

MINUTES OF THE SENATE UTILITIES

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Pat Apple at 1:30 p.m. on January 15, 2009 in Room 446-N of the Capitol.

Committee members absent:

Sen. Roger Reitz - excused

Committee staff present:

Ann McMorris, Administrative Assistant
Raney Gilliland, Kansas Legislative Research
Cindy Lash, Kansas Legislative Research
Mike Corrigan, Kansas Legislative Revisor
Melissa Doeblin, Kansas Legislative Revisor

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Heidi Zimmerman, Auditor, Legislative Post Audit
Lisa Hoopes, Senior Auditor, Legislative Post Audit

Others attending:

See attached list.

Chairperson Apple opened the meeting.

Introduction of Bills

Melissa Wangeman, Legislative Services Director and General Counsel, Kansas Association of Counties, requested a bill introduction to continue the E911 fee to finance the next generation of maintenance and upgrades to the statewide emergency response system. This proposal also includes continuation of the grant program that helps locals fund their E911 systems.

Moved by Petersen, seconded by Emler, a bill be drafted and introduced regarding the request of Kansas Association of Counties. Motion carried.

Tom Day, Kansas Corporation Commission, requested introduction of legislation to amend KSA 66-1802(s) dealing with tolerance zone for underground utility locates. (Attachment 1)

Moved by Senator Emler, seconded by Senator Lee, introduce a bill as requested by KCC to clarify tolerance zone for underground utility locates. Motion carried.

Don Jacobsen, President, AT&T Kansas, discussed their proposal and the KCC involvement regarding carriers of last resort.

Moved by Senator Emler, seconded by Senator Taddiken, introduce a bill regarding carriers of last resort as explained by AT&T. Motion carried.

The committee received information as follows:

List of Senate Utilities Staff

Reports on (1) Emissions Trading: Lessons for a Carbon Market and (2) The Electric Utility Industry and Global Climate Change as provided to Joint Committee on Energy and Environmental Policy on January 13, 2009.

Presentation of audits by Legislative Post Audit

Heidi Zimmerman, Auditor, reviewed the Performance Audit Report 08PA20 on the Department of Health and Environment: reviewing issues related to the permitting process in the Bureau of Air and Radiation. (Attachment 2)

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate Utilities at 1:30 p.m. on January 15, 2009, in Room 446-N of the Capitol.

Lisa Hoopes, Senior Auditor, reviewed the Performance Audit Report A8PA16 on Wireless Enhanced 911: reviewing implementation of the 2004 Act and provided a spread sheet on grant funds distribution. (Attachment 3).

Chairperson Apple announced appointment of a subcommittee to study net metering: Members of the subcommittee are Senators Petersen, Lee and Bruce.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 20, 2009.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Ann McMorris
Committee Assistant

Attachments - 3

GUEST LIST
SENATE UTILITIES COMMITTEE
JANUARY 15, 2009

NAME

COMPANY

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| Joe Dick | KCBPU |
| - DAN JACOBSEN | AT&T |
| - Mike Murray | Embarras |
| Shirley Allen | KRITOA |
| - Mari Tucker | Dept of Commerce |
| - Pat Lehman | KFSA |
| - Chris Clarke | } LPA |
| Amy Thompson | |
| - Lisa Hoops | |
| Heidi Zimmerman | |
| - Tom DAY | KCC |
| - Jim Gartner | AT&T |
| - Scott Jones | KCPC |
| - Patrick Fucik | Sprint |
| - Mark Schweiber | Westar Energy |
| Wad Sprung | Curb |



*Kathleen Sebelius, Governor
Thomas E. Wright, Chairman
Michael C. Moffet, Commissioner
Joseph F. Harkins, Commissioner*

January 15, 2009

Honorable Pat Apple, Chairman
Senate Utilities Committee
Statehouse, Room 242-E
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Senator Apple:

The Kansas Corporation Commission would respectfully request the Senate Utilities Committee to introduce the following legislation. The proposal amends KSA 66-1802(s) dealing with tolerance zone for underground utility locates. The proposed legislation would "bracket" the tolerance zone in hopes of providing clear direction to the excavators and utility operators. (Draft language attached)

The Corporation Commission respectfully seeks introduction of this proposal through the Senate Utilities Committee. Should you have questions, please feel free to call me at 271-3190.

Thank You,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thomas A. Day", is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas A. Day
Legislative Liaison

Senate Utilities Committee
January 15, 2009
Attachment 1-1

K.S.A. 66-1802 (s) "Tolerance zone" means the area ~~not less than~~ within 24 inches of the outside dimensions in all horizontal directions of an underground facility, except that a ~~larger~~ tolerance zone ~~for a tier 1, 2, or 3 facility~~ larger than 24 inches may be established by rules and regulations adopted under K.S.A. 2007 Supp. 66-1815, and amendments thereto. An operator of a water or wastewater facility may elect to ~~use a~~ define the tolerance zone as for such water or wastewater facility in which tolerance zone means the area ~~not less than~~ within 60 inches of the outside dimensions in all horizontal directions of an underground water or wastewater facility ~~upon notification of the excavator~~ provided notice of such election is given to the excavator prior to locates being performed. ~~, except that a larger tolerance zone may be established by rules and regulations adopted under K.S.A. 2007 Supp. 66-1815, and amendments thereto.~~

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LEGISLATIVE DIVISION OF POST AUDIT

Overview of the Air-Quality Permit Process And Sunflower Power Plant Decision

State law requires some entities that contribute to air pollution to obtain air-quality permits. page 3
Under K.S.A 65-3008, entities that emit certain levels of pollutants into the air must obtain a permit before they can construct, modify, or operate the facility or equipment. The Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) is responsible for regulating the emission of air pollutants in Kansas. The Bureau of Air and Radiation staff issues two types of air-quality permits: construction permits and operating permits.

- *Construction permits must be obtained by facilities that will emit air pollutants above a certain threshold before construction or modification begins.*
- *An operating permit is required only for facilities that have potential air pollution emissions over a certain threshold and must be obtained 6-12 months after operation begins.*

The majority of construction permit applications go through a detailed review process. The approval process includes the following steps:

- *An evaluation of potential emissions, including carbon dioxide*
- *An assessment of the facility's operations to make sure it complies with all applicable regulations*
- *A 30-day public notice and hearing, if applicable. By Kansas statute, only some permits are subject to this requirement.*

KDHE can deny an application for an air-quality permit for a number of reasons. page 6
K.S.A 65-3008b gives the Secretary of KDHE the authority to deny an air-quality permit based on specific reasons, such as an incomplete application, non-payment of fees, or non-compliance with emission limits and standards. The Secretary of KDHE denied a construction permit for Sunflower Electric Power Cooperation in October 2007 based on the Kansas Attorney General's interpretation of another statute. The Attorney General concluded Kansas statute 65-3012 gave the Secretary the authority to deny a permit if the Secretary makes a determination that a particular emission constitutes air pollution and that the emission presents a substantial endangerment to the health of people or the environment. Shortly after the decision to deny the permit was announced, Sunflower filed two lawsuits. The cases are still pending.

Senate Utilities Committee
January 15, 2009
Attachment 2-1

Question 1: Have There Been Significant Changes in the Process for Approving Permits in the Past Year, and Are Those Changes Increasing the Length of Time It Takes To Approve Permits?

The permit process hasn't changed significantly, but KDHE has begun several initiatives related to carbon dioxide emissions and other pollutants. page 9

Since November 2007, KDHE has been preparing a carbon dioxide emission estimate for every construction permit application it receives. Staff in the Bureau of Air and Radiation began calculating this estimate as part of the standard process for every construction permit application. Preparation of this estimate appears to have had very little impact on the construction permit process. Department staff told us these carbon dioxide emission estimates were being calculated and reviewed for informational purposes only, and to help establish a baseline volume for such emissions. They emphasized that the estimates would not be used during the technical review to deny any construction permits.

In the last year, KDHE also has begun several initiatives related to greenhouse gas emissions. In February 2008, KDHE sent a letter to Class I and Class II facilities asking them to complete and submit a greenhouse gas emissions inventory for 2007. Department staff told us this information was being requested on a voluntary basis. Additionally, in May 2008, KDHE began an initiative to bring existing small boilers into compliance with State and federal laws, requiring them to submit an application for a construction permit. According to staff within the Bureau of Air and Radiation, when routine reviews of a number of small boilers revealed that they didn't have the appropriate permits, KDHE adopted a "sheltered initiative" that would allow boiler owners and operators to come into compliance with the federal regulations without facing civil enforcement actions.

Preparing a carbon dioxide emission estimate appears to have no impact on construction permit approval times. page 13

Changes the Department implemented in recent years to streamline the construction permit application process have reduced processing times. To help determine how such changes have impacted the processing times for construction permit applications, we analyzed data from the Bureau's tracking database. Our analyses showed the following:

- *the total number of construction permits processed has increased 35% since fiscal year 2003*
- *average approval times for all non-expedited types of permits have decreased by 51% (from an average of 63 days to an average of 31 days) between fiscal years 2003 and 2008*
- *staffing levels in the permitting section remained relatively constant from fiscal year 2003 to fiscal year 2008. In that time period, the number of staff ranged from 13 to 16 with an average of 15*
- *as of September 2008, the Bureau had only two applications that had been pending for more than 200 days*

2-2

Question 1 Conclusion page 16

Question 2: How Does the Basic Process for Approving Air-Quality Permits in Kansas Compare to the Process in a Sample of Other States?

The basic construction permit process in Kansas is similar to other nearby states, but some differences exist. page 17
We asked officials from five other states (Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Iowa) about their state's process for approving construction permits and other issues related to the process. Most states reported that they regulate essentially the same pollutants Kansas does. In addition, based on the information they reported, their basic processes appear to be very similar to Kansas' process. We did note a few differences in how states approve construction permits. These differences include the following:

- *Oklahoma and Colorado require their enforcement department to sign-off on the permit.*
- *Iowa and Nebraska require modeling as part of the application. Modeling involves using a computer-generated model to predict whether the emissions from a project will violate certain air-quality standards.*
- *Colorado and Oklahoma require a facility inspection for some existing facilities before issuing the permit.*
- *Colorado and Iowa issue permits by emission point. For example, a facility with four smoke stacks would get four permits. Kansas issues permits by facility.*
- *Nebraska puts all of its permits on public notice. Kansas puts only permits that fit a certain criteria on public notice.*

We also found that one of the five comparison states prepares a carbon dioxide estimate for all construction permit applications, and another prepares a calculation just for power plant applications.

Question 3: How Does Recent Turnover in KDHE's Upper-Management Positions Compare with Previous Years?

KDHE experienced more turnover in upper-management positions in 2008 than in the past. page 20
Working with KDHE officials, we identified 25 positions within the Department that can be considered "upper-management." We analyzed the histories of those 25 positions to determine how many different people have held them since 1999. We found 24 upper-management positions had turned over between January 1999 and July 2008.

Calendar year 2008 had more upper-management turnover than any of the past 10 years. Much of the increase in turnovers has come through retirements. We found three upper managers had retired in calendar years 2007-2008, the highest number in any two-year period since 2001-2002, which also had three. Employees who retired in 2007-2008 retired only slightly "earlier" than employees who retired in the 1999-2006 time period. The average number of points for upper-level managers who retired in 2007-08 was 89 points, compared to 90 points for

2-3

managers who retired in 1999-2006. We also found the increase in upper-management turnover has been agency-wide.

The qualifications and experience of recent replacements generally are comparable to those who left. We reviewed the education levels and job experiences of each person who had left an upper-management position in the two most recent years, and each person who had replaced them on a full-time basis. In general, the qualifications and experiences of the "replacement" employees have been comparable to those who left. page 20

APPENDIX A: Scope Statement page 25

APPENDIX B: State-by-State Comparison of the Construction Permit Process page 27

APPENDIX C: Agency Response page 28

2-4

This audit was conducted by Heidi Zimmerman. Chris Clarke was the audit manager. If you need any additional information about the audit's findings, please contact Heidi Zimmerman at the Division's offices. Our address is: Legislative Division of Post Audit, 800 SW Jackson Street, Suite 1200, Topeka, Kansas 66612. You also may call us at (785) 296-3792, or contact us via the Internet at LPA@lpa.state.ks.us.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LEGISLATIVE DIVISION OF POST AUDIT

Overview of Wireless Enhanced 911 Services in Kansas

Wireless E-911 services improve emergency response to calls made from cell phones. page 3
Enhanced 911 (E-911), which automatically identifies the location from which an emergency call is being made, has been available for calls made from regular land-line telephones for many years. In contrast, E-911 for wireless calls made from cell phones is a fairly recent development. Determining the location of a wireless 911 phone call involves complex, costly technology that many Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) can't afford.

Two funding sources were established in 2004 and 2006 to help pay for implementation of wireless E-911 services. page 4
The Wireless Enhanced 911 Act of 2004 assesses a fee on all cell phone subscribers and purchases of pre-paid wireless phones to help offset the costs of implementing and offering E-911 services for wireless users. The 2006 Voice-over Internet Protocol (VoIP) Enhanced 911 Act assesses a similar monthly fee on VoIP subscribers. The Acts created a 25¢ local fee and a 25¢ grant fee that are assessed monthly on all cell phone and VoIP subscriber accounts, as well as a 1% grant fee assessed on the retail price of pre-paid phone services. Local fees are distributed to PSAPs based on each wireless cell phone or VoIP subscriber's zip code. Grant fees are remitted to the Secretary of Administration and held in the Statewide grant fund. PSAPs in counties with fewer than 75,000 people are eligible to apply for grants to supplement their revenue from the local fees.

The Statewide grant fund will be eliminated in 2010. Any remaining balance will be distributed to PSAPs based on population. Within each PSAP, the 911 fees for land-line or wireless phones or for VoIP subscriber accounts must be equalized. They also will be capped at 25¢ each in counties with populations of 125,000 or more, and at 50¢ each in counties with populations less than 125,000.

Question 1: What Is The Status of Implementation of Wireless E-911 And Voice-over Internet Protocol Systems, and Is the Amount of Money Being Collected to Fund the Implementation of the Systems Adequate?

Senate Utilities Committee
January 15, 2009
Attachment 3-1

Wireless E-911 services should be fully implemented in 87% of PSAPs in 2008, and in all PSAPs by 2010. *Fully implemented E-911 services means the PSAP can receive the cell phone number, billing address, and a location based on the longitude and latitude coordinates, and can also receive information from VoIP emergency calls. In all, 87% of the*

PSAPs told us they expect to have fully implemented Phase II of wireless E-911 service by the end of 2008. Those PSAPs cover 95% of the Kansas population. All PSAPs plan to have Phase II fully implemented by 2010.

All but one PSAP who hasn't reached Phase II by December 2008 should be able to cover implementation costs. Except for the Stanton County PSAP, all PSAPs will be able to cover implementation costs in 2009 and 2010, and have positive ending balances at the end of 2010. By December 2010, we estimated the Stanton County PSAP to have a negative balance of almost \$23,000. page 7

Question 2: Are Moneys Received Pursuant to the Enhanced 911 Act and Voice-over Internet Protocol Enhanced 911 Act Being Used Appropriately?

State law limits the use of wireless E-911 fees. The two E-911 Acts specify that wireless and VoIP E-911 fees can be spent only on necessary and reasonable costs to implement services, buy equipment and upgrades, pay maintenance fees, and train personnel. Wireless and VoIP E-911 fees can't be used to lease, construct, acquire, remodel, renovate or furnish a building. page 10

Through June 2008, PSAPs spent almost \$23 million from wireless and VoIP E-911 fee revenues. Almost half of the reported spending by PSAPs from grant and local fees has been for equipment. PSAPs also have spent about \$5.5 million on contractual services, such as ongoing costs for phone lines and maintenance contracts. In all, fee revenues of approximately \$40 million have been collected between July 2004 and June 2008. page 11

Grant expenditures are thoroughly reviewed by the Governor's Grants program and we found no problems with expenditures we reviewed. Administration of the grant fund involves a thorough process for reviewing and approving expenditures. PSAPs usually are reimbursed only after they submit invoices or other documentation. In our sample of 18 purchases accounting for \$281,000, all purchases appeared to be for allowable items, and PSAPs had provided supporting documentation. This result is consistent with the 2006 audit which found essentially no issues. page 12

Our review of local fee fund purchases found only minor misspending. Unlike grant funds, there's no regular outside oversight of the spending of local fee moneys that go directly to PSAPs. The League of Kansas Municipalities provides guidance to PSAPs about allowable purchases, and PSAPs are required to send bi-annual informational reports to the Governor's Grants Program. Those reports show fees received, amounts spent, and brief descriptions of purchases. In our sample of 30 purchases from 16 PSAPs totaling \$1.4 million we found all expenditures to be for allowable items. However we did find minor issues with reported page 12

3-2

expenditures not in our sample. Four payments totaling about \$1,800 were made for accounting stamps and various 911 promotional items. These results are fairly consistent with the 2006 audit which found only minor issues with local fee spending.

Question 3: What Level of Funding Is Needed for Ongoing Support of the Wireless and VoIP E-911 and Land-line Emergency Systems?

Our assessment of the adequacy of E-911 funding had to involve many estimates, projections, and assumptions. page 14
To assess the adequacy of E-911 funding for PSAPs, we had to develop estimates of their future revenues and expenditures. We sent a data collection document to PSAPs to determine the expected December 2008 ending balances of their wireless and land-line funds, other sources of revenue they planned to use, and any remaining expenditures they have planned to fully implement E-911. Estimated expenditures for future ongoing monthly costs and system upgrades were taken from a May 2008 survey of PSAPs by the Governor’s Grants Program. We projected future revenues based on historical revenue data received by the PSAPs. Both expenditure and revenues estimates are subject to error.

Statewide, revenues should cover costs for E-911, but may not be enough for emergency dispatch services. page 15
Revenues should exceed expenditures by an estimated \$21.9 million between now and the end of implementation in 2010. Statewide revenues should exceed expenditures by an estimated \$31.8 million between now and the end of 2012. However, over time, the difference between revenues and expenditures will continue to decrease.

Projected fee revenues won’t cover all costs planned to upgrade and maintain dispatch radios. We did an analysis looking beyond E-911 services (receiving the call) and factored in radios to facilitate dispatch. Based on data each PSAP reported to the Governor’s Grants Program regarding radio maintenance and upgrades, the fee fund revenues would not be enough to cover these planned expenditures. Expenditures will outweigh projected revenues in 2010-2012.

Seven PSAPs likely won’t have enough funding to cover their estimated E-911 costs through 2010. page 17
Based on a comparison of the projected funding each PSAP might have available between calendar years 2009 and 2010 to the estimated expenditures they reported, seven PSAPs will have a negative ending balance at the end of calendar year 2010. Only one of the seven PSAPs isn’t fully Phase II implemented. The others are fully implemented, but likely can’t cover their ongoing costs and any planned upgrades. In general, the seven PSAPs have smaller populations.

3-3

Some PSAPs may not be able to cover their E-911 ongoing costs after 2010. When the fee structure changes in 2010, the grant fund will be eliminated and PSAPs will be able to set their own wireless and VoIP E-911 fees, within limits set by statute. We compared projected revenues in 2011 for each PSAP with the estimates of ongoing operating costs the PSAPs provided us. Based on those projections and estimates, at least 10 PSAPs wouldn't be able to cover their ongoing costs in 2011, and 12 PSAPs wouldn't be able to cover costs in 2013. In 2011, those PSAPs will have to charge monthly fees to each subscriber ranging from 54¢ to \$1.18 to cover expenses. In addition to these ongoing costs, PSAPs will have to fund recurring equipment upgrades. page 18

The Statewide grant fund will have an estimated balance of \$9.5 million when its eliminated in June 2010. Any balance remaining in the grant fund will be distributed to PSAPs based on population. PSAPs in the most populous counties, which weren't eligible to apply for grants, will received a pro-rata share of any remaining fund balance. The lump sum distributions may range from about \$4,618 to \$1.6 million per PSAP. page 20

Conclusion. page 22
Recommendations for Legislative Action. page 22
Recommendations for Executive Action. page 22

| List of Figures | |
|--|---------|
| Figure OV-1: How a Wireless 911 Phone Call Reaches the Emergency Dispatch Center | page 4 |
| Figure OV 2: Changes in Maximum Monthly Fees for 911 Services Beginning July 1, 2020 | page 5 |
| Figure 1-1: Status of Wireless Enhanced 911 in Kansas | page 8 |
| Figure 1-2: Projected E-911 Revenues and Estimated Implementation Costs of PSAPs Not at Phase II by December 2008 | page 9 |
| Figure 2-1: Statewide Spending from Wireless and VoIP E-911 Fee Moneys Through June 30, 2008 | page 11 |
| Figure 3-1: Statewide Estimated E-911 Revenues and Expenditures (2009 to 2012) | page 16 |
| Figure 3-2: Statewide Estimated Emergency Dispatch Revenues and Expenditures (2009 to 2012) | page 17 |
| Figure 3-3: Estimated Annual Ending Balances for PSAPs With the Largest/Smallest Ending Balances in 2010 (CY 2008 to CY 2010) | page 18 |
| Figure 3-4: PSAPs That Would Need a Higher Wireless Fee Than Allowed After 2010 and 2012 to Cover Their Estimated Ongoing Operating Expenses | page 19 |
| Figure 3-5: State Wireless and VoIP Grant Fund Revenues and Obligations | page 20 |
| Figure 3-6: Statewide Grant Fund Distributions After June 2010 | page 21 |

3-4

08PA16
 Wireless Enhanced 911: Reviewing Implementation of the 2004 Act
 Cumulative Look at PSAP's Ending Balances Including Remaining Grant Funds Distribution in 2010
 2008 to 2012

| PSAP | County | Ending Balance 2008 | Ending Balance 2009 | Ending Balance 2010 | Grant Distribution 2010 | Ending Balance 2011 | Ending Balance 2012 |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Sedgwick County | Sedgwick County | \$2,450,000 | \$3,889,742 | \$4,852,227 | \$1,617,854 | \$6,974,814 | \$7,595,972 |
| Johnson County | Johnson County | \$2,270,900 | \$3,094,320 | \$3,727,771 | \$282,800 | \$4,414,689 | \$4,825,362 |
| Shawnee County | Shawnee County | \$700,000 | \$1,716,514 | \$2,473,960 | \$575,453 | \$3,560,419 | \$3,692,777 |
| Reno County | Reno County | \$1,028,371 | \$1,285,935 | \$1,570,176 | \$194,376 | \$1,936,558 | \$2,069,763 |
| City of Garden City | Finney County | \$1,103,050 | \$1,246,375 | \$1,425,905 | \$140,003 | \$1,767,560 | \$1,976,724 |
| Douglas County | Douglas County | \$1,000,257 | \$1,366,757 | \$1,379,187 | \$362,599 | \$2,186,612 | \$2,628,798 |
| Wyandotte County | Wyandotte County | \$751,430 | \$1,118,206 | \$1,305,944 | \$498,629 | \$1,863,880 | \$1,934,523 |
| Cowley County (Ark City and Winfield) | Cowley County | \$676,000 | \$871,514 | \$1,090,407 | \$117,971 | \$1,300,450 | \$1,400,055 |
| City of Overland Park | Johnson County | \$470,214 | \$730,072 | \$1,021,294 | \$592,991 | \$1,935,231 | \$2,291,610 |
| Saline County | Saline County | \$255,000 | \$581,518 | \$936,070 | \$184,804 | \$1,283,364 | \$1,280,155 |
| Marion County | Marion County | \$116,836 | \$192,448 | \$696,146 | \$44,563 | \$615,310 | \$694,192 |
| City of Olathe | Johnson County | \$303,912 | \$486,446 | \$694,944 | \$413,175 | \$1,341,563 | \$1,603,509 |
| Ford County | Ford County | \$271,000 | \$429,161 | \$647,331 | \$111,466 | \$826,080 | \$921,712 |
| Butler County | Butler County | \$275,000 | \$314,651 | \$637,795 | \$176,858 | \$953,631 | \$822,516 |
| City of Lenexa | Johnson County | \$262,434 | \$370,300 | \$481,328 | \$159,905 | \$753,999 | \$869,319 |
| Ellis County | Ellis County | \$181,600 | \$329,089 | \$479,258 | \$91,144 | \$753,349 | \$943,617 |
| Geary County | Geary County | \$172,000 | \$252,672 | \$471,557 | \$87,497 | \$733,156 | \$915,805 |
| Seward County | Seward County | \$347,341 | \$388,162 | \$471,236 | \$75,736 | \$646,066 | \$750,648 |
| Leavenworth County (Incl City of Leavenworth) | Leavenworth County | \$112,182 | \$259,768 | \$456,482 | \$245,098 | \$958,071 | \$1,227,264 |
| Barton County | Barton County | \$210,514 | \$219,685 | \$421,051 | \$84,753 | \$369,824 | \$412,420 |
| Franklin County | Franklin County | \$136,045 | \$215,943 | \$398,252 | \$83,635 | \$652,080 | \$827,250 |
| McPherson County | McPherson County | \$180,000 | \$282,373 | \$391,078 | \$99,319 | \$607,819 | \$723,504 |
| Washington County | Washington County | \$104,390 | \$236,667 | \$389,278 | \$20,161 | \$422,997 | \$436,560 |
| Labette County | Labette County | \$147,000 | \$240,604 | \$362,399 | \$74,218 | \$473,533 | \$534,349 |
| Crawford County | Crawford County | \$4,000 | \$149,875 | \$360,166 | \$130,408 | \$629,118 | \$776,109 |
| Cherokee County | Cherokee County | \$169,660 | \$275,761 | \$351,285 | \$70,755 | \$509,840 | \$601,670 |
| Osage County | Osage County | \$163,000 | \$229,064 | \$349,747 | \$68,700 | \$469,424 | \$518,835 |
| Riley County | Riley County | \$398,066 | \$486,054 | \$344,986 | \$212,286 | \$743,109 | \$937,392 |
| Sumner County | Sumner County | \$191,000 | \$270,401 | \$344,212 | \$84,619 | \$521,905 | \$241,847 |
| Republic County | Republic County | \$87,289 | \$209,397 | \$337,421 | \$17,078 | \$364,611 | \$346,034 |
| Pottawatomie County | Pottawatomie County | \$215,000 | \$262,588 | \$334,572 | \$64,885 | \$470,613 | \$498,691 |
| City of Andover | Butler County | \$32,000 | \$167,573 | \$317,116 | \$39,074 | \$402,710 | \$522,910 |
| Miami County | Miami County | \$75,000 | \$177,776 | \$300,037 | \$110,539 | \$554,782 | \$699,323 |
| City of Concordia | Cloud County | \$106,778 | \$140,697 | \$294,125 | \$29,736 | \$328,299 | \$338,113 |
| Greenwood County | Greenwood County | \$71,169 | \$213,141 | \$277,251 | \$25,850 | \$312,192 | \$322,398 |
| Clay County | Clay County | \$83,992 | \$160,541 | \$269,648 | \$27,321 | \$216,281 | \$266,316 |
| Allen County | Allen County | \$49,000 | \$215,239 | \$260,183 | \$45,127 | \$362,405 | \$412,402 |
| Harvey County | Harvey County | \$22,846 | \$126,638 | \$258,247 | \$115,993 | \$516,190 | \$695,645 |
| City of Emporia | Lyon County | \$38,859 | \$92,342 | \$247,478 | \$118,428 | \$407,598 | \$358,220 |
| Neosho County | Neosho County | \$40,000 | \$158,217 | \$246,329 | \$51,810 | \$362,575 | \$445,968 |
| Atchison County | Atchison County | \$148,838 | \$195,904 | \$245,073 | \$52,381 | \$200,537 | \$252,898 |
| City of Larned | Pawnee County | \$46,200 | \$136,363 | \$244,725 | \$22,710 | \$277,314 | \$284,891 |
| City of Independence | Montgomery County | \$77,239 | \$121,439 | \$233,388 | \$110,089 | \$494,626 | \$656,563 |
| Nemaha County | Nemaha County | \$184,865 | \$207,832 | \$231,076 | \$34,427 | \$288,857 | \$311,346 |
| Thomas County | Thomas County | \$82,397 | \$119,906 | \$230,219 | \$27,411 | \$103,499 | \$146,527 |
| Jackson County | Jackson County | \$160,148 | \$191,067 | \$227,278 | \$64,438 | \$328,870 | \$374,448 |
| Sherman County | Sherman County | \$117,000 | \$192,272 | \$225,408 | \$24,402 | \$242,053 | \$240,816 |
| Dickinson County | Dickinson County | \$145,000 | \$178,299 | \$220,981 | \$68,898 | \$345,017 | \$253,536 |
| City of Shawnee | Johnson County | \$114,504 | \$165,756 | \$216,461 | \$209,881 | \$475,450 | \$524,406 |
| Ellsworth County | Ellsworth County | \$31,362 | \$98,516 | \$214,965 | \$20,033 | \$253,945 | \$238,465 |
| Wilson County | Wilson County | \$27,000 | \$130,069 | \$203,987 | \$35,761 | \$272,706 | \$208,771 |
| Elk County | Elk County | \$4,250 | (\$9,734) | \$197,633 | \$10,233 | \$193,057 | \$178,286 |
| Logan and Gove County | Logan and Gove County | \$37,300 | \$79,355 | \$196,535 | \$19,731 | \$263,302 | \$315,081 |
| Brown County | Brown County | \$100,000 | \$137,041 | \$190,785 | \$38,054 | \$292,226 | \$356,688 |
| Pratt County | Pratt County | \$99,800 | \$142,633 | \$188,533 | \$30,139 | \$164,366 | \$216,425 |
| Osborne County | Osborne County | \$42,894 | \$114,790 | \$186,364 | \$13,058 | \$197,935 | \$196,768 |
| Russell County | Russell County | \$122,500 | \$163,122 | \$186,019 | \$21,695 | \$137,695 | \$168,761 |
| Mitchell County | Mitchell County | \$123,300 | \$126,758 | \$179,974 | \$21,376 | \$204,973 | \$207,311 |
| Haskell County | Haskell County | \$145,000 | \$154,489 | \$177,378 | \$15,230 | \$201,156 | \$206,181 |
| Marshall County | Marshall County | \$72,000 | \$118,883 | \$172,110 | \$37,759 | \$251,828 | \$295,201 |
| Ness County | Ness County | \$38,568 | \$106,147 | \$168,939 | \$10,441 | \$209,386 | (\$59,873) |
| Morris County | Morris County | \$129,290 | \$141,555 | \$155,506 | \$20,916 | \$192,900 | \$209,651 |
| Anderson County | Anderson County | \$91,625 | \$86,420 | \$155,389 | \$27,821 | \$130,362 | \$121,258 |
| Chautauqua County | Chautauqua County | \$49,730 | \$99,708 | \$155,378 | \$13,501 | \$176,682 | \$185,022 |
| Jefferson County | Jefferson County | \$48,700 | \$77,871 | \$148,306 | \$62,275 | \$265,213 | \$328,656 |
| Graham County | Graham County | \$62,000 | \$112,905 | \$146,744 | \$8,524 | \$41,161 | \$42,332 |
| Kingman County | Kingman County | \$60,751 | \$100,114 | \$143,250 | \$28,076 | \$219,720 | \$269,921 |
| City of Leawood | Johnson County | \$73,752 | \$106,014 | \$138,052 | \$108,557 | \$277,801 | \$308,973 |

08PA16
Wireless Enhanced 911: Reviewing Implementation of the 2004 Act
Cumulative Look at PSAP's Ending Balances Including Remaining Grant Funds Distribution in 2010
2008 to 2012

| PSAP | County | Ending Balance 2008 | Ending Balance 2009 | Ending Balance 2010 | Grant Distribution 2010 | Ending Balance 2011 | Ending Balance 2012 |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Linn County | Linn County | \$78,000 | \$88,716 | \$133,875 | \$31,633 | \$182,717 | \$201,187 |
| Lincoln County | Lincoln County | \$23,070 | \$24,007 | \$114,844 | \$11,640 | \$127,515 | \$127,943 |
| Rice County | Rice County | \$32,388 | \$72,569 | \$114,666 | \$34,394 | \$193,827 | \$237,712 |
| Edwards County | Edwards County | \$85,668 | \$98,768 | \$111,504 | \$8,739 | \$133,018 | \$145,408 |
| Stafford County | Stafford County | \$56,750 | \$60,224 | \$110,207 | \$15,298 | \$107,754 | (\$84,719) |
| Sheridan County | Sheridan County | \$30,850 | \$84,266 | \$108,066 | \$8,302 | \$128,038 | \$25,105 |
| Phillips County | Phillips County | \$68,000 | \$83,341 | \$107,847 | \$20,486 | \$169,150 | \$214,150 |
| Smith County | Smith County | \$43,000 | \$70,650 | \$101,628 | \$13,320 | \$107,424 | \$99,875 |
| Cheyenne County | Cheyenne County | \$10,030 | \$70,531 | \$99,781 | \$10,310 | \$113,310 | \$116,527 |
| Meade County | Meade County | \$73,000 | \$81,365 | \$99,761 | \$15,099 | \$123,574 | \$131,719 |
| Jewell County | Jewell County | \$45,000 | \$66,900 | \$91,909 | \$10,727 | \$107,699 | \$93,012 |
| Ottawa County | Ottawa County | \$6,000 | \$26,939 | \$91,211 | \$20,799 | \$131,241 | \$149,510 |
| Hodgeman County | Hodgeman County | \$13,300 | \$60,995 | \$90,307 | \$8,151 | \$101,216 | \$103,878 |
| Scott County | Scott County | \$126,496 | \$73,184 | \$87,318 | \$16,406 | \$76,210 | \$94,281 |
| Grant County | Grant County | \$48,828 | \$15,242 | \$86,956 | \$24,809 | \$122,478 | \$117,333 |
| Greeley County | Greeley County | \$650 | \$19,532 | \$80,395 | \$4,618 | \$86,518 | \$87,913 |
| Kearny County | Kearny County | \$8,970 | \$70,820 | \$78,400 | \$15,069 | \$110,162 | \$126,579 |
| Harper County | Harper County | \$29,236 | \$48,230 | \$78,387 | \$19,153 | \$120,037 | \$143,389 |
| Rawlins County | Rawlins County | \$88,200 | \$83,437 | \$77,755 | \$9,807 | \$31,204 | \$12,109 |
| Rush County | Rush County | \$16,000 | \$69,974 | \$75,305 | \$11,126 | \$52,961 | \$19,421 |
| Norton County | Norton County | \$40,000 | \$55,962 | \$73,834 | \$19,899 | \$114,722 | (\$62,180) |
| Decatur County | Decatur County | \$27,317 | \$70,875 | \$72,839 | \$10,092 | \$71,300 | (\$118,708) |
| City of Fort Scott | Bourbon County | \$120,858 | \$92,071 | \$71,741 | \$51,014 | \$113,120 | (\$34,902) |
| Coffey County | Coffey County | \$42,500 | \$28,026 | \$68,294 | \$30,021 | \$92,821 | \$65,047 |
| Wabaunsee County | Wabaunsee County | \$42,000 | \$54,325 | \$66,884 | \$23,962 | \$106,636 | \$123,219 |
| City of Prairie Village | Johnson County | \$36,066 | \$51,053 | \$65,089 | \$75,057 | \$152,850 | \$164,966 |
| City of Augusta | Butler County | \$142,000 | \$138,590 | \$60,267 | \$34,490 | \$103,032 | \$113,153 |
| Chase County | Chase County | \$53,541 | \$51,663 | \$49,237 | \$9,414 | \$57,183 | \$13,950 |
| Hamilton County | Hamilton County | \$20,417 | \$32,801 | \$47,548 | \$8,507 | \$73,493 | \$91,227 |
| Woodson County | Woodson County | \$18,600 | \$27,431 | \$37,456 | \$11,315 | \$54,678 | \$65,878 |
| Comanche County | Comanche County | \$2,200 | \$2,481 | \$30,515 | \$5,965 | \$32,404 | \$27,413 |
| Rooks County | Rooks County | \$39,000 | \$13,435 | \$29,730 | \$18,827 | \$67,764 | \$87,829 |
| Kiowa County | Kiowa County | \$16,717 | \$22,096 | \$28,836 | \$10,468 | \$47,840 | \$56,722 |
| Trego County | Trego County | \$13,161 | \$10,291 | \$22,161 | \$10,022 | \$29,316 | (\$53,800) |
| Doniphan County | Doniphan County | \$27,000 | \$20,316 | \$17,423 | \$26,757 | \$43,755 | \$40,584 |
| Stevens County | Stevens County | \$57,000 | \$69,308 | \$15,601 | \$17,484 | \$64,027 | \$96,365 |
| Clark County | Clark County | \$18,698 | \$13,839 | \$6,016 | \$8,302 | \$3,799 | (\$157,371) |
| Morton County | Morton County | \$13,650 | (\$53,699) | (\$700) | \$10,875 | \$10,825 | (\$13,902) |
| Gray County | Gray County | \$5,000 | \$10,578 | (\$18,367) | \$24,365 | \$1,852 | (\$9,600) |
| Stanton County | Stanton County | \$0 | (\$13,722) | (\$22,811) | \$8,151 | (\$39,135) | (\$69,233) |
| Wallace County | Wallace County | \$3,940 | (\$98) | (\$29,217) | \$5,437 | (\$24,891) | (\$23,128) |
| Wichita County | Wichita County | \$12,598 | \$11,523 | (\$42,952) | \$8,943 | (\$31,825) | (\$29,742) |
| Lane County | Lane County | \$9,000 | (\$4,129) | (\$47,677) | \$6,485 | (\$49,979) | (\$59,375) |
| Barber County | Barber County | \$58,750 | \$80,321 | (\$51,060) | \$15,828 | (\$13,094) | \$8,425 |
| Total | | \$19,412,597 | \$29,104,746 | \$39,545,144 | \$9,466,999 | \$54,613,890 | \$58,884,754 |

| Grant Distribution For The Five Most Populous Counties and PSAPs Within Those Counties | |
|--|---------------------------|
| PSAP | Grant Distribution Amount |
| Sedgwick County | \$1,617,854 |
| City of Overland Park | \$592,991 |
| Shawnee County | \$575,453 |
| Wyandotte County | \$498,629 |
| City of Olathe | \$413,175 |
| Douglas County | \$362,599 |
| Johnson County | \$282,800 |
| City of Shawnee | \$209,881 |
| City of Lenexa | \$159,905 |
| City of Leawood | \$108,557 |
| City of Prairie Village | \$75,057 |
| Total Distribution | \$4,896,900 |
| Grant Total | \$9,466,999 |
| % to Most Populous Counties/PSAPs | 52% |