

From: "MIKE AND MONA STEEN"
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 4/22/2008 1:49 PM
Subject: New Area Code Suggestion

Hi there!

I received the notice regarding the new area code and have a suggestion.

I lived in Arizona when they added two new area codes at once. They were going to do what Utah is planning, but got too many complaints. It would be crazy after all, if you added a second phone line in your current home and had two separate area codes in the SAME home. So, Arizona decided to divide the area codes dependent upon some road or interstate division. For instance, keep the numbers to the east of I-15 as 801 and change the numbers to the west of I-15 to the new area code. Then if another is needed in the future make it numbers to the south of 215.

Not to mention the reason for a seven digit number is it is easier to memorize than a ten digit number

I truly do hope that this will be taken into consideration, so as to alleviate some real hassles to the public!

Thanks,
Mona Steen

From: "Jane Wise"
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 4/18/2008 10:15 AM
Subject: concerns about wireless

Dear Mr. Livingston:

Yesterday I received notice from my cell phone carrier of the new area code overlay. I did not have notice of this change before the July 2007 order approving this change. I do not subscribe to a newspaper, nor do I have television. Had a notice been sent through my home telephone or cell phone carrier, I would have received it.

I strongly disapprove of this overlay. The most sensible thing to do would have been to approve a new area code for a specific area or to adjust the 435 area code to encompass a wider area. The idea of having to use ten numbers to dial a neighbor across the street is ludicrous. Also, the idea of not knowing whether a local business or neighbor is 801 or 385 is very disturbing. I want information about how many numbers are available in the 801 area and the need for another area code. I would like information about other overlay systems in the US and the problems encountered.

The foundation for every government order like this must be based on notice and hearing. This lack throws the order into question.

Jane Wise

From: Valarie Stewart
To: mlivingston@utah.gov
Date: 4/18/2008 10:28 AM
Subject: Fwd: new area code

Valarie Stewart
Office Specialist
Division of Public Utilities
(801) 530-6676
vstewart@utah.gov

>>> Kelley Bollinger <

> 4/11/2008 3:54 PM >>>

I am writing concerning the new area code. I am wondering why a new area code can be added without making everyone dial a 10 digit number when people in Manhattan, where there are lot more people than here in Salt Lake, only have 1 areacode. There has got to be a better way to add an area code without having to make every dial 10 digits. Please re-think this.

Kelley

From: Valarie Stewart
To: Livingston, Merilee
Date: 4/18/2008 10:31 AM
Subject: Fwd: New 385 area code

Valarie Stewart
Office Specialist
Division of Public Utilities
(801) 530-6676
vstewart@utah.gov

>>> Norman Angerhofer < > 4/17/2008 11:00 AM >>>
Dear Rea,

I got a letter in the mail this week about the new 385 area code. I am a bit puzzled as to why the decision to overlay two area codes over the same region from Ogden to Payson. I really think this is a mistake. I just can't see myself remembering that my area code is 801 and my neighbors around the corner is 385. It is also going to be a royal pain to dial 10 digits to call my next-door neighbor rather than the 7 digits I use now!

This plan sounds like someone is taking a shortcut by reprogramming the phone computers to use 10 digits rather than 7. In the long run, this will be a total hassle for everyone, and will be seen as a disaster.

So that is my complaint. I really think someone missed the boat on this one. You should reconsider just dividing the metropolitan area into physical regions: Salt Lake as 801, Provo area as 385, and Ogden as a third area code. That way people will keep their 7 digit numbers for local calls and will not have to dial 10 digits for most calls and will not get gray hairs trying to keep the multiple area codes straight.

Thank you for your time.

--Norman Angerhofer

From: Valarie Stewart
To: Livingston, Merilee
Date: 4/18/2008 10:33 AM
Subject: Fwd: area code overlay

Valarie Stewart
Office Specialist
Division of Public Utilities
(801) 530-6676
vstewart@utah.gov

>>> Rebecca Richards < > 4/17/2008 1:36 PM >>>

I just received my second notice about the new area code overlay. I am extremely unhappy with this. It is absolutely ridiculous to have to dial 10 numbers to call my next door neighbor. Whoever thought this was a good idea should think again. And it's not even like I can take my business elsewhere.

Rebecca Richards
Draper

From: Valarie Stewart
To: Livingston, Merilee
Date: 4/18/2008 10:48 AM
Subject: Fwd: New Area Code

Valarie Stewart
Office Specialist
Division of Public Utilities
(801) 530-6676
vstewart@utah.gov

>>> "Harry Judd" < > 4/10/2008 4:28 PM >>>

Hi,

I just received my notification of the proposed changes for implementation of a new area code. If this is an essential change I'm okay with it, however, I'm not so sure it is nor is this common practice throughout the country. If my analysis is correct for every area code there are close to ten million viable phone addresses using a seven code extension. I'm concerned if this is the case why are we implementing this change that will only be an inconvenience and costly to any entity that will need to accommodate the changes, primarily government components.

What is the difficulty with just assigning a new area code that would yield additional capacity without affecting everyone? Apparently I do not understand the workings behind transmission of calls but I am a little wary about the intent of this change without so much as an explanation of the why in your literature. Is this how they handle additional numbering in larger metropolitan areas. If it is I can't say that I have noticed in trying to make contact outside of our area.

What really is the intent or purpose here?

Thank you, please educate me.

Harry Judd

From: Stuart Cerise <
To: <mlivingston@utah.gov>
Date: 4/12/2008 6:33 AM
Subject: new area code

CC: Stu Cerise <fire30fire30@yahoo.com>

Perhaps I'm an uneducated person, or I don't understand high tech communication, but why will EVERYONE be required to dial all 10 digits for every call! If I'm calling anyone within my area code I should only have to call the last 7 digits of the number cause I'm ALREADY in the same area code!

Does the PUC actually care what its investors (us taxpayers) want, or do you do whatever the Utilitie companies desire. We pay your salary and wages.... perhaps you should do what we pay you for ...to represent us! Remember I, and all other taxpayers, are profit, and you, and all other governmental agency employees are OVERHEAD!

Set standards, guidelines and contractual obligations and require the phone service providers to comply....Its that easy!

Stuart K. Cerise

From: <SERVER@dpu.utah.gov>
To: <utilcomp@utah.gov>
Date: 4/10/2008 4:59 PM
Subject: Online Complaint Submission

UTILITY CUSTOMER:
FROM: Sharyne Wood
PHONE:
EMAIL:
IP:

SERVICE ADDRESS:

UTILITY: Qwest
ACCOUNT NUMBER: n/a

COMPLAINT TYPE: Other

COMPLAINT: This new area code 10 digit dialing for local calls is ridiculous. I have lived in other large cities and they haven't handled it in this manner. The Bay Area in CA has split many times, but to call my neighbor I didn't have to dial 10 digits.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION: Switch all cell phones to the new area code instead and keep 801 strictly for land lines and that may help. OR, split south of Salt Lake County to 385 and north to another number and keep Salt Lake County as 801. ANYTHING but this short-sighted and unbelievably bone-headed solution.

From: <SERVER@dpu.utah.gov>
To: <utilcomp@utah.gov>
Date: 4/11/2008 9:08 AM
Subject: Online Complaint Submission

UTILITY CUSTOMER:
FROM: Palmer-Christiansen Co.
CONTACT:
PHONE:
EMAIL:
IP:

SERVICE ADDRESS:

MAILING ADDRESS:
same

UTILITY: Quest
ACCOUNT NUMBER:

COMPLAINT TYPE: Customer Service
COMPLAINT: Notive was received stating that in the future ten digits must be used to place a phone call due to new area code. We strongly object as this is a waste of time and money. In addition, we consider this a safety issue regarding the use of cell phones by our employees. I think the ten digit dialing is just plain stupid.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION: Split the area served by 801 into two geographic areas. This is how other providers around the country do it. I don't care what area code we are assigned, just do not require the dialing of ten digits to make a phone call.

From: Valarie Stewart
To: Livingston, Merilee
Date: 4/10/2008 8:51 AM
Subject: Fwd: New telephone area codes

Here is another one.

Valarie Stewart
Office Specialist
Division of Public Utilities
(801) 530-6676
vstewart@utah.gov

>>> "Gary Chandler" < > 4/9/2008 10:59 AM >>>

I am just registering a complaint about the new overlay area codes. This seems like an incredibly stupid solution to me to make everyone start dialing 10 digit phone numbers. It will be extremely confusing for everyone because pretty soon we will never know if we have to dial 801 or 385 call someone. We will have to look up every number in the phone book. It appears the decision was made to inconvenience everyone instead of just those who would be affected by having to take a new number. I for one would be fine with the new area code even for my business.

Gary Chandler