



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 |
|-----------------------|
| Maryland |

2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report

| Name | Title | Organization |
|----------------|--------------------|---|
| Scott G. Roper | Executive Director | Maryland Emergency Number Systems Board |



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 | 24 |
| Secondary | 52 |
| Total | 76 |

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 | 1122 |
| Part-time | 74 |

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 (\$) | \$93,091,148.75 |
|-----------------------|-----------------|

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

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

The amount above is based on FY 2014 audits submitted by each PSAP. The fiscal year is July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014. Audits are not done on a calendar year basis; therefore a calendar year cost cannot be determined.

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 | 3,863,752 |
| Wireless | 2,609,589 |
| VoIP | Counted in wireline calls |
| Other | 10 |
| Total | 6,473,351 |

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.

Maryland Public Safety Article §1-301 to §1-313



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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 changes were made to the Public Safety Article that effect funding of 9-1-1 in Maryland.

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.

9-1-1 fees are collected by service providers on each subscriber bill. Each subscriber to switched local exchange access service, commercial mobile radio service (CMRS) or other 9-1-1 accessible service shall pay the 9-1-1 fee. The fee is currently set at \$1.00. Of that, \$0.75 is remitted to each county (The Public Safety Article recognizes the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City as one of Maryland’s 24 counties) on a quarterly based on a ratio derived from where the fee was collected. The remaining \$0.25 is deposited into the Maryland 9-1-1 Trust Fund, and is distributed upon a county PSAP application to the Maryland Emergency Numbers Board (ENSB or Board) to pay for enhancements to county 9-1-1 service. Maryland has also enacted a prepaid wireless 9-1-1 fee of \$0.60, which is collected at the point of sale by the retailer. Of that \$0.60, 75 percent is remitted to the county on a quarterly basis based on the same percentage as wireline and wireless collections. The remaining 25 percent is deposited into the Maryland 9-1-1 Trust Fund and is distributed upon a county PSAP application to the Board to pay for enhancements to county 9-1-1 service.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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.) | | |
| <p>Maryland has established written criteria identifying the allowable uses of all 9-1-1 related funds collected. Money collected from the State “9-1-1 Fee” and 25% of all collected Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fee may be used to reimburse counties for the cost of enhancing Maryland’s 9-1-1 system through payment to a third party contractor (<i>Public Safety Article §1-308</i>). The Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR 12.11.03.12) further defines equipment qualifying for funding or reimbursement. Requests for funding are approved by the Emergency Number Systems Board in public session based on the application of a county PSAP director or administrator.</p> <p>Money distributed quarterly to the counties from the collection of the county “Additional Fee” and 75 percent of the Maryland Pre-Paid Wireless E9-1-1 Fee may be spent on the installation, enhancement, maintenance, and operation of a county or multi-county 9-1-1 system. Maintenance and operation costs may include telephone company charges, equipment costs, equipment lease charges, repairs, utilities, personnel costs, and appropriate carryover costs from previous years (<i>Public Safety Article §1-312</i>).</p> | | |

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

- Yes
- No



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

Maryland Public Safety Article §1-308 to §1-313

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

Not applicable



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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.**

In Fiscal Year 2014, the Maryland Emergency Number Systems Board approved \$15,690,253.40 in funds to enhance county 9-1-1 systems. This funding was used to provide new phone systems (72 percent of the total expended), mapping for locating wireless 9-1-1 callers (5 percent of the total expended), and other project requests, such as 9-1-1 center security, backup power systems for PSAPs, redundant/diverse 9-1-1 call routing, training (entrance level, in-service and supervisory), lightning and surge protection, and emergency dispatch protocol based call processing systems (23 percent of the total expended).

The technical nature of 9-1-1 communications has evolved over time to include the advent of computer-aided dispatch, multiple agencies providing emergency response, national standard setting organizations, wireless telephone communications, and most recently, IP based communication and telematics (automatic crash notification) services. These have brought about fundamental changes in the 9-1-1 infrastructure, and added training and equipment challenges.

Historically, the vast majority of funds are allocated to upgrading phone systems, keeping current with technological advances, providing adequate backup facilities, and enhancing mapping capacity. Current phone systems funded by the Board must be IP capable and ready to accept NG 9-1-1 data once national delivery and presentation standards have been established. All Maryland PSAPs now have the capability of mapping the position of 9-1-1 callers, when location information is received by the call taker.

Should circumstances arise that prevents a PSAP from receiving or processing emergency calls, it is critical that back-up 9-1-1 service and relocation strategies are in place and regularly exercised. During 2014, the Board funded several projects for PSAPs to enhance or establish capacity for back-up service and emergency relocation procedures. Referring to the Board's back-up PSAP guidelines, the Board works with noncompliant 9-1-1 Centers to establish approved back-up facilities with appropriate service functionality.

Utilizing technological advances in 9-1-1 phone systems and IP connectivity, the Board began the process of expanding the 9-1-1 system to encompass secondary PSAPs. Through the use of remote workstations, linked directly to the primary PSAP via IP network connectivity, secondary PSAP call takers experience the same functionality, mapping capacity and data delivery on all transferred 9-1-1 calls.



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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Dispatch Costs | Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Grant Programs | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If Yes, see 2a. | <input 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. | | | |
| 9-1-1 Trust Fund expenditures were counted towards grant matches for communications related Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) and State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) grants provided through the US Department of Homeland Security, and managed by the Maryland Emergency Management Agency. | | | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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 | \$1.00 | 25 percent to the 9-1-1 Trust Fund, and 75 percent to the county PSAP |
| Wireless | \$1.00 | 25 percent to the 9-1-1 Trust Fund, and 75 percent to the county PSAP |
| Prepaid Wireless | \$0.60 | 25 percent to the 9-1-1 Trust Fund, and 75 percent to the county PSAP |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | \$1.00 | 25 percent to the 9-1-1 Trust Fund, and 75 percent to the county PSAP |
| Other | N/A | |

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 | \$21,789,423.69 |
| Wireless | \$27,182,747.00 |
| Prepaid Wireless | \$5,794,677.60 |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$0.00 |
| Total | \$54,766,848.29 |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

Figures represent collections for the calendar year, and not necessarily distributed during the calendar year. VoIP collections are recorded as wireline 9-1-1 fees.

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

In Maryland, 9-1-1 fees offset approximately 49 percent of county 9-1-1 operational costs. The balance of the operational costs are paid from the general funds of the corresponding county governments.

| 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>The State of Maryland's Department of Information Technology used \$70,000.00 from a U.S. Department of the Interior grant for the purposes of a statewide aerial mapping project that benefitted 9-1-1. The total amount funded by the ENSB from the 9-1-1 Trust Fund for this project was \$810,062.00.</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 | 48.76% |
| Local 911 Fees | 0% |
| General Fund - State | 0% |
| General Fund - County | 51.24% |
| Federal Grants | < 1% |
| State Grants | 0% |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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. | | <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

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. | <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>Each fiscal year, the Maryland Emergency Number Systems Board directs each county to provide for an audit of 9-1-1 funds remitted to the county for the purposes identified in the Maryland Public Safety Article and the Maryland Code of Regulations.</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 Board did not engage the services of an auditor for this purpose during calendar year 2014.</p> | | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1a. If yes, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority: | | |
| Maryland Public Safety Article §1-301(k) defines Next Generation 9-1-1 services as 9-1-1 services, and therefore may be allowed funding under the statute. | | |

| 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 (\$) | \$12,067,230.15 | |



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

The Board has funded IP enabled telephone systems for six primary and one backup PSAP. Additionally, the Board has funded projects to install diverse fiber optic networks from local serving wire offices to various PSAPs (known as “last mile” connectivity) to carry 9-1-1 trunks and other telephone services, which may be used for an ESInet once one is established.

| 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? | 1 |
| 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? | 7 |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures

| Question | Check the appropriate box | | If Yes, Amount Expended (\$) |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | |
| 1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

| 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? | Not Known |

| Question | Yes | No | Unknown |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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 Maryland Emergency Number Systems Board produces an annual report that outlines the efforts of the Board, the state of the 9-1-1 Trust Fund, funding of 9-1-1 in Maryland, and expenditures funded by the Board. A copy of the Fiscal Year 2014 annual report is attached.