

Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Roseville Telephone Company	)	ASD 00-28
	)	
Request for Extension of Time	)	
To File Initial Cost Allocation Manual	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

**ORDER**

**Adopted:** June 7, 2000

**Released:** June 7, 2000

By the Chief, Accounting Safeguards Division:

1. On May 31, 2000, Roseville Telephone Company (Roseville) through its attorneys Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C. requested a 120-day extension of time to file its initial cost allocation manual (CAM). Roseville is required to file a CAM because its annual operating revenue exceeded the indexed revenue threshold of \$112 million for the first time in 1998. In accordance with the Commission’s rules<sup>1</sup> incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) exceeding the indexed threshold for the first time must file their initial CAM within 90 days of the publication of the indexed threshold in the federal register. The 1998 indexed threshold was published in the federal register on September 9, 1999, and therefore, Roseville was required to file its initial CAM by December 9, 1999. On December 2, 1999, the Chief, Accounting Safeguards Division granted Roseville an extension of time until June 9, 2000, to file its initial CAM.<sup>2</sup>

2. Roseville gives several reasons why it is seeking an additional extension of time. First, Roseville states that although it has increased the size of its staff to handle the regulatory duties associated with the initial CAM filing, these employees have also been occupied with information requests related to multiple California Public Utilities Commission proceedings. Second, the implementation of new systems to compile CAM information will most likely not be completed prior to the current deadline of June 9. Finally, Roseville intends to use another carrier’s Class B CAM as a model for its own initial CAM filing once Commission staff has completed its review of the Class B CAM filings. Eligible ILECs filed Class B CAMs on April 3, 2000, and the pleading cycle for comments on the Class B CAMs is not complete. Roseville states that a 120-day extension of time would be in the public interest, because it will allow Roseville time to produce a CAM in a careful, accurate manner and also allow it to submit informal drafts

---

<sup>1</sup> 47 C.F.R. §64.903(a).

<sup>2</sup> Among other reasons, Roseville requested the initial extension of time because it had entered a Y2K “network stabilization” period to protect critical information systems and had dedicated a significant amount of its resources toward installation of a new computer system. *See* Roseville Telephone Company Request for Extension of Time to File Initial Cost Allocation Manual, 14 FCC Rcd 20729 (2000).

to the Bureau for review before the CAM is filed formally.

3. We have reviewed Roseville's request for an extension of time to file its initial CAM. Although we do not routinely grant extensions of time, we are persuaded that the grant of Roseville's request is warranted. We find merit in Roseville's request. An extension of time will cause no harm to the public interest. We, therefore, grant Roseville an extension of time until October 10, 2000 to file its initial CAM.

4. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 0.91, 0.291, and 1.46 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§0.91, 0.291, and 1.46, that Roseville's request for an extension of time until October 10, 2000, to file its initial cost allocation manual **IS GRANTED**.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Kenneth P. Moran  
Chief, Accounting Safeguards Division