

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

OF OREGON

ARB 14(5)

In the Matter of)
)
UNITED STATES CELLULAR MOBILE) STAFF COMMENTS
TELEPHONE NETWORK. and QWEST)
CORPORATION)
)
Fifth Amendment to Interconnection Agreement)
Submitted for Commission Approval Pursuant to)
Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act)
of 1996.)

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AMENDMENT

On August 11, 2005, United States Cellular Mobile Telephone Network and Qwest Corporation filed a fifth amendment to the interconnection agreement previously approved by the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Commission). 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 agreement 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 thereto reached through voluntary negotiation within 90 days of filing. The Commission may reject an agreement or amendment 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 thereof is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The amendment refers to agreements in Iowa, Idaho, and Washington as well as Oregon. These comments and any recommendation apply only to the Oregon agreement and has no bearing on the Iowa, Idaho, and Washington agreements.

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.

Staff concludes that the amendment itself 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.

Dated at Salem, Oregon this 1st day of September, 2005.

Celeste Hari
Telecommunications Analyst
Competitive Issues
Telecommunications Division