

From: "Charles Lepper"
To: <MLIVINGSTON@UTAH.GOV>
Date: 4/25/2008 8:53 AM
Subject: New Area Code

Am wondering who thought out the mixed confusion associated with combining two area codes into the same geographical location.

The following is my concern that should have been addressed prior to this decision.

When placing a call on my cell phone and the call does not go through because the company/person is in a different area code, it costs me a call and then I have to place the call again. That is not fair to have to pay for a second call either on a cell phone or to pay charges for dialing to a different area code from my home phone.

Is a new book being printed that gives the area codes for businesses and residential applications?

Is there a grandfathering clause that will not cause people to have to pay additionally for calls to another area code until a year or so after the new one takes effect?

Why didn't the commission just give the 801 to SLC and south and the new one to everything in the group above (North) of SLC? That would make better sense than combining and overlapping the two area codes. That way it's definitive that calls to the other area code are long distance.

I want to ask the media to do a story on this as thousands of cell phone and hard-wired phone users are about to be charged additionally for something they're probably not aware of at this time or haven't considered.

The public deserves more than what has been provided in the combination of the area codes.

Charles Lepper