



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
Colorado

2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report

Name	Title	Organization
Daryl Branson	Sr. 911 Telecom Analyst	Colorado Public Utilities Commission



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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	83
Secondary	6
Total	89

- 2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators² 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	390 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities)
Part-time	13 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities)

- 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	\$77,835,212 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from
---------------	---

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.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

(\$)	local 911 Authorities). We believe this number is an under-estimate due to some 911 Authorities reporting only the portion of costs paid for by 911 surcharge revenues, not total costs.
------	--

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

N/A

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	489,201
Wireless	5,639,954
VoIP	166,712
Other	
Total	6,295,867

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.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

CRS § 29-11-102 and 102.5

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.

Yes. Local jurisdictions are allowed to set their own surcharges up to 70¢ per line per month, or higher with approval of the Public Utilities Commission. Several jurisdictions chose to exercise this authority in 2014.

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.

Surcharge funds derives from landlines, contract wireless, and VoIP lines are remitted directly to local 911 Authorities by the carriers. Prepaid surcharge fees are assessed at point-of-sale on the purchase of wireless minutes and remitted to the Colorado Department of Revenue. Those funds are distributed to local governments using a formula based on wireless call volume as a percentage of total wireless calls received in the state.



Federal Communications Commission
 Washington, D.C. 20554

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Local (e.g., county, city, municipality)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.)		
Local governing bodies may expend all collected 911 surcharge fees for any of the purposes outlined in CRS § 29-11-104.		

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.

CRS § 29-11-104

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



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

D. 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.**

A comprehensive list cannot be provided by the state, as spending authority rests in the hands of 57 separate local 911 Authorities, and each may spend funds as they see fit within the authority of CRS § 29-11-104.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

2. 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)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personnel Costs	Telecommunicators' Salaries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Training of Telecommunicators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative Costs	Program Administration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Travel Expenses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dispatch Costs	Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grant Programs		<input type="checkbox"/> If Yes, see 2a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.			
N/A			



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

E. 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	43¢ to \$1.75	Local authority
Wireless	43¢ to \$1.75	Local authority
Prepaid Wireless	1.4% of retail sales of minutes	State
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	43¢ to \$1.75	Local authority
Other		

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	\$11,217,995 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities)
Wireless	\$32,949,356 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities)
Prepaid Wireless	\$2,594,643
Voice Over Internet Protocol	\$5,495,091 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

	911 Authorities)
Other	
Total	\$52,257,085

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

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

Generally, any portion of 911 service not funded by 911 surcharges is paid for by local governments participating in the operation of a public safety answering point. Grants may also be received for certain 911-related projects, though this is relatively rare.

Question	Yes	No
<p>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.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4a. If Yes, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.</p>		
<p>San Juan County received a state grant from the Colorado Department of Local Affairs in the amount of \$34,000.00 for the purchase of E911 telephone equipment.</p> <p>Additionally, 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.</p>		



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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	3.33% (calculated as prepaid surcharge revenues, being the only state 911 fees, divided by the estimate provided in B.3, which may be flawed for the reasons stated previously)
Local 911 Fees	63.8% (calculated as wireline, wireless, and VoIP surcharge revenues, being collected locally, divided by the estimate provided in B.3, which may be flawed for the reasons stated previously)
General Fund - State	0%
General Fund - County	32.86% (calculated as 100% minus the percentages for State 911 Fees and Local 911 Fees, listed above)
Federal Grants	Unknown. Local 911 Authorities are not required to report if and when they receive a grant that benefits, in whole or in part 911



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

	service.
State Grants	Unknown. Local 911 Authorities are not required to report if and when they receive a grant that benefits, in whole or in part 911 service. San Juan County received a state grant from the Colorado Department of Local Affairs in the amount of \$34,000.00 for the purchase of E911 telephone equipment. Apart from this, the state is not aware of any state grants that were used for this the purpose of funding 911 service.

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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)	



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

	NOTE: To the best of the state's knowledge, no 911 surcharge funds were spent for purposes other than those allowed by statute.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.)		
<p>Local 911 Authorities are subject to audit requirements covering all local governments, per CRS § 29-1-601 <i>et seq.</i> Additionally, each local 911 Authority must include a description of their use of funds collected in their audit, and a copy of each audit report must be made available on the governing body's web site if it has one, per CRS § 29-11-104 (5)</p> <p>No enforcement or corrective action has been required or undertaken.</p>		

Question	Yes	No
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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.)		
<p>The local governing body may, at its own expense, require an annual audit of the service supplier's books and records concerning the collection and remittance of the 911 surcharge funds (CRS § 29-11-103 (3) b).</p> <p>No such audits were required by a local governing body in 2014.</p>		



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

F. 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1a. If yes, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:		
NG9-1-1 is not specifically cited as an authorized expense, but CRS § 29-11-204 (2) (a) (I) (A) authorized expenditures of 911 surcharge funds for “costs of equipment directly related to the receipt and routing of emergency calls and installation thereof.” Furthermore, CRS § 29-11-104 (2) (a) (I) (E) authorizes expenditure on “Other costs directly related to the continued operation of the emergency telephone service and the emergency notification service.” These authorizations being technology-neutral, expenditure of 911 surcharge funds on NG9-1-1 products and services are allowed.		

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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2a. If yes, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.		
Amount (\$)	\$22,270,461 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities)	



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Local (e.g., county) ESInet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In a survey of local 911 Authorities, 18.9% of local 911 Authorities stated their PSAP(s) have 911 calls delivered by IP-network. Extrapolating to all PSAPs in the state, we can estimate 18-19 PSAPs are receiving 911 via an ESInet-like service. To our knowledge, the largest ESInet in the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Federal Communications Commission
 Washington, D.C. 20554

			state currently serves 8 PSAPs.		
c. Regional ESInets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

Responses to this question posed to local 911 Authorities in Colorado yielded a variety of responses. Here is a summary:

NG911 compliant radio system and logging recorder.

Install public safety fiber between city public safety facilities

Installation of fiber to connect local governments in service area. Consolidation of 8 PSAPs into regional NG911 center to be activated Q1 2017. Conversion of two primary PSAPs not consolidated into NG911 backup center.

New IP phone system and NG911 compliant logging recorder.

GIS updates and network upgrades

New NG911-ready call handling equipment.

New IP phone system. Direct IP text-to-911 delivered via local ESInet.

NG911-ready CPE installed.

Preparations for installation of new IP phone system.

Software upgrades to make phone system NG911-ready.

Question	Total PSAPs Accepting Texts
<p>5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?</p>	<p>6 by the end of 2014. 24 as of the writing of this report.</p>
Question	Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable
<p>6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2015, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?</p>	<p>In a survey of local 911 Authorities, 62.2% of local 911 Authorities stated they either had text-to-911 now or planned to have it by the end of 2015. Extrapolating to all PSAPs in the state, we can estimate 61 PSAPs will have text-to-911 coverage by the end of the year.</p>



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

G. 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A number of local 911 Authorities report having cybersecurity programs in place, but nothing has been implemented specifically for PSAPs from the state level.

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?	In a survey of local 911 Authorities, 16.2% of local 911 Authorities stated they had implemented a cybersecurity program in 2014. Extrapolating to all PSAPs in the state, we can estimate 16 PSAPs implemented a cybersecurity program in that calendar year.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

H. 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 2014 Colorado State of 9-1-1 Report prepared by the Colorado 9-1-1 Resource Center will be provided via separate file.