

RECEIVED

APR 27 1998

3:30
FPSC - Records/Reporting

MEMORANDUM

April 27, 1998

TO: DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING
FROM: DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (BOWMAN) *JRB/NCB*
RE: DOCKET NO. 980048-TL - REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED
NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR 813 AREA CODE.

98-0597-FDF-TL

Attached is an ORDER APPROVING GEOGRAPHIC SPLIT TO PROVIDE
NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 813 AREA CODE, to be issued in the
above referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 17)

JRB/MCB/slh

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications (Sirianni)

I: 980048o.jrb

See 16

*17 mules - breakfast
1 OPC*

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Request for review of
proposed numbering plan relief
for 813 area code.

DOCKET NO. 980048-TL
ORDER NO. PSC-98-0597-FOF-TL
ISSUED: April 27, 1998

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of
this matter:

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

BY THE COMMISSION:

**ORDER APPROVING GEOGRAPHIC SPLIT TO PROVIDE
NUMBERING PLAN RELIEF FOR THE 813 AREA CODE**

APPEARANCES:

CHARLIE BECK, Esquire, Public Counsel, Office of Public
Counsel, 111 West Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee,
Florida 32399-1400
On behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

KIMBERLY CASWELL, Esquire, P. O. Box 110, FLTC0007, Tampa,
Florida 33601-011
On behalf of GTE Florida Incorporated.

THOMAS BOND, Esquire, Hopping Green Sams and Smith, Post
Office Box 6526, Tallahassee, Florida 32314
On behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro
Access Transmission Services, Inc.

MARSHA RULE, Esquire, 101 East College Avenue, Suite 700,
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
On behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc.

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

04643 APR 27 98

REGISTRATION DIVISION

ORDER NO. PSC-98-0597-FOF-TL
DOCKET NO. 980048-TL
PAGE 2

SENATOR JACK LATVALA, 19th District, 35111 US Highway 19
North, Suite 105, Palm Harbor, Florida 34684

MARTHA CARTER BROWN, Esquire, and JOHN R. BOWMAN, Florida
Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard,
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
On behalf of the Commission Staff.

BACKGROUND

The North American Numbering Plan (NANP), which governs the assignment and use of telephone numbers in North America and other World Zone 1¹ Countries, was introduced in 1947 by AT&T. The plan is based on a destination code in which each main telephone number in the NANP is assigned a specific address or destination code. The destination codes are commonly referred to as telephone numbers. NANP telephone numbers are in a 10-digit format, consisting of a 3-digit Numbering Plan Area (NPA) code, a 3-digit Central Office code, and a 4-digit station address code. The NPA code is commonly known as the area code, and the Central Office Code is commonly known as the NXX code. BellCore is currently the code administrator with the responsibility of assigning area codes within the NANP, but this responsibility is currently being transferred to Lockheed Martin. Generally, the Regional Bell Operating Company (RBOC) or large independent in a specific area code is responsible for the assignment of central offices codes within that NPA. This responsibility will also be transferred to Lockheed Martin in the near future. The code administrators are required to follow guidelines approved by BellCore and the telecommunications industry when assigning either NPAs or Central Office Codes.

In the late 1950s it became apparent that NPAs were being assigned at a rate significantly higher than originally anticipated. Out of that early concern came a plan to expand the

¹World Zone 1 Countries consist of Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Commonwealth of the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Canada, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Turks and Caicos Islands, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United States of America, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

supply of numbers through the introduction of interchangeable codes. The introduction of interchangeable codes modifies the format previously used for area codes and central office codes. The previous format for area codes was N,0/1,X, while the central office code format was N,N,X.² Currently, the interchangeable area codes and central office codes take the format of N,X,X. The industry began the implementation of interchangeable Central Office codes in 1974. In January, 1992, BellCore notified the telecommunications industry that interchangeable NPAs would be introduced in early 1995. Prior to the introduction of interchangeable NPAs, the NANP had 160 NPAs, which provided a total of 1.28 billion available telephone numbers for assignment. The introduction of interchangeable NPA codes provided an additional 640 NPAs, which provide a total of 6.4 billion telephone numbers available for assignment.

The Industry Carriers Compatibility Forum Guidelines identify three possible alternatives to provide relief to an area code when it has exhausted all available NXXs: a geographic split; a boundary realignment; or several variations of an overlay. The guidelines state that a geographic split occurs when the exhausting NPA is split into two geographic areas, leaving the existing NPA code to serve, for example, an area with the highest customer density. This method divides areas by jurisdictional, natural, or physical boundaries between the old and new NPAs. A geographic split has been the relief of choice for virtually all NPA relief plans prior to 1995. NPA splits have occurred with enough frequency so that technical aspects have been addressed and established implementation procedures are generally understood. Public education and acceptance of the process have been made easier because of the numerous NPA splits that have occurred.

For a boundary realignment, the guidelines require that the NPA requiring relief be adjacent to an NPA within the same state or province that has spare Central Office code capacity. A boundary shift occurs so that spare codes in the adjacent NPA can be used in the NPA requiring relief. As a result, the geographic area of the exhausting NPA shrinks, and the geographic area of the NPA with spare capacity expands. Only the customers in the geographic area between the old and new boundaries are directly affected by this

²N is defined as any number from 2 through 9 and X is defined as any number from 0 through 9.

change. This method is viewed as an interim measure because it tends to provide shorter term relief than a new NPA code.

An overlay occurs when more than one NPA code serves the same geographic area. In an NPA overlay, code relief is provided by opening up a new NPA code within the same geographic area as the NPA(s) that requires relief. Numbers from this new NPA are assigned to new growth on a carrier neutral basis; i.e., first come first served. Mandatory customer number changes within the affected overlay relief area are eliminated. With the overlay relief method, the FCC requires 10-digit dialing for all of the affected customers' local calls within and between the old and new NPAs in order to ensure that competing telecommunications carriers, who would most likely receive the NXXs in the new area code for their customers, do not suffer competitive disadvantages. In addition to requiring 10-digit dialing for all local calls, the FCC requires that at least one NXX in the existing area code must be available to every carrier authorized to provide telephone service in the affected area code during the 90-day period preceding the introduction of the overlay. The overlay method eliminates the need for customer number changes like those required under the geographic split and realignment methods. It also allows the option to eliminate or shorten the permissive dialing period as a part of implementation, because existing customers do not have to change their telephone numbers.

On November 21, 1997, GTE Florida Incorporated (GTEFL), the numbering administrator for the 813 area code, notified the Commission that the 813 area code would exhaust its remaining available NXXs sooner than expected. GTEFL reported that representatives of West Florida's telecommunications service providers had agreed that relief from the imminent exhaustion should be accomplished through an overlay relief plan. The overlay relief plan would encompass the same geographic area as the current 813 area code. All new NXXs issued after October 1, 1998, would receive the new area code (727). Old NXXs would retain 813. Under the overlay plan, current customers would not be required to change their area code, but all customers would be required to dial all local calls as ten digits, within and between area codes as FCC Order No. 96-333 requires.

We received several objections to the proposed plan from members of the public and an official petition from Senator Jack

Latvala requesting that we review the proposed 813 relief plan. Because an overlay would require ten-digit dialing of all local calls, which may be confusing to customers, we determined that it was in the public interest to review this particular plan. We conducted informational workshops in St. Petersburg and Tampa on January 8, 1998 and a combined customer and technical hearing in Tampa on February 24, 1998.

After the informational workshops, Senator Jack Latvala, the Office of Public Counsel, AT&T of the Southern States, MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc. intervened in this matter. All intervenors filed testimony opposing the industry relief plan and supporting a geographic split.

At the customer hearing and the technical hearing that followed we considered four different relief mechanisms for the 813 area code: Overlay the current 813 area code; Geographic split - Pinellas in an area code and Pasco and Hillsborough in an area code; Geographic Split - Pinellas and the West Part of Pasco in an area code and the East Part of Pasco and Hillsborough in an area code; Geographic Split - Pinellas and Pasco in an area code and Hillsborough in an area code. Upon consideration of all the testimony and evidence presented at the hearings, we find that the most reasonable and appropriate relief for the imminent exhaustion of the 813 area code is a Geographic Split - Pinellas and the West Part of Pasco in an area code and the East Part of Pasco and Hillsborough in an area code. The details of our decision and the reasons for it are set forth below.

DECISION

This proceeding is the fourth in which we have been asked to determine which relief plan should be implemented in Florida to relieve an area code from impending exhaustion. (See Docket Nos. 941272-TL, 961153-TL and 971058-TL). Commissions across the country have struggled as we have over the past few years with the issue of whether a geographic split or some form of area code overlay is the more appropriate method to provide relief.

During the technical hearing the witnesses discussed four specific area code relief options:

- Option 1: Overlay the current 813 area code.
- Option 2: Geographic Split - Pinellas in an area code and Pasco and Hillsborough in an area code.
- Option 3: Geographic Split - Pinellas and the West Part of Pasco in an area code and the East Part of Pasco and Hillsborough in an area code.
- Option 4: Geographic Split - Pinellas and Pasco in an area code and Hillsborough in an area code.

As various witnesses explained in their testimony, each type of plan (geographic split or overlay) has inherent advantages and disadvantages. Listed below are some of the advantages and disadvantages identified for each type of plan.

Advantages of Overlay Plan

- 1. Customers in the overlay area can retain their telephone numbers.
- 2. Customers are not required to change advertisements containing 813 area code telephone numbers.
- 3. Cellular carriers are not required to reprogram their customers' cellular telephones.
- 4. Costs to customers and carriers are minimized.

Disadvantages of Overlay Plan

- 1. 10-digit dialing is required for all local calls within the overlay area.
- 2. Directories and Directory Assistance will be required to provide 10-digit numbers.
- 3. All advertisements that contain 7-digit telephone numbers must be changed to 10-digit numbers.

Advantages of Geographic Split

- 1. 7-digit dialing would remain for intra-NPA local calls.

Disadvantages of Geographic Split

1. Customers in an area with a new area code must change the area code portion of their telephone numbers.
2. Customers in an area with a new area code must change advertisements which included the 3-digit area code.
3. A short permissive dialing period.

In addition to the advantages and disadvantages listed above that were identified at the hearing, we considered four criteria we developed in earlier area code relief proceedings that we believe are relevant to the issue in this proceeding: 1) Competitive Concerns; 2) Impacts to Customers; 3) Impacts to Carriers; and 4) Length of Relief. (See Order Nos. PSC-95-1048, PSC-97-0637 and PSC-97-0138.)

Competitive Concerns

We explained in the previous Orders cited above that geographic splits such as Options 2 through 4 do not cause competitive problems, since all carriers will be assigned NXXs from the same area code for a given geographic area. MCI's witness Faul concurs with the Commission's previous interpretations. She indicates that if a geographic split were selected for the 813 area, all carriers would be issued 813 numbers in the remaining 813 area, and all carriers would be issued numbers with the new area code in the new area.

Various witnesses raised competitive concerns regarding overlays such as Option 1. MCI's witness Faul and AT&T's witness Smith believe that implementation of an overlay is anti-competitive and will give GTEFL a significant competitive advantage. Their first concern is associated with the customers' perception of the new and the old area codes. They believe that callers are more accustomed to the 813 area code and recognize it as being the Tampa area. They believe the overlay area code would not be familiar and would thus be considered less desirable than the existing code. They believe the customer would be more likely to select a carrier that could give them a number in the more desirable area code. Witness Faul believes the potential effect for competition in Tampa will be that CLECs will be unable to compete effectively in the growth market of additional lines for fax machines, modems, and the

like. Witness Faul goes on to state that the FCC noted in its Second Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order issued August 8, 1996, that the incumbent LECs have an advantage over new entrants when a new code is about to be introduced, because they can warehouse NXXs in the old NPA. She contends that incumbents also have an advantage when telephone numbers are returned to them as their customers move or change carriers.

MCI's witness Faul and AT&T's witness Smith identify several conditions we should consider if we decide to implement an overlay instead of a geographic split in order to minimize the anti-competitive concerns. They are:

1. Maintain the current schedule for implementation of permanent local number portability.
2. Require 10-digit dialing within and between the old and new area codes.
3. Require GTEFL to analyze and report on the feasibility of a revenue-neutral Rate Center Consolidation plan for the 813 area.
4. Establish a workshop or other appropriate process to consider number conservation mechanisms, such as Rate Center Consolidation for the Tampa LNP area.
5. Allocate all remaining NXXs in the old area code to all competing carriers, excluding the incumbent LEC.
6. Require the overlay to apply to all telecommunications carriers.

In response to these proposed conditions, GTEFL's witness Menard states that GTEFL will comply with most of the conditions to the extent that is within its control. Witness Menard points out that conditions 2 and 6 are FCC requirements when implementing an overlay. Other conditions such as condition 1, implementation of permanent number portability, are dependant on the development of a number portability database, which has been delayed from the original FCC schedule due to the vendor's inability to make the database functional. Witness Menard states that GTEFL will comply

with this condition as soon as it can. Witness Menard notes that conditions 3 and 4, as well as number pooling, are currently under consideration at this time by the Commission. She notes that GTEFL is unable to implement any Rate Center Consolidation proposal that raises customers' rates which would conflict with current Florida law.

We do not believe implementation of an overlay will create a competitive advantage for GTEFL as long as GTEFL implements 10 digit dialing for all local calls and permanent number portability as soon as possible once the database is functional. Although MCI and AT&T attempt to cite various paragraphs in the FCC's dialing parity order to support their claim of potential anti-competitive concerns, they both fail to mention that the FCC orders require various conditions when implementing an overlay to protect against the anti-competitive problems discussed above. The FCC required 10-digit dialing for all local calls to avoid the dialing disparity customers may incur when using a different carrier with an NXX from the new area code. Further, the FCC determined that in order to minimize the potential anti-competitive concern that only incumbent LECs would have NXXs in the old area code, it required that under an overlay each provider of telephone exchange service, exchange access, and paging service must be assigned at least one NXX in the old area code. (FCC 96-333, §287,289) Witnesses Faul and Smith both recognized that their companies currently were assigned NXXs in the 813 area code.

In addition to the two conditions the FCC required to minimize any anti-competitive concerns associated with an overlay, the FCC also has adopted a permanent number portability mechanism that will minimize the competitive concerns even further in the future. In addition, as witness Menard mentioned, although not helpful in the near term, the North American Numbering Council, as well as this Commission, are looking at the issues of rate center consolidation and number pooling. Both of these mechanisms may provide additional access to telephone numbers and better utilization of a carrier's currently assigned NXXs in the future. MCI witness Faul recognized that these issues are industry-wide issues and not GTEFL specific.

AT&T proposed that we allocate all remaining NXXs in the old area code to all competing carriers, excluding the incumbent LEC. We believe this is inconsistent with the intent of the FCC's order,

which states that the federal numbering guidelines were designed to ensure the fair and timely availability of numbering resources to all telecommunications carriers. (FCC 96-333, ¶291; FCC 95-19, ¶135) Excluding GTEFL from the assignment of NXXs in the old area code appears to be in direct conflict with the underlying premise of the FCC's orders referenced above.

Based on the record in this proceeding, we do not believe that a geographic split or an overlay will cause a severe impediment to the development of local exchange competition as long as GTEFL implements 10-digit dialing for all local calls and permanent number portability when available in the case of the overlay. Therefore, our review of the record leads us to believe that there are not any major competitive concerns for any of the relief options proposed in this case.

Impacts on Customers

The record support in this proceeding for this criterion is provided by the direct testimony at the informational workshops, the combined public and technical hearings, and the survey conducted by an independent consultant at the request of GTEFL.

It was apparent from the customers' testimony at the informational workshops and the technical hearing that a great majority of the customers testifying supported the implementation of a geographic split for the 813 area code instead of the proposed overlay. Only two customers supported the proposed overlay.

The main reason the customers supported the geographic split instead of the overlay appeared to be the requirement under an overlay to implement 10-digit dialing for all local calls. In addition, various customers raised other concerns that they believed supported the implementation of a geographic split instead of the proposed overlay. They are:

1. Alarm companies will have to reprogram the customers' monitoring equipment to dial 10 digits instead of 7 digits if an overlay is implemented.
2. Dialing 10 digits is difficult for older customers.

3. The overlay may require different area codes in the same household, next door neighbors, and in the same business.
4. The overlay would confuse the identification of which calls were Extended Calling Service (ECS).
5. The geographic split would be less confusing than the overlay.

The other information associated with customers' preference for a particular relief mechanism is from the survey conducted by an independent consultant at GTEFL's request. The survey was a statistically-drawn sample which solicited the response of 2,000 customers in the 813 area code. The study indicates that the majority of the 2,000 customers surveyed supported the implementation of the overlay instead of the geographic split. Several customers expressed concern with the survey and how it was conducted. The customers' main complaint appears to be that the survey was skewed to favor the overlay. Senator Latvala, who indicated that he has been conducting political public opinion surveys for 25 years, considered the survey to be biased toward the overlay. Some of the witnesses suggested that we should not even consider the survey. Although we are concerned with the difference between the survey and the direct testimony received during the hearings, we note the survey reveals that retirees support a geographic split instead of the overlay.

We have carefully reviewed the questionnaire used in the survey. Our main concern is that the survey does not appear to lay out all of the details associated with each option. For example, when discussing the geographic split the survey states that "your telephone number would be changed to a new area code." The fact is that only the telephone number of customers in the new area code will change. Also, when discussing the overlay, the survey does not identify all of the disadvantages, such as the need to change all advertisements that use 7 digits to 10 digits.

We believe that more weight should be given to the direct testimony of the witnesses in this case. We note, however, that the survey could have been a very useful tool in assisting us in determining the appropriate relief for the 813 area code. However, due to the shortcomings of the questionnaire, the final percentage

of customers identified in the survey as favoring an overlay is questionable. Our review of the record shows that from the customers' perspective a geographic split provides the most reasonable form of relief in this case.

Impacts on Carriers

The obvious impact to most carriers is the need to modify the translations in their switching equipment in order to recognize the new area code. The only impact to the carriers that has been identified in this proceeding is associated with the implementation of a geographic split. As AT&T's witness Smith stated if the Commission implements a split, all cellular carriers providing service in the new area code will need to reprogram their customers' cellular telephones to recognize the new area code instead of the old area code. Witness Smith believes the Commission should order the grandfathering of wireless and cellular subscribers' phone numbers in order to avoid the need to reprogram the cellular phones with the new area code.

Although we will do everything possible to minimize the adverse effects of any area code relief plan, AT&T's proposal would essentially exempt a specific industry segment (wireless) from any affect whatsoever. That approach is not consistent with the intent of the FCC's dialing parity order or the industry guidelines, which require that any relief plan should not favor a particular industry or consumer group. In addition, we do not believe it is appropriate to exempt an industry segment from any adverse effects of the area code relief when the growth in that industry segment is one of the reasons consumers are having to change area codes.

Length of Area Code Relief

Some witnesses at the hearing, including Senator Latvala, expressed doubt that the 813 area code is actually in jeopardy of exhausting in the near future. GTEFL's witness Gancarz, as the numbering administrator for the 813 area code, has projected the 813 area code to exhaust in late 1998. In so determining, witness Gancarz used the most recent calendar year NXX usage data as the basis for his projection. For 1997, the NXX usage was 120 codes. Once he determined the actual usage, he added a total growth factor of 10% that gave him 132 codes for the next year. In addition to

the 10%, witness Gancarz included an additional eight codes for new competitors. This brought the total projected NXX code usage per year for the entire 813 area code to 140. The NXX assignment schedule supports GTEFL's contention that the 813 area code is in jeopardy of exhaustion soon. We believe the concern some customers expressed is not supported by the evidence.

Conclusion

The following table shows the Options and the exhaust dates for each proposal.

Option	NPA	County	Number Exch.	Existing NXXs	Exhaust (years)
1 Overlay	813 & 727	Hillsborough Pasco Pinellas	8	657	6 to 8
2 Geographic Split	813	Hillsborough Pasco	5	401	3 to 5
	727	Pinellas	3*	256	7 to 9
3 Geographic Split	813	Hillsborough East Pasco	3*	371	4 to 6
	727	West Pasco Pinellas	5*	286	6 to 8
4 Geographic Split	813	Hillsborough	3*	333	5 to 7
	727	Pasco Pinellas	5*	324	6 to 8

*Exchange is located in 2 counties.

Upon review of the testimony and evidence in the record, we find that Option 3 is the best option to provide relief for the 813 area code for the reasons set forth below.

There does not appear to be a good geographic boundary for Option 3, or any other option, due to various exchanges overlapping

county boundaries, but we are reluctant to impose 10-digit dialing on customers in these counties at this time without a stronger showing in support of the overlay. We are concerned with splitting Pasco County because Pasco County will then have three different area codes. Various witnesses indicated, however, that this option would be preferable, since it would not divide communities of interest, unlike the other geographic split plans. We also believe that Option 3 will provide a good relief life for the current 813 area code.

Although most customers testified that they did not care whether they received the new area code or not as long as an overlay was not implemented, a few customers expressed an interest in retaining the 813 area code for the Pinellas area. We have consistently retained the old NPA for the area where the largest number of NXXs are assigned in order to minimize any confusion that may be associated with the relief. In all proposed geographic splits, the area that would retain 813 would be the Hillsborough area.

We must also address the implementation periods for permissive and mandatory dialing for the new area code. Usually in a geographic split relief mechanism, the Commission attempts to provide at least nine to twelve months for customers to become accustomed to the area code change. We will not be able to provide a permissive dialing period for that length of time in this case. As witness Gancarz testified, in February there were approximately 125 813 NXXs available for assignment. As witness Gancarz stated, the industry has implemented what is termed "jeopardy measures" to conserve NXXs in the 813 area code. Only 10 NXXs are assigned a month. Even with the limited number of NXXs assigned each month, we can only will allow permissive dialing for eight (8) months, beginning July 1, 1998. Mandatory dialing must begin on March 1, 1999.

Some of the alarm company witnesses stated that if an overlay is implemented, their companies would need some time to reprogram the customers' equipment to recognize the need to dial 10 digits. Although we are not choosing the overlay for this relief, if an overlay is proposed in the future, we strongly suggest to Lockheed Martin, the new numbering plan administrator, that a 12-month 7- and 10-digit permissive dialing period be included. We believe it

is imperative to do everything possible to protect against any problems that could jeopardize the security of customers.

Implementation details

The remaining issue that we must address is what the dialing patterns should be for local, toll, EAS, and ECS calls. GTEFL and MCI are the only parties that filed testimony addressing the dialing patterns for the various types of calls listed above. Both parties agree to the following dialing patterns:

- a. Intra NPA local - 7 digit dialing
Inter NPA local - 10 digit dialing
- b. toll - 1+10 digit dialing
- c. Intra NPA EAS - 7 digit dialing
Inter NPA EAS - 10 digit dialing
- d. Intra NPA ECS - 7 digit dialing
Inter NPA ECS - 10 digit dialing

We agree that the above dialing patterns should be implemented.

Customer witness Campbell also raised a concern regarding ECS dialing. He testified that customers do not know when they are dialing an ECS call. Based on the record, we believe the implementation of Option 3 does help clarify to some extent which routes are ECS, but no option will eliminate this problem unless we require all ECS calls to be dialed on a 1+10 digit basis. As witness Menard stated, GTEFL is opposed to dialing ECS calls on a 1+10 digit basis for two main reasons. First, we have deemed ECS to be local traffic. That decision was upheld by the Florida Supreme Court; and therefore, no toll competition is allowed on these routes. GTEFL believes that if we require ECS calls to be dialed on a 1+10 digit basis, we would create customer confusion about why GTEFL was handling the calls instead of the customer's presubscribed long distance carrier. Second, GTEFL's billing system will not recognize a 1+ call as local ECS; thus, the company would be unable to bill the call. While we understand the concerns raised regarding ECS calls, we do not believe there has been sufficient evidence to justify what appears to be some major modifications to GTEFL's billing system or switches in order to use dialing patterns to identify ECS calls.

ORDER NO. PSC-98-0597-FOF-TL
DOCKET NO. 980048-TL
PAGE 16

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that a geographic split as described in the body of this order is hereby approved to provide relief from the imminent exhaustion of the 813 area code. It is further

ORDERED that a permissive dialing period shall begin on July 1 1998, and mandatory dialing shall begin on February 1, 1999. It is further

ORDERED that dialing patterns for EAS and ECS calls shall be implemented as set out in the body of this order. It is further

ORDERED that this docket shall be closed.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 27th day of April, 1998.



BLANCA S. BAYÓ, Director
Division of Records and Reporting

(S E A L)

JRB

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.