



not willing to waive. RMP suggested other alternatives by which questions related to inter-jurisdictional allocation methods could be addressed. Other parties to this docket, the Division of Public Utilities (Division), the Office of Consumer Services, the UIEC and the UAE responded to RMP's Petition for Stay. All of these responding parties agree with RMP that it will be very difficult or impossible for the parties to address inter-jurisdictional allocation issues and complete this rate case within the time period currently set by our scheduling orders. They each express similar views that it would be better to address inter-jurisdictional allocation issues somewhere other than at this time in this rate case.

Based upon the foregoing, we decide to grant RMP's request to stay our October 19, 2009, Order. We agree the parties are significantly constrained, in this docket, to prepare and present an adequate evidentiary record addressing the two questions, and issues associated with inter-jurisdictional allocation methods potentially raised by the two questions. Although constrained by the time remaining in this docket, we intend to have inter-jurisdictional allocation issues addressed and the reasonableness of any allocation established prior to our approval of any future change in RMP's rates.

Wherefore, we enter this ORDER where by we stay the October 19, 2009, Order. Parties need not address the two questions contained in the October 19, 2009, Order in their forthcoming testimony to be filed in this docket.

DOCKET NO. 09-035-23

-3-

DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah this 9<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2009.

/s/ Ted Boyer, Chairman

/s/ Ric Campbell, Commissioner

/s/ Ron Allen, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Julie Orchard  
Commission Secretary  
G#64289