

**Table 4.1c**  
**Schools and Libraries Funding Commitments by State and by Type of Applicant**  
**Funding Period: July 1, 2000 Through June 30, 2001**  
**Funds Committed Through February 24, 2001**

State or Jurisdiction	Library/Library Consortium		Schools		School Districts		Other Consortium		Totals	
	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments
Alabama	\$563,229	210	\$1,398,053	454	\$15,956,261	768	\$559,052	29	\$18,476,596	1,461
Alaska	109,030	77	74,992	9	11,307,354	356	471,761	13	11,963,137	455
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,070,977	8	2,070,977	8
Arizona	403,024	173	5,620,353	347	38,572,168	904	222,894	34	44,818,439	1,458
Arkansas	58,973	106	227,104	67	11,696,396	757	5,080,042	31	17,062,515	961
California	3,041,140	296	15,298,821	1,042	450,657,408	3,674	1,890,992	55	470,888,361	5,067
Colorado	670,246	263	388,711	94	8,846,403	926	4,234,167	183	14,139,526	1,466
Connecticut	277,277	87	3,230,968	250	12,528,383	362	7,692,761	108	23,729,388	807
Delaware	54,303	27	112,630	61	661,774	59	567,036	2	1,395,743	149
Dist. of Columbia	57,190	2	504,491	76	1,934,537	4	6,894,071	97	9,390,289	179
Florida	3,006,447	296	1,563,029	341	41,759,069	1,098	7,103,909	28	53,432,453	1,763
Georgia	5,297,444	112	189,338	74	41,686,244	926	809,340	5	47,982,366	1,117
Guam	62,242	4	26,308	16	763,408	11	0	0	851,958	31
Hawaii	115,716	99	1,709,921	691	751,234	11	0	0	2,576,871	801
Idaho	88,460	63	153,056	23	2,351,018	344	57,390	29	2,649,923	459
Illinois	1,823,689	732	5,882,576	956	106,186,617	2,119	278,175	156	114,171,057	3,963
Indiana	778,177	332	901,548	132	8,457,360	764	9,201,550	986	19,338,634	2,214
Iowa	258,068	497	304,883	187	4,550,854	1,208	153,423	197	5,267,227	2,089
Kansas	352,706	258	541,993	118	6,543,165	1,127	261,301	32	7,699,165	1,535
Kentucky	839,475	266	117,686	102	23,218,784	1,066	1,960,831	33	26,136,776	1,467
Louisiana	1,295,179	118	1,131,493	537	23,038,486	897	0	0	25,465,157	1,552
Maine	84,981	50	695,060	147	2,602,235	358	62,880	8	3,445,156	563
Maryland	1,012,397	112	1,256,899	193	14,087,331	250	2,460,827	2	18,817,454	557
Massachusetts	2,756,553	74	1,923,428	451	29,442,591	636	1,337,472	57	35,460,045	1,218
Michigan	1,486,086	450	1,671,500	450	45,509,867	1,906	3,856,076	231	52,523,528	3,037
Minnesota	202,200	109	504,908	204	9,067,342	1,016	7,543,499	297	17,317,950	1,626
Mississippi	965,976	321	840,276	177	22,342,840	1,573	5,869,646	20	30,018,738	2,091
Missouri	577,998	114	772,759	315	57,628,626	986	13,248,712	2,158	72,228,095	3,573
Montana	134,605	186	133,650	118	2,815,098	749	26,549	22	3,109,902	1,075
Nebraska	205,110	233	279,651	304	4,196,618	880	1,393,587	172	6,074,966	1,589
Nevada	64,141	41	0	0	3,976,612	112	0	0	4,040,753	153
New Hampshire	60,139	58	294,792	106	868,034	192	18,441	1	1,241,405	357
New Jersey	1,054,440	219	4,859,252	859	35,911,906	1,194	169,455	34	41,995,053	2,306
New Mexico	418,891	61	1,973,795	139	16,103,810	544	166,056	2	18,662,553	746
New York	15,408,163	1,130	33,476,214	3,460	195,758,340	2,784	22,881,939	476	267,524,655	7,850
North Carolina	1,774,582	273	2,235,851	213	20,783,896	1,018	2,586,698	57	27,381,027	1,561
North Dakota	14,517	21	379,455	171	860,604	322	457,303	30	1,711,879	544
Northern Marianas	0	0	0	0	498,872	9	0	0	498,872	9
Ohio	1,460,678	131	593,610	272	49,705,120	1,531	8,565,981	1,419	60,325,389	3,353
Oklahoma	761,321	416	1,146,318	196	21,116,527	2,428	1,413,648	216	24,437,815	3,256
Oregon	479,876	196	624,631	117	7,969,108	918	1,397,409	264	10,471,023	1,495
Pennsylvania	1,433,575	616	3,760,115	1,092	44,159,520	1,840	2,631,610	150	51,984,820	3,698
Puerto Rico	4,459,052	228	6,642,878	374	55,605,088	5	10,049,347	2	76,756,365	609
Rhode Island	71,394	28	152,834	62	1,446,931	179	2,616,667	11	4,287,827	280
South Carolina	113,028	60	1,245,639	68	38,220,368	727	11,423,125	13	51,002,160	868
South Dakota	10,568	24	175,756	51	1,008,182	278	597,565	18	1,792,072	371
Tennessee	1,217,487	439	405,733	64	33,336,021	799	11,533,120	20	46,492,360	1,322
Texas	5,623,944	599	1,932,634	310	133,068,207	4,622	12,429,537	197	153,054,323	5,728
Utah	173,481	51	48,108	45	2,787,892	290	2,085,763	67	5,095,243	453
Vermont	76,331	80	725,873	357	712,927	136	149,642	54	1,664,773	627
Virgin Islands	79,100	3	652,760	39	0	0	0	0	731,860	42
Virginia	1,210,994	215	577,488	205	16,454,838	745	242,162	31	18,485,483	1,196
Washington	1,361,800	356	458,466	183	11,847,167	929	3,678,903	22	17,346,336	1,490
West Virginia	167,617	254	196,924	202	3,489,165	1,070	1,571,323	212	5,425,030	1,738
Wisconsin	1,372,582	221	4,750,814	302	14,022,958	1,290	5,122,056	66	25,268,410	1,879
Wyoming	58,434	82	284,610	12	602,136	37	181,177	71	1,126,356	202
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$65,504,052</b>	<b>11,469</b>	<b>\$115,050,638</b>	<b>16,835</b>	<b>\$1,709,473,700</b>	<b>49,734</b>	<b>\$187,277,846</b>	<b>8,426</b>	<b>\$2,077,306,236</b>	<b>86,464</b>

Source: USAC data. Rollups performed by the Industry Analysis Division, FCC.

**Table 4.2a**  
**Schools and Libraries Funding Commitments by State and by Type of Service**  
**Funding Period: January 1, 1998 Through June 30, 1999**  
**Funds Committed Through February 24, 2001\***

State or Jurisdiction	Internal Connections		Internet Access		Telecom. & Dedicated		Totals	
	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments
Alabama	\$35,952,617	816	\$2,076,042	138	\$8,601,794	796	\$46,630,453	1,750
Alaska	2,720,333	313	1,703,856	50	9,188,918	689	13,613,107	1,052
American Samoa	2,483,023	3	725,610	2	348,716	3	3,557,348	8
Arizona	22,274,884	880	5,156,470	105	8,210,174	648	35,641,528	1,633
Arkansas	5,445,285	364	3,562,785	32	4,400,434	512	13,408,504	908
California	146,400,071	2,951	4,396,389	302	57,414,604	2,599	208,211,064	5,852
Colorado	4,945,890	287	607,531	121	8,762,859	941	14,316,280	1,349
Connecticut	13,668,482	252	1,236,908	175	9,256,916	837	24,162,307	1,264
Delaware	13,806	5	41,977	4	963,452	115	1,019,235	124
District of Columbia	1,494,775	64	116,200	5	3,255,857	44	4,866,831	113
Florida	19,397,311	1,100	4,000,798	140	26,011,037	937	49,409,145	2,177
Georgia	42,456,188	1,397	7,615,894	549	17,637,504	838	67,709,586	2,784
Hawaii	4,270,409	615	673,587	18	947,561	344	5,891,557	977
Idaho	2,025,957	267	303,948	97	2,291,035	332	4,620,940	693
Illinois	46,846,818	1,049	3,680,511	444	30,499,137	3,006	81,026,467	4,532
Indiana	5,447,814	235	6,428,578	629	10,031,897	1,196	21,908,289	2,060
Iowa	1,807,760	274	1,080,869	424	4,420,837	1,321	7,309,466	2,019
Kansas	1,817,738	265	1,300,786	242	7,332,009	832	10,450,532	1,339
Kentucky	33,892,470	1,094	1,357,485	71	15,016,030	946	50,265,985	2,111
Louisiana	27,820,481	1,312	3,242,779	286	9,098,566	1,229	40,161,826	2,827
Maine	1,182,159	140	128,069	19	1,704,331	349	3,014,559	508
Maryland	2,808,617	81	897,313	70	11,320,671	427	15,026,602	578
Massachusetts	15,008,069	771	2,272,033	254	12,809,518	1,146	30,089,620	2,171
Michigan	27,764,667	1,200	3,176,092	437	27,541,916	2,285	58,482,676	3,922
Minnesota	8,510,521	266	1,038,057	141	15,116,453	1,204	24,665,031	1,611
Mississippi	11,957,733	1,391	2,674,834	249	9,746,874	919	24,379,441	2,559
Missouri	6,736,279	355	5,090,548	847	13,314,390	1,121	25,141,217	2,323
Montana	1,063,641	136	461,573	193	2,148,838	553	3,674,052	882
Nebraska	256,398	78	451,304	187	4,226,892	1,054	4,934,595	1,319
Nevada	1,525,148	21	44,740	11	3,810,920	128	5,380,808	160
New Hampshire	301,136	44	135,616	39	1,183,159	343	1,619,911	426
New Jersey	42,680,348	338	1,861,580	259	18,179,319	1,246	62,721,247	1,843
New Mexico	12,070,923	308	1,167,432	83	6,070,542	222	19,308,898	613
New York	76,503,137	4,238	12,503,589	615	81,159,763	5,938	170,166,489	10,791
North Carolina	10,739,803	939	2,278,292	160	13,900,885	1,551	26,918,980	2,650
North Dakota	918,891	224	162,153	67	1,502,598	446	2,583,641	737
Ohio	31,757,642	839	5,929,252	1,315	19,761,118	1,930	57,448,012	4,084
Oklahoma	20,967,679	1,191	3,777,386	336	8,868,624	1,092	33,613,689	2,619
Oregon	2,327,267	288	581,825	103	6,694,371	561	9,603,463	952
Pennsylvania	29,458,843	1,493	1,912,668	345	20,652,449	2,308	52,023,961	4,146
Puerto Rico	12,177,166	22	191,778	3	35,277,911	23	47,646,855	48
Rhode Island	3,966,163	201	432,647	26	1,611,588	154	6,010,398	381
South Carolina	13,366,701	536	492,119	18	12,502,025	341	26,360,845	895
South Dakota	1,038,062	251	476,469	165	1,444,087	396	2,958,618	812
Tennessee	11,593,160	1,119	24,328,240	42	14,667,478	882	50,588,878	2,043
Texas	84,455,651	2,268	3,796,954	386	41,492,667	1,958	129,745,272	4,612
Utah	605,617	16	1,491,637	52	4,288,847	384	6,386,100	452
Vermont	386,897	146	161,172	38	1,525,260	358	2,073,329	542
Virgin Islands	1,296,674	6	80,960	1	802,810	10	2,180,444	17
Virginia	6,910,321	270	2,063,067	190	16,601,731	854	25,575,119	1,314
Washington	12,103,302	593	1,227,510	162	15,069,876	1,225	28,400,688	1,980
West Virginia	3,689,346	796	2,207,453	1,102	3,453,888	2,091	9,350,687	3,989
Wisconsin	23,551,174	547	1,433,232	384	13,233,728	1,350	38,218,134	2,281
Wyoming	443,162	28	56,788	12	721,314	171	1,221,264	211
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$901,304,409</b>	<b>34,683</b>	<b>\$134,293,384</b>	<b>12,175</b>	<b>\$676,096,178</b>	<b>53,185</b>	<b>\$1,711,693,972</b>	<b>100,043</b>

\* Because of the appeals process, funding commitments have been made after the program year ended on June 30, 1999.

Source: USAC data. Rollups performed by the Industry Analysis Division, FCC.

**Table 4.2b**  
**Schools and Libraries Funding Commitments by State and by Type of Service**  
**Funding Period: July 1, 1999 Through June 30, 2000**  
**Funds Committed Through February 24, 2001\***

State or Jurisdiction	Internal Connections		Internet Access		Telecom. & Dedicated		Totals	
	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments
Alabama	\$16,458,562	696	\$3,272,547	216	\$6,476,305	730	\$26,207,413	1,642
Alaska	3,450,841	211	621,959	57	7,499,734	356	11,572,535	624
American Samoa	1,179,617	2	1,046,886	2	477,318	1	2,703,821	5
Arizona	30,888,694	775	1,233,584	168	6,026,777	657	38,149,055	1,600
Arkansas	3,298,168	260	2,579,882	34	4,437,482	644	10,315,531	938
California	177,529,778	4,028	8,413,523	459	49,520,150	2,298	235,463,452	6,785
Colorado	3,820,026	280	658,597	185	7,873,912	972	12,352,535	1,437
Connecticut	24,219,918	370	1,590,919	146	6,298,082	617	32,108,919	1,133
Delaware	33,192	14	35,155	8	1,303,015	157	1,371,361	179
District of Columbia	4,990,872	88	449,666	60	3,987,419	360	9,427,956	508
Florida	40,661,640	2,267	4,954,982	161	28,085,059	1,184	73,701,681	3,612
Georgia	66,763,537	1,302	4,631,124	162	19,651,987	652	91,046,648	2,116
Hawaii	3,502,481	621	281,952	16	1,542,166	623	5,326,598	1,260
Idaho	2,528,245	151	367,141	109	1,832,226	314	4,727,611	574
Illinois	132,720,646	1,668	3,571,923	505	25,070,170	2,581	161,362,739	4,754
Indiana	9,375,757	356	1,922,715	177	11,503,616	1,601	22,802,089	2,134
Iowa	3,659,353	586	910,413	421	3,380,352	1,249	7,950,118	2,256
Kansas	7,541,237	305	1,485,631	346	5,902,400	940	14,929,268	1,591
Kentucky	42,424,395	1,731	1,423,001	115	13,068,542	1,042	56,915,938	2,888
Louisiana	22,981,410	1,482	4,876,371	208	9,734,905	1,008	37,592,687	2,698
Maine	1,447,201	268	247,379	26	1,919,460	503	3,614,040	797
Maryland	10,477,378	209	827,698	84	10,743,738	347	22,048,815	640
Massachusetts	19,271,003	574	1,575,100	273	12,152,732	945	32,998,835	1,792
Michigan	51,093,826	1,895	5,491,306	495	22,285,146	2,108	78,870,278	4,498
Minnesota	14,413,890	628	1,380,954	196	13,601,737	1,237	29,396,581	2,061
Mississippi	16,660,744	1,276	2,027,063	217	11,910,503	962	30,598,310	2,455
Missouri	9,105,392	1,330	9,284,241	2,402	10,375,549	1,178	28,765,182	4,910
Montana	1,349,474	171	586,848	266	1,783,877	642	3,720,198	1,079
Nebraska	919,884	97	512,112	193	5,259,355	1,121	6,691,352	1,411
Nevada	117,670	5	87,282	14	2,932,278	95	3,137,231	114
New Hampshire	185,136	61	204,434	77	878,973	331	1,268,543	469
New Jersey	24,854,126	804	2,574,228	364	16,474,573	1,379	43,902,927	2,547
New Mexico	22,916,532	221	740,844	83	5,448,714	214	29,106,091	518
New York	104,860,594	2,878	15,486,192	799	72,256,892	5,499	192,603,678	9,176
North Carolina	18,499,774	725	3,711,385	298	14,466,076	1,011	36,677,235	2,034
North Dakota	657,866	239	216,656	83	1,311,431	444	2,185,954	766
Northern Marianas	0	0	9,757	1	85,643	15	95,401	16
Ohio	21,800,665	973	4,938,518	1,075	16,408,561	1,828	43,147,744	3,876
Oklahoma	20,376,022	999	3,596,435	425	9,953,398	1,963	33,925,855	3,387
Oregon	4,226,385	415	592,420	105	6,106,533	664	10,925,337	1,184
Pennsylvania	34,306,167	754	3,501,410	556	18,463,096	2,416	56,270,673	3,726
Puerto Rico	42,178,990	155	8,248,795	113	16,851,991	204	67,279,777	472
Rhode Island	4,004,239	184	401,588	37	3,418,082	201	7,823,910	422
South Carolina	16,625,160	878	229,899	17	11,801,061	312	28,656,120	1,207
South Dakota	586,268	175	519,169	163	1,008,608	333	2,114,045	671
Tennessee	31,132,713	2,786	18,395,529	282	13,236,277	597	62,764,519	3,665
Texas	88,424,026	2,656	5,364,396	654	41,147,783	2,330	134,936,206	5,640
Utah	428,430	53	2,028,688	91	3,271,463	309	5,728,582	453
Vermont	199,444	81	280,625	99	1,108,464	454	1,588,533	634
Virgin Islands	2,044,407	11	220,321	7	82,789	9	2,347,516	27
Virginia	10,109,017	460	1,832,619	194	13,235,293	704	25,176,929	1,358
Washington	19,717,373	1,110	543,581	110	12,505,611	1,067	32,766,565	2,287
West Virginia	4,540,641	2,023	2,294,972	1,095	2,524,791	1,905	9,360,404	5,023
Wisconsin	10,092,504	467	2,985,766	378	12,983,446	1,111	26,061,716	1,956
Wyoming	2,941,437	126	180,353	75	1,846,414	275	4,968,205	476
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,208,592,749</b>	<b>42,880</b>	<b>\$145,446,537</b>	<b>14,902</b>	<b>\$603,511,956</b>	<b>52,699</b>	<b>\$1,957,551,242</b>	<b>110,481</b>

\* Because of the appeals process, funding commitments have been made after the program year ended on June 30, 1999.

Source: USAC data. Rollups performed by the Industry Analysis Division, FCC.

**Table 4.2c**  
**Schools and Libraries Funding Commitments by State and by Type of Service**  
**Funding Period: July 1, 2000 Through June 30, 2001**  
**Funds Committed Through February 24, 2001**

State or Jurisdiction	Internal Connections		Internet Access		Telecom. & Dedicated		Totals	
	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments	Funds Committed	Funding Commitments
Alabama	\$5,120,708	118	\$4,644,074	201	\$8,711,814	1,142	\$18,476,596	1,461
Alaska	1,586,467	37	6,134,702	160	4,241,968	258	11,963,137	455
American Samoa	554,452	2	1,073,639	3	442,886	3	2,070,977	8
Arizona	32,458,874	384	2,342,481	251	10,017,084	823	44,818,439	1,458
Arkansas	7,928,224	99	4,214,521	42	4,919,771	820	17,062,515	961
California	401,185,384	1,512	7,254,845	651	62,448,132	2,904	470,888,361	5,067
Colorado	2,025,780	102	934,802	237	11,178,944	1,127	14,139,526	1,466
Connecticut	14,817,039	131	2,474,611	190	6,437,739	486	23,729,388	807
Delaware	9,285	1	70,074	14	1,316,385	134	1,395,743	149
District of Columbia	6,865,463	97	250,525	25	2,274,301	57	9,390,289	179
Florida	9,685,058	516	8,388,631	191	35,358,764	1,056	53,432,453	1,763
Georgia	16,224,979	389	7,090,989	113	24,666,398	615	47,982,366	1,117
Guam	112,774	1	234,786	2	504,398	28	851,958	31
Hawaii	341,147	71	325,064	20	1,910,660	710	2,576,871	801
Idaho	137,548	13	474,238	126	2,038,137	320	2,649,923	459
Illinois	87,293,621	229	2,929,819	715	23,947,618	3,019	114,171,057	3,963
Indiana	1,675,182	49	10,558,985	1,063	7,104,467	1,102	19,338,634	2,214
Iowa	222,882	40	1,466,174	566	3,578,171	1,483	5,267,227	2,089
Kansas	406,105	15	1,929,596	438	5,363,464	1,082	7,699,165	1,535
Kentucky	9,962,615	307	1,395,589	131	14,778,572	1,029	26,136,776	1,467
Louisiana	8,789,027	336	5,117,366	196	11,558,764	1,020	25,465,157	1,552
Maine	274,386	10	211,056	18	2,959,714	535	3,445,156	563
Maryland	7,640,148	96	1,328,618	105	9,848,689	356	18,817,454	557
Massachusetts	20,539,772	54	1,598,195	302	13,322,078	862	35,460,045	1,218
Michigan	20,412,190	129	5,074,619	537	27,036,719	2,371	52,523,528	3,037
Minnesota	737,942	48	2,312,172	201	14,267,836	1,377	17,317,950	1,626
Mississippi	10,447,371	791	2,047,819	88	17,523,549	1,212	30,018,738	2,091
Missouri	49,635,455	103	5,244,530	458	17,348,110	3,012	72,228,095	3,573
Montana	404,429	54	780,590	297	1,924,883	724	3,109,902	1,075
Nebraska	99,496	6	856,829	347	5,118,641	1,236	6,074,966	1,589
Nevada	595,860	53	29,799	12	3,415,094	88	4,040,753	153
New Hampshire	28,135	4	344,811	97	868,458	256	1,241,405	357
New Jersey	19,514,093	275	2,822,898	511	19,658,062	1,520	41,995,053	2,306
New Mexico	10,858,466	213	1,656,463	152	6,147,623	381	18,662,553	746
New York	167,593,632	976	13,057,128	1,344	86,873,895	5,530	267,524,655	7,850
North Carolina	8,108,979	193	5,800,340	412	13,471,707	956	27,381,027	1,561
North Dakota	98,403	11	368,211	143	1,245,265	390	1,711,879	544
Northern Marianas	0	0	328,659	4	170,213	5	498,872	9
Ohio	33,358,994	96	8,591,364	1,464	18,375,031	1,793	60,325,389	3,353
Oklahoma	8,647,284	372	4,532,158	779	11,258,372	2,105	24,437,815	3,256
Oregon	806,591	45	1,418,615	153	8,245,817	1,297	10,471,023	1,495
Pennsylvania	22,425,633	153	5,825,516	849	23,733,672	2,696	51,984,820	3,698
Puerto Rico	48,083,879	147	28,206,579	202	465,908	260	76,756,365	609
Rhode Island	882,136	81	702,500	101	2,703,191	98	4,287,827	280
South Carolina	31,869,770	447	1,302,912	26	17,829,477	395	51,002,160	868
South Dakota	165,960	36	324,062	55	1,302,051	280	1,792,072	371
Tennessee	18,152,471	459	14,266,837	231	14,073,051	632	46,492,360	1,322
Texas	91,178,435	1,310	11,097,940	1,053	50,777,948	3,365	153,054,323	5,728
Utah	342,829	10	1,440,918	107	3,311,496	336	5,095,243	453
Vermont	3,889	4	546,986	193	1,113,898	430	1,664,773	627
Arkansas	7,928,224	99	4,214,521	42	4,919,771	820	17,062,515	961
Virginia	1,219,027	22	2,668,579	239	14,597,877	935	18,485,483	1,196
Washington	3,763,777	179	1,038,807	109	12,543,752	1,202	17,346,336	1,490
West Virginia	1,484,645	251	378,976	117	3,561,408	1,370	5,425,030	1,738
Wisconsin	7,554,135	80	3,172,461	462	14,541,814	1,337	25,268,410	1,879
Wyoming	564,894	7	133,142	81	428,320	114	1,126,356	202
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,202,823,945</b>	<b>11,263</b>	<b>\$203,031,119</b>	<b>16,626</b>	<b>\$687,781,828</b>	<b>59,494</b>	<b>\$2,093,636,892</b>	<b>87,383</b>

Source: USAC data. Rollups performed by the Industry Analysis Division, FCC.

**Table 4.3a**  
**Schools and Libraries Fund Cumulative Disbursements by Service Provider Type**  
**Fund Period: January 1, 1998 Through June 30, 1999**  
**Funds Disbursed Through December 31, 2000**

Service Provider Type	Billed to USAC Directly by the Service Provider	Billed to USAC Through Schools and Libraries	Total Payments
Cellular carriers	\$186,891	\$4,932,831	\$5,119,722
Competitive access providers	11,712,724	7,809,180	19,521,904
Interexchange carriers	11,495,774	34,800,513	46,296,287
Internet service providers	45,044,173	32,127,279	77,171,452
Local exchange carriers	50,950,147	445,901,467	496,851,614
Local resellers	4,156,748	3,174,271	7,331,019
Non telecommunications providers	471,904,970	211,627,342	683,532,312
Operator service providers	0	35,679	35,679
Other local carrier	13,746,706	8,668,844	22,415,550
Other mobile providers	10,996	1,158	12,154
Other toll providers	432,449	90,544	522,994
Paging providers	381,806	680,795	1,062,602
Payphone providers	21,333	105,564	126,896
Prepaid calling card providers	0	26,702	26,702
Private line carriers	14,778,825	8,730,560	23,509,386
Satellite carriers	7,546	961,520	969,066
Shared tenant providers	128,504	190,980	319,485
Specialized mobile radio providers	620,792	35,738	656,530
Toll resellers	3,005,384	4,177,632	7,183,016
Wireless data providers	494,364	1,252,557	1,746,920
Not specified	853,848	201,589	1,055,437
<b>Total all types</b>	<b>\$629,933,980</b>	<b>\$765,532,746</b>	<b>\$1,395,466,725</b>

Note: Because of the appeals process, funding disbursements have been made after the program year ended on June 30, 1999.

Source: Universal Service Administrative Company *Federal Universal Service Programs Fund Size Projections & Contributions Base for the Fourth Quarter 2000*. Appendix SL3.

**Table 4.3b**  
**Schools and Libraries Fund Cumulative Disbursements by Service Provider Type**  
**Fund Period: July 1, 1999 Through June 30, 2000**  
**Funds Disbursed Through December 31, 2000**

Service Provider Type	Billed to USAC Directly by the Service Provider	Billed to USAC Through Schools and Libraries	Total Payments
Cellular carriers	\$1,635,829	\$4,797,969	\$6,433,798
Competitive access providers	4,458,078	7,376,219	11,834,297
Interexchange carriers	14,094,632	26,723,543	40,818,175
Internet service providers	56,050,010	16,461,303	72,511,313
Local exchange carriers	131,780,014	312,645,704	444,425,717
Local resellers	2,953,828	1,849,363	4,803,191
Non telecommunications providers	601,080,189	132,848,723	733,928,913
Operator service providers	4,369	47,130	51,499
Other local carrier	35,756,215	3,834,979	39,591,194
Other toll provider	179,537	184,109	363,646
Paging provider	514,938	540,195	1,055,133
Payphone providers	950,062	15,935	965,997
Prepaid calling card providers	0	4,699	4,699
Private line carrier	16,125,526	3,752,599	19,878,126
Satellite carrier	600,755	356,397	957,152
Shared tenant provider	48,953	0	48,953
Specialized mobile radio provider	284,964	64,883	349,847
Toll resellers	4,802,672	2,559,528	7,362,201
Wireless data providers	788,716	429,434	1,218,150
Not specified	275,069	88,708	363,777
<b>Total all types</b>	<b>\$872,384,357</b>	<b>\$514,581,420</b>	<b>\$1,386,965,777</b>

Note: Because of the appeals process, funding disbursements have been made after the program year ended on June 30, 2000.

Source: Universal Service Administrative Company *Federal Universal Service Programs Fund Size Projections & Contributions Base for the Fourth Quarter 2000*. Appendix SL6.

**Table 4.3c**  
**Schools and Libraries Fund Cumulative Disbursements by Service Provider Type**  
**Fund Period: July1, 2000 Through June 30, 2001**  
**Funds Disbursed Through December 31, 2000**

Service Provider Type	Billed to USAC Directly by the Service Provider	Billed to USAC Through Schools and Libraries	Total Payments
Cellular carriers	\$928,751	\$113,113	\$1,041,864
Competitive access providers	1,455,016	324,220	1,779,236
Interexchange carriers	5,331,952	339,844	5,671,796
Internet service providers	17,939,521	605,939	18,545,460
Local exchange carriers	22,727,189	8,899,357	31,626,546
Local resellers	4,363,030	53,305	4,416,335
Non telecommunications providers	192,037,420	1,918,992	193,956,411
Other local carrier	3,253,268	526	3,253,794
Other toll provider	24,826	821	25,647
Paging provider	38,214	15,825	54,039
Private line carrier	3,792,870	3,047	3,795,917
Satelite carrier	0	97,457	97,457
Specialized mobile radio provider	0	7,488	7,488
Toll resellers	307,315	52,297	359,613
Wireless data providers	2,291,564	102,255	2,393,819
Not specified	0	84,800	84,800
<b>Total All Types</b>	<b>\$254,490,936</b>	<b>\$12,619,287</b>	<b>\$267,110,222</b>

Source: Universal Service Administrative Company *Federal Universal Service Programs Fund Size Projections & Contributions Base for the Fourth Quarter 2000*. Appendix SL9.

**Table 4.4a**  
**Net Revenues from Schools and Libraries Mechanism, by State (Thousands)**  
**Funding Period: July 1, 1998 Through June 30, 1999**  
**Funds Disbursed Through February 24, 2001<sup>1</sup>**

State or Jurisdiction	USAC Disbursements on Behalf of Schools and Libraries	Estimated Contributions Paid to USAC for Funding Disbursements	Estimated Contributions Paid to USAC for Administrative Costs	Estimated Contributions as a Percentage of Nationwide Total <sup>2</sup>	Net Revenues <sup>3</sup>
Alabama	\$40,810	\$18,798	\$444	1.3%	\$21,567
Alaska	8,760	3,443	81	0.2%	5,235
American Samoa	2,800	0	0	0.0%	2,800
Arizona	30,020	28,157	665	2.0%	1,197
Arkansas	10,540	11,536	273	0.8%	-1,269
California	166,300	129,413	3,059	9.3%	33,828
Colorado	11,490	28,345	670	2.0%	-17,525
Connecticut	21,490	22,352	528	1.6%	-1,390
Delaware	920	5,660	134	0.4%	-4,873
District of Columbia	4,620	8,029	190	0.6%	-3,599
Florida	41,430	94,624	2,236	6.8%	-55,430
Georgia	56,800	45,158	1,067	3.2%	10,575
Guam	0	419	10	0.0%	-429
Hawaii	5,170	5,378	127	0.4%	-335
Idaho	3,510	7,024	166	0.5%	-3,680
Illinois	63,830	61,682	1,458	4.4%	691
Indiana	16,260	25,583	605	1.8%	-9,928
Iowa	5,580	13,573	321	1.0%	-8,314
Kansas	7,880	14,037	332	1.0%	-6,489
Kentucky	38,220	17,458	413	1.3%	20,349
Louisiana	33,630	19,250	455	1.4%	13,925
Maine	2,250	6,249	148	0.4%	-4,146
Maryland	13,320	30,425	719	2.2%	-17,824
Massachusetts	24,960	37,458	885	2.7%	-13,384
Michigan	49,680	39,635	937	2.8%	9,108
Minnesota	20,270	25,043	592	1.8%	-5,365
Mississippi	19,220	11,780	278	0.8%	7,162
Missouri	20,640	26,944	637	1.9%	-6,941
Montana	2,800	5,227	124	0.4%	-2,551
Nebraska	4,200	8,714	206	0.6%	-4,720
Nevada	4,070	12,494	295	0.9%	-8,719
New Hampshire	1,270	8,913	211	0.6%	-7,854
New Jersey	53,440	57,397	1,357	4.1%	-5,313
New Mexico	12,660	9,334	221	0.7%	3,105
New York	139,160	99,313	2,347	7.1%	37,500
North Carolina	21,040	40,682	961	2.9%	-20,603
North Dakota	2,190	3,838	91	0.3%	-1,739
Northern Marianas	0	156	4	0.0%	-160
Ohio	50,030	47,573	1,124	3.4%	1,333
Oklahoma	27,890	15,237	360	1.1%	12,293
Oregon	7,560	18,058	427	1.3%	-10,925
Pennsylvania	45,340	57,487	1,359	4.1%	-13,506
Puerto Rico	22,060	8,044	190	0.6%	13,826
Rhode Island	5,840	6,140	145	0.4%	-445
South Carolina	23,000	19,994	473	1.4%	2,534
South Dakota	2,010	4,259	101	0.3%	-2,350
Tennessee	45,770	26,767	633	1.9%	18,370
Texas	114,830	87,323	2,064	6.3%	25,443
Utah	5,220	10,698	253	0.8%	-5,731
Vermont	1,300	3,915	93	0.3%	-2,708
Virgin Islands	2,120	808	19	0.1%	1,293
Virginia	21,270	41,581	983	3.0%	-21,293
Washington	22,470	31,105	735	2.2%	-9,370
West Virginia	5,520	7,838	185	0.6%	-2,504
Wisconsin	31,940	22,689	536	1.6%	8,714
Wyoming	850	3,250	77	0.2%	-2,477
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,396,250</b>	<b>\$1,396,290</b>	<b>\$33,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-\$33,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Because of the appeals process, funding commitments and disbursements have been made after the program year ended on June 30, 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Carriers make payments into the fund based on their end-user interstate telecommunications revenues. The numbers in this column are used to estimate, on a state-by-state basis, the amount of money paid into the fund for disbursements and administrative costs. The state's estimated share of nationwide end-user interstate revenue is based on data from Table 4 of *State-by-State Telephone Revenues and Universal Service Data* (FCC, CCB, Industry Analysis Division, April 2001).

<sup>3</sup> This column sums to a negative number because of administrative costs.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: USAC data. Rollups performed by the Industry Analysis Division, FCC.

**Table 4.4b**  
**Net Revenues from Schools and Libraries Mechanism, by State (Thousands)**  
**Funding Period: July 1, 1999 Through June 30, 2000**  
**Funds Disbursed Through February 24, 2001<sup>1</sup>**

State or Jurisdiction	USAC Disbursements on Behalf of Schools and Libraries	Estimated Contributions Paid to USAC for Funding Disbursements	Estimated Contributions Paid to USAC for Administrative Costs	Estimated Contributions as a Percentage of Nationwide Total <sup>2</sup>	Net Revenues <sup>3</sup>
Alabama	\$21,260	\$19,684	\$416	1.3%	\$1,159
Alaska	8,810	3,606	76	0.2%	5,128
American Samoa	2,360	0	0	0.0%	2,360
Arizona	30,700	29,485	624	2.0%	592
Arkansas	7,890	12,080	256	0.8%	-4,445
California	165,870	135,514	2,867	9.3%	27,490
Colorado	9,910	29,681	628	2.0%	-20,399
Connecticut	29,720	23,405	495	1.6%	5,820
Delaware	1,220	5,926	125	0.4%	-4,832
District of Columbia	2,000	8,408	178	0.6%	-6,586
Florida	51,960	99,084	2,096	6.8%	-49,220
Georgia	53,750	47,286	1,000	3.2%	5,464
Guam	0	439	9	0.0%	-448
Hawaii	3,490	5,632	119	0.4%	-2,261
Idaho	3,550	7,355	156	0.5%	-3,961
Illinois	137,630	64,589	1,366	4.4%	71,674
Indiana	17,450	26,789	567	1.8%	-9,906
Iowa	5,370	14,213	301	1.0%	-9,143
Kansas	12,840	14,699	311	1.0%	-2,170
Kentucky	35,180	18,281	387	1.3%	16,512
Louisiana	33,070	20,158	426	1.4%	12,486
Maine	2,410	6,543	138	0.4%	-4,272
Maryland	16,800	31,859	674	2.2%	-15,733
Massachusetts	26,080	39,224	830	2.7%	-13,974
Michigan	63,100	41,504	878	2.8%	20,718
Minnesota	21,230	26,223	555	1.8%	-5,548
Mississippi	24,740	12,335	261	0.8%	12,144
Missouri	20,340	28,214	597	1.9%	-8,471
Montana	3,060	5,474	116	0.4%	-2,529
Nebraska	5,160	9,125	193	0.6%	-4,158
Nevada	2,080	13,083	277	0.9%	-11,280
New Hampshire	890	9,333	197	0.6%	-8,641
New Jersey	30,380	60,103	1,271	4.1%	-30,994
New Mexico	24,220	9,774	207	0.7%	14,239
New York	151,930	103,994	2,200	7.1%	45,736
North Carolina	28,470	42,600	901	2.9%	-15,031
North Dakota	1,640	4,019	85	0.3%	-2,464
Northern Marianas	40	163	3	0.0%	-127
Ohio	30,470	49,815	1,054	3.4%	-20,399
Oklahoma	26,600	15,955	338	1.1%	10,307
Oregon	6,950	18,909	400	1.3%	-12,359
Pennsylvania	44,720	60,197	1,273	4.1%	-16,751
Puerto Rico	37,450	8,424	178	0.6%	28,848
Rhode Island	5,460	6,429	136	0.4%	-1,105
South Carolina	24,380	20,936	443	1.4%	3,001
South Dakota	1,200	4,460	94	0.3%	-3,355
Tennessee	43,270	28,029	593	1.9%	14,648
Texas	107,040	91,440	1,934	6.3%	13,666
Utah	4,580	11,202	237	0.8%	-6,859
Vermont	990	4,100	87	0.3%	-3,197
Virgin Islands	1,920	846	18	0.1%	1,056
Virginia	19,430	43,541	921	3.0%	-25,032
Washington	22,060	32,571	689	2.2%	-11,200
West Virginia	4,810	8,208	174	0.6%	-3,572
Wisconsin	21,260	23,759	503	1.6%	-3,002
Wyoming	2,920	3,403	72	0.2%	-555
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,462,110</b>	<b>\$1,462,110</b>	<b>\$30,930</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-\$30,930</b>

<sup>1</sup> Because of the appeals process, funding commitments and disbursements have been made after the program year ended on June 30, 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Carriers make payments into the fund based on their end-user interstate telecommunications revenues. The numbers in this column are used to estimate, on a state-by-state basis, the amount of money paid into the fund for disbursements and administrative costs. The state's estimated share of nationwide end-user interstate revenue is based on data from Table 4 of *State-by-State Telephone Revenues and Universal Service Data* (FCC, CCB, Industry Analysis Division, April 2001).

<sup>3</sup> This column sums to a negative number because of administrative costs.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: USAC data. Rollups performed by the Industry Analysis Division, FCC.



## 5. Rural Health Care Support

The portion of the 1996 Telecommunications Act that covers Universal Service support for rural health care providers states that “[a] telecommunications carriers shall ... provide telecommunications services ... to any public or non-profit health care provider ... at rates that are reasonably comparable to rates charged for similar services in urban areas in that state”.<sup>1</sup> The Commission's Universal Service rules permit eligible<sup>2</sup> health care providers to receive support for any telecommunications service.<sup>3</sup> The length of a supported telecommunications service may not exceed the distance between the rural health care provider and the nearest large city.<sup>4</sup> The Commission defined "nearest large city" as the city located in the eligible health care provider's state with a population of at least 50,000 that is nearest to the health provider's location.<sup>5</sup> In addition, an eligible health care provider that cannot obtain toll-free Internet access is entitled to receive the lesser of \$180 per month in toll charge credits per month, or the toll charges incurred for 30 hours per month, for telecommunications access to an Internet service provider.<sup>6</sup>

In 1999, the FCC adopted two orders that significantly changed the Universal Service support program for rural health care providers. The Fifteenth Order on Reconsideration is mostly applicable to Funding Year 3 and future funding periods.<sup>7</sup> This order 1) removed the per-location funding limit; 2) ended the 1.544 Mbs of bandwidth restriction and authorized support for any commercially available telecommunications service regardless of bandwidth; 3) simplified the application process by allowing discounts to be based on actual long distance charges instead of basing them on a comparison of tariffed rates in urban and rural areas; and 4) affirmed the ability of rural health care providers to join consortia and allowed new members to be added to a consortium at any time after the rural health care provider applies for support. The Fourteenth Order on

---

1 Section 254 (h)

2 47 C.F.R. § 54.601.

3 A 1.544 Mbps (T1) maximum bandwidth cap was employed in funding years 1 and 2. *See Report and Order, CC Docket 96-45*. Adopted May 7, 1997. The Commission removed the bandwidth cap for year three and beyond. *See Fifteenth Order on Reconsideration CC-96-45*. Adopted September 30, 1999.

4 47 C.F.R. § 54.601(c).

5 47 C.F.R. § 54.605(c).

6 47 C.F.R. § 54.621.

7 *Fifteenth Order on Reconsideration* in CC Docket 96-45 adopted September 30, 1999 and released November 1, 1999.

Reconsideration eliminated the requirement that rural health care providers receive services from eligible telecommunications carriers.<sup>8</sup>

To apply for funding, an eligible rural health care provider must first submit FCC Form 465 (description of services requested and certification form) to the Rural Health Care Division (RHCD).<sup>9</sup> The if the RHCD determines the health care provider is eligible, it posts the Form 465 on its Web site.<sup>10</sup> After 28 days from posting, the rural health care provider may contract with the most cost-effective bidder. The service provider then fills out FCC Form 468 (verification of services to be provided), and submits it to the rural health care provider. The rural health care provider must then complete FCC Form 466 (services ordered and certification form). The rural health care provider must then submit both FCC forms to RHCD.

Upon receipt and approval of FCC Forms 466 and 468, the RHCD sends a Funding Commitment letter to the rural health care provider that notifies it of the preliminary approval of the request for support, and provides an estimate of the amount of support that can be expected. The rural health care provider must respond by submitting FCC Form 467 (receipt of service confirmation form) to verify that the service has begun. RHCD then sends a Support Schedule to the carrier and the health care provider. The carrier provides support to the rural health care provider, then invoices RHCD for the support, and upon approval, RHCD instructs USAC to reimburse the carrier.

Initially, the Commission established a \$400 million per funding year cap for the rural health care mechanism.<sup>11</sup> The Commission later determined that USAC could collect no more than \$100 million for the first funding period. For the second funding period, the Commission established a \$12 million funding cap.<sup>12</sup> The third and future funding periods continue to be governed by the \$400 million funding cap that the Commission initially established. For more information on the Universal Service Program for Rural Health Care providers, visit the RHCD Website.<sup>13</sup>

---

8 *Fourteenth Order on Reconsideration* in CC Docket 96-45 adopted September 21, 1999 and released November 3, 1999.

9 The Rural Health Care Corporation merged into the Universal Service Administrative and became the Rural Health Care Division on January 1, 1999. *See Eighth Order on Reconsideration*, adopted November 19, 1998, para. 12.

10 The forms may be viewed at <[www.rhc.universalservice.org](http://www.rhc.universalservice.org)>.

11 47 C.F.R. § 54.623(a).

12 *Twelfth Order on Reconsideration* in CC Docket 96-45, adopted May 27, 1999, released May 28, 1999.

13 [www.rhc.universalservice.org](http://www.rhc.universalservice.org)

The first funding period was from January 1, 1998 through June 30, 1999.<sup>14</sup> In December, 1998, the funding year for Rural Health Care was changed from a calendar year cycle (January 1 - December 31) to a fiscal year cycle (July 1 - June 30).<sup>15</sup> USAC reported that all activity for the first funding year has been completed. USAC committed \$3.398 million and disbursed \$3.375 million, or all but about \$22,800 of the funds set aside for those providers.<sup>16</sup>

The second funding period ran from July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000.<sup>17</sup> USAC reports that as of December 31, 2000, it received 1,234 FCC Forms 465, and that as of that date, it had committed \$6.784 million. After it has finished all processing all requests, USAC expects to have committed a total of \$7.105 million. Not all of the rural health care providers will use their entire commitments, however. USAC estimates that \$2.779 million of the \$7.105 million will not be used, so disbursements for the second funding year should not exceed \$4.326 million.<sup>18</sup> As of December 31, 2000, USAC had disbursed \$2.081 million.<sup>19</sup>

The third funding period began on July 1, 2000, and runs through June 30, 2001.<sup>20</sup> The filing window for FCC Forms 465 opened on March 30, 2000, and closed on June 13, 2000. Because the requests filed within the filing window total an amount that is less than the funding cap set by the Commission, USAC continued to receive and process requests for support for year 3 after the window closed. As of December 31, 2000, 1,125 FCC Forms 465 had been received. USAC

---

14 [www.rhc.universalservice.org](http://www.rhc.universalservice.org)

15 *Ninth Order on Reconsideration*, 14 FCC Rcd 377 (1998), paras. 1 and 6.

16 Universal Service Administrative Company *Federal Universal Service Programs Fund size Projections & Contributions Base for the Third Quarter 2000*. Page 23. See also, Universal Service Administrative Company *Federal Universal Service Programs Fund size Projections & Contributions Base for the Third Quarter 2000*, Appendix 12C and 12D.

17 [www.rhc.universalservice.org](http://www.rhc.universalservice.org)

18 Universal Service Administrative Company *Federal Universal Service Programs Fund size Projections & Contributions Base for the Second Quarter 2001*. Pages 21-22. USAC reports that as of December 31, 2000, of the 1,243 Forms 465 that had been filed, 1,097 have been posted, 20 are incomplete, 25 have been denied due to ineligibility, and 92 have been withdrawn.

19 See Table 5.2b.

20 [www.rhc.universalservice.org](http://www.rhc.universalservice.org)

estimates that program demand will be \$10.56 million for year 3<sup>21</sup>. As of December 31, 2000, one commitment had been made for \$14,325.<sup>22</sup>

USAC provides information on funding commitments and all funding authorizations made during each of the funding periods.<sup>23</sup> These files are available at the **FCC-State Link** web site.<sup>24</sup> Table 5.1a and 5.1b summarize funding commitments and authorizations on a state-by-state basis. Table 5.1a shows that in the first funding year, \$3.398 million was committed, and that \$3.375 million was disbursed. Table 5.1b shows that as of December 31, 2000, \$6.716 million has been committed, and that \$2.081 million had been authorized for disbursement.

Table 5.2 shows, for the first two funding periods, by state, the total amount of funding disbursements, the estimated contributions towards rural health care funding commitments, estimated contributions towards USAC's rural health care-related administrative expenses, and the net revenues the state receives.

---

21 Universal Service Administrative Company *Federal Universal Service Programs Fund size Projections & Contributions Base for the Second Quarter 2001*, pages 22-23.

22 Universal Service Administrative Company *Federal Universal Service Programs Fund size Projections & Contributions Base for the Second Quarter 2001*, Appendix RH4.

23 Funding authorizations are the penultimate step before payment is actually made.

24 Funding commitments and authorizations for disbursements the first two funding years are available in the file RHCDec2000.zip. The file is located under the "National Exchange Carrier Association Data" link at [www.fcc.gov/ccb/stats](http://www.fcc.gov/ccb/stats).

**Table 5.1a**  
**Rural Health Care Funding Commitments and Authorizations for Payment by State**  
**First Funding Period: January 1, 1998 Through July 1, 1999**  
**Program Year Finalized**

State or Jurisdiction	Total Funds Committed	Commitments to Providers	Total Funds Authorized for Payment	Authorizations for Providers
Alabama	\$9,199	1	\$9,199	1
Alaska	629,582	33	627,981	32
Arizona	302,740	34	302,740	34
Arkansas	13,354	8	13,354	8
California	9,982	4	9,982	4
Colorado	59,471	8	59,471	8
Connecticut	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0
Georgia	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	100,823	9	100,823	9
Idaho	21,645	5	21,625	5
Illinois	89,858	12	89,858	12
Indiana	0	0	0	0
Iowa	69,116	29	69,116	29
Kansas	91,974	20	91,974	20
Kentucky	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	0	0	0	0
Maine	1,150	1	0	0
Maryland	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	247	1	247	1
Michigan	208,000	27	208,000	27
Minnesota	276,854	46	276,666	46
Mississippi	45,050	9	44,185	8
Missouri	60,959	8	60,120	8
Montana	246,626	31	246,626	31
Nebraska	79,848	11	75,644	8
Nevada	58,236	6	58,236	6
New Hampshire	13,558	6	13,558	6
New Jersey	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	122,723	25	121,976	24
New York	124,386	12	124,181	12
North Carolina	29,679	6	29,679	6
North Dakota	317,292	29	311,250	29
Ohio	38,389	10	38,389	10
Oklahoma	20,537	3	20,537	3
Oregon	13,219	4	13,219	4
Pennsylvania	49,104	2	49,104	2
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	13,199	1	13,199	1
South Dakota	75,517	17	75,517	17
Tennessee	9,991	3	9,991	3
Texas	15,749	15	15,749	15
Utah	29,535	1	29,535	1
Vermont	4,613	3	4,613	3
Virgin Islands	7,987	2	2,971	1
Virginia	44,902	4	44,902	4
Washington	30,659	19	29,449	15
West Virginia	16,922	5	16,259	4
Wisconsin	14,941	8	14,881	8
Wyoming	30,602	3	30,602	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$3,398,219</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>\$3,375,405</b>	<b>468</b>

Source: USAC data. Rollups performed by the Industry Analysis Division, FCC.

**Table 5.1b**  
**Rural Health Care Funding Commitments and Authorizations for Payment by State**  
**Second Funding Period: July 1, 1999 Through June 30, 2000**  
**Activity through December 31, 2000**

State or Jurisdiction	Total Funds Committed	Commitments to Providers	Total Funds Authorized for Payment	Authorizations for Providers
Alabama	\$0	0	\$0	0
Alaska	4,662,920	120	1,271,530	36
Arizona	171,961	21	34,138	10
Arkansas	85,194	25	10,731	10
California	87,663	14	85,711	13
Colorado	48,531	10	0	0
Connecticut	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0
Georgia	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	86,491	10	85,358	9
Idaho	26,501	6	8,975	1
Illinois	64,289	12	0	0
Indiana	0	0	0	0
Iowa	20,070	14	3,551	2
Kansas	138,223	51	82,598	46
Kentucky	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	3,958	1	0	0
Maine	0	0	0	0
Maryland	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0
Michigan	112,672	15	4,430	1
Minnesota	229,771	56	35,224	8
Mississippi	30,023	9	4,034	2
Missouri	36,550	7	16,371	4
Montana	135,713	27	71,124	13
Nebraska	264,679	13	224,613	9
Nevada	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	18,463	5	0	0
New Jersey	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	135,942	40	26,289	7
New York	168	1	0	0
North Carolina	81,856	14	37,036	8
North Dakota	53,647	16	4,155	1
Ohio	31,761	8	24,946	5
Oklahoma	9,931	3	9,931	3
Oregon	4,993	3	4,993	3
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	9,943	2	4,636	1
South Dakota	37,725	22	15,435	6
Tennessee	5,052	3	0	0
Texas	93,606	18	6,821	7
Utah	0	0	0	0
Vermont	29	1	0	0
Virginia	3,608	1	0	0
Washington	18,095	10	8,660	6
West Virginia	804	2	0	0
Wisconsin	4,157	6	0	0
Wyoming	715	1	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$6,715,704</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>\$2,081,290</b>	<b>211</b>

Source: USAC data. Rollups performed by the Industry Analysis Division, FCC.

**Table 5.2**  
**Net Revenues from Rural Health Care Program, by State (Thousands)**  
**First Funding Period: January 1, 1998 Through June 30, 1999**  
**Program Year Complete**

State or Jurisdiction	USAC Disbursements on Behalf of Rural Health Care Providers	Estimated Contributions Paid to USAC for Funding Disbursements	Estimated Contributions Paid to USAC for Administrative Costs	Estimated Share of of Nationwide Contributions by State <sup>1</sup>	Net Revenues <sup>2</sup>
Alabama	\$9	\$46	\$42	1.3%	-\$78
Alaska	630	8	8	0.2%	614
Arizona	303	69	63	2.0%	172
Arkansas	13	28	26	0.8%	-40
California	10	315	287	9.3%	-592
Colorado	59	69	63	2.0%	-72
Connecticut	0	54	50	1.6%	-104
Delaware	0	14	13	0.4%	-26
District of Columbia	0	20	18	0.6%	-37
Florida	0	230	210	6.8%	-440
Georgia	0	110	100	3.2%	-210
Guam	0	1	1	0.0%	-2
Hawaii	101	13	12	0.4%	76
Idaho	22	17	16	0.5%	-11
Illinois	90	150	137	4.4%	-197
Indiana	0	62	57	1.8%	-119
Iowa	69	33	30	1.0%	6
Kansas	92	34	31	1.0%	27
Kentucky	0	42	39	1.3%	-81
Louisiana	0	47	43	1.4%	-90
Maine	1	15	14	0.4%	-28
Maryland	0	74	68	2.2%	-142
Massachusetts	0	91	83	2.7%	-174
Michigan	208	96	88	2.8%	24
Minnesota	277	61	56	1.8%	160
Mississippi	45	29	26	0.8%	-10
Missouri	61	66	60	1.9%	-64
Montana	247	13	12	0.4%	222
Nebraska	80	21	19	0.6%	39
Nevada	58	30	28	0.9%	0
New Hampshire	14	22	20	0.6%	-28
New Jersey	0	140	127	4.1%	-267
New Mexico	123	23	21	0.7%	79
New York	124	242	221	7.1%	-338
North Carolina	30	99	90	2.9%	-160
North Dakota	317	9	9	0.3%	299
Northern Marianas	0	0	0	0.0%	-1
Ohio	38	116	106	3.4%	-183
Oklahoma	21	37	34	1.1%	-50
Oregon	13	44	40	1.3%	-71
Pennsylvania	49	140	128	4.1%	-218
Puerto Rico	0	20	18	0.6%	-37
Rhode Island	0	15	14	0.4%	-29
South Carolina	13	49	44	1.4%	-80
South Dakota	76	10	9	0.3%	56
Tennessee	10	65	59	1.9%	-115
Texas	16	213	194	6.3%	-391
Utah	30	26	24	0.8%	-20
Vermont	5	10	9	0.3%	-14
Virgin Islands	8	2	2	0.1%	4
Virginia	45	101	92	3.0%	-149
Washington	31	76	69	2.2%	-114
West Virginia	17	19	17	0.6%	-20
Wisconsin	15	55	50	1.6%	-91
Wyoming	31	8	7	0.2%	15
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$3,398</b>	<b>\$3,398</b>	<b>\$3,101</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>-\$3,101</b>

<sup>1</sup> Carriers make payments into the fund based on their end-user interstate telecommunications revenues. The numbers in this column are used to estimate, on a state-by-state basis, the amount of money paid into the fund for disbursements and administrative costs. The state's estimated share of nationwide end-user interstate revenues is based on data from Table 4 of *State-by-State Telephone Revenues and Universal Service Data* (FCC, CCB, Industry Analysis Division, April 2001).

<sup>2</sup> This column sums to a negative number because of administrative costs.

Source: raw data provided by the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC), rollups performed by Industry Analysis Division, FCC.



## 6. Subscribership and Penetration

The number and percentage of households that have telephone service represent the most fundamental measures of the extent of universal service. Continuing analysis of telephone penetration statistics allows us to examine the aggregate effects of Commission actions on households' decisions to maintain, acquire or drop telephone service. This section presents comprehensive data on telephone penetration statistics collected by the Bureau of the Census under contract with the Federal Communications Commission. Along with telephone penetration statistics for the United States and each of the states from November 1983 to November 2000, data are provided on penetration based on various demographic characteristics. This section also updates information on telephone penetration by income by state.<sup>1</sup> This information is designed to help evaluate the degree of success of making telephone service available to low-income households in each state.

The most widely used measure of telephone subscribership is the percentage of households with telephone service, sometimes called a measure of telephone penetration. Prior to the 1980s, precise measurements of telephone subscribership received little attention. Traditionally, telephone penetration was measured by dividing the number of residential telephone lines by the number of households. Measures of penetration based on the number of residential lines, however, became subject to a large margin of error as more and more households added second telephone lines and more consumers acquired second homes. By 1980, the traditional penetration measure (residential lines divided by the number of households) reached 96%, while the number of households reporting that they had telephones in the 1980 census was 92.9%.

Recognizing the need for more precise periodic measurements of subscribership, the Commission requested that the Bureau of the Census include questions on telephone availability as part of its Current Population Survey (CPS), which monitors demographic trends between the decennial censuses. This survey is a staggered panel survey in which the people residing at particular addresses are included in the survey for four consecutive months in one year and the same four months in the following year. Use of the CPS has several advantages: it is conducted every month by an independent and expert agency; the sample is large; and the questions are consistent. Thus, changes in the results can be compared over time with a great deal of confidence.

Unfortunately, the results of the CPS cannot be directly compared with the penetration figures contained in the 1980 and 1990 decennial censuses. This is due to differences in sampling techniques, survey methodologies, and the context in which the questions were asked. Thus, the 1990 decennial census reported 94.8% of all households in the United States had telephones, whereas the CPS data showed a penetration rate of 93.3% for 1990. This difference is statistically significant and appears to indicate that the CPS value may be on the low side and the decennial

---

1 This information was included in the FCC report, *Telephone Penetration by Income by State*, released July 13, 2001. That report contains information on the number of households in each state as well as the percentages reported here.

census value may be on the high side, with the most probable value lying somewhere in between. In the 2000 decennial census, the telephone question was changed from asking whether there was a telephone instrument to asking whether there was telephone service.<sup>2</sup>

The specific questions asked in the CPS are: "Is there a telephone in this house/apartment?" and, if the answer to the first question is "no," this is followed up with, "Is there a telephone elsewhere on which people in this household can be called?" If the answer to the first question is "yes," the household is counted as having a telephone "in unit." If the answer to either the first or second question is "yes," the household is counted as having a telephone "available." The "in unit" data and the "available" data are reported in Tables 6.6 through 6.10 and 6.12 through 6.16, and Charts 6.1 and 6.8. All of the remaining tables and charts of this section just report the "in unit" data.

Although the survey is conducted every month, not all questions are asked every month. The telephone questions are asked once every four months: in the month that a household is first included in the sample and in the month that the household reenters the sample a year later. Since the sample is staggered, the reported information for any given month actually reflects responses over the preceding four months. Aggregated summaries of the responses are reported to the Commission, based on the surveys conducted through March, July, and November of each year. The CPS later provides the Commission with the raw data files containing all of the responses to all of the questions on the CPS questionnaires in those months.<sup>3</sup>

The Census Bureau data are based on a nationwide sample of about 48,000 households in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. (The CPS does not cover outlying areas that are not states, such as Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.) Because a sample is used, the estimates are subject to sampling error. For the nationwide totals, changes in telephone penetration between consecutive reports of less than 0.4% may be due to sampling error and cannot be regarded as statistically significant.<sup>4</sup> As explained below, when comparing the same month in two consecutive years, changes of less than or equal to 0.3% are not statistically significant. When comparing annual averages, changes of less than or equal to 0.2% are not statistically significant. The annual averages are the average of the three surveys of the year in question. For individual states or other subgroups of the U.S. population, the amount of sampling variability is much greater, because the sample sizes are smaller. This will require larger changes to yield statistical significance at the same confidence level.

---

2 The type of service (e.g., wireline or wireless) is not specified. The question only asks whether the household has service which allows them to make and receive calls.

3 Tables 6.3 through 6.5, 6.11, and 6.17 of this section are derived from these raw data files.

4 The determination of the statistical significance of a change over time is discussed below. The critical value is dependent on the sizes of the samples from which the change is computed and by the confidence level, which is 95%.

Once a year, in March, the CPS augments its sample with about 2,500 additional Hispanic households, and supplements its survey with additional questions, which include detailed information about income.<sup>5</sup> In the July and November surveys, only broad income categories are reported. (These are the categories that appear in Table 6.7.)

The data in this section are not seasonally adjusted. After adjusting for the trend over time, there is an average increase of 0.2% between November and March, followed by an average decrease of 0.1% between March and July, and another average 0.1% decrease between July and November. However, these changes are not statistically significant.

Census Bureau figures for November 2000, the most recent data available, show that the percentage of households subscribing to telephone service is 94.1%, which is unchanged from November 1999. The average penetration rate for the year 2000 is 94.4%, which is up 0.2% from the 1999 average. Although this change is not statistically significant, the annual average for 2000 is the highest annual average ever reported by the CPS. As a result of an increasing number of households, 1.1 million households were added to the nation's telephone system between November 1999 and November 2000.

This section includes figures showing subscribership percentages by state, by the head of the household's age and race, by household size, by income, and for adult individuals by labor force status. The November 2000 data show that 94.8% of adult individuals in the civilian non-institutionalized population have a telephone in their household. This figure is down 0.3% from the November 1999 level. The average penetration rate for 2000 is 95.1% for adult individuals, which is down 0.1% from the 1999 average. These decreases are not statistically significant.

This section contains seventeen tables and nine charts presenting penetration statistics for various geographic and demographic characteristics. The charts and the first five tables present summaries of the available information. Tables 6.6 through 6.11 present more detailed information. In Tables 6.6 through 6.10, only the annual averages are included for the years 1984 through 1997. March, July, and November data for those years are available in Monitoring Reports in CC Docket Nos. 87-339 or 98-202. Tables 6.12 through 6.17 provide information necessary to determine the statistical significance of changes in the penetration rates over time.

Table 6.1 summarizes the telephone penetration for the United States, combining information on the number of households with the penetration rates.

Chart 6.1 graphically depicts the nationwide penetration rates for households over time.

Table 6.2 summarizes the telephone penetration rates by state, showing the average rates for

---

5 The responses from the additional Hispanic households are not included in Tables 6.6 through 6.10, but they are included in Table 6.11. Thus, in some cases, there may be small discrepancies between the percentages in Table 6.6 and Table 6.11.

1984 and 2000, the change between those two years, and an indication as to whether the change is statistically significant. The statistical significance of a change is determined not only by the magnitude of that change, but also by the sizes of the samples used to estimate the change.

The Commission's Lifeline program was instituted in 1985 to help low-income households afford the monthly cost of telephone service. Under the federal Lifeline program, local telephone companies offer reduced rates to qualifying households and currently receive reimbursement from the federal universal service support mechanisms. Initially, the program was available only in those states that chose to participate by providing matching assistance.

Effective in 1998, the federal Lifeline program was revised so that a basic level of assistance would be provided in all states. The basic level of federal assistance was \$5.25 per month for each participating household.<sup>6</sup> Additional federal support is also provided wherever a state chooses to provide matching assistance, at a rate of \$1 in federal support for each \$2 of state matching support, up to a maximum of \$1.75 federal support (corresponding to \$3.50 of state matching support). States may provide further support without further matching federal assistance.

To help evaluate the effect of the federal Lifeline program, Table 6.3 focuses on changes in telephone penetration rates from just before the program was established to just before it was substantially expanded in 1998, by comparing penetration rates for states with and without state Lifeline programs prior to 1998.<sup>7</sup> Briefly, penetration rate increases were greater, on average, in states with Lifeline programs than in states without Lifeline programs.<sup>8</sup> The effect is especially apparent for low-income households,<sup>9</sup> which are the households primarily affected by the federal and state Lifeline programs. Between March 1984 and March 1997, the increase in the average penetration rate in states with Lifeline programs was 6.5% for low-income households. During this period, subscribership among low-income households undoubtedly increased for other

---

6 On July 1, 2000, the maximum residential subscriber line charge was increased by \$0.85. The basic federal Lifeline support level was correspondingly increased to a maximum of \$6.10 per line per month. Thus, the total federal and state support level generally increased by \$0.85 at that time.

7 The expanded program was adopted in 1997, and took effect on January 1, 1998. States with Lifeline programs prior to 1998 are identified in Table 6.3 by showing that the year Lifeline began was before 1998. Prior to the expansion, states participating in the federal Lifeline program were required to match the federal support with their own state support.

8 The averages for the two groups of states were computed as weighted averages of the states in the groups, using the total number of households in each state as weights.

9 Low-income households are those with incomes under \$10,000 (expressed in 1984 dollars).

reasons as well, but the increase in those states that adopted Lifeline programs was double that of states that did not adopt such programs.

Information on all households is also included in Table 6.3. Overall penetration rates are more generally available and more commonly cited as measures of penetration than are rates only for low-income households. Penetration rate increases were again greater, on average, in states that established Lifeline programs. The increase for states with Lifeline programs was statistically significant,<sup>10</sup> but the increase for other states was not. Thus, it appears that increases in subscribership among low-income households were sufficient to have measurable impacts on the overall level of subscribership in states with Lifeline programs. States that adopted Lifeline programs before 1998 generally had lower penetration rates in 1984 than those that did not adopt such programs. By 1997, the difference in the penetration rates for the two groups diminished significantly.

Table 6.4 focuses on the change in penetration rates between March 1997 (before the expansion of the federal Lifeline program) and March 2000. The states are divided into three groups:

- “Full Assistance” states providing sufficient support to get the maximum federal matching support. The total federal and state support in these states was \$10.50 or more;<sup>11</sup>
- “Intermediate Assistance” states providing some support, but less than enough to qualify for the maximum federal support. The monthly level of support in such states was more than \$5.25, but less than \$10.50;
- “Basic Assistance” states providing no support, but receiving the basic federal support of \$5.25 per line per month.

On average, for low-income households in those states where the maximum federal support is provided, telephone penetration increased significantly, by 2.2%, between March 1997 and March 2000. In this group of states, there was a small but also statistically significant increase in the overall penetration rate for all households. For states with some but less than the maximum matching federal support, there was only a small (and statistically insignificant) increase in the low-income penetration rate and no change at all in overall penetration. For states with just the basic federal support, there was, on average, a small, albeit insignificant decline in penetration for both low-income households and all households. On average, states with greater support had lower penetration rates in 1997. By 2000, the penetration rates for the groups nearly equalized.

---

10 See the paragraph describing Tables 6.12 through 6.16 for a discussion of the determination of the statistical significance of a change over time. The critical value is dependent on the sizes of the samples from which the change is computed.

11 Any total support over \$10.50 (now increased to \$11.35) is not matched by further federal support.

The results are consistent and significant. The federal Lifeline program has raised penetration rates and the sizes of the increases are related to the amount of assistance provided.

Data on individual states are provided in Table 6.5. The support amounts shown in Table 6.5 are the total of federal and state support, as of January 2000.

Chart 6.2 depicts the states with average year 2000 penetration rates (as shown in Table 6.2) more than 1% below the national average, within 1% of the national average, or more than 1% above the national average.

Chart 6.3 depicts changes in household penetration rates by state (as shown in Table 6.2) between the average year 1984 and year 2000 rates. States with statistically significant increases or decreases are shown, along with other states with increases or decreases.

Chart 6.4 depicts the relationship between telephone penetration and household income, using average year 2000 penetration rates for all households and for households headed by white, black, and Hispanic persons.<sup>12</sup> It is based on data in Table 6.7.

Chart 6.5 depicts the relationship between telephone penetration and household size, using average year 2000 penetration rates for all households and for households headed by white, black, and Hispanic persons. It is based on data in Table 6.8.

Chart 6.6 depicts the relationship between telephone penetration and the head of the household's age, using average year 2000 penetration rates for all households and for households headed by white, black, and Hispanic persons. It is based on data in Table 6.9.

Chart 6.7 depicts the relationship between telephone penetration and labor force status for civilian non-institutionalized adults, using average year 2000 penetration rates for all adults and for white, black, and Hispanic adults. It is based on data in Table 6.10.

Chart 6.8 graphically depicts the nationwide penetration rates for civilian non-institutionalized adults over time. It is also based on data in Table 6.10.

Chart 6.9 shows the telephone penetration rates in March of each year through 2000 for each of five income categories for the total United States. It is based on data in Table 6.11. The income categories (expressed in March 1984 dollars) are: \$9,999 or less; \$10,000 - \$19,999; \$20,000 - \$29,999; \$30,000 - \$39,999; and \$40,000 or more. These categories were chosen because they are of approximately equal size, both in terms of income ranges and the number of

---

12 The CPS includes three racial categories: white, black, and other. Others, which include Native Americans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders, are not reported separately because of small sample sizes, but they are included in the totals. Hispanics are reported as an ethnic group, and can be of any race.

households in each category. As can be seen from the chart, most income categories have experienced increases in penetration over time, with the largest increases being in the lowest income categories. The changes between 1984 and 2000 are statistically significant for the two lowest income categories and for all households, but not for the three highest income categories.<sup>13</sup> Not all of the increases in the national total penetration rate can be explained by increases in real income, because real income increases are reflected in the movement of households between categories. Thus, penetration changes within each income category represent changes holding real income constant.

Table 6.6 shows the CPS responses for the United States and for each state beginning with November 1983. Because the CPS began collecting this data only in 1983, comparable values are not available prior to November 1983. For each of the surveys, the column headed "Unit" indicates the percentage of households for which there is a telephone in the housing unit. The column headed "Avail." indicates the percentage of households which have telephone service available for incoming calls, either in the housing unit or elsewhere (such as at work or at a neighbor's home).

Table 6.7 shows the nationwide penetration rates for households by income and the race of the head of the household. It shows a strong relationship between income and penetration. Caution should be used in comparing these figures over time, because these income levels are not adjusted for inflation. Thus, the same nominal income level at two points in time will reflect different real incomes in terms of purchasing power. Also, the income categories have changed over time due to the changing value of the dollar. Consequently, when evaluating penetration changes by income levels over time, Table 6.11 should be used.

Table 6.8 shows the nationwide penetration rates for households by the size of the household and the race of the householder. It shows that penetration is higher for households of 2 to 5 people than it is for single-person households or those with 6 or more people.

Table 6.9 shows the nationwide penetration rates for households by the age and race of the head of the household. It shows that the penetration rate is lowest for young and non-white households.

Table 6.10 shows the nationwide penetration rates for all persons that are at least 15 years old in the civilian non-institutionalized population by their race and employment status. Since this table is for individual adults rather than households, the total penetration rates are different from those in the previous tables. It shows that penetration is lowest among the unemployed.

Table 6.11 shows the penetration rates for each of the income categories shown in Chart 6.9 for each state for March of each year through 1998. The more detailed information from the March surveys makes it possible to adjust the income categories for inflation. The relative levels of the March Consumer Price Index for all items (as reported in Table 7.4) were used to make the

---

13 See footnote 14 for the critical values for these significance tests.

inflation adjustment. Thus, for example, \$10,000 in March 1984 dollars had the same purchasing power as \$16,676 in March 2000 dollars. The precise current dollar values in each year are reported at the end of Table 6.11.

Tables 6.12 through 6.16 present the critical values at the 95% confidence level for testing the statistical significance of changes in penetration rates over time in the earlier tables. These critical values are relevant because changes less than or equal to the values shown are likely to be due to sampling error, and thus cannot be regarded as demonstrating that a change in telephone penetration has occurred. In some cases, these critical values are very large because the sample sizes are very small for these subcategories, rendering the changes in estimated penetration rates unreliable. Because there is an overlap of half of the sample from year to year, but no overlap in the sample between surveys that are four months apart, annual changes are less subject to variations in sampling error. Consequently, the critical values should be multiplied by 0.8 when making a comparison for the same month in two consecutive years. When comparing the annual averages, the critical values should be multiplied by 0.5774, since these averages are based on three surveys, and hence have a lower standard error. When comparing annual averages of two consecutive years, the critical values should be multiplied by .46, taking into account both of the above factors.

Table 6.17 shows the sample sizes on which the estimates of Table 6.11 are based. The sampling variability is inversely related to the square root of the sample size. The critical values for individual income categories in Table 6.11 can therefore be estimated by taking the critical value for the state "In Unit" total and multiplying it by the square root of the ratio of the sample size for the state total to the sample size for the income category. In most cases, the critical value for an individual income category will be between two and three times the critical value for the state total.<sup>14</sup> In some cases, these critical values are very large because the sample sizes are very small for these subcategories, thereby rendering the estimated penetration rates unreliable.

---

14 For example, using this methodology to calculate critical values for comparing the 1984 and 2000 values for the United States Total, the critical values are 0.8% for the \$9,999 or less, the \$10,000 - \$19,999, and the \$40,000 or more categories, 0.9% for the \$20,000 - \$29,999 categories, and 1.1% for the \$30,000 - \$39,999 category. These compare with 0.4% for all households.