

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

**OF OREGON**

ARB 497(2)

In the Matter of )  
 )  
HUNTER CONSTRUCTION, INC. dba ) STAFF COMMENTS  
HUNTER COMMUNICATIONS AND CORE )  
DIGITAL SERVICES and QWEST )  
CORPORATION, )  
 )  
Second Amendment to the Interconnection )  
Agreement Previously Submitted for )  
Commission Approval Pursuant to Section )  
252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. )

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AMENDMENT**

On June 14, 2004, Hunter Construction, Inc. dba Hunter Communications and Core Digital Services and Qwest Corporation (Qwest) filed a second amendment to the interconnection agreement previously filed with 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 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 thereof is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

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 recommends approval of the agreement. Staff also cautions all parties to interconnection agreements to file agreements immediately after final signature and within a reasonable time period relative to the stated effective date. Staff concludes that the agreement 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, this 6th day of July, 2004.

---

**Celeste Hari**  
Telecommunications Analyst