## NUSF-139 – Workshop Agenda

## March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024 - 1:00 PM

## **Nebraska Public Service Commission Hearing Room**

- 1. Announcement of Open Meetings Act
- 2. Introductions
- 3. Summary of Issues / Staff Viewpoint
  - a. Brief History/Rationale for existing mechanism
  - b. Rationale for modifications to process
    - i. Reduce Complexity
    - ii. Better incorporate federal funding mechanisms (E-ACAM, etc.)
    - iii. Address influx of Broadband Funding
  - c. Departmental Position on Outstanding Issues
- 4. Overview of Discussion Items from Feb. 13<sup>th</sup> order:
  - 1. Should sustainability of broadband-capable networks be expressly adopted as a goal of the high-cost program?
  - 2. Should the NUSF continue to provide BDS support?
    - a. If so, under what parameters?
    - b. Should BDS support continue to be available for locations that continue to lack broadband once the federal Broadband Equity, Access and Deployment ("BEAD"), American Rescue Plan Act ("ARPA"), Rural Digital Opportunity Fund ("RDOF") and Enhanced Alternative Connect America Cost Model ("Enhanced ACAM") and the Nebraska Broadband Bridge Program ("NBBP")?
    - c. If BDS support is discontinued, when and how should that transition occur? Is it prudent to take action at this time?
    - d. How should such support be reallocated?
  - 3. What should be the process for retirement of copper-based outside plant and phase-out of ongoing support associated with such plant?
  - 4. What requirements should be imposed on carriers for the receipt of ongoing support, and when should such requirements be applied?
    - a. What methodology should the Commission employ to determine the need for ongoing support? How should ongoing support be reallocated to ensure that limited financial resources are effectively and efficiently used to ensure broadband services are accessible in all regions and that services in rural areas are reasonably comparable to services provided in urban areas? When should this transition be put in place?
    - b. Should the State Broadband Cost Model ("SBCM") be updated to more accurately reflect ongoing expense costs that are consistent with current market realities? If so, what should be the basis for such updates?