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On December 16, 1997, U S WEST Communications filed a Notice of Appeal in the Company’s recently completed rate case.  Attached to the Notice of Appeal was a Motion to Limit Clerk’s Standard Record on Appeal. The Motion requested that the Commission limit the adminis­tra­tive record on appeal to the single issue relating to “toll restriction.” As part of its Notice of Appeal, the Company attached “Addendum A” requesting that the Commission augment the record on appeal with several documents.

On December 30, 1997, the Commission Staff filed an unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to Answer U S WEST’s Motion.  Although the Staff generally agreed with the Company’s intention to limit the agency record on appeal, the Staff stated that it intended to oppose several of the items “that the Company requests be included in the appeal record as set out in Addendum A to U S WEST’s Notice of Appeal.”  Staff Motion at 2.  Staff also argued that several “of the items mentioned in Addendum A lacked the requisite identification necessary for the Commission Secretary to include these items in the [appeal] record.  Id. (footnote omitted).

The Staff Motion disclosed that the Company intends to make a subsequent filing identifying with greater specificity those documents that the Company requests be included in the Appellate Record.  Rather than file an Answer to the Company’s December 16 Motion and then again file another Answer to the Company’s subsequent filing, Staff requested an extension of time so that it may file a single answer to both the December 16 Motion and the Company’s subsequent request.  The Staff’s Motion indicated that U S WEST does not oppose an extension of time.  The Staff also asserted that granting the Motion will not prejudice any party.

DISCUSSION

Based upon the assertions contained in the Staff’s Motion and the fact that U S WEST did not oppose the Motion, we find: there is sufficient cause to grant Staff’s Motion for Extension of Time.  Accordingly, the Staff may answer U S WEST’s December 16 Motion and the Company’s subsequent request to include specific documents in the Appellate Record within fourteen (14) days of when the subsequent request is filed.  See Commission Procedural Rule 57.03, IDAPA 31.01.01.057.03.

O R D E R

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Staff’s Motion for Extension of Time to Answer U S WEST’s Motion is granted.

DONE by Order of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission at Boise, Idaho this                  day of January 1998.

                                                                                                                                      DENNIS S. HANSEN, PRESIDENT

                                                                                           RALPH NELSON, COMMISSIONER

MARSHA H. SMITH, COMMISSIONER

ATTEST:

Myrna J. Walters

Commission Secretary
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