

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Investigation of Alascom, Inc.	)	CC Docket No. 95-182
Interstate Transport and Switching Services	)	
Tariff FCC No. 11	)	

**ORDER EXTENDING PLEADING CYCLE**

**Adopted: August 25, 2004**

**Released: August 25, 2004**

**Computer Models, Data Inputs and Outputs Responsive to Paragraph 13 of the *Designation Order***

**Due:** August 30, 2004

**Direct Case Due:** September 17, 2004

**Oppositions to Direct Case Due:** October 5, 2004

**Replies Due:** October 15, 2004

By the Chief, Pricing Policy Division:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. In September 1995, Alascom, Inc. (Alascom), a telecommunications common carrier providing interstate transport and switching services to other common carriers in Alaska and between Alaska and the continental United States, filed its first Tariff FCC No. 11.<sup>1</sup> The Common Carrier Bureau (now the Wireline Competition Bureau) (Bureau) suspended this tariff, imposed an accounting order, and instituted an investigation.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, all of Alascom's subsequent annual Tariff FCC No. 11 revisions have been suspended and set for investigation, with accounting orders imposed.<sup>3</sup> All of these investigations have been incorporated into the investigation of Alascom's original Tariff FCC No. 11. The Bureau recently released an order designating issues for investigation in this proceeding, which, among other things, established a pleading cycle for the filing of a direct case by Alascom, oppositions to the direct case, and replies to the oppositions.<sup>4</sup> On August 12, 2004, Alascom filed a motion seeking an

<sup>1</sup> See Alascom, Inc., Tariff FCC No. 11, Transmittal No. 790 (filed Sept. 22, 1995). Alascom is required to provide these services to other common carriers pursuant to tariff by the Commission's *Market Structure Order. Integration of Rates and Services for the Provision of Communications by Authorized Common Carriers between the Contiguous States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands*, CC Docket No. 83-1376, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 9 FCC Rcd 3023 (1994) (*Market Structure Order*).

<sup>2</sup> *Alascom, Inc. Tariff FCC No. 11, Transmittal No. 790*, CC Docket No. 95-182, Order, 11 FCC Rcd 3703 (Com. Car. Bur. 1995).

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., *Investigation of Alascom, Inc., Interstate Transport and Switching Services, Tariff FCC No. 11, Transmittal No. 807*, CC Docket No. 95-182, Order, 11 FCC Rcd 10833 (Tariff Div. 1996); *Transmittal No. 852*, CC Docket No. 95-182, Order, 12 FCC Rcd 3646 (Comp. Pric. Div. 1997); *Transmittal No. 921*, CC Docket No. 95-182, Order, 13 FCC Rcd 187 (Comp. Pric. Div. 1997).

<sup>4</sup> *Investigation of Alascom, Inc., Interstate Transport and Switching Services, Tariff FCC No. 11*, CC Docket No. 95-182, Order Designating Issues for Investigation, DA 04-2349 (Wire. Comp. Bur. rel. July 30, 2004) (*Designation Order*).

extension of the filing deadlines to September 17, 2004, for its direct case, October 8, 2004, for oppositions, and October 22, 2004, for replies.<sup>5</sup> In this order we grant Alascom's motion in part, and deny it in part.

## II. DISCUSSION

2. Alascom states in its motion that "the additional time . . . are [sic] necessary to the interested parties and would serve the public interest in a thorough and complete record."<sup>6</sup> While several parties have participated in this investigation since it began, Alascom's motion refers to only one other party, General Communication, Inc (GCI), stating that GCI has authorized Alascom to state that it concurs with Alascom's proposed pleading cycle.<sup>7</sup> Thus we cannot conclude from Alascom's motion that additional time is necessary to all interested parties. Further, while we agree that a thorough and complete record would serve the public interest, we note that completion of this investigation would also serve the public and parties' interests. Therefore, we require Alascom to file its direct case in part by the original deadline of August 30, 2004, and allow Alascom until September 17, 2004, to file the remainder of its direct case. Specifically, we require Alascom to provide by August 30, 2004, the electronic computer models and hard copies of the data inputs and outputs of these models as described in paragraph 13 of the *Designation Order*.<sup>8</sup> Alascom shall file the remainder of its direct case by September 17, 2004. In addition we require oppositions to the direct case to be filed by October 5, 2004, and replies to the oppositions to be filed by October 15, 2004.

## III. ORDERING CLAUSES

3. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j), 201-205, and 403 of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j), 201-205, and 403, and pursuant to the authority delegated by sections 0.91 and 0.291 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, the pleading cycle established by the order designating issues for investigation in this matter shall be modified as follows:

Computer Models, Data Inputs and Outputs Responsive to Paragraph 13 of the *Designation Order* Due:  
August 30, 2004

Remainder of Direct Case Due: September 17, 2004

Oppositions to Direct Case Due: October 5, 2004

Replies Due: October 15, 2004

4. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Alascom, Inc.'s Motion for Extension is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part, as set forth herein.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Tamara L. Preiss  
Chief, Pricing Policy Division  
Wireline Competition Bureau

---

<sup>5</sup> Alascom, Inc. Motion for Extension, CC Docket No. 95-182 (filed Aug. 12, 2004).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> *Designation Order* at 7, para. 13.

