

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

\*\*\*\*\*

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion,	)	
to consider implementation of a 616 area code	)	Case No. U-12850
relief plan.	)	
_____	)	

At the June 5, 2001 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing, Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. Laura Chappelle, Chairman  
Hon. David A. Svanda, Commissioner  
Hon. Robert B. Nelson, Commissioner

**OPINION AND ORDER**

**I.**

**HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS**

The 1999 Central Office Code Utilization Survey's projected demand for new central office codes (frequently referred to as NXX codes) indicated that the still-available NXX codes in the 616 area code could be exhausted by the second quarter of 2001. Based upon the projected exhaustion date and an unanticipated increase in the demand for NXX codes within the 616 area code, the North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator, which is currently NeuStar, Inc.,<sup>1</sup> formally declared the 616 area code's numbering plan to be in jeopardy and, on January 4, 2000, notified the Commission and the telecommunications industry of that fact. Following

---

<sup>1</sup>In late 1999, all NANP and other numbering functions were transferred from Lockheed Martin IMS, Inc., to NeuStar.

discussions both among its members and with NeuStar, the industry adopted procedures intended to delay the exhaustion of NXX codes within the 616 area code until the fourth quarter of 2001.

On February 16, 2000, members of the industry met again with NeuStar, this time to discuss long-term relief alternatives for the 616 area code. Those alternatives included proposals to implement various geographic splits or overlays.<sup>2</sup> As a result of that meeting, and on behalf of both itself and the industry, NeuStar prepared a petition for 616 area code relief (the petition) in which an all-services distributed overlay was recommended as the preferred means of relief.

Because the statutes then in effect did not allow the Commission to assert jurisdiction over the proposed area code relief plan, on April 20, 2000, NeuStar submitted the petition to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for review and approval. However, on July 17, 2000, Governor John Engler signed into law Public Act 295 of 2000, which amended the Michigan Telecommunications Act, 1991 PA 179, as previously amended, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; MSA 22.1469(101) et seq. (the Act). Among other things, those amendments granted the Commission authority to address proposed area code changes in Michigan. In light of that extension of the Commission's authority, the FCC forwarded the petition--and, with it, all issues relating to the potential 616 area code relief plan--to the Commission for its consideration by letter dated July 28, 2000.

On February 22, 2001, having dealt with even more time-sensitive requests for area code relief in other parts of Michigan, the Commission issued an order in this case setting a public hearing on the 616 area code relief plan for March 19, 2001 in Grand Rapids. The Commission's order also

---

<sup>2</sup>A geographic split refers to situations in which the geographic area served by an area code in which there are few or no NXX codes left for assignment is split into two or more geographic parts, each with a separate area code. In contrast, an overlay provides relief by opening up a new area code covering the same geographic area as the area code requiring relief.

provided an opportunity for interested persons to file written comments and responses to those comments. Subsequently, the Commission scheduled a second public hearing for April 24, 2001 in this case, with that hearing to be held in Kalamazoo, and extended to May 8, 2001 the deadline for filing written comments.

## II.

### DISCUSSION

#### The Petition

In its petition, NeuStar explained that the industry examined six alternatives for 616 area code relief. The first of these was a geographic split in which all territory north of Van Buren, Kalamazoo, and Calhoun counties (designated in the petition as “Area A”) would be separated from that located south of the line (designated as “Area B”). As with all two-way geographic splits, this alternative would allow for the continuation of 7-digit local dialing for calls within each area, require existing customers located in one of those areas to change their phone numbers in recognition of their new area code, and necessitate 10- or 11-digit dialing (the area code plus the 7-digit local number or 1 plus the 10 digit number) from one area to the other. According to NeuStar, adopting this proposal would result in estimated lives of approximately 4 years for the area code assigned to Area A and 10 years for Area B.

The second alternative also consisted of a two-way, north/south geographic split. However, as noted in the petition, the dividing line for this split was moved approximately 25 miles north from that proposed in the first alternative and was designed to follow the northern boundaries of the Saugatuck, Hamilton, Hopkins, Wayland, Middleville, Hastings, and Woodland rate centers. According to NeuStar, this change would avoid splitting communities of interest while, at the same

time, making the estimated life-spans of the two areas more comparable. Specifically, moving the dividing line north produced estimated lives of 5.5 years and 7.3 years for Areas A and B, respectively.

The third alternative also involved a geographic split. However, instead of a north/south division, this proposal designated 37 rate centers located northwest of Kalamazoo as Area A and placed the remaining 75 rate centers lying to their south and east in Area B. Although this plan produced relatively equal estimated lives for the two areas, it had the unfortunate result of taking customers from the Cedar Springs and Greenville rate centers (located only 10 to 15 miles from Grand Rapids) and pairing them with end users located in the New Buffalo and Three Oaks rate centers (up to 140 miles away).

The fourth alternative consisted of an all-services distributed overlay that would establish a new area code covering the same geographic area as the 616 area code. Under this proposal, all existing customers would retain their existing telephone numbers, including their 616 area code. Once any still-available NXX codes in the 616 area code were exhausted, new customers requesting any type of service (landline, cellular, paging, fax, etc.) would be assigned the new area code. However, as is the case with every all-services distributed overlay, this alternative would necessitate customers dialing either 10 or 11 digits in order to complete a local call.<sup>3</sup> According to NeuStar, the new area code arising from this alternative would have an expected life of 6.3 years.

The fifth alternative described in the petition was a concentrated growth overlay. Under this proposal, a new overlay area code would be assigned exclusively to the Grand Rapids rate center,

---

<sup>3</sup>This requirement, established by the FCC in its Second Report and Order on Local Competition, 11 FCC Rcd at 19518, is based on the assumption that dialing parity is necessary to preserve competition between carriers assigned numbers in the underlying area code and those assigned numbers in the overlay area code.

which would be designated as Area A. According to the petition, this proposal would allow customers in Area A to keep their current telephone numbers and area code designation, but would require them to use 10- or 11-digit dialing for all calls, including local calls. This was because all new numbers assigned within that area would be given the new area code. As for Area B, all customers would be allowed to keep the 616 area code and retain 7-digit local dialing until all remaining NXX codes for 616 are utilized. At that point, however, the new area code (which had initially been limited to the Grand Rapids rate center) would be extended to cover the entire geographic region at issue in this case. According to NeuStar, adopting this proposal would result in estimated lives of 6.3 years for Area A and 1 year for Area B.

Finally, the sixth alternative set forth in the petition was to establish a new area code within the 616 region that would apply only to wireless customers. However, based on their understanding that current FCC regulations ban the use of technology-specific overlays, NeuStar and the industry eliminated this alternative from consideration prior to developing an estimate of how long it would last.

The petition went on to recommend adopting the fourth alternative, namely the all-services distributed overlay covering the entire 616 area code. According to NeuStar, it and the industry “eliminated geographic split Alternatives #1, #2, and #3 because customers would have to change their telephone numbers for the second time in less than two years,” as well as the fact that the first alternative resulted in projected lives for the respective area codes that were excessively “unbalanced.” Petition, p. 6. It was further stated that, due to the short life expected for Area B (namely, one year), the fifth alternative had to be rejected as well. Because the sixth alternative had already been rejected as being violative of FCC regulations, NeuStar concluded, the only reasonable option was to select the all-services distributed overlay.

## Comments

Twenty-seven parties made statements at the March 19 and April 24, 2001 public hearings. In addition, 149 written comments were submitted for the Commission's consideration, including a lengthy petition signed by customers that opposed any form of overlay.

Among the members of the industry that provided comments on the issue, there was universal support for implementing the all-services distributed overlay recommended in the petition. This support was based largely on the fact that overlays (1) are generally easier, and thus faster, to implement than geographic splits, (2) require no customers to change their current telephone numbers, (3) avoid dividing communities of interest, (4) make it easier to provide future area code relief through the application of additional overlays, if needed, and (5) provide more flexibility when implementing number conservation. Finally, Ameritech Michigan and Verizon North Inc. (Verizon) asserted that Section 303(5) of the Act, MCL 484.2303(5); MSA 22.1469(303)(5), does not require adjusting the 616 area code's boundaries to conform to county lines because it is not "technically and economically feasible" to split or reconfigure the area code in that manner.

As for the other parties, their comments ran the gamut from recommending the implementation of a technology-specific overlay (despite NeuStar's earlier assertion that this is currently barred by FCC regulation) to contending that the Commission should reject all overlays and splits and, instead, rely on such things as number reclamation,<sup>4</sup> thousands-block number pooling, and rate center consolidation to remedy the current NXX code exhaustion problem in the 616 area

---

<sup>4</sup>Based on a recent amendment to its rules concerning the assignment of NXX codes, as set forth in 47 CFR § 52.15(i), the FCC provided state commissions an opportunity to investigate and determine whether service providers have activated the NXX codes assigned to them within the required time frame, and to seek the release of codes that were not activated in a timely manner. The Commission issued a November 2, 2000 order in Case No. U-12703, which established a process for reclaiming unused NXX codes in Michigan.

code. However, the overwhelming majority of these parties strongly opposed implementation of an overlay on the grounds that it would confuse customers by breaking the traditional link between area codes and geographic territories, require every customer to dial 10 or 11 digits to make a local call, and wreak havoc on existing alarm and 9-1-1 calling systems. Two of these parties went so far as to propose, albeit relatively late in the comment period, their own splits. For example, the Cornerstone Chamber of Commerce (Cornerstone) suggested an east/west split that would keep the St. Joseph/ Benton Harbor region in the same area code as Grand Rapids. Also, Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett, LLP, and the Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce (collectively, the Grand Rapids Chamber) proposed revising the north/south split set forth in the petition as “Alternative #2” by adding the Wayland, Middleville, Hastings, and Woodland rate centers to Area A.

### Conclusion

Notwithstanding their proponents’ respective assertions to the contrary, a majority of the proposals offered by the various parties must be rejected on legal or practical grounds.

First, although their implementation (both in the past and the present) may well have been the best, least-disruptive method for dealing with the exhaustion of NXX codes throughout the country, the use of technology-specific overlays is currently banned by the FCC. Specifically, FCC regulations concerning area code relief state, in pertinent part, that:

No area code overlay may be implemented unless all central office codes in the new overlay area are assigned to those entities requesting assignment on a first-come, first-serve basis, regardless of the identity of, technology used by, or type of service provided by that entity. No group of telecommunications carriers shall be excluded from assignment of central office codes in the existing area code, or be assigned such codes only from the overlay area code, based solely on that group’s provision of a specific type of telecommunications service or use of a particular technology.

47 CFR § 52.19(c)(3)(i) [Emphasis added]. Thus, the Commission is legally precluded from establishing a technology-specific overlay to be applied exclusively to the providers of cellular telephone or paging services, as was recommended by a number of the commentors.<sup>5</sup>

Furthermore, various proposals to reject all forms of area code relief and rely exclusively on numbering resource optimization efforts, such as rate center consolidation, thousands-block number pooling, and number reclamation, are not practical in this particular case. For example, rate center consolidation is a complex process that, because it requires the resolution of myriad technical and revenue-related issues, could take years to implement. Moreover, its benefits are primarily forward-looking (i.e., reducing future demand for NXX codes within a geographic area), instead of providing for the quick recapture of stranded codes. As for number pooling, the Commission has already filed a petition with the FCC seeking additional delegated authority to implement mandatory thousands-block number pooling for both the Detroit and Grand Rapids areas. Nevertheless, it will likely be months before the FCC rules on that petition, a pooling administrator is selected, and the program is implemented. Finally, number reclamation is also a relatively slow process. This is shown by the fact that, despite extensive Commission efforts, only three additional NXX codes have been recovered to date in the 616 area code. Therefore, because the exhaustion of NXX codes within the 616 area code could occur as early as the close of 2001, these numbering resource optimization efforts do not, by themselves, constitute an adequate response.

---

<sup>5</sup>The FCC has commenced a further notice of proposed rulemaking in an effort to “revisit the prohibition against service-specific and technology-specific overlays.” FCC Docket No. 00-429, released December 29, 2000. The Commission filed comments in support of lifting the prohibition, but the FCC has yet to act.

Moreover, two of the geographic splits proposed in this case (namely the east/west split proposed by Cornerstone and the north/south split designated in the petition as “Alternative #1”), as well as the concentrated growth overlay (set forth in the petition as “Alternative #5”) conflict with the NANP Relief Planning Guidelines. Specifically, Section 5.0(a) of those guidelines demands that relief options cover a period of at least five years beyond the area code’s currently expected exhaust date. Pursuant to a request by the Commission Staff, NeuStar performed an assessment of Cornerstone’s proposed east/west split and determined that the western half of the area code would have a projected life of only three years. Moreover, the petition itself indicates that (1) under the first alternative, Area A’s life expectancy is only four years, and (2) under the fifth alternative, Area B could only be expected to last for one year. Because none of these three proposals satisfies Section 5.0(a) of the Relief Planning Guidelines, the Commission concludes that they must be rejected.

Finally, the geographic split designated as “Alternative #3” in the petition should be rejected on the grounds that it unreasonably divides communities of interest. As noted earlier in this order, this proposal takes customers from the Cedar Springs and Greenville rate centers (located 10 to 15 miles north of Grand Rapids), separates them from the area code assigned to the rest of the Grand Rapids metropolitan area, and instead pairs them with end users in the New Buffalo and Three Oaks rate centers (which are, in contrast, located adjacent to the Indiana state line, nearly 150 miles to the south). Because one of the goals in providing area code relief is to avoid the unnecessary division of communities of interest, and because other alternatives do a better job of achieving this goal, “Alternative #3” must also be rejected.

Thus, the Commission is effectively required to choose between the north/south geographic split set forth in the petition as “Alternative #2” or the all-services distributed overlay designated

as “Alternative #4.” Based on the facts of this case, the Commission finds that the area code relief plan recommended by NeuStar and the industry (namely, the all-services distributed overlay covering the entire 616 area code) should be rejected and the proposed split designated as “Alternative #2” should be adopted instead. It reaches this conclusion for the following reasons.

First, contrary to assertions set forth in the petition, customers within the 616 area code have never had their area code changed since it was first established in 1949. Although the 616 area code was split in 1999, only the northern portion (including Traverse City) received the new 231 area code. In contrast, all customers at issue in this case retained the 616 designation. Thus, the reason cited by NeuStar and the industry for summarily rejecting all geographic split proposals (namely, because it would force customers to change their telephone numbers twice in two years) was based on a false assumption and is, therefore, invalid.

Second, notwithstanding that previous geographic split, the 616 area code continues to cover a relatively large area including all or parts of 16 counties. Thus, it cannot reasonably be said that the region now covered by the 616 area code has been divided into the smallest practical area without dividing communities of interest (as was the situation faced in Case No. U-12721, where the Commission approved an overlay for the 248 area code).

Third, comments received in this case, from business and residential customers alike, overwhelmingly oppose the implementation of an overlay and support the adoption of a geographic split. The opposition to an overlay is based primarily on those customers’ concerns regarding the potential need for dialing 10 or 11 digits to make a local call. According to a vast majority of the comments received in this case, that could lead to significant confusion, particularly on the part of children and seniors in the current 616 area code.

The Commission therefore concludes that although overlays make good sense in some circumstances, this is not the situation in the present case. As a result, it finds that the second alternative 616 area code relief proposal filed by NeuStar should be approved. The Commission further finds that the alteration to this alternative suggested by the Grand Rapids Chamber, which would move four rate centers from Area B to Area A, should be rejected for two reasons. First, as it did with the proposal submitted by Cornerstone, NeuStar performed an assessment of the effect that the Grand Rapids Chamber's suggestion would have on the projected lives of those two areas. According to that assessment, adding those rate centers to Area A would reduce its projected life from 5.5 to 5.0 years, thus hastening the date upon which further area code relief would be needed. Second, removing those four rate centers from Area B would produce a boundary that diverges significantly from nearby county lines. This is not the case with NeuStar's proposal. In order to avoid these situations, the Commission finds that "Alternative #2" should be approved and implemented in its original form.

In reaching this conclusion, the Commission is keenly aware of the inconvenience and confusion that area code relief can entail. The Commission will therefore continue to aggressively exercise the legislative authority it was granted last summer to minimize the need for, as well as the adverse consequences arising from, future area code relief. For example, it will continue the NXX code reclamation efforts that, following issuance of its November 2, 2000 order in Case No. U-12703, have resulted in the Commission reclaiming nearly 30 formerly-stranded codes (each containing 10,000 telephone numbers) across the state. Furthermore, assuming the FCC grants the Commission's January 26, 2001 request for authority to implement thousands-block number pooling, the Commission will work as expeditiously as possible to select a pooling administrator and implement the program. In addition, the Commission will investigate the

potential use of rate center consolidation to reduce the need for future area code relief, and pursue the possibility of using either transitional or technology-specific overlays (assuming their use is ultimately approved by the FCC) to reduce the adverse effect that area code relief may have on customers.

### Miscellaneous Issues

In addition to the question of which relief proposal should be approved for use in the 616 area code, several related issues have arisen in this case.

First, the Commission is required--pursuant to Section 303(5) of the Act--to determine whether, in the context of granting area code relief or otherwise, it can somehow modify area code boundaries to make them better conform to county lines. In this instance, it agrees with assertions by Ameritech Michigan and Verizon to the effect that it is neither technically nor economically feasible to split or otherwise reconfigure the 616 area code precisely along county lines. To conform to county lines, providers along the boundary would have to reconstruct their networks and reconfigure their exchange boundaries. The required changes would likely be too expensive and time-consuming, as well as disruptive to customers, to justify their adoption in this instance.

Second, the Commission must specifically establish implementation dates for the area code relief plan approved in this order. According to Kelly Fennell, the Director of Regulatory Affairs for Ameritech Michigan, the amount of work required to implement the Commission's previously-approved relief plans for the 517, 810, and 248 area codes necessitates waiting until July 13, 2002 to initiate permissive dialing and until February 15, 2003 to begin mandatory dialing for the 616 area code. See, 2 Tr. 111-12. Because those dates would delay 616 area code relief until well

beyond the initially-predicted NXX code exhaustion date, the Commission had grave concerns about their use.

However, information provided by Ameritech Michigan following a May 16, 2001 meeting among industry members indicates that the gap between expected NXX code exhaustion and the implementation of mandatory dialing has narrowed substantially. Based on the industry's recent decision to ration codes at the rate of five per month, Ameritech Michigan reports, the expected NXX code exhaustion date has now been pushed back to at least December 1, 2002. Because this comes much closer to her proposed mandatory dialing date of February 15, 2003, the Commission finds that it would not be unreasonable to adopt the implementation schedule suggested by Ms. Fennell. Nevertheless, the Commission requests that Ameritech Michigan make every effort to speed up implementation of the relief plan approved in this case, as well as those plans previously approved with regard to the 517, 810, and 248 area codes. Because it is adopting the schedule proposed by the company's representative, the Commission fully expects that Ameritech Michigan will find a way to complete implementation of the 616 area code relief plan before NXX code exhaustion actually occurs. In order for it to better track the implementation efforts of Ameritech Michigan and other providers, the Commission further concludes that the industry should file monthly progress reports, beginning July 1, 2001, until the 616 area code relief plan is fully implemented.

Third, comments received in this case indicate that a high level of confusion exists among customers concerning the effects of area code relief. Thus, to better facilitate implementation of this area code relief plan, the Commission directs the industry to file, within 30 days, a detailed plan for customer education. The plan should include training for company personnel in dealing with customer inquiries related to the area code relief plan, as well as examples of training

materials that will be used to educate company personnel involved in customer relations. Moreover, the plan should address such items as billing inserts, press kits, public service announcements, and other resources that will be used to respond to customer education needs and inquiries. The plan should also identify primary contacts within each company to address area code questions. Due to the significant level of customer confusion expressed both in this case and others, the Commission further finds that the industry's education plan should be more comprehensive than those implemented over the last 12 to 18 months.

Fourth, several providers of wireless telecommunications service contend that adoption of a geographic split should be accompanied by wireless "grandfathering", which would permit wireless customers throughout the existing 616 area code to retain the 616 designation either indefinitely (as proposed by AT&T Wireless, PCS, LLC) or for a minimum of two years (as suggested by Verizon Wireless). According to these carriers, wireless grandfathering would spare them the necessity of immediately reprogramming the wireless telephones of any customers based in the territory covered by the new area code. Thus, this request raises the issues of whether, and in what form, wireless grandfathering should be allowed for the 616 area code.

The Commission recently addressed identical issues in Case No. U-12588, where it approved a geographic split for the 810 area code. In its April 17, 2001 order in that case, the Commission determined that "an extended permissive dialing arrangement is the most reasonable means of furthering the [twin] objectives of accommodating the transitional needs of wireless carriers and conserving numbering resources." April 17, 2001 order in Case No. U-12588, p. 3. It therefore permitted wireless carriers affected by the 810 area code split to use permissive dialing for one year beyond the date established for the start of mandatory dialing. See, id., at p. 4.

The Commission finds that the same result is warranted in the present case. A significant disadvantage of authorizing wireless grandfathering on an indefinite basis is that it would reduce the expected life of the split 616 area code by permanently withholding a number of central office codes from reassignment. An extended permissive dialing arrangement, in contrast, has the advantage of freeing up the wireless numbers for reassignment after the permissive dialing period ends. Although a permissive dialing arrangement requires an eventual reprogramming of wireless handsets, it gives wireless carriers more time to guide their customers through that transition. However, given the relative urgency of maximizing the availability of additional numbering resources in the 616 area code, the Commission is not inclined to approve Verizon Wireless's request for a two-year extension. Rather, it finds that a one-year extension best accommodates the interests of those wireless carriers desiring some form of grandfathering without unduly prolonging the transition. The Commission therefore concludes that the extended permissive dialing period for wireless carriers must end by February 15, 2004.

Fifth, various parties, ranging from alarm service providers to 9-1-1 emergency dispatch operators, expressed concern about the harmful effect that area code relief could have on public safety, as well as on their own economic well-being. However, without knowing what form of area code relief would be adopted in this order, these parties were unable to determine the exact effect that the approved relief would have and what steps could be taken to avoid or reduce any resultant harm. The Commission therefore directs all telecommunications providers within the original 616 area code to enter into informal discussions with the alarm service providers and emergency dispatch operators with which they do business, and to attempt to resolve any unique concerns or problems that may arise for those customers. If necessary, those customers may file,

not less than 60 days after the issuance of this order, separate applications proposing transitional arrangements tailored to their particular circumstances.

Sixth and finally, the Commission must determine which of the two regions created by the geographic split adopted in this order should retain the 616 area code and which should be assigned the new number. The Commission concludes that the most equitable result would be to allow the area with the shortest projected life (Area A, in this case) to retain the 616 designation, while assigning the new area code to the territory with the longer projected life (Area B). This conclusion is based on the Commission's belief that, because customers in Area B will be forced to revise their stationery and alert friends, relatives, and business contacts to the fact that their phone numbers have changed, they deserve to be protected from the need for further area code relief--and any corresponding detrimental effects--for as long as possible. Based on the projections set forth in NeuStar's petition, this protection should last for 7.3 years in Area B, as opposed to only 5.5 years in Area A.

The Commission FINDS that:

- a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1991 PA 179, as amended, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; MSA 22.1469(101) et seq.; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201 et seq.; MSA 3.560(101) et seq.; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as amended, 1992 AACSR 460.17101 et seq.
- b. The second alternative 616 area code relief plan set forth in the petition should be approved, with certain restrictions and requirements as described in this order.
- c. Permissive dialing should commence by July 13, 2002, and mandatory dialing should commence on February 15, 2003.

d. The industry should file monthly progress reports until the area code relief plan is fully implemented.

e. The industry should file, within 30 days, a comprehensive plan for customer education consistent with this order.

f. Wireless carriers affected by the 616 area code split should be permitted to use an extended permissive dialing period expiring February 15, 2004.

g. Telecommunications providers within the original 616 area code should enter into informal discussions with alarm service providers and emergency dispatch operators with which they do business, and should attempt to resolve any unique concerns or problems that may arise for those customers as a result of the 616 area code split.

h. The 616 area code designation should be retained by the rate centers comprising Area A of the second alternative 616 area code relief plan approved in this order.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

A. The 616 area code relief plan set forth as the second alternative in the petition filed by NeuStar, Inc., namely the implementation of a north/south geographic split whose dividing line follows the northern boundaries of the Saugatuck, Hamilton, Hopkins, Wayland, Middleville, Hastings, and Woodland rate centers, is approved with certain restrictions and requirements as described in this order.

B. Permissive dialing shall commence by July 13, 2002, and mandatory dialing shall commence on February 15, 2003.

C. Beginning July 1, 2001, the industry shall file monthly progress reports until the area code relief plan is fully implemented.

D. The industry shall file, within 30 days, a comprehensive plan for customer education.

E. Wireless carriers affected by the 616 area code split shall be permitted to use an extended permissive dialing period expiring February 15, 2004.

F. Telecommunications service providers within the original 616 area code shall enter into informal discussions with alarm service providers and emergency dispatch operators with which they do business, and should attempt to resolve any unique concerns or problems that may arise for those customers as a result of the 616 area code split approved in this order.

G. The 616 area code designation shall be retained by the rate centers comprising Area A of the second alternative 616 area code relief plan approved in this order.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26; MSA 22.45.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

( S E A L )

/s/ Laura Chappelle  
Chairman

By its action of June 5, 2001.

/s/ David A. Svanda  
Commissioner

/s/ Dorothy Wideman  
Its Executive Secretary

/s/ Robert B. Nelson  
Commissioner

D. The industry shall file, within 30 days, a comprehensive plan for customer education.

E. Wireless carriers affected by the 616 area code split shall be permitted to use an extended permissive dialing period expiring February 15, 2004.

F. Telecommunications service providers within the original 616 area code shall enter into informal discussions with alarm service providers and emergency dispatch operators with which they do business, and should attempt to resolve any unique concerns or problems that may arise for those customers as a result of the 616 area code split approved in this order.

G. The 616 area code designation shall be retained by the rate centers comprising Area A of the second alternative 616 area code relief plan approved in this order.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26; MSA 22.45.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

By its action of June 5, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Its Executive Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
to consider implementation of a 616 area code )  
relief plan. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. U-12850

Suggested Minute:

“Adopt and issue order dated June 5, 2001 approving, with certain restrictions and requirements, one geographic split alternative of the 616 area code relief plan filed by NeuStar, Inc., on behalf of the telecommunications industry, and establishing dates for the commencement of permissive and mandatory dialing for the new area code, as set forth in the order.”