

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS  
ON STATE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF  
911 AND ENHANCED 911 FEES AND CHARGES  
FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2016 TO DECEMBER 31, 2016

Submitted Pursuant to  
Public Law No. 110-283

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Ajit Pai, Chairman

December 29, 2017

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Heading	Page #
I. INTRODUCTION.....	2
II. KEY FINDINGS.....	3
III. BACKGROUND.....	4
IV. DISCUSSION.....	5
A. Summary of Reporting Methodology.....	5
B. Overview of State 911 Systems.....	5
C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanism.....	17
D. Description of State Authority that Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent.....	18
E. Description of Uses of State 911 Fees.....	21
F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected.....	29
G. Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Use.....	43
H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees.....	50
I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures.....	53
J. Cybersecurity Expenditures.....	69
K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees.....	75
L. Public Comments on 2016 Eighth Annual Report.....	76
V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2017 NINTH ANNUAL REPORT.....	78
Appendix A – Summary of State and Other Jurisdiction Responses Regarding 2016 Collections	
Appendix B – Overview of Total State and Other Jurisdiction 911 Fees – 2009 – 2017	
Appendix C – State 911 Fees by Service Type	
Appendix D – Information Collection Questionnaire	

### I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman, Federal Communications Commission (Commission),<sup>1</sup> hereby submits this Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, as mandated by the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008 (NET 911 Act)<sup>2</sup> and as prepared by the staff in the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (Bureau).<sup>3</sup> This is the ninth annual report on the collection and distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 (E911) fees and charges by the states, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, and tribal authorities, and covers the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016. This report also reflects the third annual collection of new data elements relating to the number of 911 call centers and telecommunicators, 911 call volumes, 911 expenditure categories, implementation of Next Generation 911, and cybersecurity for 911 systems.

---

<sup>1</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 155(a) (stating, *inter alia*, that “[i]t shall be [the Chairman’s] duty . . . to represent the Commission in all matters relating to legislation and legislative reports”).

<sup>2</sup> New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-283, 122 Stat. 2620 (2008) (NET 911 Act).

<sup>3</sup> See 47 C.F.R. § 0.191(k) (providing delegated authority to the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau to develop responses to legislative inquiries).

## II. KEY FINDINGS

2. Forty-six states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the United States Virgin Islands responded to this year's data request. The following is a compilation of key findings based on the responses:

- In calendar year 2016, states and other reporting jurisdictions collected 911/E911 fees or charges totaling \$2,763,916,948.
- Twenty-seven states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported collecting 911/E911 fees at the state level, four states reported collecting fees at the local level, and fourteen states collected fees at both the state and local level.
- The Bureau identified six states as diverting or transferring 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911.
  - New Jersey and West Virginia used a portion of their 911/E911 funds to support non-911 related public safety programs.
  - Illinois, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Rhode Island used a portion of their 911/E911 funds for either non-public safety or unspecified uses.
  - New York did not submit a report in response to this year's data collection, but sufficient public record information exists to support a finding that New York diverted funds for non-public safety uses.
  - The total amount of 911/E911 funds diverted by all reporting jurisdictions in calendar year 2016 was \$128,909,169, or approximately 5 percent of total 911/E911 fees collected.
- Thirty-eight states and the District of Columbia reported engaging in Next Generation 911 (NG911) programs in calendar year 2016. The total amount of reported NG911 expenditures from 911/E911 fees was \$205,494,105, or approximately 7.4 percent of total 911/E911 fees collected.
- Thirteen states reported having deployed state-wide Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets). Twelve states reported having regional ESInets within the state, and eight states reported local-level ESInets.
- Forty-six states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported on deployment of text-to-911. Collectively, respondents reported 811 PSAPs as being text-capable as of the end of 2016, and projected that an additional 1,026 PSAPs would be text-capable by the end of 2017, for a total of 1,837 text capable PSAPs. Data from the Commission's Text-to-911 Registry suggests that the expansion of text-to-911 in 2017 has come close to these projections.
- While almost every state collects 911 fees from in-state subscribers, twenty states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they lack authority to audit service providers to verify that the collected fees accurately reflect the number of in-state subscribers served by the provider. Of the states that have audit authority, five conducted audits in 2016.

- On the topic of cybersecurity preparedness for Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), thirty-four states, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that they spent no 911 funds in 2016 on 911-related cybersecurity programs for PSAPs. Eleven states and the District of Columbia stated that they had made cybersecurity-related expenditures.

### III. BACKGROUND

3. Section 101 of the NET 911 Act added a new section 6(f)(2) to the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Wireless 911 Act), which provides:

To ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability in the collection and expenditure of a fee or charge for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services, the Commission shall submit a report within 1 year after the date of enactment of the New and Emerging Technologies 911 Improvement Act of 2008, and annually thereafter, to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges, and including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.

4. *Information Request and Responses.* In April 2017, the Bureau sent questionnaires to the Governor of each state and territory and the Mayor of the District of Columbia requesting information on 911 fee collection and expenditure for calendar year 2016.<sup>4</sup> The Bureau received responsive information from 46 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.<sup>5</sup> The Bureau did not receive responses from Missouri, Montana, New York, and Oklahoma. Other non-responding jurisdictions include Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and Puerto Rico.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix C - Annual Collection of Information Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions (FCC Questionnaire). This year's data collection incorporates recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in its April 2013 report on state collection and use of 911 funds. See Government Accountability Office, "Most States Used 911 Funds for Intended Purposes, but FCC Could Improve Its Reporting on States' Use of Funds," GAO-13-376 (Apr. 2013) (GAO Report). GAO prepared this report pursuant to a directive in the Next Generation 911 Advancement Act of 2012. See Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-96, 126 Stat. 158 (2012). Consistent with GAO's recommendation, and in order to improve the collection and analysis of data in its annual reports, the Bureau modified its information collection authorization under the Paperwork Reduction Act to include closed-ended questions in the annual information request. Additionally, the Bureau provided responders with electronic forms that can be filled out and returned by e-mail to ease the information collection burden. The expanded information collection was approved by the Office of Management and Budget in April 2015. See Letter from Dominic J. Mancini, Acting Deputy Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, to Walter Boswell, Certifying Official, FCC, OMB Control Number 201501-3060-021 (Mar. 25, 2015). In previous years, the Bureau has sent questionnaires to the regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), but these offices have either failed to respond, indicated they have no responsive information, or requested that they not be contacted. Accordingly, the Bureau did not include the BIA regional offices in this year's data collection.

<sup>5</sup> Copies of reports from all responding jurisdictions are available on the FCC web site at <https://www.fcc.gov/9th-annual-911-fee-report-state-filings>.

## IV. DISCUSSION

5. This Report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in calendar year 2016, how much they collected, and how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds.<sup>6</sup> The Report describes the extent to which states diverted or transferred collected 911/E911 funds to funds or programs other than those that support or implement 911/E911 services. The report also examines the collection and expenditure of funds on NG911 and cybersecurity programs.

### A. Summary of Reporting Methodology

6. Section 6(f)(1) of the Act affirms the ability of “[a] State, political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or village or regional corporation serving a region established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended . . .” to collect fees or charges “[applicable] to commercial mobile services or IP-enabled voice services . . . for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services, provided that the fee or charge is obligated or expended only in support of 9-1-1 and enhanced 9-1-1 services, or enhancements of such services, *as specified in the provision of State or local law adopting the fee or charge.*”<sup>7</sup> Section 6(f)(2) further requires the Commission to obtain information “detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges, and including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof *for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.*”<sup>8</sup>

7. Given the NET 911 Act’s reference to state and local 911 fee statutes, our state-by-state analysis of 911/E911 fee expenditures in this report is determined by the applicable statute governing the collection and expenditure of 911/E911 fees within each state. States determine how 911/E911 fee revenues are to be spent, therefore, individual state definitions of what constitute permissible expenditures may vary. The Bureau’s information collection questionnaire asks each state to confirm whether it has spent 911/E911 funds solely for purposes permitted under the particular state’s 911 funding statute, and also requests information on what uses are deemed permissible under the state’s statute and how such uses support 911 or E911 service. Although some state statutes expressly authorize the diversion or transfer of collected 911/E911 fees, the Bureau reviews the reported expenditures to determine whether such diversions or transfers are not “in support of 9-1-1 and enhanced 9-1-1 services, or enhancements of such services” within the meaning of the NET 911 Act. The report on 911/E911 fee diversion in Section G below is consistent with this interpretation.

### B. Overview of State 911 Systems

8. To provide a broader context for the information provided on collection and use of 911 fees, the data collection sought information about the total number of Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) that receive funding derived from the collection of 911 fees, the number of active telecommunicators funded through the collection of 911 fees, the total number and type of 911 calls the state or jurisdiction received, and an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Our analysis includes states that collect and distribute fees over the course of a fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year covered by our reports.

<sup>7</sup> NET 911 Act at §6(f)(1) (emphasis added).

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at §6(f)(2) (emphasis added).

<sup>9</sup> FCC Questionnaire at 2-3.

9. **Number and Type of PSAPs.** The questionnaire requested that states “provide the total number of active [Primary and Secondary PSAPs]<sup>10</sup> in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2016.” Table 1 shows that 45 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this request, reporting a total of 4,384 Primary PSAPs and 800 Secondary PSAPs, for a total of 5,184 PSAPs dependent on funding derived from the collection of 911 fees.<sup>11</sup>

**Table 1 - Number and Types of PSAPs that Receive Funding from the Collection of 911 Fees**

State	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs
AK	38	5	43
AL	118	0	118
AR	102	25	127
AZ	76	10	86
CA	390	51	441
CO	94	12	106
CT	110	--	110
DE	8	1	9
FL	155	51	206
GA	137	18	155
HI	5	3	8
IA	113	--	113
ID	46	3	49
IL	255	23	278
IN	91	30	121
KS	117	--	117
KY	116	40	156
LA	57	50	107
MA	241	72	313
MD	24	70	94
ME	26	--	26

<sup>10</sup> A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control Office. A Secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association, Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (NENA Master Glossary), July 29, 2014, at 118, 126, available at [https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014\\_2014072.pdf](https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014_2014072.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> We note that because the Bureau’s data request focused on PSAPs that receive funding from 911 fees, the reported data does not necessarily include PSAPs that are funded through sources other than 911 fees.

<b>State</b>	<b>Total Primary</b>	<b>Total Secondary</b>	<b>Total PSAPs</b>
MI	143	--	143 <sup>12</sup>
MN	99	5	104
MO	Did Not File		
MS	130	37	167
MT	Did Not File		
NC	117	11	128
ND	21	1	22
NE	70	0	70
NH	2	--	2
NJ <sup>13</sup>	0	0	0
NM	45	2	47
NV	17 <sup>14</sup>	--	17
NY	Did Not File		
OH	155	75	230
OK	Did Not File		
OR	43	14	57
PA	69	--	69
RI	1	1	2
SC	65	4	69
SD	28	--	28
TN	140	30	170
TX	512	69	581
UT	32	4	36
VA	119	41	160
VT	6	--	6
WA	54	9	63
WI	109	30	139
WV	52	--	52

---

<sup>12</sup> Michigan reports that there are five secondary PSAPs in the state, however, they are all operated by private Emergency Medical Services and receive no direct funding through 911 fees and surcharges. Michigan Response at 2.

<sup>13</sup> New Jersey reports that its PSAPs are not funded through 911 fees and thus did not report a total number. New Jersey Response at 2.

<sup>14</sup> Nevada Counties reported as follows: Boulder City Police Department (1); Carson City (1); Douglas County (1); Las Vegas Metro Police Department (1); Lyon County (3); Mineral County (1); Nye County (6); Sparks Police Department (1); and Storey County (1).

State	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs
WY	33	3	36
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>			
AS <sup>15</sup>			0
DC	1	--	1
Guam	Did Not File		
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not File		
PR	Did Not File		
USVI	2	--	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,384</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>5,184</b>

10. **Number of Telecommunicators.** Respondents were asked to provide the total number of active telecommunicators<sup>16</sup> in each state or territory that were funded through the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2016. As detailed in Table 2, 45 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this data request. Thirty states and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported a total of 32,096 full time telecommunicators and 2,697 part-time telecommunicators that are funded through the collection of 911 fees. Six states reported they do not know how telecommunicators are funded, nine states, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia reported they are not funded by 911 fees, and one state did not respond to the question.

**Table 2 – Total Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees**

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Reported “Unknown”	Not Funded by Fees	Provided No Response
AK	319	6			
AL	--	--	X		
AR	1,005	175			
AZ	--	--		X	
CA	--	--		X	

<sup>15</sup> American Samoa reports that it has one PSAP but it is not funded through 911 fees. American Samoa Response at 3.

<sup>16</sup> A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a “person employed by a PSAP and/or an [Emergency Medical Dispatch] Service Provider qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP.” See NENA Master Glossary at 196, available at [https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.21-2017\\_FINAL\\_2.pdf](https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.21-2017_FINAL_2.pdf).

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Reported "Unknown"	Not Funded by Fees	Provided No Response
CO	419	27			
CT	--	--	X		
DE	253	3			
FL	2,209	182			
GA	--	--	X		
HI	--	--		X	
IA	--	--		X	
ID	--	--	X		
IL	3,130	507			
IN	1,649	405			
KS	1,098	123			
KY	1,542	--			
LA	820	8			
MA	5,000	--			
MD	1,417	94			
ME	--	--		X	
MI	1,887	281			
MN	--	--		X	
MO	Did Not File				
MS	1,233	--			
MT	Did Not File				
NC	--	--		X	
ND	230	--			
NE	590	96			
NH	73	10			
NJ	--	--		X	
NM	--	--		X	
NV	35	--			
NY	Did Not File				
OH	1,044	146			
OK	Did Not File				
OR	897	--			
PA	2,073	279			
RI	27	--			
SC	--	--			X
SD	283	38			
TN	--	--	X		

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Reported "Unknown"	Not Funded by Fees	Provided No Response
TX	853	18			
UT	790	80			
VA	912	--			
VT	77	16			
WA	1,110	100			
WI	500	--			
WV	576	103			
WY	--	--	X		
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>					
AS	--	--		X	
DC	--	--		X	
Guam	Did Not File				
Northern Mariana Is.	Did Not File				
PR	Did Not File				
USVI	45	--			
Total	<b>32,096</b>	<b>2,697</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>

11. **Number of 911/E911 Calls.** The Bureau asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total number of 911 calls the state or jurisdiction received for the annual period ending December 31, 2016. Forty-three states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported a cumulative total of 220,482,252 calls of all types during the 2016 annual period. This total is significantly lower than the reported call volume for the 2015 annual reporting period, but the Bureau attributes a significant portion of the decrease to the absence of reported call data from New York and Puerto Rico.<sup>17</sup> Of the total reported calls in 2016, 153,404,008 calls came from wireless phones, representing approximately 70 percent of the total reported call volume. The Bureau believes this likely understates the percentage of wireless 911 calls because a number of states reported total 911 calls but did not break out service categories separately.<sup>18</sup> Table 3 provides specific call volume information provided by each state or other jurisdiction for each service type. In addition, the Bureau has included an estimate of annual 911 calls on a per capita basis in each reporting state and jurisdiction.

<sup>17</sup> In the 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Report (2016), forty-four states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported a total of 253,844,538 911 calls for calendar year 2015. Of that total, New York reported 29,417,934 calls and Puerto Rico reported 2,571,660 calls. Assuming that New York and Puerto Rico experienced the same 911 call volumes in 2016 that they reported in 2015, the resulting total 2016 call volume for the U.S. would be 0.5 percent lower than the equivalent reported call volume for 2015.

<sup>18</sup> Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, South Dakota, Tennessee and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported total 911 call volumes but did not provide service category subtotals.

**Table 3 – Total 911 Calls by Service Type**

State	Type of Service						Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita <sup>19</sup>
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Reported “Unknown”	
AK	349,012	98,439	Unknown	Unknown	447,451		0.63
AL	Did Not Specify	2,672,191	Did Not Specify	--	2,672,191		0.56
AR	--	--	--	--	--	X	--
AZ	971,912	4,297,454	Did Not Specify	--	5,269,366		0.82
CA	4,813,211	22,665,329	1,028,994	5,833	28,513,367		0.77
CO	391,684	5,574,449	186,421	--	6,152,554		1.22
CT	332,287	1,746,802	119,666	--	2,198,755		0.62
DE	166,067	595,686	63,350	29,177	854,280		0.95
FL	2,446,096	19,070,052	461,144	230,873	22,208,165		1.18
GA	--	--	--	--	--	X	--
HI	297,300	1,011,050	52,800	3,000	1,364,150		1.00
IA	232,072	875,058	12,176	--	1,119,306		0.37
ID	--	--	--	--	--	X	--
IL	3,832,569	7,691,231	Included in Wireline	--	11,523,800		0.90
IN	1,287,890	3,871,665	166,290	180,930	5,506,775		0.85
KS	759,015	1,290,626	29,536	213,392	2,292,569		0.80
KY	959,064	2,485,256	Included in Wireline	--	3,444,320		0.79
LA	764,116	3,412,344	Unknown	Unknown	4,176,460		0.92
MA	2,867,145	824,603	Did Not Specify	--	3,691,748		0.56
MD	1,185,386	3,819,777	Unknown	240	5,005,403		0.87
ME	125,035	383,675	50,922	--	559,632		0.42
MI	1,030,797	5,030,124	321,566	4,733	6,387,220		0.65
MN	531,672	2,331,929	124,742	12	2,988,355		0.56
MO	Did Not File						--
MS	Did Not Specify				3,621,100		1.22
MT	Did Not File						--
NC	1,343,033	5,646,736	587,296	--	7,577,065		0.79
ND	39,462	194,810	2,125	--	236,397		0.35
NE	249,509	903,003	Unknown	Unknown	1,152,512		0.63
NH	63,510	340,199	52,049	16,925	472,683		0.36

<sup>19</sup> Bureau estimate based on United States 2010 Census data for each jurisdiction.

State	Type of Service						Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita <sup>19</sup>
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Reported "Unknown"	
NJ	Did Not Specify				8,250,000		0.94
NM	171,955	1,143,239	35,785	6,160	1,357,139		0.66
NV	--	--	--	--	3,825,639		1.42
NY	Did Not File						--
OH	939,855	5,989,116	345,008	579,178	7,853,157		0.68
OK	Did Not File						--
OR	344,732	1,369,144	94,595	5,032	1,813,503		0.47
PA	2,849,599	6,245,566	433,557	7,548	9,536,270		0.75
RI	119,659	376,397	Did Not Specify	345	496,401		0.47
SC	1,019,847	4,079,389	--	--	5,099,236		1.10
SD	Did Not Specify				307,866		0.38
TN	Did Not Specify				3,389,039		0.53
TX	3,547,478	25,113,405	793,725	945,775	30,400,383		1.21
UT	94,616	956,413	34,681	23,267	1,108,977		0.40
VA	1,083,170	3,387,594	Did Not Specify	--	4,470,764		0.56
VT	42,136	135,427	19,499	6,080	203,142		0.32
WA	885,047	5,452,271	396,829	--	6,734,147		1.00
WI	2,024,217	539,791	134,947	--	2,698,955		0.47
WV	882,793	534,872	110,915	86,415	1,614,995		0.87
WY	26,496	222,725	2,437	8,376	260,034		0.46
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>							
AS	9,672	34,943	--	--	44,615		0.80
DC	415,784	991,228	--	--	1,407,012		2.34
Guam	Did Not File						--
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not File						--
PR	Did Not File						--
USVI	Did Not Specify				175,354		1.65
<b>Totals</b>	<b>39,494,900</b>	<b>153,404,008</b>	<b>5,661,055</b>	<b>2,353,291</b>	<b>220,482,252</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.71</b>

12. **Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service.** The Bureau asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911 service during the annual period ending December 31, 2016, regardless of whether such costs are supported by 911 fees or other funding sources. As detailed in Table 4, 39 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands provided cost estimates totaling \$3,492,515,691.<sup>20</sup> Table 4 also includes the Bureau's estimate of reported costs on a per capita basis for

<sup>20</sup> For a comparison of total costs to total revenue from fees and charges, see Table 13.

each reporting state and jurisdiction. Seven states and American Samoa did not provide cost estimates, with many of the respondents noting that they lacked authority to collect 911 cost data from local jurisdictions. Some states that did submit estimates qualified their cost figures by noting that they had only partial information regarding the total cost to provide 911 service.<sup>21</sup>

**Table 4 – Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service**

<b>State</b>	<b>Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service</b>	<b>Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could not be Provided</b>	<b>Per Capita Expenditures</b>
AK	\$11,595,445		\$16.33
AL	\$111,070,563	“This figure is for total expenditures as provided by an independent auditors' report for fiscal period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016.”	\$23.24
AR	--		--
AZ	\$15,538,696		\$2.43
CA	\$84,113,987		\$2.26
CO	\$113,539,000		\$22.58
CT	\$25,883,602		\$7.24
DE	\$10,000,000		\$11.14
FL	\$203,420,288	Based on counties fiscal year data	\$10.82
GA	--	“There is no 9-1-1 authority established in the State of Georgia. There is also no central tracking mechanism in place to compile a total of fees imposed or collected by local governments.”	--
HI	\$40,000,000		\$29.41
IA	\$146,302,788		\$48.03
ID	--	“The cost of providing 911 services is kept at each of the jurisdictional levels and requests can be made for that data; however it is incomplete. The cost responses were not broken out sufficiently to give a solid number and only 14 of 46 PSAPs responded to the request with some responses as “unknown”. Due to some responses being intermingled with 911 costs paid by the 911 fees and personnel costs that were paid for by General Funds, not all responses could be calculated and not all jurisdictions reported on the survey that was sent out to gather the information.”	--

<sup>21</sup> States lacking complete information include Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Nebraska, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Per Capita Expenditures
IL	\$276,833,191	Statewide (not including Chicago): \$140,583,131 Chicago Only: \$136,250,060	\$21.58
IN	\$184,798,847		\$28.50
KS	\$72,200,810		\$25.31
KY	\$111,256,278	“Centralized data collection is new to the CMRS Board so data collection is incomplete and is not always reliable. The total does not include state general funds dollars budgeted to the Kentucky State Police (KSP). KSP budgets are not designed to break out ‘911 costs, estimated to be \$8 million in state general fund dollars.”	\$25.64
LA	\$68,846,754		\$15.19
MA	\$28,694,312	“The estimated amount (based upon the amount contracted for Fiscal Year 2016) to provide E911 service is: \$28,694,312 This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the legacy E911 service provider contracts, MassGIS, and the mobile PSAP. This estimated amount does not include costs associated with Next Generation 911, grant programs, training programs, disability access programs, public education, administrative costs, or other costs for the administration and programs of the State 911 Department.”	\$4.38
MD	\$97,539,230	“FY 2016 (July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016) as reported by annual county audits.”	\$16.89
ME	\$6,536,575	“State share only”	\$4.92
MI	\$204,463,273	“1) Expenses reported by PSAPs: \$194,639,474.11 2) The total reported technical costs for network collections by landline telephone companies for 911 network and delivery costs in 2016: \$6,930,217.36 3) \$2,893,581.06 for calendar year 2016 for the cost of wireless 911 delivery was reimbursed to landline service providers (AT & T, Frontier, and Peninsula Fiber Network) under the Michigan Public Service Commission’s Docket U-14000.”	\$20.69
MN	\$76,542,107		\$14.43
MO		Did Not File	--
MS	\$52,332,689		\$17.64
MT		Did Not File	--
NC	\$112,792,750		\$11.83

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Per Capita Expenditures
ND	\$19,309,099		\$28.71
NE	--	“The Nebraska Public Service Commission (NPSC) has oversight over Wireless 911 only. An annual allocation of wireless 911 surcharge revenue is distributed to the PSAPs. The PSC does not have information regarding the costs to run the PSAPs at this time.”	--
NH	\$12,711,613		\$9.66
NJ	\$14,000,000	“The State of New Jersey funds the statewide enhanced 911 infrastructure at an annual cost of approximately \$14M, the operational, equipment, and personnel costs are the responsibility of the PSAP and not reported to the State 911 Office.”	\$1.59
NM	\$10,058,192		\$4.88
NV	\$4,505,698	<u>Individual County Reports:</u> Boulder City PD - \$44,698 Carson City - 1,900,000 Douglas County - \$194,000 Lander County - \$75,000 Lyon County - \$900,000 Nye County - \$242,000 Sparks PD - \$250,000 Storey County - \$900,000 Elko, Esmerelda, LV MPD, and Mineral report "unknown"	\$1.67
NY	Did Not File		--
OH	\$165,937,072	“Estimates from previous years' information or similar counties for counties that did not respond to the survey.”	\$14.38
OK	Did Not File		--
OR	\$140,600,513		\$36.70
PA	\$340,260,872		\$26.79
RI	\$5,699,440		\$5.41
SC	--	“We do not collect that type of information. The State 911 office only deals with wireless 911 and the distribution of wireless 911 surcharges back to the PSAPs.”	--
SD	\$25,175,306		\$30.92
TN	\$83,300,000		\$13.13

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Per Capita Expenditures
TX	\$266,688,159	“Amount equals total 772 ECD wireline/wireless/prepaid wireless revenues collected; for the state 911 program appropriated wireline/wireless/prepaid wireless and (911 only) equalization surcharge, and for the municipal ECDs a total cost estimate.”	\$10.61
UT	\$80,000		\$0.03
VA	\$115,253,631	“The only costs that we track directly at the state level are local PSAP personnel costs and payments made on behalf of the localities for wireless trunks and services. The total amount for these items is \$115,253,631.”	\$14.40
VT	\$4,761,608		\$7.61
WA	\$109,528,437		\$16.29
WI	Unknown	“In Wisconsin, county and municipal governments operate and administer the 911 system and all public safety answering points. County and municipal governments do not report to any state agency the number of staff employed, the total cost to provide 911 service, or a statistical summary of the 911 service provided.”	--
WV	\$50,069,236	“Amount is only a partial total because 13 out of 52 PSAPs did not provide data.”	\$27.02
WY	--	“According to Title 16, Chapter 9 of the Wyoming State Statutes for the emergency Telephone Service Act, Wyoming does not assign over-sight responsibility to a state-level agency for 9-1-1 services. (16-9-102(a)(iv).”	--
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>			
AS	--	Did Not Provide a Number	
DC	\$44,354,100		\$73.71
Guam		Did Not File	--
No. Mariana. Is.		Did Not File	--
PR		Did Not File	--
USVI	\$25,921,530		\$243.93
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,492,515,691</b>	<b>Average State Per Capita Expenditure</b>	<b>\$18.23</b>
		<b>National Per Capita Expenditure</b>	<b>\$11.39</b>

**C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanism**

13. The Bureau’s questionnaire seeks data on the funding mechanisms states use to collect fees. Forty-five states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands affirmed that their state or jurisdiction has established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation.<sup>22</sup> Of those states that have an established funding mechanism, Table 5 identifies five states that enlarged or altered their funding mechanism during calendar year 2016. Specifically, each of these five states amended their fee structure. For example, Illinois reports that the Emergency Telephone System Act, with an effective date of January 1, 2016, equalized the surcharge collected for wireline, wireless and VoIP across Illinois, except for the City of Chicago, to \$0.87 per line.<sup>23</sup> Kentucky altered the funding formula for pre-paid wireless connections by requiring at point of sale that retailers collect \$0.93 per transaction.<sup>24</sup> Similarly, New Hampshire imposed a surcharge of \$0.75 on prepaid services at the retail point of sale, the same surcharge applied to wireline, wireless, and VoIP services.<sup>25</sup>

**Table 5 – States That Amended or Enlarged 911 Funding Mechanism**

State	Description
IL	“The Emergency Telephone System Act with an effective date of January 1, 2016 equalized the surcharge collected for wireline, wireless and VoIP across the State, except for the City of Chicago, to \$.87. The City of Chicago’s surcharge [increased to] \$3.90. Prepaid wireless was increased to 3%.”
KY	"In July 2016 HB 585 was passed into law by the Kentucky General Assembly that changed the funding formula for pre-paid wireless connections to a point of sale collection method. Each pre-paid connection is now charged [\$0.93] per transaction."
LA	“In 2016 the Louisiana State Legislature Passed Act 665 and Act 590 adjusting the Wireless and Prepaid Wireless Rates for the State of Louisiana.”
MA	“(The funding mechanism was not altered. However, the Enhanced 911 Surcharge was adjusted from \$1.25 to \$1.00, effective July 1, 2016.)”
NH	"Effective January 1, 2016 the state imposed a prepaid commercial mobile radio service E911 surcharge that shall be levied on each retail transaction sourced to New Hampshire. The amount of the surcharge levied for each retail transaction shall be the same as the surcharge imposed under RSA 106-H:9 I(a)."

14. The Bureau asked states to describe the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911 fees, specifically whether 911/E911 funds are collected by the state (or equivalent jurisdiction),

<sup>22</sup> Nevada did not respond to the question. American Samoa reported that it has not established a funding mechanism. American Samoa Response at 2.

<sup>23</sup> Illinois Response at 4.

<sup>24</sup> Kentucky Response at 4.

<sup>25</sup> New Hampshire Response at 4.

by local jurisdictions, or by a combination of the two. As described in Table 6 below, 27 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they collect all 911 fees on a statewide basis, with the collected funds administered by the state. Four states reported that 911 fee collection occurs exclusively at the local level, although in some cases such local collection is authorized by state statute.<sup>26</sup> Fourteen states reported using a hybrid approach to 911 fee collection, in which state and local governing bodies share authority over fee collection from customers. For example, Colorado reported that “[s]urcharge funds derived from landlines, contract wireless, and VoIP lines are remitted directly to local 911 Authorities by the carriers, but prepaid surcharge fees are assessed at point-of-sale on the purchase of wireless minutes and remitted to the Colorado Department of Revenue, which then distributes those funds to local governments using a formula based on wireless call volume as a percentage of total wireless calls received in the state.”<sup>27</sup>

**Table 6 – Authority to Collect 911/E911 Fees**

Type of Collection	Number of States/Jurisdictions	States/Jurisdictions
State	29	States: Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and Wyoming  Other: District of Columbia, U.S. Virgin Islands
Local	4	Alaska, Georgia, Mississippi, and Nevada
Hybrid	14	Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, and West Virginia

**D. Description of State Authority that Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent**

15. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions identify the entity that has authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 purposes. As detailed in Table 7, 14 states and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that a state entity has authority to approve expenditure of 911 fees. Nine states described authority resting exclusively with local entities. Twenty-two states and the District of Columbia indicated that authority is shared between state and local authorities.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> See, e.g., Alaska Response at 3-4; Georgia Response at 4.

<sup>27</sup> Colorado Response at 4.

<sup>28</sup> With respect to the District of Columbia, the District reported that under D.C. Official Code § 34-1802(c), “expenditures of fees collected and deposited in the 9-1-1 Fund are subject to the approval of the D.C. Council upon request of the Mayor as part of the annual budget submission [and] Expenditures of 9-1-1 Funds approved by the (continued....)”

16. The Bureau also sought information on whether states have established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected funds may be used. As indicated in Table 7, states that responded ‘no’ to this question typically cede control of how 911 funds are spent to local jurisdictions. Forty-one states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded that they have a mechanism mandating how 911 fees may be spent, whereas five states and American Samoa indicated they have no such mechanism.

**Table 7 – State Authority for Approval of 911 Fee Expenditures**

State	State, Local, or Combined Authority to Approve Expenditures			State Funding Mechanism Mandating <i>How</i> Funds Can be Used
	State	Local	Both	
AK		X		No
AL			X	Yes
AR			X	Yes
AZ	X			Yes
CA	X			Yes
CO		X		Yes
CT	X			Yes
DE			X	Yes
FL			X	Yes
GA		X		No
HI	X			Yes
IA			X	Yes
ID		X		No
IL			X	Yes
IN			X	Yes
KS			X	Yes
KY			X	Yes
LA		X		Yes
MA	X			Yes
MD	X			Yes
ME	X			Yes
MI			X	Yes
MN	X			Yes
MO	Did Not File			

(Continued from previous page) \_\_\_\_\_  
D.C. Council are then subject to authorization by Congress in an appropriations act pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 34-1802(a).” District of Columbia Response at 5.

State	State, Local, or Combined Authority to Approve Expenditures			State Funding Mechanism Mandating <i>How</i> Funds Can be Used	
	State	Local	Both	Yes	No
MS		X		No	
MT	Did Not File				
NC	X			Yes	
ND		X		Yes	
NE			X	Yes	
NH	X			Yes	
NJ	X			Yes	
NM	X			Yes	
NV		X		No	
NY	Did Not File				
OH			X	Yes	
OK	Did Not File				
OR			X	Yes	
PA			X	Yes	
RI	X			Yes	
SC			X	Yes	
SD			X	Yes	
TN			X	Yes	
TX			X	Yes	
UT			X	Yes	
VA			X	Yes	
VT	X			Yes	
WA			X	Yes	
WI	Not Applicable - LECs Bill and Keep			Yes	
WV			X	Yes	
WY		X		Yes	
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>					
AS	Does Not Collect 911 fees			No	
DC			X	Yes	
Guam	Did Not File				
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not File				
PR	Did Not File				
USVI	X			Yes	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Local</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>6</b>

**E. Description of Uses of State 911 Fees**

17. The Bureau asked responding states to provide a statement identifying with specificity “all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.” Forty-six states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this question.

18. The Bureau also requested that states identify whether their 911 fee collections were authorized to be used for specific expenditure categories, including (1) operating costs for customer premises equipment (CPE), computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment and building and facilities; (2) personnel costs (telecommunicator salaries and training); (3) administrative costs associated with program administration and travel expenses; and (4) dispatch costs, including reimbursements to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch services and lease, purchase, and maintenance of radio dispatch networks. Cumulative responses are provided in Table 8 and individual state responses are provided in Table 9.

**Table 8 – Summary of State Responses Regarding Allowable Use of Fees**

Allowable Uses		Total States
Operating Costs	CPE	46
	CAD	37
	Buildings and Facilities	28
Personnel	Salaries	30
	Training	43
Administrative	Programs	42
	Travel	40
Dispatch	Reimbursement to Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch	17
	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	26

**Table 9 – Allowed Uses of Collected Fees**

State	Operating Costs			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CPE (hardware and software)	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CAD (hardware and software)	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Building and Facilities	Salaries	Training	Program Administration	Travel Expenses	Reimbursement to Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks
AK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
AL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
AZ	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
CA	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
CO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CT	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DE	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
FL	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
GA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Yes
HI	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
IA	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ID	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
IL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IN	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
KS	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
KY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
LA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
MA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MD	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
ME	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
MI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MN	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
MO	Did Not File								
MS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MT	Did Not File								
NC	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
ND	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NJ	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
NM	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NV	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

State	Operating Costs			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CPE (hardware and software)	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CAD (hardware and software)	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Building and Facilities	Salaries	Training	Program Administration	Travel Expenses	Reimbursement to Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks
NY	Did Not File								
OH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
OK	Did Not File								
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
PA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
RI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
SC	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VT	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
WA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
WI	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
WV	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
WY	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>									
AS	No Funds Collected								
DC	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Guam	Did Not File								
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not File								
PR	Did Not File								
USVI	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

19. The Bureau requested information on grants that each state or jurisdiction paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant. Twenty-one states reported that they paid for grants through the use of collected 911 fees, and twenty-four states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands said they did not.<sup>29</sup> Table 10 provides states' descriptions of their grant programs.

<sup>29</sup> Nevada did not respond to this question. American Samoa reports that no funds are collected to support grant programs.

**Table 10 – State Grants or Grant Programs**

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
AL	“A total of \$699,149.75 was granted to seven individual districts based on the demonstration of need. Grant funds are only available from the funds remaining in the state office’s administrative 1%.”
CT	“Capital Expense Grants for upgrades to PSAPs and transition grant funding for reimbursing costs related to consolidation of PSAPs.”
FL	“Collected funds were used to fund the State Grant Program for counties in Florida to maintain and upgrade their E911 equipment as well as NG911 system upgrades. Funds were also used to support a Rural County Grant Program to specifically assist rural counties in maintaining their E911 systems. The E911 Board approved 28 rural county grants that totaled \$2,083,626. The board approved \$1,565,734 for eight counties under the State Grant Program.”
IA	“The State did not have any external grants available during this time frame. The state operated an E911 Carryover Grant as detailed in Code of Iowa 34A. During this period, the State offered consolidation grants to local PSAPs up to \$200,000 or half of the associated costs for physical or virtual consolidation. \$4.4 million was approved statewide under this grant program.”
ID	“Pursuant to Idaho Code §31-4803, a county must get voter approval to institute an emergency communications fee in an amount no greater than one dollar (\$1.00) per month per “telephone line”. The Act has been amended in recent years to include assessing the fee on both wireless and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service and now uses the term “access line” to indicate that all technology that is able to provide dial tone to access 9-1-1 is mandated to collect the fee. In 2008, the Idaho Legislature promulgated the implementation of an Enhanced Emergency Communications Grant Fee that was signed into law by the Governor and became Idaho Code §31-4819. This additional fee can be imposed by the boards of commissioners of Idaho counties in the amount of \$0.25 per month per access line to be contributed to the Enhanced Emergency Communications Grant Fund. The funds are distributed via a grant process governed by the IPSCC. Thirty-eight Idaho counties have begun assessing the enhanced fee.”
IL	<p>“The Act allows for the Advisory Board to set aside money from surcharge received to fund grants to assist in offsetting nonrecurring costs associated with 9-1-1 system consolidation. The Statewide 9-1-1 Administrator administers the grant program for the Department by establishing a grant request, reviewing grant applications and ultimately determining grant recipients. Grants are given out on a priority basis based on enumerated criteria as outlined below:</p> <p><b>GRANT PRIORITIES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unserved Counties</li> <li>• Consolidations</li> <li>• NG911</li> <li>• Reimbursement for Consolidation Costs Incurred from 2010 to 2015”</li> </ul>
KS	“The Council has used the grant funds, which are derived from the 1.20% fee placed on prepaid wireless sales, to fund projects that are of statewide benefit, rather than making individual PSAP grants. These projects to date are the statewide GIS Enhancement Project, Statewide digital orthoimagery, consulting Services for NG911, planning and implementation, and statewide NG911 program management. Council operating expenses are also paid from the state grant fund. The grant funds are also utilized to pay nonrecurring costs for the statewide ESINet and call handling system and for recurring costs for the ESINet.”

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
KY	<p>Kentucky's Response referenced the Kentucky CMRS Board/Office of the 911 Coordinator FY 2016 Annual Report at p.20:</p> <p>"Fiscal Year 2016 saw the announcement of \$2,419,485 in competitive CMRS Grant Awards to 37 different entities.</p> <p>With both the CMRS Grant Committee and CMRS Board focused on the ultimate goal of providing Next Generation 9-1-1 capabilities to all citizens in the Commonwealth, all awards this cycle were once again geared towards interim solutions that assist in making the most of our grant dollars and technologies while we await the formal rollout of a seamless NG9-1-1 network in Kentucky.</p> <p>"Category #1" CMRS Grant awards for Board approved Host/Remote controller solutions continued in 2016. This solution promotes more reliable disaster recovery capabilities in the PSAP and has the potential to lower the PSAP's recurring equipment cost since the main pieces of technology used are housed remotely, maintained by the Host provider and shared. A common term for this type of solution is "virtual consolidation" whereby the PSAP still maintains their physical autonomy but consolidates their backroom equipment with PSAPs that share the same solution.</p> <p>Other awards in 2016 cycle included CAD upgrades, logging recorders, PSAP specific furniture, radio con-soles and call taking protocol software."</p>
MA	<p>"The State 911 Department has developed and administers grant programs to assist PSAPs and regional emergency communication centers, or RECCs, in providing enhanced 911 service and to foster the development of regional PSAPs, regional secondary PSAPs, and RECCs.</p> <p>M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(i) requires that the State 911 Department fund the following grant programs: the PSAP and Regional Emergency Communications Center Training Grant ("Training Grant"); the PSAP and Regional Emergency Communication Center Support Grant ("Support Grant"); the Regional PSAP and Regional Emergency Communication Center Incentive Grant ("Incentive Grant"); the Wireless State Police PSAP Grant; and the Regional and Regional Secondary PSAP and Regional Emergency Communications Center Development Grant ("Development Grant"). See MG.L. Chapter 6A, Sections 18B(i)(1)-(5).</p> <p>The statute also permits the State 911 Department to introduce new grants associated with providing enhanced 911 service in the Commonwealth. See MG.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(f).</p> <p>As permitted by the statute, in 2011, the State 911 Department introduced a new grant, the Emergency Medical Dispatch ("EMD") Grant. The statute provides that the State 911 Commission shall approve all formulas, percentages, guidelines, or other mechanisms used to distribute these grants. See M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(a).</p> <p>The eligibility requirements, purpose, use of funding, including categories of use of funds, application process, grant review and selection process, and grant reimbursement process for each of these grants are set forth in the Grant Guidelines that are approved by the State 911 Commission. These Grant Guidelines are available on the State 911 Department website at <a href="http://www.mass.gov/e911">www.mass.gov/e911</a>."</p>
MD	<p>"The Maryland 9-1-1 Trust Fund may be used by any county (including the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City) for enhancements to 9-1-1 in a process defined in Maryland Public Safety Article §1-309, and is typically used for PSAP telephone equipment, logging recorders, emergency standby electrical power, security, mapping, furniture and training. Application for funds must be made by the county PSAP director, and approved by the majority of voting members present at a public session of</p>

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
	<p>the Maryland Emergency Number Systems Board. The Emergency Number Systems Board is defined under Maryland Public Safety Article §1-305 and §1-306.</p> <p>Additional Funds are passed through the state to each county and the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City in the same percentage collected from the vendor on a quarterly basis. These funds are used to offset operational and maintenance costs for each PSAP.”</p>
MN	<p>“According to Minn. Stat. §403.113, a portion of the fee collected must be used to fund implementation, operation, maintenance, enhancement, and expansion of enhanced 911 service, including acquisition of necessary equipment and the costs of the commissioner to administer the program. After payment of costs of the commissioner to administer the program, money collected shall be distributed as follows:</p> <p>(1) one-half of the amount equally to all qualified counties, and after October 1, 1997, to all qualified counties, existing ten public safety answering points operated by the Minnesota State Patrol, and each governmental entity operating the individual public safety answering points serving the Metropolitan Airports Commission, the Red Lake Indian Reservation, and the University of Minnesota Police Department; and</p> <p>(2) the remaining one-half to qualified counties and cities with existing 911 systems based on each county's or city's percentage of the total population of qualified counties and cities. The population of a qualified city with an existing system must be deducted from its county's population when calculating the county's share under this clause if the city seeks direct distribution of its share.</p> <p>(b) A county's share under subdivision 1 must be shared pro rata between the county and existing city systems in the county. A county or city or other governmental entity as described in paragraph (a), clause (1), shall deposit money received under this subdivision in an interest-bearing fund or account separate from the governmental entity's general fund and may use money in the fund or account only for the purposes specified in subdivision 3.</p> <p>(c) A county or city or other governmental entity as described in paragraph (a), clause (1), is not qualified to share in the distribution of money for enhanced 911 service if it has not implemented enhanced 911 service before December 31, 1998.”</p>
NC	<p>“Rockingham County PSAP Consolidation Rockingham Sheriff, Eden Police, Reidsville Police, Madison PD, Mayodan Police, Stoneville Police, Rockingham Fire, Rockingham EMS, Rockingham Co Rescue Squad</p> <p>Lenoir County PSAP Consolidation Lenoir Co and Jones Co for all Law Enforcement, EMS and Fire Depts. within each county</p> <p>Henderson County PSAP Relocation</p> <p>Hertford County PSAP Consolidation Hertford Co, Murfreesboro PD &amp; Ahoskie PD</p> <p>Caldwell County PSAP Upgrade and create a backup PSAP</p> <p>Dare County PSAP Consolidation with Tyrell County</p> <p>Haywood County PSAP Consolidation with Sheriff's Dept. and upgrade PSAP Equipment</p>

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
	<p>Swain-Jackson County Regional PSAP Connectivity</p> <p>Graham County Participant in the Regional PSAP Initiative, in cooperation with the PSAPs of Jackson and Swain Counties.</p> <p>Hyde County PSAP consolidation with Dare and Tyrell Counties</p> <p>Richmond County PSAP consolidation of the primary 9 1 1 Center and three secondary centers within the county</p> <p>E-CATS Emergency Call Tracking System (call answering statistics)</p> <p>Ortho Project Image 15 Southern Piedmont 24 Counties (Orthoimagery Mapping)</p> <p>Ortho Project Image 16 Coastal 26 Counties (Orthoimagery Mapping)”</p>
NE	<p>“Within the 911-SAM cost model for wireless funds, the PSC established a WSP grant fund. The details of which can be found on pages 11 and 12 of the following linked order. This grant fund is being phased out and will no longer be available in the 2017 fiscal year.  <a href="http://psc.nebraska.gov/orders/ntips/911-019.PI-118.14.pdf">http://psc.nebraska.gov/orders/ntips/911-019.PI-118.14.pdf</a>”</p>
NM	<p>"Grants to local government pay for E-911 equipment and maintenance, generators, dispatch consoles, recorders, dispatch software, GIS equipment and training, 911 training, 911 and Data Networks, Network termination equipment, such as routers, firewalls and switches."</p>
PA	<p>“Per 35 Pa.C.S. § 5306.1 (d) (2) Fifteen (15) percent of the revenue collected is set aside to be used to establish, enhance, operate or maintain statewide interconnectivity of 9-1-1 systems. Any of these statewide interconnectivity funds distributed to a PSAP will be through an annual grant process. In 2016, PEMA awarded Pennsylvania PSAPs \$53.5 million for 34 projects related to PSAP consolidations, projects that establish or maintain broadband connectivity between PSAPs, and projects that allow PSAPs to share 911 system resources.”</p>
TN	<p>“The TECB offered ECDs non-recurring (one-time) funding and reimbursements for the purchase of essential equipment and other items up to the following amounts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$50,000 for Geographic Information System (“GIS”) Mapping Systems</li> <li>• \$40,000 for Controllers</li> <li>• \$450,000 for Essential Equipment</li> <li>• \$5,000 for Master Clocks</li> <li>• \$150,000 to each ECD that Consolidates (to a maximum of 3 ECDs)</li> <li>• \$1,000 to Train Dispatcher Trainers</li> <li>• \$100,000 to Cover Uninsured Catastrophic Event Losses</li> </ul> <p>The TECB also made \$25 million available to ECDs for CPE equipment used to connect them to the state-wide NG911 platform the state is deploying to modernize Tennessee’s 911 infrastructure. The funding plan provided each ECD with a base amount of \$120,000 plus an additional amount determined by the district’s population.</p> <p>As of January, 2015, the TECB ceased these funding programs due to the new funding law. However, the TECB is still distributing funds from the essential and necessary equipment fund until the funding is exhausted.”</p>

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
TX	<p>“The state 9-1-1 program administered by CSEC provides grants of legislatively appropriated 9-1-1 and equalization surcharge funds to 22 RPCs for the specific purpose of providing 9-1-1 service in each RPC’s region. CSEC provides grants of appropriated surcharge revenues to six Regional Poison Control Center host hospitals to partially fund the state Poison Control Program. (Equalization surcharge revenue is also appropriated to the Department of State Health Services and TTUHSC to fund county and regional emergency medical services and trauma care, and a telemedicine medical services pilot program, respectively.)”</p>
UT	<p>“Grants for CPE equipment were paid through the use of collected 911/E911 fees from the statewide \$0.09 fee (9 cent fund) directed to the Utah 911 Advisory Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grants for consulting services regarding a CAD study were paid from the statewide Computer Aided Dispatch \$0.06 fee (6 cent fund).</li> <li>• Grants for CAD functional elements were paid from the statewide Computer Aided Dispatch \$0.06 fee (6 cent fund).”</li> </ul>
VA	<p>“The PSAP Grant Program is a multi-million dollar grant program administered by the Virginia 9-1-1 Services Board. The PSAP Grant Program will financially assist primary PSAPs with non-recurring NG9-1-1 costs, limited legacy equipment purchase, PSAP consolidation projects, and 9-1-1/GIS educational and training opportunities. Funding is made available through the Code of Virginia and administered by the Board.”</p>
WA	<p>“The state provides operational funding grants to smaller counties that do not collect sufficient local 911 excise tax revenues to support a basic level 911 program. These grants provide for salaries, equipment, maintenance, and training funds.”</p>
WV	<p>"One million (\$1,000,000.00) dollars per year is awarded by the Public Service Commission of West Virginia as grants for the construction of cell towers, pursuant to WV Code §24-6-6b."</p>

**F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected**

20. In order to provide an overview of the sources of 911 fees, the Bureau directed respondents to describe the amount of fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services and to distinguish between state and local fees for each service type (wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, VoIP, and other services). Table 11 provides an overview of the number of states and localities that levy a fee on each service type.

**Table 11 – Summary of State and Local Authorities That Levy 911 Fees**

<b>Service Type</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Local</b>	<b>Both</b>	<b>No Response or No Fee</b>
<b>Wireline</b>	26	16	6	1
<b>Wireless</b>	34	7	5	3
<b>Prepaid</b>	37	1	3	8
<b>VoIP</b>	27	10	6	6
<b>Other</b>	8	2	--	39

21. Table 12 details the average fee by type of service.<sup>30</sup> Based on responding states’ information, the average wireline 911 fee is \$1.00 per line per month; the average wireless 911 fee is \$0.92 per line per month; the average prepaid wireless percentage of retail transaction 911 fee is 2.05%; the average prepaid wireless flat 911 fee per transaction is \$0.83; the average VoIP service 911 fee is \$0.96 per line per month.<sup>31</sup> Several states reported imposing a percentage fee on wireline and wireless service rates.<sup>32</sup> American Samoa reported that it has no 911 fees on any service types. Wisconsin reported that it had no wireless service 911 fee. Eight states reported that they have no prepaid service 911 fee and five states reported they had no VoIP service 911 fee.

<sup>30</sup> See Appendix C for a detailed description of fees and charges that each reporting state and jurisdiction levied on wireline, wireless, prepaid, VoIP and other services during calendar year 2016.

<sup>31</sup> Several states reported other 911 fees, with an average of \$0.61 per line per month.

<sup>32</sup> Arkansas imposes an “amount up to five percent (5%), or for any counties with a population fewer than 27,500 the amount may be up to twelve percent (12%) of the tariff rate.” Arkansas Response at 12. California reported that it imposes “.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue” on wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, and VoIP services. California Response at 9. Louisiana reported that it imposed “Up to 5% of Tariff Rate on Exchange Service.” Louisiana Response at 9. Vermont reported that it imposed “2% customer telecommunications charges on wireline, wireless, and prepaid wireless services. It further noted that VoIP 911 fees are collected from subscribers on a voluntary basis. Vermont Response at 10.

**Table 12 – 911 Fee Highlights by Service Type**

<b>Service Type</b>	<b>Average 911 Fee</b>	<b>State with Lowest Associated Fee (per line per month)</b>	<b>State with Highest Associated Fee (per line per month)</b>	<b>States/Jurisdictions with No Associated Service Fee</b>
Wireline – Flat Fee	\$1.00	MI - \$0.19	AK - \$2.00	American Samoa
Wireless – Flat Fee	\$0.92	MI - \$0.19	WV - \$3.00	Wisconsin American Samoa
Prepaid -Percentage of Retail Transaction	2.05%	OH – .05%	WV – 6%	Alaska Hawaii Mississippi New Jersey New Mexico Nevada Wisconsin American Samoa
Prepaid - Flat Fee per Retail Transaction	\$0.83	ME - \$0.45	AL - \$1.75	
VoIP – Flat Fee	\$0.96	MI - \$0.19	AL - \$1.75	Alaska Louisiana New Mexico Ohio Wisconsin American Samoa

22. The Bureau asked states to report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges by service type, including wireline, wireless, VoIP, prepaid wireless, and any other service-based fees. Table 13 shows that, in total, states and other jurisdictions reported collecting approximately \$2,763,916,948 in 911 fees or related charges for calendar year 2016. Table 13 also includes the Bureau’s estimate of annual fee collections on a per capita basis for each reporting state and jurisdiction. Although 911 fees are typically collected on a per customer basis rather than a per capita basis, the per capita estimate nonetheless provides a useful benchmark for comparing fee collections and expenditures across states and other jurisdictions.

**Table 13 – Total Amount Collected in 911 Fees by Service Type**

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost <sup>33</sup>	Fees as a Percentage of Cost	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita <sup>34</sup>
AK	\$2,435,043	\$9,160,402	--	--	--	\$11,595,445	\$11,595,445	100%	\$16.33
AL	\$96,435,820		--	\$19,509,063	--	\$115,944,883	\$111,070,563	105%	\$24.26
AR	Unknown	\$15,442,351	--	\$4,719,523	--	\$20,161,873	--	--	\$6.91
AZ	\$18,406,139			\$1,920,514	\$62,861	\$20,389,514	\$15,538,696	131%	\$3.19
CA	Did Not Specify					\$79,648,535	\$84,113,987	95%	\$2.14
CO	\$10,208,492	\$35,436,178	\$5,645,956	\$2,696,800	--	\$53,987,426	\$113,539,000	48%	\$10.73
CT	Unknown			\$1,658,219	--	\$1,658,219	\$25,883,602	6%	\$0.46
DE	Did Not Specify					\$8,718,169	\$10,000,000	87%	\$9.71
FL	\$13,636,245	\$59,499,178	\$21,568,403	\$17,096,045	--	\$111,799,871	\$203,420,288	55%	\$5.95
GA	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	\$19,840,298	--	\$19,840,298	--	--	\$2.05
HI	\$729,918	\$8,728,198	\$1,176,190	None	--	\$10,634,306	\$40,000,000	27%	\$7.82
IA	\$11,163,568	\$26,561,065	--	\$2,124,959	--	\$39,849,592	\$146,302,788	27%	\$13.08
ID	\$18,563,793	--	--	\$1,755,021	\$2,137,908	\$22,456,722	--	--	\$14.33

<sup>33</sup> These figures are cross-referenced from Table 4.

<sup>34</sup> Bureau estimate based on United States 2010 Census data for each jurisdiction.

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost <sup>33</sup>	Fees as a Percentage of Cost	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita <sup>34</sup>
IL	\$73,278,474	\$141,008,742	\$12,846,021	\$6,937,067		\$234,070,304	\$276,833,191	85%	\$18.24
IN	\$9,216,085	\$54,792,567	\$9,908,639	\$12,790,081	\$157,649	\$86,865,020	\$184,798,847	47%	\$13.40
KS	\$17,648,683			\$1,545,025	00	\$19,193,708	\$72,200,810	27%	\$6.73
KY	\$27,073,729	\$22,161,849	Unknown	\$4,331,539	\$57,521,959	\$111,089,076	\$111,256,278	99%	\$25.60
LA	\$18,477,389	\$32,131,792	Data Not Collected	\$5,683,700	\$9,943,109	\$66,235,990	\$68,846,754	96%	\$14.61
MA	\$14,294,139	\$55,040,600	\$25,039,848	\$23,509,312	--	\$117,883,899	\$28,694,312	411%	\$18.00
MD	\$20,478,008	\$27,392,871	Included in Wireline	\$5,933,865	\$169,268	\$53,974,012	\$97,539,230	55%	\$9.35
ME	\$2,067,664	\$4,283,019	\$1,033,832	\$1,122,155	--	\$8,506,670	\$6,536,575	130%	\$6.40
MI	State: \$23,559,167 County: \$70,371,705			State: \$8,457,494	--	\$102,388,366	\$204,463,273	50%	\$10.36
MN	\$21,318,104	\$46,575,733	\$2,470,079	\$6,178,192	--	\$76,542,107	\$76,542,107	100%	\$14.43
MO	Did Not File						--	--	--
MS	Did Not Specify					\$31,884,472	\$52,332,689	61%	\$10.75
MT	Did Not File						---	--	--
NC	\$12,439,582	\$44,045,195	\$12,614,581	\$12,702,141	--	\$81,801,499	\$112,792,750	73%	\$8.58
ND	\$11,816,399		\$998,284	Included in Wireless	--	\$12,814,683	\$19,309,099	66%	\$19.05
NE	\$5,870,367	\$7,108,741	Unknown	\$1,082,864	--	\$14,061,973	--	--	\$7.70

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost <sup>33</sup>	Fees as a Percentage of Cost	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita <sup>34</sup>
NH	\$2,462,136	\$8,838,292	\$2,859,564	\$1,127,958	\$647	\$15,288,598	\$12,711,613	120%	\$11.61
NJ	Did Not Provide					\$122,150,000	\$14,000,000	873%	\$13.89--
NM	Did Not Specify					\$10,919,490	\$10,058,192	109%	\$5.30
NV	--	\$437,144 <sup>35</sup>	--	--	--	\$437,144	\$4,505,698	10%	\$0.16
NY	Did Not File						--	--	--
OH	\$2,317,865	\$25,689,296	\$8,447	\$90,474	\$16,614,002	\$44,720,083	\$165,937,072	27%	\$3.88
OK	Did Not File						--	--	--
OR	Did Not Specify					\$42,832,475	\$140,600,513	30%	\$11.18
PA	\$57,311,655	\$180,711,429	\$49,499,044	\$28,441,522	--	\$315,963,650	\$340,260,872	93%	\$24.87
RI	\$4,424,625	\$8,990,829		\$606,242	--	\$14,021,695	\$5,699,440	246%	\$13.32
SC	\$10,683,269	\$22,375,964	Included in Wireline	\$7,821,530	--	\$40,880,762	--	--	\$8.84
SD	\$3,765,692	\$8,042,188	\$71,275	\$1,096,864	--	\$12,976,019	\$25,175,306	52%	\$15.94
TN	Did Not Specify					\$102,699,664	\$83,300,000	123%	\$16.18
TX	\$70,127,002	\$110,487,924	Included in Wireline	\$23,733,501	\$18,966,698	\$223,315,125	\$266,688,159	84%	\$8.88

<sup>35</sup> Nevada's wireless fee total is based on reporting of three Nevada jurisdictions: Carson City - \$213,444; Douglas County - \$151,000; Nye County - \$73,000.

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost <sup>33</sup>	Fees as a Percentage of Cost	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita <sup>34</sup>
UT	\$6,858,340	\$18,826,674	Included in Wireless	\$1,477,189	--	\$27,162,203	\$80,000	--	\$9.83
VA	\$27,388,897	\$58,639,869	Unknown	Included in Wireless	--	\$86,028,766	\$115,253,631	75%	\$10.75
VT	\$3,015,696	\$2,604,274	\$2,871	\$462,221	\$85,789	\$6,170,851	\$4,761,608	130%	\$9.86
WA	State: \$3,642,361 Counties: \$10,408,667	State: \$15,982,006 Counties: \$43,709,197	State: \$3,062,021 Counties: \$8,514,594	State: \$2,649,543 Counties: \$7,273,730	--	\$95,242,119	\$109,528,437	87%	\$14.16
WI	Unknown					--	--	--	--
WV	\$16,106,125	\$34,720,056	\$3,536,410	\$1,419,487	\$558,382	\$56,340,460	\$50,069,236	113%	\$30.41
WY	Unknown					--	--	--	--
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>									
AS	Does Not Collect 911 Fees					--	--	--	--
DC	\$1,986,228	\$5,479,507	\$1,585,457	\$595,519	\$1,717,636.22 <sup>36</sup>	\$11,354,347	\$44,354,100	26%	\$19
Guam	Did Not File					--	--	--	--

<sup>36</sup> The total is based on fees from Centrex services of \$1,131,498.14 and fees from PBX trunks of \$586,138.08.

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost <sup>33</sup>	Fees as a Percentage of Cost	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita <sup>34</sup>
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not File						--	--	--
PR	Did Not File						--	--	--
USVI	Did Not Specify					\$1,416,865	\$25,921,530	5%	\$13.32
<b>Total Estimated Fees Collected</b>							<b>\$2,763,916,948</b>		
<b>Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911</b>							<b>\$3,492,515,691</b>		
<b>Total Estimated Fees as a Percentage of Total Estimated Cost</b>							<b>79%</b>		
<b>Average State Amount Collected Per Capita</b>							<b>\$11.52</b>		
<b>National Amount Collected Per Capita</b>							<b>\$9.00</b>		

23. States were asked whether any 911/E911 fees were combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services. Of the 49 responding jurisdictions listed in Table 14, 22 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported combining collected fees with other funds or grants to support 911 services and 24 states and American Samoa report they did not.

**Table 14 – States Reporting Whether 911 Fees Are Combined with Federal, State or Local Funds or Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations**

<b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees</b>
AK		X	
AL	X		Did not provide a description
AR		X	
AZ		X	
CA		X	
CO	X		“911 surcharge funds are combined with local funds regularly across the state to fund the provision of 911 service. 911 surcharge funds are generally not sufficient to fully fund 911 services, and the difference is made up by city and county governments.”
CT		X	
DE		X	
FL	X		“For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, the 911 fees collected provide approximately 49 percent of operating expenses for 911 operations with local county general budget appropriations providing the remaining 51 percent of funding to support 911 operations.”
GA	X		“Unknown”
HI		X	
IA	X		“In addition to surcharge funding, local PSAPs are often also provided funds through county general fund appropriations, support from Sheriff Office funds, city general funds, and emergency management grants.”
ID		X	

<b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees</b>
IL		X	
IN	X		"On average, the 911 fee pays for 43% of operating costs at the local level. Local government relies upon other sources of funding to make up the difference. Those funds come from one or more of the following: property taxes, local option income tax, county adjusted gross income tax, casino funds, other."
KS	X		"Local general fund monies are used extensively to fund E911 in Kansas. These funds are derived from property taxes."
KY	X		"Essentially, the costs for providing 911 services are paid at the local level. 911 fees collected by the state on wireless phones are distributed to local governments in regular quarterly payments (and grants) to help pay for daily operational costs and capital purchases (\$19 million). State 911 fees are combined at the local level with local general fund appropriations (\$32 million) and local 911 fees (\$28 million) to support 911 services. No other state funds are appropriated for 'local' 911 services. (State general funds help pay for 911 services provided by the State Police.) A minimal amount of federal grant money (<\$2 million) will be used at the local level for 911 services."
LA		X	
MA		X	
MD	X		"County (including the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City) general funds were used to offset difference between 9-1-1 operational costs and 9-1-1 Additional Fee support."
ME		X	
MI	X		"County Millages: \$33,575,726.25 Local/County General Funds: \$94,936,536.21 Other Receipts: \$16,093,680.80 (grants, tower rentals, contracts for service, etc.)"
MN		X	
MO	Did Not File		
MS	X		"Local budgets must supplement funds received from wireline fees collected to cover operation costs."

<b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees</b>
MT	Did Not File		
NC	X		“E911 funds were combined with general fund allocations from each of the 117 Primary PSAPs and 11 Secondary PSAPs to pay for expenses not allowed by NC General Statutes to provide for E911 services. Examples of expenses not allowed from collected 911 fees are telecommunicator salaries, facility maintenance, and radio network infrastructure.”
ND	X		“Prepaid wireless revenue collected by the Office of State Tax Commissioner are combined with a percentage of the fee revenue collected locally to cover expenses associated with the state's transition to NG911.”
NE	X		“Local jurisdictions are also supported by general funds. State 911 funds have not been comingled with any other funding source.”
NH		X	
NJ		X	
NM		X	
NV	X		<p><b>Carson City County:</b> "911 Local Surcharge"</p> <p><b>Douglas County:</b> "Property Tax"</p> <p><b>Nye County:</b> "We combined the telecommunications surcharge funds with the property tax assessment funds. That would be \$73,000 from surcharge and \$56,000 from tax assessment."</p>
NY	Did Not File		
OH	X		“Counties and municipalities use general funds at many localities.”
OK	Did Not File		
OR	X		“Approximately 80% of expenditures for E9-1-1 in the state are paid for by local resources. This could be local monies from the general funds of the governing authorities over the PSAPS or it could be contract or dispatch fees paid by local cities/counties or Public Safety agencies to the PSAP governing authority. These local amounts would be approximately \$100,000,000.”

<b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees</b>
PA	X		“Any 911 related expenses not covered by 911 fees are covered by the general fund or other revenue sources of the respective county or city.”
RI		X	
SC	X		“Local jurisdictions collect landline 911 fees and combine those fees with the wireless 911 funds distributed by our office to support local 911/E911/NG911 services.”
SD	X		“At the state level, the answer to this question is no. The 911 dollars were not combined with any other funding at the state level.  However, at the local level (county/municipality) they supplement their 911 surcharge funds with additional funding from these sources: local general funds, Office of Homeland Security grant funds, State 911 Surcharge interest, State Grants, Other Intergovernmental Revenue, Charges for Goods/Services, Emergency Management Performance Grant, other Federal Grants, PSAP city/county host subsidy.”
TN		X	
TX	X		“\$17,944,651 (City of Dallas General Funds for call taking and dispatch support by Police and Fire).”
UT		X	
VA		X	
VT		X	
WA	X		“While the exact amount is unknown, all local PSAP jurisdictions contribute additional local funds to augment State and Local E911 excise taxes, in covering the costs of 911 statewide. It is estimated that on average statewide 15% of the actual cost of providing Washington State approved 911 activities comes from these local sources. In many cases this comes from local government general use funds or individual agency user fees. In addition, Washington State Patrol operates 4 Primary and 4 Secondary PSAPs using the majority of funding from their departmental budget.”
WI		X	

<b>Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees</b>
WV		X	
WY		X	
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>			
AS		X	
DC	X		“Local Funds - \$29,744,000.00 Grant Funds - \$1,102,397.00”
Guam	Did Not File		
No. Mar.	Did Not File		
PR	Did Not File		
VI	X		“Appropriated general budget in the amount of \$27,064,120 and Health Revolving Fund in the amount of \$101,875.”
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	

24. Lastly, the Bureau requested that states provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in the state or jurisdiction. As described in Table 15, 13 states reported that state 911 fees were the sole source of revenue funding 911 services; seven states indicated that 50 to 99 percent of funding came from state 911 fees; four states and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that 50 to 99 percent of funding came from local fees; one state reported that the source of fees was split evenly between state and local jurisdictions’ 911 fee collection; and two states reported that local fees were the sole source of funding. Nine states, the District of Columbia, and American Samoa reported that state and local General Fund revenues accounted for 50 to 100 percent of 911 funding. Seven states reported not knowing the proportional contributions.

**Table 15 – State Estimates of Proportional Contributions from Each Funding Source**

<b>State</b>	<b>State 911 Fees</b>	<b>Local 911 or Other Fees</b>	<b>General Fund - State</b>	<b>General Fund - County</b>	<b>Federal Grants</b>	<b>State Grants</b>
AK	--	65%	15%	20%	--	--
AL	90.1%	--	--	5.6%	0.03%	0.20%
AR	Unknown					
AZ	100%	--	--	--	--	--

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
CA	100%	--	--	--	--	--
CO	2.3%	45.2%	--	52.5%	Reported "Unknown"	Reported "Unknown"
CT	100%	--	--	--	--	--
DE	100%	--	--	--	--	--
FL	43%	--	--	51.0%	--	6%
GA	Unknown					
HI	24%	--	--	75%	1%	--
IA	29%	--	37%	15%	--	--
ID	90%	Reported "Unknown"	--	Reported "Unknown"	--	10%
IL	30%	100% - Chicago Only	10%	60%	--	--
IN	43%	Reported "Not Permitted"	--	57%	--	--
KS	26%	N/A	--	74%	--	--
KY	19%	27%	9%	41%	<1%	3%
LA	8.4%	91.6%	--	--	--	--
MA	100%	--	--	--	--	--
MD	41.8%	--	--	42.1%	--	16.2%
ME	100%	--	--	--	--	--
MI <sup>37</sup>	10%	29%	--	40%	--	--
MN <sup>38</sup>	100%	--	--	--	--	--
MO	Did Not File					
MS	--	100%	--	--	--	--
MT	Did Not File					

<sup>37</sup> Michigan reported that counties also rely on voter-approved property tax assessments (millages) of approximately 14 percent and other local sources accounting for 7 percent. Michigan Response at 10-11.

<sup>38</sup> Minnesota reports that "PSAPs may receive general funds from the county in which they operate in addition to the monthly 9-1-1 fee distribution allocated by the legislature." Minnesota Response at 15.

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
NC	49%	--	--	48%	--	3%
ND	5%	61%	--	34%	--	--
NE	Reported "Unknown"					
NH	100%	--	--	---	---	--
NJ	Reported "Unknown"	--	--	Reported "Unknown"	--	--
NM	100%	--	--	--	--	--
NV	--	100%	--	--	--	--
NY	Did Not File					
OH	Did Not Respond to Question					
OK	Did Not File					
OR	20%	80%	--	--	--	--
PA	93%	--	--	7%	--	--
RI	--	--	100%	--	--	--
SC	45%	15%	--	--	--	--
SD	63%	--	--	36.3%	0.7%	--
TN	100%	--	--	--	--	--
TX	75.2%	24.8%	--	--	--	--
UT	100%	--	--	--	--	--
VA	50%	50%	--	--	--	--
VT	100%	--	--	--	--	--
WA	20%	65%	--	15%	--	--
WI	--	15%	--	85%	--	--
WV	100%	--	--	--	--	--
WY	Reported "Varies by jurisdiction"					
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>						
AS			100%			
DC	--	48%	48%	--	4%	--

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
Guam	Did Not File					
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not File					
PR	Did Not File					
USVI	5%	95%	--	--	--	--

### G. Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses

25. Under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act, the Commission is required to obtain information “detailing the status in each State of the collection and distribution of such fees or charges, and including findings on the amount of revenues obligated or expended by each State or political subdivision thereof for any purpose other than the purpose for which any such fees or charges are specified.”<sup>39</sup> Therefore, the Bureau requested that states and territories identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purpose other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, such as funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state’s General Fund.

26. As in previous reports, we have identified diversion or transfers of 911/E911 funds and categorized them as to whether the funds were directed to other public safety uses or to non-public safety uses such as state General Fund accounts. With respect to funds devoted to other public safety uses, we have generally determined that funds used to support public safety radio systems, including maintenance, upgrades, and new system acquisitions, are not 911-related within the meaning of the NET 911 Act and therefore constitute a diversion of 911 funds. However, several states have documented expenses associated with integrating public safety dispatch and 911 systems (e.g., purchase of CAD hardware and software to support integrated 911 and dispatch operations) and asserted that these should be categorized as 911-related expenses. We agree that where sufficient documentation is provided, the expenditure of 911 funds to support integration of dispatch and 911 calltaking systems may be categorized as 911-related, and we follow this approach in this report.

27. Five reporting states diverted or transferred fees in calendar year 2016.<sup>40</sup> As described in Table 16 below, New Mexico and Rhode Island self-identified in their responses to the questionnaire that they used collected funds, at least in part, for non-911 related purposes. Three states - Illinois, New Jersey and West Virginia - did not self-identify as diverting funds, but the Bureau has determined based on review of the information provided that these states in fact diverted funds for non-911 related purposes within the meaning of the NET 911 Act. All of the jurisdictions listed in Table 16 diverted an aggregate amount of \$128,909,169, or 5 percent of all 911/E911 funds reported to have been collected by all responding states and jurisdictions in 2016.

<sup>39</sup> NET 911 Act at §6(f)(2) (emphasis added).

<sup>40</sup> In addition, as discussed in Section G.2 *infra*, New York did not file a report but has been identified as diverting 911 fees to non-public safety uses.

**Table 16 – Total Funds Diverted or Otherwise Transferred from 911 Uses**

State/Territory	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2016)	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Percentage Diverted	Type of Transfer
<b>States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds</b>				
New Mexico	\$10,919,490	\$6,000,000	55%	General Fund
Rhode Island	\$14,021,695	\$8,387,831	60%	General Fund
<b>States/Jurisdictions Identified by Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds</b>				
Illinois	\$234,070,304	\$2,500,000	1%	General Fund
New Jersey	\$122,150,000	\$108,128,000	89%	General Fund and Public Safety Related
West Virginia	\$56,340,460	\$3,893,338	7%	Public Safety Related
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$437,501,949</b>	<b>\$128,909,169</b>	<b>29%</b>	
<i>Percent Diverted From Total Funds Collected by All States</i>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,763,916,948</b>		<b>5%</b>	

**1. States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds.**

28. New Mexico stated that “as a result of a 2016 special legislative session action, \$6,000,000 in E911 fund balance was transferred to the General Fund to assist in achieving state government solvency.”<sup>41</sup>

29. Rhode Island reported that in its 2016 fiscal year (ending May 30, 2017), the state collected \$14,021,695.25 in E911 surcharges, with approximately 90 percent of the collected fees going into the state General Fund and the remaining 10 percent being contributed to the state Information Technology Fund. The state indicated that it used a portion of the General Fund revenues to fund the E-911 program: \$4,388,356 in personnel costs and \$1,215,508 in operating costs, for a total of

<sup>41</sup> New Mexico Response at 11. *See also* State of New Mexico Enhanced 911 (E-911) Program, Report to the New Mexico 53<sup>rd</sup> Legislature, First Session, 2017 (April 2017) at 1 (“During the 2016 Special Legislative Session, Senate Bill 2 swept \$6,000,000 from the E-911 fund, reducing the FY2017 year-end fund balance to an estimated \$1,694,727.”).

\$5,633,864. Rhode Island reported that all remaining funds collected were distributed for other purposes via the General Fund.<sup>42</sup>

30. As in previous years, two states, California and Virginia, reported that they diverted a portion of the 911 funds collected in calendar year 2016 for purposes outside the scope of their established state funding mechanisms. However, on review of the expenditures at issue, the Bureau again concludes that the states have demonstrated a sufficient nexus with 911 to support a finding that the expenditures were 911-related.

- California stated that in 2016 approximately \$3,827,000 was appropriated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE).<sup>43</sup> According to California, “[w]hile CAL FIRE’s use of the State Emergency Telephone Number Account (SETNA) was not specific to the intent for 911 related expenditures, the equipment purchased is for use at emergency dispatch centers in response to 911 call activity.”<sup>44</sup> We find that the information provided by California regarding use of funds to support emergency dispatch center response to 911 call activity is sufficient to support a finding that the expenditure was 911-related even though the expenditure was outside the state’s statutory funding mechanism. Therefore, we do not identify California as having diverted funds.
- As in 2015, Virginia reported that in 2016 it diverted a total of \$11,700,000 of the 911/E911 funds it collected, with \$3,700,000 used to help finance the Virginia State Police (VSP) for costs incurred for answering wireless 911 telephone calls, and \$8,000,000 to support sheriffs’ 911 dispatchers throughout the Commonwealth. Virginia notes that while the 911 funding mechanism established in Virginia does not specifically provide for funds to be diverted to the VSP and sheriffs’ offices, the diverted funds were used to support 911-related activities.<sup>45</sup> Similar to our finding on 2015, we agree that Virginia’s 2016 expenditure to support 911 dispatch by these agencies is 911-related, and we therefore do not identify Virginia as having diverted funds.

## **2. States/Jurisdictions Identified by the Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds.**

31. New Jersey reported that it did not divert or transfer any collected funds.<sup>46</sup> However, New Jersey, in response to Question E.1., stated that, in accordance with New Jersey statute (P.L.2004, c.48), all fees collected were “deposited into the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of related programs.”<sup>47</sup> According to New Jersey, of the \$122,150,000 it collected in 911 fees, approximately \$13,122,000 was applied to “the Statewide 911 Emergency Telephone System” and \$900,000 was applied to “the Office of Emergency

---

<sup>42</sup> Rhode Island Supplemental Letter Response at 2.

<sup>43</sup> California Response at 12.

<sup>44</sup> *Id.* As it described in its 2015 filing, California stated that “the appropriations were to purchase and install new hardware and computer aided dispatch (CAD) software at CAL FIRE’s Emergency Command Centers. In addition redundant hardware and a CAD system were purchased and installed at their Fire Academy, which is used for training.” *Id.*

<sup>45</sup> Virginia Response at 11.

<sup>46</sup> New Jersey Response at 11.

<sup>47</sup> *Id.* at 6.

Telecommunications Service.”<sup>48</sup> By the Bureau’s analysis, New Jersey applied the remainder of \$108,128,000 to offset costs related to programs within the New Jersey Departments of Law and Public Safety and Military and Veterans’ Affairs that are unrelated to 911 or were not demonstrated to be 911-related. Accordingly, the Bureau determined that New Jersey diverted \$108,128,000 in fees for non-911 related uses.<sup>49</sup>

32. West Virginia reported that it did not divert funds, but the Bureau determined that, of the \$34,720,056 in wireless 911/E911 fees collected in 2016, the state apportioned approximately \$3,893,338 to certain dedicated accounts, as follows: \$1,000,000 for the Tower Assistance Fund, to subsidize construction of towers, which the state describes as ensuring enhanced 911 wireless coverage; \$1,736,003 for the state’s Department of Homeland Security, to be used solely for the purpose of maintaining radio systems used by state and 911 Centers to dispatch emergency services and other agencies; and \$1,157,335 for the West Virginia State Police, to be used for equipment upgrades for improving and integrating their communication efforts with those of enhanced 911 systems.<sup>50</sup> We categorize these expenditures as non-911 related. We do not agree with the state’s characterization of tower construction and radio system maintenance as 911-related programs. Arguably, the state’s expenditure of \$1,157,335.20 on integrating the West Virginia State Police’s radio systems with 911 could be considered 911-related, but as in previous year’s the state has not provided sufficient documentation of these expenditures to support such a finding.

33. Since the Commission began reporting on the collection and use of 911 fees, the Commission has identified Illinois as a 911 fee diverter. This year, Illinois reported that it did not divert any 911 funds during the 2016 annual period. However, last year, in its response to the Commission’s data collection, the state reported a total diversion for the 2015 Fiscal Year (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015) of \$7,500,000, explaining that “the money was transferred out of the Wireless Services Emergency Fund to the State’s General Revenue Fund. The state transferred \$5,000,000 in April 2015 and an additional \$2,500,000 in June of 2016.”<sup>51</sup> In the 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Report, the Bureau counted only the \$5,000,000 transfer as a diversion in the 2015 annual reporting period. In this year’s report, the Bureau considers the remaining \$2,500,000 to be a diversion that occurred during the 2016 annual reporting period.

34. New York has not filed a response to this year’s data collection. However, the Bureau has found New York to be a diverter of 911 fees every year since the 2009 Report to Congress, and in 2016 New York continued to operate under the state law framework that provides for such diversion. New York State Consolidated Tax Law §186-f requires the collection of a monthly \$1.20 fee for each mobile device.<sup>52</sup> Under the statute, approximately forty-one percent of the collected fee is diverted to the state’s General Fund.<sup>53</sup> In addition, the law requires that \$25.5 million “must be” allocated to the

---

<sup>48</sup> *Id.*

<sup>49</sup> *Id.*

<sup>50</sup> West Virginia Response at 12. The Bureau derived the amounts provided based on a 5% wireless fee to the Department of Homeland Security; a \$0.10 per wireless fee collected to the West Virginia State Police; and a set \$1,000,000 transfer to the state’s Tower Assistance Fund.

<sup>51</sup> Illinois 2016 Response at 15.

<sup>52</sup> N.Y. Tax Law § 186-f 2 (McKinney 2017).

<sup>53</sup> *Id.* at § 186-f 5(a).

New York State Police.<sup>54</sup> Further, also by statute, “up to” another \$75 million of collected fees is set aside for grants or reimbursements to counties for the development, consolidation, or operation of public safety communications systems or networks designed to support statewide interoperable communications for first responders.<sup>55</sup> An additional \$10 million “shall be” used for the provision of grants to counties for costs related to the operations of PSAPs.<sup>56</sup> Lastly, the statute allows for the diversion of approximately \$1.5 million to the New York State Emergency Services Revolving Fund, but that provision is suspended from fiscal years 2011-2018.<sup>57</sup> State tax records indicate that in 2016, New York collected approximately \$185,344,986 from the Public Safety Surcharge.<sup>58</sup> During the annual 2016 period, the state awarded approximately \$10 million in grants to counties to support PSAP related costs.<sup>59</sup> Thus, while New York has not provided 911 fee data to the Bureau to enable a calculation of the amount of fees diverted by the state in 2016, and is therefore not listed in Table 16, the Bureau finds sufficient information in the public record to support a finding that New York diverted funds for non-public safety purposes and that the amount diverted was likely substantial.

35. In Table 17 below, we compare the number of states reporting fee diversions in this reporting year to past years.

**Table 17 – States/Jurisdictions Identified as Diverting 911/E911 Funds (2009 – 2017)**

Report Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015 <sup>60</sup>	2016	2017
States	RI	RI	RI						
	NY	NY							
	IL	IL	IL						
						NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ
		AZ	AZ	AZ					

<sup>54</sup> *Id.* at § 186-f 6(a).

<sup>55</sup> *Id.* at § 186-f 6(c).

<sup>56</sup> *Id.* at § 186-f 6(g).

<sup>57</sup> *Id.* at § 186-f 6(b).

<sup>58</sup> See New York State, Department of Taxation and Finance, at [https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/2015-16\\_Collections/Table6.pdf](https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/2015-16_Collections/Table6.pdf).

<sup>59</sup> See New York State, Homeland Security and Emergency Services, Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications, at <http://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-announces-10-million-grant-support-emergency-services-dispatching-new-york>.

<sup>60</sup> Reflects removal of California and Virginia from the 2015 list.

Report Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015 <sup>60</sup>	2016	2017
		GA	GA	GA					
	ME		ME	ME					
	OR	OR	OR						
						WA		WA	
							WV	WV	WV
							NH	NH	
	WI	WI							
						CA			
		DE							
		HI							
								IA	
					KS				
	MT								
		NE							
									NM
	TN								
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>						Puerto Rico		Puerto Rico	
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>States and Other Jurisdictions That Did Not File a Fee Report</b>									
<b>States Not Filing A Report</b>				LA		LA	LA		
							MO	MO	MO

Report Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015 <sup>60</sup>	2016	2017
			OK						OK
					AR				
			KS						
									MT
				NH					
			NJ						
									NY
				RI					
<b>Other Jurisdictions Not Filing A Report</b>	Northern Mariana Islands								
		Guam	Guam		Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam
	U.S. Virgin Islands			U.S. Virgin Islands	U.S. Virgin Islands	U.S. Virgin Islands	U.S. Virgin Islands		
					American Samoa	American Samoa			
				District of Columbia					
									Puerto Rico
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>

36. In 2012, Congress passed the Next Generation 911 Advancement Act, Public Law 112-96 (2012 Act), which dedicated \$115 million in FCC spectrum auction proceeds to support future matching grants to eligible states and U.S. territories for the implementation and operation of 911, E911, and NG911 services and applications, migration to IP-enabled emergency networks, and training public safety personnel involved in the 911 emergency response chain. The 2012 Act tasked the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) with administering the grant program, which will be implemented

at a later date to be determined.<sup>61</sup> As with last year's report, we remind interested parties that Section 6503 of the 2012 Act requires applicants seeking to receive grants under this program to certify that no portion of any designated 911 charges imposed by the state or other taxing jurisdiction within which the applicant is located are being obligated or expended "for any purpose other than the purposes for which such charges are designated or presented."

## **H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees**

37. In order to understand the degree to which states and other jurisdictions track the collection and use of 911 fees, the Bureau requested that respondents provide information about whether they had established any oversight or auditing mechanisms in connection with the collection or expenditure of 911 fees. As indicated in Table 18 below, 39 states and the District of Columbia indicated that they have established an oversight mechanism; seven states, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands stated they have not.

38. The Bureau also asked whether each state or other jurisdiction has the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers. Twenty-six states reported that they have authority to conduct audits of service providers. Twenty states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they do not. Texas reported that auditing of carriers varies by governmental authority and political organization. Thus, the Texas Comptroller is authorized to audit any service provider that has been set-up at a state level to remit 9-1-1 fees and/or equalization surcharge to the Comptroller, including retailers of prepaid telecommunications service, whereas a statutory Emergency Communications District Board of Managers "may require a service provider to provide to the board any information the board requires . . . to determine whether the service provider is correctly billing, collecting, and remitting the ECD's wireline/VoIP 9-1-1 fee."<sup>62</sup> According to Texas, for calendar year 2016, Cameron County Emergency Communication District reported auditing 75 service providers.<sup>63</sup> New Hampshire stated that Department of Revenue Administration conducts audits on behalf of the Division of Emergency Service and Communications as part of overall auditing authority over tax paying entities. Further, the state reported that the New Hampshire legislature authorized one full time temporary auditor position in FY 2016 and one permanent full time position in FY 2017 to provide auditing and enforcement services specific to the state's E911 surcharge.<sup>64</sup> Of the 26 jurisdictions indicating they have authority to audit service providers, five states indicated that they had undertaken "authority or enforcement or other corrective actions" in connection with such auditing, 13 states indicated no such actions were taken during the period under review, and eight states did not respond or did not know.

---

<sup>61</sup> See The National 911 Program, at [https://www.911.gov/project\\_911grantprogram.html](https://www.911.gov/project_911grantprogram.html).

<sup>62</sup> Texas Response at 19.

<sup>63</sup> *Id.* at 20. The state did not provide any details about the outcomes of the audit.

<sup>64</sup> New Hampshire Response at 12.

**Table 18. Description of Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911 Fees**

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?	Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2016
AK	No	No	NA
AL	Yes	Yes	Yes
AR	No	No	NA
AZ	Yes	Yes	No
CA	Yes	Yes	No Response
CO	Yes	Yes	Responded "Unknown"
CT	Yes	Yes	No Response
DE	Yes	No	NA
FL	Yes	No	NA
GA	Yes	Yes	Responded "Unknown"
HI	Yes	No	NA
IA	Yes	No	NA
ID	Yes	No	NA
IL	Yes	No	NA
IN	Yes	Yes	No Response
KS	Yes	Yes	No
KY	Yes	Yes	No
LA	Yes	No	NA
MA	Yes	No	NA
MD	Yes	Yes	No
ME	Yes	Yes	No
MI	Yes	No	NA

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?	Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2016
MN	Yes	Yes	Yes
MO	Did Not File		
MS	No	Yes	Responded "Unknown"
MT	Did Not File		
NC	Yes	No	NA
ND	Yes	Yes	No
NE	Yes	Yes	No
NH	Yes	Yes	No
NJ	No	No	NA
NM	Yes	No	NA
NV	No	No	NA
NY	Did Not File		
OH	Yes	Yes	No
OK	Did Not File		
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes
PA	Yes	Yes	No
RI	Yes	Yes	Responded "Unknown"
SC	No	No	NA
SD	Yes	Yes	Yes
TN	Yes	No	NA
TX	Yes	Yes	Yes
UT	No	No	NA
VA	Yes	Yes	Responded "Unknown"

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?		Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers?		Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2016	
VT	Yes		Yes		No	
WA	Yes		Yes		No	
WI	Yes		No		NA	
WV	Yes		Yes		No	
WY	Yes		No		NA	
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>						
AS	No		No		NA	
DC	Yes		No		NA	
Guam	Did Not File					
No. Mar.	Did Not File					
PR	Did Not File					
USVI	No		No		NA	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	40	9	26	23	5	13

### I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

39. The Bureau requested that states and other jurisdictions specify whether they classify NG911 expenditures as within the scope of permissible expenditures for 911 or E911 purposes, and whether they expended funds on NG911 in calendar year 2016. With respect to classifying NG911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures, 44 states and the District of Columbia indicated that their 911 funding mechanism allows for distribution of 911 funds for the implementation of NG911. Alaska, Hawaii, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that their funding mechanism does not allow for the use of 911 funds for NG911 implementation.<sup>65</sup> With respect to expending funds on NG911 programs, thirty-five states and the District of Columbia indicated that they used 911 funds for NG911 programs in 2016. Table 19 shows the general categories of NG911 expenditures that respondents reported

<sup>65</sup> Alaska Response at 15; Hawaii Response at 16. We note that Hawaii stated that “although [its] State statutes do not specifically state Next Generation 911 as an allowable cost, it does not prohibit reimbursement for such expenses.” *Id.* American Samoa did not respond to this question.

supporting with 911/E911 funds, although most respondents did not specify NG911 expenditures by category.

**Table 19 – Number of States Indicating One or More Areas of NG911 Investment**

<b>Area of Expenditure</b>	<b>States/Other Jurisdictions</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>General Project or Not Specified</b>	Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington	18
<b>Planning or Consulting Services</b>	Alabama, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas, Wisconsin	13
<b>ESInet Construction</b>	Arizona, Delaware, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington	17
<b>NG911 Core Services</b>	Arizona, California, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, South Dakota	6
<b>Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades</b>	Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Mexico, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, West Virginia	14
<b>GIS</b>	Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia	10
<b>NG Security Planning</b>	Minnesota	1
<b>Training</b>	Louisiana, Massachusetts	2

40. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions report the amount of funds expended on NG911 programs in the annual period ending December 31, 2016. Table 20 shows the NG911-related expenditures and projects reported by 38 states and the District of Columbia.<sup>66</sup> Collectively, these jurisdictions spent \$205,494,105 on NG911 programs, or approximately 7.4% percent of total 911/E911 fees collected. Six states did not specify the amount spent for NG911 purposes. Eleven states, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands report no expenditures for NG911-related programs.<sup>67</sup>

**Table 20 – Funds Spent on Next Generation 911 Programs**

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
AL	\$656,916	<p>“Alabama completed its wireless aggregation project in December 2014, which was as far as the first iteration of Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN) was able to accomplish with the vendor selected during the first phase of the project. All wireless calls in AL have been routed through this network for 2+ years.</p> <p>In CY2016, Alabama completed our second RFP process for NG911 core services and transition/ incorporation of our existing network. After evaluating the proposals, the evaluation team made a recommendation to the full Board in July 2016 to enter contract negotiations with an intent to award, which the Board unanimously supported. We successfully negotiated a contract that was executed and then favorably reviewed by the Contract Review Permanent Legislative Oversight Committee in March 2017. Transition of our existing network has begun.”</p>
AZ	\$1,980,976	<p>“CenturyLink completed the installation of an NG911 i3 network and will start turning up PSAPs in March 2017. Initially it will support the NG911 Managed Services project for 10 of 15 counties in Arizona.”</p>
CA	\$5,300,000	<p>“The State of California has two NG911 ESInet projects under development. The Regional Integrated Next Generation project in Pasadena and the Northeast ESInet project. Both projects will utilize a NENA i3 compliant solution. In addition each ESInet will include a hosted CPE solution that supports all or some of the PSAPs in the Regional ESInet currently under development.”</p>

<sup>66</sup> We note that in response to Question I.2, Mississippi, Nebraska, and Wisconsin indicated they did not spend any funds on NG911 programs in 2016, but nevertheless provided a description of NG911-related programs in response to question I.4.

<sup>67</sup> These include Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, Nevada, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
CT	\$4,026,961	<p>“Labor, equipment and maintenance costs for Connecticut’s Public Safety Data Network (PDSN); an ultra-high speed fiber optic data network. The PSDN provides the base transport infrastructure and interconnectivity pathway for public safety related applications and connectivity for NG 911 services.</p> <p>Network based components were installed first in the Network Control Centers and Emergency Call Data Centers. Deployment and maintenance of NG 911 in 50% of PSAPs which included hardware, software and training.”</p>
DE	\$2,700,000	<p>"NG Advanced 9-1-1 Routing implemented at all DE PSAPs A9-1-1 VIPER (Redundant Hosted CPE) implemented at all DE PSAPs."</p>
FL	\$23,889,941	<p>“Florida E911 Board initiated the development of a strategic plan to cast the vision for NG911 services in Florida. The study included surveying all 67 counties 911 coordinators to capture their vision of what NG911 service would look like in Florida and to define the potential issues to implementing NG911 services in the state. The result of this project was the E911 Board deciding to create a NG911 model and implementation plan for the State of Florida.”</p>
HI	\$4,500,000	<p>“Text to 911”</p>
IA	\$16,600,000	<p>The state does not track “amounts by ‘NG programs’. Total expended on 911 in Iowa by local jurisdictions and the State is \$146,302,788. A reasonable estimate is that approximately \$16,600,000 was spent statewide just on NG upgrades.”</p>
IL	Not Specified	<p>“The Department of State Police designed and issued a competitive request for a proposal to secure the services of a consultant to complete a feasibility study on the implementation of a statewide Next Generation 9-1-1 network in Illinois in June 2016.</p> <p>A consulting firm was selected and a contract signed in December 2016.</p> <p>13 Counties in Northern Illinois have entered into an agreement with a provider to deploy a NG911 ESInet. An implementation date has not been scheduled.”</p>
IN	\$15,000,000	<p>“The board has continued working with INdigital and AT&amp;T during this reporting period to build out two dual ESInets and build out should be completed in calendar year 2017.”</p>
KS	\$5,685,942	<p>“Statewide IP Network and hosted call handling solution is currently being deployed. As of 12/31/16, 47 Kansas PSAPs had been migrated to this system. Statewide GIS data remediation has been completed, with 105 of 105 counties having completed remediation and moved into data maintenance mode. Planning has begun for migration to geospatial call routing and interconnect with AT&amp;T Nationwide ESInet.”</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
KY	\$2,419,485	“Grant implementation continued for 38 grant awardees totaling \$2,419,485. The grants were awarded for next generation 911 technology and critical equipment replacement while adhering to the Kentucky 911 state plan. Next generation technology including host/remote solutions and other critical 911 components such as CAD upgrades, logging recorders and radio consoles.”	
LA	\$1,531,131	Parish	Project
		Acadia	Ongoing GIS mapping of Parish
		Allen	Developing Texting services and Mapping services
		Ascension	Building new 911 Center - proposed opening late summer 2017
		Bienville	Preparing to receive text message from cell phones.
		Bossier	Evaluating contracts for operational equipment upgrades for 2018
		Caddo	Held NG911 Vendor Demonstrations Dec.7,8,13 for NG911 equip. and text to 9-1-1 for 3rd Qr. of 2017
		Calcasieu	Executed contract for a new NG-911 compliant Computer Aided Dispatch system Project cost \$1,101,130.80. in 2017 Planned upgrade of Phone system \$350,000.00 est.
		Cameron	Planned upgrade of Phone system \$350,000.00 est.
		De Soto	Working with a consultant from the Police Jury to give us the go ahead to lease a new system. Evaluating proposals for a new Parish Wide NG 9-1-1 Computer Aided Dispatch System
		East Baton Rouge	Evaluating proposals for a new Parish Wide NG 9-1-1 Computer Aided Dispatch System
		Evangeline	Training that is specific to NG-911 for dispatchers/ Back-up system from Caliber (\$80,000)
		Iberia	Procurement of a NG--911 phone system in 2017
		Iberville	TXT-2-911 Capable. Waiting for service providers to activate
Jefferson	TXT-2-911 capable.		

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
		La Salle	Saving to purchase NG911 equipment
		Lafayette	New NG-911 Telephone system which will enable text to 911 along with other emerging technologies and a new parish wide CAD system
		Lafourche	Yes / In process of upgrading to A911
		Lincoln	None
		Livingston	Building of a new PSAP with NG 911 capabilities. Fiber lines from the AT&T Central Office to the PSAP to facilitate faster speed of the 911 calls. Livingston Parish Communications District will also be upgrading both equipment and software for implementing Texting to 911, along with the ability to add future NG 911 capabilities as they are developed.
		Madison	New Mapping Software
		Natchitoches	Construction of a multi-agency co-located Emergency Communications Center. Local funds combined with Capital Outlay funding.
		Orleans	Data Synchronization effort ongoing between OPCD, GIS, ALI Records.
		Ouachita	New NG ready 9-1-1 telephone equipment
		Plaquemines	TXT-2-911 capable.
		Pointe Coupee	Recently upgraded to NG911 compatible system. Will integrate Text to 911 within 12 months
		Rapides	E911 Switch and all upgrades are with NG as priority.
		Red River	Text-to-911 - Receiving Quotes on hardware/software upgrades from West regarding the implementation of text-2-911
		Richland	Upgrading to new telephone system
		Sabine	Working to obtain more info, but nothing planned
		St. Charles	In Process of installing NG911 May, 2017
		St. Helena	Not specified
		St. James	Upgrade of 911 Infrastructure in 2017

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
		St. Landry	Upgrade ANI/ALI System to NG-911 in 2017
		St. Martin	Upgrade 911 System in near future
		St. Mary	Transitioning to NG911 CAD
		St. Tammany	Yes, Constructing a new co-located 911 center with upgraded 911 equipment
		Tangipahoa	We are presently waiting to install new 9-1-1 phone equipment in our center that will upgrade all areas of our operations. Also, we will start our own Phase II testing and send results to carriers in order to receive better cell phone locations.
		Tensas	Mapping and pay off debt service
		Terrebonne	Yes. 2016 - Upgraded West Viper 911 Phone system with FlexMap for more reliable NG911 location; Upgraded Zetron paging system to connect to Lafourche FD3;
		Union	LA Capital Outlay Emergency Project
		Vermilion	Dec 2016 upgraded 911 voice recorder to NG-911 Compliant Version. Need to upgrade to NG-911 CAD System. Phone system upgrade in 2-3 years.
		Washington	CPE Replacement in 2019
		Webster	Update PSAP wiring and installed new UPS
		West Baton Rouge	Point addressing for GIS project has been completed and ARC GIS online to track and update address information has been implemented.
		West Feliciana	Accepting proposals for CAD and Computer telephony upgrade
		Winn	Pictometry Project 100000 Aerial Photography of the Parish.
MA	\$5,426,445	<p>“On August 4, 2014, the Department entered into a contract with General Dynamics Information Technology, Inc. to provide a comprehensive, end-to-end, fully featured, standards-based Next Generation 911 system to replace the current enhanced 911 system. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, significant testing, training, data center testing and installations, training center installations, PSAP pilot deployments, installation of circuits, PSAP deployments, integration of digital logging recorders, and other activities were undertaken.”</p>	

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
MD	\$13,714,102	“The Emergency Number Systems Board funds telephone systems and logging recorders that are Next Generation IP enabled systems. During FY 2016, the Board funded IP phone systems for four (4) primary and four (4) backup PSAPs. Maryland has developed requirements for a NG911 Request for Proposals (RFP), and has engaged the services of a consultant to manage the RFP process for Maryland’s PSAPs.”
ME	\$5,019,747	“The State of Maine has a single, statewide NG911 system that was fully deployed by August 2014 and was in place for all of 2015 and 2016.”
MI	\$1,751,881	“For the delivery of wireless calls through Peninsula Fiber Network  The State 911 Office is working with the Upper Peninsula 911 Authority to utilize data from the Michigan 911 GIS Repository for geospatial routing. GIS data from the repository will be exported to the LVF/ECRF serving Upper Peninsula 911 Authority ESInet and utilized for text and call routing.”
MN	\$7,285,722	“The State of Minnesota has completed a single, statewide ESInet that all 104 PSAPs are connected with. All wireline, wireless, and VOIP calls are delivered via the ESInet. We are also working on the text-to-911 deployment, improving the state’s GIS Geospatial dataset for 911, and direct-SIP CPE deployments including a managed firewall solution as an initial cybersecurity measure.”
MS	Not Specified	“The number of NG911 projects completed and underway during the annual period under review was 17.”
NC	\$4,690,978	“In July of 2016, the NC 911 Board released the first of a planned 4 RFP towards the implementation of a statewide NG911 network. That RFP was for the ESInet and Hosted CPE. There were 11 responses and the 911 Board Technology Committee is conducting their evaluation of the responses with an anticipated award expected in August 2017. The RFP for Network Management (NMAC) was released in September 2016 and only had two respondents, both were evaluated as non-compliant and so the committee will seek other vendors.”
ND	\$1,294,784	“Completion of ESInet deployment to all of the state's PSAPs.”
NE	Not Specified	General planning activities related to the implementation of the Nebraska Public Service Commission 911 Service System Plan.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects																					
NH	\$2,141,303	<p>“The Division released two Requests for Proposals (RFPs) to acquire systems for supporting the future of 911 emergency service requests and calls. One of the RFPs was for the networks necessary to deliver 911 emergency service requests and call and the eventual transfer to local agencies using today's call-handling systems and the possible future or Next Generation (NG) system. The RFP was completed and a contract was awarded to INdigital, an Indiana-based telecommunications company. The systems were migrated on time and without disruption to call processing.</p> <p>The second RFP was for a NG911 compliant system to replace the current 'end of life' call-handling systems or Customer Premise equipment (CPE). This system will be designed to meet currently established NG911 standards as well as for standards still not yet established by the industry. This RFP process was completed and a contract was awarded to AK Associates, a New Hampshire-based company, March 2016. The implementation of this project has begun but is not yet completed.”</p>																					
NJ	\$93,129	<p>“Consultant services to begin the development of a RFP for the replacement of the State's legacy 911 network with a state of the art, IP-based, NG911 network.”</p>																					
OH	\$600,000	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="573 919 898 982">County</th> <th data-bbox="898 919 1448 982">Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 982 898 1045">Columbiana</td> <td data-bbox="898 982 1448 1045">“Participation in state ESInet pilot program”</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1045 898 1108">Erie</td> <td data-bbox="898 1045 1448 1108">Text to 911</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1108 898 1171">Franklin</td> <td data-bbox="898 1108 1448 1171">Text to 911</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1171 898 1234">Hamilton</td> <td data-bbox="898 1171 1448 1234">Text to 911</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1234 898 1297">Henry</td> <td data-bbox="898 1234 1448 1297">“Installed NG911 Phone System”</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1297 898 1434">Marion</td> <td data-bbox="898 1297 1448 1434">From May 15, 2016 forward NG 911 was implemented in Marion County after a consolidation with Marion City and the Marion County Sheriff's Office for dispatching services.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1434 898 1507">Miami</td> <td data-bbox="898 1434 1448 1507">“Purchased a new NG911 Telephone System. In the process of establishing Text to 911.”</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1507 898 1801">Monroe</td> <td data-bbox="898 1507 1448 1801">“Total upgrade/Monroe County Ohio has installed a NG911 system provided by GDTIT. Monroe County is one of the first Counties to be functional on the ESInet Test Pilot program. All 911 calls go through the SOCC in Columbus, Ohio and then to Monroe County through the OARnet network. Additionally a CAD system was installed that communicates with the 911 Call Station.”</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="573 1801 898 1877">Montgomery</td> <td data-bbox="898 1801 1448 1877">“A majority PSAPs have either completed upgrading to NextGen compatible phone</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	County	Description	Columbiana	“Participation in state ESInet pilot program”	Erie	Text to 911	Franklin	Text to 911	Hamilton	Text to 911	Henry	“Installed NG911 Phone System”	Marion	From May 15, 2016 forward NG 911 was implemented in Marion County after a consolidation with Marion City and the Marion County Sheriff's Office for dispatching services.	Miami	“Purchased a new NG911 Telephone System. In the process of establishing Text to 911.”	Monroe	“Total upgrade/Monroe County Ohio has installed a NG911 system provided by GDTIT. Monroe County is one of the first Counties to be functional on the ESInet Test Pilot program. All 911 calls go through the SOCC in Columbus, Ohio and then to Monroe County through the OARnet network. Additionally a CAD system was installed that communicates with the 911 Call Station.”	Montgomery	“A majority PSAPs have either completed upgrading to NextGen compatible phone	
County	Description																						
Columbiana	“Participation in state ESInet pilot program”																						
Erie	Text to 911																						
Franklin	Text to 911																						
Hamilton	Text to 911																						
Henry	“Installed NG911 Phone System”																						
Marion	From May 15, 2016 forward NG 911 was implemented in Marion County after a consolidation with Marion City and the Marion County Sheriff's Office for dispatching services.																						
Miami	“Purchased a new NG911 Telephone System. In the process of establishing Text to 911.”																						
Monroe	“Total upgrade/Monroe County Ohio has installed a NG911 system provided by GDTIT. Monroe County is one of the first Counties to be functional on the ESInet Test Pilot program. All 911 calls go through the SOCC in Columbus, Ohio and then to Monroe County through the OARnet network. Additionally a CAD system was installed that communicates with the 911 Call Station.”																						
Montgomery	“A majority PSAPs have either completed upgrading to NextGen compatible phone																						

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
			systems or are in the process of such upgrades.”
		Portage	“NG 9-1-1 contracts were signed with the network being built during this time frame.”
		Shelby	“We implemented a geo-diverse NG911 system.”
		Union	“We are in the process of implementing a NG911 system.”
		Warren	“INdigital 9-1-1 System Underway.”
		Wayne	“Transition from E911 to NG911.”
OR	\$1,774,680	“Transitioned from analog Frame Relay to digital IP network for transport of ALI only at this time. For transitional NG911, in planning stage.”	
PA	Not Specified	<p>“Pennsylvania continues with the development of Emergency Service IP networks (ESInets). In addition to the WestCore and Northern Tier ESInets in place, other regional ESInet and 911 system sharing projects in progress include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 county ESInet and CPE sharing project in NE Pennsylvania</li> <li>• 14 county ESInet and CPE sharing project in NC Pennsylvania</li> <li>• 5 county ESInet in SE Pennsylvania</li> <li>• 4 county ESInet in SC Pennsylvania</li> </ul> <p>PEMA continues to work with our county partners to deploy a statewide ESInet and call delivery solution. Geo-spatial data development continues for NG9-1-1 call routing.”</p>	
RI	\$255,869	“Presently, RI E 911 is migrating to Text to 911 via our NG911 platform.”	

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
SC	Not Specified	<p>“We have approximately 5 counties that are operating on their own ESInet. Each has the capability of interconnecting with other counties, however, none of the counties have connected yet. There is a project between two counties to form an ESInet. Charleston Co. (a coastal county) and Spartanburg Co (an upstate county).</p> <p>South Carolina is in the beginning stages of implementing our 5-year NG9-1-1 Strategic Plan, recently endorsed by the SC Revenue &amp; Fiscal Affairs Board. The plan strongly recommends South Carolina start building statewide NG9-1-1 infrastructure. Antiquated legislation needs to be updated, since it prohibits the state from providing/funding a statewide ESInet with NG9-1-1 Core Services functionality and to allow migration to NG9-1-1 from legacy systems. Legislative and Fiscal subcommittees have been organized in order to address the legislative issues keeping South Carolina from moving forward; these subcommittees will also help identify the costs and funding concerns of such a move. Both subcommittees are made up of a mixture of SC CMRS Advisory committee members and local 911 officials from across the state.</p> <p>Since GIS is such an integral component of NG9-1-1 and counties will need assistance preparing local GIS data for NG9-1-1 standards, a GIS subcommittee has been organized as well. This GIS subcommittee will establish a process to integrate local GIS data into a statewide GIS database to be used in statewide NG9-1-1 Core Services. Like the Legislative and Fiscal subcommittees, the GIS subcommittee is a collaborative effort of the SC CMRS committee, the state GIS coordinator, and local 911 and GIS officials from around the state.”</p>
SD	\$3,892,747	<p>“During calendar year 2016 we continued deploying a statewide hosted CPE. We have dual host equipment on either side of the state (Rapid City and Sioux Falls). We have installed leased CPE equipment in the PSAPs. By the end of the calendar year, we had cut over 17 PSAPs to the new hosted CPE. This is phase one of our statewide NG911 project.</p> <p>We continued work with our GIS vendor, GeoComm, to compile all of the existing GIS data in the state and create a statewide seamless GIS dataset. During the 2016 calendar year, GeoComm completed assessments of each county’s data and then provided reports back to each entity for data remediation. After data remediation, the counties submitted their revised data again for another evaluation and assessment. A second round of assessments and remediation was completed in 2016. Counties who have completed the assessments and remediation have moved to maintenance mode and submit updates to their data on an ongoing basis via a web portal maintained by GeoComm.</p> <p>The state also worked with their vendor, Comtech (formerly TeleCommunications Systems) on the statewide ESInet portion of our NG911 project. We collected trunking worksheets from each of the telecos that serve South Dakota. This assisted Comtech with sizing the network. All carriers seem willing to connect to the new network other than a group of rural carriers. At this time they say they are not willing nor responsible to connect to Comtech outside of their coverage area. Comtech disagrees and is negotiating</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		with the carriers to find a solution.”
TN	\$11,800,000	“As of December 31, 2016 108 PSAPs tested for live traffic and 99 are live on the network, 2,866 of 2,900 (or 99%) trunks across all carriers have completed call-through testing and are currently delivering live wireline traffic, or are currently pending carrier traffic migration.”
TX	\$33,460,890	<p>“State 9-1-1 Program: During the calendar year of 2016, CSEC had 22 of 22 regional planning commissions completing various stages of their ESInet. Some entities were ordering equipment, while others were receiving, installing, and testing.</p> <p>772 ECDs: No projects reported.</p> <p>Municipal ECDs: Purchased Next Gen capable equipment. Consolidated dispatch center between cities of Addison, Farmers Branch, Coppell and Carrollton, TX.”</p>
UT	\$427,920	<p>“A regional ESINet was turned over to the Utah Communications Authority so that it could become a statewide ESINet so that all PSAPs could have the opportunity to connect to it. Davis County, Utah Valley and Dixie Area Regional Multinodes were created in 2016.</p> <p>The Greater Wasatch Multi Node started to accept text to 911. This multi node is made up of 8 PSAPs.”</p>
VA	\$1,000,000	<p>“Northern VA Regional SI Project: Knowing that the existing Verizon Selective Router Network for the legacy 9-1-1 system is nearing obsolescence, and that data preparation is a key element of transitioning to NG9-1-1, the Northern Virginia PSAPs have received a PSAP Grant to prepare the GIS datasets that are necessary to transition from the tabular MSAG and ALI database to the data that is needed to populate the Emergency Call Routing Function (ECRF) and Location Validation Function (LVF) of the NENA i3 architecture. The goal of this SI project is to develop a regional GIS dataset for Northern Virginia that is suitable for provisioning into a live NG9-1-1 ECRF/ LVF system residing on the ESInet.</p> <p>Transition to Managed IP Network for 9-1-1 Call Delivery: 8 of 119 PSAPs in Virginia have cut off the Verizon or Century Link selective routers in Virginia, and transitioned away from the LEC to a managed IP Network solution through a 3rd-party provider. All 8 of those PSAPs selected West as their provider. These transitions are all individual decisions by each PSAP.”</p>
VT	\$4,761,608	“The State of Vermont has and continues to allow expenditures under the 911 program for NG911 services. Vermont's current statewide NG911 system is provided by FairPoint Communications.”

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
WA	\$21,154,242	“Washington State continued to replace analog 911 telephone equipment in the state’s 54 primary PSAPs with NG911 phone systems. A total of 10 primary PSAPs were upgraded during the calendar year. In 2016, the State of Washington solicited and procured a new ESInet for Washington State. Implementation has begun with an anticipated completion date in 2019.”
WI	Not Specified	“NG911 Strategic Plan NG911 Cost Based Analysis NG911 PSAP Survey”
WV	Not Specified	“Upgrade of CAD systems, NG Recorder Installations”
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>		
DC	\$656,705	“The DC OUC is in the process of migrating to a NG9-1-1 Legacy Network Call Routing and NG9-1-1 CAD integrated call handling system. This system will also manage Integrated MSRP Text-to-9-1-1. The deployment includes migration to a backup text-to-9-1-1 web browser solution, an upgrade to the eCDR collector, and upgrade to NG9-1-1 IP audio recording and screen capture recording.”
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$205,494,105</b>

41. **ESInet Deployments.** The Bureau requested that states and other responding jurisdictions provide information on whether they had any Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets) operating during calendar year 2016.<sup>68</sup> The Bureau further requested descriptions of the type and number of ESInets operating within each state or jurisdiction, and the number of PSAPs linked to each ESInet. As detailed in Table 21, 13 states reported having deployed state-wide ESInets, 12 states reported having regional ESInets within the state, and eight states reported local-level ESInets.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> ESInet deployment is an indicator that the state or jurisdiction is transitioning to IP-based routing of 911 calls, but ESInet deployment, by itself, does not mean the state has completed its transition to NG911 service. The deployment of ESInets, while a significant step in the transition to NG911, does not in and of itself constitute full implementation of NG911 functionality. In addition, while the data reported here indicates that significant ESInet deployment has occurred, the data also indicates that the vast majority of PSAPs nationwide continue to operate on legacy networks.

<sup>69</sup> The following states indicated that they have both regional and local ESInets operating within the state: Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, and Virginia.

**Table 21 – Type and Number of ESInets Deployed During Period Ending December 31, 2016**

Type Of ESInet	Number of States/Jurisdictions Indicating PSAPs Connected to ESInets		States/Jurisdictions Responding YES	Total PSAPs Operating on ESInets
	No	Yes		
<b>Single Statewide ESInet</b>	30	13	Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia	353
<b>Regional ESInet</b>	30	12	Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Washington	547
<b>Local ESInet</b>	34	8	Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Louisiana, Michigan, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia	49

42. **Text-to-911 Service.** The Bureau requested that respondents specify the number of PSAPs within each state and jurisdiction that had implemented text-to-911 as of the end of calendar year 2016. The Bureau also requested that respondents estimate the number of PSAPs that they anticipated would become text-capable by the end of calendar year 2017. Table 22 sets forth the information provided by 46 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Collectively, respondents reported 811 PSAPs as being text-capable as of the end of 2016, and further reported that they anticipated an additional 1,026 PSAPs would become text-capable by the end of 2017. For purposes of comparison, Table 22 also includes data from the FCC’s Text-to-911 Registry as of December 21, 2017, which shows the number of PSAPs that the reporting jurisdictions have registered with the FCC as text capable.<sup>70</sup> While the total number of registered PSAPs is lower than the number of PSAPs that respondents projected would be text-capable at the end of 2017, the Bureau has received data indicating that many additional PSAPs that are not listed in the FCC registry (which is a voluntary registry) are in fact text-capable. Thus, the actual number of text-capable PSAPs as of year-end 2017 may be considerably closer to the projected total in Table 22.

<sup>70</sup> The FCC’s PSAP Text-to-911 Readiness and Certification Registry is available at <https://www.fcc.gov/general/psap-text-911-readiness-and-certification-form>. FCC rules do not require PSAPs to register with the FCC when they become text-capable; they may notify service providers directly that they are text-capable and certified to accept texts. The FCC has encouraged all text-capable PSAPs to register with the FCC.

**Table 22 – Text-to-911 Deployments**

State	Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2016	No Response	Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2017	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2017	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 21, 2017 <sup>71</sup>
AK	0		2		2	0
AL	14		45		59	3
AR	4		10		14	10
AZ	0		14		14	27
CA	46		104		150	179
CO	46		Reported “Unknown”		46	53
CT	0		0		0	106
DE	9		0		9 Text Capable Statewide	9
FL	34		82		116	15
GA	31		27		58	7
HI	8		0		8 Text Capable Statewide	9
IA	11		102		113	102
ID	11		10		21	19
IL	29		Not Specified		29	25
IN	91		0		91 Text Capable Statewide	92
KS	11		77		88	86
KY	2		18		20	3
LA	12		13		25	9
MA	0		2		2	0
MD	1		5		6	1
ME	2		24		26 Text Capable Statewide	2
MI	29		33		62	44

<sup>71</sup> Based on the FCC’s Registry, the following states and territories are considered to have statewide text-to-911 availability: Delaware, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Vermont, and Puerto Rico. In addition, although Missouri did not file a report, we note that 38 Missouri PSAPs are listed in the FCC Registry as text capable.

State	Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2016	No Response	Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2017	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2017	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 21, 2017 <sup>71</sup>
MN	0		7		7 Text Capable Statewide <sup>72</sup>	16
MO	Did Not File					38
MS	7		14		21	0
MT	Did Not File					30
NC	92		25		117	84
ND	4		12		16 Text Capable Statewide	12
NE	8		20		28	4
NH	2		0		2 Text Capable Statewide	2
NJ	17		0		17 Text Capable Statewide	19
NM	0		0		0	0
NV	0		1		1	2
NY	Did Not File					13
OH	5		65		70	5
OK	Did Not File					1
OR	7		33		40	19
PA	37		55		92	17
RI	0		0		0	0
SC	5		10		15	13
SD	0		0		0	0
TN	0		0		0	1
TX	168		146		314	258
UT	8		22		30	13
VA	30		15		45	32
VT	6		0		6 Text Capable Statewide	6
WA	10		10		20	12
WI	5		Reported		5	7

<sup>72</sup> In its report, Minnesota reported that no PSAPs were text capable in 2016 and it anticipated that seven PSAPs would be text capable by the end of 2017. However, on December 5, 2017, the state announced that it had launched statewide text to 911 service. See State of Minnesota, Department of Public Safety – Emergency Communications Networks, at <https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ooc/news-releases/Pages/minnesota-text-to-911-available-statewide.aspx>.

State	Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2016	No Response	Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2017	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2017	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 21, 2017 <sup>71</sup>
			"Unknown"			
WV	6		7		13	2
WY	2		2		4	2
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>						
AS	0		0		0	0
DC	1		0		1 Text Capable City-wide	1
Guam	Did Not File					0
No. Mar.	Did Not File					0
PR	Did Not File Text Capable Commonwealth-wide					2
USVI	0		0		0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>811</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1,026</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1,837</b>	<b>1,412</b>

## J. Cybersecurity Expenditures

43. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions provide information on whether they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2016 and, if so, the amounts of those expenditures. As represented in Table 23, 34 states, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded that they did not expend funds on PSAP-related cybersecurity programs. Eleven states and the District of Columbia reported that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2016. The Bureau additionally requested information on the number of PSAPs in each state or jurisdiction that implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs in 2016. Twelve states and the District of Columbia reported that one or more of their PSAPs either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program. Eight states and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that their PSAPs did not implement or participate in cybersecurity programs. Twenty-one states reported that they lacked data or otherwise did not know whether their PSAPs had implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs.

**Table 23 – Annual Cybersecurity Expenditures**

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2016				Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program.
	Yes	No	Reported “Unknown”	Amount	
AK		X			0
AL		X			0
AR		X			0
AZ		X			0
CA		X			0
CO		X			0
CT		X			0
DE		X			0
FL	X			\$182,996	45
GA			X		0
HI		X			8
IA	X			Not Specified	113
ID		X			18
IL		X			0
IN	X			Not Specified	Unknown
KS	X			Not Specified	18
KY		X			Unknown
LA	X			Not Specified	18
MA		X			Unknown
MD		X			Unknown
ME	X			Not Specified	26
MI	X			Not Specified	0
MN		X			0
MO	Did Not File				

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2016				Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program.
	Yes	No	Reported "Unknown"	Amount	
MS		X			0
MT	Did Not File				
NC		X			0
ND		X			0
NE		X			0
NH		X			2
NJ		X			0
NM		X			0
NV		X			0
NY	Did Not File				
OH		X			9
OK	Did Not File				
OR		X			0
PA	X			Not Specified	0
RI	X			\$11,630	2
SC		X			5
SD		X			0
TN		X			0
TX	X			\$710,184	Unknown
UT		X			0
VA		X			0
VT		X			0
WA	X			\$300,000	63
WI		X			0
WV		X			0

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2016				Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program.
	Yes	No	Reported "Unknown"	Amount	
WY		X			0
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>					
AS		X			0
DC	X			\$350,097	1
Guam	Did Not File				
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not File				
PR	Did Not File				
USVI		X			0
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$1,554,907<sup>73</sup></b>	<b>328</b>

44. The Bureau asked states and jurisdictions to report whether they adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology *Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* (NIST Framework)<sup>74</sup> for networks that support one or more PSAPs. As detailed in Table 24, sixteen states and the District of Columbia reported that they do adhere to the NIST Framework, five states reported that they do not, and 25 states, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated they did not know.

<sup>73</sup> We note that in its 2016 filing, Michigan reported spending approximately \$22,000,000 on cybersecurity for PSAPs and accounted for the majority of total reported expenditures of \$22,896,976.61 in the 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Report to Congress. See 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Report at p. 86. In this year's filing, Michigan states that cyber expenditures cannot be broken out from total expenditures, therefore a significantly lower total expenditure is reported. Nevertheless, in 2016, all other states reported spending approximately \$896,976.61 on cyber security and this year all other states report spending approximately \$1,554,907, an increase of 58 percent.

<sup>74</sup> See National Institute of Standards and Technology, *Cybersecurity Framework*, at <http://www.nist.gov/cyberframework/>.

**Table 24 – Adherence to the NIST Cybersecurity Framework**

State	State or jurisdiction adheres to the National Institute of Standards and Technology Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction.		
	Yes	No	Reported “Unknown”
AK			X
AL		X	
AR			X
AZ			X
CA	X		
CO			X
CT		X	
DE	X		
FL	X		
GA	X		
HI			X
IA	X		
ID			X
IL			X
IN	X		
KS	X		
KY			X
LA			X
MA			X
MD	X		
ME			X
MI	X		

State	State or jurisdiction adheres to the National Institute of Standards and Technology Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction.		
	Yes	No	Reported "Unknown"
MN			X
MO	Did Not File		
MS			X
MT	Did Not File		
NC			X
ND			X
NE			X
NH	X		
NJ			X
NM		X	
NV			X
NY	Did Not File		
OH	X		
OK	Did Not File		
OR	X		
PA			X
RI		X	
SC			X
SD	X		
TN			X
TX	X		
UT		X	
VA			X
VT	X		

State	State or jurisdiction adheres to the National Institute of Standards and Technology Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction.		
	Yes	No	Reported "Unknown"
WA	X		
WI			X
WV			X
WY			X
Other Jurisdictions			
AS			X
DC	X		
Guam	Did Not File		
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not File		
PR	Did Not File		
USVI			X
<b>Totals</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>27</b>

**K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**

45. The Bureau asked respondents to provide “an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria [the] state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges.” Of the jurisdictions that responded, 40 described some effort to measure the effectiveness of 911/E911 fund expenditures. Responses varied from descriptions of how funds had been spent on NG911 to state plans with metrics describing improvements to the 911 system.

46. Utah reported that the state conducted a performance audit in 2016.<sup>75</sup> Although the Utah report found that local 911 funds have been maintained and appropriately used, it identified several areas that could lead to more efficient use of 911 fees. For example, the report found that auditing collection of 911 fees is problematic due to the complexity of Utah’s tax system; local 911 fee collection process allows for inaccuracies in filings, resulting in insufficient payment of 911 fees by

<sup>75</sup> State of Utah, Office of the Auditor General, A Review of the Distribution and Use of Local 911 Surcharge Funds, Report to the Utah Legislature, Number 2016-08, October 2016, available at [https://le.utah.gov/audit/16\\_08rpt.pdf](https://le.utah.gov/audit/16_08rpt.pdf).

local telephone companies and inconsistent year-to-year filings; and the Department of Public Safety, which administers distribution of collected fees, could ensure more efficient 911 operation through consistent application of cost sharing among consolidated PSAPs and use of service contracts for dispatch services.<sup>76</sup>

47. Some states indicate that measuring effectiveness lies with local organizations. Wisconsin reported that it has not undertaken a program to measure the effective utilization of 911/E911 fees and it does not know whether any county or municipality operating a PSAP in Wisconsin has implemented a program to measure or assess the effectiveness of its 911 service.<sup>77</sup>

48. In December 2016, the Task Force on Optimal Public Safety Answering Point Architecture (Task Force), an expert advisory committee the Commission formed in 2014, completed its work on a comprehensive set of recommendations on actions that state, local, and tribal 911 authorities can take to optimize PSAP cybersecurity, network architecture, and funding.<sup>78</sup> Included in the Task Force's report are detailed recommendations for state and local NG911 planning and budgeting and a common NG911 "scorecard" to enable jurisdictions to assess the progress and maturity of their NG911 implementations. We anticipate that as states and other jurisdictions incorporate these guidelines into their planning, future fee reports will provide enhanced information on the effective utilization of 911/E911 fees.

#### **L. Public Comments on 2016 Eighth Annual Report**

49. As in past reports, this section summarizes public comments received in response to the prior year's report. On January 13, 2016 the Commission issued a Public Notice seeking comment on the 2016 Eighth Annual Report and the sufficiency and accuracy of the reported information.<sup>79</sup> We received input from four commenters.<sup>80</sup> The New Jersey Wireless Association (NJWA) argues that "repeat raiding of fees by [New Jersey] and that of our neighbor N[ew] Y[ork], will eventually prove to be devastating in the event of a major catastrophe."<sup>81</sup>

50. We sought comment on whether expenditure of 911 fees on NG911-related programs as documented in the Report is effectively contributing to implementation of NG911 services and infrastructure, including deployment of text-to-911.<sup>82</sup> APCO believes the Commission should define NG911 "as end-to-end (from the caller to the telecommunicator) IP connectivity enabling current voice

---

<sup>76</sup> *Id.* at 1-3.

<sup>77</sup> Wisconsin Response at 18.

<sup>78</sup> See FCC, Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture, at <https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/advisory-committees/general/task-force-optimal-public-safety-answering-point>.

<sup>79</sup> FCC Seeks Public Comment on Seventh Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, Public Notice, 31 FCC Rcd 84 (Jan. 8, 2016) (*Public Notice*), available at <https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/60001536009.pdf>.

<sup>80</sup> The Commission received comments from APCO, the Washington State APCO-NENA Chapter, the New Jersey Association of Counties, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and Reply Comments from T-Mobile USA, Inc. and the New Jersey Wireless Association.

<sup>81</sup> New Jersey Wireless Association Reply Comments at 4.

<sup>82</sup> *Public Notice* at 2.

communications, future multimedia, and other data capabilities to flow from the 9-1-1- caller to the PSAP and be properly reported, archived, and further transmitted between the PSAP and first responders.”<sup>83</sup> According to APCO, this will result in future FCC reports that “more accurately represent deployments, plans, and expenditures, and thereby become more useful planning and advocacy tools” and “presents an opportunity to identify gaps and determine whether standards are incomplete or require modification.”<sup>84</sup> NJWA agrees, arguing that a clarification of eligible expenditures and definition of NG911 services would provide guidance” to states.<sup>85</sup> APCO further recommends that the Commission seek additional information “to better understand how laws and regulations impede the deployment of NG9-1-1 . . . to help states identify optimal governance structures, enact laws that protect 9-1-1 fees, expand permissible expenditures for NG9-1-1, and ensure sustainable and sufficient funding going forward.”<sup>86</sup> NJWA argues that, although New Jersey “appears to be delinquent in the adoption of NG911 for its residents at a statewide level, many of the PSAPs in the State have already or are in the process of upgrading their dispatch and communications to be ‘NG911 ready’, as these PSAPs and the lawmakers accountable for them, realize they answer to and are responsible for the public safety of their constituents.”<sup>87</sup> It further argues that “these upgrades are being paid for using normal taxpayer revenues [footnote omitted], not the 911 fees specifically collected for this purpose, effectively ‘double dipping’ our residents.”<sup>88</sup>

51. APCO recommends that the Commission request information about how states and their vendors are ensuring NG9-1-1 components are fully interoperable as “a fully functional NG9-1-1 system requires completion of consensus-based, accredited standards and must include fully interoperable IP-based connectivity as well as other data capabilities and equipment within the PSAP to seamlessly report, archive, and further transmit data between the PSAP and first responders.”<sup>89</sup>

52. We also sought comment on whether 911 fees are being effectively used by state, local, and tribal jurisdictions to implement cybersecurity best practices within PSAPs as well as adherence to the National Institute of Standards and Technology Cybersecurity Framework.<sup>90</sup> Because cybersecurity programs may be interpreted to encompass a vast array of practices and initiatives, including cyber hygiene, workforce training, and employing cyber security consultants, APCO recommends that the Commission “provide guidance about what constitutes a cyber security program and seek additional information about the types of cyber security programs states and PSAPs are participating in and implementing.”<sup>91</sup>

53. We further sought comment on the role of oversight and auditing in ensuring that collected 911 fees are used according to state and local requirements, and on whether additional efforts

---

<sup>83</sup> APCO Comments at 2. See also New Jersey Wireless Association Reply Comments at 3 (“any definition or clarification should include end-to-end IP connectivity”).

<sup>84</sup> *Id.*

<sup>85</sup> New Jersey Wireless Association Reply Comments at 4.

<sup>86</sup> APCO Comments at 3-4.

<sup>87</sup> New Jersey Wireless Association Reply Comments at 6.

<sup>88</sup> *Id.*

<sup>89</sup> APCO Comments at 3.

<sup>90</sup> *Public Notice* at 2.

<sup>91</sup> APCO Comments at 3.

are needed to ensure that state and local entities have the authority to monitor and audit 911 fee collections.<sup>92</sup> Kentucky argues that the auditing of the collection of 911 fees is complicated by the inequities created by collection of the regular collection of a fee on post-paid service versus the irregular or random replenishing of prepaid services.<sup>93</sup> Kentucky further argues that “no state has set the prepaid point of sale fee at a level to collect the equivalent amount [of post-paid] revenue,” thus many states are “under collecting from prepaid by an estimated \$276 million annually nationwide.”<sup>94</sup> Kentucky further believes auditing and monitoring of prepaid collections is hampered when the fee is collected by a government entity, such as a state’s department of revenue, and the state’s 911 authority does not collect the fee; inability to tie a prepaid purchase to a specific carrier; the lack of information from carriers on the number of prepaid subscribers; and the complications associated with tracking the online prepaid replenishment transactions.<sup>95</sup> Kentucky recommends that the Commission require wireless service providers to provide their subscriber count of active connections and for each type of service (post-paid and prepaid) in order to enable states to conduct auditing of service providers.<sup>96</sup>

54. With respect to the NET 911 Act, the NJWA states that Congress “mandated that the process and organizations with jurisdiction over the expenditures of 911 fees are subject to [Open Public Records Act] and other such state open records laws with the transparency clauses in the [NET 911] Act.”<sup>97</sup> According to NJWA, New Jersey ignores the intent of the Act “to ensure efficiency, transparency and accountability in the collection of a fee or charge for the support or implementation of 9-1-1 or enhanced 9-1-1 services.”<sup>98</sup> Further, NJWA argues that “the lack of transparency . . . does not afford the general public within [New Jersey] or other states the ability to understand how and if there fees are being properly allocated as directed by the Act [and] the FCC and Congress should clarify the definitions within or related to the Act of what expenditures are intended under the Act as originally contemplated and subsequently adopted.”<sup>99</sup>

## V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2017 NINTH ANNUAL REPORT

55. Following submission of this report to Congress, the Commission will make the report public and will formally seek public comment on it. We will include any pertinent information from public comments in next year’s report.

---

<sup>92</sup> *Public Notice* at 2.

<sup>93</sup> Kentucky 911 Services Board Comments at 3.

<sup>94</sup> *Id.* at 3 (citing the research of the Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture Adopted Final Report (January 29, 2016)).

<sup>95</sup> *Id.* at 3-4.

<sup>96</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>97</sup> New Jersey Wireless Association Reply Comments at 5.

<sup>98</sup> *Id.*

<sup>99</sup> *Id.* at 6.

## Appendix A

### Summary of State Responses Regarding Collections during 2016 Annual Period

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service (2016 Annual Period)	Total 911 Funds Collected (2016 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes (2016 Annual Period)	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2016 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
AK	Local	Local	\$11,595,445.19	\$11,595,445	--	No	None	--
AL	State	Hybrid	\$111,070,563	\$115,944,883	--	Yes	\$656,916	0.6%
AR	Hybrid	Hybrid	Did Not Provide	\$20,161,873	--	Yes	None	--
AZ	State	State	\$15,538,696	\$20,389,514	--	Yes	\$1,980,976	9.7%
CA	State	State	\$84,113,987	\$79,648,535	--	Yes	\$5,300,000	6.7%
CO	Hybrid	Local	\$113,539,000	\$53,987,426	--	Yes	None	--
CT	State	State	\$25,883,602.27	\$1,658,219	--	Yes	\$4,026,961	242.8%
DE	State	Hybrid	\$10,000,000	\$8,718,169	--	Yes	\$2,700,000	31%
FL	State	Hybrid	\$203,420,288	\$111,799,871	--	Yes	\$23,889,940.85	21.4%
GA	Local	Local	Unknown	\$19,840,298	--	Yes	None	--
HI	State	State	\$40,000,000	\$10,634,306	--	Yes	\$4,500,000	42.3%
IA	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$146,302,788	\$39,849,592	--	Yes	\$16,600,000	41.7%
ID	Hybrid	Local	Unknown	\$22,456,722	--	Yes	None	--

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service (2016 Annual Period)	Total 911 Funds Collected (2016 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes (2016 Annual Period)	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2016 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
IL	State	Hybrid	\$276,833,191 (Statewide and Chicago)	\$234,070,304	\$2,500,000	Yes	None	--
IN	State	Hybrid	\$184,798,847.30	\$86,865,020	--	Yes	\$15,000,000	17.3%
KS	State	Hybrid	\$72,200,809.79	\$19,193,708	--	Yes	\$5,685,941.98	29.6%
KY	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$111,256,277.81	\$111,089,076	--	Yes	\$2,419,485	2.2%
LA	Hybrid	Local	\$68,846,753.97	\$66,235,990	--	Yes	None	--
MA	State	State	\$28,694,312	\$117,883,899	--	Yes	\$5,426,445	4.6%
MD	State	State	\$97,539,229.74	\$53,974,012	--	Yes	\$13,714,101.99	25.4%
ME	State	State	\$6,536,575	\$8,506,670	--	Yes	\$5,019,747	59%
MI	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$204,463,272.53	\$102,388,366	--	Yes	\$1,751,880.86	1.7%
MN	State	State	\$76,542,107.38	\$76,542,107	--	Yes	\$7,285,722.29	9.5%
MO	Did Not File a Report							
MS	Local	Local	\$52,332,689	\$31,884,472	--	Yes	None	--
MT	Did Not File a Report							
NC	State	State	\$112,792,750	\$81,801,499	--	Yes	\$4,690,978	5.7%
ND	Hybrid	Local	\$19,309,099	\$12,814,683	--	Yes	\$1,294,784.88	10.1%

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service (2016 Annual Period)	Total 911 Funds Collected (2016 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes (2016 Annual Period)	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2016 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
NE	Hybrid	Hybrid	Unknown	\$14,061,973	--	Yes	None	--
NH	State	State	\$12,711,612.77	\$15,298,598	--	Yes	\$2,141,303	14%
NJ	State	State	\$14,000,000	\$122,150,000	\$108,128,000	Yes	\$93,129	0.01%
NM	State	State	\$10,058,192.16	\$10,919,490	\$6,000,000	Yes	None	--
NV	Local	Local	\$4,505,698	\$437,144 (Douglas and Nye Counties Only)	--	Yes	None	--
NY	Did Not File a Report							
OH	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$165,937,071.75	\$44,720,083	--	Yes	\$600,000	1.3%
OK	Did Not File a Report							
OR	State	Hybrid	\$140,600,513	\$42,832,475	--	Yes	\$1,774,680.44	4.1%
PA	State	Hybrid	\$340,260,872	\$315,963,650	--	Yes	None	--
RI	State	State	\$5,699,440	\$14,021,695	\$8,387,831	Yes	\$255,868.79	1.8%
SC	Hybrid	Hybrid	Does Not Collect Information at State Level	\$40,880,762	--	Yes	None	--
SD	State	Hybrid	\$25,175,306	\$12,976,019	--	Yes	\$3,892,747	30%

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service (2016 Annual Period)	Total 911 Funds Collected (2016 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes (2016 Annual Period)	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2016 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
TN	State	Hybrid	\$83,300,000	\$102,699,664	--	Yes	\$11,800,000	11.5%
TX	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$266,688,159	\$223,315,125	--	Yes	None	--
UT	State	Hybrid	\$80,000	\$27,162,203	--	Yes	\$427,919.81	1.6%
VA	State	Hybrid	\$115,253,631	\$86,028,766	--	Yes	\$1,000,000	1.2%
VT	State	State	\$4,761,608	\$6,170,851	--	Yes	\$4,761,608	77.2%
WA	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$109,528,437	\$95,242,119	--	Yes	\$21,154,242	22.2%
WI	Fees Retained In Full by Service Providers	Not Applicable	Does Not Collect Information at State Level	Does Not Collect Information at State Level	--	Yes	None	--
WV	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$50,069,236	\$56,340,460	\$3,893,338	Yes	None	--
WY	State	Local	Does Not Collect Information at State Level	Unknown	--	Yes	None	--
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>								
AS	Does not Collect 911 Fees	NA	Did Not Report	Does Not Collect 911 Fees	--	Did Not Respond	None	--
DC	City	Hybrid	\$44,354,099.98	\$11,354,347	--	Yes	\$656,705.34	5.8%

<b>State/Other Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Type of Fund Collection</b>	<b>Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures</b>	<b>Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service (2016 Annual Period)</b>	<b>Total 911 Funds Collected (2016 Annual Period)</b>	<b>Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes (2016 Annual Period)</b>	<b>NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority</b>	<b>Total Funds Used for NG911 (2016 Annual Period)</b>	<b>NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected</b>
Guam	Did Not File a Report							
Northern Mariana Islands	Did Not File a Report							
PR	Did Not File a Report							
USVI	State	State	\$25,921,530	\$1,416,865	--	No	None	--

**Appendix B**

**Overview of Total State 911 Fees - 2009 to 2017 Reports<sup>100</sup>**

State	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report	2016 Report	2017 Report
AK	DNP	\$8,199,046	\$8,649,083	\$12,320,888	\$12,256,620	\$12,448,651	\$13,969,231	\$12,837,114	\$11,595,445
AL	\$60,465,104	\$29,857,571	\$28,680,846	\$28,401,585	\$28,401,585	\$41,974,724	\$108,787,856	\$116,440,103	\$115,944,883
AR	\$24,799,338	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	\$25,290,790	\$26,985,555	\$20,161,873
AZ	\$15,056,353	\$17,460,160	\$16,238,766	\$16,747,691	\$16,445,301	\$16,628,695	\$17,589,404	\$19,227,222	\$20,389,514
CA	\$106,817,447	\$101,450,093	\$100,000,000	\$85,952,018	\$82,126,695	\$75,714,948	\$97,077,234	\$87,838,234	\$79,648,535
CO	\$45,000,000	\$45,000,000	\$45,000,000	\$1,907,087	\$42,900,000	\$42,900,000	\$52,257,085	\$52,732,731	\$53,987,426
CT	\$20,116,091	\$21,397,573	\$20,723,228	\$22,413,228	\$24,001,890	\$35,755,788	\$37,176,000	\$32,564,308	\$1,658,219 <sup>101</sup>
DE	DNP	\$2,259,728	\$8,044,859	\$8,775,757	\$7,623,392	\$7,786,659	\$8,159,730	\$8,159,730 <sup>102</sup>	\$8,718,169
FL	\$130,962,053	\$125,531,674	\$123,059,300	\$122,550,767	\$108,896,142	\$107,884,715	\$108,324,754	\$108,226,957	\$111,799,871
GA	DNP	\$8,537,319	\$8,950,569	\$13,700,097	DNP	\$18,462,645	\$17,538,556	\$17,659,037	\$19,840,298
HI	\$8,842,841	\$9,578,764	\$9,544,397	\$9,755,031	\$10,020,045	\$9,599,983	\$10,489,700	\$10,237,032	\$10,634,306
IA	\$29,054,622	\$31,458,531	\$31,304,377	\$30,664,253	\$30,297,168	\$20,657,733	\$27,820,552	\$40,547,767	\$39,849,592
ID	\$19,191,410	\$18,673,809	\$18,013,902	\$17,013,000	\$19,313,000	\$20,768,995	\$20,879,778	\$20,952,379	\$22,456,722

<sup>100</sup> “DNP” indicates that the state or jurisdiction filed a report but did not provide the information.

<sup>101</sup> Connecticut reported only total fees from prepaid wireless service.

<sup>102</sup> Delaware’s 2014 total used as a proxy for 2015 annual period.

State	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report	2016 Report	2017 Report
IL	DNP	\$67,000,000	\$69,700,000	\$71,900,000	\$69,200,000	\$71,200,000	\$213,983,628	\$95,500,349	\$234,070,304
IN	\$71,000,000	\$39,600,000	\$30,000,000	DNP	\$69,515,800	\$73,114,656	\$72,075,593	\$79,108,858	\$86,865,020
KS	DNP	\$6,705,539	DNP	\$22,125,937	\$20,477,020	\$20,573,217	\$20,337,748	\$20,821,974	\$19,193,708
KY	\$23,569,921	\$22,979,828	\$54,900,000	\$56,500,000	\$55,700,000	\$53,506,843	\$53,920,232	\$53,500,000	\$111,089,076
LA	DNP	DNP	\$3,017,672	Did Not File	\$4,912,926	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$42,750,000	\$66,235,990
MA	DNP	\$69,694,702	\$75,125,185	\$73,408,835	\$73,677,263	\$74,561,728	\$74,947,715	\$95,508,773	\$117,883,899
MD	\$57,176,923	\$55,556,616	\$54,560,255	\$52,099,601	\$52,240,761	\$51,716,232	\$54,766,848	\$53,314,406	\$53,974,012
ME	\$6,664,062	\$6,108,985	\$7,786,855	\$8,416,235	\$8,342,459	\$8,034,327	\$8,340,150	\$8,402,473	\$8,506,670
MI	\$69,835,672	\$93,000,132	\$87,673,893	\$196,215,849	\$181,204,131	\$178,224,826	\$88,932,891	\$93,333,483	\$102,388,366
MN	\$51,281,641	\$51,269,514	\$58,821,937	\$58,654,182	\$62,353,897	\$62,056,116	\$61,446,108	\$62,110,858	\$76,542,107
MO	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File
MS	\$11,758,733	DNP	\$56,335,986	\$60,813,014	\$65,290,042	\$58,175,490	\$31,280,357	\$26,510,538	\$31,884,472
MT	\$13,172,462	\$13,172,462	\$13,715,064	\$13,626,940	\$13,177,752	\$13,099,542	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	Did Not File
NC	\$84,613,672	\$87,367,015	\$80,001,662	DNP	\$69,424,897	\$71,688,784	\$78,161,246	\$81,135,377	\$81,801,499
ND	DNP	\$8,369,366	DNP	\$9,506,000	\$9,506,000	\$9,998,322	\$10,337,907	\$10,337,907	\$12,814,683
NE	\$13,278,907	\$5,507,240	\$8,128,042	\$14,808,421	\$15,555,734	\$15,663,631	\$13,940,368	\$13,900,448	\$14,061,973
NH	\$10,854,203	DNP	\$9,832,831	Did Not File	\$10,493,486	\$10,467,787	\$10,582,269	\$12,317,418	\$15,288,598
NJ	\$130,000,000	\$128,900,000	Did Not File	\$125,000,000	\$126,000,000	\$121,000,000	\$120,000,000	\$122,632,000	\$122,150,000
NM	\$12,786,328	\$12,073,923	\$13,081,062	\$13,424,002	\$12,028,770	\$11,970,079	\$11,600,163	\$11,146,012	\$10,919,490

State	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report	2016 Report	2017 Report
NV	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	\$2,010,342	\$1,944,447	DNP	\$1,591,367 <sup>103</sup>	\$437,144 <sup>104</sup>
NY	\$83,700,000	DNP	\$193,194,759	\$194,787,113	\$190,281,716	\$183,219,891	\$185,513,240	\$185,262,082	Did Not File
OH	\$28,544,924	\$28,164,050	\$29,175,929	DNP	\$28,837,121	\$25,689,296	\$25,736,970	\$40,382,365	\$44,720,083
OK	DNP	Did Not File	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	Did Not File
OR	\$87,447,640	\$40,155,054	\$39,592,560	\$39,370,086	\$39,229,319	\$39,115,990	\$39,470,386	\$39,470,386	\$42,832,475
PA	\$190,239,805	\$116,656,193	\$194,554,260	\$192,297,459	\$184,044,508	\$192,779,782	\$190,711,113	\$239,800,218	\$315,963,650
RI	\$19,400,000	\$18,200,000	\$15,488,729	Did Not File	\$16,500,000	\$17,454,000	\$17,640,703	\$16,345,364	\$14,021,695
SC	\$22,000,000	DNP	\$21,988,052	\$22,215,748	\$28,948,882	\$27,690,958	\$28,458,896	\$39,054,282	\$40,880,762
SD	DNP	DNP	\$8,100,000	\$8,200,000	\$9,111,476	\$13,275,031	\$13,095,234	\$13,093,702	\$12,976,019
TN	\$51,536,089	\$55,965,000	\$58,500,000	\$94,497,881	\$60,852,140	\$98,199,801	\$67,404,840	\$78,729,854	\$102,699,664
TX	\$197,228,796	\$203,547,360	\$199,025,787	\$209,202,098	\$212,788,623	\$213,215,483	\$208,478,516	\$222,938,735	\$223,315,125
UT	\$23,366,301	\$2,724,374	\$23,909,566	\$23,070,307	\$26,188,051	\$29,354,710	\$24,572,000	\$27,130,872	\$27,162,203
VA	DNP	\$52,022,170	\$53,217,635	\$54,079,487	\$51,658,843	\$55,212,204	\$85,187,560	\$85,431,606	\$86,028,766
VT	\$4,832,374	\$5,487,046	\$4,605,803	\$4,993,132	\$5,416,336	\$4,628,027	DNP	\$6,256,658	\$6,170,851
WA	\$69,523,163	\$71,036,718	\$71,244,435	\$100,952,115	\$95,417,114	\$95,887,087	\$91,529,550	\$94,445,461	\$95,242,119
WI	\$9,602,745	DNP	DNP						

<sup>103</sup> Total as reported by Washoe County.

<sup>104</sup> Total as reported by Carson City (\$213,444) and counties of Douglas (\$151,000) and Nye (\$73,000).

State	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report	2016 Report	2017 Report
WV	\$32,278,728	\$33,760,563	\$35,375,580	\$36,176,377	\$37,928,204	\$58,001,075	\$56,323,471	\$56,649,322	\$56,340,460
WY	\$6,700,000	DNP							
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>									
AS	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	Did Not File	Did Not File	DNP	DNP	Does Not Collect Fees
DC	\$12,744,103	\$12,714,347	\$12,700,000	DNP	\$12,064,842	\$13,700,000	\$10,488,988	\$12,189,231	\$11,354,347
Guam	\$1,468,363	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$1,779,710	Did Not File				
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not File								
PR	\$20,952,459	\$21,876,277	Did Not File	\$21,367,260	\$20,323,324	\$19,507,889	Did Not File	\$21,896,789	Did Not File
USVI	Did Not File	\$590,812	\$554,245	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$1,297,671	\$1,416,865
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,877,863,272</b>	<b>\$1,749,609,554</b>	<b>\$2,002,117,111</b>	<b>\$2,149,689,191</b>	<b>\$2,322,983,616</b>	<b>\$2,404,510,788</b>	<b>\$2,527,625,361</b>	<b>\$2,631,705,009</b>	<b>\$2,763,916,948</b>

**Appendix C**

**State 911 Fees by Service Type**

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
AK	Wireline	Up to 2.00 per phone		X		
	Wireless	Up to 2.00 per phone	X			
	Prepaid	N/A				
	VoIP	N/A				
	Other					X
AL	Wireline	\$1.75	X			
	Wireless	\$1.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.75	X			
	VoIP	\$1.75	X			
	Other	\$1.75	X			
AR	Wireline	Amount up to five percent (5%), or for any counties with a population fewer than 27,500 the amount may be up to twelve percent (12%), of the tariff rate (Note: Four Arkansas Counties have not levied the wireline surcharge.)		X		
	Wireless	\$0.65	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.65 (per transaction at point of sale)	X			
	VoIP	\$0.65	X			
	Other					X
AZ	Wireline	\$0.20 per month for each activated wire service account	X			
	Wireless	\$0.20 per month for each activated wireless service account	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Prepaid	.80 of one percent from the retail sale of wireless services. Retailer can retain 3% prior to submittal	X			
	VoIP	\$0.20 per month for each activated wire service account	X			
	Other	None				X
CA	Wireline	\$0.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	Other	N/A				X
CO	Wireline	\$0.43 to \$1.75		X		
	Wireless	\$0.43 to \$1.75		X		
	Prepaid	1.4% of retail sales of minutes	X			
	VoIP	\$0.43 to \$1.75		X		
	Other	None				X
CT	Wireline	\$0.47	X			
	Wireless	\$0.47	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.47	X			
	VoIP	\$0.47	X			
	Other					X
DE	Wireline	\$0.60 per line	X			
	Wireless	\$0.60 per line	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.60 per line	X			
	VoIP	\$0.60 per line	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Other					
FL	Wireline	\$0.40 cents per line	X			
	Wireless	\$0.40 per line	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.40 per line	X			
	VoIP	\$0.40 per line	X			
	Other					X
GA	Wireline	\$1.50 per month		X		
	Wireless	\$1.00 per month		X		
	Prepaid	\$0.75 per transaction		X		
	VoIP	\$1.50 per month		X		
	Other					X
HI	Wireline	\$0.27 per user per month			Hawaiian Telcom Bill and Keep	
	Wireless	\$0.66 per line per month	X			
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	\$0.66 per user month	X			
	Other					X
IA	Wireline	\$1.00 per line per month		X		
	Wireless	\$1.00 per line per month	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Prepaid	\$0.51 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00 per line per month	Nomadic VoIP	Static VoIP		
	Other					X
ID	Wireline	\$1.00 or \$1.25	If collecting \$1.00, \$0.99 to local, \$0.01 to IPSCC Operations If collecting \$1.25, \$0.99 to local, \$0.01 to ECC Operations and \$0.25 to Grant Fund			
	Wireless	\$1.00 or \$1.25	If collecting \$1.00, \$0.99 to local, \$0.01 to ECC Operations If collecting \$1.25, \$0.99 to local, \$0.01 to IPSCC Operations and \$0.25 to Grant Fund			
	Prepaid	2.5% per transaction at point of sale	99% to local 1% to IPSCC Operations			
	VoIP	\$1.00 or \$1.25	If collecting \$1.00, \$0.99 to local, \$0.01 to IPSCC Operations If collecting \$1.25, \$0.99 to local, \$0.01 to IPSCC Operations and \$0.25 to Grant Fund			
	Other					X
IL	Wireline	\$0.87	X			
	Wireless	\$0.87	X			
	Prepaid	3% per retail transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$0.87	X			
	Other					X
IN	Wireline	\$1.00	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Wireless	\$1.00	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.00 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00	X			
	Other					X
KS	Wireline	\$0.60 per subscriber account	X			
	Wireless	\$0.60 per subscriber account	X			
	Prepaid	1.2% of total retail transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$0.60 per subscriber account	X			
	Other	\$0.60 per subscriber account	X			
KY	Wireline	\$0.32 to \$4.00 (varies by county)		X		
	Wireless	\$0.70	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.93 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$0.32 to \$4.00 (varies by county)		X		
	Other	Several local governments have imposed a fee on either utilities, or parcels of land etc., to supplement diminishing land line fees			X	
LA	Wireline	Up to 5% of Tariff Rate on Exchange Service		X		
	Wireless	Up to \$1.25 for all Parishes except for Jefferson Parish		X		
	Prepaid	4% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	Not Specified		X		

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Other					X
MA	Wireline	\$1.00 per month	X			
	Wireless	\$1.00 per month	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.00 per month	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00 per month	X			
	Other					X
MD	Wireline	\$1.00			\$0.25 to State Trust Fund \$0.75 to county	
	Wireless	\$1.00			\$0.25 to State Trust Fund \$0.75 to county	
	Prepaid	\$0.60			\$0.15 to State Trust Fund \$0.45 to county	
	VoIP	\$1.00			\$0.25 to State Trust Fund \$0.75 to county	
	Other					X
ME	Wireline	\$0.45	X			
	Wireless	\$0.45	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.45	X			
	VoIP	\$0.45	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Other					X
MI	Wireline	\$0.19 (state) \$0.20 to \$3.00 (local)	X	X		
	Wireless	\$0.19 (state) \$0.20 to \$3.00 (local)	X	X		
	Prepaid	1.92% per transaction				
	VoIP	\$0.19 (state) \$0.20 to \$3.00 (local)	X	X		
	Other					X
MN	Wireline	\$1.05	X			
	Wireless	\$1.05	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.02	X			
	VoIP	\$0.95	X			
	Other					X
MO	Wireline	Did Not File				
	Wireless					
	Prepaid					
	VoIP					
	Other					
MS	Wireline	\$1.00 per residential line \$2.00 per commercial line		X		
	Wireless	NA				X
	Prepaid	NA				X
	VoIP	\$1.00 per line		X		
	Other	\$0.05 per line	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
MT <sup>105</sup>	Wireline	\$1.00				
	Wireless	\$1.00				
	Prepaid					X
	VoIP	None				
	Other					X
NC	Wireline	\$0.60	X			
	Wireless	\$0.60	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.60	X			
	VoIP	\$0.60	X			
	Other					X
ND	Wireline	\$1.50 - \$2.00		X		
	Wireless	\$1.50 - \$2.00		X		
	Prepaid	2.5% of gross receipts at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	\$1.50 - \$2.00		X		
	Other					X
NE	Wireline	\$0.50 to \$1.00 per line		X		
	Wireless	\$0.45	X			
	Prepaid	1% of transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$0.50 to \$1.00 per line		X		
	Other					X
NH	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75	X			

<sup>105</sup> Montana did not file a report for the 2016 annual period. The numbers shown are based on the state's filing for the 2015 annual period.

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	VoIP	\$0.75	X			
	Other					X
NJ	Wireline	\$0.90 per month	X			
	Wireless	\$0.90 per month	X			
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	\$0.90 per month	X			
	Other					X
NM	Wireline	\$0.51 per line per month	X			
	Wireless	\$0.51 per line per month	X			
	Prepaid	[To be imposed 7-1-2017]				X
	VoIP	[To be imposed 7-1-2017]				X
	Other					X
NV	Wireline	\$0.25 or greater per line (varies by county)		X		
	Wireless	\$0.25 or greater per line (varies by county)		X		
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	\$0.25 or greater per line (varies by county)		X		
	Other					X
NY <sup>106</sup>	Wireline	\$0.35 to \$1.00 per month per access line		X		
	Wireless	State: \$1.20 per month per device Local: \$0.30 per month per device			X	

<sup>106</sup> New York did not file a report for the 2016 annual period. The numbers shown are based on the state's filing for the 2015 annual period.

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Prepaid	[Surcharge to be applied beginning 12-1-2017]				X
	VoIP	\$0.25 or greater per line (varies by county)		X		
	Other					X
OH	Wireline	Varies by county		X		
	Wireless	\$0.25 per month	X			
	Prepaid	.05% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP					
	Other					
OK <sup>107</sup>	Wireline	Percentage of bill [Not Specified]		X		
	Wireless	\$0.50	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.50		X		
	VoIP					X
	Other					
OR	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75	X			
	Other					X
PA	Wireline	\$1.65	X			
	Wireless	\$1.65	X			

<sup>107</sup> Oklahoma did not file a report for the 2016 annual period. The numbers shown are based on the state's filing for the 2015 annual period.

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Prepaid	\$1.65	X			
	VoIP	\$1.65	X			
	Other					X
RI	Wireline	\$1.00 per month per device	X			
	Wireless	\$1.26 per month per device	X			
	Prepaid	2.5% per transaction at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	\$1.26 per line	X			
	Other					X
SC	Wireline	\$0.45 - \$1.00		X		
	Wireless	\$0.62	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.62	X			
	VoIP	\$0.45 - \$1.00		X		
	Other					X
SD	Wireline	\$1.25 per line	X			
	Wireless	\$1.25 per line	X			
	Prepaid	2% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	\$1.25 per line	X			
	Other					X
TN	Wireline	\$1.16 per line	X			
	Wireless	\$1.16 per line	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.16 per line	X			
	VoIP	\$1.16 per line	X			
	Other	\$1.16 per line	X			X

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
TX	Wireline	<p><b>State 9-1-1 Program (CSEC/RPC):</b></p> <p>The wireline fee is set by CSEC at \$0.50 per access line/per month (the rate is capped by statute at \$0.50).</p> <p><b>Emergency Communications Districts:</b></p> <p>Residential: \$0.20 - \$1.50 per local exchange access line per month.</p> <p>Business: \$0.46 - \$5.94 per access line per month, up to a 100 line maximum in most ECD service areas.</p> <p>Business Trunk: \$0.74 to \$5.94 per access line per month</p>	<p>“In the state 9-1-1 program area (CSEC/RPCs), wireline fees are collected and remitted to the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts (Texas Comptroller) and deposited into a general revenue dedicated account (GRD).</p> <p>Funds in the GRD are appropriated by the Texas Legislature to CSEC on a biennial basis to fund 9-1-1 service in the state 9-1-1 program.</p> <p>In ECD (statutory and municipal) service areas, wireline fees are set by each ECD; and collected and remitted directly to the ECD.”</p>			
	Wireless	\$0.50 per month per wireless telecommunication connection	X			
	Prepaid	2% of the purchase price of each prepaid wireless telecommunications service	X			
	VoIP	<p>State 9-1-1 Program (CSEC/RPC):</p> <p>The wireline fee is set by CSEC at \$0.50 per access line/per month (the rate is capped by statute at \$0.50).</p> <p>Emergency Communications Districts:</p> <p>Residential: \$0.20 - \$1.50 per local exchange access line/month.</p> <p>Business: \$0.46 - \$5.94 per access line/month, up to a 100 line maximum in most ECD service areas.</p> <p>Business Trunk: \$0.50 to \$5.94."</p>	<p>“In the state 9-1-1 program area (CSEC/RPCs), wireline fees are collected and remitted to the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts (Texas Comptroller) and deposited into a general revenue dedicated account (GRD). Funds in the GRD are appropriated by the Texas Legislature to CSEC on a biennial basis to fund 9-1-1 service in the state 9-1-1 program. In ECD (statutory and municipal) service areas, wireline fees are set by each ECD; and collected and remitted directly to the ECD.”</p>			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Other	State equalization surcharge: \$0.06/month per local exchange access line access line or wireless telecommunications connection (excluding connections that constitute prepaid wireless telecommunications service).	X			
UT	Wireline	\$0.76	X			
	Wireless	\$0.76	X			
	Prepaid	1.9% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	\$0.76	X			
	Other	\$0.76	X			
VA	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.50	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75	X			
	Other					X
VT	Wireline	2% customer telecommunications charges	X			
	Wireless	2% customer telecommunications charges	X			
	Prepaid	2% customer telecommunications charges	X			
	VoIP	Voluntary	X			
	Other					X

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
WA	Wireline	State: \$0.25 per line County: \$0.70 per line			X	
	Wireless	State: \$0.25 per line County: \$0.70 per line			X	
	Prepaid	State: \$0.25 per line County: \$0.70 per line			X	
	VoIP	State: \$0.25 per line County: \$0.70 per line			X	
	Other					X
WI	Wireline	Varies by county	Participating local exchange carriers			
	Wireless	None				X
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	None				X
	Other					X
WV	Wireline	Varies by county		X		
	Wireless	\$3.00 per line	X			
	Prepaid	6% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	Varies by county		X		
	Other					X
WY	Wireline	Up to \$0.75 per line established county-by-county		X		
	Wireless	Up to \$0.75 per line established county-by-county		X		

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Prepaid	1.5% at Point of Sale	X			
	VoIP	Up to \$0.75 per line established county-by-county		X		
	Other					
<b>Other Jurisdictions</b>						
AS	Wireline	Does Not Collect a 911 Fee				
	Wireless					
	Prepaid					
	VoIP					
	Other					
DC	Wireline	\$0.76 per line	X			
	Wireless	\$0.76 per line	X			
	Prepaid	"Two percent at the sales price per retail transaction occurring in the District, including sales made over the Internet"	X			
	VoIP	\$0.76 per line	X			
	Other	"\$0.62 per Centrex line in the District of Columbia and \$0.62 per private branch exchange station in the District of Columbia"	X			
Guam	Wireline	Did Not File				
	Wireless					
	Prepaid					
	VoIP					
	Other					

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
Northern Mariana Islands	Wireline	Did Not File				
	Wireless					
	Prepaid					
	VoIP					
	Other					
PR	Wireline	Did Not File				
	Wireless					
	Prepaid					
	VoIP					
	Other					
USVI	Wireline	\$1.00	X			
	Wireless	\$1.00	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.00	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00	X			
	Other					X

**Appendix D**

**Approved by OMB  
3060-1122  
Expires: March 31, 2018  
Estimated time per response: 10-55  
hours**

**Annual Collection of Information**

**Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions**

Pursuant to OMB authorization 3060-1122 , the FCC’s Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission’s obligations under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act:

**A. Filing Information**

**1. Name of State or Jurisdiction**

State or Jurisdiction

**2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report**

Name	Title	Organization

**B. Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**

- 1. Please provide the total number of active Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2016:**

<b>PSAP Type<sup>108</sup></b>	<b>Total</b>
Primary	
Secondary	
<b>Total</b>	

- 2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators<sup>109</sup> in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2016:**

<b>Number of Active Telecommunicators</b>	<b>Total</b>
Full-Time	
Part-time	

- 3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

<b>Amount (\$)</b>	
--------------------	--

---

<sup>108</sup> A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control office. A secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association, *Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (Master Glossary)*, July 29, 2014, at 118, 126, available at [https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014\\_2014072.pdf](https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014_2014072.pdf).

<sup>109</sup> A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. See *Master Glossary* at 137.

3a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.

--

4. Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.

Type of Service	Total 911 Calls
Wireline	
Wireless	
VoIP	
Other	
<b>Total</b>	

**C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanisms**

1. Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian tribe, village or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (please include a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism)? *Check one.*

- Yes .....
- No .....

1a. If yes, provide a citation to the legal authority for such a mechanism.

--

1b. If yes, during the annual period January 1 - December 31, 2016, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.

--

**2. Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees? Check one.**

- The State collects the fees .....
- A Local Authority collects the fees .....
- A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies  
(e.g., state and local authority) collect the fees .....

**3. Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.**

**D. Description of State or Jurisdictional Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent**

<b>1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.</b>		
Jurisdiction	Authority to Approve Expenditure of Funds (Check one)	
	Yes	No
State	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local (e.g., county, city, municipality)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (e.g., limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.)</b>		

2. Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? *Check one.*

- Yes .....
- No .....

2a. If you checked YES, provide a legal citation to the funding mechanism of any such criteria.

2b. If you checked NO, describe how your state or jurisdiction decides how collected funds can be used.

**E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**

1. Provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.

<b>2. Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. Check all that apply.</b>			
<b>Type of Cost</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Operating Costs</b>	Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Personnel Costs</b>	Telecommunicators' Salaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Training of Telecommunicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Administrative Costs</b>	Program Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Travel Expenses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Dispatch Costs</b>	Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Grant Programs</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> If Yes, see 2a.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.</b>			

**F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected**

<b>1. Please describe the amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services. Please distinguish between state and local fees for each service type.</b>		
<b>Service Type</b>	<b>Fee/Charge Imposed</b>	<b>Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance (e.g., state, county, local authority, or a combination)</b>
Wireline		
Wireless		
Prepaid Wireless		
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)		
Other		

**2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.**

<b>Service Type</b>	<b>Total Amount Collected (\$)</b>
Wireline	
Wireless	
Prepaid Wireless	
Voice Over Internet Protocol	
Other	
<b>Total</b>	

**2a. If an amount cannot be provided, please explain why.**

--

**3. Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding.**

--

Question	Yes	No
<b>4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, were any 911/E911 fees that were collected by your state or jurisdiction combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services? <i>Check one.</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4a. If Yes, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.</b>		

5. Please provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in your state or jurisdiction.	Percent
State 911 Fees	
Local 911 Fees	
General Fund - State	
General Fund - County	
Federal Grants	
State Grants	

**G. Description of Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses**

Question	Yes	No
<p><b>1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2016, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for purposes designated by the funding mechanism identified in Question 5? <i>Check one.</i></b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>1a. If No, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's general fund. Along with identifying the amount, please include a statement identifying the non-related purposes for which the collected 911 or E911 funds were made available or used.</b></p>		
<p><b>Amount of Funds (\$)</b></p>	<p><b>Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. <i>(Add lines as necessary)</i></b></p>	

**H. Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911/E911 Fees**

Question	Yes	No
<p><b>1. Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911? Check one.</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>1a. If yes, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2016. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</b></p>		

Question	Yes	No
<p><b>2. Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers? Check one.</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>2a. If yes, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2016. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</b></p>		

**I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures**

Question	Yes	No
<b>1. Does your state or jurisdiction classify expenditures on Next Generation 911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures of funds for 911 or E911 purposes? <i>Check one.</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1a. If yes, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:</b>		

Question	Yes	No
<b>2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2016, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs? <i>Check one.</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2a. If yes, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.</b>		
<b>Amount</b> <b>(\$)</b>		

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, please describe the type and number of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state.					
Type of ESInet	Yes	No	If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs Operating on the ESInet	If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets?	
				Yes	No
a. A single, state-wide ESInet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Local (e.g., county) ESInet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Regional ESInets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	[If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet:				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet:				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2016.

--

Question	Total PSAPs Accepting Texts
5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?	
Question	Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable
6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2017, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?	

**J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures**

Question	Check the appropriate box		If Yes, Amount Expended (\$)
<b>1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	

Question	Total PSAPs
<b>2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cyber security program?</b>	

Question	Yes	No	Unknown
<b>3. Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology <i>Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</i> (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**

- 1. Please provide an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria your state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges. If your state conducts annual or other periodic assessments, please provide an electronic copy (*e.g.*, Word, PDF) of the latest such report upon submission of this questionnaire to the FCC or provide links to online versions of such reports in the space below.**