

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Karin Brownlee at 8:30 a.m. on February 13, 2003 in Room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Senator Kerr, absent

Committee staff present: April Holman, Legislative Research
Deb Hollon, Legislative Research
Mitch Rice, Revisor of Statutes
Norman Furse, Revisor of Statutes
Jodie Anspaugh, Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: April Holman, Legislative Research
Amy Yarkoni, Cingular

Others attending: See attached list.

Chairperson Brownlee opened the hearings on SB 153 and 180. She hopes the committee will be able to come to a resolution on Enhanced 911 this year. April Holman from Legislative Research gave an overview of the two bills. She read various portions of each bill and explained that the Association of Counties originally requested SB 153 and the wireless industry originally requested SB 180. Ms. Holman distributed a State Wireless Funding Table, current as of November 2001, that explains how other states are funding their E911 programs. (Attachment 1) She answered questions from her testimony regarding possible federal monies available and additional employees for the KCC. She said she will prepare a side-by-side comparison of the two bills.

Amy Yarkoni, Director of External Affairs for Cingular Wireless, testified in support of SB 180 on behalf of Alltel, AT&T Wireless, Cingular, Sprint PCS, T-Mobile, Verizon, and Western Wireless. (Attachment 2) These carriers combined provide wireless service to an estimated 90% of Kansas wireless customers. Some of the states around Kansas have a 50 cent fee for E911, and Ms. Yarkoni believes this is sufficient. She is not aware of any available federal funding for E911. The companies Ms. Yarkoni testified on behalf of agree to a 50 cent customer surcharge, public safety and wireless carrier cost recovery, neutral program administration, efficient and required deployment, limitations on liability, and no technology mandate. Ms. Yarkoni distributed a packet of information to the committee, CC Docket No. 94-102 from the Federal Communications Commission, a Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems. (Attachment 3) Ms. Yarkoni answered questions, and confirmed that no matter what is done, they will not have basic service for many people until the towers are built. There will be dead zones, even in 20 years. Ms. Yarkoni said she cannot share what a wireless carrier's legitimate costs are because that information is proprietary.

Chairperson Brownlee announced that the committee will meet at 8:15 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 14, 2003 at 8:15 a.m. in Room 123-S.

SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

GUEST LIST

DATE: Thursday, Feb. 13, 2003

| NAME | REPRESENTING |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Erik Sartorius | City of Overland Park |
| Danielle Lee | Johnson County |
| Lisa Durand | " " |
| Kevin Barone | Helen Law Firm |
| Sandra Braden | Cingular |
| Amy Parkoni | Cingular |
| Mike Murray | Sprint |
| Jim Sullinger | KCSTAR |
| Judy Melu | Ks. Assoc of Counties |
| John Peterson | Ky Governmental Consulting |
| Robert Lamkey | Sedgwick County Public Safety |
| Diane Goetz | Sedgwick County Emer. Communicator's |
| Mike Peppon | Gov. Rel. - Sedgwick County |
| Walter May | Johnson County Sheriff |
| Mayavenport | KMCA |
| BRAD SNOOKEN | KANSAS FARM BUREAU |
| Bob Jayroe | SBC |
| Doug Smith | KLPG |
| Amber Kychko | Sen. Bunnagard |
| KEVIN M. WALKER | American Nestor Association |
| Fran Force | Coffey County Farm Bureau |
| Don Scifert | City of Olathe |

Stephanie Buchanan

DQB

SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

GUEST LIST

DATE: ~~Thursday~~ Feb. 13 2003

| NAME | REPRESENTING |
|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Dennis Humberger | Kansas Farm Bureau |
| GAIL S. Moeckel | Kansas Farm Bureau |
| Dan Leary | T-Mobile |
| Carolyn States | Kansas Farm Bureau |
| Debbie Suter | Kansas Farm Bureau |
| DINA FISK | VERIZON WIRELESS |
| Nelson Krueger | Western Wireless |
| Denny Burgess | westar |
| Whitney Jamron | City of Topeka / Coffey Co. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| State Wireless Funding Table -- As of November 2001 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|--------------|--|------------------------------|--------------|--|-------------------|--|
| State | Wireless Funding | Single Fund | Wireless Funding Amt. (\$) | Comments | Portion to Public Safety? | PS Amount | PS Purpose | Portion to Wireless Carrier? | WC Amount | WC Purpose | Legislation Type | |
| Alabama | YES | YES | 0.70 | NA | YES | 56% | Upgrading equipment & operating costs for E911 | YES | 44% | E911 cost recovery | Governing Statute | |
| Alaska | YES | NO | 0.50; 0.75 | Municipalities with pop. >100K; Municipalities with pop. <100K | YES | Undetermined | E911 operations | YES | Undetermined | E911 cost recovery | HB 186 | |
| Arizona | YES | YES | 0.37 | \$0.28 (7-1-06 thru 6-30-07); \$0.20 (7-1-07) | YES | Undetermined | E911 operations | YES | Undetermined | E911 cost recovery | HB 2625 | |
| Arkansas | YES | YES | 0.50 | NA | YES | 38% | E911 operations | YES | 58% | E911 implementation | HB 309 | |
| California | YES | NO | 0.72 | Could increase to \$0.75 | YES | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | NO | NA | NA | HB 1263 | |
| Colorado | YES | NO | 0.70 | Will not exceed current surcharge. | YES | Undetermined | ALI/ANI services | YES | Undetermined | Cost recovery for equipment | Governing Statute | |
| Connecticut | YES | YES | 0.25 | Surcharge per access line; sliding scale down to \$0.06 per line if over 100. | YES | Undetermined | E911 expenses | YES | Undetermined | E911 expenses | Governing Statute | |
| Delaware | YES | YES | 0.60 | NA | YES | Undetermined | E911 operations | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | HB 283 | |
| District of Columbia | YES | NO | 0.56 | NA | Undetermined | Undetermined | Undetermined | Undetermined | Undetermined | Undetermined | Undetermined | |
| Florida | YES | YES | 0.50 | NA | YES | 44% | Full cost recovery - E911 expenses | YES | 54% | Full cost recovery - E911 expenses | Governing Statute | |
| Georgia | YES | NO | 1.00 | Lower surcharge will be issues - \$1.00 or amount charged to wireline. | YES | Undetermined | Phase 1 cost recovery | YES | 30% | Phase 1 cost recovery | Governing Statute | |
| Hawaii | NO | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| Idaho | NO | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| Illinois | YES | YES | 0.75 | NA | YES | 67% | E911 maintenance and upgrade costs | YES | 33% | E911 cost recovery | Governing Statute | |
| Indiana | YES | YES | 0.65 | NA | YES | 54% | E911 cost recovery | YES | 39% | E911 cost recovery | Governing Statute | |
| Iowa | YES | YES | 0.50 | NA | NO | NA | NA | YES | 100% | E911 cost recovery | Governing Statute | |
| Kansas | NO | NA | NA | Proposed legislation did not pass. | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | HB 2034 | |
| Kentucky | YES | YES | 0.70 | NA | YES | 50% | Upgrading equipment & operating costs for E911 | YES | 50% | Upgrading equipment & operating costs for E911 | HB 99 | |
| Louisiana | YES | NO | 0.85 | Will not exceed current surcharge. | YES | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | HB 426 | |
| Maine | YES | YES | 0.32 | NA | YES | Undetermined | E911 staffing & operating costs | NO | NA | NA | Governing Statute | |
| Maryland | YES | YES | 0.60 | NA | YES | Undetermined | E911 system costs | NO | NA | NA | Governing Statute | |
| Massachusetts | NO | NA | 0.30 | Proposed legislation is pending. | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | Senate Bill 1920 | |
| Michigan | YES | YES | 0.55 | NA | YES | 48% | Specifics undetermined | YES | 48% | Specifics undetermined | Governing Statute | |
| Minnesota | YES | YES | 0.27 | Includes range of \$0.08 and \$0.30 plus \$0.10 interim fee per month. | YES | 50% | E911 cost recovery | YES | 12% | E911 cost recovery | Governing Statute | |
| Mississippi | YES | YES | 1.00 | NA | YES | 70% | E911 operations | YES | 30% | E911 implementation | Governing Statute | |
| Missouri | NO | NA | NA | Proposed legislation did not pass. | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | HB 826 | |
| Montana | YES | NO | 0.50 | Split between basic and enhanced 911. | YES | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | 50% | E911 implementation | Governing Statute | |

2-1

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----------------------|--|--------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Nebraska | YES | YES | 0.50 | Will not exceed current surcharge. | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | Legislative Bill 585 |
| Nevada | YES | NO | 0.25 | Affects counties with less than 40K, but more than 100k in population. | YES | Undetermined | Personnel costs related to E911 implementation. | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Senate Bill 569 |
| New Hampshire | YES | NO | 0.42 | NA | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| New Jersey | YES | YES | Not stated in statute | Annual appropriation | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| New Mexico | YES | YES | 0.51 | NA | YES | Undetermined | E911 operations | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | HB 339 |
| New York | YES | NO | 0.70 | All surcharge moneys are earmarked for payment of state police costs related to the statewide operation of cellular 911. | NO | NA | NA | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | Governing Statute |
| North Carolina | YES | YES | 0.80 | NA | YES | 40% | E911 operations | YES | 60% | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| North Dakota | YES | NO | 1.00 | Will not exceed current surcharge. | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Senate Bill 2067 |
| Ohio | NO | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Oklahoma | YES | NO | 0.50 | Until contributions equals \$5 million. | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| Oregon | YES | YES | 0.75 | NA | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | 35% | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| Pennsylvania | NO | YES | 0.50 | Proposed legislation is pending. | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | Senate Bill 884 |
| Rhode Island | YES | YES | 0.47 | NA | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| South Carolina | YES | YES | 0.55 | NA | YES | 39% | Personnel costs related to E911 implementation. | YES | 57% | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| South Dakota | YES | NO | 0.75 | NA | YES | Undetermined | E911 operations | NO | NA | NA | Governing Statute |
| Tennessee | YES | YES | 1.00 | NA | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| Texas | YES | YES | 0.50 | NA | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| Utah | YES | NO | 0.53 | NA | Undetermined | Undetermined | Specifics undetermined | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| Vermont | NO | YES | NA | 911 system financed through annual legislative appropriation. | YES | Undetermined | E911 operations | NO | NA | NA | Governing Statute |
| Virginia | YES | YES | 0.75 | NA | YES | Undetermined | E911 operations | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| Washington | YES | YES | 0.25 | NA | YES | Undetermined | E911 operations | NO | NA | NA | Governing Statute |
| West Virginia | YES | NO | 0.94 | NA | YES | Pro rata share of proceeds. | E911 operations | YES | Undetermined | E911 implementation | Governing Statute |
| Wisconsin | NO | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Wyoming | NO | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

**Emergency Telephone Systems (Enhanced 911)
Senate Bill 180**

**Testimony by Amy Yarkoni on behalf of:
Alltel, ATT Wireless, Cingular Wireless, Sprint PCS,
T-Mobile, Verizon and Western Wireless**

Submitted to the Senate Commerce Committee

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Thank you, Senator Brownlee, for this opportunity to appear before your Committee in support of Senate Bill 180. My name is Amy Yarkoni and I am the Director of External Affairs for Cingular Wireless LLC. *I appear before you today representing the views of Alltel, AT&T Wireless, Cingular, Sprint PCS, T-Mobile, Verizon and Western Wireless.*

These carriers combined provide wireless services to an estimated 90% of Kansas wireless customers.

These carriers agree that ALL wireless customers deserve to have Wireless Enhanced 911 as soon as possible. Combined, we have had the experience of deploying enhanced 911 to thousands of public safety answering points throughout the United States. We continue to deploy enhanced 911 to allow our customers to be safe whenever and wherever they use our phones. It is vital that the Kansas Legislature and Governor Sebelius enact legislation to facilitate the delivery of wireless enhanced 911 as soon as possible.

The carriers I represent today agree to the following principles regarding wireless enhanced 911 legislation:

- Minimal Customer Surcharge – \$.50 Cents
- Public Safety and Wireless Carrier Cost Recovery
- Neutral Program Administration
- Efficient and Required Deployment
- Limitations on Liability
- No Technology Mandate

We believe the groundwork has been laid within Senate Bill 180 to provide both the funds and the administrative mechanism to speed deployment of wireless enhanced 911. We will continue to work with any and all interested parties towards the deployment of wireless enhanced 911. We look forward to the day when all Kansas wireless customers are able to use such an invaluable service.

Senate Commerce Committee

2-13-03
Attachment 2-1

Background

When a wireless 9-1-1 call is placed the operator at the 9-1-1 Public Safety Answering Point does not know where the caller is located.

In 1996 the Federal Communications Commission mandated the implementation and deployment of enhanced 9-1-1 service in two phases to enable wireless callers to have the same benefits as wire line callers.

Under Phase I, 9-1-1 systems must deliver the phone number of the wireless handset from which an emergency call originates and the location of the base station carrying the call to the 9-1-1 operator.

Phase II requires that the 9-1-1 system locate handsets within a radius of 125 meters 67% of the time. Phase II requirements become effective October 1, 2001.



**The FCC Acknowledges Receipt of Comments From ...
Cingular Wireless LLC
...and Thank You for Your Comments**

| Your Confirmation Number is: '200323663351 ' | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| Date Received: Feb 3 2003 | | |
| Docket: 94-102 | | |
| Number of Files Transmitted: 1 | | |
| File Name | File Type | File Size (bytes) |
| REPORT | Adobe Acrobat PDF | 463697 |
| DISCLOSURE | | |
| <p>This confirmation verifies that ECFS has received and accepted your filing. However, your filing will be rejected by ECFS if it contains macros, passwords, redlining, read-only formatting, a virus or automated links to source documents that is not included with your filing. Filers are encouraged to retrieve and view their filing within 24 hours of receipt of this confirmation. For any problems contact the Help Desk at 202-418-0193.</p> | | |

[Initiate a Submission](#) | [Search ECFS](#) | [Return to ECFS Home Page](#)

[FCC Home Page](#) | [Search](#) | [Commissioners](#) | [Bureaus/Offices](#) | [Finding Info](#)

updated 02/11/02

Senate Commerce Committee
2-13-03
 Attachment 3-1

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure) CC Docket No. 94-102
Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency) FRN 00004-9792-33
Calling Systems)

To: Chief, Enforcement Bureau
Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

**CINGULAR WIRELESS LLC FIFTH QUARTERLY
E911 IMPLEMENTATION REPORT FOR GSM NETWORKS**

Cingular Wireless LLC ("Cingular"), by its attorneys and pursuant to the October 12, 2001 *Order* in this proceeding,¹ hereby submits its Fifth Quarterly E911 Implementation Report concerning the status of its Phase I and Phase II E911 implementation efforts in its GSM markets. The instant Report is limited to updating information that has changed since the filing of Cingular's Fourth Quarterly E911 Implementation Report for GSM Networks ("Fourth Report") on November 1, 2002, and supplemented on December 13, 2002 ("Supplement").

I. PHASE I AND PHASE II PSAP REQUESTS

Cingular continues to make progress in its efforts to deploy Phase I location capability services. To date, Cingular has received 1,043 PSAP requests for Phase I service. Of those requests, 1008 (96.6%) are in service/in progress² and 35 (3.4%) are on hold. Reasons for

¹ *Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems; Request for Waiver by Cingular Wireless LLC*, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Order*, 16 F.C.C.R. 18305 (2001), *recon. pending* ("Order").

² Of the 1008 requests that are in service/in progress, 880 (84.4%) are in service and 128 (12.3%) are in progress.

placing requests on hold include, *inter alia*, the ongoing negotiation of service agreements and miscellaneous reasons for delay attributable to the particular PSAP. While 13 “on hold” requests were resolved during the fourth quarter of 2002, it is unlikely that any of the remaining 35 will be resolved in the foreseeable future. As noted in Cingular’s Fourth Report, most of the “on hold” requests were received over two years ago, and some were received as many as five years ago. Rather than challenge the validity of these requests, Cingular is working with the PSAPs to resolve outstanding issues. Specific details regarding Phase I requests for Cingular’s GSM and TDMA markets, including the specific reasons underlying each request pending for more than six months, is included in Attachment B to this Report.

To date, Cingular has received 273 requests for Phase II service on its GSM networks. Many of these requests were received in GSM overlay markets where Cingular has begun offering GSM service only recently. Thus, they predate Cingular’s offering of GSM service. Cingular has provided specific details regarding the validity of the requests for Phase II service, including which of those requests relate to GSM overlay markets, in Attachment C to this Report.

By carefully reviewing the information included in responses to Cingular’s PSAP Profile form³, Cingular has classified each request for Phase II service as valid, invalid, or pending. The

³ Cingular developed this form to assist in determining PSAP readiness and to facilitate Phase II planning. The form requests the information deemed relevant by the *City of Richardson Order* for determining the validity of a request for Phase II service. *See Petition of City of Richardson, Texas*, CC Docket No. 94-102, *Order*, 16 F.C.C.R. 18982 (2001). *See Attachment A*. Even where it appears on the face of the form that a PSAP request is valid, Cingular’s experience with Phase II deployment on its TDMA networks indicates that this is often not the case. Cingular has discovered that many PSAPs who appeared to have valid requests were unable to successfully complete end-to-end testing of Cingular’s Phase II solution because of readiness problems, including a lack of upgraded PSAP customer premises equipment (“CPE”) and improper connectivity between the PSAP’s ALI database and its CPE. Thus, although Cingular was capable of supplying Phase II location information, many PSAPs were unable to

pending category includes those requests which require follow-up because the PSAP Profile form either has not been completed and returned, or does not fully demonstrate PSAP readiness. Cingular continues to work with PSAPs whose requests have been classified as pending in order to verify the validity of the requests. Since the last report, however, several PSAPs have rescinded their requests.

II. STATUS OF PHASE II DEPLOYMENT AND TESTING

As discussed in its Fourth Report and Supplement, Cingular completed a field trial of TruePosition's network-based Uplink Time Difference of Arrival ("U-TDOA") solution in Wilmington, Delaware. The trial took place on October 23-24, 2002, and included 17 sites that covered an approximately 20 square mile suburban area. Test calls, totaling more than 1500, were made from both a moving vehicle and more than 125 separate stationary locations. The collected data revealed that 67% were located within 47.1 meters and 95% were located within 112.2 meters – well within the Commission's accuracy limits for network-based solutions.⁴ Based on these successful test results, Cingular has decided to deploy U-TDOA as its E911 Phase II solution, rather than E-OTD.

receive the information. *See* Cingular Wireless LLC, Third Quarterly E911 Implementation Report for TDMA, AMPS and TDMA/AMPS Networks, filed on February 3, 2003.

⁴ 47 C.F.R. § 20.18(h). These results were obtained on an unloaded system; however, degradation as a result of system loading is expected to be partially or fully offset by ongoing improvements in data collection and processing algorithms.

Respectfully submitted,

CINGULAR WIRELESS LLC

By: /s/
J. R. Carbonell
Carol L. Tacker
David G. Richards
5565 Glenridge Connector
Suite 1700
Atlanta, GA 30342
(404) 236-5543

Its Attorneys

February 3, 2003

Attachment A

E911 PHASE II PSAP PROFILE



WIRELESS E911 PHASE II PSAP PROFILE

Please complete one profile for each PSAP included in the Phase II request under this 911 authority

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Name of 911 Authority (ex: Orleans Parish Comm. District or Fulton County 911) | | 2. Number of PSAPs under this Authority | |
| 3. Contact Information for 911 Authority Name/Title: | | Phone: | |
| Street: | | Fax: | |
| City, State, Zip: | | E-mail: | |
| 4. Name of PSAP (ex: Fulton County 911 or Hall County Sheriff's Office) | | | |
| 5. Contact Information for PSAP Director/Manager Name/Title: | | Phone: | |
| Street: | | Fax: | |
| City, State, Zip: | | E-mail: | |
| 6. Is PSAP currently receiving Phase I service (call back number and address of cell tower)? Yes No If YES, then via NCAS? | | | |
| 7. Type of customer premise equipment or phone system (ex: Positron Lifeline or Motorola Centralink 2000) | | | |
| 8. What equipment will PSAP use to translate lat/long coordinates into location / address? | | | |
| 9. Has the mapping equipment / software been installed and tested? Yes No If no, order date: Due date: Please provide copy of order or correspondence | | | |
| 10. Has PSAP requested necessary facilities from the LEC to enable the PSAP to receive Phase II data including upgrade to ALI database and PAM interface with re-query capability? Yes No If yes, then provide copy of request | | | |
| 11. Is a funding mechanism in place for the PSAP to recover costs associated with Phase II implementation? Yes No If YES, please attach description of funding mechanism. | | | |
| 12. Comments / Notes: | | | |
| Signature: | | Date: | |

Attachment B

3-8

PSAP PHASE I REQUESTS

Cingular Wireless Phase I Implementation Status - Kansas

As of 12/31/02

39

| Jurisdiction | Phase I Code | Phase I Service Requested | Phase I Turn up date | Phase I Request WIP | Phase I Request on hold | Phase I Request completed in 6 mo window | Phase I Status | Phase I Responsible Party |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Allen Co | 5 | | | | | | Licensed but no sites | |
| Atchison Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Butler Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Chautauqua Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Cherokee Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Crawford Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Doniphan Co | 5 | | | | | | Licensed but no sites | |
| Douglas Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Jackson Co | 5 | | | | | | Licensed but no sites | |
| Jefferson Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Labette Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| MARC - 6 counties | 1 | 08/02/01 | 12/31/02 | | | | Live where PSAP is ready | Jurisdiction, LEC |
| Montgomery Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Neosho Co | 5 | | | | | | Licensed but no sites | |
| Osage Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Sedgewick Co | 1 | 07/25/01 | 06/25/02 | | | | | |
| Shawnee Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Wilson Co | 6 | | | | | | No request | |
| Totals | 18 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Status: 1- Deployed; 2-Cingular Past 6 Mo. Window; 3-PSAP or LEC Past 6 Mo. Window; 4-Request within 6 Mo. Window 5-Lic, no sites: 6- No Request

1/29/2003