

Table 3: Total Net Household Resources* at 135% and 150% 2003 Federal Poverty Level***
3-person Household (2 parents/1 child)
Six Communities (August 2004)**

Community	135% of FPL		150% of FPL		Gain / (Loss)
	Income	Net Resources	Income	Net Resources	
Philadelphia (PA)	\$21,000	(\$10,206)	\$23,000	(\$10,638)	(\$432)
Reading (PA)	\$21,000	(\$4,156)	\$23,000	(\$4,158)	(\$2)
Hartford (CT)	\$21,000	(\$2,229)	\$23,000	(\$1,815)	\$414
Waterbury (CT)	\$21,000	(\$2,609)	\$23,000	(\$2,180)	\$429
Atlanta (GA)	\$21,000	(\$8,079)	\$23,000	(\$7,339)	\$740
Columbus (GA)	\$21,000	(\$1,961)	\$23,000	(\$1,199)	\$762

*Net resources include post-tax earnings, plus the Earned Income Tax Credit, plus public benefits (e.g., TANF, Food Stamps, Child Care Credit, housing subsidy, health insurance subsidy), minus basic household expenses.

**135% of Federal Poverty Level for a household of three persons (\$20,601) has been rounded to \$21,000.

***Poverty Level calculated on pre-tax earnings. 150% of Federal Poverty Level for a household of three persons (\$22,890) has been rounded to \$23,000.

I conclude that households with income at 150% of the Federal Poverty Level are at a cusp relative to total household resources. These households are at that transitional point where increasing income generally leads to the loss of public benefits. As a result, the move from income at 135% of the Federal Poverty Level to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level tends to leave households with minimal, if any, additional total household resources.

SECTION 3

Households with income between 135% and 150% of the Federal Poverty Level frequently lack telephone service.

Given the discussion above, it should come as no surprise that a substantial number of households that live with income between 135% and 150% of the Federal Poverty Level lack telephone service in the home. To estimate how prevalent this is, I use the Census Bureau's April 2004 Current Population Survey (CPS) micro-data. By combining data on household size and income, I calculate the ratio of each household's income to the Federal Poverty Level. Since the micro-data reports income in the form of a range (e.g., \$0 - \$4,999), I use the mid-point of each range to calculate the Federal Poverty Level. For example, for the income range of \$0 to \$4,999, I impute an income of \$2,500. For the range of \$15,000 to \$19,999, I impute an income of \$17,500 (and so forth). Poverty Level is income taking into account household size. I do *not* account for the difference in Poverty Level income figures for Hawaii and Alaska.

The CPS also reports whether a household has a telephone in the home. I thus combine the data on Poverty Level with the data on which households lack telephone service to determine the prevalence of the lack of telephone service for the relevant range of FPL.

Setting the values in this manner, the Current Population Survey indicates that there are 742,695 households in the United States with income between 135% and 150% of the Federal Poverty Level who live without a telephone in their home. While the use of the midpoint of the income range will cause some error in this figure, the error is minimal and the estimated number of households at this range of Poverty Level should be reasonable.

Providing Lifeline benefits to low-income households in this range of Poverty Level will assist many of these households to obtain service when, in the absence of Lifeline, they would not have access to affordable service.

SECTION 4

Increasing the Lifeline income eligibility guidelines to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level is necessary to ensure that households with equal incomes, but who live in different states, will have access to Lifeline benefits whether or not they participate in the LIHEAP and/or Food Stamp programs.

The FCC's assumption that setting the income eligibility guideline for Lifeline service equal to 135% of the Federal Poverty Level would reflect the income eligibility guidelines which underlie the public assistance programs serving as the basis for categorical Lifeline eligibility is incomplete. In fact, the income guidelines for programs such as Food Stamps and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) allow participation by households with incomes substantially higher than 135% of the Federal Poverty Level. Increasing the income eligibility to 150% of FPL will allow two households with identical incomes to participate in Lifeline whether or not both of the households also participate in Food Stamps and/or LIHEAP (or both).

In reaching this conclusion, I do not consider the programs that the FCC added as categorical eligibility determinants in April 2004. Instead, I examine only the federal Food Stamp and LIHEAP programs.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY

The FCC relied on the observation that the federal Food Stamp program has an income eligibility guideline of 130% of the Federal Poverty Level as at least partial support for

its determination that income eligibility for Lifeline assistance should be set at 135% of FPL.⁷

In fact, the federal Food Stamp program allows many households to participate in the program with incomes substantially higher than 130% of the Federal Poverty Level. The 130% income eligibility standard applies *only* to households that have neither elderly nor disabled persons. There are, however, two significant exceptions to this income eligibility standard:

- First, households with only members that are either elderly or disabled are subject only to the net income test. The gross income of these households is not considered so long as their net income (income after deductions) is at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Level.
- In addition, elderly persons who cannot buy food and prepare meals separately because of a substantial disability, but who live in a household with an income at or below 165% of Poverty Level, may receive Food Stamp so long as their net income is at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Level.

Table 4 shows the difference in gross monthly income between the households with 165% of the Federal Poverty Level and 130% of the Federal Poverty Level.

⁷ See, e.g., footnote 47, page 10, FCC Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, WC Docket No. 03-109 (noting Food Stamp eligibility if gross household income is at or below 130% of the Federal Poverty Level).

**Table 4: Food Stamp Gross Monthly Income Eligibility Standards
(October 1, 2003 - September 30, 2004)**

Household Size	130% Poverty Level	165% of Poverty Level
1	\$973	\$1,235
2	\$1,313	\$1,667
3	\$1,654	\$2,099
4	\$1,994	\$2,530
5	\$2,334	\$2,962
6	\$2,674	\$3,394
7	\$3,014	\$3,826
8	\$3,354	\$4,257
Each Additional Member	+ \$341	+ \$432

Includes District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Excludes Hawaii and Alaska.

Participation in the Food Stamp program with income of more than 130% of the Federal Poverty Level is not an uncommon occurrence. The 2001 national American Housing Survey (AHS),⁸ for example, found that nearly 135,000 households receiving Food Stamps with a householder age 60 or older⁹ had incomes higher than 130% of the Federal Poverty Level. This number is somewhat understated. Unlike the Census, the AHS is not intended to provide comprehensive national data. Instead, it is based on a sample of roughly 61,000 households drawn from 878 counties and independent cities. The AHS does cover all 50 states plus the District of Columbia.

Given the use of the Food Stamp program to establish categorical eligibility for the telecommunications Lifeline program, it would be equitable to increase income eligibility to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level to ensure that households in equivalent circumstances would have equal access to Lifeline benefits whether or not they participate in the Food Stamp program.

⁸ The American Housing Survey also provides periodic survey data for nearly 40 specific metropolitan areas. This discussion is not based on that metropolitan data.

⁹ The number of households with a householder age 60 or older will be smaller than the number of households with at least one member age 60 or older.

LIHEAP PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY

The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), another public benefits program participation in which will yield categorical eligibility for the federal telecommunication Lifeline program, has substantial state-to-state variation in its income eligibility standards. As a block grant program, LIHEAP allows each state to set its own income eligibility standard, so long as that income eligibility does not go *below* 110% of the Federal Poverty Level or *above* the higher of either 150% of the Federal Poverty Level or 60% of state median income.¹⁰

States have used their discretion to establish income eligibility standards that vary widely by jurisdiction. Table 5 sets forth the LIHEAP eligibility standards for each state for the 2004 Program Year (October 1, 2003 through September 30, 2004). As Table 5 shows:

- 20 states have set their LIHEAP basic grant eligibility standards at exactly 150% of the Federal Poverty Level.¹¹
- Five more have set the eligibility standard for their basic grant program at a multiplier of Poverty Level above 150%.
- Eight more have set the eligibility standard for their basic grant program at a multiplier of state median income (SMI) rather than as a multiplier of Federal Poverty Level, six of which have set their standard at the maximum allowable standard (60% of State Median Income).

Virtually all states use the same income standard for their LIHEAP crisis program as they use for their basic grant program.

Given the fact that LIHEAP is a block grant program, there will never be a uniformity of income eligibility standards among the various states. As of Program Year 2004 for LIHEAP, however, 33 of the 51 jurisdictions (50 states plus D.C.) have LIHEAP income eligibility standards that are higher than the 135% income standard established for the telecommunications Lifeline program.

¹⁰ In virtually all instances, 60% of State Median Income is higher than 150% of the Federal Poverty Level.

¹¹ Some states have special eligibility guidelines (or exemptions) for specific subpopulations, such as households with aging members, households with disabled persons, or households with children.

**Table 5: Program Year 2004 LIHEAP Maximum Income Guidelines by State
Basic LIHEAP and Crisis Assistance**

	Heating	Crisis
Alaska	150% FPG	150% FPG
Alabama	125% FPG	125% FPG
Arkansas	125% FPG	125% FPG
Arizona	150% FPG	150% FPG
California	60% SMI	60% SMI
Colorado	185% FPG	185% FPG
Connecticut	150% FPG	150% FPG
District of Columbia	150% FPG	150% FPG
Delaware	200% FPG	200% FPG
Florida	150% FPG	150% FPG
Georgia	150% FPG	150% FPG
Hawaii	150% FPG	150% FPG
Iowa	150% FPG*	150% FPG
Idaho	150% FPG	150% FPG
Illinois	150% FPG	150% FPG
Indiana	125% FPG	125% FPG
Kansas	130% FPG	130% FPG
Kentucky	110% FPG	110% FPG
Louisiana	60% SMI	60% SMI
Massachusetts	200% FPG	200% FPG
Maryland	150% FPG	150% FPG
Maine	150% FPG	150% FPG
Michigan	110% FPG	60% SMI
Minnesota	50% SMI	50% SMI
Missouri	125% FPG	125% FPG
Mississippi	150% FPG	150% FPG
Montana	150% FPG	150% FPG
North Carolina	110% FPG	150% FPG
North Dakota	60% SMI	60% SMI
Nebraska	116% FPG	116% FPG
New Hampshire	47.5% SMI	47.5% SMI
New Jersey	175% FPG	175% FPG
New Mexico	150% FPG	150% FPG
Nevada	150% FPG	150% FPG
New York	60% SMI	60% SMI
Ohio	150% FPG	150% FPG
Oklahoma	110% FPG	110% FPG
Oregon	60% SMI	60% SMI
Pennsylvania	135% FPG	135% FPG
Rhode Island	60% SMI	60% SMI
South Carolina	150% FPG	150% FPG
South Dakota	160% FPG	160% FPG
Tennessee	125% FPG	125% FPG
Texas	125% FPG	125% FPG
Utah	125% FPG	125% FPG
Virginia	130% FPG	130% FPG
Vermont	125% FPG	150% FPG
Washington	125% FPG	125% FPG
Wisconsin	150% FPG	150% FPG
West Virginia	130% FPG	130% FPG
Wyoming	150% FPG	150% FPG

FPG = Federal Poverty Guidelines. SMI = State Median Income.

SOURCE: LIHEAP Clearinghouse, <http://www.ncat.org/liheap/tables/FY2004/POP04.htm> (August 2004).

Table 6 converts the State Median Income (SMI) for each of the eight states using SMI as their LIHEAP eligibility standard into a multiplier of the Federal Poverty Level. As can be seen for these states, LIHEAP eligibility is substantially higher than the 135% of FPL income standard that the FCC adopted for Lifeline eligibility in its April 2004 Order.

**Table 6: Percent of 2004 State Median Income (SMI)
Converted into Percent of 2004 Federal Poverty Level (FPL) (3-person household)
States Using Multiplier of SMI as LIHEAP Eligibility Standard**

	LIHEAP Eligibility (SMI)	Income (\$s)	Percent FPL
California	60%	\$32,135	205%
Louisiana	60%	\$25,822	165%
Minnesota	50%	\$30,507	195%
North Dakota	60%	\$27,790	177%
New Hampshire	47.5%	\$28,970	185%
New York	60%	\$33,515	214%
Oregon	60%	\$29,603	189%
Rhode Island	60%	\$35,505	227%

SOURCE: Columbia University, School of Public Health, Income Converter (August 2004).

Fundamental fairness would dictate that households in those states that seek to enter the Lifeline program through an income standard rather than through the categorical eligibility established by participation in LIHEAP should be provided an opportunity to enter the Lifeline by establishing that their income is at or below 150% of the FPL. Setting 150% as the income guideline produces a reasonable accommodation of the different state LIHEAP income eligibility standards.

SECTION 5

Increasing Lifeline income eligibility guidelines to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level is necessary to ensure that low-income households living in the same state have equal access to Lifeline whether or not they participate in categorical eligibility programs.

Setting income eligibility guidelines for the federal telecommunications Lifeline program at 150% of the Federal Poverty Level is necessary to provide equity between states with widely divergent participation rates in the federal LIHEAP program. LIHEAP is a program, participation in which can serve as the basis for categorical Lifeline eligibility. As is discussed in detail above, eligibility for LIHEAP is frequently set at 150% of the Federal Poverty Level or higher.

Making households that receive LIHEAP categorically eligible for the federal Lifeline program does not make Lifeline equally accessible to low-income households. In FY 2002, 15 states set their LIHEAP eligibility standard equal to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level. An *additional* 16 states set their LIHEAP eligibility standard above 150%

of the Federal Poverty Level (often using a multiplier of state median income rather than a percent of Poverty Level as the standard).

A listing of the 31 states that used a LIHEAP eligibility standard of 150% of FPL or higher in FY 2002 is set forth in Table 7.¹²

As Table 7 indicates, however, merely because a state establishes 150% of the Federal Poverty Level (or higher) as the income eligibility standard does not mean that that state ubiquitously (let alone universally) serves households at those income levels.

- In only three of these 31 states did LIHEAP participation reach 40% or more of those eligible, with the states of Iowa (40%), Illinois (40%) and Maine (41%) having the highest participation rates. In each of these states, the eligibility guideline was exactly 150% of the FPL in FY2002.
- In only seven of these 31 states did LIHEAP participation reach between 30% and 39% of those eligible, with Ohio (34%) having the highest participation rate among those seven.
- In 12 of these 31 states, LIHEAP participation was at 20% or below of those eligible, with four of those twelve having participation rates below 10% of those eligible.

Clearly, to the extent that LIHEAP can be used to establish categorical eligibility in these 31 states (with LIHEAP eligibility at or above 150% of the FPL), two households with identical incomes can be treated in disparate fashion by the federal Lifeline program if one of the households participates in LIHEAP while the other does not.

This impact is mitigated to the extent that LIHEAP-eligible households might participate in other public assistance programs that also establish categorical eligibility for the federal telecommunications Lifeline program. While, as the FCC noted in its April 2004 Order, no data exists on the extent to which there is an overlap between each of the categorical eligibility programs (e.g., Food Stamps, LIHEAP, Medicaid, Free School Lunch program), some data can be reviewed to assess whether the use of multiple programs as a source of categorical eligibility will redress the problem of the eligible-but-non-participating household.

¹² Table 6 differs from Table 4 in that Table 6 presents data from FY2002 rather than FY2004. Data on the number of eligible persons, as well as total program participants, is not yet available for FY2004. FY2002 data is the most recent available.

**Table 7: Number and Percent of Households Eligible to Receive LIHEAP that
Actually Received LIHEAP Heating Benefits**

	Income Eligibility for Heating Benefits (2001)	No. of Income- Eligible Households (2001)	No of Participants Households (2002)	Percent participating
Alaska	150%	42,690	7,264	17%
California	194%	3,461,308	139,876	4%
Colorado	158%	254,078	83,171	33%
Connecticut	266%	420,037	79,476	19%
Delaware	200%	66,156	13,198	20%
District of Columbia	150%	55,435	18,042	33%
Georgia	150%	612,303	83,131	14%
Hawaii	189%	119,065	6,627	6%
Idaho	150%	102,057	29,867	29%
Illinois	150%	788,794	316,329	40%
Indiana	150%	420,623	126,855	30%
Iowa	150%	193,140	77,853	40%
Louisiana	155%	485,314	15,958	3%
Maine	150%	111,507	45,289	41%
Maryland	150%	285,247	77,825	27%
Massachusetts	200%	663,601	136,441	21%
Michigan	208%	1,110,048	334,817	30%
Minnesota	197%	373,459	122,327	33%
Nevada	150%	115,525	15,597	14%
New Hampshire	215%	126,383	27,131	21%
New Jersey	175%	639,129	151,333	24%
New Mexico	150%	185,506	37,594	20%
New York	201%	2,335,682	692,000	30%
North Dakota	179%	77,173	14,243	18%
Ohio	150%	814,986	275,506	34%
Oregon	159%	264,061	58,946	22%
Rhode Island	219%	141,868	25,900	18%
South Carolina	150%	332,661	27,505	8%
South Dakota	160%	63,818	16,075	25%
Wisconsin	150%	297,350	N/A	N/A
Wyoming	150%	36,654	8,800	24%

LIHEAP Home Energy Notebook For Fiscal Year 2002, Table B-2 (April 2004)

We do know that that there is a considerable (but not universal) overlap between LIHEAP recipients and Food Stamp recipients. According to 1994 research by Oak Ridge National Laboratory, sixty-five percent of all LIHEAP recipients also receive Food Stamps.¹³ More recent research is not available.

Table 8 presents data with respect to the overlapping eligibility between certain hunger-related programs. The data is limited by its focus on households with uninsured children, as reported in the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF). The data, however, provides considerable insight into the extent to which multiple programs can reach the entire universe of a low-income population. Moreover, the data is strengthened by the fact that it includes two of the most ubiquitous public assistance programs that exist (Free School Lunches and Food Stamps).

For our purposes here, the most important findings presented in this NSAF data involve the percentages of low-income families with uninsured children that participate in *any one* of the four programs included in the analysis. The data shows remarkable consistency as between different types of family structure, different childhood ages, and different household Poverty Levels. The percentage of households participating in any one of the four programs studied ranges from 75% (household income less than 50% of FPL), to 77% (household income of 51% to 100% of FPL), to 76% (household income of 101% to 150% of FPL).

Assuming that a program such as LIHEAP would not have a greater influence on this bottom line than do programs such as the supplemental nutrition program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) or unemployment compensation,¹⁴ it is possible to conclude that establishing Lifeline eligibility through multi-program categorical eligibility would nonetheless miss from one-fifth to one-quarter of all eligible households.

Table 9 presents the same data by geographic area. With the exception of the Northeast, which has a significantly lower penetration rate into any one of the four programs examined (64%), the penetration is in a *very* narrow band reaching from 73% to 76%. When examined on a state-by-state basis,¹⁵ the variation in penetration ranges from roughly 60% to roughly 80% of the total population.

¹³ Joel Eisenberg, et al. (November 1994). *The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program: Profile of the Eligible Recipient and Nonrecipient Populations in 1990*, at 48, Oak Ridge National Laboratory: Oak Ridge (TN).

¹⁴ This would be a safe assumption. LIHEAP is a smaller program reaching fewer households than WIC and unemployment compensation.

¹⁵ The National Survey of America's Families (NSAF) has a sufficient sample to provide state-specific data on thirteen states.

Table 8: Low-Income Uninsured Children in Families Enrolled in Public Programs, 1996-97											
	School Lunch Program^a		WIC^b		Food Stamps^c		Unemployment Compensation^d		Any of These Four Programs		
	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(S.E.)^e
Child Characteristics											
Age											
0-5	750,155	38	950,634	48	166,680	8	141,556	7	1,344,959	68	(2.3)
6-11	1,600,824	75	286,925	13	170,786	8	225,583	11	1,677,171	79	(2.8)
12-17	1,504,354	65	292,089	13	313,911	14	262,340	11	1,676,873	72	(2.3)
Family Characteristics											
Family Structure											
Single-parent household	1,376,979	61	432,532	19	342,711	15	210,820	9	1,649,338	73	(2.5)
Two-parent household	2,232,796	59	1,022,827	27	246,109	7	411,970	11	2,786,604	74	(2.2)
No parents in household	245,558	63	74,289	19	62,557	16	6,688	2	263,061	68	(4.9)
Family Income											
Less than 50% FPL	688,303	62	299,040	27	268,947	24	35,038	3	826,989	75	(3.8)
50-100% FPL	1,265,554	65	497,365	26	241,962	12	265,863	14	1,496,907	77	(2.6)
100-150% FPL	1,322,484	63	512,626	24	73,120	3	148,726	7	158,877	76	(2.8)
150-200% FPL	578,992	46	220,617	18	67,348	5	179,851	14	776,230	62	(3.8)
<i>Source:</i> Urban Institute calculations from the 1997 National Survey of America's Families (NSAF).											
<i>Note:</i> Insurance coverage is measured at the time of the survey.											
A. Represents children in families in which at least one child received benefits from the School Lunch Program in 1996.											
B. Represents children in families in which at least one child received benefits from the WIC program in 1996.											
C. Represents children in families that were receiving Food Stamp benefits at the time the NSAF was administered in 1997.											
D. Represents children in families in which at least one person received Unemployment Compensation in 1996.											
E. Standard error. f. Represents status of child's primary caregiver.											

**Table 9:
Low-Income Uninsured Children in Families Enrolled in Public Programs, 1996-97**

Geographic Location	School Lunch Program ^a		WIC ^b		Food Stamps ^c		Unemployment Compensation ^d		Any of These Four Programs		
	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(No.)	(%)	(S.E.) ^e
Region											
Northeast	365,972	51	130,622	18	66,737	9	80,500	11	460,227	64	(4.1)
Midwest	595,897	60	251,603	25	78,867	8	112,762	11	734,029	74	(4.3)
Midwest	595,897	60	251,603	25	78,867	8	112,762	11	734,029	74	(4.3)
South	1,705,665	61	560,906	20	336,514	12	185,737	7	2,065,097	73	(2.2)
West	1,187,800	63	586,517	31	169,258	9	250,480	13	1,439,650	76	(3.0)
State											
Alabama	82,473	66	19,597	16	40,069	32	9,410	7	98,757	79	(4.4)
California	700,323	66	314,980	30	92,151	9	115,318	11	854,048	81	(3.3)
Colorado	53,083	51	14,650	14	9,235	9	4,938	5	64,400	62	(4.2)
Florida	248,409	53	128,574	28	38,531	8	14,847	3	317,709	68	(3.8)
Massachusetts	26,980	46	10,319	18	6,371	11	4,950	8	35,531	61	(7.7)
Michigan	58,910	56	13,329	13	8,337	8	17,428	17	77,356	74	(5.8)
Minnesota	24,786	54	12,170	26	1,412	3	5,584	10	33,091	72	(7.2)
Mississippi	85,077	67	28,723	23	37,214	29	12,025	9	100,324	79	(3.4)
New Jersey	65,136	57	12,791	11	10,663	9	13,998	12	79,603	69	(4.4)
New York	194,224	57	63,585	19	34,624	10	37,891	11	239,765	70	(3.4)
Texas	589,108	64	204,591	22	115,480	13	51,982	6	682,203	74	(2.8)
Washington	24,252	39	16,727	27	6,354	10	10,963	17	38,756	62	(4.1)
Wisconsin	35,203	55	10,135	16	3,284	5	10,478	16	41,634	65	(3.6)

Source: Urban Institute calculations from the 1997 National Survey of America's Families (NSAF).
Note: Insurance coverage is measured at the time of the survey.
A. Represents children in families in which at least one child received benefits from the School Lunch Program in 1996.
B. Represents children in families in which at least one child received benefits from the WIC program in 1996.
C. Represents children in families that were receiving Food Stamp benefits at the time the NSAF was administered in 1997.
D. Represents children in families in which at least one person received Unemployment Compensation in 1996.
E. Standard error. f. Represents status of child's primary caregiver.

The purpose of presenting this data is not to establish an exact number for the proportion of households that would be categorically eligible for the federal telecommunications Lifeline program because of their participation in the programs designated by the FCC. Still, the various studies are remarkably consistent in their findings. The conclusion that can be drawn from this data is that a substantial number of households (that might range from 20% to 40% of those eligible) will have income identical to those households categorically eligible but will not be able to participate in the Lifeline program because of the limitation of income eligibility to 135% of the Federal Poverty Level.

SECTION 6

Increasing Lifeline income eligibility guidelines to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level is necessary to ensure that Lifeline assistance will not miss important vulnerable low-income constituencies that need Lifeline assistance.

Setting the Lifeline income eligibility guidelines at 135% of the Federal Poverty Level means that Lifeline assistance will not be available to low-income constituencies to whom it is important to deliver affordable telecommunications service. Two populations in particular have been considered in these comments:

- The working poor; and
- The aged on Social Security income.¹⁶

THE WORKING POOR

Increasing income eligibility guidelines from 135% to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level will encompass a sizable portion of the working poor. The working poor frequently have incomes that fall between 135% and 150% of the FPL and would thus be ineligible for Lifeline assistance even though, as discussed in more detail above, these households lack sufficient income to have affordable telephone service.

Consider work by the Urban Institute based on the National Survey of American Families (NSAF). The Urban Institute reports that:

. . .the average working poor family's income is 39 percent above the federal poverty line. For a single parent with one child, this implies an average income of \$15,600; for a two-parent family with two children, it implies an average income of \$23,000. Working poor families in California have the lowest average incomes (124 percent of the poverty

¹⁶ These comments consider those aged persons who rely on Social Security as their exclusive or primary source of income.

line) and those in Minnesota have the highest (149 percent of the poverty line).¹⁷

What this statement says, in other words, is that the average income for a working poor family nationwide places this family at 139% of the Federal Poverty Level, with the state-specific averages for the thirteen NSAF study states ranging from a low of 124% of FPL to a high of 149%.¹⁸

Table 10 presents the state-specific results from the National Survey of America's Families. Table 10 shows that, in addition to the average working poor family's income nationwide falling between 135% and 150% of the FPL, the average working family income in nine of the 13 NSAF states falls between 135% and 150% of the FPL. Finally, Table 10 shows the same result for the "balance of the nation" (outside of the 13 specific states) (with an average income for the working poor of 144% of FPL).

Table 10: Income Relative to the Poverty Line for the Working Poor* by NSAF State, 1996

	All Working Poor	Between 135% & 150% FPL?
US Total	1.39	Yes
Alabama	1.34	
California	1.24	
Colorado	1.40	Yes
Florida	1.36	Yes
Massachusetts	1.45	Yes
Michigan	1.44	Yes
Minnesota	1.49	Yes
Mississippi	1.32	
New Jersey	1.41	Yes
New York	1.39	Yes
Texas	1.32	
Washington	1.41	Yes
Wisconsin	1.45	Yes
Balance of Nation	1.44	Yes

*Working poor are defined as persons living in a family with annual income less than 200% of the federal poverty line and where the average annual hours of work per adult is greater than 1,000 hours.

Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the 1997 National Survey of America's Families as published in: Gregory Acs, et al. (May 2000). *Playing by the Rules but Losing the Game: America's Working Poor*, at Table 3, Urban Institute: Washington D.C.

¹⁷ Gregory Acs, et al. (May 2000). *Playing by the Rules but Losing the Game: America's Working Poor*, Urban Institute: Washington D.C.

¹⁸ As discussed in more detail elsewhere, the NSAF collects sufficiently detailed survey data to provide state-specific information for 13 states. Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. According to the Urban Institute, "Together, these states are home to more than half the nation's population and represent a broad range of fiscal capacity, child well-being, and approaches to government programs." The survey allows for national analysis to be performed. It allows for an analysis of data for the aggregate of the country outside the thirteen study states as well. <http://anfdata.urban.org/nsaf/> (August 2004).

It is particularly important for the working poor to have access to affordable telephone service. Working poor households tend to be hourly wage employees without paid leave. It is, therefore, critical for these households to be able to contact (and be contacted by) their employers. Moreover, working poor households frequently lack the resources to obtain adequate childcare to cover all of their working hours. Having telephone service is thus critical to help these households fulfill their family care responsibilities.

THE AGED RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY

Aging households receiving Social Security benefits as a primary source of income will be another population that will receive substantive benefits by increasing the income eligibility standard for the federal telecommunications Lifeline program from 135% to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level. The Social Security Administration (SSA) publishes a biannual report on the income of the population age 55 or older.¹⁹ The SSA reports the total money income of aged units by Social Security beneficiary status, combined with a number of demographic data.

Table 11 shows that many Social Security recipients will have income between 135% and 150% of the Federal Poverty Level. Since this report presents income for the year 2000, that income is compared to the Federal Poverty Level for the year 2000. In 2000, 135% of the FPL for a one-person household would have been \$11,273. In contrast, 150% of the FPL for a one-person household in 2000 would have been \$12,525.

**Table 11: Total Money Income of Aged Units
by Social Security Beneficiary Status, Age, Marital Status and Sex of Nonmarried Persons**

Income	Nonmarried Persons/Social Security Beneficiaries								
	Total			Men			Women		
	55-61	62-64	65 or older	55-61	62-64	65 or older	55-61	62-64	65 or older
Median Income	\$9,713	\$12,983	\$13,155	\$10,877	\$14,206	\$15,978	\$9,382	\$12,710	\$12,504

SOURCE: Social Security Administration (February 2002). Income of the Population Age 55 or Older, 2000, at page 46, Table 3.2, Social Security Administration: Washington D.C.

As can be seen from Table 11, the median incomes (meaning that incomes for half of the recipients were greater and incomes for the other half were lower than that presented) of nonmarried Social Security beneficiaries cluster around the 135% to 150% of FPL range. The “total money income” of unmarried women who are Social Security beneficiaries is somewhat lower than that of men. Nonetheless, Table 11 shows that nonmarried Social Security recipients will frequently have total money income that place them precisely within the 135% to 150% of FPL range.²⁰

¹⁹ While this is a biannual report, the most recent report available is the 2000 report, released in February 2002.

²⁰ In contrast, the median total money income figures for married couples receiving Social Security benefits are as follows: (1) Age 55 – 61: \$33,289; (2) Age 62 – 64: \$40,323; and (3) Age 65 or older: \$31,298. Unlike the nonmarried Social Security recipient, the Social Security recipients consisting of married

Table 12 presents data that further confirms this conclusion. Table 12 presents the income ranges most closely approximating the relevant income, given an income of between \$11,273 (135% FPL) and \$12,575 (150% FPL) for a 1-person household. Table 12 shows that:²¹

- 14.5% of unmarried men aged 62 – 64 who are Social Security recipients fall into this income range, while 11.9% of unmarried women do.
- 7.6% of unmarried men aged 65 or older who are Social Security recipients fall into this income range, while 11.6% of unmarried women do.

Moreover, the numbers are not small in absolute terms. More than 260,000 unmarried men age 65 or older who receive Social Security benefits fall into the income bracket bounded by 135% and 150% of the FPL. More than 1.1 million unmarried women age 65 or older do.

**Table 12: Total Money Income of Aged Units
by Social Security Beneficiary Status, Age, Marital Status and Sex of Nonmarried Persons**

Income	Nonmarried Persons/Social Security Beneficiaries								
	Total Nonmarried			Nonmarried Men			Nonmarried Women		
	55-61	62-64	65 or older	55-61	62-64	65 or older	55-61	62-64	65 or older
%									
\$11,000 - \$11,999	4.2%	7.2%	5.9%	2.4%	8.0%	4.1%	5.0%	6.9%	6.4%
\$12,000 - \$12,999	7.5%	5.5%	4.8%	12.5%	6.5%	3.5%	5.3%	5.0%	5.2%
Number (000s)									
Total by Age	792	992	13,378	243	311	3,473	549	681	9,905
\$11,000 - \$11,999	33	71	789	6	25	142	27	47	634
\$12,000 - \$12,999	59	55	642	30	20	122	29	34	515
Total	93	126	1,431	36	45	264	57	81	1,149

SOURCE:

Social Security Administration (February 2002). *Income of the Population Age 55 or Older, 2000*, at page 47, Table 3.2, Social Security Administration: Washington D.C.

It is particularly important for the aging person who lives in a single person household to have access to affordable telephone service. Telephone service not only promotes important social goals for the one-person aging household, but serves important health and safety functions as well.

In addition, as measured by the penetration rate of telephone service in the home, aging households value telephone service more highly than do younger households. Data from the FCC's most recent *Telephone Subscribership* report indicate that telephone

couples will not generally benefit from the increase in Lifeline income eligibility from 135% to 150% of FPL.

²¹ This analysis assumes that unmarried men and women in these age brackets live in 1-person households.

penetration rates by age are highest for households headed by a person over age 70.²² Table 13 shows that telephone penetration increases along with age. This has been true over time; it is not a recent phenomenon.

Table 13: Percentage of Households with a Telephone by Householder's Age

	March 2004		2003 Annual		2002 Annual		2001 Annual	
	Unit	Available	Unit	Available	Unit	Available	Unit	Available
Total HHs	94.2%	95.1%	95.1%	96.0%	95.3%	96.2%	94.9%	95.0%
16-24 yrs old	87.0%	89.6%	87.9%	90.4%	88.5%	91.0%	88.8%	91.0%
25-54 yrs old	93.9%	94.8%	94.8%	95.7%	95.0%	95.9%	94.7%	95.6%
55-59 yrs old	95.0%	95.5%	96.8%	97.3%	96.8%	97.4%	96.4%	96.9%
60-64 yrs old	96.0%	96.4%	96.8%	97.3%	96.9%	97.4%	96.2%	96.6%
65-69 yrs old	95.5%	96.2%	97.0%	97.4%	97.5%	97.8%	96.4%	96.8%
70-99 yrs old	96.6%	97.0%	97.1%	97.5%	97.2%	97.6%	96.3%	96.8%

SOURCE: FCC (August 13, 2004). Telephone Subscribership in the United States (data through March 2004), at Table 6.

With older Americans in particular, Lifeline serves the critical function of helping to preserve service (along with helping households to initiate service in the first place). As recognized by the FCC's 1997 definition of "affordability," the lack of affordable telephone service will have different impacts on different households. Some households will fail to obtain telephone service. For these households, the Lifeline program will help them initiate a service they would otherwise lack altogether.

Other households may initiate telephone service even though the service is not "affordable" in "relative" terms as that term is defined by the FCC. Some of these households will be forced to give up some other household necessity in order to maintain telephone service. Others of these households will face continuing payment troubles with their service. Others will maintain service for some period of time, before disconnecting from the system. Others will cycle on and off the system, depending on the exigencies which they face at any particular moment.²³ Extending Lifeline to these households serves an important public purpose even if that purpose is not to assist these households in subscribing to service they would not otherwise have.

²² Federal Communications Commission (August 13, 2004). *Telephone Subscribership in the U.S. (data through March 2004)*, at Table 6, Federal Communications Commission: Washington D.C.

²³ While a similar study has not been performed for unaffordable telephone service, we know that these impacts arise attributable to unaffordable home energy service. These various impacts were documented in the Congressionally-funded 2004 National Energy Assistance (NEA) survey performed for the National Energy Assistance Directors Association (NEADA). Apprise, Inc. (April 2004). *National Energy Assistance Survey Report*, National Energy Assistance Directors Association: Washington D.C.

SECTION 7

The FCC should clarify and, if necessary, modify its definition of "income" to exclude Food Stamps and LIHEAP benefits and other non-cash benefits.

The FCC should clarify its definition of "income" to ensure that public benefits that, by statute, are not to be considered "income or resources" for other programs are excluded from the FCC definition as well. The FCC's new regulatory definition of "income" for Lifeline and Link-up purposes (54.400(f), eff. July 22, 2004) says income is:

all income actually received by all members of the household. This includes salary before deduction for taxes, public assistance benefits, social security payments, pensions, unemployment compensation, veteran's benefits, inheritances, alimony, child support payments, worker's compensation benefits, gifts, lottery winnings, and the like. The only exceptions are student financial aid, military housing and cost-of-living allowances, irregular income from occasional small jobs such as baby-sitting or lawn mowing, and the like.

This inclusion of "public assistance benefits" in this definition of "income" might erroneously be construed to include both Food Stamp benefits and benefits provided pursuant to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). Such inclusion would be contrary to statute.

The federal Food Stamp statute, 7 U.S.C. Section 2017(b) (1995), provides that:

The value of benefits that may be provided under this chapter, whether through coupons, access devices, or otherwise, shall not be considered income or resources for any purpose under any Federal, State or local laws, including but not limited to, laws relating to taxation, welfare, and public assistance programs, and no participating State or political subdivision thereof shall decrease any assistance otherwise provided an individual or individuals because of the receipt of benefits under this Chapter.

(emphasis added). Two different aspects exist to this statutory limit on how food stamps may be considered:

1. The value of benefits. . . shall not be considered income or resources. . . for any purpose under any. . . State. . . laws. . .
2. . . no participating State. . . shall decrease any assistance otherwise provided an individual. . . because of the receipt of benefits under this Chapter.

The federal LIHEAP statute has a similar provision, which states:

Payments or assistance not to be deemed income or resources for any purpose under Federal or State law; determination of excess shelter expense deduction. . .(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law unless enacted in express limitation of this paragraph, the amount of any home energy assistance payments or allowances provided directly to, or indirectly for the benefit of, an eligible household under this subchapter shall not be considered income or resources of such household (or any member thereof) for any purpose under any Federal or State law, including any law relating to taxation, food stamps, public assistance, or welfare programs.

(42 U.S.C. §8624(f)(1) (2004)). The FCC's Lifeline program would, of course, be considered a "public assistance" program provided "under. . .Federal. . .law."

It is not objectionable to consider public assistance benefits such as Supplemental Security Income (SSI), TANF or other cash benefits as "income" pursuant to the Lifeline program. Program benefits, however, such as housing assistance, pharmaceutical assistance, health insurance, and similar non-cash benefits do not provide "income" to the household, but rather provide discounts on goods and services. These non-cash benefits, which represent discounts, should not be considered "income" for Lifeline purposes.

As discounts, these non-cash benefits are generally recognized as being extremely difficult to quantify for purposes of including their value as "income" to the recipient. Whether it is a discount on housing, a discount on pharmaceuticals, or a discount on some other goods or services, the process of calculating a value for the discount would entail the need to calculate what the benefit recipient *would have paid* absent the discount in order to calculate the baseline against which the discount is applied. The "income" would thus be the difference between the baseline and the discounted amount.

CONCLUSION

Based on the information and analysis presented above, I reach the following conclusions. Households living with incomes between 135% and 150% of the Federal Poverty Level lack sufficient resources to obtain affordable telephone service without Lifeline telephone assistance. Some households in this income bracket will go without telephone service altogether, while others will suffer significant deprivation of other household necessities in order to have telephone service. Indeed, I conclude that households with incomes at 150% of the Federal Poverty Level do not have significantly more total net resources than do households with incomes at 135% of the FPL.

I conclude further that increasing Lifeline income eligibility guidelines to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level is necessary to ensure that households who have the same incomes, but who live in different states, will have equal access to Lifeline whether or not they participate in the LIHEAP and/or Food Stamp programs. Even for households living

within the same state, I find that increasing Lifeline income eligibility guidelines to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level is necessary to ensure that low-income households have equal access to Lifeline whether or not they participate in categorical eligibility programs.

Finally, I conclude that increasing Lifeline income eligibility guidelines from 135% to 150% of the Federal Poverty Level is necessary to avoid missing important vulnerable low-income constituencies. Working poor households and aging households, in particular, are vulnerable households that would be “missed” by an income eligibility guideline of 135% of the Federal Poverty Level but would be eligible for Lifeline assistance with a 150% of FPL income eligibility guideline.

**BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**


In the Matter of:)
Setting Income Eligibility for) Docket No. WC 03-109
Federal Lifeline Service at)
150% of the Federal Poverty Level)

AFFIDAVIT OF ROGER D. COLTON

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS)
) ss
COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX)


Roger D. Colton, of lawful age and being first duly sworn, deposes and states:

1. My name is Roger D. Colton. I am a consultant retained by the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates.
2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my written statement consisting of pages 1 through 25.
3. I hereby swear and affirm that the statements contained in the attached written statement are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.



Roger D. Colton

Subscribed and sworn to me this 19th day of August, 2004.



Notary Public

My commission expires 9/17/04

ROGER D. COLTON

BUSINESS ADDRESS: Fisher Sheehan & Colton
Public Finance and General Economics
34 Warwick Road, Belmont, MA 02478
617-484-0597 (voice) *** 617-484-0594 (fax)
roger@fsconline.com (e-mail)
<http://www.fsconline.com> (www address)

BOOKS

Colton. (1996). *Funding Fuel Assistance: State and Local Strategies to Help Pay Low-Income Home Energy Bills*, Fisher, Sheehan and Colton, Public Finance and General Economics: Belmont, MA (1996).

Colton and Sheehan. (1995). *The Other Part of the Year: Low-Income Households and Their Need for Cooling: A State-by-State Look at Low-Income Summer Electric Bills*, Flying Pencil Publications: Portland, OR.

Colton. (1995). *Energy Efficiency and the Low-Income Consumer: Planning, Designing and Financing*, Flying Pencil Publications: Portland, OR.

Colton and Sheehan. (1994). *On the Brink of Disaster: A State-by-State Look at Low-Income Winter Natural Gas Heating Bills*, Flying Pencil Publications: Portland, OR.

Colton, *et al.*, *Access to Utility Service*, National Consumer Law Center: Boston (2d ed. 2001).

Colton, *et al.*, *Tenants' Rights to Utility Service*, National Consumer Law Center: Boston (1994).

Colton, *The Regulation of Rural Electric Cooperatives*, National Consumer Law Center: Boston (1992).

JOURNAL PUBLICATIONS

Colton (November 2003). "Winter Weather Payments: The Impact of Iowa's Winter Utility Shutoff Moratorium on Utilitybill Payments by Low-Income Customers." 16(9) *Electricity Journal* 59.

Colton (March 2002). "Energy Consumption and Expenditures by Low-Income Households," 15(3) *Electricity Journal* 70.

Colton, Roger and Stephen Colton. "An Alternative to Regulation in the Control of Occupational Exposure to Tuberculosis in Homeless Shelters," *New Solutions: Journal of Environmental and Occupational Health Policy* (Spring 2002).

Colton (2001). "The Lawfulness of Utility Actions Seeking to Impose as a Condition of Service Liability for a Roommate's Debt Incurred at a Prior Address," *Clearinghouse Review*.

Colton (2001). "Limiting The "Family Necessaries" Doctrine as a Means of Imposing Third Party Liability for Utility Bills," *Clearinghouse Review*.

Colton (2001). "Prepayment Utility Meters and the Low-Income Consumer." *Journal of Housing and Community Development Law* (American Bar Association).

Colton, Brown and Ackermann (June 2000). "Mergers and the Public Interest: Saving the Savings for the Poorest

Customers." *Public Utilities Fortnightly*.

Colton. (2000). "Aggregation and the Low-Income Consumer." *LEAP Newsletter*.

Colton. (1999). "Challenging Entrance and Transfer Fees in Mobile Home Park Lot Rentals." *Clearinghouse Review*.

Colton and Adams (1999). "Y2K and Communities of Color," *Media Alert: The Quarterly Publication of the National Black Media Coalition*.

Colton and Sheehan (1999). "The Problem of Mass Evictions in Mobile Home Parks Subject to Conversion." *Journal of Housing and Community Development Law* (American Bar Association).

Colton (1999). "Utility Rate Classifications and Group Homes as "Residential" Customers," *Clearinghouse Review*.

Colton (1998). "Provider of Last Resort: Lessons from the Insurance Industry." *The Electricity Journal*.

Colton and Adams (1998). "Fingerprints for Check Cashing: Where Lies the Real Fraud," *Media Alert: The Quarterly Publication of the National Black Media Coalition*.

Colton. (1998). "Universal Service: A Performance-Based Measure for a Competitive Industry," *Public Utilities Fortnightly*.

Colton, Roger and Stephen Colton (1998). "Evaluating Hospital Mergers," 17 *Health Affairs* 5:260.

Colton. (1998). "Supportive Housing Facilities as "Low-Income Residential" Customers for Energy Efficiency Purposes," 7 *Journal of Housing and Community Development Law* 406 (American Bar Association).

Colton, Frisof and King. (1998). "Lessons for the Health Care Industry from America's Experience with Public Utilities." 18 *Journal of Public Health Policy* 389.

Colton (1997). "Fair Housing and Affordable Housing: Availability, Distribution and Quality." 1997 *Colloqui: Cornell Journal of Planning and Urban Issues* 9.

Colton, (1997). "Competition Comes to Electricity: Industry Gains, People and the Environment Lose," *Dollars and Sense*.

Colton (1996). "The Road Oft Taken: Unaffordable Home Energy Bills, Forced Mobility And Childhood Education in Missouri." 2 *Journal on Children and Poverty* 23.

Colton and Sheehan. (1995). "Utility Franchise Charges and the Rental of City Property." 72 *New Jersey Municipalities* 9:10.

Colton. (1995). "Arguing Against Utilities' Claims of Federal Preemption of Customer-Service Regulations." 29 *Clearinghouse Review* 772.

Colton and Labella. (1995). "Landlord Failure to Resolve Shared Meter Problems Breaches Tenant's Right to Quiet Enjoyment." 29 *Clearinghouse Review* 536.

Colton and Morrissey. (1995). "Tenants' Rights to Pretermination Notice in Cases of Landlords' Nonpayment of Utilities". 29 *Clearinghouse Review* 277.

- Colton. (1995). "The Perverse Incentives of Fair Market Rents." 52 *Journal of Housing and Community Development* 6.
- Colton (1994). "Energy Efficiency and Low-Income Housing: Energy Policy Hurts the Poor." XVI *ShelterForce: The Journal of Affordable Housing Strategies* 9.
- Colton (1994). "The Use of Consumer Credit Reports in Establishing Creditworthiness for Utility Deposits." *Clearinghouse Review*.
- Colton (1994). "Institutional and Regulatory Issues Affecting Bank Product Diversification Into the Sale of Insurance," *Journal of the American Society of CLU and ChFC*.
- Colton. (1993). "The Use of State Utility Regulations to Control the 'Unregulated' Utility." 27 *Clearinghouse Review* 443.
- Colton and Smith. (1993). "The Duty of a Public Utility to Mitigate 'Damages' from Nonpayment through the Offer of Conservation Programs." 3 *Boston University Public Interest Law Journal* 239.
- Colton and Sheehan. (1993). "Cash for Clunkers Program Can Hurt the Poor," 19 *State Legislatures: National Conference of State Legislatures* 5:33.
- Colton. (1993). "Consumer Information and Workable Competition in the Telecommunications Industry." XXVII *Journal of Economic Issues* 775.
- Colton and Sheehan. (1992). "Mobile Home Rent Control: Protecting Local Regulation," *Land Use Law and Zoning Digest*.
- Colton and Smith. (1992 - 1993). "Co-op Membership and Utility Shutoffs: Service Protections that Arise as an Incident of REC 'Membership.'" 29 *Idaho Law Review* 1, reprinted, XV *Public Utilities Law Anthology* 451.
- Colton and Smith. (1992). "Protections for the Low-Income Customer of Unregulated Utilities: Federal Fuel Assistance as More than Cash Grants." 13 *Hamline University Journal of Public Law and Policy* 263.
- Colton. (1992). "CHAS: The Energy Connection," 49 *The Journal of Housing* 35, reprinted, 19 *Current Municipal Problems* 173.
- Colton. (March 1991). "A Cost-Based Response to Low-Income Energy Problems." *Public Utilities Fortnightly*.
- Colton. (1991). "Protecting Against the Harms of the Mistaken Utility Undercharge." 39 *Washington University Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law* 99, reprinted, XIV *Public Utilities Anthology* 787.
- Colton. (1990). "Customer Consumption Patterns within an Income-Based Energy Assistance Program." 24 *Journal of Economic Issues* 1079
- Colton. (1990). "Heightening the Burden of Proof in Utility Shutoff Cases Involving Allegations of Fraud." 33 *Howard L. Review* 137.
- Colton. (1990). "When the Phone Company is not the Phone Company: Credit Reporting in the Post-Divestiture Era." 24 *Clearinghouse Review* 98.
- Colton. (1990). "Discrimination as a Sword: Use of an 'Effects Test' in Utility Litigation." 37 *Washington University*

Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law 97, reprinted, XIII *Public Utilities Anthology* 813.

Colton. (1989). "Statutes of Limitations: Barring the Delinquent Disconnection of Utility Service." 23 *Clearinghouse Review* 2.

Colton & Sheehan. (1989). "Raising Local Revenue through Utility Franchise Fees: When the Fee Fits, Foot It." 21 *The Urban Lawyer* 55, reprinted, XII *Public Utilities Anthology* 653, reprinted, Freilich and Bushek (1995). *Exactions, Impacts Fees and Dedications: Shaping Land Use Development and Funding Infrastructure in the Dolan Era*, American Bar Association: Chicago.

Colton. (1989). "Unlawful Utility Disconnections as a Tort: Gaining Compensation for the Harms of Unlawful Shutoffs." 22 *Clearinghouse Review* 609.

Colton, Sheehan & Uehling. (1987). "Seven cum Eleven: Rolling the Toxic Dice in the U.S. Supreme Court," 14 *Boston College Environmental L. Rev.* 345.

Colton & Sheehan. (1987). "A New Basis for Conservation Programs for the Poor: Expanding the Concept of Avoided Costs," 21 *Clearinghouse Review* 135.

Colton & Fisher. (1987). "Public Inducement of Local Economic Development: Legal Constraints on Government Equity Funding Programs." 31 *Washington University J. of Urban and Contemporary Law* 45.

Colton & Sheehan. (1986). "The Illinois Review of Natural Gas Procurement Practices: Permissible Regulation or Federally Preempted Activity?" 35 *DePaul Law Review* 317, reprinted, IX *Public Utilities Anthology* 221.

Colton. (1986). "Utility Involvement in Energy Management: The Role of a State Power Plant Certification Statute." 16 *Environmental Law* 175, reprinted, IX *Public Utilities Anthology* 381.

Colton. (1986). "Utility Service for Tenants of Delinquent Landlords," 20 *Clearinghouse Review* 554.

Colton. (1985). "Municipal Utility Financing of Energy Conservation: Can Loans only be Made through an IOU?." 64 *Nebraska Law Review* 189.

Colton. (1985). "Excess Capacity: A Case Study in Ratemaking Theory and Application." 20 *Tulsa Law Journal* 402, reprinted, VIII *Public Utilities Anthology* 739.

Colton. (1985). "Conservation, Cost-Containment and Full Energy Service Corporations: Iowa's New Definition of 'Reasonably Adequate Utility Service.'" 34 *Drake Law Journal* 1.

Colton. (1984). "Prudence, Planning and Principled Ratemaking." 35 *Hastings Law Journal* 721.

Colton. (1983). "Excess Capacity: Who Gets the Charge from the Power Plant?" 33 *Hastings Law Journal* 1133.

Colton. (1983). "Old McDonald (Inc.) Has a Farm. . . Maybe, or Nebraska's Corporate Farm Ban; Is it Constitutional?" 6 *University of Arkansas at Little Rock Law Review* 247.

Colton. (1982). "Mandatory Utility Financing of Conservation and Solar Measures." 3 *Solar Law Reporter* 167.

Colton. (1982). "The Use of Canons of Statutory Construction: A Case Study from Iowa, or When Does 'GHOTI' Spell 'Fish'?" 5 *Seton Hall Legislative Journal* 149.

Colton. (1977). "The Case for a Broad Construction of 'Use' in Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act." 21 *St. Louis Law Journal* 113.

INVITED PAPERS

Colton, *Just Like Them: The "Benefit" to the Small and Disadvantaged User from Competition*, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (November 1998).

Colton, *Communities and Age-Sensitive Planning*, Pratt Institute Symposium on Community Planning, New York City (February 1998).

Colton, *Electric Industry Restructuring and Universal Service for Low-Income Consumers: Lessons from State Health Insurance Purchasing Cooperatives*, National Community Action Foundation (July 1997).

Colton, *The Regulation of Industries Affected with the Public Interest: Lessons for Health Care?*, Universal Health Care Action Network (December 1996).

Colton, *Financing Energy Efficiency in Affordable Housing Programs*, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (October 1996).

Colton, *Changing Paradigms for Delivering Energy Efficiency to the Low-Income Consumer by Competitive Utilities: The Need for a Shelter-Based Approach*, National Association of State Energy Officials (May 1996).

Colton, *Prepayment Meters and the Low-Income Consumer*, Hydro-Quebec Symposium on Quality Service to Customers, Montreal (May 1995).

Colton and Sheehan, *Linked Deposits as a Utility Investment in Energy Efficiency for Low-Income Housing*, National Regulatory Information Conference (April 1994).

Colton, Sachs and DeBarros, *Models of Public and Private Investment in Energy Efficiency for Low-Income Housing*, American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings (August 1994).

Colton, *Universal Residential Telephone Service: Needs and Strategies*, presented to the 105th National Meeting of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (1993).

Colton and Sheehan, *Securing Private Investment in Low-Income Energy Efficiency: Breaking the Reliance on Government and Utility Programs*, presented to 16th World Energy Engineering Conference (1993).

Colton and Sheehan, *Improving Assisted Housing Affordability by Financing Energy Efficiency Improvements*, presented to 1993 Annual Meeting of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (1993).

Colton and Sheehan, *The Economics of Pursuing Energy Efficiency in Affordable Housing*, presented to the 14th International Making Cities Livable Conference (1993).

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Colton (2004). *Paid but Unaffordable: The Consequences of Energy Poverty in Missouri*, prepared for the National Low-Income Home Energy Consortium.

Sheehan and Colton (2004). *Fair Housing Plan: An Analysis of Impediments and Strategies on How to Address The:*

Washington County/Beaverton (OR), prepared for Washington County Department of Community Development.

Colton (2004). *Controlling Tuberculosis in Fulton County (GA) Homeless Shelters: A Needs Assessment*, prepared for the Georgia Department of Human Resources, Division of Public Health.

Colton (2003). *The Impact of Missouri Gas Energy's Experimental Low-Income Rate (ELIR) On Utility Bill Payments by Low-Income Customers: Preliminary Assessment*, prepared for Missouri Gas Energy.

Colton (2003). *The Economic Development Impacts of Home Energy Assistance: The Entergy States*, prepared for Entergy Services, Inc.

Colton (2003). *Energy Efficiency as an Affordable Housing Tool in Colorado*, prepared for Colorado Energy Assistance Foundation.

Colton (2003). *The Economic Development Impacts of Home Energy Assistance in Colorado*, Colorado Energy Assistance Foundation.

Colton (2003). *Measuring the Outcomes of Home Energy Assistance through a Home Energy Insecurity Scale*, prepared for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.

Colton (2002). *Winter Weather Payments: The Impact of Iowa's Winter Utility Shutoff Moratorium On Utility Bill Payments by Low-Income Customer*, prepared for Iowa Department of Human Rights.

Colton (2002). *A Fragile Income: Deferred Payment Plans and the Ability-to-Pay of Working Poor Utility Customers*, prepared for National Fuel Funds Network.

Colton (2002). *Credit where Credit is Due: Public Utilities and the Earned Income Tax Credit for Working Poor Utility Customers*, prepared for National Fuel Funds Network.

Colton (2001). *Integrating Government-Funded and Ratepayer-Funded Low-Income Energy Assistance Programs*, prepared for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Colton (2001). *In Harm's Way: Home Heating, Fire Hazards, and Low-Income Households*, prepared for National Fuel Funds Network.

Colton (2001). *Reducing Energy Distress: "Seeing RED" Project Evaluation* (evaluation of Iowa REACH project), prepared for Iowa Department of Human Rights.

Colton (2001). *Group Buying of Propane and Fuel Oil in New York State: A Feasibility Study*, prepared for New York State Community Action Association.

Colton (2000). *Establishing Telecommunications Lifeline Eligibility: The Use of Public Benefit Programs and its Impact on Lawful Immigrants*, prepared for Dayton (OH) Legal Aide.

Colton (2000). *Outreach Strategies for Iowa's LIHEAP Program Innovation in Improved Targeting*, prepared for Iowa Department of Human Rights.

Colton (1999). *Integration of LIHEAP with Energy Assistance Programs Created through Electric and/or Natural Gas Restructuring*, prepared for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (Nov. 1999).

Colton. *Fair Housing in the Suburbs: The Role of a Merged Fleet Boston in The Diversification of the Suburbs Report to the Federal Reserve Board Concerning the Merger of BankBoston Corp. and Fleet Financial Group*, prepared for Belmont Fair Housing Committee/Belmont Housing Partnership (July 1999).

Colton. *Measuring LIHEAP's Results: Responding to Home Energy Unaffordability*, prepared for Iowa Department of Human Resources (June 1999).

Colton. *Monitoring the Impact of Electric Restructuring on Low-Income Consumers: The What, How and Why of Data Collection*, prepared for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (June 1999).

Colton. *Developing Consumer Education Programs in a Restructured Electric Industry*, prepared for Central Missouri Counties Community Development Corporation (June 1999).

Colton. *Electric Restructuring and the Low-Income Consumer: Legislative Implications for Colorado*, prepared for Colorado General Assembly (April 1999).

Colton. *Low-Income Electric Rate Affordability in Virginia: Funding Low-Income Assistance*, prepared for Virginia Council Against Poverty (December 1998).

Colton and Alexander. *The Implications of an Increased Federal Role in the Regulation of Electricity on State Regulation of Consumer Protection and Universal Service Programs* (September 1998).

R.Colton and S.Colton. *The Occupational Control of Tuberculosis in Homeless Shelters*, prepared for the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (August 1998).

Colton. *The Connection Between Affordable Housing and Educational Excellence in Belmont* (April 1998).

Colton. *Serving the Affordable Housing Needs of Belmont's Older Residents* (May 1998).

Colton. *The Costs of a Universal Service Fund in Minnesota: Electric and Natural Gas*, prepared for the Energy Cents Coalition (Sept. 1998).

Colton. *Controlling the Occupational Exposure to Tuberculosis in Homeless Shelters: Applying Federal OSHA Standards to Volunteers*, prepared for the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (February 1998).

Colton. *Public Housing Utility Allowances for the Metro Dade Housing Agency* (Nov. 1997).

Colton. *Low-Income Energy Needs in Maryland: An Overview*, prepared for Maryland Office of Peoples Counsel (August 1997).

Colton. *Structuring a Public Purpose Distribution Fee for Missouri*, prepared for Missouri Department of Natural Resources (July 1997).

Colton. *The Low-Income Interest in Utility Mergers and Acquisitions* (June 1997).

Colton. *The Obligation to Serve and a Restructured Electric Industry*, prepared for U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge National Laboratory (November 1997).

Colton. *Structuring and Evaluating a Direct Vendor Payment Shadow Billing Program for Publicly Assisted*

Housing in Houston, prepared under contract to Gulf Coast Legal Foundation (with funding by Houston Lighting Company) (April 1997).

Colton. *The For-Profit Conversion of the New England Education Loan Marketing Corporation: Lessons from Non-Profit Hospital Conversions* (March 1997).

Colton. *Rental Housing Affordability in Burlington, Vermont: A Report to the Burlington City Council*. (January 1997).

Colton. *Structuring a "Wires Charge" for New Hampshire: A Framework for Administration and Operation*, prepared under contract to the New Hampshire Community Action Association (January 1997).

Colton. *Setting Income Eligibility for Fuel Assistance and Energy Efficiency Programs in a Competitive Electric Industry: The Marginal Impacts of Increasing Household Income* (October 1996).

Colton. *Fair Housing and Affordable Housing in Belmont, Massachusetts: Data on Availability, Distribution and Quality* (October 1996).

Colton and Sheehan. *Fair Housing Analysis of Impediments Study for Washington County (Oregon)*. (July 1996).

Colton. *Structuring a Low-Income "Wires Charge" for New Jersey*, prepared for Citizens Against Rate Escalation (CARE) (August 1996).

Colton. *Structuring a Low-Income "Wires Charge" for Kentucky*, prepared for Louisville Legal Aide Association (August 1996).

Colton. *Structuring a Low-Income "Wires Charge" for Iowa*, prepared for Iowa Bureau of Human Resources, Office of Weatherization (July 1996).

Colton. *Structuring a Low-Income "Wires Charge" for Montana*, prepared for Energy Share of Montana (July 1996).

Colton. *Structuring a Low-Income "Wires Charge" for Oklahoma*, prepared for Oklahoma State Association of Community Action Agencies (June 1996).

Colton. *Structuring a Low-Income "Wires Charge" for Ohio*, prepared for Ohio Legal Services Corporation (June 1996).

Colton. *Structuring a Low-Income "Wires Charge" for Indiana*, prepared for Indiana Citizen Action Campaign (May 1996).

Colton. *Shawmut Bank and Community Reinvestment in Boston: Community Credit Needs and Affordable Housing* (February 1996).

Colton. *Understanding "Redlining" in a Competitive Electric Utility Industry* (December 1995).

Colton. *Energy Efficiency as a Credit Enhancement: Public Utilities and the Affordability of First-Time Homeownership* (October 1995).

Colton. *Competition in the Electric Industry: Assessing the Impacts on Residential, Commercial and Low-Income Customers*, prepared under contract to the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (October 1995).

Colton. *Performance-Based Evaluation of Customer Collections in a Competitive Electric Utility Industry* (August 1995).

Colton. *Poverty Law and Economics: Calculating the Household Budget*, prepared for presentation to National Legal Aid and Defender Association, Substantive Law Training (August 1995).

Colton. *The Need for Regulation in a Competitive Electric Utility Industry* (July 1995).

Colton. *Rewriting the Social Compact: A Competitive Electric Industry and its Core Customers* (July 1995).

Colton. *The Road Oft Taken: Unaffordable Home Energy Bills, Forced Mobility, and Childhood Education in Missouri*, prepared for the Missouri Association of Head Start Directors (June 1995).

Colton. *Models of Low-Income Utility Rates*, prepared under contract to Washington Gas Company (November 1994) (revised June 1995).

Colton. *Beyond Social Welfare: Promoting the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) as an Economic Development Strategy by Public Utilities* (May 1995).

Colton. *Should Regulation of Electricity Depend on the Absence of Competition?*(April 1995).

Colton. *Comprehensive Credit and Collection Strategies in a Competitive Electric Utility Industry*, prepared under contract to Hydro-Quebec (April 1995).

Colton. *Economically Stranded Investment in a Competitive Electric Industry: A Primer for Cities, Consumers and Small Business Advocates* (February 1995).

Colton. *Competitive Solicitation as an Integrated Resource Planning Model: Its Competitive Impacts on Small Businesses Serving Low-Income Households*, prepared under contract to the Arkansas State Weatherization

Colton. *Reviewing Utility Low-Income DSM Programs: A Suggested Framework for Analysis* (February 1995).

Colton. *Least-Cost Integrated Resource Planning in Arkansas: The Role of Low-Income Energy Efficiency* prepared under contract to the Arkansas State Weatherization Assistance Program (January 1995).

Colton. *Addressing Low-Income Inability-to-Pay Utility Bills During the Winter Months On Tribal Lands Served By Electric Co-ops: A Model Tribal Winter Utility Shutoff Regulation* (December 1994).

Colton. *An Earned Income Tax Credit Utility Intervention Kit* (December 1994).

Colton. *Telecommunications Credit and Collections and Controlling SNET Uncollectibles*, prepared under contract to the Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel (November 1994).

Colton. *Customer Deposit Demands by U.S. West: Reasonable Rationales and the Proper Assessment of Risk*, prepared on behalf of the Staff of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (August 1994).

Colton. *Credit and Collection Fees and Low-Income Households: Ensuring Effectiveness and Cost-Effectiveness*, prepared on behalf of the Missouri Office of Public Counsel (July 1994).

Colton. *Weatherization Assistance Program Evaluations: Assessing the Impact on Low-Income Ability-to-Pay* (July