

**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 497(3)

In the Matter of)	
)	
HUNTER CONSTRUCTION INC. and)	
QWEST CORPORATION)	ORDER
)	
Third Amendment to Interconnection)	
Agreement, Submitted for Commission)	
Approval Pursuant to Section 252(e) of the)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996.)	

DISPOSITION: AMENDMENT APPROVED

On January 10, 2005, Hunter Construction Inc. and Qwest Corporation (Qwest) filed a third amendment to the interconnection agreement and subsequent amendments previously approved by the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Commission) in Orders No. 03-582 and 04-499. The parties seek approval of the amendment under Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The amendment adopts a wholesale collocation promotion offered by Qwest. The Commission provided notice by posting an electronic copy of the agreement and amendment on the World Wide Web, at: <http://www.puc.state.or.us/caragmnt/>.

Qwest previously sought acknowledgement of the wholesale collocation promotion, under OAR 860-016-0021, in docket ARB 641. On November 30, 2004, the Commission acknowledged Qwest's promotion in Order No. 04-696.

When a carrier accepts a promotional offering, the accepting carrier and the offering carrier must file any required amendment to their existing carrier-to-carrier agreement. To qualify for expedited review under OAR 860-016-0021, the amendment must be identical to the promotion previously acknowledged by the Commission.

The Commission has reviewed the amendment under the standards set forth in OAR 860-016-0020 and Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and concludes that it should be approved.

OPINION

The Commission concludes that the amendment to the agreement adopting the promotion 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. Accordingly, the amendment should be approved.

CONCLUSIONS

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

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the amendment to the previously approved agreement between Hunter Construction Inc. and Qwest Corporation is approved.

Made, entered, and effective _____.

Michael Grant
Chief Administrative Law Judge
Administrative Hearings Division

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.