Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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
UTAH

2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report

Name	Title	Organization
Eric N. Parry	Director, 911 Division	Utah Communications Authority

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, 2014:

PSAP Type[1]	Total
Primary	32
Secondary	4
Total	36

2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators[2] in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2014:

Number of Active Telecommunicators	Total
Full-Time	382
Part-time	20

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2014, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.

Amount ($)	$48M

[1] 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 .

[2] 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.

This is the best guess based on the fact that the revenues collected do not cover the total cost of 911 services.

4. Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014.

Type of Service	Total 911 Calls
Wireline	166,368
Wireless	802,428
VoIP	29,554
Other	18,846
Total	1,017,196

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 …….. X
- No ……..….. ☐

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

- The local government $0.61 fee (61 cent fund) is outlined in Utah Code Ann. § **69-2-5**
- The statewide Computer Aided Dispatch $0.06 fee (6 cent fund) directed to the Utah 911 Advisory Committee is outlined in Utah Code Ann. § **69-2-5.5**
- The statewide $0.09 fee (9 cent fund) directed to the Utah 911 Advisory Committee is outlined in Utah Code Ann. § **69-2-5.6**
- Prepaid wireless 911 service charge is outlined in Utah Code Ann. § **69-2-5.7**

1b. If yes, during the annual period January 1 - December 31, 2014, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.

No.

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 …….. X
- 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.

- The Utah State Tax Commission collects the fees on each local exchange service switched access line and each revenue producing radio communications access line that is subject to an emergency services telecommunications charge levied by a county, city, or town under Utah Code Ann. **§ 69-2-5** or **§ 69-2-5.5**. Upon the collection of qualifying telecommunications charge revenues, the Tax Commission transmits the amount of qualifying telecommunications charge revenues to an original recipient political subdivision. "Original recipient political subdivision" means a county, city, or town to which the commission makes an original distribution.
- The allowable use of collected 911 funds are outlined in Utah Code Ann. **§ 69-2-5(4)(b)**.

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

1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.		
Jurisdiction	**Authority to Approve Expenditure of Funds** *(Check one)*	
	Yes	**No**
State	**X**	☐
Local (*e.g.*, county, city, municipality)	**X**	☐

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.)

- Upon the collection of qualifying telecommunications charge revenues, the Tax Commission transmits the amount of qualifying telecommunications charge revenues to an original recipient political subdivision. "Original recipient political subdivision" means a county, city, or town to which the commission makes an original distribution.
- The allowable use of collected 911 funds are outlined in Utah Code Ann. **§ 69-2-5(4)(b)**.
- In addition, the Utah 911 Advisory Committee has authority under Rules governing the use of funds has the authority to approve the expenditure of funds in the Rules authorized by Section **63G-3** **Note – New Rules are in the process of being developed and approved.**

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

- Yes …….. X
- No ……..….. ☐

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

- The allowable use of collected 911 funds are outlined in Utah Code Ann. **§** 69-2-5(4)(b).
- In addition, the Utah 911 Advisory Committee has authority under Rules governing the use of funds has the authority to approve the expenditure of funds in the Rules authorized by Section 63G-3 **Note – New Rules are in the process of being developed and approved.**

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

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.

- Regulations covering the oversight of distribution of the 61 cent fund are found in Utah Code Ann. **§** 69-2-5.8 State Tax Commission Redistribution of Revenues from Certain Telecommunications Charges.
- The Utah Tax Commission oversees how the collected 61 cent funds are being made available for used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 9-1-1.
- In addition, the Utah 911Advisory Committee has authority under Rules governing the use of funds has the authority to approve the expenditure of funds in the Rules authorized by Section 63G-3 **Note – New Rules are in the process of being developed and approved.**

1. Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. *Check all that apply*.			
Type of Cost		**Yes**	**No**
Operating Costs	Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software)	**X**	☐
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)	**X**	☐
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility	**X**	☐
Personnel Costs	Telecommunicators' Salaries	**X**	☐
	Training of Telecommunicators	**X**	☐
Administrative Costs	Program Administration	**X**	☐
	Travel Expenses	☐	**X**
Dispatch Costs	Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch	**X**	☐
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	**X**	**X**
Grant Programs		**X** **If Yes, see 2a.**	☐

2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.

- 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.
- Grants for consulting services regarding a CAD study were paid from the statewide

Computer Aided Dispatch $0.06 fee (6 cent fund).
- Grants for CAD functional elements were paid from the statewide Computer Aided Dispatch $0.06 fee (6 cent fund).

F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected

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.

Service Type	Fee/Charge Imposed	Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance (*e.g.*, state, county, local authority, or a combination)
Wireline	76 cents	State
Wireless	76 cents	State
Prepaid Wireless	1.9%	State
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	76 cents	State
Other	76 cents	State

2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2014, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.

Service Type	Total Amount Collected ($)
Wireline	$21.6M
Wireless	$2.817K
Prepaid Wireless	155K
Voice Over Internet Protocol	Included in Wireless

Other	
Total	$24.572M

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

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

N/A

Question	Yes	No
4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2014, 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? *Check one.*	☐	**X**
4a. If Yes, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.		

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	100%
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
1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2014, 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? *Check one.*	**X**	☐

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.

Amount of Funds ($)	Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. (*Add lines as necessary*)

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

Question	Yes	No
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.*	☐	**X**
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, 2014. *(Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)*		

Question	Yes	No
2. Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected form subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers? *Check one.*	☐	**X**
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, 2014. *(Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)*		

I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

Question	Yes	No
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? *Check one.*	☐	**X**
1a. If yes, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:		

Question	Yes	No
2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2014, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs? *Check one.*	☐	**X**
2a. If yes, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.		
Amount ($)		

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2014, 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	☐	**X**		☐	☐
b. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet	**X**	☐	3	☐	**X**
c. Regional ESInets	**X**	☐	6 [If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet]	☐	**X**
Name of Regional ESInet:			Greater Wasatch Multi-node	☐	**X**
Name of Regional ESInet:				☐	☐

4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2014.

None in calendar year 2014, other than upgrades to CPE to make all Utah PSAPs NG ready.

Question	Total PSAPs Accepting Texts
5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?	0
Question	**Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable**
6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2015, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?	6 (Greater Wasatch Multi-node PSAPs)

J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures

Question	Check the appropriate box		If Yes, Amount Expended ($)
1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?	Yes ☐	No **X**	

Question	Total PSAPs
2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cyber security program?	0

Question	Yes	No	Unknown
3. Does your state or jurisdiction adhere 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?	☐	**X**	☐

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.

The state is in the process of executing a Performance Audit to measure efficiencies in the state 911 system. This audit and the recommendations to the Legislature arising from the audit will set the pathway for NG911 in Utah. The statement of work for the Audit reads as follows:

The study's focus is to assess Utah's 911 emergency response system and public safety communications network, and to provide advice on an optimal statewide 911 network and the delivery of emergency services. The successful respondent will work with Utah Communications Authority (UCA) staff, the 911 Advisory Committee, participating 911 entities, participating police, fire, and emergency medical response agencies, and emergency call delivery service providers. Additional stakeholders may be identified with whom the respondent will also be required to work. The performance audit and study will include the assessment and strategic planning recommendations as described in the following Statement of Work (SOW):

I. Statutory Governance and Compliance
   a. Review the statutory provisions and efforts of the:
      i. Utah Communications Authority
      ii. Executive Director, and
      iii. Utah 911 Division
   b. Determine the compliance of the 911 Advisory Committee, and 911 systems managers, with the statutorily authorized use of 911 fees and taxes with existing laws, administrative rules and approved grants over the past five years; and
   c. Recommend changes to the existing 911 funding models currently used throughout Utah including;
      i. How Customer Premises Equipment CPE) is procured, funded, and maintained;
      ii. The current Grant Match process (matching %);
      iii. Funding of ESInets (networks) including monitoring and maintenance costs; and
      iv. Recommending which services should be funded locally or by the state.

II. Organizational Review and Recommendations
   a. Review the office of the 911 Program Manager
      i. Roles and responsibilities

III. Determine Potential Operations Efficiencies and Cost Savings:
   a. Work with a defined cross-section of state and local stakeholders to determine

potential cost savings and increases in quality and efficiency that may be achieved by the functional consolidation of PSAPs and dispatch centers throughout the state, including recommendations regarding:

i. An efficient and effective public safety communications management structure that ensures high quality 911 emergency services are available to the state's citizens;
ii. Standardization of telecommunicator training and certifications including:
    1. Mandatory certifications and recertification,
    2. Use of structured call taking and dispatch protocol systems, and
    3. Establishing PSAP performance metrics.
iii. Common standard operating procedures that ensure the least amount of call processing time;
iv. Minimum staffing levels;
v. Efficient methods to transfer calls between PSAPs and from a PSAP to a first responder, regardless of jurisdiction.
vi. Uniformity of equipment and software protocols to accomplish seamless functionality between computer aided dispatch systems;
vii. Interoperable telephonic and radio systems to ensure coordination between jurisdictions;
viii. How unnecessary duplication of services may be reduced or eliminated; and
ix. How the sharing of available network resources may reduce costs.

IV. Strategic Planning:

a. Make recommendations for the state's 911 emergency response system and related elements of the public safety communications network, which may include how:
    i. PSAPs may benefit from functional consolidation;
    ii. PSAPs within designated regions may accept calls and provide emergency communication services for first responders using interoperable equipment, software, protocols, and standard operating procedures;
    iii. PSAPs, regardless of physical location, may operate on interoperable, shared, or hosted technology platforms and with common policies to reduce the need to transfer calls between PSAPs;
    iv. Interoperable, shared, or hosted technology platforms are funded, monitored, and maintained.
b. Describe and recommend potential solutions to the biggest impediments to functional consolidation of PSAPs;
c. Make recommendations regarding the necessary personnel and associated job duties within the authority; and
d. Evaluate and make recommendations concerning the current 911 Funding Model
    i. Review the funding methodology and make recommendations concerning funding model options
    ii. Perform a gap-analysis on funding sources, revenues, and expenditures
    iii. Recommend changes to the PSAP funding formula(s)
    iv. Evaluate eligible funding criteria
    v. Evaluate the Tax Commission’s role in the collection and distribution of 911 surcharge funds

vi. Evaluate special funding consideration options for counties

We currently have a regional multi-node ESInet project that has been operating for three years, supporting 6 PSAPs.

We are in the process of implementing text-to-911 on this multi-node to be operational Fall of 2015, as well as establishing another Multi-node regional ESInet in Utah County (Summer 2016).

We are preparing to transition stand-alone PSAPs to I/P call delivery over the next two years.