



FILED

06-18-07

04:59 PM

A0706018

Exhibit C

March 5, 2007

To: All 760 NPA Code Holders and Interested Industry Members (California)

Subject: Additional Information for Conference Call to Review Public Comments

On March 14, 2007, NANPA will conduct a follow-up planning meeting via conference call to review the attached CPUC summary reports of the public comments submitted from the local jurisdiction and public meetings for the 760 NPA. Also attached are the 760 NPA CO Code Summary Report and the Pooling Administration Statistics Report.

The results of this meeting and the industry's recommendations from the October 10, 2006 meeting will be submitted to the CPUC in the form of a new petition for relief. The details of the follow-up planning meeting conference call are as follows:

Date: Wednesday, March 14, 2007

Time: 10:00 a.m. Pacific Time (11:00 a.m. MT, 12:00 p.m. CT, 1:00 p.m. ET)

Bridge: (630) 827-6799

Passcode: 6972048 #

If you have any questions, please give me a call at (805) 520-1945 or via email at joe.cocke@neustar.biz.

Sincerely,

Joseph R. Cocke
Sr. NPA Relief Planner
NANPA

C: Cherrie Conner – CPUC – Telecom Division

Attachments

Summary of all 760 Written, E-mailed, or Spoken Relief Preferences

Relief Preference	Written comments	E-Mailed to Public Advisor	CPUC website	Spoken Preferences	Total
Total votes for Split #1	187	5	407	6	605
Total votes for Split #4	1	0	169	0	170
Total votes for Overlay	12	17	233	6	268
Split #1 or Overlay	0	0	0	3	3
Total votes for Undecided	0	1	85	0	86
No Preference Stated	0	0	0	20	20
No Preference Stated but did want to keep 760	0	0	0	2	2
Total votes for None	2	26	124	0	152
Total votes for Un-Named Split	0	15	0	0	15
Total votes for TSO	0	6	0	1	7
Hexadecimal	0	0	0	1	1
Grand Total	202	70	1018	39	1329

Source: CPUC 2007

Speaker Summaries from 760 Area Code Meetings

I. Quantitative Summary of Preferences by Speakers:

Split #1 = 6

Split #4 = 0

Overlay = 6

TSO = 1

Hex = 1

Split #1 or Overlay = 3

No Preference Stated = 20

No Preference Stated but did want to keep 760 = 2

Total = 39 votes¹

II. Apple Valley Local Jurisdiction Meeting held on 02/05/07 at 1:30 P.M. and the Public Participation Meeting held at 7:00 P.M.

Apple Valley Local Jurisdiction Meeting held at 1:30 P.M.

- 1) Susan Cash (County of Inyo) – No preference stated.
 - She requested that a meeting be held closer to the Inyo County area.
- 2) Cory Kates (City of Indian Wells and Coachella Valley) – No preference stated.
 - He stated that they have a large senior population, and that he wanted to know how this change would work.
- 3) Joyce Masamitsu (Verizon Wireless) – Overlay.
 - She stated that the overlay is the best option, in that it allows all parties which wish to keep the 760 area code to do so with a certainty.

Apple Valley Public Participation Meeting Held at 7:00 P.M.

- 1) Lawrence Johnston (Self) – Overlay.
 - He thinks that “they” always must change because of San Diego area residents, and that the overlay is the best plan.
- 2) Charles Collarini (Self) – No preference stated.
 - He wanted to know when a decision would be made regarding whom received 760.

¹ There were a total of 43 speakers; however 4 were from the industry and therefore their votes for the overlay were not included in this survey.

- 3) Brett Collin (Self) – No preference stated.
 - He wanted to know why they couldn't have multiple area codes.
- 4) Charles Cotton (Self) – No preference stated.
 - He wanted to know if cell phones consumed more numbers than other technologies.
- 5) Ron Axelrod (Self) – No preference stated.
 - He wanted to know why a star couldn't be added to the area code to create additional resources instead of adding a new area code.
- 6) Donna Knoch (Self) – No preference stated.
 - She wanted to know what the drawbacks were to previously implemented overlays.
- 7) James Stevenson (Self) – No preference stated.
 - He wanted to know if the allocation of the area code is based on where the growth is.
 - He wanted to know if dialing went to 11 digits, how would toll calls be allocated.
- 8) Joyce Masamitsu (Verizon Wireless) – Overlay.
 - She stated that an overlay allows everyone that wants to keep their number to do so.
 - She stated that 17 states and Puerto Rico have implemented 70 overlays.
 - She stated that phones are now programmable, and this can handle any extra digits which may need to be entered.

Palm Springs Public Participation Meeting held on 02/06/07 at 7:00 P.M.

- 1) R. Klopfenstein (Self) – Overlay.
 - He supports the overlay.
- 2) Brian Nestande (Self) – Overlay.
 - He prefers the overlay.
- 3) Richard Brodie (Self) – Overlay.
 - He prefers the overlay because he has 10 million music CDs with his number on them, and he is a senior citizen.
- 4) Jess Miller (Self) – No preference stated.
 - He wanted to know if there was a way for Palm Springs to keep the 760 area code and assign the other area codes to other areas.
- 5) Lyndall Nipps (Self) – No preference stated.

- He stated that he is a consultant and wants to know what it is that compels the plans put forward.
- 6) Assemblyman John Benoit (California Assembly Person) - No preference stated.
- He wanted to know if seven digits could still be dialed with an overlay.
 - He wanted to know how the areas had been determined, and what the criteria was in determining who will keep the 760 area code.
 - He wanted to know how many area codes were left, and when they were expected to run out.
- 7) Justine Hill (Self) - No preference stated.
- She stated that “it is not inconvenient to dial 10 digits.”
- 9) Joyce Masamitsu (Verizon Wireless) – Overlay.
- She stated that the overlay is the only option that allows individuals to keep their numbers.
 - She stated that it is the most popular solution.
 - She stated that it has been utilized in 17 states.
 - She stated that the 310 overlay was smooth.
 - She stated that splits will cause more splits.

Carlsbad Local Jurisdiction Meeting held on 02/21/07 at 11:00 A.M. and the Public Participation Meeting held at 7:00 P.M.

Carlsbad Local Jurisdiction Meeting held at 11:00 A.M.

- 1) Karl Schwartmin (City of San Marcos) – No preference stated.
- He wanted to know if population change had been considered in this process.
 - He stated that the majority of a the area inside B is near build-out. Therefore the growth will occur in area A, and this is why they should get the new area code.
- 2) Newell Dubail (Self) – No preference stated.
- He wanted to know if telephone numbers can be assigned based upon equipment type.
- 3) Joan Wanseley (County Supervisor’s Office) – No preference stated.
- She wanted to know who else in California had an overlay.
- 4) Ken Metcalf (Self) – Overlay.
- He is concerned that a split will precipitate additional long distance charges.

- 5) Jenny Piesteron (City of Vista) – Overlay, if they can't keep 760.
 - They want to keep the 760 area code, and give the new code to the less populated areas.

Carlsbad Public Participation Meeting held a 7:00 P.M.

- 1) Chuck Rabel (Vista Chamber of Commerce) – Split #1.
 - They want split #1, but they want to keep the 760 area code.
 - They do not like the overlay.
- 2) Professor Neill (Self) – Hexadecimal.
 - He states that all of the plans presented are myopic. He believes the only long-term solution is to implement a hexadecimal dialing system.
- 3) Reese Brown (Self) -No preference stated.
 - He thinks that the 760 area code boundaries are wrong.
- 4) Enrique Mora (Self) – Split #1.
 - He thinks the split is necessary.
 - He thinks an overlay is a waste of time.
- 5) Stuart Barasch (Self) – No preference stated.
 - He thinks Area B has a higher income concentration than Area A, and they can better afford the costs of a change.
- 6) Mark Robinson (Self) – Split #1 if area B gets to keep 760.
 - He had no other comment aside from the qualified choice presented.
- 7) Doug Munson (Poweh Telecom) – Split #1 or an Overlay secondarily
 - He chose this option, because it provided 20 years of life.
 - He would like multiple area codes assigned to the area.
 - If no Split #1, then an overlay.
- 8) Ben Hayes (Self) – Split #1 or the overlay.
 - He wants Split #1 if San Diego keeps 760.
 - He wants the overlay if San Diego doesn't keep 760.
- 10) Mike McReynolds (Self) – No preference stated.
 - He stated that he would like the chance to buy his old number back.
 - He stated that he lost \$50,000.00 – \$100,000.00 on the last area code split.
- 11) Mark McCormack (Self) – TSO.
 - He wants cell phones to have their own area code.

- 12) Claudia Brown (Self) – No preference stated.
 - She states the law should allow movement of blocks among rate centers.
- 13) Courtney Enriquez (Self) – No preference stated.
 - She stated that Carlsbad had just experienced a zip code change.

El Centro Public Participation Meeting held a 7:00 P.M.

- 1) Norma Villicana (City of El Centro/City Council/City Manager's office) – Split #1.
 - They want 760 to remain in the Imperial Valley.
- 2) Dennis Morita (El Centro Chamber of Commerce) – Split #1.
 - They want to keep 760.
 - They think a change would negatively impact their economy.
 - They are a border town and a change would impact trade with Mexico.
- 3) Nicole Gilles (Brawley Chamber of Commerce) – Split #1.
 - They want to keep 760.
 - They think Split #4 would split the school district and injure the students.
- 4) Tim Kelly (Imperial Valley Economic Development Corp.) – No preference stated.
 - They would like to the 760 Area code to remain in their area.
- 5) Maria Birdsall (El Centro Police Dept.) – No preference stated.
 - They wanted to know how the PSAPS and ANI would be affected by the change proposals.
- 6) Cal Masons (Self) – Split #1.
 - He wants to keep 760.
- 7) Paula Jordan (T-Mobile) – Overlay.
 - She stated that the overlay is the only method which will assure them that they will all get to keep the 760 area code.
- 8) Leslie Andrews (Desert Local News) – No preference stated.
 - She wanted to know when a decision would be made.

California
NPA 760 NXX Summary
Data as of 3/5/07

<u>NPA</u>	<u>760</u>					
Assigned NXXs	720					
Protected NXXs	0					
Reserved NXXs	0					
Unavailable NXXs	36	See Note				
Available NXXs	44					
Total	800					
<u>Codes Assigned NPA 760</u>						
	<u>01/2005</u>	<u>02/2005</u>	<u>03/2005</u>	<u>04/2005</u>	<u>05/2005</u>	<u>06/2005</u>
	1	1	1	1	0	1
	<u>07/2005</u>	<u>08/2005</u>	<u>09/2005</u>	<u>10/2005</u>	<u>11/2005</u>	<u>12/2005</u>
	1	1	1	0	0	1
	<u>01/2006</u>	<u>02/2006</u>	<u>03/2006</u>	<u>04/2006</u>	<u>05/2006</u>	<u>06/2006</u>
	3	0	8	2	1	0
	<u>07/2006</u>	<u>08/2006</u>	<u>09/2006</u>	<u>10/2006</u>	<u>11/2006</u>	<u>12/2006</u>
	1	4	2	0	0	1
	<u>01/2007</u>	<u>02/2007</u>	<u>03/2007</u>			
	1	3	0			
Note: Unavailable indicates codes that are unavailable for assignment. These codes include, but are not limited to, test and special use codes (e.g., 958,959, 555, time), N11 and other unique codes (e.g., 976, 950), codes set aside for pooling, and codes with special dialing arrangements (e.g., 7-digit dialing across NPA boundary).						
UA Codes: total 18						
N11s, 555, 700, 950, 958, 959, 976,						
853-Time Service,						
570 - HVCI						
760- HNPA						
442- FNPA						

POOLING STATISTICS	
<i>Provided By: Cecilia Louie</i>	
ST/NPA:	CA 760
MEETING DATE:	
MEETING SUBJECT:	
<i>Relief Planning</i>	X
<i>Jeopardy</i>	
<i>Jeopardy Status Review</i>	
<i>UA NXXs</i>	
<i>Other</i>	
POOL START DATE (PSD)	8/2/2002
RATE CENTERS	
<i># Total</i>	84
<i># Mandatory</i>	60
<i># Mandatory-Single Service Providers (M*)</i>	2
<i># Optional</i>	21
<i># Excluded</i>	1
BLOCKS ASSIGNED	
<i># Total</i>	463
<i>(For the Last Twelve Months)</i>	
BLOCKS AVAILABLE	
<i>#Total</i>	998
<i>(As of preparation date: 2/28/07)</i>	
CODES ASSIGNED	
<i># Total</i>	23
<i># for Pool Replenishment</i>	18
<i># for Dedicated Customers</i>	0
<i># for LRNs</i>	5
<i>(For the Last Twelve Months)</i>	
CODES FORECASTED	
<i># Total</i>	24
<i># for Pool Replenishment and Dedicated Customers</i>	24
<i># for LRNs</i>	0
<i>(For the next twelve months)</i>	