

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

April 6, 1999

LB 78

to a franchise agreement with an investor-owned natural gas utility, a metropolitan utilities district shall not solicit such franchise or promote discontinuance of service with the utility unless a specific invitation to bid on the franchise has been formally presented to the board of directors of the metropolitan utilities district. And it goes on to define what a specific invitation to bid is concerned. This situation that's described in Section 2 is a situation where UtiliCorp had a franchise with a small town, right, basically?

SENATOR BRUNING: That's correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR BRUNING: The city of Valley.

SENATOR BEUTLER: And what we're doing here is making it more difficult for Metropolitan Utilities District to put in a bid on that franchise. Would that...wouldn't that be accurate?

SENATOR BRUNING: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: And we're making it more difficult in two ways. First of all, we...they cannot solicit unless a resolution has been passed by the city council putting out...

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...a specific invitation. That's one way. And then, when that invitation is received, the Metropolitan Utilities District has to approve it at a board meeting, which presumably is open to the public. So those two impediments are put in the way of competing with UtiliCorp essentially. Is that accurate in this situation?

SENATOR BRUNING: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. Why are we putting impediments in the way of Metropolitan Utility (sic) District but not putting the same impediments in favor of Metropolitan Utility (sic) District when they are the operator of a current franchise in a small town? Why are the impediments going one way but not the other?