

Vermont E-rate Funding Analysis

March 7, 2008



Educational Technology
(802) 828-5149

Vermont E-Rate Funding Analysis

Prepared for

Vermont Department of Education

Submitted by

E-Rate Central

March 7, 2008

Vermont E-Rate Funding Analysis

Analysis Objectives:

At the request of the Vermont Department of Education, E-Rate Central undertook this analysis to address the Department's concern that Vermont schools — most specifically, its public schools, districts, and supervisory unions — may not be making optimal use of E-rate funding. If this federal funding source is not being effectively used, Vermont's schools are paying more than they need to for their current telecommunications, Internet, and other technology infrastructure products and services. Perhaps more importantly, they would be paying more for future connectivity into a state broadband network.

As a first step in addressing this issue, E-Rate Central's analysis focused on:

- E-rate funding requests and awards, with the greatest emphasis on FY 2006 (fiscal year 2006-2007) and FY 2007, including:
 - Discount rates
 - Funding by service categories
 - Denials and utilization
- Comparative national funding measures.
- Identification of public school applicants who are or are not applying for E-rate funding.

Summary of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations:

Overall, Vermont is a clear net beneficiary of funding from the four Universal Service Fund programs in total. The benefits it receives from the Schools and Libraries (more commonly called "E-rate") program, however, are significantly below average. In particular, based on the three most recent and complete funding years (FY 2004 to FY 2006):

- Vermont's total three-year funding was \$5.1 million — less than 0.1% of total funding nationwide.
- Among all states and the District of Columbia, Vermont ranked 50th in total E-rate funding.
- On a normalized "per student" basis (to account for school size), Vermont's ranking was still only to 48th — more than 60% below average.
- Vermont's funding in the Internal Connections categories (for network cabling, equipment, and maintenance within individual school buildings) was virtually nil.
- As a percentage of state funding, Vermont's libraries accounted for only 1.2% — less than a third of the national average.

Based on E-Rate Central's analysis, there are several reasons that Vermont's use of E-rate funding falls below the national average. As discussed more fully within the body of this report, these reasons include:

- Although difficult to quantify without a more detailed examination of actual applications, it appears that pre-discount school expenditures for telecommunications and Internet services are lower in Vermont than in many other states where there has been a broader deployment of fiber optic wide area networks ("WANs") at the school district level and, in many cases, of statewide broadband networks.
- Vermont's average discount rate of 59.5% for the past two years was well below the national average of 67.0%. This alone reduced Vermont's comparative E-rate funding figures by over 10%.
- Very few of Vermont schools qualify for 90% discounts that would provide consistent E-rate funding of Internal Connections products and services. In other states, it is not unusual for Internal Connections requests of high discount applicants to significantly exceed their telecommunications and Internet requests.
- As a general rule, the most successful Vermont applicants have been those supervisory unions filing on behalf of their schools. Given the complexities of the E-rate program, application filings by small individual schools and libraries tend not to be cost-effective.

For the most part, Vermont's below average utilization of E-rate funding is structural in nature — a function of the State's size and demographics. Nevertheless, there are steps that Vermont can take to better optimize E-rate funding by its schools and libraries. E-Rate Central suggests the following:

- Encourage greater participation in the E-rate application process at the supervisory union level, either as applicants or as coordinators of participating school applications.
- Coordinate with the Vermont Department of Buildings & General Services to broaden the availability of master price agreements for standard E-rate products and services, to file state-wide Form 470s to make these contracts E-rate eligible.
- Commit additional Department of Education resources for applicant E-rate training and support.
- On a longer-term basis, to support the creation of a state-wide broadband network, consider direct State funding supported by State-filed consortium E-rate applications.

Vermont Funding: All Universal Service Programs:

Overall, Vermont is a major net beneficiary of the Universal Service Fund. Either directly or indirectly, Vermont receives on the order of \$2.50 in benefits for every \$1.00 that its citizens contribute to the Fund through the surcharges they are paying on their monthly telephone bills.

The Universal Service Fund ("USF"), which is administered by the Universal Service Administrative Company ("USAC") under the auspices of the Federal Communications

Commission (“FCC”), is a nationwide fund, maintained through contributions made by telecommunications providers (and ultimately their customers), that provides financial support for the following four programs:

- **High Cost** – provides support to telecommunications companies serving high cost areas to ensure that all consumers have access to comparably-priced, affordable telephone service.
- **Low Income** (a.k.a. “Lifeline” or “Link Up”) – provides discounts on basic local telephone service for low income users.
- **Rural Health Care** – provides reduced rates to rural health care providers for telecommunications and Internet services.
- **Schools and Libraries** (a.k.a. “E-rate”) – provides discounts to public and private K-12 schools and public libraries on eligible telecommunications, Internet, and networking products and services.

Exhibit 1 tabulates the annual Universal Service Fund payments and contributions from all states and territories for 2005 (the last year for which complete data is currently available). Primarily because of High Cost payments supporting its rural telephone operations, USF payments to Vermont’s service providers and other recipients exceeded Vermont contributions by a large margin. The key figures to focus on in this analysis are Vermont’s Estimated Net Dollar Flow and, for relative comparison purposes, the ratio of payments to contributions. In 2005, this ratio was 2.49x — well above the 1.00 average — the 14th highest.

As shown in the two far right columns of Exhibit 1 (and discussed further below), Vermont’s comparative E-rate funding is considerably less favorable.

Vermont Funding: E-Rate Program:

Two important measures of E-rate funding that we use most commonly to illustrate a state’s funding success are:

- Absolute E-rate awards over multiple funding years; and
- Relative E-rate awards expressed in terms of dollars/student.

The latter measure is specifically designed to eliminate the obvious bias on state funding measures of differences in the size of each state’s student population. This is particularly important when analyzing E-rate funding for Vermont, not one of the larger states.

Exhibit 2 provides a list of E-rate funding awarded over the three-year period FY 2004–FY 2006, the three most recent, reasonably complete, funding years. The list includes the 50 states plus the District of Columbia. The list in Exhibit 2a is ranked by total funding; the list in Exhibit 2b is ranked by funding per student (using our best consistent estimates of both public and private school students). In either case, Vermont’s E-rate funding is ranked near the bottom — 50th in terms of total funding and only a marginally better 48th on a per student basis. On average, Vermont received E-rate discount awards of just over \$15 per student per year

compared with the national average of over \$40 per student. Alaska, the highest ranking state, but also one with a comparatively small student population, averaged \$132 per student.

There are two key questions that this analysis was designed to address. First, why does Vermont rank so low? And second, what, if anything, can Vermont do to improve its ranking?

The answers to the first, as suggested in the initial summary, are largely structural and are discussed in the following section. Possible answers to the second are discussed throughout and in the introductory and concluding summaries.

E-Rate Funding Analysis:

E-Rate Central's analysis of Vermont's E-rate funding focuses on six factors. Although discussed separately, many of these factors are interrelated. Some are related specifically to Vermont's comparative E-rate performance; others simply explain problems, not uncommon in other states, which have reduced E-rate effectiveness in Vermont.

Pre-Discount Expense Levels:

E-rate is a discount program, not a grant program. For any particular applicant, therefore, the two critical factors determining potential funding awards are: (a) the pre-discount level of expenditures that an applicant can substantiate for E-rate eligible products and services; and (b), the applicant's discount rate.

The most striking aspect of Vermont's E-rate usage is how few applicants have filed for, much less have been funded for, Internal Connections (intra-building network cabling and equipment, plus associated maintenance). Nationwide, over the past three years, the Internal Connections category has accounted for 31-49% of total E-rate funding. Internal Connections funding in Vermont is virtually nil. Since FY 2004, only 10-16 applicants have filed for Internal Connections funding in any one year; no more than one per year has been funded. The complete list of Vermont's Internal Connections funding over this period is shown below.

Vermont Internal Connections Funding: FY 2004 – FY 2007

FY 2004	Brownington School District	\$4,138.86
FY 2005	Johnson Elementary School	\$505.60
FY 2006	– None –	
FY 2007	Kindle Farm Children's Services	<u>\$3,857.40</u> *
		\$8,501.86

* One additional funding request for FY 2007 is still pending.

Had Vermont achieved the nationwide average of Internal Connections funding over the last three years, total E-rate funding would have been approximately \$8.6 million rather than the \$5.1 million shown in Exhibit 2. On a comparative basis, that would have increased funding per

student from \$15 per year to over \$25, and would have raised Vermont's ranking from 48th to 35th — still below average, but significantly better.

Several factors may contribute to low Internal Connections funding in Vermont, including:

- Internal Connections are Priority 2 services. They are funded only after available funds are set aside to fund all Priority 1 services (Telecommunications and Internet Access), and only then to fund the highest discount applicants. As discussed further in the following subsection, Vermont's average discount rate is well below the national average; few Vermont schools appear to qualify for the highest 90% discount rate that would assure Internal Connections funding.
- The E-rate application process for Internal Connections is more complex than for Priority 1 services. Although the same forms are used, Internal Connections requests typically involve more detailed technology planning, bidding procedures, contracts, and application documentation. The application review process itself is more intensive. These complexities can represent a significant filing disincentive for small applicants such as many of the smaller Vermont schools who are applying for E-rate on their own.
- Although difficult to quantify, Vermont schools may simply not be installing and maintaining extensive local area networks as has become common in larger schools and school districts nationwide.

Looking beyond Internal Connections, it is also clear that Vermont's applicants are filing for discounts on lower than average levels of telecommunications and Internet access services. Again, echoing the last factor discussed above, this may be the result of less sophisticated network deployment. Our sense, without looking in detail at individual Vermont applications, is that there is less use of, and less E-rate applications for, broadband networks (district-wide and/or statewide) than have been or are being installed throughout many other states.

Regardless of the underlying reasons, the major factor responsible for Vermont's relatively low level of E-rate funding is that the eligible pre-discount expenses of its applicants are significantly below average. With E-rate — for better or worse — the less you spend, the less you receive.

Discount Percentage Levels:

Even if Vermont's pre-discount expense levels were on par with those of applicants in other states, below average discount rates of Vermont's applicants would mean below average funding.

Exhibit 3 provides a comparison of average discount rates by state as reflected in Priority 1 funding over the past two years (FY 2006 and FY 2007). The analysis was confined to Telecommunications and Internet Access funding so as not to bias the comparison with Internal Connections funding that was available only to applicants with discounts above 80%. Vermont's

average discount rate of 59.5% places it in the lower tier of states, more than 10% below the 66.9% discount rate average.¹

This number, by itself, is not that significant. By our estimate, if Vermont applicants had had an average discount rate, Vermont’s position in the per-student funding rankings shown in Exhibit 2 would have been only two spots higher, raising its ranking from 48th to 46th.

The more significant implication of a lower than average discount rate — but one that is difficult to test on a nationwide basis — is that it suggests a much lower proportion of schools (and libraries) with high enough discount rates to qualify them for Internal Connections funding. Because these services are treated as Priority 2, and only funded down to a certain discount rate threshold each year, a 1% difference in discount rate between one applicant and another may make much more than a 1% difference in funding. The lower discount applicant may not be funded at all for Internal Connections.

There has been only one year in the E-rate program’s history in which Internal Connections have been funded at all discount levels. As shown below, the funding threshold in five of the last nine years has been above 80%, and below it only once in recent years.

Internal Connections Discount Rate Threshold History

Funding Year	IC Discount Rate Threshold	Comments
1998	70%	
1999	20%	All discount levels funded
2000	82%	
2001	86%	
2002	81%	
2003	70%	Including \$420M roll-over
2004	81%	
2005	80%	
2006	86%	
2007	80-83%	Not final. Including \$650M roll-over

Notes:

1. FY 1999 was an anomaly. Applications were due before any awards had been made for the first funding year; many potential applicants failed to apply.
2. FY 2003 and FY 2007 had additional funds added to the regular \$2.25B.
3. The threshold for FY 2007 is currently 83%, but the FCC is considering adding even more funds so as to be able to fund at 80%.

Not only is Vermont’s average discount rate low, but it appears to have relatively few schools that qualify for a 90% discount rate — the only level that would consistently be funded for

¹ A lower than average discount rate suggests a higher than average income level. According to the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, however, Vermont’s per capita income is about average (ranked 25th among all states based on revised 2005 data, and 24th on preliminary 2006 data). Additional analysis is needed to explain — or correct — this discrepancy.

Internal Connections. To qualify for a 90% E-rate discount, 75% or more of a school's students must be eligible for free or reduced-price lunches under the National School Lunch Program. Although alternative poverty measures may be used, most E-rate applicants rely on official NSLP data to validate their discount rates.

Based on 2007 NSLP data for Vermont, summarized in Exhibit 4, only 13 schools would qualify for 90% E-rate discounts next year — most being very small, special-purpose, schools. A somewhat larger number of schools have NSLP populations over 50% which would qualify them for 80% discounts. At this level, Internal Connections funding is by no means assured.

Applicant Size and Organization:

As a practical matter, an applicant's size and organization plays a significant role in the cost-effectiveness and ultimate success of the E-rate application process. At a minimum, participation in one funding year requires the filing of three forms. It is not unusual for an applicant to file multiple applications and many additional forms. Worse still, the full application cycle typically spans three years so that, within any given school year, an applicant is dealing with three separate funding years — all involving multiple forms and multiple deadlines. Small schools and libraries may find that E-rate participation is not worth the administrative burden.

Vermont's public school structure of supervisory unions, some districts, and individual schools have created fragmented E-rate structures. Since E-rate applications have to be filed on behalf of the entities actually paying the bills for eligible services, the financial arrangements between schools, districts, and their supervisory unions dictate how applications are to be filed. There is little consistency within the State. In particular:

- Some supervisory unions (or districts) file applications on behalf of themselves and their schools; others do not.
- Some schools file individual applications for their own services; others do not.
- Some supervisory unions and their schools all file applications for different sets of services (e.g., Internet services at the supervisory union level and telecom services at the school level).
- Some supervisory unions and/or schools don't file at all.

A survey of all public school E-rate funding, organized by supervisory union (or districts), is provided in Appendix A. The survey includes comparisons of total funding for the two most recent funding years (FY 2006 and FY 2007), discount rates, services covered, application strategies, and comments. A ranking of E-rate effectiveness of the 60 supervisory unions and city school districts is shown in Exhibit 5. This admittedly subjective ranking shows:

- 29 SU/districts making effective use of E-rate
- 10 SU/districts not effectively using E-rate
- 21 SU/districts with mixed success

As a general rule, we believe that the supervisory unions and associated schools which have consolidated their E-rate applications and/or processes have been the most effective beneficiaries of E-rate funding.

Library E-Rate Utilization:

The small applicant problem appears to be particularly prevalent among Vermont’s libraries for which E-rate applications are, or would be, smaller than those of their neighboring schools. As shown in Exhibit 6, only 21 Vermont libraries received E-rate funding in FY 2007. Average awards barely exceeded \$1,000 per library.

As shown in the table below, libraries do not constitute a large part of the E-rate program nationwide, but Vermont library participation is less than a third of the national average.

National Comparison of Library Funding

FY 2007 as of Wave 33

	<u>Total E-Rate</u>	<u>Total Library</u>	<u>% Library</u>
Vermont	\$1,849,931	\$22,009	1.19%
National Total	\$1,789,353,371	\$69,409,281	3.88%

Funding Denial Rates:

One bright area in Vermont’s E-rate picture is the below average percentage of funding denials and reductions. To the extent that Vermont’s schools and libraries apply for E-rate funding, the percentage of funds actually awarded has been at or above the national average. Exhibit 7 provides a comparison of awarded funds as a percentage of requested funds for the most recent three years. Vermont’s Priority 1 funding success — the only valid comparison given the low level of Internal Connections (Priority 2) requests — has ranged from equal to as much as 10% higher than the rest of the nation.²

An analysis of Vermont funding request denials over the past two years (ignoring requests canceled by the applicants and Internal Connections requests below the funding threshold) indicates that the following two reasons account for the majority of the denials:

- “Applicant has not provided sufficient documentation to determine the eligibility of this item.” This type of denial is usually issued when an applicant fails to respond to application review questions.
- “The Form 471 application was signed and submitted prior to the expiration of the 28-day waiting period thus violating program rules” or “FCC Rules require that tariff and month-to-month services be posted on a Form 470 each funding year.” Both denial

² The recent upward trend in funding approval rates nationwide is the result of more applicant-friendly application review procedures implement by the SLD in the wake of a series of FCC appeal decisions beginning with the *Bishop Perry Order* in May 2006.

statements reflect applicant failure to comply with the program's procurement rules, usually as a result of a misunderstanding of these requirements.

Although Vermont has a lower than average record of funding denials and reductions, additional training and support may serve to further reduce the most common denials its applicants have experienced.

Funding Utilization:

Another measure of E-rate effectiveness is the percentage of awarded funds that are actually used. Recent data indicates that funding utilization by Vermont applicants is at least on par with the national averages.

Because E-rate is a discount program, not a grant program, there are two major reasons that awarded funding is not actually received. The two reasons — one to be expected, one to be avoided — are as follows:

- Funding is awarded based on estimated service costs that are not incurred until well after annual E-rate applications are filed. If actual service costs are less than the estimates, the discounts received will also be less. The reverse is not true. If costs are greater than the estimates, discounts are limited to the awarded amounts. Most applicants, therefore, have learned to request slightly greater funding than they actually expect to use. Except for fixed priced services, a funds utilization rate of 90% is an appropriate target.
- The major funding utilization problem arises when funding is awarded, services used, but no discounts are received. Zero utilization can occur for either of the following reasons:
 1. The services were not discounted by the service provider, but were instead billed for and paid for in full. To recover the discounts on such services, applicants are required to file reimbursement forms (Form 472s or "BEARs"). A disturbingly high number of applicants fail to file for reimbursements.
 2. Invoices, most typically BEARs filed by applicants, are submitted, but are rejected. The E-rate invoice processing system is based on a so-called "pass zero" procedure that results in \$0.00 decisions for a wide variety of invoice errors. Although applicants and service providers are advised of these decisions by letter, a surprising number of failed invoices are never corrected and resubmitted.

Recent Vermont and national funding utilization rates are shown in the table below. The data included is for all Priority 1 (Telecommunications and Internet Access) funding, almost all of which was supposed to have been invoiced by an October 29, 2007 deadline.

On a comparative basis, Vermont's total utilization of funds was over 3% higher than the national average. The percent of funds that went completely unused, however, was marginally below average. Although it is possible that some of the funded services were never used, and

should not have been discounted, we suspect that over 10% of Vermont’s awarded funding last year was not realized because of invoice lapses or errors.

Priority 1 Funding Utilization: FY 2006

As of 2/25/2008

	Funding	<u>Total Undisbursed Funds</u>		<u>Zero Disbursed Funds</u>	
	Awarded	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Vermont	\$1,622,124	\$398,042	24.54%	\$213,341	13.15%
National Total	\$1,372,582,750	\$383,306,906	27.93%	\$176,611,034	12.87%

A complete list of Vermont’s zero funding awards for the period is provided in Exhibit 8. As a general rule, those shown with a “NOT SET” mode were not invoiced at all. Those shown with a “BEAR” mode were unsuccessfully invoiced (and not yet corrected).

Although Vermont’s zero utilization experience is no worse than average, it does represent an unfortunate loss of funding for the State that may be partially correctable with additional support.

Summary and Conclusions:

E-Rate Central draws the following four major conclusions from its analysis of Vermont’s E-rate funding:

1. Vermont is one of the major beneficiaries of the Universal Service Fund, primarily as the result of High Cost funding of its rural telephone operations. But with respect to E-rate funding, Vermont is one of the lowest ranking states.
2. To a large degree, Vermont’s poor E-rate performance can be attributed to structural and demographic factors. Applicant use of E-rate services, as well as discount rates, is below average. In some cases, supervisory union structures have led to fragmented and ineffective E-rate application strategies.
3. Additional applicant training and support services at the Department of Education level could encourage E-rate filings, reduce denial rates, and improve funds utilization.
4. A more centralized effort would be particularly important to make effective use of E-rate to support a statewide broadband initiative.

Universal Service Support Mechanism by State: 2005

(Annual Payments and Contributions in Thousands)

State or Jurisdiction	USF Payments to Service Providers/Recipients						Estimated Contributions		Estimated Net Dollar Flow			E-Rate to Contributions	
	High Cost	Low Income	Rural Health	Schools & Libraries	Total Payments	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	Ratio	Rank	Ratio	Rank
Alabama	\$109,343	\$3,224	\$19	\$28,023	\$140,609	2.16%	\$94,041	1.44%	\$46,568	1.50	23	0.30	19
Alaska	120,274	7,374	14,949	15,909	158,506	2.43%	21,785	0.33%	136,720	7.28	2	0.73	5
American Samoa	2,318	60	0	2,421	4,799	0.07%	182	0.00%	4,617	26.37	1	13.30	1
Arizona	74,550	20,310	675	36,008	131,543	2.02%	124,323	1.91%	7,221	1.06	31	0.29	22
Arkansas	140,997	2,369	120	15,662	159,148	2.44%	57,850	0.89%	101,298	2.75	12	0.27	24
California	98,866	304,668	456	220,789	624,779	9.58%	707,331	10.85%	-82,552	0.88	36	0.31	16
Colorado	79,277	3,514	120	11,256	94,167	1.44%	119,982	1.84%	-25,815	0.78	38	0.09	47
Connecticut	2,249	5,315	0	19,307	26,871	0.41%	99,496	1.53%	-72,625	0.27	52	0.19	29
Delaware	259	277	0	377	913	0.01%	24,521	0.38%	-23,608	0.04	56	0.02	56
Dist. of Columbia	0	893	0	10,840	11,733	0.18%	30,838	0.47%	-19,105	0.38	49	0.35	13
Florida	91,450	17,761	107	53,437	162,755	2.50%	468,424	7.18%	-305,669	0.35	50	0.11	45
Georgia	111,693	8,282	114	50,126	170,215	2.61%	209,935	3.22%	-39,719	0.81	37	0.24	27
Guam	19,165	421	0	3,093	22,679	0.35%	3,358	0.05%	19,321	6.75	3	0.92	3
Hawaii	29,525	694	277	1,812	32,308	0.50%	27,677	0.42%	4,630	1.17	28	0.07	51
Idaho	55,055	3,923	153	2,797	61,928	0.95%	31,945	0.49%	29,983	1.94	17	0.09	48
Illinois	63,506	9,291	196	73,442	146,435	2.25%	263,937	4.05%	-117,501	0.55	45	0.28	23
Indiana	56,632	5,716	112	12,516	74,976	1.15%	121,127	1.86%	-46,150	0.62	41	0.10	46
Iowa	90,336	6,198	186	10,042	106,762	1.64%	59,710	0.92%	47,053	1.79	18	0.17	36
Kansas	178,684	3,149	290	10,545	192,668	2.96%	57,915	0.89%	134,754	3.33	10	0.18	34
Kentucky	83,600	7,537	720	26,481	118,338	1.81%	79,587	1.22%	38,751	1.49	24	0.33	15
Louisiana	111,241	2,414	5	41,487	155,147	2.38%	89,661	1.38%	65,486	1.73	21	0.46	11
Maine	28,812	8,795	49	9,099	46,755	0.72%	29,607	0.45%	17,147	1.58	22	0.31	18
Maryland	4,327	502	0	12,644	17,473	0.27%	145,384	2.23%	-127,911	0.12	55	0.09	49
Massachusetts	3,634	14,270	0	20,954	38,858	0.60%	155,438	2.38%	-116,580	0.25	53	0.13	42
Michigan	53,575	11,425	694	34,722	100,416	1.54%	185,371	2.84%	-84,956	0.54	47	0.19	32
Minnesota	113,352	5,993	845	19,911	140,101	2.15%	105,365	1.62%	34,736	1.33	27	0.19	31
Mississippi	209,251	3,619	133	29,364	242,367	3.72%	57,756	0.89%	184,610	4.20	6	0.51	9
Missouri	85,146	5,396	118	36,291	126,951	1.95%	124,409	1.91%	2,541	1.02	32	0.29	20
Montana	76,731	2,631	542	3,807	83,711	1.28%	23,153	0.36%	60,558	3.62	9	0.16	38
Nebraska	55,890	2,406	746	6,254	65,296	1.00%	37,189	0.57%	28,107	1.76	20	0.17	37
Nevada	29,639	4,075	36	3,166	36,916	0.57%	67,998	1.04%	-31,082	0.54	46	0.05	55
New Hampshire	8,732	632	2	1,736	11,102	0.17%	33,919	0.52%	-22,818	0.33	51	0.05	53
New Jersey	1,332	14,530	0	39,404	55,266	0.85%	242,943	3.73%	-187,677	0.23	54	0.16	39
New Mexico	58,511	10,655	293	17,819	87,278	1.34%	44,433	0.68%	42,845	1.96	16	0.40	12
New York	51,833	52,544	6	298,250	402,633	6.18%	401,313	6.15%	1,320	1.00	33	0.74	4
North Carolina	80,179	14,504	149	36,946	131,778	2.02%	197,860	3.03%	-66,081	0.67	40	0.19	33
North Dakota	62,718	3,804	503	2,956	69,981	1.07%	14,480	0.22%	55,502	4.83	5	0.20	28
Northern Mariana Is.	668	85	0	1,364	2,117	0.03%	1,042	0.02%	1,075	2.03	15	1.31	2
Ohio	37,754	35,022	45	57,444	130,265	2.00%	221,875	3.40%	-91,610	0.59	43	0.26	25
Oklahoma	120,188	32,358	129	44,003	196,678	3.02%	73,143	1.12%	123,535	2.69	13	0.60	7
Oregon	68,469	7,307	22	11,394	87,192	1.34%	81,131	1.24%	6,061	1.07	30	0.14	41
Pennsylvania	65,504	19,156	75	67,149	151,884	2.33%	273,286	4.19%	-121,402	0.56	44	0.25	26
Puerto Rico	133,786	13,286	0	2,966	150,038	2.30%	52,247	0.80%	97,791	2.87	11	0.06	52
Rhode Island	44	4,622	0	6,925	11,591	0.18%	22,286	0.34%	-10,694	0.52	48	0.31	17
South Carolina	76,322	2,869	41	27,579	106,811	1.64%	94,597	1.45%	12,215	1.13	29	0.29	21
South Dakota	77,788	7,280	469	5,434	90,971	1.40%	15,641	0.24%	75,330	5.82	4	0.35	14
Tennessee	54,684	6,141	61	59,517	120,403	1.85%	123,888	1.90%	-3,485	0.97	34	0.48	10
Texas	230,017	72,330	132	274,218	576,697	8.84%	428,929	6.58%	147,768	1.34	26	0.64	6
Utah	23,579	2,927	363	7,542	34,411	0.53%	48,456	0.74%	-14,044	0.71	39	0.16	40
Vermont	35,244	2,842	20	1,236	39,342	0.60%	15,817	0.24%	23,525	2.49	14	0.08	50
Virgin Islands	22,618	158	102	3,976	26,854	0.41%	6,652	0.10%	20,202	4.04	8	0.60	8
Virginia	87,312	2,257	299	25,263	115,131	1.77%	190,915	2.93%	-75,784	0.60	42	0.13	43
Washington	94,387	19,823	64	16,679	130,953	2.01%	143,655	2.20%	-12,702	0.91	35	0.12	44
West Virginia	66,318	710	91	7,658	74,777	1.15%	42,074	0.65%	32,703	1.78	19	0.18	35
Wisconsin	130,225	8,829	940	21,021	161,015	2.47%	109,759	1.68%	51,256	1.47	25	0.19	30
Wyoming	56,598	1,395	100	684	58,777	0.90%	14,529	0.22%	44,248	4.05	7	0.05	54
Total	\$3,824,186	\$808,568	\$25,568	\$1,861,745	\$6,520,067	100.00%	\$6,520,162	100.00%	-\$95	1.00		0.29	

Source: Universal Service Monitoring Report: 2006

E-Rate Funding Analysis by State: FY 2004 - FY 2006
Ranked by Funding per State

Rank	State	Public K-12 Students	Private K-12 Students	Total K-12 Students	FY 2004-2006 E-rate Funding	Funding/ Student
1	CA	6,071,004	655,502	6,726,506	\$846,306,156	\$125.82
2	NY	2,697,714	492,518	3,190,232	\$737,729,335	\$231.25
3	TX	3,997,230	241,674	4,238,904	\$714,689,605	\$168.60
4	IL	2,009,175	293,290	2,302,465	\$297,497,444	\$129.21
5	OH	1,797,325	256,427	2,053,752	\$208,333,310	\$101.44
6	PA	1,812,070	331,471	2,143,541	\$207,967,502	\$97.02
7	FL	2,442,271	303,093	2,745,364	\$203,804,547	\$74.24
8	GA	1,437,877	117,229	1,555,106	\$194,924,933	\$125.35
9	LA	713,067	137,266	850,333	\$170,962,675	\$201.05
10	NC	1,306,970	103,219	1,410,189	\$161,276,236	\$114.36
11	MI	1,678,129	177,026	1,855,155	\$161,274,280	\$86.93
12	TN	896,487	92,099	988,586	\$151,631,696	\$153.38
13	AZ	907,705	44,360	952,065	\$149,279,280	\$156.80
14	OK	597,321	30,579	627,900	\$140,885,040	\$224.37
15	NJ	1,245,354	218,187	1,463,541	\$140,614,747	\$96.08
16	MS	479,063	52,565	531,628	\$125,720,326	\$236.48
17	SC	657,912	58,937	716,849	\$123,129,312	\$171.76
18	AL	726,574	76,634	803,208	\$109,352,687	\$136.14
19	NM	316,801	23,637	340,438	\$100,371,436	\$294.83
20	MO	885,194	124,326	1,009,520	\$94,499,043	\$93.61
21	KY	621,014	72,819	693,833	\$91,238,687	\$131.50
22	VA	1,145,840	109,993	1,255,833	\$89,175,579	\$71.01
23	MA	954,141	140,810	1,094,951	\$86,539,654	\$79.04
24	CT	559,677	71,147	630,824	\$78,230,195	\$124.01
25	IN	987,782	111,257	1,099,039	\$69,829,903	\$63.54
26	WI	852,803	141,812	994,615	\$69,535,206	\$69.91
27	CO	722,763	54,450	777,213	\$67,350,274	\$86.66
28	MN	840,742	101,180	941,922	\$66,464,005	\$70.56
29	WA	1,001,323	82,189	1,083,512	\$60,778,866	\$56.09
30	AK	132,700	6,747	139,447	\$55,318,164	\$396.70
31	MD	833,585	153,861	987,446	\$51,147,255	\$51.80
32	UT	467,893	16,814	484,707	\$50,991,932	\$105.20
33	AR	447,116	29,290	476,406	\$44,483,528	\$93.37
34	KS	454,110	41,027	495,137	\$43,631,634	\$88.12
35	OR	549,164	45,448	594,612	\$39,981,589	\$67.24
36	IA	474,431	47,647	522,078	\$39,724,702	\$76.09
37	WV	276,172	15,737	291,909	\$30,839,114	\$105.65
38	NE	280,067	43,137	323,204	\$23,673,090	\$73.25
39	DC	60,024	20,043	80,067	\$22,970,115	\$286.89
40	ME	201,695	18,779	220,474	\$21,620,599	\$98.06
41	SD	125,902	10,950	136,852	\$19,848,237	\$145.03
42	RI	156,414	26,125	182,539	\$15,953,515	\$87.40
43	NV	354,513	16,623	371,136	\$15,605,479	\$42.05
44	ND	105,250	6,782	112,032	\$13,174,827	\$117.60
45	ID	244,103	10,291	254,394	\$12,467,452	\$49.01
46	MT	151,213	9,941	161,154	\$11,948,374	\$74.14
47	HI	183,171	40,199	223,370	\$10,914,343	\$48.86
48	WY	87,795	2,209	90,004	\$8,635,790	\$95.95
49	NH	204,626	24,750	229,376	\$6,608,838	\$28.81
50	VT	98,294	13,058	111,352	\$5,095,708	\$45.76
51	DE	114,957	26,365	141,322	\$2,142,465	\$15.16
	Total/Average	46,364,523	5,341,519	51,706,042	\$6,266,168,706	\$121.19

Source: Collected and analyzed by E-Rate Central using data from the Schools and Libraries Division and student numbers from the National Center for Education Statistics 2001-2002.

E-Rate Funding Analysis by State: FY 2004 - FY 2006
Ranked by Funding per Student

Rank	State	Public K-12 Students	Private K-12 Students	Total K-12 Students	FY 2004-2006 E-rate Funding	Funding/ Student
1	AK	132,700	6,747	139,447	\$55,318,164	\$396.70
2	NM	316,801	23,637	340,438	\$100,371,436	\$294.83
3	DC	60,024	20,043	80,067	\$22,970,115	\$286.89
4	MS	479,063	52,565	531,628	\$125,720,326	\$236.48
5	NY	2,697,714	492,518	3,190,232	\$737,729,335	\$231.25
6	OK	597,321	30,579	627,900	\$140,885,040	\$224.37
7	LA	713,067	137,266	850,333	\$170,962,675	\$201.05
8	SC	657,912	58,937	716,849	\$123,129,312	\$171.76
9	TX	3,997,230	241,674	4,238,904	\$714,689,605	\$168.60
10	AZ	907,705	44,360	952,065	\$149,279,280	\$156.80
11	TN	896,487	92,099	988,586	\$151,631,696	\$153.38
12	SD	125,902	10,950	136,852	\$19,848,237	\$145.03
13	AL	726,574	76,634	803,208	\$109,352,687	\$136.14
14	KY	621,014	72,819	693,833	\$91,238,687	\$131.50
15	IL	2,009,175	293,290	2,302,465	\$297,497,444	\$129.21
16	CA	6,071,004	655,502	6,726,506	\$846,306,156	\$125.82
17	GA	1,437,877	117,229	1,555,106	\$194,924,933	\$125.35
18	CT	559,677	71,147	630,824	\$78,230,195	\$124.01
19	ND	105,250	6,782	112,032	\$13,174,827	\$117.60
20	NC	1,306,970	103,219	1,410,189	\$161,276,236	\$114.36
21	WV	276,172	15,737	291,909	\$30,839,114	\$105.65
22	UT	467,893	16,814	484,707	\$50,991,932	\$105.20
23	OH	1,797,325	256,427	2,053,752	\$208,333,310	\$101.44
24	ME	201,695	18,779	220,474	\$21,620,599	\$98.06
25	PA	1,812,070	331,471	2,143,541	\$207,967,502	\$97.02
26	NJ	1,245,354	218,187	1,463,541	\$140,614,747	\$96.08
27	WY	87,795	2,209	90,004	\$8,635,790	\$95.95
28	MO	885,194	124,326	1,009,520	\$94,499,043	\$93.61
29	AR	447,116	29,290	476,406	\$44,483,528	\$93.37
30	KS	454,110	41,027	495,137	\$43,631,634	\$88.12
31	RI	156,414	26,125	182,539	\$15,953,515	\$87.40
32	MI	1,678,129	177,026	1,855,155	\$161,274,280	\$86.93
33	CO	722,763	54,450	777,213	\$67,350,274	\$86.66
34	MA	954,141	140,810	1,094,951	\$86,539,654	\$79.04
35	IA	474,431	47,647	522,078	\$39,724,702	\$76.09
36	FL	2,442,271	303,093	2,745,364	\$203,804,547	\$74.24
37	MT	151,213	9,941	161,154	\$11,948,374	\$74.14
38	NE	280,067	43,137	323,204	\$23,673,090	\$73.25
39	VA	1,145,840	109,993	1,255,833	\$89,175,579	\$71.01
40	MN	840,742	101,180	941,922	\$66,464,005	\$70.56
41	WI	852,803	141,812	994,615	\$69,535,206	\$69.91
42	OR	549,164	45,448	594,612	\$39,981,589	\$67.24
43	IN	987,782	111,257	1,099,039	\$69,829,903	\$63.54
44	WA	1,001,323	82,189	1,083,512	\$60,778,866	\$56.09
45	MD	833,585	153,861	987,446	\$51,147,255	\$51.80
46	ID	244,103	10,291	254,394	\$12,467,452	\$49.01
47	HI	183,171	40,199	223,370	\$10,914,343	\$48.86
48	VT	98,294	13,058	111,352	\$5,095,708	\$45.76
49	NV	354,513	16,623	371,136	\$15,605,479	\$42.05
50	NH	204,626	24,750	229,376	\$6,608,838	\$28.81
51	DE	114,957	26,365	141,322	\$2,142,465	\$15.16
	Total/Average	46,364,523	5,341,519	51,706,042	\$6,266,168,706	\$121.19

Source: Collected and analyzed by E-Rate Central using data from the Schools and Libraries Division and student numbers from the National Center for Education Statistics 2001-2002.

Average Discount Rates by State: FY 2006 and FY 2007

As of 1/3/2008

Rank	State/Territory	Total Priority 1 Funding		Average Discount %
		Pre-Discount	Discount	
1	Louisiana	67,678,806.41	54,168,751.94	80.0
2	New Mexico	31,042,506.76	24,717,195.89	79.6
3	District of Columbia	25,327,300.01	19,895,739.40	78.6
4	Mississippi	55,020,459.89	42,699,032.05	77.6
5	Alaska	30,177,346.40	23,291,065.60	77.2
6	Arkansas	20,607,633.31	15,606,519.18	75.7
7	Oklahoma	71,151,925.21	53,863,832.40	75.7
8	South Carolina	81,050,316.09	60,447,880.48	74.6
9	Alabama	74,452,584.56	54,590,491.84	73.3
10	West Virginia	24,267,306.87	17,760,053.70	73.2
11	Kentucky	53,675,200.32	39,177,828.18	73.0
12	Georgia	110,240,483.85	80,079,061.05	72.6
13	Texas	232,537,671.94	168,183,382.95	72.3
14	Tennessee	102,713,965.78	73,083,242.11	71.2
15	North Carolina	114,537,083.18	80,930,467.46	70.7
16	California	455,121,423.85	317,538,454.59	69.8
17	Arizona	63,505,116.93	44,175,243.90	69.6
18	New York	348,237,058.97	234,937,024.60	67.5
19	Idaho	12,840,346.62	8,645,671.43	67.3
20	Oregon	38,236,510.95	25,700,321.62	67.2
21	Michigan	124,095,838.43	83,043,638.63	66.9
22	Montana	10,421,053.94	6,967,343.23	66.9
23	South Dakota	13,725,403.78	9,123,885.93	66.5
24	Kansas	42,629,930.84	28,008,322.79	65.7
25	Florida	192,237,927.37	126,235,098.88	65.7
26	Hawaii	9,980,347.32	6,548,540.78	65.6
27	Maine	22,271,002.96	14,565,841.28	65.4
28	Illinois	136,912,397.22	88,916,399.92	64.9
29	Missouri	54,092,682.83	34,830,656.24	64.4
30	Massachusetts	67,084,297.61	43,050,283.81	64.2
31	Indiana	81,210,285.65	51,709,673.98	63.7
32	Nebraska	24,739,386.51	15,714,082.25	63.5
33	Washington	59,513,910.62	37,700,489.72	63.3
34	Ohio	166,471,507.67	104,990,137.08	63.1
35	Utah	51,828,140.04	32,622,745.89	62.9
36	Nevada	11,678,148.47	7,342,410.41	62.9
37	Wyoming	12,543,098.18	7,735,193.04	61.7
38	Colorado	49,585,325.33	30,514,535.34	61.5
39	Iowa	33,583,192.74	20,307,772.33	60.5
40	Minnesota	60,969,749.53	36,687,334.58	60.2
41	Wisconsin	59,210,808.93	35,407,583.70	59.8
42	Pennsylvania	168,634,287.37	100,640,022.45	59.7
43	Vermont	5,818,143.28	3,458,899.31	59.5
44	North Dakota	12,439,743.08	7,240,630.28	58.2
45	Virginia	97,039,527.28	56,412,186.67	58.1
46	Maryland	61,778,274.64	35,876,818.56	58.1
47	Delaware	4,577,451.24	2,588,107.96	56.5
48	Connecticut	54,620,702.73	30,773,148.59	56.3
49	Rhode Island	14,704,199.28	8,242,231.15	56.1
50	New Jersey	129,911,158.71	69,213,772.61	53.3
51	New Hampshire	8,461,218.08	4,407,738.72	52.1
	Total/Average	3,855,190,189.56	2,580,366,786.48	66.9

High Discount Vermont Schools

Based on 2007 NSLP Data

S.U./District/School	School	Students	NSLP	% Eligible
Braintree Town School District	Braintree Elementary School	101	79	78.2%
Burlington School District	Baird Center	59	44	74.6%
Burlington School District	HO Wheeler	243	202	83.1%
Burlington School District	ONTOP School	59	46	78.0%
Rock Point School	Rock Point School	35	29	82.9%
Rutland City School District	Success School	68	51	75.0%
Southwest Vermont Supervisory Union	Plus Program at Congress St.	21	21	100.0%
Springfield Town School District	Gateway School	29	22	75.9%
St. Johnsbury Town School District	Caledonia School	35	30	85.7%
St. Johnsbury Town School District	Cornerstone School	29	25	86.2%
St. Johnsbury Town School District	Lyndon Educational Alternative Resources Network (LEARN)	13	12	92.3%
The Brattleboro Retreat	Meadows School	60	60	100.0%
Woodside Juvenile Rehabilitation Center	Woodside Juvenile Rehabilitation Center	31	31	100.0%
	13 Schools	783	652	
Albany Town School District	Albany Community School	122	69	56.6%
Alburtown School District	Alburtown Community Education Center	230	125	54.3%
Avalon Triumvirate Academy	Avalon Triumvirate Academy	9	5	55.6%
Barton ID Town School District	Barton Graded School	176	107	60.8%
Benson Town School District	Benson Village School	131	65	49.6%
Bradford ID Town School District	Connecticut River Academy	25	13	52.0%
Brattleboro Town School District	Academy School	358	183	51.1%
Brattleboro Town School District	Oak Grove School	146	92	63.0%
Brighton Town School District	Brighton Elementary School	109	71	65.1%
Brownington Town School District	Brownington Central School	81	59	72.8%
Burlington School District	Barnes Elementary	153	112	73.2%
Burlington School District	Transitional Services	4	2	50.0%
Charleston Town School District	Charleston Elementary School	92	56	60.9%
Coventry Town School District	Coventry Village School	104	55	52.9%
Currier Memorial School	Currier Memorial School	114	61	53.5%
Derby Town School District	Derby Elementary School	403	203	50.4%
East Haven Town School District	East Haven School	34	17	50.0%
Eden Town SD	Eden Central School	173	96	55.5%
Enosburg Falls ID Town SD	Enosburg Elementary School	187	95	50.8%
Glover Town School District	Glover Community School	114	64	56.1%
Hardwick Town School District	Hardwick Elementary School	280	176	62.9%
Hartford Town School District	Regional Alternative Program	24	12	50.0%
Hazen Union High SD #26	Hazen Union High SD#26	381	194	50.9%
Holland Town School District	Holland Elementary School	69	44	63.8%
Irasburg Town School District	Irasburg Village School	153	90	58.8%
Isle La Motte Town School District	Isle La Motte Elementary School	37	20	54.1%
Johnson Town School District	Johnson Elementary School	214	107	50.0%
Lake Region UHS District	Lake Region UHS	396	231	58.3%
Lakeview Union SD #43	Lakeview Union USD #43	76	43	56.6%
Lowell Town School District	Lowell Graded School	119	76	63.9%
Lunenburg Town School District	Gilman Middle School	62	35	56.5%
Lunenburg Town School District	Lunenburg Elementary	75	41	54.7%
Lyndon Town School District	Lyndon Town School	498	274	55.0%
Morgan Town School District	Elizabeth Taylor Hatton Elementary School	40	25	62.5%
Newport City School District	Newport City Elementary School	287	174	60.6%
Newport Town School District	Newport Town School District	113	74	65.5%
North Country Union School District #22	North Country Union High School	1,100	593	53.9%
North Country Union School District #22	North Country Union Junior High School	340	182	53.5%
Orleans Town School District	Orleans Elementary	117	70	59.8%
Readsboro Town School District	Readsboro Central School	66	40	60.6%
Richford Town School District	Richford Elementary School	214	145	67.8%
Rutland City School District	Northwest Elementary School	293	178	60.8%
Southwest Vermont Supervisory Union	Catamount Elementary School	292	201	68.8%
Southwest Vermont Supervisory Union	Molly Stark School	355	201	56.6%
Southwest Vermont Supervisory Union	Pownal Elementary School	259	148	57.1%
Spaulding High School/Barre City	Barre City Elementary & Middle School	891	469	52.6%
Springfield Town School District	Park Street School	274	140	51.1%
St. Albans City School District	Project Soar	49	31	63.3%
St. Johnsbury Town School District	The St. Johnsbury School	699	386	55.2%
Sutton Town School District	Sutton Village School	105	72	68.6%
The Village School	Granville School	15	10	66.7%
Troy Town School District	Troy Elementary School	161	113	70.2%
Winooski School District	The Family Center	16	10	62.5%
Winooski School District	Winooski Schools	726	496	68.3%
	54 Schools	11,561	6,651	

Vermont Public School E-Rate Summary
By Supervisory Union: FY 2006 and FY 2007

Effectively using E-rate.		Mixed E-rate success.		Not effectively using E-rate.	
Supervisory Union	Avg. Discount	Supervisory Union	Avg. Discount	Supervisory Union	Avg. Discount
Addison Northeast	30,599.35	Addison Central	38,784.58	Addison Northwest	6,108.27
Blue Mountain	5,200.06	Addison Rutland	26,975.39	Barre	0.00
Burlington	104,588.60	Battenkill Valley	4,624.05	Dresden (Norwich)	0.00
Calendonia North	33,900.44	Bennington Rutland	16,106.43	Essex Calendonia	0.00
Chittenden Central	71,718.25	Calendonia Central	19,330.72	Franklin Northwest	10,750.05
Chittenden East	28,124.99	Essex North	7,056.00	Lamoille South	0.00
Chittenden South	50,632.27	Franklin Central	21,075.04	Rivendell Interstate	4,813.44
Colchester	25,723.63	Franklin Northeast	44,087.00	Rutland Central	5,101.96
Essex Town	14,612.83	Franklin West	10,750.05	Rutland Northeast	9,807.90
Grand Isle	17,086.54	Hartford	15,737.40	Windsor Southeast	1,785.54
Lamoille North	42,796.39	Orange East	10,817.70		
Milton Town	15,316.96	Orange North	15,962.39		
Montpelier	37,013.01	Rutland South	4,440.00		
Orange Southwest	24,778.84	Rutland Southwest	12,675.93		
Orange Windsor	21,134.54	Springfield	30,016.56		
Orleans Central	76,471.45	St. Johnsbury	37,759.39		
Orleans Essex North	115,775.10	Washington Northeast	11,460.79		
Orleans Southwest	51,516.00	Washington South	14,312.21		
Rutland City	54,912.41	Washington West	5,413.34		
Rutland Windsor	10,932.19	Windham Northeast	20,038.43		
South Burlington	56,375.62	Windham Southeast	36,934.82		
Southwest Vermont	98,240.22				
Washington Central	28,765.06				
Windham Central	36,265.23				
Windham Southwest	35,360.97				
Windsor Central	36,191.69				
Windsor Northwest	35,791.88				
Windsor Southwest	13,099.66				
Winooski	35,589.94				

Vermont Library Funding FY 2007

Library Name	Committed Funding		
	Prediscount	Rate	Discount
Albany Town Library	\$ 633.36	80	\$ 506.69
Alburg Public Library	1,380	80	1,104
Aldrich Public Library	5,280	60	3,168
Alice M. Ward Memorial Library	2,096	60	1,257
Bennington Free Library	3,650	60	2,190
Blake Memorial Library	1,200	70	840
Bradford Public Library	780	70	546
Brooks Memorial Library	1,560	70	936
Hancock Free Public Library	672	60	134
Highgate Public Library	1,320	20	924
Johnson Public Library	504	70	403
Kellogg-Hubbard Library	2,409	80	1,446
Kittay Public Library	1,512	60	907
Martha Canfield Memorial Free Library	1,962	60	1,177
Pierson Library	2,992	60	1,197
Royalton Memorial Library	540	40	378
Salisbury Free Public Library	469	70	328
Springfield Town Library	3,416	70	2,391
St Johnsbury Athenaeum	1,380	70	828
Waterville Town Library	900	60	630
Windsor Public Library	1,196	60	718
			<u>\$22,009</u>

Denial/Reduction Analysis - Original Request vs. Awarded Funds (1)

As of 2/11/2008

	Funding Year 2005		Funding Year 2006		Funding Year 2007	
	Orig. Request	Committed Amt. Percent	Orig. Request	Committed Amt. Percent	Orig. Request	Committed Amt. Percent
Priority 1 Vermont:	1,954,939	1,794,332 92%	1,938,315	1,612,858 83%	2,058,913	1,913,793 93%
Priority 1 Everyone Else:	1,500,611,991	1,224,197,356 82%	1,625,924,063	1,356,146,353 83%	1,476,291,511	1,312,103,839 89%
Priority 1 Subtotal:	1,502,566,931	1,225,991,688 82%	1,627,862,378	1,357,759,211 83%	1,478,350,424	1,314,017,632 89%
Priority 2 Vermont:	3,305	506 15%	801	0 0%	3,857	3,857 100%
Priority 2 Everyone Else:	1,586,013,369	895,148,645 56%	867,162,289	614,594,043 71%	774,631,513	620,442,621 80%
Priority 2 Subtotal: (2)	1,586,016,674	895,149,151 56%	867,163,090	614,594,043 71%	774,635,370	620,446,478 80%
Total Vermont:	1,958,244	1,794,837 92%	1,939,116	1,612,858 83%	2,062,770	1,917,650 93%
Total Everyone Else:	3,086,625,361	2,119,346,001 69%	2,493,086,352	1,970,740,396 79%	2,250,923,024	1,932,546,460 86%
Total All Priorities:	3,088,583,605	2,121,140,839 69%	2,495,025,468	1,972,353,254 79%	2,252,985,794	1,934,464,110 86%

Notes:

(1) Original Requested Amount vs. Committed Funds for all requests that have FCDLs (i.e., excluding still pending requests).

(2) Priority 2 Discount Rate greater than or equal to (i.e., excluding request and denials below the threshold):

Threshold FY 2005	80%
FY 2006	86%
FY 2007	83% (so far)

Vermont Unused Funding: FY 2006

As of 1/3/2008

Applicant Name	Service Provider Name	Service	Funding	Disbursed	Mode*
Albany Town Library	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	\$ 406.14	\$0.00	BEAR
Arlington School District	Verizon Internet Services Inc.	Internet	1,470.03	\$0.00	NOT SET
Barnard Central Elem School	Excel Telecommunications, Inc.	Telecom	36.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Barstow Memorial School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	2,100.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Barstow Memorial School	BCN Telecom, Inc.	Telecom	240.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Barstow Memorial School	Rural Cellular Corporation	Telecom	360.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	ACC Operations, Inc.	Internet	494.67	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	ACC Operations, Inc.	Internet	120.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,765.43	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	Telrite Corporation	Telecom	1,220.67	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	MCI Communications Corporation	Telecom	490.48	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	AT&T Corporation	Telecom	156.99	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	Telrite Corporation	Telecom	33.91	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	RCC Atlantic, Inc.	Telecom	149.94	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	AT&T Corp.	Telecom	1,079.22	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,726.88	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	372.99	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,798.80	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bennington Rutland S U 06	RCC Atlantic, Inc.	Telecom	322.61	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bingham Memorial Elementary School	Shoreham Telephone Co. Inc.	Telecom	769.08	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bingham Memorial Elementary School	Shoreham Telephone Co. Inc.	Telecom	237.06	\$0.00	NOT SET
Brattleboro Academy School	AT&T Corp.	Telecom	1,050.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Bridport Central Elem School	Waitsfield Fayston Telephone Inc. dba Green Mountain Access	Internet	863.52	\$0.00	NOT SET
Brooks Memorial Library	CTC Communications Corp.	Telecom	468.00	\$0.00	BEAR
Caledonia Central S U 09	Utilities, Inc. dba Pivot.net	Internet	339.05	\$0.00	BEAR
Caledonia Central S U 09	Utilities, Inc. dba Pivot.net	Internet	689.56	\$0.00	BEAR
Caledonia Central S U 09	Skycasters, LLC	Internet	2,049.60	\$0.00	BEAR
Caledonia Central S U 09	Charter Communications	Internet	1,043.21	\$0.00	NOT SET
Caledonia Central S U 09	Fairpoint New England	Telecom	1,856.48	\$0.00	BEAR
Caledonia Central S U 09	Fairpoint New England	Telecom	1,174.32	\$0.00	BEAR
Caledonia Central S U 09	Working Assets Funding Service, Inc.	Telecom	235.73	\$0.00	BEAR
Caledonia Central S U 09	MCI Communications Corporation	Telecom	1,291.39	\$0.00	BEAR
Caledonia Central S U 09	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	546.19	\$0.00	NOT SET
Caledonia North Su 08-Consortium	Verizon Select Services Inc.	Telecom	548.91	\$0.00	NOT SET
Caledonia North Su 08-Consortium	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	2,121.12	\$0.00	NOT SET
Cambridge School District	Verizon Internet Services Inc.	Internet	894.46	\$0.00	NOT SET
Canaan School District	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	2,160.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Castleton Village School	ACC Operations, Inc.	Internet	288.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Chittenden Central S U 13	Sovernet, Inc.	Internet	882.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Chittenden Central S U 13	Central Vermont Communications, Inc.	Telecom	136.90	\$0.00	BEAR
Chittenden Central S U 13	Verizon Wireless	Telecom	3,107.46	\$0.00	NOT SET
Chittenden Central S U 13	Lincoln Communications	Telecom	10.41	\$0.00	NOT SET
Chittenden Central S U 13	Lincoln Communications	Telecom	31.84	\$0.00	NOT SET
Chittenden Central S U 13	Lightyear Communications	Telecom	2,569.95	\$0.00	NOT SET
Chittenden Central S U 13	Verizon Wireless	Telecom	207.65	\$0.00	NOT SET
Chittenden Central S U 13	Lightship Telecom	Telecom	4,193.94	\$0.00	NOT SET
Chittenden Central S U 13	RCC Atlantic, Inc.	Telecom	744.86	\$0.00	NOT SET
Chittenden East Supervisory Union	CTC Communications Corp.	Telecom	88.80	\$0.00	NOT SET
Enosburg Graded School District	North Country Cablevision Inc	Internet	5,694.00	\$0.00	BEAR
Enosburg Graded School District	RCC Atlantic Long Distance, Inc	Telecom	2,409.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Fair Haven Elementary School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,321.09	\$0.00	BEAR
Ferrisburgh Central School	Verizon Vermont	Internet	1,007.28	\$0.00	NOT SET
Grand Isle S U 24	BCN Telecom	Telecom	1,217.46	\$0.00	NOT SET
Granville Village Elem School	Matrix Telecom, Inc.	Telecom	263.14	\$0.00	NOT SET
Green Street Elementary School	AT&T Corp.	Telecom	630.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Greenwood School	T-Mobile USA, Inc.	Telecom	4,200.00	\$0.00	BEAR
Greenwood School	Rural Cellular Corporation	Telecom	300.00	\$0.00	BEAR
Greenwood School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	450.00	\$0.00	BEAR
Hancock Free Public Library	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	728.00	\$0.00	BEAR
Hancock Village School	AT&T Corp.	Telecom	259.01	\$0.00	NOT SET
Hartford Super School Dist 54	TelCove of Vermont, Inc.	Internet	2,952.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Hartford Super School Dist 54	TelCove of Vermont, Inc.	Internet	1,338.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Hartford Super School Dist 54	TelCove of Vermont, Inc.	Internet	1,605.60	\$0.00	NOT SET
Hartford Super School Dist 54	TelCove of Vermont, Inc.	Internet	1,338.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Johnson Elementary School	Novell, Inc.	Internet	400.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Kellogg-Hubbard Library	SoverNet Communications	Telecom	878.28	\$0.00	NOT SET
Kindle Farm Childrens Services Inc.	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	4,642.94	\$0.00	NOT SET
Kindle Farm Childrens Services Inc.	Vermont RSA No. 2- B2, Inc. dba U.S. Cellular	Telecom	5,770.66	\$0.00	NOT SET
Kindle Farm Childrens Services Inc.	Working Assets Funding Service, Inc.	Telecom	1,956.86	\$0.00	NOT SET
Laraway School Inc.	Lincoln Communications	Telecom	1,814.40	\$0.00	NOT SET
Leicester Central Elem School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,728.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Leicester Central Elem School	BCN Telecom, Inc.	Telecom	180.00	\$0.00	NOT SET

Vermont Unused Funding: FY 2006

As of 1/3/2008

Applicant Name	Service Provider Name	Service	Funding	Disbursed	Mode*
Ludlow Elementary School	Waitsfield Fayston Telephone Inc. dba Green Mountain Access	Internet	259.20	\$0.00	NOT SET
Lyndon Institute, Inc.	Charter Communications	Internet	7,526.23	\$0.00	NOT SET
Lyndon Institute, Inc.	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	34,529.21	\$0.00	NOT SET
Middletown Springs Elem School	BCN Telecom	Telecom	317.44	\$0.00	NOT SET
Neshobe Elementary School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	3,612.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Neshobe Elementary School	BCN Telecom, Inc.	Telecom	336.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Northfield School District	Northfield Telephone Company, dba TDS Telecom	Telecom	239.06	\$0.00	NOT SET
Orange Southwest S U 28	StarBand Communications, Inc.	Internet	1,079.93	\$0.00	NOT SET
Orleans Essex North S U 31	BCN Telecom	Telecom	301.56	\$0.00	NOT SET
Orwell Village Elem School	Shoreham Telephone Co. Inc.	Internet	1,007.64	\$0.00	NOT SET
Otter Valley Dist 08 High Sch	SoverNet Communications	Internet	3,460.80	\$0.00	NOT SET
Otter Valley Dist 08 High Sch	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	3,864.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Otter Valley Dist 08 High Sch	BCN Telecom	Telecom	189.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Otter Valley Dist 08 High Sch	Rural Cellular Corporation	Telecom	630.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Patricia A Hannaford Career	TelCove of Vermont, Inc.	Telecom	3,360.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Patricia A Hannaford Career	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,350.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Poultney Elementary School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	4,009.57	\$0.00	NOT SET
Poultney Elementary School	BCN Telecom	Telecom	475.52	\$0.00	NOT SET
Poultney High School	BCN Telecom, Inc.	Telecom	692.35	\$0.00	NOT SET
Richford High School	North Country Cablevision Inc	Internet	5,625.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Richford High School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	2,520.00	\$0.00	BEAR
Richford High School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,248.00	\$0.00	BEAR
Richford High School	SoverNet Communications	Telecom	420.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Richford High School	SoverNet Communications	Telecom	192.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Rockingham School District	Vermont Telephone Company	Internet	324.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Rockingham School District	SoverNet Communications	Telecom	2,805.60	\$0.00	NOT SET
Rockingham School District	SoverNet Communications	Telecom	2,100.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Salisbury Elementary School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,994.54	\$0.00	BEAR
St Albans Town Educational Ctr	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,530.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
The Long Trail School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	2,400.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Turnbridge Public Library	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,780.80	\$0.00	NOT SET
Twinfield Union School	Fairpoint New England	Telecom	4,792.96	\$0.00	NOT SET
Twinfield Union School	Telrite Corporation	Telecom	1,520.06	\$0.00	NOT SET
Vergennes Dist 05 Jr-Sr H S	SoverNet Communications	Internet	3,908.52	\$0.00	NOT SET
Waits River Valley School	Topsham Telephone Company, Inc.	Internet	1,617.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Waits River Valley School	Topsham Telephone Company, Inc.	Telecom	3,040.80	\$0.00	NOT SET
Waits River Valley School	AT&T Corp.	Telecom	1,915.20	\$0.00	NOT SET
Wells Village School	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	1,203.64	\$0.00	NOT SET
Wells Village School	BCN Telecom	Telecom	352.04	\$0.00	NOT SET
West Fairlee Free Library	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	288.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Westminster West Public Library	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	313.20	\$0.00	NOT SET
Weybridge Elementary School	Waitsfield Fayston Telephone Inc. dba Green Mountain Access	Internet	239.70	\$0.00	NOT SET
Weybridge Elementary School	Waitsfield-Fayston Telephone Co., Inc.	Telecom	1,296.72	\$0.00	NOT SET
Whiting Village Elem School	Shoreham Telephone Co. Inc.	Internet	1,512.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Whiting Village Elem School	Shoreham Telephone Co. Inc.	Telecom	1,404.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Windham Central S U 46	Lightship Telecom	Internet	3,443.94	\$0.00	NOT SET
Windham Central S U 46	Lightship Telecom	Telecom	2,097.62	\$0.00	NOT SET
Windham Central S U 46	RCC Atlantic, Inc.	Telecom	2,623.96	\$0.00	NOT SET
Windham Elementary School	CTC Communications Corp.	Telecom	756.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Windsor Central S U 51	Edline LLC	Internet	744.19	\$0.00	NOT SET
Windsor Central S U 51	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	232.56	\$0.00	NOT SET
Windsor Central S U 51	Verizon Vermont	Telecom	144.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Woodstock Elementary School	Rural Cellular Corporation	Telecom	216.00	\$0.00	NOT SET
Woodstock Un High Sch Dist	Edline LLC	Internet	1,345.20	\$0.00	SPI
Woodstock Un High Sch Dist	Lightyear Communications	Telecom	126.00	\$0.00	NOT SET

Total Unused \$ 213,340.73

* Note: Generally, if the indicated mode is "NOT SET," no invoice has been submitted to USAC.

An indicated mode of "BEAR" (or "SPI") a \$0.00 disbursement usually mean that an invoice was submitted, but rejected.

Appendix A

Vermont Public School E-Rate Analysis By Supervisory Union: FY2006 and FY 2007

Color Coding: **Effectively using E-rate.**
Mixed E-rate success.
Not effectively using E-rate.

Addison Central

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	67,337.68	60%	40,402.61	T, IA
2006	67,575.53	55%	37,166.54	T, IA
Average	67,456.61	57%	38,784.58	
Applicant(s):	Addison Central and selected schools (Bingham, Bridport, Ripton, Salisbury, and Weybridge).			
Comments:	Several of the schools filing their own applications did not file BEARs for FY 2006. Four schools/districts may not be getting full E-rate benefits (Mary Hogan, Middlebury, and Shoreham).			

Addison Northeast

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	50,130.39	61%	30,579.54	T, IA
2006	49,385.69	62%	30,619.13	T, IA
Average	49,758.04	61%	30,599.34	
Applicant(s):	Addison Northeast and each school			
Comments:	No problems.			

Addison Northwest

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	-		-	DNF
2006	20,360.88	60%	12,216.53	T, IA
Average	10,180.44	60%	6,108.27	
Applicant(s):	Addison Northwest and selected schools (Vergennes, Addison Central, and Ferrisburgh) in FY 2006.			
Comments:	No filings in FY 2007. Spotty earlier history (some denials; missing some BEARs).			

Addison Rutland

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	51,705.95	64%	33,091.81	T, IA
2006	30,674.96	68%	20,858.97	T, IA
Average	41,190.45	65%	26,975.39	
Applicant(s):	Most schools file independently (except Castleton Elementary).			
Comments:	Addison Rutland filed small application only in FY 1999 (and did not use funding). Schools experienced some denials, and did not always file BEARs.			

Barre

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007				DNF
2006				DNF
Average				
Applicant(s):	Last filing was by Barre SU in FY 2005			
Comments:	Barre funding in FY 2005 was not used. Some FY 2004 filings; denied for various problems.			

Battenkill Valley

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	6,545.64	64%	4,189.21	T, IA
2006	7,904.52	64%	5,058.89	T, IA
Average	7,225.08	64%	4,624.05	
Applicant(s):	Arlington School District			
Comments:	No Internet BEAR for FY 2006.			

Bennington Rutland

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	20,210.10	58%	11,721.86	T, IA
2006	35,949.11	57%	20,490.99	T, IA
Average	28,079.60	57%	16,106.43	
Applicant(s):	Bennington Rutland files on behalf of all but one school. Mettawee Community files separately.			
Comments:	Missing a number of BEARs for FY 2006.			

Blue Mountain

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	6,770.29	70%	4,739.20	T, IA
2006	7,076.15	80%	5,660.92	T, IA
Average	6,923.22	75%	5,200.06	
Applicant(s):	Blue Mountain Unified.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Burlington

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	168,430.68	59%	99,374.10	T, IA
2006	177,101.76	62%	109,803.09	T, IA
Average	172,766.22	61%	104,588.60	
Applicant(s):	Burlington Supervisory files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Caledonia Central

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	34,930.65	65%	22,704.92	T, IA
2006	24,548.49	65%	15,956.52	T, IA
Average	29,739.57	65%	19,330.72	
Applicant(s):	Caledonia Central files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	BEARs not filed for more than half the FY 2006 FRNs.			

Caledonia North

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	46,965.00	75%	35,223.75	T, IA
2006	43,436.16	75%	32,577.12	T, IA
Average	45,200.58	75%	33,900.44	
Applicant(s):	Caledonia North files consortium application on behalf of its schools and itself.			
Comments:	100% BEARS indicate possible problem.			

Chittenden Central

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	132,671.37	41%	54,395.26	T, IA
2006	212,002.93	42%	89,041.23	T, IA
Average	172,337.15	42%	71,718.25	
Applicant(s):	Chittenden Central files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	100% BEARS indicate possible problem.			

Chittenden East

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	65,018.47	43%	27,957.94	T, IA
2006	57,738.84	49%	28,292.03	T, IA
Average	61,378.65	46%	28,124.99	
Applicant(s):	Chittenden East files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	100% BEARS indicate possible problem.			

Chittenden South

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	128,513.98	40%	51,405.59	T, IA
2006	124,647.35	40%	49,858.94	T, IA
Average	126,580.66	40%	50,632.27	
Applicant(s):	Chittenden South and schools file.			
Comments:	No problems (excluding a couple of school denials in FY 2005).			

Colchester

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	54,076.11	44%	23,793.49	T, IA
2006	69,134.40	40%	27,653.76	T, IA
Average	61,605.26	42%	25,723.63	
Applicant(s):	Colchester School District 7			
Comments:	Internal Connections at 40% not funded in FY 2006.			

Dresden (Norwich SD)

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	-	-	-	DNF
2006	-	-	-	DNF
Average	-	-	-	
Applicant(s):	None			
Comments:	Marion Cross Elementary filed once (FY 1998)			

Essex Calendonía

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	-	-	-	DNF
2006	-	-	-	DNF
Average	-	-	-	
Applicant(s):	None			
Comments:	Neither SU or schools have ever filed			

Essex North

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	-	-	-	DNF
2006	23,520.00	60%	14,112.00	T, IA
Average	11,760.00	60%	7,056.00	
Applicant(s):	Canaan School District in FY 2006.			
Comments:	Canaan filed Form 470 for FY 2008. No filings for Norton Village School.			

Essex Town

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	44,244.00	40%	17,697.60	T, IA
2006	28,820.13	40%	11,528.05	T, IA
Average	36,532.06	40%	14,612.83	
Applicant(s):	Essex Town on behalf of schools.			
Comments:	No BEAR for one FRN in FY 2006.			

Franklin Central

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	72,388.00	56%	40,537.28	T, IA
2006	2,880.00	56%	1,612.80	IA
Average	37,634.00	56%	21,075.04	
Applicant(s):	Franklin Central on behalf of schools.			
Comments:	Telecom FRNs denied in FY 2006 for ETP and 470 problems.			

Franklin Northeast

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	87,033.04	72%	62,663.79	All
2006	34,945.48	73%	25,510.20	T, IA
Average	60,989.26	72%	44,087.00	
Applicant(s):	Individual schools or districts (Enosburg and Richford). Franklin Northeast hasn't filed since FY 1999.			
Comments:	Many BEARs not filed for FY 2006. Franklin always filing 100% BEARs.			

Franklin Northwest

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	9,002.98	58%	5,221.73	All
2006	7,805.05	63%	4,917.18	T
Average	8,404.02	60%	5,069.46	
Applicant(s):	Three schools filing (Franklin, Missisquoi Valley, and Waterville) recently. Franklin Northwest and other schools had filed earlier.			
Comments:	Many schools not filing BEARs. Only telecom in FY 2006.			

Franklin West

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	44,791.88	48%	21,500.10	T, IA
2006	-	-	-	DNF
Average	22,395.94	48%	10,750.05	
Applicant(s):	Franklin West (IA in FY 2007 only); Bellows Free Academy (cellular in FY 2007 only).			
Comments:	No recent filing for regular telecommunications services.			

Grand Isle

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	29,728.30	63%	18,728.83	T, IA
2006	24,910.06	62%	15,444.24	T, IA
Average	27,319.18	63%	17,086.54	
Applicant(s):	Grand Isle on behalf of schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Hartford

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	45,738.11	53%	24,241.20	T, IA
2006	13,910.77	52%	7,233.60	T, IA
Average	29,824.44	53%	15,737.40	
Applicant(s):	Hartford on behalf of schools.			
Comments:	Telecom denied in FY 2006. No IA BEARs filed for FY 2006.			

Lamoille North

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	74,756.33	66%	49,339.18	All
2006	54,929.70	66%	36,253.60	T, IA
Average	64,843.02	66%	42,796.39	
Applicant(s):	Lamoille North (in FY 2007 only) and selected schools.			
Comments:	No problems if everyone files in FY 2008.			

Lamoille South

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	-	-	-	DNF
2006	-	-	-	DNF
Average	-	-	-	
Applicant(s):	Lamoille South and Stowe filed last in FY 2004.			
Comments:	No BEARs filed since FY 2000.			

Milton Town

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	37,937.64	45%	17,071.94	T, IA
2006	27,123.96	50%	13,561.98	T, IA
Average	32,530.80	47%	15,316.96	
Applicant(s):	Milton Town files on behalf of schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Montpelier

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	66,080.36	56%	37,005.00	T, IA
2006	66,108.95	56%	37,021.01	T, IA
Average	66,094.65	56%	37,013.01	
Applicant(s):	Montpelier files on behalf of schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Orange East

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	27,893.33	54%	15,062.40	T, IA
2006	9,390.00	70%	6,573.00	T, IA
Average	18,641.67	58%	10,817.70	
Applicant(s):	Orange East in FY 2007 only. Waits River filed up through FY 2006. Other schools have not filed since FY 2004.			
Comments:	Waits River did not file BEARs for FY 2006			

Orange North

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	25,654.88	64%	16,419.12	T, IA
2006	24,227.58	64%	15,505.65	T, IA
Average	24,941.23	64%	15,962.39	
Applicant(s):	Orange North (for Internet) and two schools (Orange Center and Washington Village).			
Comments:	Past Form 470 and BEAR problems.			

Orange Southwest

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	47,804.26	66%	31,550.81	T, IA
2006	28,135.73	64%	18,006.87	T, IA
Average	37,970.00	65%	24,778.84	
Applicant(s):	Orange Southwest files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Orange Windsor

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	30,563.08	65%	19,866.00	T, IA
2006	34,466.26	65%	22,403.07	T, IA
Average	32,514.67	65%	21,134.54	
Applicant(s):	Orange Windsor files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Orleans Central

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	101,174.23	80%	80,939.38	T, IA
2006	90,004.39	80%	72,003.51	T, IA
Average	95,589.31	80%	76,471.45	
Applicant(s):	Orleans Central files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Orleans Essex North

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	150,673.45	80%	120,538.76	T, IA
2006	144,170.70	77%	111,011.44	T, IA
Average	147,422.08	79%	115,775.10	
Applicant(s):	Orleans Essex North files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Orleans Southwest

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	75,037.68	75%	56,278.26	T, IA
2006	63,180.72	74%	46,753.73	T, IA
Average	69,109.20	75%	51,516.00	T, IA
Applicant(s):	Orleans Southwest files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Rivendell Interstate

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	-	-	-	DNF
2006	13,752.69	70%	9,626.88	T, IA
Average	6,876.34	70%	4,813.44	
Applicant(s):	Rivendell filed on behalf of schools in FY 2006.			
Comments:	No BEARs on 2 of 3 FRNs in FY 2006.			

Rutland Central

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	15,460.48	66%	10,203.92	T, IA
2006	-	70%	-	T
Average	7,730.24	66%	5,101.96	
Applicant(s):	Proctor School District filed for its schools only in FY 2007; West Rutland filed for itself (but was denied) in FY 2006.			
Comments:	Proctor's filings in FY 2004 and FY 2005 were largely denied. Other schools filed in only some of the earlier years.			

Rutland City

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	91,341.38	66%	60,285.31	T, IA
2006	73,939.55	67%	49,539.50	T, IA
Average	82,640.47	66%	54,912.41	
Applicant(s):	Rutland City files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	No problems.			

Rutland Northeast

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	-	-	-	DNF
2006	32,693.00	60%	19,615.80	T, IA
Average	16,346.50	60%	9,807.90	
Applicant(s):	Individual schools filed in FY 2006.			
Comments:	Rutland Northeast and individual schools all filed incomplete applications in FY 2007. Several schools were denied funding in FY 2006 for 470 and contract issues. <u>No</u> BEARS have been filed by any of the schools for FY 2006.			

Rutland South

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	16,754.72	53%	8,880.00	T, IA
2006	-	-	-	DNF
Average	8,377.36	53%	4,440.00	
Applicant(s):	Schools filed for themselves in FY 2007; none in FY 2006.			
Comments:	Clarendon and Mill River had denials in FY 2007.			

Rutland Southwest

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	22,912.29	68%	15,580.36	T, IA
2006	14,369.84	68%	9,771.49	T, IA
Average	18,641.07	68%	12,675.93	
Applicant(s):	Schools file for themselves.			
Comments:	Most schools not filing BEARs. Not all schools filing for IA.			

Rutland Windsor

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	15,567.63	62%	9,651.93	T, IA
2006	20,354.08	60%	12,212.45	T, IA
Average	17,960.86	61%	10,932.19	
Applicant(s):	Schools file for themselves.			
Comments:	A few minor problems.			

South Burlington

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	136,760.61	41%	56,071.85	T, IA
2006	138,242.39	41%	56,679.38	T, IA
Average	137,501.50	41%	56,375.62	
Applicant(s):	South Burlington files on behalf of its schools			
Comments:	All schools may be getting aggregate discount.			

Southwest Vermont

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	144,021.64	66%	95,054.28	T, IA
2006	153,676.00	66%	101,426.16	T, IA
Average	148,848.82	66%	98,240.22	
Applicant(s):	Southwest Vermont files on behalf of its schools			
Comments:	100% BEARS indicate possible problem.			

Springfield

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	88,284.00	68%	60,033.12	T, IA
2006	-	70%	Denied	T, IA
Average	44,142.00	68%	30,016.56	
Applicant(s):	Springfield files on behalf of its schools.			
Comments:	FY 2007 still pending. FY 2006 denied; FCC appeal possible.			

St. Johnsbury

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	75,058.02	60%	45,034.81	T, IA
2006	60,967.92	50%	30,483.96	T, IA
Average	68,012.97	56%	37,759.39	
Applicant(s):	St. Johnsbury district files for school. Academy files for itself.			
Comments:	St. Johnsbury district denied in FY 2006; BEARs not filed in some earlier years.			

Washington Central

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	71,883.02	56%	40,254.49	T, IA
2006	30,849.34	56%	17,275.63	T, IA
Average	51,366.18	56%	28,765.06	
Applicant(s):	Schools file for themselves. Washington central may have filed for itself in FY 2007.			
Comments:	Scattered denial and BEAR problems at school level.			

Washington Northeast

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	22,865.03	65%	14,862.27	T, IA
2006	11,513.29	70%	8,059.30	T, IA
Average	17,189.16	67%	11,460.79	
Applicant(s):	Twinfield files for itself; Cabot filed in FY 2007.			
Comments:	BEARs not always filed.			

Washington South

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	24,791.63	64%	15,866.64	T, IA
2006	20,250.43	63%	12,757.77	T, IA
Average	22,521.03	64%	14,312.21	
Applicant(s):	Washington South filing for itself. Northfield district and Roxbury School filing separately.			
Comments:	Only Northfield filing for IA. Scattered BEAR problems.			

Washington West

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	15,721.00	58%	9,118.18	T, IA
2006	2,997.35	57%	1,708.49	T, IA
Average	9,359.18	58%	5,413.34	
Applicant(s):	One district and two schools filed in FY 2007; one school funded in FY 2006.			
Comments:	BEARs not always filed. One apparently missed Form 486 filing.			

Windham Central

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	65,738.74	58%	38,128.47	T, IA
2006	60,354.35	57%	34,401.98	T, IA
Average	63,046.55	58%	36,265.23	
Applicant(s):	Windham Central and most schools file.			
Comments:	A few bEARs not filed.			

Windham Northeast

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	32,527.74	68%	22,118.86	T, IA
2006	26,408.82	68%	17,958.00	T, IA
Average	29,468.28	68%	20,038.43	
Applicant(s):	Only Bellows Falls and Rockingham districts have filed recently.			
Comments:				

Windham Southeast

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	69,820.95	65%	45,383.62	T, IA
2006	44,509.39	64%	28,486.01	T, IA
Average	57,165.17	65%	36,934.82	
Applicant(s):	All but one district or school filed in FY 2007; less in FY 2006.			
Comments:	Not all filed for telecom and Internet. A few missing BEARs.			

Windham Southwest

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	52,128.04	62%	32,319.39	T, IA
2006	61,939.60	62%	38,402.55	T, IA
Average	57,033.82	62%	35,360.97	
Applicant(s):	All schools or districts filing.			
Comments:	Windham Southwest not filing.			

Windsor Central

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	54,909.23	52%	28,552.80	T, IA
2006	81,167.72	54%	43,830.57	T, IA
Average	68,038.48	53%	36,191.69	
Applicant(s):	Windsor Central and schools are filing.			
Comments:	Some filing only for telecom.			

Windsor Northwest

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	66,786.34	70%	46,750.44	T, IA
2006	38,205.09	65%	24,833.31	T, IA
Average	52,495.72	68%	35,791.88	
Applicant(s):	Windsor Northwest and other schools or districts.			
Comments:	A few missing BEARs.			

Windsor Southeast

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	5,579.80	64%	3,571.07	T, IA
2006	-	-	-	DNF
Average	2,789.90	64%	1,785.54	
Applicant(s):	Windsor district only in FY 2007 (but most FRNs denied).			
Comments:	Windsor Southeast and most other have not filed since at least FY 2004.			

Windsor Southwest

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	23,455.06	63%	14,776.69	T, IA
2006	19,037.70	60%	11,422.62	T, IA
Average	21,246.38	62%	13,099.66	
Applicant(s):	Schools filing individually.			
Comments:	Windsor Southwest not filing.			

Winooski

Funding Year	Pre-Discount	Est. Rate	Discount	Services
2007	61,935.60	80%	49,548.48	T, IA
2006	27,039.24	80%	21,631.39	T, IA
Average	44,487.42	80%	35,589.94	
Applicant(s):	Winooski filing as district.			
Comments:	No problems.			