ORDER NO.	13	Z	2	Ô

ENTERED SEP 0'\$ 2013

## **BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

## **OF OREGON**

ARB 66(1), ARB 401(13), ARB 985(1)

In the Matter of

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON STAFF,

ORDER ·

Request to approve Negotiated Interconnection Agreements and Amendments Submitted Pursuant to Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

DISPOSITION: STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED

At its Public Meeting on September 3, 2013, the Public Utility Commission of Oregon adopted Staff's recommendation in this matter. The Staff Report with the recommendation is attached as Appendix A.



BY THE COMMISSION:

Barry L. Proier

Becky L. Beier Commission Secretary

A party may request rehearing or reconsideration of this order under 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 860-001-0720. A copy of the request must also be served on each party to the proceedings as provided in OAR 860-001-0180(2). A party may appeal this order by filing a petition for review with the Court of Appeals in compliance with ORS 183.480 through 183.484.

# ORDER NO. 13 320

#### ITEM NO. CA4

## PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON STAFF REPORT PUBLIC MEETING DATE: September 3, 2013

REGULAR			N/A
DATE:	August 26, 2013		
то:	Public Utility Commiss	ion	
FROM:	Mitch Moore	PAZ VN	
THROUGH:	Jason Eisdorfer, Bryan	Conway, and Kay Marinos	
SUBJECT:	Negotiated Interconne	ILITY COMMISSION STAFF: Rec ction Agreements and Amendmen 2(e) of the Telecommunications A	its submitted

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Commission approve the new amendments to previously negotiated agreements listed below, with the amendments to be considered legally enforceable on the date of Commission approval.

### DISCUSSION:

47 U.S.C. Sections 252(a) and (e) (hereafter Section 252) require that any negotiated interconnection agreement, including amendments to an existing agreement, be submitted to a state commission for approval. Under the Act, the Commission must approve or reject such agreements within 90 days of filing. The Commission may reject an agreement only if it finds that:

(i) the agreement, or portion thereof, discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or

(ii) the implementation of such agreement, or portion thereof, is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. See Section 252(e)(2).

# ORDER NO.

320

ARB Agreements August 26, 2013 Page 2

An interconnection agreement or amendment thereto is not legally enforceable until approved by a state commission. *See* Sections 252 (a) and (e). Accordingly, although the contracting parties may state in the agreement that each will abide by the agreement prior to its approval by the Commission, the legally enforceable date under Section 252 of any submitted agreement or amendment is the date the Commission approves it.

Staff has reviewed the following amendments submitted for Commission approval:

Docket	Parties to the Amendment or Agreement
ARB 66(1)	New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, and its Commercial Mobile Radio Affiliates, dba AT&T Mobility and CenturyTel of Oregon, Inc., dba CenturyLink and CenturyTel of Eastern Oregon, Inc. dba CenturyLink
ARB 401(13)	Douglas Services, Inc. and Qwest Corporation dba CenturyLink QC
ARB 985(1)	Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless and CenturyTel of Eastern Oregon, Inc. dba CenturyLink and CenturyTel of Oregon, Inc. dba CenturyLink

Staff recommends approval of the amendments. Staff finds that the amendments do not discriminate against non-party telecommunications carriers and do not appear to be inconsistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. Accordingly, Staff concludes that there is no basis under the Act to reject the amendments.

#### **PROPOSED COMMISSION MOTION:**

The new amendments to previously negotiated agreements listed above be approved.

ARB agreements 9-3-13.doc