BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Alma Telephone Company's Filing to Revise its Access Service Tariff, P.S.C. Mo. No. 2.	)))	**Case No. TT-99-428** Tariff No. 9900658
In the Matter of MoKan Dial, Inc.'s Filing to Revise its Access Service Tariff, P.S.C. Mo. No. 2.	)))	**Case No. TT-99-429** Tariff No. 9900656
In the Matter of Mid-Missouri Telephone Company's Filing to Revise its Access Service Tariff, P.S.C. Mo. No. 2.	)))	**Case No. TT-99-430** Tariff No. 9900712
In the Matter of Choctaw Telephone Company's Filing to Revise its Access Service Tariff, P.S.C. Mo. No. 1	)))	**Case No. TT-99-431** Tariff No. 9900667
In the Matter of Chariton Valley Telephone Company's Filing to Revise its Access Service Tariff, P.S.C. Mo. No. 2.	))))	**Case No. TT-99-432** Tariff No. 9900657
In the Matter of Peace Valley Telephone Company's Filing to Revise its Access Service Tariff, P.S.C. Mo. No. 2.	))))	**Case No. TT-99-433** Tariff No. 9900655

ORDER SETTING DATE OF FILING OF PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

All of the above-captioned cases involve tariffs suspended at the request of the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff). All of the cases involve the same issue of law: Whether the local telephone companies (Applicants) involved are allowed to amend their tariffs so that they can apply their switched access rates to traffic originating on a commercial mobile radio service that terminates in their

territory. At the prehearing conference held on April 29, 1999, the parties attending agreed that there are no disputed facts.

Thus, on May 11, 1999, the Commission entered its *Order Consolidating Cases and Extending Date of Filing of Procedural Schedule* (order consolidating). In its order consolidating, the Commission ordered, *inter alia*, that the procedural schedule should be filed no later than May 21, 1999. Since no procedural schedule was filed as ordered, the Commission entered its *Show Cause Order* on June 16, 1999, ordering that the Applicants explain why they had not complied with the Commission's order and to show cause why their cases should not be dismissed.

On June 21, 1999, Applicants filed their *Response to Show Cause Order* (response). Applicants stated that they had not received any service copies of any order entered in any of the above-captioned cases, other than the order suspending tariffs. Applicants also stated that on May 3, 1999, they sent a preliminary draft of a factual stipulation to all counsel of record. As of the date of the response, Applicants stated that they had received no answer from any of the other counsel, probably due to the press of other business. Applicants also stated that, in the past, the Staff had normally taken the lead in drafting proposed procedural schedules and stipulations, but that no such drafts had been received by Applicants from Staff. Finally, Applicants requested that a "telephonic supplemental pre-hearing" be conducted in order to ". . . revisit the schedule which will be required in order to present this case on the most expedited and simplified basis possible."

The Commissions finds that there is good cause to extend the filing date of the procedural schedule and that there is good cause not to dismiss these cases, in that not only Applicants, but also the other parties, apparently have done little, if anything, to expedite this case. Also, the Commission's records show that Applicants have been sent all documents in this case. Thus, the Commission would request that Applicants more closely monitor the delivery of documents in their own offices.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That the parties shall file a procedural schedule no later than 3:00 p.m. on July 20, 1999. The procedural schedule shall include dates for the filing of testimony and for an evidentiary hearing.

2. That this order shall become effective on June 30, 1999.

BY THE COMMISSION

Dale Hardy Roberts

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 30th day of June, 1999.

STATE OF MISSOURI
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I have compared the preceding copy with the original on file in this office and I do hereby certify the same to be a true copy therefrom and the whole thereof.

WITNESS my hand and seal of the Public Service Commission, at Jefferson City,

Missouri, this 30TH day of JUNE, 1999.

Dale Hardy Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge