

MICHIGAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS REPORT™

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

Vol. 17, No. 23, November 9, 2001

In this issue . . .
page no.

2 Features

- **Governor Engler: Michigan needs plan to fast track universal broadband access**

3 Pending Legislation

4 Orders

7 Notices of Hearing

8 PSC Hearings Schedule

9 Applications and Complaints

16 Opportunities for Comment

16 PSC Meetings

16 MTR Subscription Information

MICHIGAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS REPORT (ISSN 08980357) is published every other week by Clark Hill PLC., 2455 Woodlake Circle, Okemos, Michigan 48864-5941. Although considerable care is exercised in reporting critical information (filing and hearing dates, etc.), such information should be confirmed with the original source. This newsletter should not be construed as legal advice or legal opinion on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general informational purposes only, and you are urged to consult a lawyer concerning your own situation and any specific legal questions you may have. Editor, Roderick S. Coy; Assistant Editor, Kristine M. Clements; Contributors, Haran C. Rashes and Leland R. Rosier; Annual Subscription \$375.00 (US).

INDEX OF CASES HIGHLIGHTED

Orders:

U-12863 and U-13024: Seaway Painting v MCI WorldCom: slamming and billing dispute
U-13038: McLeodUSA: rate alteration
U-13058: Guzniczak v AT&T: unauthorized charges
U-13073: MichTel v Ameritech: interconnection agreement dispute
U-13082: AT&T v Ameritech: interconnection agreement dispute
U-13123: Truly Clear/Ameritech: interconnection agreement

Applications and Complaints:

U-11151 and U-11152: AT&T/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-11168: MCImetro Access Transmission/Ameritech: interc'n agreement
U-11326: McLeodUSA/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-11973: AirTouch Cellular/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-11980: Message Express/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-12646: NationNet Communications/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-12962: Adelphia Business Solutions/Ameritech: interc'n agreement
U-12987: Allegiance/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-12992 and U-13175: XO/Ameritech: interconnection agreement
U-13062: Wolford v Ameritech: cramming
U-13068: Bierlein v Ameritech: unauthorized charges
U-13133: Truly Clear Communications/Ameritech: interc'n agreement
U-13164: Pattison v AT&T: slamming
U-13165: MCImetro Access: eligible carrier designation
U-13166: Copeland v Ameritech: unauthorized charges
U-13167: C-H Maintenance v Long Distance Service: slamming
U-13168: C-H Maintenance v Consolidated Bill PR: slamming
U-13169: Honor Insurance v American Phone Service: slamming
U-13174: C3 Networks: license
U-13176: New Edge/Ameritech SBC Advanced Solutions: interc'n agreement
U-13177: Westphalia Telco: TSLRIC study
U-13178: Vanover v Talk America: slamming
U-13179: JAS Networks: amended license
U-13180: Kerr v MCI: slamming

*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

GOVERNOR ENGLER: MICHIGAN NEEDS PLAN TO FAST TRACK UNIVERSAL BROADBAND ACCESS

Governor John Engler, Doug Rothwell, president and CEO of the Michigan Economic Development Corporation, and Laura Chappelle, chair of the Michigan Public Service Commission held a press conference on Friday, November 2, 2001 to urge the Michigan Legislature to work with industry, education and government leaders to enact a plan to jumpstart the spread of broadband high-speed Internet service and help create an estimated 500,000 jobs. Engler said that expanding access to broadband is the key to attracting new jobs in Michigan, strengthening emergency preparedness and connecting citizens to education, information and other important online services. In a press release issued the same day, Engler said, "Michigan lags behind other states in the deployment of broadband. For example, 1) Michigan has almost 4 percent of the nation's population, but only 1.3 percent of the high-speed broadband phone lines (ADSL); 2) Michigan is 37th in the nation in the percentage of families and small businesses using high-speed lines; 3) Michigan is 40th in the nation in K-12 schools with high-speed access; and 4) Michigan is 51st, or dead last in investment per phone line."

In order to get Michigan's economy back on track, Governor Engler proposes that "a plan for universal access to broadband should focus on two fundamental steps: a level playing field for all providers on rights-of-way issues by establishing a uniform permitting process and a uniform fee system; and, creating a financing authority to provide loans and grants and to work with private telecommunications vendors to make statewide investment more viable."

FCC MAKES TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER REGISTRATION INFORMATION AVAILABLE ONLINE

The FCC's Consumer Information Bureau (CIB) announces that telecommunications carrier registration information will now be available to the public online at <<http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/cib/form499/499a.cfm>>.

This will make it easier for consumers and carriers to access pertinent contact and/or background information on telecommunications carriers that they are, or will be, doing business with. Specifically, consumers and carriers will now be able to view such things as the carrier's business name(s) and primary address(es), names and business addresses of certain of the carrier's officers, the carrier's regulatory contact and/or designated agent for service of process, all names

under which the carrier has conducted business in the past, and the state(s) in which the carrier is certified to provide telecommunications service.

Currently, all new and existing telecommunications carriers providing interstate telecommunications service are required to file FCC Form 499-A in April of each year. The registration information is collected on behalf of the FCC by the National Exchange Carrier Association ("NECA"). Among other things, this registration requirement enables the Commission to (1) monitor the entry of carriers into the interstate telecommunications marketplace, (2) keep entities that are unqualified from entering or remaining in the telecommunications marketplace, and (3) have a means of tracking and contacting carriers that may be engaged in "slamming," the illegal practice of changing a consumer's telephone service without permission.

* * *

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 446 Dunaskiss	05/01/01	Provides for the clarification of the definition of public utilities	Passed by Senate 24-11; passed by House 69-36; given immediate effect; signed by Gov. 9/19/01; Assigned PA 48 of 2001

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-12863

**Seaway Painting LLC v MCI WorldCom Communications Inc
(consumer complaint: slamming and billing dispute)**

Case No. U-13024

**Seaway Painting LLC v MCI WorldCom Communications Inc
(consumer complaint: slamming and billing dispute)**

On October 29, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) issued an order denying the petition of MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. (“WorldCom”) for rehearing in Case No. U-12863, and granting the application for leave to appeal filed by Seaway Painting, L.L.C. (“Complainant”) in Case No. U-13024 requesting that the Commission reverse the Administrative Law Judge’s (“ALJ”) decision to stay the proceedings and set the complaint for hearing before the Commission.

Complainant requested to withdraw its initial complaint, Case No. U-12863, after the ALJ would not permit Complainant, as a corporate entity, to pursue the complaint unless it secured an attorney to represent it. In an order issued June 5, 2001, the Commission dismissed the complaint without prejudice, but indicated in the order that it disagreed with the ALJ’s statements regarding attorney representation. WorldCom then filed a petition for rehearing. Although WorldCom did not object to the order’s dismissal of the complaint, it argued that the Commission erred in stating that the Complainant could pursue a slamming or cramming complaint without counsel. WorldCom noted that case law establishes that a corporation cannot be represented by any one other than a licensed attorney in an administrative proceeding, unless there is a statutory exception. Further, WorldCom argues that section 506(1)(a) of the Michigan Telecommunications Act (“MTA”) does not provide an exception for slamming or cramming cases, but that it merely recognizes that an individual person may permissibly represent himself or herself.

Complainant then filed a new complaint, Case No. U-13024, relating to the same dispute and again indicated that it would not retain an attorney to represent it. The Commission, in addressing

whether it is proper for a corporate entity to bring a complaint case under Section 505, 506, and 507 of the MTA without the representation of a licensed attorney, reaffirms its statements in the June 5, 2001 order, and states that section 506(1)(a) “requires the Commission to facilitate the adjudication of slamming and cramming complaints brought by retail customers by, among other things, removing objections based on the lack of counsel. . . . It is only when a non-attorney acts in a legal capacity on behalf of someone else that he or she engages in the unauthorized practice of law.”

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

On October 29, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) approved the request of McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. (“McLeodUSA”) to increase its rates for business basic local exchange service and directory assistance as proposed in its application of August 1, 2001. The Commission determined that the new rates are just and reasonable. McLeodUSA’s business line monthly recurring charge will increase from \$13.25 to \$13.50 in access area A, from \$13.25 to \$13.78 in access area B, and from \$13.25 to \$14.57 in access area C. McLeodUSA’s local directory assistance charge per number requested (above the customer’s allowance) will increase from \$0.35 to \$0.45, and a national directory assistance charge of \$0.78 per number requested will be implemented.

Case No. U-13058
Kevin Guzniczak v AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc
(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)

On October 29, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) dismissed without prejudice the complaint of Kevin Guzniczak (“Complainant”) against AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. regarding unauthorized charges. On September 13, 2001 Complainant filed a request to withdraw the complaint.

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

On October 29, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) ordered that the recommended settlement proposed by the Administrative Law Judge should be adopted as the final order resolving the complaint of MichTel, Inc. against Ameritech Michigan regarding a dispute concerning payment for reciprocal compensation. On October 18, 2001 both parties filed acceptance of the recommended settlement.

Case No. U-13082

**AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc v Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement dispute)**

On October 29, 2001, the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) issued an order granting AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc.’s (“AT&T”) application and complaint for an emergency relief order (“ERO”). The ERO requires Ameritech Michigan to revise a provision its Michigan Section 271 interconnection agreement (the “Mi2A”) such that CLECs signing the Mi2A do not waive their rights to challenge whether the services provided to CLECs under the Mi2A are sufficient compliance with federal and state law so as to allow Ameritech Michigan to offer interLATA long distance telephone services to end users in Michigan.

On September 7, 2001, AT&T filed an application and complaint and request for emergency relief, on a narrow issue that arose as a result of Commission orders issued on January 4, 2001 and March 19, 2001 in Case No. U-12320. In those orders, the Commission had addressed the proposed offering of the Mi2A by Ameritech Michigan, and had allowed Ameritech Michigan to implement the Mi2A. As offered by Ameritech Michigan, the Mi2A included a paragraph 6.2 indicating that the CLEC would waive its rights to challenge the sufficiency of the Mi2A as meeting the requirements of the competitive checklist under Section 271 of the Federal Communications Act.

In its October 29, 2001 Opinion and Order, the Commission concluded that it should modify the waiver provision such that CLECs do not waive such rights on signing the Mi2A. The Commission stated: “It is now apparent that the waiver is having the unintended effect of hampering the development of competition, as demonstrated by AT&T’s and other CLECs’ unwillingness to sign the Mi2A as is and Ameritech Michigan’s consequent refusal to provide new UNE combinations.”

The Commission granted AT&T’s application and complaint and request for emergency relief in full. Ameritech Michigan was required to execute and submit a modified Mi2A to AT&T with the modified waiver provision within 5 business days of the issuance of the Commission’s order. The Commission determined there would be no further proceedings unless a party files a notice of the need for further proceedings within 10 days of the issuance of the Commission’s order.

Case No. U-13123

**Truly Clear Communications Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On October 29, 2001 the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) approved the Interconnection Agreement between Truly Clear Communications, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan.

* * *

NOTICES OF HEARING

Case No. U-13081
NTERA Inc
(license)

The September 6, 2001 application of NTERA, Inc. for a license to provide telecommunications services in the exchange areas presently served by Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Ameritech Michigan is set for an evidentiary hearing at 10:00 a.m. on November 26, 2001. Interventions are due on or before November 20, 2001.

Case No. U-13092
Michael J. Watza v AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc
(consumer complaint: billing dispute)

On September 17, 2001 Michael J. Watza filed a formal complaint against AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. alleging billing errors for long distance service. A public hearing in the matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. on November 8, 2001.

Case No. U-13125
AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc v Verizon North Inc and
Contel of the South Inc, d/b/a Verizon North Systems
(intrastate access rates)

On September 26, 2001 AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. filed a formal complaint against Verizon North, Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, alleging that Verizon has violated the Michigan Telecommunications Act by failing to reduce certain intrastate rates to correspond with its recently reduced interstate rates. A public hearing in the matter will be held at 9:00 a.m. on October 30, 2001.

Case No. U-13128
VarTec Telecom Inc
(license)

The October 2, 2001 application of VarTec Telecom, Inc. for a license to provide telecommunications services in the exchange areas presently served by Verizon North Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc., d/b/a Verizon North Systems, and Ameritech Michigan is set for an evidentiary hearing at 10:00 a.m. on November 26, 2001. Interventions are due on or before November 20, 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 29 -November 2, 2001)

Oct. 29, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13068/evidentiary hearing
Bierlein v Ameritech Michigan (unauthorized charges)

Nov. 1, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13080/evidentiary hearing
Mavis v LDMI (slamming)

Oct. 30, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13125/prehearing
AT&T v Verizon (intrastate access rates)

Hearings Scheduled for This Week (November 5 - 9, 2001)

Nov. 8, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13092/evidentiary hearing
Watza v AT&T (billing dispute)

Nov. 9, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13063/evidentiary hearing
Ma v MCI WorldCom (slamming)

Future Hearings Scheduled

Nov. 14, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13132/evidentiary hearing
Larocca v Webnet (slamming)

Nov. 26, 2001, 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13081/evidentiary hearing
NTERA (license)

Nov. 15, 2001 9:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13079/evidentiary hearing
Rovas v Ameritech (quality of service)

Nov. 26, 2001, 10:00 a.m.
Case No. U-13128/evidentiary hearing
VarTec Telecom (license)

APPLICATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

Case Nos. U-11151 and U-11152

AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc and Ameritech Michigan (interconnection agreement)

On October 25, 2001 AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the Fourth Amendment to their Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) approved by the Commission on April 4, 1997. The Fourth Amendment executed as of September 25, 2001 incorporates into the Agreement certain provision applicable to the provision of unbundled network elements, shared transport, and operator services/directory assistance. The Applicants state that although the Agreement, by its terms, terminated on January 28, 2000, the parties have stipulated that the Agreement remains in effect until superceded by a successor interconnection agreement.

Case Nos. U-11151 and U-11152

AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc and Ameritech Michigan (interconnection agreement)

On November 2, 2001 AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the Fifth (Mi2A) Amendment to their Interconnection Agreement approved by the Commission on April 4, 1997.

Case No. U-11168

MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC and Ameritech Michigan (interconnection agreement)

On October 31, 2001 MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC and Ameritech Michigan applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the Second and Third Amendments to their Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) approved by the Commission in a series of orders dated December 20, 1996, June 5, 1997, and July 31, 1997. The Second Amendment executed as of July 3, 2001 incorporates into the Agreement certain rates, terms and conditions pertaining to the payment of reciprocal compensation, interconnection, and trunking. The Third Amendment executed as of August 30, 2001 incorporates into the Agreement the Appendix Performance Measurements. The Applicants state that although the Agreement, by its terms, terminated on June 15, 2001, the parties continue to operate under the terms and conditions of the Agreement during negotiations until a successor agreement can be reached.

Case No. U-11326

**McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On October 25, 2001 McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. (BRE Communications, LLC, d/b/a Phone Michigan) and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the Seventh Amendment to their Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) approved by the Commission on June 5, 1997. The Seventh Amendment executed as of September 17, 2001 incorporates into the Agreement the Appendix DSL. The Applicants state that although the Agreement, by its terms, terminated on February 2, 2000, the parties continue to operate under the terms of the Agreement while negotiations are ongoing until a successor agreement can be reached.

**Case No. U-11973
AirTouch Cellular Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On November 5, 2001 AirTouch Cellular, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the First Amendment to their Wireless Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) approved by the Commission on January 10, 2000. The First Amendment executed as of September 25, 2001 incorporates into the Agreement the rates approved by the Commission in Case No. U-11831.

**Case No. U-11980
Message Express Company and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On October 31, 2001 Message Express Company and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the First Amendment to their Wireless Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) approved by the Commission on May 27, 1999. The First Amendment executed as of September 25, 2001 incorporates in the Agreement the rates approved by the Commission in Case No. U-11831.

**Case No. U-12646
NationNet Communications Corporation and Ameritech Michigan
(Interconnection Agreement)**

On November 5, 2001 NationNet Communications Corporation and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the Second Amendment to their Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement”) approved by the Commission on October 24, 2000. The Second Amendment executed as of October 3, 2001 incorporates into the Agreement the rates and charges approved by the Commission in Case No. U-12699.

Case No. U-12962

**Adelphia Business Solutions Operations Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On October 26, 2001 Adelphia Business Solutions Operations, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the Mi2A Amendment to their Interconnection Agreement approved by the Commission on July 11, 2001.

Case No. U-12987

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

On October 31, 2001 Allegiance Telecom of Michigan, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the Third Amendment to their Interconnection Agreement (“Agreement) approved by the Commission on September 7, 2001. The Third Amendment executed as of October 2, 2001 incorporates into the Agreement Appendix DSL and Appendix UNE Remand and the related pricing tables.

Case No. U-12992

**XO Michigan Inc
(arbitration of interconnection agreement with Ameritech Michigan)**

Case No. U-13175

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

On November 1, 2001 XO Michigan, Inc. (“XO”) and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for approval of their interconnection agreement executed as of October 31, 2001 (“Agreement”). The Agreement result from the request of XO to adopt certain terms and conditions of the interconnection agreement between Focal Communications Corporation of Illinois and Ameritech Illinois. The Agreement has an initial term that expires on August 19, 2003.

Case No. U-13062

**Dale F. Wofford v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: cramming)**

On November 7, 2001 Dale F. Wofford (“Complainant”) filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) an amended complaint against Ameritech Michigan involving a billing dispute “to specifically cite the section(s) of the Michigan Telecommunications Act and/or other law or rule claimed by [Complainant] to have been violated by Respondent.” Complainant

states that Ameritech has violated sections 502(1)(b) and 507(1) and has failed to comply with Rule 40c(1) and (2) of the Commission Rules.

Case No. U-13068

**Paul and Evelyn Bierlein v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer amended complaint: unauthorized charges)**

On October 30, 2001 Paul and Evelyn Bierlein (“Complainants”), of Lowell, amended their August 29, 2001 complaint against Ameritech Michigan alleging unauthorized repair charges “to include section 507 of the Michigan Telecommunications Act, which was violated by Ameritech Michigan, and to include penalties and fines defined by section of 506.”

Case No. U-13123

**Truly Clear Communications Inc and Ameritech Michigan
(interconnection agreement)**

On November 1, 2001 Truly Clear Communications, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of the Mi2A Amendment (“Agreement”) to their Interconnection Agreement approved by the Commission on October 29, 2001.

Case No. U-13164

**Marilynn Pattison v AT&T Communications of Michigan Inc
(consumer complaint: slamming)**

On October 25, 2001 Marilynn Pattison (“Complainant”), of Jenison, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. switched her long distance telephone service without her authorization. Complainant states that AT&T sent a \$75.00 check payable to her son, who neither lives at her address nor subscribes to the telephone service at her address, and now contends that the switch was authorized because her son signed a Letter of Authorization by endorsing the \$75.00 check. Complainant states that AT&T has billed her in excess of \$125.00.

Case No. U-13165

**MCImetro Access Transmission Services Inc
(eligible telecommunications carrier designation)**

On October 25, 2001 MCImetro Access Transmission Services, Inc. applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier for purposes of receiving universal service support for high cost, low income, and rural healthcare funding assistance.

Case No. U-13166

**El'Tarell Copeland v Ameritech Michigan
(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)**

On October 26, 2001 El'Tarell Copeland ("Complainant"), of Oak Park, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Ameritech Michigan is charging for calls that are not placed from Complainant's phone, but are instead a result of crossed wires.

**Case No. U-13167
C - H Maintenance Services Inc v Long Distance Saving
(consumer complaint: slamming)**

On October 26, 2001 C - H Maintenance Services, Inc. ("Complainant"), of Traverse City, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Long Distance Saving switched its long distance telephone service without authorization.

**Case No. U-13168
C - H Maintenance Services Inc v Consolidated Bill PR
(consumer complaint: slamming)**

On October 26, 2001 C - H Maintenance Services, Inc. ("Complainant"), of Traverse City, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Consolidated Bill PR switched its long distance telephone service without authorization.

**Case No. U-13169
Honor Insurance v American Phone Service
(consumer complaint: slamming)**

On October 26, 2001 Honor Insurance ("Complainant"), of Honor, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that American Phone Service switched its long distance service without authorization.

**Case No. U-13174
C3 Networks & Communications Limited Partnership
(license)**

On November 1, 2001 C3 Networks & Communications Limited Partnership ("C3") applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for a license to provide competitive telecommunications services in those zones and exchanges in which Verizon North Incorporated, Verizon North Systems and Ameritech Michigan are the incumbent local exchange carriers. C3, headquartered in Austin, Texas, states that it is a limited partnership formed under Delaware law and that its predecessor, C3 Communications, Inc. ("C3C"), was formed under the name CSW Communications, Inc. ("CSW").

“By virtue of CSW’s merger with American Electric Power (“AEP”), C3C became a wholly-owned subsidiary of AEP and CSW. AEP Communications, LLC, (“AEPC”) is also a wholly-owned subsidiary of AEP and is likewise a telecommunications company. In order to operate these businesses in a more efficient manner, AEP and C3C are being restructured. Each company will contribute fiber and collocations assets into a new limited partnership: C3. . . .”

Case No. U-13176

**New Edge Network Inc and Ameritech SBC Advanced Solutions Inc
(interconnection agreement)**

On November 1, 2001 New Edge Network, Inc. and Ameritech SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc. (“AADS”) jointly applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of an interconnection agreement between New Edge and SBC Advanced Solutions, Inc. on behalf of Ameritech Advanced Data Services of Michigan, Inc. The Agreement has an initial one-year term with an effective date ten days after approval by the Commission.

Case No. U-13177

**Westphalia Telephone Company
(TSLRIC study)**

On November 2, 2001 Westphalia Telephone Company (“Westphalia”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) for approval of a total services long run incremental cost (TSLRIC) study pursuant to Section 304a of the Michigan Telecommunications Act. Westphalia states that while in the past it has relied on the modified cost study prepared by the Michigan Exchange Carriers Association, Inc. (“MECA”), it has now prepared its own TSLRIC study which generates different TSLRIC results from the MECA cost study. Westphalia’s cost study and supporting documentation were submitted to the Commission under separate confidential cover.

Case No. U-13178

**Mary Ann Vanover v Talk America
(consumer complaint: slamming, unauthorized charges, and
false, misleading and deceptive information)**

On November 5, 2001 Mary Ann Vanover (“Complainant”), of Detroit, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Talk America had switched her local, local toll and long distance telephone service without her authorization and refuses to fully credit her account. Complainant further states that the recorded tape Talk America has presented as evidence of her consent to switch providers is fraudulent.

Case No. U-13179

JAS Networks Inc

(amended license)

On November 5, 2001 JAS Networks, Inc. (“JAS”) applied to the Michigan Public Service Commission for approval to amend the geographic service area of its existing license to provide basic local exchange service. JAS states that it is currently authorized to provide service in the Ameritech exchanges of Albion, Battle Creek, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Marshall, Otsego, Plainwell and Vicksburg, and the Verizon North Inc. exchanges of Fruitport and Muskegon. JAS proposes to increase its service area to include all the remaining zones and exchanges in the service areas currently served by Ameritech Michigan, Verizon North, Inc., and Verizon North Systems in the Lower Peninsula of Michigan.

Case No. U-13180

Barbara L. and James F. Kerr v MCI WorldCom Communications Inc
(consumer complaint: slamming)

On October 29, 2001 Barbara L. and James F. Kerr (“Complainants”), of Battle Creek, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. (“WorldCom”) switched their telephone service without authorization. Complainants state that they were contacted by a WorldCom telemarketer and that they agreed to switch only their local service because they felt WorldCom’s long distance service was more expensive than their current provider, Life Line. Complainants found, however, that when they attempted to place a long distance call, they got a recording stating that they must enter their WorldCom PIN number. Complainants state that they called WorldCom to complain and switched their long distance service back to Life Line, but that WorldCom then cancelled both their long distance and their local service. Further, Complainants state that when they contacted Ameritech to switch back their local service, Ameritech informed them that they would have to get a new number because WorldCom “took [their] dial tone.”

Case No. U-13181

Barbara L. and James F. Kerr v MCI WorldCom Communications Inc
(consumer complaint: unauthorized charges)

On October 29, 2001 Barbara L. and James F. Kerr (“Complainants”), of Battle Creek, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission against MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. (“WorldCom”) regarding unauthorized charges--cramming and false and misleading representation of fact--in connection with a slamming violation (see Case No. U-13180 above). Complainants state that after switching their long distance service without authorization, WorldCom assessed their account for \$50.77.

Case No. U-13183

Nils R. Kessler v Zone Telecom Inc
(consumer complaint: slamming)

On November 5, 2001 Nils R. Kessler (“Complainant”), of Marquette, filed a formal complaint with the Michigan Public Service Commission alleging that Zone Telecom, Inc. switched his long distance service without his authorization. Complainant states that when he ordered new phone service from Ameritech Michigan he requested that Sprint be his long distance carrier. His bills, however, showed that his carrier was Zone Telecom, Inc. whose billing services were provided by Integretel, Inc.

* * *

PSC NOTICES OF OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT

Case No. U-13161
Comcast Business Communications Inc
(amended license)

On October 25, 2001 Comcast Business Communications, Inc (“CBC”) filed an application with the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) to expand the geographic area of its license to provide basic local exchange service to portions of the zones and exchanges in Michigan currently served by Verizon North, Inc. and Ameritech Michigan. The Commission has directed CBC to issue a notice of opportunity to comment by November 29, 2001. Written comments must be filed with the Commission no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 13, 2001.

* * *

SCHEDULED MPSC MEETINGS FOR NOVEMBER 2001

November 20, 2001	Regular Meeting	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.