

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 11, 1999 LB 514

be needed in order to bring the costs down, for the companies on a local level in Nebraska, to a reasonable level of monthly telephone costs per user, or bring them up, in some cases, where the monthly charges were extremely low. And that the loss of revenue for those particularly smaller companies would be incurred by the change in their monthly fee and the access charges that would be reduced, that it would take X number of dollars to put that company in a reasonable position after they severely lowered the access charges. Using the federal expected contribution, the access charge reduction and this monthly change in the telephone bill, this figure was arrived at, which is very much a guesstimate because the federal government continues to waffle on how they are going to implement the rural portion of the Universal Service Fund and how much money they're going to inject into it. So that could impact, eventually, the level of Universal Service Fund contribution by Nebraska. But that's...have I kind of answered your question?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yeah. And here's my area of uncertainty, and perhaps you can further answer, if I identify it for you, but perhaps not. I do not discern that bottom line the need for the subsidy is made on an individual basis. That is, what I think ultimately should be done with any sort of subsidy is determine whether the individual, bottom line consumer who gets the subsidy, should get a subsidy. And I suppose one might take a broad-base approach to the sparsity factor and the subsidy in that case. But I'm not sure that we should, in the sense that there may be people moving out to remote recreational cabins who have lots of money and just want to do that. And when somebody does something like that, it seems to me...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...that, just as they pay for the gasoline to go back and forth to that place, maybe they ought to pay for the electrical services in that place. And I'm wondering if, in exploring those distinctions further and making that subsidy income related, just as the Lifeline subsidy is income related, that we might not figure out a way not to tax more and increase the Universal Service Fund as a whole, in order to provide a greater Lifeline subsidy, but rather find a way to make the density subsidy more explicit and, by saving some money there,