

97

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**  
**OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of One Call Communications,	)	<u>Case No. TT-2000-537</u>
Inc. d/b/a OPTICOM Tariff Filings for	)	Tariff No. 200000698
Operator Services Rate Plans B, C, and D	)	Tariff No. 200000725

**SECOND ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO EXTEND TIME**

On March 3, 2000, the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff) filed with the Commission its motion to suspend the proposed tariff sheets of One Call Communications, Inc. d/b/a OPTICOM (OPTICOM) which was granted on March 14, 2000.

In the order granting the suspension of tariff, the Commission, *inter alia*, set an intervention date of April 3, 2000, and also ordered the parties to file their proposed procedural schedule the same day.

On March 29, 2000, OPTICOM filed its motion to extend the time of the deadline to file the proposed procedural schedule. The Commission granted this motion on March 31, 2000, giving the parties until April 24, 2000, to file a proposed procedural schedule.

On April 24, 2000, OPTICOM filed its second motion for the extension of the time to file the proposed procedural schedule. OPTICOM stated that it and the Staff had been diverted by other assignments and by obligations incidental to the recent (Easter) holiday, and that, as a result, they had been unable to confer on the subject of a mutually satisfactory proposed procedural schedule. OPTICOM stated that the

parties needed additional time to prepare a proposed procedural schedule and estimated the time needed would be an additional fifteen days (i.e., 15 days from April 24, 2000, or May 8, 2000<sup>1</sup>) to prepare the proposed procedural schedule.

OPTICOM stated that Staff had no objection to the request for the extension of time and that OPTICOM had contacted the Office of the Public Counsel (Public Counsel) but that Public Counsel had not indicated its stance on the extension of time.

Because the position of Public Counsel was not indicated in OPTICOM's motion, the Commission was required to wait ten (10) days for a response from Public Counsel pursuant to Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.080(16). Public Counsel did not respond to the motion.

Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.050(3)(A) states, in part: "When an act is required...to be done by order...within a specified time...the commission...may...[o]rder the period enlarged...as extended by a previous order...." The Commission will extend the time for the parties to file a procedural order.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

1. That the parties shall file a proposed procedural schedule no later than 3:00 p.m. on May 9, 2000. The procedural schedule shall include dates for the filing of testimony and for an evidentiary hearing.

---

<sup>1</sup> May 8 is Harry Truman's birthday, which is a legal holiday in Missouri.

2. That this order shall become effective on May 5, 2000.

BY THE COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Dale Hardy Roberts". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Dale Hardy Roberts  
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

(S E A L)

Bill Hopkins, Senior Regulatory Law Judge,  
by delegation of authority pursuant to  
4 CSR 240-2.120(1) (November 30, 1995)  
and Section 386.240, RSMo 1994.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,  
on this 5th day of May, 2000.