

**This is an electronic copy. Format and font may vary from the official version.
Attachments may not appear.**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

ARB 578

In the Matter of)	
)	
VERIZON WIRELESS LLC and HOME)	ORDER
TELEPHONE COMPANY)	
)	
Negotiated Interconnection Agreement, Submitted)	
for Commission Approval Pursuant to Section)	
252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.)	

DISPOSITION: AGREEMENT APPROVED

On June 22, 2004, Verizon Wireless LLC and Home Telephone Company filed a negotiated interconnection agreement with the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Commission). The parties seek approval of this agreement 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/>. Only the Commission Staff (Staff) filed comments.

Under the Act, the Commission must approve or reject an agreement 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 noted that the agreement is part of a group of wireless agreements that are being filed in compliance with the Commission's May 11, 2004, letter and FCC Order No. 02-276, regarding the filing of wireless agreements. The signature date on this agreement is old. However, at the time of signature, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 was not clear regarding the filing of wireless agreements.

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, the effective date of this filing will be the date the Commission signs an order approving it, and any provision stating that the parties' agreement is effective prior to that date is not enforceable.

Staff recommended approval of the agreement. Staff concluded 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.

OPINION

The Commission adopts Staff’s recommendation and concludes that there is no basis under the Act to reject the agreement. No participant in the proceeding has requested that the agreement be rejected or has presented any reason for rejection. Accordingly, the agreement should be approved.

CONCLUSIONS

1. There is no basis for finding that the agreement discriminates against any telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement.
2. There is no basis for finding that implementation of the agreement is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.
3. The agreement should be approved.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the agreement between Verizon Wireless LLC and Home Telephone Company is approved.

Made, entered, and effective _____.

Lee Sparling
Director
Utility Program

A party may request rehearing or reconsideration of this order pursuant to ORS 756.561. A request for rehearing or reconsideration must be filed with the Commission within 60 days of the date of service of this order. The request must comply with the requirements in OAR 860-014-0095. A copy of any such request must also be served on each party to the proceeding as provided by OAR 860-013-0070(2). A party may appeal this order to a court pursuant to applicable law.