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RE:EAS BETWEEN ANATONE, WASHINGTON (TDS TELECOM), AND LEWISTON/CLARKSTON (U S WEST).

U S WEST has filed Advice 95-06-N requesting Commission approval to complete the Idaho portion of an interstate EAS between TDS’s Anatone, Washington exchange, and U S WEST’s Lewiston, Idaho/Clarkston, Washington exchanges.  The effective date for the tariff is August 18, 1995, with an effective date of September 23 for the EAS.

Background

On April 13, 1994 this Commission received correspondence from TDS Telecom regarding the extension of the Asotin (WA) and Lewiston (ID)/Clarkston (WA) EAS to include Anatone (WA), which is 18 highway miles west of Asotin.  The Anatone and Asotin exchanges are contiguous.  I have attached a copy of the Briefing Paper that was included in the correspondence.

Anatone has 78 residential customers and 12 business customers, for a total of 90 customers.  These customers call Lewiston an average of 10.19 times per month and Clarkston an average of 12 times per month.  Fewer than 18% of the customers make no calls to Clarkston and approximately 20% make no calls to Lewiston.  U S WEST estimates a total Idaho revenue effect consisting of lost toll revenues, reduced access expense and estimated network costs to be approximately $11,000 per year and the Company does not request additional revenue to make up this deficiency.  (See the attached letter from Pat Stewart of U S WEST.)

According to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) Staff, this route meets Washington’s criteria for consideration of conversion to extended area service.  TDS and U S WEST have filed tariff applications with WUTC and resolution is expected by September 14, following a September 13 hearing.  Additional problems to be considered revolved around the fact that some of Anatone’s EAS traffic may be carried to Lewiston, making this an interstate route.  The foremost concern was to determine whether the FCC would assert jurisdiction; and secondarily, would the Idaho Public Utilities Commission concur?  A letter (copy attached) from Robert Kimball of the FCC says that “local carriers who propose to offer extended service are not required to file Section 214 applications to do so, even though such service crosses state lines.”

Recommendation

If the Washington Commission determines that there is sufficient community benefit to implement EAS, Staff recommends that Idaho concur.  Staff recommends that this tariff advice be approved contingent upon WUTC approval of the Washington portion.

U S WEST should be requested to provide this Commission with evidence of Washington’s approval before the EAS is implemented.

Does the Commission agree?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Birdelle Brown
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