Approved: March 25, 1998
date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Alicia Salisbury at 8:00 a.m. on March 24, 1998 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

Members present: Senators Salisbury, Barone, Brownlee, Donovan, Feleciano, Gooch, Jordan, Ranson, Steffes, Steineger and Umbarger.

Committee staff present: Lynne Holt, Legislative Research Department
Bob Nugent, Revisor of Statutes
Betty Bomar, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Glenda Cafer, General Counsel, Kansas Corporation Commission
Jan Kruh, Congressional District Coordinator, AARP
Theresa E. Gram, Director, orth Central Kansas Distance Learning Network

Others attending: See attached list

Upon motion of Senator Steineger, seconded by Senator Ranson, Minutes of March 20, 1998, March 23, 1998 and the March 23, 1998 afternoon meeting were unanimously approved as corrected.

SB 666 - Telecommunications act; cost-based regulation; eliminating universal service requirements

Glenda Cafer, General Counsel, Kansas Corporation Commission (KCC) testified in support of **SB 666** stating it addresses the problems the KCC is experiencing in implementing the Kansas Telecommunication Act (KTA). Ms. Cafer stated the March 13, 1998 Supreme Court decision clearly states that the KCC has the authority to perform a cost study, conduct an audit or earnings review; and that the revenue neutrality and no audit or earnings review provisions in the KTA are transitional. The KCC staff intends to immediately commence such studies or reviews as authorized by the Supreme Court Decision. (Attachment 1)

Ms. Cafer stated the Committee may want to help the KCC avoid litigation on the issue of price caps by confirming that the KCC has the authority to perform an earnings audit if a company elects to go on a price cap plan. Representatives of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (SWBT) claim the KCC is forever barred from performing an earnings audit of their company once they elect to go on a price cap plan. Such an election has been made by SWBT, and Sprint/United has filed such an election. **SB 666** clarifies this issue. Ms. Cafer stated a less comprehensive way to make such a clarification is to add the following language in KSA 66-2005(b): (Page 6, line 3) "Carriers that elect price cap regulation shall be exempt from *rate adjustments* resulting from rate base, rate of return earnings regulation."; and on Page 10, Line 11, insert (KSA 66-3005(u)) "No audit, earnings review or rate case shall be performed *only* with reference to the initial prices filed as required herein."

Ms. Cafer stated **SB 666** addresses the "enhanced universal service", which has an estimated cost of between $416 Million to $770 Million which will require an annual increase in the Kansas Universal Service Fund (KUSF) of approximately $78 Million. There is concern regarding these costs due to the fast pace of evolving technology and the fear that what is mandated by enhanced universal service is already outdated. **SB 666** strikes this section of the KTA on page 4, Line 31. However, if the Committee wishes to address enhanced universal service, the KCC suggests 1) deleting the 28.8 kb Internet requirement in KSA 66-2011 and inserting 19.4 kb; 2) freeze future investments until the legislature takes action; 3) order the KCC to establish a working group to define enhanced universal service, determine how and when it should be deployed, and determine an appropriate method for capital cost recovery.

Ms. Cafer stated the KCC will apply the present reserve in the KUSF to the next access reduction, and the KCC recommends lowering the assessment rate for cellular companies by one-half. This assessment is appropriate as one-half of cellular lines go over land lines. **SB 666** does not adjust the cellular assessment.

Ms. Cafer stated the KUSF should be adjusted so that it is only subsidizing companies for their actual cost of providing universal service. Once the KCC performs its audits and determines the actual costs, the adjustments can occur when the revenue neutral transition period expires on March 2, 1999 (the end of the 3 year phase down of access rates.) Some companies maintain they are to remain revenue neutral beyond the 3-year period, the Supreme Court declared the revenue neutral plan to be legal because it is transitional. **SB 666** removes any potential claim for ongoing revenue neutrality.

Ms. Cafer stated the KCC needs to rebalance rates after making a determination of the actual cost of providing local service. The KCC is allowed to do this without any additional legislation. There have been some suggestions that an amendment be made that would arbitrarily increase all SWBT local rates by $2.00 and Sprint's by $1.35. Ms. Cafer stated if the subsidy is buried in local rates, it violates the Federal Telecommunication Act (FTA) which requires the subsidy to be explicit, not implicit. Further, if companies subsidize their high cost areas with the local rates charged in urban areas, the subsidy will deteriorate every time a competitor takes a customer away from SWBT or Sprint in an urban area. Ms. Cafer also stated if a company's subsidy for high cost areas is embedded in local rates charged in urban areas, then it is not portable to a competing carrier.

Ms. Cafer stated the KCC held hearings and received public comments during Phase II of the Competition Docket resulting in the order establishing the present KUSF structure. Customers were strongly opposed to a local rate increase, therefore, prior to such increases, it is necessary to obtain data to justify an increase in the local rates. The KTA requires all companies to pay into the KUSF on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis, thus, if a $2.00 local rate increase is legislated for certain customers to subsidize high cost rates, and later circumstances warrant a lower rate for the subsidy, the KCC cannot lower that local rate because it will be locked in through a price cap plan. It is incumbent the KCC maintain the flexibility to adjust rates as circumstances change.

Ms. Cafer stated by shifting SWBT and Sprint's KUSF assessment from the fund to a local rate increase, their local customers are assessed twice; once with the local rate increase, and again with the remaining KUSF assessment. Such an assessment may be acceptable provided the local rate increase is cost based and set at a level which insures a subsidy is not included.

Ms. Cafer stated the KCC staff supports **SB 666** but acknowledge the difficulty of passage due to its comprehensive nature. The Supreme Court's decision did provide clarification on most issues; however, it may be prudent to clarify the KCC's authority further to avoid costly litigation. The KCC is taking steps to analyze and adjust the KUSF and its corresponding assessments downward. The KCC, after a review of cost data, will identify the appropriate amount and structure of rebalancing rates.

Jan Kruh, AARP, testified in support of **SB 666** stating the KUSF is out of control and the Legislature needs to correct provisions of the KTA in order to comply with the Federal statute and to ensure that consumers' rights are protected. Ms. Kruh urged corrective steps be taken to: 1) disallow the inclusion of enhanced universal service as a part of the KUSF; 2) disallow the use of the KUSF for infrastructure costs; 3) restore the KCC's regulatory authority which was removed by the KTA; and require the KCC to conduct cost studies for providing basic universal service and to carry out audits of costs and revenues so that fair rates are established. (Attachment 2)

Theresa E. Gram, Director, North Central Kansas Distance Learning Network testified in support of **SB 666**, stating there should be an audit of the earnings of telecommunication companies; an environment established for competition; an assurance of quality service; and an assurance that end-users are participants in the process. Ms. Gram submitted information for cities in Northeast Kansas who have entered into contracts with telecommunication providers for long distance learning which reflects monthly rates, annual rates and the reduction under Form 470 for Universal Service Assistance (E-Rate) which amounts to a reduction of approximately 68%. (Attachment 3)

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 a.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 25, 1998.

SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE: March 24 1998

NAME	REPRESENTING
Bob Hodges	KTA
Bud Grant	KCCI
Terry Leatherman	KCCI
[illegible] Johnson	KASB
[illegible]	North Central Kansas Distance Learning Network
Janet Kruh	AARP
Richard Nelson	AirTouch
E. Kirk Dolbach	CMT Partners
RICHARD LAWSON	SPRINT
William Roche	Sprint
SHAWN McKENZIE	SOUTHWESTERN BELL
ANDY SCHARF	DISC
Debra Prideaux	FHSU
Roger Baker	KCPR
CARL KREHBIEL	MOUNDRIDGE TELEPHONE CO.
Ron Gaches	McGill Asso.

Testimony on SB 666
Glenda Cafer
General Counsel, Kansas Corporation Commission
Before the Senate Commerce Committee
March 24, 1998

The Kansas Corporation Commission's (Commission) order implementing the Kansas Telecommunications Act of 1996 (KTA) has recently been upheld, in its entirety, by the Supreme Court of Kansas. The Supreme Court's decision has provided some clarification on certain provisions of the State Act which arguably were ambiguous and subject to various interpretations. As such, the need for amendments to the KTA in order to clarify the authority of the Commission is no longer of primary concern. Other issues, such as the size of the Kansas Universal Service Fund (KUSF) and the potential impact to the KUSF of enhanced universal service investments required under the KTA are of serious concern and hopefully the legislature will deem it appropriate to address these issues this session.

SB 666 addresses the problems we are experiencing in implementing the KTA and the Commission Staff supports this bill. However, anticipating that its provisions may be deemed too comprehensive at this time, my testimony focuses on those issues which Staff believes need to be resolved immediately, through legislative and/or Commission action.

I. SUPREME COURT DECISION

The Supreme Court's decision very clearly states that the KTA does not prevent the Commission from making appropriate adjustments and performing a cost study or from conducting an audit or earnings review at this time. It states that the revenue neutrality and no audit or earnings review provisions in the KTA are transitional. It seems clear to our Staff now that the Commission can perform cost studies or an earnings review once the initial phases of the KTA are in place. That is the course of action our Commission Staff intends to take immediately. We believe the language of the KTA, the legislative history behind the KTA, and the interpretation of the KTA provided by the Supreme Court support the Commission's authority in this regard.

However, we have been informed by representatives of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company that they believe the Commission is forever barred from performing an earnings audit of their company once they elect to go on a price cap plan. (That election has been made by the company and is now on file with the Commission.) The legislature may want to help the Commission avoid litigation on this issue by confirming that the Commission has the authority to perform an earnings audit if the Commission deems it necessary and appropriate.

Senate Commerce Committee
Date 3-24-98
Attachment # 1-1 thru 1-4

SB 666 accomplishes this clarification. A less comprehensive way to make this clarification would be to simply add the following italicized language in KSA 66-2005(b): "Carriers that elect price cap regulation shall be exempt from *rate adjustments* resulting from rate base, rate of return and earnings regulation." You should also add the following italicized language in KSA 66-2005(u): "No audit, earnings review or rate case shall be performed *only* with reference to the initial prices filed as required herein."

II. SIZE OF THE KUSF

A. Enhanced Universal Service - The cost for this requirement in the KTA is now estimated at $416m to $770m, which translates into an annual increase in the KUSF of approximately $78m. This is very expensive and there is good cause to fear that the technology we are mandating is already becoming outdated. Immediate action is warranted on this issue and SB 666 adequately addresses this problem. In the alternative, we suggest the following:

1. Delete the 28.8 kb Internet requirement in KSA 66-2011. Reducing it to 19.4 kb, as proposed by some parties, may be acceptable on an interim basis.
2. Freeze future investment in enhanced universal service facility deployment until the legislature takes further action on the issue next session. Order the Commission to establish a working group over the summer involving industry, CURB, legislators, ISP's, and Commission Staff. This group should define enhanced universal service, determine how and when it should be deployed, and decide an appropriate method for capital cost recovery. It should explore the possibility of setting a cap on the amount to be spent on deployment of enhanced universal service each year, rather than mandating the level of deployment and then hoping the price tag does not come in too high. This working group would provide to the Commission a report of issues upon which agreement is reached, including individual positions on issues where no agreement is reached. The Commission would provide the report and a Commission recommendation to the legislature next session.

B. Reserve - The Commission will apply the present reserve in the fund to the next access reduction.

C. Cellular Companies - The assessment for cellular companies can be reduced to one-half of the assessment imposed on land line companies by amending KSA 66-2008(b) to include such a mandate. SB 666 does not adjust the cellular assessment.

D. The KUSF should be adjusted so that it is only subsidizing companies for the actual cost of providing universal service. This will occur once the Commission performs its audits and determines those actual costs. This adjustment can occur once the revenue neutral transition period expires on March 2, 1999 (the end of the 3 year phase down of access rates.) Although some companies have argued that they are to remain revenue neutral under the KTA beyond this 3 year period, the Supreme Court appears to have put this issue to rest by declaring the revenue neutral plan to be legal because it is transitional. The Supreme Court's decision in this regard is consistent with the present language in the KTA and it does not appear that a clarifying amendment is needed any longer. However, SB 666 does remove any potential claim for ongoing revenue neutrality.

E. The Commission needs to rebalance rates, (increase some local rates to bring them closer to recovering more of their own costs), AFTER the Commission determines the actual cost of providing local service. No amendment to the KTA is needed to allow the Commission to do this. Some parties have suggested an amendment which would arbitrarily increase all SWBT local rates by $2.00 and Sprint's by $1.35. This is problematic for the following reasons:

1. If the subsidy is buried in local rates, it violates the Federal Telecommunications Act (FTA) which requires the subsidy to be explicit, not implicit. It also violates the FTA because it is not portable to competing companies, thus serving as a barrier to competition which is prohibited by the FTA. As the amount is arbitrary and not based on an actual review of costs, it violates the FTA's requirements that universal service bear only a reasonable share of joint and common costs, and that a noncompetitive service not subsidize competitive services.
2. If the companies subsidize their high cost areas with the local rates they charge in their urban areas, the subsidy will deteriorate every time a competitor takes a customer away from SWBT or Sprint in an urban area. This internally funded subsidy system places universal service in their high cost areas at risk.
3. As stated in number 1 above, if the companies' subsidy for high cost areas is embedded in their local rates charged in urban areas, then it is not portable to a competing carrier who wishes to serve in a SWBT or Sprint high cost area. If you try to fix this problem by providing a subsidy out of the KUSF for the competing carrier, then you have a double subsidy; one that still exists in SWBT's or Sprint's urban rates and one that is paid out of the fund to the competing carrier who is actually serving the high cost customer. This puts upward pressure on the KUSF.
4. The Commission held hearings and received public comment during

Phase II of the Competition Docket which resulted in the order establishing our present KUSF structure. Customers were strongly opposed to a local rate increase. Although this may eventually be what has to happen, it seems unwise to tell ratepayers you are going to legislate a rate increase for them when you have no data to show that a local rate increase is justified.

5. The KTA requires all companies to pay into the KUSF on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis. If you legislate a $2.00 local rate increase now for certain customers resulting in some local rates subsidizing high cost areas, and then later circumstances warrant a lower rate for the subsidy, the Commission can not lower that local rate because it will be locked in through a price cap plan. By placing the subsidy in rates, you forfeit the flexibility needed to adjust it as circumstances change.
6. Shifting SWBT and Sprint's KUSF assessment from the fund to a local rate increase, you hit their local customers twice. Once with the local rate increase, and again with the remaining KUSF assessment. This is acceptable PROVIDED that the local rate increase is cost based and is set at a level which insures that the subsidy is not included in it. The legislature does not have adequate data to make that determination right now.

III. SUMMARY

In summary, the Supreme Court's decision provided us with clarification on most issues, however, the legislature may wish to clarify the Commission's authority further to help the State avoid another round of costly litigation. As for the size of the KUSF, the Commission is already taking steps to analyze and adjust the fund and its corresponding assessments downward. Although rate rebalancing should be a part of this analysis and adjustment process, it should be done by the Commission after a review of cost data which will identify the appropriate amount and structure of any rebalancing effort.

Commission Staff support SB 666, but recognizes its passage may be difficult due to its comprehensive nature. As such, if the issues identified above are addressed, our Staff believes the problems being experienced under the KTA can be adequately resolved.

AARP

Bringing lifetimes of experience and leadership to serve all generations.

CONSUMERS CONCERNED OVER KUSF CHARGES

Statement to the Kansas Senate Commerce Committee

JAN KRUH
Congressional District Coordinator, AARP/VOTE
March 24, 1998

My name is Jan Kruh, and, as an AARP volunteer, I would like to speak to the harmful effects of the Kansas Telecommunications Act. The main thing that the ordinary telephone user sees is that the rates keep going up. We are facing some extremely serious problems that will become more acute unless they receive attention now.

The Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 was supposed to generate competition in telephone service. It was also supposed that competition would result in rate decreases to users.

When we read the papers and then look at our telephone bills, however, it is easy to conclude that neither of these expectations is being realized. I am especially concerned about the continued escalation of residential rates based on the fees we pay for the Universal Service Fund.

In principle, the USF sounds like a good idea -- making sure that remote and ~~low-income~~ subscribers have affordable telephone service. AARP endorses that concept.

In practice, however, the USF is going out of control. The Legislature needs to correct the provisions of the Kansas Telecommunications Act in order to comply with the Federal statute and to ensure that consumers' rights are protected.

Specifically:

- The KCC is now prohibited from auditing the cost base on which a proper USF rate might be set. The current $2 per month on residential and the 9.89% assessment on cell phone service appear to be estimates at best. At worst, they are arbitrary, bearing no documented relation to the cost of providing universal service. Just as these fees were being added, Southwestern Bell also chose to make significant increases in its charges for discretionary services such as call waiting, caller ID, and so forth. I believe that customers are now being seriously overcharged. But another way of describing this situation is that the telephone companies are gaining handsome new revenues not clearly related to the cost of providing services.

- The regulatory authority of the Kansas Corporation Commission has been compromised. When Kansas reduced intrastate access charges to the level of Federal interstate charges, the Legislature mandated that the telephone companies be reimbursed for the difference through an increase in local service rates. The KCC is not only barred from changing the rates of these providers, but it is also prohibited from even auditing rates and revenues to establish fair fees.

Senate Commerce Committee

Date 3-24-98

Attachment # 2-1 thru 2-2

- To make matters worse, the Kansas law allows USF funds to be used for a wide variety of purposes beyond **basic** universal service. In effect, a slush fund has been created, which the utilities may use to cover both infrastructure expenses normally met through the pre-existing rate base and also expenses for so-called enhanced services that benefit only a few specialized users. Use of USF monies for such purposes is now jeopardizing the affordability of basic telephone service.

Representing many small users, I have to say that this is a very complicated situation that few ordinary citizens understand. With their lawyers and accountants it is easy for the telephone companies to conceal their agenda and to confuse the bewildered consumers. We consumers don't have the same influence as the large corporations, and we are now at the mercy of a flawed system -- a system which provides that the telephone companies gain more and more revenues and that those revenues are shielded from review. The field we play on is not level. The small user must rely on the Legislature, KCC, and CURB to protect the interests of the consumer. It is therefore to this body that I appeal for some simple and obvious corrective measures:

- Disallow the inclusion of enhanced universal service as part of the USF concept.
- Disallow the use of the USF for infrastructure costs that should be supported by regular earnings.
- Restore the KCC's regulatory authority that was removed in the Kansas Telecommunications Act.
- Require and allow the KCC to conduct cost studies of providing **basic** universal service and to carry out audits of costs and revenues so that **fair rates** may be set.

The small consumer is depending on you to correct an increasingly burdensome system. We support the efforts of CURB to protect the interests of the small consumer, and we expect the Legislature to give the KCC the power to work toward those same interests.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation.

N C K D L N

Theresa E. Gram, Director

North Central Kansas Distance Learning Network

219 West 7th Street

Concordia KS 66901

e-mail: theresa.dln@dustdevil.com
www: www.nckesc.org
Office: 785.243.4187
Mobile: 785.243.6661
Cellular: 785.243.0235

Senate Commerce Committee

Date 3-24-98

Attachment # 3-1 thru 3-5

3-8

RATES for Sites Investigating Connection

PROVIDER:	Location	Monthly Rate	Annual Rate	One Time Hook-up Fee	ILEC Interconnect	Line Charge with E-Rate in Effect
SWBT	Concordia (DLN)	$ 2,300	$ 27,600	$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 8,832.00
	Hiawatha *	0**	?	1,000	720	?
	Highland *	0**	?	1,000	720	?
	Sabetha	3,390	40,680	1,000	0	13,017.60
	Seneca	2,800	33,600	1,000	0	10,752.00
	Shawnee Heights	2,100	25,200	1,000	0	8,064.00
	Troy	0**	?	1,000	720	?

* Non-SWBT sites.
** Interconnect Charge. Quotes for monthly line charges are not available at this time.

PROVIDER:	Location	Monthly Rate	Annual Rate	One Time Hook-up Fee	ILEC Interconnect	Line Charge with E-Rate in Effect
Sprint-United	Blue Valley •	$ 2,246.39	26,956.68	$ 1,000	$ 720	$ 8,626.14
	Riley County	1,923.77	23,085.24	1,000	720	7,387.28
	Clifton-Clyde	≈ 2,500.00	30,000.00	1,000	720	9,600.00

• Like Riley County and Clifton-Clyde, the Blue Valley-Randolph district withdrew because of line charges that are not affordable. Immediately prior to the U.S.D. 384 to withdraw from the DLN, Sprint-United countered its *final offer* -- a rate between $1,172 and $1,600. This offer was likely in response to the community's interest in inviting an alternative ILEC to survey area patrons. The inability to specify a rate prior to the conclusion of the tariff provided the district B.O.E. no choice but to withdraw from the DLN project.

Note: The DLN submitted an aggregate Form 470 for Universal Service Fund assistance (E-Rate). The weighted reduction is approximately 68%.

RATES for Sites Currently Connected

PROVIDER:	Location	Monthly Rate	Annual Rate	One Time Hook-up Fee	ILEC Interconnect	Line Charge with E-Rate in Effect
SWBT						
	Belleville	$ 1,155	$13,860	$ 0	$ 0	$ 4,435.20
	Beloit	1,155	13,860	0	0	4,435.20
	Clay Center	1,155	13,860	0	0	4,435.20
	Concordia (2)	1,155	13,860	0	0	4,435.20
	Frankfort †	1,155	13,860	0	0	4,435.20
	Lincoln †	1,155	13,860	0	0	4,435.20
	Scandia	1,155	13,860	0	0	4,435.20
	Solomon †	1,155	13,860	0	0	4,435.20
	Blue Rapids	1,155	13,860	0	0	4,435.20

† Post-tariff rates... SWBT extended the tariff rate opportunity from Oct. 1-'96 to Oct. 1-'97.

PROVIDER:	Location	Monthly Rate	Annual Rate	One Time Hook-up Fee	ILEC Interconnect	Line Charge with E-Rate in Effect
Sprint-United						
	Burr Oak	$ 1,172.64	$14,071.68	$ 0	$ 0 **	$ 4,502.94
	Wakefield	$ 1,466.00	17,592.00	0	0 **	5,629.44

* SWBT waived the $ 565.00 monthly interconnect charge.

PROVIDER:	Location	Monthly Rate	Annual Rate	One Time Hook-up Fee	ILEC Interconnect	Line Charge with E-Rate in Effect
JBN						
	Cuba	$ 1,155 *	$13,860	$ 0	$ 0 **	$ 4,435.20
	Morrowville	1,155 *	13,860	0	0 **	4,435.20

* Note that the ILEC is matching the SWBT tariff rate.
** SWBT waived the $ 565.00 monthly interconnect charge.

PROVIDER:	Location	Monthly Rate	Annual Rate	One Time Hook-up Fee	ILEC Interconnect	Line Charge with E-Rate in Effect
Blue Valley	Centralia	$ 1,155 *	$13,860	$ 0	$ 0 **	$ 4,435.20

* Note that the ILEC is matching the SWBT tariff rate.
** SWBT waived the $ 565.00 monthly interconnect charge.

Rural School Needs

Rural school districts are typified by -

- students who need access to educational opportunities that prepare them for immediate career entry or post-secondary schools;
- students who need access to coursework that supports their competitive placement in post-secondary colleges and universities;
- students who need access to coursework that supports their competitive placement in pursuit of academic scholarships;

- an inability to attract and maintain quality faculty because of noncompetitive salary schedules;
- an inability to attract and maintain quality faculty who hold broad teaching endorsements;

- faculty who teach up to seven different preparations daily;
- faculty who, singularly, represent an entire department;
- itinerant faculty whose work days are distributed across two schools or two districts;
- faculty who provide instruction in second languages delivered via satellite downlink;

- low enrollment;
- low enrollment numbers in upper level electives - i.e., sometimes as low as 1 enrollee in Calculus;
- declining enrollment projections;

- regional per capitas substantially lower than the state and national per capita averages;
- aging populations;
- populations that are undereducated;
- dependency upon service-related and agricultural economies; and
- patrons who want or need to complete a post-secondary degree but cannot absorb the various costs of commuting.

35

Distance Learning Networks

- Make educational and economic development opportunities affordable for communities that are geographically, economically and technologically isolated.

- Broaden an otherwise narrow high school curriculum...

  - second language courses that provide daily interaction between learners and instructors unlike satellite delivered services that provide interaction on only a monthly cycle - i.e., Spanish I-IV, French I-IV, and German I-II

  - courses in disciplines not currently represented in the school curriculum - i.e., business - business law, entrepreneuerialship, economics, and accounting

  - upper level elective courses - i.e., Calculus, Trigonometry, Statistics, Anatomy & Physiology, Physics, Zoology, Botany, Psychology, Sociology, Current Events and so on.

  - upper level courses offered for concurrent enrollment - i.e., Calculus I & Analytical Geometry, Business Calculus, College Trigonometry, College Algebra, English Composition I & II, College Speech, Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Anatomy & Physiology, Microbiology, Physics, Meteorology and so on.

- Provide access to others with shared interests...

  - inter-district projects - i.e. electronic field trips and elementary school presentations involving authentic productions led by students
  - professional development and recertification/relicensure for all manner of professions

  - lifelong learning opportunities for all ages - i.e., Intro. to Sign Language

  - extension services

  - regional economic development that takes advantage of a shared workspace