

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

April 7, 1999

LB 496

fiber, new copper, whatever they have, or have advanced services, what rights do they have to come in to those communities and provide them for the common public good? There's an existing law, we've had it for a long time, that the communications systems are vital and they have the ability to come in to the right-of-ways. Under the Communications Act, there was some issue and there was a part of the federal law that says, look, the cities can still receive fair and reasonable compensation for letting someone in their right-of-way. The issue is, what is fair and reasonable compensation mean? Congress meant, and I think it's clear, there's a few court cases, if you're interested I can talk about those cases, that fair and reasonable meant the actual expense of taking up the right-of-way, digging in a street, digging up curbs and so on, that the cities needed to be fairly and reasonably compensated for what their expenses were, what it actually cost them to allow this right-of-way to be used. It's not a matter of if you don't pass this bill they're not going to get in to the right-of-ways. What's happened is there are a variety of people out there, consultants, who have traveled the country and, quite frankly, some enterprising communities who have gone and decided all of a sudden we're now the landlords and that these right-of-ways have a fair market value and here's our chance to make money, and that we're not going to allow these companies to come in and these right-of-way monies any...or right-of-ways anymore. We're going to charge you more money. Or a company may come up to a community and the community says, we're not going to let you in, we're not going to give you a permit unless you build us a park, unless you do something and you contribute some other way, and that has gone on by a city-by-city basis and it's starting to proliferate across this state. It's become a real problem. Why is that a problem? Well, the existing company that's already there that's had the good old boy relationship for all those years is safe. They've got their things in the ground. These new requirements are not what they call competitively neutral. Other words, they're requiring higher standards. What this bill attempts to do is to clarify and I think to set up some uniformity of what these ordinances can be. The cities have had a legitimate concern about not losing the ability and the power to do certain things and I would entertain, and I hope there is some, discussion about what the cities want to make sure happen. But