

**From:** John Harvey  
**To:** Livingston, Merilee  
**Date:** 2/11/2009 11:04 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: NO on 385 overlay

>>> 2/11/2009 9:35 AM >>>  
TO: Utah Public Service Commission, c/o [jsharvey@utah.gov](mailto:jsharvey@utah.gov)

I read in a Feb 8 Standard-Examiner article that Rep. Jim Dunnigan is sponsoring a bill to ditch the pending 385 area code overlay in favor of a geographical split. Since there appears to be an opportunity to comment, I am taking advantage of it.

I STRONGLY favor a split !

True, a split would force some people to change their LONG DISTANCE phone number. But all local phone numbers would stay the same. Most calls are local calls. When I dial long distance, I'm used to using an area code, so whether it's 801 or 385 or 666 is only a minor difference.

With an overlay, the effect is that EACH AND EVERY phone# changes, even LOCAL phone#s, because with overlay, to call across the street to my neighbor, whose 7-digit phone# didn't even change, I would have to dial a different number - 10 digits instead of 7. Everywhere I call locally would be a different phone# than before. EVERY ONE, EVERY DAY, for EVER AFTER! The after-effects of the overlay would NEVER go away.

Doing a split causes a relatively painful transition. But it's a one-time pain. Once it's past, it's over. But with an overlay, while the initial transition is less painful for some, for all, the pain never goes away - we will be forever shackled to dialing 10 digits for EACH AND EVERY call, when 7 digits could suffice.

One of the specious arguments being used for the overlay plan is that phones these days can easily store 10 digit phone#s. True, but guess what? Most (non-cell) auto-dial phones only store 8 - 20 phone#s. The rest of the phone#s I either have to remember in my head, or I have to look up in a phone book or a on a list. My head isn't so easily extended. I can't program phone#s for ALL my local family, friends, and neighbors into my phone. Remembering which of my family, friends, and neighbors are 801 and which are 385 will be a royal pain! People whose 7 digit phone#s I would be able to remember after a split, after an overlay I would have to look up because I'd never be sure which area code to use. An overlay would likely result in me (and many other people) never again being able to rely on my heads to remember the majority of my local callees - I'd have to look most of them up.

With a cell phone, which can hold many phone#s, there is no advantage to doing an overlay. In the case of an overlay, for every 7-digit phone# in my cell phone, I would have to add an area code and for a few 10-digit phone#s, I'd have to change the area code. Whereas with a split, worst case, I'd only have to change a few area codes on some of the 10-digit phone#s.

Another faulty argument is that an overlay is better for business. I say it's not. I don't carry around very many business phone#s in my head, my wired telephone, nor my cell phone. When I need a business phone#, I have to look it up. In the case of a split, I'd do the same thing I've always done - look it up in the local phone book and dial 7 digits. If it's not a local #, then I dial 10-digits, and again, whether the first three are 801 or 385 or 666 makes no difference. But with an overlay, EVERY time I call a business, I would have to read 10 digits from the directory/list, and then dial 10 digits. Plus, I'd have to try to figure out which businesses are local calls and which are long distance calls -

RECEIVED  
2009 FEB 11 P 2:02  
UTAH PUBLIC  
SERVICE COMMISSION

1612001

the area code alone would no longer tell me that. Put another way, it's far more convenient to call a local business using a 7-digit phone# than a 10-digit phone#. Businesses like customers to have convenient access to them. I'd guess that for most businesses, most of their incoming calls are from locals customers. The claim that businesses would lose customers after a split because the customers wouldn't know the area code changed - that's a pretty lame argument.

I don't buy the PSC's statement that "... the overlay approach imposes lower costs spread fairly across all parties and decided the public interest was best served by implementing the overlay option." I think the overlay will cost us all plenty in terms of money, and convenience.

I hope you'll reconsider. The split makes more sense for the rest of us.

-Scott Carter