

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Staff Briefing Papers

Meeting Date: October 16, 2014.....*Agenda Item # 2

Company: **All Utilities**

Docket No. **P-999/R-13-459**

In the Matter of Possible Amendments to Rules Concerning White Pages
Directory Publication and Distribution

Issue(s): A. Are rule amendments needed and, if so, what amendments?

B. How should the rulemaking proceed?

Staff: Christopher Moseng.....651-201-2223

I. Relevant Documents

Request for Comments published in the *State Register*October 14, 2013
Comments, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency December 5, 2013
Comments, Minnesota Cable Communications Association..... December 6, 2013
Comments, Pinnacle Publishing, LLC..... December 6, 2013
Comments, Product Stewardship Institute..... December 6, 2013
Comments, CenturyLink December 6, 2013
Comments, Citizens Telecommunications Company of Minnesota, LLC
and Frontier Communications of Minnesota, Inc. December 6, 2013
Comments, Minnesota Telecom Alliance..... December 6, 2013
Comments, Dex Media East, Inc. December 6, 2013
Comments, Minnesota Department of Commerce..... December 6, 2013
Notice of Comment Period on Revised Draft June 10, 2014
Notice of Extension of Comment Period..... June 27, 2014
Comments, Minnesota Department of Commerce..... July 1, 2014
Comments, Minnesota Cable Communications Association..... July 31, 2014
Comments, Minnesota Telecom Alliance..... July 31, 2014
Comments, CenturyLink..... July 31, 2014
Comments, Dex Media East, Inc. July 31, 2014

Comments, Citizens Telecommunications Company of Minnesota, LLC and Frontier Communications of Minnesota, Inc.	July 31, 2014
Reply Comments, Citizens Telecommunications Company of Minnesota, LLC and Frontier Communications of Minnesota, Inc.	August 11, 2014
Reply Comments, Minnesota Cable Communications Association	August 11, 2014
Reply Comments, Dex Media East, Inc.....	August 12, 2014

The attached materials are work papers of the Commission Staff. They are intended for use by the Public Utilities Commission and are based upon information already in the record unless noted otherwise.

This document can be made available in alternative formats (e.g., large print or audio) by calling 651.296.0406 (voice). Persons with hearing loss or speech disabilities may call us through their preferred Telecommunications Relay Service.

II. Statement of the Issues

Should the Commission publish a Notice of Intent to Adopt Rules and, if so, what rule language should be included with the notice?

III. Background

Commission rules currently require delivery of a printed white pages directory to each customer of a local service provider, except where an offer for a directory is made and explicitly refused by the customer.¹ Recently, parties have requested that the Commission vary this rule, in part because the economic and environmental burden of requiring printed directories may outweigh the directories' usefulness.

The Commission published a Request for Comments on possible rule revisions in the State Register on October 14, 2013, and sought additional comments on a revised draft on June 10, 2014. The Commission sought input on whether to modify or eliminate the directory requirement. In the initial request for comments, the Commission stated that:

[it] is likely to consider modifying or eliminating the requirement that local service providers deliver printed directories, and also consider allowing or requiring electronic publication of directories.

In an effort to focus the comments to maximize their usefulness for evaluating the directory rules, the Commission included a draft of possible rule language. The Commission asked participants to respond with the following considerations in mind:

- the expense, materials, effort, and environmental consequences of distributing printed directories;
- the effect on customers who may prefer to receive printed directories, and on customers who may prefer to receive electronic directories;
- the privacy issues that may arise from electronic publication of directory information;
- the economic effects, including identifying any other federal or state regulations that may have a cumulative effect;
- any other issue the Commission should consider.

After receiving and considering the initial public comments, staff revised the draft and solicited a second round of comments and reply comments. Staff revised the draft again in light of those additional comments.

The staff-recommended draft is attached as Appendix A to these briefing papers.

¹ Minn. R. 7810.2900, 7811.0600, and 7812.0600.

IV. Summary of Staff-Recommended Draft

At the outset of this rulemaking proceeding, staff developed a draft rule anticipating some of the likely competing interests at play regarding telephone directory distribution rules. Comments in this docket suggest that even among local service providers, and among customers, there is not complete agreement about the value, need for, or reasonableness of printed or electronic directories. The list of considerations posed to commenters (expense, environmental consequences, customer preference, privacy, and economic effects) also informed staff's initial rule draft.

Whether to continue to require telephone directories as a basic service requirement is a threshold policy determination for the Commission. Some comments recommend eliminating the requirement entirely. Implicit in the recommended draft is the premise that telephone directories will remain a basic service requirement. Staff approached the drafting process with this assumption, in the absence of contrary guidance from the Commission, to develop a draft reasonably suited for an environment where that basic requirement would remain in place.

Assuming that the Commission intends to continue to require directories as a basic aspect of telephone service, the draft constitutes an incremental step away from printed directories and toward electronic directories.

The draft allows Local Service Providers to determine whether they will offer electronic directories in lieu of printed directories, but ensures that individual customers may elect to receive printed directories if that is their preference. The draft also allows Local Service Providers *not* to publish electronic directories and to continue to deliver printed directories consistent with the status quo. Finally, in cases where an electronic directory is the Local Service Provider's default option, the draft requires notice to customers to ensure they know how to access or receive their preferred directory format.

The staff recommends this flexibility to balance the diverse interests of local service providers, customers, and the public. Some local service providers and some customers believe printed directories are useful and necessary. Others do not. Others still consider them more harmful than beneficial. Staff's proposed resolution is to allow for more flexibility in the publication of directories, facilitating a transition away from print and toward electronic directories.

V. Participants' Comments

The Commission received comments from a total of nine participants over two comment periods. All participants agreed with the premise that revising the rule at this time is reasonable and necessary, but not all agreed about the extent and the nature of the needed change.

Three participants commented only during the initial comment period. Their comments are summarized first. Six participants submitted comments in both rounds of comments—three now support the staff-recommended approach, and three recommend changes. For the six participants

commenting in both rounds, these briefing papers will focus primarily on comments made in the most recent comment period.

Dex, Citizens, Frontier, and the Minnesota Cable Communications Association also filed reply comments in the second round. Their positions with respect to other commenters' positions are noted in Section C, below.

A. Comments from Participants Who Commented Only in the First Round

These participants responded to the initial Request for Comments, but did not offer comments on the most recent draft: The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), Pinnacle Publishing, LLC, and Product Stewardship Institute (PSI).

1. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency commented “in full support of eliminating the requirement that the white pages directories must be delivered in a paper publication,” and in support of a rule that would require electronic directories except where a customer expressly elects to receive a printed directory. The MPCA stated that the PUC should require that electronic directories be the default directory format.

In support of its position, the MPCA pointed to negative environmental consequences of mandatory distribution of printed directories, including the consumption of resources and the creation of “CO₂ equivalent,” particulate matter, and volatile organic compounds. The MPCA also stated that notwithstanding state statutory requirements that phonebooks not be placed in the solid waste stream, the EPA estimated that in 2009 less than 37% of phonebooks were properly recycled. According to the MPCA, counties are bearing the burden and cost of recycling telephone directories.

Finally, the MPCA argued that even with electronic directories, customers should still receive emergency and government phone numbers in a paper form to ensure all customers have access to this information.

2. Product Stewardship Institute

The Product Stewardship Institute similarly argued that the mandatory distribution of white pages is no longer necessary, and that it should be discontinued except for individual customers who expressly elect to receive one. PSI cited resource consumption, release of CO₂ equivalent, and the expense of collection and recycling.

3. Pinnacle Publishing, LLC

Pinnacle Publishing commented to support electronic directories being an option for local service providers, but opposed making electronic directories mandatory and opposed an “opt-in” rule that would allow directory distribution only to those who have expressly requested one. Pinnacle argued that, besides having a First Amendment interest in distributing directories, selective

delivery of directories would be cost prohibitive using common directory distribution methods (bulk mail or hand delivery).

B. Comments Supporting the Staff's Recommended Draft

CenturyLink, Dex Media East, Inc. (Dex), Citizens Telecommunications Company of Minnesota, LLC, and Frontier Communications of Minnesota, Inc. stated in the most recent round of comments that they support the Staff's Recommended Draft. In their initial comments, these participants cited low demand for directories and a changed business and information environment as justification to revise the existing rule.

C. Comments Recommending Changes to the Draft

The Minnesota Department of Commerce (the Department), The Minnesota Cable Communications Association (MCCA), and the Minnesota Telecom Alliance (MTA) recommended changes to the Staff's Recommended Draft. The recommended changes are summarized and discussed below, with a focus on the changes recommended but not adopted by staff.

1. The Department

- The Department recommends using the term "Local Exchange Carrier" throughout, which would eliminate the need to define Local Service Provider in Chapter 7810. The Department argues that if the Commission intends for Local Service Provider to carry the same meaning as Local Exchange Carrier as defined in Minn. Stat. § 237.01, subd. 8, it should use one term consistently to avoid ambiguity.

Reply Comments

In reply comments, Dex opposed the Department's suggested changes, generally, because they are restrictive, unnecessary, and may cause delay in resolving this rulemaking.

Staff Discussion

Rule Chapter 7810 does not presently define Local Service Provider or Local Exchange Carrier. However, the existing rules imposing a directory requirement are in Chapters 7811 and 7812. Those rules currently impose the directory obligation—and all "basic service requirements"—on local service providers. Chapters 7811 and 7812 define Local Service Provider exactly as staff proposes to define the term in Chapter 7810.

Because staff's intent is neither to broaden nor to narrow the application of the rule, staff elected to use the term already in use, and simply to repeat the Chapter 7811/7812 definition in Chapter 7810 for clarity.

Staff believes that the term Local Service Provider is superior to Local Exchange Carrier. "Local Exchange Carrier" is defined in 7811/7812 as "a telephone company that is authorized to provide

local telephone service in Minnesota under Minnesota Statutes 1994, section 237.16, subdivision 2.” Minn. Stat. § 237.16, subd. 2 was repealed in 1995.²

The potential for confusion from changing the rule to apply to a Local Exchange Carrier, and thereby referring to a repealed statute, is much greater than from using a term already in use that does not inherit that ambiguity. Accordingly, staff has not adopted the Department’s recommendation.

- The Department recommends adding the phrase “and published” to 7810.2900, subp. 1. The Department asserts that it is necessary to specifically require that directories be regularly published. Citizens and Frontier do not oppose the Department’s recommended changes to 7810.2900, subp. 1.

Staff Discussion

Restating the publication requirement in this provision would appear to be inconsistent with the general subject matter of the rest of the subpart. The Staff Recommended Draft contains a requirement for regular publication of directories in parts 7811.0600 and 7812.0600.

- The Department recommends adding a requirement to printed directories to “display on the front cover the availability of, and how to access, any electronic complete directory for residential and/or business listings”

Staff Discussion:

Staff did not adopt this recommendation to maintain maximum flexibility for Local Service Providers to notify their customers of the availability and means to access an electronic directory. While many may voluntarily put this information on the front of printed directories, notification requirements in draft part 7810.2950 ensure that customers will receive effective notice of relevant directory information.

- The Department recommends specifying that electronic directories must make available information pertaining to emergency calls, including information for police and fire departments in a prominent location.

Staff Discussion

Staff did not adopt this recommendation to maintain flexibility in the presentation and technology of electronic directory information.

In drafting the requirements for electronic directories, staff were mindful of differences between presentation and use of electronic and print formats. Presentation of *relevant* emergency phone call information, beyond an instruction to call 911, presents a greater challenge in electronic format than in a printed directory that is distributed generally in a limited and certain geographic

² 1995 Minn. Laws Ch. 156 § 5.

area. Staff concluded that the usability decision involved in presenting relevant emergency call information is best left to local service providers.

- The Department recommended several changes to the Customer Option provision in 7810.2950, subps. 1 & 2. The provisions related to customer privacy have already been incorporated into the recommended draft.

Staff Discussion

The Department's recommended A, B, and C are already incorporated, with slight modification as D, E, and F in the Staff Recommended Draft.

Staff did not adopt the recommendations for 7810.2950, subps. 1 & 2 beyond those pertaining to customer privacy because they may not provide actionable guidance for local service providers. For example, the Department's recommended language is silent about notice obligations for local service providers that provide a complete directory using a combination of print and electronic publication. And, the suggested language would impose an obligation "upon issuance of a new [electronic] directory," but providers are likely to be constantly updating their electronic directories, not issuing them periodically.

However, a modified version of the Department's recommendation could serve to simplify the rule.

- The Department recommended adding language to 7811.0600 and 7812.0600 to expressly allow physical electronic media as a directory format option.

Staff Discussion:

Staff did not adopt the recommendation because it is unnecessary; the recommended draft does not exclude directories distributed as physical electronic media. The draft would allow physical electronic media as a form of electronically published directory.

2. The Minnesota Cable Communications Association

The MCCA's recommendations include 1) moving the directory-related requirements from 7810 to 7811 and 7812 and 2) adding language to expressly reflect "the need for coordination among local service providers to assemble complete directories and ensure that such coordination occurs in a fair and reasonable way."

Reply Comments

Dex opposes the MCCA's recommendations, stating that they are "solutions in search of problems, at best." Citizens and Frontier do not oppose the concept of moving the provisions into 7811 and 7812, but otherwise recommends to reject MCCA's proposals.

- The MCCA argues that the directory requirement rules fit more appropriately in chapters 7811 and 7812. The MCCA identifies several differences in defined terms that it argues supports its recommendation to move the rule from 7810 to those chapters.

Staff Discussion

Staff did not incorporate this recommendation into the recommended draft, chiefly because it arose late in the development of the rule. Moving rule language drafted to be located in one chapter into another chapter could have unforeseen, unintended consequences. Staff did not adopt the recommendation to avoid possibly undermining the growing consensus around the draft. It is unlikely that the recommendation would result in a net improvement to the rule.

However, no party in reply comments identified a substantive, negative consequence of relocating the rule. At a minimum, locating the directory requirement rules entirely within 7811/7812 would eliminate the need to define Local Service Provider in chapter 7810. The Department did not file reply comments, so the Commission does not have the advantage of a Department analysis of the MCCA recommendation. The Commission could, in its notice of intent to adopt, include notice of its intent to relocate the directory requirements entirely into 7811 and 7812, and make a final decision about relocation after providing the public a full opportunity to consider and comment on the change. This would allow the rulemaking to proceed but still allow the Commission to fully consider the merits of the recommendation.

- The MCCA recommends several changes that would cause the rule to more expressly acknowledge the cooperation needed between local service providers to publish complete directories.

Staff Discussion

Staff incorporated some, but not all of MCCA's recommended changes. Staff did not incorporate recommended changes that staff concluded were unnecessary, did not improve the rule language, or were overbroad and shifted the balance of interests.

In particular, the MCCA recommended expressly stating in the rule that the directory obligation is to "arrange for" or "make available" directories. Staff considered the qualification unnecessary. Existing directory obligations are already often satisfied through contractual arrangements, and express rule language acknowledging the practice is unnecessary.

Similarly, the MCCA recommended to restate in state rules certain nondiscrimination practices already required by federal law, but the restatement of which could be construed to broaden those requirements. Staff did not adopt recommendations that it concluded could be construed to unnecessarily shift the balance of interests within and among the entities involved in directory publication.

- The MCCA recommends that the rule "reflect a beginning presumption that most customers will receive or otherwise have access to an electronic version of the white pages directory."

Staff Discussion

Staff did not change rule language based on this recommendation. *Requiring* electronic directory availability would be a new administrative burden on all local service providers, and comments

in this docket suggest opposition to such a requirement. While it may be reasonable and in the public interest to compel local service providers to provide electronic directories notwithstanding that opposition, staff did not include the requirement to avoid possibly undermining the growing consensus around the draft.

To the extent that the MCCA's suggestion is only that the final amended rule should anticipate that most customers will, over time, receive or access electronic directories in lieu of printed directories, no additional changes to the draft are necessary. The draft is consistent with this anticipated future.

3. The Minnesota Telecom Alliance

- The MTA recommends to repeal the directory publication requirement.

Many comments through the course of the rulemaking offer support for a determination to repeal the publication requirement. In this rulemaking, the MTA, Dex, and the MCCA have supported repeal. In their most recent comments, Dex and the MCCA support the staff recommended draft, but also conditionally support repeal.

The following arguments have been offered to support repeal: (1) First Amendment considerations preclude certain directory distribution limitations;³ (2) significant changes in telecommunication have rendered the traditional telephone directory un-useful and obsolete; (3) whether to publish a directory, and in what format(s), should be left entirely to Local Service Providers' business judgment; (4) other jurisdictions have repealed, relaxed, or never adopted directory requirements.

Dex supports the repeal proposal if the Commission were inclined to do it and could do it before the end of December this year. Dex points out that, as drafted, the Staff Recommended Draft "will not increase the regulatory burden on any LEC." And Dex expresses concern about possible delay arising from consideration of the MTA's repeal proposal.

The MCCA argues that if directories are not required, customers (who may be expecting to receive printed directories) should be advised of the impact of the change.

³ This claim relied heavily on a 9th Circuit Court of Appeals case, *Dex Media West v. City of Seattle*, 696 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 2012), in which the Court struck down a Seattle ordinance requiring yellow-pages distributors to obtain a distribution permit, pay a fee for each directory distributed, deliver only to residents and businesses not listed in a central opt-out registry, and advertise the central opt-out registry on the front cover of each directory. The Court invalidated the ordinance for failing to use the least restrictive means to achieve its goals and suggested private opt-out directories as a potentially permissible, less restrictive means.

The *Dex* case is inapposite for several reasons. Among them, this draft rule pertains to white pages listings, in the context of a Commission executing its mandate to regulate local service providers, and does not require participation in a central opt-out registry.

Staff Discussion

Staff did not adopt this recommendation. Staff sought to draft a rule that acknowledges and moves toward electronically published directories, but assumed, in the absence of Commission guidance to the contrary, that the underlying requirement for directories as a basic service requirement would remain.

The Commission may decide that mandatory telephone directories should no longer be a basic service requirement. In that case, staff agrees with MCCA that, at a minimum, some notice to customers regarding the change would be reasonable.

Staff notes that eliminating the requirement to distribute directories would not necessarily result in fewer or smaller printed directories than Staff's Recommended Draft—simply eliminating the requirement would not prohibit directory distribution. And it could diminish the Commission's ability to require electronic directories, further discourage printed directories, or otherwise regulate directory availability in the future.

- The MTA argues that local service providers alone should determine the format and availability of directories. The MTA recommends eliminating the aspect of the rule that requires local service providers to provide a printed directory if that is the customer's preference.

Staff Discussion

Staff did not adopt this recommendation because it would significantly impair the interests of customers in a basic aspect of telephone service. If a local service provider decided to make its directories available only electronically, customers without the means or ability to access the directory will be deprived of an aspect of service that the Commission has long considered a basic service requirement.

Upon Commission approval of a draft, the next steps in this rulemaking are as follows:

1. Send Commission-approved draft rules to the Revisor for final editing.
2. Prepare a *Statement of Need and Reasonableness* (SONAR) explaining and justifying each rule provision.
3. Send Commission-approved draft rules and the SONAR to the Office of the Governor for authorization to publish, and to MMB for an evaluation of the fiscal impact on local governments.
4. Draft a Dual Notice, both setting a hearing date and stating that the Commission will adopt these rules without a hearing if it does not receive the 25 requests triggering a hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).
5. Submit the approved draft rules, the dual notice, the SONAR and an additional notice plan to the Office of Administrative Hearings for approval and authorization to publish.
6. Publish proposed rules and dual notice in *State Register*.

7. Serve notice on all persons on the Commission's local service provider service list and general rulemaking lists.
8. Mail required notice to legislators specified in the APA and to the Legislative Reference Librarian.
9. Put rulemaking materials on the website.

VI. Commission Options

A. Are rule amendments are needed and, if so, what amendments?

1. Yes, the Staff Recommended Draft.
2. Yes, the Staff Recommended Draft, with the additional modifications proposed by the Department.
3. Yes, the draft proposed by MCCA.
4. Yes, the draft proposed by MTA.
5. Yes, the Staff Recommended Draft, with such modifications as the Commission deems appropriate.
6. No, no rule change is necessary at this time.

B. How should the rulemaking proceed?

1. Proceed with formal rulemaking.
 - a) Direct staff to prepare and publish a Notice of Intent to Adopt and a Statement of Need and Reasonableness.
 - b) Delegate to Commissioner Wergin the authority to approve any necessary, non-substantive edits to the draft prior to publication in the State Register.
2. Take some other action.

VII. Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends decision option A.1. and B.1.

**APPENDIX A:
STAFF RECOMMENDED DRAFT**

7810.0100 DEFINITIONS.

Subp. 11a. Complete Directory.

“Complete directory” means a directory that includes the information compiled under Rule 7810.2900, subpart 1, whether printed, electronically published, or some combination thereof. For example, a complete directory may comprise a printed subset of exchanges in a local calling area relevant to customers in a particular geographic area or community of interest, and publication of the remainder of the local calling area either electronically or in separate printed volumes.

Subp. 26a. Local Service Provider.

“Local Service Provider” or “LSP” means a telephone company or telecommunications carrier providing local service in Minnesota pursuant to a certificate of authority granted by the commission. Local service provider includes both local exchange carriers and competitive local exchange carriers.

7810.2900 FORMAT, CONTENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DIRECTORIES.

Subpart 1. Basic Requirements.

Telephone directories shall be regularly compiled and shall contain each customer’s name, telephone number, and, if practical, address, except they shall not contain non-published telephone numbers. Upon issuance, a local service provider shall provide to all customers served by that directory a complete directory consistent with the customer option provisions of Rule 7810.2950. Upon commission request, a local service provider shall furnish to the commission a copy of each directory issued, whether printed or electronic.

Subp. 2. Printed Directories.

~~Telephone directories shall be regularly published, listing the name, address when practical, and telephone number of all customers, except public telephones and numbers unlisted at customer's request. The name of the telephone utility, the area included in the directory, the year and month of issue, shall appear on the front cover. Information pertaining to emergency calls such as for the police and fire departments shall appear conspicuously in the front part of the directory pages. The directory shall contain such instructions concerning placing local and long distance calls, calls to repair and directory assistance services, and location of telephone company business offices as may be appropriate to the area served by the directory. Upon issuance, a copy of each directory shall be distributed to all customers served by that directory and a copy of each directory shall be furnished to the commission, upon request.~~

Printed directories shall:

- A. display on the front cover the name of the local service provider, the area included in the directory, and the year and month of issue;
- B. display in the front portion of the directory information pertaining to emergency calls, including information for police and fire departments; and

- C. contain instructions, appropriate to the area served by the directory, concerning placing local and long distance calls, calls to repair and directory assistance services, calls to local, state, and federal government offices, and the location of local service provider business offices;

Subp. 3. Electronically Published Directories.

Any electronic directory to which a Local Service Provider directs its customers shall comply with the provisions of parts 7810.2900, subpart 1 and 7810.2950. Electronically published directories shall:

- A. display the name of the local service provider;
- B. make available information pertaining to emergency calls, including information for police and fire departments;
- C. make available instructions concerning placing local and long distance calls, calls to repair and directory assistance services, calls to local, state, and federal government offices, and the location of local service provider business offices; and
- D. be prominently displayed on, and accessible from, the company's website;

7810.2950 DIRECTORIES: CUSTOMER OPTION.

Subpart 1. Customer Option.

A local service provider may publish printed or electronic directories, or some combination thereof. A local service provider that does not make an electronic directory available shall distribute a printed directory to each customer, except where an offer is made and explicitly refused by the customer. A local service providers that makes an electronic directory available must deliver a printed directory if that is the customer's format preference. Local service providers offering an electronic directory in lieu of any portion of a printed directory shall provide each customer a complete directory, and shall:

- A. present customers an opportunity to establish a directory format preference;
- B. permit a customer to establish or change their directory format preference at any time;
- C. notify customers how they can change their directory format preference when updated print directories are issued;
- D. not require customers to divulge any personally identifiable information other than their name and delivery address in order to request a complete directory that is printed or contained on a portable physical medium;
- E. not require users to create an account, log in, or otherwise provide any personally identifiable information in order to access an electronic directory; and
- F. not obtain, use, or retain any personally identifiable information from customer use of or request for a directory, except for the limited purpose of providing a directory in the format requested; and

G. not market services, including through its affiliate or publisher, other than directories to such requesting customers.

Subp. 2. When No Customer Option is Specified.

Local service providers shall determine whether customers who do not state a directory format preference will receive a printed directory, have access to an electronically published directory, or a combination thereof. Local service providers shall notify customers how the complete directory will be provided, including how to access any electronically published portion.

7811.0600 BASIC LOCAL SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.

Subpart 1. Required services.

F. ~~one white pages complete directory per year for each local calling area, which may include more than one local calling area, consistent with the customer option provisions of part 7810.2950 and, upon a customer request and in the customer's preferred format, one copy of any other directory within the local calling area or except where an offer is made and explicitly refused by the customer;~~

Statutory Authority:

MS s 216A.05; 237.10; 237.16

7812.0600 BASIC SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.

Subpart 1. Required services.

F. ~~one white pages complete directory per year for each local calling area, which may include more than one local calling area, consistent with the customer option provisions of part 7810.2950 and, upon a customer request and in the customer's preferred format, one copy of any other directory within the local calling area or except where an offer is made and explicitly refused by the customer;~~

Statutory Authority:

MS s 216A.05; 237.10; 237.16