

From: "Dave Wilbur" <DWILBUR@novell.com>
To: <psscal@state.ut.us>
Date: Mon, Mar 20, 2000 9:44 AM
Subject: New area codes

Handwritten signature and initials:
Crawford
dg

I just saw a newspaper report on the potential plans for new area codes within Utah. While I live in Utah County, I saw no notices that there was to be a meeting to discuss this item. I would like to strongly recommend that we keep area codes for *areas* and avoid the overlay plan. It would be very short-sighted to implement the overlay plan because you didn't get input from unadvertised meetings. The public outcry would definitely be felt once you make everyone start remembering and dialing 10-digit phone numbers for neighbors.

Thank you for allowing this input.

David Wilbur
1382 N 910 E
American Fork, UT 84003
801-763-1134 (I don't mind if the area code changes...)

From: Kent Harrison <harrison@physics.byu.edu>
To: <psscal@state.ut.us>
Date: Mon, Mar 20, 2000 10:16 AM
Subject: new area code

Dear Commission Members:

The Daily Herald of 16 March 2000 ran a story about a possible new area code for the Wasatch Front. It listed an alternate to a new area code, that of an "overlay", which would require some customers to dial 10 digits for all calls.

I was not at the Tuesday night meeting, not being aware of it (and I couldn't have gone anyway), so I don't have all the details of the two plans. However, it seems obvious to me that the better choice is to have a new area code. That doesn't seem much of a problem. Then one dials 10 digits only for long distance; it seems unnecessary to require some people to dial 10 digits for ALL calls. So put me down as favoring a new area code.

Kent Harrison
380 East 4380 North
Provo, UT 84604
801-226-3743

From: Douglas Nielsen <Douglas.Nielsen@adm.alpine.k12.ut.us>
To: <psscal@state.ut.us>
Date: Mon, Mar 20, 2000 1:14 PM
Subject: Area Code

PSC:

I am writing to support the concept of keeping area codes by "area." While the initial switch to new area codes does involve some cost for businesses, in the long run the cost is worth it as compared to a confusing overlay system. As a business owner I'm willing to absorb the cost so that everyone will know what my area code is simply because my business is located in Sandy.

I would also encourage more advance planning. This 3rd area codes is coming quite quickly after the second. Wouldn't it have been better to have made the change to 3 at the same time. Should we be changing to 4 now to eliminate the costs of another change in a few years?

Yes to 'area'. No to 'overlay'. Thank you for your consideration.

Doug Nielsen, Owner
Wild Birds Unlimited
9322 South 700 East
Sandy, Utah 84070
801-566-0862

From: "Dawn Shiley" <silver_fem@hotmail.com>
To: <psscal@state.ut.us>
Date: Mon, Mar 20, 2000 7:30 PM
Subject: new area code for Wasatch Front

In the 16 March 2000 edition of the Daily Herald there was an article about the need for a new area code. This message is to let you know that I do not support the overlay proposal. It would be very inconvenient and confusing to have two area codes in the same calling area.

Please choose the plan where Salt Lake County keeps the 801 area code and Davis and Utah Counties receive a new area code. This would have to be done in a short time anyway even if the overlay plan was adopted.

Thank you for giving my opinion consideration.

Cordially,
Dawn Shiley
Springville

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

From: "D.J. Baxter" <djbaxter@home.com>
To: <psscal@state.ut.us>
Date: Sun, Mar 19, 2000 6:36 PM
Subject: Area Code Comments

I am writing to offer my comments regarding a new area code. I think that we should enable all current and future Salt Lake County residents and businesses to use the 801 area code. I am strongly opposed to the idea of having 10-digit dialing for all numbers.

Thank you,

D.J. Baxter
1532 Ramona Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

From: "Craig K. Sedgwick" <SedgwickCK@ldschurch.org>
To: <psscal@state.ut.us>
Date: Sun, Mar 19, 2000 11:18 PM
Subject: Area Codes

This is a plea to make the new area code divisions on geographical lines. Who wants to dial 10 digits every time you call anywhere---even next door? Please consider what it will do to the average phone user, not just the businesses that may have to reprint letterhead, etc.

Thanks,

Craig Sedgwick
e-mail: SedgwickCK@ldschurch.org

From: Cochran Shirley I Civ OO-ALC/LICS <Shirley.Cochran@HILL.af.mil>
To: "psccl@state.ut.us" <psccl@state.ut.us>
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2000 11:02 AM
Subject: New Area Code

I want to voice my opinion about the need for a new area code. I want the new area code to be assigned a specific geographical area, and NOT an overlay on the existing area codes. Thank you. Shirley Cochran

Handwritten notes:
E
crow 3/21
ag

RECEIVED

MAR 16 8 43 AM '00

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Handwritten note:
3/17/2000 - Call from a Mary
Voicing opinion for
geographic split

From: <BLC4UWNU@aol.com>
To: <psscal@state.ut.us>
Date: Thu, Mar 16, 2000 10:49 AM
Subject: NEW AREA CODE

I am opposed to the overlay option for the new area code. Please assign it to a geographical region / area..

RECEIVED
MAR 16 10 51 AM '00
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

From: "eliots" <eliots@gateway.net>
To: <psscal@state.ut.us>
Date: Wed, Mar 15, 2000 7:38 PM
Subject: New Utah Area Code

The following is a new release from the California Public Utilities Commission. California recently stopped the creation of numerous overlay area codes because of the public clamor over having to dial 11+ digits to call within the same area code.

I would ask you to consider the arguments in this news release and proceed with a geographic split of the Wasatch Front. Hopefully by the time the new area codes are full, the telecommunications industry will modernize and eliminate the need to create numerous new area codes.

I would suggest that you create two new area codes in Utah. One for Davis/Weber Counties and one for Utah County. According to growth data I seen on the NANPA web page, the creation of one area code for Salt Lake and another for the rest of the Wasatch Front, would only allow for 8 to 10 years of growth in each area code. A third area code would relinquish the need to have new area codes in Ogden and Provo for some time to come. Also, if the ring around Salt Lake is to get a new area code, it makes no difference whether you create one or two. Everyone in that area has to changes their numbers. It doesn't matter whether that number is 234 or 567.

Thank you for your consideration of my stance on this important matter.

Shawn Eliot
Citizen - Payson, UT

CPUC
NEWS RELEASE
California Public Utilities Commission
Headquarters Office: 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
Southern California: 320 West 4th Street, Suite 500 Los Angeles, California 90013
<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov>

[News Releases Home Page]

CONTACT:
Kyle DeVine 213-576-7050
September 16, 1999
CPUC - 546
(R95-04-043)

CPUC Stops 310 Overlay
The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) today stopped the implementation of the 424-310 area code "overlay" and eliminated 11-digit dialing in the Westside and South Bay areas of Los Angeles County. The decision pursues a variety of number conservation measures. Commission Joel Hyatt, who sponsored the proposal, applauded the Commission's action and said, "the Governor's leadership and intercession on this matter was critical to our acting on behalf of thousands of California customers."

RECEIVED
Mar 16 10 04 AM '00
PUBLIC UTILITIES
SERVICE COMMISSION

The decision reverses an earlier Commission decision in May 1998 that adopted the overlay plan, granting a request made by Assembly Member Wally Knox, Congress Member Henry Waxman and a number of other parties. The "customer resistance and disruption generated by the implementation of 11-digit dialing," the decision states, "suggests that the hardships encountered by the public have been greater than those the Commission originally anticipated."

Until yesterday, September 15th, Federal Communications Commission (FCC) rules required that phone numbers be assigned to telecommunications providers in blocks of 10,000 for every "rate center" even if they only need a few numbers to serve their customers. As a result, the remaining numbers are not available for use by other companies. There are 16 rate centers in the 310 area code. If a telephone company wants to provide service over the entire 310 area, for example, it would end up with 160,000 numbers even if it only had 3,000 customers in the area. Yesterday, the FCC granted the CPUC's requests to implement several number conservation measures that would assure more efficient use of numbers in the 310 area and statewide. "We are pleased that the FCC has granted us the flexibility we need to implement a more efficient way of allocating and using telephone numbers," Commissioner Hyatt stated.

Rather than creating new area codes to respond to the exhaustion of telephone numbers, the Commission calls on the telecommunications industry to use information age technologies already in place in their networks to allocate numbers in blocks of 1,000 and to return blocks of unused numbers to a pool for their assignment to carriers who need them.

The Commission ordered a study to determine the extent to which numbers already allocated to telecommunications providers are being used. It directs the industry to form a numbering pool that will allow numbers to be allocated in blocks of 1,000 and companies must return unused blocks of numbers to the pool so they can be allocated to those that need them. It requires carriers to use up numbers from one block of 1,000 numbers before assigning numbers from another. In this way, untapped blocks of 1,000 numbers can be preserved.

The Commission authorizes the creation of a Number Pool that will require phone companies to be assigned numbers in blocks of 1,000. This number pool will be initially stocked with 160,000 numbers. Thousand-block number pooling will extend the life of the 310 area code and will assure a more efficient use of phone numbers.