

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

March 16, 1999 LB 150

to the amendment you mentioned Section 4, and in particular the first five words or...

SENATOR LANDIS: Right.

SENATOR BROMM: ...so, that say, "except as provided in Section 86-808". And you said that exempts or takes out the wireless carriers. Correct?

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes.

SENATOR BROMM: The question I have is, if you have a wireless carrier that also engages in wire-based business, is it your intent that they would be exempt just because they have a wireless enterprise or wireless arm of their business? Or would their wire-based part of their company still be subject to the slamming provisions?

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you for the chance to clarify that. And I'm glad you've asked that question. The answer is, if a company is doing both, they are covered by the slamming with respect to the wire-based technology. Section 86-808 is meant to refer to a body of technology, cellular or wireless technology, not to all of the business holdings and all of the business applications by a company who does wireless as well as multiple other things. So, SPRINT, who's standing out here in the lobby and watching this whole thing, says, I do both, I'm covered with respect to wire, I'm not covered with respect to wireless because the technology is different. That's what that means.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay. That helps, I think that's the intent that I would hope that you would have, and clarifies the record. Secondly, in Section 5 of your amendment, the first couple of lines talk about an exception being when a subscriber initiates the change. And, as you said in your opening, if I call up the company and say, hey, I want to be switched to ABC Company, I'm initiating the change, and that's absolutely not slamming. And so the provisions about authorization and confirmation and all that do not apply. Is that right?

SENATOR LANDIS: That's right.