



Agenda Date: 02/19/14
Agenda Item: IVC

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
Board of Public Utilities
44 South Clinton Avenue, 9th Floor
Post Office Box 350
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0350
www.nj.gov/bpu/

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT APPLICATION OF)	ORDER APPROVING
VERIZON NEW JERSEY, INC. AND DISHNET)	INTERCONNECTION
WIRELINE L.L.C. FOR APPROVAL OF AN)	AGREEMENT
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION)	
252 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996)	DOCKET NO. TO13121163

Parties of Record:

Gregory M. Romano, Esq., for Verizon New Jersey Inc.
Stefanie A. Brand, Esq., Director, for New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel
William Hunt, for Dishnet Wireline, L.L.C.

BY THE BOARD:

By letter dated December 5, 2013, Verizon New Jersey, Inc. ("Verizon"), a New Jersey corporation, and Dishnet Wireless L.L.C. ("Dishnet") (individually, "a Party", and jointly, "the Parties"), pursuant to Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, P.L. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (codified in scattered sections of 47 U.S.C. § 151 et seq.) ("the Act"), submitted to the Board of Public Utilities ("Board") a joint application ("Application") for approval of a certain negotiated interconnection agreement dated August 14, 2013 ("the Agreement").

The Agreement sets forth the terms, conditions, and prices under which Verizon will offer and provide access to unbundled network elements, ancillary services, and wholesale telecommunications services available for resale to Dishnet. The Agreement is in effect until August 13, 2015 and thereafter, as noted in the Agreement, continues in full force and effect unless terminated as provided in the Agreement.

By letter dated January 13, 2014, the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel ("Rate Counsel") filed its comments with the Board. Citing to 47 U.S.C. § 252(e), Rate Counsel notes that the Board "may reject the Agreement only if it finds that the Agreement discriminates against other carriers or is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, or necessity." Id. at 1-2. Rate Counsel "is satisfied that the terms of the Agreement meet the requirements of Section 252(e)." Id. at 2. Nevertheless, Rate Counsel states that it "does not object to Board approval of the Agreement subject to the conditions and comments" set forth in its letter. Id. at 8. For example, Rate Counsel recommends that the Board "assert its continuing authority over

the adoption of, as well as the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and state specifically in its Order approving the adoption of same that any subsequent amendments or modifications to the adopted Agreement shall be subject to review and approval of the Board.” Id. at 2. Also, Rate Counsel recommends that the Board reject certain provisions of the Agreement. Id. at 2-7.

DISCUSSION

The Board finds that Rate Counsel’s objections to certain provisions of the Agreement are without merit and, accordingly, the Board declines to make modifications to the Agreement. See e.g., In the Matter of the Joint Application of Verizon New Jersey, Inc. and Ernest Communications, Inc. For Approval of an Interconnection Agreement Under Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Docket No. TO02050287, Order dated September 18, 2002 (rejecting Rate Counsel’s recommendation that Condition 3 of the Pricing Section of the Agreement is inconsistent with FCC rules).

Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(a)(1), an incumbent Local Exchange Carrier may negotiate and enter into a binding interconnection agreement with a carrier requesting interconnection, service, or network elements. In addition, 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(1) requires approval by the Board of any interconnection agreement adopted by negotiation or arbitration, and further requires the Board to approve or reject the Agreement, with written findings as to any deficiencies. The Act provides that the Board may reject a negotiated agreement or any portion thereof 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. [47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(A)].

The Board’s review of the Agreement and the record in this matter indicate that the Agreement is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity, and that the Agreement does not discriminate against telecommunications carriers not parties to the Agreement. Therefore, the Board **FINDS** that the Agreement meets the standards set forth in the Act, and **HEREBY APPROVES** the Agreement as presented by the Parties. This approval should not be construed as preapproval of any future petitions for rate recovery of costs incurred pursuant to the Agreement, nor shall the Board be bound by any provisions within the Agreement regarding the confidentiality of information.

The Board notes that amendments or modifications to Board-approved interconnection agreements are subject to Board review and approval. No agreement shall be read, nor does the Board believe the Parties to the Agreement intend that it be read, to limit the authority of the Board under Section 252(e) of the Act to review interconnection agreements. Accordingly, until and unless otherwise provided by the Board, subsequent amendments or modifications to the Agreement approved herein shall be subject to review and approval by the Board. Additionally, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(h), a copy of the Agreement will be made available for public inspection and copying within ten days of the issuance of this Order.

This Order shall be effective March 1, 2014.


DATED: 2/19/14

BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES
BY:



DIANNE SOLOMON
PRESIDENT



JEANNE M. FOX
COMMISSIONER


JOSEPH L. FIORDALISO
COMMISSIONER


MARY-ANNA HOLDEN
COMMISSIONER

ATTEST:


KRISTI IZZO
SECRETARY

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the within
document is a true copy of the original
in the files of the Board of Public
Utilities


IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT APPLICATION OF VERIZON NEW JERSEY, INC. AND
DISHNET WIRELINE L.L.C. FOR APPROVAL OF AN INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT
UNDER SECTION 252 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

DOCKET NO. TO13121163

SERVICE LIST

Gregory M. Romano, Esq.
General Counsel
Verizon New Jersey, Inc.
Mid-Atlantic Region
One Verizon Way, VC54S204
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

William Hunt
Dishnet Wireline L.L.C.
9601 S. Meridan Boulevard
Englewood, CO 80112

Tamara Volmer
Dishnet Wireline L.L.C.
9601 S. Meridan Boulevard
Englewood, CO 80112

Stefanie A. Brand, Esq., Director
Division of Rate Counsel
140 Front Street, 4th Floor
Post Office Box 003
Trenton, NJ 08625-0003

Christopher White, Esq.
Division of Rate Counsel
140 Front Street, 4th Floor
Post Office Box 003
Trenton, NJ 08625-0003

Maria Novas-Ruiz, Esq.
Division of Rate Counsel
140 Front Street, 4th Floor
Post Office Box 003
Trenton, NJ 08625-0003

Alex Moreau
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Law & Public Safety
Division of Law
124 Halsey Street
Post Office Box 45029
Newark, NJ 07101-45029

James Murphy, Chief
Division of Telecommunications
Board of Public Utilities
44 South Clinton Avenue, 9th Floor
Post Office Box 350
Trenton, NJ 08625-0350

Jimarli Figueiredo
Division of Telecommunications
Board of Public Utilities
44 South Clinton Avenue, 9th Floor
Post Office Box 350
Trenton, NJ 08625-0350