

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**03-24-08
10:33 AM

March 24, 2008

Agenda ID # 7494
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 07-12-018

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) O'Donnell. It will not appear on the Commission's agenda for at least 30 days after the date it is mailed. The Commission may act then, or it may postpone action until later.

When the Commission acts on the proposed decision, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend or modify it, or set it aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Article 14 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), accessible on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov. Pursuant to Rule 14.3, opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages.

Comments must be filed either electronically pursuant to Resolution ALJ-188 or with the Commission's Docket Office. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to ALJ O'Donnell at jpo@cpuc.ca.gov and the assigned Commissioner. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ ANGELA K. MINKIN
Angela K. Minkin, Chief
Administrative Law Judge

ANG:eap

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ O'DONNELL** (Mailed 3/24/2008)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of the North American
Numbering Plan Administrator, on Behalf
of the California Telecommunications
Industry, for Relief of the 818 Numbering
Plan Area.

Application 07-12-018
(Filed December 19, 2007)

**OPINION GRANTING REQUEST FOR AREA CODE
OVERLAY IN THE 818 AREA CODE**

1. Summary

By this decision, we grant the application, filed by the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) on behalf of the telecommunications industry (industry), requesting approval of an all-services distributed overlay (overlay) for the 818 numbering plan area (NPA), which currently utilizes the 818 area code, with a 13-month implementation schedule.¹ The overlay will provide additional numbering resources to meet the demand for telephone numbers. Implementation shall commence immediately.

¹ As a neutral third party administrator, NANPA has no independent view regarding the relief option proposed in the application by the industry. The "industry" is composed of current and prospective telecommunications carriers operating in, or considering operations within, the 818 area code. The 818 NPA is the geographic area served by the 818 area code. For convenience and because it is common practice, we refer to both as the 818 area code.

To facilitate implementation of the overlay, a public education program (PEP) will be implemented.

After the implementation period, the overlay area code (747) will be available in the same geographic location as the current 818 area code. Consequently, customers must dial the three-digit area code for all calls to and from telephone numbers with the 818 and 747 area codes.² Customers may begin using this new dialing procedure six months after the start of the 13-month implementation schedule and continue to do so for six months, i.e., during the permissive dialing period. However, customers must use the new dialing procedure at the start of the mandatory dialing period 12 months after the start of the implementation schedule. No customers will be required to change their telephone numbers. New telephone numbers with the 747 area code will be issued to customers beginning one month after the start of the mandatory dialing period.

This proceeding is closed.

2. Background

The 818 area code was created in 1984 when it was geographically split from the 213 area code. In 1997, the original 818 area code was split creating the 626 area code and the current 818 area code. The current 818 area code covers predominantly the San Fernando Valley area of Los Angeles County in Southern California.

² The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in paragraph 70 of *FCC 00-429* “required mandatory 10-digit dialing for all calls in areas served by overlays to ensure that competition will not be deterred in overlay area codes as a result of dialing disparity.”

In Decision (D.) 99-10-022, the Commission approved a two-way split of the 818 area code as a backup plan to the number conservation measures it ordered in that decision. As a result, thousand-block number pooling and other conservation measures have extended the life of the 818 area code and delayed the need for an area code change.³ However, at this point in time, conservation measures have run their course, and the remaining supply of numbers has dwindled to the point that a new area code must be opened. NANPA estimates that the 818 area code will exhaust in the third quarter of 2009.⁴

The application presents two alternatives. The first alternative consists of an area code split, which would geographically divide the 818 area code into two area codes. This is the same split adopted in D.99-10-022. In a split, one side of the split retains the existing area code, while the other side acquires the new area code. The other alternative is an all-services overlay where the original and new area codes apply to the same geographic area. Both alternatives result in area codes estimated to exhaust in 24-26 years.

3. Need for a New Area Code

Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code §§ 7936 and 7943(c), before approving any new area code, the Commission must obtain utilization data from NANPA for any area code for which a change is proposed, perform a telephone utilization

³ Thousand-block number pooling is a resource allocation system that divides a prefix or central office code (NXX code), which is a group of 10,000 telephone numbers, into ten sequential blocks or groups of 1,000 telephone numbers and allocates telephone numbers in blocks of 1,000. This system allows multiple service providers operating in the same rate area to share the ten thousand-blocks in a prefix at the thousand-block level.

⁴ An area code reaches "exhaust" when the supply of available central office codes or NXX codes (three-digit prefixes in common parlance) is depleted.

study and implement all reasonable telephone number conservation measures.⁵ Where there is no reasonable alternative other than to create a new area code, the Commission must do so in a way that creates the least inconvenience for customers.⁶

As set out above, the Commission adopted number conservation measures that extended the life of the 818 area code. Despite these measures, NANPA now projects the 818 area code will exhaust in the third quarter of 2009. NANPA fully supported this projection by providing utilization data and performing a utilization study on the 818 area code.⁷ The Commission's Communications Division (CD) reviewed the utilization data and study and agrees that the 818 area code will exhaust in the third quarter of 2009. Thus, the statutory requirements of §§ 7936 and 7943(c) have been satisfied. Accordingly, there is no other reasonable alternative but to create a new area code.

4. Split versus Overlay

A split allows some existing customers to retain their current telephone numbers while others will not. Those customers whose numbers change will incur the inconvenience of having to notify family, friends and those they do business with of the change. In the case of some businesses, they will also incur costs for new business cards, stationary, etc., and may lose business because existing or potential customers are not made aware of the change. All customers

⁵ All citations are to the Public Utilities Code, unless otherwise indicated.

⁶ § 7943(a).

⁷ The utilization data and study consists of NANPA's October 2007 Number Resource and Utilization Forecast and NPA Exhaust Analysis, which form the basis for NANPA's exhaust forecast.

will have to dial 1 plus the area code and the new phone number (1+10 digit dialing) to reach customers who are on the opposite side of the geographic demarcation between the 818 area code and the new area code.

An overlay requires no customers to change their numbers. However, they will have to use 1+10 digit dialing for all calls.

5. Public Meetings and Comments

Section 7931(e)(2) requires NANPA and Commission staff to conduct at least one meeting for representatives of local jurisdictions and three public meetings within nine months from when NANPA informs the Commission of the need for an area code change. The purpose of the meetings is to inform the local representatives and the public about the area code change options and provide a forum for them to voice their opinions concerning the proposed options.

With NANPA's assistance, the CD staff conducted a meeting with the industry on January 14, 2007, via conference call, to discuss the relief options. The industry reached a unanimous consensus to recommend the overlay.

On October 22, 2007, a meeting with representatives of local jurisdictions was held in Glendale, California. Public participation meetings were held in the Cities of Burbank (October 22, 2007), Calabasas (October 23, 2007), San Fernando (October 23, 2007) and Van Nuys (October 24, 2007). At the meetings, attendees were given the option of indicating their preferences by commenting orally or in writing using comment forms. In addition, the Commission received input via e-mail and the Commission's web site. Overall, the Commission received 741 statements of preferences and comments of which 442 supported the overlay, 199 favored a geographic split and 100 did not indicate a preference.

On November 29, 2007, another industry relief meeting was held to discuss the results of the above meetings and comments. The industry consensus was to recommend the overlay.

6. Discussion

The Commission adopted a split rather than an overlay for the 818 area code in D.99-10-022. However, due to the passage of time, it is reasonable to reconsider that decision.

While most customers responded in favor of the overlay, many did not. The reason most commonly cited was the inconvenience of 1+10-digit dialing.⁸ In addition, some members of the public opposed any change at all or preferred that there be a unique area code for a given geographic area. While we are sympathetic to these concerns, some level of inconvenience and change is inevitable to expand the supply of telephone numbers available in this region. Ceasing to issue new telephone numbers is not a viable option. Overall, we conclude that the overlay will cause the least inconvenience for consumers and is the option preferred by customers and the industry. Thus, we adopt it as proposed. However, there is a need for a PEP to facilitate implementation of the overlay.

7. Public Education Program (PEP)

7.1. Background

⁸ In ordering paragraph 5 of D.96-12-086, the Commission ordered that mandatory 1+10-digit dialing “be implemented as a condition of approving any overlay, but only in the NPA regions covered by the overlay” to alleviate any anticompetitive consequences of an area code overlay.

In D.96-12-086, in Rulemaking (R.) 95-04-043 and Investigation (I.) 95-04-044, we decided that an appropriate customer education program was necessary when instituting overlays to explain the concept of an overlay, the fact that the new dialing procedure will not affect the distinction between local and toll calls or the rates charged for the calls, and the mandatory 1+10-digit dialing procedure. We also required the industry to correct signage for dialing instructions on payphones and in directories.

In D.98-05-021, in R.95-04-043 and I.95-04-044, we:

- Required service providers to institute an instructional announcement directing callers to dial 1+10-digits indefinitely after implementing the overlay;
- Required the PEP to communicate changes associated with the overlay to children, the elderly, the disabled community, and the various ethnic groups in the region;
- Prioritized the education of those entities that will need to reprogram equipment due to the new dialing procedure, such as alarm companies;
- Required the PEP to inform customers how to dial directory assistance to locate numbers applicable to different area codes within the overlay region;
- Required the use of press releases, television and radio announcements, billing inserts and the updating of telephone directories; and
- Extended the coverage of the PEP to include not only the region in which the overlay will be implemented, which should be the first priority, but also the adjacent area codes and, to a lesser extent, the whole state.

In D.98-12-081, in R.95-04-043 and I.95-04-044, we set four major objectives for the PEP:

- Public awareness of the change in dialing patterns and area code identification resulting from implementation of the overlay;
- Public understanding of how they will be affected by the change and the rationale behind the change;
- Public assurance that the cost and quality of service will not be adversely affected; and
- Promotion of positive acceptance by customers of the change.

In D.98-12-081, we required:

- The operation of a call center for consumers to obtain information regarding the overlay;
- Targeted paid advertising in the relevant zoned editions of major newspapers as well as newspapers targeted to ethnic communities;
- Bill insert notices to the adjacent area codes;
- Limited use of billboard and radio advertising;
- Mailing of letters, brochures, and collateral materials to local government officials in the overlay and adjacent area codes.

In D.05-08-040, in R.95-04-043 and I.95-04-044, we required:

- The activities and standards previously required for the 310 and 408 overlay PEPs to achieve at least a 70% public awareness level;
- PEP outreach efforts to specifically target key governmental agencies, community leaders, chambers of commerce, major airports, hospitals, alarm providers, pay telephone providers and the state coordinator for E-911;
- Special outreach to senior citizens, children, the disabled, and ethnic minorities including targeted newspaper, billboard, radio, and television advertising.

The application proposes to conduct a PEP, but includes no information on it.

7.2. Discussion

The assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling seeking comments on a proposed PEP. The proposed PEP was based on what we have authorized in previous decisions and the PEPs ultimately implemented. The comments were considered in developing the PEP adopted in this decision and included as Attachment A.

Previously, we have authorized our staff to oversee the finalization and implementation of the PEP.⁹ Accordingly, we direct the CD Director to perform this function. In doing so, the CD Director may designate CD staff to carry out these tasks.

In previous decisions, we have specified a budget for the PEP.¹⁰ We see no need to specify a specific budget here, because the industry should have sufficient experience with previous PEPs to determine the specifics of the budget. We require the industry to fund the PEP as necessary to achieve at least a 70% customer awareness and understanding of the change in dialing patterns and area code identification resulting from implementation of the overlay, how they will be affected by the change and the rationale behind the change. Given the budget for previous PEPs, we expect the budget to be roughly \$500,000. The 70% awareness requirement shall be across all major customer groups.

In previous decisions, we have utilized an industry task force to implement the PEP and manage the PEP fund. We do so here, and require this

⁹ D.98-12-081, Ordering Paragraph 7.

task force to include Commission staff and representatives from the service providers holding numbering resources in the 818 area code as of the effective date of this decision. We require the task force to develop a reasonable means of delineating the division of responsibility for the PEP activities so that adequate tracking and compliance can be assured. The task force will be responsible for developing the materials and content of the PEP, maximizing the use of prior PEP efforts, and conforming to the requirements of this order.

We authorize the CD Director to require sufficient industry contributions to the PEP budget fund to achieve the 70% customer awareness requirement. The CD Director shall require the task force to conduct a well-balanced and statistically significant survey of customers to determine whether the 70% requirement has been met. The survey shall be designed and conducted such that the general public, as well as senior citizens, children, the disabled and ethnic minorities are adequately represented in the survey.¹¹ The task force shall submit the survey questions, process, and methodology to the CD Director for review and approval prior to implementation.

If necessary to ensure the success of the PEP, the CD Director may require the task force to employ outside professional assistance in PEP implementation.

PEP educational, outreach, and advertising materials shall explain the type of area code change being implemented and the new dialing procedure, identify the region covered by the overlay, and explain that the cost and quality of telephone service will not be adversely affected by the change. The materials

¹⁰ D.98-12-081, Ordering Paragraph 1.

¹¹ Senior citizens are defined as those 65 and older.

should also address the permissive dialing period, the mandatory dialing period, the tasks consumers should do in preparation of the overlay, and the reasons for adding a new area code. The task force shall submit all PEP educational, outreach, and advertising materials to the Director of the Consumer Services and Information Division (CSID) for review and approval.¹²

7.3. Potential for Continuation of the PEP Beyond the Overlay Opening Date

In D.99-06-087, we determined that a second-phase PEP extending beyond the opening of the overlay area code might be necessary to promote necessary public awareness regarding the overlay. Therefore, the CD Director shall monitor the effectiveness of the PEP and, if the 70% customer awareness requirement is not achieved by the end of the 13-month implementation period, shall require the task force to continue the PEP to achieve the requirement.

7.4. PEP Funding

Similar to the funding mechanism established in D.05-08-040 for the 310/424 area code PEP, we shall require PEP funds for tasks jointly assigned to all the service providers to come from those service providers holding thousand-blocks in the 818 area code as of the effective date of this decision. The amount collected from each service provider shall be in proportion to the relative percentage of thousand-blocks that it holds as of the effective date of this decision. Any additional assessments or refunds shall be made on the same basis. Individual service provider costs for service provider-specific tasks shall be the responsibility of each service provider.

¹² The CSID Director may utilize CSID staff to accomplish the required functions.

The task force shall arrange for adequate accounting of the PEP fund to ensure it is properly managed. The budget shall not include the labor costs of each service provider's representatives on the task force. The task force shall periodically report to the CD Director concerning the details of collections and disbursements.

8. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of the ALJ in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____, by _____.

9. Categorization and Need for Hearings

In Resolution ALJ 176-3206, dated January 10, 2008, the Commission preliminarily categorized this application as ratesetting and preliminarily determined that hearings were not necessary. No protests have been received. Given these developments, a public hearing is not necessary, and it is not necessary to disturb the preliminary determinations.

10. Assignment of Proceeding

Timothy Alan Simon is the assigned Commissioner and Jeffrey P. O'Donnell is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. In D.99-10-022, the Commission approved a two-way split of the 818 area code as a backup plan to the number conservation measures it ordered in that decision.

2. Thousand-block number pooling and other conservation measures have extended the life of the 818 area code and delayed the need for an area code change.

3. The conservation measures have run their course, and the 818 area code will exhaust in the third quarter of 2009.

4. Both alternatives presented by NANPA, a split and an overlay result in area codes estimated to exhaust in 24-26 years.

5. Pursuant to §§ 7936 and 7943(c), before approving any new area code, the Commission must obtain utilization data from NANPA for any area code for which a change is proposed, perform a telephone utilization study and implement all reasonable telephone number conservation measures.

6. Pursuant to § 7943(a), where there is no reasonable alternative other than to create a new area code, the Commission must do so in a way that creates the least inconvenience for customers.

7. CD reviewed the utilization data and study provided by NANPA and agrees that the 818 area code will exhaust in the third quarter of 2009.

8. The meetings required by § 7931(e)(2) were conducted as discussed herein.

9. The Commission received 741 statements of preferences and comments of which 442 supported the overlay.

10. Due to the passage of time, it is reasonable to reconsider the Commission's adoption of a split rather than an overlay for the 818 area code in D. 99-10-022.

11. The overlay will cause the least inconvenience for consumers and is the option preferred by customers and the industry.

12. There is a need for a PEP to facilitate implementation of the overlay for the reasons discussed herein.

13. The application proposes to conduct a PEP, but includes no information on it.

14. The assigned ALJ issued a ruling seeking comments on proposed requirements for the PEP. The comments received were considered in developing the PEP included herein as Attachment A.

15. In previous decisions, we have utilized an industry task force to implement the PEP and manage the PEP fund.

16. In D.99-06-087, we determined that a second-phase PEP extending beyond the opening of the overlay area code might be necessary to promote necessary public awareness regarding the overlay.

17. No protests have been received.

Conclusions of Law

1. Since the statutory requirements of §§ 7936 and 7943(c) have been satisfied, there is no other reasonable alternative but to create a new area code.

2. The proposed overlay for the 818 area code should be adopted.

3. The PEP included herein as Attachment A should be adopted.

4. The CD Director should be directed oversee the finalization and implementation of the PEP.

5. The industry should be required to fund the PEP as necessary to achieve at least a 70% customer awareness and understanding of the change in dialing patterns and area code identification resulting from implementation of the overlay, how they will be affected by the change and the rationale behind the change.

6. The 70% awareness requirement should be across all major customer groups.

7. An industry task force should be utilized to implement the PEP and manage the PEP fund.

8. The industry task force should include Commission staff and representatives from the service providers holding numbering resources in the 818 area code as of the effective date of this decision.

9. The task force should develop a reasonable means of delineating the division of responsibility for the PEP activities so that adequate tracking and compliance can be assured.

10. The task force should be responsible for developing the materials and content of the PEP, maximizing the use of prior PEP efforts, and conforming to the requirements of this order.

11. The CD Director should be authorized to require sufficient industry contributions to the PEP budget fund to achieve the 70% customer awareness requirement.

12. The CD Director should require the task force to conduct a well-balanced and statistically significant survey of customers to determine whether the 70% requirement has been met.

13. The survey should be designed and conducted such that the general public, as well as senior citizens, children, the disabled and ethnic minorities are adequately represented in the survey.

14. The task force should be required to submit the survey questions, process, and methodology to the CD Director for review and approval prior to implementation.

15. If necessary to ensure the success of the PEP, the CD Director should be authorized to require the task force to employ outside professional assistance in PEP implementation.

16. PEP educational, outreach, and advertising materials should explain the type of area code change being implemented and the new dialing procedure, identify the region covered by the overlay, and explain that the cost and quality of telephone service will not be adversely affected by the change. The materials should also address the permissive dialing period, the mandatory dialing period, the tasks consumers should do in preparation of the overlay, and the reasons for adding a new area code.

17. The task force should be required to submit all PEP educational, outreach, and advertising materials to the CSID Director for review and approval.

18. The CD Director should monitor the effectiveness of the PEP and, if the 70% customer awareness requirement is not achieved by the end of the 13-month implementation period, should require the task force to continue the PEP to achieve the requirement.

19. PEP funds for tasks jointly assigned to all the service providers should come from those service providers holding thousand-blocks in the 818 area code as of the effective date of this decision. The amount collected from each service provider should be in proportion to the relative percentage of thousand-blocks that it holds as of the effective date of this decision. Any additional assessments or refunds should be made on the same basis.

20. Individual service provider costs for service provider-specific tasks should be the responsibility of each service provider.

21. The task force should arrange for adequate accounting of the PEP fund to ensure it is properly managed.

22. The PEP budget should not include the labor costs of each service provider's representatives on the task force.

23. The task force should periodically report to the CD Director concerning the details of collections and disbursements.

24. A public hearing is not necessary.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The proposed overlay for the 818 area code is adopted.
2. The public education program (PEP) included herein as Attachment A is adopted.
3. The Communications Division (CD) Director shall oversee the finalization and implementation of the PEP.
4. The industry shall fund the PEP as necessary to achieve at least a 70% customer awareness and understanding of the change in dialing patterns and area code identification resulting from implementation of the overlay, how they will be affected by the change and the rationale behind the change.
5. The 70% awareness requirement shall be across all major customer groups.
6. An industry task force (task force) shall be utilized to implement the PEP and manage the PEP fund.
7. The task force shall include Commission staff and representatives from the service providers holding numbering resources in the 818 area code as of the effective date of this decision.
8. The task force shall develop a reasonable means of delineating the division of responsibility for the PEP activities so that adequate tracking and compliance can be assured.

9. The task force shall be responsible for developing the materials and content of the PEP, maximizing the use of prior PEP efforts, and conforming to the requirements of this order.

10. The CD Director shall require sufficient industry contributions to the PEP budget fund to achieve the 70% customer awareness requirement.

11. The CD Director shall require the task force to conduct a well-balanced and statistically significant survey of customers to determine whether the 70% requirement has been met.

12. The survey shall be designed and conducted such that the general public, as well as senior citizens, children, the disabled and ethnic minorities are adequately represented in the survey.

13. The task force shall submit the survey questions, process, and methodology to the CD Director for review and approval prior to implementation.

14. If necessary to ensure the success of the PEP, the CD Director shall require the task force to employ outside professional assistance in PEP implementation.

15. PEP educational, outreach, and advertising materials shall explain the type of area code change being implemented and the new dialing procedure, identify the region covered by the overlay, and explain that the cost and quality of telephone service will not be adversely affected by the change. The materials shall also address the permissive dialing period, the mandatory dialing period, the tasks consumers should do in preparation of the overlay and the reasons for adding a new area code.

16. The task force shall submit all PEP educational, outreach, and advertising materials to the Director of the Consumer Services and Information Division for review and approval.

17. The CD Director shall monitor the effectiveness of the PEP and, if the 70% customer awareness requirement is not met, shall require the task force to continue the PEP to achieve the requirement.

18. PEP funds for tasks jointly assigned to all the service providers shall come from those service providers holding thousand-blocks in the 818 area code as of the effective date of this decision. The amount collected from each service provider shall be in proportion to the relative percentage of thousand-blocks that it holds as of the effective date of this decision. Any additional assessments or refunds shall be made on the same basis.

19. Individual service provider costs for service provider-specific tasks shall be the responsibility of each service provider.

20. The task force shall arrange for adequate accounting of the PEP fund to ensure it is properly managed.

21. The PEP budget shall not include the labor costs of each service provider's representatives on the task force.

22. The task force shall periodically report to the CD Director concerning the details of PEP fund collections and disbursements.

23. Application 07-12-018 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE

I have provided notification of filing to the electronic mail addresses on the attached service list.

Upon confirmation of this document's acceptance for filing, I will cause a Notice of Availability of the filed document to be served upon the service list to this proceeding by U.S. mail. The service list I will use to serve the Notice of Availability of the filed document is current as of today's date.

Dated March 24, 2008, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ERLINDA PULMANO

Erlinda Pulmano

***** SERVICE LIST *****
Last Updated on 20-MAR-2008 by: CPL
A0712018 LIST

***** PARTIES *****

Gregory L. Castle
Senior Counsel
AT&T CALIFORNIA
525 MARKET STREET, RM. 2022
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 778-1487
gregory.castle@att.com
For: AT&T CALIFORNIA

James Mctarnaghan
Attorney At Law
DUANE MORRIS
ONE MARKET, SPEAR TOWER, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 957-3088
jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com
For: Verizon Wireless

Kimberly Wheeler Miller
NEUSTAR, INC.
2000 M STREET, NW, SUITE 600
WASHINGTON DC 20036
(202) 533-2912
kimberly.miller@neustar.biz
For: North American Numbering Plan Administrator

Leon Bloomfield
WILSON & BLOOMFIELD
1901 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 1620
OAKLAND CA 94612
(510) 625-8250
lmb@wblaw.net
For: Omnipoint Communications dba T-Mobile

***** STATE EMPLOYEE *****

Maribeth A. Bushey
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5018
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-3362
mab@cpuc.ca.gov

Cherrie Conner
Communications Division
AREA 3-D
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2767
chr@cpuc.ca.gov

Michael Evans
Communications Division
AREA 3-D
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2438
mde@cpuc.ca.gov

Paul Krekorian
Assemblyman
PO BOX 942849
SACRAMENTO CA 94249-0043

Katherine S. Morehouse
Communications Division
AREA 3-D
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-5331
ksm@cpuc.ca.gov

Jeffrey P. O'Donnell
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5111
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-3134
jpo@cpuc.ca.gov

Alicia Priego
SENATOR ALEX PADILLA
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 4032
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
alicia.priego@sen.ca.gov

***** INFORMATION ONLY *****

Lynn Goodroe
AMERICAN MESSAGING
1720 LAKEPOINTE DRIVE
LEWISVILLE TX 75057
For: AMERICAN MESSAGING

Kanchan Matoo
ASSEMBLYMAN LLOYD LEVINE
6150 VAN NUYS BLVD. STE. 300
VAN NUYS CA 91401
kanchan.matoo@asm.ca.gov
For: ASSEMBLYMAN LLOYD LEVINE

George Guerra
AT&T
3475B NORTH 1ST STREET - ROOM 500
SAN JOSE CA 95134
For: AT&T

Marcy Baxter
AT&T
ONE AT&T WAY
BEDMINSTER NJ 07921
For: AT&T

Micki Burton
Associate Directory - Regulatory
AT&T CALIFORNIA
525 MARKET STREET, 19TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 778-1433
michelle.burton@att.com
For: AT&T CALIFORNIA

Weston Jackert
AT&T MOBILITY
1741 LOMA VISTA ST.
PASADENA CA 91104
For: AT&T MOBILITY

Mike Belmont
BROADWING COMMUNICATIONS
200 N. LASALLE ST.
CHICAGO IL 60601
For: BROADWING COMMUNICATIONS

Jerome F. Candelaria
Attorney At Law
CALIFORNIA CABLE TELEVISION ASSOCIATION
360 22ND STREET, NO. 750
OAKLAND CA 94612
(510) 628-8043
jerome@calcable.org
For: CALIFORNIA CABLE TELEVISION ASSOCIATION

Stacie Houghton
CBEYOUND COMMUNICATIONS
320 INTERSTATE N. PARKWAY
ATLANTA GA 30339
For: CBEYOUND COMMUNICATIONS

Holly Kuester
CHARTER FIBERLINK
12405 POWERSCOURT DR.
ST. LOUIS MO 63131
For: CHARTER FIBERLINK

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF AGOURA HILLS
30001 LADYFACE COURT
AGOURA HILLS CA 91301
For: CITY OF AGOURA HILLS

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF BURBANK
275 EAST OLIVE AVE
BURBANK CA 91510
For: CITY OF BURBANK

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF CALBASAS
26135 MUREAU ROAD
CALABASAS CA 91302-3172
For: CITY OF CALBASAS

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF GLENDALE
613 E. BROADWAY
GLENDALE CA 91206-4391
For: CITY OF GLENDALE

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF HIDDEN HILLS
6165 SPRING VALLEY ROAD
HIDDEN HILLS CA 91302
For: CITY OF HIDDEN HILLS

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
1327 FOOTHILL BLVD.
LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE CA 91011
For: CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
200 N. SPRING STREET, RM 360
LOS ANGELES CA 90012
For: CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF PASADENA
100 N. GARFIELD AVE
PASADENA CA 91109
For: CITY OF PASADENA

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF SAN FERNANDO
117 MANEIL STREET
SAN FERNANDO CA 91340
For: CITY OF SAN FERNANDO

CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS, CITY CLERK
CIVIC ARTS PLAZA
2100 THOUSAND OAKS BLV
THOUSAND OAKS CA 91362
For: CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

Attn: City Clerk
CITY OF WESTLAKE VILLAGE
31200 OAK CREST DRIVE
WESTLAKE VILLAGE CA 91361
For: CITY OF WESTLAKE VILLAGE

Kimberly Swenson
COMCAST PHONE, LLC
5800 S. QUEBEC ST.
GREENWOOD VILLAGE CO 80111
For: COMCAST PHONE, LLC

Michael Hess
COMMPARTNERS
3291 N. BUFFALO DR. SUITE 150
LAS VEGAS NV 89129
For: COMMPARTNERS

Kevin Neilan
COOK TELECOM, INC.
9388-B PACIFIC HEIGHTS BLVD.
SAN DIEGO CA 92121
For: COOK TELECOM, INC.

Moussa Attallah
CROWN CELLULAR
1385 N. CITRUS AVE
COVINA CA 91722
For: CROWN CELLULAR

Steve Hamilton
DIGITCOM SERVICES, INC.
5280 E. BEVERLY BLVD. SUITE C, PMB 274
LOS ANGELES CA 90022
For: DIGITCOM SERVICES, INC.

Jennifer Imbag
FONES4ALL
6320 CANOGA AVE, SUITE 650
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367
For: FONES4ALL

Karla Gallenberger
GLOBAL CROSSING
2737 S. RIDGE RD.
GREEN BAY WI 54304

Janet Lima
GLOBAL NAPS
10 MERRYMOUNT RD.
QUNICY MA 02169
For: GLOBAL NAPS

Terry Kreglo
GVC WINSTAR
PO BOX 7153
MCLEAN VA 22016
For: GVC WINSTAR

Alex Pannath
INTEGRATED COMMUNICATIONS CONSULTANTS
333 WASHINGTON BLVD.
MARINA DEL REY CA 90292
For: INTEGRATED COMMUNICATIONS
CONSULTANTS

Ploude Joshua
LA CURACAO TEL
1605 W. OLYMPIC BLVD. SUITE 701
LOS ANGELES CA 90015
For: LA CURACAO TEL

Leslie Miklos
LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS
121 CHAMPION WAY
CANONSBURG PA 15317
For: LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS

Attn: County Clerk
LOS ANGELES COUNTY
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90012
For: LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Cynthia Smith
METRO PCS, ROYAL STREET COMMUNICATIONS
511 S. U.S. HIGHWAY 301
TAMPA FL 33619

Penny Compton
MPOWER COMMUNICATIONS
330 N. CIMARRON RD.
LAS VEGAS NV 89129
For: MPOWER COMMUNICATIONS

Joseph R. Cocke
Senior Npa Relief Planner
NEUSTAR, INC.
1445 LOS ANGELES AVE., SUITE 301-N
SIMI VALLEY CA 93065
(805) 520-1945
Joe.Cocke@neustar.biz
For: NEUSTAR, INC.

A.07-12-018 ALJ/JPO/eap

Joe Cocke
NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN
1445 E. LOS ANGELES AVE, SUITE 301-N
SIMI VALLEY CA 93065
For: NANPA

Todd Lesser
NORTH COUNTY COMMUNICATIONS CORP
3802 ROSECRANS ST.
SAN DIEGO CA 92110
For: NORTH COUNTY COMMUNICATIONS CORP

Alexandra Hanson
O1 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
1515 K STREET, SUITE 100
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 554-2115
ahanson@o1.com
For: O1 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Jami Perez
PAC WEST COMMUNICATIONS
4217 CORONADO AVE
STOCKTON CA 95204
For: PAC WEST COMMUNICATIONS

John Klass
PACIFIC CENTREX
6855 TUJUANGA AVE.
NORTH HOLLYWOOD CA 91605
For: PACIFIC CENTREX

Barbara Lainson
PAETEC COMMUNICATIONS
ONE PAETEC PLAZA
FAIRPORT NY 14450
For: PAETEC COMMUNICATIONS

Christopher Stumpf
PLANET TELESIS
20501 VENTURA BLVD. SUITE 148A
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91364
For: PLANET TELESIS

Michael Schelin
SHELCOMM
14160 LIVE OAK AVE
BALDWIN PARK CA 91706
For: SHELCOMM

Patrick Maroney
SPRINT NEXTEL
6330 SPRINT PARKWAY
OVERLAND PARK KS 66251-6102
For: SPRINT NEXTEL

Paula Jordan
T-MOBILE
2380 BISSO LANE, SUITE A
CONCORD CA 94520
For: T-MOBILE

Andrew L. Rasura
Government And Regulatory Manager
TCAST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
24251 TOWN CENTER DR., 2ND FLOOR
VALENCIA CA 91355
(661) 253-5030
arasura@tcastcom.com
For: TCAST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Darrick Dobson
TELEKENEX
3221 20TH STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110
For: TELEKENEX

Maureen Matthews
TELSCAPE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
606 E. HUNTINGTON DR.
MONROVIA CA 91016
For: TELSCAPE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Marc O'Krent
THE TELEPHONE CONNECTION OF L.A. INC.
9911 WEST PICO BLVD., ROOM 680
LOS ANGELES CA 90035-2710
(310) 789-7979
mok@ttcmail.net
For: THE TELEPHONE CONNECTION OF L.A. INC.

Tom Pease
TIME WARNER TELECOM
5700 S. QUEBEC ST.
GREENWOOD VILLAGE CO 80110
For: TIME WARNER TELECOM

Mark Burns
USA MOBILITY
2800 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
PLANO TX 75074
For: USA MOBILITY

Jason Mills
UTILITY TELEPHONE, INC.
7720 LORRAINE AVE, SUITE 109
STOCKTON CA 95210
(209) 940-1000
jmills@utilitytelephone.com
For: UTILITY TELEPHONE, INC.

Attn: County Clerk
VENTURA COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
800 S. VICTORIA AVE
VENTURA CA 93009
For: VENTURA COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER

Jena Downs
VERIZON
99 SHAWAN ROAD
COCKEYSVILLE MD 21030
For: VERIZON

Debra Gooden
VERIZON BUSINESS
2400 NORTH GLENVILLE
RICHARDSON TX 75082
For: VERIZON BUSINESS

Jesus G. Roman
Attorney At Law
VERIZON CALIFORNIA INC
112 LAKEVIEW CANYON ROAD, CA501LB
THOUSAND OAKS CA 91362
(805) 372-6233
jesus.g.roman@verizon.com
For: VERIZON CALIFORNIA INC

Julie Marotta
VOLO COMMUNICATIONS
4 COOLIDGE ROAD
MILTON MA 02186
For: VOLO COMMUNICATIONS

Marlon Brown
XO COMMUNICATIONS
2637 SUMMIT AVE
PLANO TX 75023
For: XO COMMUNICATIONS

Bob Salvo
YMAX COMMUNICATIONS
270 S. MAIN STREET
FLEMMINGTON NJ 08822
For: YMAX COMMUNICATIONS

Lorraine A. Kocen
VERIZON CALIFORNIA INC.
112 S. LAKEVIEW CANYON ROAD, CA 501
THOUSAND OAKS CA 91362
(805) 372-6945
lorraine.kocen@verizon.com
For: VERIZON CALIFORNIA INC.

Joanne Edelman
VERIZON WIRELESS
2785 MITCHELL DRIVE MS 8-1
WALNUT CREEK CA 94598
For: VERIZON WIRELESS

Lolita Forbes
VERIZON WIRELESS
1300 I STREET NW
WASHINGTON CA 20005
For: VERIZON WIRELESS

(END OF SERVICE LIST)