

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS  
STANDING COMMITTEE**

March 22, 2001  
8:09 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Kevin Meyer, Co-Chair  
Representative Drew Scalzi  
Representative Lisa Murkowski  
Representative Gretchen Guess  
Representative Beth Kerttula

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Carl Morgan, Co-Chair  
Representative Andrew Halcro

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

HOUSE BILL NO. 186

"An Act relating to a municipal enhanced 911 surcharge on wireless telephones."

- MOVED HB 186 OUT OF COMMITTEE

**PREVIOUS ACTION**

BILL: HB 186

SHORT TITLE: 911 SURCHARGE ON MOBILE TELEPHONES

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) MEYER

Jrn-Date	Jrn-Page		Action
03/15/01	0609	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/15/01	0609	(H)	CRA, L&C
03/22/01		(H)	CRA AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 124

**WITNESS REGISTER**

MARK MEW, Deputy Chief  
Anchorage Police Department  
4501 S Bragaw  
Anchorage, Alaska 99507

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified on HB 186.

DOUG ROBINSON, Communications Manager  
Municipality of Anchorage  
3650 E Tudor Rd Bldg C  
Anchorage, Alaska 99507  
POSITION STATEMENT: Testified on HB 186.

DAN YOUMANS, Director  
External Affairs, Washington & Alaska  
AT&T Wireless Services, Inc.  
617 Eastlake Avenue East  
Seattle, Washington 98109  
POSITION STATEMENT: Mr. Youmans' letter to Co-Chair Meyer was read into the record by Mr. Gillespie.

RAY GILLESPIE, Lobbyist  
AT&T Wireless  
PO Box 589  
Seward, Alaska 99664  
POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions.

RAY MILLER, Lieutenant  
Fairbanks Police Department  
656 7th Avenue  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701  
POSITION STATEMENT: Informed the committee of the situation in Fairbanks.

TIM BIGGANE, Director  
Emergency Operations  
Fairbanks North Star Borough  
Peger Road  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701  
POSITION STATEMENT: Testified that the Fairbanks North Star Borough is in support of HB 186.

SCOOTER WELCH, Chief  
Fairbanks Police Department  
656 7th Ave.  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701  
POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 186.

TIM ROGERS, Legislative Coordinator  
Municipality of Anchorage  
(No address provided.)  
Anchorage, Alaska  
POSITION STATEMENT: Discussed the intent of HB 186.

GINA WEYMILLER, Supervisor  
Wheeler University Dispatcher Center  
611 N. Chandalar  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99775

POSITION STATEMENT: Discussed the need for a wireless surcharge.

MARK JOHNSON, Chief  
Community Health & Emergency Medical Services  
Division of Public Health  
Department of Health & Social Services  
PO Box 110616  
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0616

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 186.

JULIE KRAFFT  
Alaska Municipal League  
217 Second Street, Suite 200  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 186.

#### **ACTION NARRATIVE**

TAPE 01-15, SIDE A  
Number 0001

CO-CHAIR KEVIN MEYER called the House Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 8:09 a.m. Representatives Meyer, Scalzi, Guess, and Kerttula were present at the call to order. Representative Murkowski arrived as the meeting was in progress.

#### HB 186-911 SURCHARGE ON MOBILE TELEPHONES

CO-CHAIR MEYER announced that the only order of business before the committee today would be HOUSE BILL NO. 186, "An Act relating to a municipal enhanced 911 surcharge on wireless telephones."

Number 0115

REPRESENTATIVE GUESS declared a conflict of interest because she is currently on paid leave from the Alaska Communications Systems (ACS). There was objection, and therefore Representative Guess was required to participate.

Number 0157

CO-CHAIR MEYER, Alaska State Legislature, testified as sponsor of HB 186. Co-Chair Meyer informed the committee that the Enhanced 911 (E911) system provides a visual location and telephone number of the person calling 911. Therefore, the E911 system provides faster response time and automatic routing to the appropriate emergency response unit. Currently, 25 percent of the [911] calls in Anchorage are from wireless telephones, however "we" don't have the technology or the capability for the E911 system [with wireless calls]. Therefore, wireless 911 calls are not automatically routed nor do they provide a visual location both of which result in inefficiency. Currently, Anchorage imposes a surcharge of up to \$.50 for wireline 911 calls. This surcharge was made possible by the enactment of a state law in 1994. Therefore, HB 186 would amend the current state law to allow municipalities to impose a [911] surcharge on wireless telephones, which many cities across the nation already do. Co-Chair Meyer directed the committee to the bill packet that includes his sponsor statement, letters of support, a sectional analysis by Legislative Legal and Research Services, a legislative priority list from the City of Anchorage, and letters from the industry.

Number 0488

MARK MEW, Deputy Chief, Anchorage Police Department (APD), testified via teleconference. He pointed out that although [APD] has been collecting a surcharge for a communications center and 911 capability, the revenue collected does not cover the entire cost of the operation. With the increase in wireless communication, wireless calls are making up a larger portion of the call load. Therefore, one consideration is just handling all the incoming calls, many of which are duplicate. In the past although many people might see an accident, only a few people would actually have access to a phone. However, it is now customary for the entire center to receive 20-30 calls reporting the same event. This possibility requires the communications center to be staffed so that all calls can be answered, even though they may be duplicate calls. Sometimes there are so many calls that the 911 capacity is overloaded, which means that there are more incoming calls than there are incoming lines. Therefore, some of the people calling 911 receive a busy signal and there is no way to know what those people are calling about. Therefore, the need to expand the 911 system, at some point, is apparent.

MR. MEW noted that he isn't complaining about cell phone calls because those calls result in more accurate and timely information. Mr. Mew said, "I think we owe it to the community to respond to that [wireless calls] and be able to provide timely response. But I also think that the people using the technology should support ... our growth and our efforts to provide that service." He predicted that wireless communications will eventually replace wireline communications and thus the revenue [for the communication center] would shrink at some point in the future. This situation is occurring across the nation. Soon the industry will change and Automatic Location Identification (ALI) and Automatic Number Identification (ANI) data will be available through cellular communications. Therefore, the collection of a surcharge could help fund whatever [APD] has to do in order to meet the technological changes.

MR. MEW, in response to Representative Scalzi, reiterated that a couple of years ago, there was a study that showed that 25 percent of the 911 calls were wireless. Mr. Mew was certain that the percentage had risen since then.

Number 0991

DOUG ROBINSON, Communications Manager, Municipality of Anchorage, testified via teleconference. He began by informing the committee that currently 30 states have passed legislation for the collection of a wireless 911 surcharge, which ranges from \$.35 to \$2.00 per wireless phone. The revenue that is collected would be used to assist in financing equipment and software upgrades for the E911 public safety answering points (PSAP). The revenues would also be used to modify existing mapping software that would be in the dispatch center in order to display and track the wireless location information within the dispatch center. The revenues from the wireless surcharge would also be used to develop required data interfaces for the computer aided dispatch and to perform network upgrades to current E911 systems. If revenue was obtained from the surcharge, then the upgrades would be performed in order to pass the wireless ANI and ALI information to the dispatch center.

MR. ROBINSON informed the committee that a wireless surcharge as a cost recovery mechanism is endorsed by several national professional organizations, such as the Association of Public Safety Communication Officials (APSCO) and the National Emergency Number Association (NENA). He pointed out that NENA works with Project Locate whose mandate is to have a model city

in [each] state so that there is Phase II wireless technology within their dispatch centers. Therefore, that PSAP would be used as the model for other PSAPs [as they work] to become Phase II compliant. He explained that Phase II compliance means that the ANI and ALI information could be obtained from a wireless phone. Anchorage has been selected as the [model city] that will receive [the Phase II wireless technology]. Therefore, Anchorage is required to send letters to the wireless carriers that request their support in providing [the PSAP] with the ANI and ALI information for wireless phones. In turn, the necessary upgrades to receive the wireless information within the PSAP would be done.

MR. ROBINSON outlined the timing of this. He said that between April and this summer, PSAPs that are interested in Phase II technology should write letters requesting such to the wireless carriers. By October 2001 the wireless carriers that are choosing the handset-based solution, that is a global positioning satellite (GPS) chip, must begin selling and activating the handsets with the location capability. By December 31, 2002, 100 percent of all new wireless handsets must be location capable. By December 31, 2005, 95 percent of all wireless handsets and the carriers total subscriber base must have the location capability. In summary, Mr. Robinson pointed out that Alaska is in the bottom third of the states that haven't put in place a 911 surcharge. He felt that now is an appropriate time for Alaska to become involved in this.

Number 1383

REPRESENTATIVE SCALZI said he was encouraged that the GPS chip would be used. He asked if a 911 call [on a wireless phone] would trigger the GPS. He also asked if there would be an added cost in retrieving that GPS information.

MR. ROBINSON explained that the wireless carriers will be required to provide the tracking equipment. Once the GPS chip is in the cellular phone, that cellular phone will be tracked by the wireless carrier. The dispatch center has to have the mapping capability and the ability to receive the GPS signal in order to have the information display on a mapping screen.

REPRESENTATIVE SCALZI related his understanding that this will not be a direct link between the cellular phone and the dispatch center.

MR. ROBINSON explained that the [information] will pass through a controller of the wireless carrier to the dispatch center through the network.

Number 1528

RAY GILLESPIE, Lobbyist, AT&T Wireless, read a letter from Dan Youmans, Director, External Affairs, Washington & Alaska, AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., which is included in the committee packet. Mr. Gillespie read the letter as follows:

Dear Representative Meyer:

On behalf of AT&T Wireless [Services (AWS)], I would like to thank you for your interest in public safety and the 911 emergency communication system. [AT&T Wireless Services] is a strong supporter of 911. We believe wireless phones are making a significant contribution to the safety of wireless customers and the overall community by providing immediate emergency communication through the 911 system.

Because wireless phones are often used to call 911, AT&T Wireless supports a reasonable surcharge on wireless customers to help cover the costs incurred by the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs). House Bill 186 would create a monthly surcharge of up to 50 cents for municipalities with a population of 100,000 or greater, and a monthly surcharge of up to 75 cents for municipalities with a population of less than 100,000. [AT&T Wireless Services] can support the legislation if amended to create a surcharge level at 50 cents for all municipalities statewide.

[AT&T Wireless Services] feels a consistent rate across the state would be a more equitable way to levy the 911 surcharge, especially since wireless phones are used by customers in multiple jurisdictions. For example, a customer who lives in Anchorage may be visiting Fairbanks where he or she may witness a car accident. A call to 911 on a wireless phone would go to the Fairbanks PSAP. The opposite may be true of a visitor from Fairbanks calling an Anchorage PSAP. Since wireless phones can be used in many jurisdictions across the state to make emergency phone calls, it seems only fair that the surcharge be the same no matter where the customer lives.

[AT&T Wireless Services] would also like to thank you for including "cost recovery" language in the legislation, recognizing the [Federal Communication Commission's] mandate that carrier costs associated with Enhanced 911 be reimbursed in jurisdictions where cost recovery mechanisms, like the one contemplated by this legislation, exist.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on House Bill 186. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  
Dan Youmans

Number 1700

CO-CHAIR MEYER related his understanding of the letter to be that AT&T would like an amendment that would require a flat \$.50 fee no matter the location.

MR. GILLESPIE answered in the affirmative.

CO-CHAIR MEYER said he imagined that the difference in the fee was because of the population differences. For instance, he imagined that Anchorage would experience more calls than Bethel. Therefore, he surmised that the thought was that in Bethel the charge would be higher in order to have the same technology and equipment that is in Anchorage. That same cost differential would exist with the cell phone, he thought.

MR. GILLESPIE clarified the position of the company, "They will support the bill, the surcharge for wireless and landlines. They are reluctant, however, to go out and support increasing the cost to their customers above 50 cents. It doesn't mean they're going to oppose the bill."

CO-CHAIR MEYER pointed out that [with the wireline calls] the \$.50/\$.75 split already exists.

MR. GILLESPIE noted that he wasn't around when the landline surcharge was enacted and thus he didn't know the rationale behind the differential. Mr. Gillespie said, "In the case of the wireless, I think, as the Municipality of Anchorage indicated earlier, that the percentage of overall calls to the system may be 25 percent. It could be up to 50 percent now."

And a 50 percent [cent] statewide rate, I think would reflect probably more equitably that ... proportion of calls coming from landline and wireless."

CO-CHAIR MEYER referred to the flat fee desired by AT&T Wireless Services and asked whether it would be better for areas that can get by with charging less to do so rather than have a flat rate.

MR. GILLESPIE said that Co-Chair Meyer has a good point and that is why he didn't read the sentence from Mr. Youmans' letter that read, "We [AT&T Wireless Services] also suggest the rate be set at 50 cents as opposed to 'may not exceed' 50 cents to simplify the rate structure for all wireless carriers and customers."

Number 1903

REPRESENTATIVE GUESS pointed out that if a flat fee of \$.50 is imposed, then those communities that are currently charging \$.75 may not be able to pay for this [enhanced 911] system in that local community. Therefore, Representative Guess expressed the need to keep the differential.

MR. GILLESPIE said that is a decision for the legislative body to make. However, he reiterated the corporate reluctance to go on record [as supporting] a surcharge above \$.50.

REPRESENTATIVE KERTTULA posed a situation in which an Anchorage cellular phone is used to make a call in Bethel. She inquired as to the rate the individual would pay. She assumed that the Anchorage rate would be paid.

MR. GILLESPIE answered that he believes that would be the case.

REPRESENTATIVE GUESS said that the surcharge would be derived from the location that bills. Therefore, there would be some cost transfers between municipalities "that will never happen," she said.

CO-CHAIR MEYER clarified that in the situation posed by Representative Kerttula, the money would go to Anchorage, even though the call was made to Bethel. He said, "Hopefully, in the long run, that all works out."

Number 2049

RAY MILLER, Lieutenant, Fairbanks Police Department (FPD), testified via teleconference. He informed the committee that

Fairbanks did a survey last month, from which it determined that 44 percent of its [911] calls were wireless. He also informed the committee that [FPD] is trying to put together a new dispatch center. The new equipment that would allow receipt of the ANI and ALI information from wireless technology has been estimated to cost about \$600,000. This legislation would help fund the purchase and maintenance of this equipment.

LIEUTENANT MILLER said that the [Fairbanks] dispatch center receives virtually all the 911 calls from the northern half of Alaska. With such a large area to serve, the ability to pinpoint the location is important in order to determine the appropriate response mechanism.

Number 2181

TIM BIGGANE, Director, Emergency Operations, Fairbanks North Star Borough, testified via teleconference. He informed the committee that the Fairbanks North Star Borough is in support of HB 186. Emergency Operations is the agency that manages the E911 system in Fairbanks. Since 1997 a surcharge on the landline system has been collected. The surcharge of \$.65 pays for the maintenance, the operational database costs, and a long-term capital replacement program. Mr. Biggane noted that although they do receive ANI information, it is [only a small amount] and is only received by one dispatch center. Fairbanks is [considering] building a regional dispatch center that will bring dispatch centers together. Mr. Biggane said, "This technology ... enhances the ability for us to take a E911 call (indisc.) dispatch center and provide a higher level of service."

MR. BIGGANE turned to AT&T's suggestion of a flat rate. He encouraged the committee to maintain the current language in the bill in order to allow the local government entity to set the surcharge necessary to be able to maintain the cost [of the E911 system]. Mr. Biggane mentioned that Fairbanks has a capital replacement fund that was started in 1997 to replace the entire system within ten years. However, technology has moved faster than that, which means Fairbanks is behind in that aspect. Add to that the possibility of lowering the surcharge [if the flat fee suggestion is adopted] and this will create a different surcharge between the landline surcharge and the wireless surcharge, which will make for an interesting battle. Therefore, Mr. Biggane encouraged allowing the local community to set the necessary surcharge in order to maintain the operation of long-term capital. He remarked that the Denali

location is necessary. In conclusion, he reiterated that the Fairbanks North Star Borough does support the bill.

MR. BIGGANE, in response to Co-Chair Meyer, explained that Fairbanks began with a surcharge of \$.75 that was reduced to \$.65 after the first year.

CO-CHAIR MEYER expressed his encouragement in hearing that scenario because he hoped that communities would only charge the amount needed.

Number 2390

REPRESENTATIVE KERTTULA mentioned that if tourists are dialing 911, their phone is probably from out-of-state. Therefore, she pondered whether, at some point, there would be technology that would allow the surcharge to be placed on the phone. Perhaps, that would be a disincentive for people to call 911.

Number 2461

SCOOTER WELCH, Chief, Fairbanks Police Department, testified via teleconference. He noted his support of HB 186. He recalled when the community of Fairbanks and the North Star Borough didn't have the technology available to provide public safety, police, fire, and Emergency Medical Service (EMS) providers on scene when a call was disconnected. The ability to have an E911 system has made the police department's job much simpler and provides an additional level of safety to the community. Furthermore, the ability to have cellular technology in Alaska has been a great asset, but it has technologically impacted us in many ways. In conclusion, Mr. Welch reiterated his support of the bill.

Number 2560

TIM ROGERS, Legislative Coordinator, Municipality of Anchorage, explained that the original intent with this legislation was to mirror the language that is already in place for landlines. He noted that "we" worked closely with AT&T Wireless and ACS in order to ensure their concerns were addressed in the bill. Mr. Rogers turned to the question of how much money is currently collected from the surcharge. Currently, the Municipality of Anchorage receives almost \$900,000 a year [from the surcharge], which is a fraction of the cost of running the dispatch center or the cost to upgrade the system. Currently, a multi-million dollar upgrade to the E911 system is occurring in Anchorage.

The current surcharge helps offset a portion of that and thus it is hoped that the wireless surcharge will also help.

CO-CHAIR MEYER related his understanding that (E911) calls that come in to the dispatch center are automatically answered by the police department and then routed to the [appropriate] department.

MR. ROGERS answered that is the current situation, although there are efforts to consolidate the dispatch centers. Currently, an upgrade is occurring in order to make that a more efficient system. In further response to Co-Chair Meyer, Mr. Rogers affirmed that a wireless surcharge would help with that.

CO-CHAIR MEYER inquired as to how much money is necessary for the [dispatch center].

MR. ROGERS related his belief that the operating budget for the dispatch center is well over \$2 million a year. Mr. Rogers shared Co-Chair Meyer's understanding that this is a priority and is important to other cities besides Anchorage. He pointed out that the committee packet should contain a letter of support from the Alaska Municipal League (AML) Public Works & Infrastructure Legislative Subcommittee.

Number 2726

REPRESENTATIVE MURKOWSKI recalled Mr. Rogers' earlier testimony that this legislation was intended to mirror what is already in statute for wirelines and apply it to wireless. From the sponsor statement, Representative Murkowski understood that the reason to add the wireless calls is because of the current lack of automatic tracking with wireless calls. She suggested that there is a greater cost associated with a wireless call versus a wireline call. Therefore, she asked if there has been any discussion regarding having a surcharge for wireless calls that is greater than the surcharge for wireline calls.

MR. ROGERS answered that there was some discussion on that matter. However, it was thought to be more palatable to the industry and the legislature if the wireless surcharge was equal to that of the current wireline surcharge. He agreed with Representative Murkowski that currently it is more labor-intensive to handle a wireless call than a wireline call. He reiterated earlier testimony regarding the fact that an incident will frequently bring in multiple [wireless] calls, which clogs the system.

REPRESENTATIVE MURKOWSKI asked if the Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA) is involved in setting the surcharge or ensuring that the surcharge is reasonable.

MR. ROGERS replied no and noted that this is exempt from RCA.

REPRESENTATIVE MURKOWSKI remarked that it would seem reasonable for wireless calls, if wireless calls are a greater source of the problem, to [pay a greater portion]. However, she appreciated the politics of the situation and recognized that perhaps this is a compromise.

CO-CHAIR MEYER recalled his days on the Anchorage Assembly and the telephone wars, during which it was difficult to get all the telephone companies to agree. However, the carriers don't have a problem with this. Co-Chair Meyer then asked whether GCI has been contacted.

MR. ROGERS said that he has spoken with GCI, who is supposed to send a letter [to the committee].

REPRESENTATIVE GUESS restated Representative Murkowski's question regarding allowing the flexibility to have a higher surcharge.

MR. ROGERS restated his earlier answer that those discussions have occurred, but it was felt best politically to maintain [the current surcharge].

Number 2909

GINA WEYMILLER, Supervisor, Wheeler University Dispatcher Center, testified via teleconference. Ms. Weymiller remarked that one of the tangible benefits of the wireless surcharge would be the resource allocation. Currently, when cellular calls come in and the individual doesn't know their location, then resources are sent out to search for these locations. She said that she is speaking strictly from the fire and EMS perspective, although she imagined there to be the same case with the police. She pointed out that all the money collected from the current surcharge is going towards equipment with no cost recovery for training. Therefore, with wireline calls, the technology affords the location of the caller, but there are not adequate [resources] ...

TAPE 01-15, SIDE B

MS. WEYMILLER continued, "[to increase funding] coming in to the PSAPs." She informed the committee that [Fairbanks] is also looking at a consolidated dispatch center, which would bring all the resources together and thus the standard of training could be brought up to a higher level. In the Wheeler University Dispatch Center the volume of cellular calls is about 14 percent. In conclusion, Ms. Weymiller remarked that HB 186 is overdue.

Number 2889

MARK JOHNSON, Chief, Community Health & Emergency Medical Services, Division of Public Health, Department of Health & Social Services, testified in support of HB 186. He agreed that receiving [wireless] calls from people who don't know their location is a growing problem. He pointed out that delays in emergency situations can be life-threatening. Although he said that he was pleased to see the section dealing with the extraterritorial jurisdiction, Mr. Johnson mentioned that there is a continuing problem in not having enhanced [911] service in some of the rural areas in the state. From discussions with various people, Mr. Johnson does believe there to be an issue regarding the volumes of phones and the cost of putting in the equipment, which he believes to be one of the justifications of a \$.75 surcharge for smaller communities. In regard to the future, Mr. Johnson encouraged someone to develop a solution for the rural areas outside the municipalities. However, for now this is a good piece of legislation that [DHSS] supports.

CO CHAIR MEYER inquired as to how the rural areas could be helped.

MR. JOHNSON answered that Senator Pearce, the sponsor of the 1994 legislation, should be contacted in reference to the history of the [wireline surcharge]. However, Mr. Johnson related his belief that initial discussions involved the state collecting the fee, which was problematic [due to the inability to have] a dedicated fund. The legislation was then drafted so that the fee would be collected at the local level, which apparently solved the dedicated fund problem. Still, there are situations that occur outside of municipalities in which an individual doesn't know their location and that causes problems. Mr. Johnson said that for those areas the solution has to be completely different and thus, for now, HB 186 is appropriate.

CO-CHAIR MEYER asked Mr. Johnson to review the difference between the \$.50 and \$.75 [wireline] surcharge.

MR. JOHNSON related his understanding that there is a certain cost involved with obtaining the equipment to do this at the PSAP. In the smaller communities, there wouldn't be enough volume, which was the justification for having the higher \$.75 surcharge.

REPRESENTATIVE MURKOWSKI asked if anyone that the committee has heard from today is opposed to HB 186.

CO-CHAIR MEYER replied no.

Number 2662

JULIE KRAFFT, Alaska Municipal League, testified in support of HB 186. She noted AML's letter of support in the committee packet that, in part, said the following:

In 1994 the state adopted a bill, supported by the [Alaska] Municipal League, allowing municipalities to place a 50 cents to 75 cents per month surcharge on hard-wired telephones to help offset the costs for the critical life-saving services of the 911 emergency telephone system. With the dramatic increase in the use of cellular phones, especially for emergency calls, it is equitable and appropriate to extend the same charge to cellular phones.

CO-CHAIR MEYER asked if this is a priority of the Municipal League of Cities.

MS. KRAFFT said that although this issue hasn't made it to the top of the list, "we very much support this."

CO-CHAIR MEYER asked if there was anyone else who wished to testify. There being no one, the public testimony portion of HB 186 was closed. He noted that he had received a request to offer an amendment that would establish the wireless surcharge at \$.50 regardless of the size of the location.

Number 2536

CO-CHAIR MEYER moved that the committee adopt the following amendment:

Page 2, lines 7 - 13:

Delete "For a municipality with a population of 100,000 or more, an enhanced 911 [THE] surcharge may not exceed 50 cents per month for each wireless telephone number or 50 cents per month for each [PER] local exchange access line for wireline telephones. For a municipality with fewer than 100,000 people, an enhanced 911 [THE] surcharge may not exceed 75 cents per month for each wireless telephone number or 75 cents per month for each [PER] local exchange access line for wireline telephones."

Insert "For a municipality with a population of 100,000 or more, an enhanced 911 [THE] surcharge may not exceed 50 cents per month per local exchange access line for wireline telephones. For a municipality with fewer than 100,000 people, an enhanced 911 [THE] surcharge may not exceed 75 cents per month per local exchange access line for wireline telephones. An enhanced 911 surcharge may not exceed 50 cents per month for each wireless telephone number."

REPRESENTATIVE SCALZI objected because there is the need to be flexible in the face of not knowing the costs for the wireless services, which seem to cost more per today's testimony.

CO-CHAIR MEYER noted his agreement with Representative Scalzi.

REPRESENTATIVE MURKOWSKI related her understanding that under the amendment an area could have a \$.75 landline surcharge and a \$.50 wireless surcharge. Therefore, she inquired as to the rationale behind that.

CO-CHAIR MEYER mentioned the letter from AT&T, which seemed to relate that it would be easier to collect a flat fee throughout the entire state.

REPRESENTATIVE MURKOWSKI said she understood, but noted [AT&T's] "incredibly impressive billing techniques."

Number 2398

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Murkowski, Kerttula, Scalzi, and Meyer voted against the amendment. Therefore, the amendment failed to be adopted by a vote of 0-4.

CO-CHAIR MEYER explained that there is a zero fiscal note with the understanding that there could be a cost to the state if the local municipalities decide to enact an ordinance. This legislation is merely an enabling statute.

Number 2364

REPRESENTATIVE SCALZI moved to report HB 186 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying zero fiscal note. There being no objection, HB 186 was reported from the House Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 9:12 a.m.