



0000091525

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

DEC 18 2000

DOCKETED BY *CP*

RECEIVED

2000 DEC 18 P 3:06

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL

From: <Sphboc@aol.com>
To: CC.UTIL(hmurphy)
Date: 12/17/00 9:17pm
Subject: T-00000F-99-0641 (Proposed split of Area Code 520).

It appears that use of a properly-designed "overlay", as opposed to a geographic split, might result in less overall inconvenience and confusion. In the case of 520, the exchanges tend to be more-or-less-evenly distributed, over most of the State. From any given exchange, a relatively small fraction of the other exchanges are local calls; all other calls ALREADY require dialing of 1-520.

Consider the Flagstaff area; there may be as many as 50 exchange prefixes within its non-toll calling area. Assume that another 50 exchanges need to be implemented; due to numbering limitations, all of these must go into a "521" area code. Will this require that all local calls, between 520 and 521, dial more than seven digits?

Not necessarily. As long as only one exchange, with a given prefix, is a local call, this can be the one which is connected to when only seven digits are dialed. For example, 520-745 is currently implemented in Tucson; 520-779 is currently implemented in Flagstaff. If we implement 521-779 in Tucson, and 521-745 in Flagstaff, both of the latter can be dialable, within their local calling area, with only seven digits.

The underlying reason why this would be viable in 520 is that relatively few exchanges need to be, from any given exchange, local calls.

Steven P Haver/602-242-9708/251-6104

CC: CC.SMTP("jtucker@azdailysun.com")