



COMMISSIONERS:
ERIC KAMLER
CHRISTIAN MIRCH
TIM SCHRAM
KEVIN STOCKER
DAN WATERMEIER

August 27, 2025

CERTIFICATION

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I, Gregory J. Walklin, Executive Director of the Nebraska Public Service Commission, certify that the enclosed is a true and correct copy of the original Order made and entered in the proceeding docketed as **Application No. NUSF-139, PO #8 on the 26th of August 2025**. The original Order is filed and recorded in the official records of the Commission.

Please direct any questions concerning this Order to Cullen Robbins, Director, at 402-471-3101.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Seal of the Nebraska Public Service Commission, Lincoln, Nebraska, **on the 26th of August 2025**.

Sincerely,

Gregory J. Walklin
Executive Director

GW:sr

Cc: ETC List

SECRETARY’S RECORD, PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Nebraska Public)	Application No. NUSF-139
Service Commission, on its own Motion,)	Progression Order No. 8
to consider appropriate modifications to)	
the high-cost distribution and reporting)	ORDER REQUESTING PRE-FILED
mechanisms in its Universal Service)	TESTIMONY AND SETTING
Fund program in light of federal and)	HEARING
state infrastructure grants.)	
)	Entered: August 26, 2025

BY THE COMMISSION:

Background

The Nebraska Public Service Commission (“Commission”) initiated this proceeding, on its own motion, on August 29, 2023 (“August 29th Order”), to consider appropriate modifications to the Nebraska Universal Service Fund (“NUSF”) high-cost distribution mechanism and associated reporting requirements.¹ The Commission’s August 29th Order identified certain issues as those which needed to be determined for the distribution for high-cost support in the 2024 calendar year.

On March 5, 2025, the Commission held a workshop to discuss a number of additional issues. Those issues were outlined in its February 4, 2025 Order, and in the Commission’s workshop agenda released on February 28, 2025. On April 8, 2025, the Commission released an order seeking comment and scheduling a hearing. Prior to comments being filed, the Commission paused the procedural schedule to provide an opportunity to hold an additional workshop and a technical conference with CostQuest representatives. The Commission held a workshop on May 14, 2025, and a technical conference with CostQuest representatives on June 17, 2025.

Pursuant to the discussion at the technical conference, the Commission, through the Hearing Officer, partially modified the issues for comment, set a comment deadline and scheduled a workshop for July 15, 2025. In the present Order, the Commission focuses its attention on two main issues: the framework for

¹ *In the Matter of the Nebraska Public Service Commission, on its own Motion, to consider appropriate modifications to the high-cost distribution and reporting mechanisms in its Universal Service Fund program in light of federal and state infrastructure grants*, Application No. NUSF-139, ORDER OPENING DOCKET SEEKING COMMENT AND SETTING HEARING (August 29, 2023)(“August 29th Order”).

transitioning of or porting of NUSF support to competitive eligible telecommunications carriers, and the scope of work for the cost model updates for 2026.

Issues Previously Released for Comment

A. Framework for transitioning support and obligations to Competitive Carriers

The Commission sought comments on the framework outlined below for transitioning NUSF high-cost support to competitive eligible telecommunications carriers. The Commission received comments which are summarized below. The Commission invites interested parties to update their comments based on the discussion had at the workshop held on July 15th through their pre-filed testimony submitted prior to the hearing.

1. Competitive carriers may file an application with the Commission seeking NUSF support which would include taking on carrier of last resort obligations.²
2. Applications seeking NUSF support could be filed on a rolling basis throughout the year.
3. The Application would be processed consistent with the Commission's Rules of Procedure.
4. The minimum required elements to be included in Applications seeking NUSF high-cost support would consist of the following:
 - a. A description of the carrier's organizational structure, including a certificate of good standing from the Nebraska Secretary of State.
 - b. A demonstration that the carrier is a Nebraska eligible telecommunications carrier ("NETC") or commitment to become a NETC prior to a COLR transition taking place and becoming authorized for ongoing NUSF support.
 - c. An election to take on COLR obligations in the described service area.

² This may be separate from an application filed by an incumbent carrier seeking to be relieved of carrier of last resort obligations. Such an application could be separately filed and considered under the Rural Communications Sustainability Act where a grant was awarded and a project has been completed. However, the Commission could approve a transition of carrier of last resort obligations from one carrier to another if such a request is also filed. The Commission will continue its policy of providing NUSF support to only one wireline provider in a given area.

- d. A specific description of the described service area.³
- e. A commitment to offering service to every location within the designated service area.⁴
- f. A demonstration that the competitive carrier provides voice and broadband service with minimum service speeds of 100/20 Mbps to locations in the designated service area, including but not limited to reporting the locations as serviceable through the FCC Broadband Data Collection process.
- g. A commitment to the provision of NUSF supported services including but not limited to 911 and Telecommunications Relay services.
- h. A commitment to offering affordable and reasonably comparable services at a rate which is at or below the benchmark rate established by the Commission.
- i. A commitment to filing the NUSF EARN Form, or any replacement filing, on an annual basis.
- j. A commitment to filing the Commission-prescribed NETC certification reports on an annual basis.
- k. A commitment to provide interconnection with any requesting carrier on a reasonable and nondiscriminatory basis.
- l. A commitment to filing speed test data and meeting speed testing metrics consistent with the Commission's Orders in Docket No. NUSF-133.
- m. A commitment that the NUSF support received will be used in a manner which is consistent with the requirements of the NUSF Act (Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 86-316 through 86-329), the Commission rules and regulations, and Commission orders relevant to the use of NUSF high-cost support.⁵
- n. An affidavit affirming that Applicant is not using or deploying any communications equipment or service deemed to pose a threat to

³ This election could include a statement as to whether the incumbent carrier voluntarily wishes to be relieved of carrier of last resort obligations in the described service territory.

⁴ The Petition must include a list of locations served/to be served, as well as a map, and supporting map data in shapefile or other GIS-supported format, of the service area. A Petitioner must commit to providing service to all locations within the service area upon a subscriber's request.

⁵ This commitment would include compliance with the Commission's audit requirements for NUSF high-cost program support received as required by Commission rules and orders. *See* Title 291 Neb. Admin. Code § 10-004.02(J).

national security which is identified on the Covered List anywhere on its network.⁶

5. The Commission would, on an annual basis, determine eligible locations for the purpose of calculating eligible competitive carriers' high-cost support. The Commission proposes to establish a date certain, such as October 1st, as the date by which competitive carriers' eligibility and NUSF application for support for the specific area/locations would be determined. Applicants who have not had applications approved by the Commission prior to that date-certain would not have their locations included in the high-cost distribution mechanism for the subsequent calendar year. Once an application is approved, the competitive carrier maintains eligibility as long as the Commission re-certifies the carrier for NUSF support for the relevant year.⁷
6. However, for the purposes of calculating 2026 calendar year support, due to the fact that the newly established framework does not provide for a lot of time, the Commission would propose to include location-based support calculations for all competitive carriers approved for NUSF support using the mechanism described above if their application has been approved by December 31st. Carriers would need to consider the potential time to have an application filed, noticed, and approved by the December 31st deadline and plan accordingly.
7. Competitive carriers seeking support in an approved support area, may not be eligible to receive support based on other criteria tied to location eligibility, earnings test limitations, or other factors which cause a reduction in NUSF support.

B. Cost Model Updates

The Commission sought comment on whether to keep using the SBCM model, use a carrier agnostic cost support area ("CASA") model, or use a composite of both of the SBCM/CASA models for the purpose of determining relative costs for high-cost support distribution in 2026.⁸ The Commission sought comment on whether to

⁶ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.50002; see also Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 86-125(4)(c) and 86-324(2)(d).

⁷ The Commission plans to keep the annual re-certification date in place so that it is consistent with the timeline for annual federal universal service support certifications.

⁸ With a composite model, certain portions of the state would be predetermined to be modeled utilizing SBCM support areas (i.e. – exchange boundaries), and the remaining areas would be modeled based off of the CASA model.

update the following inputs in the model: Plant Mix, Labor Rates, Optical Network Terminal (“ONT”), and Weighted Average Cost of Capital (“WACC”) as discussed in the technical conference on June 17, 2025. The Commission also sought comment on how often updates to the cost model should be made due to boundary changes, inflation, or other significant events. The Commission has since entered into an agreement with CostQuest to update the SBCM model and has requested that carriers provide carrier specific cost input data that will be incorporated into the overall model. The Commission plans to hold a webinar on August 26, 2025 to provide further information to carriers. The Commission will delay consideration of using a secondary CASA model for service areas served by competitive carriers.

Comments Received

Charter Fiberlink-Nebraska, LLC and Time Warner Cable Information Services (Nebraska)(“Charter”) filed comments on two issues.⁹ First, Charter stated that support should be limited to locations that are truly unserved, and that the Commission should take into account all revenue and support sources available to providers when assessing the need for support.¹⁰ Charter stated that funding should not be awarded for locations with existing service. Charter also stated that the Commission should avoid duplicate funding for locations in the process of being built out or scheduled for buildout with private investment or other federal or state funding sources.¹¹ Charter recommended the Commission take into account federal universal service fund support received, as well as other revenue sources when calculating support.¹² Charter supported the use of an agnostic model and generally supported the Commission continuing to obtain data from CostQuest as part of a necessary micro level examination of need.¹³ Charter took no position on specific methodologies or inputs for CostQuest modeling.¹⁴

⁹ See Comments filed by Charter Fiberlink-Nebraska, LLC and Time Warner Cable Information Services (Nebraska) LLC (“Charter”) at 1.

¹⁰ See *id.*

¹¹ See *id.* at 2.

¹² See *id.* at 5.

¹³ See *id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*

The Rural Telecommunications Coalition of Nebraska (“RTCN”)¹⁵ responded to the Commission’s June 20th Order by filing comments on the proposed framework and the questions the Commission asked regarding cost model updates. The RTCN generally supported the Commission’s proposal with respect to the framework for transitioning support to competitive NETCs.¹⁶ In prior comments, the RTCN recommended the Commission include the following components:

- Nebraska eligible telecommunications carrier (“NETC”) designation and a commitment to offering voice and the NUSF supported services;
- Assumption of carrier of last resort (“COLR”) obligations;
- Provision of broadband service to all supported locations at the required speeds;
- Verification of speed requirements through the Commission’s current speed testing protocol;
- Participation in existing affordability programs or an equivalent commitment to providing affordable service offerings.¹⁷

RTCN recommended that the Commission implement a composite or hybrid model system for the purpose of determining relative costs for high-cost support distribution in 2026.¹⁸ In areas served by rate of return carriers, the RTCN suggested that the Commission retain the SBCM model for cost determination. In other areas, the RTCN believed use of the carrier agnostic support areas (CASA) model would be appropriate.¹⁹ The RTCN recommended that cost model inputs be updated with a goal of establishing an accurate baseline for these inputs as the Commission finalizes the new NUSF methodology through the conclusion of this docket.²⁰

¹⁵ For purposes of this proceeding, the RTCN consists of the following carriers: Arapahoe Telephone Company d/b/a ATC Communications; Benkelman Telephone Company, Inc., Cozad Telephone Company, Hartman Telephone Exchanges, Inc., Diller Telephone Company, Southeast Nebraska Communications, Inc., Pierce Telephone Company, and Wauneta Telephone Company

¹⁶ *See* RTCN Comments at 1.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 2.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 3.

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.* at 4.

The RIC members' comments²¹ provided an overview of the statutory framework in Nebraska Revised Statutes pointing out the distinctions between the Rural Sustainability Act, the Deregulation Act and § 86-134 provisions. RIC stated that the consequences of the Commission's approval of a CLEC petition are that COLR obligations are transferred to the CLEC and the incumbent carrier not receiving high-cost support shall no longer have carrier of last resort obligations.²² RIC believed a fundamental principle which should govern the provision of high-cost support to CLECs is that CLECs should be subject to the same eligibility and operational requirements applicable to ILECs.²³ However, RIC advocated that the CLEC seeking high-cost support should apply for and receive NETC status prior to the CLEC being authorized to receive high-cost support.²⁴ Additionally, the Commission should require a demonstration that the CLEC is in compliance with all Commission orders related to high-cost support.²⁵ The CLEC should also be required to provide broadband with minimum service speeds of 100/20 Mbps.²⁶ RIC supported the proposed timeline set forth in Issue A, paragraphs 2,3, and 6.²⁷ As far as the annual October 1st deadline, RIC stated the acceptability of that proposal depends on whether that deadline would provide the Commission staff with enough time to determine support determinations and issue an order by December 31st. Additional considerations might also include updates to the FCC's fabric data or any challenges that might be permitted and filed.²⁸ RIC recommended the Commission modify the terminology to mirror the defined terms in the Commission's rules. Specifically, RIC recommended the Commission utilize the term "support area" rather than "service territory". RIC also recommended the Commission engage in an analysis of the CLEC's application so that the proposed support area does not result

²¹ For the purposes of this proceeding, RIC consists of Consolidated Telephone Company, Consolidated Telco, Inc., Consolidated Telecom, Inc., The Curtis Telephone Company, Great Plains Communications LLC, Hamilton Telephone Company, Hartington Telecommunications Co., Inc., Hershey Cooperative Telephone Company, K & M Telephone Company., Inc., The Nebraska Central Telephone Company, Northeast Nebraska Telephone Company, Sodtown Communications, Inc., and Three River Telco.

²² See RIC Comments at 5.

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ See *id.* at 6.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ See *id.* at 7.

²⁸ See *id.* at 8.

in cream-skimming.²⁹ With respect to the affordability requirement, RIC stated that it should be understood that the referenced rates include both broadband and local exchange service.³⁰ RIC did not understand the requirements in paragraph 7, and requested further clarification.

RIC supported the continued use of the SBCM with updated inputs. RIC stated there was no rational justification to replace the SBCM with the CASA model.³¹ In normal economic times, RIC recommended updates to the SBCM be made every three years.³²

RIC also supported the implementation of the minimum support base amount proposal. However, RIC requested clarification of the Commission's rationale for proposing the monthly support cap of \$100 per location.³³ RIC further emphasized if the requirements of the current NUSF EARN Form and process are retained in the current form or revised, the same requirements must be applied to CLECs seeking high-cost support.³⁴

The NRBA³⁵ generally supported the framework proposed by the Commission for transitioning NUSF high-cost support and obligations to competitive carriers.³⁶ The NRBA stated the framework is consistent with the Rural Communications Stability Act and the Telecommunications Exchange Deregulation Act.³⁷ The NRBA requested the Commission defined COLR obligations.³⁸ The NRBA suggested the

²⁹ *See id.* at 9.

³⁰ *See id.* at 10.

³¹ *See id.* at 12.

³² *See id.* at 13.

³³ *See id.*

³⁴ *See id.*

³⁵ For purposes of this proceeding, the NRBA consists of the following carriers: Cambridge Telephone Company; Glenwood Telephone Membership Corporation; Glenwood Network Services; Glenwood Telecommunications, Inc.; Hemingford Cooperative Telephone Co.; Mainstay Communications; Midstates Data Transport, LLC dba Stealth Communications; Mobius Communications; Pinpoint Communications; Plainview Telephone Company; Stanton Telecom, Inc.; Town & Country Technologies; WesTel Systems, dba Hooper Telephone Company.

³⁶ NRBA Comments at 2.

³⁷ *See id.* at 2-3.

³⁸ *See id.* at 3.

Commission include the following in the definition: the duty to provide voice services consistent with the Commission's rules and regulations, internet service at statutorily required speeds, and reliable access to 911 and Telecommunications Relay services.³⁹ Importantly, the NRBA stated, the definition should be based on locations subject to the support that is transitioning. It should reference location identification numbers assigned by the Federal Communications Commission and other information the Commission identifies.⁴⁰ The NRBA stated the Commission cannot impose COLR obligations on competitive carriers for locations they do not serve for locations which they choose not to accept support.⁴¹

NRBA further stated that it was not convinced that a carrier agnostic model would appropriately reflect provider costs for existing fiber networks.⁴² Since, however, it could not analyze the carrier agnostic model without further details, the NRBA urged the Commission to retain CostQuest to run both models – the SBCM and the carrier agnostic models.⁴³ The NRBA recommended updating the Plant Mix inputs, including but not limited to the ratios of aerial to buried fiber; Labor Rates; upgraded ONTS; and the WACC. The NRBA stated that plant and labor costs have increased since the model inputs were initially developed and need updating to better represent current costs.⁴⁴

Windstream also generally supported the framework the Commission's proposal for transitioning support and obligations to competitive ETCs.⁴⁵ Windstream encouraged the Commission to continue utilizing the current cost model with existing inputs.⁴⁶ As far as future updates, Windstream recommended that the Commission allow providers to seek off-cycle adjustments for either 1)

³⁹ *See id.*

⁴⁰ *See id.* at 4.

⁴¹ *See id.*

⁴² *Id.* at 5.

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ *Id.* at 6.

⁴⁵ Windstream Comments at 1.

⁴⁶ *Id.*

exogenous events, and 2) increased costs greater than 20 percent.⁴⁷ Windstream suggested the Commission make updates to the cost model on a two-year cycle.⁴⁸

Workshop

A workshop was held on **July 15, 2025** in Lincoln and via WebEx. The discussion centered on two primary topics: the framework for transitioning NUSF support and obligations to competitive carriers, and the cost model updates. The Commission was asked to define some terms including “service area” or “support area” as well as carrier of last resort obligations. The Commission was also asked to clarify the obligations the competitive carriers will be required to meet when taking on COLR obligations. The interested parties also discussed cost model alternatives. There was general support for the continued use of the SBCM to determine high-cost support in the rate-of-return carrier areas, with updated inputs. There were mixed opinions about the need for a carrier agnostic model in the 2026 high-cost support distribution period.

Next Steps

Through this Order, in response to the comments and discussion at the workshop, we provide definitional suggestions and further clarification of the proposed obligations as set forth below. We invite interested parties to suggest alternative suggestions or wording changes in their pre-filed testimony.

Building on the proposed framework detailed in the Hearing Officer’s June 20, 2025 Order to transition high-cost support and COLR obligations to competitive NETCs we seek comment on the scope and definition of COLR obligations for the purpose of NUSF high-cost program support.⁴⁹ We propose to require any NETC receiving high cost support to take on the following COLR obligations:

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ We note that LB 4 (2025) included a definition of “carrier of last resort obligations” generally, but for purposes of eligibility of NUSF high-cost support we include requirements consistent with those imposed on incumbent carriers receiving NUSF support which advance the purposes and goals of the NUSF Act.

1. Offer reliable voice and broadband services to every location in the support area in compliance with all pertinent statutes, rules and regulations, and orders of the Commission;⁵⁰
2. Offer 911 and Telecommunications Relay services;
3. Offer affordable voice and broadband services at affordable rates in compliance with the Broadband Benchmark Rate and Voice Benchmark Rate; and
4. Participate in the Nebraska Telephone Assistance Program.

The Commission seeks comment on the foregoing list and asks whether any other obligations should be specifically enumerated. Are there any obligations which should differ between ILECs versus the competitive carriers taking on COLR responsibilities and receiving high-cost support? If so, what are those obligations?

The Commission further seeks comment on whether to utilize the term “support area” to describe the area in which NUSF obligations and COLR obligations would attach. We propose that the term “support area” be defined consistent with our current rule in Chapter 10 with one slight modification denoted as follows:

001.01(V) SUPPORT AREA. A geographic area containing broadband and voice capable serviceable locations within a service area designated by the Commission in which an NETC receives a specific level of NUSF support.

We further propose to continue use of the term “service area” as the geographic area for which COLR obligations attach.

001.01(U) SERVICE AREA. A geographic area designated by the Commission in which an NETC shall provide service.⁵¹

⁵⁰ This would include taking on the same obligations imposed on the incumbent carrier relative to service quality and consumer protection standards, outage reporting, and financial reporting, including but not limited to: the filing an NUSF EARN Form where required, filing the NUSF-25/66 reports, and being subject to remittance/payment audit requirements.

⁵¹ We anticipate that the “service area” would generally be the same as the “deployment project area.” *See* Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-1503(5) However, interested parties are free to explain why that may not be the case.

The Commission seeks comment on the definitions above and asks whether further clarification should be added. We note that historically, with the exception of ILEC service area boundaries, the NETC has defined the area in which it desired to be designated as an NETC. Those areas have historically been determined by the petitioner and have included exchange, wire center, census block, or zip code boundaries. Further, those areas have typically been defined in a manner that is consistent with how federal support is provided. We would propose allowing petitioners to instead base their petition on a shapefile of the locations for which NETC designation is sought, with the understanding that any party receiving NUSF high-cost support in the service area and affected by the petition may file an opposition on the basis of creamskimming concerns.⁵² The Commission may also consider such issues on an independent basis, as well as the impact of a defined support area on the continuity of service and consistency with the legislative goals of the universal service fund high-cost program. We seek comment on this proposal and the proposed definitions. Are there any other factors the Commission should consider?

In addition, we seek comment on the suggestion by the RIC group that there be a requirement for competitive providers petitioning the Commission to replace the incumbent carrier to file for and receive federal ETC designation pursuant to § 47 USC Section 214(e) as a condition to the transfer COLR and high-cost support. Likewise, should the incumbent carrier be required to file a petition to relinquish it

⁵² We note that a creamskimming analysis has historically been a part of the eligible telecommunications carrier designation process where the applicant proposes to be designated below the study area level of a rural telephone company. *See In the Matter of the Commission on its own motion seeking to establish an interim policy on eligible telecommunications carrier standards*, Docket No. C-3415, Order Adopting Guidelines (June 28, 2005) at 5, para. 4; *See also ETC Designation Report and Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 6393-95, paras. 48-53. The purpose of a creamskimming analysis is to ensure that potential designees could not selectively choose to serve high-density portions of a rural telephone company's study area while receiving support based on the average costs of the rural telephone company in providing service throughout the study area. However, as the FCC has explained, a creamskimming analysis may be less relevant where, the designee will be the only carrier receiving support within the service area and must serve high-cost areas that the marketplace would not otherwise serve absent subsidy. *See Connect America Fund, et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 31 FCC Rcd 5949, 6008, para. 165 (2016). We believe that the NETC designation process may be the time where a creamskimming analysis may be more relevant. However, we do not plan to foreclose the ability to consider it where relevant in a petition seeking to be the supported carrier in a given support area and taking on COLR responsibilities. As a reminder, carriers seeking NETC designation have an obligation to provide the supported services throughout the entire geographic area in which NETC designation is received within a reasonable period of time.

federal and/or state ETC designation in the service area? In doing so, should the Commission require the petitioner or the incumbent carrier or both to notify and coordinate any ETC transition issues with the FCC to the extent necessary?

We also anticipate that when the Commission works through the petition process, new issues may be presented. Accordingly, there may be a need for initial flexibility to address some unanticipated issues as they arise. Once we have developed the proper framework we intend to initiate a rulemaking to update the NUSF rules and regulations.

Pre-filed Testimony

We ask interested parties to file their comments in the form of pre-filed testimony as the Commission hopes to build a record upon which to make a decision. Pre-filed testimony covering the general proposed framework, the definitions, and other issues described above may be filed electronically to psc.nusf@nebraska.gov on or before **September 16, 2025 by 5:00 p.m., Central Time**. Parties filing pre-filed testimony should electronically serve the other interested parties filing comments in this proceeding.

Hearing

Additionally, we hereby set a hearing date for the purpose of establishing a record by which to make a decision and adopt the framework for transitioning NUSF support and obligations to competitive carriers. The hearing shall be scheduled for **September 30, 2025 at 1:30 p.m., Central Time**, in the Commission Hearing Room, 300 The Atrium Building, 1200 N Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508 and via WebEx. If auxiliary aids or reasonable accommodations are needed for attendance at the meeting, please call the Commission at (402) 471-3101. For people with hearing/speech impairments, please call the Nebraska Relay System at (800) 833-7352 (TDD) or (800) 833-0920 (Voice). Advance notice of at least seven days is needed when requesting an interpreter.

O R D E R

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Nebraska Public Service Commission that interested parties may file comments in the form of pre-filed testimony which shall be filed on or before **September 16, 2025 at 5:00 p.m., Central Time**, in the manner prescribed herein.

SECRETARY'S RECORD, PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Application No. NUSF-139

Page 14

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a hearing shall be held on **September 30, 2025 at 1:30 p.m., Central Time**, in the Commission Hearing Room, 300 The Atrium Building, 1200 N Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508 and via WebEx.

ENTERED AND MADE EFFECTIVE at Lincoln, Nebraska this 26th day of August, 2025.

NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS CONCURRING:

Eric M. Hamler
[Signature]
Kevin Stocker
Don Wassenaar

Tim Schram

Chair

ATTEST:

G. A. Walker

Executive Director