SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED
760 NPA Exhaust Relief Plan

Alternative #	Alternative Name	NPA Alternative Status / Dates:
6B	San Diego & Borrego Receive New NPA	
Rate Center(s) Retaining Existing NPA (65): Baker; Barstow; Benton Station; Big Pine; Bishop; Blythe; Boron; Brawley; Bridgeport; Calexico; California City; California Village; Calipatria; Cima; Crowley Lake; Death Valley; Desert Center; Desert Hot Springs; Eagle Mountain; Earp; Earp:Lost Lake; El Centro; El Mirage; Fort Irwin; Havasu Lake; Holtville; Homestead Valley; Imperial; Independence; Indio; Inyokern; Joshua Tree; June Lake; Kernville; Lake Isabella; Lee Vining; Lenwood; Lone Pine; Lucerne Valley; Mammoth Lakes; Morongo Valley; Mountain Pass; Needles; Newberry; Ocotillo; Olancha; Palm Desert; Palm Springs; Palo Verde; Parker Dam; Pine Creek; Pinyon; Randsburg; Ridgecrest; Salton; Sandy Valley; Shoshone; Summit Valley; Trona; Twentynine Palms; Victorville; Weldon; Winterhaven; Wrightwood; Yucca Valley **Rate Center(s) Receiving New NPA (14):** Borrego; Encinitas; Escondido; Fallbrook; Julian; Oceanside:Carlsbad; Oceanside:Oceanside; Oceanside:Pendleton; Pauma Valley; Ramona; San Marcos; Valley Center; Vista; Warner Springs		[X] Proposed to Local Jurisdictions 12/08/98 [X] Proposed to Public 01/13-21/99 [ ] Eliminated from Consideration 00/00/00 [X] Industry-Recommended Plan 01/27/99 (One of two plans submitted)

Criteria for Evaluating Exhaust Relief Alternatives	Meets Criteria	Doesn't Meet	Explanation of Why / How Criteria Isn't Met
1. Minimizes end users' confusion	X		
2. Balances the cost of implementation for all affected parties	X		
3. Customers who undergo number change won't have to change again for 8-10 years		X	New NPA projected to exhaust in 6-8 years.
4. Doesn't favor a particular interest group	X		
5. Covers a period of at least 5 years beyond predicted exhaust	X		
6. All codes in a given area exhaust about the same time in the case of splits	X		
7. Complies with State and Federal statutes, rulings and orders	X		

Rev: 5/31/99

(END OF APPENDIX A)



Alternative # 6B **New NPA – west** **760 NPA – east & north**	**Split, east & north areas keep 760 area code** **6.75 years – 8.5 years** **162 NXX codes** **14 years -- 17.5 years** **199 NXX codes+62 tandem**



Alternative # 6B New NPA – west 760 NPA – east & north	Split, east & north areas keep 760 area code 6.75 years – 8.5 years 162 NXX codes 14 years – 17.5 years 199 NXX codes+62 tandem

ALT 6B PG 2



Alternative # 6B New NPA – west 760 NPA – east & north	Split, east & north areas keep 760 area code 6.75 years – 8.5 years 162 NXX codes 14 years – – 17.5 years 199 NXX codes+62 tandem	REV: 5/31/99

and mandatory dialing periods for the new area code to be activated, and specify the geographic areas to be covered by the old and new area codes.

4. Each telephone corporation, including paging companies and resellers, serving the geographic area covered by the existing 760 NPA shall give written notice to its affected customers of the adopted 760 NPA relief plan schedule as prescribed in O.P. 3, without delay and no later than August 1999.

5. Each telephone corporation serving the existing 760 NPA shall provide a second notice of the schedule for the new area code implementation and affected geographic areas within three months of the new area code opening.

6. The NANPA shall provide nationwide notification of the adopted 760 NPA relief plan by no later than October 1999.

This order is effective today.

Dated July 8, 1999, at San Francisco, California.

RICHARD A. BILAS
President
HENRY M. DUQUE
JOSIAH L. NEEPER
JOEL Z. HYATT
CARL W. WOOD
Commissioners

than 15 years, should be avoided.

g. Comply with state and federal statutes, rulings and orders.

2. The proposed Alternative 6B plan should be approved in accordance with the terms and conditions adopted in the order below.

3. It is premature, at best, to authorize any second-phase relief plan for the 760 NPA at this time, as proposed in Alternative 9B.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The proposed geographic split for the 760 Numbering Plan Area (NPA), identified as Alternative 6B, as presented by the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) is hereby approved.

2. The NANPA and the telephone corporations, including paging companies and resellers, are hereby ordered to proceed with all due diligence to expeditiously implement the approved 760 NPA Alternative 6B relief plan, with the new area code to take effect under the following schedule:

Events	Dates:
Start of Permissive Dialing	10/21/2000
Start of Mandatory Dialing	4/14/2001
End of Mandatory Dailing	7/21/2001

3. No later than August 1999, the NANPA shall notify the general public regarding the new area code to be assigned, through a geographic split of the existing 760 area code. The notice shall set forth the schedule for the permissive

17. With an overlay, customers will experience the loss of seven-digit dialing for calls within the same NPA.

18. A business may consider an assignment of the overlay NPA less desirable than the original NPA, since customers may perceive the business with the new NPA to be newer or less established than the neighboring business that retains the more recognized original NPA.

19. Number pooling can promote more efficient utilization of numbering resources for all participating carriers by enabling multiple carriers to share a single NXX code, thereby extending the useful life of an NPA.

20. Alternative 6B will have less overall adverse impacts than the Alternative 9B proposed for the 760 NPA by avoiding the disruptions of adding a subsequent new area code only one year after a geographic split.

Conclusions of Law

1. The adopted relief plan should be the alternative which best satisfies the criteria applied by the Industry Team in their selection of relief alternatives, namely:

   a. Minimize end users' confusion.

   b. Balance the cost of implementation for all affected parties.

   c. Provide that customers who undergo number changes shall not be required to change again for a period of eight to 10 years.

   d. Not favor a particular interest group.

   e. Cover a period of at least five years beyond the predicted date of exhaustion.

   f. Provide that all of the codes in a given area shall exhaust about the same time in the case of splits. In practice, this may not be possible, but severe imbalances, for example, a difference in NPA lifetimes of more

8. FCC Order 96-286 established that all carriers, both incumbents and new entrants, must provide LNP in the 100 largest MSAs to all requesting telecommunications carriers, by December 31, 1998.

9. There may not be sufficient time to allow for LNP implementation to be fully operational throughout the 760 NPA before the opening of an overlay as an initial phase of relief.

10. D.96-12-086, as well as FCC rules, require mandatory 1+10-digit dialing within the region subject to an overlay to prevent an anticompetitive dialing disparity between customers of competing carriers who lacked equivalent access to NXX codes in the old NPA.

11. D.96-12-086 required that a customer education program be instituted at least 12 months before an overlay would take effect, explaining the new mandatory 1+10-digit dialing requirements and the overlay plan to the public.

12. The shorter the NPA life, the more frequently customers must be subjected to the disruptions and hardships that come with changing area codes yet again.

13. The overlay avoids the contentiousness of drawing new NPA boundaries by leaving existing boundaries intact, and avoids the need for existing customers to change their existing telephone number area code.

14. It is not necessary to adopt a decision at this time adopting a second-phase NPA overlay as contemplated in Alternative 9B

15. A geographic split creates economic hardships particularly on affected businesses which must notify customers of area code changes, and change business cards, letterheads, advertisements, etc.

16. With an overlay, geographic boundaries no longer define a single NPA, thereby eliminating the advantage of having geographically-defined NPA boundaries as a means of identifying and unifying communities of interest.

VII. Comments on Draft Decision

The draft decision of the ALJ in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Pub. Util. Code § 311(g) and Rule 77.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. No comments were filed in response to the draft decision.

Findings of Fact

1. Area code relief is needed due to the impending exhaustion of NXX codes in the 760 NPA projected to occur during the first quarter of 2001.

2. The Area Code Relief Coordinator convened a series of meetings with the telecommunications Industry Planning Team to discuss and develop relief alternatives for the 760 NPA.

3. The Industry Team eliminated alternative plans which failed to meet the designated criteria, but was unable to reach consensus on a *single* relief plan.

4. The Industry Team narrowed the alternatives to two options: (1) single-phase geographic split; and (2) a two-phase geographic split followed by a subsequent overlay.

5. The creation of a new NPA through a geographic split as proposed in Alternative 6B best meets the designated criteria for the relief of code exhaust in the 760 NPA.

6. The only significant point of controversy over 760 NPA relief is whether the Alternative 6B geographic split will be sufficient, or whether yet a further new NPA in the form of a subsequent overlay is warranted, as proposed in Alternative 9B.

7. In the case of Alternative 9B, affected customers would experience the worst of both splits and overlays; first, by a forced change in their area code in Phase 1, then by the loss of seven-digit dialing and the unique geographic identification of a single area code in Phase 2.

appears to offer a longer NPA life than does Alternative 6B. Yet the longer life is achieved by subjecting customers to yet another new area code just one year after adjusting to the geographic split. Under Alternative 9B, customers would be forced to accept an overlay, giving up seven-digit dialing and losing the unique geographic identity of their area code in only one year following the disruptions of the geographic split. We see no necessity to subject customers to such sequential disruption. Customers should not be subjected to the costs and disruptions of a subsequent area code before it is truly necessary.

We find it preferable to limit the approved NPA relief plan to the single geographic split even though the expected life is relatively short. During this intervening period, however, we expect progress to be made regarding the implementation of number pooling and other measures which have the potential to result in more efficient utilization of numbering resources, thereby extending the life of existing NPAs. Number pooling can promote enhanced competitively neutral access to numbering resources by enabling multiple carriers to share the numbers within a single NXX code. As number pooling and other measures are implemented, the prospects for extending the projected life of the new NPA created out of the 760 NPA geographic split should be enhanced through more efficient utilization of existing NXX codes.

Accordingly, we shall adopt the Alternative 6B geographic split to provide relief in the 760 NPA. We are unpersuaded as to the need for a subsequent phase of NPA overlay relief as contemplated in Alternative 9B. We expect number pooling and/or other code conservation measures to extend the expected NPA life, and defer the need for further creation of another area code subsequent to the geographic split we authorize herein.

whether yet a further new NPA in the form of a subsequent overlay is warranted in the year following the geographic split, as proposed in Alternative 9B.

We conclude that it is premature, at best, to authorize any second-phase relief plan for the 760 NPA at this time, as proposed in Alternative 9B. The imposition of the additional new overlay area code would result in further disruption and hardship to affected customers just a year after imposing a geographic split on them. We have discussed in several previous decisions on area code relief how both the geographic split and overlay result in disruptions to customers, albeit in different ways. In the case of Alternative 9B, affected customers would experience the worst of both methods of relief. First, they would have to change their area code when the region is geographically split. Then, they would lose the benefits of seven-digit dialing and the unique geographic identification of a single area code once the Phase 2 overlay took effect just a little more than a year later.

The presumed benefit of the second-phase area code would be to extend the life of the first new NPA. We conclude, however, that this presumed benefit does not justify inflicting on customers the disruptions of a subsequent overlay on top of a geographic split, just one year later. The proposed implementation of the second new overlay area code would occur in July of 2001 with the introduction of permissive 1+10-digit dialing in the affected NPA. The new overlay area code would take effect the succeeding year in July of 2002. We appreciate that the projected life of the new NPA created by the Alternative 6B geographic split is only six-to-eight years. Assuming this projected life proved accurate, customers in the new NPA would again be subject to yet another new area code within less than 10 years. While we seek to minimize the frequency of area code changes which customers must go through, we do not believe that Alternative 9B best promotes this outcome. On the surface, Alternative 9B

unnecessary, and premature at this juncture, in light of the various national and California efforts to improve the efficiency in telephone number utilization (pooling, 1,000 number-block assignment, etc).

V. Discussion

There is no dispute among parties that the impending exhaustion of NXX codes in the 760 NPA requires that a relief plan for a new area code be implemented expeditiously. The only question is what form the relief should take. No matter what form of relief is adopted, there will be inevitable disruptions to some customers. A geographic split requires affected customers to change their area code and to incur the cost involved in notifying others of the change. An area code overlay requires customers to give up the advantages of seven digit dialing within their own NPA, and to lose the identification with a unique geographic area code. Our goal is to adopt a plan which minimizes customer disruption, and which best conforms to the industry criteria for evaluation of relief plans, as set forth above. We believe that the industry has properly narrowed the options down to the two alternatives which most effectively meet the specified criteria.

Based on the results of public and local jurisdiction meetings as well as the consensus of industry members, there is substantial agreement that the creation of a new NPA through a geographic split as proposed in Alternative 6B is appropriate for the 760 NPA. There is no significant dispute concerning how the boundary line is drawn, or the propriety of using a split instead of an overlay for the initial stage of relief. The comments of the joint parties, noted above, describe the relative advantages offered by Alternative 6B. The only significant point of controversy involves whether the geographic split will be sufficient, or

The joint parties feel that Alternative # 6B would best meet industry goals and Commission requirements, arguing that it minimizes the impact on telecommunication providers and customers while providing a reasonable life. The joint parties believe it is equitable to assign a new area code to 14 rate areas in the northern San Diego County portion of this vast NPA since that is where the bulk of the demand for codes in the current 760 NPA has occurred.

The remaining 760 NPA area, much of which is lightly populated and exhibits slow growth, would have an expected remaining life of 14 to 17.5 years. Alternative # 6B also received the most public support. This alternative allows customers in both areas to retain 7-digit dialing with their respective home area codes.

GTEC filed a position paper in support of Alternative 9B as the best overall relief solution. GTEC argues that Alternative 9B will provide a longer-term of relief than Alternative Plan 6B. Alternative Plan 9B, Phase I, achieves the same life gained in split Alternative 6B of 6.75-to-8.5 years. However, in Phase II of Alternative Plan 9B, the NPA's projected combined life is increased to 15-to-19 years when the overlay is introduced. Experience has taught that the shorter the NPA life, the more frequently customers must be subjected to the disruptions and hardships that come with changing area codes yet again. Thus, GTEC argues that Alternative 9B, with a longer life, will minimize customer disruption and hardship.

The joint parties object to Alternative # 9B, characterizing it as basically Alternative # 6B with the addition of a premature and unnecessary overlay on the new NPA to be created for northern San Diego County. As noted in the Relief Plan submitted by NANPA, the new area code under Alternative 6B is projected to have a life of 6.75 to 8.5 years. The joint parties claim that a decision to adopt a second-round relief plan for northern San Diego County is clearly

that time, customers in both area codes within the overlay area would be required to dial 1 + 10 digits (1 + area code + prefix + number) on all calls. The new area codes introduced in Phases 1 and 2 are projected to have a combined life of 15 – 19 years. The industry recommends that when the second new NPA is introduced, NXX codes in the first new NPA be allocated via the lottery process until all codes have been assigned (technical exhaust) in order to maximize the availability of NXX codes in that NPA to service providers.

The industry agreed on the following implementation dates for the proposed Alternative 9B two-phase relief plan. These dates conform to the California Telecommunications Industry Master Area Code Relief Schedule.

The Phase 1 Schedule would incorporate the same implementation dates as for Alternative 6B. The Phase 2 overlay schedule would be:

PHASE 2 – OVERLAY

Event	Relief Schedule
Start of Formal Permissive Dialing	07/21/2001
Start of Mandatory 1 + 10 Digit Dialing	04/20/2002
Activation of Overlay	07/20/2002

In the event the Commission elects to modify the recommended implementation dates, the industry respectfully requests that each date be scheduled for a Saturday.

Parties' Positions

Two positions papers were filed:

One in support of Alternative # 6B was jointly sponsored by the California Cable Television Association (CCTA), Cox California Telcom (COX), First World Communications (First) and ICG Telecom Group, Inc. (ICG). (the joint parties.)

A second position paper was sponsored by GTEC California, Inc. (GTEC).

The bulk of the land area currently served by the 760 NPA would retain this area code, including 65 rate areas serving Imperial, Riverside, San Bernardino, Kern, Tulare and Mono Counties. This includes a diverse geographic area along the eastern side of the state, from the Mexican border to Mammoth and Bridgeport in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, with a projected life of 14-17 years before this area is projected to exhaust.

The industry agreed on the following implementation dates for the proposed split plan. These dates conform to the California Telecommunications Industry Master Area Code Relief Schedule:

GEOGRAPHIC SPLIT – Standard Implementation

Event	Relief Schedule
Start of Formal Permissive Dialing	10/21/2000
Start of Mandatory Dialing Period	04/14/2001
End of Mandatory Dialing Period	07/21/2001

B. Alternative 9B – Geographic Split with Subsequent Overlay

Alternative 9B is a geographic split with a subsequent overlay. In Phase 1, a new area code would be assigned as a geographic split, to serve the same 14 rate areas the northern San Diego County as in Alternative 6B.

Also, in Alternative 6B, the new area code would have a projected life of 6.75-8.5 years. The 760 area code is projected to last 14 – 17 years before further relief would be required. Customers in the 760 area code would retain 7-digit dialing within their home area code, as would customers in the new area code only during Phase 1 of the plan.

Approximately one year later, in Phase 2, a new overlay area code would be introduced over the area that received the new NPA in Phase 1. At

A. Alternative 6B - Geographic Split

Alternative 6B is a geographic split which would assign a new area code to 14 rate areas in the northern San Diego County portion of the 760 NPA,* where the bulk of the demand for numbers has been and is projected to continue. It permits the majority of the current 760 NPA, much of which is lightly populated, slow-growth areas, to retain the 760 NPA. This alternative allows customers in both areas to retain 7-digit dialing within their home area code. Under this alternative, the 760 NPA has a projected life of 14-17.5 years; the new NPA has a projected life of 6.75-8.5 years before additional relief would be required.

This split line was designed to separate the densely populated, high-growth areas of the 760 NPA from the more rural areas which comprise the majority of the geographic area served by this NPA. The map in Appendix A depicts the NPA boundary line splitting these two regions. In recognition of the disparate economic conditions of these two areas, and the fact that the 760 area code, with the costs associated with any new area code, was introduced only two years ago, this alternative imposes the bulk of the economic impact of a new area code on the geographic area which is driving the exhaust.

---

* Specifically, Alternative 6B assigns a new area code to 13 rate areas serving north San Diego County:

Oceanside: Pendleton	Valley Center	Vista
Oceanside: Oceanside	Escondido	Pauma Valley
Oceanside: Carlsbad	Warner Springs	Borrego
Encinitas	Ramona	San Marcos
Fallbrook	Julian	

meetings, a two-way geographic split plan (Alternative 6A/6B), and a combination split-and-overlay plan (Alternative 9A/9B) were presented.

A total of 20 Show-of-Interest forms were received from all of the Local Jurisdiction and Public Meetings.

0	Favored Alternative 3
0	Favored Alternative 6A
13	Favored Alternative 6B
0	Favored Alternative 9A
4	Favored Alternative 9B
2	Favored Alternative 6B or 9B
0	Favored Alternative 10
1	Other/None of the Above/No Opinion

The single relief alternative receiving the most support was Alternative 6B, a geographic split. Alternative 9B, a geographic split with a subsequent overlay was the second most favored alternative.

IV. Proposed Alternatives

The industry could not reach consensus on one plan but was able to reach consensus on forwarding two exhaust relief alternatives to the Commission. During its January 27, 1999 meeting, the industry directed the NANPA to forward Alternatives 6B (a two-way geographic split) and 9B (a geographic split with a subsequent overlay) to the Commission for a final decision. By letter to the assigned Administrative Law Judge dated March 16, 1999, Lockheed Martin IMS, in its role as the NANPA, presented these two alternative NPA relief plans for the 760 area code. NANPA requests, on behalf of the industry, the Commission to approve one of these plans.

relief planning guidelines. Important input to the relief plans was provided at public meetings required by Pub. Util. Code § 7930(b), which were conducted on January 13, 14, and 21, 1999, and at a local jurisdiction meeting, which was held with city and county government representatives on December 8, 1998.

III. Public Notification and Meetings

The industry, NANPA and the CPUC jointly conducted a meeting with local jurisdictions in Palm Springs on December 8, 1998. This kind of meeting assists in the relief planning process by obtaining another layer of public input to help the industry in either reducing the number of alternatives or identifying the best plan to present to the general public.

The industry presented a total of five (5) relief alternatives at this meeting. Alternative 3 was a single overlay over the entire 760 NPA; Alternatives 6A and 6B were two-way geographic splits; and Alternatives 9A and 9B were two-way geographic splits with a subsequent overlay. Local Jurisdiction representatives were asked to express their support for these alternatives by filling out a "Show of Interest" form. A total of three (3) non-industry members attended the local jurisdiction meeting, 2 people spoke on the record, and 2 Show of Interest forms were submitted. Of those speaking, 1 expressed support for either Alternative 6B or 9B; the other expressed no preference.

Public meetings were required to occur within six months of the June 1998 customer notification, i.e., by January 1999. The industry team held four public meetings in Bishop, Oceanside, Palm Springs, and El Centro, one more than required by Pub. Util. Code § 7930 to ensure adequate coverage of the area served by the 760 NPA. The industry conducted two meetings on January 13 and 14, 1999, and two meetings on January 21, 1999. At these

for exhaustion relief in the 760 NPA, based on criteria adopted by the industry for previous relief plans.[3] The criteria are:

1. Minimize end users' confusion.
2. Balance the cost of implementation for all affected parties.
3. Provide that customers who undergo number changes shall not be required to change again for a period of eight to ten years.
4. Not favor a particular interest group.
5. Cover a period of at least five years beyond the predicted date of exhaustion.
6. Provide that all of the codes in a given area shall exhaust about the same time in the case of splits. In practice, this may not be possible, but severe imbalances, for example, a difference in NPA lifetimes of more than 15 years, should be avoided.
7. Comply with state and federal statutes, rulings and orders.

The NANPA convened a series of meetings attended by members of the telecommunications Industry Planning Team to discuss and develop relief alternatives for the 760 NPA. This team is composed of the NANPA, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Staff* and current code holders: local exchange carriers, interexchange carriers, wireless carriers and competitive local carriers.

These NPA relief alternatives were developed by representatives of the California telecommunications industry in meetings facilitated by NANPA using a consensus decision-making process and following industry approved NPA

---

[3] The criteria are based on the INC 97-0404-016 "NPA Code Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines."

* CPUC Staff do not vote on NPA relief plans.

c. Correct signage for dialing instructions on payphones and in directories.

d. Perform switch translation work for implementing mandatory dialing (12 weeks prior to cutover).

e. Simultaneously with the cutover, institute customer instructional announcements for misdialed seven-digit calls.

In addition to the requirements imposed by the Commission, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) issued its own requirements in FCC Order 96-333 with respect to overlays. In particular, the FCC required that every carrier was to be assured of at least one NXX code in the existing area code during the 90-day period preceding the introduction of the overlay. The FCC also prohibited overlays from being applied only to specific telecommunications services such as cellular, but required that overlays must apply to all services. Based upon these policies, we now consider the proposed options submitted by the NANPA for relief in the 760 NPA.

II. Industry Relief Planning Process

The planning process for NPA relief is established in the industry-approved document INC 97-0404-016 "NPA Code Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines," to be used by NPA Relief Coordinators. The document lists the assumptions, constraints, and planning principles used in NPA code relief planning efforts. It also lists the steps of the NPA code relief planning process and describes the alternative methods of providing NPA code relief and their characteristics. Industry meetings were conducted to develop alternatives

to be used for relief plans which would take effect at least through the end of the year 2000. However, particularly in light of the consumer preference survey which reflected a greater receptiveness among certain classes of customers to the overlay proposal in the 310 NPA compared to other NPAs, we left open the possibility of adopting an overlay for the next round of relief in the 310 NPA to take effect prior to 2000.

In the case of the proposed 760 NPA relief plan now before us, the proposed implementation date for the overlay portion of that plan would occur after the end of the year 2000. Therefore, the previous policy limiting relief options to geographic splits does not preclude our adoption of the overlay option. The Commission has opened R.98-12-014 to develop a NPA relief planning policy on a prospective basis. For purposes of the present 760 NPA proposal, we shall evaluate it based on its own merits. In D.97-08-065, we required that an overlay be evaluated in reference to the same criteria applicable to a geographic split.

In D.96-12-086, we further developed the necessary conditions which would have to be met in order to justify approval of an overlay. We required that a customer education program be instituted at least 12 months before an overlay would take effect explaining the new mandatory 1+10-digit dialing requirements and the overlay plan to the public. We also required that upon approval of any overlay, the code administrator and telecommunications industry members were to:

a. Notify the nationwide industry, the national code administrator, and customers of the proposed dialing plan change.

b. Educate customers, industry, and internal employees on the dialing plan change.

be overcome. We further directed that the Local Competition Docket be used to develop a comprehensive statewide policy regarding NPA relief.

On August 2, 1996, we issued D.96-08-028, adopting certain initial measures as part of a statewide policy on area code relief. We concluded in D.96-08-028 that as a condition for consideration of the overlay as a relief option, the overlay must be competitively neutral. We also established two prerequisites at a minimum for competitive neutrality. These were: (1) mandatory 1+10-digit dialing for all calls within the service areas subject to the overlay;[2] and (2) the full implementation of permanent local number portability (LNP) within the service area subject to the overlay. We determined that a further record needed to be developed regarding the relative merits of overlays versus splits once anticompetitive impediments could be overcome.

On December 20, 1996, the Commission released D.96-12-086, further expanding on the policy regarding the use of overlays once the competitive impediments could be resolved. In D.96-12-086, we evaluated the relative merits of splits versus overlays in terms of how consumers would be impacted differently with an overlay versus a geographic split. In particular, we reviewed consumer surveys conducted by various parties concerning preferences for overlays and geographic splits as a means of creating new area codes. In that decision, we concluded that, at least for the near term, customers were better served with the geographic split option. We directed that splits should continue

[2] In D.96-12-086, we ruled not to adopt statewide mandatory 1+10-digit dialing concurrently with the first overlay. We concluded that the advantages of preserving seven-digit dialing, for as many customers and for as long as possible, outweigh any potential customer confusion resulting from instituting mandatory 1+10-digit dialing only in those regions subject to overlays.

The 760 area code was implemented in 1997 when it was split from the 619 NPA. One or more new area codes are now needed again to relieve the impending exhaustion of NXX codes in the current 760 NPA. The NANPA projects exhaustion of NXX codes in the 760 NPA to occur during the first quarter of 2001. The demand for numbering resources in the 760 NPA is being stimulated by the introduction of competition in the local exchange market and accelerated demand for new services and rapid changes in technology.

The process for implementing new area codes in California is covered both by state statute, applicable Commission decisions, and industry guidelines. California state statutes prescribe requirements for customer notification, establishment of new NPA boundaries and transitional dialing periods. "Affected subscribers" must have written notice at least 24 months prior to the introduction of a new area code.

We have formulated statewide policies regarding area code relief through a series of decisions since 1995. Area code relief plans have become increasingly controversial in recent years as the demand for numbering resources has risen dramatically due to new technological advances in telecommunications and to the advent of local competition. We acknowledged the need for a comprehensive statewide policy on area code relief in connection with the proposed 310 NPA relief plan filed in 1995. We considered at that time the adoption of an overlay for the 310 NPA as an alternative to the traditional use of geographic splits. In Decision (D.) 95-08-052, we rejected the overlay option for the 310 NPA on the basis that among other things, it was not at that time a competitively neutral relief remedy. We left open the prospect of considering an overlay as an option in future NPA relief plans once the anticompetitive aspects of the overlay could

ALJ/TRP/avs*

Mailed 7/9/99

Decision 99-07-017 July 8, 1999

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion into Competition for Local Exchange Service.	Rulemaking 95-04-043 (Filed April 26, 1995)
Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion into Competition for Local Exchange Service.	Investigation 95-04-044 (Filed April 26, 1995)

RECEIVED
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM
TELECOMMUNICATIONS DIVISION
DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
99 JUL 12 AM 11:06

OPINION

I. Introduction

By this decision, we formally approve the proposed geographic split relief plan Alternative 6B for the 760 Numbering Plan Area (NPA) based upon review of the alternatives as presented to the Commission by the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) by transmittal letter dated March 16, 1999.[1] The 760 NPA currently serves a portion of Local Access and Transport Areas (LATAs) 666, 721, 730, 732, and 973. There are 79 rate centers in the 760 NPA, which serves the area east of the Sierra Nevada mountains to the Nevada and Arizona borders, south to the Mexican border, and part of northern San Diego County.

[1] By letter to the Docket Clerk dated June 4, 1999, the NANPA submitted errata to the 760 NPA Relief Plan.