



March 19, 2025

The Honorable Melissa H. Wiklund  
Chair, Health and Human Services Committee  
95 University Avenue W.  
Minnesota Senate Bldg., Room 2107  
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Chair Wiklund and Members of the Health and Human Services Committee:

On behalf of CTIA®, the trade association for the wireless communications industry, I write to respectfully oppose SF 1688, which would impose a new Emergency Medical Services (EMS) telecommunications fee on wireless consumers in Minnesota. While we recognize the critical role of emergency medical services, we have concerns about placing an additional financial burden on wireless consumers, who already face some of the highest state and local tax rates on their wireless bills.

Wireless service connects Minnesota residents to work, education, public safety, and emergency services. However, Minnesota wireless consumers already pay significant taxes and fees on their bills. Just last year, the legislature enacted a new 988 mental health crisis fee on wireless customers, adding to the growing wireless tax burden.

Wireless consumers in the state currently pay state and local sales taxes, 911 fees, telecommunications access fees, and now the 988 fees—all of which contribute to the rising cost of staying connected. Imposing yet another fee would only add to this financial strain, making wireless service less affordable, particularly for low-income consumers who rely on mobile phones as their primary means of communication.

We fully support efforts to ensure adequate funding for EMS and emergency response services, but these vital programs should be supported through broad-based funding mechanisms, such as the state's general revenue. No other state imposes a fee on wireless consumers to fund EMS services or any other broad-based emergency response services, such as police and fire services. EMS services are essential to all Minnesotans, and funding for these programs should reflect that broad benefit. Additionally, imposing a wireless telecommunications-specific fee to fund EMS sets a concerning precedent that wireless consumers will continue to be targeted for additional taxes whenever new funding needs arise. Instead, the legislature should look to existing general revenue sources or consider reallocating current state funds to support EMS services, rather than disproportionately burdening wireless consumers.

We urge the committee to not move SF 1688 with the proposed wireless telecommunications fee and instead explore alternative funding sources that do not place the financial responsibility on wireless consumers. While we appreciate the importance of EMS funding, we oppose this bill because of the burden it would add to Minnesota's wireless consumers. We encourage the legislature to consider funding emergency medical services through the general fund.

Sincerely,  
*Annissa Reed*

Annissa Reed



Director, State and Local Affairs