



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 |
|-----------------------|
| Vermont |

Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report

| Name | Title | Organization |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Barbara M. Neal | Executive Director | Vermont Enhanced 9-1-1 Board |

2.



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, 2015:

| PSAP Type ¹ | Total |
|------------------------|----------|
| Primary | 6 |
| Secondary | |
| Total | 6 |

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, 2015:

| Number of Active Telecommunicators | Total |
|------------------------------------|-------|
| Full-Time | 76 |
| Part-time | 31 |

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2015, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.

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.yimcdn.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

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Amount (\$) | 4,604,830.00 |
|-----------------------|--------------|

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, 2015 to December 31, 2015.

| Type of Service | Total 911 Calls |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Wireline | 41826 |
| Wireless | 139926 |
| VoIP | 18366 |
| Other | 6283 |
| Total | 206401 |

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.*



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

- Yes
- No

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

The State of Vermont collects fees from certain retail telecom customers in the State under the authority of state statute Title 30, Chapter 88 Universal Telecommunications Service. Funds collected through this mechanism support the Vermont telecommunicator relay service, the Vermont lifeline program, the statewide 9-1-1 program. The funds may also be used to reduce the cost to service customers of basic telecommunications in high-cost areas and to provide access to internet service for unserved and underserved locations in Vermont.

1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, 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
-
-



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

- 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 Vermont USF rate is established on an annual basis. An automatic 2% is assessed on certain retail telecommunications services sold to subscribers with a Vermont address. All programs funded by the USF are managed at the state level only and receipts are not distributed to localities in Vermont. The 9-1-1 Board submits a budget request each year to the legislature and the approved budget amount is made available in the Enhanced 9-1-1 fund from the VUSF. Some of these funds are used to support twenty-four (24) call-taker “seats” in the six Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), in the amount of \$45,000 per seat per year. The VUSF rate is set based on the budgets for the programs it funds as passed by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor in the session immediately preceding the annual setting of the rate.



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 (<i>Check one</i>) | |
| | Yes | No |
| State | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Local (<i>e.g.</i> , county, city, municipality) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (<i>e.g.</i>, limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.) | | |
| The Enhanced 9-1-1 Board is the only entity authorized to approve expenditure of funds collected for 9-1-1 purposes. | | |

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.



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

Vermont state statute Title 30, Chapter 87, § 7054. (d) Disbursements from the Enhanced 911 Fund shall be made by the State Treasurer on warrants drawn by the Director solely for the purposes

specified in this chapter. The Director may issue such warrants pursuant to contracts or grants.

(e) Disbursements may be made for:

- (1) nonrecurring costs, including establishing public safety answering points, purchasing network equipment and software, developing data bases, and providing for initial training and public education;
- (2) recurring costs, including network access fees and other telephone charges, software, equipment, data base management and improvement, public education, ongoing training and equipment maintenance;
- (3) expenses of the Board and the Department of Public Service incurred under this chapter;
- (4) costs solely attributable to statewide public safety answering point operations; and
- (5) costs attributable to demonstration projects designed to enhance the delivery of emergency 911 and other emergency services.

(f) Disbursements may not be made for:

- (1) personnel costs for emergency dispatch answering points;
- (2) construction, purchase, renovation or furnishings for buildings at emergency dispatch points;
- (3) two-way radios; and
- (4) vehicles and associated equipment. (Added 1993, No. 197 (Adj. Sess.), § 2; amended 1999, No. 62, § 82; 2007, No. 192 (Adj. Sess.), § 6.025, eff. June 7, 2008; 2011, No. 64, § 1, eff. June 2, 2011.)

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

N/A



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.**

Funds appropriated for 9-1-1 services in Vermont support the statewide hosted 9-1-1 system. In July 2015, Vermont transitioned from a system provided by Intrado, Inc. (now West) to a FairPoint provided solution. The funds also support additional telecom circuits used as part of the 9-1-1 program, Enhanced 9-1-1 Board staff who develop and manage GIS and Mapping solutions used as part of our program, other staff who work in support of the 9-1-1 program, including training, information technology, database and administrative staff, and to pay a stipend to each of the six PSAPs to partially offset the cost of 24 calltaker seats distributed in those six PSAPs



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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Personnel Costs | Telecommunicators' Salaries | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Grant Programs | | <input type="checkbox"/> If YES, see 2a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.

N/A

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 | 2% customer telecommunications charges | State |
| Wireless | 2% customer telecommunications charges | State |
| Prepaid Wireless | 2% customer telecommunications charges | State |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | Voluntary | State |
| Other | N/A | |



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2015, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.

| Service Type | Total Amount Collected (\$) |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Wireline | |
| Wireless | |
| Prepaid Wireless | |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | |
| Other | |
| Total | |

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

This information was requested of the fiscal agent, but has not yet been received.

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

There are no other sources of 9-1-1 funding

| Question | Yes | No |
|----------|-----|----|
|----------|-----|----|



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2015, 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> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| |
|---|
| 4a. If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees. |
| |



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 | 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, 2015, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism? Check one. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

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. <i>(Add lines as necessary)</i> |
|----------------------|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

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

| Question | Yes | No |
|----------|-----|----|
|----------|-----|----|



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>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, 2015. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</p> | | |
| <p>Audit and oversight mechanisms are defined by the State of Vermont in Title 30, Chapter 88 § 7503 (d) The fiscal agent shall be audited annually by a certified public accountant in a manner determined by and under the direction of the Public Service Board.</p> | | |

| Question | Yes | No |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>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, 2015. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</p> | | |

The latest audit report available at the time of this submission is from 2015. No corrective actions were taken.



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

| Question | Yes | No |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>1a. If YES, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:</p> | | |
| <p>Title 30, Chapter 87, § 7053. Board Responsibilities and Powers.</p> | | |

| Question | Yes | No |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2015, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs? Check one.</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>2a. If YES, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.</p> | | |
| <p>Amount (\$)</p> | <p>4,604,830.00</p> | |



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2015, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | <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"/> |



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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, 2015.

The State of Vermont has and continues to allow expenditures under the 9-1-1 program for Next Generation 9-1-1 services. Vermont’s current statewide NG911 system is provided by FairPoint Communications.

| Question | Total PSAPs Accepting Texts |
|--|---|
| 5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts? | 6 (All PSAPs) |
| Question | Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable |
| 6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2016, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable? | 6 (All PSAPs) |

J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

| Question | Check the appropriate box | | If Yes, Amount Expended (\$) |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | |
| 1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, 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, 2015, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or staterun cybersecurity program? | Unknown |

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

K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees



Federal Communications Commission Washington,
D.C. 20554

- 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 Board has a number of numerical standards related to system availability that, in 2015, were monitored by Board staff along with our system providers, Intrado prior to July 29, 2015 and FairPoint Communications after July 29, 2015. In addition, the Board has access to MIS reporting tools that provide information on call volumes, call routing, call answer times, call duration times etc. Board staff perform annual ALI and GIS audits to ensure accuracy. Call-taker performance is measured through a call review process which measures how well call-takers are adhering to established call-handling standards.