

cm

Decision No. 82075

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation on the Commission's own motion into the promulgation of a General Order providing for the procedures and standards to be followed for the interconnection of customer-provided communications terminal equipment to the telecommunication facilities of intrastate telephone utilities.

Case No. 9625

ORDER SETTING HEARING
TO CONSIDER INTERIM ARRANGEMENTS

The order instituting this investigation, issued October 24, 1973 (the "OII"), contemplates a period of one hundred (100) days for the filing of written comments and replies with respect to the General Order proposed therein. Following receipt and evaluation of such comments, it appears likely, in the opinion of the Commission, that evidentiary hearings may be scheduled in order to consider more fully the numerous and complex issues involved in this proceeding. While the scope or duration of such hearings is not yet subject to precise estimate, it appears reasonable to assume that a final decision in this proceeding will not be forthcoming within a time frame short enough to justify an indefinite continuance of all contested matters presently pending before the Commission which could be affected by the proposed General Order, without making some arrangements to eliminate or mitigate the economic hardship which is alleged by the complainants in such cases to result from the existing tariff provisions of the Respondents herein.

Accordingly, it is the desire of the Commission that the Respondents to this investigation, as well as any interested parties which may be affected, submit written proposals suitable for adoption by the Commission as an interim measure in this proceeding to alleviate such alleged hardship. While the primary purpose of

such interim measures would be to relieve the economic hardships alleged by the proponents of customer-owned equipment, the Commission is also concerned that such measures not impose any undue or avoidable cost burdens on Respondents' other subscribers.

Such proposals shall be submitted in the manner described in the ordering paragraphs set forth herein. Because of the need for expedition in establishing such arrangements for the period of this investigation, a hearing will be scheduled to consider this matter at the earliest feasible date following the Commission's receipt of such written proposals.

Moreover, because of the need to consider the possible economic impact of interconnection arrangements, both upon those offering customer-owned equipment and upon the other subscribers of Respondents, it is necessary to rescind the statement contained at pp. 3-4 of the OII that it should not encompass such considerations.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that:

1. Within fifteen (15) days from the date hereof, any Respondent or interested party who so desires shall file with the Commission a written proposal for the adoption of suitable interim arrangements by the Commission to deal with the problem described herein. Any proposal so submitted shall include a statement of the facts justifying such proposal and shall be served upon all parties listed in Appendices A and B of the OII.

2. A public hearing to consider such proposals shall be held at such time and place and before such Commissioner and/or examiner as shall hereafter be designated by written notice to all parties listed in the OII.

3. No party which fails to submit a written proposal in the manner specified herein will be allowed to present testimony or argument at such hearing.

4. The statements contained in the OII, beginning four

C. 9625 cm

lines from the bottom of page 3 and ending nine lines from the top of page 4 thereof, are hereby rescinded and deleted.

The effective date of this order is the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 30th
day of OCTOBER, 1973.

William L. Steyer
President
William Synow J.
Commissioners

Commissioner J. P. Vukasin, Jr., being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Commissioner Thomas Moran, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.