

# The Civic Federation

## Telecommunications Tax Project

**Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001**

### **Introduction**

The purpose of the Telecommunications Tax Project is to provide an objective analysis of the Chicagoland governments in relation to the structure of telecommunications taxes in Illinois. Specifically, the study provides a systematic model of telecommunications taxes. The model can be subjected to hypothetical scenarios provide meaningful information to municipalities, the telecommunications industry, and legislators. The information generated by this project will help governments assess their own situation with respect to the taxation of telecommunications. The information provided by the study will also elevate the level of public debate concerning tax policy by providing information on the existing telecom tax structure and how it may be impacted in future years.

The intent of this report is to spur discussions of the municipal telecom tax structure in Illinois. It is intended to be an objective report that helps municipalities and the telecommunications industry to assess the impacts of proposals to simplify and modernize the existing structure.

### **Summary of Findings**

The state of Illinois possesses a telecommunications tax structure that includes several types of locally administered taxes. The rate structure is decentralized and is cumbersome to telecommunications retailers attempting to comply with the maintenance of all telecom tax rates. The revenue for municipal telecom taxes statewide is substantial. Municipalities rely on these revenue streams and telecom tax revenues are a significant percentage of the total tax revenues in their budgets. The compliance of administration of these taxes is significant and the costs associated are substantial for both telecommunications carriers and the municipalities that administer these taxes. More specifically:

- Over \$430 million in municipal telecom tax revenues are imposed by municipalities and collected annually by telecom carriers
- Roughly 105,000 municipal telecom tax filings are prepared by telecom retailers and processed by municipalities on an annual basis
- Approximately 15,000 telecom tax rates need to be maintained by telecom carriers on an annual basis

# The Civic Federation

## Telecommunications Tax Project

- The ability of municipalities to increase telecom tax revenues through rate increases is severely limited without legislative action
- Over 9 million people in Illinois are subject to some type of telecom tax
- Roughly 625 municipalities in Illinois impose telecom taxes
- Residents in municipalities that impose a telecom excise tax pay an approximate average of \$45 annually
- Residents in municipalities that impose a municipal utility tax pay an approximate average of \$29 annually
- Residents in municipalities that impose a municipal infrastructure maintenance fee pay an approximate average of \$12 annually

# The Civic Federation

## Telecommunications Tax Project


### **The History of the Telecommunications Tax Structure in Illinois**

Telecommunications taxes in Illinois are imposed on businesses that provide telecommunications services or on the actual service itself. These services include telephone, telegraph, mobile radio and telephone, personal communications, private line, computer exchange, and paging services. Moreover, these taxes apply to the transmission of messages or information through various means. As technology in the telecommunications industry continues to progress rapidly, the nature of these services and the application of telecommunications taxes to these services continue to evolve.

In addition to the Federal Excise Tax, the state of Illinois along with hundreds of municipalities impose several telecommunications taxes on telecommunications providers and their services. These taxes are generally part of the government's General Operating Funds, however some of these revenues are raised for school funding or to pay for the costs of maintaining the rights of way.

#### **1) State Telecommunications Message/Excise Tax**

The original state messages tax was enacted in 1945 and was replaced by the state telecommunications excise tax in 1985. The rates of tax in terms of percentage of gross receipts taxed from 1945 to current are as follows:



It is important to note that although the rate of tax remained the same when the state telecommunications excise tax was enacted in 1985, the tax base was expanded to include interstate telecommunications and other services. The rate was raised from 5% to 7% in 1998 due to budgetary requirements primarily with respect to school funding as the rate increase is earmarked for the Common School and School Infrastructure Funds.

As a result of the enactment of the state telecommunications excise tax in 1985, a legal challenge to the state's authority to tax interstate activity was filed. Illinois was one of

# The Civic Federation

## Telecommunications Tax Project

the first states to attempt to apply an excise tax to a transaction that was within the scope of interstate commerce. The case of Goldberg vs. Sweet was decided in the United States Supreme Court in 1989. This was a landmark decision in that it set a standard for the taxation of interstate telecommunications for all states and met the requirements of the United States Constitution. The court found that a state could apply a transaction tax to interstate telecommunications as long as the activity originated or terminated within the state and was billed to a service address within the state. Following this standard afforded the authority to only one state to apply tax to any given transaction.

### **2) Municipal Utility Tax**

Any municipality has the authority to impose an occupation tax, otherwise known as a municipal utility tax or messages tax, on businesses providing intrastate message transmission services at a rate not to exceed 5% of gross receipts (Section 8-11-2, Ch. 65 ILCS).

### **3) Municipal Excise Tax**

Alternatively, a municipality may enact a telecommunications tax, otherwise known as a municipal excise tax, on intrastate and interstate telecommunications services provided by the carrier up to 5% of gross receipts (Section 8-11-17, Ch. 65 ILCS). Currently, over 400 municipalities in Illinois impose a telecommunications excise or utility tax.

### **4) State Infrastructure Maintenance Fee**

The State Infrastructure Maintenance Fee was created via passage of the Telecommunications Municipal Infrastructure Maintenance Fee Act (“MIMF Act”) in 1997 and became effective on January 1, 1998 ( 35 ILCS 635/15(a)). In conjunction with creation of this fee, the Act repealed the State Invested Capital Tax (35 ILCS 635/905) which levied a tax on telecommunications retailers of an amount equal to 0.8% of the annual apportionable Illinois invested capital.

This fee is imposed in an amount equal to 0.5% of gross charges from telecommunications retailers to their customers. Gross charges include interstate as well as intrastate telecommunications services.

### **5) Municipal Infrastructure Maintenance Fee**

The MIMF Act also authorized the imposition of Municipal Infrastructure Maintenance Fees (35 ILCS 635/20) by municipalities throughout Illinois and became effective January 1, 1998. Municipalities are required to pass an ordinance to adopt a Municipal Infrastructure Maintenance Fee.

# The Civic Federation

## Telecommunications Tax Project

This fee is based on gross charges that include intrastate and interstate activities. Cities in excess of 500,000 in population, i.e. Chicago, are authorized to impose a rate of up to 2% of gross charges. Chicago implemented a 2% MIMF in 1997 which became effective on January 1, 1998. All other municipalities are authorized to impose a rate of up to 1% of gross charges. There are over 450 municipalities that have adopted a MIMF as of the end of 2000.

In addition, the Optional Municipal Infrastructure Maintenance Fee (35 ILCS 635/15) was created. This fee is imposed only in the event that a MIMF has not been adopted and there is no preexisting franchise fee agreement between the municipality and the telecommunications retailer. The purpose of the fee is to incent municipalities to adopt the MIMF and help minimize situations whereby retailers and municipalities are having to negotiate new franchise fee agreements.

In 1998, a legal challenge to the constitutionality of the MIMF was filed. The contest stated that the MIMF violated the uniformity clause of the Illinois Constitution with respect to wireless telecommunications providers and others that are similarly situated. The case, **PrimeCo Personal Communications, et al. vs. The Illinois Commerce Commission, et al.**, was decided in March, 2001, by the Illinois Supreme Court. Although the court found that the MIMF was unconstitutional as applied to the plaintiffs in the case, the court also found that the statute was not invalid on its face. More specifically, the court found that the MIMF violates the uniformity clause of the Illinois constitution only to the extent that it applies to telecommunications retailers that do not own, operate or maintain any part of their infrastructure within the public rights-of-way.

The resulting loss of revenue from the exclusion of the wireless telecommunications providers has prompted municipalities to analyze alternative sources of revenue. As of the issuance of this report, the City of Chicago has introduced an ordinance to levy a tax upon the activity of leasing cable capacity from network providers.

### **6) Municipal Franchise Fee**

Municipal franchise fees are imposed on telecommunications retailers as a result of agreements entered into by the municipality and the retailer. These fees are generally levied on an access line basis and are intended to reimburse the municipality for costs associated with managing the public rights-of way. Adoption of the MIMF along with a waiver regarding a preexisting franchise fee agreement eliminates the fee within that municipality.

Prior to adoption of the MIMF, a case involving AT&T and the Village of Arlington Heights (American Telephone and Telegraph vs. Village of Arlington Heights, 156Ill. 2d 399,620 N.E. 2d 1040, 189Ill. Dec.723 (1993)) clarified the relationship between the municipality and a party attempting to utilize the public right-of-way. Arlington Heights refused to allow AT&T to install fiber optic cable under the village streets unless it

# The Civic Federation

## Telecommunications Tax Project

agreed to enter into a franchise agreement. When AT&T refused to enter into such an agreement, the village refused to issue permits to AT&T. The Illinois Supreme Court held that “while municipalities have the authority to enact regulations relating to the use of the public streets and to charge reasonable regulatory fees for such use, they do not have the authority to hold the public streets hostage as a means of raising revenue”. This cornerstone case provided a great deal of impetus to bring municipalities and the industry together to create the MIMF.

### **7) Public Utility Commission Fee**

The public utility commission fee (220 ILCS 5/2-202), also known as the State Additional Charge, is levied upon the regulated telecommunications retailer and passed through to the consumer. The fee is 0.1% of the retailer’s intrastate gross charges and is intended to partially fund the budget for the Illinois Commerce Commission.

The base of the public utility commission fee is limited to revenues subject to tariff regulation. A legal challenge was filed in 1996 with respect to the fee’s applicability to wireless revenues. In **Chicago SMSA Limited Partnership, et al., vs. The Illinois Commerce Commission**, the Illinois Appellate Court found that the definition of “gross revenue” subject to the fee was limited to revenue collected by a public utility subject to certain regulations under the Public Utility Tax Act, i.e., the requirement to file tariff schedules setting forth all rates, charges, and classifications of service. Wireless revenues are not subject to these regulations and were determined to be excluded from the definition of “gross revenue”.

### **8) Emergency 911 Surcharge**

The emergency telephone system act authorizes the imposition of an emergency 911 surcharge on network connections at a monthly flat rate as determined by the local emergency telephone system board. This purpose of this fee is to fund the operation of the emergency 911 systems throughout Illinois. Wireless carriers have recently begun collection of 911 surcharges throughout the state.

# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project

## **METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATING THE IMPACTS OF TELECOM TAX REVENUES**

### **1) The Major Municipalities included in the Case Studies**

The eleven municipalities participating in the case studies are eleven of the top sixteen major municipalities of the Chicago metropolitan region with a population over 50,000. These cities and villages are located geographically in five of the six counties of Northeastern Illinois, a region that is home to approximately 64% of the population of the entire state. This area, together with neighboring counties in Indiana and Wisconsin, forms a coherent economic unit, closely linked by a good transportation and telecommunications network.

Table 1 below ranks the municipalities in this study by population. They range in size from the nation's third largest city, Chicago, to the village of Mount Prospect, with a population of roughly 54,000. Excluding Chicago because of its immense size, the average population of municipalities in this study is approximately 78,000.

**Table 1**  
**The Major Municipalities of Northeastern Illinois Ranked by Population**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Estimated Population</b>	<b>Incorporated</b>	<b>County</b>
Chicago	2,799,050	1835	Cook, DuPage
Aurora	129,371	1887	Kane
Naperville	122,993	1857	DuPage
Waukegan	76,425	1890	Lake
Arlington Heights	76,242	1887	Cook, Lake
Schaumburg	75,242	1956	Cook
Evanston	71,679	1857	Cook
Oak Lawn	58,002	1909	Cook
Des Plaines	57,068	1869	Cook
Wheaton	56,225	1890	DuPage
Mount Prospect	53,613	1917	Cook

Source: The Population Estimates Program, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau as of 7/1/99.

Most of the municipalities of Northeastern Illinois were incorporated in the decades after the Civil War and before the close of World War I, a period of tremendous growth in Illinois population and economic development. Only one, Schaumburg, was incorporated in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. All of the municipalities have home-rule status under the Illinois' 1970 Constitution. This means that they "may exercise any power and perform any function" except as explicitly limited by the Illinois Constitution. This includes the right to impose any taxes not expressly forbidden, such as income taxes.

# The Civic Federation

## Telecommunications Tax Project

While overwhelmingly 19<sup>th</sup> century in origin, the eleven municipalities in the study are a diverse group in terms of socioeconomic situation and demographics. Chicago is the economic engine and cultural center of the region. Two municipalities, Evanston and Oak Lawn, are landlocked “inner ring” suburbs bordering Chicago and unable to expand boundaries. Naperville, Arlington Heights, Schaumburg, Des Plaines, and Mount Prospect are all located in the relatively prosperous, fast-growing suburbs in the Northwest portion of Cook County. Schaumburg contains a major regional shopping center. Aurora is home to riverboat gaming casinos that generate millions of dollars for local treasuries.

Most of the communities furnished copies of their current Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports. In addition to the completed survey information, most municipalities provided copies of the telecommunications utility or excise tax ordinance, along with copies of the municipal infrastructure maintenance fee ordinance.

# The Civic Federation

## Telecommunications Tax Project

### ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS TAXES IN THE AGGREGATE

Municipal telecommunications taxes in Illinois are locally administered with no reporting requirements to a centralized agency such as the Illinois Department of Revenue or the Illinois Commerce Commission. Some taxes, such as the municipal utility tax are levied upon the telecommunications carrier and are passed through directly on the end user customer's bill as an additional charge. As such, the charge is a tariffed rate and is subject to the jurisdiction of the Illinois Commerce Commission.

Still no centralized reporting mechanism exists to compile, let alone analyze, total municipal telecom tax revenues, whether or not these taxes are levied upon the telecom retailer and passed through, or directly levied upon the end user consumer and simply collected by the telecom retailer. Based upon the survey information provided by the participating municipalities, the Civic Federation has created a model that estimates the impacts of telecommunications tax revenues, among other information, on an aggregate basis.

#### 1) Aggregate Model

The aggregate model incorporates municipal tax information from the two largest incumbent local exchange carriers, Ameritech Illinois and Verizon North. These two carriers encompass over 93% of the total states' access lines. Furthermore, taking into consideration the weight of revenues generated from these access lines versus the remainder of access lines in the state, it can be stated that the municipalities included in the model represent substantially all of the activity in the entire state.

The model includes tax rate information with respect to the municipal excise tax rate, the municipal utility tax rate, the actual municipal additional charge to the end user customer including the accounting charge reimbursement, and the municipal infrastructure maintenance fee rate. Although emergency 911 surcharges are not a major focus of this study, the model does include all of the E911 rates for all municipalities as well as county rates for unincorporated areas.

The model also includes the population of all Illinois municipalities that have imposed a MET, MUT, or MIMF. The source of all population figures is the Population Estimates Program, Population Division of the United States Census Bureau, as of July 1, 1999.

The model includes the MET, MUT, and MIMF revenue amounts reported by the survey municipalities. Based on these survey revenues, actual revenues per resident are calculated on an individual basis for the survey communities. The weighted average revenues per resident are utilized to extrapolate revenues to all other municipalities that impose a MUT, MET, or MIMF based on population.

# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project


With respect to tax compliance, information with respect to the estimated number of tax filings for the survey municipalities is incorporated into the model. Estimates of total tax filings with respect to all municipalities that impose a telecom tax are calculated.

Finally, the model calculates aggregate computations in two ways, both including and excluding the information provided by the City of Chicago due to its immense size of population. There are other reasons to segregate Chicago data, i.e., Chicago has its own Department of Revenue with substantial resources and its own administration. Moreover, Chicago is often provided a separate tax status with legislation carving out municipalities with populations of over 500,000.

## 1) Tax Rates

The model includes rates for 94 MET communities, 258 MUT communities (including both the statutory rates and the actual rates charged), and 399 MIMF communities. The model also includes 228 counties and local jurisdictions that impose a flat rate emergency 911 surcharge. Assuming a telecommunications retailer does business in all of these taxing jurisdictions, a total of 1,237 telecom tax rates need to be maintained on a monthly basis. This equates to nearly 15,000 municipal rates that need to be maintained on an annual basis.


Of the 94 MET communities, 69 impose the maximum rate of 5%. 8 municipalities impose a rate of 4% or higher but below 5%. 12 municipalities impose a rate of 3% or higher but below 4%. 5 municipalities impose a rate of 2.75% and below. The weighted average rate by population is 4.76%. The specific breakdown is shown on the chart below.




Of the 258 MUT communities in the model, 193 impose the maximum statutory rate of 5%. 13 municipalities impose a rate of 4% or higher, but less than 5%. Another 34 communities impose a rate of 3% or higher, but less than 4%. 17 communities impose a

# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project

rate of 2.75% or less. The weighted average rate by population is 4.54%, which is slightly less than the weighted average MET rate of 4.76%.



Of the 398 municipalities in the model that have enacted a MIMF, excluding Chicago, 369 impose the maximum rate of 1%. Ten communities impose a rate of  $\frac{3}{4}$  of 1%. Yet another 10 impose a rate of  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1%. Nine communities impose a rate of  $\frac{1}{4}$  of 1%. The weighted average rate by population, excluding Chicago, is 0.97%. The weighted average rate including Chicago, which imposes a 2% rate, is 1.34%.




## 2) Revenues

The model estimates total statewide MET revenues for the fiscal year 2000 at roughly \$215.7 million. Given the average growth rate of 10% over the last five-year period for the survey communities, the estimate for the fiscal year 2001 is \$237.2 million. As previously stated, this amount may be slightly understated due to the small percentage of municipalities not served by the two major incumbent local exchange carriers.

# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project

The model estimates total MUT revenues for the fiscal year 2000 at roughly \$59.6 million. Given the growth rate described above, the estimate for the fiscal year 2001 is approximately \$65.5 million. Finally, with respect to MIMF, the model estimates total statewide revenues of \$116.4 million. The fiscal year 2001 estimate given the growth rate utilized is \$128.0 million.

The current fiscal estimates are included in the pie chart below. Total telecom revenues with respect to these three municipal taxes are estimated to be \$430.7 million.




---

The weighted average MET revenue per resident on an annual basis is roughly \$50 for the survey municipalities assuming a tax rate of 5%. Applied throughout the state taking into consideration the various MET rates imposed, the average annual MET per resident in Illinois is approximately \$45.

The weighted average MUT revenue per resident on an annual basis is roughly \$32 for the survey municipality of Naperville, the only survey community imposing a MUT. Naperville's MUT rate is 5%. Given the various MUT rates throughout the state, the average annual MUT per resident in Illinois is approximately \$29.

The weighted average MIMF revenue per resident on an annual basis is roughly \$12 for the survey municipalities that impose a 1% rate. The \$12 average also includes actual amounts reported by the DuPage Mayors/Managers and the Northwest Municipal Conference for municipalities under their jurisdiction. Chicago was not included in the weighted average MIMF revenue per resident as it is the only community that imposes a rate of 2%. Chicago's average annual MIMF revenue per resident is roughly \$20.


# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project



### 3) Telecommunications Tax Compliance in Illinois

The average number of annual MUT/MET returns per the survey communities is 959, excluding Chicago. The average number of annual MIMF returns per the survey communities is 806, once again excluding Chicago. The model extrapolates the average number of filings over all municipalities in Illinois that impose a MET, MUT, or MIMF based on the estimated revenue per municipality per the survey average revenue per resident.

The estimated total of all MET/MUT return filings on an annual basis for all Illinois municipalities that impose either tax is roughly 52,000. The estimated total of all MIMF return filings on an annual basis for all Illinois municipalities that impose the fee is roughly 53,000. The total estimated telecom tax filings on an annual basis throughout the state is approximately 105,000. This figure does not include estimated remittances, as in the case of the Chicago, which requires annual returns for some carriers along with monthly remittances.




# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project

## THE CASE STUDIES

The communities that participated in the case study survey are Arlington Heights, Aurora, Chicago, Des Plaines, Evanston, Mount Prospect, Naperville, Oak Lawn, Schaumburg, Waukegan, and Wheaton. The communities range in population from Mount Prospect at roughly 54,000 to Chicago with nearly 2.8 million people. The surveys requested information such as tax rates, specific revenues by tax type, telecom tax revenues as a percentage of total municipal revenues, number and frequency of return filings, and copies of pertinent ordinances, among other data.

### 1) Tax Rates

The average rate for the eight communities that impose a municipal utility or excise tax is 4.36%. Moreover, the weighted average rate for these communities weighted by population is 4.90%. Five of the communities have imposed the maximum rate of 5% as allowed per statute. Those communities are Aurora, Chicago, Evanston, Naperville, and Waukegan. Three other communities, Mount Prospect, Schaumburg, and Wheaton have imposed rates of 3.3%, 3%, and 3.6%, respectively. Finally, the last three communities, Arlington Heights, Des Plaines, and Oak Lawn have not imposed any municipal telecommunications utility or excise tax. The chart below displays the rates for the eight survey communities that impose a municipal utility or excise tax.




All eleven of the municipalities participating in the survey have enacted a municipal infrastructure maintenance fee. Furthermore, all eleven municipalities have imposed the maximum rate allowed by statute. Chicago imposes a two percent rate and all other survey municipalities impose a one percent rate.

### 2) Telecommunication Tax Revenues


With respect to those communities that have imposed a municipal telecom utility or excise tax, the range of tax revenues in fiscal year 2000 begins with Mount Prospect at

# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project

\$1,354,747 up to Chicago with roughly \$123,600,000. Excluding Chicago, the average telecom tax revenue generated for fiscal year 2000 for the seven communities imposing the tax is approximately \$2,976,404. Schaumburg increased its tax rate from 1% to 3% effective June 2000 and the revenues below reflect that material increase.




Furthermore, telecom utility or excise tax revenues as a percentage of total municipal tax revenues for the current fiscal year in our survey communities ranged from 3% in Evanston to roughly 9.29% in Schaumburg.




Municipal telecom utility/excise tax revenues increased roughly 40% over the last five years with respect to the survey municipalities. The rate of revenue growth over the last five years ranged from Evanston at roughly 20% to Mount Prospect at 94.7%. The average rate of growth for the survey communities over this five year period is approximately 51.4%. As previously noted, Schaumburg increased its rate of excise tax from 1% to 3% in June 2000, and was excluded from this percentage of growth analysis.

# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project




The following chart displays the revenue growth in terms of actual revenue amounts over the last five years. The rapid revenue growth for Schaumburg is primarily due to the rate increase from 1% to 3% during the five year period. Chicago telecom excise tax revenues increased from \$90.9 million in 1996 to roughly \$123.6 million in 2000.




Municipal infrastructure maintenance fees for the survey municipalities for the fiscal year 1999/2000 range from Oak Lawn at \$335,728 to Chicago at roughly \$54 million. The survey average MIMF revenue is \$5,697,693. Excluding Chicago, the survey average MIMF revenue is \$787,462.

# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project



### 3) Tax Compliance


The following municipalities provided the number of telecom utility or excise tax returns that are filed on an annual basis. Excluding Chicago, the fiscal year 2000 annual filings ranged from 648 in Schaumburg to 1,260 in Waukegan. The City of Chicago reported annual filings of 549, consistent with the Taxpayer Simplification ordinance passed in 1999 that converted a majority of monthly filings to annual filings with monthly remittances. The average number of annual filings in the survey, excluding Chicago, is 959.




Municipal infrastructure maintenance fee annual return filings were provided by the following survey municipalities. The number of filings ranged from 150 in Arlington Heights to 1,300 in Waukegan. The number of filings reported by Chicago was 508, once again consistent with the conversion of monthly filings to annual filings as a result

# The Civic Federation Telecommunications Tax Project

of the 1999 Tax Simplification ordinance. The average number of annual filings, excluding Chicago, is 806.



Some communities provided the number of annual filings for both the utility/excise tax and the municipal infrastructure maintenance fee. Total telecom tax filings for the current fiscal year with respect to the survey municipalities ranged from Schaumburg at 1,228 to Waukegan at 2,560. Chicago reported total annual filings of 1,057 reflecting the Tax Simplification ordinance revisions.



Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
0467	Addison				1.00	34,259					\$357,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$10.42	0.50	34,259		115		360
	Albany		5.00	5.15	1.00	808			\$25,762.53	\$31.88	\$9,986.88	\$12.36		808	3	3	10	8
ALEX	Alexander County												3.00					
0468	Algonquin		4.00	4.12	1.00	21,716			\$553,919.89	\$25.51	\$268,409.76	\$12.36		21,716	78	73	271	228
	Allendale				1.00	461					\$5,697.96	\$12.36		461		2		5
0119	Alorton			5.00	5.15	2,773			\$88,415.22	\$31.88				2,773	10		35	
	Alsey	2.00				260	\$5,245.02	\$20.17						260	1		3	
0114	Alsip				1.00	19,586					\$242,082.96	\$12.36	0.50	19,586		66		206
	Altamont				1.00	2,330					\$28,798.80	\$12.36		2,330		8		24
0034	Alton		5.00	5.15	1.00	31,072			\$990,709.55	\$31.88	\$384,049.92	\$12.36		31,072	111	104	387	326
	Amboy		5.00	5.15		2,443			\$77,893.39	\$31.88				2,443	9		30	
0023	Andalusia		5.00	5.15		1,058			\$33,733.61	\$31.88				1,058	4		13	
0167	Antioch				1.00	8,212					\$101,500.32	\$12.36		8,212		28		86
	Apple River				1.00	407					\$5,030.52	\$12.36		407		1		4
	Argenta				1.00	842					\$10,407.12	\$12.36		842		3		9
	Arlington		5.00	5.15		199			\$6,344.98	\$31.88				199	1		2	
<b>0047</b>	<b>Arlington Heights</b>				<b>1.00</b>	<b>76,242</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$708,289.00<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$9.29</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>76,242</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>150</b>
	Armington		5.00	5.15		339			\$10,808.78	\$31.88				339	1		4	
	Atlanta		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,706			\$54,394.65	\$31.88	\$21,086.16	\$12.36		1,706	6	6	21	18
<b>0157</b>	<b>Aurora</b>	<b>5.00</b>			<b>1.00</b>	<b>129,371</b>	<b>\$4,108,171.00</b>	<b>\$31.75</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$840,000.00<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>\$6.49</b>		<b>129,371</b>	<b>N/P</b>	<b>N/P</b>	<b>N/P</b>	<b>N/P</b>
	Ava		3.00	3.09	1.00	655			\$12,530.54	\$19.13				655	2	2	8	7
0172	Bannockburn	1.00				1,451	\$14,635.63	\$10.09					0.50	1,451	5		18	
0173	Barrington	2.50			1.00	9,764	\$246,213.38	\$25.22			\$184,906.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$18.94	0.75	9,764	35	33	122	103
0094	Barrington Hills		5.00	5.15		4,546			\$144,946.11	\$31.88			1.50	4,546	16		57	
0174	Bartlett				1.00	35,335					\$191,796.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$5.43	0.50	35,335		119		371
0175	Bartonville				1.00	6,432					\$79,499.52	\$12.36		6,432		22		68
0101	Batavia		3.00	3.09	1.00	23,413			\$447,904.53	\$19.13	\$289,384.68	\$12.36		23,413	84	79	292	246
0164	Beach Park	5.00				10,200	\$514,415.51	\$50.43						10,200	36		127	
0177	Beardstown		3.50	3.61		5,128			\$114,451.95	\$22.32				5,128	18		64	
0079	Bedford Park				1.00	539					\$6,662.04	\$12.36	0.75	539		2		6
0179	Beecher		5.00	5.15	1.00	2,277			\$72,600.59	\$31.88	\$28,143.72	\$12.36		2,277	8	8	28	24
0146	Belleville		4.00	4.12		40,429			\$1,031,240.89	\$25.51				40,429	145		504	
0181	Bellevue				1.00	1,513					\$18,700.68	\$12.36		1,513		5		16
	Bellflower				1.00	382					\$4,721.52	\$12.36		382		1		4
	Belvidere		5.00	5.15	1.00	18,322			\$584,184.49	\$31.88	\$226,459.92	\$12.36		18,322	66	61	228	192
0032	Bellwood		5.00	5.15	1.00	19,877			\$633,764.60	\$31.88	\$245,679.72	\$12.36	0.95	19,877	71	67	248	209
0182	Bensenville	5.00			1.00	18,342	\$925,040.12	\$50.43			\$226,707.12	\$12.36	0.50	18,342	66	62	229	193
	Benton		5.00	5.15	0.75	7,111			\$226,729.39	\$31.88	\$65,918.97	\$9.27		7,111	25	24	89	75
0183	Berkeley	5.00				4,975	\$250,903.64	\$50.43					1.00	4,975	18		62	
0043	Berwyn		5.00	5.15		42,894			\$1,367,645.96	\$31.88			0.96	42,894	153		535	
0184	Bethalto				1.00	9,994					\$123,525.84	\$12.36		9,994		34		105

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
0185	Bloomingtondale												0.50					
	Bloomington		2.50	2.58	1.00	60,872			\$970,431.12	\$15.94	\$752,377.92	\$12.36		60,872	218	204	759	639
0186	Blue Island		5.00	5.15		20,547			\$655,127.09	\$31.88			0.75	20,547	73		256	
	Bluffs		5.00	5.15		576			\$18,365.37	\$31.88				576	2		7	
0139	Bolingbrook		3.50	3.61	1.00	56,156			\$1,253,347.06	\$22.32	\$600,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$10.68	0.87	56,156	201	188	700	590
BOND	Bond County												1.45					
0189	Bonnie				1.00	423					\$5,228.28	\$12.36		423		1		4
BOON	Boone County												0.60					
0191	Braceville		3.00	3.09		653			\$12,492.28	\$19.13				653	2		8	
0193	Braidwood		5.00	5.15	1.00	5,140			\$163,885.40	\$31.88	\$63,530.40	\$12.36		5,140	18	17	64	54
0195	Bridgeview				1.00	15,652					\$193,458.72	\$12.36	1.25	15,652		52		164
	Brimfield				1.00	787					\$9,727.32	\$12.36		787		3		8
	Broadlands				1.00	334					\$4,128.24	\$12.36		334		1		4
0071	Broadview	5.00			1.00	8,119	\$409,464.66	\$50.43			\$100,350.84	\$12.36	1.30	8,119	29	27	101	85
0084	Brookfield	5.00			1.00	18,056	\$910,616.31	\$50.43			\$223,172.16	\$12.36	1.25	18,056	65	61	225	190
0120	Brooklyn		3.94	4.06		1,057			\$26,556.96	\$25.12				1,057	4		13	
	Brownstown				1.00	766					\$9,467.76	\$12.36		766		3		8
	Buckley		3.00	3.09		555			\$10,617.48	\$19.13				555	2		7	
0089	Buffalo		3.00	3.09	1.00	485			\$9,278.34	\$19.13	\$5,994.60	\$12.36		485	2	2	6	5
0200	Buffalo Grove	3.00			1.00	42,624	\$1,289,790.98	\$30.26			\$367,129.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$8.61	0.75	42,624	152	143	532	447
0201	Bull Valley		5.00	5.15		692			\$22,063.95	\$31.88				692	2		9	
0110	Burbank	3.00			1.00	27,834	\$842,249.48	\$30.26			\$344,028.24	\$12.36	0.85	27,834	100	93	347	292
BURU	Bureau County												1.95					
0202	Burlington				1.00	478					\$5,908.08	\$12.36		478		2		5
	Burnham												0.95					
0007	Burr Ridge	3.85			1.00	10,372	\$402,779.27	\$38.83			\$178,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$17.16	0.60	10,372	37	35	129	109
0121	Cahokia		5.00	5.15		16,093			\$513,114.34	\$31.88				16,093	58		201	
0006	Cairo		5.00	5.15		4,128			\$131,618.47	\$31.88				4,128	15		51	
0204	Calumet City		5.00	5.15	1.00	36,994			\$1,179,528.48	\$31.88	\$457,245.84	\$12.36	0.95	36,994	132	124	461	388
0205	Calumet Park	5.00				8,383	\$422,778.94	\$50.43					0.95	8,383	30		105	
	Camargo		5.00	5.15		455			\$14,507.36	\$31.88				455	2		6	
	Cambria		5.00	5.15		1,356			\$43,235.14	\$31.88				1,356	5		17	
0209	Carbon Hill		5.00	5.15		433			\$13,805.91	\$31.88				433	2		5	
	Carbondale		5.00	5.15	0.75	27,228			\$868,146.23	\$31.88	\$252,403.56	\$9.27		27,228	97	91	340	286
	Carmi		5.00	5.15		5,576			\$177,786.96	\$31.88				5,576	20		70	
0011	Carol Stream	5.00			1.00	37,738	\$1,903,236.51	\$50.43			\$295,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$7.82	0.50	37,738	135	127	471	396
0049	Carpentersville		5.00	5.15	1.00	28,411			\$905,865.38	\$31.88	\$351,159.96	\$12.36	0.65	28,411	102	95	354	298
	Carrier Mills				0.50	1,989					\$12,292.02	\$6.18		1,989		7		21
	Carroll County												1.75					
	Carrollton				0.50	2,096					\$12,953.28	\$6.18		2,096		7		22
	Cartersville		5.00	5.15		4,466			\$142,395.37	\$31.88				4,466	16		56	

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
0211	Cary				1.00	14,471					\$178,861.56	\$12.36		14,471		49		152
	Casey		3.00	3.09		3,252			\$62,212.68	\$19.13				3,252	12		41	
0212	Caseyville		3.00	3.09		4,294			\$82,146.76	\$19.13				4,294	15		54	
CASS	Cass County												2.00					
0214	Central City				1.00	44					\$543.84	\$12.36		44		0		0
0215	Centralia				1.00	14,061					\$173,793.96	\$12.36		14,061		47		148
0122	Centreville		5.00	5.15		7,033			\$224,242.41	\$31.88				7,033	25		88	
	Chadwick		5.00	5.15		599			\$19,098.71	\$31.88				599	2		7	
0019	Champaign	2.75				65,226	\$1,809,244.73	\$27.74						65,226	233		813	
CHPN	Champaign County												1.50					
	Chapin		5.00	5.15		634			\$20,214.66	\$31.88				634	2		8	
	Chatham				1.00	7,570					\$93,565.20	\$12.36		7,570		25		79
	Cherry		5.00	5.15		502			\$16,005.93	\$31.88				502	2		6	
	Chester				0.75	7,814					\$72,435.78	\$9.27		7,814		26		82
0002	Chicago	5.00			2.00	2,799,050	\$120,600,000.00	\$43.09	N/A	N/A	\$54,800,000.00 <sup>3</sup>	\$19.58	1.25	2,799,050	549 (2)	508 (2)	549 (2)	508 (2)
0074	Chicago Heights		4.00	4.12		31,726			\$809,249.51	\$25.51			1.00	31,726	113		396	
0216	Chicago Ridge				1.00	13,941					\$172,310.76	\$12.36	0.75	13,941		47		146
	Chillicothe				1.00	5,934					\$73,344.24	\$12.36		5,934		20		62
	Christopher				1.00	2,776					\$34,311.36	\$12.36		2,776		9		29
0217	Cicero	5.00			1.00	70,344	\$3,547,651.42	\$50.43			\$869,451.84	\$12.36	1.00	70,344	252	236	877	738
	Cisco				1.00	314					\$3,881.04	\$12.36		314		1		3
0129	Clarendon Hills	4.00			1.00	7,628	\$307,761.69	\$40.35			\$61,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$8.00	0.50	7,628	27	26	95	80
	Clark County												2.95					
CLTN	Clinton County												1.80					
0219	Coal City	5.00			1.00	4,769	\$240,514.47	\$50.43			\$58,944.84	\$12.36		4,769	17	16	59	50
0220	Coal Valley				1.00	3,997					\$49,402.92	\$12.36		3,997		13		42
	Cobden		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,139			\$36,316.24	\$31.88	\$14,078.04	\$12.36		1,139	4	4	14	12
	Coffeen				1.00	812					\$10,036.32	\$12.36		812		3		9
	Coles County												1.95					
	Colfax		5.00	5.15		857			\$27,324.86	\$31.88				857	3		11	
0222	Colona		5.00	5.15	1.00	5,367			\$171,123.14	\$31.88	\$66,336.12	\$12.36		5,367	19	18	67	56
COOK	Cook County												1.25					
	Cortland		5.00	5.15	1.00	2,133			\$68,009.25	\$31.88	\$26,363.88	\$12.36		2,133	8	7	27	22
	Coulterville				1.00	964					\$11,915.04	\$12.36		964		3		10
0224	Country Club Hills	5.00			1.00	16,521	\$833,201.82	\$50.43			\$204,199.56	\$12.36	0.80	16,521	59	55	206	173
0225	Countryside				1.00	6,205					\$76,693.80	\$12.36	0.60	6,205		21		65
	Crawford County												1.35					
	Crestwood												0.90					
0227	Crest Hill				1.00	13,070					\$161,545.20	\$12.36		13,070		44		137
0230	Crystal Lake				1.00	34,661					\$428,409.96	\$12.36		34,661		116		364
	Cumberland County												2.50					

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
	Cutler		5.00	5.15		526			\$16,771.15	\$31.88				526	2		7	
	Dalton City		2.00	2.06		560			\$7,142.09	\$12.75				560	2		7	
0231	Danville				1.00	32,938					\$407,113.68	\$12.36		32,938		110		346
0095	Darien		1.50	1.55	1.00	23,958			\$229,165.35	\$9.57	\$127,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$5.30	0.50	23,958	86	80	299	252
0058	Dawson		5.00	5.15	1.00	548			\$17,472.61	\$31.88	\$6,773.28	\$12.36		548	2	2	7	6
	De Kalb		5.00	5.15		39,329			\$1,253,978.37	\$31.88				39,329	141		490	
	De Soto		5.00	5.15		1,516			\$48,336.63	\$31.88				1,516	5		19	
0083	Decatur		5.00	5.15	1.00	80,945			\$2,580,876.17	\$31.88	\$1,000,480.20	\$12.36		80,945	289	271	1009	850
0232	Deerfield				1.00	18,893					\$233,517.48	\$12.36	0.50	18,893		63		198
	Deer Creek		5.00	5.15	1.00	620			\$19,768.28	\$31.88	\$7,663.20	\$12.36		620	2	2	8	7
0038	Deer Park		5.00	5.15		3,174			\$101,200.83	\$31.88				3,174	11		40	
DKLB	DeKalb County												0.84					
<b>0471</b>	<b>Des Plaines</b>				<b>1.00</b>	<b>57,068</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$704,178.00<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$12.34</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>57,068</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/P</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/P</b>
	Dewitt County												1.25					
0234	Diamond		5.00	5.15		1,166			\$37,177.12	\$31.88				1,166	4		15	
	Divernon				1.00	1,205					\$14,893.80	\$12.36		1,205		4		13
0081	Dixmoor		5.00	5.15		4,005			\$127,696.70	\$31.88			0.75	4,005	14		50	
0236	Dolton		3.00	3.09		23,892			\$457,068.08	\$19.13			1.25	23,892	85		298	
	Douglas County												1.70					
	Dowell		5.00	5.15	1.00	450			\$14,347.94	\$31.88	\$5,562.00	\$12.36		450	2	2	6	5
	Downs				1.00	601					\$7,428.36	\$12.36		601		2		6
0237	Downers Grove	2.30			1.00	51,856	\$1,203,014.12	\$23.20			\$1,140,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$21.98	0.50	51,856	185	174	647	544
	Dunlap				0.50	891					\$5,506.38	\$6.18		891		3		9
DUPG	Dupage County												0.50					
	Durand		3.50	3.61		1,278			\$28,523.71	\$22.32				1,278	5		16	
0239	Dwight		3.00	3.09		4,561			\$87,254.63	\$19.13				4,561	16		57	
	Earlville				1.00	1,556					\$19,232.16	\$12.36		1,556		5		16
0240	East Alton				1.00	6,748					\$83,405.28	\$12.36		6,748		23		71
	East Dubuque		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,822			\$58,093.23	\$31.88	\$22,519.92	\$12.36		1,822	7	6	23	19
0144	East Dundee	5.00				3,442	\$173,590.02	\$50.43					0.65	3,442	12		43	
0156	East Hazel Crest	5.00			1.00	1,594	\$80,390.03	\$50.43			\$19,701.84	\$12.36	0.65	1,594	6	5	20	17
0004	East Moline		5.00	5.15	1.00	20,299			\$647,219.78	\$31.88	\$250,895.64	\$12.36		20,299	73	68	253	213
0242	East Peoria				1.00	23,497					\$290,422.92	\$12.36		23,497		79		247
0123	East St. Louis		4.40	4.53		36,656			\$1,028,501.39	\$28.06				36,656	131		457	
	Edgar County												2.00					
	Edgewood		5.00	5.15		535			\$17,058.11	\$31.88				535	2		7	
	Effingham		1.50	1.55		12,974			\$124,100.14	\$9.57				12,974	46		162	
0245	Elburn		5.00	5.15		2,689			\$85,736.93	\$31.88				2,689	10		34	
	Eldorado		3.00	3.06	1.00	4,695			\$89,818.13	\$19.13	\$58,030.20	\$12.36		4,695	17	16	59	49
0246	Elgin				1.00	89,408					\$1,105,082.88	\$12.36	0.65	89,408		300		939
0073	Elk Grove Village	3.00			1.00	35,058	\$1,060,845.82	\$30.26			\$619,463.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$17.67		35,058	125	118	437	368

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
	Elkhart				1.00	468					\$5,784.48	\$12.36		468		2		5
	Elkville				1.00	912					\$11,272.32	\$12.36		912		3		10
	Ellis Grove				0.75	430					\$3,986.10	\$9.27		430		1		5
0163	Elmhurst	4.94			1.00	44,153	\$2,200,042.36	\$49.83			\$399,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$9.04	0.50	44,153	158	148	551	464
0145	Elmwood		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,882			\$60,006.29	\$31.88	\$23,261.52	\$12.36		1,882	7	6	23	20
0247	Elmwood Park	4.00			1.00	22,379	\$902,910.17	\$40.35			\$276,604.44	\$12.36	1.25	22,379	80	75	279	235
	Energy		5.00	5.15		1,271			\$40,524.97	\$31.88				1,271	5		16	
	Erie		3.50	3.61	1.00	1,480			\$33,032.15	\$22.32	\$18,292.80	\$12.36		1,480	5	5	18	16
0030	Evanston	5.00			1.00	71,679	\$3,000,000.00	\$41.85	N/A	N/A	\$665,000.00 <sup>3</sup>	\$9.28	1.50	71,679	N/P	N/P	N/P	N/P
	Evansville		5.00	5.15		779			\$24,837.88	\$31.88				779	3		10	
0249	Evergreen Park	3.00			1.00	20,348	\$615,725.10	\$30.26			\$251,501.28	\$12.36	1.00	20,348	73	68	254	214
	Fairbury				0.75	3,809					\$35,309.43	\$9.27		3,809		13		40
	Fairfield		5.00	5.15		4,899			\$156,201.28	\$31.88				4,899	18		61	
0124	Fairmont City		5.00	5.15		1,963			\$62,588.92	\$31.88				1,963	7		24	
	Farmer City		3.00	3.09		2,209			\$42,259.48	\$19.13				2,209	8		28	
	Fayetteville				1.00	253					\$3,127.08	\$12.36		253		1		3
	Fisher		3.00	3.09		1,504			\$28,772.41	\$19.13				1,504	5		19	
0253	Fithian		3.00	3.09		502			\$9,603.56	\$19.13				502	2		6	
	Flora				1.00	4,636					\$57,300.96	\$12.36		4,636		16		49
0028	Flossmoor	5.00			1.00	9,464	\$477,296.90	\$50.43			\$116,975.04	\$12.36	1.00	9,464	34	32	118	99
FORD	Ford County												1.50					
0010	Ford Heights		5.00	5.15		4,123			\$131,459.05	\$31.88				4,123	15		51	
0254	Forest Park	5.00				14,184	\$715,340.15	\$50.43					1.00	14,184	51		177	
0027	Forest View	4.00			1.00	741	\$29,896.62	\$40.35			\$9,158.76	\$12.36	1.25	741	3	2	9	8
0255	Forrest		5.00	5.15		1,109			\$35,359.71	\$31.88				1,109	4		14	
	Forreston		5.00	5.15		1,426			\$45,467.04	\$31.88				1,426	5		18	
0256	Forsyth				1.00	2,219					\$27,426.84	\$12.36	0.65	2,219		7		23
0161	Fox Lake				1.00	8,920					\$110,251.20	\$12.36		8,920		30		94
0118	Fox River Grove		5.00	5.15	1.00	4,475			\$142,682.33	\$31.88	\$55,311.00	\$12.36		4,475	16	15	56	47
0126	Fox River Valley Gardens		5.00	5.15	1.00	829			\$26,432.10	\$31.88	\$10,246.44	\$12.36		829	3	3	10	9
0257	Frankfort	5.00				10,681	\$538,673.73	\$50.43						10,681	38		133	
0258	Franklin Park	5.00			1.00	17,900	\$902,748.78	\$50.43			\$221,244.00	\$12.36	1.00	17,900	64	60	223	188
	Freeman Spur		5.00	5.15		316			\$10,075.44	\$31.88				316	1		4	
	Freeport				1.00	26,031					\$321,743.16	\$12.36		26,031		87		273
	Fulton				1.00	3,914					\$48,377.04	\$12.36		3,914		13		41
FLTN	Fulton County												1.85					
0057	Galena		5.00	5.15		3,325			\$106,015.36	\$31.88				3,325	12		41	
0158	Geneva		5.00	5.15	1.00	18,854			\$601,146.94	\$31.88	\$233,035.44	\$12.36		18,854	67	63	235	198
	Genoa		5.00	5.15	1.00	3,433			\$109,458.87	\$31.88	\$42,431.88	\$12.36		3,433	12	12	43	36
0262	Germantown				1.00	1,205					\$14,893.80	\$12.36		1,205		4		13
0263	Gibson City		3.00	3.09		3,366			\$64,393.57	\$19.13				3,366	12		42	

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
0264	Gilberts		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,310			\$41,768.46	\$31.88	\$16,191.60	\$12.36		1,310	5	4	16	14
	Gillespie		5.00	5.00	1.00	2,882			\$91,890.61	\$31.88	\$35,621.52	\$12.36		2,882	10	10	36	30
0266	Glen Carbon				1.00	10,440					\$129,038.40	\$12.36		10,440		35		110
0090	Glen Ellyn	5.00			1.00	26,789	\$1,351,046.77	\$50.43			\$247,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$9.22	0.50	26,789	96	90	334	281
0078	Glenview		5.00	5.15	1.00	41,208			\$1,313,889.00	\$31.88	\$509,330.88	\$12.36	1.00	41,208	147	138	514	433
0267	Glenwood		5.00	5.15	1.00	9,056			\$288,744.39	\$31.88	\$111,932.16	\$12.36	0.85	9,056	32	30	113	95
0068	Glencoe	5.00			1.00	8,350	\$421,114.66	\$50.43			\$62,500.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$7.49	1.50	8,350	30	28	104	88
0052	Glendale Heights	4.00			1.00	30,170	\$1,217,248.30	\$40.35			\$372,901.20	\$12.36	0.50	30,170	108	101	376	317
0475	Godfrey				1.00	16,114					\$199,169.04	\$12.36		16,114		54		169
0268	Godley		5.00	5.15		504			\$16,069.70	\$31.88				504	2		6	
	Golconda				1.00	861					\$10,641.96	\$12.36		861		3		9
0005	Golf		5.00	5.15	1.00	445			\$14,188.52	\$31.88	\$5,500.20	\$12.36	1.25	445	2	1	6	5
	Goodfield		5.00	5.15	1.00	570			\$18,174.06	\$31.88	\$7,045.20	\$12.36		570	2	2	7	6
	Grand Tower		5.00	5.15		725			\$23,116.13	\$31.88				725	3		9	
0269	Grandview				1.00	1,477					\$18,255.72	\$12.36		1,477		5		16
0155	Granite City		5.00	5.15		31,041			\$989,721.13	\$31.88				31,041	111		387	
	Granville				1.00	1,379					\$17,044.44	\$12.36		1,379		5		14
0271	Graylake				1.00	16,572					\$125,699.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$7.59	0.90	16,572		56		174
	Greenfield				1.00	994					\$12,285.84	\$12.36		994		3		10
0273	Greenville				1.00	7,073					\$87,422.28	\$12.36		7,073		24		74
	Griggsville		5.00	5.15	0.25	1,220			\$38,898.87	\$31.88	\$3,769.80	\$3.09		1,220	4	4	15	13
GNDY	Grundy County												1.80					
0274	Gurnee				1.00	26,256					\$324,524.16	\$12.36	0.75	26,256		88		276
0275	Hainesville		5.00	5.15	1.00	574			\$18,301.60	\$31.88	\$7,094.64	\$12.36	0.75	574	2	2	7	6
0276	Hampshire		3.00	3.09	1.00	2,340			\$44,765.58	\$19.13	\$28,922.40	\$12.36		2,340	8	8	29	25
0013	Hampton		5.00	5.15		1,691			\$53,916.38	\$31.88				1,691	6		21	
0278	Hanover Park				1.00	36,099					\$197,502.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$5.47	0.50	36,099		121		379
	Hardin				0.25	996					\$3,077.64	\$3.09		996		3		10
	Harrisburg				1.00	9,468					\$117,024.48	\$12.36		9,468		32		99
0280	Hartford				1.00	1,562					\$19,306.32	\$12.36		1,562		5		16
0281	Harvard		3.00	3.09	1.00	6,996			\$133,837.62	\$19.13	\$86,470.56	\$12.36	0.50	6,996	25	23	87	73
0070	Harvey		5.00	5.15	1.00	29,167			\$929,969.92	\$31.88	\$360,504.12	\$12.36	1.25	29,167	104	98	364	306
0035	Harwood Heights	5.00			1.00	7,977	\$402,303.19	\$50.43			\$98,595.72	\$12.36	1.25	7,977	29	27	99	84
0282	Hawthorne Woods				1.00	5,916					\$73,121.76	\$12.36		5,916		20		62
0022	Hazel Crest	5.00			1.00	13,942	\$703,135.39	\$50.43			\$172,323.12	\$12.36	0.80	13,942	50	47	174	146
	Hebron		4.75	4.89	1.00	917			\$27,776.02	\$30.29	\$11,334.12	\$12.36		917	3	3	11	10
	Hecker		5.00	5.15		621			\$19,800.16	\$31.88				621	2		8	
	Henry				0.25	2,585					\$7,987.65	\$3.09		2,585		9		27
HNRY	Henry County												0.95					
0283	Herscher				1.00	1,440					\$17,798.40	\$12.36		1,440		5		15
	Heyworth		2.00	2.06		2,158			\$27,522.54	\$12.75				2,158	8		27	

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
0091	Hickory Hills	5.00			1.00	14,137	\$712,969.81	\$50.43			\$174,733.32	\$12.36	0.85	14,137	51	47	176	148
	Highland				0.75	8,420					\$78,053.40	\$9.27		8,420		28		88
0036	Highland Park		5.00	5.15		31,343			\$999,350.20	\$31.88			1.00	31,343	112		391	
0065	Highwood		5.00	5.15	1.00	5,196			\$165,670.92	\$31.88	\$64,222.56	\$12.36	1.00	5,196	19	17	65	55
0160	Hillside	5.00				7,501	\$378,297.13	\$50.43					0.85	7,501	27		94	
	Hinckley		5.00	5.15		2,106			\$67,148.38	\$31.88				2,106	8		26	
0128	Hinsdale		3.00	3.09	1.00	16,793			\$321,260.02	\$19.13	\$400,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$23.82	0.50	16,793	60	56	209	176
0284	Hodgkins				1.00	2,087					\$25,795.32	\$12.36	1.00	2,087		7		22
0107	Hoffman Estates	5.00			1.00	48,521	\$2,447,054.40	\$50.43			\$307,393.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$6.34	0.84	48,521	173	163	605	509
0285	Holiday Hills	5.00				790	\$39,841.99	\$50.43						790	3		10	
0286	Hometown												1.00					
0287	Homewood				1.00	19,378					\$239,512.08	\$12.36	0.50	19,378		65		203
	Hopedale		5.00	5.15		926			\$29,524.88	\$31.88				926	3		12	
0097	Hopkins Park		5.00	5.15		791			\$25,220.50	\$31.88				791	3		10	
0289	Huntley				1.00	3,986					\$49,266.96	\$12.36		3,986		13		42
0099	Indian Head Park		5.00	5.15		3,753			\$119,661.85	\$31.88			3.00	3,753	13		47	
IRQS	Iroquois County												2.00					
	Irvington				1.00	834					\$10,308.24	\$12.36		834		3		9
0082	Island Lake		5.00	5.15	1.00	7,915			\$252,364.38	\$31.88	\$97,829.40	\$12.36		7,915	28	27	99	83
0295	Itasca				1.00	8,546					\$262,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$30.66	0.50	8,546		29		90
	Jacksonville		1.50	1.55		18,059			\$172,739.67	\$9.57				18,059	65		225	
	Jasper County												1.85					
	Jefferson County												0.90					
	Jerseyville				1.00	7,589					\$93,800.04	\$12.36		7,589		25		80
	Jersey County												0.90					
	Jo Daviess County												1.75					
0433	Johnsburg				1.00	5,059					\$62,529.24	\$12.36		5,059		17		53
	Johnston City		5.00	5.15	1.00	3,587			\$114,369.05	\$31.88	\$44,335.32	\$12.36		3,587	13	12	45	38
0298	Joliet	5.00				97,308	\$4,907,523.94	\$50.43						97,308	348		1214	
	Joppa		2.50	2.58		541			\$8,624.71	\$15.94				541	2		7	
0300	Justice		5.00	5.15	1.00	11,590			\$369,539.25	\$31.88	\$143,252.40	\$12.36	1.25	11,590	41	39	145	122
KANE	Kane County												0.50					
0067	Kankakee	5.00			1.00	26,717	\$1,347,415.60	\$50.43			\$330,222.12	\$12.36		26,717	96	90	333	280
	Kankakee County												1.00					
	Keithsburg		5.00	5.15	1.00	768			\$24,487.16	\$31.88	\$9,492.48	\$12.36		768	3	3	10	8
KNDL	Kendall County												0.75					
0042	Kenilworth		5.00	5.15		2,275			\$72,536.82	\$31.88			1.00	2,275	8		28	
	Kewanee				1.00	12,686					\$156,798.96	\$12.36		12,686		43		133
	Keyesport				1.00	423					\$5,228.28	\$12.36		423		1		4
0302	Kildeer				1.00	3,341					\$41,294.76	\$12.36		3,341		11		35
	Kingston				1.00	666					\$8,231.76	\$12.36		666		2		7

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
	Knox County												1.25					
0137	La Grange	3.00			1.00	18,066	\$546,672.39	\$30.26			\$223,295.76	\$12.36	0.75	18,066	65	61	225	190
0093	La Grange Park	5.00			1.00	9,265	\$467,260.75	\$50.43			\$114,515.40	\$12.36	1.00	9,265	33	31	116	97
0304	Lake Barrington				1.00	4,831					\$10,081.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$2.09		4,831		16		51
0077	Lake Bluff	5.00				5,662	\$285,551.04	\$50.43					0.85	5,662	20		71	
	LAKE Lake County												0.75					
0033	Lake Forest	5.00			1.00	19,751	\$996,100.07	\$50.43			\$68,644.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$3.48	0.65	19,751	71	66	246	207
0305	Lake Villa				1.00	4,934					\$60,984.24	\$12.36		4,934		17		52
0104	Lake Zurich				1.00	17,769					\$127,360.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$7.17		17,769		60		187
0003	Lake-in-the-Hills		5.00	5.15	1.00	21,228			\$676,840.32	\$31.88	\$262,378.08	\$12.36		21,228	76	71	265	223
0135	Lakemoor				1.00	1,809					\$22,359.24	\$12.36		1,809		6		19
0306	Lakewood	5.00			1.00	2,268	\$114,381.80	\$50.43			\$28,032.48	\$12.36		2,268	8	8	28	24
0307	Lansing		3.00	3.09	1.00	28,612			\$547,364.47	\$19.13	\$353,644.32	\$12.36	0.50	28,612	102	96	357	300
0159	LaSalle		5.00	5.15		9,358			\$298,373.45	\$31.88			0.65	9,358	33		117	
	Lawrenceville				1.00	4,103					\$50,713.08	\$12.36		4,103		14		43
0308	Lebanon				1.00	3,715					\$45,917.40	\$12.36		3,715		12		39
	Lee		5.00	5.15		338			\$10,776.90	\$31.88				338	1		4	
	LEEE Lee County												1.75					
	Leland	5.00				948	\$47,810.38	\$50.43						948	3		12	
0309	Leland Grove		5.00	5.15		1,506			\$48,017.78	\$31.88				1,506	5		19	
0310	Lemont	5.00				11,492	\$579,574.81	\$50.43					0.75	11,492	41		143	
	Lena		5.00	5.15		2,807			\$89,499.28	\$31.88				2,807	10		35	
0311	Lenzburg		5.00	5.15		545			\$17,376.95	\$31.88				545	2		7	
	Leroy		5.00	5.15	1.00	3,184			\$101,519.67	\$31.88	\$39,354.24	\$12.36		3,184	11	11	40	33
0312	Lewistown				1.00	2,538					\$31,369.68	\$12.36		2,538		9		27
	Lexington				1.00	1,785					\$22,062.60	\$12.36		1,785		6		19
0314	Libertyville				1.00	20,879					\$213,418.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$10.22	0.75	20,879		70		219
0472	Lily Lake				1.00	728					\$8,998.08	\$12.36		728		2		8
	Lincoln				1.00	15,297					\$189,070.92	\$12.36		15,297		51		161
0012	Lincolnshire		5.00	5.15	1.00	6,223			\$198,416.11	\$31.88	\$295,811.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$47.54	1.50	6,223	22	21	78	65
0315	Lincolnwood	5.00			1.00	11,353	\$572,564.63	\$50.43			\$94,744.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$8.35	0.50	11,353	41	38	142	119
0316	Lindenhurst				1.00	11,969					\$147,936.84	\$12.36		11,969		40		126
0116	Lisle		5.00	5.15	1.00	21,099			\$672,727.24	\$31.88	\$493,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$23.37	0.50	21,099	75	71	263	222
	Little York		5.00	5.15		328			\$10,458.06	\$31.88				328	1		4	
	LVSN Livingston County												1.50					
	Loami		5.00	5.15	1.00	823			\$26,240.79	\$31.88	\$10,172.28	\$12.36		823	3	3	10	9
0319	Lockport				1.00	14,263					\$176,290.68	\$12.36		14,263		48		150
	Loda		3.00	3.09		385			\$7,365.28	\$19.13				385	1		5	
	LOGN Logan County												0.85					
0320	Lombard	5.00			1.00	43,099	\$2,173,607.25	\$50.43			\$565,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$13.11	0.50	43,099	154	145	537	452
0321	Long Grove				0.25	6,339					\$19,587.51	\$3.09		6,339		21		67

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
	Long Point				1.00	213					\$2,632.68	\$12.36		213		1		2
0322	Loves Park				1.00	19,008					\$234,938.88	\$12.36		19,008		64		200
0323	Lynwood		5.00	5.15	1.00	7,751			\$247,135.35	\$31.88	\$95,802.36	\$12.36	1.00	7,751	28	26	97	81
0029	Lyons	5.00			1.00	9,688	\$488,593.87	\$50.43			\$119,743.68	\$12.36	1.00	9,688	35	32	121	102
0297	Machesney Park				1.00	19,777					\$244,443.72	\$12.36		19,777		66		208
	Mackinaw		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,421			\$45,307.62	\$31.88	\$17,563.56	\$12.36		1,421	5	5	18	15
	Macomb				1.00	18,843					\$232,899.48	\$12.36		18,843		63		198
	Macon				1.00	1,240					\$15,326.40	\$12.36		1,240		4		13
MACN	Macon County												0.90					
MCPN	Macoupin County												2.00					
0148	Madison	5.00			1.00	4,664	\$235,219.01	\$50.43			\$57,647.04	\$12.36		4,664	17	16	58	49
MDSN	Madison County												0.65					
	Makanda				0.75	318					\$2,947.86	\$9.27		318		1		3
	Malta		4.00	4.12		989			\$25,226.87	\$25.51				989	4		12	
0324	Manhattan				0.50	3,177					\$19,633.86	\$6.18		3,177		11		33
	Mansfield		2.50	2.58		1,018			\$16,229.12	\$15.94				1,018	4		13	
0325	Manteno				1.00	5,505					\$68,041.80	\$12.36		5,505		18		58
	Maple Park		5.00	5.15	1.00	699			\$22,287.14	\$31.88	\$8,639.64	\$12.36		699	2	2	9	7
0327	Marengo		5.00	5.15		5,534			\$176,447.82	\$31.88				5,534	20		69	
MARN	Marion County												1.25					
0329	Markham				1.00	12,823					\$158,492.28	\$12.36	0.86	12,823		43		135
	Maroa		3.00	3.09	1.00	1,600			\$30,608.95	\$19.13	\$19,776.00	\$12.36		1,600	6	5	20	17
	Marshall				1.00	3,328					\$41,134.08	\$12.36		3,328		11		35
0040	Maryville		4.00	4.12		3,271			\$83,434.88	\$25.51				3,271	12		41	
	Mascoutah		3.00	3.09	1.00	5,739			\$109,790.46	\$19.13	\$70,934.04	\$12.36		5,739	21	19	72	60
MASN	Mason County												1.85					
0330	Matteson				1.00	13,025					\$160,989.00	\$12.36	0.80	13,025		44		137
	Maunie		2.00	2.06		153			\$1,951.32	\$12.75				153	1		2	
0024	Maywood		5.00	5.15		25,743			\$820,798.01	\$31.88			0.85	25,743	92		321	
0332	McCook				1.00	283					\$3,497.88	\$12.36	0.85	283		1		3
0333	McCullom Lake				1.00	1,069					\$13,212.84	\$12.36		1,069		4		11
0334	McHenry				1.00	20,194					\$249,597.84	\$12.36		20,194		68		212
MCHY	McHenry County												0.50					
MCLN	McLean County												1.25					
0336	Melrose Park		5.00	5.15		20,414			\$650,886.48	\$31.88			2.00	20,414	73		255	
0131	Merrionette				1.00	2,226					\$27,513.36	\$12.36		2,226		7		23
	Metropolis				1.00	7,094					\$87,681.84	\$12.36		7,094		24		74
0338	Midlothian	5.00			1.00	14,873	\$750,088.42	\$50.43			\$183,830.28	\$12.36	1.25	14,873	53	50	185	156
	Mill Shoals				1.00	240					\$2,966.40	\$12.36		240		1		3
	Milledgeville		5.00	5.15	0.25	1,025			\$32,681.43	\$31.88	\$3,167.25	\$3.09		1,025	4	3	13	11
0341	Millington												0.75					

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
	Minier		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,190			\$37,942.34	\$31.88	\$14,708.40	\$12.36		1,190	4	4	15	12
	Minonk		3.50	3.61		2,063			\$46,044.14	\$22.32				2,063	7		26	
0342	Minooka				1.00	3,955					\$48,883.80	\$12.36		3,955		13		42
0343	Mokena				1.00	13,199					\$163,139.64	\$12.36		13,199		44		139
0344	Moline				1.00	42,720					\$528,019.20	\$12.36		42,720		143		448
0346	Monee				1.00	2,038					\$25,189.68	\$12.36		2,038		7		21
	Monmouth				0.50	9,569					\$59,136.42	\$6.18		9,569		32		100
	Monroe County												1.00					
0347	Montgomery		5.00	5.15	1.00	5,945			\$189,552.27	\$31.88	\$73,480.20	\$12.36		5,945	21	20	74	62
	Monticello				0.50	5,186					\$32,049.48	\$6.18		5,186		17		54
	Morrison		5.00	5.15	1.00	4,315			\$137,580.83	\$31.88	\$53,333.40	\$12.36		4,315	15	14	54	45
0076	Morton Grove	5.00			1.00	22,064	\$1,112,751.35	\$50.43			\$96,084.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$4.35	0.75	22,064	79	74	275	232
0132	Mound City		5.00	5.15		726			\$23,148.02	\$31.88				726	3		9	
0141	Mounds		5.00	5.15		1,290			\$41,130.77	\$31.88				1,290	5		16	
	Mount Carmel		5.00	5.15	0.75	7,818			\$249,271.60	\$31.88	\$72,472.86	\$9.27		7,818	28	26	97	82
	Mount Clare				0.25	313					\$967.17	\$3.09		313		1		3
	Mount Morris				1.00	2,946					\$36,412.56	\$12.36		2,946		10		31
	Mount Olive		5.00	5.15		2,293			\$73,110.74	\$31.88				2,293	8		29	
0349	Mount Prospect	3.30			1.00	53,613	\$1,371,240.00	\$25.58	N/A	N/A	\$169,158.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$3.16	0.75	53,613	678	645	678	645
0350	Mount Vernon				1.00	17,483					\$216,089.88	\$12.36		17,483		59		184
	Mount Zion		3.00	3.09	0.25	4,566			\$87,350.28	\$19.13	\$14,108.94	\$3.09		4,566	16	15	57	48
0352	Mundelein				1.00	28,949					\$357,809.64	\$12.36	0.50	28,949		97		304
	Murphysboro				1.00	8,925					\$110,313.00	\$12.36		8,925		30		94
0051	Naperville		5.00	5.15	1.00	122,993	N/A	N/A	\$3,921,548.00	\$31.88	\$1,425,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$11.59	0.50	122,993	1,128	1,164	1,128	1,164
0354	Nashville				1.00	3,107					\$38,402.52	\$12.36		3,107		10		33
	Nauvoo				1.00	1,241					\$15,338.76	\$12.36		1,241		4		13
0153	New Athens		2.75	2.83		1,955			\$34,283.61	\$17.54				1,955	7		24	
	New Berlin				1.00	912					\$11,272.32	\$12.36		912		3		10
	New Boston				1.00	659					\$8,145.24	\$12.36		659		2		7
	New Haven		5.00	5.15		442			\$14,092.87	\$31.88				442	2		6	
0355	New Lenox				1.00	16,217					\$200,442.12	\$12.36		16,217		54		170
	New Millford		3.00	3.09		680			\$13,008.80	\$19.13				680	2		8	
	New Minden				1.00	183					\$2,261.88	\$12.36		183		1		2
0053	Newark		5.00	5.15		949			\$30,258.22	\$31.88				949	3		12	
	Newman		4.00	4.12	1.00	952			\$24,283.10	\$25.51	\$11,766.72	\$12.36		952	3	3	12	10
0025	Niles	3.00			1.00	30,004	\$907,913.11	\$30.26			\$60,000.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$2.00	1.00	30,004	107	101	374	315
	Nilwood				1.00	258					\$3,188.88	\$12.36		258		1		3
	Normal		5.00	5.15	1.00	45,623			\$1,454,658.27	\$31.88	\$563,900.28	\$12.36		45,623	163	153	569	479
	Norris City		5.00	5.15		1,294			\$41,258.31	\$31.88				1,294	5		16	
0358	North Aurora				1.00	9,545					\$117,976.20	\$12.36		9,545		32		100
0015	North Chicago	5.00			1.00	36,097	\$1,820,476.14	\$50.43			\$446,158.92	\$12.36	0.75	36,097	129	121	450	379

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
0360	North Riverside		5.00	5.15		6,094			\$194,303.04	\$31.88			1.25	6,094	22		76	
0361	North Utica		5.00	5.15	1.00	833			\$26,559.64	\$31.88	\$10,295.88	\$12.36		833	3	3	10	9
0088	Northbrook				1.00	33,645					\$668,866.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$19.88	0.75	33,645		113		353
0069	Northfield		5.00	5.15	1.00	5,621			\$179,221.75	\$31.88	\$92,000.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$16.37	2.00	5,621	20	19	70	59
0147	Northlake		5.00	5.15	1.00	11,674			\$372,217.54	\$31.88	\$144,290.64	\$12.36	1.25	11,674	42	39	146	123
0370	O'Fallon				1.00	20,091					\$248,324.76	\$12.36		20,091		67		211
0363	Oak Brook		3.00	3.09	1.00	9,779			\$187,078.05	\$19.13	\$570,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$58.29	0.50	9,779	35	33	122	103
0152	Oak Brook Terrace		5.00	5.15	1.00	2,375			\$75,725.26	\$31.88	\$100,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$42.11	0.50	2,375	8	8	30	25
0365	Oak Forest				1.00	28,866					\$356,783.76	\$12.36	0.75	28,866		97		303
0367	Oak Lawn				1.00	58,002	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$335,728.00 <sup>3</sup>	\$5.79	1.00	58,002	N/A	N/P	N/A	N/P
0031	Oak Park	5.00			1.00	53,787	\$2,712,634.01	\$50.43			\$664,807.32	\$12.36	1.00	53,787	192	180	671	565
0369	Oakwood Hills				1.00	2,021					\$24,979.56	\$12.36		2,021		7		21
	Odell		5.00	5.15		1,037			\$33,064.04	\$31.88				1,037	4		13	
OGLE	Ogle County												1.25					
0371	Oglesby		2.00	2.06		3,703			\$47,227.05	\$12.75			1.50	3,703	13		46	
0143	Olmsted		5.00	5.15		337			\$10,745.02	\$31.88				337	1		4	
0061	Olympia Fields		1.00	1.03	1.00	4,820			\$30,736.48	\$6.38	\$59,575.20	\$12.36		4,820	17	16	60	51
	Oreana				1.00	867					\$10,716.12	\$12.36		867		3		9
	Oregon				1.00	4,006					\$49,514.16	\$12.36		4,006		13		42
0018	Orland Hills		5.00	5.15	1.00	6,673			\$212,764.06	\$31.88	\$82,478.28	\$12.36	1.00	6,673	24	22	83	70
0375	Orland Park				1.00	51,548					\$637,133.28	\$12.36	1.00	51,548		173		541
0376	Oswego				1.00	11,885					\$146,898.60	\$12.36		11,885		40		125
	Ottawa												0.58					
0378	Palatine				1.00	53,768					\$460,000.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$8.56	0.75	53,768		180		564
0108	Palos Heights	5.00				12,130	\$611,750.99	\$50.43					0.75	12,130	43		151	
0379	Palos Hills	4.00			1.00	18,774	\$757,461.71	\$40.35			\$232,046.64	\$12.36	0.75	18,774	67	63	234	197
0106	Palos Park		5.00	5.15		4,822			\$153,746.18	\$31.88			0.75	4,822	17		60	
	Paris		5.00	5.15	1.00	9,095			\$289,987.88	\$31.88	\$112,414.20	\$12.36		9,095	33	31	113	95
	Park City												0.75					
0103	Park Forest	5.00				24,443	\$1,232,731.20	\$50.43					0.75	24,443	87		305	
0037	Park Ridge	5.00			1.00	37,866	\$1,909,691.92	\$50.43			\$371,640.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$9.81	1.00	37,866	135	127	472	398
	Pawnee				1.00	2,218					\$27,414.48	\$12.36		2,218		7		23
0381	Payson				1.00	1,170					\$14,461.20	\$12.36		1,170		4		12
	Pecatonica		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,792			\$57,136.70	\$31.88	\$22,149.12	\$12.36		1,792	6	6	22	19
0064	Peoria		5.00	5.15	1.00	111,127			\$3,543,208.68	\$31.88	\$1,373,529.72	\$12.36		111,127	397	373	1386	1167
PEOR	Peoria County												0.80					
0382	Peoria Heights				1.00	6,376					\$78,807.36	\$12.36		6,376		21		67
0384	Peru												0.65					
	Pesotum		5.00	5.15		520			\$16,579.85	\$31.88				520	2		6	
0383	Peotone		5.00	5.15		3,452			\$110,064.67	\$31.88				3,452	12		43	
0055	Phoenix		5.00	5.15	1.00	2,306			\$73,525.24	\$31.88	\$28,502.16	\$12.36	1.25	2,306	8	8	29	24

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
	Piatt County												1.95					
	Pinckneyville				1.00	3,578			\$44,224.08	\$12.36				3,578		12		38
0386	Pingree Grove				1.00	92			\$1,137.12	\$12.36				92		0		1
	Piper City		2.00	2.06	1.00	753			\$9,603.56	\$12.75	\$9,307.08	\$12.36		753	3	3	9	8
	Pittsburg			5.00	5.15	637			\$20,310.31	\$31.88				637	2		8	
0387	Plainfield	4.00				10,695	\$431,503.83	\$40.35						10,695	38		133	
	Plano												0.50					
	Pontiac				0.50	11,521			\$71,199.78	\$6.18				11,521		39		121
0125	Pontoon Beach		5.00	5.15		5,042			\$160,760.73	\$31.88				5,042	18		63	
0390	Posen		5.00	5.15		4,410			\$140,609.85	\$31.88			0.75	4,410	16		55	
0391	Prarie Grove				1.00	882					\$10,901.52	\$12.36		882		3		9
	Princeton		5.00	5.00	1.00	7,531			\$240,120.80	\$31.88	\$93,083.16	\$12.36		7,531	27	25	94	79
	Prophetstown				1.00	1,919					\$23,718.84	\$12.36		1,919		6		20
0392	Prospect Heights	5.00			1.00	15,708	\$792,199.88	\$50.43			\$194,150.88	\$12.36	0.75	15,708	56	53	196	165
	Pulaski		5.00	5.15		349			\$11,127.63	\$31.88				349	1		4	
	Pulaski County												3.00					
	Raleigh		5.00	5.15		317			\$10,107.33	\$31.88				317	1		4	
RAND	Randolph County												0.98					
	Rankin		5.00	5.15		582			\$18,556.67	\$31.88				582	2		7	
	Rantoul		5.00	5.00	0.50	13,894			\$443,000.72	\$31.88	\$85,864.92	\$6.18		13,894	50	47	173	146
	Rapids City		5.00	5.15	1.00	994			\$31,693.01	\$31.88	\$12,285.84	\$12.36		994	4	3	12	10
	Richmond				0.25	1,096					\$3,386.64	\$3.09		1,096		4		12
0102	Richton Park	5.00			1.00	11,871	\$598,688.87	\$50.43			\$146,725.56	\$12.36	0.70	11,871	42	40	148	125
	Richview				1.00	340					\$4,202.40	\$12.36		340		1		4
	Ridgway		5.00	5.15		1,056			\$33,669.84	\$31.88				1,056	4		13	
0115	River Forest	5.00			1.00	12,051	\$607,766.79	\$50.43			\$148,950.36	\$12.36	1.00	12,051	43	40	150	127
0396	River Grove	5.00			1.00	9,635	\$485,920.92	\$50.43			\$119,088.60	\$12.36	1.00	9,635	34	32	120	101
0395	Riverdale		5.00	5.15	1.00	13,014			\$414,942.52	\$31.88	\$160,853.04	\$12.36	1.25	13,014	47	44	162	137
0105	Riverside	5.00			1.00	8,312	\$419,198.21	\$50.43			\$102,736.32	\$12.36	1.50	8,312	30	28	104	87
0397	Riverton				1.00	3,029					\$37,438.44	\$12.36		3,029		10		32
0398	Riverwoods	5.00			1.00	3,949	\$199,159.49	\$50.43			\$48,809.64	\$12.36		3,949	14	13	49	41
	Roanoke				1.00	1,910					\$23,607.60	\$12.36		1,910		6		20
0014	Robbins		5.00	5.15	1.00	7,272			\$231,862.77	\$31.88	\$89,881.92	\$12.36	1.25	7,272	26	24	91	76
	Robinson				0.50	6,338					\$39,168.84	\$6.18		6,338		21		67
	Rochelle				1.00	9,307					\$115,034.52	\$12.36		9,307		31		98
0080	Rochester		5.00	5.15	1.00	2,813			\$89,690.59	\$31.88	\$34,768.68	\$12.36		2,813	10	9	35	30
0399	Rock Falls				1.00	9,356					\$115,640.16	\$12.36		9,356		31		98
0162	Rock Island		5.00	5.15	1.00	38,389			\$1,224,007.11	\$31.88	\$474,488.04	\$12.36		38,389	137	129	479	403
RKIS	Rock Island County												0.65					
0112	Rockdale		5.00	5.15		1,869			\$59,591.79	\$31.88				1,869	7		23	
0400	Rockford				1.00	143,831					\$1,777,751.16	\$12.36		143,831		482		1510

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
0401	Rockton				0.75	3,390					\$31,425.30	\$9.27		3,390		11		36
0117	Rolling Meadows				1.00	23,279					\$400,000.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$17.18	0.75	23,279		78		244
	Romeoville		5.00	5.15		21,763		\$693,898.43	\$31.88					21,763	78		271	
	Roodhouse		5.00	5.15	1.00	2,465		\$78,594.85	\$31.88		\$30,467.40	\$12.36		2,465	9	8	31	26
	Roscoe				1.00	2,519					\$31,134.84	\$12.36		2,519		8		26
0154	Roselle	5.00			1.00	24,121	\$1,216,491.81	\$50.43			\$225,551.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$9.35	0.50	24,121	86	81	301	253
0020	Rosemont	5.00			1.00	3,899	\$196,637.85	\$50.43			\$48,191.64	\$12.36	1.65	3,899	14	13	49	41
0402	Round Lake		5.00	5.15		5,304		\$169,114.43	\$31.88				0.75	5,304	19			66
0026	Round Lake Beach		4.00	4.12	1.00	23,655		\$603,378.85	\$25.51		\$292,375.80	\$12.36	0.75	23,655	85	79	295	248
0130	Round Lake Heights		3.00	3.09		1,420		\$27,165.44	\$19.13				0.75	1,420	5		18	
0403	Round Lake Park		5.00	5.15	1.00	4,926		\$157,062.15	\$31.88		\$60,885.36	\$12.36	0.75	4,926	18	17	61	52
0404	Roxana				1.00	1,558					\$19,256.88	\$12.36		1,558		5		16
	Royalton		5.00	5.15		1,237		\$39,440.90	\$31.88					1,237	4		15	
	Rutland		5.00	5.15		410		\$13,072.57	\$31.88					410	1		5	
	Sadorus		4.00	4.12		435		\$11,095.74	\$25.51					435	2		5	
0406	St. Charles	3.00			1.00	27,957	\$845,971.43	\$30.26			\$215,153.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$7.70		27,957	100	94	349	294
	St. Elmo		1.00	1.03		1,372		\$8,749.06	\$6.38					1,372	5		17	
0409	Salem				1.00	7,644					\$94,479.84	\$12.36		7,644		26		80
	Sangamon County												0.75					
0410	San Jose				1.00	686					\$8,478.96	\$12.36		686		2		7
	Sandoval		5.00	5.15		1,644		\$52,417.82	\$31.88					1,644	6		21	
	Sandwich		4.00	4.12	1.00	6,146		\$156,768.82	\$25.51		\$75,964.56	\$12.36		6,146	22	21	77	65
0412	Sauk Village		5.00	5.15		11,031		\$351,715.92	\$31.88				1.00	11,031	39		138	
	St. Charles												0.50					
STCL	St Clair County												0.65					
0414	Schaumburg	3.00			1.00	75,242	\$6,300,000.00 <sup>5</sup>	\$83.73	N/A	N/A	\$2,100,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$27.91		75,242	648	580	648	580
0127	Schiller Park	5.00			1.00	10,936	\$551,534.12	\$50.43			\$135,168.96	\$12.36	1.00	10,936	39	37	136	115
0415	Seneca		5.00	5.15	0.75	2,508		\$79,965.87	\$31.88		\$23,249.16	\$9.27	2.00	2,508	9	8	31	26
	Shabbona		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,029		\$32,808.96	\$31.88		\$12,718.44	\$12.36		1,029	4	3	13	11
	Shannon		2.00	2.06		936		\$11,937.49	\$12.75					936	3		12	
	Shawneetown		5.00	5.15		1,505		\$47,985.90	\$31.88					1,505	5		19	
	Sheffield				1.00	946					\$11,692.56	\$12.36		946		3		10
	Sheldon				1.00	1,083		\$13,385.88	\$12.36					1,083		4		11
	Sheridan				1.00	2,444		\$30,207.84	\$12.36					2,444		8		26
0416	Shiloh				1.00	5,762					\$71,218.32	\$12.36		5,762		19		60
0060	Shorewood		4.00	4.12		8,473		\$216,124.67	\$25.51					8,473	30		106	
0017	Silvis		5.00	5.15		6,934		\$221,085.87	\$31.88					6,934	25		86	
0085	Skokie		2.00	2.06	1.00	58,573		\$747,024.08	\$12.75		\$563,802.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$9.63		58,573	209	196	730	615
0050	Sleepy Hollow		5.00	5.15	1.00	3,673		\$117,111.10	\$31.88		\$45,398.28	\$12.36	0.65	3,673	13	12	46	39
0418	Smithton		5.00	5.15		1,976		\$63,003.41	\$31.88					1,976	7		25	
	Somonauk		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,388		\$44,255.43	\$31.88		\$17,155.68	\$12.36		1,388	5	5	17	15

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
	Sorento				1.00	586					\$7,242.96	\$12.36		586		2		6
0419	South Barrington				1.00	4,426					\$54,705.36	\$12.36	2.00	4,426		15		46
0421	South Chicago Heights		4.00	4.12	1.00	3,793			\$96,749.78	\$25.51	\$46,881.48	\$12.36	1.25	3,793	14	13	47	40
0422	South Elgin		1.00	1.03	1.00	15,737			\$100,352.70	\$6.38	\$194,509.32	\$12.36	0.68	15,737	56	53	196	165
0423	South Holland		3.00	3.09	1.00	21,862			\$418,232.98	\$19.13	\$270,214.32	\$12.36	0.95	21,862	78	73	273	230
	South Jacksonville				1.00	3,358					\$41,504.88	\$12.36		3,358		11		35
0092	South Roxana		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,883			\$60,038.17	\$31.88	\$23,273.88	\$12.36		1,883	7	6	23	20
0009	Southern View		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,881			\$59,974.40	\$31.88	\$23,249.16	\$12.36		1,881	7	6	23	20
0425	Spaulding				1.00	479					\$5,920.44	\$12.36		479		2		5
	Spring Grove		5.00	5.15		3,626			\$115,612.54	\$31.88				3,626	13		45	
	Spring Valley				1.00	5,233					\$64,679.88	\$12.36		5,233		18		55
0427	Springfield				1.00	117,876					\$1,456,947.36	\$12.36		117,876		395		1238
	Stanford		5.00	5.15	1.00	639			\$20,374.08	\$31.88	\$7,898.04	\$12.36		639	2	2	8	7
	Steeleville		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,975			\$62,971.53	\$31.88	\$24,411.00	\$12.36		1,975	7	7	25	21
0428	Steger				1.00	10,210					\$126,195.60	\$12.36	0.76	10,210		34		107
0429	Sterling				1.00	14,793					\$182,841.48	\$12.36		14,793		50		155
	Stickney												1.25					
	Stillman Valley				1.00	1,012					\$12,508.32	\$12.36		1,012		3		11
	Stockton				1.00	1,738					\$21,481.68	\$12.36		1,738		6		18
0072	Stone Park		5.00	5.15	1.00	4,335			\$138,218.52	\$31.88	\$53,580.60	\$12.36	1.25	4,335	16	15	54	46
0046	Streamwood	4.00			1.00	35,746	\$1,442,219.35	\$40.35			\$142,959.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$4.00	0.55	35,746	128	120	446	375
	Streator				1.00	14,265					\$176,315.40	\$12.36		14,265		48		150
0431	Sugar Grove		5.00	5.15	1.00	3,497			\$111,499.46	\$31.88	\$43,222.92	\$12.36		3,497	13	12	44	37
0432	Summit		5.00	5.15	1.00	9,594			\$305,898.15	\$31.88	\$118,581.84	\$12.36	1.00	9,594	34	32	120	101
0434	Swansea				1.00	9,539					\$117,902.04	\$12.36		9,539		32		100
	Tazewell County												0.80					
0439	Third Lake				1.00	1,516					\$18,737.76	\$12.36		1,516		5		16
0111	Thornton		4.00	4.12	1.00	2,691			\$68,640.56	\$25.51	\$33,260.76	\$12.36	1.25	2,691	10	9	34	28
	Tilden				0.25	914					\$2,824.26	\$3.09		914		3		10
0440	Tilton		3.50	3.61		2,653			\$59,212.37	\$22.32				2,653	9		33	
0441	Tinley Park				1.00	47,929					\$592,402.44	\$12.36	0.75	47,929		161		503
	Tiskilwa				1.00	825					\$10,197.00	\$12.36		825		3		9
	Towanda		5.00	5.00	1.00	526			\$16,771.15	\$31.88	\$6,501.36	\$12.36		526	2	2	7	6
0138	Union		5.00	5.15	1.00	531			\$16,930.57	\$31.88	\$6,563.16	\$12.36		531	2	2	7	6
UNIN	Union County												2.50					
0096	University Park		5.00	5.15	1.00	6,741			\$214,932.19	\$31.88	\$83,318.76	\$12.36		6,741	24	23	84	71
0016	Urbana	5.00				36,744	\$1,853,106.22	\$50.43						36,744	131		458	
	Valier		5.00	5.15	1.00	684			\$21,808.87	\$31.88	\$8,454.24	\$12.36		684	2	2	9	7
0134	Venice		5.00	5.15	1.00	3,504			\$111,722.65	\$31.88	\$43,309.44	\$12.36		3,504	13	12	44	37
VRML	Vermillion County												0.75					
	Vermont		5.00	5.15		813			\$25,921.95	\$31.88				813	3		10	

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee  
for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)
	Vernon Hills												0.75					
	Versailles		3.00	3.09		519			\$9,928.78	\$19.13				519	2		6	
	Villa Grove		5.00	5.00	1.00	2,766			\$88,192.03	\$31.88	\$34,187.76	\$12.36		2,766	10	9	34	29
0054	Villa Park	5.00			1.00	21,870	\$1,102,967.37	\$50.43			\$160,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$7.32	0.50	21,870	78	73	273	230
0489	Virgil				1.00	346					\$4,276.56	\$12.36		346		1		4
0448	Wadsworth				1.00	3,071					\$37,957.56	\$12.36		3,071		10		32
	Wapella		5.00	5.15	1.00	692			\$22,063.95	\$31.88	\$8,553.12	\$12.36		692	2	2	9	7
	Warren		5.00	5.15	1.00	1,443			\$46,009.07	\$31.88	\$17,835.48	\$12.36		1,443	5	5	18	15
0451	Warrenville				1.00	13,614					\$120,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$8.81	0.50	13,614		46		143
	Washburn				1.00	1,011					\$12,495.96	\$12.36		1,011		3		11
0133	Washington Park		5.00	5.15		6,755			\$215,378.57	\$31.88				6,755	24		84	
0453	Wauconda	5.00				9,122	\$460,048.85	\$50.43						9,122	33		114	
<b>0151</b>	<b>Waukegan</b>	<b>5.00</b>			<b>1.00</b>	<b>76,425</b>	<b>\$1,551,526.00</b>	<b>\$20.30</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$503,268.00<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>\$6.59</b>		<b>76,425</b>	<b>1,260</b>	<b>1,300</b>	<b>1,260</b>	<b>1,300</b>
	Waverly				1.00	1,264					\$15,623.04	\$12.36		1,264		4		13
0454	Wayne		5.00	5.15		1,977			\$63,035.30	\$31.88				1,977	7		25	
	Wayne City				1.00	1,167					\$14,424.12	\$12.36		1,167		4		12
	Waynesville				1.00	550					\$6,798.00	\$12.36		550		2		6
	Wenona		5.00	5.15		960			\$30,608.95	\$31.88				960	3		12	
0455	Westchester	5.00			1.00	17,606	\$887,921.51	\$50.43			\$217,610.16	\$12.36		17,606	63	59	220	185
	Westfield		5.00	5.15		717			\$22,861.06	\$31.88				717	3		9	
0456	West Chicago		5.00	5.15	1.00	18,729			\$597,161.40	\$31.88	\$111,260.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$5.94		18,729	67	63	234	197
0457	West Dundee				0.50	4,956					\$30,628.08	\$6.18		4,956		17		52
	West Frankfort				1.00	8,160					\$100,857.60	\$12.36		8,160		27		86
0473	West Peoria				1.00	5,519					\$68,214.84	\$12.36		5,519		19		58
0136	Western Springs	5.00			1.00	12,482	\$629,503.37	\$50.43			\$154,277.52	\$12.36		12,482	45	42	156	131
0063	Westmont	5.00			1.00	23,482	\$1,184,265.19	\$50.43			\$249,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$10.60		23,482	84	79	293	247
<b>0041</b>	<b>Wheaton</b>	<b>3.60</b>			<b>1.00</b>	<b>56,225</b>	<b>\$1,527,487.00</b>	<b>\$27.17</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$424,000.00<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>\$7.54</b>		<b>56,225</b>	<b>1,081</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>1,081</b>	<b>998</b>
	White City				1.00	239					\$2,954.04	\$12.36		239		1		3
	Whiteside County												0.75					
0459	Wheeling	5.00			1.00	30,262	\$1,526,200.21	\$50.43			\$527,355.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$17.43		30,262	108	101	377	318
WILL	Will County												0.75					
	Willisville		5.00	5.15		575			\$18,333.48	\$31.88				575	2		7	
0460	Willowbrook	3.00			1.00	9,629	\$291,371.00	\$30.26			\$91,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$9.45		9,629	34	32	120	101
0109	Willow Springs		5.00	5.15	1.00	5,017			\$159,963.63	\$31.88	\$62,010.12	\$12.36		5,017	18	17	63	53
0039	Wilmette	5.00			1.00	26,345	\$1,328,654.56	\$50.43			\$56,529.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$2.15		26,345	94	88	329	277
0461	Wilmington		5.00	5.15	1.00	5,512			\$175,746.36	\$31.88	\$68,128.32	\$12.36		5,512	20	18	69	58
0056	Winfield	5.00			1.00	8,674	\$437,454.91	\$50.43			\$56,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$6.46	0.50	8,674	31	29	108	91
	Winnebago				1.00	2,651					\$32,766.36	\$12.36		2,651		9		28
WINB	Winnegago County												0.50					
0462	Winnetka	5.00			1.00	11,662	\$588,148.40	\$50.43			\$220,255.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$18.89		11,662	42	39	145	122
0021	Winthrop Harbor		5.00	5.15		7,282			\$232,181.61	\$31.88			1.00	7,282	26		91	

Municipalities Imposing a Municipal Telecommunications Utility, Excise Tax or Infrastructure Maintenance Fee for the Largest Incumbent LECs in Illinois

Prepared by the Civic Federation  
September 2001

TAR Code	Municipality	MET Rate (%)	MUT Rate (%)	MUT Rate Charged	MIMF Rate (%)	Population	FY 1999/2000 MET Revenues	FY 99/00 MET Rev / Resident	FY 99/00 MUT Revenues	FY 99/00 MUT Rev / Resident	FY 1999/2000 MIMF Revenues	FY 99/00 MIMF Rev / Resident	Surcharge Rate	Population Surcharge Purposes	# MUT or MET Returns (Incl CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (Incl CHI)	# MUT or MET Returns (W/O CHI)	# of MIMF Returns (W/O CHI)	
	Wonder Lake				1.00	1,293					\$15,981.48	\$12.36		1,293		4		14	
0463	Wood Dale	5.00			1.00	13,859	\$698,949.46	\$50.43			\$240,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$17.32	0.50	13,859	50	46	173	145	
WDFD	Woodford County												1.00						
0464	Wood River				1.00	10,894					\$134,649.84	\$12.36		10,894		37		114	
0059	Woodridge	5.00			1.00	29,836	\$1,504,715.79	\$50.43			\$166,000.00 <sup>1</sup>	\$5.56	0.50	29,836	107	100	372	313	
0465	Woodstock	5.00			1.00	18,289	\$922,367.18	\$50.43			\$226,052.04	\$12.36		18,289	65	61	228	192	
0466	Worth				1.00	11,157					\$137,900.52	\$12.36	0.75	11,157		37		117	
0062	Yorkville		5.00	5.15		6,226			\$198,511.77	\$31.88				6,226	22		78		
	Zeigler		5.00	5.15		1,636			\$52,162.75	\$31.88				1,636	6		20		
0001	Zion		5.00	5.15		22,840			\$728,237.84	\$31.88			0.75	22,840	82		285		
<b>Averages</b>		<b>4.53</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>16,500</b>	<b>\$2,294,557</b>	<b>\$45.44</b>	<b>\$230,847</b>	<b>\$28.67</b>	<b>\$292,373</b>	<b>\$11.97</b>	<b>\$1.01</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>134</b>	
<b>Wgtd Avg by Pop</b>		<b>4.76</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>4.54</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>\$1.03</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	
<b>Totals</b>		<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>9,157,551</b>	<b>\$215,688,394</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>\$59,558,415</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>\$116,364,642</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>18,592</b>	<b>20,589</b>	<b>51,550</b>	<b>53,062</b>	
<b>Survey Totals</b>		<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>3,575,910</b>	<b>\$138,458,424</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>\$3,921,548</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>\$62,674,621</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>11,383</b>	<b>10,933</b>	<b>11,383</b>	<b>10,933</b>	
<b>Survey Averages</b>		<b>4.27</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.15</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>325,083</b>	<b>\$19,779,775</b>	<b>\$39.07</b>	<b>\$3,921,548</b>	<b>\$31.88</b>	<b>\$5,697,693</b>	<b>\$10.87</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>1,897</b>	<b>1,562</b>	<b>1,897</b>	<b>1,562</b>
<b>Survey Wgtd Avgs</b>		<b>4.90</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.15</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>\$50.43 (1)</b>	<b>\$3,921,548</b>	<b>\$31.88</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>0.0035756</b>	<b>0.0033539</b>	<b>0.0035756</b>	<b>0.0033539</b>	
<b>Surv Avg w/o CHI</b>		<b>4.15</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.15</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>77,686</b>	<b>\$2,976,404</b>	<b>\$38.40</b>	<b>\$3,921,548</b>	<b>\$31.88</b>	<b>\$787,462</b>	<b>\$12.36</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>959</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>959</b>	<b>806</b>
<b>SuWgt Avg w/o CHI</b>		<b>4.31</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.15</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>\$3,921,548</b>	<b>\$31.88</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>XX</b>	<b>0.012471</b>	<b>0.010498</b>	<b>0.012471</b>	<b>0.010498</b>	
<b>Population of municipalities not listed or not taxed</b>						<b>2,970,819</b>													
<b>Total Illinois Population</b>						<b>12,128,370</b>													

Footnote 1: MIMF Revenues According to DuPage Mayors and Managers

Footnote 2: MIMF Revenues According to NWMC Members

Footnote 3: MIMF Revenues According to Original Survey Reported Amounts

Footnote 4: MIMF Average Per Resident Amount Includes Survey Reported Amounts, along with amounts reported by the DuPage Managers/Mayors and NWMC.

Footnote 5: Schaumburg increased its rate from 1% to 3% effective June 2000 and the adjusted revenues are reflected for greater accuracy

Footnote 6: Please note that the survey average for municipal utility and excise tax, when including Naperville, is 4.36%.