

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Request for review of
proposed numbering plan relief
for the 941 area
code.

DOCKET NO. 990223-TL

In re: Investigation into
boundary issues in South
Sarasota and North Charlotte
Counties (Englewood area).

DOCKET NO. 990184-TL

In re: Investigation into
telephone exchange boundary
issues in South Polk County
(Fort Meade area).

DOCKET NO. 981941-TL
ORDER NO. PSC-99-1757-FOF-TL
ISSUED: September 8, 1999

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of
this matter:

JOE GARCIA, Chairman
J. TERRY DEASON
SUSAN F. CLARK
JULIA L. JOHNSON
E. LEON JACOBS, JR.

ORDER OF CLARIFICATION

BY THE COMMISSION:

Pursuant to the Number Plan Area (NPA) Code Relief Planning
and Notification Guidelines (INC 97-0404-016), Mr. Stan Washer,
Senior NPA Relief Planner for the Eastern Region of the North
American Numbering Plan (NANP), notified the code holders and other
industry members on June 16, 1998, that the 941 area code was
approaching exhaustion. The NANP administrator hosted an industry
meeting in Tampa, Florida, on July 8, 1998 to discuss alternative
relief plans. The industry reached a consensus to recommend a
geographic split, as the method of relief for the 941 area code. On

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

10743 SEP-89

FPCO-RECORDS/REPORTING

ORDER NO. PSC-99-1757-FOF-TL
DOCKETS NOS. 990223-TL, 990184-TL, 981941-TL
PAGE 2

August 14, 1998, Mr. Washer notified the Commission of the industry's consensus.

In response to many objections to the proposed relief plan, dockets were established to investigate certain boundary issues: Docket No. 981941-TL for the Ft. Meade/Polk County region and Docket No. 990184-TL for the Englewood/Sarasota County region. On February 26, 1999, a formal complaint pertaining to the 941 relief plan was filed by Wireless One (d/b/a/ Cellular One), which necessitated the initiation of a third docket, Docket No. 990223-TP, Request for Review of Proposed Numbering Plan Relief for the 941 Area Code. The dockets were consolidated, and customer hearings and a technical hearing were held. On May 25, 1999, the Commission issued Order No. PSC-99-1066-FOF-TL (941 Final Order), approving a single geographic split.

On June 8, 1999, Lockheed Martin IMS (Lockheed or NANPA) filed a Petition for Clarification of the 941 Final Order. Lockheed seeks clarification of a statement found on page 17 of Order No. PSC-99-1066-FOF-TL, which reads as follows:

Based on testimony provided by the NANPA witness, the projected exhaust dates for the 941 and the new area code under Alternative #16 (a single geographic split), are 3.5 and 8.9, respectively.

Lockheed believes that this sentence indicates that the NANPA (Lockheed) witness, Pamela Kenworthy, calculated and testified as to the projected lives of the 941 and new area codes for Alternative #16, the 941 relief plan that the Commission approved. Lockheed maintains that its witness could not have provided testimony regarding Alternative #16 since it did not exist at the time Lockheed filed its testimony in this proceeding. As a result, Lockheed respectfully requests that the Commission clarify the 941 Final Order to delete attribution of the projected lives of Alternative #16 to Lockheed's witness.

We believe that Lockheed raises a valid point in its petition. The record demonstrates some ambiguity in the 941 Final Order regarding the attribution to the Lockheed (NANPA) witness of the calculation of the projected lives for the 941 area code relief plan, Alternative #16. Accordingly, we hereby grant Lockheed's Petition for Clarification. We find it appropriate to clarify the relevant portion of page 17 of Order No. PSC-99-1066-FOF-TL to read as follows:

ORDER NO. PSC-99-1757-FOF-TL
DOCKETS NOS. 990223-TL, 990184-TL, 981941-TL
PAGE 3

Based on our calculations of the exhaust lives utilizing Central Office Code Utilization Survey (COCUS) data provided by the NANPA witness, the projected exhaust dates for the 941 and the new area code under Alternative #16 (a single geographic split), are 3.5 and 8.9 years, respectively.

Further we find it appropriate to close this docket upon the clarification as stated above.


Based on the foregoing it is hereby

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that the petition by Lockheed Martin IMS for clarification of Order No. PSC-99-1066-FOF-TL is hereby granted. It is further

ORDERED that the clarified portion of page 17 of Order No. PSC-99-1066-FOF-TL read as indicated in the body of this order. It is further

ORDERED that these dockets shall be closed.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 8th day of September, 1999.



BLANCA S. BAYÓ, Director
Division of Records and Reporting

(S E A L)

CBW

ORDER NO. PSC-99-1757-FOF-TL
DOCKETS NOS. 990223-TL, 990184-TL, 981941-TL
PAGE 4

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request: 1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water and/or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of Records and reporting and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.