## HOPPING GREEN SAMS & SMITH

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

## ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

123 SOUTH CALHOUN STREET

POST OFFICE BOX 6526

TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32314

(850) 222-7500

FAX (850) 224-8551

FAX (850) 425-3415

Writer's Direct Dial No. (904) 425-2313

June 12, 1998

ORIGINAL

ANGELA R. MORRISON
GABRIEL E. NIETO
GARY V. PERKO
MICHAEL P. PETROVICH
DAVID L. POWELL
WILLIAM D. PRESTON
CAROLYN S. RAEPPLE
DOUGLAS S. ROBERTS
GARY P. SAMS
TIMOTHY G. SCHOENWALDER
ROBERT P. SMITH
CHERYL G. STUART
W. STEVE SYKES
T. KENT WETHERELL, II

OF COUNSEL ELIZABETH C. BOWMAN

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

Re: 407 Area Code -- Docket No. 980671-TL

Dear Ms. Bayó:

JAMES S. ALVES

BRIAN H. BIBEAU

RALPH A. DEMEO

THOMAS M. DEROSE

WILLIAM H. GREEN

WADE L. HOPPING

KIMBERLY A. GRIPPA

GARY K. HUNTER, JR.

ROBERT A. MANNING

FRANK E. MATTHEWS

RICHARD D. MELSON

JONATHAN T. JOHNSON

KATHLEEN BLIZZARD

RICHARD 5, BRIGHTMAN

KEVIN B. COVINGTON PETER C. CUNNINGHAM

RANDOLPH M. GIDDINGS

Enclosed for filing on behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCImetro Access Transmission Services, Inc. (collectively, "MCI") are the original and fifteen copies of MCI's prefiled direct testimony.

By copy of this letter, this document is being furnished to the parties on the attached service list.

₹CK	1	_				
4FA	-	-				
4PP						
)AE	<del></del>					
M)	Siria	nn;				
MR	<del></del>	RDM/				
2.3		Encl	osures Parties	of Rec	ord	
EG	1					
<del>1</del> 50	5t o	8				
r3	<u></u>		RECEIVED	a FILE	D	
<u> </u>			REGERVE	7		
98.			EDSO MIS	REAU OF	RECOR	5 <del>5</del>
ΆS.		110783.1	FF 30-031	9		

Pio O. Melson

Very truly yours,

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

06256 JUN 128

TPSC-SECONDS/REPORTING

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing was furnished to the following parties by U.S. mail or Hand Delivery (\*) this 12th day of June, 1998.

Will Cox (\*)
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Nancy White (\*) c/o Nancy Sims BellSouth Telecommunications 150 South Monroe St., Ste. 400 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Sprint-Florida Incorporated F.B. (Ben) Poag P.O. Box 2214 (MC FLTLH00107) Tallahassee, FL 32316-2214

Vista-United Telecommunications Lynn B. Hall P.O. Box 10180 Lake Buena Vista, FL 32830-0180 Jeffry Wahlen Ausley Law Firm P.O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Lockheed Martin IMS
D. Wayne Milby
Communications Industry Services
1133 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 200005

Two D. Mar

Attorney

	MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
	AND MCI METRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC.
	DIRECT TESTIMONY OF SUZANNE BROOKS
	BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
	DOCKET NO. 980671-TL
	JUNE 12, 1998
_	TAMED OF LOTTION
	INTRODUCTION  THE ASSESSMENT WOLD MANUE AND PHISDUSS ADDRESS
	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
A.	My name is Suzanne Brooks. My business address is 2250 Lakeside
	Boulevard, Richardson, TX, 75082.
Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND
A.	I am currently employed by MCI in its Local Numbering Group. I am
	responsible for representing MCI with respect to NPA Relief and various
	numbering issues and to participate in numerous state area code relief
	industry meetings and regulatory proceedings. I have been employed by
	MCI since February 1997. My responsibilities have included working on
	number conservation issues for the states of Texas, Colorado, Minnesota,
	and Missouri.
	Prior to being hired by MCI, I was employed by GTE for 26 years, from
	1969 to 1996. At the time I left GTE's employment, I was Senior Product
	Manager-Switched Access, my responsibilities included budgeting for
	Interexchange Access Revenues, new product development (such as 500
	and 555 Access) and all Federal and State regulatory support relating to DOCUMENT HUMBER-DATE
	06256 JUN 12 #

FPSC-PECGROS/REPERTING

1		Switched Access. Other responsibilities over the years have been in
2		Traffic Study Engineering, Capital Recovery, Depreciation, Tariffs,
3		Operations, Marketing, and Operator Services.
4		
5	II.	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY
6	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
7	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to identify competitive issues related to the
8		proposal for area code relief in the 407 area code and discuss various
9		options for relief. I also discuss some of the methods the Florida Public
10		Service Commission ("Commission") should consider to conserve
11		numbers, extend the lives of area codes, and reduce the need of creating
12		new area codes in the future. Considering that this is the third area code
13		relief hearing this Commission has had to have in less than a year, the issue
14		of number conservation has become a critical one.
15		
16	IП.	AREA CODE RELIEF ALTERNATIVES
17	Q.	WHAT AREA CODE ALERTNATIVES ARE BEING CONSIDERED FOR
18		THE 407 AREA CODE?
19	A.	The Commission was notified by the numbering administrator that some
20		members of the industry were proposing an overlay plan for area code relief in
21		the 407 area. The Commission on its own initiative has scheduled this matter
22		for hearings to seek recommendations for area code relief.
23		

1	Q.	WHAT TYPES OF IMPACTS SHOULD THE COMMISSION
2		CONSIDER WHEN DECIDING WHICH ALTERNATIVE IS BEST
3		FOR THE ORLANDO AREA?
4	<b>A</b> .	There are several alternatives that can be considered, individually or in
5		combination, to provide the greatest utilization of numbers.
6		
7	Q.	WHAT ARE THE ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE THAT COULD
8		MITIGATE THE EXHAUST OF AREA CODE 407?
9	A.	There are several alternatives available that could offer short term and long
10		term relief opportunities. The Commission could look at sequential
11		number assignment, rate center consolidations, and number pooling in
12		conjunction with an area code split or overlay. This list is not inclusive and
13		serves only as an illustrative example of a few of the alternatives that are
14		available to the Commission.
15		
16	Q.	WILL YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THESE ALTERNATIVES?
17	A.	Sequential Number Assignment is where carriers who have been assigned a
18		10-thousand block of numbers, must assign those numbers sequentially for
19		a thousand block at a time until utilization of that block reaches, say 80 to
20		90 percent, before beginning the assignment of numbers from another 1000
21		block within that NXX. Assigning numbers in this manner assures greater
22		accessibility to blocks of numbers should the Commission decide to
23		implement number pooling.
24		

1		Rate Center Consolidation ("RCC") involves the combining, or collapsing,
2		of existing incumbent LEC rating areas into fewer rate areas, so that fewer
3		NXXs are required by a carrier serving a local calling area.
4		
5		Number Pooling involves the sharing of a block of ten thousand numbers
6		among two or more carriers. The industry, in various forums such as the
7		Industry Number Committee (INC) and also Numbering Resource
8		Optimization Working Group (NRO-WG) along with several state
9		commissions (Illinois, New York and Pennsylvania) are examining number
10		pooling alternatives.
11		
12	Q.	ARE THESE THE ONLY ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE THAT MCI
13		IS SUGGESTING?
14	A.	No. MCI is only pointing out a few of the options that other state
15		commissions have implemented or are currently examining as alternatives
16		to area code relief, in conjunction with an area code split or overlay, in an
17		attempt to further extend the life of an area code.
18		
19	Q.	WHAT ARE THE IMPACTS OF THE SPLIT AND OVERLAY
20		ALTERNATIVES ON END USERS?
21	A.	Unfortunately, some end users will suffer some cost and disruption under
22		either the split or overlay alternatives, although the degree to which end
23		users are negatively impacted differs based on whether a split or overlay
24		alternative is selected.

The end user impacts of an overlay include: loss of all 7-digit local dialing (because the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") requires mandatory 10-digit dialing for all local calls as a condition for overlay implementation); loss of the ability to associate an area code with a unique geographic area code; confusion resulting from different area codes assigned in the same home, business or neighborhood; cost to customers (throughout the overlay area) that currently use their 7-digit number for advertising, stationery, etc., for new materials with their 10-digit number; and cost to customers (throughout the overlay area) to reprogram or replace automatic dialing systems (e.g., home alarm and apartment security systems, elevator emergency phones, etc.) that are currently programmed for 7-digits. Further safety concerns are created during any period when such devises are incorrectly programmed.

The end user impacts of an area code split include: need for customers in a portion of the existing area code to change area codes; some additional 10-digit dialing required for calling between the old and new area codes; and cost to customers in the new area code to change advertising, stationery, etc., to show the new area code.

## V. CONCLUSION

Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMISSION
REGARDING AREA CODE RELIEF FOR THE ORLANDO AREA?

MCI believes that a geographic split or an overlay is not the only solution
to relieve number exhaust in the Orlando area. MCI suggests that the

1		Commission immediately establish a workshop or other appropriate
2		process to consider all number conservation mechanisms (including, but
3		not limited to those suggested above) in conjunction with and perhaps prior
4		to that of any area code split or overlay.
5		
6	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
7	A.	Yes, it does.