

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**OF OREGON**

ARB 169(6)

In the Matter of )  
 )  
ATL COMMUNICATIONS dba SUNRIVER ) STAFF COMMENTS  
TELECOM and QWEST CORPORATION. )  
 )  
Sixth Amendment to the Interconnection )  
Agreement Submitted for Commission )  
Approval Pursuant to Section 252(e) of the )  
Telecommunications Act of 1996. )

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AMENDMENT

On September 30, 2005, ATL Communications dba Sunriver Telecom and Qwest Corporation filed a sixth amendment to the interconnection agreement previously acknowledged by the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Commission), recognizing the adoption of the ARB 6 terms. The parties seek approval of the amendment under Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Commission provided notice by posting an electronic copy of the amendment on the World Wide Web, at: <http://www.puc.state.or.us/caragmnt/>. The Commission Staff (Staff) offers these comments.

Under the Act, the Commission must approve or reject an agreement or amendment reached through voluntary negotiation within 90 days of filing. The Commission may reject an agreement only if it finds that:

- (1) the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or
- (2) the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Staff recommends the Commission approve the amendment to the agreement. Staff concludes that the agreement does not appear to discriminate against telecommunications carriers who are not parties to the agreement and does not appear to be inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Staff notes that an interconnection agreement or amendment thereto has no effect or force until approved by a state Commission. *See* 47 U.S.C. Sections 252 (a) and (e). Accordingly, Staff points out that the effective date of this filing will be the date the Commission signs an order approving it, and that any provision stating that the parties' agreement is effective prior to that date is not enforceable.

Dated at Salem, Oregon this 19th day of September, 2005.

---

**Celeste Hari**  
Telecommunications Analyst  
Competitive Issues