

**REPORT ON THE 909 AREA CODE
LOCAL JURISDICTION MEETINGS AND
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETINGS**

Held on July 11-17, 2003

In

Riverside, San Bernardino, Murrieta, Moreno Valley, and Ontario

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

TELECOMMUNICATIONS DIVISION

September 11, 2003

Prepared by the Telecommunications Division Staff

BACKGROUND

As required by the Federal Communications Commission, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) must adopt a contingency plan to provide for the possibility of an area code change for the 909 area code. In 2000, the CPUC suspended plans to introduce a new area code to the 909 area, instead initiating conservation measures that have extended the life of the 909 area code by nearly four years. The 909 area code is now projected to run out of numbers during the fourth quarter of 2003.

In June 2002 the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) filed with the CPUC the telecommunications industry proposal for a new area code in the 909 area. Seven alternative area code changes were studied: six different area code splits and one overlay. The industry could not reach consensus on one plan, instead, in the plan filed, the telecommunications industry recommended two options: an area code split roughly along the San Bernardino and Riverside county boundaries (Alternative #7); or a “generalized overlay” covering the present 909 area code (Alternative #6). In the overlay proposal, all new telephones would have the new area code and all calls within the 909/overlay area would require 11-digit dialing.

CPUC PUBLIC OUTREACH

In order to learn firsthand what both public officials and regular citizens of the 909 area code thought about the proposed changes, and as part of the Commission’s outreach efforts, the CPUC hosted two meetings with the local jurisdictions and five meetings with the general public to review potential relief alternatives for the 909 area code.

Two local jurisdiction meetings, one in each of the affected counties (San Bernardino and Riverside Counties), were held as follows:

Friday, July 11, 2003 - 10:00 A.M.
San Bernardino City Council Chambers
300 North D Street
San Bernardino, CA 92418

Friday, July 11, 2003 - 2:00 P.M.
Riverside County Board of Supervisors-Board Room
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92501

In addition to the local jurisdiction meetings, the CPUC held five meetings to present the proposed alternatives to the general public and gather their input.

These meetings were held as follows:

Saturday, July 12, 2003 – 10 A.M.
Riverside City Council Chambers
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522

Tuesday, July 15, 2003 – 7 P.M.
San Bernardino City Council Chambers
300 North 'D' Street
San Bernardino, CA 92418

Wednesday, July 16, 2003 – 2 P.M.
Murrieta City Council Chambers
26422 Beckman Court
Murrieta, CA 92562

Wednesday, July 16, 2003 – 7 P.M.
Moreno Valley City Council Chambers
14177 Frederick Street
Moreno Valley, CA 92552

Thursday, July 17, 2003 – 7 P.M.
Ontario Senior Community Center
225 East 'B' Street
Ontario, CA 91764

As part of the outreach efforts, Commissioner Loretta Lynch sent letters to some 320 public agencies and elected officials notifying them of the meetings, asking them to attend, and enclosing informational materials regarding the potential area code changes. Letters were sent to city council members, mayors, city managers, fire chiefs, police chiefs, Riverside and San Bernardino County Boards of Supervisors, California State assembly members and senators, and U.S. congresspersons and senators associated with the 909 area code.

The Public Advisors Office in Los Angeles sent 154 letters to community-based organizations and various community groups. They also contacted the

League of Cities representatives who in turn sent emails notifying their member cities of the meetings. The San Bernardino League representative gave an overview of the proposals at its monthly legislative meeting about a month before the CPUC public meetings. The Public Advisor also telephoned all the legislative offices of the affected state assembly members and senators informing them of the upcoming meetings.

Prior to the meetings, the CPUC press office issued press releases to key reporters and contacts detailing information about the public meetings. Two articles appearing in the Riverside Press-Enterprise on June 18, 2003 and June 25, 2003 highlighted the series of planned meetings, listing their times and locations. All seven meetings were also noticed in the CPUC Daily Calendar and on the Commission's web site.

MEETING FORMAT

All meetings used the same format. Informational materials were made available at the meeting room entrance to incoming participants. These included an agenda, fact sheets regarding the 909 area code and conservation measures adopted by the CPUC, maps of all seven alternative area code changes under consideration, a rate center chart, and a comment form. Participants were requested to sign in, although this was not required. Speakers were asked to sign up using speaker cards. Following a brief presentation by CPUC commissioners or staff and Joe Cocke, senior planner with the North American Numbering Plan Administration, the meetings were opened to questions and comments from the public. Speakers were called in the order their speaker cards were received, with the public called first and industry representatives second.

Commissioners Loretta Lynch and Carl Wood were present at both local jurisdiction meetings in Riverside and San Bernardino on July 11, 2003 and the first public participation meeting on July 12, 2003. Commissioner Lynch also attended the last public participation meeting in Ontario on July 17, 2003. Mary Jo Borak of the Telecommunications Division participated in all seven meetings. Helen Mickiewicz of the Legal Division participated in the Murrieta and Moreno

Valley meetings. The Public Advisor's Office staff attended all meetings, providing informational materials and signing up speakers.

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

(see Attachment A for actual maps)

Alternative #1 – Two-way Geographic Split

The split boundary line runs along rate center boundaries in a west to east direction approximately through the center of the 909 area code, creating a northern area code referred to as "Area A" and a southern area code, referred to as "Area B." Area A would keep the 909 number following the split. Area B would be assigned the 951 area code following the split. The boundary line approximately separates Riverside and San Bernardino counties.

Alternative #2 – Two-way Geographic Split

The split boundary runs along rate center boundaries and carves out a small geographic section with the potential for high growth, referred to as "Area B" in the western portion of the existing 909 area code. Area B consists of 10 rate center including Corona, Arlington, Riverside, and San Bernardino. The remainder of the area code is referred to as "Area A". Area A would receive the new 951 area code, and Area B would retain the 909 number. Alternative #2 keeps the Ontario, Riverside, and San Bernardino corridor together.

Alternative #3 – Two-way Geographic Split

The split boundary line runs along rater centers boundaries and separates the 909 area code into a western portion, called "Area A" and a geographically larger eastern portion called Area B. Area A consists of 12 rate centers including Corona, Arlington, Rialto, and Upland. Alternative #3 keeps the Riverside and Sean Bernardino County seats together and the Pomona, Ontario, and corona corridor together. The projected lives of the two new areas are balanced so there is no recommendation regarding which side of the split line keeps the existing 909 number.

Alternative #4 - Three-way Geographic Split

In this option, the 909 area code is divided into three sections, with the western portion or Area A including the Chino, Ontario, and Upland rate centers. The northern portion, Area B, includes the Marshall, Riverside, Colton, and Calimesa rate centers. The southern portion, Area C, includes the Corona, Arlington, Moreno and Banning rate centers. This alternative keeps the Riverside and San Bernardino county seats together.

Alternative #5 - Three-way Geographic Split

This alternative is similar to Alternative #4, but with an enlarged Area A. It did not meet industry criteria and was not seriously considered as an option by the industry planning group.

Alternative #6 – All Services Overlay

A new area code would be assigned to the same geographic area as the existing 909 area code. With an overlay, all calls, whether within the same area code or outside of the area code, would require 11-digit dialing

Alternative #7 - Two-way Geographic Split

Alternative #7 is a variation of Alternative #1, except the Calimesa rate center is moved from Area A into Area B. The split boundary runs along rate center boundaries in a west to east direction approximately through the center of the 909 area code. In this option, the northern portion would retain the 909 number and the southern portion would receive the 951 area code.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE MEETINGS

Local Jurisdiction Meeting July 11, 2003 - 10:00 A.M.
San Bernardino City Council Chambers
300 North D Street
San Bernardino, CA 92418

Number of Attendees: 26
Industry: 8
Public: 18
Speakers: 6
Comment forms received: 5
Want change at this time
Yes: 3
No: 1
Prefer Alternative #1: 8
Prefer Alternative #2: 0
Prefer Alternative #3: 0
Prefer Alternative #4: 0
Prefer Alternative #5: 0
Prefer Alternative #6: 1
Prefer Alternative #7: 2
Opposed to Overlay: 4

Speakers' Comments

Dennis Hansberger, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Bernardino, presented Resolution 2003-208. The Resolution opposes the California telecommunications industry's recommended alternatives to the 909 area code expansion. Alternative # 6, a generalized overlay, is opposed because it would make local calls more difficult to dial and would be cumbersome for users. Alternative # 7, an area code split, is opposed because it would be an extreme hardship for residents of the City of Yucaipa and communities of Oak Glen, Forest Falls, and Angelus Oaks who would be placed in a different area code.

Rather, the County of San Bernardino recommends Alternative # 1, because this alternative essentially splits the area code along the counties of San Bernardino and Riverside county boundaries. This alternative would provide for all of San Bernardino County to retain the 909 area code and use the seven-digit

dialing that is currently in use. This alternative would include the City of Calimesa in the 909 area code, since Calimesa, Yucaipa, and the communities of Oak Glen, Forest Falls, and Angelus Oaks make up the “Calimesa Rate Center.” While the City of Calimesa, located in Riverside County, would have a different area code from the rest of Riverside County, it is a small city of approximately 7,300 residents. The City of Yucaipa, on the other hand, has approximately 43,500 residents. San Bernardino residents make up the vast majority of the “Calimesa Rate Center.” Alternative # 1 would therefore adversely impact fewer residents.

Dick Riddell, Mayor of the City of Yucaipa, presented a letter conveying his city’s views of the proposed alternatives. Yucaipa opposes Alternative # 7, since it separates Yucaipa from much of San Bernardino County. This alternative would separate a small portion of western Yucaipa from the rest of the community, creating two area codes within the city. Yucaipa has a population of approximately 45,000, and is the largest city in the rate center. Alternative # 7 disrupts both residents and businesses, and disassociates Yucaipa from those with whom they conduct on-going business. Historically, the city of Yucaipa has been considered a part of the “East Valley” of San Bernardino County. Residents’ travel/commute patterns are generally to the West, not to the South.

Rather, the City of Yucaipa supports Alternative # 1, which includes Yucaipa with neighboring communities in San Bernardino County. This association is consistent with current, well-established patterns of communication for residents within the city.

David Seidel, Information and Technology Coordinator for San Bernardino County, spoke of the difficulties of coordinating the telecommunications needs for a county covering 20,000 square miles. The county essentially runs its own phone company, with 16 full PBX systems and 20,000 county users. The poor economy compounds the fiscal impact any area code change will exact on county staffing needs and budget. Alternative # 1 solves most of the problems posed by the area code change options. There remains both an economic and training issue, however. The overlay alternative is extremely problematic, requiring one hour per switch to make changes required by the overlay, and the

county has over 60 switches. Taking the switches off line to complete the translations also entails real intangible problems.

Amy Carter, representing the City of Pomona, spoke in favor of a split, and stated that Alternative # 1 or # 7 are acceptable to the City of Pomona. They do not want an overlay.

Paula Jordan, representing T-Mobile, commended the CPUC on moving forward with plans to introduce a new area code to the 909 area. She stressed the importance of having sufficient numbering resources available in a timely manner.

Jan Morris, with Verizon Wireless, spoke on behalf of his company as well as T-Mobile, and AT&T Wireless. He also commended The CPUC for moving forward with plans for a new area code. He stated that the wireless carriers prefer an overlay, since it is less disruptive than an area code split. With an overlay, only new customers take a new area code. The 909 area code will exhaust in six to twelve months. It will take one year to implement a new area code. It is important to avoid time when there are no numbers and customers cannot get the wireless carrier of their choice. The benefits of an overlay include 1) choice, 2) no change for customers, 3) no consumers will have to pay for new stationery, 4) provides more numbers, and 5) is less disruptive.

Gary Ovid, with the City Of Ontario, indicated he was there to hear the presentations and learn the facts.

Comment Forms Received

Staff received five comment forms following this meeting. Michael Maxfield, representing the city of Claremont, prefers Alternative # 7, although he does not support an area code change at this time. He writes "We are adamantly opposed to an overlay because it would require the same company/organization to have two area codes as they add numbers. Strongly support increased efforts re: number conservation and CPUC's contamination petition."

Richard Schepler, writing on his own behalf, supports an area code change at this time. He prefers Alternative # 1, and writes " I am absolutely opposed to the overlay."

Anita Schuma, representing the County of San Bernardino, prefers Alternative #1. She writes, "Alt.1 runs on county lines in keeping with county needs. The overlay has the worst impact on the county."

Robbie Broedow, field representative for Assemblyman Bob Dutton, 63rd District, attended for education on the issue and to listen to comments. She asked to keep their office apprised of this process.

David Sediel, who spoke at the meeting, also filled out a comment form noting a preference for Alternative # 1.

**Local Jurisdiction Meeting July 11, 2003 - 2:00 P.M.
Riverside County Board of Supervisors-Board Room
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92501**

Number of Attendees: 21
Industry: 6
Public: 15
Speakers: 8
Comment forms received: 6
Want change at this time
Yes: 4
No: 2
Prefer Alternative #1: 3
Prefer Alternative #2: 0
Prefer Alternative #3: 1
Prefer Alternative #4: 0
Prefer Alternative #5: 0
Prefer Alternative #6: 1
Prefer Alternative #7: 8
Opposed to Overlay: 5

Speakers' Comments

Gregory Schook, Mayor of Calimesa, submitted a letter stating his city council on July 7, 2003 strongly endorsed Alternative #3. He added that his city is against the overlay, which would be confusing for seniors because of the 10 digit dialing. There would also be confusion over long distance calls. He stated the overlay would be "extremely detrimental". Commissioner Wood asked Mayor

Schook what his thoughts were about Alternative #1. He replied that Calimesa likes Alternative #3, since Redlands is a community of interest for them.

Kevin Pape, former mayor of Lake Elsinore, eight-year city councilman, and elected Riverside County Republican Central Committee, remarked that change is inevitable. He prefers an area code change, sooner rather than later. There are tens of thousands of new homes under construction in his area. He prefers to have as long a transition time as possible. Mandatory dialing should be a long time, the longer the more beneficial.

Chris Jensen, representing City of Riverside Fire Department, urges that 9-1-1 PSAPs (Public Safety Answering Point) remain contiguous following any area code change. Alternative #7 is preferred.

Cindy Roth, President of the Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce, says they only received two options, and of those two they prefer Alternative #7. She said, "No one likes the overlay." Hers is the 11th largest Chamber in the state, and their members all oppose Alternative #6, the overlay. The overlay is confusing, and would be difficult for visitors, she said. Additionally, Alternatives #2, #3, and #4 split Riverside and they hate this. They prefer a long permissive dialing period, as long as possible. They oppose the overlay, but Alternative #1 or #7 are acceptable. They also support receiving the new 951 area code on the Riverside side of the split line, and think the new area code would work nicely with a new advertising campaign they are developing for the area.

Darren Magness, Administrative Chairman of the Valley Health Systems, represents three hospitals in Hemet, Moreno Valley, and Sun City, as well as a nursing home, and his hospitals have a relationship with physician's group. He

stated that if we run out of phone numbers, then there's a problem. His message is to make a decision quickly and not hold up on alternatives. They prefer a split.

Jan Morris, with Verizon Wireless, is representing Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, T-Mobile, Sprint, Nextel, and Cingular. He re-iterated the comments he made in the morning's meeting.

Robin Von Coy, with the Riverside County Sheriff 9-1-1, manages their database and likes Alternative #7. Riverside County needs to stay together. She likes the concept of a technology specific overlay for cell phones.

Assemblyman John Benoit, representing the 64th Assembly District, is concerned with the adverse impacts of area code changes. He urges the CPUC to not do anything until we're out of numbers. He remarked that not having phone numbers will be bad for business. He urged the commission to move more rapidly to avoid impacting economic growth. He does not want Riverside split. He said that "county pure" and city pure" are important considerations. He doesn't like the overlay. He prefers Alternative #1 or Alternative #7.

Comment Forms Received

Juan Romero, representing the City of Riverside Telecommunications Department, supports a change at this time and prefers Alternative #7. He writes, "I was sent by the city of Riverside Telecommunications to express the choice of going to the 951 area code split and not the overlay...."

Robin Von Koehe, representing the Riverside County Sheriff's Department, 9-1-1, does not support a change at this time and prefers Alternative #7. She writes, "All of Riverside County - if any - should have the new area code. Cell phones should all have the new area code. I have a cell phone & I would rather my cell phone have the new area code and remainder of the county keep

the 909. Cell phones are able to call numerous other areas codes within calling area so what's one more? Overlay (#6) would be too confusing to the elderly & other people. Also confusing to know what's long distance & what's not. With 9-1-1 calls there are already numerous misroutes, the 11 digit dialing will be horrendous. I'm not in favor of a split but if it has to happen, keep all of Riverside County together".

Kevin Pape, from Corona, prefers a change at this time and supports Alternative #7. He writes, " I am not excited about a new area code, but if we are going to have one, I would rather see it done sooner rather than later. This is a very fast growing area. We cannot afford to run short of numbers. I do not like the overlay idea."

Chris Jensen, representing City of Riverside Fire Department, does not support a change at this time and prefers Alternative # 7. He writes, "#7 appears to be set on County lines. That's good!! Delay any change as long as possible. Local government cannot afford the change. Try to keep PSAPs intact." He also submitted 911 statistics for the first half of 2003, showing over 70,000 9-1-1 calls to the fire department.

Crista Curtis, representing the City of Riverside, supports a change at this time and prefers Alternative #7, with her second choice Alternative # 1. She writes, "Definitely NO overlay. We want a defined split." Gerald Buydos, also representing the City of Riverside, supports a change at this time, with Alternative #7 his first choice, and Alternative #1 his second choice. He writes, "Do not do an overlay."

**Public Participation Meeting
SATURDAY, JULY 12, 2003 – 10 A.M.
Riverside City Council Chambers
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522**

Number of Attendees: 27
Industry: 7
Public: 20
Speakers: 11
Comment forms received: 7
Want change at this time
Yes: 1
No:1
Prefer Alternative #1: 3
Prefer Alternative #2: 1
Prefer Alternative #3: 0
Prefer Alternative #4: 0
Prefer Alternative #5: 0
Prefer Alternative #6: 8
Prefer Alternative #7: 5
Opposed to Overlay: 1

Speakers' Comments

Gary Lupo, a local mortgage broker, prefers an overlay. He also believes that the evolution of technology can solve the area code dilemma without requiring an area code change.

Thomas Webb, a local resident, states that the cost of area code changes are borne by the consumers. Carriers have the answers and the CPUC should go after them to come up with a new system. Technology is the solution. He does not want an overlay or a split.

Steven Lipter, of Riverside, a retired telephone company technician, prefers an overlay. He prefers the European network system and thinks we should add four or five digits to the dialing pattern.

Richard Castillo, a local business owner and resident, is concerned about the loss of business and the bad economy. Area code changes are bad for small businesses. The CPUC is offering band-aid solutions. Technology should help us. The longevity of the solution is an important element. The overlay is the long-term resolution and effective for the time he's here.

Chris Jensen, Division Chief with the Riverside Fire Department, has responsibility for the Riverside, Arlington, and Woodcrest 9-1-1 system. He prefers map #7 and any geographic split to an overlay.

Rhonda Whittaker, with the California Small Business Association, says that it's hard times for small businesses. Workers compensation rules are bad and businesses are leaving California. The counties should be kept separate and prefers Map #7.

Bill Gavitt, resident of Riverside, believes Riverside should have its own identity. He thinks San Bernardino should undergo the area code change. He prefers Alternative #7 or #1. There is no sense to the overlay system.

Dan Felix, a native of Riverside, expressed his view that the problem lies with the North American Numbering Plan Administration. He believes we are going to a packet system, not analog or digital. We'll all have an individual phone number soon.

Edwin Richards, a resident of Riverside, and a small business consultant, wants local number portability for cell phones as a short-term solution. He likes the Alternative #6 overlay option, but it's not the solution to the problem.

Keith Karpe, with Verizon Wireless, is representing Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, T-Mobile, Sprint, Nextel, and Cingular. He re-iterated the comments made in the previous meetings by Jan Morris.

Comment Forms Received

Ann Vickers, supports a change at this time "only if necessary." She prefers Alternative #6, the overlay. She believes that with advanced technology, there is most likely a better solution that would last longer.

Edwin Richards does not support a change at this time. He prefers the overlay, Alternative #6. He asks the CPUC to work with FCC and Congress to insure portability of cell phones be implemented.

Joe Hernandez does not support a change at this time. He prefers none of the alternatives presented. Rather, he wants area codes assigned by county with an overlay for wireless only. He asks the CPUC to plan ahead! with the new change lasting at least 25 years.

Donald M. Saylor, does not want a change at this time. He prefers Alternative #2.

Bill Gavitt does not want a change at this time. He prefers Alternative #1 or #7.

Gary Lupo supports a change at this time. He prefers Alternative #1, #6, or #7. He asks that we dump the current system.

Inge Weatherbie supports a change at this time, but does not support any of the proposed alternatives. "We need a LONG term solution. It should have been in place by now. These are not new issues."

**Public Participation Meeting
TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2003 – 7 P.M.
San Bernardino City Council Chambers
300 North 'D' Street
San Bernardino, CA 92418**

Number of Attendees: 16
Industry: 7
Public: 9
Speakers: 5
Comment forms received: 3
Want change at this time
Yes: 1
No: 1
Prefer Alternative #1: 3
Prefer Alternative #2: 0
Prefer Alternative #3: 1
Prefer Alternative #4: 0
Prefer Alternative #5: 0
Prefer Alternative #6: 1
Prefer Alternative #7: 0
Opposed to overlay: 2

Speakers' Comments

Joyce Hopp, a Yucaipa resident, prefers that Calimesa remain in the same area code as Loma Linda. She likes Alternative #1. She prefers a very simple solution, and does not want 11-digit dialing.

Dennis Hansberger, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Bernardino, spoke again at this meeting and reiterated his comments from the first local jurisdiction meeting. The county prefers Alternative #1.

Melody Catlett likes Alternative #6, the overlay. She is mad that her phone bill will increase and wants the proposal on the ballot.

Keith Karpe, with Verizon Wireless, is representing Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, T-Mobile, Sprint, Nextel, and Cingular. He re-iterated the comments made in the previous meetings.

John Powers wishes to keep the 909 area code in San Bernardino.

Comment Forms Received

Melody Catlett (and Sara Sue Boggs) prefers Alternative #3. She writes that the overlay has real concerns as far as our elderly citizens are concerned.

Joyce Hopps supports a change at this time. She prefers Alternative #1 or #3. she writes, "I live in Yucaipa, and as a retiree from Loma Linda University and a continued user of its medical facility I would really appreciate being able to be in same area code (with no overlay) as Loma Linda. It will be very difficult for me & other senior citizens to work with an 11-digit number."

John Powers does not support a change at this time, but prefers Alternative #1. He prefers to keep 909 strictly for personal reasons. "The inconvenience of changing to another code would be quite large."

**Public Participation Meeting
WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2003 – 2 P.M.
Murrieta City Council Chambers
26422 Beckman Court
Murrieta, CA 92562**

Number of Attendees: 34
Industry: 9
Public: 25
Speakers: 10
Comment forms received: 7
Want change at this time
Yes: 0
No: 7
Prefer Alternative #1: 3
Prefer Alternative #2: 0
Prefer Alternative #3: 0
Prefer Alternative #4: 0
Prefer Alternative #5: 0
Prefer Alternative #6: 2
Prefer Alternative #7: 2
Opposed to overlay: 2

Speakers' comments

Gerri Engelhart, representing the City of Hemet, expressed concern that an overlay would be too confusing for their seniors. She wanted to know how their city could keep the 909 area code. She prefers the CPUC release the numbers in reserve.

Lavon Hayes had an off topic question regarding her AOL connection.

Gary Guinn mentioned the overlay for cell phones in New York City (later expanded to include wireline service) and suggested an overlay for wireless use.

Jim Horn suggested that social security has nine digits and we should apply that technology.

Mario Reyes has concerns that the overlay would be devastating to the community. In Temecula, a new exchange was introduced and many customers were required to take a seven digit number change when their numbers were moved to the new rate center. Having to undergo an area code change on top of the earlier change would be burdensome.

Wendy Lesovsky, a small business owner, agreed with other speakers concerning how unfair it is to small businesses to have to absorb the costs of an area code change.

Lorraine Smith expressed concerns for small businesses. She believes that small home-based businesses are being hit the hardest.

Steve Porter, representing the Murrieta Police Department, wants to insure that the Murrieta area keeps the 909 area code number. He believes that mixing area codes via the overlay option would be harder.

Bonnie Wright, with the Valley Economic Development Corp., is concerned with small business retention. Many businesses are moving out of the state. Workers Compensation is a big issue. She is concerned with who bears the costs of an area code change. She likes the overlay because of cost issues.

Keith Karpe, with Verizon Wireless, is representing Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, T-Mobile, Sprint, Nextel, and Cingular. He re-iterated the comments made in the previous meetings.

Comment Forms Received

David Rosenthal does not support an area code change at this time. He wishes for his area to keep the 909 area code with “NO” overlay.

James Horn does not support a change at this time. He wants the PUC, the FCC, and etc. to compel the phone companies to move forward technologically and stop wasting numbers.

Lorraine Smith does not support a change at this time. She wants the CPUC to create an option where Murrieta stays in the 909 area code. She expressed the following general comments: Murrieta has a high percentage of small/home-based business. Expenses associated with an area code change are too great. Operating a small business in California is already too expensive. We are being taxed to death. If California wants to remain a viable economic hub, they need to give businesses a break.

Janese Reyes would like to see Alternative #1 adopted, with Area B keeping the 909 area code and Area A changing to 951.

Mario Reyes does not support a change at this time, but prefers Alternative #1. He writes, “This would be a 3rd time for many Temecula residents and business in less than five years to make changes in their phones due to previous Verizon changes.”

Valerie Preston, with the Murrieta Chamber of commerce, does not support a change at this time, but prefers Alternative #1.

Rebecca Hogan, representing the retirement community of Air Force Village West, does not support a change at this time, but prefers Alternative #7. She writes, “Re: Overlay, Concerned about the effect on the senior community- They will be very confused & it will cause much grief.”

**Public Participation Meeting
WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2003 – 7 P.M.
Moreno Valley City Council Chambers
14177 Frederick Street
Moreno Valley, CA 92552**

Number of Attendees: 20
Industry: 8
Public: 12
Speakers: 6
Comment forms received: 7
Want change at this time
Yes: 3
No: 5
Prefer Alternative #1: 1
Prefer Alternative #2: 0
Prefer Alternative #3: 1
Prefer Alternative #4: 0
Prefer Alternative #5: 0
Prefer Alternative #6: 4
Prefer Alternative #7: 0
Opposed to overlay: 2

Speakers' comments

Tim Miller suggested another option than the alternatives considered. He would like to see area code 919 for cell phones, 929 for pagers, and 939 for specialized use.

Keri Then of Moreno Valley is disappointed with the arbitrary lines associated with the area code boundaries. She would like a national or regional area code plan for a new data base.

Gary Lupo is concerned that the Inland Empire is about to be cut in half. He would have opted for a split but now wants an overlay. He comments that smaller area codes are not good.

Jamil Dada, representing the Moreno Valley Chamber of Commerce, believes the area needs some form of relief. Because an overlay would disadvantage new businesses that would be using the new area code, he prefers a split as the best way to go.

Keith Karpe, with Verizon Wireless, is representing Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, T-Mobile, Sprint, Nextel, and Cingular. He re-iterated the comments made in the previous meetings.

Carol Miller remarked that in the 714/909 area code split, her phone number was listed incorrectly in the phone book.

Tim Miller believes that the overlay is the worst.

Robert Wood asked if we could implement a technology specific area code for wireless services.

Comment Forms Received

Hayes Lavon does not support a change at this time, but prefers Alternative #3.

Bonnie Wright, Chairman of the Valley Economic Development Corp, also does not support a change at this time, but prefers an overlay if a new area code must be implemented. She voiced concerns about the additional costs to the business community of a new area code, and does not want the burden of additional expense to the already overtaxed over burdened business community.

Wendy Lesovsky does not support an area code change but if one is necessary she would like to see the cell phones and pagers put in a different area code, freeing up local area codes for local locations.

Keri Then supports an area code change, but prefers none of the alternatives suggested. She would like a national plan that would allow use of numbers in under-utilized states and communities to be distributed to those communities and states that are growing.

Vaughn Lucas supports a change at this time and prefers Alternative #1.

Jose Sanchez does not support a change at this time but prefers either Alternative #6 (overlay) or Alternative #2. He commented that Alternative #2 is good since it allows Riverside and surroundings to be assigned the new 951 area code, with the neighboring area keeping the 909 area code.

Gerri Engelhart, with the City of Hemet, does not support a change at this time. She prefers carriers to release numbers they have in reserve. She states that because Hemet is a community of senior citizens, it would be a hardship to institute an overlay with 11 digit dialing, as well as the possibility that your next door neighbor could have a different area code.

**Public Participation Meeting
THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2003 – 7 P.M.
Ontario Senior Community Center
225 East 'B' Street
Ontario, CA 91764**

Number of Attendees: 24
Industry: 10
Public: 14
Speakers: 7
Comment forms received: 6
Want change at this time
Yes: 0
No: 4
Prefer Alternative #1: 1
Prefer Alternative #2: 0
Prefer Alternative #3: 1
Prefer Alternative #4: 0
Prefer Alternative #5: 0
Prefer Alternative #6: 4
Prefer Alternative #7: 3
Opposed to Overlay: 1

Speakers' Comments

Bob Henry wants mandatory dialing to last for a long period of time. He remarked that it is expensive to change business cards and stationery.

Margaret Zubia expressed concern that Ontario may be split in half geographically. She prefers an overlay.

Clint Combs submitted a letter detailing the business costs of an area code change to his pool repair business. The total expenses, including projected lost business, totaled \$6588.

Hank Fung supports the overlay and is opposed to splits.

Bill Ruh, Government Affairs Director of the Citrus Valley Association of Realtors, stated that no change at this time would be good. He believes business integrity and community integrity are important. He thinks the disadvantage of the overlay is the ten-digit dialing. He mentioned school boundaries, community college boundaries, and business interests as important considerations. Alternative #7 is the best choice, he opined. He prefers lengthening the time for dialing changes.

Keith Karpe, with Verizon Wireless, is representing Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, T-Mobile, Sprint, Nextel, and Cingular. He re-iterated the comments made in the previous meetings.

Paul Chapek of Pomona suggests no change is needed, as splits are inconvenient. He believes regional identify is important and is against overlays.

Comment Forms Received

Hank Fung does not support a change at this time, preferring the CPUC to delay this as much as possible. He prefers the overlay.

Clint Combs prefers the overlay, Alternative #6.

Paul Chapek does not want a change at this time, but prefers Alternative #7.

Bill Ruh does not support a change at this time, but prefers Alternative #7, as it best preserves the integrity of the business community.

Margaret Zubia does not support a change at this time, but prefers Alternative #3.

An anonymous writer supports a change, but only if it must be done. She supports Alternative #1, adding that the overlay plan would be very confusing.

Additional Comment Forms Received Following the Meetings

Comment forms received: 72

Want change at this time

Yes: 66

No: 4

Prefer Alternative #1: 72

Prefer Alternative #2: 0

Prefer Alternative #3: 0

Prefer Alternative #4: 0

Prefer Alternative #5: 0

Prefer Alternative #6: 0

Prefer Alternative #7: 0

Comment Forms Received

71 comment forms were received in two mailings from the Riverside Chamber of Commerce. Most of the forms were copies with the Alternative #1 checked and the “Yes” box checked indicating preference for a change at this time. The respondents filled in their names and addresses.

SUBMITTALS SENT TO FORMAL FILES

At the direction of the assigned Administrative Law Judge, Thomas Pulsifer, all informational materials received in conjunction with the local jurisdiction meetings and public meetings (Resolutions, letters, other submitted materials, comment forms, speaker cards, sign-in sheets) have been placed in the formal correspondence files in Rulemaking 95-04-043 and Investigation 95-04-044.

[Area Code Maps \(Alternatives 1 through 7\) -- Area Code 909](#)