC filed a formal complaint against Ameritech Michigan alleging violations of the interconnection requirements of the state and federal telecommunications acts. The complaint included a request for emergency relief. A public hearing in this matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. on October 12, 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 This Week (October 8-12, 2001)

October 8, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13082/evidentiary hearing
AT&T v Ameritech (interconnection dispute)

October 8, 2001, 1:00 p.m.
Case No. U-13007/motion hearing
Ameritech (directory assistance services)

October 9, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13007/evidentiary hearing
Ameritech (directory assistance services)

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

October 9, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13059/evidentiary hearing
Arnold v Talk.com (slamming)

October 10, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13007/evidentiary hearing
Ameritech (directory assistance services)

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

October 12, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13045/evidentiary hearing
Lamothe v Ameritech (quality of service)

October 12, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13062/evidentiary hearing
Wofford v Ameritech (cramming)

October 12, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13072/prehearing/evidentiary hearing
Borderland v Ameritech (interconnection dispute)

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.

October 17, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-12985/prehearing
Benton Harbor v AT&T (billing dispute)

October 19, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13065/evidentiary hearing
Weingarden v AT&T (unauthorized charges/slamming)

APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Case No. U-13122

Uniland Corporation v Ameritech Michigan (consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)

On September 27, 2001 Uniland Corporation (“Complainant”), of Farmington Hills, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) alleging that Ameritech Michigan is improperly billing the company for nearly \$2,500.00 and threatening to disconnect its service if the payment is not made. Complainant states that it entered into a contract with Ameritech to take service through its ValueLink Extra-Select program. “through the utilization of twelve telephone accounts. Complainant states that under terms of the contract, it was to “receive discounted telephone rates in return for agreeing to achieve a minimum annual revenue commitment of \$6,000.00 for each of the three years of the Agreement.” Complainant states that its records indicate it “has exceeded” its minimum commitment “by a very substantial margin.” Complainant requests that the Commission order Ameritech to supply all detailed billing for the period of the contract for all twelve accounts.

Case No. U-13124

McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services Inc (arbitration for interconnection agreement with Ameritech Michigan)

On September 28, 2001 McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. “McLeodUSA”) filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) a petition for arbitration of certain unresolved terms, conditions and prices and related arrangements with Ameritech Michigan.

Case No. U-13127

Lansing Art Gallery v Ameritech Michigan (consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)

On September 28, 2001 the Lansing Art Gallery (“Complainant”) filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission against Ameritech Michigan for the assessment of unauthorized charges. Complainant states that from March 1983 through February 2001 it was improperly assessed charges for two “special services circuits” that were not ordered or authorized by the Lansing Art Gallery, and that the charges were concealed in the local service monthly charge and not identified separately. Complainant further states that Ameritech has failed to remove the charges, which now total approximately \$10,584 or more over and above what Complainant should have paid for its authorized service. Complainant requests reimbursement for economic loss, a refund of the remaining collected unauthorized charges, the imposition of fines, attorneys fees and actual costs.

Case No. U-13128

**VarTec Telecom Inc
(license)**

On October 1, 2001 VarTec Telecom, Inc. (“VarTec”) 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. VarTec proposed to provide service on both a reseller and facilities-based basis, as well as provide non-licensed and unregulated telecommunications services on a competitive basis. VarTec is a Texas corporation headquartered in Dallas.

**Case No. U-13130
Ciera Network Systems Inc
(license)**

On October 2, 2001 Ciera Network Systems, Inc. (“Ciera”) 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. Ciera proposes to provide basic local exchange service on both a reseller and facilities-based basis, as well as provide non-licensed and unregulated telecommunications services on a competitive basis. Ciera is a Texas corporation headquartered in Houston.

**Case No. U-13131
YogaWorks Inc v Choice One Communications
(consumer complaint: quality of service)**

On September 28, 2001 Rita M. Joseph on behalf of YogaWorks, Inc. (“Complainant”), of Grand Rapids, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission against Choice One Communications (“Choice One”) for the lack of phone service. Complainant states that after switching its local and long distance telephone service to Choice One, Choice One contacted Complainant stating that the switch would occur within the next half hour. Complainant states that they lost their dial tone within 20 minutes and for the next ten days. Complainant states that she made many calls to both the Grand Rapids and Green Bay offices of Choice One trying to remedy the problem. She was initially told by Choice One that the problem was due to Ameritech’s equipment, however, Choice One eventually said it was its own equipment “that caused the inability to bring [her] into service.” Complainant requests reimbursement for her time, loss of business, and the cost of alternative phone service, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order.

Case No. U-13132
Jamie LaRocca v Webnet
(consumer complaint: slamming)

On October 2, 2001 Jamie LaRocca (“Complainant”), of Ottawa Lake, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission against Webnet alleging a slamming violation. Complainant states that much higher rates were charged by Webnet without the benefit of the Adjacent Exchange Calling Plan that had been in place. Complainant requests reimbursement for economic loss, the imposition of fines and the entry of a cease and desist order against Webnet

Case No. U-13134
XO Michigan Inc
(directory assistance services)

On October 5, 2001 XO Michigan, Inc. (“XO”) filed an application with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) seeking to modify its directory assistance offerings in Michigan. XO states that it currently provides its customers two types of directory assistance service, local at \$0.45 per call and toll at \$0.95 per call. XO proposes to eliminate these two separate offerings and instead offer one national directory assistance service for all local and toll calls within the United States, Canada and Puerto Rico, at a rate of \$0.75 with a maximum of two number requests per call. XO requests a Commission order without a hearing.

Case No. U-13135
KMC Telecom V Inc and Verizon North Inc and Contel of the South Inc
(interconnection agreement)

On October 5, 2001 KMC Telecom V, Inc. (“KMC”) and Verizon North, Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc. (collectively, “Verizon”) jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for approval of their Interconnection Agreement executed as of August 28, 2001 (“Agreement”). The application states that KMC elected to adopt the terms of the interconnection agreement between GTE and BRE Communications, approved by the Commission in Case No. U-11551, and that the Agreement is set to terminate on March 3, 2002.

Case No. U-13136
Christopher Rooseboom v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: quality of service)

On October 5, 2001 Christopher Rooseboom (“Complainant”), of Shelbyville, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission against Ameritech Michigan for providing only an intermittent dial tone during a 45 day period. Complainant states that Ameritech has failed to provide the proper credit for the service outage .

Case No. U-13137

**Local Exchange Carriers of Michigan Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On October 10, 2001 the Local Exchange Carriers of Michigan, Inc. (“LECMI”), f/k/a Mutual Information Exchange, Inc., and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of their Interconnection Agreement executed as of June 12, 2001 (“Agreement”). The Agreement results from the decision of LECMI to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement dated September 18, 2000 between Coast to Coast Telecommunications, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan, including the Appendix DSL for line sharing or HFPL, that was approved by the Commission in an order issued on October 24, 2000 in Case No. U-12382. The Agreement has an initial term that expires on September 18, 2003.

Case No. U-13138

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

On October 10, 2001 EagleNet, Inc. (“EagleNet”) and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of their Interconnection Agreement executed as of July 12, 2001 (“Agreement”). The Agreement results from the decision of EagleNet to adopt the terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement dated September 18, 2000 between Coast to Coast Telecommunications, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan, including the Appendix DSL for line sharing or HFPL, that was approved by the Commission in an order issued on October 24, 2000 in Case No. U-12382. The Agreement has an initial term that expires on September 18, 2003.

Case No. U-13139

**Joann R. Griffin v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: quality of service)**

On October 9, 2001 Joann R. Griffin (“Complainant”), of Eastpointe, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission against Ameritech Michigan. Complainant states that she is being harassed by Ameritech and its employees through inaccurate and delayed billings, dial tone interruptions, failure to make repairs, prank calls, questionable technicians, and the failure to switch Complainant to a difference carrier. Complainant states she has been forced to change her phone number seven times.

**Case No. U-13140
VoiceStream Wireless Corporation and
Verizon North Inc and Contel of the South Inc, d/b/a Verizon Mid-States
(interconnection agreement)**

On October 10, 2001 VoiceStream Wireless Corporation and Verizon North Inc and Contel of the South Inc, d/b/a Verizon Mid-States, jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of their Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”). The Agreement results from the decision of VoiceStream to adopt the terms of the interconnection agreement, as amended, between Verizon and AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., approved by the Commission in Case No. U-12178. The Agreement is scheduled to terminate on December 30, 2001.

* * *

PSC NOTICES OF OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT

No current notices of opportunity for comment have been issued by the MPSC.

* * *

SCHEDULED MPSC MEETINGS FOR OCTOBER 2001

October 2, 2001	Special Meeting	9:00 a.m.
October 11, 2001	Regular Meeting	11:30 a.m.
October 29, 2001	Regular Meeting	3:30 p.m.

* * *

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

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

* * *

