Section 1 - Division of Records and Report	(RAR) Completes	
Docket No. 990517-TL Date Docketed: 0	04/22/1999 Title: Request for re 904 area code.	eview of proposed numbering plan relief for the
Company: ALLTEL Florida, Inc. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Northeast Florida Telephone Company Sprint-Florida, Incorporated		
Official Filing Date: Last Day to Suspend: Expira	ition:	
Referred to: ADM AF ("()" indicates OPR)	APP CAF (CMU) EAG	GCL LEG RAR RRR WAW
Section 2 - OPR Completes and returns to RAR	in 10 workdays.	Time Schedule
Program/Module B12 Staff Assignments	IT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT FOR UPDATES CONTACT THE RECO	ORDS SECTION: (850) 413-6770
OPR Staff	Current CASR revision level	in the second of
		Previous Current
	_ 2	
Staff Counsel	_ 4	
<u>OCRs</u> ()		
	8.	
()	10.	
	12.	
()	16.	
	_ 10.	
()	20.	
	_ 22. 23.	
	24. 25.	
()	26. 27.	
Recommended assignments for hearing and/or deciding this case:	31.	DOCUMENT NO.
Full Commission Commission Panel _ Hearing Examiner Staff	34	
Date filed with RAR:	37.	
Initials: OPR Staff Counsel	38. 39. 40.	17-200 01
Section 3 - Chairman Completes		
Hearing Officer(-)	Assignments are as follows:	TL716
- Hearing Officer(s)	na C+off	- Prehearing Officer 72720
	rg. Staff xam.	Commissioners ADM 72715
ALL GR DS CL UN SC		GR DS CL JN JC 727
Where panels are assigned the senior Commission	oner is Panel Chairman;	
the identical panel decides the case. Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or assigned the full Commission decides the case	a Staff Member is	Approved:
PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/98)	* COMPLETED EVENTS	

Case Assignment and Scheduling Record Section 1 - Division of Records and Reporting (RAR) Completes Date Docketed: 04/22/1999 Title: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the Docket No. 990517-TL 904 area code. Company: ALLTEL Florida, Inc. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Northeast Florida Telephone Company, Inc. Sprint-Florida, Incorporated Official Filing Date: Last Day to Suspend: Expiration: Referred to: APP ADM AFA CAF (CMU) EAG GCL WAW ("()" indicates OPR) Χ X Section 2 - OPR Completes and returns to RAR in 10 workdays. Time Schedule WARNING: THIS SCHEDULE IS AN INTERNAL PLANNING DOCUMENT. IT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO REVISION. Program/Module B12 FOR UPDATES CONTACT THE RECORDS SECTION: (850) 413-6770 Staff Assignments Current CASR revision level Due Dates OPR Staff Ileri, J Audu 0 Previous Current Close Docket or Revise CASR NONE 07/15/1999 2 3 Staff Counsel B Keating 4 5. OCRs () 6 8 9 10. () 11 12. 13.

Initials: OPR Staff Counsel Section 3 - Chairman Completes

Date filed with RAR: 05/05/1999

Recommended assignments for hearing

and/or deciding this case:

Full Commission X Hearing Examiner

)

)

Assignments are as follows:

14 15

16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26.

27. 28. 29. 30.

31

32.

34

35 36

37 38

39.

40.

- Hearing Officer(s)

Commission Panel

Staff

| | Comm: | issio | ners | | | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff |
|-----|-------|-------|------|----|----|---------------|-------|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | EXaiii. | |
| Х | | | | | | | 0 |

Where panels are assigned the senior Commissioner is Panel Chairman; the identical panel decides the case. Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

- Prehearing Officer

| | Comm | ission | ners | | ADM |
|----|------|--------|------|----|-----|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | |
| | | | Χ | | · |

| Approv | red: _ | -RIA | m |
10 |
|--------|--------|-------|---|--------|
| Date: | 05/05 | /1999 | | |
| | | | | |

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/98)

* COMPLETED EVENTS

 \wedge

To:

| X | Commissioner Deason |
|---|----------------------------|
| х | Commissioner Clark |
| Х | Commissioner Johnson |
| | Commissioner Jacobs |
| х | Executive Director |
| X | Public Information Officer |
| | |

Deputy Ex. Director/Technical

х Appeals Director Legal Director X

Auditing & Financial Analysis Director

X Communications Director Consumer Affairs Director X

Electric & Gas Director X

Records & Reporting Director

Research Director Х

Water & Wastewater Director

х Court Reporter

Staff Contact - M Keating

From: Office of Chairman Joe Garcia

Docket No. 990517-TL

Title: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

X

1. Schedule Information

| Event | Former Date | New Date | Location | Time |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------|------------------|-------------|
| Prehearing Conference | | 11/17/1999 | Tallahassee, 152 | 13:30-17:00 |
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | Deltona | 10:00-12:00 |
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | St. Augustine | 16:00-18:00 |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | Jacksonville | 10:00-12:00 |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | Lake City | 14:00-16:00 |
| Hearing | | 03/13/2000 | Tallahassee, 148 | 13:30-17:00 |

Remarks: Involves docket(s) 990517-TL

2. Hearing/Prehearing Assignment Information:

Former Assignments

| | Co | mmis | ssione | rs | | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff |
|-----|----|------|--------|----|----|---------------|-------|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | | | | | | | |

New or Changed Assignments

| | Con | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------------|-------|----|----|-----|--|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | X | X | X | X | | (4) | |

Prehearing Officer

Hearing

| | (| Comm | issio | ners | |
|----|----|------|-------|------|-----|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ADM |
| | | | | | |

Commissioners GR DS CL JN ADM JC X

Reason for Reassignment: 1. Unavailability 2. Good Cause 3. Recused 4. Disqualified

Comments: Document ID is 99051701.CCS

Section 1 - Division of Records and Reporti. (RAR) Completes

| Docket No. 990 | 517-TL | Date | Docketed | : 04/22 | /1999 | Title: | | | | f pro | posed | numbe | ring | plan r | elief | for the |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|--|----------|-------------|---------|-------|------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| North | outh Tele
east Flo | a, Inc.
ecommunica
rida Telep
a, Incorpo | phone Com | nc.
pany, In | c. | | 904 a | rea cod | e. | | | | | | | |
| Official Filing
Last Day to Susp | Date:
pend: | | Ex | piration | : _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Referred to:
("()" indicates | OPR) | | ADM | AFA | APP | CAF | (CMU) | EAG | GCL | LEG
X | RAF | R R | RR | WAW | | |
| Section 2 - OPR | Complete | es and re | turns to | RAR in 1 | 0 workd | lays. | | | | Ti | me Sch | nedul e | | | | |
| Program/Module | B12 | | | | WARNIN | G: THIS | SCHEDU | JLE IS / | AN INTER | NAL P | LANNIN | NG DOC | UMENT | | | |
| | | aff Assign | | | FOR UP | DATES C | ONTACT | THE REC | TO REV
CORDS SE | CTION | : (850 | 0) 413 | -6770 | | Due | Dates |
| OPR Staff | L Ileri | , J Audu | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | Р | revious | s Current |
| | | | | | 1. N | otice o | f Issu | _
e Ident' | ificatio | n | | | | | NONE | 10/08/1999 |
| | | | | | 2. 0 | rder Es
ssue Id | tablish | ning Pro | ocedure | | | | | | NONE
NONE | 10/08/1999 |
| Staff Counsel | B Keati | ng | | | 4. N | otice o | f Preh | earing (| Conferen | ce | | | | | NONE | 11/01/1999 |
| OCRs () | | | | | 5. <u>P</u> | reheari
reheari | ng Star
ng | tements | | | | | | _ | NONE
NONE | 11/03/1999 |
| Many and a second secon | | | | | 7. D | irect T
otice o | estimor | nies Due | 2 | | | | | | NONE
NONE | 12/15/1999 01/05/2000 |
| | | | | | 9. S | ervice | Hearing | (Delta | ona 10AM | | | | | | NONE | 01/26/2000 |
| () | | | | | 10. <u>s</u> | ervice
ervice | Hearing | (St Au | ugustine
sonville | 4-6PI | 1)
-12N) | | | | NONE
NONE | 01/26/2000
01/27/2000 |
| | | | | | 12. S | ervice | Hearing | (Lake | City 2- | 4PM) | | | | | NONE | 01/27/2000 |
| | | | | | 14. T | estimon
echnica | l Hear | ing (Tal | lahasse | e) | | | | | NONE
NONE | 02/11/2000 03/13/2000 |
| | | | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | - - | 15. B | riefs D | ue | | | | | | | - | NONE
NONE | 03/27/2000 04/20/2000 |
| () | | | | | 17. A | genda - | Regula | ar | | | | | | | NONE | 05/02/2000 |
| | | | | | 18. S | tandard | Order | | CASR | | | | | - | NONE
NONE | 05/23/2000
06/23/2000 |
| | | | | | 20. | | | | | | | | | | NONE | 00/23/2000 |
| () | | | | | 21 | | | | | | | | | - | | - |
| | | | | | 23 | | | | | | | | | _ | | - |
| | | | | | 24. | | | | | | | | | _ | | - |
| () | | | | | 26. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 27 | · | | | | | | | | - | | - |
| | | | | | 29. | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| Recommended ass | ianments | for hear | ina | | 30 | | | | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | | | | - | | - |
| and/or deciding | | | | | 32 | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| Full Commission | on | Commiss | sion Pane | X | 34. | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| Hearing Examin | ner | Staff | | | 35 | | | | | | | | | - | | - |
| Date filed with | RAR: 06 | /29/1999 | | | 37 | | | | | | | | | - - | | |
| Initials: OPR | | | | | 38 | | | | | | | | | - | | - |
| | f Counse | ι | | | 40. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - Char | irman Cor | mpletes | , |): | | | | al Laura | | | | | | | | |
| | | Hearing (| Officer/s | | MSS I GIIII | ents ar | e as it | ottows. | | - Drei | nearir | ng Off | icer | | | |
| | | | Ji i i cei (s | T | I | | | | r | 2000 | | | Teer | | 7 | |
| | Commis | ssioners | | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff | | | | | Comm | ission | ners | | ADM | | |
| ALL | GR | DS CL | JN JC | | | | | | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | | |
| 1 1111111111111111111111111111111111111 | Х | х х | х | | | | | | | | | х | | | | |
| Where panels are | | | | issioner | is Pan | ∟
el Chai | rman; | | | | | 11 | , | | | CERR |
| Where one Commis | | | | roras | taff M≏ | mber is | | | Appro | ved: | | 181. | m | 1 | | - 21013 |
| assigned the ful | | | | | | | | | Date: | 06/ | 29/199 | 99 | | | | |

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/98)

* COMPLETED EVENTS

Date Docketed: 04/22/1999 Title: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the

3 (RAR) Completes

| Nort
Spri | South Te
heast Fl
nt-Flori | elecon
lorida
ida, 1 | municat
a Telepho
(ncorpora | one Com | nc.
pany, In | nc. | | 904 a | rea cod | ie. | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|--|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---------|-------|-------|-----|--------------------------------------|--|
| Official Filin
Last Day to Su | g Date:
spend: | - | | Ex | oiration | n: _ | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| Referred to:
("()" indicate | s OPR) | | | ADM | AFA | APP | CAF | (CMU) | EAG | GCL | LEG
X | RAR | P | PAI | WAW | | |
| Section 2 - OP | R Comple | etes a | and retur | ns to I | RAR in ' | 10 work | days. | | | | Tir | ne Sche | edule | 2 | | | |
| Program/Module | | Staff | Assignme | ents | | IT IS | TENTA1
PDATES | S SCHEDUTIVE AND | SUBJEC
THE RE | T TO REV | ISION. | | | | 77 | | |
| OPR Staff | | | Audu, L | | | 200-380-170 | | SR revisi |] | | - | | | | _ | Previous | |
| Staff Counsel | | | | | | 2. <u>9</u>
3. <u>4. j</u> | Order E
Issue I
Prehear | of Issue
stablish
dentific
ing Stat
Testimor | ation
ements | ocedure | | | | | | SAME
SAME
SAME
SAME | 10/08/1999
10/08/1999
10/29/1999
11/03/1999
12/15/1999 |
| OCRs () | | | | | | 6.
7.
8.
9. | Service
Service
Service
Service | Hearing
Hearing
Hearing
Hearing | (St A
(Jacks)
(Lake | ona 10AM
ugustine
sonville | 4-6PM | 1) | | | | SAME
SAME
SAME | 01/26/2000
01/26/2000
01/27/2000
01/27/2000 |
| () | | | | 110 | | 10. 1
11. 1
12. 1 | Testimo
Notice
Prehear
Notice | ony - Reb | outtal
earing (| Conferen | ice | | | | | SAME
/01/1999
/17/1999
SAME | 02/11/2000
02/11/2000
02/18/2000
02/28/2000
03/13/2000 |
| () | 3 | | | | | 15. <u>1</u>
16. <u>9</u>
17. <u>1</u> | Briefs
Staff R
Agenda
Standar | | lation | | | | | | | SAME
SAME
SAME | 03/27/2000
04/20/2000
05/02/2000
05/23/2000
06/23/2000 |
| () | | | | | | 20.
21.
22.
23. | | | | | | | | | | JANE | |
| () | | | | | | 25.
26.
27. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommended as:
and/or deciding
Full Commiss | this c | ase: | hearing | | X | 30.
31.
32.
33. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Commiss
Hearing Exam | ner | S | taff | | - | 35. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date filed with
Initials: OPR | RAR: 0 | 6/29/ | 1999 | | | 37. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | f Couns | el _ | | | | 40. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - Cha | | | <u>tes</u>
ring Off | icer(s) | | Assignm | ments a | re as fo | llows: | | - Preh | earing | Off | icer | | | |
| | Comm | issio | ners | | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff | f : | | | | Commi | ssione | rs | - 17. | ADM | | |
| ALI | | DS | CL J | | EAdil's | | | | | GR | DS | | JN | JC | | _ | |
| Where panels ar | | | | r Commi | ssioner | is Par | nel Cha | irman; | | | | | x | | | | 200 |
| the identical p | anel de | cides | the cas | e. | | | | | | Appro | ved: | J | 5/ | 200 | 2 | | CSRA |

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/98)

Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

Section 1 - Division of Records and Repoi

Docket No. 990517-TL

Date: 07/30/1999

To: Commissioner Deason Deputy Ex. Director/Technical Electric & Gas Director Records & Reporting Director Commissioner Clark Appeals Director X Х Commissioner Johnson Legal Director Research Director X X X Commissioner Jacobs Auditing & Financial Analysis Director Water & Wastewater Director X **Executive Director** Communications Director Court Reporter х Public Information Officer Consumer Affairs Director Staff Contact - M Keating X

From: Office of Chairman Joe Garcia

Docket No. 990517-TL

Title: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

1. Schedule Information

| Event | Former Date | New Date | Location | Time |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------|------------------|-------------|
| Prehearing Conference | | 11/17/1999 | Tallahassee, 152 | 13:30-17:00 |
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | Deltona | 10:00-12:00 |
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | St. Augustine | 16:00-18:00 |
| Service Hearing (PM) | | 01/27/2000 | Jacksonville | 10:00-12:00 |
| Service Hearing | 4 | 01/27/2000 | Lake City | 14:00-16:00 |
| Hearing | | 03/13/2000 | Tallahassee, 148 | 13:30-17:00 |

Remarks: Involves docket(s) 990517-TL PANEL ASSIGNED TO THREE MEMBERS.

2. Hearing/Prehearing Assignment Information:

Former Assignments

| | Co | mmis | ssione | rs | | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff |
|-----|----|------|--------|----|----|----------------------|-------|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ena caracteria de la | |
| | X | X | 5 | X | | e
RA | |

New or Changed Assignments

| | Co | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------|-------|----|----|--|--|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | X | X | | X | | | |

Prehearing Officer

Hearing

| | (| Comm | ommissioners | | |
|----|----|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| GR | DS | DS CL JN JC ADM | ADM | | |
| | | | X | | |

| | Commissioners | | | | |
|----|---------------|----|----|----|-----|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ADM |
| | | | | | |

Reason for Reassignment: 1. Unavailability 2. Good Cause 3. Recused 4. Disqualified 5. See Remarks

Comments: Document ID is 99051702.CCS

Printed on 07/30/1999 at 17:18:46

Page 1 of 1

| Electric & Gas Director
Records & Reporting Director
PAI Director
Water & Wastewater Director
Court Reporter
Staff Contact - Beth Keating |
|--|
| Staff Contact - Beth Keating |
| Staf |

From: Office of Chairman Joe Garcia

Docket Number: 990517-TL

Docket Title:

Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

1. Schedule Information

| Event | Former Date | New Date | Location | Time |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | Deltona | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | St. Augustine | 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | Jacksonville | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | Lake City | 2:00 PM - 4:00 PM |
| Prehearing Conference | 11/17/1999 | 02/18/2000 | Tallahassee, Room 152 | 1:30 PM - 5:00 PM |
| Hearing | | 03/13/2000 | Tallahassee, Room 148 | 1:30 PM - 5:00 PM |

2. Hearing/Prehearing Assignment Information

Former Assignments

Hearing Officers

| Con | nmıs | sion | ers | Exam. | Staff | |
|-----|------|------|-----|----------------------------|-------|-------|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | | | | Commissioners GR DS CL JN | | Exam. |

Current Assignments

| | Con | nmis | sion | Hearing Exam. | Staff | | |
|-----|-----|------|------|---------------|-------|--|--|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | X | X | | X | | | |

Prehearing Officer

| | Co | omm | issic | oner | S |
|----|----|-----|-------|------|-----|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ADM |
| | | | | | |

| | Co | omm | issic | ner | S |
|----|----|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ADM |
| | | | X | | |

Reason for Revision: A. New Assignment 1. Unavailability 2. Good Cause 3. Recused 4. Disqualified 5. See Remarks

Remarks:

Former form number is 061899130711

PSC/NAN 8 (06/1999) CCS Form Number: 990517-TL-00001

Case Assignment and Scheduling Record Section 1 - Division of Records and Repor (RAR) Completes Docket No. 990517-TL Date Docketed: 04/22/1999 Title: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code. Company: ALLTEL Florida, Inc. BellSouth Telecommunications. Inc. Northeast Florida Telephone Company. Inc. Sprint-Florida, Incorporated Official Filing Date: Last Day to Suspend: Expiration: Referred to: ("()" indicates OPR) APP CAF AFA (CMU) LEG PAI WAW X X Section 2 - OPR Completes and returns to RAR in 10 workdays. Time Schedule Program/Module B12 WARNING: THIS SCHEDULE IS AN INTERNAL PLANNING DOCUMENT. IT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO REVISION. FOR UPDATES CONTACT THE RECORDS SECTION: (850) 413-6770 Staff Assignments Current CASR revision level <u>Due Dates</u> OPR Staff L Ileri. J Audu, L Fulwood Previous Current Notice of Issue Identification 10/08/1999 Order Establishing Procedure SAME 10/08/1999 10/29/1999 11/03/1999 Issue Identification SAME Staff Counsel Prehearing Statements B Keating SAME Direct Testimonies Due SAME 12/15/1999 Service Hearing (Deltona 10AM-12N) Service Hearing (St Augustine 4-6PM) OCRs () 01/26/2000 01/26/2000 6. SAME SAME Service Hearing (Jacksonville 10AM-12N) SAME 01/27/2000 Service Hearing (Lake City 2-4PM) SAME Testimony - Rebuttal 10. SAME Notice of Prehearing Conference 11. 11/01/1999 02/11/2000 12. 13. Prehearing Notice of Hearing 02/18/2000 02/28/2000 Technical Hearing (Tallahassee) 14. SAME 15. Briefs Due SAME Staff Recommendation 04/20/2000 05/02/2000 16. 05/16/2000 17. Agenda - Regular 18. Standard Order 05/23/2000 06/06/2000 19. Close Docket or Revise CASR 06/23/2000 07/07/2000 20. 21 22 23 24. 25 26. 27 28 29 30. 31 Recommended assignments for hearing and/or deciding this case: 32 33 34 Full Commission Commission Panel Hearing Examiner -35 Staff 36 Date filed with RAR: 08/05/1999 37 38 Initials: 39 Staff Counsel 40

Section 3 - Chairman Completes

Assignments are as follows:

agenda careled. 5/2/2000

- Hearing Officer(s)

| | Comm | issio | ners | | | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff |
|-----|------|-------|------|----|----|---------------|-------|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | EXdIII. | |
| | Х | Х | | χ | | | |

Where panels are assigned the senior Commissioner is Panel Chairman: the identical panel decides the case. Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

- Prehearing Officer

| ADM | | ners | issio | Comm | |
|-----|----|------|-------|------|----|
| | JC | JN | CL | DS | GR |
| | | Χ | | | |

Date: Pending

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/98)

(RAR) Completes

| Docket No. 990 | 517-TL | | Date | Docket | .ed: | 04/22 | /1999 | Title | e: Reque | est for i | review | of prop | osed nu | umbering | plan relief | for the |
|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|---------|--------------|---------|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|-------------|--|--|
| North | L Florio
South Te
meast Florio
nt-Florio | lecomm
orida | nunica
Telep | hone C | Inc
Compa | ny, Ind | С. | | 904 6 | rea codi | е. | | | | | |
| Official Filing
Last Day to Sus | Date: | | | | Expi | ration | | | _ | | | | | | | |
| Referred to:
("()" indicates | OPR) | | | ADM | | AFA | APP | CAF | (CMU) | EAG | GCL | LEG
X | RAR | PAI | WAW | |
| Section 2 - OPF | Comple | tes an | nd ret | urns t | o RAI | R in 10 | 0 work | days. | | | | Tim | ie Sched | <u>dule</u> | | |
| <u>Program/Module</u> | | taff A | Assign | ments | | | IT IS | TENTA | HIS SCHED
ATIVE AND
S CONTACT | SUBJECT | T TO RE | VISION. | | | | |
| OPR Staff | L Iler | | | | ood | | Curr | ent C | ASR revis | ion leve | el | | | | Du€ | Dates |
| | | | | 12.7 | | | į. | | 4 | | | | | | Previou | s Current |
| Staff Counsel OCRs () | B Keat | | | | | | 2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8. | Issue
Prehea
Direct
Staff
Servia
Servia
Servia | e of Issue Identification State Testimon Testimon Ce Hearing H | cation
tements
onies Due
y
g (Delto
g (St Au | e
ona 10AM
ugustine
sonville | M-12N)
e 4-6PM
e 10AM- |)) | | SAME SAME SAME NONE SAME SAME SAME SAME SAME SAME SAME SAM | 10/08/1999
10/29/1999
11/03/1999
12/15/1999
12/17/1999
01/26/2000
01/26/2000
01/27/2000
01/27/2000 |
| () | | | | - 10 | | | 10.
11.
12.
13.
14. | Testin
Notice
Prehea
Techn
Brief:
Staff | nony - Re
e of Preh
aring
ical Hear
s Due
Recommer | buttal
learing &
ling (5/2 | & Heari | ng
000) | | | 02/11/200
11/01/199
02/18/200
03/13/200
03/27/200
05/04/200 | 00 04/21/2000
09 05/04/2000
00 05/11/2000
00 05/18/2000
00 06/23/2000
00 08/03/2000 |
| () | | | | | | | 17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24. | Standa
Close | a - Regul
ard Order
Docket o | r Revise | | | | | 06/06/200 | 00 08/15/2000
00 09/05/2000
00 10/05/2000 |
| () | | | | | | | 25. | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommended ass
and/or deciding | | | heari | ng | | | 31. | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Commiss
Hearing Exam | | | ommiss
taff | sion Pa | nel | _X_ | 35. | 20 | | | | | 1 175 | - | | |
| Date filed with | n RAR: <u>0</u> | 8/27/1 | 1999 | | | | 3/. | | | | | | | | | |
| Initials: OPR
Star | ff Couns | e1 _ | | | | | 39. | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - Cha | airman C | omplet | tes | | | | Accian | monts | are as | Follows: | | | | | | |
| | | - Hear | ring (| Officer | r(5) | | ASSIGN | ments | are as | TOTTOWS. | | - Preh | nearing | Officer | | |
| | Comm | ission | ners | - 2 | | Hrg. | Staf | f | | | | Comm | issione | rs | ADM | |
| ALI | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | Exam. | | | | | GR | DS | CL | JN JC | | |
| | X | X | | | Χ | | | | | | Χ | | | | | |
| Where panels at
the identical p
Where one Comm | panel de | cides | the o | case. | | | | | | | Appr | oved: | 7 | Jan | 1199 | CSRPI |
| assigned the fi | ull Comm | 1155101 | n dec | ides th | ne ca | se. | section ? | | 2.70 | | Date | : Pen | ding | 8/3 | 1199 | |

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/98)

Section 1 - Division of Records and Repor

* COMPLETED EVENTS

2

Printed on 08/23/1999 at 17:29:41

Page 1 of 1

| | X
X
X | Commissioner Deason
Commissioner Clark
Commissioner Johnson
Commissioner Jacobs
Executive Director
Public Information Officer | X
X
X
X | Deputy Executive Director/Technical
Appeals Director
Legal Director
Auditing & Financial Analysis Director
Telecommunications Director
Consumer Affairs Director | X
X
X | Electric & Gas Director
Records & Reporting Director
PAI Director
Water & Wastewater Director
Court Reporter
Staff Contact - Beth Keating |
|--|-------------|--|------------------|---|-------------|--|
|--|-------------|--|------------------|---|-------------|--|

From: Office of Chairman Joe Garcia

Docket Number: 990517-TL

Docket Title:

Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

1. Schedule Information

| Event | Former Date | New Date | Location | Time |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | Deltona | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | St. Augustine | 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | Jacksonville | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | Lake City | 2:00 PM - 4:00 PM |
| Prehearing Conference | 02/18/2000 | Cancelled | Tallahassee, Room 152 | 1:30 PM - 5:00 PM |
| Hearing | 03/13/2000 | Cancelled | Tallahassee, Room 148 | 1:30 PM - 5:00 PM |

2. Hearing/Prehearing Assignment Information

| Hearing | |
|----------|--|
| Officers | |

| | Con | Hearing
Exam. | Staff | | | | |
|-----|-----|------------------|-------|----|----|--|--|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | | | | 1 | | | |

Former Assignments

Current Assignments

| | Con | nmis | sion | ers | | Hearing Exam. | Staff |
|-----|-----|------|------|-----|----|---------------|-------|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | X | X | | | A | | |

Prehearing Officer

| Commissioners | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| GR DS CL JN JC ADM | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |

| Commissioners | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----|----|----|----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ADM | | | | | | |
| X | | | | | | | | | | | |

Reason for Revision: A. New Assignment 1. Unavailability 2. Good Cause 3. Recused 4. Disqualified 5. See Remarks

Remarks:

Former form number is 061899130711

PSC/NAN 8 (06/1999)

(RAR) Completes

Section 1 - Division of Records and R

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/98)

| Docket No. 990 |)517-TL | Da | ate Doc | keted: | 04/22 | 2/1999 | Title: | Reque | st for
rea cod | review (| of pro | posed n | umbering | plan relief | for the |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|----------|----------|---------------|----------------|----------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------|-------------|----------------------|--|
| North | South Te
neast Fl | da, Inc.
lecommur
orida Te
da, Incc | nication | e Comp | c.
any, Ir | IC. | | 904 d | rea cou | е. | | | | | |
| Official Filing
Last Day to Sus | Date: | | | Exp | iration | 1: _ | | | | | | | | | |
| Referred to: ("()" indicates | OPR) | | | ADM | | APP | CAF | (CMU) | EAG | GCL. | LEG
X | RAR | PAI | WAW | |
| Section 2 - OPR | Comple | tes and | | | | .0 workd | days. | | | | Tir | ne Sched | <u>dule</u> | | |
| Program/Module | B12 | | | | | WARNIN | NG: THI | S SCHED | ULE IS | AN INTER | RNAL PI | ANNING | DOCUMENT | <u>Γ.</u> | |
| | <u>S</u> | taff Ass | ignment | <u>s</u> | | FOR UP | PDATES | CONTACT | SUBJEC
THE RE | T TO REV | CTION | (850) | 413-6770 | | Dates |
| OPR Staff | <u>L Iler</u> | i, J Aud | lu, L Fu | boowlu | | Guire | SITE GAG | 5 | | C.I | | | | 3,000,000 | <u>Dates</u> |
| | | | | | | 1 1 | Issuo I | | cation | | | | | | s Current
9 10/20/1999 |
| | - | | | | | [C. L | Trect | Testimo
estimon | riy | | | | | SAME
SAME | 11/17/1999 |
| Staff Counsel | B Keat | ing | | | | 4. 5 | Service | Hearin | g (Delta | ona 10AN
ugustine | 1-12N) | W. | | SAME
SAME | 01/26/2000 |
| <u>OCRs</u> () | | | | | | 6. 3 | Service | Hearin | g (Jack | sonville | 10AM- | -12N) | | SAME
SAME
SAME | 01/26/2000
01/27/2000
01/27/2000 |
| | | | | | | 8. 1 | estimo | ny - Re | buttal | City 2 | 46(1) | | | 02/11/200 | 04/21/2000 |
| () | - | | | | | 10. N | Notice o | of Preh | earing a | & Hearin | ng | -2::::- | | 11/01/199 | 9 04/21/2000
9 05/04/2000
05/11/2000 |
| () | | | | 33. | | 12. 1 | echnica | al Hear | ing (5/ | 18-19/20
echnical | 000) | 200 | | 03/13/200 | 05/18/2000 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | NONE
03/27/200 | 05/26/2000 |
| () | | | | | | 15. § | genda | - Regul | dation
ar | | | | | 05/16/200 | 0 08/03/2000
0 08/15/2000 |
| | | | | | | 18. 7 | Close Do | ocket o | r Revise | e CASR | | | | 06/06/200 | 0 09/05/2000
10/05/2000 |
| 27 W | | ii. | | | | 20. | , | | | | | | | _ | |
| () | | | | | | 22 | 10 | | | | | | | 1 | |
| | | | | | | 24. | | | | | | | | | |
| () | | | | | | 600 | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| | | | | | | 27 | | | | | | | | | - |
| | | | | | | 29. –
30. – | - | | | | | | | | |
| Recommended ass
and/or deciding | ignment:
this ca | s for he
ase: | aring | | | 01. | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Full Commissi | on | Comm | ission | Pane1 | Χ | 33. | | | | | | | | | |
| Hearing Exami | ner | Staf | f | | | 35. | | | | | | | | | |
| Date filed with | RAR: 09 | 9/27/199 | 9 | | | 0/. | | | | | | | | | - |
| Initials: OPR
Staf | f Counse | el | | *** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - Cha | irman Co | ompletes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Assignm | nents ar | re as fo | ollows: | | | | | | |
| | | - Hearin | g Offic | er(s) | | | _ | | | | - Preh | nearing | Officer | | |
| | | issioner | S | _ | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff | | | | | Commi | ssioner | 'S | ADM | |
| ALL | 3790.74 | DS C | L JN | JC | | | | | | GR | DS | CL J | IN JC | | |
| | X | Х | | X | | | | | | Х | | | | | |
| Where panels ar
the identical p | anel ded | cides the | e case. | | | | | | | Appro | ved: | | Kla | - | |
| Where one Commi | ssioner | . a Hear | ing Exa | miner | or a S | taff Me | ember is | 5 | | COS1 5- 0 - | | -7 | 91201 | 96 | |

* COMPLETED EVENTS

Section 1 - Division of Records and Repc, .g (RAR) Completes

the identical panel decides the case.
Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/98)

| Docket No. 990 | 517-TL | | Date | Docketed | : 04/22 | /1999 | Title: | Reque | st for | review o | of pro | posed | numb | ering | plan relief | for the |
|--|----------------|----------|---------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--------|----------------------------------|---------|-------------|----------|----------|--------|--------|-------------|---|--------------------------|
| North | outh Te | lecom | munic
Tele | ations, I
phone Com
orated | nc.
pany, In | c. | | 904 a | rea cod | le. | | | | | | |
| Official Filing
Last Day to Sus | Date:
pend: | | | Ex | piration | : _ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Referred to:
("()" indicates | OPR) | | | ADM | AFA | APP | CAF | (CMU) | EAG | GCL | LEG
X | RAI | R I | PAI | WAW | |
| Section 2 - OPR | Comple | tes a | nd re | turns to | RAR in 1 | 0 work | days. | | | | Ti | me Sci | hedul | e | | |
| Program/Module | B12 | | | | | WARNI | NG: THIS | SCHED | ULE IS | AN INTER | NAL P | LANNII | NG DO | CUMENT | _ | |
| | <u>s</u> | taff / | Assig | nments | | FOR U | PDATES C | ONTACT | THE RE | CORDS SE | CTION | : (850 | 0) 413 | 3-6770 | | Dates |
| OPR Staff | L Iler | i, J | Audu, | L Fulwoo | <u> </u> | 0 | | 6 | 7 | | | | | | Previous | - Managarani - S |
| | | | | | | 1. | Issue Ic | lentifi | _
cation | | | | | | *************************************** | 10/20/1999 |
| | | | | | | 2. | Direct T | estimo | ny | | | | | | SAME | 11/17/1999 |
| Staff Counsel | B Keat | ing | | | | 4. | Staff Te
Service | Hearin | q (Jacks | sonville | 6PM- | BPM) | | | SAME
01/27/2000 | 12/17/1999
01/26/2000 |
| OCRs () | | | | | | 6. | Service
Service | Hearing | g (St A | ugustine | 10AM | -12N) | | | | 01/26/2000 |
| | | | | | | 7. | Service
Service | Hearin | g (Dayto | ona Beac | h 4PM | -6PM) | | | SAME
01/26/2000 | 01/27/2000 |
| | | | | | | 9. | Staff Wo | rkshop | | | | | | | SAME | 04/06/2000 |
| () | | | | | | 11. | Staff Wo
Testimor
Preheari | ng Sta | tements | | | | | | 11/03/1999 | 04/21/2000 |
| | | | | | | 12. | Notice o | t Preh | earing 8 | & Hearir | ng | | | | 11/01/1999 | 05/04/2000 |
| | | | | | | 14. | Preheari
Technica | l Hear | ing (5/ | 18-19/20 | 100) | | | | | 05/18/2000 |
| , , | | | | | | 15. | Transcri | pts Du | e for Te | echnical | Hear | | | | SAME | 05/26/2000 |
| () | | | | | | 17. | Briefs D
Staff Re | commen | dation | | | | | | | 08/03/2000 |
| | | | | | | 18. | Agenda -
Standard | Regul | ar | | | | | | 05/16/2000 | 08/15/2000 |
| | | | | | | 19. | Standard
Close Do | Order | r Revise | e CASR | | | | | 06/06/2000 | 09/05/2000 |
| () | | - 10 | | | | 21. | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 22. | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | 24. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1107 - XO-7 | 11 11 11 | 11 | | | 25. | -:- | | | | | | | | | |
| () | | | | | | 27. | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| | | | | | | 28. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 30. | | | | | | | | | - 1 | |
| Recommended assi | | | hear | ing | | 31. | | | | | | | | | | |
| and/or deciding | this c | ase: | | | | 32. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Commission | on | Co | ommis | sion Pane | L X | 34. | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Hearing Examin | ner | S | taff | | | 35. | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Date filed with | RAR: 0 | 9/27/ | 1999 | | | 37. | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Initials: OPR
Staff | f Couns | el _ | | | | 39. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - Char | rman C | omple | tee | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 5 that | THICH C | Ompte | 000 | | | Assign | ments ar | e as f | ollows: | | | | | | | |
| | | - Hear | ring (| Officer(s |) | | | | | | - Pre | heari | ng Of | ficer | | |
| | Comm | ission | ners | | Hrg. | Staf | f | | | | Comm | ission | ners | | ADM | |
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN JC | Exam. | | | | | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| . 166 60 | X | X | - | X | | | | | | x | | | | | | |
| L | | | | | L | | | | | | | L | | | | |
| Where panels are
the identical pa
Where one Commis | nel de | cides | the o | case. | | | | | | Appro | ved: | -9 | 14 | m | ~ | CSRA |

* COMPLETED EVENTS

Date: 11/01/1999

Printed on 11/01/1999 at 16:22:25

Page 1 of 2

| To: | X
X
X | Commissioner Deason
Commissioner Clark
Commissioner Johnson
Commissioner Jacobs
Executive Director
Public Information Officer | X
X
X
X | Deputy Executive Director/Technical
Appeals Director
Legal Director
Auditing & Financial Analysis Director
Telecommunications Director
Consumer Affairs Director | X
X
X | Electric & Gas Director Records & Reporting Director PAI Director Water & Wastewater Director Court Reporter Staff Contact - Beth Keating |
|-----|-------------|--|------------------|---|-------------|---|
| | | | | | | 0 |

From: Office of Chairman Joe Garcia

Docket Number: 990517-TL

Docket Title:

Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

1. Schedule Information

| Event | Former Date | New Date | Location | Time |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | Lake City | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | Jacksonville | 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | St. Augustine | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | Daytona Beach | 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/28/2000 | Deltona | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Prehearing Conference | 02/18/2000 | Cancelled | Tallahassee, Room 152 | 1:30 PM - 5:00 PM |

2. Hearing/Prehearing Assignment Information

Former Assignments

| | Con | nmis | sion | ers | | Hearing
Exam. | Staff |
|-----|-----|------|------|-----|----|------------------|-------|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |

Current Assignments

| | Con | nmis | sion | ers | | Hearing
Exam. | Staff |
|-----|-----|------|------|-----|----|------------------|-------|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | X | X | | | A | | |

Prehearing Officer

Hearing Officers

| | Co | omm | issic | ner | S |
|----|----|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ADM |
| | | | | | |

| | Co | omm | issic | ner | S |
|----|----|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ADM |
| X | | | | | |

Reason for Revision: A. New Assignment 1. Unavailability 2. Good Cause 3. Recused 4. Disqualified 5. See Remarks

Former form number is 061899130711. PLEASE NOTE THE LOCATION AND TIME CHANGES. Remarks:

Printed on 11/01/1999 at 16:22:25

Page 2 of 2

| Commis X Commis X Commis X Executi | ssioner Deason
ssioner Clark
ssioner Johnson
ssioner Jacobs
ve Director
nformation Office | X Appeal X Legal I X Auditin X Teleco | s Director
Director | | Water & Wastewater Direct |
|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| From: Office of | Chairman Joe Ga | ırcia | | | |
| Docket Number | 990517-TL | | | | |
| Docket Title:
1. Schedule Info | | of proposed numb | ering plan relief fo | or the 904 area code. | |
| Eve | ent | Former Date | New Date | Location | Time |
| Hearing | | 03/13/2000 | Cancelled | Tallahassee, Room 148 | 8 1:30 PM - 5:00 PM |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2. Hearing/Preh | earing Assignme | ent Informatio | n | | |
| | Form | er Assignment | S | Current | Assignments |
| Hearing
Officers | Commissio | oners Hear | | Commissione | ers Hearing Staff Exam. |
| | ALL GR DS C | L JN JC | | ALL GR DS CL X X | JN JC A |
| Prehearing | | | | | |

Reason for Revision: A. New Assignment 1. Unavailability 2. Good Cause 3. Recused 4. Disqualified 5. See Remarks

Commissioners

GR DS CL JN JC ADM

Remarks: Former form number is 061899130711. PLEASE NOTE THE LOCATION AND TIME CHANGES.

Commissioners

GR DS CL JN JC ADM

PSC/NAN 8 (06/1999)

Officer

Printed on 11/01/1999 at 16:22:25

Page 1 of 2

| To: | X Commissioner Deason Commissioner Clark X Commissioner Johnson X Commissioner Jacobs X Executive Director X Public Information Officer | X
X
X
X | Deputy Executive Director/Technical
Appeals Director
Legal Director
Auditing & Financial Analysis Director
Telecommunications Director
Consumer Affairs Director | XXX | Electric & Gas Director
Records & Reporting Director
PAI Director
Water & Wastewater Director
Court Reporter
Staff Contact - Beth Keating |
|-----|---|------------------|---|-----|--|
|-----|---|------------------|---|-----|--|

From: Office of Chairman Joe Garcia

Docket Number: 990517-TL

Docket Title:

Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

1. Schedule Information

| Event | Former Date | New Date | Location | Time |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | Lake City | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/26/2000 | Jacksonville | 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | St. Augustine | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/27/2000 | Daytona Beach | 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM |
| Service Hearing | | 01/28/2000 | Deltona | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| Prehearing Conference | 02/18/2000 | Cancelled | Tallahassee, Room 152 | 1:30 PM - 5:00 PM |

2. Hearing/Prehearing Assignment Information

Former Assignments

| Hearing
Officers | | Con | nmis | sion | ers | · | Hearing
Exam. | Staff |
|---------------------|-----|-----|------|------|-----|----|------------------|-------|
| | ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | - 1 | | | | | | | - |

Current Assignments

| | Con | nmis | sion | ers | | Hearing
Exam. | Staff |
|-----|-----|------|------|-----|----|------------------|-------|
| ALL | GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | | |
| | X | X | | | Α | | |

Prehearing Officer

| | Co | omm | issic | ner | S |
|----|----|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ADM |
| | | | | | |

| | Co | omm | issic | ner | S |
|----|----|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| GR | DS | CL | JN | JC | ADM |
| X | | | | | |

Reason for Revision: A. New Assignment 1. Unavailability 2. Good Cause 3. Recused 4. Disqualified 5. See Remarks

Remarks: Former form number is 061899130711. PLEASE NOTE THE LOCATION AND TIME CHANGES.

PSC/NAN 8 (06/1999)

Printed on 11/01/1999 at 16:22:25

Page 2 of 2

| Commi
X Commi
X Commi
X Executi | ssioner Deason
ssioner Clark
ssioner Johnson
ssioner Jacobs
ve Director
information Office | X Appeal X Legal I X Auditin X Teleco | s Director
Director | | X Rec
X PA
Wa
X Co | I Director
ter & Waste
urt Reporter | oorting Director ewater Director |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| From: Office of | Chairman Joe Ga | rcia | | | | | |
| Docket Number | : 990517-TL | | | | | | |
| Docket Title: | Request for review | of proposed numb | ering plan relief fo | or the 904 area code. | | | |
| 1. Schedule Info | rmation | | | | | | |
| Ev | ent | Former Date | New Date | Location | | Ti | me |
| Hearing | | 03/13/2000 | Cancelled | Tallahassee, Room | 148 | 1:30 PM - | 5:00 PM |
| | | | | | | | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | |
| | · | | | | | | |
| | *************************************** | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2. Hearing/Preh | earing Assignme | nt Informatio | on | | | | |
| 444 | Form | er Assignment | s | Curi | rent Assi | gnments | |
| Hearing
Officers | Commissio | oners Hear | _ | Commiss | ioners | Hearing
Exam. | Staff |
| | ALL GR DS C | | | ALL GR DS | CL JN J | IC . | |
| | | | | | | A | |
| Prehearing
Officer | Commission | oners | | Commiss | ioners | | |
| | Horacon Lancon Louisian Louisian | and the second second | | | | 1 | |

Reason for Revision: A. New Assignment 1. Unavailability 2. Good Cause 3. Recused 4. Disqualified 5. See Remarks

Remarks: Former form number is 061899130711. PLEASE NOTE THE LOCATION AND TIME CHANGES.

PSC/NAN 8 (06/1999)

Printed on 03/30/2000 at 12:53

Page 1 of 1

| Commis Commis Commis X Executiv | ssioner Deason
ssioner Clark
ssioner Jacobs
ssioner Jaber
ve Director
nformation Office | X Appeal
X Legal I
X Auditin
X Teleco | s Director
Director | Analysis Director
Director
rector | X Rec
X PA
Wa
X Con | ctric & Gas Director
cords & Reporting Director
I Director
ter & Wastewater Director
urt Reporter
ff Contact - Beth Keating |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|
| | Chairman Joe Ga | rcia | | | | |
| Docket Number: | 990517-TL | | | | | |
| Docket Title:
1. Schedule Info | 70 CO | of proposed numb | ering plan relief fo | or the 904 area code. | _ | |
| Eve | ent | Former Date | New Date | Location | | Time |
| Staff Workshop | | | 04/06/2000 | Tallahassee, Room | 148 | 9:30 AM - 12:00 PM |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
|) Heaving/Pych | earing Assignme | nt Informatic | <u> </u> | | | |
| 2. mearing/fren | | er Assignment | | Curr | rent Assi | gnments |
| Hearing
Officers | Commission | | ring Staff | Commiss | | Hearing Staff Exam. |
| | ALL GR DS C | L JC JB | | ALL GR DS | CL JC . | JB X |
| Prehearing
Officer | Commission | oners | | Commiss | ioners | |
| JIIICI | GR DS CL JC | JB ADM | | GR DS CL JC | јв Аг | DM
K |
| Reaso | on for Revision: A. 1 | New Assignment | 1. Unavailabilit | y 2. Good Cause 3. Re | cused 4. | Disqualified 5. See Remarks |

CCS Form Number: 990517-TL-00003

(Related dockets: 990455, 990456, 990457).

Remarks:

| Section 1 - Di | vision of Record | s and Report | ing (R | AR) Completes | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---------------|--|-------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|--------|---|--|
| Docket No. 99 | 0517-TL Dat | te Docketed: | 04/2 | <u>2/1999</u> Title: | Request for i | review o | of propo | sed numi | bering | plan relief | for the |
| Bell:
North | EL Florida, Inc.
South Telecommun
heast Florida Te
nt-Florida, Incon | ications, Ir
Lephone Comm | nc. | | 904 area code | е. | | | ă | 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | |
| Official Filing
Last Day to Sus | g Date:spend: | - Exp | iration | 1: | | | | | | | |
| Referred to: ("()" indicates | s OPR) | ADM | AFA | APP CAF | (CMU) EAG | GCL | LEG
X | RAR | PAI | WAW | |
| Section 2 - OPF | R Completes and r | eturns to R | AR in 1 | .0 workdays. | | | | Schedu1 | le | | |
| Program/Module | B12
Staff Assi | gnments | | WARNING: THIS
IT IS TENTATIVE
FOR UPDATES CO | E AND SUBJECT | TO REV | ISION. | | | | |
| OPR Staff | L Ileri, J Audu | ı, L Fulwood | <u> </u> | Current CASR | revision leve | 1 | | | | Due | <u>Dates</u> .
Current |
| | | | | 1. Rebuttal/ | Supplemental
Prehearing & | Testimo | ny (to S | Staff's) | i | SAME | 105/01/2000 |
| Staff Counsel | B Keating | | | 3. Prehearin | Hearing (5/1
ts Due for Te | 8-19/20 | 00) | | | 02/18/2000 | 05/04/2000
05/11/2000
05/18/2000 |
| <u>OCRs</u> () | | | | 6. Briefs Du
7. Staff Red
8. Agenda | e
commendation | | | | | 05/04/2000
05/16/2000 | 05/26/2000
06/23/2000
08/03/2000
08/15/2000 |
| () | | | | 9. Standard
10. Close Doc
11.
12. | ket or Revise | | | | | 106/06/2000 | 09/05/2000
10/05/2000 |
| | | | | 13.
14.
15. | | | | | | | |
| () | | | | 17. | | | | | | | |
| | 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1 | | | 19.
20. | | | | | | - | |
| () | | | | 21.
22.
23. | | | | | | | |
| () | | | | 24.
25.
26. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 27. | | | | | | | |
| Recommended ass and/or deciding | ignments for hea this case: | ring | | 29.
30.
31.
32. | | | | | - 0 | | |
| Full Commissi
Hearing Exami | on Commi
ner Staff | ssion Panel | _X_ | 33.
34. | | | | | | | |
| Date filed with | RAR: <u>09/27/1999</u> | | - | 36.
37. | | | | | | | |
| Initials: OPR
Staf | f Counsel | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - Cha | irman Completes | | | Assianments and | falle | | | | | | |
| | - Hearing | Officer(s) | , | Assignments are | as TOTTOWS: | , | - Prehea | ring Of | ficer | | |
| | Commissioners | | Hrg. | Staff | | | Commiss | ioners | | ADM | |
| ALL | GR DS CL | JC JB | Exam. | | | GR | DS C | L JC | JB | | |
| | XX | X | | | | Х | | | | | |
| Where one Commis | e assigned the se
anel decides the
ssioner, a Hearin | case.
ng Examiner | or a St | | man; | Approv | ved: 🚤 | #Sfe | - | _ | |
| assigned the fu | 11 Commission dec | cides the ca | ise. | | | Date: | 04/27/ | 2000 | | | |

* COMPLETED EVENTS

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 2/00)

Section 1 - Division of Records and Reporting (KAR) Completes

| Docket No. 9 | 90517-TI | | Date | Dockete | 1: 04/22 | 2/1999 | Title: | Reque | st for
rea cod | review | of pro | posed | numberi | ing pl | an relief f | or the |
|--|---|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|------------|--------------------|---------|----------|--------|---------|--------|--|--|
| Nor | 1South 7 | elecor
lorida | mmunica
a Telen | ations,
ohone Com
orated | Inc.
mpany, Ir | ıc. | | 904 d | rea cou | е. | | | | | | \$ h. |
| Official Fili
Last Day to S | ng Date
uspend: | K 194 | | E. | kpiration | 1: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Referred to:
("()" indicat | es OPR) | | | ADM | | APP | CAF | (CMU)
X | EAG | GCL | LEG
X | RAR | PAI | . W | IAW | |
| Section 2 - 0 | | etes a | and ret | | RAR in 1 | | davs . | | | | | me Sch | edule | | | |
| Program/Modul | 19-3-19-3-19-3-19-3-19-3-19-3-19-3-19-3 | | | | | | NG: THI | S SCHED | ULE IS | AN INTE | | | | MENT. | | |
| One of the state o | | Staff | Assign | nments | | IT IS | TENTAT
IPDATES
ent CAS | IVE AND | SUBJECT
THE REC | T TO RE | VISION | | | | Duo | Dates |
| OPR Staff | LIle | eri. J | Audu | | | Curi | ent cas | 8 | | eı | | | | | 5000 | Current |
| | 11-11-11-11 | | | | | 1 | Prehear | | | | | | | | | [05/11/2000 |
| | - | | <u> </u> | | | 2. | Technic
Transcr | al Hear | ing (5/ | 18-19/2 | 000) | ina | | | 03/13/2000
SAME | 05/18/2000
05/18/2000
05/26/2000 |
| Staff Counsel | В Ке | iting | | | | 4 | Briefs | Due | | | | | | | 03/27/2000 | 06/23/2000 |
| <u>OCRs</u> () | | | | | | 6. | Staff Ri
Agenda | | | | | | | | 08/15/2000 | 08/17/2000
08/29/2000
09/18/2000 |
| | | | | | | 8. | Standar
Close D | ocket o | r Revis | e CASR | | | | | 10/05/2000 | 10/19/2000 |
| | 11 | | <u> 41 m</u> | | | IU. | | | | | | | | | | |
| () | | | | | | 12. | | | ; long- | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 14. | | | | | | | | | | |
| () | | | | | | 10. | 27 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3 | | | | | 1/. | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | - | | | | | 12. | | | | | | | | | | |
| () | | | | | | 21. | | | | | | | | | . (3. 16 10 10 11 11 11 | |
| | | | | | | 122. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 64. | | | | | | | | | H-1700 H | |
| () | | | | | | 20. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 27. | | | | ii | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 29.
30. | 200-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00- | | | | 19 | | | | | |
| Recommended a | | | hear | ing | | 31. | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| and/or decidi | | | | | | 32. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Commis
Hearing Exa | | | | sion Pane | el <u>X</u> | 34.
35.
36. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date filed wi | th RAR: | 05/03/ | /2000 | | | 37. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Initials: OP
St | R
aff Cour | nsel | | | | - WW | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - C | nairman | Comple | etes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Assign | ments a | re as f | ollows: | | | | | | | |
| r | | - Hea | aring (| Officer(| 5) | | | | | | - Pre | hearin | g Offic | er | | |
| | Cor | nmissio | ners | | Hrg.
Exam | Staf | f | | | | Comm | ission | ers | | ADM | |
| А | LL GF | DS | CL | JC JI | | | | | | GR | DS | CL | JC J | IB | | |
| | Х | Х | | Х | | | | | | Х | | | | | | |
| Where panels the identical | | | | | nissioner | is Pa | inel Cha | irman: | | Appr | oved: | | 10/ | ~ | | na. |

Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 2/00)

* COMPLETED EVENTS

Date: 05/03/2000

C

Section 1 - Division of Records and Reporting (RAR) Completes

Docket No. 951056-WS

Date Docketed: 09/05/1995 Title: Application for rate increase in Flagler County by Palm

Coast Utility Corporation.

Company: Palm Coast Utility Corporation

Official Filing Date:

Last Day to Suspend:

 $\frac{02/12/1996}{04/12/1996} \ \ \, 8 \, \, \text{MoExpiration};$

10/12/1996

Referred to: ("()" indicates OPR)

ADM AFA APP CAF CMP CMU EAG (ECR) GCL LEG PAI RAR RGO SER WAW

Section 2 - OPR Completes and returns to RAR in 10 workdays.

Time Schedule

| Program/Module | Al(a) | WARNING: THIS SCHEDULE IS AN INTERNAL PLANNING DOCUMENT.
IT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO REVISION. | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| 000 0++44 | Staff Assignments | FOR UPDATES CONTACT THE RECORDS SECTION: (850) 413-6770 Current CASR revision level | Due I | <u>Dates</u> |
| OPR Staff | M Willis, T Merchant. S Moniz,
T Rendell | 7 | Previous | Current |
| Staff Counsel | J Fudge. R Gervasi | 1. Staff Recommendation 2. Agenda 3. Standard Order 4. Close Docket or Revise CASR | NONE
NONE
NONE
NONE | 09/14/2000
09/26/2000
10/16/2000
11/16/2000 |
| OCRs (RGO) | D Vandiver | 5. | | |
| () | | 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. | | |
| () | | 15.
16.
17.
18. | | |
| () | | 20.
21.
22.
23. | | |
| () | | 25.
26. | | |
| Recommended ass
and/or deciding | ignments for hearing this case: | 31.
32. | | |
| Full Commission
Hearing Examin | on Commission Panel <u>X</u>
ner Stäff | 34. | | |
| | RAR: 09/18/2000 | 37. | | |
| Initials: OPR
Staf | f Counsel | 38.
39.
40. | | |

Section 3 - Chairman Completes

Assignments are as follows:

- Hearing Officer(s)

| | Comm | issio | ners | | Hrg.
Exam. | Staff | |
|-----|------|-------|------|----|---------------|----------|--|
| ALL | DS | JC | JB | BZ | ХХ | E.XdIII. | |
| | X | Χ | | Χ | | | |

Where panels are assigned the senior Commissioner is Panel Chairman; the identical panel decides the case

Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

- Prehearing Officer

| ADM | | Commissioners | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------|----|----|----|--|--|--|--|
| | XX | BZ | JВ | JC | DS | | | | |
| | | χ | | | | | | | |

Approved:

Date: 09/18/2000

Last Revised 10/09/2000 at 08:29 Printed on 10/09/2000 at 17:04

Page 1 of 1

| | X
X
X | Commissioner Jaber
Commissioner Baez
New Commissioner-SC
Executive Director | Deputy Executive Director/Tech X Appeals Director X Legal Director X Economic Regulation Director Competitive Services Director X Consumer Affairs Director | Safety & Electric Reliability Director X Records & Reporting Director X PAI Director X Regulatory Oversight Director X Court Reporter X Staff Contact - Trish Merchant |
|--|-------------|--|---|--|
|--|-------------|--|---|--|

From: Office of Chairman Terry Deason

Docket Number: 951056-WS

Docket Title:

Application for rate increase in Flagler County by Palm Coast Utility Corporation.

1. Schedule Information

| Former Date | New Date | Location | Time |
|-------------|--|--|--|
| 02/19/2001 | Cancelled | Tallahassee, Room 152 | 9:30 AM - 12:00 PM |
| 03/20/2001 | Cancelled | Flagler County | 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM |
| 03/20/2001 | Cancelled | Flagler County | 12:00 PM - 5:00 PM |
| 03/20/2001 | Cancelled | Flagler County | 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM |
| 03/21/2001 | Cancelled | Flagler County | 10:00 AM - 5:00 PM |
| | 02/19/2001
03/20/2001
03/20/2001
03/20/2001 | 02/19/2001 Cancelled
03/20/2001 Cancelled
03/20/2001 Cancelled
03/20/2001 Cancelled | 02/19/2001 Cancelled Tallahassee, Room 152 03/20/2001 Cancelled Flagler County 03/20/2001 Cancelled Flagler County 03/20/2001 Cancelled Flagler County |

2. Hearing/Prehearing Assignment Information

Former Assignments

| Hea | ring |
|-----|------|
| Off | cers |

| | Cor | nmi | ssio | ners | | Hearing
Exam. | Staff | |
|-----|-----|-----|------|------|----|------------------|-------|--|
| ALL | DS | JC | JВ | BZ | SC | | - | |
| | | | | | | | 1 | |

Current Assignments

| | Cor | nmi | ssion | ners | | Hearing
Exam. | Staff |
|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|----|------------------|-------|
| ALL | DS | JC | JB | BZ | SC | | |
| | | | | X | X | | |

Prehearing Officer

| | C | omn | nissio | oner | S |
|----|----|-----|--------|------|-----|
| DS | JC | JB | BZ | SC | ADM |

| | C | omn | nissio | oner | s |
|----|----|-----|--------|------|-----|
| DS | JC | JB | BZ | SC | ADM |
| | | | X | | |

Reason for Revision: A. New Assignment 1. Unavailability 2. Good Cause 3. Recused 4. Disqualified 5. See Remarks

Remarks:

PSC/JBE 8 (06/1999)

CCS Form Number: 951056-WS-00001-008

(RAR) Completes

Section 1 - Division of Records and Repor

| N
S | LLTEL
ellSou
orthea
print- | Florio
th Tel
st Flo
Florio | da, Ir
lecomm
brida
da. Ir | nc.
Munic
Tele
Ncorp | atio | ons. In
ne Comp | | | | | 904 ar | | | ., ., | p. 9p | | | | P 1811 | relief | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|---|----------|---------|------------------|------------|-------|-------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Official Fi
Last Day to | ling D
Suspe | ate:
nd: | | | | Exp | oiratio | n: _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Referred to ("()" indic | | | | | | , | ADM AF | A APP | CAF | (CMF | | EAG | | | LEG
X | PAI | RAR | RGO | SER | WAW | | |
| Section 2 - | OPR C | omplet | es ar | nd re | turr | ns to f | RAR in | 10 work | days | | | | | - KP | Tim | ie Sch | nedu1 | 2 | | | | 1 0 |
| Program/Mod | <u>ule</u> B | 12 | | | | | | WARNI | NG: | THIS | SCHEDU
/E AND | JLE IS | AN I | NTERN | IAL PL | ANNI | NG DO | CUMEN | <u>T.</u> | | | |
| | | St | aff A | Assig | nmer | nts | | FOR U | PDAT | ES CO | NTACT
revisi | THE R | ECORD | S SEC | TION: | (850 |)) 413 | 3-6770 | 0 | Due | e Dates | |
| OPR Staff | L | Heri | , J A | Audu | | 7, 7 | | Juni | CITO | 0,1011 | 10 | 7 | 101 | | | | | | | - | us Cu | |
| | _ | | | | | | | 1. | Spec | ial A | L
Agenda | 」
(Defe | rred | from | 9/5/0 | 0) | | | Т | SAME | | 9/2000 |
| | | | | | | | | 2. | Stan | idard | Örder
cket or | | | | | | | | $-\left \frac{1}{1}\right $ | 0/02/200
1/02/200 | $\frac{10}{10}$ | 4/2000
4/2000 |
| Staff Couns | <u>el</u> <u>B</u> | Keati | ng | | | | | 4.
5. | | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | _ | 10 |
| <u>OCRs</u> () | 1 | | | | | | | 6.
7. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | 8. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| () | | | | | | | | 10. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | | | 12. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| x 1 | _ | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | 15. | | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | | |
| () | - | | | | | | | 1/. | | | | · | | | | | | | _ - | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | 18.
19.
20. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| () | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | 23. | | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | _ | |
| () | _ | | | | | | | 25. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V 7 | - | | | | | | | 27. | - | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| | _ | | | | | | | 29. | | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | | |
| Recommended and/or deci | | | | hear | ing | | | 31. | | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | _ | |
| Full Comm | ission | | Сс | ommi s | sion | n Pane | X | 33.
34. | | | | - | | | | | | | _ - | | | |
| Hearing E | xamine | r | St | caff | | | - | 35.
36. | | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | | |
| Date filed | with R. | AR: <u>09</u> | 9/06/2 | 2000 | | | | 138. | | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | | |
| Initials: | OPR
Staff | Counse | 91 _ | | | | | 39. | | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - | Chair | man Co | mplet | <u>ces</u> | | | | Assign | mont | c are | as fo | 11 Julie | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | - Hear | rina | Off. | icer(s |) | naargii | ilici re | ,5 ui c | . 03 10 | 7110W3 | | | Preh | earir | na Of | ficer | | | | |
| | | was in the same | ssion | | A. 1 | | Hrg. | Staf | f | | | | | · · · · · · | Commi | | | NeSe f | ADI | м | | |
| in the second | ALL | DS | JC | JB | В | 3 XX | Exam | 100000000000000000000000000000000000000 | * | | | | | DS | JC. | JB | BB | XX | 1 | | | |
| - | | X | Х | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Where panel | s are | L
assigr | ned th | ne se | l
nior | Comm | Issione | r is Pa | nel | Chair | rman; | | 22 | | | | A . 1 | | | | | |
| the identic
Where one C | al pan
ommiss | el dec
ioner. | ides
a He | the
earin | case
g Ex | e.
xaminer | or a ! | | | | | | | pprov | | | - 1 | 81 | ~ | | | <u> </u> |
| assigned th | e full | Commi | ssion | ı dec | ides | s the o | case. | | | | | | D | ate: | 09/0 | 6/200 | 00 | | | | | |

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 2/00)

* COMPLETED EVENTS

C

| Section 1 - Div | /ision o | of Rec | ords | and F | Repor | _(R | AR) C | Comp | letes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|----------------|---------------|-----------|----------------|----------|------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|----------------|----------------|-------|----------|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|----------|------------|--|
| Docket No. 990 |)517-TL | | Date | e Dock | eted: | 04/2 | 2/199 | 99 | Title: | Rec | quest | for | revi | ew of | f pro | posed | numb | ering | pla | an rel | ief f | or the |
| North | L Flori
South Te
neast Fl
nt-Flori | lecom | munic
Tele | ephone | Comp | c.
any, I | nc. | | | 504 | are | a co | ue. | | | | | | | ř | | |
| Official Filing
Last Day to Sus | Date:
spend: | | | | Exp | iratio | n: | _ | | E. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Referred to:
("()" indicates | OPR) | | | | Α | DM AF | A AP | P
— | CAF (C | MP) C | MU . | EAG | ECR | GCL | LEG
X | PAI | RAR | RG0 | SE | ER WA | W | |
| Section 2 - OPF | Comple | tes a | nd re | eturns | to R | AR in | 10 wo | rkd | lays. | | | | | | Ti | me Sc | hedu1 | <u>e</u> | | | | |
| Program/Module | | taff . | Assig | nment | <u>.s</u> | | FOR | IS
UP | IG: THI
TENTAT
DATES | IVE A | ND S | UBJE(
HE RI | CT TO
ECORD | REV1 | SION | gi i i i | | | | | 2 | Destate |
| OPR Staff | L Iler | | | | | | Cu | irre | ent CAS | _ | 11 | n rev | veı | | | | | | | D | | <u>Dates</u> |
| | | | | | | | 1 | т | ssue I | L | | tion | | | | | | | , | | 2 . marros | Current |
| | | | | | | | 2 | 2. 0 | ssue I
Irder E
Irect | stab1 | ishi | ng Pi | roced | ure | | | | | _ | NO
NO | NË | 01/12/2001
01/26/2001
02/16/2001 |
| Staff Counsel | B Keat | ing | | | | | 4 | . N | otice | of Pr | ehea | ring | and | Heari | ng | | | | _ | NO
NO | NE | 03/07/2001
03/09/2001 |
| <u>OCRs</u> () | | | | | | | 6 | . <u>P</u> | rehear | ing S | tate | ments | | | | | | | _ | NO
NO | NE | 03/14/2001 03/28/2001 |
| | | | | | | | 8 | . P | rehear
rehear
rehear | ing T | rans | cript | ts | | | | | | | NO
NO | NE | 03/30/2001
04/03/2001 |
| () | | | | | | | 1.0 | | earing
ranscr | | | | | | | | | | _ | NO
NO | NE | 04/09/2001
04/18/2001 |
| | The second section of the second sections | | | | | | | | riefs
taff R | | | | | | | | | | _ | NO
NO | NE | 05/02/2001
06/14/2001 |
| | | | | | | | 14 | . A | genda
tandar | | | CTOIT | | | | | | | | NO
NO | NE | 06/26/2001
07/16/2001 |
| () | | | | | | | 1 16 | . C | lose D | ocket | or | Revis | se CA | SR | | | | | = | NO | NE | 08/16/2001 |
| | | | | | | | 18 | : = | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| / 1 | | | | | | | 20 | i. – | | | | | | | | | | | - 1 | | | |
| () | | | | | | | 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | —% | | | |
| | | | | | | | 24 | | | | | | | | 100 | | | | - 1 | | | |
| () | | | | | | | 26 | - | | | | | | | - | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | | | 28 | : - | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | - |
| Company of the control of the contro | | | | LIZVIK-V-1 | <u> </u> | | 30 | : - | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | |
| Recommended ass
and/or deciding | | | hear | ing | | | 32 | : - | | | | | | 9 | | | | | - 89 | | | |
| Full Commissi
Hearing Exami | on
ner | Co
S | ommis
taff | sion | Panel | <u>X</u> | 34
35 | - | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| Date filed with | | | | | | | 37 | | | | | | | 1,5 | | | | | - | | | |
| Initials: OPR
Stan | f Couns | el _ | | | | | - 00 | 197 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - Cha | irman C | omple | tes | | | | | | | | | 2: | | | | | | | | | | CSRA |
| | | Haza | | 0.66: - | /\ | | ASS1 | gnm | ents a | re as | TOI | I OWS : | | | | Francisco (1864) | | | | | | ************************************** |
| | | - Hear | 1.50 | UTTIC | er(s) | Lucia | T 61 | | | | | | г | | | 3 (2-80)(2 1 2) | ng Of | ficer | т — | | | |
| | | ission | | 1 07 | 1 00 | Hrg.
Exam | | aff | | | | | - | | | issio | | 1 | ļ ^A | ADM | | |
| ALL | | JC | JB | BZ | XX | - | | | | | | | - | DS | JC | JB | BZ | XX | | | | |
| Libono 1 | X | X | | X | <u> </u> | | | 0 | | | | | , L | X | | | | | | | | |
| Where panels ar | anel de | cides | the | case. | | | | | | | | | A | pprov | ed: | | | | | | | |
| Where one Commi
assigned the fu | 11 Comm | , a He | earin
n dec | g Exa
ides | the c | or a :
ase. | Statt | Me | inder 1 | S | | | D | ate: | | 08/20 | | | | | | TV |

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 2/00)

(RAR) Completes

Section 1 - Division of Records and Repor

| Docket No. | 99051 | 7-TL | | Date [| Docket | ed: | 04/22 | /1999 | Titl | e: Reque | st for
rea co | r revi | iew of | prop | osed | numbe | ring | plan | relief | for the |
|----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------|--------------|----------------------------|
| N | ellSout
orthea: | th Te [*]
st Flo | lecom
orida | nc.
municat
Teleph
ncorpon | hone Co | | | С. | | 304 u | | , de . | | | | | | | | |
| Official Fi
Last Day to | ling Da
Susper | ate:
nd: | | | 3 | Expi | ration | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Referred to ("()" indic | :
ates O | PR) | | | | AD | M AFA | APP | CAF | (CMP) CMU | | | | | PAI | | RG0 | SER | WAW | |
| Section 2 - | OPR Co | omplet | tes a | nd reti | urns to | o RA | R in 1 | 0 work | days. | | | | | | ie Sch | nedule | | | | |
| Program/Mod | ule B | 12 | | | | | | WARNIN | NG: T | HIS SCHED | ULE IS | AN I | INTERN | IAL PL | ANNIN | IG DOC | UMENT | | | |
| | | <u>S1</u> | taff . | Assignr | ments | | | FOR UF | PDATE | ATIVE AND
S CONTACT
ASR revis | THE R | RECORD | OS SEC | CTION: | (850 |)) 413 | -6770 | 6 | Due | Dates |
| OPR Staff | L | Iler: | i. B | Casey | | | | Curre | ent C | ASK revis | \neg | eveı | | | | | | | 16 | <u>Dates</u>
us Current |
| | | | | | | | | 1 1 | DECON | SIDERATIO | | NOTE | ASSTO | NMENT | · ns | : 10 | | T | SAME | 12/08/2000 |
| | - | | | <u> </u> | | | | 2. | Issue | Identifi | cation | 1 | | | (anti- | 1100 | | _ _ | SAME
SAME | 01/16/2001
01/26/2001 |
| Staff Couns | <u>el B</u> | Keat | ing | | | | | 4. | Staff | Establis
Recommend
t Testimo | dation | (Ost | teen (| Custom | er Ba | llot) | | _ _ | NONE
SAME | 02/08/2001 02/16/2001 |
| OCRs () | - | | | | | | | 6.7 | Agend | | | and | Heari | na | | | 1111 | _ - | NONE
SAME | 02/20/2001 03/07/2001 |
| | - | | | | | | | 8. F | Rebut | tal Testi | mony | | | | | | | | SAME
NONE | 03/09/2001 03/12/2001 |
| () | 1000 | | | | | | 2.00 | 10. F | rehe | ard Order
aring Sta
aring | tement | S | | | | | | _ - | SAME
SAME | 03/14/2001 03/28/2001 |
| 8 7 | _ | | | | | | | 12. F | rehe | aring Tra
aring Ord | | | | | | | | _ _ | SAME
SAME | 03/30/2001 |
| | - | | | | | | | 14. F | Heari | ng
cripts Du | | | | | | | | - - | SAME
SAME | 04/09/2001
04/18/2001 |
| () | _ | | | | | | | I 16. E | Brief | s Due
Recommen | | | | | | | | - - | SAME
SAME | 05/02/2001
06/14/2001 |
| | _ | | | | | | | 18. 7 | Agend | a
ard Order | | | | | | | | _ _ | SAME
SAME | 06/26/2001
07/16/2001 |
| () | - | | | - | | | · · · · · · · · | 20. 0 | Close | Docket o | r Revi | se CA | ASR | | | | | _ | SAME | 08/16/2001 |
| Λ / | | | | | | | | 22. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | | | 24 | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | _ |
| () | - | | | | | | | 26
27. | | | - | | - 35 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 28. | | :- | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommended | assim | nment | s for | hearir | na | | | 30. | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | _ |
| and/or deci | ding th | his ca | ase: | (icur (i | ng. | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ - | | _ |
| Full Comm
Hearing E | ission
xamine | r | C
S | ommiss
taff | ion Pai | nel | X | 34.
35. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date filed | with R/ | AR: <u>0</u> | 1/24/ | 2001 | | | | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Initials: | | Counse | el _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - | Chair | man Co | omple | tes | | | | | -90.000 V +04. | - A100.0 A100 0.0 | | 2= | Lu | res) | 4. | 6,0 | 9 0 | acld | led | |
| | | | | | | 2 | | Ass1gnr | nents | are as f | Ollows | 5: | | | | | | | | |
| 100 | | | | ring O | fficer | (s) | 176 | T | \equiv | | | | | | | ng Off | ncer | | .] | |
| | 01.7 | Г | issio | T T | 0.7 | DI | Hrg.
Exam. | Staf | | | | | 10 | Commi | | | D. | ADN | ή | |
| | ALL | JC | DS | JB | | PL | | | | | | | JC | DS | JB | BZ | PL | | | |
| 116-22 | | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | 72 | Х | | | | | | |
| Where panel
the identic | al pane | el ded | cides | the ca | ase. | | | | | | | 1 | Approv | /ed: | Z | g / | | | ilian i | |
| Where one C
assigned th | ommiss
e full | Comm | . a H
issio | earing
n decid | Exami
des the | ner
e ca | or a S
se. | tatt Me | ember | 15 | | [| Date: | 01/2 | 6/200 |)1 | | | | |
| PSC/RAR-15 | (Rev. 2 | 2/00) | | | | | | | * | COMPLETED | EVENT | TS . | | | | | | | | C |

(RAR) Completes

| Docket No. 9 | 90517- | TL | | Date [| ocketed | 1: 04/2 | 2/1999 | Title: | Reques | st for | revi | ew of | prop | osed | numbe | ering | plan | relief · | for the |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|----------------|-------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Nor | 1South
theast | Tele | ecomn | nunicat | ions, l
none Com
rated | nc.
npany, I | nc. | | 904 aı | rea co | ae. | | | | | | | | |
| Official Fili
Last Day to S | ng Dati
uspend | e: . | | | Ex | piratio | n: _ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Referred to: ("()" indicat | es OPR |) | | | | ADM AF | A APP | CAF (C | MP) CMU | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 2 - 0 | PR Com | plete | es ar | nd retu | irns to | RAR in | 10 work | | | | | | | 1000 | edule | | | | |
| Program/Modul | <u>e</u> B12 | | | | | | WARN] | NG: THI | S SCHEDU | JLE IS | AN I | NTERN | IAL PL | ANNIN | IG DOC | UMENT | | | |
| | | | | Assignm | | | FOR L | TENTAT
JPDATES
ent CAS | CONTACT | THE R | ECORD | S SEC | SION.
TION: | (850 |) 413 | 3-6770 | | Due | Dates |
| OPR Staff | | | | | | | | | 13 | 7 | | | | | | | | |
s Current |
| | | | | | | | 1. | Standar | | | een C | ustom | ers | | | | Т | SAME | [03/12/2001 |
| | | | | | | | 2. | Standar
Standar
Revised | d Order
CASR Di | - Set
Je | tleme | nt | | | | | - - | NONE
NONE | 03/26/2001 08/17/2001 |
| Staff Counsel | B Ke | eatir | ng | | | | 4.
5. | | | | | | | | | | - - | | |
| OCRs () | - | | | | | | 6. | | | | | | | | | | = = | | |
| | | | | | | | 0. | | | | | | | | | | 200 | | - |
| () | - | | | | | | 10. | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| | - | | | | | | 12. | | | | | | | | | | - 1 | | |
| | - | 7.5 | | | | | 14. | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| () | - | | | | | | 10. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 10. | | | | | | | | | | 544 | | - |
| () | - | | | | 11 - | | 20. | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| | | | | | | | 66. | | | | | | | | | | - 1 | | |
| | | | | | | | 67. | | | | | | | | | | . 15.5. | | |
| () | | | | | | | 26. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | | 28. | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommended as | ecianma | ontc | for | hoarin | 10 | | 30. | | | | | | | | | | - - | | |
| and/or decidi | ng this | s cas | se: | ilear ii | ig | | 32. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Commis
Hearing Exam | | | | ommissi
aff | on Pane | 1 <u>X</u> | 34.
35. | | | | | | | | | | = = | | |
| Date filed wi | th RAR | : 03/ | 09/2 | 2001 | | | 36.
37. | | | | | | | | | | - - | | |
| Initials: OPI | R
aff Cou | unsel | - | | | | 38.
39.
40. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - C | nairmar | n Con | plet | es | | | | | | | | . 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | V271 | 1 201 | 120 3 | 9 | Assign | ments a | re as fo | llows | : | | 13. W | | | | | | |
| | | | | | ficer(s | | 1 | _ | | | Г | | Preh | | | icer | 0.000 | | |
| | | ommis | | | p7 - | Hrg.
Exam | | 1 | | | | | Commi | | | | ADM | 1 | |
| Al | | | DS | | BZ PL | | | | | | | JC | DS | JB | BZ | PL | | _ | |
| | | X | X | | X | | 1 | | • 000 had not 100 a had 100 a | | L | | X | | | | | | |
| Where panels a | panel | deci | des | the ca | se. | | | | | | A | pprov | ed: . | 8 | . < | m | _ | | |
| Where one Commassigned the | nissior
full Co | ner.
ommis | a He
sion | earing
n decid | Examine
les the | r or a :
case. | staff M | ember i: | S | | D | ate: | 03/1 | 2/200 | 1 | | | | |

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 2/00)

Section 1 - Division of Records and Report

(RAR) Completes

Docket No. 990517-TL Date Docketed: 04/22/1999 Title: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code. Company: ALLTEL Florida, Inc. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Northeast Florida Telephone Company, Inc. Sprint-Florida, Incorporated Official Filing Date: Expiration: Last Day to Suspend: Referred to: ADM AFA APP CAF (CMP) CMU EAG ECR GCL LEG PAI RAR RGO SER WAW ("()" indicates OPR) X Section 2 - OPR Completes and returns to RAR in 10 workdays. Time Schedule WARNING: THIS SCHEDULE IS AN INTERNAL PLANNING DOCUMENT. IT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO REVISION.
FOR UPDATES CONTACT THE RECORDS SECTION: (850) 413-6770 Program/Module B12 Staff Assignments Current CASR revision level Due Dates Ileri, C Bulecza-Banks, OPR Staff B Casey 14 Previous Current 05/15/2001 Agenda 2. Standard Order NONE 06/04/2001 Revise CASR or Close Docket NONE 07/09/2001 Staff Counsel B Keating 5. OCRs (67 9 10 11. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27) 28 29 30 31 32 Recommended assignments for hearing and/or deciding this case: 33 34 Full Commission Commission Panel Hearing Examiner 35 Staff 36 37 Date filed with RAR: 05/02/2001 38. Initials: OPR 39 Staff Counsel 40 Section 3 - Chairman Completes Assignments are as follows: - Hearing Officer(s) - Prehearing Officer Hrg. Commissioners Staff Commissioners ADM Exam. ALL JC DS JB BZ PL JC DS JB BZ PL X X X X Where panels are assigned the senior Commissioner is Panel Chairman: the identical panel decides the case. Approved:

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 2/00)

Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

Section 1 - Division of Records and Report

Date: 05/02/2001

Florida Cable Telecommunications Association

Steve Wilkerson, President

VIA FACSIMILE

April 29, 1999

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RE: FPSC Docket No. 990517-TL

Dear Ms. Bayo:

I am writing to request that the Florida Cable Telecommunications Association, Inc. ("FCTA") be placed on the mailing list of persons interested in monitoring the above-referenced docket. Please send all mailings to the following:

Michael A. Gross
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs & Regulatory Counsel
Florida Cable Telecommunications Association, Inc.
310 North Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850/681-1990 Tel.
850/681-9676 Fax
E-Mail Address: GROSSFCTA@aol.com.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please contact me with any questions.

Yours very truly,

Michael A. Gross

Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

& Regulatory Counsel

MAG:mi

Done 5/04/98

KECENTED-FROM

The parties are Volusia County and the City of Deltona. Their mailing address information can be found in Docket No. 981795-TP. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

8:09am

Done 5/17/199

MEMORANDUM

May 5, 1999

RECEIVED

MAY 05 1999

FPSC - Records/Reporting

TO : Division of Records and Reporting

FROM : Division of Communications (ILERI)

RE: Docket No. 990517-TL - In re: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

Attached are correspondence letter, fax and e-mail to be filed on the correspondence side in the above-referenced dockets.

LI Attachments From: TERRYYAW @ SMTP (Terry Yawn) {terryyawn@sfcc.net} To: CAF Internet E-mail

Subject: fwd: area code boundaries

Return-Path: <terryyawn@sfcc.net> Received: from grucom2 (209.251.129.9)

by mail.psc.state.fl.us (Connect2-SMTP 4.30A.1000128)

for <CONTACT@PSC.STATE.FL.US>: Tue, 8 Dec 1998 15:12:47 -0500

Received: from [198.190.223.42] by grucom2 (NTMail 3.02.13) with ESMTP id pa396619 for

<CONTACT@PSC.STATE.FL.US>: Tue. 8 Dec 1998 15:18:50 -0500

Message-ID: <366D88B3.D0404DF6@sfcc.net> Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 15:14:43 -0500 From: Terry Yawn <terryyawn@sfcc.net> X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: CONTACT@PSC.STATE.FL.US Subject: area code boundaries

Content-Type: text/plain: charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I live and work in Alachua County. I often have need to phone people on either side of the 904/352 boundary. I have learned some of the codes by trial and error (at considerable cost of time and money). I have tried repeatedly to obtain (from any source) a detailed map of the area code boundaries. Surely such must be available from your regulatory agency as you had to vote to approve/disapprove the gerry-mandering when it was put in force.

Although a hard copy would be useful. I think a website devoted to this purpose would not only perform a true public service, it would cost less than printing and distributing thousands of maps, and doing it again each time a revision is necessary (make one change on the website map. and your done, and the update is instantly available to the public). Alternatively, require the various phone companies to provide FREE access to their directories so we can get that information for ourselves, instead of paying 75 cents or more per number checked (outrageous!)

Your reply is appreciated, and by email is fine with me.

Terry Yawn terryyawn@sfcc.net Gainesville, FL

Fwd to: Pamela Johnson, Ruth McHargue

Fwd to: Della Kimberl CC: Ruth McHargue

Good morning Della, for CMU review/handling. Thanks.

| Printed | by | Levent | Ileri | 12 4/98 | 10:37am |
|---------|----|--------|-------|---------|---------|
|---------|----|--------|-------|---------|---------|

From: Levent Ileri Confirm receipt

To: MAIL @ SMTP {terryyawn@sfcc.net}

Subject: Area Code Boundaries

CC: Sally Simmons

Dear Ms. Yawn:

Thank you for your e-mail message dated 12/8/98. We truly appreciate your concerns and suggestions regarding providing information on area codes as a part of the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) on Florida Public Service Commission's web site.

The Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) staff is currently working on providing information which are mostly asked by customers and the industry, including the recent NPA-NXX assignments in the form of a spreadsheet and a pdf format, maps of Florida area codes (past, now, and future), and a map of Florida local exchange telephone companies.

We hope that the FAQ web site of FPSC including the maps will be in effect early this year.

Thank you again for your concerns, and if you have any questions, please either send me an e-mail or call me at (850) 413-6562.

Sincerely,

Levent Ileri Engineer, Division of Communications Florida Public Service Commission Law Offices

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

RECEIVED-FPSC

99 MAY 12 AM 11: 01

315 South Calhoun Street Suite 600

P.O. Drawer 810 (ZIP 32302-0810) Tallahassee, Florida 32301

850-224-7000 FAX 850-224-8832 www.hklaw.com

RECURSS AND

REPORTING

Atlanta

Northern Virginia

Boston

Orlando

Fort Lauderdale

Providence

Jacksonville Lakeland

San Francisco St. Petersburg

Melbourne Mexico City

Tallahassee Tampa

Miami New York

Washington, D.C. West Palm Beach

D. BRUCE MAY, JR.

850-425-5607

Internet Address:

dbmav@hklaw.com

May 11, 1999

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Betty Easley Conference Center, Room 110 Tallahassee, Fl. 32399-0850

> In re: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 305 area code (Florida Keys), Docket No. 990455-TL

In re: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 561 area code, Docket No. 990456-TL

In re: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 954 area code, Docket No. 990457-TL

In re: Request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code, Docket No. 990517-TL

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Holland & Knight has an ongoing interest in the dockets referenced above. Please place the undersigned on the dockets' mailing lists.

Thank you for your continued consideration.

Sincerely,

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

DBM/kig

Jone 5/13/99

RECEIVED-FPSC

MEMORANDUM

July 6, 1999

99 JUL -7 AM 11:02

RECORDS AND REPORTING

TO: DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

99-1303-PCD

Attached is an ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 2)

BK/anc

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517vo.bk

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - RECORDS AND REPORTING

| equested B | originals — 2
y — Marte Protite | | 3 1 1 1 1 2 1 | Original |
|------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Agen | Man - Man - North Addition | Order No. —
For (Date) — | 99-1303 | in Docket No. 99.05/7-73 |
| | Specie | | ructions | |
| Number | Distributed/Mailed To Commission Offices | histribution/Mail | Number | Distribution/Mailed To |
| Ø | Docket Mailing List - Mailed | - durithin one h | working day after | er issue unless specified here: |
| Note: Ite | | | 1 | |
| | </td <td>rint Shop Verific
Verified By</td> <td>TU</td> <td>tiness and Quality (Initial)</td> | rint Shop Verific
Verified By | TU | tiness and Quality (Initial) |

PSC/RAR 12(2/91)

Messer, Caparello & Self

A Professional Association

215 South Monroe Street, Suite 701
Post Office Box 1876
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876
Telephone: (850) 222-0720
Telecopiers: (850) 224-4359; (850) 425-1942
Internet: www.lawfla.com

July 15, 1999

RECEIVED FPSO

Ms. Blanca Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

> Re: Docket No. 990517-TP - Florida Public Service Commission's Review of Proposed Numbering Plan Relief for the 904 Area Code

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Please add this firm to the mailing list for Docket No. 990517-TP directing all orders and notices to the undersigned.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Yours yery truly,

Floyd R. Self

FRS/amb

Done 7/19/99

Florida Public Service Commission Division of Records and Reporting 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399

> **Bob Koslow** News-Journal Corp. 1200 Deltona Blvd., Suite 51 Deltona, FL 32725 e-mail: swnews@n-jcenter.com

July 20, 1999

I request my name be added to the interested parties list for Docket No. 990517-TL, request for review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 telephone area code. Thank you for your assistance.

Bob Koslow

Bol Koslow



FAX TRANSMISSION

Law & Public Policy South East Region

325 John Knox Road, Suite 105 Tallahassee, FL 32303 FAX: 850-422-2586 or V922-2586

| DATE: | 7-22.99 | | JUL 22 |
|----------|--|-------------------------|--------|
| TO: | Division of Acads | Reporting | TOE W |
| PHONE | A CANZANO MCNULTY 850-422-1254 AGES (INCLUDING COVER | SHEET): | 0 |
| MESSAGE: | Please place me on the | interested persons list | far |
| DN | 990517 (924 | - NPA Relief) | |

Done 7/23/99

CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION

The information contained in this facsimile message, and any and all accompanying documents constitutes confidential information. This information is the property of the Regulatory and Governmental Affairs Department. If you are not the intended recipient of this information, any disclosure copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone to make arrangements for its return to us. Thank you.

July 22, 1999

LUEIVED-FPSC

JUL 22 AHII: 24

RECORDS AND REPORTING

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

99-1402-PCO

Attached is an ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 21

KMP/anc

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517bs.bk

layed 56

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - RECORDS AND REPORTING

| | Requisition fo | or Photocopy | ing and M | ailing | |
|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Number of Original Requested By | als — A the | pate/_2 | | Original | 19 |
| | | — item Presented | 100 110 | | 000517 |
| Agenda Fo | or (Date) | _ Order No | 97-144 | in Docket No. | 99051 |
| Notice of | | _ For (Date) _ | | in Docket No. | |
| Other | | | | | |
| Cor_ | ributed/Mailed To
nmission Offices
cket Mailing List - Mailed
cket Mailing List - Faxed | Distribution/Mail | Number | Distribution/Mo | |
| | t be mailed and/or retu | med within one w | orking day after | · issue unless specif | ied here: |
| | | rint Shop Verifico | ation - | | |
| Job Number | 237 | _ Verified By | M | lack | |
| Date and Time Co | empleted 7/27 | _ Job Checke | ed For Correcti | ness and Quality (| (Initial) |
| | N | Aail Room Verific | ution — | | The last section of the last o |
| Date Mailed | | _ Verified By . | / | | |
| | | | | | |

PSC/RAR 12(2/91)



JUL 3 0 1999

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Commissioner Jacobs

July 27, 1999

Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Fla. 32399-0850

Dear Leon:

The Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce has been working in conjunction with other Chambers in Volusia County on the issue of a single area code. We have also worked closely with the Volusia Council of Governments.

On July 22, our Board of Directors approved the following recommendation:

- the creation of a single new area code that will encompass all of Volusia County;
- maintaining current telephone numbers;
- uniting with neighboring counties in support of a single area code;
- maintaining 7-digit dialing as long as possible to lessen confusion when 10-digit dialing arrives.

We would like to stay in contact with your office in reference to this issue. We would also like to be notified of any Public Service Commission meetings concerning the future of the 904 area code.

Our recommendation is to let Duval and other counties in that vicinity maintain the 904 code. We would like a new code but only with sufficient advanced notice. We understand that the 904 code will last for another 2 to 2.5 years. Our businesses need ample time to prepare in terms of notifying out of county customers, replenish their letterhead needs, and so forth.

In the meantime, please call me at 255-0981 ext 226 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jim Cameron Vice President

Government Relations

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: August 3, 1999

TO: Blanca Bayó, Director of Records and Reporting

FROM: Wilbur Stiles, Assistant to Commissioner Clark

RE: Communication Received in Docket No. 990517-TL

Attached is a copy of a letter received by our office from Mr. Jim Cameron regarding the above-referenced docket. Please place this letter on the correspondence side of the docket file.



July 27, 1999

Commissioner Susan F. Clark Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Fla. 32399-0850

Dear Susan:

The Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce has been working in conjunction with other Chambers in Volusia County on the issue of a single area code. We have also worked closely with the Volusia Council of Governments.

On July 22, our Board of Directors approved the following recommendation:

- the creation of a single new area code that will encompass all of Volusia County;
- maintaining current telephone numbers;
- uniting with neighboring counties in support of a single area code;
- maintaining 7-digit dialing as long as possible to lessen confusion when 10-digit dialing arrives.

We would like to stay in contact with your office in reference to this issue. We would also like to be notified of any Public Service Commission meetings concerning the future of the 904 area code.

Our recommendation is to let Duval and other counties in that vicinity maintain the 904 code. We would like a new code but only with sufficient advanced notice. We understand that the 904 code will last for another 2 to 2.5 years. Our businesses need ample time to prepare in terms of notifying out of county customers, replenish their letterhead needs, and so forth.

In the meantime, please call me at 255-0981 ext 226 if you have any questions.

RECEIVED

Florida Public Service Comm. Commissioner Clark Sincerely,

Jim Cameron Vice President

Government Relations

AUGUST 4, 1999

RECEIVED-FPSO 99 AUG -4 PM 3:37

RECORDS AND REPORTING

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR 904 AREA CODE

1543-PCO

Attached is an ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 1)2

BK/anc

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517dl.bk

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - RECORDS AND REPORTING

| | Requisition fo | r Photocopying and Mo | ailing |
|---------------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| Number of C | Originals Do | ate// | Original |
| Agen | ida For (Date) | Order No | in Docket No |
| | | ial Handling Instructions | |
| Number | | Distribution/Mailing Number | Distribution/Mailed To |
| Noniber
19 | Distributed/Mailed To Commission Offices | Number
 | DISTRIBUTION/Maked 10 |
| | Docket Mailing List - Mailed | | |
| | | | |
| (6) | Docket Mailing List - Faxed | _ | - No. 2017 State State State Condition |
| Note: Item | | ned within one working day after i | issue unless specified here: |
| | s must be mailed and/or return | int Shop Verification | |
| Job Number | s must be mailed and/or return | | last |
| Job Number | Pri 93 ne Completed 8/6 | int Shop Verification Verified By | last |

PSC/RAR 12(2/91)

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-N

DATE: August 10, 1999

TO:

Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs on 3

RE:

Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the attached correspondence of Jim Cameron. Vice President/Government Relations, The Datona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce, dated July 27, 1999. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the following letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner and by the fact that the Commissioner is not assigned to the panel hearing the case. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

August 12, 1999

RECEIVED-FPSC

99 AUG 12 AM 11: 36

RECORDS AND REPORTING

TO: DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING) ** RC Catly Redell

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

1583-PCO

Attached is an ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 3)?

BK/anc

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517sp.bk

Parked 6/2

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - RECORDS AND REPORTING

| | Requisition for | r Photocopying | and M | ailing
· |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---------------|------------------------------|
| Number of (| Driginals | # 1 + 6 c | opies Per (| Original |
| Name of Street, or other Desires. | | - item Presented - | | |
| | e of | | 7-158 | In Docket No. 79051; |
| | Speci | ial Handling Instruction | ons — | |
| | | | | |
| Number | Distributed/Mailed To | Distribution/Mailing • | umber | Distribution/Mailed To |
| Number | | | <i>i</i> mber | Distribution/Mailed To |
| Number | Distributed/Mailed To Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed | _ No | umber | Distribution/Mailed To |
| Number | Distributed/Mailed To Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed Docket Mailing List - Faxed | - No | | |
| 19 | Distributed/Mailed To Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed | - No | | |
| 19 | Distributed/Mailed To Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed Docket Mailing List - Faxed as must be mailed and/or return | ned within one working | g day after | issue unless specified here: |
| Note: Item | Distributed/Mailed To Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed Docket Mailing List - Faxed Instructions must be mailed and/or return | ned within one working int Shop Verification Verified By | g day after | issue unless specified here: |
| Note: Item | Distributed/Mailed To Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed Docket Mailing List - Faxed Instructions must be mailed and/or return | ned within one working int Shop Verification Verified By | g day after | issue unless specified here: |
| Note: Item | Distributed/Mailed To Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed Docket Mailing List - Faxed Ins must be mailed and/or return The Completed | ned within one working int Shop Verification Verified By | g day after | issue unless specified here: |

VANCERISON & FOERSTER LLP

SAN FRANCISCO LOS ANGELES SACRAMENTO ORANGE COUNTY PALO ALTO WALNUT CREEK DENVER ATTORNEYS AT LAW

2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1888 TELEPHONE (202) 887-1500 TELEFACSIMILE (202) 887-0763



Writer's Direct Dial Number (202) 887-8739

August 18, 1999

By U.S. Mail

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo Director, Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850 REPORTING

AUG 23 AM IO: 30

Re:

Docket Nos. 990373-TP, 990455-TL, 990456-TL,

990457-TL, 990517-TL

Dear Ms. Bayo:

The purpose of this letter is to request that the following name be added to the official Commission service list for the dockets listed above.

Thomas Foley Lockheed Martin IMS/NANPA 820 Riverbend Boulevard Longwood, Florida 32779 Phone: (407) 389-8929

Phone: (407) 389-892 Fax: (407) 682-1108

E-mail: foleyt@ix.netcom.com

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at the address or telephone number listed above.

Yours truly

Jim Bucholz

Legal Assistant

cc: Tom Foley

990373 Chard Done 8/23/99

dc-171266

August 23, 1999

SECEIVED-FPSC

19 AUG 23 AM 10: 55

RECORDS AND REPORTING

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

Attached is an ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - \$12

BK/anc

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517at.bk

August 23, 1999

FECEIVED-FPSO

53 AUG 23 AM 10: 55

RECURDS AND

TO: DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

1634-PCO

Attached is an ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 1)2

BK/anc

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517nf.bk

RECEIVED-FPSC

99 AUG 25 PM 1: 11

RECORDS AND REPORTING

August 25, 1999

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (FORDHAM)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

Attached is an ORDER AUTHORIZING QUALIFIED REPRESENTATIVE STATUS, to be issued in the above-referenced docket.

(Number of pages in order - 2)

AUST GO TODAY

CF/ALC/dr

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications (Ileri, Audu, Fulwood)

I:\990517C.ALC

boried 7/2

5.1

MAUG 26 PM 1: 36

MECEIVED-FPSC

RECORDS AND REPORTING

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

1656-PCD

Attached is an ORDER AUTHORIZING QUALIFIED REPRESENTATIVE STATUS, to be issued in the above-referenced docket.

(Number of pages in order - 2)

MUST GO TODAY

BK/ALC/dr

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications (Ileri, Audu, Fulwood)

I:\990517A.ALC

paxed - 7 () mailed -

August 19, 1999

W.JEIVED-FPSC

. AUG 26 PM 1:36

RECURDS AND REPORTING

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

1657-PCO

Attached is an ORDER AUTHORIZING QUALIFIED REPRESENTATIVE STATUS, to be issued in the above-referenced docket.

(Number of pages in order - 2)

MUST GO TODAY

BK/ALC/dr

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications (Ileri, Audu, Fulwood)

I:\990517B.ALC

taxed-7/2



-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: August 26, 1999

TO: Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Division of Telecommunications (Ileri)

RE: Docket No. 990517-TL - In re: Request for review of proposed numbering relief plan

for the 904 area code

Attached is a **LETTER** from Mr. and Mrs. Richard Rubino to be filed on the correspondence side of the above-referenced docket. Please include Mr. and Mrs. Richard Rubino's names as a party to this docket per their request in their letter.

LI

Attachment

cc: Division of Legal Services (B. Keating)

| 70 | - 15 | |
|-----|----------|-----|
| BB | 2276 | |
| O. | GO | i |
| 30 | 07 | ** |
| 100 | -0 | - 6 |
| 1 | | |
| Ó | | |
| | co
co | × |
| | | |

| 1.11.24 | Waterland and American and American and American |
|---------|--|
| APP | Wallest School of the Control of the |
| CAF | NETWORK AND TO-INVANIGNED AND THE |
| | Whitesthird address No |
| CMU | Military and a distant state of |
| CTR | |
| EAG | NO TEACHTON & Manifestories (A) will! |
| LEG | PLPS in the Secretaria de Secr |
| | "Alternay felly south," or |
| MAS | Will have belle semales (I), visuality |
| OPC | |
| PAI | get the entities in an extra contract of the c |
| . 7 7. | And resolved a semiline, substitute of |
| SEC | qua Algumen y pirm gargamentes |
| NAW | |
| HTC | Greatha. |
| | John |
| | 1 |
| | () |

Mr. Levant Ileri, Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Fl. 32399

RE: LATTA Boundry Lines crossing ST. JOHNS COUNTY/MARINELAND ESTATES/ FLAGLER COUNTY

Dear Mr. Ileri:

As per our conversation this morning I am writing to you as you suggested and I am hopeful that I will be able to explain in detail what has transpired since my last letter of 3/9/99.

Since moving into our new home last month, my husband and I are desperately trying to gain support in trying to move or waiver the existing LATTA lines that currently separate the area of MARINELAND ESTATES from the rest of Flagler County/ Palm Coast.

My address about 1600' from my current address of 6931 Oceanshore Blvd. Palm Coast, Fl. 32137 was also Palm Coast, 32137, but yet I cannot call toll free to anywhere in Flagler County/ Palm Coast. It is a most difficult problem that everyone knows exists, but yet somehow cannot be resolved. There are so many factors involved and so many frustrating circumstances that surround this issue of not being able to access services, medical providers, and just not being able to call anywhere where one lives without incurring a fee. We have called every phone company available and no one can offer me a plan to call back into the county of Flagler. Cell and mobile phones service also is not available.

The fact that my husband is disabled and could need medical attention at anytime, especially 911, is another issue we must deal with. A 911 number must first relay to St. John's County and then back into Flagler.

All of these issues have been brought to the attention of the County Board of Commissioners who have put it on the agenda for their next meeting. The County Administrator, David Haas, has also taken interest and has assured us that he will begin to do what he can to rectify this. We understand from previous correspondence that Bell South, together with the Commissioners can petition the PSC and the FCC to remedy this problem.

As we spoke this morning you informed me that there will be changes made in area codes affecting Jacksonville, St. Aug. etc., and that at that time other changes such as the one we are discussing can be corrected. If that is possble, please keep me informed as to what we can do to make this happen.

In our conversation you also mentioned a survey that would be taken to determine what the people in the area desire. Let me explain to you what I see as a problem here. There are residents living in this area now that have migrated from Jax., St. Augustine area. And they are very happy calling back and doing business where they came from. My question is this? Which residents should begiven favorable consideration here. Those who live in Flagler County and are able to call another county toll-free or residents like myself who live in Flagler County, trying to call Flagler County toll-free. I realize LATTA lines were established in 1984 and had to be placed somewhere, but it is unfair to prohibit people from calling where they live. Progress happens everyday and changes are made for the betterment of services and I believe that this is the time for this change.

There are other families living in this same area facing hardships of children attending Flagler/Palm Coast H.S. and costing \$2.85 to call home. The school complaining whenever they need to call for whatever reasons. They will be happy to also write you and explain their difficulties.

Mr. Ileri, please put this petition on Docket #990517-TL and also if you would be kind enough to place my name as party to whatever information you can send me. I will follow this letter with another one with other names that would also want to be party to this information.

When we purchased the property to build our home, no one informed us of the changes in telephone status. It is my belief that this information should be provided and had it been provided to us, I am sure it would have been given much thought. Or better still, if we had been prepared for this difficulty, and accepted the consequences, then we would now have to be reconciled to what now exists.

I believe that this situation, with everyone co-operating who is involved, can make a difference in correcting what now exists as a problem area. We strongly urge you to do whatever you can to help us resolve this very stressful situation and we and many others here would be very grateful.

Very sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Richard Rubino (Dorothy)

6930 N. Oceanshore Blvd. Palm Coast, Fla. 32137

904-431-4315

P.S. Mr. Dlein - Does the flagler Caunty B of Comm. and Beel So seed have to petities the PSC juntly to achieve this change in Conjunction with the Dochet you mention? Please explain

904 AREA CODE FIVED FPS

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL

00 FEB -7 AM 10: 54

Name JE MAZZ RECORDS AND
REPORTING# 207

Address: 3023 S ATLANTIC AVE # 207

PAY TONA BEACH SHORES 32118

If you want to let the Public Service Commission know how you feel about this case, please fill out this comment form and return it by mail. It will be placed in a correspondence file.

| | CONSUMER COMMENTS |
|-------|------------------------------------|
| | |
| | 1-27-00-400 PM |
| MR 51 | a RC/A |
| Y | OUR MISTINS WAS EXCOLUTED TO |
| | AS MERGLY A CONCERNED CITIZEN |
| ATTEN | DINS THE MIETING. |
| | |
| | DO DID NOT WANT TO WASTE YOUR |
| TIMO | SAYING ANYTHINS - IT HAD ALL BOTTH |
| SAID. | |
| | HAUD HAD MY ARTA CODY CHANSID |
| AND | THEN OUDRIAID. UNBELIEVABLY! |
| | AS LONG AT THE FCC INCREASES OUR |
| | s + ALLONS Q 56,006 PTR COMPANY, |
| - You | HAUR YOUR-WORK CUT OUT PROTECTING |
| - Us. | GLAP TO BE IN FLORIPA |
| | |
| | Jay May |
| | |

AFA
APP
CAF
CMU
CTR
EAG
LEG
NIAS
OPC
RRR
SIEC
WAW
OTH

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - RECORDS AND REPORTING

| | Requistion fo | r Photocopying and Ma | iling |
|----------------|--|---|------------------------------|
| Number of C | Date: | Copies Per Origin | nal |
| | | Item Presented | |
| Noti | nda For (Date) | Order No. OO - 0180
For (Date) | In Docket No |
| AT DATE OF | Specia | l Handling Instructions | |
| | Dis | stribution/Mailing"—— | |
| Number | Distributed/ Mailed To | Number | Distribution/Mailed To |
| | Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed | _ | _ |
| MSY | Docket Mailing List - Faxed | | |
| Note: I | tems must be mailed and/or retu | urned within one working day after | issue unless specified here: |
| | | | |
| | Print | Shop Verification | 1.0 |
| Job Number | 2/ | _ Verified By | ness and Quality (Initial) |
| Date and Tir | ne Completed 2// | Job Checked For Correct | ness and Quality (Initial) |
| | Mai | Room Verification —— | |
| Date Mailed | | Verified By | |
| C/RAR 12(9/99) | | | |

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-N

DATE:

February 5, 2000

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF COMPETITIVE SERVICES (ILERI)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE

Attached is a box of over 3,000 CONSUMER CORRESPONDENCE LETTERS to be filed on the correspondence side in the above-referenced docket.

LI Attachment

> CLK note: Consumer correspondence letters were disposed on 07/05/2007 in accordance with Retention Schedule 149, I tem 1 (retention 3 FYs).

D:\ILERI\990517-T\MEMO_CLO.WPD

| RECORDS DISPOSITION DOCUMENT | | | | PAG | PAGE 1 OF 1 PAGES | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Publi
2540 | c Service
Shumard | ME and ADDRESS Commission Oak Blvd. Plorida 32399-0850 | 3. | BUREAU | | | | |
| 4. AGE | 4. AGENCY CONTACT : Kimberley Peňa (850) 413-6393 | | | | | | | |
| This | schedule | JTENTION d records listed in item are to be tion | <u></u> | nner checked belov | v (specify only | one): | | |
| 6. SUB
have | 6. SUBMITTED BY: I hereby certify that the records to be disposed of are correctly represented below, that any audit requirements for the records have been fully justified, and that further retention is not required for any litigation pending or imminent. Kimberley Peña | | | | | for the records | | |
| Sign | ature | | thief Deputy Commission
lame and Title | | | | | Date |
| 7. LIST | OF REC | ORD SERIES | | | | | | |
| a. | b. | | c. | | d. | e. | f. | g. |
| Schedule
No. | Item
No. | Title | | | Retention | Inclusive
Dates | Volume
In
Cubic
Feet | Disposition
Action and Date
(Completed After
Authorization) |
| 149 | 1 | | | | | Disposed on onlos/2007 | | |
| 8. DISPOSAL AUTHORIZATION: Disposal for the above-listed records is authorized. Any deletions or modifications are indicated. 9. DISPOSAL CERTIFICATE: The above listed records have been disposed of in the manner and on the date shown in Column g. 1. Signature 1. Date 1. Disposal Certificate: The above listed records have been disposed of in the manner and on the date shown in Column g. 1. Signature 1. Date 1. Date | | | | | | | | |
| 10. DISP | OSAL AC | TION ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | Kimber | ley M. F. | ena
fficer or Design | gnee | 07/05 | /2007
Date |

CITY OF DELAND

DELAND, FLORIDA 32721



POST OFFICE DRAWER 449 TELEPHONE: (904) 736-3900

FAX: (904) 736-9819

January 31, 2000

Ms. Beth Keating, Senior Attorney Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0855 RECEIVED

FEB 03 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMM.
Chairman Garcia

Dear Ms. Keating:

The City of DeLand would like to extend a word of thanks to the Public Service Commission for your efforts in solving the very complex issue of providing relief for residents and businesses in the 904 area code. We have reviewed the proposal and strongly support the alternative proposal presented to you by Dr. John Otterson. Although this proposal was not numbered, we would respectfully request that it become alternate number 14. If after hearing all the testimony and taking into account all the positions, your Commission elects on one of the proposals presented in the package, the City of DeLand would respectfully support alternate proposal number 14. Even though the City of DeLand adamantly opposes Deltona and DeBary being separated from the mother county, we would choose number 8 as the lesser evil to all of the other alternatives which further separates DeLand from the east coast cities.

Again we understand the very difficult job you have in determining the best alternative but hopefully this letter will express to you our support, first, for the proposal number 14 of Dr. Otterson, and second our support for alternate number 8.

Sincerely.

James A. McCroskey

Community Development Director

JAM/db

ugl/PSC Keating

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE:

February 5, 2000

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS (İLERİ)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE

Attached is a CONSUMER CORRESPONDECE LETTER to be filed on the correspondence side in the above-referenced docket.

LI

Attachment

cc: Division of Legal Services (B. Keating)

D:\ILERI\990517-T\MEMO_CLO.WPD


ORIGINAL 1-5-00 990517-TL

Jie, you asked for suggestion on the area code deal. Wouldn't it be a lot easier to just give out more 3 digit starting numbers? Live Oak now has 4 but it could certainly have more and so could other towns in the 904 Calling area. It seems a little extreme to change the area code since you will just hove to do it again and again. There's so many other combinations. There's so many other combinations.

| AFA | |
|------------|---|
| CAF | |
| CMU | |
| CTR
EAG | |
| LEG | 1 |
| MAS . | |
| RRR | |
| SEC
WAW | |
| OMAA _ | |

Sixually any King

Mrs. Amy King 6435 161st Rd. # 1804B Live Oak, FL 32060





City of St. Augustine Beach

370 A1A BEACH BLVD.

ST. AUGUSTINE BEACH, FLORIDA 32084

CITY MGR. (904) 471-2122 FAX (904) 471-4108

99 0517

February 8, 2000

Joe Garcia, Chairman Florida Public Service Commission Att: Beth Keating, Senior Attorney 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Chairman Garcia:

The St. Augustine Beach City Commission at their February 7, 2000 meeting resolved to support the PSC staff recommended alternative #6 for the 904 area code. This alternative proposes a geographic split that would allow St. Johns County to remain in the 904 area code for approximately 5.8 additional years without an overlay.

St. Johns County and its municipalities are closely tied to Duval County economically and culturally. The City of St. Augustine Beach would prefer to remain in the 904 area code as long as possible.

Sincerely,

Emmett W. Pacetti

Mayor

EWP:sw

enc.

RECEIVED

BLDG. & ZONING (904) 471-8758


FAX (904) 471-4470

FEB 14 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMM. Chairman Garcia

added 2/17/00

The Parelle



CAF Internet E-mail

ORIGINAL 990517-TL

From:

The Johnson's [pattyg@geocities.com]

To: Subject: contact@psc.state.fl.us 904 area code change!!!

I had no idea that you all were considering changing the area code again until I saw this article in the Ponte Vedra Recorder!!! I do have a preference and wish

to be

considered!! Here is it: I think you should keep all of St Augustine then

from T

from Route 16

to Route301 to the Georgia border with the St Mary's river bordering the north and the

Atlantic Ocean to the west ... in the 904 area code PLEASE! and ...

Thank you, Patricia Johnson 1820 Pitch Pine Ave Fruit Cove, FL 32259 904-287-5406 home phone

Do You Yahoo!?
Talk to your friends online with Yahoo! Messenger.
http://im.yahoo.com

| AFA | |
|-------|--------------------------------|
| APP | |
| CAF | hadigan parameters for |
| CMU | estratura como destinación |
| EAG | |
| LEG | |
| MAS | emiliane en en al tradition de |
| OPC | |
| 35C | T |
| WAW | |
| OTH . | Hore |

Done 2/14/00

1



-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: February 16, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayó, Director, Records and Reporting

FROM: Jane Faurot, Chief, Bureau of Reporting

RE: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL, SERVICES HEARINGS HELD IN: LAKE CITY

(1-26-2000); JACKSONVILLE (1-26-2000); ST. AUGUSTINE (1-27-2000)

RE: REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF

FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

DOCUMENT NO. JACKSONVILLE, 01799, 2-10-2000; ST. AUGUSTINE,

01800, LAKE CITY, 02000, 2-15-00

The transcript for the above proceedings has been completed and is forwarded for placement in the docket file, including attachments.

Please note that Staff distribution of this transcript was made to:

LEGAL, AFAD, CMU

Acknowledged by:

JK/pc



-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: February 16, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayó, Director, Records and Reporting

FROM: Jane Faurot, Chief, Bureau of Reporting

RE: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL, SERVICES HEARINGS HELD IN: LAKE CITY

(1-26-2000); JACKSONVILLE (1-26-2000); ST. AUGUSTINE (1-27-2000)

RE: REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF

FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

DOCUMENT NO. JACKSONVILLE, 01799, 2-10-2000; ST. AUGUSTINE,

01800, LAKE CITY, 02000, 2-15-00

The transcript for the above proceedings has been completed and is forwarded for placement in the docket file, including attachments.

Please note that Staff distribution of this transcript was made to:

LEGAL, AFAD, CMU

Acknowledged by:

JK/pc



-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: February 16, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayó, Director, Records and Reporting

FROM: Jane Faurot, Chief, Bureau of Reporting

RE: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL, SERVICES HEARINGS HELD IN: LAKE CITY

(1-26-2000); JACKSONVILLE (1-26-2000); ST. AUGUSTINE (1-27-2000)

RE: REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF

FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

DOCUMENT NO. JACKSONVILLE, 01799, 2-10-2000; ST. AUGUSTINE,

01800, LAKE CITY, 02000, 2-15-00

The transcript for the above proceedings has been completed and is forwarded for placement in the docket file, including attachments.

Please note that Staff distribution of this transcript was made to:

LEGAL, AFAD, CMU

Acknowledged by:

JK/pc

St. Johns County Board of County Commissioners

P.O. BOX 349 SAINT AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA 32085-0349



PHONE: (904) 823-2400 FAX: (904) 823-2362 SUNCOM: 865-2400

February 14, 2000

Joe Garcia, Chairman Florida Public Service Commission Att: Beth Keating, Senior Attorney 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 RECEIVED

FEB 17 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMM. Chairman Garcia

Dear Chairman Garcia:

The St. Johns County Commission at their February 15, 2000 meeting resolved to support the Public Service Commission Staff recommended Alternative #6 for the 904 area code. This alternative proposes a geographic split that would allow St. Johns County to remain in the 904 area code for approximately 5.8 additional years without an overlay.

St. Johns County and it's municipalities are closely tied to Duval County economically and culturally.

We are experiencing a high degree of regional cooperation with Duval County at this time and we believe a uniform area code for Duval and St. Johns County would help further this unity.

Sincerely,

James E. Bryant

James & Bryant

Chairman

JEB/jc





St. Augustine, Florida

Office of the Mayor

February 16, 2000

RECEIVED

FEB 18 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMM.

Chairman Garcia

Joe Garcia, Chairman
Florida Public Service Commission
Attn: Beth Keating, Senior Attorney
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Chairman Garcia:

The City of St. Augustine City Commission at their regular meeting of February 14, 2000 voted unanimously to support the Public Service Commission staff recommended alternative #6 for the 904 area code. The geographic split that is offered in alternative #6 would extend the 904 area code in our region for approximately 5.8 additional years.

The City of St. Augustine and St. Johns County share many economic and cultural ties with Duval County. It is the City of St. Augustine's desire to retain the 904 area code as long as possible.

If I can be of further assistance in the matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely.

Len Weeks

Mayor

LW:sjs

RECEIVED

FEB 22 2000

CMU



-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: February 18, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayó, Director, Records and Reporting

FROM: Jane Faurot, Chief, Bureau of Reporting

RE: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL, SERVICES HEARINGS HELD IN: DAYTONA

BEACH, 1-27-00

RE: REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF

FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

DOCUMENT NO. 02124, 2-16-00

The transcript for the above proceedings has been completed and is forwarded for placement in the docket file, including attachments.

Please note that Staff distribution of this transcript was made to:

LEGAL, AFAD, CMU

Acknowledged by:

JK/pc



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: February 21, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayó, Director, Records and Reporting

FROM: Jane Faurot, Chief, Bureau of Reporting

RE: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL, SERVICES HEARINGS HELD IN DELTONA, 1-

28-00

RE: REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF

FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

DOCUMENT NO. 02283, 2-21-00

The transcript for the above proceedings has been completed and is forwarded for placement in the docket file, including attachments.

Please note that Staff distribution of this transcript was made to:

LEGAL, AFAD, CMU

Acknowledged by:

JK/pc

mar

PSC/RAR 28 (Rev7/94)

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR. LILA JABER



DIVISION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS WALTER D'HAESELEER DIRECTOR (850) 413-6600

Public Service Commission

March 1, 2000

James E. Bryant Chairman St. Johns County Board of County Commissioners PO Box 349 St. Augustine, FL 32085

Re: 904 Area Code (Docket No. 990517-TL)

Dear Mr. Bryant:

This is in response to your February 14, 2000 letter to Chairman Garcia regarding the numbering issues in the 904 area code. We truly appreciate your interest in this matter. I am responding to your letter because Chairman Garcia is prohibited by Chapter 350, Florida Statutes, from commenting on the merits of a docket pending before the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC).

As you may be aware, the FPSC held public hearings in Lake City, Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Daytona Beach and Deltona between January 26 and 28, 2000, to receive input from customers regarding the relief proposals for the 904 area code. Staff's recommendation is scheduled to be presented to the Commission at the August 15, 2000, Agenda Conference.

We will place your comment letter in our docket file. Thank you again for your interest in this matter. If you have any additional questions, please call me at (850) 413-6562.

Sincerely,

Levent İleri

Engineer, Division of Telecommunications

cc: Jorge Cruz-Bustillo

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners:
JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN
J. TERRY DEASON
SUSAN F. CLARK
E. LEON JACOBS, JR.
LILA JABER



DIVISION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS WALTER D'HAESELEER DIRECTOR (850) 413-6600

Public Service Commission

March 1, 2000

Len Weeks Mayor City of St. Augustine 75 King Street PO Drawer 210 St. Augustine, FL 32085

Re: 904 Area Code (Docket No. 990517-TL)

Dear Mr. Weeks:

This is in response to your February 16, 2000 letter to Chairman Garcia regarding the numbering issues in the 904 area code. We truly appreciate your interest in this matter. I am responding to your letter because Chairman Garcia is prohibited by Chapter 350, Florida Statutes, from commenting on the merits of a docket pending before the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC).

As you may be aware, the FPSC held public hearings in Lake City, Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Daytona Beach and Deltona between January 26 and 28, 2000, to receive input from customers regarding the relief proposals for the 904 area code. Staff's recommendation is scheduled to be presented to the Commission at the August 15, 2000, Agenda Conference.

We will place your comment letter in our docket file. Thank you again for your interest in this matter. If you have any additional questions, please call me at (850) 413-6562.

Sincerely,

Levent İleri

Engineer, Division of Telecommunications

cc: Jorge Cruz-Bustillo

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE:

MARCH 20, 2000

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (FLYNN, WANG)

FROM:

DIVISION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS (İLERİ)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - In re: REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF

PROPOSED NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE

Attached are CONSUMER CORRESPONDENCE and RESPONSE LETTERS to be filed on the correspondence side in the above-referenced docket.

If you've any questions, please call me at 413-6562.

LI

Attachment

cc: Division of Legal Services (B. KEATING)

MEMORANDUM

March 23, 2000

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

DOCKET NO. 990455-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED NUMBERINGPLAN RELIEF FOR THE 305/786 AREA CODE - DADE

COUNTY AND MONROE COUNTY/KEYS REGION.

DOCKET NO. 990456-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 561 AREA CODE.

DOCKET NO. 990457-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 954 AREA CODE.

Attached is a <u>NOTICE OF WORKSHOP</u> to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 2)

BK/jmb

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: areawork.bk

faxed 70/10

Hong Wang

From: Sent:

Dotti226@cs.com Thursday, March 30, 2000 8:49 AM HWang@psc.state.fl.us Address Update

To: Subject:

To PSC Commission:

The correct address for Dotti Rubino is: 6931 N. OceanShore

Blvd,

Palm Coast, Fl 32137. The telephone number is: 904-461-4315. Please correct

all inappropriate information.

FOWLER, BARICE, FEENEY & O'QUINN, P.A.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

JAMES A. FOWLER
CAROLE JOY BARICE, P.A. *
THOMAS C. FEENEY, III, P.A.
MICHAEL A. U. O'QUINN, P.A.*
MARY L. SNEED
*Board Certified City, County & Local Government Law

EMPIRE BUILDING 28 W. CENTRAL BLVD. ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32801 TELEPHONE: (407) 425-2684 TELEFAX: (407) 425-2690 E-MAIL: FBFOLAW@aol.com

**Also Itcensed in Georgia

April 20, 2000

Division of Records and Reporting Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850 ATTN: Matilda

Re: PSC Docket No.: 990517-TL

Dear Matilda:

Pursuant to our telephone conversation this date, enclosed please find a disk in WordPerfect format of the City of Deltona's Prehearing Statement, which is required pursuant to Rule 25-22.028(1), Florida Administrative Code.

Thank you again for bringing this to our attention.

Sincerely,

Karen M. Noble, Paralegal

:kmn

Enclosures (as stated above)
C:\(karen\(C)B\(Deltona\(PSC\(Bayo\(L)TR\() \)



Legal Department

00 APR 25 AM 10: 35

123 West Indiana Avenue • DeLand, FL 32720-4613 Tel. 904/736-5950 • Fax 904/736-5990

April 24, 2000

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Ms. Linda Williams
Director, Division of Records and Reporting
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No.: 990517-TL

Dear Ms. Williams:

Enclosed please find a diskette which contains the Prehearing Statement of County of Volusia. This document is in the Wordperf 8.

Very truly yours,

Frank B. Gummey, III

Assistant County Attorney

FBG:mhl Enclosures (as stated above)





City of Deltona

00 APR 25 PM 4: 21

RECORDS AND REPORTING

April 24, 2000

Mr. Joe Garcia, Chairman Florida Public Service Commission Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shimmered Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 RECEIVED

APR 24 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMM. Chairman García

Dear Mr. Garcia:

Enclosed please find a certified copy of Resolution No. 2000-09, expressing the City of Deltona's support of the Florida Public Service Commission approving a single area code for all of Volusia County and designated 386 (FUN) as the new area code to replace 904 and 407 in Volusia County. The Resolution was duly adopted by the Deltona City Commission at the Regular City Commission meeting held on April 17, 2000.

We strongly encourage your support in this matter.

Please share this information with the remaining members of the Public Service Commission.

If you should have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact my office or our City Manager Fritz Behring, at (407) 860-7160.

Sincerely.

Faith G. Miller, CMC

City Clerk

fgm

Enclosure

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-09

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DELTONA, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the City Commission the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and other leisure activities, is world-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DELTONA, FLORIDA, as follows:

<u>SECTION 1.</u> The City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED BY the City Commission of the City of Deltona, Florida this 17th day of April,

2000.

ATTECT.

Faith G Miller CMC/AAF City Clerk

Approved as to Form & Legality for Use & Reliance by the City of Deltona, Florida

James A. Powler, City Attorney

John Masiarczyk, Mayor

NAME YES NO
CAREY X
HARVEY X
HORN X
PEREZ X
RUNGE X
WHEATLEY

2. 「1000円分割である。」では、「2000円では、1000円では、

and the second of the second o

्रा स्थापन क्षेत्र प्राप्त कर १८ जा हो है। स्थानी स्थापन के प्राप्त कर्ता के **स्थापन क्षेत्र से अपने स्थापन कर्ता**

n new kalandari kalandari kalandari kalandari kalandari kalandari kalandari kalandari kalandari kalandari ya k Kalandari

ng ng mga katang

- Communication of the commu

en de la composition de la composition de la composition de la composition de la composition de la composition La composition de la composition de la composition de la composition de la composition de la composition de la

and the second of the second o

TO THE REPORT OF THE PROPERTY

STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF VOLUSIA This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of

Res. # 2000-09 Witness my hand and official Seel this

Jatto 6. Miller

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLE

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SAN FRANCISCO LOS ANGELES SACRAMENTO ORANGE COUNTY PALO ALTO WALNUT CREEK DENVER

2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1888 TELEPHONE (202) 887-1500 TELEFACSIMILE (202) 887-0763 NEW YORK LONDON BRUSSELS BEIJING HONG KONG SINGAPORE TOKYO

Writer's Direct Dial Number (202) 887-8750

DO APR 26 AM 10: 00
RECUED AND
RECUED AND

April 25, 2000

By Overnight Courier

Ms. Linda Williams Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re:

Prehearing Statement of NeuStar, Inc.

Docket Nos. 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL

and 990517-TL

Dear Ms. Williams:

Enclosed please find a diskette containing the Prehearing Statement of NeuStar, Inc., as the North American Numbering Plan Administrator. Please date-stamp the enclosed return copy as received and return it in the attached self-addressed stamped envelope.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Wheeler

Counsel for NeuStar, Inc.

North American Numbering Plan

Administrator

Enclosure

MAIL ROOM

Hong Wang

From:

Sent:

Beth Keating Friday, April 28, 2000 5:51 PM Hong Wang RE: 990517

To: Subject:

O.k. They should still just be listed as interested persons.

----Original Message----

From: Hong Wang

Sent: Friday, April 28, 2000 5:10 PM To: Beth Keating

Subject: 990517

Beth, City of Port Orange filed their resolution in this docket. I have enter them as "Interested Persons" in CMS. Would you please let me know whether and when I can change them to "Party" status? Thanks!

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-MRECEIVED

MAY - 3 2000

DATE:

May 2, 2000

FPSC - Records/Reporting

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS (İLERİ)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE

Attached are MAPS of FDOT District 5, Florida Highway Patrol District, and East Central Florida Regional Planning to be filed on the correspondence side in the above-referenced docket. This information was provided to staff during the 990517-TL service hearings.

LΙ


Attachments

cc: Division of Legal Services (B. Keating)


D:\ILERI\990517-T\MEMO_CLO.WPD















STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR. LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

| TO: M. Corgan | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| FROM: Lillians, Division of Records and Reporting | | |
| RE: Acknowledgment of Receipt of Confidential Filing | | |
| | | |
| This will acknowledge receipt of a CONFIDENTIAL D | OCUMENT filed in Docket No. | |
| 9905/7-7L or (if filed in an undocketed matter | | |
| to 2nd Set & Items 7-328 POD #5 1- | and filed on behalf of | |
| BellSould | The document will | |
| be maintained in locked storage. | | |
| Any questions regarding this matter should be directed | to Kay Flynn at (850) 413-6744. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

PSC/RAR 19 (3/00)



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: May 16, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayó, Director, Records and Reporting

FROM: Jane Faurot, Chief, Bureau of Reporting

RE: DOCKET NO. 990455, 456, 457 and 517-TP, PREHEARING HELD 5-11-00

RE:

REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF

FOR AREA CODES 305, 786 561, 954, 904

DOCUMENT NO. 06022, 5-16-00

The transcript for the above proceedings has been completed and is forwarded for placement in the docket file, including attachments.

Please note that Staff distribution of this transcript was made to:

LEGAL, AFAD, CMU

| Acknowledged | BY: |
|--------------|-----|
| Mas | |
| JF/pc | |

PSC/RAR 28 (Rev1/00)

Hong Wang

From:

Sent: To:

Beth Keating Monday, May 22, 2000 11:15 AM Hong Wang

Subject:

RE: Docket 990517

They have not petitioned to intervene, and it is too late for them to do so. So they should just stay as an interested person. Thanks!

----Original Message----

From: Hong Wang

Sent: Monday, May 22, 2000 11:12 AM

To: Beth Keating

Subject: Docket 990517

Beth, City of Orange City filed their resolution in this docket. I have entered them as a "interested person." Would you please let me know whether and when I can change them to "Party" status. Thanks.



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: May 23, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: William B. Berg, Assistant to Commissioner Deason

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in Docket No:

990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL AND 990517-TL

This office has received the attached correspondence from Gilbert Yablon, SMART Dialing Systems. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Deason. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-31-JULY 19, 1991), the following letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Because it is not deemed to be an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Deason has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo be, as a matter of routine, placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

WBB:mm

SMART Dialing Systems - 2 14 Dumetz Road - Woodland Hills, 2 31364 - 818

5/15/00

Commissioner J. Terry Deason Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

c.c. Chairman Joe Garcia Comm

c.c. Chairman Joe Galda
c.c. Commissioner Susan F. Classoner Co.c. Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. Deason

c.c. Commissioner Lila A. Jaber

Re: 8-Digit Dialing in Overlays and Dockets 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL and 990517-TL

Dear Commissioner Deason,

I am the author of the 8-Digit Overlay proposal which the Florida PSC has recently been investigating. The proposal describes how NPA relief can be provided in a manner that is less disruptive than geographic splits and traditional overlays.

The 8-Digit Overlay is consumer friendly, competitively neutral and technically workable. It does not require any modification to the North American Numbering Plan (NANP), and can be implemented locally without having any impact on dialing patterns or telecommunications systems outside of the region where it would be implemented.

With this plan, all calls within overlay regions can be dialed using only 8-digits -- providing a functionally equivalent alternative to 10-digit dialing which is currently required in overlays.

Because the proposal merely provides a shortcut method for dialing standard 10-digit telephone numbers within overlay regions, and because the proposed 8-digit dialing system maintains competitive neutrality for both users and service providers, the Florida Commission has the authority to implement this relief solution independent of national regulatory or telecommunication industry consensus.

I have included a copy of a letter written by the 1996/1997 co-chair of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) supporting the technical feasibility of this proposal.

Also attached is a brief description of how the 8-Digit Overlay would function.

More information is available at the website www.SMARToverlay.com, or by contacting me directly.

I respectfully request that the Florida Commission devote the necessary time and resources to seriously evaluate this proposal on its merits, so that Florida consumers can benefit from the advantages it offers.

Please include this letter and the attachments in the record for Dockets 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL, 990517-TL, and any other appropriate venues, so that it can be appropriately addressed and considered.

I am available to answer any questions you may have regarding this proposal, and request the opportunity to respond to any of your concerns.

Sincerely,

Gilbert Yablon

SMART Dialing Systems

818-999-1070 - 24 hour voicemail

818-956-2200 - M - F 10:00 AM - 7:00 PM Pacific Time

888-793-1315 - alpha-numeric pager

gilbert@SMARToverlay.com - email

ATTACHMENTS

July 11, 1999

Re: Technical feasibility of the 8-Digit Dialing Plan proposed by Gilbert J. Yablon

To Whom It May Concern:

In July of 1997 I retired as the Executive Director - Operations and Engineering for the United States Telephone Association (USTA) after 36 plus years of experience encompassing diverse disciplines in the telecommunications industry.

As the Executive Director of the Technical Disciplines Department, I managed a large portion of the technical committee activities at USTA associated with numbering issues. As part of my responsibilities, I was required to regularly attend and participate in most of the industry meetings concerning numbering matters. I served as Chair or Co-Chair on a number of these various committees and working groups including the Industry Numbering Committee (INC).

I have thoroughly reviewed Gilbert J. Yablon's 8-Digit Dialing Plan and have found it to be a technically feasible plan that should be considered when addressing area code relief. The plan does conform to the NANP in that each customer retains a seven digit address (ten digit including area code) and the eighth digit is used for dialing purposes only to identify the specific NPA.

As with any plan to provide relief, there will be costs associated with the plan. The cost and the extent of equipment modifications that will incurred by the industry for each of the alternatives considered can only be addressed by the industry. The same is true for the cost to be incurred by the consumer. A cross-section of consumer groups needs to compile this data. And no matter what plan is implemented there will be customer confusion and education.

Providing area code relief is expensive and disruptive to both the industry and the consumer, therefore, all methods available that would ease this burden should be considered in enough detail to minimize the impacts.

Sincerely,

Dennis J. Byrne

1925 Rollingwood Drive

Fairfield, CA 94533

707-435-8285



A SMART Overlay Solution

10 Digit Dialing is a source of hardship and frustration for telephone users within overlay regions, but overlays don't have to be painful. In fact, a consumer-friendly variation called SMART (Simplified Multi Area Code Region Telephony) could make overlays a painless option for area code relief.

SMART provides customers with two tools that make living with overlays easier. First, it provides a shortcut "8-digit method" for dialing (1+)10-digit calls within overlay regions; and second, it prevents calls dialed with only 7-digits from being rejected.

To make eight-digit dialing possible, telephone companies would assign a one-digit identifier to each area code in the overlay region. Customers could then dial local 7-digit telephone numbers and use an 8th digit to identify the area code. Using the repealed California 310 overlay region as an example, the 310 area code would be identified by "0" and the "424" area code would be identified by "1". Dialing 1234567-0 would direct the call to the 310 area code, and dialing 1234567-1 would direct the call to the 424 area code.

But what happens when a customer or auto-dialer enters only 7-digits? In a "standard overlay", customers hear an announcement directing them to hang-up and redial using (1+)10-digits -- a huge inconvenience. But with the "SMART overlay", customers who forget about (or don't know about) the 8th digit would hear an announcement after a few seconds to help them complete their call:

"To reach the 310 area code, dial "0" now. To reach 424, dial "1" now."

Customers would have a few seconds to enter the 8th digit, and after doing so the call would be routed to the selected area code.

If for some reason the "8th digit" is still not entered, the call would default to the original area code of the region (in this case the 310 area code). This enhancement reduces the need for customers to reprogram or replace automated dialing devices (such as security entry systems and other unattended auto-dialers), and minimizes the kind of disruption that occurs when "standard overlays" are implemented.

Calls "to" and "from" area codes that are outside of the SMART region will continue to require (1+)10-digits to be dialed (the same as was required before the overlay). If the new "area code identifier" is inadvertently entered at the end of a (1+)10-digit call, the identifier is ignored and the call completes to the (1+)10-digit number that was dialed.

Customers would always have the option of dialing (1+)10-digits if they want to (even for local calls within the overlay region), but the 8-digit shortcut should make local calls easier for most customers.

Several telecommunications industry experts consider the "SMART overlay" to be a technically workable solution for area code relief, however the industry as a whole has chosen not to pursue this option on its own.

To benefit from this consumer-friendly solution the public must tell their Legislators, Utility Regulators and the Telecommunications Industry that they are interested in this alternative, and that they want it to be considered as an available option for area code relief.

Gilbert Yablon is the developer of the "SMART Dialing System for Overlays". He has been active in telecommunications industry dialing issues for the past four years, and has made numerous contributions to industry forums on numbering.

Hong Wang

From:

Beth Keating

Sent:

Wednesday, May 24, 2000 10:08 AM

To:

Subject:

Hong Wang RE: 990455, 990456, 990457, 990517, 981444

Sorry, I was out yesterday.

The name of Lockheed Martin IMS should be changed to NeuStar for purposes of these dockets. The same address and counsel apply. Only the name of the company has changed.

----Original Message----

From: Hong Wang

Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2000 9:33 AM

To: Beth Keating

Subject: 990455, 990456, 990457, 990517, 981444

Beth, as we discussed on Monday, would you please send me an e-mail on changing Lockheed Martin IMS to NeuStar, Inc. in these dockets, so I can have a record in the files. Thank you so much!!

State of Florida

Susan F. Clark
Commissioner



Public Service Commission

Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 (850) 413-6040 Fax (850) 413-6395

MEMORANDUM

May 24, 2000

TO:

BLANCA BAYO, DIRECTOR OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

KAY POSEY, COMMISSIONER CLARK'S OFFICE

RE:

INTERCEPTED COMMUNICATION FROM INTERESTED PARTY RECEIVED IN DOCKET NOs. 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL AND

990517-TL

This office has received the following correspondence. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Clark. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as CEO 91-31-July 19, 1991), the following letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Because it is not deemed to be an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However, in such cases Commissioner Clark has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo be, as a matter of routine, placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

Attachment

SMART Dialing Systems - 914 Dumetz Road - Woodland Hills, 🤛 91364 - 818-999-1070

5/15/00

Commissioner Susan F. Clark Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

c.c. Chairman Joe Garcia

c.c. Commissioner J. Terry Deason

c.c. Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs, Jr.

c.c. Commissioner Lila A. Jaber

Re: 8-Digit Dialing in Overlays and Dockets 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL and 990517-TL

Dear Commissioner Clark,

I am the author of the 8-Digit Overlay proposal which the Florida PSC has recently been investigating. The proposal describes how NPA relief can be provided in a manner that is less disruptive than geographic splits and traditional overlays.

The 8-Digit Overlay is consumer friendly, competitively neutral and technically workable. It does not require any modification to the North American Numbering Plan (NANP), and can be implemented locally without having any impact on dialing patterns or telecommunications systems outside of the region where it would be implemented.

With this plan, all calls within overlay regions can be dialed using only 8-digits -- providing a functionally equivalent alternative to 10-digit dialing which is currently required in overlays.

Because the proposal merely provides a shortcut method for dialing standard 10-digit telephone numbers within overlay regions, and because the proposed 8-digit dialing system maintains competitive neutrality for both users and service providers, the Florida Commission has the authority to implement this relief solution independent of national regulatory or telecommunication industry consensus.

I have included a copy of a letter written by the 1996/1997 co-chair of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) supporting the technical feasibility of this proposal.

Also attached is a brief description of how the 8-Digit Overlay would function.

More information is available at the website www.SMARToverlay.com, or by contacting me directly.

I respectfully request that the Florida Commission devote the necessary time and resources to seriously evaluate this proposal on its merits, so that Florida consumers can benefit from the advantages it offers.

Please include this letter and the attachments in the record for Dockets 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL, 990517-TL, and any other appropriate venues, so that it can be appropriately addressed and considered.

I am available to answer any questions you may have regarding this proposal, and request the opportunity to respond to any of your concerns. RECEIVED

Sincerely,

Gilbert Yablon

SMART Dialing Systems

818-999-1070 - 24 hour voicemail

818-956-2200 - M - F 10:00 AM - 7:00 PM Pacific Time

888-793-1315 - alpha-numeric pager

gilbert@SMARToverlay.com - email

ATTACHMENTS

Florida Public Service Comm. Commissioner Clark

July 11, 1999

Re: Technical feasibility of the 8-Digit Dialing Plan proposed by Gilbert J. Yablon

To Whom It May Concern:

In July of 1997 I retired as the Executive Director - Operations and Engineering for the United States Telephone Association (USTA) after 36 plus years of experience encompassing diverse disciplines in the telecommunications industry.

As the Executive Director of the Technical Disciplines Department, I managed a large portion of the technical committee activities at USTA associated with numbering issues. As part of my responsibilities, I was required to regularly attend and participate in most of the industry meetings concerning numbering matters. I served as Chair or Co-Chair on a number of these various committees and working groups including the Industry Numbering Committee (INC).

I have thoroughly reviewed Gilbert J. Yablon's 8-Digit Dialing Plan and have found it to be a technically feasible plan that should be considered when addressing area code relief. The plan does conform to the NANP in that each customer retains a seven digit address (ten digit including area code) and the eighth digit is used for dialing purposes only to identify the specific NPA.

As with any plan to provide relief, there will be costs associated with the plan. The cost and the extent of equipment modifications that will incurred by the industry for each of the alternatives considered can only be addressed by the industry. The same is true for the cost to be incurred by the consumer. A cross-section of consumer groups needs to compile this data. And no matter what plan is implemented there will be customer confusion and education.

Providing area code relief is expensive and disruptive to both the industry and the consumer, therefore, all methods available that would ease this burden should be considered in enough detail to minimize the impacts.

Sincerely,

Dennis J. Byrne

1925 Rollingwood Drive

Fairfield, CA 94533 707-435-8285



A SMART Overlay Solution

10 Digit Dialing is a source of hardship and frustration for telephone users within overlay regions, but overlays don't have to be painful. In fact, a consumer-friendly variation called SMART (Simplified Multi Area Code Region Telephony) could make overlays a painless option for area code relief.

SMART provides customers with two tools that make living with overlays easier. First, it provides a shortcut "8-digit method" for dialing (1+)10-digit calls within overlay regions; and second, it prevents calls dialed with only 7-digits from being rejected.

To make eight-digit dialing possible, telephone companies would assign a one-digit identifier to each area code in the overlay region. Customers could then dial local 7-digit telephone numbers and use an 8th digit to identify the area code. Using the repealed California 310 overlay region as an example, the 310 area code would be identified by "0" and the "424" area code would be identified by "1". Dialing 1234567-0 would direct the call to the 310 area code, and dialing 1234567-1 would direct the call to the 424 area code.

But what happens when a customer or auto-dialer enters only 7-digits? In a "standard overlay", customers hear an announcement directing them to hang-up and redial using (1+)10-digits -- a huge inconvenience. But with the "SMART overlay", customers who forget about (or don't know about) the 8th digit would hear an announcement after a few seconds to help them complete their call:

"To reach the 310 area code, dial "0" now. To reach 424, dial "1" now."

Customers would have a few seconds to enter the 8th digit, and after doing so the call would be routed to the selected area code.

If for some reason the "8th digit" is still not entered, the call would default to the original area code of the region (in this case the 310 area code). This enhancement reduces the need for customers to reprogram or replace automated dialing devices (such as security entry systems and other unattended auto-dialers), and minimizes the kind of disruption that occurs when "standard overlays" are implemented.

Calls "to" and "from" area codes that are outside of the SMART region will continue to require (1+)10-digits to be dialed (the same as was required before the overlay). If the new "area code identifier" is inadvertently entered at the end of a (1+)10-digit call, the identifier is ignored and the call completes to the (1+)10-digit number that was dialed.

Customers would always have the option of dialing (1+)10-digits if they want to (even for local calls within the overlay region), but the 8-digit shortcut should make local calls easier for most customers.

Several telecommunications industry experts consider the "SMART overlay" to be a technically workable solution for area code relief, however the industry as a whole has chosen not to pursue this option on its own.

To benefit from this consumer-friendly solution the public must tell their Legislators, Utility Regulators and the Telecommunications Industry that they are interested in this alternative, and that they want it to be considered as an available option for area code relief.

Gilbert Yablon is the developer of the "SMART Dialing System for Overlays". He has been active in telecommunications industry dialing issues for the past four years, and has made numerous contributions to industry forums on numbering.

Hong Wang

From:

Kay Flynn

Sent:

Wednesday, May 24, 2000 10:18 AM

To: Cc:

Beth Keating Hong Wang RE: 990517 et al.

Subject:

It's Volusia Council of Governments. We'll add them as interested persons only, in 990517.

----Original Message----

From: Beth Keating

Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2000 10:17 AM

To: Kay Flynn

Subject: RE: 990517 et al.

I forget what VCOG stands for. Volution County is a party, but anyone else who has not been approved for intervention should only be listed as an interested person.

----Original Message----

From: Kay Flynn

Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2000 10:43 AM

To: Beth Keating

Subject: 990517 et al.

Beth, should VCOG be on the mailing list in this docket as "interested person"--but not "party"? They have filed some resolutions but never a petition to intervene.

Kay



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: May 25, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayó, Director, Records and Reporting

FROM: Jane Faurot, Chief, Bureau of Reporting

RE: DOCKET NO. 990455, 456, 457 and 0517-TF, HEARING HELD 5-18-00

RE: REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED NUMBERING PLANT RELIEF FOR THE 306/786; 561; 954; AND 904 AREA CODES

DOCUMENT NO. VOLUME 1, 0644800, 5-25-00; VOLUME 2, 0644900, 5-25-00

The transcript for the above proceedings has been completed and is forwarded for placement in the docket file, including attachments.

Please note that Staff distribution of this transcript was made to:

LEGAL, AFAD, CMU

Acknowledged BY:

JF/pc

Meis

PSC/RAR 28 (Rev1/00)

filed in 990455-TL only.

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners:
JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN
J. TERRY DEASON
SUSAN F. CLARK
E. LEON JACOBS, JR.
LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BEVERLEE DEMELLO DIRECTOR (850) 413-6100 TOLL FREE 1-800-342-3552

Public Service Commission

June 15, 2000

Ms. Ann Hurst East Wind Condominiums 4505 South Atlantic Avenue Ponce Inlet, FL 32127

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL 904 AREA CODE

Dear Ms. Hurst:

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your letter will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Beverlee S. DeMello, Director

Burles. DeMello

Division of Consumer Affairs

BSD:kes

c: Records & Reporting




CONDOMINIUM APARTMENTS

4505 SOUTH ATLANTIC AVENUE PONCE INLET, FLORIDA 32127 OFFICE (904) 767-7561




Dear Mr. Talbott:



We are writing you today to dispute the proposal to have more than one area code in our area and to make 10-digit dialing mandatory. We believe that the mandatory 10-digit dialing will end up costing more money than it is worth. We do support the idea to adopt 386 as the new area code for Volusia and Flagler counties. The idea that 386 spells FUN on your telephone keypad is a very clever marketing tool and why not use it. Not to mention that it will be inefficient and just plain confusing to everyone involved. Please reconsider your proposal and make it "FUN" for everyone involved!!!

Sincerely,

East Wind Condominiums





STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR. LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BEVERLEE DEMELLO DIRECTOR (850) 413-6100 TOLL FREE 1-800-342-3552

Public Service Commission

June 15, 2000

Mr. Robert Cameron Joe Cameron Insurance Agency, Inc. 1835 South Ridgewood Avenue South Daytona, FL 32119

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL 904 AREA CODE

Dear Mr. Cameron:

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your letter will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Beverlee S. DeMello, Director

Bevale J. Dedello

Division of Consumer Affairs

BSD:kes

c: Records & Reporting



TO:

June 09, 2000

Public Service Commission

Mr. Bill Talbott, Exec Dir 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd Tallahassee, FL 32399 FROM:

JOE CAMERON INSURANCE AGCY, INC JOE CAMERON, AGENT, CLU, CPCU

1835 S. RIDGEWOOD AVENUE SOUTH DAYTONA, FL 32119

OFF: (904) 767-5363 FAX: (904) 788-8362

RE: New Area Code for Volusia & Flagler Counties

Dear Mr. Talbott,

I am writing in reference to your pending action regarding the splitting of area codes for the Volusia/Flagler county area. I am a lifelong resident and 30+ year insurance agent, serving this very same market area. It would truly create a hardship, as I see it, and an unnceesary burden on my business, other businesses in the area, and personal telephone communications to require all of us to use a 10-digit dial for next door businesses or neighbors.


I am encouraging you to assign one area code to Volusia/Flagler county, which would eliminate the need for 10-digit dialing. I encourage you to consider area code 386 as that area code.


Thank you for your consideration of this request and, hopefully, you can find a way to accomplish this important measure.

Sincerely,

108

Joseph W. Cameron





STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners:
JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN
J. TERRY DEASON
SUSAN F. CLARK
E. LEON JACOBS, JR.
LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BEVERLEE DEMELLO DIRECTOR (850) 413-6100 TOLL FREE 1-800-342-3552

Public Service Commission

June 15, 2000

RECORDS AND REPORTING

Mr. Thomas Staed Staed Family Associates Post Office Box 7318 2001 South Atlantic Avenue Daytona Beach Shores, FL 32116

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL 904 AREA CODE

Dear Mr. Staed:

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your letter will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Beverlee S. DeMello, Director

Beverle S. DeMello

Division of Consumer Affairs

BSD:kes

: Records & Reporting

Area Code Task Force Daytona Beach Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce Post Office Box 2475 Daytona Beach, FL 32115-2475

STAED FAMILY ASSOCIATES

2001 South Atlantic Avenue P.O. Box 7218 Daytona Beach Shores, FL 32116

Phone and Fax: 904 257-0251 Toll Free: 1 877-BEACHVU

June 8, 2000

Mr. Bill Talbott, Executive Director Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 TO THE STORY OF TH

Dear Mr. Talbott:

It has come to my attention that the Florida Public Service Commission is considering an "overlay" system to remedy the increasing problem of insufficient telephone numbers in the Volusia/Flagler area. As I understand it, under this system PSC would add one more additional area code to our counties, thereby making full 10-digit dialing mandatory for every call. I would like for you to consider another option.

As you know, by adding another area code it would be possible for the business across the street, the neighbor next door, or even two telephones within an office to have a different area code. This would mean major revisions of autodialers, as well as any printed material indicating a telephone number. It would be costly, inefficient and very confusing. Instead, I encourage you to consider adopting 386 as a new area code for Volusia and Flagler counties.

Using the area code of 386, which spells FUN, would be a great marketing tool for our local tourism industry. As a hotelier in Daytona Beach and a board member of Visit Florida, Florida's public/private partnership for tourism, I am aware of the benefits that could be derived by adopting the FUN area code, just as was done in Brevard County with the 321 area code.

I fully support the Chambers of Commerce in our area, the County Council, municipal governments, the Volusia Council of Governments and the leaders of major local businesses in their efforts to obtain 386 as the one area code for the "FUNcoast" of Volusia and Flagler counties.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Thomas W. Staed

Chairman

TWS/s



Public Service Commission June 8, 2000 Page 2

cc: Area Code Task Force

Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce

P.O. Box 2475

Daytona Beach, FL 32115-2475

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR. LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BEVERLEE DEMELLO DIRECTOR (850) 413-6100 TOLL FREE 1-800-342-3552

Public Service Commission

June 15, 2000

Mr. Richard Friedman Harbour Village 4620 South Atlantic Avenue Ponce Inlet, FL 32127

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL 904 AREA CODE

Dear Mr. Friedman:

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your letter will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Beverlee S. DeMello, Director

Bevalue S. De Mella

Division of Consumer Affairs

BSD:kes

Records & Reporting





June 8, 2000

Mr. Bill Talbott, Executive Director Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re:

Volusia County Area Code

Dear Mr. Talbott:

We are real estate developers in Volusia County. Our present project, Harbour Village Golf & Yacht Club, is under construction and will consist of over 800 residential units, a 142 slip marina, yacht club, beach club, golf club, tennis club, health spa and over 25,000 square feet of commercial space.

It has come to our attention that, as Volusia and Flagler counties are running out of telephone numbers, local telephone companies are lobbying for an "overlay" system that would result in multiple area codes for the same geographic region and even the same neighborhood.

Representing our company as well as the thousands of telephone customers that will be residing here in the next several years, we feel this approach is costly, inefficient, confusing and counterproductive to an orderly and effective form of communication.

We are further advised that the possibility exists for a new "386" area code for Volusia and Flagler counties. This area code or any one new area code has our support. Multiple area codes, in our opinion, are not acceptable.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any comments.

Very truly yours,

PONCE LIGHTHOUSE PROPERTIES ANC.

Richard A. Friedman

Executive Vice President of Development

cc;

Mr. Joe Garcia, PSC

Mr. J Terry Deason, PSC

Ms. Lilia A. Jaber, PSC

Ms. Susan F. Clark, PSC

Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, PSC

Mary Albee, Port Orange / South Daytona Chamber of Commerce

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR. LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BEVERLEE DEMELLO DIRECTOR (850) 413-6100 TOLL FREE 1-800-342-3552

Public Service Commission

June 21, 2000



Mr. Ronald Scott R. A. Scott Construction Company P. O. Box 9667 Daytona Beach, FL 32120-9667

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL 904 AREA CODE

Dear Mr. Scott:

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your letter will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Beverlee S. DeMello, Director Division of Consumer Affairs

Beverlee S. DeMillo

BSD:kes

c: Records & Reporting

P.O. BOX 9667, DAYTONA BEACH, FL 32120-9667 • (904) 238-1234 • FAX (904) 238-7877

32/588C

June 12, 2000

Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Attention:

Mr. Bill Talbott, Executive Director

Re:

Telephone Area Code Needs Volusia and Flagler Counties

Dear Mr. Talbott:

I have visited areas outside of Florida where the "overlay" system of area codes was implemented. Both residents and businesses there were outspoken about the continuing confusion, inconvenience, and added expense imposed on them by the "overlay" system.

Please don't allow the telephone companies to "overlay" us. I urge you to adopt the proposed new 386 area code as the least disruptive system change.

Very truly yours,

Ronald A. Scott

Secretary/Treasurer

RAS:kc

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners:
JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN
J. TERRY DEASON
SUSAN F. CLARK
E. LEON JACOBS, JR.
LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BEVERLEE DEMELLO DIRECTOR (850) 413-6100 TOLL FREE 1-800-342-3552

Public Service Commission

June 21, 2000



Ms. Karen Jacobs Morreale Adelphia Business Solutions 1800 Pembroke Drive, Suite 200 Orlando, FL 32810

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL 904 AREA CODE

Dear Ms. Morreale:

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your letter will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Beverlee S. DeMello, Director Division of Consumer Affairs

Burly S. Derlelb

BSD:kes

: Records & Reporting

Area Code Task Force
Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce
P. O. Box 2475
Daytona Beach, FL 32115-2475



321640c

June 12, 2000

Mr. Bill Talbott, Executive Director **Public Service Commission** 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Attention Mr. Talbott:

The Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce is supporting an area wide task force, which seeks to have the PSC adopt 386 as a new and lasting area code for Volusia & Flagler counties.

As a business owner in the Volusia county area we are in support of having 386 as our new area code. 386 spells FUN and can be a memorable marketing tool for our tourism industry, and additional support for the growing use of Funcoast as the designation for our place in Florida.

We hope that as our commissioner and spokesperson that you will recognize that this is truly an area wide effort that will reflect the strong local support from the business community.

Sincerely,

Karen Jacobs Morreale

Account Manager

BUSINESS SOLUTIONS

Karen Jacobs Morreale Account Executive

1800 Pembrook Drive Suite 200 Orlando, FL 32810

407-659-8049 Phone 407-659-3918

Customer Service 877-279-3900

karen.morreale@adelphiacom.com Email

Cc: Area Code Task Force Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce PO.Box 2475 Daytona Beach, FL 32115-2475

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners:

JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN
J. TERRY DEASON
SUSAN F. CLARK
E. LEON JACOBS, JR.
LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BEVERLEE DEMELLO DIRECTOR (850) 413-6100 TOLL FREE 1-800-342-3552

Public Service Commission

June 21, 2000



Mr. Robert C. Culleton, President Culleton Construction Company, Inc. 5896 Azalea South Nova Road At Azalea Port Orange, FL 32127

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL 904 AREA CODE

Dear Mr. Culleton:

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your letter will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Beverlee S. DeMello, Director Division of Consumer Affairs

Burnlu S. Derlelb

BSD:kes

c: Records & Reporting

321589C

CULLETON CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.





5896 Azalea (South Nova Road At Azalea) Port Orange, Florida 32127 (904) 767-8413 Fax: (904) 767-1333 CGC-031686

Mr. Bill Talbott, Ex Director PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RE:

TELEPHONE COMPANY 'OVERLAY' SYSTEM

VOLUSIA COUNTY, FL

Dear Mr. Talbott:

As a commercial business owner in the Daytona Beach area of Volusia County, I am greatly concerned about the impact the "overlay" system ,which the telephone companies are lobbying for, would have on my business and other businesses.

The overlay system would add one more additional area code to our county and make a full 10 digit dialing mandatory for every call. Under this system it would be possible for the business across the street, my neighbors, or even two telephones within my office to have different area codes.

This would also mean a massive revision of AutoDial, changes in advertising, business cards, forms and everything else in which phone information is used. It would not only be costly, but very inefficient, confusing, and could result in a loss of business for my company.

If a new area code is required for our area, then it should be a consistent area code for Volusia and Flager counties. I support an area wide task force which seeks to have the PSC adopt 386 as a new and lasting area code for Volusia & Flagler counties. 386 spells FUN, and could be a great marketing tool for our tourism industry, and additional support for the growing use of Funcoast as the designation for our place in Florida.

Respectfully.

Robert C. Culleton, President

RCC:dc

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR. LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BEVERLEE DEMELLO DIRECTOR (850) 413-6100 TOLL FREE 1-800-342-3552

Public Service Commission

June 21, 2000



Ms. Amber A. Nass Mail Boxes, Etc. 1500 Beville Road, Suite 606 Daytona Beach, FL 32114-5644

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL 904 AREA CODE

Dear Ms. Nass:

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your letter will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Beverlee S. DeMello, Director Division of Consumer Affairs

Beverle S. DeMello

BSD:kes

e: Records & Reporting

Area Code Task Force Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce P. O. Box 2475 Daytona Beach, FL 32115-2475









Mr. Bill Talbott, Executive Director Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Attention Mr. Talbott:

The Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce is supporting an area wide task force, which seeks to have the PSC adopt 386 as a new and lasting area code for Volusia & Flagler counties.

As a business owner in the Volusia county area we are in support of having 386 as our new area code. 386 spells FUN and can be a memorable marketing tool for our tourism industry, and additional support for the growing use of Funcoast as the designation for our place in Florida.

We hope that as our commissioner and spokesperson that you will recognize that this is truly an area wide effort that will reflect the strong local support from the business community.

Thank you,

Amber A. Nass

President/Daytona Business Solutions, Inc

Cc: Area Code Task Force Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce PO.Box 2475 Daytona Beach, FL 32115-2475



STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR. LILA A. JABER



DIVISION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BEVERLEE DEMELLO DIRECTOR (850) 413-6100 TOLL FREE 1-800-342-3552

Public Service Commission

June 21, 2000

Mr. Michael Ako Adam's Mark 100 North Atlantic Avenue Daytona Beach, FL 32118

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL 904 AREA CODE

Dear Mr. Ako:

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your letter will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Beverlee S. DeMello, Director

Burley S. DeMelh

Division of Consumer Affairs

BSD:kes

c: Records & Reporting



June 12, 2000



Dear Mr. Talbott:

It has come to my attention that the Florida Public Service Commission will be making a decision in the near future regarding a change in the area code that covers most of Volusia and Flagler counties.

CEI

Car

321581C

It is also my understanding that the telephone companies are lobbying for a system which would make ten-digit dialing mandatory for every call. In addition, the changes that would be required in business cards, advertising, etc., would be costly and inefficient.

I fully support the task force created by the Chamber, Daytona Beach/Halifax Area which is seeking to have the Public Service Commission adopt 386 as a new and lasting area code for Volusia and Flagler counties. 386 spells FUN and can be a memorable marketing tool for our tourism industry, and additional support for the growing use of Funcoast as the designation for our part of Florida.

I believe the adoption of 386 will give us an area code to grow with that will have minimal impact on our current usage and open promotional opportunities for many businesses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ADAM'S MARK DAYTONA BEACH RESORT

Michael C. Ako General Manager

MCA:ck

Buffalo, NY

Charlotte, NC

Clearwater Beach, FL

Colorado Springs, CO

Columbia, SC

Columbus, OH

Dallas, TX

Daytona Beach, FL

Denver, CO

Grand Junction, CO

Houston, TX

Indianapolis, IN

Jacksonville, FL

Kansas City, MO

Memphis, TN

Mobile, AL

Orlando, FL

Philadelphia, PA

St. Louis, MO

San Antonio, TX

Tulsa, OK

Winston-Salem, NC

Daytona Beach 100 N. Arlantic Avenue Daytona Beach, FL 32118 904-254-8200 FAX: 904-253-8841

Adam's Mark Hotels & Resorts A Division of HBE Corporation Reservations: 800-444-ADAM

State of Florida

Susan F. Clark Commissioner



Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 (850) 413-6040 Fax: (850) 413-6395

Public Service Commission

MEMORANDUM

June 22, 2000

TO:

BLANCA BAYO, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

KAY POSEY, COMMISSIONER CLARK'S OFFICE

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517

Please place the attached letters on the correspondence side of the docket file for the above-noted docket. Thank you.

Attachment

The Daytona Beach Area Says...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

DE TUMBLE BOOK SAYS...

Dear Commissioner Clark,

Although this card is part of our community effort to secure a single area code for Volusia and Flagler Counties, and for it to be 386 – FUN, I have signed this card personally and do ask you to consider the positive impact your vote to grant our request will have.

Many thanks, Duald farge. Volusia Task Force
For Having FUN
The Chamber, City Island
Daytona Beach, FL 32114 6 6 0 2 8 0
2 0 9 0 0 2 0 0 1 UN 1 6 0 0
7 7 MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 3 2 1 1 4

Honorable Susan F. Clark Public Service Commissioner 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RECEIVED

JUN Z L ZLOU

Florida Public Service Comm, Commissioner Clark

hallsalahalahallahalahahallamatti

ORIGINAL

2000 JUN 21 AM 9 01

E C E I V E 88

JUN 21 2000

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

June 16, 2000

Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee Fl. 32399-0850

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like you to know that I am in agreement of Volusia & Flagler County having one area code. Having more then one is going to cause confusion and would be inefficient.

Thank You,

Dirinda Maddy



ORIGINAL

June 16, 2000

Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee Fl. 32399-0850 JUN 2 1 2000 CONSUMER AFFAIRS RECOFUS AND RECOFUS AND REPPORTING

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like you to know that I am in agreement of Volusia & Flagler County having one area code. Having more then one is going to cause confusion and would be inefficient.

Thank You,

Margaret Mugford

ORIGINAL

RECORDS AND REPORTING

June 16, 2000

Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee Fl. 32399-0850

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like you to know that I am in agreement of Volusia & Flagler County having one area code. Having more then one is going to cause confusion and would be inefficient.

Thank You,

Mary Ann Wilson



APP
CAF
CMP
COM
CTR
ECR
LEG
OPC
PAI
RGO
SEC
SER



June 8, 2000

Mr. Bill Talbott, Executive Director **Public Service Commission** 2540 Shumard Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re:

Volusia County Area Code

Dear Mr. Talbott:

We are real estate developers in Volusia County. Our present project, Harbour Village Golf & Yacht Club, is under construction and will consist of over 800 residential units, a 142 slip marina, yacht club, beach club, golf club, tennis club, health spa and over 25,000 square feet of commercial space.

It has come to our attention that, as Volusia and Flagler counties are running out of telephone numbers, local telephone companies are lobbying for an "overlay" system that would result in multiple area codes for the same geographic region and even the same neighborhood.

Representing our company as well as the thousands of telephone customers that will be residing here in the next several years, we feel this approach is costly, inefficient, confusing and counterproductive to an orderly and effective form of communication.

We are further advised that the possibility exists for a new "386" area code for Volusia and Flagler counties. This area code or any one new area code has our support. Multiple area codes, in our opinion, are not acceptable.

RECEIVED

Florida Public Service Comm.

Commissioner Clark

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any comments.

Very truly yours.

PONCE LIGHTHOUSE PROPERTIES A

Executive Vice President of Development

cc:

Mr. Joe Garcia, PSC

Mr. J Terry Deason, PSC Ms. Lilia A. Jaber, PSC

Ms. Susan F. Clark, PSC

Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, PSC

Mary Albee, Port Orange / South Daytona Chamber of Commerce



RECEIVED

JUN 1 2 ZUUU

Florida Public Service Comm. Commissioner Clark

June 09, 2000

TO:

Public Service Commission Ms. Susan F. Clark Comm 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd Tallahassee, FL 32399

FROM:

JOE CAMERON INSURANCE AGCY, INC

JOE CAMERON, AGENT, CLU, CPCU

1835 S. RIDGEWOOD AVENUE SOUTH DAYTONA, FL 32119

OFF: (904) 767-5363 FAX: (904) 788-8362

RE: New Area Code for Volusia & Flagler Counties

Dear Ms. Clark,

I am writing in reference to your pending action regarding the splitting of area codes for the Volusia/Flagler county area. I am a lifelong resident and 30+ year insurance agent, serving this very same market area. It would truly create a hardship, as I see it, and an unnceesary burden on my business, other businesses in the area, and personal telephone communications to require all of us to use a 10-digit dial for next door businesses or neighbors.

I am encouraging you to assign one area code to Volusia/Flagler county, which would eliminate the need for 10-digit dialing. I encourage you to consider area code 386 as that area code.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and, hopefully, you can find a way to accomplish this important measure.

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Cameron



CONDOMINIUM APARTMENTS

4505 SOUTH ATLANTIC AVENUE PONCE INLET, FLORIDA 32127 OFFICE (904) 767-7561

June 9, 2000

Dear Ms Clark:

We are writing you today to dispute the proposal to have more than one area code in our area and to make 10-digit dialing mandatory. We believe that the mandatory 10-digit dialing will end up costing more money than it is worth. We do support the idea to adopt 386 as the new area code for Volusia and Flagler counties. The idea that 386 spells FUN on your telephone keypad is a very clever marketing tool and why not use it. Not to mention that it will be inefficient and just plain confusing to everyone involved. Please reconsider your proposal and make it "FUN" for everyone involved!!!

Sincerely,

East Wind Condominiums



Florida Public Sarvice Comm. Commissioner Clark

STAED FAMILY ASSOCIATES

2001 South Atlantic Avenue P.O. Box 7218 Daytona Beach Shores, FL 32116

Phone and Fax: 904 257-0251 Toll Free: 1 877-BEACHVU RECEIVED

JUN 12 6000

Florida Public Service Comm. Commissioner Clark

June 8, 2000

Ms. Susan F. Clark, Commissioner Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Ms. Clark:

It has come to my attention that the Florida Public Service Commission is considering an "overlay" system to remedy the increasing problem of insufficient telephone numbers in the Volusia/Flagler area. As I understand it, under this system PSC would add one more additional area code to our counties, thereby making full 10-digit dialing mandatory for every call. I would like for you to consider another option.

As you know, by adding another area code it would be possible for the business across the street, the neighbor next door, or even two telephones within an office to have a different area code. This would mean major revisions of autodialers, as well as any printed material indicating a telephone number. It would be costly, inefficient and very confusing. Instead, I encourage you to consider adopting 386 as a new area code for Volusia and Flagler counties.

Using the area code of 386, which spells FUN, would be a great marketing tool for our local tourism industry. As a hotelier in Daytona Beach and a board member of Visit Florida, Florida's public/private partnership for tourism, I am aware of the benefits that could be derived by adopting the FUN area code, just as was done in Brevard County with the 321 area code.

I fully support the Chambers of Commerce in our area, the County Council, municipal governments, the Volusia Council of Governments and the leaders of major local businesses in their efforts to obtain 386 as the one area code for the "FUNcoast" of Volusia and Flagler counties.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Thomas W. Staed

Chairman

TWS/s

Public Service Commission June 8, 2000 Page 2

cc: Area Code Task Force

Daytona Beach/Halifax Area Chamber of Commerce

P.O. Box 2475

Daytona Beach, FL 32115-2475

CULLETON CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.



5896 Azalea (South Nova Road At Azalea) Port Orange, Florida 32127 (904) 767-8413 Fax: (904) 767-1333 CGC-031686

June 12, 2000

Ms. Susan F. Clark PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RE: TELEPHONE COMPANY 'OVERLAY' SYSTEM

VOLUSIA COUNTY, FL

Dear Ms. Clark:

As a commercial business owner in the Daytona Beach area of Volusia County, I am greatly concerned about the impact the "overlay" system ,which the telephone companies are lobbying for, would have on my business and other businesses.

The overlay system would add one more additional area code to our county and make a full 10 digit dialing mandatory for every call. Under this system it would be possible for the business across the street, my neighbors, or even two telephones within my office to have different area codes.

This would also mean a massive revision of AutoDial, changes in advertising, business cards, forms and everything else in which phone information is used. It would not only be costly, but very inefficient, confusing, and could result in a loss of business for my company.

If a new area code is required for our area, then it should be a consistent area code for Volusia and Flager counties. I support an area wide task force which seeks to have the PSC adopt 386 as a new and lasting area code for Volusia & Flagler counties. 386 spells FUN, and could be a great marketing tool for our tourism industry, and additional support for the growing use of Funcoast as the designation for our place in Florida.

Respectfully,

Robert C. Culleton, President

RCC:dc

RECEIVED

Florida Public Service Comm. Commissioner Clark



June 12, 2000

Buffalo, NY

Charlotte, NC

Clearwater Beach, FL

Colorado Springs, CO

Columbia, SC

Columbus, OH

Dallas, TX

Daytona Beach, FL

Denver, CO

Grand Junction, CO

Houston, TX

Indianapolis, IN

Jacksonville, FL

Kansas City, MO

Memphis, TN

Mobile, AL

Orlando, FL

Philadelphia, PA

St. Louis, MO

San Antonio, TX

Tulsa, OK

Winston-Salem, NC

Daytona Beach 100 N. Atlantic Avenue Daytona Beach, FL 32118 904-254-8200 FAX: 904-253-8841

Adam's Mark Hotels & Resorts A Division of HBE Corporation Reservations: 800-444-ADAM Ms. Susan F. Clark Commissioner Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Ms. Clark:

It has come to my attention that the Florida Public Service Commission will be making a decision in the near future regarding a change in the area code that covers most of Volusia and Flagler counties.

It is also my understanding that the telephone companies are lobbying for a system which would make ten-digit dialing mandatory for every call. In addition, the changes that would be required in business cards, advertising, etc., would be costly and inefficient.

I fully support the task force created by the Chamber, Daytona Beach/Halifax Area which is seeking to have the Public Service Commission adopt 386 as a new and lasting area code for Volusia and Flagler counties. 386 spells FUN and can be a memorable marketing tool for our tourism industry, and additional support for the growing use of Funcoast as the designation for our part of Florida.

I believe the adoption of 386 will give us an area code to grow with that will have minimal impact on our current usage and open promotional opportunities for many businesses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ADAM'S MARK DAYTONA BEACH RESORT

Michael C. Ako General Manager

MCA:ck

RECEIVED

JUN 1 6 2000

Florida Public Service Commissioner Clark

700 OAK STREET(32127) P.O. BOX 290688 PORT ORANGE, FL(32129)

PHONE (904) 767-0711 (904) 767-2543 FAX

June 14, 2000

Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 3299-0805

Attn: Susan F. Clark

Dear Ms. Clark,

It has come to my attention that coming changes in the way we make telephone calls will significantly impact me both in my business and personal phones.

My understanding is that the telephone companies are lobbying for an "overlay" system that would add an additional area code and make a 10 digit dialing mandatory for every call. This would have a massive manpower and costly financial impact on my business. The revisions necessary in speed dial's of phones, computers, and fax machines, business cards, forms and advertising redesigned are only some of the areas impacted.

I believe it is imperative to adopt one lasting area code for Volusia and Flagler county. This is costly to the citizens. The telephone industry needs to be accountable for their planning, verses passing on the costs and impact to the general public.

Sincerely,

ATLAS GLASS, INC.

Elmin K Brounch, Dr Elmer R. Branch, Jr.

RECEIVED

Florida Public Service Comm. Commissioner Clark



R. A. SCOTT CONSTRUCTION CO.

PO. BOX 9667, DAYTONA BEACH, FL 32120-9667 • (904) 238-1234 • FAX (904) 238-7877

June 13, 2000

Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Attention:

Ms. Susan F. Clark

Re:

Telephone Area Code Needs Volusia and Flagler Counties

Dear Ms. Clark:

I have visited areas outside of Florida where the "overlay" system of area codes was implemented. Both residents and businesses there were outspoken about the continuing confusion, inconvenience, and added expense imposed on them by the "overlay" system.

Please don't allow the telephone companies to "overlay" us. I urge you to adopt the proposed new 386 area code as the least disruptive system change.

Very truly yours,

Ronald A. Scott

Secretary/Treasurer

RAS:kc

RECEIVED

JUN 16 2000

Florida Public Service Commiscioner Clark

Hong Wang

From:

Sent:

Beth Keating Wednesday, June 28, 2000 2:36 PM Hong Wang

To: Subject:

RE: 990517

They do not need to be changed to parties. Thanks!

----Original Message----

From: Hong Wang

Sent: Wednesday, June 28, 2000 2:05 PM

To: Beth Keating Subject: 990517

Beth, City of Ormond Beach filed their resolution in this docket. I entered them in CMS as "interested persons." Would you please let me know whether and when I need to change them to "party" status? Thanks.



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: July 6, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: William B. Berg, Assistant to Commissioner Deason

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in Docket No

990517-TL

This office has received the attached correspondence from Taver B. Cornett, Main Street Deland Association. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Deason. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-31-JULY 19, 1991), the following letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Because it is not deemed to be an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However, in such cases Commissioner Deason has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo be, as a matter of routine, placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

WBB:mm

RECEIVED

0 3 2000

Florida Public Service Commissioner Deason

June 28, 2000

Honorable J. Terry Deason Public Service Commissioner 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Honorable J. Terry Deason:

Via this letter I am requesting your efforts to secure a single area code for Volusia and Flagler Counties and for it to be 386 FUN. Our county is already divided between 2 area codes and seems to be headed for 10 digit dialing for all local calls.

In downtown DeLand we have 200 businesses and individuals which MainStreet represents and we hope you can help unite the entire county within one area code.

MainStreet DeLand Association affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunication subscribers in Volusia County.

Thanking you for your efforts for this campaign.

Sincerely,

Taver B. Cornett Executive Director



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE: July 6, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: William B. Berg, Assistant to Commissioner Deason WBD

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in Docket No:

990517-TL

This office has received the attached correspondence from James V. Canfield, Mayor, City of Palm Coast. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Deason. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-31-JULY 19, 1991), the following letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Because it is not deemed to be an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However, in such cases Commissioner Deason has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo be, as a matter of routine, placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

WBB:mm

Cty of Palm Coust

P. O. Box 354610 Palm Coast, FL 32135-4610 Phone: (904) 447-4255 Fax: (904) 447-4259

Mayor Jim Canfield

Vice-Mayor James F. Holland City Manager Richard Kelton City Clerk/Finance Director Doug Courtney JUL 5 7000

Councilman William Venne, Seat b MM. Councilman Jerome K. Full, Seat 2 Councilman Rathy Curren Seat 4

June 28, 2000

The Honorable Joe Garcia
Chairman
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Public Service Corporation
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Ref. Docket 990517

Dear Mr. Garcia:

The City Council of the City of Palm Coast has voted unanimously to support the position advanced by government and business leaders of Volusia County to establish 386 as the new Volusia/Flagler two-county area code.

The two counties are linked in many ways—through the Daytona Beach Community College, which has a major branch here; though the drainage and water management concerns of the St. Johns River Water Management District; through the services available at the Daytona Beach International Airport and the shopping recreational, employment, and civic institutions serving residents of both counties. There is a steady flow of workers, shoppers, and visitors between the two counties on I-95, U.S. 1 and A1A.

A fractured area code would be a significant inconvenience and cost to the citizens of both counties, which we hope you will recognize by approving a common area code.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue to our residents.

Sincerely.

Janes V. Carfuld/tw

Mayor

cc:

Ms. Susan F. Clark, Commissioner

Mr. J. Terry Deason, Commissioner

Ms. Lila A. Jaber, Commissioner

Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, Commissioner

Mr. Bill Talbott, Commissioner

Ann McFall, Co-Chair, Area Code Task Force John E. Evans, Co-Chair Area Code Task Force Palm Coart

P. O. Box 354610 Palm Coast, FL 32135-4610 Phone: (904) 447-4255 Fax: (904) 447-4259

Mayor Jim Canfield

Vice-Mayor James F. Holland City Manager Richard Kelton City Clerk/Finance Director Doug Courtney Councilman William Venne, Seat 1 Councilman Jerome K. Full, Seat 2 Councilman Raiph Carter, Seat 4

June 28, 2000

The Honorable Joe Garcia Chairman 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Public Service Corporation Tallahassee, Florida 32399

RECEIVED

JUN 2 9 2000

Florida Public Service Comm. Commissioner Deason

Ref. Docket 990517

Dear Mr. Garcia:

The City Council of the City of Palm Coast has voted unanimously to support the position advanced by government and business leaders of Volusia County to establish 386 as the new Volusia/Flagler two-county area code.

The two counties are linked in many ways—through the Daytona Beach Community College, which has a major branch here; though the drainage and water management concerns of the St. Johns River Water Management District; through the services available at the Daytona Beach International Airport and the shopping recreational, employment, and civic institutions serving residents of both counties. There is a steady flow of workers, shoppers, and visitors between the two counties on I-95, U.S. 1 and A1A.

A fractured area code would be a significant inconvenience and cost to the citizens of both counties, which we hope you will recognize by approving a common area code.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue to our residents.

Sincerely,

Janes V. Carfuld/tw

cc:

Ms. Susan F. Clark, Commissioner

Mr. J. Terry Deason, Commissioner Ms. Lila A. Jaber, Commissioner

Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, Commissioner

Mr. Bill Talbott, Commissioner

Ann McFall, Co-Chair, Area Code Task Force

John E. Evans, Co-Chair Area Code Task Force

Kay Flynn

To:

Leroy Rasberry

Subject: RE: Area code

Yes, it's docketed. I will print a copy for the docket file.

----Original Message-----From: Leroy Rasberry

Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2000 12:56 PM

To: Kay Flynn
Cc: Leroy Rasberry
Subject: RE: Area code

Kay,

Is this yours?

----Original Message----From: Ruth McHarque

Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2000 11:55 AM

To: Leroy Rasberry; Carmen Pena

Subject: FW: Area code

Should this be sent to Records and Reporting since it is a docket matter?

----Original Message-----From: Angie Hashisho

Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2000 11:10 AM

To: Ruth McHargue Subject: FW: Area code

Addressed to Chairman Deason

----Original Message----

From: don howell [mailto:don0992@cfl.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2000 11:07 AM
To: Jeb@Jeb.org; contact@psc.state.fl.us

Cc: Frank Bruno; Joe Jaynes; Big John; Dwight Lewis; Ann McFall; Pat Northy; Jim Ward; Jim

King; Evelyn Lynn; John Thrasher; Pat Patterson; Toni Jennings

Subject: Area code

Attn. J. Terry Deason,

Chairman:

Florida Public Services Commission

It has come to my attention that your board is considering area code changes in central and north Florida. We of Volusia County are standing by our 904 area code and hope that the entire county can have that (904) area code as well as county wide toll free service.

This was probably going to be in place a few years back but was stopped by a Count Council member at the last minute. He was not knowledgeable of what he was doing.

APP
CAF
CMP
COM
CTR
ECR
LEG
I
OPC
PAI
RGO
SEC
SER
OTH

It is hoped that you and your board will be more cognizant to the people of Volusia instead of the few who think they know the will of the people than the people do.

Thank you, Donald C. Howell 253 W. Palmetto Av. DeLand, FL. 32720

don0992@cfl.rr.com

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CONSUMER REQUEST

2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD

TALLAHASSEE, FL. 32399-850

850-413-6100



PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM WITH REPORT OF ACTION TO:

Kate Smith

Public Service Commission

| Name HOWELL , DONALD MR. | _ | Company | Request | No. 323791C |
|-------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| i iness Name | | | * : # | 500 00 2 00 00 100 1 00 |
| Address 253 W PALMETTO AVENUE | | County Consumer's Telephone # | By KES Tim | Phone INTERNET |
| 8 12175 121 | | Can be | | |
| City/Zip De Land | 32720- | Reached | | |
| Account Number E-Mail Address | | don0992@cfl.rr.com | Outreach OTHER | Date 07/12/20 |
| | | | Public Official N | - |

Customer comments on the 9904 Area Code issue in Volusia County. Close by e-mail Copy to RAR

REPORTING RECORDS AND

00 JUL 17 PH 3:22

RECEIVED FPSC

Kate Smith

To: Subject: don0992@cfl.rr.com 904 Area Code Issue

Re: DOCKET NO. 990517-TL

904 AREA CODE

Thank you for contacting the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) about the 904 Area Code Relief Plan for Volusia and Flagler Counties. We appreciate your comments.

Your E-mail will be placed in the correspondence side of the docket and will be available for review by all interested parties. The PSC is scheduled to vote on this docket at the Agenda Conference on August 29, 2000.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Kate Smith at 1-800-342-3552, by toll-free fax at 1-800-511-0809, or by E-mail at ksmith@psc.state.fl.us.

323787C

Karen Dockham

From:

don howell [don0992@cfl.rr.com]

Sent:

Wednesday, July 12, 2000 10:15 AM

To:

Jeb@Jeb.org; Joe Garcia

Cc:

Jim King; Evelyn Lynn; John Thrasher; Pat Patterson; Toni Jennings

Subject: Area code

Joe,

It has come to my attention that your board is considering area code changes in central and north Florida. We of Volusia County are standing by our 904 area code and hope that the entire county can have that (904) area code as well as county wide toll free service.

This was probably going to be in place a few years back but was stopped by a Count Council member at the last minute. He went now knowledgeable of what he was doing.

It is hoped that you and your board will be more cognizant to the people of Volusia instead of the few who think they know the will of the people than the people do.

Thank you, Donald C. Howell 253 W. Palmetto Av. DeLand, FL. 32720

don0992@cfl.rr.com

Karen Dockham

> << Area code>>

From: don howell [don0992@cfl.rr.com] Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2000 1:26 PM To: Kathleen Stewart; Karen Dockham Subject: Re: Notification: Inbound Mail Failure Please have them do the courtesy of a reply. Don ---- Original Message ----From: "Karen Dockham" < KDockham@PSC.STATE.FL.US> To: "'don howell'" <don0992@cfl.rr.com>; "Kathleen Stewart" <KStewart@PSC.STATE.FL.US> Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2000 10:18 AM Subject: FW: Notification: Inbound Mail Failure > Commissioner Garcia is no longer with the PSC. Your message is being sent > to the appropriate Commission personnel. > Sys Admin >> ----Original Message---->> From: Karen Dockham >> Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2000 10:15 AM >> To: Karen Dockham >> Subject: Notification: Inbound Mail Failure >> >> >> The following recipients did not receive the attached mail. >> Reasons are listed with each recipient: >> >> < jgarcia@psc.state.fl.us> jgarcia@psc.state.fl.us >> MSEXCH:IMS:FPSC:PSC:PSC-EXCHANGE 0 (000C05A6) Unknown Recipient >> >> The message that caused this notification was: >> >> >>

2:22 PM 7/12/00

Karen Dockham

From:

Karen Dockham

Sent:

Wednesday, July 12, 2000 10:15 AM

To:

Karen Dockham

Subject:

Notification: Inbound Mail Failure

The following recipients did not receive the attached mail. Reasons are listed with each recipient:

<jgarcia@psc.state.fl.us> jgarcia@psc.state.fl.us
MSEXCH:IMS:FPSC:PSC:PSC-EXCHANGE 0 (000C05A6) Unknown Recipient

The message that caused this notification was:

 \searrow

Area code

Kay Flynn

From:

Levent Ileri

Sent:

Tuesday, July 25, 2000 8:28 AM

To:

'patkelly@n-jcenter.com'

Cc:

Cheryl Bulecza-Banks; Della Fordham; Ruth McHargue; Kay Flynn

Subject:

904 Area Code (Docket No. 990517-TL)

Dear Ms. Pounds:

This is in response to your July 19, 2000, e-mail to the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) regarding the numbering issues in the 904 area code. We truly appreciate your interest in this matter. I am responding to your letter because Commissioners are prohibited by Chapter 350, Florida Statutes, from commenting on the merits of a docket pending before the FPSC.

As you may be aware, the FPSC held public hearings in Lake City, Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Daytona Beach, and Deltona between January 26 and 28, 2000, to receive input from customers regarding the relief proposals for the 904 area code. The North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) recently stated that the 386 area code is reserved for the relief of the 904 area code.

NANPA has to follow the Industry Numbering Committee's guidelines. Ideally, all of the area codes in a given area should exhaust about the same time in the case of geographic splits. According to these guidelines, severe imbalances, for example, a difference in area code lifetimes of more than 15 years, should be avoided. Thus, the 386 area code needs to be used in conjunction with an area code relief alternative that Commissioners will decide at the August 29, 2000, Agenda Conference.

Thank you again for your interest in this matter, and we will place your comment letter in our docket file. If you have any additional questions, please call me at (850) 413-6562.

Sincerely,

Levent Ileri

Engineer, Division of Competitive Services

CC:

Cheryl Bulecza-Banks, Chief, Bureau of Competitive Safeguards Bureau of Records and Recording, Docket File, Docket No. 990517REPORTING

JUL 25 AM 8: 44

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: July 31, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: William B. Berg, Assistant to Commissioner Deason

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in Docket No

990517-TL

This office has received the attached correspondence from Gregory S. Wood, Executive Director, VCOG, Inc. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Deason. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-31-JULY 19, 1991), the following letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Because it is not deemed to be an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However, in such cases Commissioner Deason has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo be, as a matter of routine, placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

WBB:mm

VCOG, INC.

Chairman. ...ayor James Vandergrifft Executive Director: Gregory S. Wood

RECEIVED

JUL 28 2000

Chairman Deason

1190 Pelican Bay Drive Daytona Beach, FL 32119-1381

July 25, 2000

Honorable J. Terry Deason Public Service Commissioner 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

REFERENCE DOCKET 990517

KEFERENCE DOCKET 99051

Dear Commissioner Deason:

During the public hearings regarding potential changes to the area code for Volusia and Flagler counties, one of the most significant arguments against anything but a new single area code was the potential economic damage that would result from further fragmentation of the area's identity. Area business and government leaders have seen a single area code as a means to reduce divisions. However, a potential change to a single area code also provides a unique opportunity to capitalize on our area's uncommon qualities by assigning the 386 (FUN) area code. Attached you will find numerous resolutions from all the area's local governments, businesses, and other organizations. They all see the economic value of this unique code for our area. We hope that you will see that same value and your recommendation will be in support of a single area code and that it be 386.

Thank you for your continued attention and understanding.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Wood

Executive Director

Attachments

cc: John C. Cutting, PSC Regulatory Analyst Supervisor

Chairman: Mayor James L. Vandergrifft Executive Director: Gregory S. Wood

1190 Pelican Bay Drive Daytona Beach, FL 32119-1381

REFERENCE DOCKET 990517

CERTIFICATE OF RESOLUTION NO. 2000-04

I THE UNERSIGNED ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT AND CUSTODIAN OF THE OFFICIAL RECORDS OF VCOG, INC. DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ATTACHED IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF RESOLUTION NO. 2000-04, DULY ADOPTED AT THE APRIL 24, 2000, REGULAR MEETING OF THE VCOG GOVERNING BOARD, AND AS THE SAME APPEARS ON RECORD IN THE FILES OF VCOG, INC.

MARY CURRAN VCOG ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT July 26, 2000

Resolution No. 2000-04

A Resolution Of VCOG, Inc., Volusia County, Florida, In Addendum To Resolution 99-03, Expressing A Desire That The Florida Public Service Commission Approve A Single Area Code For All Of Volusia County And Designate 386 (FUN) As The New Area Code To Replace 904 And 407 In Volusia County.

Whereas, VCOG (Volusia Council of Governments) was established in January, 1970, as a council of local public officials to develop coordinated plans, programs, and policies of mutual interest; and

Whereas, the Governing Board of VCOG is comprised of representatives from the Cities of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, DeBary, DeLand, Deltona, Edgewater, Holly Hill, Lake Helen, New Smyrna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, South Daytona and the County of Volusia; and

Whereas, the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

Whereas, it is apparent that the 904 area code, which applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

Whereas, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit;

Now Therefore, Be It Resolved, by the Governing Board of VCOG, Inc. as follows:

Section 1. The Governing Board of VCOG, Inc. reaffirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 3. The VCOG staff is hereby directed to provide a certified copy of this resolution to the Public Service Commission.

Be It Further Resolved, that this Resolution as adopted be attached to the minutes of this meeting held April 24, 2000, in the Conference Room at 1190 Pelican Bay Drive, Daytona Beach, Florida.

VCOG, Inc

Attest:

Recording Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 00-153

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH SUPPORTING THE VOLUSIA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS' (VCOG) DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING WHEN THIS RESOLUTION SHALL TAKE EFFECT.

WHEREAS, in recognizing that explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers, the Volusia County Council believes the 904 area code will soon run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, the members of VCOG have requested that 386 (FUN) be the area code assigned to Volusia County and ask area cities to support this request by resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. The City Commission hereby supports the Volusia Council of Governments' (VCOG) desire that the Florida Public Service Commission approves a single area code for all of Volusia County and designates 386 (FUN) as the new area code to replace 904 and 407 in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The City Clerk is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Volusia Council of Governments.

RESOLUTION 2000-11

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Daytona Beach Shores City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is world famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA:

The Daytona Beach Shores City Council affirms its position that there should be Section 1. a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN). Section 2.

This resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption. Section 3.

MAYOR, DR. RALPH BETANCOURT

ATTEST:

CITY MANAGER, MICHAEL T. BOOKER

Approved as to form and legality:

CITY ATTORNEY, MARGARET ROBERTS

Adopted this 14th day of Time, 2000. Posted on the 15th day of Time, 2000.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-08

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF DeBARY, FLORIDA EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications industry is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the Volusia County Council and the City of DeBary that the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, within the corporate limits of the City of DeBary there are 904 and 407 area codes assigned to telecommunication subscribers; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF DEBARY AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City of DeBary affirms the Volusia County Council's position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2.

The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3.

This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED BY the City Council of the City of DeBary, Florida this 5th day of April, 2000.

ATTEST:

Maryana Karkanich, City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-16

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF DELAND, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA AND FLAGLER COUNTIES AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUISA AND FLAGLER COUNTIES; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the City Commission that the 904 area code, which applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia/Flagler County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF DELAND, FLORIDA:

Section 1. The City Commission hereby affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia/Flagler Counties, and that the new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 2. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED this 17th day of April, 2000.

David C. Rigsby Mayor-Commissioner

ATTEST:

Julie A. Hennessy

City Clerk - Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

Mark A. Zimmerman

City Attorney

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-09

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DELTONA, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the City Commission the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and other leisure activities, is worldfamous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY
OF DELTONA, FLORIDA, as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED BY the City Commission of the City of Deltona, Florida this 17th day of April,

2000.

Touth G. Miller CMC/A AF City Clerk

Approved as to Form & Legality for Use & Reliance by the City of Deltona, Florida

James A. Fowler, City Attorney

NAME YES NO
CAREY X
HARVEY X
HORN X
MASIARCZYK X
PEREZ X
RUNGE X
WHEATLEY X

John Masiarczyk, Mayor

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-R-11

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EDGEWATER, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Edgewater City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is Word-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Edgewater, Florida:

- Section 1. The City of Edgewater affirms its position that there should be single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
 - Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).
 - Section 3. This resolution shall take effect upon adoption.

After a motion by <u>Councilmo Brom</u> and Second by <u>Councilon Leette</u>, the vote on this resolution was as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-R-30

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF HOLLY HILL, FLORIDA EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY: SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY: AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County and is expected to run out of numbers - necessitating its replacement; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and seemingly endless other leisure activities is known to be World Famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HOLLY HILL, FLORIDA:

Section 1. That the Holly Hill City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

That the Holly Hill City Commission supports the designation of 386 (FUN) as the new area code in Volusia County.

That this Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption. Section 3.

The within and foregoing Resolution was read before the City Commission of the City of Holly Hill, Florida, at its regular meeting held in Commission Chambers at City Hall, 1065 Ridgewood Avenue, Holly Hill, Florida, on the 13th day of June, A.D. 2000.

It was moved by Commissioner Via and seconded by Commissioner Tarrer that said Resolution be adopted. A roll call vote of the Commission on said motion of the Resolution resulted as follows:

| Mayor William Arthur | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Arthur Byrnes | Yes |
| Commissioner Paul Lockeby | Yes |
| Commissioner Keith Tarrer | Yes |
| Commissioner Roland Via | Yes |

Res. 2000-R-30 6/13/00

WHEREAS, the Mayor of the City of Holly Hill, Florida, has hereunto set his official signature, duly authorized by the City Clerk, and has caused the official seal of said City to be affixed, all at the City Hall in the City of Holly Hill, this 15th day of June, A.D. 2000, for the purpose of authenticity as is required by law.

City of Holly Hill, Florida

William D. Arthur, Mayor

Continued to appear in the company of the continued of th

Attest:

(flancent.

Jeaneen P. Clauss, City Clerk

RESOLUTION 2000-07

A RESOLUTION BY THE CITY OF LAKE HELEN, FLORIDA, SUPPORTING THE VOLUSIA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT PROPOSAL TO THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR A NEW SINGLE AREA CODE OF "386" (FUN) FOR ALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUBSCRIBERS IN VOLUSIA COUNTY TO REPLACE AREA CODES 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Volusia Council of Governments (VCOG) was established in January, 1970, as a council of local public officials to develop coordinated plans, programs, and policies of mutual interest; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of VCOG is comprised of representatives from the cities of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, Debary, DeLand, Deltona, Edgewater, Holly Hill, Lake Helen, New Smryna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, South Daytona and the County of Volusia; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County and is soon to run out of available numbers and is likely to be replaced with a new area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County offers a plethora of leisure activities, sparkling beaches, radiant sunshine and friendly residents all attributing to a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Commission of the City of Lake Helen, Florida, as follows:

SECTION I: The City Commission of the City of Lake Helen supports VCOG's recommendation for a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION II: That the City Commission of the City of Lake Helen endorses "386" (FUN) as the single, new area code for all of Volusia County.

SECTION III: That the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Public Service Commission.

SECTION IV: This Resolution repeals all resolutions, or parts of resolutions, in conflict herewith.

SECTION V: This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage and adoption.

THIS RESOLUTION DULY PASSED AND ADOPTED ON THIS 64 DAY OF Meeting duly assembled.

DAY OF Meeting duly assembled.

ATTEST:

Ray Leibensperger, CMC, City Clerk

CITY OF LAKE HELEN, FLORIDA

Mark Shuttleworth, Mayor

APPROYED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

Mighael S. Teal, City Attorney

1 **RESOLUTION NO. 13-00** A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE 2 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE 3 A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY 4 5 AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE 6 TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY: PRO-7 VIDING FOR CONFLICTING RESOLUTIONS; AND PRO-VIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. 8 WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly 9 is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and 10 WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the 11 greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; and 12 WHEREAS, the area is expected to run out of numbers and the 13 City Commission expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and 14 WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and 1.5 endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place 16 17 to live and visit. NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY 18 19 OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA: Desire for One Area Code for Volusia County. That 20 the City Commission affirms its position that there should be a 21 single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in 22 23 Volusia County. 24 **SECTION 2:** Designation of New Area Code. That the new area 25 code should be designated as 386 (FUN). 26 Conflicting Resolutions. That all other resolutions SECTION3: or parts thereof that are in conflict with this resolution are 27 28 hereby rescinded and repealed. 29 **SECTION 4:** Effective Date. That this resolution shall take 30 effect immediately upon its final passage.

| 31 | APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CORRECTNESS: |
|----|--------------------------------------|
| 32 | Zamillen |
| 33 | EDWARD H. BEAZLEY, JR. |
| 34 | City Attorney |
| 35 | DATE: May 25, 2000 |

The Within and Foregoing Resolution No. 13-00 was introduced and read before the City Commission of the City of New Smyrna Beach, Florida at its Special Meeting held at City Hall in said City on May 30, 2000. Motion was made by Vice Mayor Rogers, and seconded by Commissioner O'Bannon, that said Resolution be adopted.

A roll-call vote of the City Commission on said motion to adopt the Resolution resulted as follows:

| MAYOR JAMES L. VANDERGRIFFT | Yes |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| VICE MAYOR WILLIAM D. ROGERS | Yes |
| COMMISSIONER JAMES W. HATHAWAY | Yes |
| COMMISSIONER ORETHA W. BELL | Yes |
| COMMISSIONER JO ANN O'BANNON | Yes |

Whereupon, the Mayor of the City of New Smyrna Beach, Florida has hereunto set his official signature, duly attested by the Acting City Clerk, and has caused the Official Seal of said City to be hereunto affixed for the purpose of authenticity and as is required by law.

Mayor of the City of Ne

Smyrna Beach, Florida

As Acting City Clerk of the City of New Smyrna Beach,

Florida

RESOLUTION NO. 13-00

RESOLUTION 00-12

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF OAK HILL, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386(FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Port Orange City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling leaches and endless other leisure activities, is Word-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Commission of the City of Oak Hill, Volusia County, Florida:

- The Qak Hill City Council affirms its position that there should Section 1. be a single, new code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
- Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).
- Section 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

The above and foregoing resolution was moved for approval by Commissioner Jusan Cook and seconded by Commissioner Davy Frans and upon vote subscribed herein, the same was declared to be adopted at this Regular Meeting of the City Commission of Oak Hill, Florida held on June 5,2000.

A roll call vote resulted as follows: 3-0 passed.

GARY C. BITTLE, VICE-MAYOR/COMMISSIONER (5)

RESOLUTION

00-08

05/25/00

DARRY L. EVANS, COMMISSIONER (1)

Abent
ROBERTA S. SIMMONS, COMMISSIONER (4)

Susan a. Cook, Commissioner (3)

ATTEST:

Am Chebano
City Clerk Kim Cherbano

Approved for Legality and Form:

EITY ATTORNEY GAYLE GRAZIANO

RESOLUTION 00-08 05/25/00

RESOLUTION NO. 18-00

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ORANGE CITY, FLORIDA, SUPPORTING VOLUSIA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS PROPOSAL TO THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR A NEW, SINGLE AREA CODE OF "386" (FUN) FOR ALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUBSCRIBERS IN VOLUSIA COUNTY TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA.

WHEREAS, the Volusia Council of Governments (VCOG) was established in January, 1970, as a council of local public officials to develop coordinated plans, programs, and policies of mutual interest; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of VCOG is comprised of representatives from the Cities of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, Debary, Deland, Deltona, Edgewater, Holly Hill, Lake Helen, New Smyrna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, South Daytona and the County of Volusia; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County and is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced with a new area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County has sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities as well as being the home of the world-famous beach that is a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Orange City, Florida:

- **SECTION 1.** That the City Council of the City of Orange City supports VCOG's recommendation for a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
- SECTION 2. That the City Council of the City of Orange City endorses "386" (FUN) as the single, new area code for all of Volusia County.
- SECTION 3. That the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Public Service Commission.
- SECTION 4. All resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict herewith be and the same are hereby repealed.

| SECTION 5. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption. | 0 |
|--|-------------------|
| Carried mandre | Ht n |
| This Resolution was introduced and sponsored by Councilments | SCOTH |
| and was read and passed by the City Council of the City of Orange City, Florida, at a regular | meeting |
| of said Council held on the day of May, 2000, and approved as provided | l by law. |
| COM CONTROL OF SOLVE | |
| ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS: | |
| 在1997年以中的一个人已经通過1985年的1986年代的大学。1987年1987年,所通過2019年 | |
| CORP. WE THE STREET AND THE STREET OF STREET OF STREET | |
| | |
| Gary A. Blair | |
| Jan Mahree. Us | |
| Jim Mahoney /// | |
| 20001 | |
| Veras 6 MMI | |
| George E. Stone | |
| I I I I I I I I I I | |
| Saint & cisteel | |
| Harold D. Casteel | |
| | |
| 9) - C W - VX | |
| David W. Fancher | |
| and NO | |
| alla Thin | <u>a</u> samen si |
| Albert T. Erwin, Vice Mayor | word harde |
| // / // // // // // // // // // // // / | |
| Christing R. Jebbr Wis | <u>1</u> 147 |
| Anthony R. Yebba, Mayor | |
| | |
| of the state of the state of the first by the City council at the City of the state | |
| ATTEST: | |
| Attrice of Son | |
| y would be | |
| Patricia A. Lee, CMC, City Clerk | |
| TI: D 14' | |
| This Resolution approved as to form and legal sufficiency: | |
| CEDA 3. Let $_{ m Li}$ City Correlate of the City at Outrige City and the $_{ m City}$ | |
| Mark Ly | |
| William Paigahmann City Attamay | 0 |
| William Reischmann, City Attorney Resolution No. 18-0 |) |

RESOLUTION NO. 2000 - 97

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the City of Ormond Beach City Commission expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is world famous as a FUN place to live and visit, now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ORMOND BEACH, FLORIDA, THAT:

SECTION ONE. The City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION TWO. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION THREE. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

APPROVED AND AUTHENTICATED this 20th day of June, 2000.

Carl Leisis

CARL PERSIS

Mayor

ATTEST:

VERONICA PATTERSON

City Clerk

RESOLUTION 00-02

A Resolution of the municipality the Town of Pierson, Volusia County, Florida supporting VCOG, Inc. in its application for funding from the Emergency Medical Services Award Trust Fund, for the purpose of studying the Fire/Rescue and the Emergency Medical services Delivery System on behalf of the County of Volusia and its municipalities.

Whereas, the Municipality of the Town of Pierson is dedicated to providing its residents with the highest service levels practical utilizing the most cost effective means; and

Whereas, there is need of more cost efficiency in response to medical emergencies within Volusia County; and

Whereas, there may be cost savings and efficiencies which may be identified in the Fire / EMS response structure through a study of that structure; and

Whereas, the VCOG Governing Board was tasked with developing recommendations for such savings and efficiencies based on the groundwork initially laid by the local Government Study Commission;

Now therefore, it be it resolved by the Municipal Council of the Town of Pierson, Florida:

Section 1. The municipality of the Town of Pierson supports the application of VCOG, Inc. for Emergency Medical Services Award trust fund, not to exceed \$ 125,000.00, on behalf of the municipality to fund a study of the Fire / Rescue and Emergency Medical Services delivery system to identify potential areas of municipal cost avoidance, resource sharing, and first tier compensation.

Section 2. This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption and staff is hereby directed to provide a certified copy of this resolution to VCOG, Inc. for inclusion in the support materials for the Emergency Medical Services Award Trust Fund.

Be it further resolved, that this Resolution as adopted be attached to the minutes Of this meeting held June 13, 2000.

Municipality of the Town of Pierson

amuel G.S. Bennett, Chairman

ATTEST:

Deborah J. LeBlanc, Town Clerk

RESOLUTION # 00-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF PONCE INLET, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the Ponce Inlet Town Council the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced;

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF PONCE INLET, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Town Council affirms its position there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

It was moved by Mr. Hampton and seconded by Mr. Rogerson that said Resolution be adopted. A roll call vote of the Town Council on said motion resulted as follows:

Mayor Hoak
Councilman Albuquerque
Councilman Hampton
Vice Mayor Lewis
Councilman Rogerson

YES
ABSENT
YES

Passed and adopted this 19th day of April, 2000.

William P. Hoak, Mayor


ATTEST:

Robert L. Norris Town Manager

Approved as to form and legality for the use and reliance of the Town of Ponce

Inlet, Florida, only.

Theodore R. Doran/Town Attorney



RESOLUTION NO. 00-23

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORT ORANGE, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Port Orange City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is Word-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORT ORANGE, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1. The Port Orange City Council affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 3. This resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

MAYOR DOROTHY L. HUKILL

ATTEST:

Jenneth W. Tarlur Kenneth W. Parker, City Manager

Adopted this 18thday of April, 2000

Reviewed and Approved:

Acting City Attorney

c:\wpdocs\res\areacode.386

RESOLUTION No. 2000-63

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the Volusia County Council the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced;

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, IN OPEN MEETING DULY ASSEMBLED IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, DELAND, FLORIDA, THIS 23RD DAY OF MARCH, A.D. 2000, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION I: The Volusia County Council affirms its position there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION II: The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION III: This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

DONE AND ORDERED IN OPEN MEETING.

COUNTY COUNCIL VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA

BY

AMES E. WARD, CHAIR

RAY W. PENNEBAKER,

ACTING COUNTY MANAGER



RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator is the agency to control telephone numbers in all North America and the explosion of new telephone lines for fax machines, cellular phone and internet access makes it difficult to make projections on future area code needs.

WHEREAS, the County is now divided between the 904 and 407 area codes, but the 904 is expected to exhaust its available telephone numbers by 2001.

WHEREAS, Volusia Council of Government (VCOG) has initiated a campaign to rid Volusia County of its 904/407 split and to gain a new single area code.

WHEREAS, the options available to Volusia County include a new area code, or overlay, for the entire geographical area served by 904 and, an overlay for the entire 904 area code would require callers to dial 10 digits for local calls.

WHEREAS, Volusia County Council has already declared its intention to shift Southwest Volusia out of 407 code back into any code serving the existing 904 code.

WHEREAS, the PSC agreed to exempt most of Southwest Volusia from the new code plan because the area already is split between the 407 and 904 area codes.

WHEREAS, government and business leaders lobbied for the exemption, hoping to unite the entire county within one new area code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY ENTERPRISE VOLUSIA, INC. OF VOLUSIA COUNTY FLORIDA:

<u>Section 1.</u> Enterprise Volusia Inc. affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunication subscribers in Volusia County.


Section 2. The new area code should be designated at 386 (FUN).

Taver Cornett

Chairman of the Board

a partnership for economic development

1901 Mason Avenue • Suite 107 • Daytona Beach, FL 32117 • 904-274-3800 FAX 904-274-3804 • E-MAIL: info@floridabusiness.org • www.floridabusiness.org



HOTEL MOTEL association OF VOLUSIA COUNTY

RESOLUTION 2000-10

WHEREAS, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator is the agency to control telephone numbers in all North America and the explosion of new telephone lines for fax machines, cellular phones and internet access makes it difficult to make projections on future area code needs.

WHEREAS, the County is now divided between the 904 and 407 area codes, but the 904 is expected to exhausts its available telephone numbers by 2001.

WHEREAS, Volusia Council of Government, (VCOG) has initiated a campaign to rid Volusia County of its 904/407 spit and to gain a new single area code.

WHEREAS, the options available to Volusia County include a) new area code, or overlay, for the entire geographical area served by 904. An overlay for the entire 904 area code would require callers to dial 10 digits for local calls.

WHEREAS, Volusia County Council has already declared its intention to shift Southwest Volusia out of 407 code back into any code serving the existing 904 code.

WHEREAS, the PSC agreed to exempt most of Southwest Volusia from the new code plan because the area already is spit between the 407 and 904 area codes.

WHEREAS, government and business leaders lobbied for the exemption, hoping to unite the entire county within one new area code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOTEL MOTEL ASSOCIATION OF VOLUSIA COUNTY FLORIDA:

Section 1. The Hotel Motel Association of Volusia County affirms it position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunication subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated at 386 (FUN).

Bob Davis

President, Hotel Motel Association of Volusia County

2 Davis

140 South Beach Street, Suite 101, Daytona Beach, FL 32114 Phone: 904-257-6828 Fax: 904-257-0909 Email: Hlodgingas@aol.com REFERENCE DOCKET 990517

City of Palm Coust

P. O. Box 354610 Palm Coast, FL 32135-4610 Phone: (904) 447-4255 Fax: (904) 447-4259

Mayor Jim Canfield

Vice-Mayor James F. Holland City Manager Richard Kelton City Clerk/Finance Director Dong Courtney Councilman William Venne, Seat 1 Councilman Jerome K. Full, Seat 2 Councilman Ralph Carter, Seat 4

June 28, 2000

The Honorable Joe Garcia Chairman 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Public Service Corporation Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Ref. Docket 990517

Dear Mr. Garcia:

The City Council of the City of Palm Coast has voted unanimously to support the position advanced by government and business leaders of Volusia County to establish 386 as the new Volusia/Flagler two-county area code.

The two counties are linked in many ways—through the Daytona Beach Community College, which has a major branch here; though the drainage and water management concerns of the St. Johns River Water Management District; through the services available at the Daytona Beach International Airport and the shopping recreational, employment, and civic institutions serving residents of both counties. There is a steady flow of workers, shoppers, and visitors between the two counties on I-95, U.S. 1 and A1A.

A fractured area code would be a significant inconvenience and cost to the citizens of both counties, which we hope you will recognize by approving a common area code.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue to our residents.

Sincerely,

James V. Carfuld/tw

Mayor

cc: Ms. Susan F. Clark, Commissioner

Mr. J. Terry Deason, Commissioner Ms. Lila A. Jaber, Commissioner

Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, Commissioner

Mr. Bill Talbott, Commissioner

Ann McFall, Co-Chair, Area Code Task Force John E. Evans, Co-Chair Area Code Task Force

State of Florida

Susan F. Clark Commissioner



Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 (850) 413-6040

Fax: (850) 413-6395

Public Service Commission

MEMORANDUM

August 2, 2000

TO:

BLANCA BAYO, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

KAY POSEY, COMMISSIONER CLARK'S OFFICE

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517

Please place the attached letter and attachments on the correspondence side of the docket file for the above-noted docket. Thank you.

Attachment

An Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer

VCOG, INC.
Volusia Council of Governments

Chairman: Mayor James Vandergrifft Executive Director: Gregory S. Wood

1190 Pelican Bay Drive Daytona Beach, FL 32119-1381

July 25, 2000

Honorable Susan F. Clark Public Service Commissioner 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

REFERENCE DOCKET 99051

Dear Commissioner Clark:

During the public hearings regarding potential changes to the area code for Volusia and Flagler counties, one of the most significant arguments against anything but a new single area code was the potential economic damage that would result from further fragmentation of the area's identity. Area business and government leaders have seen a single area code as a means to reduce divisions. However, a potential change to a single area code also provides a unique opportunity to capitalize on our area's uncommon qualities by assigning the 386 (FUN) area code. Attached you will find numerous resolutions from all the area's local governments, businesses, and other organizations. They all see the economic value of this unique code for our area. We hope that you will see that same value and your recommendation will be in support of a single area code and that it be 386.

Thank you for your continued attention and understanding.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Wood Executive Director

Attachments

RECEIVED

Florida Public Service Comm. Commissioner Clark

cc: John C. Cutting, PSC Regulatory Analyst Supervisor

SERVING THE MEMBER GOVERNMENTS OF VOLUSIA COUNTY

(904) 322 -5160

Suncom 380-5160

Fax (904) 322-5164



1190 Pelican Bay Drive Daytona Beach, FL 32119-1381

REFERENCE DOCKET 990517

CERTIFICATE OF RESOLUTION NO. 2000-04

I THE UNERSIGNED ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT AND CUSTODIAN OF THE OFFICIAL RECORDS OF VCOG, INC. DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ATTACHED IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF RESOLUTION NO. 2000-04, DULY ADOPTED AT THE APRIL 24, 2000, REGULAR MEETING OF THE VCOG GOVERNING BOARD, AND AS THE SAME APPEARS ON RECORD IN THE FILES OF VCOG, INC.

MARY CURRAN VCOG ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT DATE OF CERTIFICATION

SERVING THE MEMBER GOVERNMENTS OF VOLUSIA COUNTY

VCOG, Inc.

Resolution No. 2000-04

A Resolution Of VCOG, Inc., Volusia County, Florida, In Addendum To Resolution 99-03, Expressing A Desire That The Florida Public Service Commission Approve A Single Area Code For All Of Volusia County And Designate 386 (FUN) As The New Area Code To Replace 904 And 407 In Volusia County.

Whereas, VCOG (Volusia Council of Governments) was established in January, 1970, as a council of local public officials to develop coordinated plans, programs, and policies of mutual interest; and

Whereas, the Governing Board of VCOG is comprised of representatives from the Cities of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, DeBary, DeLand, Deltona, Edgewater, Holly Hill, Lake Helen, New Smyrna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, South Daytona and the County of Volusia; and

Whereas, the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

Whereas, it is apparent that the 904 area code, which applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

Whereas, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit;

Now Therefore, Be It Resolved, by the Governing Board of VCOG, Inc. as follows:

Section 1. The Governing Board of VCOG, Inc. reaffirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 3. The VCOG staff is hereby directed to provide a certified copy of this resolution to the Public Service Commission.

Be It Further Resolved, that this Resolution as adopted be attached to the minutes of this meeting held April 24, 2000, in the Conference Room at 1190 Pelican Bay Drive, Daytona Beach, Florida.

Attest:

Recording Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 00-153

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH SUPPORTING THE VOLUSIA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS' (VCOG) DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING WHEN THIS RESOLUTION SHALL TAKE EFFECT.

WHEREAS, in recognizing that explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers, the Volusia County Council believes the 904 area code will soon run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, the members of VCOG have requested that 386 (FUN) be the area code assigned to Volusia County and ask area cities to support this request by resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. The City Commission hereby supports the Volusia Council of Governments' (VCOG) desire that the Florida Public Service Commission approves a single area code for all of Volusia County and designates 386 (FUN) as the new area code to replace 904 and 407 in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The City Clerk is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Volusia Council of Governments.

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

BARON H. ASHER

Mayor

ATTEST:

GWEN AZAMA-EDWARDS

City Clerk

Adopted: April 19, 2000

RESOLUTION 2000-11

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Daytona Beach Shores City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is world famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1.

The Daytona Beach Shores City Council affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2.

The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 3.

This resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

MAYOR, DR. RALPH BETANCOURT

ATTEST:

CITY MANAGER, MICHAEL T. BOOKER

Approved as to form and legality:

ATTORNEY, MARGARET ROBERTS

Adopted this 14th day of Time, 2000.

Posted on the 15th day of Time, 2000.

Res. 2000-11

Page 1 of 1

RESOLUTION NO. 00-08

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF DeBARY, FLORIDA EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications industry is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the Volusia County Council and the City of DeBary that the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, within the corporate limits of the City of DeBary there are 904 and 407 area codes assigned to telecommunication subscribers; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF DEBARY AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City of DeBary affirms the Volusia County Council's position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

Carmen Rosapponda, Mayor

ADOPTED BY the City Council of the City of DeBary, Florida this 5th day of April, 2000.

anich, City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-16

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF DELAND, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA AND FLAGLER COUNTIES AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUISA AND FLAGLER COUNTIES; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the City Commission that the 904 area code, which applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia/Flagler County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF DELAND, FLORIDA:

Section 1. The City Commission hereby affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia/Flagler Counties, and that the new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 2. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED this 17th day of April, 2000.

David C. Rigsby Mayor-Commissioner

ATTEST:

Julie A. Hennessy City Clerk - Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

Mark A. Zimmerman

City Attorney

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-09

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DELTONA, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the City Commission the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and other leisure activities, is worldfamous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DELTONA, FLORIDA, as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED BY the City Commission of the City of Deltona, Florida this 17th day of April,

2000.

Faith G. Miller, CMC/AAE, City Clerk

Approved as to Form & Legality for Use & Reliance by the City of Deltona, Florida

Il and Duck

John Masiarczyk, Mayor

NAME YES NO
CAREY X
HARVEY X
HORN X
MASIARCZYK X
PEREZ X
RUNGE X
WHEATLEY X

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-R-11

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EDGEWATER, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Edgewater City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is Word-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Edgewater, Florida:

- Section 1. The City of Edgewater affirms its position that there should be single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
 - Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).
 - Section 3. This resolution shall take effect upon adoption.

After a motion by <u>Councilmo Brow</u> and Second by <u>Councilor Lette</u>, the vote on this resolution was as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-R-30

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF HOLLY HILL, FLORIDA EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY; SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County and is expected to run out of numbers – necessitating its replacement; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and seemingly endless other leisure activities is known to be World Famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HOLLY HILL, FLORIDA:

Section 1. That the Holly Hill City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. That the Holly Hill City Commission supports the designation of 386 (FUN) as the new area code in Volusia County.

Section 3. That this Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

The within and foregoing Resolution was read before the City Commission of the City of Holly Hill, Florida, at its regular meeting held in Commission Chambers at City Hall, 1065 Ridgewood Avenue, Holly Hill, Florida, on the 13th day of June, A.D. 2000.

It was moved by Commissioner Via and seconded by Commissioner Tarrer that said Resolution be adopted. A roll call vote of the Commission on said motion of the Resolution resulted as follows:

| Mayor William Arthur | Yes | |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| Commissioner Arthur Byrnes | Yes | |
| Commissioner Paul Lockeby | Yes | |
| Commissioner Keith Tarrer | Yes | |
| Commissioner Roland Via | Yes | |

WHEREAS, the Mayor of the City of Holly Hill, Florida, has hereunto set his official signature, duly authorized by the City Clerk, and has caused the official seal of said City to be affixed, all at the City Hall in the City of Holly Hill, this 15th day of June, A.D. 2000, for the purpose of authenticity as is required by law.

City of Holly Hill, Florida

William D. Arthur, Mayor

Attest:

Jeaneen P. Clauss, City Clerk

6/13/00 2

Res. 2000-R-30

RESOLUTION 2000-07

A RESOLUTION BY THE CITY OF LAKE HELEN, FLORIDA, SUPPORTING THE VOLUSIA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT PROPOSAL TO THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR A NEW SINGLE AREA CODE OF "386" (FUN) FOR ALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUBSCRIBERS IN VOLUSIA COUNTY TO REPLACE AREA CODES 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Volusia Council of Governments (VCOG) was established in January, 1970, as a council of local public officials to develop coordinated plans, programs, and policies of mutual interest; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of VCOG is comprised of representatives from the cities of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, Debary, DeLand, Deltona, Edgewater, Holly Hill, Lake Helen, New Smryna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, South Daytona and the County of Volusia; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County and is soon to run out of available numbers and is likely to be replaced with a new area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County offers a plethora of leisure activities, sparkling beaches, radiant sunshine and friendly residents all attributing to a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Commission of the City of Lake Helen, Florida, as follows:

SECTION I: The City Commission of the City of Lake Helen supports VCOG's recommendation for a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION II: That the City Commission of the City of Lake Helen endorses "386" (FUN) as the single, new area code for all of Volusia County.

SECTION III: That the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Public Service Commission.

SECTION IV: This Resolution repeals all resolutions, or parts of resolutions, in conflict herewith.

SECTION V: This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage and adoption.

THIS RESOLUTION DULY PASSED AND ADOPTED ON THIS 64 DAY OF A.D., 2000, by the City Commission of the City of Lake Helen, Florida, at its Regular Meeting duly assembled.

ATTEST:

Ray Leibensperger, CMC, City Clerk

CITY OF LAKE HELEN, FLORIDA,

Mark Shuttleworth, Mayor

APPROYED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

Mighael S. Teal, City Attorney

RESOLUTION NO. 13-00 1 2 A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE 3 A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY 4 AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE 5 TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY: PRO-6 VIDING FOR CONFLICTING RESOLUTIONS; AND PRO-7 VIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. 8 WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly 9 is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and 10 WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the 11 greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; and 12 WHEREAS, the area is expected to run out of numbers and the 13 City Commission expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and 14 WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and 15 endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place 16 17 to live and visit. 18 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA: 19 Desire for One Area Code for Volusia County. That 20 the City Commission affirms its position that there should be a 21 22 single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in 23 Volusia County. 24 **SECTION 2:** Designation of New Area Code. That the new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN). 25 26 Conflicting Resolutions. That all other resolutions or parts thereof that are in conflict with this resolution are 27 hereby rescinded and repealed. 28 Effective Date. 29 **SECTION 4:** That this resolution shall take 30 effect immediately upon its final passage.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CORRECTNESS: 2 2 32 EDWARD H. BEAZLEY, JR. 34 City Attorney DATE: May 25, 2000

Page 2 of 2

- ROW, THUREFORCE BEST WESSON AND PETER LOOP.

The Within and Foregoing Resolution No. 13-00 was introduced and read before the City Commission of the City of New Smyrna Beach, Florida at its Special Meeting held at City Hall in said City on May 30, 2000. Motion was made by Vice Mayor Rogers, and seconded by Commissioner O'Bannon, that said Resolution be adopted.

A roll-call vote of the City Commission on said motion to adopt the Resolution resulted as follows:

| MAYOR JAMES L. VANDERGRIFFT | Yes |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| VICE MAYOR WILLIAM D. ROGERS | Yes |
| COMMISSIONER JAMES W. HATHAWAY | Yes |
| COMMISSIONER ORETHA W. BELL | Yes |
| COMMISSIONER JO ANN O'BANNON | Yes |

Whereupon, the Mayor of the City of New Smyrna Beach, Florida has hereunto set his official signature, duly attested by the Acting City Clerk, and has caused the Official Seal of said City to be hereunto affixed for the purpose of authenticity and as is required by law.

As Mayor of the City of New

Smyrna Beach, Florida

(OFFICIAL SEAL)

As Acting City Clerk of the City of New Smyrna Beach,

Florida

RESOLUTION NO. 13-00

RESOLUTION 00-12

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF OAK HILL, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386(FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Port Orange City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling leaches and endless other leisure activities, is Word-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Commission of the City of Oak Hill, Volusia County, Florida:

- The Qak Hill City Council affirms its position that there should Section 1. be a single, new code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
- The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN). Section 2.
- This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its Section 3. adoption.

The above and foregoing resolution was moved for approval by Commissioner Jusan Cook and seconded by Commissioner Dany Evans and upon vote subscribed herein, the same was declared to be adopted at this Regular Meeting of the City Commission of Oak Hill, Florida held on June 5,2000.

A roll call vote resulted as follows: 3-0 passed.

GARY C. BITTLE, VICE-MAYOR/COMMISSIONER (5)

RESOLUTION

00-08

05/25/00

DARRY L. EVANS, COMMISSIONER (1)

About
ROBERTA S. SIMMONS, COMMISSIONER (4)

Susa a Coll
SUSAN A. COOK, COMMISSIONER (3)

ATTEST:

Lim Chebano
CHY CLERK KIM CHERBANO

APPROVED FOR LEGALITY AND FORM:

EITY ATTORNEY GAYLE GRAZIANO

RESOLUTION 00-08 05/25/00

RESOLUTION NO. 18-00

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ORANGE CITY, FLORIDA, SUPPORTING VOLUSIA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS PROPOSAL TO THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR A NEW, SINGLE AREA CODE OF "386" (FUN) FOR ALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUBSCRIBERS IN VOLUSIA COUNTY TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA.

WHEREAS, the Volusia Council of Governments (VCOG) was established in January, 1970, as a council of local public officials to develop coordinated plans, programs, and policies of mutual interest; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of VCOG is comprised of representatives from the Cities of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, Debary, Deland, Deltona, Edgewater, Holly Hill, Lake Helen, New Smyrna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, South Daytona and the County of Volusia; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County and is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced with a new area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County has sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities as well as being the home of the world-famous beach that is a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Orange City, Florida:

- SECTION 1. That the City Council of the City of Orange City supports VCOG's recommendation for a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
- SECTION 2. That the City Council of the City of Orange City endorses "386" (FUN) as the single, new area code for all of Volusia County.
- **SECTION 3**. That the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Public Service Commission.
- SECTION 4. All resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict herewith be and the same are hereby repealed.

| SECTION 5. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption. |
|--|
| This Resolution was introduced and sponsored by <u>Council member</u> Jayand was read and passed by the City Council of the City of Orange City, Florida, at a regular meeting of said Council held on the <u>day of May</u> , 2000, and approved as provided by law. |
| ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS: |
| |
| The state of the second |
| Gary A. Blair |
| Jan Mahrie. Us |
| Im Mahoney |
| George E. Stone |
| Harold O Castel Us |
| Harold D. Casteel |
| D-512 02 Ws |
| David W. Fancher |
| allot I Janine The |
| Albert T. Erwin, Vice Mayor |
| Continy R. Jobb - Us |
| Anthony R. Yebba, Mayor |
| ATTEST: JULIULA LEL Patricia A. Lee, CMC, City Clerk |
| This Resolution approved as to form and legal sufficiency: |
| Lind |

Resolution No. 18-00

William Reischmann, City Attorney

RESOLUTION NO. 2000 - 97

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the City of Ormond Beach City Commission expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is world famous as a FUN place to live and visit, now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ORMOND BEACH, FLORIDA, THAT:

SECTION ONE. The City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION TWO. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION THREE. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

APPROVED AND AUTHENTICATED this 20th day of June, 2000.

Carl Persis

CARL PERSIS

Mayor

ATTEST:

VERONICA PATTERSON

City Clerk

RESOLUTION 00-02

A Resolution of the municipality the Town of Pierson, Volusia County, Florida supporting VCOG, Inc. in its application for funding from the Emergency Medical Services Award Trust Fund, for the purpose of studying the Fire/Rescue and the Emergency Medical services Delivery System on behalf of the County of Volusia and its municipalities.

Whereas, the Municipality of the Town of Pierson is dedicated to providing its residents with the highest service levels practical utilizing the most cost effective means; and

Whereas, there is need of more cost efficiency in response to medical emergencies within Volusia County; and

Whereas, there may be cost savings and efficiencies which may be identified in the Fire / EMS response structure through a study of that structure; and

Whereas, the VCOG Governing Board was tasked with developing recommendations for such savings and efficiencies based on the groundwork initially laid by the local Government Study Commission;

Now therefore, it be it resolved by the Municipal Council of the Town of Pierson, Florida:

Section 1. The municipality of the Town of Pierson supports the application of VCOG, Inc. for Emergency Medical Services Award trust fund, not to exceed \$ 125,000.00, on behalf of the municipality to fund a study of the Fire / Rescue and Emergency Medical Services delivery system to identify potential areas of municipal cost avoidance, resource sharing, and first tier compensation.

Section 2. This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption and staff is hereby directed to provide a certified copy of this resolution to VCOG, Inc. for inclusion in the support materials for the Emergency Medical Services Award Trust Fund.

Be it further resolved, that this Resolution as adopted be attached to the minutes Of this meeting held June 13, 2000.

Municipality of the Town of Pierson

Samuel G.S. Bennett, Chairman

ATTEST:

Deborah J. LeBlanc, Town Clerk

RESOLUTION # 00-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF PONCE INLET, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the Ponce Inlet Town Council the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced;

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF PONCE INLET, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:

<u>SECTION 1.</u> The Town Council affirms its position there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

It was moved by Mr. Hampton and seconded by Mr. Rogerson that said Resolution be adopted. A roll call vote of the Town Council on said motion resulted as follows:

Mayor Hoak
Councilman Albuquerque
Councilman Hampton
Vice Mayor Lewis
Councilman Rogerson

YES

ABSENT
YES

Passed and adopted this 19th day of April, 2000.

William P. Hoak, Mayor

ATTEST:

Robert L. Norris Town Manager

Approved as to form and legality for the use and reliance of the Town of Ponce

Inlet, Florida, only.

Theodore R. Doran/Town Attorney



RESOLUTION NO. 00-23

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORT ORANGE, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Port Orange City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is Word-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORT ORANGE, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1. The Port Orange City Council affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 3. This resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

MAYOR DOROTHY L. HUKILL

ATTEST:

Jenneth W. Parlu

Kenneth W. Parker, City Manager

Adopted this 18thday of April, 2000

Reviewed and Approved:

Acting City Attorney

c:\wpdocs\res\areacode.386

RESOLUTION No. 2000-63

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the Volusia County Council the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced;

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, IN OPEN MEETING DULY ASSEMBLED IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, DELAND, FLORIDA, THIS 23RD DAY OF MARCH, A.D. 2000, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION I: The Volusia County Council affirms its position there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION II: The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION III: This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

DONE AND ORDERED IN OPEN MEETING.

COUNTY COUNCIL VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA

BY:

'AMES E. WARD, CHAIR

AY W. PENNEBAKER,

ACTING COUNTY MANAGER



RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator is the agency to control telephone numbers in all North America and the explosion of new telephone lines for fax machines, cellular phone and internet access makes it difficult to make projections on future area code needs.

WHEREAS, the County is now divided between the 904 and 407 area codes, but the 904 is expected to exhaust its available telephone numbers by 2001.

WHEREAS, Volusia Council of Government (VCOG) has initiated a campaign to rid Volusia County of its 904/407 split and to gain a new single area code.

WHEREAS, the options available to Volusia County include a new area code, or overlay, for the entire geographical area served by 904 and, an overlay for the entire 904 area code would require callers to dial 10 digits for local calls.

WHEREAS, Volusia County Council has already declared its intention to shift Southwest Volusia out of 407 code back into any code serving the existing 904 code.

WHEREAS, the PSC agreed to exempt most of Southwest Volusia from the new code plan because the area already is split between the 407 and 904 area codes.

WHEREAS, government and business leaders lobbied for the exemption, hoping to unite the entire county within one new area code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY ENTERPRISE VOLUSIA, INC. OF VOLUSIA COUNTY FLORIDA:

<u>Section 1.</u> Enterprise Volusia Inc. affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunication subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated at 386 (FUN).

Taver Cornett

Chairman of the Board



HOTEL MOTEL association OF VOLUSIA COUNTY

RESOLUTION 2000-10

WHEREAS, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator is the agency to control telephone numbers in all North America and the explosion of new telephone lines for fax machines, cellular phones and internet access makes it difficult to make projections on future area code needs.

WHEREAS, the County is now divided between the 904 and 407 area codes, but the 904 is expected to exhausts its available telephone numbers by 2001.

WHEREAS, Volusia Council of Government, (VCOG) has initiated a campaign to rid Volusia County of its 904/407 spit and to gain a new single area code.

WHEREAS, the options available to Volusia County include a) new area code, or overlay, for the entire geographical area served by 904. An overlay for the entire 904 area code would require callers to dial 10 digits for local calls.

WHEREAS, Volusia County Council has already declared its intention to shift Southwest Volusia out of 407 code back into any code serving the existing 904 code.

WHEREAS, the PSC agreed to exempt most of Southwest Volusia from the new code plan because the area already is spit between the 407 and 904 area codes.

WHEREAS, government and business leaders lobbied for the exemption, hoping to unite the entire county within one new area code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOTEL MOTEL ASSOCIATION OF VOLUSIA COUNTY FLORIDA:

Section 1. The Hotel Motel Association of Volusia County affirms it position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunication subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated at 386 (FUN).

Bob Davis

President, Hotel Motel Association of Volusia County

140 South Beach Street, Suite 101, Daytona Beach, FL 32114 Phone: 904-257-6828 Fax: 904-257-0909 Email: Hlodgingas@aol.com REFERENCE DOCKET 99051

City of Palm Coust

P. O. Box 354610 Palm Coast, FL 32135-4610 Phone: (904) 447-4255 Fax: (904) 447-4259

Mayor Jim Canfield

Vice-Mayor James F. Holland City Manager Richard Kelton City Clerk/Finance Director Dong Courtney Councilman William Venne, Seat 1 Councilman Jerome K. Full, Seat 2 Councilman Ralph Carter, Seat 4

June 28, 2000

The Honorable Joe Garcia Chairman 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Public Service Corporation Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Ref. Docket 990517

Dear Mr. Garcia:

The City Council of the City of Palm Coast has voted unanimously to support the position advanced by government and business leaders of Volusia County to establish 386 as the new Volusia/Flagler two-county area code.

The two counties are linked in many ways—through the Daytona Beach Community College, which has a major branch here; though the drainage and water management concerns of the St. Johns River Water Management District; through the services available at the Daytona Beach International Airport and the shopping recreational, employment, and civic institutions serving residents of both counties. There is a steady flow of workers, shoppers, and visitors between the two counties on I-95, U.S. 1 and A1A.

A fractured area code would be a significant inconvenience and cost to the citizens of both counties, which we hope you will recognize by approving a common area code.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue to our residents.

Sincerely,

Janes V. Carfuld/tw

Mayor

cc:

Ms. Susan F. Clark, Commissioner

Mr. J. Terry Deason, Commissioner

Ms. Lila A. Jaber, Commissioner

Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, Commissioner

Mr. Bill Talbott, Commissioner

Ann McFall, Co-Chair, Area Code Task Force

John E. Evans, Co-Chair Area Code Task Force

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - RECORDS AND REPORTING

| Requisition for | or Photocopying and Mailing |
|--|--|
| Number of Originals Requested By | Copies Per Original 1910 |
| | tem Presented |
| Agenda For (Date) | Order No. 99 1634 In Docket No. 990517 |
| Notice of | 1/ 07 |
| Other | |
| | |
| Spe | cial Handling Instructions |
| | |
| | Distribution/Mailing |
| Number Distributed/Mailed To | Number Distribution/Mailed To |
| Commission Offices | |
| Docket Mailing List - Mailed | |
| Docket Mailing List - Faxed | |
| Note: Items must be mailed and/or retu | amed within one working day after issue unless specified here: |
| | |
| | |
| | Print Shop Verification |
| Job Number | |
| Date and Time Completed 8/3/ | Job Checked For Correctness and Quality (Initial) |
| | Mail Room Verification |
| Date Mailed | Verified By |
| | |

PSC/RAR 12(2/91)

From: Levent Ileri To: Sandy Moses Subject: fwd: (990517)

Hi Sandy,

Last week, I sent a memo to have Mr. and Mrs. Richard Rubino to be included as party to Docket No. 990517 per their request. I checked the CASR this morning but they were not listed.

In case the memo is lost, here is the info about them:

Mr. and Mrs. Richard Rubino 6931 N. Oceanshore Blvd. Palm Coast, Fl 32137 Tel: (904) 461-4315

Let me know if you've any questions.

Levent Ileri

Fwd=by:=Sandy=Moses===8/30/99=11:52am== Fwd to: Levent Ileri

CC: Kay Flynn

I'm passing this on to Kay; adding parties to dockets is in her area.

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-MORTING

DATE:

AUGUST 31, 1999

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (FLYNN, WANG)

FROM:

DIVISION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS (ILERI)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - In re: REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF

PROPOSED NUMBERING RELIEF PLAN FOR THE 904 AREA CODE

Attached is a copy of the **MEMORANDUM** that was sent on August 26, 1999, to Division of Records and Reporting. This memo was intended to include Mr. and Mrs. Rubino's names as a **PARTY** to this docket per their request on their letter, and **FILE** their letter on the correspondence side of the above-referenced docket.

Attached is another **LETTER** from Mrs. Rubino concerning the 904 area code, and therefore, please also file this letter to the correspondence side of the above referenced docket.

If you've any questions, please call me at 413-6562.

LI

Attachment

cc: Division of Legal Services (B. KEATING)

Done 8/31/89



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE:

August 26, 1999

TO:

Division of Records and Reporting

FROM:

Division of Telecommunications (Ileri)

RE

Docket No. 990517-TL - In re: Request for review of proposed numbering relief plan

for the 904 area code

Attached is a **LETTER** from Mr. and Mrs. Richard Rubino to be filed on the correspondence side of the above-referenced docket. Please include Mr. and Mrs. Richard Rubino's names as a party to this docket per their request in their letter.

LI

Attachment

cc: Division of Legal Services (B. Keating)

August 11, 1999

Mr. Levant Ileri, Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Fl. 32399

RE: LATTA Boundry Lines crossing ST. JOHNS COUNTY/MARINELAND ESTATES/ FLAGLER **QO**UNTY

Dear Mr. Ileri:

As per our conversation this morning I am writing to you as you suggested and I am hopeful that I will be able to explain in detail what has transpired since my last letter of 3/9/99.

Since moving into our new home last month, my husband and I are desperately trying to gain support in trying to move or waiver the existing LATTA lines that currently separate the area of MARINELAND ESTATES from the rest of Flagler County/ Palm Coast.

My address about 1600' from my current address of 6931 Oceanshore Blvd. Palm Coast, Fl. 32137 was also Palm Coast, 32137, but yet I cannot call toll free to anywhere in Flagler County/ Palm Coast. It is a most difficult problem that everyone knows exists, but yet somehow cannot be resolved. There are so many factors involved and so many frustrating circumstances that surround this issue of not being able to access services, medical providers, and just not being able to call anywhere where one lives without incurring a fee. We have called every phone company available and no one can offer me a plan to call back into the county of Flagler. Cell and mobile phones service also is not available.

The fact that my husband is disabled and could need medical attention at anytime, especially 911, is another issue we must deal with. A 911 number must first relay to St. John's County and then back into Flagler.

All of these issues have been brought to the attention of the County Board of Commissioners who have put it on the agenda for their next meeting. The County Administrator, David Haas, has also taken interest and has assured us that he will begin to do what he can to rectify this. We understand from previous correspondence that Bell South, together with the Commissioners can petition the PSC and the FCC to remedy this problem.

As we spoke this morning you informed me that there will be changes made in area codes affecting Jacksonville, St. Aug. etc., and that at that time other changes such as the one we are discussing can be corrected. If that is possble, please keep me informed as to what we can do to make this happen.

In our conversation you also mentioned a survey that would be taken to determine what the people in the area desire. Let me explain to you what I see as a problem here. There are residents living in this area now that have migrated from Jax., St. Augustine area. And they are very happy calling back and doing business where they came from. My question is this? Which residents should begiven favorable consideration here. Those who live in Flagler County and are able to call another county toll-free or residents like myself who live in Flagler County, trying to call Flagler County toll-free. I realize LATTA lines were established in 1984 and had to be placed somewhere, but it is unfair to prohibit people from calling where they live. Progress happens everyday and changes are made for the betterment of services and I believe that this is the time for this change.

There are other families living in this same area facing hardships of children attending Flagler/Palm Coast H.S. and costing \$2.85 to call home. The school complaining whenever they need to call for whatever reasons. They will be happy to also write you and explain their difficulties.

Mr. Ileri, please put this petition on Docket #990517-TL and also if you would be kind enough to place my name as party to whatever information you can send me. I will follow this letter with another one with other names that would also want to be party to this information.

When we purchased the property to build our home, no one informed us of the changes in telephone status. It is my belief that this information should be provided and had it been provided to us, I am sure it would have been given much thought. Or better still, if we had been prepared for this difficulty, and accepted the consequences, then we would now have to be reconciled to what now exists.

I believe that this situation, with everyone co-operating who is involved, can make a difference in correcting what now exists as a problem area. We strongly urge you to do whatever you can to help us resolve this very stressful situation and we and many others here would be very grateful.

Very sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Richard Rubino (Dorothy)

6930 N. Oceanshore Blvd.

Palm Coast, Fla. 32137

904-431-4315


P.S. Mr. Dlei - Drew the flagle County B of Command Bell So still have to petition the PSC spiritly to achieve this change in Conjunction with the Docket you mention Deare elalors

RECEIVED
FEGRIDA PUBLIC
SERVICE COMMISSION

99 AUG 16 AM 7: 15 MAILROOM

RECEIVED

Mr. & Mrs. Rubino P.O. Box 1806 Flagler Beach, Fl. 32136



Mr. Levant Ileri Public Service Comission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Ysllshsddrr, Gl. 32399



32399+0850 - ไลไหลโปลไปสินใหลโปลไปสินใหลโปลไปสินใหลโนไไ

August 25, 1999

RECEIVED

Mr.Levent Ileri PSC 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Fl. 32399 AUG 30 1999

CMU

RE: Docket No. 990517-TL

Dear Mr. Ileri:

Thank you for your correspondence of August 12, 1999 and our conversation this morning. To refresh that conversation I will repeat it in this letter. My question to you was this. You had enclosed a proposed area code changes for St. John's, Flagler & Volusia counties and I had hoped that when this took place that the existing LATA line that separates my area from the rest of Flagler County would be waived. You indicated that the existing LATA line would remain in place. How unfortunate that is for me, and others living with this problem.

On the other hand, you did encourage me by indicating that special waiver could be granted in cases such as mine and for others dealing with this very stressful telephone situation. One cannot realize the impact of being separated by the place you call home, have friends and relations living there, school and medical facilities, services, etc. all requiring dialing (1010-811) * 1 + 904* number, just to access a person. It is most inconvenient, stressful, costly, and very wrong.

My husband, as I mentioned before, is disabled and under Fla. Health Care Medical Plan and is compelled to patronize all of his medical services in Palm Coast/Volusia County. Many times I serve as a care giver in the Palm Coast area, yet I cannot call those I serve readily to checkk on their behalf. When I need to call county offices, or speak to a county commissioner or official, it is again costly.

Again, my husband and I request to be party to these proposed hearings addressing the telephone issue. Believe me Mr. Aleri, I have inquired to just about every telephone company in existence, and no one can offer any calling plan that will allow me to access the rest of Flagler County. Icannot, for the life of me, understand why a LATA line established in 1984 is still allowed to exist even when it is detrimental to the phone users now living in that area. Why should we be penalized and deprived of a service, such as local calling? We live in Palm Coast, Fl. and yet cannot call Palm Coast, Fl. In our opinion, there needs to be action taken to alievate this costly and most stressful situation. We don; t know how to express more clearly our unhappiness with the current status of our telephone service. Anything the PSC can and will do on our behalf would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Richard Rubino

904-461-4315

Dick & Dorothy Rubino 6931 N. Oceanshore Blvd. Palm Coast, Fl. 32137



PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ATTN: Mr. Levent Aleri 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. TAllahassee, Fl. 32399-0850 .

Printed by Hong Wang 8/31/99 11:19am

------From: Kay Flynn

CONFIRMED

To: Levent Ileri Subject: 990517-TL

===NOTE=========8/31/99=11:13am==

CC: Beth Keating, Hong Wang

Good morning, Levent. I have your memo with attached copies of the Rubino letters. I will place the memo and attachments in the file, and Hong will place their name on the mailing list -- as interested persons rather than parties. They would need to intervene in this docket to have party status. As interested persons on the mailing list, they will receive most orders (other than procedural) and all notices (including agenda notice). Please let me know if questions. Kay

RECEIVED-FPSC

59 SEP 22 PM 2: 56

RECOILUS AND REPORTING

Florida Public Service Commission Division of Records and Reporting 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassec, FL 32399

Bob Koslow
News-Journal Corp.
Southwest Volusia Bureau
1107 Saxon Blvd.
Orange City, FL 32763
c-mail swnews@n-jcenter.com

Sept. 22, 1999

Please note and record the above change of address. I am a registered interested party in Docket No. 990517-TL and Docket No. 950495-WS. Thank you for your assistance.

Bob Koslow Staff Writer Daytona Beach News-Journal

Done 9/22/89

The Daytona Beach

Fax Transmittal Sheet

Southwest Volusia Bureau 1107 Saxon Blvd. Orange City, Fla. 32763

(904) 774-2777 (904) 774-4141 (FAX)

| TO: FPSC |
|---------------------------------------|
| COMPANY: Div of Records and Reporting |
| FAX: |
| MESSAGE: Change of address |
| |
| |
| FROM: BOS 1hoslow |
| TOTAL PAGES: 2 |
| |
| DATE: 5ept. 22,1999 |
| TIME: 2:50 PM |

If you do not receive all the pages, please call: (904) 774-2777

MORRISON & FOERSTER UPPCEIVED-FPSC

Aitorneys at Law 2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006-1888

Telephone: (202) 887-1500 Facsimile: (202) 887-0763

39 OCT -6 AM II: 27

To:

Florida Public Service Commission

Attn: Records and Reporting

Facsimile: (850) 413-7118

Phone:

(850) 413-6770

From: Kimberly Wheeler

Date: October 6, 1999

Time:

We are transmitting a total of \perp pages (including this page). Original or hard copy to follow if this box is checked \(\sigma\).

If you do not receive all pages, please call (202) 887-8747 as soon as possible.

Preparer of this slip has confirmed that facsimile number given is correct: / asmw

This facsimile contains confidential information which may also be privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not copy, use, or distribute it. If you have received it in error, please advise Morrison & Foerster immediately by telephone or facsimile and return it promptly by mail.

Comments: Please send filed copies of Docket No. 990517-TL to:

Kimberly D. Wheeler Morrison & Foerster LLP 2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Suite 5500

Washington, D.C. 20006-1888 Tel: (202) 887-1500

Fax: (202) 887-0763

Done 10/06/99

RECEIVE 1999

JORDAN & ASSOCIATES Commissions by

1202 Kingsley Avenue Orange Park, FL 32073 Phone: (904) 264-6203

Fax: (904) 278-0840

October 26, 1999

Mr. Walter D'Haeseleer, Director Division of Communications State of Florida Public Service Commission Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RE: Docket No. 990517-TL Request for review of roposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code

Dear Mr. D'Haeseler:

I understand that the North American Numbering Plan Administration has informed the Florida Public Service (FPSC) that the 904 area code is expected to exhaust its supply of numbers by 2001 and the telecommunications industry has recommended an overlay relief plan for the 904 area code.

Considering the 904 area code service area was just divided with the western portion of the state (commonly known as the panhandle) assigned a new area code of 850, I fail to see how all of the numbers have been used so quickly. It creates great concern to think of having to dial ten (10) numbers instead of seven (7) when one is in need of contacting a unit of government for a non emergency, a doctor's office, a child's school, a hospital, or the poison control center. In contacting these type of entities, time is usually of the essence as they are generally contacted when one is under stress. Not only does the time it takes to dial three (3) additional numbers concern me but so does the initial adjustment of dialing ten (10) numbers rather than seven (7) at such times. Further, it concerns me with the amount of time required to dial the three (3) additional numbers for routine calls made during the course of the business day.

If in fact the above is true, possibly the FPSC should consider alternate solutions such as restructuring the Jacksonville LATA or shifting bordering areas into other LATA to reduce the size of the Jacksonville LATA freeing up additional numbers.

Mr. Walter D'Haeseleer October 26, 1999 Page 2

Having provided you with thought for alternate solutions, the bottom line is I am opposed to the overlay relief plan for the 904 area code currently under consideration by your office. Should you desire to discuss my position or alternate solutions, please do not hesitate to contact me at the number indicated above.

Sincerely,

Betty J. Jordan

President

cc: Levent Ileri, Engineer, Division of Telecommunications

Commissioners: Joe Garcia, Chairman

J. Terry Deason Susan F. Clark Julia L. Johnson

E. Leon Jacobs, Jr.

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: November 3, 1999

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs 7007

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517-TL

This office has received the attached correspondence of Betty J. Jordan, President, Jordan & Associates dated October 26, 1999. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the following letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

MEMORANDUM

November 17, 1999



TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM .

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TF - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

2265-PCO

Attached is an \underline{ORDER} $\underline{GRANTING}$ $\underline{INTERVENTION}$, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 3)

BK/anc

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517at.bk

poo!

FAVED 912

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - RECORDS AND REPORTING

| | Requistion fo | or Photocopyin | g and Mail | ing | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Number of C
Requested By | Driginals | 11 <u>23 1</u> Copie | 44
es Per Origina | al | 16 |
| | | Item Presente | d —— | | |
| Ager | nda For (Date) | Order No. 9 | 9-2265 | In Docket N | 10.990517 |
| Notice ofOther | | For (Date) In Docket No | | 10 | |
| dil annoque sustant de la qua ma sono | ———— Specia | l Handling Ins | tructions - | | |
| | Dis | stribution/Mai | | | |
| Number | Distributed/ Mailed To | | Number | Distributi | on/Mailed To |
| | Commission Offices | - | | | |
| (8) | Docket Mailing List - Mailed Docket Mailing List - Faxed | _ | | | |
| | | 7 ta 1 ta 1 ta 1 ta 1 ta 1 ta 1 ta 1 ta | | | |
| Note: It | tems must be mailed and/or retu | urned within one woi | rking day affer is | ssue uniess spe | cified here: |
| | Print | t Shan Vorifica | tion —— | | |
| lah Number | 218 | Verified By | The The | la D | |
| Date and Tim | ne Completed | Joh Checked | For Corrector | ess and Que | dity (Initial) |
| Date and Till | ie Completed ——— | _ JOD CHECKEG | TOT COTTOCITY | oss and Que | , (|
| | Mai | l Room Verific | ation —— | | |
| Date Mailed | | Verified By | / | | |
| | | | / | | |
| C/RAR 12(9/99) | | | | | |

MEMORANDUM

December 3, 1999

RECEIVED-FPSC

99 DEC -3 PM 2: 04

RECORDS AND REPORTING

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING) 18/2

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

2365-PCD

Attached is an $\underline{\text{ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION}}$, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 4)

BK/anc

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517tw.bk

Vouted 1/2

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - RECORDS AND REPORTING

| | Requistion fo | or Photocopying | g and Maili | ng |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Number of
Requested E | Originals ———————————————————————————————————— | 12,41
Copie | s Per Origina | 1 |
| Agenda For (Date)
Notice of
Other | | Item Presente Order No For (Date) | d
1-2365 | In Docket No. 7909/ |
| | Specio | ıl Handling Ins | tructions — | |
| Number | Distributed/ Mailed To Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed | _ | Number | Distribution/Mailed To |
| Note: | Docket Mailing List - Faxed Items must be mailed and/or ret | turned within one wor | king day after is: | sue unless specified here: |
| Job Numbe
Date and T | Prin | Verified By | Mich | 000 |
| Date Maile | d Ma | | 1 | |

PSC/RAR 12(9/99)

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR.



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

December 8, 1999

Ms. Leona Raulerson Daytona Beach City Hall 301 S. Ridgewood Avenue Daytona Beach, FL 32114

Re: Docket No. 990517-TL - Review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

Dear Ms. Raulerson:

This will confirm our reservation of the Daytona Beach City Commission Chambers for the purpose of holding a Public Service Commission hearing on Thursday, January 27, 2000, in the above-referenced matter. The hearing will begin at 4:00 p.m. and should end by 6:00 p.m. We will need access to the Chambers by 3:00 p.m.

As previously discussed, there is no charge for use of the room. A copy of our insurance certificate is enclosed.

I appreciate the opportunity to use this facility for our hearing. Please call my assistant, Sandy Moses, at (850) 413-6728, if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Blanca S. Bayó

skm

Enclosure



215 South Monroe Street Suite 705 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 Phone: 850.561.3010 Fax: 850.561.3013

Daniel H. Thompson

email at: dthompson@bdslaw.com

December 9, 1999

REPORTING

VIA FACSIMILE

Blanca Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Public Service Commission 2540 Shurmard Oaks Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-6850

Re:

Docket Number 990517-TL

Dear Ms. Bayo:

This firm represents ADT Security Systems, Inc. On behalf of ADT, we hereby request that ADT be listed as an interested person in the above referenced cases. Please forward copies of relevant PSC documents to my attention at the address listed above. In addition, by copy of this letter I am requesting that the parties of record, on the attached service list, serve copies of their pleadings accordingly.

If there are any problems or concerns with this request, please call me at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

Yours truly,

BERGER DAVIS & SINGERMAN

Daniel H. Thompson

DHT:eam

cc:

Gray Finney

Diana Caldwell

placed on docket list 12/13/99

6687.1/4832.005/BDS_TAL 12/9/99 wp8

Miami · Fort Lauderdale · Tallahassee

Parties of Record Report for Docket 990517-TL As of 12/07/1999

Comments: None

ALLTEL Florida, Inc.

Address:

Ms. Harriet Eudy

P. O. Box 550 Live Oak, FL 32060-3357 (904) 364-2517, (904) 364-2505 (904) 362-4950

Phone: FAX:

Party of record: CASR list:

Yes Yes

Represents:

Represented by:

Ausley Law Firm

AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

Address:

Tracy Hatch/Marsha Rule

101 North Monroe Street. Ste 700

Tallahassee, FL 32301

Phone:

850-425-6364

FAX:

850-425-6361 Yes

Party of record: CASR list:

Yes

Represents:

Represented by:

Messer Law Firm

Ausley Law Firm

Address:

Jeffrey Wahlen

P.O. Box 391

Tallahassee, FL 32302

Phone:

850-224-9115

FAX: Party of record: 850-222-7952 Yes

Yes

CASR list:

Represents:

ALLTEL, Northeast Florida Telephone

Represented by:

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. (TL720)

Address:

Ms. Nancy B. White

c/o Nancy H. Sims

150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556 (850) 224-7798, (850) 222-1201

Phone:

FAX:

850-222-8640

Party of record: CASR list:

Yes

Yes

Represents:

Represented by:

Parties of Record Report for Docket 990517-TL As of 12/07/1999

City of Deltona

Address:

Fritz Behring

P.O. Box 5550

Deltona, FL 32728-5550 407-860-7160 Phone:

FAX:

Party of record: CASR list:

Yes No

Represents:

Represented by:

Fowler, Barice Law Firm

Fowler, Barice Law Firm

Address:

Carole Barice/James Fowler

28 W. Central Blvd. Orlando, FL 32801 407-425-2684 407-425-2690

Phone: FAX:

Party of record: CASR list:

Yes Yes

Represents:

City of Deltona

Represented by:

Messer Law Firm

Address:

Floyd Self

P.O. Box 1876

Tallahassee, FL 32302 850-222-0720 850-224-4359

Phone: FAX:

Party of record: CASR list:

Yes Yes

Represents:

Represented by:

AT&T

Northeast Florida Telephone Company, Inc. (TL715) Address: Ms. Deborah (Debi) L. Nobles P.O. Box 485

Macclenny. FL 32063-0485 (904) 259-0639 (904) 259-7722

Phone:

FAX: Party of record: CASR list:

Yes No

Represents:

Represented by:

Ausley Law Firm

BERGER & DAVIS

Parties of Record Report for Docket 990517-TL As of 12/07/1999

Pennington Law Firm

Address:

Peter Dunbar/Karen Camechis

P.O. Box 10095

Tallahassee, FL 32301

Phone:

850-222-3533 850-222-2126

FAX:

Yes

Party of record: CASR list:

Represents:

Yes

Time Warner

Represented by:

Sprint PCS

Address:

Joe Assenzo

Legal Department

4900 Main, 11th Floor Kansas City, MO 64112 816-559-1000

Phone:

FAX:

Party of record: CASR list:

Yes Yes

Represents:

Represented by:

Sprint-Florida, Incorporated

Address:

Charles Rehwinkel/Susan Masterson

P.O. Box 2214

Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214 (850) 847-0244 850-599-1458

Phone: FAX:

Party of record: CASR list:

Yes

Yes

Represents: Represented by:

Time Warner Communications

Address:

Carolyn Marek, VP, Regulatory Affairs Southeast Region

233 Bramerton Court Franklin, TN 37069 (615) 376-6404 (615) 376-6405

Phone: FAX:

Party of record: CASR list:

Yes

Represents: Represented by: Yes

Pennington Law Firm

BERGER & DAVIS

Parties of Record Report for Docket 990517-TL As of 12/07/1999

Volusia County Address:

Robert M. Weiss 123 W. Indiana Ave. Room #205 DeLand, FL 32720 904-822-5750, 904-822-5700 904-822-5795

Phone:

FAX: Party of record: CASR list:

Yes Yes

Represents: Represented by:

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR.



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

December 8, 1999

Ms. Karen Johnson St. Johns County Administrative Center P. O. Box 349 St. Augustine, FL 32085

Re: Docket No. 990517-TL - Review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

Dear Ms. Johnson:

This will confirm our reservation of the St. Johns County Auditorium at the Administrative Complex for the purpose of holding a Public Service Commission hearing on Thursday, January 27, 2000, in the above-referenced matter. The hearing will begin at 10:00 a.m. and should end by 12:00 noon. We will need access to the auditorium by 9:00 a.m.

As previously discussed, there is no charge for use of the room. A copy of our insurance certificate is enclosed.

I appreciate the opportunity to use this facility for our hearing. Please call my assistant, Sandy Moses, at (850) 413-6728, if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Blanca S. Bayó

skm Enclosure

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR.



Division of Records & Reporting Blanca S. Bayó Director (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

December 16, 1999

Ms. Kim Harris Columbia County School Board P. O. Box 1148 Lake City, FL 32056

Re: Docket No. 990517-TL - Review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

Dear Ms. Harris:

This will confirm our reservation of the Columbia County School Board Administrative Complex Auditorium for the purpose of holding a Public Service Commission hearing on Wednesday, January 26, 2000, in the above-referenced matter. The hearing will begin at 10:00 a.m. and should end by 12:00 noon. Please arrange the auditorium in accordance with the enclosed diagram by 7:00 a.m.

As previously discussed, there is no charge for use of the room. A copy of our insurance certificate is enclosed.

I appreciate the opportunity to use this facility for our hearing. Please call my assistant, Sandy Moses, at (850) 413-6728, if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Blanca S. Bavó


skm Enclosures

Florida Public Service Commission Hearing Room Configuration for Docket No. 990517-TL

Review of Proposed Numbering Plan Relief for the 904 Area Code

Wednesday, January 26, 2000 10:00 a.m. Columbia County Shool Board Administrative Complex Auditorium 328 W. Duval Street Lake City, FL





Theater-style Seating for 150

XXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXX

6' Table outside entrance of room

X X
Office of Public Information

LEGEND:

X Chairs

Microphones

☎ Location for telephone line

■ Wastebaskets

- Location where court reporter's cassette recorder will be plugged into audio system.

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR.



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

December 16, 1999

Ms. Sharon Costanzo Deltona Hills Golf and Country Culb 1120 Elkcam Blvd. Deltona, FL 32725

Re: Docket No. 990517-TL - Review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

Dear Ms. Costanzo:

This will confirm our reservation of the Deltona Hills Golf and Country Club for the purpose of holding a Public Service Commission hearing on Friday, January 28, 2000, in the above-referenced matter. The hearing will begin at 10:00 a.m. and should end by 12:00 noon. Please arrange the auditorium in accordance with the enclosed diagram by 7:00 a.m.

As previously discussed, the charge for use of the room is \$100.00. A copy of our insurance and tax exempt certificates are enclosed.

I appreciate the opportunity to use this facility for our hearing. Please call my assistant, Sandy Moses, at (850) 413-6728, if you have any questions regarding this matter.


Sincerely,

skm Enclosures

Florida Public Service Commission Hearing Room Configuration for Docket No. 990517-TL Review of Proposed Numbering Plan Relief for the 904 Area Code

Friday, January 28, 2000 10:00 a.m. Deltona Hills Golf and Country Club 1120 Elkcam Blvd. Deltona, FL





6' Table outside entrance of room

X X
Office of Public Information

LEGEND:

X Chairs

Microphones

□ Location for telephone line

■ Wastebaskets

• Location where court reporter's cassette recorder will be plugged into audio system.

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR.



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

December 17, 1999

Ms. Sandy Simmons Holiday Inn - Commonwealth P. O. Box 37888 Jacksonville, FL 32236

Re: Docket No. 990517-TL - Review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

Dear Ms. Simmons:

This will confirm our reservation for meeting space at the Holiday Inn - Commonwealth for the purpose of holding a Public Service Commission hearing on Wednesday, January 26, 2000, in the above-referenced matter. The hearing will begin at 6:00 p.m. Please arrange the meeting space in accordance with the enclosed diagram by 4:00 p.m.

As previously discussed, the charge for use of the room and rental of audio equipment is \$1,000.00 (\$500 room rental/\$500 audio equipment). A copy of our insurance and tax exempt certificates are enclosed. Our purchase order will be forwarded shortly.

I appreciate the opportunity to use this facility for our hearing. Please call my assistant, Sandy Moses, at (850) 413-6728, if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,


skm **Enclosures**

Florida Public Service Commission Hearing Room Configuration for Docket No. 990517-TL

Review of Proposed Numbering Plan Relief for the 904 Area Code

Wednesday, January 26, 2000 6:00 p.m. Holiday Inn - Commonwealth 6802 Commonwealth Avenue Jacksonville, FL

| X | Χ | Χ |
|---|---|----------|
| 8 | ⊗ | ® |



8' Tables Podium



AUDIO REQUIREMENTS 6 TABLETOP MICROPHONES 1 PODIUM MICROPHONE 2 SPEAKERS MIXER

Theater-style Seating for 150

XXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXX

0

6' Table outside entrance of room

Office of Public Information

LEGEND:

X Chairs

Microphones

☎ Location for telephone line

Wastebaskets

•• Location where court reporter's cassette recorder will be plugged into audio system.

CITY

P.O. Box 37888

CATER NG CONTRACT DAY Wednesday DATE January 26 2000 TIME:SETUP : 30 PM END 10:00 PM ROOM 3 MEET JG ROOMS @ \$500.00 PLUS TAX STA TIME: START 6 0 PM ORGANIZATION FLA. PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION IN CHARGE _ 850-413-7118 P HONE STATE ____ GTD: VIENU SELECTION Iced Wat r Station in room Tax exer pt on file

Holiday Inn - Commonwealth 6802 Commonwealth Ave.

CONTACT SANDY GIMMONS

See Diagram

Theater Style

@ \$35.00 Ea

COUNTS: ESTIMATED 150

(6) Table Mics & Goose neck

SETUP & EQUIPMENT

Jacksonville, FL 32236

(2) Mixers @ \$35.00 1 Free standing Podium & Mic @ N/C Registration table outside room

2 speakers @ \$175 total

Overhead proj. @ \$45 Screen at no charge

> FOC) AND BEVERAGE SERVICE: \$0.00 ESTIMATED MISC. CHARGES: \$0.00 \$0.00 18% GRATUITY: \$0.00 6.5% TAX: 6.5% TAX: \$0.00 TOTAL ESTIMATED MISC .: \$0.00 ESTIN ATED TOTAL PER PERSON: \$0.00

BILLING INSTRUCTIONS

Direct Bill: Will Pay with Purchase Order

CONTRACT TERMS

| | CONTRACT TERMS | |
|----|---|--|
| | A final guarantee of the attendance at any catering function must be recieved Guarantees for a Monday or Tuesday function must be recieved by 12:00 noon If attendance falls below the guaranteed number, the customer will be charged and prepare for 5% over the guaranteed number. | on the preceding Friday. |
| | If fewer than N/A persons are served a meal in a banquet room a | |
| 4. | added to the banquet check. If beverage consumption does not equal or exceed N/A per bartends per shift will be added to the banquet check. Each shift includes set-up and telegraphics. | |
| | have reed the shove contract and the hotel's Catering Policies and Procedures | printed on the reverse side and constituting a |
| | Air pooking will remain tentative, subject to cancellation by the latest and | un Moure |
| | CUSTOMER SIGNATURE DATE HOTEL | REPRESENTATIVE DATE |



HOLIDAY INN COMMON VEALTH

Catering / Room Cor ract

A deposit is required for all catering functions unless prior credit/payment arrai gements have been established with the Hotel. Payment in full is required in advance for all catering functions unless prior cree it arrangements have been established with the All catering functions are subject to service (gratuity) charges and applicable si te and local sales taxes. If no guarantee is received, the Hotel will prepare and charge for the number of ersons estimated from the catering contract. If a change from the original room set-up is requested on the day of the function a labor charge will be added to the banquet check for the change. Final menu selections should be submitted two weeks prior to the function to eliure the availability of the desired menu items. All banquet checks must be signed by the person in charge or a designated rep sentative at the completion of each function. Any discrepancies in counts or charges should be identified and resolved at the time. If a function is cancelled, the deposit will be refunded in full if the Hotel has reclived notification of the cancellation at least 30 days prior to the function. (No refunds of deposit will be made during the mont) of December because of limited space and demand.) It will be at the discretion of the Notel whether to refund a deposit if ancellation notice is received less than 30 days prior to the scheduled function. The Hotel reserves the right to move functions to meeting/banquet rooms othe than those appearing on the catering contract without prior notification. 10. No guest may bring food or beverage of any kind into any banquet/meeting roo 11. Any items to be put on any meeting room or lobby walls or any directional signs rust be approved by the Hotel. 12. The hotel may request that the customer obtain and pay for bonded security pe onnel when valuable merchandise or exhibits are displayed or held overnight in the hotel or when deemed necessary. 13. The customer is responsible for the arrangements and all expenses of shipping liaterials, merchandise, exhibits, or any other items to and from the hotel. The hotel must be notified in advance of shipping a rangements to ensure proper acceptance of these items upon arrival at hotel. 14. The Hotel is not responsible for damage to or loss of any items left in the hotel lor to or following any function. 15. Function guests will be admitted to the banquet room and expected to depart a the times stated on this hotel contract. 16. The customer agrees to not publicly engage in conduct that will disturb the pea e or comfort of other guests or the public. The Hotel reserves the right to remove any customer or the customer's guests or ag ants if the customer or any of the customer's guests or agents participate or engage in conduct that disturbs the peace of cc. ifort of the other hotel guests or the public. The Hotel will refund any unused portion of any advance payment if the Hotel requires the customer or the customer's guests or agents to leave the premises based on their conduct. 17. The customer is responsible and shall reimburse the hotel for any damage, loss or liability incurred by the hotel by any of the customer's guests or any persons or organizations contracted by the customer | provide any service or goods before, during 18. Where appropriate, the term "Hotel" refers to Holiday Inn., Murphco of Florida, c., its Officers, Directors, Agents, Employees and Independent Contractors and not intended necessarily to refer to the particlar hotel building where the function is held. 19. The Hotel shall not be liable for non-performance of this contract when such no performance is attributable to labor troubles, disputes or strikes, accidents, government (Federal, State and Municipal) regul tions of, or restrictions upon travel or transportation, non-availability of food, beverage, or supplies, riots, national en rigencies, acts of God and other causes whether enumerated herein or not, which are beyond the reasonable control of the Hote preventing or interfering with the Hotel's performance. 20. Notwithstauding any other provision of this agreement, Holiday Inn and Murpho of Fiorida, Inc. shall be relieved from all requirements hereof, and this agreement shall terminate if Holiday Inn or Murp :0 of Florida, Inc. shall sell, transfer or otherwise convey its interest in this Holiday inn hotel, provided Holiday inn or N riphco of Florida, Inc. has given at least 60 days. notice of the transfer of its interest in the hotel and termination of this agreem: it. In the event of any such termination, Holiday Inns, Inc. or Murphoo of Florida, Inc. shall return all advance payments or depor is whereupon the parties shall have no further obligations to each other, provided that if the hotel shall be continued in operation as a hotel after such transfer by Holiday inns, Inc. or Murphco of Florida, Inc. then Holiday Inns, Inc. or Murphco of Florida, Inc. may assign all of its rights and obligations under this agreement to the new owner who shall then be solely responsible for performance hereunder, and Holiday Inns, Inc. and Murphco of Florida, Inc. shall be relieved of all obligations and responsibilities under this agreement upon transfer of all advance payments and deposits received by Hollday Inns, Inc. or Murphoo of Fir Ida, Inc. to the new owner.

| Name of group as it appears on this contract

| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract
| Name of group as it appears on this contract

MEMORANDUM

January 5, 2000

RECEIVED-FPSC 00 JAN -6 AM 10: 45

RECORDS AND REPORTING

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

BR

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

Attached is a <u>NOTICE OF COMMISSION SERVICE HEARINGS</u>, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 3)

BK/anc Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517sh.bk

See 2



FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION - RECORDS AND REPORTING

| Requistion for Photocopying and Mailing | | | | |
|--|--------|--|--|--|
| Number of Originals Copies Per Original Requested By | 116 | | | |
| Item Presented — | | | | |
| Agenda For (Date) Order No In Docket No
Notice of For (Date) In Docket No | 517-7L | | | |
| Special Handling Instructions — | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Number Distributed/ Mailed To Number Distribution/Mail Commission Offices Docket Mailing List - Mailed Docket Mailing List - Faxed Note: Items must be mailed and/or returned within one working day after issue unless specified here | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Job Number Verified By Job Checked For Correctness and Quality (Initial Completed | al) | | | |
| ———— Mail Room Verification —— | | | | |
| Date Mailed Verified By | | | | |

PSC/RAR 12(9/99)

ORIGINAL 1-5-00 990517-TL

| 1105/1-12 |
|--|
| |
| He, |
| you asked for suggestion on the |
| you asked for suggestion on the area code deal. Wouldn't it be a |
| area conte acar, or out ons. It |
| lot easier to just give out more |
| 3 diget starling numbers? Live Oak |
| now has 4 but it could certainly |
| have more and so could other towns |
| |
| in The 904 Calling area. |
| It seems a little extreme to |
| Change the area code since you will |
| in the to the it again and again |
| just have to do it again and again. |
| There's so many other combinations |
| That you could go with The other way. |
| 7 |
| f' |
| NEW Sexuely |
| APP CAF Comy King |
| CAF Cong |
| CAF
CMU I |
| CTR |
| Mrs. Amy King
6435 161st Rd. # 1804B |
| Live Oak, FL 32060 |
| |
| RRR |
| SEC |
| JAN 1 2 2000 |
| |
| Division of Consumer Affairs |

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK E. LEON JACOBS, JR.



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

January 11, 2000

Ms. Tina Shaw Digital DJ Services 1256 Enterprise Osteen Road Deltona, FL 32725

Re: Docket No. 990517-TL - Review of proposed numbering plan relief for the 904 area code.

Dear Ms. Shaw:

This will confirm the rental of audio equipment for a Commission workshop to be held on Friday, January 28, 2000 in the above-referenced matter. The workshop is scheduled to begin at 10:00 a.m. at the Deltona Hills Golf and Country Club, 1120 Elkcam Blvd., Deltona, FL. As discussed, the fee for providing this equipment will be \$495.00, and our purchase order will be forwarded shortly. Payment will be made after services are rendered and upon receipt of an invoice. To ensure timely payment, please submit your invoice to the Bureau of Fiscal Services, 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd., Tallahassee, FL 32399.

The enclosed diagram demonstrates the number of microphones and the location for each. Our court reporter's cassette recorder should be plugged into the audio system and the microphones arranged in accordance with the diagram by 8:30 a.m. Please contact Ms. Sharon Costanzo at telephone number 789-3911 regarding access to the country club.

I look forward to working with you and your staff. If you have questions regarding this matter, please call my assistant, Sandy Moses, at (850) 413-6728.

Sincerely,

skm Enclosure

Florida Public Service Commission Hearing Room Configuration for Docket No. 990517-TL Review of Proposed Numbering Plan Relief for the 904 Area Code

Friday, January 28, 2000 10:00 a.m. Deltona Hills Golf and Country Club 1120 Elkcam Blvd. Deltona, FL

② ③ ③

Tr

S' Tables

Podium

Description:

6' Table outside entrance of room

Office of Public Information

LEGEND:

X Chairs

Microphones

Wastebaskets

• Location where court reporter's cassette recorder will be plugged into audio system.

MEMORANDUM

January 11, 2000

RECEIVED-FPSC

00 JAN 11 PM 2: 25

RECORDS AND REPORTING

TO: DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

Attached is a CORRECTED NOTICE OF COMMISSION SERVICE HEARINGS, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 3)

BK/anc Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517N2.bk

MEMORANDUM

RECEIVED-FPSC

January 25, 2000

00 JAN 25 AM 10: 41

RECORDS AND REPORTING

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (B. KEATING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE 86-PC0

Attached is an ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION, to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 3)

BK/anc Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 990517mo.bk

3 RAR_

Changed suite #; To correct #.

CITY OF DELAND

DELAND, FLORIDA 32721

ORIOT

00-0397 FEB-8

POST OFFICE DRAWER 449 TELEPHONE: (904) 736-3900 FAX: (904) 736-9819

January 26, 2000

RECEIVED

FEB 0 8 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMM. Chairman Garcia

Honoraple Joe

RECEIVED-FPSC

Honorable Joe Garcia, Chairman Florida Public Service Commission Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0855

Dear Chairman Garcia:

The City of DeLand would like to extend a word of thanks to the Public Service Commission for your efforts in solving the very complex issue of providing relief for residents and businesses in the 904 area code. We have reviewed the proposal and strongly support the alternative proposal presented to you by Dr. John Otterson. Although this proposal was not numbered, we would respectfully request that it become alternate number 14. If after hearing all the testimony and taking into account all the positions, your Commission elects on one of the proposals presented in the package, the City of DeLand would respectfully support alternate proposal number 14. Even though the City of DeLand adamantly opposes Deltona and DeBary being separated from the mother county, we would chose alternate number 8 as the lesser evil to all of the other alternatives which further separates DeLand from the east coast cities.

Again we understand the very difficult job you have in determining the best alternative but hopefully this letter will express to you our support, first, for the proposal number 14 of Dr. Otterson, and second our support for alternate number 8.

David C. Rigsby

Mayor

Sincerely,

JAM/sp popes/mayor/areacode

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2000

CMU

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

00 JAN 25

DATE:

JANUARY 25, 1998

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING (BAYÓ)

FROM:

DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS (ILERI) &

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE.

Attached is a memorandum placed in Docket No. 981444-TP (Number Utilization Study: Investigation into Number Conservation Measures).

In order to address area code relief plans, this memorandum - Response to Mr. Gilbert Yablon's fax and letter regarding "The Unified Dialing Plans for Overlays" - is to be filed on the correspondence side in the above-referenced docket for further investigation.

LI

Attachments

cc: Division of Legal Services (Keating)

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE:

July 22, 1999

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS (İLERİ) $\mathcal H$

RE:

DOCKET NO. 981444-TP - In re: Number Utilization Study:

Investigation into Number Conservation Measures.

Attached is a RESPONSE to Mr. Gilbert Yablon's fax and letter to be filed on the correspondence side in the above-referenced docket. In addition, the FAX and LETTER are also attached.

LI

Attachments

cc: Division of Legal Services (Cox)

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners:
JOE GARCIA, CHAIRMAN
J. TERRY DEASON
SUSAN F. CLARK
JULIA L. JOHNSON
E. LEON JACOBS, JR..



DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS WALTER D'HAESELEER DIRECTOR (850) 413-6600

Public Service Commission

July 22, 1999

Gilbert Yablon 21914 Dumetz Road Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Re: A simplified dialing system for overlaid area codes

Dear Mr. Yablon:

Thank you for recommending a new alternative for overlays. We truly appreciate your interest and concern with regard to area code relief plans.

The Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC), along with other state public utility commissions in the nation, faces an enormous burden in determining when, and in what form, to implement area code relief. The FPSC has expanded its resources to convene public service hearings and workshops and to plan for different area code relief plans depending upon the geographic structure of the region being considered. As the FCC notes in its June 2, 1999, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, all state commissions inevitably bear the brunt of consumer dissatisfaction with whatever method of area code relief is chosen.

Currently, Florida has five area codes which are in extraordinary jeopardy and by the end of 1999, Florida would double its area codes unless certain number conservation measures are taken. The FPSC is working on ways to improve the utilization of telephone numbers in Florida. On April 2, 1999, the FPSC filed a petition before the FCC to get additional jurisdiction over numbering issues.

The FPSC, in its Docket No. 981444-TL (Number Utilization Study: Investigation into Number Conservation Measures) is investigating various number conservation measures. We placed

Mr. Yablon Page 2 July 22, 1999

your simplified dialing system for overlaid area codes into this docket for further investigation when addressing area code relief plans.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (850) 413-6562.

Sincerely,

Levent Ileri

Engineer

C:\ILERI\ACCOMPLA\GYABLON.LI

'The Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays'

A Dialing Plan which Supports the Implementation of Overlays for Area Code Relief proposed by Gilbert Yablon revised 5/25/97

The following plan describes a dialing system which supports the implementation of overlays for area code relief by eliminating the public's main objections to them. The plan preserves established dialing patterns to existing numbers, and unifies all levels of an overlay area with a consistent abbreviated dialing method. Long term relief is provided for exhausted area codes without impacting dialing in any other areas of the North American Numbering Plan (NANP).

This plan offers the following advantages over standard overlays:

- It greatly reduces the confusion and inconvenience that is associated with having multiple area codes within individual neighborhoods and households.
- Because the plan is non-disruptive to existing 7 digit and 1+10 digit dialing patterns:
 no one is put in jeopardy by a change to their local dialing plan (especially children),
 and it ensures that existing auto dialers can complete calls without reprogramming.
- It reduces the likelihood that the new overlay area code will be a stigma for new businesses.
- · It ensures that costs to businesses and disruption overall will be kept to a minimum.

Defining these terms will be helpful for the discussions that follow:

the original area code (in these examples the 818 area parent level of overlay code). a new overlaid area code (in these examples the 626 area child level of overlay code is the first child level). a single geographic area which contains the parent level overlay area and all of the child overlay levels. intra-overlay area calls refers to calls where the origin and the destination area codes both reside within the geographic overlay area. dialing which requires fewer than 11 digits to complete abbreviated dialing (abbreviated dialing within an area code is typically 7 digits). timing

as used in this *Unified Dialing Plan*: an industry determined interval (probably 3 - 4 seconds) invoked after the 7th digit of a phone number is dialed. If this interval elapses and no further digits have been entered, the phone system switch will run an analysis on the 7 digit number that has been dialed. This technique will allow customers to dial valid phone numbers of varying lengths (7 or 8 digits).

In Brief:

I am proposing a method of implementing an overlay, in which local dialing within the overlay area is facilitated by:

- <u>'7 digit' + timing dialing</u> for intra-overlay area calls directed to the parent level of the
 overlay <u>from any level</u> of the overlay. This will ensure that dialing patterns to existing
 numbers (parent level numbers) will not be disrupted with the introduction of an
 overlay.
- '8 digit' (7 + suffix) dialing for intra-overlay area calls directed to any level of the overlay (parent or child). This would be a '7 + x' system, where the 8th digit is a suffix and acts as an overlay selector. Each area code within the overlay area will be assigned a unique identifier, which will then be used as the '8th digit suffix' or 'overlay selector' in dialing. This feature unifies all levels of the overlay area with consistent abbreviated dialing, regardless of the originating or destination overlay area codes.
- 1+10 digit dialing (permissive not mandatory) throughout the entire overlay area.

Refer to Fig. 4A at the end of this report for an illustration of how these three dialing methods are integrated in the Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays.

This plan is applicable to any area where an overlay might need to be implemented, but for ease of illustration I will describe it hypothetically using 818 as the original area code, and 626 as the first new 'overlaid' level.

How the plan would be implemented:

Within the overlay area only (example: the hypothetical 818/626 overlay area):

The suffixes for intra-overlay area dialing would be determined as follows:

- All 818 numbers would receive a suffix of '0' (representing the parent level).
- All 626 numbers would receive a suffix of '1' (representing the <u>first child</u> level).
- Any future overlay levels would receive a suffix of '2' '9' in that order. This
 framework will allow for easy future expansion when more numbers are needed.

For example:

123-4567-0 = 1-818-123-4567 Within the 818/626 overlay area, either style is valid.

123-4567-1 = 1-626-123-4567 Within the 818/626 overlay area, either style is valid.

123-4567-2 = 1-???-123-4567 Within the 818/626/??? overlay area, either style will be valid (for a third area code).

Further:

All 818 numbers can also be reached from any level of the overlay area simply by
dialing the original 7 digit number + waiting for a short timing delay. This feature of
the Unified Dialing Plan makes the introduction of an overlay completely nondisruptive to the existing dialing patterns of the original area code.

For example:

123-4567+timing delay = 1-818-123-4567

Defaults to 818 + 7 digit number to accommodate existing dialing patterns. The industry would determine the appropriate length for this timing delay.

From within the ove area, the dialing plan would of late as follows:

- Once 7 digits are received, the call will be considered legal, however the system will
 wait an additional timing period (to be determined by the industry) for a possible 8th
 digit which technically is the 'overlay selector'.
- If 8 digits are received, the phone system switch will run an analysis on the number, examining the 8th digit first.
- If the 8th digit is a '0', the call will be directed to the <u>818</u> level of the overlay.
- If the 8th digit is a '1', the call will be directed to the 626 level of the overlay.
- If the industry determined 'timing delay' elapses before the 8th digit is received, a suffix of '0' is assumed, and the 7 digit call will automatically be directed to the 818 level of the overlay.
- If an industry determined 'timing delay' elapses and less than 7 digits have been received, the call is considered abandoned, and the standard 'try again' message is given.
- Once the proper overlay level is determined and the call is routed to the proper area code within the overlay area, the suffix is discarded, leaving a standard 7 digit number to be routed by traditional 7 digit switching logic.
- To summarize, all '7 digit + timing' or '7 digit + suffix' calls are converted to 1+10 numbers by the phone system, and are then transparently routed to the proper overlay level.

Note: 1 + 10 digit dialing for intra-overlay area calls would also be supported, if that were how people preferred to dial, but it would not be mandatory.

Handling local or toll calls going outside the 818 626 overlay area:

Mandatory 1 + 10 digit dialing would be used for dialing to any number outside of the 818/626 overlay area, whether it be local or toll. If someone in the overlay area were to accidentally use the '1 + 10 + x' format (because they had become accustomed to dialing 8 digit phone numbers) it wouldn't matter because in 1 + 10 dialing, all extra digits beyond 1+10 are ignored, just as it has always been.

Handling local or toll calls coming into the 818 626 overlay area:

When calling from outside 818/626, standard 1 + 10 digit dialing would be used to dial to any number inside the 818/626 overlay area. If someone from outside the 818/626 overlay area were to accidentally use the '1 + 10 + x' format (because they were unclear as to the correct dialing rules in the overlay area) it wouldn't matter because in 1 + 10 dialing, all additional digits are ignored.

Directory listings:

In the 818/626 telephone directories the numbers will be listed as follows:

| lege | nd: | 7 digit + '0' = 818 area code | 7 d | igit | + '1' $=$ 62 | 26 area | a code |
|------|--------|-------------------------------|-----|------|--------------|---------------------|--------|
| 818 | number | 999-3360-0 | | | | | |
| 626 | number | 956-2200-1 | | | | | |
| 213 | number | 213-462-2110 | out | of | 'overlay | area' | number |
| 626 | number | 347-9426-1 | | -) | | (0.00 (0.00 (0.00)) | |
| 818 | number | 883-6234-0 | | | | | |
| 818 | number | | | | | | |
| 818 | number | | | | | | |
| 626 | number | | | | | | |
| 310 | number | | out | of | 'overlay | area' | number |

Because no area codes would need to be listed for intra-overlay area phone numbers, the 'new' 626 numbers (which a new business might have) will not stand out as red flags to customers looking for experienced services. Only out of 'overlay area' phone numbers would stand out, the same as they already do in current directories.

To further remind people how the system works, a sticker could be supplied to customers in the 818/626 area that said:

8 digit dialing supported:

7 digit phone number + 0 = 818 area code 7 digit phone number + 1 = 626 area code

How to inform the public on how to use the new plan:

On and after the date that the overlay plan is to take effect:

For calls made from any telephone within the 818/626 overlay area:

- to any phone number in the 818 area code overlay level (the parent level of the overlay area):
 - You may dial all 818 area code telephone numbers exactly as you always have in the past using just 7 digits. After a short delay your call will go through. You may avoid this delay by dialing the 7 digit number + 0.
- to any phone number in the 626 area code overlay level (the first child level of the overlay area):
 - You must dial all new 626 area code telephone numbers as the 7 digit number + 1.
- to phone numbers in area codes outside of the 818/626 overlay area:

 Dial 1 + area code + 7 digits the same as you would before the overlay went into effect.

For calls made from area codes outside of the 818/626 overlay area:

• to any area code within the 818/626 overlay area:

Dial 1 + area code + 7 digits - the same as you would before the overlay went into effect.

Conclusion:

This plan addresses customers' objections to using overlays which they fear would result in confusion and/or the inconvenience of having to dial 11 digits just to call across the street.

To ease the public's transition to overlays, simple 7 digit dialing to all existing parent level numbers is maintained (this is also a benefit for children and automatic dialing systems).

The plan allows for abbreviated '7 digit + suffix' dialing from and to any phone within the entire overlay area, without affecting how 1 + 10 digit calls 'out-of', 'into', or within the overlay area are handled. It is expandable to 10 levels (0-9) of overlay within a single geographic dialing area, allowing for painless addition of many new numbers in the future.

Additionally, the new style of directory listings won't be a disadvantage for new businesses.

For the public, this plan will have the psychological appeal of being a new 'high tech' solution to the challenges presented by splits and standard overlays. It answers all of the public's concerns about overlays, and will leave citizens and businesses with a feeling that something is finally being done to protect them from the expense and disruption that traditionally comes with area code exhaust and relief.

When the advantages of this plan are weighed against the disadvantages of area code splits and standard implementations of overlays (expense, disruption, confusion, inconvenience, permanent impact on the size of geographic dialing areas, etc.), this uniform dialing plan for overlays clearly makes sense as a solution for both the short and the long term.

This system can be applied to any area that is faced with the need to introduce an overlay. If this system becomes a standard, over time large areas of North America would be able to locally take advantage of this plan without affecting how any 'out of area' or 'into area' dialing and switching is handled.

Illustrations:

Using the 818/626 area code as an example, the attached diagrams illustrate how dialing patterns are impacted by various forms of area code relief.

- Figure 1A shows the established dialing patterns in an area code prior to implementing relief.
- Figure 2A shows how an area code split disrupts established dialing patterns.
- Figure 3A shows how a standard overlay impacts established dialing patterns and how its overlay levels are not united by a distinctive dialing plan.
- Figure 4A shows that <u>The Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays</u> is non-disruptive to
 established dialing patterns AND unifies all levels of the overlay area with a simple 8
 digit dialing system.


Submitted by:
Gilbert Yablon
The Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays
21914 Dumetz Rd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
818-999-1070-0 - (voice)
818-956-2200-0 - (alt. voice)
818-956-3298-0 - (fax)



Fig.1: Communities Involved



Fig.1A: Dialing Patterns



This map shows the established dialing patterns of an area code before being impacted by area code relief. These dialing patterns will be disrupted by either a split or a standard overlay.



Fig.2: Communities Involved





Fig.2A: Dialing Patterns

| | Dialing Options |
|---------------|--------------------|
| | 7 Digit Dialing |
| ^ | Within 818 |
| (4) | 123-4567 |
| /A | |
| 1 | or |
| \Diamond | |
| ((a)) | Within 626 |
| | 123-4567 |
| V | |
| | 11 Digit Dialing |
| - | Into Area |
| | 1+818+123-4567 |
| \Rightarrow | 1+626+123-4567 |
| 7 | |
| | Out of Area |
| \rightarrow | 1+NXX+123-4567 |
| | |
| | Between 818/626 |
| -> | 1+818+123-4567 |
| \Rightarrow | 1+626+123-4567 |
| | |

Implementing a split greatly impacts dialing for calls both within and into the original NPA. This method of relief is expensive for business and disruptive to all customers, both within and outside of the affected area.

© 1997 Gilhert Yabler





Dialing Options

7 Digit Dialing
Thought to be impractical for
this Overlay Method

Mandatory 11 Digit Dialing
Into Area

1+818+123-4567

or 1+626+123-4567

Out of Area


1+NXX+123-4567


Within 818/626 Area
1+818+123-4567
or 1+626+123-4567

With abbreviated dialing abandoned, the overlay levels are not unified by a distinctive dialing plan. The concern that this mix of area codes will cause hardship and confusion for citizens has prevented overlays from becoming widely accepted.

S 1997 Gilbert Yahle

Fig.4: Communities Involved





This overlay method provides for long term relief AND maintains the intregity of the original dialing area by:

1) Preserving established 7 digit dialing to all parent level numbers from any level within the overlay area.

2) Unifying all levels of the overlay with a simple 8 digit (7+suffix) dialing system.

3) Allowing for optional (not mandatory) 11 digit dialing between levels of the overlay.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT

"THE UNIFIED DIALING PLAN FOR OVERLAYS"

Submitted to the INC on 7/13/98 by:

Gilbert Yablon The Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays 21914 Dumetz Rd. Woodland Hills, CA 91364 818-999-1070-0 - (voice) 818-956-2200-0 - (alt. voice) 818-956-3298-0 - (fax) UNIFIEDdpo@aol.com - email

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Page |
|--|
| Introduction |
| What prompted development of the Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays?1 |
| What is the Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays?2 |
| Functionally, how does the UDPFO work? |
| Are you saying that customers in the original area code will be able to dial 7 digits to make calls, but people in the overlaid area codes will have to dial 8? |
| The UDPFO seems to offer a dialing advantage to customers in the "original" area code of the overlay - isn't that a violation of the FCC's mandate for dialing parity in overlays?3 |
| The UDPFO describes a 7 digit default dialing method which can only reach phone numbers in the original area code - isn't that a clear violation of dialing parity? |
| How can a plan like this be implemented locally (on a case by case basis) without interfering with, or requiring changes to, the rest of the telephone network?6 |
| Won't this system cause chaos among CPE manufactures? It seems like everyone would have to change equipment to accommodate this plan |
| Won't on demand features such as Auto Call Return, Busy Number Redial and other enhanced features be severely impacted by the need for additional digits?7 |
| Won't the increase in real time processor delay inherent in this plan have severe impacts on the existing public network and possibly have dire impacts in the future? I am concerned that any increase in call delay will stress the network and render ineffective the gains in efficiency the CCS/SS7 Network provides |
| Won't the non sequential digit analysis of this plan place undue delays in the provisioning of Local Number Portability? |
| Won't the post digit analysis cause a further increase in the time required to process a call? |
| The Federal Communication Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission require 10 digit dialing with an overlay of an area code. Further, the Industry Numbering Committee has endorsed 10 digit dialing as a standard, and it is expected that there will be a need to move beyond the 10 digit format arrangement in the future to possibly 12 digits. Doesn't this render the Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays unusable and unworkable? |
| Wouldn't any dialing plan change of this kind have to be agreed upon by the entire North American Telecommunications Industry? |
| What about the effect of this plan on Computer Telephony Integration (CTI) products such as computer software dialing programs, dial-in/dial-back security systems and credit card validation systems. Won't adaptation by the developer be required to accommodate this plan? |
| Won't the insertion of any delay in the completion of calls cause customer confusion, increase trouble reports and increase customer dissatisfaction?9 |

| Wouldn't this plan prompt a significant increase in wrong numbers? For example: I would hate to have the number in the original area code that corresponded to a cab company in the new area code. Every night at bar closing time I could get dozens (or hundreds) of calls from callers who dial 1 digit every 10 seconds and then slur their request for a cab and won't admit that they dialed a wrong number |
|---|
| My Public Utilities Commission has already examined the feasibility of using timing in other dialing scenarios, and has rejected it. Is the use of timing in this plan different? If so, what distinguishes timing in this plan from other attempts to implement it? |
| How well would this plan work for long distance calls? Customers would not be used to the new overlaid area code since they wouldn't have to dial it internally, and instead of dialing 1-732-949-1000 to get that number they are likely to dial 1-908-949-1000-1, prompting a wrong number. Won't this be problematic? |
| Does this plan offer a permissive dialing period? |
| Wouldn't a massive re-education campaign be required and need to be on-going since out-of-towners would not know about 8 digit dialing? |
| How would the translation be implemented by phone company equipment? Are you asking carriers to read the 8th digit and prefix, in the switch, to derive the correct area code? |
| How are things like the Dallas retroactive overlay handled? How about if the retroactive overlay was not done, but an overlay over two existing NPAs was done? |
| Won't problems arise from the fact that the number the customer knows is not the number that the customer is identified with in the PSAP (911) database? |
| Switches are set to look at an initial digit string. Wouldn't it be expensive to build the features necessary to do what the UDPFO suggests in looking at the first 3, plus the last 1 to determine the area code? |
| Things would get very interesting where digits had to be outpulsed to a PBX; this is done with a delete and prefix. Wouldn't this create a problem in a UDPFO scenario? |
| Won't some interesting (and expensive) recording and billing system changes be required by this plan? |
| Wouldn't there be lots of problems with getting people to do the timing reliably? It seems as though the failure cases would keep the PUC up at night with complaints |
| How does this plan fix the competitive issue? For instance: If I the CLEC get a code in the child NPA, folks need to do something special to get to my customers, i.e. dial that funky suffix or dial 1+10 digits. Won't this be a competitive disadvantage for my company? |
| Why should the industry take the time to give serious consideration to this plan?1 |
| UDPFO Conclusion |
| How to contact the LIDPEO |

Introduction:

The Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays (UDPFO) is a non-disruptive, consumer friendly, competitively neutral solution for area code relief. In addition to supporting all of the features found in standard overlay implementations, the plan offers an advanced 8 digit dialing system for overlay groupings, and is backward compatible with all established dialing patterns to existing pre-relief phone numbers. Some of the techniques and ideas offered in the plan involve "outside of the box" thinking, which has raised some initial concerns among regulators and telecom officials. However, a closer examination of the issues, and how this plan addresses them, will demonstrate that the UDPFO is workable, easy to use, and solves the problems that are typically associated with area code relief. The following discussion is offered as clarification to questions which have been asked about the plan.

What prompted development of the Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays?

Current solutions for area code relief (splits and standard overlays) create, rather than solve, problems for customers. Recently, the widespread use of these methods has resulted in what can readily be described as a "National Area Code Disaster." Our dialing landscape has been damaged, and this damage has been expensive and disruptive for businesses and consumers. Some of the impacts from current relief methods are outlined below.

Impacts from implementing an area code split:

An area code split forces half of the customers in the affected area to give up their existing phone numbers, cuts abbreviated (7 digit) dialing areas in half, and permanently disrupts established dialing patterns both within the affected area and into the affected area from everywhere else in the world. The overall cost just for mopping up after a single area code split is estimated to be over 40 million dollars (this includes updating signs and stationary, reprogramming of burglar alarms, fire alarms and other auto dialing systems, notifying customers and friends of number changes, modifying local phone switches, etc.). This reshuffling of phone numbers creates confusion for customers, resulting in numerous missed calls and misdialed phone numbers for many years to come.

Impacts from implementing a standard overlay:

Using standard overlays for relief also creates hardship for customers. Existing dialing patterns are disrupted for <u>all</u> customers in the affected area. Seven (7) digit abbreviated dialing is abandoned for less convenient (and very unpopular and controversial) 10 digit dialing. For <u>all</u> calls in a standard overlay scenario, the area code must be dialed before the 7 digit number, creating difficulty for customers — especially children, handicapped persons and the elderly. Many people have expressed concern that dialing multiple area codes for calls within a single geographic region will create a feeling of disunity for the area. The shift from 7 digit to 10 digit dialing also necessitates reprogramming for all burglar alarms, fire alarms and other automatic dialing systems which had previously been programmed with 7 digit numbers. Incomplete calls will occur when 7 digits are dialed without the area code, and it is likely that the wrong area code will often be used by mistake (this happens today even where area codes are not overlaid). And, the likelihood of misdialing at least one out of 10 or 11 digits is significantly greater than when only 7 digits are dialed (expect an increase of 42% for 10 digits and 57% for 1+10 digits).

By disrupting established dialing patterns, area code splits and standard overlays cause hardship and confusion for customers, and prompt numerous misdials and wrong numbers.

It would be desirable if area code relief could be achieved with a minimum of disruption and expense. For a solution to be "preferred" it would have to satisfy both the needs of the customer and the requirements of the telecommunications industry.

For customers, a preferred solution would:

- 1) Be consumer friendly, non-disruptive and competitively neutral.
- 2) Allow customers to keep their existing area codes and phone numbers.
- 3) Preserve all dialing patterns to established phone numbers (backward compatibility).
- 4) Minimize impact on children, handicapped persons and the elderly.
- 5) Avoid costly reprogramming of existing burglar alarms, fire alarms and other auto-dialers.
- 6) Save consumers, businesses and telephone companies money overall.
- 7) Provide long term, non-disruptive relief to exhausted area codes.

For the telecom industry, a preferred solution must:

- 1) Offer benefit to customers.
- 2) Be competitively neutral.
- 3) Be technically workable.
- 4) Be cost effective to implement.
- 5) Be built on top of the existing network so that past investment is not discarded.
- 6) Limit all costs and changes in "dialing, switching and programming" to the geographic area in which the solution is implemented.

It would be hard to argue against an alternative which met these specifications, yet it is natural that controversy might surround it.

What is the Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays?

The Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays (UDPFO) is a non-disruptive solution for area code relief which is both competitively neutral and consumer friendly. It provides a technically workable alternative for area code relief which minimizes hardship to local business and the public.

New numbers can be added to a geographic area without changing the way that existing numbers are dialed. Established 7 and 1+10 digit dialing patterns are maintained and a new 8 digit option is enabled which allows for abbreviated dialing within and between all area codes in the geographic overlay area.

Further, the plan demonstrates how dialing parity (mandated by the FCC) can be maintained in an overlay without requiring the full 10 digit (or actually 1 + 10 digit) phone number to be dialed.

Many of the ideas presented in the UDPFO might, at first glance, seem to call upon techniques which previously (and for good reason) have been rejected by the Telecommunications Industry and Public Utilities Commissions. But a closer examination of the plan demonstrates that these techniques, as proposed here, solve rather than create problems.

The "customer concerns" and "competitive issues" which the plan addresses were derived directly from transcripts of public hearings on area code relief. After numerous discussions with telecommunications officials, followed by multiple redesigns of the plan, the UDPFO has been evaluated as "technically workable" by several industry experts (including a former co-chair of the Industry Numbering Committee). In addition, the cost of implementing the plan for an affected region may well be less than the overall cost (cost to business, cost to public and cost to telecom industry) of an area code split.

Functionally, how does the UDPFO work?

In brief, the Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays consists of a dialing system which:

1) Allows for optional (not mandatory) 1+10 digit dialing within and between all area codes in the geographic overlay area.

UDPFOfag.doc 2 of 16 7/11/98

- 2) Unifies all area codes in the geographic overlay area with a simple 8 digit (7+suffix) dialing system. The suffix represents one of ten possible overlaid area codes with '0' being the original area code, '1' being the first overlaid area code, '2' being a future second overlaid area code, etc. After the phone company's equipment receives the full 8 digits, it translates the number into a traditional 10 digit number (3 digit area code + 7 digit phone number) and passes it through the network as if the number had been originally dialed as 1+10.
- 3) Preserves established '7 digit style' dialing (see explanation below of how this <u>default dialing</u> is accomplished by using a 'timing delay') to all phone numbers in the original area code from any area code within the geographic overlay area.

Functionally the network switch will be looking for either 1+10 style numbers or 7+suffix style numbers. With default dialing, if only 7 digits are dialed, after an appropriate timing delay the switch will assume that '0' is the intended 8th digit and will put the call through to the original area code of the overlay area. In this way backward compatibility is achieved for dialing to 'prerelief phone numbers' from any area code in the geographic overlay area, and the system appears completely non-disruptive to the customer.

It should be noted that while numbers in all of the area codes within the geographic overlay area can be reached by dialing either '7+suffix' or '1+10', the '7 digit default' dialing option (which always requires a timing delay) applies only to numbers in the original area code and only under default conditions. On the surface this would seem to offer preferential dialing to certain numbers, however, on closer examination it becomes clear that very few people would intentionally take advantage of this option. Because of the timing delay when only 7 digits are dialed, customers will quickly opt for dialing the 8th digit (in this case '0') in order to complete calls in the most expedient way. This 7 digit option is really only provided in order to ease the transition into an overlay scenario, and to act as a safety net for old "7 digit style" calls which would otherwise be lost. It provides an extremely long permissive dialing period, ensures that any phone number that had been dialed with 7 digits in the past could still be dialed the same way, and minimizes the need to immediately update auto dialers and databases. More than likely, (a short time after implementation of the UDPFO), 7 digit calls will only be initiated by auto dialers which had been programmed pre-relief (i.e. alarm system auto dialers) which are typically difficult or costly for their owners to update.

Are you saying that customers in the original area code will be able to dial 7 digits to make calls, but people in the overlaid area codes will have to dial 8?

No. Everyone can dial every number in the overlay area with 8 digits. Seven digit default dialing is also available to all customers for reaching numbers in the original area code. This feature is provided as courtesy to customers who already have phones and services in the original area code. It provides a way to not have to reprogram pre-relief auto dialers. When only 7 digits are dialed, after a significant delay the call will default through to the original area code. This is a safety net to catch 7 digit calls that would otherwise be lost.

The UDPFO seems to offer a dialing advantage to customers in the "original" area code of the overlay isn't that a violation of the FCC's mandate for dialing parity in overlays?

While some numbers in the UDPFO can be dialed with only 7 digits, the conclusion that this offers a dialing advantage and violates parity is in error. Two factors mitigate this:

1) Everyone in a UDPFO grouping (from any area code in the grouping) can dial these same numbers with any of the three dialing options (7 digit default, 8 digit or 1+10 digit).

UDPFOfaq.doc 3 of 16 7/11/98

2) The timing delay which is always part of the 7 digit default option, counteracts any perceived dialing advantage. Customers will quickly migrate (from this inefficient 7 digit+delay method) to the plan's preferred 8 digit option. The 7 digit default is offered so that customers who already have an investment in the established dialing structure won't be disadvantaged by area code relief. Why would customers intentionally dial 7 digits and then waste several seconds, when they can simply dial one extra digit to avoid the delay? The default is only provided as a "safety net" to keep old style 7 digit calls (i.e. from alarm systems, auto dialers, and calls made under conditions of panic, emergency or lingering force of habit) from falling through the cracks.

A detailed discussion of the 7 digit vs. 8 digit issue follows

These questions should be asked: "What counts as a digit?" and/or "What length delay would be required before the 7 digit default is not seen as a dialing advantage?"

Would people really dial 7 digits and then wait 4 or 5 or 8 or 10 seconds just so they could avoid having to dial that "bothersome" 8th digit? In our fast paced society a 3 or 4 second delay should neutralize any perceived (or arguable) advantage that dialing only 7 digits provides.

In other words, how can a method of dialing which takes longer be considered to be a dialing advantage?

And, since everyone in the entire overlay area has equal access to the same dialing options that are available for reaching any specific number, how is this a disadvantage to anyone?

Other variations on overlay implementations which propose 7 digit dialing within individual area codes of an overlay but require 10 or 1+10 digits for dialing between those same area codes, do clearly violate of the FCC's mandate for dialing parity. In these scenarios, the dialing options for reaching any specific number are not equally available to all customers in the overlay area.

The Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays on the other hand, is in accord with the FCC mandate on parity. All of the area codes in the UDPFO are equally able to initiate calls with any of the options that are available for any specific number. There is no dialing advantage or disadvantage associated with either the original area code or any of the overlaid area codes. Customers from any area code within the geographic overlay area can dial the original area code with '7 digit default' (which always requires a timing delay) — but why would they want to, when they can make the call more expediently by simply dialing it as an 8 digit number (7digits+'0') and thus avoid the delay?

The '7 digit default' option is provided so that there is no <u>penalty</u> to people who already have phones and services in the original area code; who would otherwise be forced to immediately change dialing habits, update auto dialers and reprogram 'alarm type' systems from '7 digit' to '8 digit' or '1+10 digit' dialing.

The <u>preferred</u> dialing method in the UDPFO is the 8 digit method. Any telephone within the overlay area can be dialed from any area code in the overlay grouping with this simple, efficient method. Customers in a UDPFO area would quickly migrate to 8 digit dialing in order to avoid the delay which is always part of 7 digit default.

It is hard to imagine that someone in the original area code would advise friends, relatives or customers that they should use the 7 digit default method just so that they can enjoy the advantage of their calls taking several seconds longer to connect. If this were the case, a strong argument could be made for reissuing rotary dial telephones.

UDPFOfaq.doc 4 of 16 7/11/98

The following three examples further illustrate that there is no advantage to being in any particular area code in a UDPFO scenario:

Customer A:

This customer already has a phone in the original area code before the UDPFO is implemented. Because people had called Customer A with 7 digits in the past, there is a likelihood that he might still receive calls of this nature in the future because of: force of habit after years of people knowing and using his 7 digit number, and pre-programmed auto dialers that might not have been updated to 8 digit or 1+10 digit for this number. The UDPFO will keep these types of calls from falling through the cracks, allowing them to complete after a designated timing delay.

If the customer already has existing 7 digit numbers entered in his auto dialer, burglar alarm, fire alarm or other automated dialing system, the UDPFO offers another advantage over other forms of area code relief. Since all pre-relief dialing patterns to existing numbers are maintained by the UDPFO, customers will not be forced to immediately update these systems (although they may choose to in order to avoid the timing delay).

Customer B:

Looking for new service after UDPFO – this customer gets a number in the original area code. No one has ever used 7 digits to call this customer at this number, so there is no force of habit and no preprogrammed auto dialers that need to be updated for this number. This customer will be given his new number as (NXX) NXX-XXXX-0, and that is how he will tell people to call him. The ability to dial this number with 7 digits will not be expected or missed. More than likely if this number were dialed as only 7 digits it would be because it had been intended for a previous owner of that number.

Customer B will enjoy the same advantages as Customer A in terms of his own auto dialers. Any previously programmed devices the customer moves to this new number (from any area code in the grouping) will not need reprogramming.

Customer C:

Looking for new service after UDPFO—this customer gets service in the new overlaid area code. Same situation as Customer B above. This customer's number will be (NXX) NXX-XXXX-1. No one will have ever tried to dial this number with 7 digits in the past, and there is no reason or logic to why anyone would do it now. To any person dialing this number, the '1' suffix will be as much a part of this number as the 7th digit of a traditional number is today.

Customer C will enjoy the same advantages as Customers A and B in terms of his own auto dialers. Any previously programmed devices the customer moves to this new number (from any area code in the grouping) will not need reprogramming.

Customers A, B and C:

All will enjoy the same dialing advantages:

When calling someone in the original area code, they can all use 8 digit, 1+10 digit or 7 digit default (which always requires a delay).

When calling someone in the new overlaid area code, they can all use 8 digit or 1+10 digit.

The 7 digit default safety net offers an important advantage over other forms of area code relief: customers are not penalized or put in jeopardy by a change to their dialing plan. Area code splits and standard overlays do not offer this advantage.

The UDPFO describes a 7 digit default dialing method which can only reach phone numbers in the original area code - isn't that a clear violation of dialing parity?

Again, the 7 digit default 'safety net' feature of the UDPFO does not violate dialing parity.

UDPFOfaq.doc 5 of 16 7/11/98

The most efficient method for dialing any number within the overlay grouping is the 8 digit option, and this method is available to all customers in the overlay area for dialing every number in the area.

The 7 digit default (which always requires a delay) is less efficient, but is provided to help minimize disruption to customers who already have phones and services in the original area code.

Clearly, if the less efficient 7 digits + delay method were the <u>only</u> option for reaching customers in the original area code (while all other area codes in the overlay group could be reached more efficiently by dialing 8 digits), <u>the original area code would have an undeniable dialing disadvantage</u>.

On the other hand, if the 7 digit default method is not provided, people who already have numbers in the original area code will suffer more disruption than people who later obtain service in either the new area code or the original area code.

I trust regulators will conclude that the intent and function of the 7 digit default is to minimize hardship for people who already have service, and that no "dialing advantage", or violation of "dialing parity" is generated by this feature.

How can a plan like this be implemented locally (on a case by case basis) without interfering with, or requiring changes to, the rest of the telephone network?

Although there will be a change in the way that numbers may be dialed (7 digits, 8 digits or 1+10 digits), once in the network all calls are handled as traditional 10 digit numbers, which is already the network standard in overlay situations. Because all calls are translated into 10 digits, the UDPFO is able to solve local dialing issues without affecting "dialing to" or "dialing from" any outside area codes. It can be adopted on a situation by situation basis, and would have no impact on dialing or switching for the rest of the telephone network.

To the network as a whole, a UDPFO implementation will look like a standard overlay grouping. Each of the area codes in the group will have telephone numbers that are known to the network as standard 3 digit area codes followed by standard 7 digit telephone numbers. The new suffix digit is only significant when dialing 7 or 8 digit numbers within the geographic overlay area. The 8th digit, when dialed, functions as an area code selector (or indicator) and is used by telephone company equipment to translate the number into a standard 3 digit area code + 7 digit telephone number. Outside of a UDPFO grouping, there will be no impact on the normal functioning of the network, because all dialing and switching into and out of the grouping will be done with industry standard 10 digit numbers (the same as the current standard for dialing across area code boundaries).

How to best integrate the UDPFO into the existing telephone network is really a matter for the industry to resolve, but I would like to suggest that there may be more than one approach worth considering. It was suggested to me (by a Lead Programmer for the Advanced Intelligent Network) that it might be relatively easy to implement this system if it were handled as a <u>custom calling service</u>. Though custom calling services are normally preceded by "*XX" ("star X X" -- like "star 69" for call return), wouldn't applying the following logic be able to automatically trigger the custom service without having to first dial the "*XX"?:

- 1) Since any calls beginning with a "0" or a "1" would not be of the <u>7 digit default</u> or <u>8 digit (7+X)</u> type, these calls could be released directly to the network without special handling.
- 2) The switch could then assume that any call (in a UDPFO area) which begins with "2" "9",

UDPFOfag.doc 6 of 16 7/11/98

might be a 7 or 8 digit call, and would automatically trigger the custom service for handling these types of calls -- eliminating the need for first dialing "*XX". The service would then "watch" as digits were entered, and "decide" what to do with any given number. Naturally 411, 911 and other special services would immediately be forwarded along after only 3 digits are entered. Seven (7) digit calls would not be released until after the timing delay, and both 7 and 8 digit calls would be translated into the proper 3 digit area code + 7 digit phone number before entering the network.

PLEASE NOTE: the above is only suggested as one possible way to implement the UDPFO, based on input from a Lead Programmer of the Advanced Intelligent Network for a major local service provider. There may be other, better ways of accomplishing the same thing, and the industry as a whole is welcome to make suggestions on this.

Won't this system cause chaos among CPE manufactures? It seems like everyone would have to change equipment to accommodate this plan.

No, that will not be the case. One of the main advantages of this plan is that it minimizes the impact on devices such as speed dialers, burglar alarms, and auto dialers because it eliminates the need to reprogram them when the numbers they have been set up to dial are split off into a new area code, or when 7 digit numbers need converting to 1+10 (as would be the case if a standard overlay were implemented). In most cases, a PBX or telephone key system would be unaffected by the UDPFO since the suffix logic is handled at the network switch level. At worst, a PBX software change might be necessary to allow the release of the 8th digit. This might actually be less disruptive to a PBX than the changes that are necessary after a traditional area code split. Any problems that are caused may well be less significant than those created by recent changes that have been made to the NANP, i.e. PBX problems caused by 2-9 being used for the second digit of an area code and 0-1 being used for the second digit of a prefix.

Won't on demand features such as Auto Call Return, Busy Number Redial and other enhanced features be severely impacted by the need for additional digits?

No. All 7 and 8 digit entries will be translated to 10 digit numbers before switching begins. Ten digits is the same protocol that phone numbers have been know to the network since the 1940's. It seems hard to imagine that there would be any impact on services that have already been designed to use 10 digit numbers.

Won't the increase in real time processor delay inherent in this plan have severe impacts on the existing public network and possibly have dire impacts in the future? I am concerned that any increase in call delay will stress the network and render ineffective the gains in efficiency the CCS/SS7 Network provides.

Any delay that would occur would happen prior to connection to the CCS/SS7 network and would have no impact on the efficiency of the CCS/SS7 network. The industry needs to define what the 'severe impacts on the existing public network' would be and provide some examples of 'dire impacts in the future'.

Also, as explained earlier, very few calls will actually be intentionally made using the '7 digit default' method -- which requires a delay. Most calls within the geographic overlay area will be initiated with the '7+suffix' method which avoids the delay. With traditional relief alternatives, a large number of calls that previously only required 7 digit dialing would afterwards require dialing 1+10 digits. A better question might be "how much stress is put on the network by the additional time

UDPFOfaq.doc 7 of 16 7/11/98

required to dial 1+10 digits after a split or a standard overlay is implemented?" It may very well be that the 7+suffix method of the UDPFO would result in an overall network time savings compared to 1+10 digit dialing. The network would save the time it takes for dialing those 3 extra digits.

Won't the non sequential digit analysis of this plan place undue delays in the provisioning of Local Number Portability?

As stated earlier nothing in what I am proposing changes the 10-digit format and therefore should have no impact on Local Number Portability. As currently proposed, Local Number Portability is simply intended to allow a customer to change his/her carrier without requiring a number change.

Won't the post digit analysis cause a further increase in the time required to process a call?

Answering this question will require a further analysis (by the industry) which should include the timing differences between the various dialing scenarios.

The Federal Communication Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission require 10 digit dialing with an overlay of an area code. Further, the Industry Numbering Committee has endorsed 10 digit dialing as a standard, and it is expected that there will be a need to move beyond the 10 digit format arrangement in the future to possibly 12 digits. Doesn't this render the Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays unusable and unworkable?

This plan introduces new ideas which challenge the necessity of using 1+10 digits in order to maintain dialing parity in an overlay situation. In the Unified Dialing Plan, dialing parity is provided with only 8 digits.

The INC's work in promoting uniform 10 digit dialing as a standard is to be applauded - it ensures that one method of dialing will work for all calls anywhere in the North American Numbering Plan. However, it does not exclude other local methods of dialing from coexisting with it. The UDPFO does transparently co-exist with 1+10 digit dialing.

The 12 digit format that is planned for the future does not necessarily render this plan unusable and unworkable. In addition, it is my understanding that Local Number Portability and other actions to conserve the existing resource should delay expansion until well into the next century. However, even with expansion, if thought is given to maintaining the same backward compatibility that the Unified Dialing Plan offers for overlays, this plan can very likely co-exist with a plan requiring any new number of digits.

Wouldn't any dialing plan change of this kind have to be agreed upon by the entire North American Telecommunications Industry?

Not necessarily. Because the changes that are required for this plan are isolated within the single area where it is being implemented, it does not have any effect on the industry as a whole. The beauty of this plan is that it solves local dialing issues and does not affect 'dialing to' or 'dialing from' any 'outside' area codes. It could be adopted on a situation by situation basis, and would have no impact on dialing or switching for the rest of the telephone network. Universal agreement would be great, but it is unnecessary for implementation of this local solution.

UDPFOfaq.doc 8 of 16 7/11/98

What about the effect of this plan on Computer Telephony Integration (CTI) products such as computer software dialing programs, dial-in/dial-back security systems and credit card validation systems. Won't adaptation by the developer be required to accommodate this plan?

There should be no effect on CTI products since all numbers will still be known to the network as 10 digit numbers, and will be still be reported by network Caller ID type systems to telephony equipment as those same 10 digit numbers. Any device on the receiving end of a call would recognize the caller in the same way that it always has.

Won't the insertion of any delay in the completion of calls cause customer confusion, increase trouble reports and increase customer dissatisfaction?

Call completion delays will not be an issue. As stated before, the 8 digit option would be the preferred (or dominant) dialing method in a UDPFO scenario. The '7 digit default' dialing option (which does require the timing delay) is really only offered to facilitate transition to an overlay, and it eliminates the need to immediately reprogram auto dialers and alarm systems which can be extremely time consuming and expensive to the customer (especially businesses). In a short time customers will (on their own) start using the more expedient 8 digit option.

Wouldn't this plan prompt a significant increase in wrong numbers? For example: I would hate to have the number in the original area code that corresponded to a cab company in the new area code. Every night at bar closing time I could get dozens (or hundreds) of calls from callers who dial 1 digit every 10 seconds and then slur their request for a cab and won't admit that they dialed a wrong number.

It is interesting that you have cited this particular example. Does this imply that a drunk will always dial correctly <u>unless</u> he is dialing in a UDPFO scenario? In practice, all of the other solutions for area code relief will create similar or worse problems under the same conditions. After an area code split, will a drunk (or anyone for that matter) always remember which area code he is in, and what if any area code he needs to dial for his intended connection? After a standard overlay isn't it more likely that a person will have a harder time negotiating 10 or 11 digits, compared to only 8 which would be available for all numbers in a UDPFO grouping?

What about an emergency situation (after a split or a standard overlay where dialing patterns have been completely disrupted), and the emergency call does not go through because the dialer has panicked and can't remember the new way to dial a number that used to be valid with just 7 digits? The UDPFO provides a "safety net" for these types of calls, by preserving all existing dialing patterns, while the other methods of relief do not.

The potential for misdials exists for all methods of area code relief, but with the UDPFO there is less potential for disaster.

Yes, there may be a problem with misdials, but likely not any greater a problem than other forms of relief currently present, and with some creative problem solving, the likelihood of misdials could be minimized. Here are some thoughts I offer on how this might be addressed:

1) When the UDPFO overlay is first implemented, there will not be many numbers in the new area code (same as a standard overlay), so the chances of too short of a delay causing a misdial early on is very low. This might justify a relatively short timing delay at first implementation — say 3 to 4 seconds. As the months go by — if warranted by frequent misdials — the delay could be gradually increased as the new area code gets more populated.

UDPFOfaq.doc 9 of 16 7/11/98

- 2) Or, a few seconds after 7 digits have been entered, a recorded message could play that would give instructions on how to input the 8th digit -- "for 818 area code enter 0, for 626 area code enter 1," etc. After a few more seconds it might say "at the tone, your call will default to the 818 area code..... beep".
- 3) Or, if certain numbers were consistently misdialed, those numbers might be selectively blocked from 7 digit default dialing or people could request that they never receive any 7 digit default calls. This would not harm the functionality of the plan. These customers would still be able to dial with 7 digit default (protecting auto dialers, burglar alarms, fire alarms, etc.), but their own number would no longer be reachable that way.
- 4) Or, it could be that the 7 digit default method will only serve as a transition device during the first 6 months to 1 year of implementation. If misdials do become problematic, it could be phased out altogether. Though this would defeat the non-disruptive intent of the UDPFO, it would still leave the overlay area with a very functional and efficient 8 digit abbreviated dialing plan.
- 5) Or, on the other hand, there may turn out to be no problem, so none of these modifications would need to be made.

These are just a few suggestions — they may or may not be easy to implement. The point is that there are many ways to address this potential problem — if it turns out to be a problem at all.

My Public Utilities Commission has already examined the feasibility of using timing in other dialing scenarios, and has rejected it. Is the use of timing in this plan different? If so, what distinguishes timing in this plan from other attempts to implement it?

Yes, the way that timing is implemented in the UDPFO is different from other dialing scenarios.

Timing provides a method for dialing telephone numbers of varying length, but it is usually problematic for two main reasons:

- A delay that is too short can increase the number of misdials. This occurs when customers are not given enough time to enter the extra digits and the phone company switch assumes dialing to the shorter number is complete.
- 2) A delay that is long enough to minimize misdials can cause customers who have dialed the shorter number to abandon calls, concluding that something is wrong because their call is taking unusually long to connect.

Clearly misdials must be avoided, but these two opposing criteria make it difficult or impossible to implement the optimum timing delay when the primary (or only method) for dialing the shorter number depends on timing.

In a UDPFO implementation, the primary method for dialing all numbers in the overlay area is the longer "8 digit" method. This "8 digit" method is also the preferred - or recommended - dialing method for all calls. This is fortunate because it allows the timing delay to be long enough to avoid misdials. The shorter "7 digit" method of dialing is a "default" option, which is triggered only after the likelihood of a misdial has been minimized by an appropriately long timing delay. The appropriate length for this delay should be determined by the industry, but it will likely be somewhere between 3 - 7 seconds. This "7 digit default" option is provided as a "safety net", intended to catch calls that, for whatever reason, are not being dialed with the primary (or preferred) "8 digit" method. This "safety net" will allow automated dialing systems (such as burglar alarms, fire

UDPFOfaq.doc 10 of 16 7/11/98

alarms, auto dialers, etc.) to complete calls to pre-relief phone numbers without costly reprogramming. The "safety net" is also helpful for children, the elderly and the handicapped (or anyone for that matter), who might find it difficult to always remember to dial old (established pre-relief) numbers in the new way. It also provides a mechanism for an extremely long permissive dialing period during transition to the UDPFO's 8 digit preferred dialing method.

To recap:

Within the dialing plans of other scenarios using timing, there is usually only one method for correctly dialing a particular long or short number - the long numbers must be entered before the timing delay elapses, while the short numbers must wait until after the delay is complete. Implementing the optimum timing delay to efficiently accommodate these two requirements can be problematic.

In a UDPFO scenario timing issues are mitigated by these factors:

- 1) There are multiple methods for customers to dial every number.
- 2) All numbers can be dialed quickly with 8 digits (the "primary" or "recommended" dialing method), which avoids waiting for the delay.
- 3) All numbers can also be reached with 1+10 or 0+10 also avoiding the delay.
- 4) The "7 digit default" option (which does require the delay) is intended to serve as a courtesy to people who already have phones and services in the original area code, and eliminates the expense and hardship of having to quickly conform systems and habits to the new dialing plan.
- 5) The timing delay could be extremely long (if necessary to avoid misdials), since the 7 digit default option is not the primary (or preferred) method of dialing.
- 6) Because the delay can be significant, the timing delay could even contain recorded instructions as to how to use it (if found to be necessary).
- 7) If the delay is too long, a customer can always enter a "0" at the end of the 7 digit number and avoid the delay it will still reach the same number: 7 digits + delay = 7 digits + 0.
- 8) The timing mechanism can be avoided altogether by dialing with the 1+ 10 option, if that is how a customer prefers to dial.

How well would this plan work for long distance calls? Customers would not be used to the new overlaid area code since they wouldn't have to dial it internally, and instead of dialing 1-732-949-1000 to get that number they are likely to dial 1-908-949-1000-1, prompting a wrong number. Won't this be problematic?

The UDPFO offers an evolved dialing system which allows all calls made within the UDPFO geographic area to be dialed by using only 8 digits. This would hold true for both local <u>and</u> long distance calls. If you choose to dial 1+10 digits for local or long distance calls within the grouping you may, but it would not be mandatory.

When dialing to an area code <u>outside</u> of the UDPFO grouping, it would be necessary to dial 1+10 digits. This is no different than how the network currently works. Customers must commit these foreign area codes to memory in any dialing scenario.

Customers dialing into a UDPFO grouping from a foreign area code would also have to remember the various area codes, but this is also no different than when dialing into a standard overlay grouping.

In traditional NPAs with 7 digit internal dialing, people are aware of their own area code even though they don't use it for day to day calls. When they leave their NPA and call home, they typically remember to dial their area code first, followed by their 7 digit number — if they forget to dial the area code a wrong number will result in these cases as well.

UDPFOfaq.doc 11 of 16 7/11/98

There is no reason to believe that people in the new level of a UDPFO overlay would be any less aware of their own new area code than people in traditional 7 digit NPAs.

This question should be further analyzed in comparison to the effects of area code splits and standard overlays.

After an area code split or a standard overlay implementation, people are also not used to the new area code, and there are many "wrong numbers" prompted in these cases, for instance:

After an area code split:

Because of force of habit, where people have had the same area code for many years:

- a) Customers with the new area code will often attempt to dial into the old area code by dialing only 7 digits, while customers in the old area code will make the same mistake for the new area code this is not a problem in the UDPFO, since area codes are not rearranged, and the 7 digit default method will accommodate force of habit for an extended period of time.
- b) Even when dialing from outside either of the "split" area codes (with 10 digit or 1+10 digit dialing), force of habit will continue to prompt wrong numbers into both area codes. In fact customers from all over the world are likely to make this mistake when calling into an NPA that has been split. These mistakes are far less likely to happen with a UDPFO or standard overlay situation, since the numbers in the original area code remain unchanged.
- c) Occasional callers of a customer who gets a new "split off" area code will continue to dial the customer's old area code for many years, and possibly loose contact with him altogether because of the area code change. Again, this type of mistake is far less likely to happen with a UDPFO or standard overlay situation.

Also, in a standard overlay implementation, will a person always remember to use the correct area code, or by force of habit will they use the original area code when making Long Distance calls even from inside the overlay area?

When a standard overlay is implemented, people from each of the overlay's area codes must always remember to dial it, which may or may not happen reliably — especially at first. In the UDPFO, any number that has ever been dialed will always be dialable in the same manner it always has been, and by everybody in the entire overlay area.

Does this plan offer a permissive dialing period?

Yes, there is a permissive dialing period, and it is supported indefinitely by the 7 digit default feature of the UDPFO. The permissive period for calls originating from outside of the UDPFO grouping would be similar to that of a standard overlay.

Wouldn't a massive re-education campaign be required and need to be on-going since out-of-towners would not know about 8 digit dialing?

The non-disruptive nature of this plan actually simplifies the public education process. The "7 digit default" dialing option ensures that all pre-relief phone numbers can still be dialed the same way that they always have been from anywhere in the overlay area. All numbers can also be dialed with '1+10 digit' dialing, which is also nothing new to learn. The only new option is the '7 digit + X' suffix option, which is different, but not difficult to understand or learn. Public education is probably less of a challenge than in an area code split (where you can no longer reach certain numbers the way you have in the past) or in a standard overlay (where every number changes to 1+10, which is also different from what customers are accustomed to).

UDPFOfaq.doc 12 of 16 7/11/98

It is also important to examine the issue of out-of-towners in relation to area code splits and standard overlays.

In standard overlay areas out-of-towners also might not know about mandatory 10 digit or 1+10 digit dialing, being accustomed to dialing 7 digits within their own area code.

In a split situation, out-of-towners calling into the area from out of town might not be able to find the people they had always been able to reach before with the old area code.

Also, out-of-towners who came to town after a split and wanted to call someone who was in the new area code probably would not realize there was now a new area code, and would just dial 7 like they always had done, getting either a wrong number or a not in service message.

In the UDPFO, the out-of-towner has the best chance of dialing correctly. Any 7 digit number they had dialed in the past would still be valid (from any phone, regardless of the area code, in the UDPFO grouping). If they wanted to call any new number, they could simply dial with 1+10 digit dialing -- industry standard stuff. If they were aware of the 8 digit option they could also use that method. In the timing delay suggestions I outlined earlier, a recorded message could possibly act as a continuing reminder of how the 8 digit plan works.

How would the translation be implemented by phone company equipment? Are you asking carriers to read the 8th digit and prefix, in the switch, to derive the correct area code?

Exactly how the translation is best accomplished is really a matter for the industry to resolve, and the cost of implementation will depend on the choices the industry makes for this deployment. An important question is this: How will these costs compare to the overall cost of a split or an overlay in terms of total expense and disruption to both the phone companies and the public? A single area code split costs local businesses between 20 and 40 million dollars, and the phone companies spend between 6 and 10 million per split. Would the cost of developing the software and installing switch upgrades for a UDPFO implementation be greater than the overall cost of an area code split? It is very possible that developing this technology could quickly pay off as an overall savings. So, while it is obvious that there is a cost associated with any change to the network, it is also obvious that it is not the only cost. The full answer to what those costs will be will have to wait until a fair assessment is done by the industry.

How are things like the Dallas retroactive overlay handled? How about if the retroactive overlay was not done, but an overlay over two existing NPAs was done?

The UDPFO was designed to deliver the most benefit in situations where the overlay grouping consists of one original area code and one or more new overlaid area codes, all of which occupy the identical geographic area. However, the 8 digit "unified dialing" feature of the plan (for dialing within and between groups of related area codes) could benefit consumers in these other overlay scenarios as well. In these cases the 7 digit default feature would also be employed, but only as a short term "transitional" permissive dialing vehicle.

Where two existing NPAs are overlaid, the transition would take place in two phases.

Area Code A = either of the existing area codes Area Code B = the other existing area code

Area Code C = the new overlay area code

Note: to avoid confusion with UDPFO scenarios where there is only one original area code, the '0' suffix should not be used in cases where there are two or more original area codes.

UDPFOfaq.doc 13 of 16 7/11/98

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT "THE UNIFIED DIALING PLAN FOR OVERLAYS"

First:

- a) Before implementing the overlay, each of the two existing NPAs would separately migrate from 7 digit to 8 digit dialing using the 7 digit default as the transition vehicle (1+10 digit dialing within each area code would also be an enabled at this time).
- b) Area Code A would migrate to 7 digit+'1' suffix.
- c) Area Code B would migrate to 7 digit+'2' suffix.
- d) In either case, 7 digit calls (with a delay) would default to the area code of origin during the permissive period. Remember, in this scenario the two area codes are in separate geographic areas, so 7 digits can default to the area code of origin without confusion.
- e) During this period it might be possible to dial between the two area codes using either the 8 digit option or standard 1+10 digit dialing.

Second:

- a) At the end of the permissive dialing period, each of the existing area codes would have separately migrated to 8 digit or 1+10 digit dialing for all calls, and the 7 digit default method will no longer be available for either area code.
- b) At this point the 8 digit option would definitely be available for dialing between "Area Code A" and "Area Code B".
- c) The third area code would now be overlaid and could immediately use 8 digit or 1+10 digit dialing for all calls. The 8 digit numbers in this overlaid area code would be 7 digit+'3' suffix.
- d) Finally, all three area codes are *unified* with the 8 digit dialing option. Naturally 1+10 digit dialing would also be an available dialing method, if anyone cared to use it.

Won't problems arise from the fact that the number the customer knows is not the number that the customer is identified with in the PSAP (911) database?

Drawing from my own experience, I have always dialed 7 digits in my local area, but I am still aware that my area code is 818. In a UDPFO scenario, the customer will think of his number as a 3 digit area code + 8 digit number. There is no reason why a person would not be aware of his/her full 11 digit number any more than people who are used to dialing 7 digits now would be unaware that their full numbers have 10 digits.

Switches are set to look at an initial digit string. Wouldn't it be expensive to build the features necessary to do what the UDPFO suggests in looking at the first 3, plus the last 1 to determine the area code?

The plan may or may not be expensive to implement, but any discussion of costs must take into consideration the overall cost of not implementing this plan. As stated earlier, a single area code split costs business, the public and the telephone companies up to an estimated 50 million dollars each time — is this current expenditure for area code splits acceptable now? Would the costs to modify one NPA for a UDPFO scenario be greater than that?

Things would get very interesting where digits had to be outpulsed to a PBX; this is done with a delete and prefix. Wouldn't this create a problem in a UDPFO scenario?

The PBX would receive the outpulsed numbers <u>after</u> they were translated to standard 3+7 digit numbers by the network. Therefore, no changes at all from current procedures would be necessary for outpulsing numbers to a PBX.

Won't some interesting (and expensive) recording and billing system changes be required by this plan?

No changes to billing systems will be required since all numbers are translated to the same industry standard 3+7 digit numbers which the billing systems are already designed to understand.

UDPFOfaq.doc 14 of 16 7/11/98

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT "THE UNIFIED DIALING PLAN FOR OVERLAYS"

Wouldn't there be lots of problems with getting people to do the timing reliably? It seems as though the failure cases would keep the PUC up at night with complaints.

Possibly, but refer to the earlier question on this issue. As mentioned previously, this feature could be modified, phased out over time, or even left alone if it works fine as is. Also, make sure to evaluate the UDPFO in relation to the other forms of area code relief that are already in use. Splits and standard overlays provide new numbers to exhausted areas, but in the process they create many problems for customers. The UDPFO also provides new numbers, but minimizes hardship to the customer by solving many area code relief related problems. If there are some minor problems introduced by the UDPFO, they are far outweighed by the benefits it offers over the current area code relief methods.

How does this plan fix the competitive issue? For instance: If I the CLEC get a code in the child NPA, folks need to do something special to get to my customers, i.e. dial that funky suffix or dial 1+10 digits. Won't this be a competitive disadvantage for my company?

As pointed out earlier in great detail, people will not intentionally dial with the 7 digit default method (which always requires a timing delay), it is less efficient than dialing 8 digits, and it is probably also less efficient than dialing 1+10 digits. It is provided to act as a safety net — to protect people who might accidentally forget to dial 8 digits for the numbers they have known for many years as 7 digit numbers. It is also for use by auto dialers and burglar and fire alarms which have already been programmed, where updating those programs would be difficult or expensive for the customer. There is no competitive advantage or disadvantage to the 7 digit default — people will prefer to dial phone numbers as 8 digits (7+suffix) regardless of area code — it's just simply more efficient that way.

Why should the industry take the time to give serious consideration to this plan?

The ideas offered in the UDPFO are intended to solve the area code crisis with a minimum of disruption and hardship for the public. It has been offered in good faith as a serious solution by a citizen/business owner who has been impacted several times already with the disruption and expense of area code relief. It deserves to be evaluated with the same consideration with which it is presented.

UDPFO Conclusion:

The true purpose of this plan is to eliminate the expenses and hardships that customers have endured whenever area code relief has been necessary. By allowing backward compatibility for existing dialing patterns to pre-relief phone numbers, the UDPFO simplifies the public's transition to overlays and minimizes direct costs, hardships and confusion for the customer. The plan's 8 digit dialing option demonstrates how dialing parity can be maintained in an overlay without requiring the full 1 + 10 digit phone number to be dialed. This is a further convenience to the customer, and it provides a sense of 'unity' (instead of the sense of disunity) in an area where multiple area codes coexist.

This plan addresses and resolves all of the public policy issues that are presented by splits and standard overlays. Given its benefits, if this plan is given a fair evaluation by the industry in terms of "how can we make this work" instead of proclaiming "why this plan won't work", the industry will be providing its customers and our communities a great service.

UDPFOfag.doc 15 of 16 7/11/98

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT "THE UNIFIED DIALING PLAN FOR OVERLAYS"

How to contact the UDPFO:

If you have questions or comments regarding this information, please contact me at:

818-999-1070-0 (voice/voice mail) 818-956-2200-0 (alt. voice) 818-956-3298-0 (fax)

UNIFIEDdpo@AOL.com (email)

Gilbert Yablon The Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays 21914 Dumetz Rd. Woodland Hills, CA 91364 July 11, 1999

Re: Technical feasibility of the 8-Digit Dialing Plan proposed by Gilbert J. Yablon

To Whom It May Concern:

In July of 1998 I retired as the Executive Director - Operations and Engineering for the United States Telephone Association (USTA) after 36 plus years of experience encompassing diverse disciplines in the telecommunications industry.

As the Executive Director of the Technical Disciplines Department, I managed a large portion of the technical committee activities at USTA associated with numbering issues. As part of my responsibilities, I was required to regularly attend and participate in most of the industry meetings concerning numbering matters. I served as Chair or Co-Chair on a number of these various committees and working groups including the Industry Numbering Committee (INC).

I have thoroughly reviewed Gilbert J. Yablon's 8-Digit Dialing Plan and have found it to be a technically feasible plan that should be considered when addressing area code relief. The plan does conform to the NANP in that each customer retains a seven digit address (ten digit including area code) and the eighth digit is used for dialing purposes only to identify the specific NPA.

As with any plan to provide relief, there will be costs associated with the plan. The cost and the extent of equipment modifications that will incurred by the industry for each of the alternatives considered can only be addressed by the industry. The same is true for the cost to be incurred by the consumer. A cross-section of consumer groups needs to compile this data. And no matter what plan is implemented there will be customer confusion and education.

Providing area code relief is expensive and disruptive to both the industry and the consumer, therefore, all methods available that would ease this burden should be considered in enough detail to minimize the impacts.

Sincerely,

Dennis J. Hyrne

1925 Rollingwood Drive Fairfield, CA 94533

707-435-8285

A SMART Overlay Solution

The overlay has been a source of hardship and frustration for telephone users within the 310 region, but the overlay didn't have to be painful. In fact, a consumer-friendly variation called SMART (Simplified Multi Area Code Region Telephony) could transform overlays (including the 310 overlay) into a painless option for area code relief.

SMART provides customers with two tools that make living with overlays easier. First, it provides a shortcut "8-digit method" for dialing 1+10-digit calls within the region; and second, it prevents calls dialed with only 7-digits from being rejected.

To make eight-digit dialing possible, telephone companies would assign a one-digit identifier to each area code in the overlay region. Customers could then dial local 7-digit telephone numbers and use an 8th digit to identify the area code. For example, the 310 area code would be identified by "0" and the "424" area code would be identified by "1". Dialing 1234567-0 would direct the call to the 310 area code, and dialing 1234567-1 would direct the call to the 424 area code.

But what happens when a customer or auto-dialer enters only 7-digits? In a "standard overlay", customers hear an announcement directing them to hang-up and redial using 1+10-digits -- a huge inconvenience. But with the "SMART overlay", customers who forget about (or don't know about) the 8th digit would hear an announcement after a few seconds to help them complete their call:

"To reach the 310 area code, dial "0" now. To reach 424, dial "1" now."

Customers would have a few more seconds to enter the 8th digit, and after doing so the call would be routed to the selected area code.

If for some reason the "8th digit" is still not entered, the call would default to the original area code of the region (in this case the 310 area code). This enhancement reduces the need for customers to reprogram or replace automated dialing devices (such as security entry systems and other unattended auto-dialers), and minimizes the kind of disruption that occurs when "standard overlays" are implemented.

Calls "to" and "from" area codes that are outside of the SMART region will continue to require 1+10-digits to be dialed (the same as was required before the overlay). If the new "area code identifier" is inadvertently entered at the end of a 1+10-digit call, the identifier is ignored and the call completes to the 1+10-digit number that was dialed.

Customers would always have the option of dialing 1+10-digits if they want to (even for local calls within the overlay region), but the 8-digit shortcut should make local calls easier for most customers.

Several telecommunications industry experts consider the "SMART overlay" to be a technically workable solution for area code relief, however the industry as a whole has chosen not to pursue this option on its own.

To benefit from this consumer-friendly solution the public must tell their legislators, the Public Utilities Commission and the telecommunications industry that they are interested in this alternative, and that they want it to be considered as an available option for area code relief.

For more information contact:

Gilbert Yablon SMART Dialing Systems gilbert@SMARToverlay.com (e-mail) 818-999-1070-0 (voice / voice mail)

Gilbert Yablon is the developer of the "SMART Dialing System for Overlays". He has been active in telecommunications industry dialing issues for the past three years, and has made numerous contributions to industry forums on numbering.

TIM/hkr 6/29/99

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion Regarding Commission Policy on Area Code Relief.

Rulemaking 98-12-014 (Filed December 17, 1998)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART THE PETITIONS TO INTERVENE FILED BY (1) BILL NEILL, and (2) GILBERT J. YABLON

This ruling grants the petitions to intervene filed by Bill Neill and Gilbert J. Yablon to the extent their participation in this proceeding is necessary to determine if their proposals for novel dialing arrangements should be formally considered by the Commission in a future proceeding. In all other respects, their petitions to intervene are denied. This ruling also instructs Neill and Yablon to file and serve written comments containing detailed information on their dialing proposals so that the Commission can determine if their proposals merit further consideration in a future proceeding. Parties may also file and serve comments on the dialing proposals.

Ruling on Neill's Petition to Intervene

On May 26, 1999, Bill Neill filed a petition to intervene in this proceeding¹ for the purpose of presenting a "solution" to the "extensive proliferation of area codes in this state." There was no response to Neill's petition.

¹ Petition to Intervene of Prof Bill Neill, In Pro Per.

Neill's petition failed to identify any "solution" to proliferation of area codes. However, in a phone call to the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Neill stated that his "solution" to the proliferation of area codes is "hexa-decimal dialing." According to Neill, hexa-decimal dialing reduces the need for new area codes by expanding the universe of phone numbers within existing area codes by using six additional "symbols" that are already part of the public telecommunications network. For example, the "star" and "pound" symbols that can be dialed by touch-tone telephones could be used to create the following 7-digit phone number within any of the existing area codes: 703-77*#.

For the following reasons, Neill's petition to intervene is denied to the extent the petition asks the Commission to consider in this proceeding whether to require the use of hexa-decimal dialing. First, the petition provided no information on hexa-decimal dialing. Because of this, it is impossible to make a preliminary determination of whether hexa-decimal dialing is feasible. On the other hand, what little information on hexa-decimal dialing that was provided to the assigned ALJ in a phone call indicates that hexa-decimal dialing may not be feasible. For example, people with rotary phones might not be able to dial hexa-decimal phone numbers that contain "star" or "pound" symbols. Until there is some initial showing that hexa-decimal dialing is feasible - a showing that was completely absent from the petition - it is not prudent for the Commission to use its scarce resources to consider the merits of hexa-decimal dialing.

Second, no party had notice of Neill's true purpose for intervening in this proceeding since Neill's petition failed to mention hexa-decimal dialing. As a result, expanding the scope of this proceeding to consider the adoption of hexa-decimal dialing could be prejudicial to those parties who may have opposed Neill's petition had they known of Neill's true purpose for intervening in this proceeding.

Finally, in Order Instituting Rulemaking 98-12-014, the Commission stated that it would not consider in this proceeding any proposals that require changes to the North American Numbering Plan (NANP)² since implementation of such proposals is beyond the Commission's jurisdiction.³ Since Neill's petition is devoid of information on hexa-decimal dialing, it is impossible to determine if hexa-decimal dialing conforms with the NANP, and, therefore, is a matter within the scope of this proceeding.⁴ Consequently, Neill has failed to meet his burden under the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules) to demonstrate that he seeks to intervene in this proceeding on matters that are reasonably pertinent to scope of this proceeding.⁵

Although Neill's petition to intervene is denied to the extent it asks the Commission to consider in this proceeding whether to implement hexa-decimal dialing, Neill shall have an opportunity to demonstrate that the Commission should consider in a future proceeding whether to implement hexa-decimal

² The NANP is the numbering plan for the public switched network. Telephone numbers used by the NANP consist of NXX-NXX-XXX, where "N" is any digit 2-9, and "X" is any digit 0-9. (http://www.nanpa.com/nanpa_info/index.html)

³ OIR 98-12-014, mimeo., pp. 1, 21, Ordering Paragraph 1, and Appendix B.

⁴ Although Neill seems to suggest in his petition that hexa-decimal dialing would not require changes to the NANP, the validly of this suggestion is questionable given that telephone numbers in common use under the NANP do not include "symbols."

Neill's filed his petition pursuant to Rule 53 which states: "petitions to intervene...shall set forth the grounds of the proposed intervention, [and] the position and interest of the petitioner in the proceeding ...Leave will not be granted except on averments which are reasonably pertinent to the issues already presented, but do not unduly broaden them." Although Rule 53 applies only to complaint proceedings, the Commission has often used Rule 53 for guidance in determining whether parties should be permitted to intervene in other types of proceedings.

dialing. To this end, Neill shall file and serve written comments that contain the all of the following information:

- A thorough description of hexa-decimal dialing.
- A thorough explanation of how and why hexa-decimal dialing would alleviate the proliferation of area codes.
- A statement of whether hexa-decimal dialing conforms with the NANP. If Neill asserts that hexa-decimal dialing conforms with the NANP, he must present evidence and arguments in his comments that support this assertion.
- A statement of whether the Commission has authority to implement hexa-decimal dialing. If Neill asserts that the Commission has such authority, he must present evidence and arguments in his comments that support this assertion, including why the Commission's authority is not preempted by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) pursuant to § 251(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act).⁶
- A detailed showing that hexa-decimal dialing is a feasible solution to the proliferation of area codes. This showing should address the following factors: (1) the scope of changes to the telecommunications network (e.g., switch modifications) that are required to implement hexa-decimal dialing; (2) the cost to telephone companies to implement hexa-decimal dialing; (3) the cost to the public to implement hexa-decimal dialing; (4) customer confusion, customer education, and the cost of customer education; (4) compatibility with existing and planned "split" and "overlay" area codes; and (5) compatibility with existing telephones (e.g., whether rotary phones can dial "hexa-symbols," and whether touch-tone phones can dial more than two of the hexa-symbols).

^{§ 251(}e) of the Act states that the FCC "shall have exclusive jurisdiction over those portions of the North American Numbering Plan that pertain to the United States. Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude the [FCC] from delegating to State commissions or other entities all or any portion of such jurisdiction."

- A thorough explanation as to whether hexa-decimal dialing is compatible with local number portability.
- A thorough explanation as to whether hexa-decimal dialing is compatible with number conservation measures, such as number pooling and rate center consolidation.
- Whether hexa-decimal dialing can be used in conjunction with 8-digit dialing described later in this ruling.

Neill shall file and serve his written comments on July 23, 1999. Parties may file and serve reply comments on August 6, 1999. Neill and the parties may file and serve a final round of comments on August 20, 1999. The Commission will use the comments to decide whether, and to what extent, hexa-decimal dialing merits consideration in a future proceeding.

Consistent with the previous discussion, Neill's petition to intervene is granted to the limited extent of allowing him to participate in this proceeding on the single matter of whether, and to what extent, the Commission should consider hexa-decimal dialing in a future proceeding.

Ruling on Yablon's Petition to Intervene and Motion to Have the Commission Consider 8-Digit Dialing

On May 4, 1999, Gilbert J. Yablon filed (1) a petition to intervene in this proceeding, and (2) a motion to have the Commission consider in this proceeding whether 8-digit dialing should be used in Numbering Plan Areas (NPAs) subject to overlays. The were no responses to Yablon's petition or motion (referred to individually and collective hereafter as the "petition").

⁷ Motion to Intervene of Gilbert J. Yablon.

Motion to Have the Commission Consider "A Simplified Dialing System for Overlaid Area Codes" AKA "The Unified Dialing Plan for Overlays" filed by Gilbert J. Yablon of SMART Dialing Systems.

Yablon states in his petition that 8-digit dialing would be used in lieu of 1+10-digit dialing to make calls within an NPA subject to "overlays" (i.e., NPAs served by two or more area codes). For example, to place calls within an NPA served by two area codes, a caller using 8-digit dialing would dial the 7-digit phone number plus the suffix digits of "zero" or "one" (e.g., 703-4567-0 or 703-4567-1) to reach a number in the first or second area code, respectively.

For the following reasons, Yablon's petition is denied to the extent the petition asks the Commission to consider in this proceeding whether to require the use of 8-digit dialing. First, Yablon does not address in his petition whether 8-digit dialing complies with the NANP and, therefore, is a matter within the scope of this proceeding. Consequently, Yablon has failed to meet his burden under the Commission's Rules to demonstrate that he seeks to intervene in this proceeding on matters that are reasonably pertinent to scope of this proceeding. 10

Second, Yablon states that 8-digit dialing has been through two "telecommunications industry reviews" in which "[i]ndustry experts refuted the 'need for' and 'value of'" 8-digit dialing due to concerns about costs, switch modifications, and customer education. Yablon dismisses these concerns, but he provided no information that convincingly demonstrates the concerns are unwarranted. Therefore, before the Commission commits its limited resources to

⁹ Yablon states in his petition that 8-digit dialing does "not alter the 10-digit structure of the North American Numbering Plan," but this statement does not address the issue of whether 8-digit dialing complies with the NANP.

Rule 53 states: "Leave [to intervene] will not be granted except on averments which are reasonably pertinent to the issues already presented, but do not unduly broaden them." Although Rule 53 applies only to complaint proceedings, the Commission has often used Rule 53 for guidance in determining whether parties should be allowed to intervene in other types of proceedings.

seriously considering the adoption of 8-digit dialing, Yablon needs to make a more convincing showing that the concerns about the feasibility of 8-digit dialing are unwarranted.

Although Yablon's petition to intervene is denied to the extent the petition asks the Commission to consider the adoption of 8-digit dialing, Yablon shall have an opportunity to demonstrate in this proceeding that 8-digit dialing is feasible and worthy of serous consideration by the Commission in a future proceeding. To this end, Yablon shall file and serve written comments that contain the all of the following information:

- A thorough description of 8-digit dialing.
- A statement of whether 8-digit dialing conforms with the NANP.
 If Yablon asserts that 8-digit dialing conforms with the NANP, he must present evidence and arguments in his comments that support this assertion.
- A statement of whether the Commission has authority to implement 8-digit dialing. If Yablon asserts that the Commission has such authority, he must present evidence and arguments in his comments that support this assertion, including why the Commission's authority is not preempted by the FCC pursuant to § 251(e) of the Act.¹¹

^{§ 251(}e) of the Act states that the FCC "shall have exclusive jurisdiction over those portions of the North American Numbering Plan that pertain to the United States. Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude the [FCC] from delegating to State commissions or other entities all or any portion of such jurisdiction."

- A detailed showing that 8-digit dialing is feasible. This showing should address the following factors: (1) the scope of changes to the telecommunications network (e.g., switch modifications) that are required to implement 8-digit dialing; (2) the cost to telephone companies to implement 8-digit dialing; (3) the cost to the public to implement 8-digit dialing, (4) customer confusion, customer education, and the cost of customer education; and (4) compatibility with existing and planned overlays.
- A thorough explanation as to whether 8-digit dialing is compatible with local number portability.
- A thorough explanation as to whether 8-digit dialing is compatible with number conservation measures, such as number pooling and rate center consolidation.
- A description of the two telecommunications industry reviews of 8-digit dialing. Yablon shall append to his comments a copy of any formal reports and/or findings that resulted from these reviews. Yablon may also provide information that demonstrates why the concerns raised in the industry reviews are unwarranted.
- Whether 8-digit dialing can be used in conjunction with haxa-decimal dialing described earlier in this ruling.

Yablon shall file and serve his written comments on July 23, 1999. The parties may file and serve reply comments on August 6, 1999. Yablon and the parties may file and serve a final round of comments on August 20, 1999. The Commission will use the comments to decide whether, and to what extent, the Commission should consider 8-digit dialing in a future proceeding.

Consistent with the previous discussion, Yablon's petition is granted to the limited extent of allowing him to participate in this proceeding on the single matter of whether, and to what extent, the Commission should consider 8-digit dialing in a future proceeding.

IT IS RULED that;

- Neill may participate in this proceeding on the single matter of whether, and to what extent, the Commission should consider hexa-decimal dialing in a future proceeding.
- 2. Neill's petition to intervene in this proceeding is granted to the extent set forth in Ruling Paragraph 1. In all other respects, Neill's petition is denied.
- 3. Yablon may participate in this proceeding on the single matter of whether, and to what extent, the Commission should consider 8-digit dialing in a future proceeding.
- 4. Yablon's petition to intervene in this proceeding and motion to have the Commission consider 8-digit dialing in this proceeding are granted to the extent set forth in Ruling Paragraph 3. In all other respects, Yablon's petition and motion are denied.
- 5. Neill and Yablon shall each file and serve written comments on July 23, 1999, containing the information specified in the body of this ruling. The parties may file and serve reply comments on August 6, 1999. Neill, Yablon, and the parties may file and serve a final round of comments on August 20, 1999. The Commission will use these comments to decide whether, and to what extent, hexa-decimal dialing and/or 8-digit dialing will be considered in a future proceeding.

Dated June 29, 1999, at San Francisco, California.

Timothy Kenney
Administrative Law Judge

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: August 3, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs 7000

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the letter from James V. Canfield, the mayor of the City of Palm Coast dated June 29, 2000. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the postcards do not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

City of Palm Coust

P. O. Box 354610 Palm Coast, FL 32135-4610 Phone: (904) 447-4255 Fax: (904) 447-4259

Mayor Jim Canfield

Vice-Mayor James F. Holland City Manager Richard Kelton City Clerk/Finance Director Dong Courtney Councilman William Venne, Seat 1 Councilman Jerome K. Full, Seat 2 Councilman Ralph Carter, Seat 4

June 28, 2000

The Honorable Joe Garcia Chairman 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Public Service Corporation Tallahassee, Florida 32399 RECEIVED

JUN 2 9 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
Commissioner Jacobs

Ref. Docket 990517

Dear Mr. Garcia:

The City Council of the City of Palm Coast has voted unanimously to support the position advanced by government and business leaders of Volusia County to establish 386 as the new Volusia/Flagler two-county area code.

The two counties are linked in many ways—through the Daytona Beach Community College, which has a major branch here; though the drainage and water management concerns of the St. Johns River Water Management District; through the services available at the Daytona Beach International Airport and the shopping recreational, employment, and civic institutions serving residents of both counties. There is a steady flow of workers, shoppers, and visitors between the two counties on I-95, U.S. 1 and A1A.

A fractured area code would be a significant inconvenience and cost to the citizens of both counties, which we hope you will recognize by approving a common area code.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue to our residents.

Sincerely,

James V. Carfuld/tw

Mayor

cc:

Ms. Susan F. Clark, Commissioner

Mr. J. Terry Deason, Commissioner

Ms. Lila A. Jaber, Commissioner
Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, Commissioner

Mr. Bill Talbott, Commissioner

Ann McFall, Co-Chair, Area Code Task Force

John E. Evans, Co-Chair Area Code Task Force

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: August 3, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs 1

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the letter from Gregory S. Wood, Executive Director, Volucia Council of Governments dated July 25, 2000. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letter does not constitute an <u>ex parte</u> communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an <u>ex parte</u> communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

VCOG, INC.

Chairman: Mayor James Vandergrifft Executive Director: Gregory S. Wood

1190 Pelican Bay Drive Daytona Beach, FL 32119-1381

July 25, 2000

Honorable E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. Public Service Commissioner 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

REFERENCE DOCKET 990517

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

During the public hearings regarding potential changes to the area code for Volusia and Flagler counties, one of the most significant arguments against anything but a new single area code was the potential economic damage that would result from further fragmentation of the area's identity. Area business and government leaders have seen a single area code as a means to reduce divisions. However, a potential change to a single area code also provides a unique opportunity to capitalize on our area's uncommon qualities by assigning the 386 (FUN) area code. Attached you will find numerous resolutions from all the area's local governments, businesses, and other organizations. They all see the economic value of this unique code for our area. We hope that you will see that same value and your recommendation will be in support of a single area code and that it be 386.

Thank you for your continued attention and understanding.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Wood
Executive Director

Attachments

cc: John C. Cutting, PSC Regulatory Analyst Supervisor

RECEIVED

.1111 2 8 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMINISION Commissioner Jacobs

Chairman: Mayor James L. Vandergrifft Executive Director: Gregory S. Wood

1190 Pelican Bay Drive Daytona Beach, FL 32119-1381

REFERENCE DOCKET 990517

CERTIFICATE OF RESOLUTION NO. 2000-04

I THE UNERSIGNED ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT AND CUSTODIAN OF THE OFFICIAL RECORDS OF VCOG, INC. DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ATTACHED IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF RESOLUTION NO. 2000-04, DULY ADOPTED AT THE APRIL 24, 2000, REGULAR MEETING OF THE VCOG GOVERNING BOARD, AND AS THE SAME APPEARS ON RECORD IN THE FILES OF VCOG, INC.

MARY CURRAN
VCOG ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Date of Certification

VCOG, Inc. Resolution No. 2000-04

A Resolution Of VCOG, Inc., Volusia County, Florida, In Addendum To Resolution 99-03, Expressing A Desire That The Florida Public Service Commission Approve A Single Area Code For All Of Volusia County And Designate 386 (FUN) As The New Area Code To Replace 904 And 407 In Volusia County.

Whereas, VCOG (Volusia Council of Governments) was established in January, 1970, as a council of local public officials to develop coordinated plans, programs, and policies of mutual interest; and

Whereas, the Governing Board of VCOG is comprised of representatives from the Cities of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, DeBary, DeLand, Deltona, Edgewater, Holly Hill, Lake Helen, New Smyrna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, South Daytona and the County of Volusia; and

Whereas, the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

Whereas, it is apparent that the 904 area code, which applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

Whereas, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit;

Now Therefore, Be It Resolved, by the Governing Board of VCOG, Inc. as follows:

Section 1. The Governing Board of VCOG, Inc. reaffirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 3. The VCOG staff is hereby directed to provide a certified copy of this resolution to the Public Service Commission.

Be It Further Resolved, that this Resolution as adopted be attached to the minutes of this meeting held April 24, 2000, in the Conference Room at 1190 Pelican Bay Drive, Daytona Beach, Florida.

VCOG, Inc

mes L. Vandergrifft

Chairman

Attest:

Mary Curran

Recording Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 00-153

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH SUPPORTING THE VOLUSIA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS' (VCOG) DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING WHEN THIS RESOLUTION SHALL TAKE EFFECT.

WHEREAS, in recognizing that explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers, the Volusia County Council believes the 904 area code will soon run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, the members of VCOG have requested that 386 (FUN) be the area code assigned to Volusia County and ask area cities to support this request by resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. The City Commission hereby supports the Volusia Council of Governments' (VCOG) desire that the Florida Public Service Commission approves a single area code for all of Volusia County and designates 386 (FUN) as the new area code to replace 904 and 407 in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The City Clerk is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Volusia Council of Governments.

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

BARON H. ASHER

Mayor

ATTEST:

GWEN AZAMA-EDWARDS

City Clerk

Adopted: April 19, 2000

RESOLUTION 2000-11

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Daytona Beach Shores City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is world famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1.

The Daytona Beach Shores City Council affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia

County.

Section 2.

The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 3.

This resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

PH BETANCOURT

ATTEST:

CITY MANAGER, MICHAEL T. BOOKER

Approved as to form and legality:

CITY ATTORNEY, MARGARET ROBERTS

Adopted this 14th day of Time, 2000. Posted on the 15th day of Time, 2000.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-08

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF DeBARY, FLORIDA EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications industry is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the Volusia County Council and the City of DeBary that the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, within the corporate limits of the City of DeBary there are 904 and 407 area codes assigned to telecommunication subscribers; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF DEBARY AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City of DeBary affirms the Volusia County Council's position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2.

The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3.

This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED BY the City Council of the City of DeBary, Florida this 5th day of April, 2000.

ATTEST:

Kanich, City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-16

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF DELAND, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA AND FLAGLER COUNTIES AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSA AND FLAGLER COUNTIES; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the City Commission that the 904 area code, which applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia/Flagler County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF DELAND, FLORIDA:

Section 1. The City Commission hereby affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia/Flagler Counties, and that the new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 2. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED this 17th day of April, 2000.

David C. Rigsby Mayor-Commissioner

ATTEST:

Julie A. Hennessy

City Clerk - Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

Mark A. Ziphmerman

City Attorney

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-09

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DELTONA, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the City Commission the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and other leisure activities, is worldfamous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF DELTONA, FLORIDA, as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED BY the City Commission of the City of Deltona, Florida this 17th day of April,

2000.

ATTEST.

Faith G Miller CMC/AAE City Clerk

Approved as to Form & Legality for Use & Reliance by the City of Deltona, Florida

Tornes A Fowler City Attorney

NAME YES NO
CAREY X
HARVEY X
HORN X
MASIARCZYK X
PEREZ X
RUNGE X
WHEATLEY X

John Masiarczyk, Mayor

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-R-11

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EDGEWATER, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Edgewater City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is Word-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Edgewater, Florida:

- Section 1. The City of Edgewater affirms its position that there should be single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
 - Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).
 - Section 3. This resolution shall take effect upon adoption.

After a motion by <u>Councilm Brom</u> and Second by <u>Councilm Lette</u>, the vote on this resolution was as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 2000-R-30

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF HOLLY HILL, FLORIDA EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY; SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County and is expected to run out of numbers – necessitating its replacement; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and seemingly endless other leisure activities is known to be World Famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HOLLY HILL, FLORIDA:

- Section 1. That the Holly Hill City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
- Section 2. That the Holly Hill City Commission supports the designation of 386 (FUN) as the new area code in Volusia County.
 - Section 3. That this Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

The within and foregoing Resolution was read before the City Commission of the City of Holly Hill, Florida, at its regular meeting held in Commission Chambers at City Hall, 1065 Ridgewood Avenue, Holly Hill, Florida, on the 13th day of June, A.D. 2000.

It was moved by Commissioner Via and seconded by Commissioner Tarrer that said Resolution be adopted. A roll call vote of the Commission on said motion of the Resolution resulted as follows:

| Mayor William Arthur | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Arthur Byrnes | Yes |
| Commissioner Paul Lockeby | Yes |
| Commissioner Keith Tarrer | Yes |
| Commissioner Roland Via | Yes |

WHEREAS, the Mayor of the City of Holly Hill, Florida, has hereunto set his official signature, duly authorized by the City Clerk, and has caused the official seal of said City to be affixed, all at the City Hall in the City of Holly Hill, this 15th day of June, A.D. 2000, for the purpose of authenticity as is required by law.

City of Holly Hill, Florida

William D. Arthur, Mayor

Attest:

Jeaneen P. Clauss, City Clerk

Res. 2000-R-30 6/13/00 2

RESOLUTION 2000-07

A RESOLUTION BY THE CITY OF LAKE HELEN, FLORIDA, SUPPORTING THE VOLUSIA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT PROPOSAL TO THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR A NEW SINGLE AREA CODE OF "386" (FUN) FOR ALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUBSCRIBERS IN VOLUSIA COUNTY TO REPLACE AREA CODES 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Volusia Council of Governments (VCOG) was established in January, 1970, as a council of local public officials to develop coordinated plans, programs, and policies of mutual interest; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of VCOG is comprised of representatives from the cities of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, Debary, DeLand, Deltona, Edgewater, Holly Hill, Lake Helen, New Smryna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, South Daytona and the County of Volusia; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County and is soon to run out of available numbers and is likely to be replaced with a new area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County offers a plethora of leisure activities, sparkling beaches, radiant sunshine and friendly residents all attributing to a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Commission of the City of Lake Helen, Florida, as follows:

SECTION I: The City Commission of the City of Lake Helen supports VCOG's recommendation for a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION II: That the City Commission of the City of Lake Helen endorses "386" (FUN) as the single, new area code for all of Volusia County.

SECTION III: That the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Public Service Commission.

SECTION IV: This Resolution repeals all resolutions, or parts of resolutions, in conflict herewith.

SECTION V: This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage and adoption.

THIS RESOLUTION DULY PASSED AND ADOPTED ON THIS H DAY OF A.D., 2000, by the City Commission of the City of Lake Helen, Florida, at its Regular Meeting duly assembled.

ATTEST:

Ray Leibensperger, CMC, Cicy Clerk

CITY OF LAKE HELEN, FLORIDA

Mark Shuttleworth, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

Mighael S. Teal, City Attorney

Line or sitte or

ni meen di est i

errangen für Rankombert in

An analysis of the second seco

gda, as follows:

वाह्येष्ट्र, तरफ हरूर वार्तार वि

same City Coranization of

of the Carottal Administration (ART

RESOLUTION NO. 13-00 1 A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE 2 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE 3 A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY 4 AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE 5 TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; PRO-6 VIDING FOR CONFLICTING RESOLUTIONS; AND PRO-7 VIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. 8 WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly 9 is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and 10 WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the 11 greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; and 12 WHEREAS, the area is expected to run out of numbers and the 13 City Commission expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and 14 WHEREAS. Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and 15 endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place 16 to live and visit. 17 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY 18 19 OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA: Desire for One Area Code for Volusia County. That 20 SECTION 1: the City Commission affirms its position that there should be a 21 22 single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in 23 Volusia County. Designation of New Area Code. That the new area 24 SECTION 2: 25 code should be designated as 386 (FUN). 26 SECTION3: Conflicting Resolutions. That all other resolutions or parts thereof that are in conflict with this resolution are 27 hereby rescinded and repealed. 28 SECTION 4: Effective Date. That this resolution shall take 29 30 effect immediately upon its final passage.

| 31 | APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CORRECTNESS: | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| | Lulli. | | |
| 32 | // / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / | | |
| 33 | EDWARD H. BEAZLEY, JR. | | |
| 34 | City Attorney | | |
| | | | |
| 35 | DATE: May 25, 2000 | | |

· 영화는 그는 이번 시간에 가지 그리고 있는 나를 다 있다고 있다고 있다고 있다.

The Within and Foregoing Resolution No. 13-00 was introduced and read before the City Commission of the City of New Smyrna Beach, Florida at its Special Meeting held at City Hall in said City on May 30, 2000. Motion was made by Vice Mayor Rogers, and seconded by Commissioner O'Bannon, that said Resolution be adopted.

A roll-call vote of the City Commission on said motion to adopt the Resolution resulted as follows:

| MAYOR JAMES L. VANDERGRIFFT | Yes |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| VICE MAYOR WILLIAM D. ROGERS | Yes |
| COMMISSIONER JAMES W. HATHAWAY | Yes |
| COMMISSIONER ORETHA W. BELL | Yes |
| COMMISSIONER JO ANN O'BANNON | Yes |

Whereupon, the Mayor of the City of New Smyrna Beach, Florida has hereunto set his official signature, duly attested by the Acting City Clerk, and has caused the Official Seal of said City to be hereunto affixed for the purpose of authenticity and as is required by law.

Mayor of the City of Ne

Smyrna Beach, Florida

As Acting City Clerk of the City of New Smyrna Beach,

Florida

RESOLUTION NO. 13-00

RESOLUTION 00-12

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF OAK HILL, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386(FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Port Orange City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling leaches and endless other leisure activities, is Word-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Commission of the City of Oak Hill, Volusia County, Florida:

- The Qak Hill City Council affirms its position that there should Section 1. be a single, new code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
- The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN). Section 2.
- Section 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

The above and foregoing resolution was moved for approval by Commissioner Jusan Cook and seconded by Commissioner Dany Frans and upon vote subscribed herein, the same was declared to be adopted at this Regular Meeting of the City Commission of Oak Hill, Florida held on June 5,2000.

A roll call vote resulted as follows: 3-0 passed.

GARY C. BITTLE, VICE-MAYOR/COMMISSIONER (5)

RESOLUTION

00-08

05/25/00

Darry L. Evans, Commissioner (1)

Absent
ROBERTA S. SIMMONS, COMMISSIONER (4)

Susa a Cook, Commissioner (3)

ATTEST:

CHY CLERK KIM CHERBANO

APPROVED FOR LEGALITY AND FORM:

CITY ATTORNEY GAYLE GRAZIANO

RESOLUTION 00-08 05/25/00

RESOLUTION NO. 18-00

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ORANGE CITY, FLORIDA, SUPPORTING VOLUSIA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS PROPOSAL TO THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR A NEW, SINGLE AREA CODE OF "386" (FUN) FOR ALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SUBSCRIBERS IN VOLUSIA COUNTY TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA.

WHEREAS, the Volusia Council of Governments (VCOG) was established in January, 1970, as a council of local public officials to develop coordinated plans, programs, and policies of mutual interest; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of VCOG is comprised of representatives from the Cities of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, Debary, Deland, Deltona, Edgewater, Holly Hill, Lake Helen, New Smyrna Beach, Oak Hill, Orange City, Ormond Beach, Pierson, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, South Daytona and the County of Volusia; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the explosive growth in telecommunications is rapidly exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County and is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced with a new area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County has sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities as well as being the home of the world-famous beach that is a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Orange City, Florida:

- SECTION 1. That the City Council of the City of Orange City supports VCOG's recommendation for a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.
- SECTION 2. That the City Council of the City of Orange City endorses "386" (FUN) as the single, new area code for all of Volusia County.
- SECTION 3. That the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the Public Service Commission.
- SECTION 4. All resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict herewith be and the same are hereby repealed.

| SECTION 5. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption. |
|--|
| This Resolution was introduced and sponsored by Councilmenter Stopp |
| and was read and passed by the City Council of the City of Orange City, Florida, at a regular meeting of said Council held on the day of day of day, 2000, and approved as provided by law. |
| ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS: |
| A LITTLE A CALL A SINERIA DE LA CALLA DE COMPAGNICAMENTA DE CALLA DE COMPAGNICA DECOMPAGNICA DE COMPAGNICA e same of the sa |
| Gary A. Blair |
| Jan Mahre. Us |
| Jim Mahoney |
| Server & Stone |
| George E. Stone |
| Harold O Custeel Us |
| Harold D. Casteel |
| D-512 1/2 |
| David W. Fancher |
| allot Again The |
| Albert T. Erwin, Vice Mayor |
| Christing R. Gobbin |
| Anthony R. Yebba, Mayor |
| |
| ATTEST: Jahrena Lee |
| Patricia A. Lee, CMC, City Clerk |
| This Resolution approved as to form and legal sufficiency: |
| Les Q |
| William Reischmann, City Attorney Resolution No. 18-00 |

RESOLUTION NO. 2000 - 97

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the City of Ormond Beach City Commission expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is world famous as a FUN place to live and visit, now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ORMOND BEACH, FLORIDA, THAT:

SECTION ONE. The City Commission affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION TWO. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION THREE. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

APPROVED AND AUTHENTICATED this 20th day of June, 2000.

Carl Esis

CARL PERSIS

Mayor ...

ATTEST:

VERONICA PATTERSON

City Clerk

RESOLUTION 00-02

A Resolution of the municipality the Town of Pierson, Volusia County, Florida supporting VCOG, Inc. in its application for funding from the Emergency Medical Services Award Trust Fund, for the purpose of studying the Fire/Rescue and the Emergency Medical services Delivery System on behalf of the County of Volusia and its municipalities.

Whereas, the Municipality of the Town of Pierson is dedicated to providing its residents with the highest service levels practical utilizing the most cost effective means; and

Whereas, there is need of more cost efficiency in response to medical emergencies within Volusia County; and

Whereas, there may be cost savings and efficiencies which may be identified in the Fire / EMS response structure through a study of that structure; and

Whereas, the VCOG Governing Board was tasked with developing recommendations for such savings and efficiencies based on the groundwork initially laid by the local Government Study Commission;

Now therefore, it be it resolved by the Municipal Council of the Town of Pierson, Florida:

Section 1. The municipality of the Town of Pierson supports the application of VCOG, Inc. for Emergency Medical Services Award trust fund, not to exceed \$ 125,000.00, on behalf of the municipality to fund a study of the Fire / Rescue and Emergency Medical Services delivery system to identify potential areas of municipal cost avoidance, resource sharing, and first tier compensation.

Section 2. This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption and staff is hereby directed to provide a certified copy of this resolution to VCOG, Inc. for inclusion in the support materials for the Emergency Medical Services Award Trust Fund.

Be it further resolved, that this Resolution as adopted be attached to the minutes Of this meeting held June 13, 2000.

Municipality of the Town of Pierson

Samuel G.S. Bennett, Chairman

ATTEST:

Deborah J. LeBlanc, Town Clerk

RESOLUTION # 00-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF PONCE INLET, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the Ponce Inlet Town Council the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced;

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF PONCE INLET, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Town Council affirms its position there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

It was moved by Mr. Hampton and seconded by Mr. Rogerson that said Resolution be adopted. A roll call vote of the Town Council on said motion resulted as follows:

Mayor Hoak
Councilman Albuquerque
Councilman Hampton
Vice Mayor Lewis
Councilman Rogerson

YES
YES
YES
ABSENT
YES

Passed and adopted this 19th day of April, 2000.

William P. Hoak, Mayor

ATTEST:

Robert L. Norris

Town Manager

Approved as to form and legality for the use and reliance of the Town of Ponce

Inlet, Florida, only.

Theodore R. Doran/Town Attorney



RESOLUTION NO. 00-23

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORT ORANGE, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear that the 904 area code applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County; the area is expected to run out of numbers and the Port Orange City Council expects the replacement of the 904 area code; and

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is Word-famous as a FUN place to live and visit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORT ORANGE, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1. The Port Orange City Council affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

Section 3. This resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

MAYOR DOROTHY L. HUKILL

ATTEST:

Kenneth W. Parker, City Manager

Adopted this 18thday of April, 2000

Reviewed and Approved:

Acting City Attorney

c:\wpdocs\res\areacode.386

RESOLUTION No. 2000-63

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, EXPRESSING A DESIRE FOR THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO APPROVE A SINGLE AREA CODE FOR ALL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY AND TO DESIGNATE 386 (FUN) AS THE NEW AREA CODE TO REPLACE 904 AND 407 IN VOLUSIA COUNTY.

WHEREAS, the explosive growth in telecommunications rapidly is exhausting telephone area code numbers; and

WHEREAS, it is clear to the Volusia County Council the 904 area code, that applies to the greatest majority of telephone subscribers in Volusia County, is soon to run out of numbers and is likely to be replaced;

WHEREAS, Volusia County, with its sparkling beaches and endless other leisure activities, is World-famous as a FUN place to live and visit,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA, IN OPEN MEETING DULY ASSEMBLED IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, DELAND, FLORIDA, THIS 23RD DAY OF MARCH, A.D. 2000, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION I: The Volusia County Council affirms its position there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunications subscribers in Volusia County.

SECTION II: The new area code should be designated as 386 (FUN).

SECTION III: This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

DONE AND ORDERED IN OPEN MEETING.

COUNTY COUNCIL

VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA

BY:

AMES E. WARD, CHAIR

RAY W. PENNEBAKER

ACTING COUNTY MANAGER



RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator is the agency to control telephone numbers in all North America and the explosion of new telephone lines for fax machines, cellular phone and internet access makes it difficult to make projections on future area code needs.

WHEREAS, the County is now divided between the 904 and 407 area codes, but the 904 is expected to exhaust its available telephone numbers by 2001.

WHEREAS, Volusia Council of Government (VCOG) has initiated a campaign to rid Volusia County of its 904/407 split and to gain a new single area code.

WHEREAS, the options available to Volusia County include a new area code, or overlay, for the entire geographical area served by 904 and, an overlay for the entire 904 area code would require callers to dial 10 digits for local calls.

WHEREAS, Volusia County Council has already declared its intention to shift Southwest Volusia out of 407 code back into any code serving the existing 904 code.

WHEREAS, the PSC agreed to exempt most of Southwest Volusia from the new code plan because the area already is split between the 407 and 904 area codes.

WHEREAS, government and business leaders lobbied for the exemption, hoping to unite the entire county within one new area code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY ENTERPRISE VOLUSIA, INC. OF VOLUSIA COUNTY FLORIDA:

<u>Section 1.</u> Enterprise Volusia Inc. affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunication subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated at 386 (FUN).

Taver Cornett

Chairman of the Board



HOTEL MOTEL association OF VOLUSIA COUNTY

RESOLUTION 2000-10

WHEREAS, the North American Numbering Plan Administrator is the agency to control telephone numbers in all North America and the explosion of new telephone lines for fax machines, cellular phones and internet access makes it difficult to make projections on future area code needs.

WHEREAS, the County is now divided between the 904 and 407 area codes, but the 904 is expected to exhausts its available telephone numbers by 2001.

WHEREAS, Volusia Council of Government, (VCOG) has initiated a campaign to rid Volusia County of its 904/407 spit and to gain a new single area code.

WHEREAS, the options available to Volusia County include a) new area code, or overlay, for the entire geographical area served by 904. An overlay for the entire 904 area code would require callers to dial 10 digits for local calls.

WHEREAS, Volusia County Council has already declared its intention to shift Southwest Volusia out of 407 code back into any code serving the existing 904 code.

WHEREAS, the PSC agreed to exempt most of Southwest Volusia from the new code plan because the area already is spit between the 407 and 904 area codes.

WHEREAS, government and business leaders lobbied for the exemption, hoping to unite the entire county within one new area code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOTEL MOTEL ASSOCIATION OF VOLUSIA COUNTY FLORIDA:

<u>Section 1.</u> The Hotel Motel Association of Volusia County affirms it position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunication subscribers in Volusia County.

Section 2. The new area code should be designated at 386 (FUN).

Bob Davis

President, Hotel Motel Association of Volusia County

140 South Beach Street, Suite 101, Daytona Beach, FL 32114 Phone: 904-257-6828 Fax: 904-257-0909 Email: Hlodgingas@aol.com REFERENCE DOCKET 990517

City of Palm Coust

P. O. Box 354610 Paim Coast, FL 32135-4610 Phone: (904) 447-4255 Fax: (904) 447-4259

Mayor Jim Canfield

Vice-Mayor James F. Holland City Manager Richard Kelton City Clerk/Finance Director Dong Courtney Councilman William Venne, Seat 1 Councilman Jerome K. Full, Seat 2 Councilman Ralph Carter, Seat 4

June 28, 2000

The Honorable Joe Garcia Chairman 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Public Service Corporation Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Ref. Docket 990517

Dear Mr. Garcia:

The City Council of the City of Palm Coast has voted unanimously to support the position advanced by government and business leaders of Volusia County to establish 386 as the new Volusia/Flagler two-county area code.

The two counties are linked in many ways—through the Daytona Beach Community College, which has a major branch here; though the drainage and water management concerns of the St. Johns River Water Management District; through the services available at the Daytona Beach International Airport and the shopping recreational, employment, and civic institutions serving residents of both counties. There is a steady flow of workers, shoppers, and visitors between the two counties on I-95, U.S. 1 and A1A.

A fractured area code would be a significant inconvenience and cost to the citizens of both counties, which we hope you will recognize by approving a common area code.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue to our residents.

Sincerely,

Janes V. Carfuld/tw

Mayor

cc:

Ms. Susan F. Clark, Commissioner

Mr. J. Terry Deason, Commissioner

Ms. Lila A. Jaber, Commissioner Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, Commissioner

Mr. Bill Talbott, Commissioner

Ann McFall, Co-Chair, Area Code Task Force

John E. Evans, Co-Chair Area Code Task Force



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: August 3, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the letter fromTavor B. Cornett, Executive Director Mainstreet Deland Association dated June 28, 2000. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the postcards do not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.



June 28, 2000

Honorable E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. Public Service Commissioner 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Honorable Leon Jacobs::

Via this letter I am requesting your efforts to secure a single area code for Volusia and Flagler Counties and for it to be 386 FUN. Our county is already divided between 2 area codes and seems to be headed for 10 digit dialing for all local calls.

In downtown DeLand we have 200 businesses and individuals which MainStreet represents and we hope you can help unite the entire county within one area code.

MainStreet DeLand Association affirms its position that there should be a single, new area code for all telecommunication subscribers in Volusia County.

Thanking you for your efforts for this campaign.

Sincerely,

Taver B. Cornett Executive Director

RECEIVED

JUL 0 6 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMINSION Commissioner Jacobs



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: August 3, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs 7973

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the attached 634 postcards. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the postcards do not constitute an <u>ex parte</u> communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an <u>ex parte</u> communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

RECORDS AND



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-N

DATE: August 14, 2000

TO:

Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs

RE:

Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517-TL

This office has received the attached letter from Guy M. Roberts dated August 9, 2000. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.



August 9, 2000

Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, Commissioner Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Fl 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I'm writing this letter on behalf of the business community of Volusia & Flagler counties.

I understand that it is inevitable to have an area code change affect our area. I am asking that you give serious consideration into providing the entire Volusia/Flagler area with a single area code.

There is a "movement" to suggest 386 (FUN) as the code of choice. I only ask that there be a single code to eliminate 10 digit dialing. I've heard a lot of arguments that there are excessive costs associated with code changes related to stationary, etc. Most businesses have to order these staples at least annually and most code changes are given nearly a year notice so the businesses' should have ample time make the necessary changes.

I thank you for your time.

Cordially,

Guy M. Roberts Branch Manager



AUG 1 4 2000

FLORIDA PUEL IN SCENIFICACIÓN DE LA COMPOSITA DEL COMPOSITA DE LA COMPOSITA DE LA COMPOSITA DELA COMPOSITA DEL COMPOSITA DELA



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE: August 15, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: William B. Berg, Assistant to Commissioner Deason

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in Docket No:

990517-TL

This office has received the attached correspondence from Guy M. Roberts, Loomis Fargo & Company. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Deason. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-31-JULY 19, 1991), the following letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Because it is not deemed to be an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However, in such cases Commissioner Deason has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo be, as a matter of routine, placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

WBB:mm



August 9, 2000

Mr. J. Terry Deason, Commissioner Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Fl 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Deason:

I'm writing this letter on behalf of the business community of Volusia & Flagler counties.

I understand that it is inevitable to have an area code change affect our area. I am asking that you give serious consideration into providing the entire Volusia/Flagler area with a single area code.

There is a "movement" to suggest 386 (FUN) as the code of choice. I only ask that there be a single code to eliminate 10 digit dialing. I've heard a lot of arguments that there are excessive costs associated with code changes related to stationary, etc. Most businesses have to order these staples at least annually and most code changes are given nearly a year notice so the businesses' should have ample time make the necessary changes.

I thank you for your time.

Cordially,

Guy M. Roberts Branch Manager

Susan F. Clark Commissioner



Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 (850) 413-6040 Fax: (850) 413-6395

Public Service Commission

REPORTING

AUG 15 PM 4: 01

MEMORANDUM

August 15, 2000

TO:

BLANCA BAYO, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

KAY POSEY, COMMISSIONER CLARK'S OFFICE

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517

Please place the attached cards on the correspondence side of the docket file for the above-noted docket. Thank you.

Attachment



August 9, 2000

ALG 15 2000

Florida Public Service Comm. Commissioner Clark

Phone: 904.672.3363

Fax: 904.677.9745

Ms. Susan F. Clark, Commissioner Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Fl 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Clark:

I'm writing this letter on behalf of the business community of Volusia & Flagler counties.

I understand that it is inevitable to have an area code change affect our area. I am asking that you give serious consideration into providing the entire Volusia/Flagler area with a single area code.

There is a "movement" to suggest 386 (FUN) as the code of choice. I only ask that there be a single code to eliminate 10 digit dialing. I've heard a lot of arguments that there are excessive costs associated with code changes related to stationary, etc. Most businesses have to order these staples at least annually and most code changes are given nearly a year notice so the businesses' should have ample time make the necessary changes.

I thank you for your time.

Cordially,

Guy M. Roberts Branch Manager



RECEIVED FPSC UO AUG 31 AM 9: 31 RECORUS AND REPORTING



August 29, 2000

Ms. Blanca Bayo, Director Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850


990517

Dear Ms. Bayo:

It has only just now come to our attention, through published media reports, that the Public Service Commission staff is recommending changes to the Area Code allocation in northeast Florida that would result in Putnam County being assigned a different Area Code than its neighboring counties to the north, northeast, and east. The proposed plan is divisive, arbitrary, ill conceived, and contributes negatively to the entire concept of regionalism and cooperation—a major planning objective in today's environment.

This proposed plan is NOT in the best interests of Putnam County and northeast Florida for many reasons including:

- Putnam County is a member of the Northeast Florida Regional Planning Council and it should continue to have an Area Code in common with its geographical partners.
- Putnam County is a member of the northeast Florida economic development consortium - Cornerstone - and would become the ONLY member of that group to have an Area Code different than the rest of its partners.



P.O. Box 550, Palatka, Florida 32178-0550 Phone: (904) 328-1503 • Fax: (904) 328-7076 E-Mail: chamber@tcity.com

Website: http://www.putnamcountychamber.org



- Putnam County is a member of the Florida First Coast Association of Chambers of Commerce and if assigned a new Area Code would be the only member of that promotional group to have a different Area Code.
- Putnam County is a member of the northeast Florida regional tourism coalition and if the proposed plan is approved would become the only member of that group to have a different Area Code.

These are only a few of the regional alliances and cooperative ventures that would be adversely affected by the proposed change in Area Code for Putnam County.

The Putnam County Chamber of Commerce urges each member of the Public Service Commission to give serious consideration to rejecting the staff recommendation to excise Putnam County from the Area Code 904 partnership with its regional trading, governmental, planning, and tourism promotion partners.

Thank you for your favorable consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

C.W. Larson II

President

Susan F. Clark Commissioner



Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 (850) 413-6040

Fax: (850) 413-6395

Public Service Commission

MEMORANDUM

August 31, 2000

TO:

BLANCA BAYO, DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

KAY POSEY, COMMISSIONER CLARK'S OFFICE

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517

Please place the attached cards on the correspondence side of the docket file for the above-noted docket. Thank you.

Attachment



CURIGINAL

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

HOWARD GRISHAM

LINDA MYERS DISTRICT 2 BILL WATTS

CHARLES "SKEET" ALFORD DISTRICT 5

P.O. BOX 758 PALATKA, FLORIDA 32178-0758 (904) 329-0205

August 31, 2000

Ms. Blanca Bayo Director of Records and Reporting Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Ms. Bayo:

RECORDS AND REPORTING PROPERTING

The Putnam County Board of County Commissioners have in the past voted and expressed their support of maintaining the present 904 area code exchange for all residents.

Putnam County currently has many different prefix numbers that make placing a call to the County seat a toll call for some residents. Any further change in telephone numbers will only increase confusion and cost the County additional money they had not budgeted for.

We appreciate your request for comments and notification of the upcoming hearings, and thank you for the opportunity to place on record our position that all of Putnam County remain within the 904 area code.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS PUTNAM COUNTY, FLORIDA

Howard Grisham

CTR BCC/HG/tl
ECR
LEG L
OPC
PAI
RGO
SEC
SER
OTH org to Hong

APP CAF CMP COM

Done 9/11/00



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE:

February 5, 2000

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF COMPETITIVE SERVICES (İLERİ)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 990517-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED

NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 904 AREA CODE

Attached is a box of over 3,000 CONSUMER CORRESPONDENCE LETTERS to be filed on the correspondence side in the above-referenced docket.

LI Attachment

D:\ILERI\990517-T\MEMO_CLO.WPD



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE:

September 8, 2000

TO:

Blanca Bayo, Director, Division Records and Reporting

FROM:

William B. Berg, Assistant to Chairman Deason

RE:

Docket No: 990517-TL

Chairman Deason has received and read the attached letter. He has requested me to insert these letters into the docket file.

Done 9712/00

990517-TL

Mary Curran

2320 Éslinger Road New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168



August 22, 2000

RECEIVED

AUG 24 2000

Florida Public Service Comm. Chairman Deason

Commissioners Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear PSC Commissioners:

As I understand it, the Public Service Commission members are in the process of deciding whether or not to grant Volusia County a new single area code in place of 904. I reside in an unincorporated area of Volusia County, approximately 1½ miles west of (incorporated) New Smyrna Beach. I have friends and family who live in other areas of Volusia County, such as New Smyrna Beach, Port Orange, Holly Hill and DeLand. Also, I work for an agency that's located in Daytona Beach. Currently, because we're all in the same area code (904) I am able to make local calls to my friends, family and employer. However, it is my understanding, if Volusia County loses area code 904 and the Public Service Commission does not grant a new single area code, then all of our communities may end up with 1 or maybe more overlays of different area codes. Please understand, the necessity of 10-digit dialing does not daunt me – I am used to that in the daily course of my job. What's really upsetting is the possibility of having to pay long distance charges to talk with friends or family who may live less than a couple of miles away.

I implore you to carefully consider what the long-term effects of imposing several different area codes will mean to the average citizens of Volusia and please don't allow the lobbying by the affluent telephone companies (they already reap millions of dollars from customers) to sway you. Also important is that in the area where I live and throughout Volusia County there are a multitude of retirees and older persons who must survive on a fixed income.

PLEASE, grant all of us in Volusia County a new single area code. I have heard there is a local campaign in support of having the Public Service Commission designate 386 (FUN) for Volusia County. I would gladly accept that.

I sincerely appreciate your careful consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,

Mangama



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE: September 27, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the attached correspondence from George J. Bergalts, Acting City Manager of the City of Fort Pierce dated September 21, 2000. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.





OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE CITY HALL, 100 NORTH U.S. 1 P.O. BOX 1480 FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA 34954-1480 TEL. (561) 460-2200 FAX (561) 489-2594

September 21, 2000

Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. State of Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FC 32399

Re: New Area Code

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

Please be advised the City of Fort Pierce is opposed to the Public Service Commission staff recommendation that a ten digit overlay be used to add a new area code to our region. Such a procedural change would be costly, disruptive and ill-conceived.

The City requests that you consider other alternatives.

Sincerely,

George J. Bergalts

Acting City Manager

GJB:jdr

cc: Mayor Edward G. Enns

Fort Pierce, Florida 1901-2001 Celebrating 100 Years of Heritage



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: August 14, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the attached thirty-seven e-mails from various entities. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the e-mails do not constitute an <u>ex parte</u> communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an <u>ex parte</u> communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.



1870 S.E. Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie, Florida 34952 (561) 398-8182 * Fax: (561) 398-8180 * CAPTEC1@aol.com

E-MAIL COVER SHEET

Date:

September 26, 2000

Total No. of Pages: (Includes Cover Sheet)

To:

Chrmn. J. Terry Deason

850-413-6038

Company:

FL Public Service Commiss.

E-Mail Address: tdeason@psc/state.fl.us

From:

Joseph W. Capra, PE

Reference:

Phone No.:

Treasure Coast 10-digit

overlay

This e-mail is transmitted to express my strong disagreement with the proposed 10-digit overlay for the Martin, St. Lucie, Indian River County area. The overlay would be a short-term solution, providing only band-aid relief, at best.

Other alternatives include utilizing the wealth of unused telephone numbers in the 561 area code bank that are not being used, assigning new prefixes, or choosing a specific geographic section from the proposed overlay area and assigning a new code to only that portion of telephone customers and would provide longer term relief and cause much less inconvenience to the public.

Business and residential customers from areas such as Dade County that have been forced to implement a 10-digit system are less than satisfied with the results.

As a business owner and resident of the Treasure Coast, I encourage the PSC to make every effort to arrive at a long-term solution to this problem, thereby setting an example for other regions of the country that are seeking a viable solution to their phone number "shortage" to follow, rather than adopting the "easy way out" and implementing a 10-digit overlay.

JWC/cm L:\Joes_memos\10digit092600 eml.doc

Melinda Butler

From: Bevery [theboss1@gate.net]

Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2000 9:32 AM

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us; bbaez@psc.state.fl.us To:

Subject: 10 digit dialing

Please be advised that we are OPPOSED to 10 digit dialing. Being business owners in St. Lucie County, we think we have gone through enough turmoil and business disruption with possible loss of income when the area code was changed to 561. We don't see how adding an additional burden of 10 digit dialing would enhance our business in any fashion. Enough is enough. It is time policy makers placed more emphasis on helping rather than hindering the very people that make their jobs possible. Thank you very much.

Beverley and Wayne Larsen

Melinda Butler

From:

Frank4ems@aol.com

Sent:

Sunday, September 24, 2000 5:51 PM

To:

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us;

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Subject:

New AREA CODE overlay

Dear Public Service Commissioners:

I am writing to you after hearing from our St. Lucie County Chamber of Commerce on the subject of the growing number of phone numbers and hence Area Codes in our region. I am OPPOSED to an overlay and prefer that a new geographic area be established for the new code for the area of Indian River, St. Lucie and, with the exception of Hobe Sound, Martin Counties.

This option is projected to last 24 years before another code would be needed.

Please consider this option in order to alleviate the tremendous setup and ongoing burden that an overlay would present to us.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Frank Lillo 2490 SE Marseille St. Port St. Lucie, FL 34952 561-398-9533

Melinda Butler

From:

Shirley Jeff

Sent: To:

Monday, September 25, 2000 9:55 AM Melinda Butler

Subject:

FW: 10 digit area code

fyi

----Original Message----

From: Laurie Carney [mailto:lcarney@fau.edu] Sent: Friday, September 22, 2000 9:02 AM

To: 'sjeff@psc.state.fl.us' Subject: 10 digit area code

To: E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. - I would like to express my opinion as to the proposed 10 digit area code change in PB County. I strongly "oppose" the current proposed structure as I feel that it will be extremely confusing to individuals making calls in PB County.

I know that tremendous growth in this county will ultimately need a change, however I think PB County should be given "one" code only, not mixed as proposed. Neighboring counties should then also have their own individual code to prevent confusion.

Please take this thought into consideration. Thank you. Laurie Carney

From:

Shirley Jeff

Sent: To: Monday, September 25, 2000 9:54 AM

Melinda Butler

Subject:

FW: 561 overlay for Palm Beach County

FYI.

----Original Message----

From: AMSTRAUS@aol.com [mailto:AMSTRAUS@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, September 22, 2000 10:33 AM

To: tdeason@psc.state.fl.us

Cc: sjeff@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us; bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Subject: 561 overlay for Palm Beach County

I wholeheartedly support the alternative plan proposed by the Palm Beach County Commission which will allow residents of Palm Beach County to retain the 561 area code until at least 2006 without ten digit dialing and St. Lucie, Martin, and Indian River Counties would be the recipients of a new area code. We have had two changes in the recent past and it is inconvenient and costly to both residents and businesses. I believe this is in the best interests of the greatest majority of citizens involved.

ARNOLD M. STRAUS

Chairman Public Affairs Committee

Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce

From:

Sent:

Shirley Jeff Monday, September 25, 2000 9:45 AM Melinda Butler

To: Subject:

FW: 10-digit overlay

FYI.

----Original Message----

From: della marteny [mailto:dmarteny@yahoo.com] Sent: Friday, September 22, 2000 9:06 PM

To: sjeff@psc.state.fl.us Subject: 10-digit overlay

I vote to keep 561 in pb co. and let the other areas have a new area code.

Do You Yahoo!?

Send instant messages & get email alerts with Yahoo! Messenger. http://im.yahoo.com/

From:

Sent:

To:

JDR53787@aol.com
Friday, September 22, 2000 10:05 AM
ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us; bbaez@psc.state.fl.us
Ftpiercemayor@aol.com; alrivett@stluciechamber.org
NEW AREA CODE

Cc: Subject:

Dear Commissioner:

Please be advised the City of Fort Pierce is opposed to the Public Service Commission staff recommendation that a ten digit overlay be used to add a new area code to our region. Such a procedural change would be costly, disruptive and ill-conceived.

The City requests that you consider other alternatives.

Sincerely,

George J. Bergalis Acting City Manager

gjb456@aol.com

From:

Kathy Gates [kathy@mesapark.com] Friday, September 22, 2000 1:20 PM ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us Against 10 Digit Telephone Overlay

Sent: To:

Subject:

Please vote against the 10-digit overlay for the new telephone code in the St Lucie County Area. I am a resident of St. Lucie County and will vote against anyone who supports this issue. thanks Kathy Gates

From: Sent: pr@publicrelations.nu

Friday, September 22, 2000 5:17 PM

To:

tdeason@psc.state; fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us;

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Cc:

Klein.Ron.S28@leg.state.fl.us

Subject: New Area Code

I am writing to implore you to please leave the 561 area code for Palm Beach County and create a new area code for St. Lucie, Martin and Indian River Counties. This will be much less disruptive for the businesses in Palm Beach County, which is the most populous and provide the same service as Broward County now has. To institute an overlay in the 561 area code, like was done in Dade County, would require 10 digit dialing which would be most intrusive to the businesses and residents in Palm Beach County. I realize that ultimately, we may have to have it, but if it could be delayed for a few years more, as long as possible, it would be much more preferable. I also understand that the other counties would prefer to get their own new area code too, rather than having to deal with an overlay and the annoyance of requiring 10 digit dialing for them. Thank you for your consideration in this matter, I remain, most respectfully, Barry R. Epstein, APR.

barry r. epstein, APR, CCE, CED; president/ceo

barry r. epstein associates, inc. public relations

talk: 561.852.0000 send: 561.451.0000

click: pr@publicrelations.nu

portfolio: http://www.publicrelations.nu

write: 11922 waterwood drive boca raton, fl 33428-1026

From:

Sent:

To:

MEDISSAGE@aol.com Friday, September 22, 2000 10:24 PM tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us;

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Subject:

New Area Code

I am writing to OPPOSE a 10-digit overlay to add a new area code to our region (St. Lucie County - Area Code 561). I prefer that a new geographic area be established for the new code. Thank you, Suzanne Jensen, President MEDISSAGE, Inc. 774 W. Midway Road Fort Pierce, FL 34982

From: Karen Carbone [kcarbone@gate.net]

Sent: Saturday, September 23, 2000 10:01 AM

To: tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us; bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Subject: Area Code 561

I want you to retain the 561 area code solely for the residents of Palm Beach County.

Karen Carbone 22159 Palms Way Apt. 102 Boca Raton, FL 33433

From: Susan M. Fines [smfines@peoplepc.com]

Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2000 8:38 PM

To: tdeason@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us

Subject: Dailing 10 numbers for a local phone call

FROM: S.M. Fines Insurance Agency, 1250 SE Port St. Lucie Blvd., Port St. Luice, FL 34952, Phone # (561)335-8804, 335-8758, 335-8847, 335-8515, 337-0593, & 340-0001(home#)

Please give us a new area code and <u>do not</u>, <u>I repeat</u>, <u>do not</u> have us dial 10 number for a local call. If you do this to us we will loose business because other people will be confused and everyone around will be confused. It is hard enough in today's world to get messages and communicate with people. Old people in our area will really have trouble with 10 number dialing.

We do not want to be different from other area's, everyone already knows about area codes, we do not want to change. Look at the phone number that I already have to deal with & this does not include cell phones!!! Please try and not make things more confusing, the public always suffers when you do!!!!!

Sincerely,

Susan M. Fines President

From: Carmen Fields [cfields@ircc.cc.fl.us]
Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2000 2:45 PM

To: 'ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us'; 'ljaber@psc.state.fl.us'; 'bbaez@psc.state.fl.us'

Please do not give us the 10-digit overlay for local phone calls. This would present undo burden and hardship for the residents of St. Lucie County.

Thanks, Carmen

From: Sent: To:

Subject:

Donald Darko [donaldd@primeretail.com] Thursday, September 21, 2000 2:33 PM

'ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us' FW: New Area Code

I agree.

From:

alrivett@stluciechamber.org[SMTP:alrivett@stluciechamber.org]

Sent:

Wednesday, September 20, 2000 1:17 PM

To: donaldd@primeretail.com

Subject:

New Area Code

As you may be aware, the staff of the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) has recommended that a 10-digit overlay be used to add a new area code to our region. This means that everyone will have to use a 10-digit number to make a local call.

The St. Lucie County Chamber is opposed to an overlay and prefers that a new geographic area be establish for the new code, the area of Indian River, St. Lucie and, with the exception of Hobe Sound, Martin Counties. This option is projected to last 24 years before another code would be needed.

We are once again asking our members to e-mail, mail, telegram or telephone the PSC to get the Commission to override the staff recommendation. I have told that the PSC usually gives favorable consideration to the public's desire. We just need for them to know what it is. The PSC will be considering the issue on September 29.

Those interested in contacting the Public Service Commissioners may do so in writing at 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, FL 32399. Their phone numbers and e-mail addresses are also listed below.

Chairman J. Terry Deason - 850-413-6038 tdeason@psc.state.fl.us

Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. - 850-413-6046

ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us

Commissioner Lila A Jaber - 850-413-6044

ljaber@psc.state.fl.us

Commissioner Bravlio Baez - 850-413-6042

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Thank you in advance for taking the time to address this issue by contacting the PSC.

Al Rivett

From: Sent:

Donald Darko [donaldd@primeretail.com] Thursday, September 21, 2000 2:13 PM

To: Subject:

'ejocobs@psc.state.fl.us' FW: New Area Code

From:

alrivett@stluciechamber.org[SMTP:alrivett@stluciechamber.org]

Wednesday, September 20, 2000 1:17 PM

To: donaldd@primeretail.com

Subject:

New Area Code

As you may be aware, the staff of the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) has recommended that a 10-digit overlay be used to add a new area code to our region. This means that everyone will have to use a 10-digit number to make a local call.

The St. Lucie County Chamber is opposed to an overlay and prefers that a new geographic area be establish for the new code, the area of Indian River, St. Lucie and, with the exception of Hobe Sound, Martin Counties. This option is projected to last 24 years before another code would be needed.

We are once again asking our members to e-mail, mail, telegram or telephone the PSC to get the Commission to override the staff recommendation. I have told that the PSC usually gives favorable consideration to the public's desire. We just need for them to know what it is. The PSC will be considering the issue on September 29.

Those interested in contacting the Public Service Commissioners may do so in writing at 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, FL 32399. Their phone numbers and e-mail addresses are also listed below.

Chairman J. Terry Deason - 850-413-6038

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us

Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. - 850-413-6046

ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us

Commissioner Lila A Jaber - 850-413-6044

ljaber@psc.state.fl.us

Commissioner Bravlio Baez - 850-413-6042

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Thank you in advance for taking the time to address this issue by contacting the PSC.

Al Rivett

From:

Cafelaronde@aol.com

Sent:

Thursday, September 21, 2000 2:08 PM

To:

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us;

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Subject:

No 10 digit overlay for St. Lucie County PLEASE !!!!

Dear Sirs:

I have heard that the PSC has recommended that a 10-digit overlay be used to add a new area code to our region. This means that everyone will have to use a 10-digit

number to make a local call.

I and all of my friends are opposed to an overlay and prefers that a new geographic area be established for the new code, the area of Indian River, St. Lucie and, with the exception of Hobe Sound, Martin Counties. This option is projected to last 24 years before another code would be

In the long run, of course we will run out of area codes no matter what, unless the telcommunications industry prepares their software & equipment to begin recognising 8 digit phone numbers. Everthing else is just a top-gap, and we shouldn't have to suffer for those multi-million dollar companies lack of foresight!

Thank you,

Shelly Crandall

From:

Learntoreadslc@aol.com

Sent:

Thursday, September 21, 2000 1:06 PM

To:

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us

Cc:

ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us; bbaez@psc.state.fl.us;

alrivett@stluciechamber.org

Subject:

New Area Code

Please be advised that requiring a 10-digit overlay in this area would cause a hardship for our students and prospective students. Our work is to help adults (16 and older) to read and write English. To some the telephone is very scary. It is hard enough for them to deal with seven numbers, let alone ten.

In addition, this overlay could cause area businesses to lose business due to delays in connection. Most business have their phone programmed to use the standard seven digit number plus extension numbers. Everything would have to be reprogrammed.

The overlay plan is unnecessary when a new area code for our area would solve the problem of overcrowded lines without the inconvenience.

Please reconsider your recommendation.

Sincerely,

Corinne M. Behncke Executive Director Learn To Read of St. Lucie County, Inc. (561)464-2747 learntoreadslc@aol.com

From:

Sent:

Shirley Jeff Thursday, September 21, 2000 12:43 PM

To: Subject: Melinda Butler FW: 10-digit overlay

FYI

----Original Message----

From: Bobra Bush [mailto:bsbush@telcomcorp.com] Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2000 12:19 PM

To: sjeff@psc.state.fl.us Subject: 10-digit overlay

I am a small business owner in Palm Beach County. I urge the commission to reject the 10-digit overlay plan and to add a new area code to the counties north of us instead.

Bobra Bush Telcom Corp. 561-394-5448 bsb@telcomcorp.com

From: Shirley Jeff

Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2000 11:55 AM

To: Melinda Butler

Subject: FW: no 10 digit dialing

Here's another one.

----Original Message----

From: Jimmy @ Home [mailto:jgottlieb@adelphia.net]

Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2000 11:37 AM

To: sjeff@psc.state.fl.us Subject: no 10 digit dialing

Dear Commissioner:

I am a small business owner in Palm Beach County

I am not in support of your plan to use 10 digit dialing in Palm Beach County at this time. Although I know that it will be necessary at some point in the future.

I am in full support of the proposal of Sen Ron Klein, and others who are pushing to allow PBC to keep the 561 area code and give the counties to our north a new area code

Given the growth rate of these counties verses the rapid rate of growth in PBC I feel that this makes more sense.

James O. Gottlieb Executive Vice President Gottlieb & Company, Inc. 11320 Lake Tree Court Boca Raton, FL 33434 561.883.5400 - phone 561-883.1480 - fax 561.702.3334 - direct james@gottliebco.com

From:

Margaret McGrath [MargaretM@cityofpsl.com] Thursday, September 21, 2000 10:22 AM Ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us 10 digit overlay

Sent: To:

Subject:

I am opposed to an overlay and prefer that a new geographic area be established for the new code for Indian River & St. Lucie County.

As a resident of St. Lucie County, with family living within a 5-mile radius, dialing a 10-digit number for a local call is ridiculous.

Thank you for consideration Margaret McGrath

From:

Sent:

Shirley Jeff Thursday, September 21, 2000 10:23 AM Melinda Butler

To: Subject:

FW: 10 digit overlay

Another ex-parta?

----Original Message----

From: Libby Good [mailto:libby@bocamag.com] Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2000 10:19 AM

To: sjeff@psc.state.fl.us Subject: 10 digit overlay

Please count my voice among those opposing the additional numbers added to current and future telephone numbers in this area.

Thank you , Libby Good Boca Raton magazine Boca Raton, Florida

From: Sent:

Margaret McGrath [MargaretM@cityofpsl.com] Thursday, September 21, 2000 10:16 AM Ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; Ljaber@psc.state.fl.us New Area Code

To: Subject:

Please do not consider 10 digit dialing for our area. With the growth in this county, a new area code is needed.

thank you for your consideration, Margaret McGrath St. Lucie County Resident

From:

JulieLStanko@aol.com

Sent:

Wednesday, September 20, 2000 6:13 PM

To:

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us;

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Cc:

klein.ron.web@leg.state.fl.us

Subject:

561 area code

My name is Julie Stanko and I'm a social worker at Elder Crisis Outreach. We serve the elderly residents of Palm Beach County. On behalf of my clients, I urge you to retain the 561 area code. Changing the area code will only lead to increased confusion and frustration for this vulnerable group of people.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to this important decision. I may be reached at 561-533-1060, if you have any questions or concerns on how your vote will affect this population of Palm Beach County.

Sincerely, Julie L. Stanko, BA, CIRS Elder Crisis Outreach

From:

Sent:

To:

Mike [luderi@email.msn.com] Wednesday, September 20, 2000 7:10 PM tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us

Cc: Subject: alrivett@stluciechamber.org St. Lucie County Area Code

Dear Sir

Please be advised that I oppose the adoption of 10 digit phone numbers for St. Lucie County, Fl. I am in agreement with the St. Lucie County Chamber of Commerce recommendation to form a new area listing for Indian River, Martin and St. Lucie Counties. Thank you for the consideration of my input.

Dr. Michael C. Riordan email: luderi@msn.com Fort Pierce, Florida

From:

Sent:

Mike [luderi@email.msn.com] Wednesday, September 20, 2000 7:10 PM

To:

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us

Cc: Subject: alrivett@stluciechamber.org St. Lucie County Area Code

Dear Sir

Please be advised that I oppose the adoption of 10 digit phone numbers for St. Lucie County, Fl. I am in agreement with the St. Lucie County Chamber of Commerce recommendation to form a new area listing for Indian River, Martín and St. Lucie Counties. Thank you for the consideration of my input.

Dr. Michael C. Riordan email: luderi@msn.com Fort Pierce, Florida

From:

Davidh4708@aol.com

Sent:

Wednesday, September 20, 2000 8:37 PM

To:

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us;

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Subject:

New Area Code

Dear Commissioners,

My name is David Hall and I am the president of the St. Lucie Association of Realtors here is St. Lucie County Florida. Our area was being considered for a new area code, and for what I have learned was that the staff is recommending that our area do not receive a new area code. I'm asking you to support the granting of a new area code to our area. The St. Lucie County Florida area, has been the fastest growing area on the treasure coast and we have been exceeding our growth figures from year to year. With the State growth figures from last year to today only being 14%, the St. Lucie County area has been growing over 30%. Being in an area with over 80,000 people and growing, we need a new area code for this area and I'm asking you for your support.

I look forward to hearing from you and your support.

David Hall President "2000" St. Lucie Association of Realtors Office 1-800-542-0210

From:

Sent:

To:

MPAREAMGR@aol.com Wednesday, September 20, 2000 8:43 PM tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us; bbaez@psc.state.fl.us 10 Digit Overlay

Subject:

My husband and I, both business owners, oppose the 10 digit overlay. This will cause delays in service and waste time. We would prefer a new area code to this proposal. Please reconsider your recommendation.

Linda & Paul Ogle Port St. Lucie

From: Sent:

Valerie Hudgins [hudginsv@bellsouth.net]

Thursday, September 21, 2000 10:02 AM

To:

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us

Cc: Subject:

alrivett@stluciechamber.org RE: New Area Code - PLEASE OVERRIDE THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION.

I for one personally do not care to have to dial any more numbers than necessary to make a call. It would also become very confusing to me to know which calls are actually told calls and not local. It really would become a mess. PLEASE OVERRIDE THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION.

ACCOUNTING & PAYROLL SERVICES by Valerie Hudgins 1712 SW Lexington Drive Port St. Lucie, FL 34953-1629 561-873-1034 phone 561-873-2147 fax hudginsv@bellsouth.net

----Original Message----

From: alrivett@stluciechamber.org [mailto:alrivett@stluciechamber.org]

Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2000 1:19 PM To: hudginsv@bellsouth.net

Subject: New Area Code

As you may be aware, the staff of the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) has recommended that a 10-digit overlay be used to add a new area code to our region. This means that everyone will have to use a 10-digit number to make a local call.

The St. Lucie County Chamber is opposed to an overlay and prefers that a new geographic area be establish for the new code, the area of Indian River, St. Lucie and, with the exception of Hobe Sound, Martin Counties. This option is projected to last 24 years before another code would be

We are once again asking our members to e-mail, mail, telegram or telephone the PSC to get the Commission to override the staff recommendation. I have told that the PSC usually gives favorable consideration to the public's desire. We just need for them to know what it is. The PSC will be considering the issue on September 29.

Those interested in contacting the Public Service Commissioners may do so in writing at 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, FL 32399. Their phone numbers and e-mail addresses are also listed below.

Chairman J. Terry Deason - 850-413-6038 tdeason@psc.state.fl.us Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. - 850-413-6046 ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us Commissioner Lila A Jaber - 850-413-6044 ljaber@psc.state.fl.us Commissioner Bravlio Baez - 850-413-6042 bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Thank you in advance for taking the time to address this issue by contacting the PSC.

Al Rivett

From: Sent: To: Subject: Bob Smith [bob@bocaratonchamber.com]
Thursday, September 21, 2000 9:27 AM
tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us

10 digit overlay

Dear PSC Members; I am sure you have heard every viewpoint from every corner of Palm Beach County on this issue. The Greater Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce, representing 2,000 members, OPPOSES the implementing of the "10 Digit Overlay" in Palm Beach County.

Sincerely,

Robert Smith Vice President of Public Policy Greater Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce (561) 395-4433 http://www.bocaratonchamber.com

From: Sent: Norm Penner [normpenner@netscape.net] Thursday, September 21, 2000 9:26 AM tdeason@psc.state.fl.us ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us

To: tdeason@psc.state.fl.
Cc: ejacobs@psc.state.fl.

Subject:

Staff Recommendation 10 digit overlay

Members of the Florida Public Service Commission:

I write in strong opposition to the staff recommendation that a 10 digit overlay be used to add a new area code to our region.

I support the effort by local Chambers of Commerce to establish a new geographic area to include Indian River, St. Lucie County and parts of Martin County for the new code. It would appear to make more sense to make this change at this time (longer term effect) than to use the staff's recommendation.

I ask you to reject the staff's recommendation and adopt the $\operatorname{Chambers}$ 'suggestions.

Thank you. Norm Penner

Get your own FREE, personal Netscape WebMail account today at http://home.netscape.com/webmail

From: Lenny Van Valkenburg [lennyv@zeroll.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2000 9:40 AM

To: ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us

Good Morning!

We are a business operating in St. Lucie County, FL, and we are opposed to the proposed 10 digit overlay method for a new area code in our area.

As has been the case for decades, we would support the creation of a new area code based on our geographic area. We have operated in this area for ten years and have been through two changes with great success!! Just so that you know our product distribution is worldwide.

We this opportunity of being heard!!

Sincerely,

Lenny Van Valkenburg General Manager

From:

Sent:

To: Subject: JRingo2801@aol.com Wednesday, September 20, 2000 3:10 PM ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us 10 digits for Indian River and St Lucie Counties

Dear Commissioner Jacobs: The proposal to increase to 10 digit dialing is strongly disfavored by condo residents here in St Lucie County. Our seniors all favor a new area code. Jim Ringo, Board Member Midport Place Condo Assn.

From:

Broz05@aol.com

Sent:

Wednesday, September 20, 2000 12:55 PM

To:

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us;

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Subject:

Palm Beach County overlay

Dear Members,

Please allow Palm Beach County to keep its current area code and assign a new one to the Treasure Coast. We realize that the time may come when we will have to have a 10-digit overlay, but clearly there is an easier alternative right now that is preferred by residents, businesses and elected officials in both regions. In other words, we all win. As the old saying goes, No good reason to do something is a good reason not to do it.

In these days of heroes and villains, there are few heroes. Please be ours.

Respectfully,

Donna Brosemer 561-775-1072

From:

Sheila_Shelton@cch.com

Sent:

Tuesday, September 19, 2000 5:37 PM

To:

tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us;

bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Subject:

561 area code question for Palm Beach County

I have opened a sales office in Delray Beach for one of the 3 largest international legal publishers and I am very concerned about the pending vote for the area code changes in Palm Beach county.

I represent CCH INCORPORATED, a division of Wolters Kluwer out of Amsterdam and while we are small in number in Palm Beach County, we use this office location to reach customers round the world. We have invested heavily in promoting our phone as a resource to have customers reach us from all over the globe. If we have to reprint and distribute that information in catalogs, direct mail and business cards all over again, it would be very expensive. I'm sure that I represent the feeling of most business folks in the county. I feel that Palm Beach has worked hard to develop a strong business base, rather than all residential, and therefore should be permitted to keep the 561 area code in order to promote the business continuity.

Thank you for hearing my concerns, Sheila Shelton

From: Alan Bauman [abauman@adelphia.net]

Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2000 10:29 PM

To: ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us Subject: 10-digit overlay vote

Dear Mr. Jacobs.

I am contacting you on behalf of the upcoming vote on "overlay dialing" and how it will affect the residents & businesses of Palm Beach. I am aware of an alternative plan which would allow Palm Beach to retain 561, and allow all parties considered to experience a minimum amount of disruption and confusion over the long term. As a physician, small business owner and resident of Palm Beach County, I would urge you to please vote to retain the 561 area code solely for the residents of Palm Beach County, and allow a new area code for St. Lucie, Martin, & Indian River Counties.

Progress and growth is inevitable and encouraging, however, it would seem to me that this would allow the other counties concerned (St. Lucie, Martin & Indian River) to also benefit by retaining this new area code for a much longer period of time--considering their slower rates of growth.

Again, I urge you to "delay the overlay" and vote to maintain 561 solely for the residents and businesses of Palm Beach. Thank you for your response and attention to this matter.

Sincerely, Alan J. Bauman, M.D. doctorb@baumanmedical.com

From: Mark A. Skinner [mskinner@crfg.com]

Sent: Monday, September 18, 2000 11:36 AM

To: tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us; bbaez@psc.state.fl.us

Subject: 561 Area Code

Please vote to keep Palm Beach Counties area code as 561.

Thank you, Mark Skinner

From: Jimmy @ Home [jgottlieb@adelphia.net]

Sent: Monday, September 18, 2000 9:32 AM

To: tdeason@psc.state.fl.us; ljaber@psc.state.fl.us

Cc: ejacobs@psc.state.fl.us; bbaez@psc.state.fl.us Subject: NO 10 Digit dialing for Palm Beach County

Dear Commissioner:

I am a small business owner in Palm Beach County

I am not in support of your plan to use 10 digit dialing in Palm Beach County at this time Although I know that it will be necessary at some point in the future

I am in full support of the proposal of Sen Ron Klein, and others who are pushing to allow PBC to keep the 561 area code and give the counties to our north a new area code

Give the growth rate of these counties verses the rapid rate of growth in PBC I feel that this makes sense.

James O. Gottlieb
Executive Vice President
Gottlieb & Company, Inc.
11320 Lake Tree Court
Boca Raton, FL 33434
561.883.5400 - phone
561-883.1480 - fax
561.702.3334 - direct
james@gottliebco.com

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE: September 27, 2000


TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the attached correspondence from Al Rivett, Executive Vice President of the St. Lucie County Chamber of Commerce dated August 21, 2000. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letter does not constitute an <u>ex parte</u> communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an <u>ex parte</u> communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

In Partnership with St. Lucie County · Port St. Lucie and Fort Pierce to create and promote economic development.



Fort Pierce

(561) 595-9999

Port St. Lucie

2200 Virginia Avenue Fort Pierce, FL 34985

FAX (561) 461-9084

1626 SE Port St. Lucie Blvd.

Port St. Lucie, FL 34952 (561) 595-9999 FAX (561) 335-4446 RECEIVED

August 21, 2000

AUG 2 5 2000

Mr. Levent Ileri, Engineer Division of Telecommunications Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0866 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
Commissioner Jacobs

Dear Mr. Ileri:

Earlier this year, St. Lucie County Chamber of Commerce President Jeannette Walsh addressed the Public Service Commission (PSC) at the meeting it held in Fort Pierce. At that time, Ms. Walsh informed the PSC that the Chamber preferred changing the geographic area of the existing 561 code and creating a new code for the area of Indian River, Martin and St. Lucie Counties. This continues to be the Chamber's position.

At that time, Ms. Walsh was also asked to recommend a new code for the area. Subsequently, you were most helpful in identifying available codes from which to choose. After careful consideration, the St. Lucie County Chamber recommends that the new area code be "820". The "8" and "2" would stand for "T" "C" respectively; TC for Treasure Coast, a regional name which we market and by which the area of Indian River, Martin and St. Lucie Counties is known.

It is our hope that the Commission will give these recommendations favorable consideration. Our 1200 Chamber members and 190,000 St. Lucie County residents will appreciate being able to continue to dial 7-digit local numbers and use an area code that holds special meaning to those that call the Treasure Coast home.

Thank you for your attention and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Al Rivett

Executive Vice President

ACCREDITED DAMES OF AUGUST AND AUGUST AND AUGUST AND AUGUST AND AUGUST A

cc: Members, Florida Public Service Commission

Members, Board of Directors

St. Lucie County Chamber of Commerce

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: September 27, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs W

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the attached correspondence from James F. Fielding, Mayor of the City of Port St. Lucie dated August 28, 2000. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.



CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE

A CITY FOR ALL AGES

RECEIVED

AUG 3 1 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMINSION

Commissioner (acobs

James F. Fielding, Mayor

August 28, 2000

Mr. E. Leon Jacobs, Commissioner Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shurmand Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0866

Re: 10 Digit Dialing

Dear Mr. Jacobs:

The citizens of Port St. Lucie and I were amazed with the news of August 24, 2000, that the staff of the Public Service Commission made their recommendation for an overlay in our area. A few months ago, a meeting was held in the County Commission Chambers. Those who attended, including members of government and the Chamber of Commerce left with the belief that we were going to have a new area code assigned. It was even suggested that we could submit numbers for this new area code.

I am sure that you realize that this is one of the fastest growing areas in Florida. Projections from Bell South indicated an overlay would last three to six years. We have had area codes 305, 407, and 561 all within the last 15 years. This area is looking forward to a time that when an area code would last 20-25 years such as other areas of Florida have experienced.

Port St. Lucie is the third largest in area in the State of Florida, with build-out at approximately 30%. Currently there are about 86,000 residents and projections indicate 250,000 to 300,000 at build-out. We still have in excess of 60,000 platted lots that are in private ownership to be built upon. We are also in the middle of a much-needed commercial development. At present, the city is about 92% residential and it is a known fact that you cannot operate a city of this size with this makeup. Your plan will mean that as our new residents move in at the rate of 1200 to 1500 new homes per year our telephone use will be further exacerbated with 10-digit dialing.

Page Two August 28, 2000 Mr. E. Leon Jacobs

There are concerns regarding our computerized reverse dialing system. We use this system in emergencies to inform citizens when there are police and fire emergencies, water main breaks, and for informational purposes for special area meetings. The Sheriffs Department, 911, and others in our area have similar systems. It is our belief that with our growth pattern and the growth pattern of Martin and Indian River Counties this overlay will make it extremely hard, if not impossible, to enter the data. Port St. Lucie was laid out 40 years ago by a developer attempting to become wealthy. Lots were sold all over the city and we now have homes scattered from border to border. Some areas may only have one or two houses on a street. I believe you can see the impact that will burden the city if the 10-digit dialing occurs.

I find it hard to believe that staff studied our conditions or listened to us at the meeting earlier in the year. I have spoken to the County Commissioners, Sheriff and other officials in the area and all are upset by this decision. It appears that there was little thought by this staff and certainly no consideration of our residents and businesses. Three area codes in 15 years should entitle us to more consideration for our own area code and 20 years without always replacing stationary, advertising, dialing systems, and updating of computer systems. We are all in agreement to do it one more time and have it last for an extended period of time.

I was surprised to see that a public hearing and meeting on September 5 has been scheduled. You may not be aware that this is Primary Election day in most areas of the state and many of our elected offices, who are up for election, would be unable to travel to Tallahassee on that date. Prior to making this decision, I believe the staff should study again this issue as to how it will affect the citizens and business community. I would like you to reconsider the date of September 5 for the public hearing. You might also note that Election Day is November 7.

One suggestion that I believe should be considered is to assign an area code for cell phones, pagers and any other mobile equipment by states or regions. Since these lines are mobile and could be used anywhere in the United States it would free up lines. Why not assign them area codes accordingly?

Sincerely,

James F. Fielding, Mayor

Jff/mm

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE: October 4, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: William B. Berg, Assistant to Commissioner Deason

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Party Received in Docket No

990517-TL

This office has received the attached correspondence from James E. McCollum, Chairman, Cornerstone Regional Economic Initiative. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Deason. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-31-JULY 19, 1991), the following letter does not constitute an <u>ex parte</u> communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Because it is not deemed to be an <u>ex parte</u> communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However, in such cases Commissioner Deason has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo be, as a matter of routine, placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

WBB:mm





September 21, 2000

Mr. J. Terry Deason, Chairman The Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850



Dear Mr. Deason:

You will shortly be making a final decision on area code changes affecting parts of Florida, most notably in this case the Northeast Florida area. We understand that the decision has been made or is about to be made to maintain the '904' area code for a number of counties surrounding Jacksonville. That is much appreciated.

At the same time, Putnam County seems to be in doubt as to its inclusion in the '904' area code. This letter is an appeal to include Putnam County as part of the Jacksonville area/'904' area code. Putnam County is an integral part of what we call the 'First Coast' of Florida as well as the Regional Groups Planning Council and other groups. The First Coast includes six counties in Northeast Florida who operate very closely together in economic, educational, cultural, and other ways. The commuting patterns for the workforce in Putnam County are clearly oriented toward the First Coast and Jacksonville area and are complimented by the highway system, use of the airport in Jacksonville, and even our overall economic development program, which is totally integrated with that of Putnam County.

We recognize the need to add more area codes and provide more numbers to an expanding area. At the same time, maintaining the integrity of each region is also a very high priority. Putnam County is and will remain an integral part of the Jacksonville/Northeast Florida/ First Coast region. The adoption of a different area code would indicate a separateness and an isolation that can only degrade the interaction and relationships that we have worked so long and hard to establish.

Thank you for your consideration. We appreciate the difficult task you have of providing the communication options and numbering systems that allow us to continue our growth and development.

Sincerely,

C:

James E. McCollum, Chairman

Cornerstone Regional Economic Initiative

William D. Talbott, Executive Director Blanca Bayo, Director

Ruth McHargue

RECEIVED-FPSC

From:

Carol Healy [cwh@bitstorm.net]

Sent:

Sunday, October 15, 2000 5:33 PM

To:

contact@psc.state.fl.us

Subject: Complaint - Telecommunications

00 OCT 19 PM 4: 18

RECORDS AND

As a member of the Lemon Bluff community of Osteen, I would like to state that we do not wish our telephone area code and prefix number changed. County government officials are trying to railroad this on us. Most people in this area conduct their daily business and have families in the Sanford (407) area. We are more closely akin with communities to the south (area code 407) than Daytona Beach. Please leave us out of this change. Carol Healy, 1185 Lemon Bluff Road, Osteen.

990517

| App | |
|-----|--|
| CAF | and the said |
| CMP | |
| COM | |
| CTR | - Althority and |
| ECR | single disease and |
| LEG | |
| OPC | |
| PAI | |
| RGO | And the second s |
| SEC | |
| SER | - The state of the |
| OTH | The state of the s |

Ruth McHargue

From:

Hewittil@aol.com

Sent: To: Sunday, October 15, 2000 9:50 AM

contact@psc.state.fl.us

Subject:

FUN area code

990517

RECEIVED-FPSC

00 OCT 19 PM 4: 18

RECORDS AND REPORTING

Hello - I am writing to you in response to an article in the Daytona Beach News-Journal. It is reported that a contingency of local politicians are planning to visit the Public Service Commission next week to urge you not to let the citizens of Osteen, Florida, vote on whether we want to have our area code changed with the rest of Volusia County. I would like to thank you for allowing us that opportunity and ask that you not let these individuals sway you into taking away our right to that vote. I do not appreciate the fact that our mayor and county commissoner are lobbying against us and this will come back to them at the end of their terms in office. Again, thank you for considering our wishes and please do not rescind the decision to allow our say in this matter.

Julia L. Hewitt 1378 Swiss Lane Deltona, Florida 32738 407-321-0863

| APP | |
|-----|--|
| CAF | |
| CMP | VHaesselin |
| COM | - Control of the Cont |
| CTR | |
| ECR | |
| LEG | |
| OPC | |
| PAI | And the control of th |
| RGO | Name of the last o |
| SEC | |
| SER | And the second |
| OTH | |
| | |

BERGER DAVIS & SINGERMAN

ATTORNEYS AT LAW SUITE 705 215 SOUTH MONROE STREET TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301

Telephone 850.561.3010 Facsimile 850.561.3013

MEMORANDUM VIA FACSIMILE

TO:

Ruth - PSC

FROM:

Elizabeth Moss

DATE:

October 25, 2000

RE:

Address Correction

Per our conversation this morning please research all records relating to the Numbering plan relief order of the Florida Public Service Commission and make the address correction changing the suite from 701 to 705. The one docket number I have is 990455-TL, however I am not sure this is the only case on which we are listed as an interested party to receive all pleading and motions. correct the suite number as appropriate:

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments at 561-3010. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

/eam

Changed in DK+-990455
990456
990457
990517

Hong Wang

From: Sent: Martha J [marthaj@fcta.com] Tuesday, October 31, 2000 3:48 PM

To: Subject: Hong Wang Change of address

FYI

We have moved, our new address is

246 E. 6th Avenue Tallahassee, FL 32303

Please change your records accordingly.

Thanks

Martha 681-1990 920260, 960100, 960786, 960846, 960846, 960847, 980253, 981444, 981834, 990321, 990455, 990517, 990546, 990649, 991376, 991378, 991473, 991930, 000028, 000075, 000121, 000399, 000604, 000636, 000649, 001332

Done 11/02/00



elle little ce

Florida Cable Telecommunications Association

Steve Wilkerson, President

FCTA CHANGE OF ADDRESS

TO:

Vendors

FROM:

Steve E. Wilkerson, President

DATE:

October 10, 2000

RE:

Move to New FCTA Headquarters

As of Monday, October 16, 2000, the Florida Cable Telecommunications Association headquarters is moving to a new location. While our phone and fax numbers, as well as e-mail and web site address, will remain the same (see below), our mailing address will change.

Please note this new information below on all correspondence:

Florida Cable Telecommunications Association 246 East 6th Avenue Tallahassee, Florida 32303 - 620 850/681-1990 (tel) 850/681-9676 (fax) fcta@fcta.com (e-mail) www.fcta.com (web site)

24 / 11-6-00 XIX/160.00

Please also be aware that this move will o over the course of a few days, beginning Friday, October 13, and ending (hopefully) by Wednesday, October 18, so it is possible that there will be interruptions in phone, fax and computer services. If you are unable to reach the office during this time, please try either 850/322-3034 or 850/212-9072 as alternatives.

Thanks for your patience while this transition is underway. Please call with any questions or concerns.

M/ 310 North Monroe Street Zuelaharren Fe 32301-7636

LILA A. JABER COMMISSIONER



CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 (850) 413-6044

Public Service Commission

November 8, 2000



The Honorable Tim Smith Mayor, City of Palatka 201 N. 2nd Street Palatka, Florida 32177

Re: 904 Area Code (Docket No. 990517-TL)

Dear Mayor Smith:

I have received your letter dated October 31, 2000, regarding the area code split in Putnam County. This matter has been assigned to a panel consisting of Chairman J. Terry Deason and Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs, who will be rendering the final determination.

I have given copies of your letter to the commissioners and placed a copy in the Commission's docket file. Thank you for your comments.

Sincerely

Commissioner

cc: Division of Records & Reporting (Docket No. 990517-TL)

Division of Competitive Services (Casey) Division of Legal Services (B. Keating) TIM SMITH MAYOR-COMMISSIONER

MARY LAWSON BROWN VICE MAYOR - COMMISSIONER

ISH EDWARDS COMMISSIONER

HERNAN AZULA COMMISSIONER

JAMES NORWOOD JR. COMMISSIONER

Y OF PALA

Regular meeting 2nd and 4th Thursdays each month at 7:30 p.m.

201 N. 2ND STREET PALATKA, FLORIDA 32177 (904) 329-0100 FAX: 329-0106

October 31, 2000

BETSY JORDAN DRIGGERS CITY CLERK RUBY M. WILLIAMS FINANCE DIRECTOR **BUDY HOWARD** CHIEF FIRE DEPT. BILL DOLINSKI CHIEF OF POLICE EDWARD E. HEDSTROM

CITY ATTORNEY

ALLEN R. BUSH

RECEIVED

3 2000

Florida Public Service Commission COMMISSIONER JABER

The Honorable Lila A. Jaber, Commissioner Florida Public Service Commission Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee FL 32399-0865

Dear Commissioner Jaber:

The Palatka City Commission wishes to express its deep concerns over our community's being split into three differing area codes by the new 386 area code assignment.

Governor Bush agrees with us that it is a shame that our community will now be divided by differing area codes, and asked us to write to you, his appointee, to express our concern with the new area code assignments. West Putnam has already been split away into the 352 area code; if these plans remain unchanged, Putnam County will have 3 different area codes. The Public Service Commission has voted to assign the 'center' of our county with the new 386 area code, while areas east of the St. Johns River with the 692 area code will remain with the 904 area code.

We urge you to leave the remainder of Putnam County (that part which is not already 352) in the 904 area code. This is not New York City, where people living next door to each other can expect to have different area codes. This is Putnam County, a rural area where life is somewhat less complicated and slower-paced than in our larger, more urban neighboring cities. With this change, someone who makes a call to a neighbor a block away may have to pay a long distance charge for that call.

Governor Bush assured us that you will give every consideration to our request. We pray that you will reconsider the area code boundaries. We understand the necessity of assigning more area codes, and hope this change can be made more palatable to the citizens of Palatka and Putnam County.

Sincerely yours,

Tim Smith

Mayor

bjd/s Cc:

Putnam County Chamber of Commerce

Putnam County BOCC

LILA A. JABER COMMISSIONER



CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 (850) 473-6044

Public Service Commission

November 8, 2000

Mr. Allen R. Bush City Manager, City of Palatka 201 N. 2nd Street Palatka, Florida 32177

Re: 904 Area Code (Docket No. 990517-TL)

Dear Mr. Bush:

I have received your letter dated October 31, 2000, regarding the area code split in Putnam County. This matter has been assigned to a commission panel consisting of Chairman J. Terry Deason and Commissioner E. Leon Jacobs, who will be rendering the final determination.

I hve given copies of your letter to the commissioners and placed it in the Commission's docket file. Thank you for your comments.

Sincerely

Lila A. Jaber Commissioner

200

Division of Records & Reporting (Docket No. 990517-TL)

Division of Competitive Services (Casey) Division of Legal Services (B. Keating) TIM SMITH MAYOR-COMMISSIONER

MARY LAWSON BROWN VICE MAYOR - COMMISSIONER

ISH EDWARDS COMMISSIONER

HERNAN AZULA COMMISSIONER

JAMES NORWOOD, JR. COMMISSIONER

CITY OF PALATKA

Regular meeting 2nd and 4th Thursdays each month at 7:30 p.m.

201 N. 2ND STREET
PALATKA, FLORIDA 32177
(904) 329-0100
FAX: 329-0106

ALLEN R. BUSH
CITY MANAGER
BETSY JORDAN DRIGGERS
CITY CLERK
RUBY M. WILLIAMS
FINANCE DIRECTOR
RUDY HOWARD
CHIEF FIRE DEPT.
BILL DOLINSKI
CHIEF OF POLICE
EDWARD E. HEDSTROM
CITY ATTORNEY

October 31, 2000

RECEIVED

NOV 3 2000

The Honorable Lila A.Jaber, Commissioner Florida Public Service Commission Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee FL 32399-0865

Florida Public Service Commission COMMISSIONER JABER

Dear Commissioner Jaber:

We met and spoke with Governor Jeb Bush here in Palatka on Monday, October 2, while he was making an appearance at our downtown waterfront amphitheater. While speaking with him, we expressed our deep concerns over our county's being assigned three different area codes with the new area code assignment. In Putnam County, all areas east of the St. Johns River with the 692 exchange are remaining with the 904 exchange, all areas in the 'center' of the county are being assigned the new 386 area code, while some areas of west Putnam County were assigned 352 some time ago.

Governor Bush agreed with us it is a shame that our county will now be divided by three differing area codes, and urged us to write to you, his appointee, to express our concern with the new area code assignments. As stated before, West Putnam has already been split away into the 352 area code; if these plans remain unchanged, Putnam County will have 3 different area codes. Neighbors may be forced to make a long-distance call to someone who lives a block away.

We urge you to leave the remainder of Putnam County (that part which is not already 352) in the 904 area. This is not New York City, where people living next door to each other can expect to have different area codes. This is Putnam County, a rural area where life is somewhat less complicated and slower-paced than in our larger, more urban neighboring cities. Palatka and Putnam County considers itself a part of the "Florida's First Coast Coalition" and wish to remain with Duval County, Nassau County, Clay County and St. Johns County as part of the 904 area code.

Governor Bush assured us that you will give every consideration to our request. We pray that you will reconsider the area code boundaries. We understand the necessity of assigning more area codes, and hope this change can be made more palatable to the citizens of Palatka and Putnam County.

Sincerely yours,

Allen R. Bush City Manager

Arb/bjd/s

Cc: Putnam County Chamber of Commerce

Putnam County BOCC

Hong Wang

From:

Tim Vaccaro

Sent:

Thursday, November 09, 2000 11:27 AM

To:

Hong Wang

Subject:

RE: Dockets 990455, 990456, 990457 and 990517

Sprint was granted intervention in 990457 and should therefore be listed as a party.

The other parties are okay just they way they are. The dockets are consolidated for the purposes of hearing, but not every party is neccessarily affected by each and every docket. Therefore, to the extent parties have requested to participate in the hearing, they will be participating in the consolidated proceeding.

----Original Message----

From: Hong Wang

Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2000 9:28 AM

To: Tim Vaccaro

Subject: Dockets 990455, 990456, 990457 and 990517

Tim, a Joint Motion for Reconsideration and Request for Hearing on Proposed Agency Action was filed by several companies in 990455, 990456, 990457 and 990517. I have the following questions regarding these dockets:

- 1. We have ALLTEL and its representative, Ausley Law Firm, listed only in Docket 990517. Should I enter them in the other three dockets? If so, should they be listed as "Parties" since they have requested a hearing?
- 2. We have BellSouth Mobility only in Docket 990455. Should I enter it in the other three dockets? If so, should it and its representative, Holland Law Firm, be listed as "Parties" since they have requested a hearing?
- 3. Sprint is in Docket 990457, but, it is not listed as a "Party," should I change it to a "Party" status, because the request for a hearing?
- 4. MCI is in Docket 990517, but, it is not listed as a "Party," should I change it to a "Party" status, because the request for a hearing?

Thanks!

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE: November 13, 2000

TO:

Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs 793

RE:

Intercepted Communications From an Interested Person Received in

Docket No. 990517-TL

This office has received the attached postcard from an interested person from Daytona Beach. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the postcard does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

SECTORAL TO STATE

TO BE THE WAS A SHOWN OF THE STATE OF THE ST



Bryce Phrecton, Et Island i Records and Reporting

secrepted (a minutalizations From an interested Femon Received in

ois affect has tudelyed the attached posterid from an interested a rean term tagent in an approximation of Connection of The correspondence into not been viewed or considered in any very result of the actions of the action from the Commission of Ethers are of July 1991 as COE 91-33-HILV 19, 1991, the postered does were actions as or july communication by virius of the fact that it was not shown to the Communication in the content of the

Dear Commissioner Jacobs,

Although this card is part of our community effort to secure a single area code for Volusia and Flagler Counties, and for it to be 386 – FUN, I have signed this card personally and do ask you to consider the positive impact your vote to grant our request will have.

Many thanks,

Tolusia Task Force For Having FUN The Chamber, City Island Daytona Beach, FL 32114

> Honorable E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. Public Service Commissioner 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-

DATE: November 13, 2000

TO:

Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs w

RE:

Intercepted Communications From an Interested Person Received in

Docket No. 990517-TL

This office has received the attached letter from Councilwoman Ann Mcfall-District 5 The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.



County of Volusia

Councilwoman Ann Mcfall-District 5

1401 Clipper Terrace Deltona, Fl. 32725 407/574-4437 FAX 407/574-9667

October 12, 2000

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely bailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 16 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Ann Mall



THE NEWS-JOURNAL

Friday, October 13, 2000

HEVOLUSIAN

Area and Florida News

Section C

Effort afoot to bring FUN to Osteen

By AUTUMN C. GIUSTI Staff Writer

DELTONA — Deltona and Volusia County officials want Osteen in on the FUN.

The officials plan to head to Tallahassee on Tuesday to attend a state Public Service Commission meeting and try to sway the commission's decision to ballot residents of Osteen and southeast Deltona on the newly adopted and otherwise countywide 386 area code.

The commission on Sept. 29 approved 386, which spells FUN on the dialing pad, as the new area code for Volusia and Flagler counties effective Feb. 15, 2001.

The 3,500 BellSouth customers in Osteen and southeast Deltona are excluded from the change for now. The commission decided to mail postcard ballots to those customers, who now use the 407 area code, because the change would mean they would have to get new telephone prefixes. Customers with eychanges 330, 321, 322, 323, 324 and

328 will receive ballots in either November or December.

The officials — including Deltona Mayor John Masiarczyk, County Councilwoman Ann McFall and County Communications Director Robert Weiss — met for a strategy session Thursday.

They expressed concern that a small community could keep the county from uniting under one area code.

"The tail's wagging the dog here," said Charles Matousek, of the Greater West Volusia Chamber of Commerce.

For residents in the Osteen area to get the new area code, at least 60 percent of subscribers balloted must respond. Of those responding, a majority must vote in favor of the change.

Osteen residents traditionally have opposed telephone number changes or have not participated in the ballots.

Residents last year rejected a request to change their basic numbers and be exempt from the 407/321 overlay that results in 10-digit dialing for local calls. An overlay means placing'a second area code within an existing area code region, with the new number assigned to new telecommunications services. Only 31 percent of those eligible to vote returned the ballots, and of those, more than half rejected the change.

The officials also questioned the validity of the Public Servic Commission's decision to bailot Osteen because, according to Weiss, only two of the five commissioners voted on the measure.

Masiarczyk pointed out that uniting the county under one area code is "a one-time shot," and the group agreed that now is the time for action.

"Next Tuesday, there's going to be an agenda whether we're there or not, and I think we need to hit that hard, hard, hard," said Weiss.

The group plans to deliver a letter to municipalities statewide asking for their assistance with the issue. The 386 area code will not change calling scopes or rate plans, telephone officials said. That would hold true for Osteen residents if they received the new area code.

Southeast Deltona resident Linda Patterson said that was her primary concern about the new code.

"We do more calls to Winter Park and Sanford than anywhere in Volusia County," she said.

But Patterson said she doesn't like the idea of changing her phone number of 28 years.

Osteen resident Ann Molohon said that because the 25-cent charge she pays for calls to west Deltona would not go away, she might vote down 386.

Both Patterson and Molohon said they plan to vote and that they also cast votes on last year's phone number change.

Officials have 21 days from Sept. 29 to appeal the Public Service Commission's decision, but no plais have yet been made to do so.

usiaextra

rea-code option is hung u

Officials grappled with new ways to include Osteen phone customers with the rest of the county at 386.

By SANDRA PEDICINI and DEREK CATRON OF THE SENTINGS STAFF

DELTONA - West Volusia leaders still holding out hope for unifying the whole county within the new 386 area code met Thursday to plot how they

might yet bring Osteen into the fold.

They decided on a quick, twopronged approach. First, they will research the legality of the Public Service Commission's decision to allow Osteen the choice of opting out. Then, they will appear in front of the PSC next week to ask for a more favorable system of polling Osleen customers about whether they want to be part of the new area code.

About 3,800 Osteen customers who would need new, seven-digit tele-

phone numbers in addition to the new area code will be sent mail in ballots to vote for their preference. The rest of the county including DeBary and most of Deltona -- is preparing for the change slated to begin in February. Osteen will make the switch only if 40 percent to 60 percent of the customers return their ballots and more than half of those approve the new numbers.

If that doesn't happen, a tiny portion of Volusia County will continue to

have an area code different from everyone else -- something that commumity leaders say will be a giant hassle.

Here's the problem:

The new area code came about because the proliferation of fax lines, cell phones and pagers are quickly exhausting the supply of phone numbers in the 904 area code. Local officials feared an overlay plan - in which two area codes would be used in the same

Osteen vote delays efforts to unify county

CODE FROM GI

calls - would prove confusing for residents and visitors. Officials lobbied for the 386 area code, which spells FUN on telephone keypads.

Osteen was left out of the switch pending the vote because some of the three-digit prefixes used in the area already are in use elsewhere within the proposed 386 boundary, which includes Volusia, Flagler, Putnam and all or parts of six other North Florida coun-

The group of west Volusia leaders agreed to research whether the two PSC board members who voted in September were enough to make a legally binding decision. There are five PSC members, although only a three-person panel has been studying this issue. The group also agreed to look into whether the vote was legal because a member who hadn't made the original motion changed the wording of the decision.

But Deltona City Manager Fritz Behring said the group might want to be careful with the legal challenge. If Volusia County challenges the decision but it turns out to be legal, he said, the PSC might be offended and might not be open to allowing a balloting system that would make it easier for Volu-

The PSC could require a cerarea with 10-digit dialing for all - tain percentage of customers to return their ballots before they'll even look at what votes were cast.

> That helped kill a similar ballot measure in Osteen last year. Customers could have switched phone numbers and gotten free. seven-digit dialing to more parts of west Volusia. The voter turnout requirement was only 50 percent then, yet less than 40 percent of customers re turned the ballots. More than half of those preferred keeping their old numbers

Community leaders fear a public-awareness campaign showing residents the benefits i of switching will do no good because too many people will chuck their ballots in the wastepaper basket.

On Thursday, the group said that the system should work like any other election: The majority of those who bother to cast their ballots decide.

"The majority who votes wins," Deltona Mayor John Masiarczyk said. 'That is so simple to grasp.

The group plans to organize a letter-writing campaign to the PSC before Tuesday's meeting in Tallahassee.

The rest of the county will have to change address books. business cards and stationery when the new area code takes effect in February and becomes sia to be united under one area mandatory next November.



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-Me

DATE: November 13, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs 474

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Person Received in

Numerous Dockets

This office has received the attached packet from Michael Knapp, Executive Director of Telcordia Technologies, Inc. The information contained in the packet may apply to Dockets Nos. 981444, 990455, 990456, 990457, and 990517. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the packet does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

filed in 981444



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: November 14, 2000

TO:

Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs

RE:

Intercepted Communications From an Interested Person Received in

Numerous Dockets

This office has received the attached letter from Gregory Roberts, Vice President, Numbering Services, NeuStar. The information contained in the letter may apply to Dockets Nos. 981444, 990455, 990456, 990457, and 990517. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an exparte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

MEMORANDUM

November 21, 2000

| า | $\Gamma \Omega \cdot$ |
|---|-----------------------|
| | |

MARTHA BROWN, DIVISION OF APPEALS

FROM:

DAVID E. SMITH, DIRECTOR OF APPEALS

RE:

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. v.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION (DOCKET NOS. 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL & 990517-TL); FLA.

SUP.CT. CASE NO.____; AND

CINGULAR WIRELESS LCC v. FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE

COMMISSION (DOCKET NOS. 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL &

990517-TL); FLA. SUP.CT. CASE NO._____.

The above appeal has been assigned to you. The Notice of Administrative Appeal was filed on November 20, 2000. The case schedule is as follows:

<u>Date</u>

<u>Item</u>

FPSC, CLK - CORRESPONDENCE
Administrative Parties Consulated
DOCUMENT NO 17209-01
DISTRIBUTION:

TECENED FASC OF

From day of

filing:

Draft of Index of Record from Records and Reporting

to Appeals attorney.

JAN. 09, 2001

DEC. 26, 2000

Index of Record served on parties.

JAN. 19, 2001

Copy of Record to Appeals.

JAN. 29, 2001

Appellant's Initial Brief Due.

FEB. 13, 2001

Draft Commission Answer Brief Due.

*FEB. 18, 2001

Commission's Answer Brief Due.

*MAR. 10, 2001

Appellant's Reply Brief Due.

cc: Kay Flynn, Mary Diskerud, Noreen Davis Wanda Terrell, Cathy Bedell

^{*} Denotes weekend.

Commissioners:
J. TERRY DEASON, CHAIRMAN
E. LEON JACOBS, JR.
LILA A. JABER
BRAULIO L. BAEZ



Division of Records & Reporting Blanca S. Bayó Director (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

November 21, 2000

FPSC, CLK - CORRESPONDENCE

J Administrative Parties Consumer

DOCUMENT NO. 17209-01

DISTRIBUTION

Thomas D. Hall, Clerk Supreme Court of Florida Supreme Court Building Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Re: Cingular Wireless LCC vs. the Florida Public Service Commission (Docket Nos. 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL)

Dear Mr. Hall:

Enclosed is a certified copy of a Notice of Appeal, filed in this office on November 20, 2000, on behalf of Cingular Wireless, LCC. Also enclosed, as an exhibit to the notice, is a copy of Order No. PSC-00-1937-PAA-TL, the order on appeal.

It is our understanding that the index is due to be served on the parties to this proceeding on or before January 9, 2001.

Sincerely,

Kay Flynn, Chief Bureau of Records

Kaytun

Enclosure

cc: David Smith, Esquire

D. Bruce May, Esquire Other Parties of Record

Commissioners:
J. TERRY DEASON, CHAIRMAN
E. LEON JACOBS, JR.
LILA A. JABER
BRAULIO L. BAEZ



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

November 21, 2000

Thomas D. Hall, Clerk Supreme Court of Florida Supreme Court Building Tallahassee, Florida 32301 FPSC, CLK - CORRESPONUENCE

Administrative_Funder_Consumer

BOCUMENT NO.17209-0/

DISTRIBUTION:

Re: BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. vs. the Florida Public Service Commission (Docket Nos. 990455-TL, 990456-TL, 990457-TL, and 990517-TL)

Dear Mr. Hall:

Enclosed is a certified copy of a Notice of Appeal, filed in this office on November 20, 2000, on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Also enclosed, as an exhibit to the notice, is a copy of Order No. PSC-00-1937-PAA-TL, the order on appeal.

It is our understanding that the index is due to be served on the parties to this proceeding on or before January 9, 2001.

Sincerely,

Kay Flynn, Chief Bureau of Records

Enclosure

cc:

David Smith, Esquire Nancy B. White, Esquire Other Parties of Record

Commissioners:
E. LEON JACOBS, JR., CHAIRMAN
J. TERRY DEASON
LILA A. JABER
BRAULIO L. BAEZ
MICHAEL A. PALECKI



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

April 10, 2001

Ms. Nancy H. Sims
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1556

Re: Return of Confidential Document to the Source, Docket No. 990517-TL

Dear Ms. Sims:

Commission staff have advised that Confidential Document No. 05738-00 filed on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., can be returned to the source. The document is enclosed.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

U Kay Flynn, Chief

Bureau of Records

Enclosure

cc: Levent Ileri, Division of Competitive Services Cheryl Bulecza-Banks, Division of Competitive Services Bob Casey, Division of Competitive Services Beth Keating, Division of Legal Services

SIGNED BY FOR Hathlen Grant

DATE 4/10/01



RECEIVED

OCT 0 9 2000

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Commissioner Jacobs

September 25, 2000

E. Leon Jacobs, Jr.
Commissioner
Florida PSC
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Gerald Gunter Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs.

I am writing to assure you personally of our continued desire and commitment to be the neutral third party administrator for all state number pooling initiatives. NeuStar is the only neutral third party providing thousand block pooling administration in the nation today. We are industry pioneers, administering the first thousand block pooling trials in Illinois' 847 and New York's 212 NPAs, and our pooling administration services have expanded to encompass pooling trials in 6 states and 15 NPAs. And, now, we are in the process of turning up additional trials in another 4 states and 10 NPAs.

Since 1997, NeuStar has been working with the states and service providers to create, refine, and manage effective processes for thousand block pooling administration. This work has centered on building strong ongoing relationships with state regulatory agencies, working directly with commissioners and staff members, as well as the service provider community. Our dedicated team of personnel has attended literally hundreds of state and national pooling meetings and forums, and we are recognized nationwide for our expertise. No other neutral third party administrator has provided this level of commitment to the states and the industry.

We have dedicated and knowledgeable thousand block pooling administration staff, proven systems, and reliable methods and procedures that have been shaped and refined through the daily administration of thousand blocks for the last two years. Our position as the nation's only thousand block pooling administrator is a testimony to our high quality of service.

We have the capacity in place to administer thousand block pooling trials to meet your scheduling needs, today! You can count on NeuStar to meet your requirements as we have done in every other state we are serving.

We stand ready to serve you. If you would like to learn more about NeuStar's pooling administration services, I would like you to contact Barry Bishop, Director of Number Pooling Administration, Tel. 312-706-6255 or barry.bishop@neustar.com.

Sincerely,

Gregory Roberts

Vice President, Numbering Services

my I flater

NeuStar, Inc. 1120 Vermont Avenue, N.W.

Suite 550

Washington, DC 20005

Phone 202 533 2600

Fax 202 533 2975

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: December 7, 2000

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Commissioner Jacobs 700

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Person Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the attached letter from, Byron Shinn, Chairman of the Board of the Manatee Chamber of Commerce. The correspondence has not been viewed or considered in any way by Commissioner Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letter does not constitute an ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Commissioner. Given that it is not an ex parte communication, it does not require dissemination to parties pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However; in such cases Commissioner Jacobs has requested that a copy of the correspondence and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.





Main Office:

P.O. Box 321 • 222 - 10th Street West • Bradenton, Florida 34206-0321 • Telephone (941) 748-3411 • Fax (941) 745-1877

East Satellite Office:

Bradenton, Florida 34203 • Telephone (941) 782-5700 6150 S.R. 70 East •

Fax (941) 782-7000

Internet: http://www.manateechamber.com • E-mail: Info@manateechamber.com

November 28, 2000

RECEIVED

DEC 6 1 2000

E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 FLORIDA PUBLIC SETVICE COMMISSION Correctedatar Loobs

Dear Commissioner Jacobs,

In light of the Florida Telecommunications Industry requesting relief for the 941 area code, the Manatee Chamber of Commerce would like to reaffirm our previous position. As stated in public testimony at proceedings before the Public Service Commission on April 8, 1999, and thereafter approved, the Manatee Chamber with over 1,900 members, supports retaining the 941 area code by leaving Manatee, Sarasota, and Charlotte counties together. This would be Alternative #4 in the petitioners' attachment that places Lee, Collier, and Monroe in a second area code.

For numerous reasons including sharing mutual transportation planning organizations, water supply authorities, business/industrial locations and educational institutions, we support the current 941 alignment. There was a strong mandate of community support on this PSC decision only a short one and a half years ago. The alternative suggesting a 10-digit system would be premature because retaining the 941 numbers was supposed to last another four and a half years.

Please do not hesitate to contact Neil Spirtas, Vice President Public Affairs, at (941) 748-4842, ext. 124, if you have any questions or comments regarding our concerns. We support Manatee County government's intervention in this matter.

Sincerely,

Byron Shinn

Chairman of the Board

Dr. Brian Murphy; Neil Spirtas; Alan Zirkelbach; Bob Beck; CC: Robert Bartz; Ernie Padgett; Joe McClash; Bill Talbott, Cathy Bedell



PENNINGTON, MOORE, WILKINSON, BELL & DUNBAR, P.A. 215 S. Monroe Street, 2nd Floor P.O. Box 10095 (32302-2095)

Tallahassee, FL 32301 (850) 222-3533 FAX (850) 222-2126

| | TELECOPIE | R TRANSMITTAL C | OVER SHEET | 五冊 | -17 | T |
|-----------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--|---------|-------|
| DATE: | 2/8/01 T. | ELECOPY NO.: 41 | 3-7118 | PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF TH | - |) VIV |
| | F | ILE NUMBER: 08 | 656 | NA NA | PM 2: 3 | |
| PLEAS | E DELIVER THE FOLLOWING D | OCUMENTS TO: | | | # | |
| | NAME: Ms. Blanca Bayo, Director | | | | | |
| | FROM: Kim Stanfill | | | | | |
| | TOTAL NUMBER OF PAG | ES 5 INCLUDING | COVER SHEET | | | |
| IF YOU | J DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES, PI | LEASE CALL (850) 22 | 22-3533 | | | |
| <u></u>) | AS WE DISCUSSED | HARD COPY WI | LL BE SENT: | | | |
| | AS REQUESTED | | VIA REGULAR MAIL | | | |
| | FOR YOUR INFORMATION | | OVERNIGHT MAIL | | | |
| , inc. | FOR YOUR COMMENTS | X_ | VIA FACSIMILE ONLY | | | |
| | FOR YOUR APPROVAL | | | | | |
| | | Fax Operator | Kim Stanfill | | | |

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

The information contained in this transmission is subject to an attorney-client privilege, or is otherwise confidential, and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. Dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by telephone, and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

PENNINGTON, MOORE, WILKINSON, BELL & DUNBAR, P.A. ATTORNEYS AT LAW

JOAN H ANDERSON
DOUGLAS S BELL
SAMUEL P BELL III
GARVIN B. BOWDEN
FREDERICK L BUSACK
KAREN M CAMECHIS
KEVIN X CROWLEY
MARK K. DELEGAL
MARC W DUNBAR
PETER M DUNBAR
MARTHA J. EDENFIELD
CYNTHIA SIMMONS FLETCHER
ROGELIO J FONTELA
JAN J. GORRIE
MARK T HANEY

WILLIAM H. HUGHES III
KORY J. ICKLER
CHRISTOPHER J. KARO
KIMBERLY L. KING
A KENNETH LEVINE
EDGAR M. MOORE
E. MURRAY MOORE, JR
BRIAN A. NEWMAN
JULIUS F. PARKER, III
JOHN C. PELHAM
CARLR, PENNINGTON, JR. P. A.
C. EDWIN RUDE, JR.
GARY A. SHIPMAN
STEPHEN L. SPECTOR

CYNTHIA S TUNNICLIFF WILLIAM E WHITNEY BEN M WILKINSON CATMI C WILKINSON

OF COUNSEL
ROBERT CINTRON, JR.
R STUART HUFF P.A.
Cover Gentes For as
CHRISTOPHER W. KANAGA*
[Admind in Massachashins & Colorado Only)

SPECIAL CONSULTANTS PETE MITCHELL* R.Z SAFLEY*

"not a m-mb-, of the For A) 8x

TALLAHASSEE OFFICE. 216 SOUTH MONROE STREET 2ND FLOOR TALLAHASSEE. FLORIDA 32301 (850) 222-3533 FAX (850) 222-2126

TAMPA OFFICE: 7850 COURTNEY CAMPBELL CAUSEWAY, SUITE 220 TAMPA, FLORIDA 33607 (813)639-9599 FAX (813) 639-1488

EMAIL: email@penningtonlawfirm.com

REPLY TO: P.O. BOX 10095 TALLAHASSEE, FL 32302-2095

February 8, 2001

Ms. Blanca Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket 990517

Dear Ms. Bayo:

via Facsimile 413-7118

Several years ago, Time Warner Telecom of Florida, L.P. replaced Time Warner Communications. Time Warner Communications no longer exists. However, the Commission's records reflect the following identifying information for our client, Time Warner Telecom of Florida, L.P., in the above-referenced docket:

Time Warner Communications Carolyn Marek, VP, Regulatory Affairs Southeast Region 233 Bramerton Court Franklin, TN 37069 Phone: (615) 376-6404

Fax: (615) 376-6405

Done 2108/01

Ms. Blanca Bayo February 8, 2001 Page Two

Please update the file to reflect the correct information as follows:

Time Warner Telecom of Florida, L.P. Carolyn Marek, VP, Regulatory Affairs Southeast Region 233 Bramerton Court Franklin, TN 37069

Phone: (615) 376-6404 Fax: (615) 376-6405

Respectfully yours.

PENNINGTON, MOORE, WILKINSON,

BELL & DUNBAR P.A.

Well Owell

Karen M. Camechis

KMC/ks





Public Service Commission 3:00

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-EPORTING

DATE: March 2, 2001

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Chairman Jacobs

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Persons Received in

Docket No. 990517

This office has received the attached letters which reference issues addressed in Docket No. 990517. The letters have not been viewed or considered in any way by Chairman Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letters do not constitute ex parte communications by virtue of the fact that they were not shown to the Chairman. Given that they are not ex parte communications, dissemination to parties is not required pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However, in such cases Chairman Jacobs has requested that a copy of the letters and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.

DECENTED FPSC DI MAR-5 PM 3: 00 PERCORDS AND PERCORDS AND October 16, 2000

Office of the Mayor

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 17 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely,

Baron H. Asher

Mayor



THE CITY OF EDGEWATER

POST OFFICE BOX 100-EDGEWATER, FLORIDA 32132-0100

October 16, 2000

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 17 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely,



City of New Smyrna Beach

October 16, 2000

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its sixteen municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than one percent (3,800) of our population, none of whom, so far as we can ascertain, have complained or filed an objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the called-for survey dealing with a small number of our residents who are in the Sanford Exception Area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel on September 29, 2000. Concern within our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of postcards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception Area; total absence, as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber; and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our county, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting are to take place, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule and unrealistic in the face of responses

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Page 2 October 16, 2000

secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

If your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, we request that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 17th meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will hear and heed them.

Sincerely,

James L. Vandergrifft

Mayor

JLV:jb



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

CITY OF HOLLY HILL

TEN SIXTY - FIVE RIDGEWOOD AVENUE HOLLY HILL, FLORIDA 32117-2898 904/947-4141 FAX# 904/947-4148 SUN COM 380-4141

October 16, 2000

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 17 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely.

William D. Arthur

Mayor



Mayor

John Masiarczyk

Commissioners:

Lucille Wheatley

District 1

Ken Runge District 2

Carl Carey

District 3

District 4

District 5

Doug Horn

City Manager

Fritz Behring

District 6

Jose A. Perez

William S. Harvey

City of Deltona

October 16, 2000

Hon, E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 16 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely,

John Masiarczyk

Mayor

800 Deltona Blvd., Deltona, FL 32725 • P.O. Box 5550, Deltona, FL 32728-5550 Deltona City Hall (407) 860-7160 • Fax (407) 860-7167 • SUNCOM 392-7160 City Webpage: www.ci.deltona.fl.us

City of South Daytona

Office of the Mayor
Post Office Box 214960 • South Daytona, FL 32121 • 904/322-3010 • FAX 904/322-3008



October 16, 2000

Honorable E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Exception Area Protest

Dear Chairman Jacobs:

Please be advised that the City of South Daytona is joining in the concerns of our fellow municipal and county officials regarding the Commission's action to create an exception area in Volusia County that represents only 1% of our total population. Our initial petition to the Commission for a new countywide area code did not provide for any pocket of population to be excluded. I also concur with my elected colleagues that your appeals process should be reviewed.

Over 8,000 residents and subscribers responded with postcards asking for the 386 area code for the entire county. All of the cities in Volusia County adopted resolutions that showed solidarity in a single area code. Moreover, we are not aware of any subscriber from the exception area that objected to being included in the new area code coverage.

The necessity of a new survey or balloting for the exception area is therefore, questionable in itself. But the 60/50 criteria for establishing the principle of majority rule is an exception in procedures. If the Commission determines a survey/ballot is necessary, we request a simple majority rule be adopted.

We wholeheartedly support the representatives of Volusia County that plan to be in attendance at your October 17th meeting. Please afford them the audience and courtesy our residents deserve.

Sincerely,

"Coach" Joe M. Piggot

Mayor

C:

City Council

Joseph W. Yarbrough, City Manager



MAYOR Carmen Rosamonda

VICE MAYOR Greg France

COUNCIL MEMBERS Danny Allen George Coleman Bill Long

CITY MANAGER

CITY CLERK

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT Barbara Poulton October 16, 2000

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

City of DeBary Protesting Action of Florida Public Service Commission October 16, 2000 Page Two

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 17 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely,

Carmen Rosamonda

Mayor



CITY OF PORT ORANGE

1000 CITY CENTER CIRCLE PORT ORANGE, FLORIDA 32119 TELEPHONE 904-756-5200 FAX 904-756-5290

October 16, 2000

The Honorable E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Chairman Jacobs:

As Mayor of the City of Port Orange, I am joining leaders of the other 15 cities and Volusia County in protesting potential action by the Public Service Commission. Specifically, I am concerned about the survey that is being sent to the small number of our residents that are part of the Sanford Exceptions area. Elected officials from all over Volusia County have voiced their opposition to multiple area codes within Volusia County. We have all worked to resolve the divisive communications pattern that would be experienced if an area code other than 386 is allowed.

When the Commission was considering the type of area code to be assigned to Volusia County, over 8,000 post cards were mailed to the Commission expressing support for a unified area code for Volusia County. Further, elected officials, governmental, business representatives, and citizens appeared at several public hearings conducted by the Commission to voice support of a County-wide unified area code. Many of the individuals who submitted post cards in support of the unified area code reside in the area to be surveyed.

In reviewing the methodology proposed by the Commission staff, it appears that it is designed to achieve an objective of keeping the 3,800 Volusia residents in the Sanford area code. It seems that the fairest method is to allow a simple majority in the area to determine which area code they would rather be in rather than the method recommended by your staff.

Representatives of our communities will be present on October 17 to express our concerns and desires. We look forward to discussing this vital issue with the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

Brothy L. Ankill
Dorothy L. Hukill

Mayor

DLH:rlg



| BUILDING DEPARTMENT | (904) 775-5423 | FAX NUMBER | (904) | 775-5416 |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|---|----------|
| PARKS & RECREATION | (904) 775-5455 | PLANNING & ZONING | | 775-5415 |
| FIRE DEPARTMENT | (904) 775-5460 | UTILITIES | | 775-5444 |
| CITY CLERK | (904) 775-5403 | PUBLIC WORKS | | 775-5450 |
| BUDGET & FINANCE | (904) 775-5432 | POLICE DEPARTMENT | | 775-9999 |
| CITY MANAGER | (904) 775-5408 | personnel | 30.000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 775-5457 |

CITY OF ORANGE CITY · 205 EAST GRAVES AVENUE · ORANGE CITY, FLORIDA 32763 · (904) 775-3333

October 16, 2000

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain he complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29, Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaign; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is

the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives our communities will be present at your October 17 meeting in further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely,

Albert T. Erwin

Mayor



County of Volusia

Councilwoman Ann Mcfall-District 5
1401 Clipper Terrace
Deltona, Fl. 32725
407/574-4437
FAX 407/574-9667

October 12, 2000

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 16 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely, Am Madall





County of Volusia

COUNTY COUNCIL VICE CHAIR DWIGHT D. LEWIS, DISTRICT 1

860 Carter Road, DeLand, Florida 32724
Telephone: (904) 740-3200 • Fax (904) 740-3201
E-mail: ddlewis@co.volusia.fl.us

October 16, 2000

Honorable E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 16 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Lewis, Vice Chair

Volusia County Council Member District 1





County of Volusia

COUNTY COUNCIL MEMBER PATRICIA NORTHEY, AT LARGE

THOMAS C. KELLY ADMINISTRATION CENTER
123 West Indiana Avenue • DeLand, Florida 32720-4612
Telephone: (904) 789-7200 • (904) 248-8160 • (904) 423-3881
E-mail: pnorthey@co.volusia.fl.us • Fax: (904) 789-7201

October 16, 2000

Honorable E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 16 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely,

Patricia Northey

Volusia County Council Member At-Large





William E. Hall Superintendent of Schools

P.O. Box 2410 Daytona Beach, Florida 32115-2410

DeLand (904) 734-7190 Daytona Beach (904) 255-6475

729 Loomis Avenue Daytona Beach, Florida 32114

New Smyrna Beach (904) 427-5223 Osteen (407) 860-3322

School Board of Volusia County

Dr. Jeff Timko, Chairman Ms. Judy Conte, Vice Chairman Mr. Earl C. McCrary Mrs. Judy L. Andersen Mrs. Vicki Bumpus

October 16, 2000

Hon. E. Leon Jacobs Commissioner, Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oaks Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Commissioner Jacobs:

I am writing this letter to join with officials of our county and leaders of its 16 municipalities to protest the action of the Commission that appears to us to place concern for less than 1% (3,800) of our population, none of whom so far as we can ascertain have complained or filed objection, over the interests of our 430,000 residents.

Our specific concern is for the survey called for dealing with a small number of our residents in the Sanford Exception area included in the new 386 area code adopted by your panel September 29. Concern in our county is sufficient that we have contemplated initiation of your appeals process to pursue concerns over the ruling and procedure by which it was adopted.

Given the substantial record of public participation; evidence of extensive publicity and public awareness campaigns; the submission to the Commission of post cards requesting the 386 change by more than 8,000 residents and subscribers, including many from the Exception area, and total absence as far as we can determine or the public record reflects, of objection or concern from any affected subscriber, and the beneficial impact of your overall decision which has been widely hailed as an important unifying force for our County, we submit that the requirement is overkill.

If the survey and balloting is to be held, we submit that the procedure proposed in your staff recommendation is a blueprint for thwarting the will of affected subscribers. The 60/50 criteria is at odds with the established principle of majority rule, and unrealistic in the face of responses secured in other such surveys/ballots by your own and other agencies.

We request, if your panel determines that the survey/ballot procedure is to be implemented, that a simple majority for or against implementation of the Commission ruling apply, as is the case in most referenda in our state.

Representatives of our communities will be present at your October 16 meeting to further express the views of our region, and we hope you will both hear and heed them.

Sincerely,

William E. Hall Superintendent

Volusia County Schools

William Stall

WEH/MDS/ld

Sprint PCS

6160 Sprint Parkway, 4th Floor Overland Park, KS 66251 KSOPHIO414 Voice 913 762 7719 Fax 913 762 0913

March 7, 2001

Dear State Public Service Commission:

000761,001503

981444, 990455, 9904560

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS

990457,990517,000604平型

Please note that the Regulatory Affairs Department of Sprint Spectrum L.P. d/b/a ("Sprint PCS") a Commercial Mobile Radio Service provider in your State, will change effective Monday, February 26, 2001. The new address will be:

Sprint PCS
Legal/Regulatory Department
6160 Sprint Parkway, 4th Floor,
KSOPHIO414,
Overland Park, Kansas 66251.

New contact numbers will be:

Joseph Assenzo- 913-762-7728 Charles McKee- 913-762-7720 Jeffrey Pfaff- 913-762-7737 Scott Freiermuth- 913-762-7736 Regulatory Affairs Fax 913-762-0913

Please direct all pleadings and correspondence to the above listed address. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact one of the above listed attorneys. Thank you.

Sone 3/14/01

I'M MOVING!

LCEIVED FPSC

1 FEB 26 AM 10: 43

STATE OF Florida

PUBLIC SERVICE COGNOTISTANO

ATTN: J. TERRY DEASON

BUSINESS NAME

2540 Shumaro DAK Boulevard

ADDRESS (Complete Street Address or P O Box or Rural Route and RR Box)

TAUAHSSEE

FLORIDA

32,399-0850

City or Post Office

State

7in

32399+7019 Idhaldaldaldalallhaallhaallhaaldal

| Please CHANGE the mailing address for the person receiving your publication *****OLD ADDRESS***** | | AME OF PUBLICATION) | | |
|--|--|---------------------|---------------|--|
| | | | 4 20 20 104 1 | |
| SPRIN | | | | |
| REGULATORY AFF. | | T. | | |
| MOKC | | | | |
| 4900 MAIN, | 11 ¹¹ FLOOR | | 40 440 | |
| KANSAS CITY, I | MISSOURI 64112 | | | |
| Lity of Post Uffice | State | | Zin | |
| W. | ****NE | WADI | DRESS**** | |
| to. | S | PRINT | PCS | |
| New Mailstop Only pertinent business | REGULATORY AFFAIRS/LEGAL DEPT | | | |
| | K | SOPHI | O414 | |
| NEW ADDRESS (Complete Street Addr | 6160 SPRINT PARKWAY, 4 TH FLOOR | | | |
| | | | KANSAS 66251 | |
| City or Post Office | 1.76.368 | | | |
| | | | | |

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: March 12, 2001

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Chairman Jacobs

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Person Received in

Docket No. 990517-TL

This office has received the attached postcards. The postcards have not been viewed or considered in any way by Chairman Jacobs. Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the postcards do not constitute ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that they were not shown to the Chairman. Given that they are not ex parte communication, dissemination to parties is not required pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However, in such cases Chairman Jacobs has requested that a copy of the letter and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in the docket.

Dear Commissioner Jacobs

Although this card is part of our community effort to secure a single area code for Volusia and Flagler Counties, and for it to be 386 - FUN. I have signed this card personally and do ask you to consider the positive impact your vote to grant our request will have.

Honorable E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. Public Service Commissioner 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.

Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Frank D. Cu Many thanks,

Frank Hedley Cuzner 524 S. Beach St. Apt. 0 Daytona Beach, FL' 32 114

الاستانانانانانانانانانانانيس

Dear Commissioner Jacobs,

Although this card is part of our community effort to secure a single area code for Volusia and Flagler Counties, and for it to be 386 - FUN, I have signed this card personally and do ask you to consider the positive impact your vote to grant our request will have.

Volusia Task Force For Having FUN The Chamber, City Island Daytona Beach, FL 32114

Volusia Task Force

For Having FUN The Chamber, City Island Daytona Beach, FL 32+14



Honorable E. Leon Jacobs, Jr. Public Service Commissioner 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Many thanks, Mariseen Bunaeur

32399+0850 հվետեհվենների կոնսեների 0380+66888

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M

DATE: March 12, 2001

TO: Blanca Bayo, Director, Division of Records and Reporting

FROM: Melinda Butler, Assistant to Chairman Jacobs

RE: Intercepted Communications From an Interested Person Received in

Docket No. 990517-TL

This office has received the attached letter from Dorothy L. Hukill, Mayor of the City of Port Orange. The letter has not been viewed or considered in any way by Chairman Jacobs. (I alerted Staff to the matter and asked Staff to contact Mayor Hukill.) Under the terms of the advisory opinion from the Commission on Ethics (issued July 24, 1991 as COE 91-33-JULY 19, 1991), the letter does not constitute ex parte communication by virtue of the fact that it was not shown to the Chairman. Given that it is not ex parte communication, dissemination to parties is not required pursuant to the provisions of Section 350.042, Florida Statutes. However, in such cases Chairman Jacobs has requested that a copy of the letter and this memo, as a matter of routine, be placed in the correspondence side of the file in this docket.



CITY OF PORT ORANGE

1000 CITY CENTER CIRCLE PORT ORANGE, FLORIDA 32119 TELEPHONE 904-756-5200 FAX 904-756-5290

March 5, 2001

RECEIVED

MAR 0 9 2001

Mr. Leon Jacobs
Chairman
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
Chairman Jacqua

Dear Chairman Jacobs:

I am writing on behalf of the Port Orange City Council to express our collective concern about the implementation of the new 386 (FUN) area code here in Volusia County, Florida.

It was publicly announced several weeks ago that the new 386 area code was now available for long distance dialing in the Volusia County area. It was also announced that the old 904 area code would remain available for use until November 1, 2001. Recently, it has come to the attention of the Port Orange City Council that the new 386 area code is not working properly. On several occasions, citizens have reported that long distance callers in various parts of the United States attempting to use the new 386 area code could not successfully place a call to our City. This is most disturbing. Such technical problems only encourage the continued use of the 904 area code. In addition, such technical problems calls into question whether the phone system is programmed to operate properly and lowers public confidence that the new change will actually be implemented. If the public does not have confidence that the new area code will work properly, they will delay making changes in business stationary and sending out important notifications to customers outside our area. As you can well imagine, such problems will ultimately have a negative impact on both citizens and businesses in our community.

The Port Orange City Council would appreciate you looking into this matter and making sure that this problem is resolved as soon as possible. Each day that such technical problems exist is one less day our citizens and business community have to make proper preparations for the new area code to be implemented.

In closing, please feel free to contact me or our City Manager, Kenneth Parker, at 386-756-5494 should you have any additional questions. In advance, thank you for your time and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Dorothy L. Hukill

Mayor

Copy: The Honorable Jeb Bush, Governor, State of Florida Members of the Volusia County Council Members of the Volusia Council of Governments Cynthia Coto, County Administrator Kenneth W. Parker, City Manager Port Orange/South Daytona Chamber of Commerce The Chamber, Daytona Beach, Halifax Area Southeast Volusia Chamber of Commerce Daytona Beach Shores Chamber of Commerce

RAR Official Filing:

3/23/01***** 12:31 PM*******Linda Williams********1

Linda Williams

From:

Andrea Cowart

Sent:

Friday, March 23, 2001 12:06 PM RAR - Orders-Notices

To:

Cc:

Della Fordham

Subject:

Orders

The following orders have been copied to GCORDERS and is ready to be issued.

990517 - 990517fo.bk TV

990455 - 990455or.tv

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: E. LEON JACOBS, JR., CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON LILA A. JABER BRAULIO L. BAEZ MICHAEL A. PALECKI



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

April 10, 2001

Ms. Nancy H. Sims BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 150 South Monroe Street, Suite 400 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1556

Re: Return of Confidential Document to the Source, Docket No. 990517-TL

Dear Ms. Sims:

Commission staff have advised that Confidential Document No. 05738-00 filed on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., can be returned to the source. The document is enclosed.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

19

Kay Flynn, Chief Bureau of Records

Enclosure

cc: Levent Ileri, Division of Competitive Services Cheryl Bulecza-Banks, Division of Competitive Services Bob Casey, Division of Competitive Services Beth Keating, Division of Legal Services

SIGNED BY FOR Hathleen Grant

DATE 4/10/01

Honorable E. Leon Jacobs Chairman Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

May 2, 2001

Dear Chairman Jacobs:

Hampton, Florida is located about 8 miles from downtown Starke, Florida, its county seat. I believe that it is outrageous that the people of Hampton must pay Alltel 25 cents for each telephone call made to Starke.

I prepared the Resolution attached herewith and it was adopted by the Town Council on April 10.

Please help us! The 25 cent calls often are necessary because our children attend daycare, middle school, and high school in Starke, our medical providers are in Starke, and we shop in Starke. In other words, it is the center for the necessities of life for us.

THANK YOU!

Respectfully yours,

Diane Rhea, member Town Council

City of Hampton P.O. Drawer A

Hampton, Florida 32044

(352) 468-1045

(see on 05642-01)

01 WAY -3 AN 8 57

A Resolution to the Florida Public Service Commission from City of Hampton, Florida Resolution No.: 01 - 01 07

- WHEREAS, the Town Council is the governing body of the City of Hampton, Florida and
- WHEREAS, the Town Council believes that a majority of the telephone subscribers in Hampton desire an Extended Area Telephone Service so that unlimited calls from Hampton to its Bradford County seat, Starke, a distance of about 8 miles, will not be charged on a per-call basis, and
- WHEREAS, the Town Council believes that a majority of the telephone subscribers in Hampton would be willing to pay an increment to exchange rates, rather than the current 25 cents per message charges, and
- WHEREAS, the telephone subscribers in Hampton represent a pocket community within the larger Waldo 468 exchange, which has approximately 2200 subscribers and the Town Council is mainly concerned only about those telephone subscribers who are subject to the Hampton City Tax, and thus are located in the City of Hampton, Bradford County, and
- WHEREAS, the telephone area code for Hampton (Bradford County) and Waldo (Alachua County) is 352 and the area code for Starke (Bradford County) is 904, and Hampton is served by Alltel and Starke is served by Sprint, and the originating exchange (prefix) for Hampton is 468 and the exchanges (prefixes) to which the Extended Area Telephone Service is sought are 368, 964 and 966,
- THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Town Council of the City of Hampton, Florida, that the Town Council requests that the Florida Public Service Commission direct that the company (or companies) involved will initiate appropriate calling usage studies, pursuant to Rule 25-4.060, FAC, and that the Florida Public Service Commission take subsequent action which it deems appropriate.

This Resolution was made by the Town Council of the City of Hampton, Florida on April 10, 2001.

Attested to by:

JAMES MITZEL

AS MAYOR

CITY OF HAMPTON

JANE HALL (352) 468- 1201

AS CITY CLERK

PO BOX 250

Hampton, Fl. 32044



June 12, 2001

Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 960100,981444 990455 990457 990517 PECAPORTING

Dear Commissioner:

Please update your corresponding information for Cingular Wireless LLC, formerly d/b/a BellSouth Mobility Inc. Our Corporate Headquarters office has moved to the following address:

Cingular Wireless, LLC 5565 Glenridge Connector Suite 1710 Atlanta, GA 30342 — 47 (

Headquarters Contact: Susan Israel Contact Number: 404-236-5561

Cingular licensees in the state of Florida are: BellSouth Mobility LLC; Florida Cellular Service, LLC; Florida RSA No. 2B (Indiana River) Limited Partnership; Jacksonville MSA Limited Partnership; Orlando CGSA, LLC; Orlando SMSA Limited Partnership; and Florida Cellular Service, LLC.

Sincerely,

Susan Israel

Associate Director -

External Affairs

Done 6/19/01