SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

ON STATE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF 911 AND ENHANCED 911 FEES AND CHARGES

FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2014

Submitted Pursuant to
Public Law No. 110-283

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Thomas Wheeler, Chairman

December 31, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Heading Paragraph #

I. INTRODUCTION 1
II. KEY FINDINGS 2
III. BACKGROUND 3
IV. DISCUSSION 6
A. Summary of Reporting Methodology 7
B. Overview of State 911 Systems 9
C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanism 14
D. Description of State Authority that Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent 19
E. Description of Uses of State 911 Fees 20
F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected 23
G. Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Use 28
H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees 38
I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures 41
J. Cybersecurity Expenditures 46
K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees 49
L. Public Comments on 2014 Sixth Annual Report 51
V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2015 SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT 54
Appendix A – Information Collection Questionnaire
Appendix B – Summary of State and Other Jurisdiction Responses Regarding 2014 Collections
Appendix C – Overview of Total State and Other Jurisdiction 911 Fees – 2009 - 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman, Federal Communications Commission (Commission),[1] 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)[2] and as prepared by the staff in the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (Bureau).[3] This is the seventh 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, 2014 to December 31, 2014. This report also reflects the 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.

II. KEY FINDINGS

2. Forty-eight states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, the Navajo Nation, and three Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) offices responded to this year's data request. The following is a compilation of key findings based on the responses:

---

[1] *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").

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

[3] *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).

- In calendar year 2014, states and other reporting jurisdictions collected 911/E911 fees or charges totaling $2,527,625,360.85.

- Fees and charges collected on a per-state basis ranged from a low of $8,159,730.03 by Delaware to a high of $213,983,628 by Illinois.

- Fourteen states reported collecting 911/E911 fees at the state level, nine reported collecting fees at the local level, and twenty-four states collected fees at both the state and local level.[4]

- Eight states reported diverting or transferring 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911.

    - Five states (California, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Virginia, and West Virginia) used a portion of their 911/E911 funds to support other public safety or emergency response-related programs.

    - Three states (Illinois, New York, and Rhode Island) diverted a portion of their 911/E911 funds for either non-public safety, or unspecified, uses.

    - The total amount of 911/E911 funds diverted by all reporting jurisdictions in calendar year 2014 was $223,420,909.00 or approximately 8.8 percent of total 911/E911 fees collected.

- Twenty-eight states and the District of Columbia reported spending 911/E911 funds on Next Generation 911 (NG911) programs in calendar year 2014. The total amount of reported NG911 expenditures from 911/E911 fees was $227,574,995.97, or approximately nine percent of total 911/E911 fees collected. This indicates a higher level of expenditure on NG911 programs in 2014 than in 2013, but only nine states reported NG911 expenditures in excess of $5 million.

- While almost every state collects 911 fees from in-state subscribers, 23 states 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, only three states conducted audits in 2014.

- On the topic of cybersecurity preparedness for Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), thirty eight states indicated that they spent no 911 funds in 2014 on 911–related cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2014. Five states and the Navajo Nation 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

[4] The three reporting BIA regional offices (Eastern, Rocky Mountain, and Western) indicated that they do not collect 911/E911 fees.

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 June 2015, the Bureau sent questionnaires to the Governor of each state and territory, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, and the BIA Regional Directors requesting information on 911 fee collection and expenditure for calendar year 2014.[5] The Bureau received responsive information from 48 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the Navajo Nation.[6] The Bureau did not receive responses from Louisiana, Missouri, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and United States Virgin Islands. Additionally, the Bureau received responses from three of twelve regional BIA offices regarding the status of 911/E911 funding for Indian tribes in their regions.

5. This year's expanded data collection incorporated recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in its April 2013 report on state collection and use of 911 funds.[7] The GAO Report recommended that the Commission improve its reporting on state use of collected funds by "using close-ended questions when possible, developing written internal guidance for analyzing data, and fully describing the methodology for its report."[8] In response to the GAO's recommendations, the Bureau took a number of steps to improve the collection and analysis of data in its annual reports. Consistent with GAO's recommendation, 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,[9] and the results of the expanded collection are reported for the first time in this report.

---

[5] *See* Appendix A - Annual Collection of Information Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions (FCC Questionnaire).

[6] Copies of reports from all responding jurisdictions are available on the FCC web site at https://www.fcc.gov/fcc.gov/general/7th-annual-911-fee-report-state-filings. Of the 48 responding states, Nevada and Wyoming did not provide direct responses. Wyoming stated that it did not collect any information at the state level and referred the Bureau to individual counties for responses. Similarly, Nevada noted it did not collect the information at the state level but coordinated a response by select Nevada counties. Two states – New York and Rhode Island – responded to the data request but did not use the supplied questionnaire, instead providing their own response format.

[7] 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).

[8] *Id*. at 29.

[9] *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).

IV. DISCUSSION

6. Based upon the information gathered from the responding states and territories, this Report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in calendar year 2014, how much they collected, and how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds.[10] 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

7. 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*."[11] 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.*"[12]

8. 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. Because each State makes its own determination of how 911/E911 fee revenues are to be spent, 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 state's 911 funding statute, and also requests information on what uses are deemed permissible under the statute and how such uses support 911 or E911 service. Although some state statutes expressly authorize the diversion or transfer of some part of collected 911/E911 fees, the Bureau considers such diversions or transfers to be reportable under the NET911 Act as expenditures that are not "in support of 9-1-1 and enhanced 9-1-1 services, or enhancements of such services," within the meaning of the Act. The report on 911/E911 fee diversion in Section G below is consistent with this interpretation.

B. Overview of State 911 Systems

9. To provide a broader context for the information provided on collection and use of 911 fees, this year's data collection for the first time sought information about the total number of Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) that receive funding derived from the collection of 911 fees, the

[10] We note that some states collect and distribute fees over the course of a fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year covered by our reports.

[11] NET 911 Act at §6(f)(1).

[12] *Id.* at §6(f)(2). Emphasis added.

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.[13]

10. **Number and Type of PSAPs**. The Bureau requested that states "provide the total number of active [Primary and Secondary PSAPs][14] in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2014." Table 1 shows that 45 states and the District of Columbia responded to this request, reporting a total of 4,439 Primary PSAPs and 789 Secondary PSAPs, for a total of 5,228 PSAPs dependent on funding derived from the collection of 911 fees.[15] 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. American Samoa reports that there is a single primary PSAP in the territory housed in the Department of Public Safety, but that it is not funded through the collection of 911 fees.[16] The Navajo Nation Department of Public Safety indicates that it has no PSAPs dependent on funding from 911 fees but maintains numerous facilities providing emergency response.[17] Ohio states that it is "currently undergoing consolidation activity and defining PSAPs related to funding provided for in the Ohio Revised Code [and] currently, wireless 9-1-1 is eligible for state funding, but PSAPs that only answer wireline 9-1-1 calls and only accept transferred wireless calls are not associated with the state funding formula."[18] Other states, such as New Jersey and Wisconsin, indicate that information regarding PSAP funding is not communicated to the state office.

Table 1 - Number and Types of PSAPS of Reporting Jurisdictions

State	Number of PSAPs				
	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs	Unknown	No Response
AL	118	0	118		
AK	24	12	36		
AR	102	25	127		
AZ	78	11	89		
CA	400	51	451		
CO	83	6	89		
CT	104	1	105		
DE	8	1	9		

[13] FCC Questionnaire at 2-3.

[14] 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 .

[15] New York, Oklahoma, and Wyoming did not respond to this portion of the questionnaire.

[16] American Samoa Response at 3. The PSAP is funded under the Department of Public Safety annual operations budget.

[17] *See* Navajo Nation Telecommunications Regulatory Commission, Direct Emergency Numbers, listing seven emergency districts and various Police, Fire and EMS facilities, at http://www.nntrc.org/911-numbers.aspx.

[18] Ohio Response at 2.

State	Number of PSAPs				
	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs	Unknown	No Response
FL	158	55	213		
GA	135	23	158		
HI	5	3	8		
IA	115	0	115		
ID	46	2	48		
IL	272	24	296		
IN	91	44	135		
KS	117	0	117		
KY	115	40	155		
MA	249	94	343		
MD	24	52	76		
ME	26	0	26		
MI	148	0	148		
MN	99	5	104		
MS	150	225	375		
MT	53	0	53		
NC	121	6	127		
ND	22	0	22		
NE	71	0	71		
NH	2	0	2		
NJ	0	0	0	X	
NM	47	3	50		
NV	11	1	12		
NY			0		X
OH	322		322		
OK					X
OR	43	14	57		
PA	69		69		
RI	1		1		
SC	75		75		
SD	29		29		
TN	132	8	140		
TX	505	61	566		
UT	32	4	36		
VA	121	10	131		
VT	8		8		
WA	55	8	63		
WI				X	

State	Number of PSAPs				
	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs	Unknown	No Response
WV	51		51		
WY					X
Other Jurisdictions					
AS	1	0	1		
DC	1	0	1		
NN	0	0	0		
Total	**4,439**	**789**	**5,228**	**2**	**3**

11. **Number of Telecommunicators**. Respondents were asked to provide the total number of active telecommunicators[19] in each state or territory that were funded through the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2014. As detailed in Table 2, twenty five states and the District of Columbia responded to this data request, reporting a total of 23,360 full time telecommunicators and 1,911 part-time telecommunicators that are funded through the collection of 911 fees. American Samoa and Navajo Nation report eight and 56 full time telecommunicators, respectively, but they are not funded by 911 fees. Nine states indicated they do not know whether telecommunicators are funded with 911 fees and five states 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	Unknown	Not Funde d	NR
AK	121	6			
AL			X		
AR	1,002	176			
AZ				X	
CA				X	
CO	390	13			
CT	2,800				
DE				X	
FL			X		
GA			X		
HI			X		
IA				X	

[19] 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* NENA Master Glossary at 137.

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Unknown	Not Funde d	NR
ID					X
IL	3,770				
IN			X		
KS				X	
KY	1,250	300			
MA			X		
MD	1,122	74			
ME			X		
MI	1,949	279			
MN	1,310	250			
MS	1,367				
MT			X		
NC				X	
ND	230				
NE	590	96			
NH	74	10			
NJ				X	
NM				X	
NV	257	6			
NY					X
OH	147	40			
OK			X		
OR	668	5			
PA	2,138	347			
RI	40				
SC				X	
SD	205	32			
TN					X
TX	513	13			
UT	382	20			
VA	1,043				
VT	99	39			
WA	1,199	95			
WI					X
WV	622	110			
WY					X

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Unknown	Not Funded	NR
Other Jurisdictions					
AS				X	
DC	72	0			
NN				X	
	23,360	**1,911**	**9**	**11**	**5**

12. **Number of 911/E911 Calls**. The questionnaire asked respondents, for the annual period ending December 31, 2014, to provide an estimate of the total number of 911 calls the state or jurisdiction received. Thirty-eight states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and Navajo Nation reported a cumulative total of 196,150,195 calls of all types during 2014. Of this total, 135,788,462 calls came from wireless phones, representing approximately 69 percent of the total reported call volume. Table 3 provides specific information provided by each state or other jurisdiction for each service type. Ten states did not respond to the question.

Table 3 – Total 911 Calls by Service Type

	Type of Service						
State	**Wireline**	**Wireless**	**VoIP**	**Other**	**Total**	**No Response**	**Qualifier**
AK	26,538	209,846			236,384		
AL						X	"These statistics are maintained at the local emergency communications districts and are not readily available to the state office. However, Alabama completed their wireless aggregation project in December of 2014, which allows for all wireless calls in the state to be routed through the Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN), so we will be able to provide wireless statistics for the

	Type of Service						
State	**Wireline**	**Wireless**	**VoIP**	**Other**	**Total**	**No Response**	**Qualifier**
							state for calendar year 2015."
AR	279,348	2,352,284		54	2,631,686		"Data does not include data for the following counties/PSAPs that have not yet submitted the 2015 PSAP Certification: Chicot, Cross, Dallas, Lafayette, Lincoln, Miller County-SO, Ouachita, & Prairie"
AZ	1,037,636	3,743,175			4,780,811		"Calls transferred to Secondary PSAPs for 2014-1,258,883"
CA	5,982,152	21,117,013	878,810	23,834	28,001,809		
CO	489,201	5,639,954	166,712		6,295,867		
CT	362,472	1,665,633	124,189		2,152,294		
DE						X	
FL	2,713,611	16,927,140	442,533	96,964	20,180,248		
GA						X	
HI	324,500	1,015,100	37,000	65,500	1,442,100		
IA		795,125			795,125		"Nomadic VoIP is counted but not separated with wireless counts. Static VoIP is counted with wireline counts."

	Type of Service						
State	**Wireline**	**Wireless**	**VoIP**	**Other**	**Total**	**No Response**	**Qualifier**
ID						X	"Unknown. Note: 34 of 46 PSAPs Responded and not all PSAPs are tracking or were able to pull the requested data for the state report. 651,938 total number of 911 calls delivered for 33 responding PSAPs. Not all could break out the different types. Consequently, those reported a total number."
IL	6,398,902	5,070,127			11,469,029		
IN	1,800,000	3,399,698	81,866		5,281,564		
KS	902,966	2,104,200	22,271	98,993	3,128,430		
KY	925,000	2,500,000			3,425,000		
MA	893,419	3,040,214			3,933,633		VoIP included in wireline call total
MD	3,863,752	2,609,589		10	6,473,351		VoIP included in wireline call total
ME	184,681	417,648	44,464	107	646,900		
MI	1,444,579	4,159,576	286,004	113	5,890,272		"*not every PSAP reported their call volume numbers"
MN	471,808	2,559,242	102,842	96,400	3,230,292		
MS					3,100,000		[Only provided total calls]
MT						X	
NC	1,738,215	5,087,289	470,147		7,295,651		
ND	69,190	255,386	1,618		326,194		
NE	235,320	779,142			1,014,462		"State does not total VoIP or Other calls"
NH	76,775	353,429	47,936	21,810	499,950		
NJ					7,684,796		
NM	248,461	1,029,007	21,638		1,299,106		NOTE: NM totals it to $1,236,463

	Type of Service						
State	**Wireline**	**Wireless**	**VoIP**	**Other**	**Total**	**No Response**	**Qualifier**
NV	531,779	1,033,097	8,918	112	1,573,906		"Based on information supplied by Counties of Clark, Esmeralda, Eureka, Lincoln, Lyon, and Storey; Las Vegas Combined Communications Center; and City of Elko. Boulder City, Humboldt, and Washoe did not submit call totals."
NY						X	"In New York State, responsibilities for public safety call taking and emergency services dispatching are primarily a local government function. There is no centralized, statewide operation or system used to undertake these functions Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) metrics system information and reporting thereof are the responsibility of each PSAP operator (county, municipal or agency). New York State would not be the source for this data."
OH	939,591	3,862,833	108,931	395,634	5,306,989		Based on information provided by 55 counties.
OK						X	
OR	331,578	1,287,475	87,365	32,015	1,738,433		[NOTE: Filing totals out to 1,736,433]

	Type of Service						
State	**Wireline**	**Wireless**	**VoIP**	**Other**	**Total**	**No Response**	**Qualifier**
PA	2,583,901	6,308,126			8,892,027		"Wireline and VoIP calls are grouped together for PSAP reporting purposes in PA"
RI					511,810		RI reports that in addition to receiving 511,810 incoming 911 calls, it transferred 761,345 calls RI reports that approximately 75% of its incoming 911 calls are wireless
SC		3,862,852			3,862,852		SC only has information on wireless calls; local jurisdictions administer wireline calls
SD					319,450		"Note – this information is currently not collected from the PSAPs because every PSAP has a different CPE and some of their systems do not allow them to pull call counts by service type. However in calendar year 2015 the state is deploying a statewide hosted CPE. Once the CPE is deployed in all the PSAPs the state will have access to all of the call data. This is expected to take until March of 2017. The state will have call data on at least some of the PSAPs in 2015, 2016 and 2017. Calendar year 2018 will be the first full

	Type of Service						
State	**Wireline**	**Wireless**	**VoIP**	**Other**	**Total**	**No Response**	**Qualifier**
							year with all PSAPs on the hosted CPE and therefore the call counts will be available by service type."
TN						X	
TX	3,446,773	22,221,858	450,877	111,911	26,231,419		
UT	166,368	802,428	29,554	18,846	1,017,196		
VA	1,164,251	3,227,961			4,392,212		
VT	46,611	146,115	16,756	6,266	215,748		
WA	983,445	4,601,398	350,253	0	5,935,096		
WI						X	"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

	Type of Service						
State	**Wireline**	**Wireless**	**VoIP**	**Other**	**Total**	**No Response**	**Qualifier**
							of the 911 service provided."
WV					2,371,398		All PSAP's keep record of total calls, but all do not have the ability to keep track of Type of Service (i.e. Wireline, Wireless, VoIP, and Other). The total call number is correct and percentages have been used to reflect a breakdown of the Type of Service calls percentage that is reflected by PSAP's that can track type of calls. WV Provides percentage breakdown: Wireline - 39% Wireless - 60% VoIP - .9% Other - .1%
WY						X	
Other Jurisdictions							
AS	25,620	14,281			39,901		
DC	438,682	900,371	38,000		1,377,053		
NN	402,413	689,850	57,488		1,149,751		
Total	**41,529,538**	**135,788,462**	**3,876,172**	**968,569**	**196,150,195**	**10**	

13. **Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service in Jurisdiction**. The questionnaire asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911 service during the annual period ending December 31, 2014, regardless of whether such costs are supported by 911 fees or other funding sources. As detailed in Table 4, thirty-nine states, the District of Columbia, and the Navajo Nation provided cost estimates totaling $3,123,229,092.06. Ten 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. For example, Colorado stated that its estimate was "extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities" and that it "believe[s] 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."[20] Delaware reported that the state uses collected fees to supply equipment to 911 centers, but that local 911 authorities are responsible for funding personnel and other costs.[21] New Jersey stated that its estimate of $12.5 million in costs reflects the funding of "statewide enhanced 9-1-1 infrastructure" but that "operational, equipment and personnel costs are the responsibility of the PSAP and not reported to the State 9-1-1 Office."[22] Virginia stated that "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 service," and that its cost estimate of $115 million is therefore incomplete.[23]

Table 4 – Cost to Provide 911 Service

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, for Why Estimation Could not be Provided
AK	$13,969,230.81	
AL	$99,558,438.00	
AR	$45,222,240.75	"Data does not include data for the following counties/PSAPs that have not yet submitted the 2015 PSAP Certification: Chicot, Cross, Dallas, Lafayette, Lincoln, Miller County-SO, Ouachita, & Prairie."
AZ	$12,105,682.44	
CA	$84,584,000.00	
CO	$77,835,212.00	"Extrapolated based on partial survey responses from 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."
CT	$37,578,747.00	
DE	$100,000,000.00	"The State of Delaware E911 Board uses the 911 funds to supply equipment to the 911 centers. Each center is managed by the local agency. The agency is responsible for employees and overhead to maintain the center."
FL	$215,503,763.00	

[20] Colorado Response at 2-3.

[21] Delaware Response at 3.

[22] New Jersey Response at 3.

[23] Virginia Response at 3.

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, for Why Estimation Could not be Provided
GA	No Response	"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	No Response	"Unable to determine at this time. The Enhanced 911 Board does not have the authority to request financial information from the PSAPs at this time."
IA	$144,628,785.00	
ID	No Response	"Unknown at aggregated state level. 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 34 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."
IL	$263,503,493.00	
IN	$80,500,000.00	"This is expenditures from 911 funds only. This does not include expenditures that local government pays for from other funds."
KS	$64,299,980.00	"The amount provided in question 3 above contains estimates of personnel costs only for some PSAPs who did not provide this data upon request. The estimated amounts contained within the total are low, so actual cost of 911 is higher than shown."
KY	$105,000,000.00	"Centralized data collection is new to the CMRS Board so data collection in [sic] 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' which we estimate to be $8 million in state general fund dollars."

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, for Why Estimation Could not be Provided
MA	$29,907,980.00	"The estimated amount (based upon the amount contracted for Fiscal Year 2015) to provide E911 service is: $29,907,980. This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the legacy E911 service provider contract, 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."
MD	$93,091,148.75	"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."
ME	$10,253,498.00	"State share only. The State of Maine provides for a statewide 911 system. The cost above is limited to the services we provide. We do not collect information on the local costs of PSAPs not funded through the 911 surcharge."
MI	$207,167,178.44	"The amount provided to question 3 above is the total of the following: 1) Revenue reported by the PSAPs for 911 purposes. This includes the following: funding resources of $198,505,685.96 for PSAPs approximately included: • State 911 Fee Distribution Received: $22,986,774.39 • Local 911 Fee Received: $60,606,236.97 • Millage Receipts: $31,958,730.33 • General Fund Monies: $72,910,563.50 • Other Receipts: $10,043,380.77 2) The total reported* technical costs for network collections by landline telephone companies for 911 network and delivery costs in 2014 was $7,295,111.00 3) $1,366,381.48 for calendar year 2014 for the cost of wireless 911 delivery was reimbursed to landline service providers (AT&T, Frontier, and PFN) under the Michigan Public Service Commission's Docket U-14000. * Crawford, Delta, and Manistee Counties did not report."
MN	$27,638,145.54	This includes NG911 specific expenditures, Legacy 911 expenditures, and the allocation provided to the PSAPs towards their eligible use expenses.

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service		Explanation, if any, for Why Estimation Could not be Provided
MS	$31,280,356.96		
MT	No Response		"The required data and information required to provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 services in the state, for the annual period ending December 31, 2014 is not available."
NC	$56,047,904.00		
ND	$16,029,376.00		
NE	No Response		"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	$13,915,755.00		
NJ	$12,500,000.00		"The State of New Jersey funds the statewide enhanced 9-1-1 infrastructure at an annual cost of approximately $12.5M, the operational, equipment and personnel costs are the responsibility of the PSAP and not reported to the State 9-1-1 Office."
NM	$7,133,196.00		
NV	Boulder City	$900,000	The State of Nevada did not provide a total estimated. Of counties that responded to the questionnaire overall, the counties of Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, and Storey did not respond to this question.
	Clark County	$24,815,354	
	Las Vegas Combined Communications Center	$10,000,000	
	Lincoln County	$350,000	
	Lyon County	$1,141,755.51	
	Washoe County	$2,366,157	
	Total	**$40,932,906.51**	
NY	No Response		

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, for Why Estimation Could not be Provided
OH	$125,944.026.54	Total costs based on reports from 52 of 56 reporting counties.
OK	No Response	“Oklahoma has no centralized point for fee collection or remission and no authority to require such reporting of such fees or charges for the annual period ending December 31, 2013 [sic]”
OR	$107,378,517.00	"Four PSAPs failed to respond to state survey"
PA	$292,976,998.00	
RI	$5,320,615.00	Amount based on FY 2014 Operating Budget
SC	$62,000,000.00	
SD	$24,024,017.00	
TN	No Response	"Unknown. In 2014, Tennessee had 100 local emergency communications districts and one statewide agency that received 911 fees. Districts may or may not receive contributions from local government entities. Each district has its own budget and controls its own costs."
TX	$239,338,148.32	
UT	$48,000,000.00	"This is the best guess based on the fact that the revenues collected do not cover the total cost of 911 services."
VA	$114,872,453.00	"Unknown. 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 $114,872,453."
VT	$4,604,830.00	
WA	$115,281,000.00	"Based on 115% of statewide total E911 excise taxes collected."

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, for Why Estimation Could not be Provided
WI	No Response	"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	$56,323,470.00	
WY	No Response	
Other Jurisdictions		
AS	No Response	No separate budgeted line item for PSAP service. The service is provided by the Department of Public Safety within its regularly budgeted resources.
DC	$34,878,000.00	
NN	$2,100,000.00	
	$3,123,229,092.06	

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

14. States reported using a variety of methods to collect and distribute 911/E911 fees. Forty five states and the District of Columbia 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.[24] American Samoa and Oklahoma stated that they have not established a funding mechanism. Navajo Nation reports that in July 2014, the Navajo Nation Telecommunications Regulatory Commission adopted a Report and Order establishing the Navajo Nation 9-1-1 Program, which will outline funding mechanisms and set rules and regulations for 9-1-1 service providers that operate on and in behalf of the Navajo Nation within the Navajo Nation jurisdiction.[25]

15. Of those states that have an established funding mechanism, Table 5 identifies those reporting that their state or jurisdiction enlarged or altered their funding mechanism during calendar year 2014. For example, Arizona, California, Florida, Minnesota, North Dakota, Oregon, Vermont

[24] Two states – Nevada and Wyoming – did not respond to the question. Nevertheless, both states enable local funding mechanisms to support 911 services.

[25] Of note, the NNTRC Order directs the Navajo Nation 9-1-1 Program to pursue NG911 as the solution for the Navajo Nation and to avoid implementing a legacy 911 system. For further information about the NNTRC Order, *see* Navajo Nation Telecommunications Regulatory Commission at http://www.nntrc.org/12-001-report-and-order.aspx.

reported that they began collecting 911 fees on prepaid wireless service.[26] Alabama amended its state code to increase the monthly statewide 911 service charge from $1.60 per month to $1.75 per month effective August 1, 2014.[27]

Table 5 – States That Amended or Enlarged 911 Funding Mechanism

State	Description
Alabama	"Pursuant to § 11-98-5 Ala. Code, 1975, as amended, the Alabama 9-1-1 Board voted to increase the monthly statewide 9-1-1 service charge from $1.60 per month to $1.75 per month effective August 1, 2014. §11-98-5 (c) (1) states, "The 911 Board, from time to time but in no event more than once every fiscal year, shall increase or decrease the rate of the statewide 911 charge by an amount reasonably calculated to produce the baseline 911 revenues, plus any additional revenues necessary to meet the requirements of subdivision (6) of subsection (b) of Section 11-98-5.2."
Arizona	"Effective January 1, 2014, A.R.S. § 42-5402, prepaid wireless telecommunications retailers rather than service providers will be liable for remitting the E91 I excise tax on prepaid wireless telecommunications service. Laws 2012, Chapter 198 (HB2094). Laws 2012, Chapter 198 (HB2094) established a prepaid wireless telecommunications E91 I excise tax. The tax is 0.80% of the gross proceeds of sales or gross income from the retail sale of prepaid wireless telecommunications services. Retailers are authorized to retain 3% of the cost of the tax that they collect from their customers."
California	"In 2014 the California enacted the Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Surcharge Collection Act to the California Revenue and Taxation Code sections 42010-42018 et seq. The code established a prepaid MTS surcharge that shall be imposed on each prepaid consumer and shall be collected by a seller from each prepaid consumer at the time of each retail transaction in this state. The prepaid MTS surcharge shall be imposed as a percentage of the sales price of each retail transaction that occurs in this state. Collection of fees shall begin January 1, 2016."
Colorado	"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."
Florida	"2014 legislation, signed into law, clarified the existing statutes and provided for the collection of the prepaid wireless service E911 fee at 40 cents per retail transaction. Retail transaction collection of prepaid wireless E911 fees began Jan. 1, 2015. The 2014 statutes decreased the fee rate from 50 cents to 40 cents for both non-wireless and wireless categories on Jan. 1, 2015. New E911 fee revenue disbursement allocations percentages were established in the 2014 legislation to begin March 1, 2015."

[26] Arizona Response at 5; California Response at 4; Florida Response at 4; Minnesota Response at 4; North Dakota Response at 4; Oregon Response at 4; and Vermont Response at 4.

[27] Alabama Response at 4.

State	Description
Indiana	"During the 2014 session of the Indiana General Assembly, additional; language was added to IC 36-8-16.6 and IC 38-8-16.7 to clarify that communications service providers who held their ETC from the Indiana Regulatory Commission for purposes of receiving reimbursement from the Universal Service Administration as part of the Life Line program were not exempt from paying the 911 fee in Indiana."
Kansas	"SB284 was passed during the 2014 session of the Kansas Legislature. This bill amended the Kansas 911 Act in several areas. The only change in regard to funding was an increase in expenditure authority for administrative and other costs of the Council from 1.5% to 2.5% of total receipts."
Kentucky	"Kenton, Campbell, and Garrard Counties all amended their local funding mechanism within the last year, each moving away from the traditional landline fee collection method and changing to alternatives such as fee collection on utility bills or property bills. The issue of legality of these collection methods is before the Kentucky State Supreme Court at this time."
Minnesota	"Prepaid Wireless retail point of sale went into effect January 1, 2014. Minn. Stat. §403.16."
North Carolina	"Yes, funding for qualified secondary PSAPs through the associated Primary PSAP was instituted in January 2014."
North Dakota	"Chapter 57-40.6 of the North Dakota Century Code was amended during the 63rd Legislative Assembly (2013-2014) to include a funding mechanism for fee collection of pre-paid wireless service at the "point of sale" (57-40.6-14). This legislation became effective January 1, 2014."
Oregon	"In the 2014 Legislative Session, the Emergency Communications Tax (9-1-1 Tax) was adjusted to include Prepaid Wireless and VOIP, with collection to commence January 1, 2015. Also the "sunset" of the tax was extended to January 1, 2022."
Vermont	"In 2014, pre-paid wireless providers were added to the contribution base."

16. The questionnaire further 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), by local jurisdictions, or by a combination of the two. As described in Table 6 below, twenty-five states report that they collect all 911 fees on a statewide basis, with the collected funds administered by the state.[28]

Table 6 – Authority to Collect 911/E911 Fees

Type of Collection	Number of States
State Collection	25
Local Authority	5
Hybrid	18
No Response	3

[28] This category includes Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Navajo Nation, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Virginia.

17. Five states - Alaska, Georgia, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Wyoming - reported that 911 fee collection occurs exclusively at the local level, although in some cases such local collection is authorized by state statute. Georgia states that "landline and post-paid wireless 9-1-1 fees are remitted directly to local governments by the service providers.[29] Similarly, Mississippi states that "all funds collected by service providers are awarded directly to the counties."[30] Wyoming states that "under Wyoming State Statutes for the Emergency Telephone Service Act, Wyoming does not assign oversight responsibility to a state-level agency for 911 services."[31]

18. This year, eighteen states reported using a hybrid approach to 911 fee collection, in which state and local governing bodies share authority over fee collection from customers.[32] For example, Iowa reports that "per Iowa Code 34A.7A, the wireless and prepaid surcharge is remitted to the State and distributed to the County 911 Service Boards on a quarterly basis and the wireline surcharge is remitted directly from the local telecoms to the County Service Boards.[33]" North Dakota reports that "the fees from landline, VoIP, and wireless monthly contracts are imposed by local jurisdictions and remitted by the phone companies directly to those jurisdictions (53 counties and 1 city) [and] the prepaid fee revenue is centrally collected by the State Tax Department and remitted to a joint powers entity consisting of all local 911 jurisdictions for distribution or dedication to statewide 9-1-1 network costs."[34] Washington states that "State and County fees are collected by the carriers and are submitted to the Department of Revenue who then deposits them into the state and respective counties' enhanced 911 accounts."[35] Further, the use of the fees is controlled by two mechanisms, "the first is the limitations imposed by RCW 82.14B.020 and RCW 82.14B.050 that together permit a fairly broad utilization of the county tax [and] the second limiting factor is the requirement associated with counties receiving assistance from the State 911 Program."[36]

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

19. In this year's questionnaire, 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, fourteen states indicate that a state entity has authority to approve expenditure of 911 fees. Nine states describe authority resting exclusively with local entities. The majority of responding states indicate the authority is shared between state and local authorities. Wisconsin noted that with respect to wireline-based 911 fees, local exchange carriers keep whatever monies they have collected from subscribers and use those funds to support provision of 911 service.[37] The Bureau also sought

---

[29] Georgia Response at 4.

[30] Mississippi Response at 4.

[31] Wyoming Response at 1.

[32] This category includes Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and West Virginia.

[33] Iowa Response at 4.

[34] North Dakota Response at 4.

[35] Washington Response at 4.

[36] *Id*.

[37] Wisconsin Response at 5.

information on whether states have established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected funds may be used. As also 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 responded that they have a mechanism mandating how 911 fees may be spent, whereas eight states indicated there was no such mechanism.[38]

Table 7 – State Authority for Approval of 911 Fee Expenditures

State	State and Local Entities Having Authority to Approve Expenditure of Collected 911 Fees			State Funding Mechanism Mandating How 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
MA	X			Yes
MD			X	Yes
ME	X			Yes
MI			X	Yes
MN	X			Yes

[38] Nevada and Wyoming did not respond to this question. However, their filings otherwise indicate that local authorities maintain control over how 911 fees are spent.

State	State and Local Entities Having Authority to Approve Expenditure of Collected 911 Fees			State Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can be Used
	State	Local	Both	
MS		X		No
MT			X	Yes
NC	X			Yes
ND		X		Yes
NE			X	Yes
NH	X			No
NJ	X			Yes
NM	X			Yes
NV	No Response			
NY			X	Yes
OH			X	Yes
OK		X		Yes
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. Local exchange carriers bill and keep.			No
WV			X	Yes
WY		X		No Response
Other Jurisdictions				
AS	911 Fees not collected			No
DC			X	Yes

State	State and Local Entities Having Authority to Approve Expenditure of Collected 911 Fees			State Funding Mechanism Mandating How Funds Can be Used	
	State	**Local**	**Both**		
NN	No present authority to collect 911 fees			No	
Totals	**State**	**Local**	**Both**	**Yes**	**No**
	14	**9**	**24**	**41**	**8**

E. Description of Uses of State 911 Fees

20. 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 provided a description as requested and five did not respond.[39] California responded that the State provides funding for recognized PSAPS to pay refunds; to pay the State Board of Equalization for the cost of administration of the program; to pay the Office of Emergency Services for its costs in administration of the "911" emergency telephone number system; and "to pay bills submitted to the Office of Emergency Services by service suppliers or communications equipment companies for the installation of, and ongoing expenses for, the following communications services supplied to local agencies in connection with the "911" emergency phone number system including: network costs, Customer Premise Equipment (CPE) Costs; database costs (e.g., ALI databases); Training costs for PSAPs; and review and analysis of new technology."[40] Pennsylvania states that, by statute, "operation of Primary PSAPs in Pennsylvania is a responsibility of the counties and cities (if they so choose) within the commonwealth [and] all wireless, wireline, and VoIP funding is . . . directed to the counties and cities responsible for the provision of E911 service, and is to be used for the exclusive direct provision of E911 services as outlined in statutory language."[41]

21. 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. State responses to this data request are compiled in Table 8. Most responding states indicated that 911 funds could be used to cover operating expenses for CPE (43 states), CAD (35 states), and buildings and facilities (25 states). With respect to personnel costs, 28 states reported applying 911 funds to salaries and 40 states reported applying funds to training. Most states also applied 911 funds to administrative costs, with 39 covering program administration and 37 applying funds to travel expenses. In general, fewer states reported applying 911 fees to dispatch-related costs. Seventeen states reported using 911 fees to reimburse other law enforcement entities providing dispatch

[39] Non-responding states for this question were Delaware, Illinois, Mississippi, Nevada, and Wyoming.

[40] California Response at 7.

[41] Pennsylvania Response at 8.

service, while 24 states reported that they used 911 funds to lease, purchase or otherwise maintain radio dispatch networks.

Table 8 – Allowed Uses of Collected Fees

	Operating Costs [Lease, Maintenance, Purchase of Hardware and Software]			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
State	**CPE**	**CAD**	**Building and Facilities**	**Salaries**	**Training**	**Programs**	**Travel**	**Reimburse Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch**	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks**
AK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
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	No	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
MA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MD	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
ME	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

	Operating Costs [Lease, Maintenance, Purchase of Hardware and Software]			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
State	**CPE**	**CAD**	**Building and Facilities**	**Salaries**	**Training**	**Programs**	**Travel**	**Reimburse Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch**	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks**
MI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MN	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
MS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
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	Yes
NJ	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
NM	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NV	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
NY	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
OH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
OK	Yes	Yes	No	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
PA	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
RI	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
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	No	Yes	Yes
VA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Operating Costs [Lease, Maintenance, Purchase of Hardware and Software]			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
State	**CPE**	**CAD**	**Building and Facilities**	**Salaries**	**Training**	**Programs**	**Travel**	**Reimburse Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch**	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks**
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	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Other Jurisdictions									
AS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
DC	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
NN	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

22. The Bureau requested information related to the use of 911 funds for grant programs. Twenty states report that they paid for grants through the use of collected 911 fees, and twenty-four said they did not.[42] Table 9 provides a description of state grant programs.

Table 9 – State Grants or Grant Programs

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
AL	"While funds were set aside from the state office's administrative 1% for grants, no grants were actually paid in 2014. Alabama is currently in its inaugural grant cycle during which those FY14 funds are available and plans to have another cycle later in the 2015 calendar year during which FY15 funds will be made available."

[42] Mississippi, Nevada, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Wyoming, and American Samoa did not respond to this question.

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
CT	"Transition Grants for the purpose of consolidating emergency telecommunications $112,000 Capital Expense Grants for reimbursements for expenses related to information services, durable goods, architectural services, building materials, restoration services and labor needed to accommodate new equipment. $270,000."
FL	"The E911 Board awarded a total of $5,089,605 to 34 counties in cost reimbursement grants during fiscal year 2013-14. Maintaining enhanced 911, E911 Phase II, and funding of several NG-911 projects were the direct result of the grant programs. The E911 board disbursed a total of $1,812,374 to 30 rural counties in fiscal year 2013-14, in response to submitted grant applications. These grants provide the funds necessary for E911 deployment and maintenance. Annualized State and Rural County grant expenditures were calculated at $12,294,267"
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. 7A. From January 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014, $50,000 per PSAP was available to local service boards through the grant. An equal amount of local match was required. Starting July 1, 2014-December 31, 2014, $100,000 was available per PSAP to local county service boards and no match was required. For the entire year, approval of the grant money was made by the E911 Program Manager and the E911 Communications Council for PSAP improvements."
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 IECC. Thirty-eight Idaho counties have begun assessing the enhanced fee."
IN	"There were none in 2014"

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
KS	"The [911 Coordinating] Council has used the grant funds, which are derived from the 1.06% 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 will also be utilized to pay nonrecurring costs for the statewide ESInet and call handling system and for recurring costs for the ESInet."
KY	Kentucky awarded 42 grants totaling $3,656,300.88 to various city, county, court, and university entities, for a range of projects including radio systems, CAD, recorder, host/remote phone systems.
MA	"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. 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). 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). 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). 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 www.mass.gov/e911."
MD	"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."

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
MN	"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: Subd. 2. Distribution of money. (a) After payment of the costs of the commissioner to administer the program, the commissioner shall distribute the money collected under this section as follows: (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 (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. (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. (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. (d) For the purposes of this subdivision, "existing city system" means a city 911 system that provides at least basic 911 service and that was implemented on or before April 1, 1993. In CY2014 a total of $13,664,000 in funding was allocated to MN PSAPs using the funding mechanism described above."

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
NC	"Rockingham County: PSAP Consolidation Rockingham Sheriff, Eden Police, Reidsville Police, Madison PD, Mayodan Police, Stoneville Police, Rockingham Fire, Rockingham EMS, Rockingham Co Rescue Squad Brunswick County: PSAP Consolidation Brunswick and Oak Island Lenoir County: PSAP Consolidation Lenoir Co and Jones Co for all law enforcement, EMS and fire depts within each county Scotland County: PSAP Consolidation Scotland Co EMS and Laurinburg PD Wilson County: 911 Equipment Enhancement/Replacement Program Anson County: 911 Equipment Enhancement/Replacement Program Bladen County: Backup Center Henderson County: PSAP Relocation Hertford County: PSAP Consolidation Hertford Co, Murfreesboro PD & Ahoskie PD Swain County: 911 Equipment Enhancement/Replacement Program E-CATS : Emergency Call Tracking System Ortho Project Image 13: Image 13 Eastern Piedmont 25 Counties (Orthoimagery Mapping) Ortho Project Image 14: Image 14 Northern Piedmont 26 Counties (Orthoimagery Mapping) Ortho Project Image 15: Image 15 Southern Piedmont 24 Counties (Orthoimagery Mapping)"
NE	"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. http://psc.nebraska.gov/orders/ntips/911-019.PI-118.14.pd"
NM	"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."
SD	"The state offered a grant program in 2014 with the goal of the program to be: provide financial assistance to PSAPs that need help in funding non-recurring costs necessary to achieve or maintain compliance with the standards set out in Administrative Rules of South Dakota ("ARSD") sections 50:02:04:02 (General operational standards), 50:02:04:03 (Call taking standards), 50:02:04:04 (Communication with field units), 50:02:04:05 (Facilities and equipment) and 50:02:04:06 (Technical standards). The maximum amount of any single grant award is $50,000. The board granted $50,000 to the Winner Police Department PSAP during the 2014 calendar year and the PSAP provided a 50% match."

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
TN	"The [Tennessee Emergency Communications Board (TECB)] offers [Emergency Communications Districts (ECDs)] non-recurring (one-time) funding and reimbursements for the purchase of essential equipment and other items up to the following amounts: • $50,000 for Geographic Information System ("GIS") Mapping Systems • $40,000 for Controllers • $450,000 for Essential Equipment • $5,000 for Master Clocks • $150,000 to each ECD that Consolidates (to a maximum of 3 ECDs) • $1,000 to Train Dispatcher Trainers • $100,000 to Cover Uninsured Catastrophic Event Losses In addition, the TECB has made $25 million available to ECDs for CPE equipment used to connect them to the IP platform the state is deploying to modernize Tennessee's 911 infrastructure (Next Generation 911 Project). The funding plan provides each ECD with a base amount of $120,000 plus an additional amount determined by the district's population."
TX	"The state 9-1-1 program administered by [Commission on State Emergency Communications (CSEC)] provides grants of legislatively appropriated 9-1-1 and equalization surcharge funds to the 23 [Regional Planning Commissions (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 [University of Texas Medical Branch – Galveston (UTMB-G)] and the Department of State Health Services to fund emergency medical dispatch, and county and regional emergency medical services and trauma care, respectively."
UT	"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)."

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
VA	"The PSAP Grant Program is a multi-million dollar grant program administered by the Virginia E-911 Services Board. The primary purpose of this program is to financially assist Virginia primary PSAPs with the purchase of equipment and services that support Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG-91-1) and Enhanced (E)-911. Any Virginia primary PSAP that supports wireless E-911 is eligible to apply for and receive these funds either as an individual applicant or as part of a shared services project."
WA	"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, and maintenance and training funds."

F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected

23. In order to provide an overview of the sources of 911 fees, the questionnaire 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 10 provides an overview of the number of states and localities that levy a fee on each service type.

Table 10 – Summary of State and Local Authorities That Levy 911 Fees

Service Type	State	Local	Both	No Response or No Fee
Wireline	10	23	19	5
Wireless	15	35	8	3
Prepaid	7	27	3	3
VoIP	12	24	14	4
Other	1	5	1	43

24. Table 11 details the fees that each reporting state and jurisdiction levied on wireline, wireless, prepaid, VoIP and other services during calendar year 2014.

Table 11 – State Description of Service Type and Associated Fees

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
AK	Wireline	$2.00		X	
	Wireless	$2.00		X	
	Prepaid	NA			
	VoIP	NA			
	Other	NR			
AL	Wireline	$1.60 (1/1/14 - 7/31/14) $1.75 (8/1/14 - Present)	X		
	Wireless	$1.60 (1/1/14 - 7/31/14) $1.75 (8/1/14 - Present)	X		
	Prepaid	$1.60 (1/1/14 - 7/31/14) $1.75 (8/1/14 - Present)	X		
	VoIP	$1.60 (1/1/14 - 7/31/14) $1.75 (8/1/14 - Present)	X		
	Other	$1.60 (1/1/14 - 7/31/14) $1.75 (8/1/14 - Present)	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		

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	Prepaid	$0.65 (per transaction at point of sale)	X		
	VoIP	$0.65	X		
	Other	NR			
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		
	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 VoIP service account	X		
	Other	None			
CA	Wireline	$0.75 of 1%	X		
	Wireless	$0.75 of 1%	X		
	Prepaid	None			
	VoIP	$0.75 of 1%	X		
	Other	NA			
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	NR			
CT	Wireline	NR			

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	Wireless	NR			
	Prepaid	NR			
	VoIP	NR			
	Other	NR			
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		
	Other	NR			
FL	Wireline	$0.50 per month per each service identifier. The fee applies uniformly and is imposed throughout the state, except for three counties that, before July 1, 2007, had adopted an ordinance or resolution establishing a fee less than $0.50 per month per access line.	X		
	Wireless	$0.50 per month per each service identifier	X		
	Prepaid	$0.50 per month per each service identifier	X		
	VoIP	$0.50 per month per each service identifier	X		
	Other				
GA	Wireline	$1.50 per month		X	
	Wireless	$1.00 per month		X	
	Prepaid	$0.75 per transaction		X	

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	VoIP	$1.50 per month		X	
	Other	NR			
HI	Wireline	$0.27 per user per month			Hawaiian Telcom under Bill & Keep
	Wireless	$0.66 per user per month	X		
	Prepaid	None			
	VoIP	$0.66 per user per month			
	Other	None			
IA	Wireline	$1.00		X	
	Wireless	$1.00	X		
	Prepaid	$0.51	X		
	VoIP	$1.00	Nomadic VoIP	Static VoIP	
	Other	NR			
ID	Wireline	$1.00 or $1.25	$0.99 to local, $0.01 to ECC 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	$0.99 to local, $0.01 to ECC Operations If collecting $1.25, $0.99 to local, $0.01 to ECC Operations and $0.25 to Grant Fund		
	Prepaid	2.5% point of sale per transaction	99% to local, 1% to ECC Operations		
	VoIP	$1.00 or $1.25	$0.99 to local, $0.01 to ECC Operations If collecting $1.25, $0.99 to local, $0.01 to ECC Operations and $0.25 to Grant Fund		
	Other	NR			

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
IL	Wireline	Fee ranges from $0.30 to $5.00		X	
	Wireless	$0.73	X		
	Prepaid	Retail 1.5%	X		
	VoIP	Fee ranges from $0.30 to $5.00		X	
	Other	NR			
IN	Wireline	$0.90	X		
	Wireless	$0.90	X		
	Prepaid	$0.50 per transaction	X		
	VoIP	$0.90	X		
	Other	NR			
KS	Wireline	$0.53 per subscriber account		X	
	Wireless	$0.53 per subscriber account		X	
	Prepaid	1.06% of total sale		X	
	VoIP	$0.53 per subscriber account		X	
	Other	$0.53 per subscriber account		X	
KY	Wireline	Varies from county to county, ranges from $0.32 to $4.50		X	
	Wireless	$0.70	X		
	Prepaid	Impose $0.70, but collect $0.30 per sale	X		
	VoIP	Local governments collect the local landline fee on VoIP		X	

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
		services provided by cable companies			
	Other	NA			
MA	Wireline	$0.75 per month for the period ending December 31, 2014	X		
	Wireless	$0.75 per month for the period ending December 31, 2014	X		
	Prepaid	$0.75 per month for the period ending December 31, 2014	X		
	VoIP	$0.75 per month for the period ending December 31, 2014	X		
	Other	NR			
MD	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	$0.60			25 percent to the 9-1-1 Trust Fund, and 75 percent to the county PSAP
	VoIP	$1.00			25 percent to the 9-1-1 Trust Fund, and 75 percent to the county PSAP
	Other				
ME	Wireline	$0.45	X		
	Wireless	$0.45	X		

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	Prepaid	$0.45	X		
	VoIP	$0.45	X		
	Other	NR			
MI	Wireline	$0.19 - state $0.20 - $3.00 - local	X	X	
	Wireless	$0.19 - state $0.20 - $3.00 - local	X	X	
	Prepaid	1.92% point of sale for minutes purchased	X		
	VoIP	$0.19 - state $0.20 - $3.00 - local	X	X	
	Other				
MN	Wireline	$0.78	X		
	Wireless	$0.78	X		
	Prepaid	$0.78	X		
	VoIP	$0.78	X		
	Other	NA			
MS	Wireline	$1.00 residential $2.00 commercial		X	
	Wireless	NR			
	Prepaid	NR			
	VoIP	$1.00		X	
	Other	$0.05	X		
MT	Wireline	$1.00 per month per access on each service subscriber	X		
	Wireless	$1.00 per month per access on each service subscriber	X		
	Prepaid	NR			

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	VoIP	NR			
	Other	NR			
NC	Wireline	$0.60	X		
	Wireless	$0.60	X		
	Prepaid	$0.60	X		
	VoIP	$0.60	X		
	Other	NR			
ND	Wireline	$1.00 - $1.50		X	
	Wireless	$1.00 - $1.50		X	
	Prepaid	2% of gross receipts at point of sale	X		
	VoIP	$1.00 - $1.50		X	
	Other	NR			
NE	Wireline	$1.00/$0.50		X	
	Wireless	$0.45	X		
	Prepaid	$0.01	X		
	VoIP	$1.00/$0.50		X	
	Other	NA			
NH	Wireline	$0.57	X		
	Wireless	$0.57	X		
	Prepaid	No Charge			
	VoIP	$0.57	X		
	Other	NR			
NJ	Wireline	$0.90/month	X		
	Wireless	$0.90/month	X		
	Prepaid	None			

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	VoIP	$0.90/month	X		
	Other	None			
NM	Wireline	$0.51 per line per month	X		
	Wireless	$0.51 per line per month	X		
	Prepaid	None			
	VoIP	None			
	Other	NR			
NV	Wireline	NR			
	Wireless	NR			
	Prepaid	NR			
	VoIP	NR			
	Other	NR			
NY	Wireline	$0.35 - $1.00 per month per access line		X	
	Wireless	State: $1.20 per month per device Local: $0.30 per month per device	X	X	
	Prepaid	None			
	VoIP	$0.35 - $1.00 per month per access line		X	
	Other				
OH	Wireline	NR			
	Wireless	$0.25	X		
	Prepaid	NR			
	VoIP	NR			
	Other	NR			

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
OK	Wireline	0 - 15% of base telephone rate		X	
	Wireless	$0.50		X	
	Prepaid	$0.50		X	
	VoIP	$0.50		X	
	Other	NR			
OR	Wireline	$0.75	X		
	Wireless	$0.75	X		
	Prepaid	$0.75	X		
	VoIP	$0.75	X		
	Other	NA			
PA	Wireline	$1.00 - $1.50		X	
	Wireless	$1.00	X		
	Prepaid	$1.00	X		
	VoIP	$1.00	X	X	
	Other	NR			
RI	Wireline	$1.00 per line per month	X		
	Wireless	$1.26 per month per device	X		
	Prepaid	2.5% per retail transaction	X		
	VoIP	NR			
	Other	NR			
SC	Wireline	$0.30 - $1.00		X	
	Wireless	$0.62	X		
	Prepaid	$0.62	X		
	VoIP	$0.30 - $1.00		X	

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	Other	NR			
SD	Wireline	$1.25 per line	X		
	Wireless	$1.25 per line	X		
	Prepaid	$1.25 per line	X		
	VoIP	$1.25 per line	X		
	Other	NA			
TN	Wireline	$0.65 to $3.00		X	
	Wireless	$1.00	X		
	Prepaid	$0.53	X		
	VoIP	$1.00	X		
	Other	NR			
TX	Wireline	State 9-1-1 Program (CSEC/RPC): The wireline fee is set by CSEC at $0.50 per access line/month (the rate is capped by statute at $0.50) Emergency Communications Districts: Res: $0.20 - $1.38 per local exchange access line/month. Bus: $0.46 - $3.96 per access line/month, up to a 100 line maximum in most ECD service areas. Bus. Trunk: $0.74 to $3.96	X	X	
	Wireless	$0.50 per month per wireless telecom connection.	X		

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	Prepaid	2% of the purchase price of each prepaid wireless telecom service	X		
	VoIP	State 9-1-1 Program (CSEC/RPC): The wireline fee is set by CSEC at $0.50 per access line/month (the rate is capped by statute at $0.50)	X		
	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	1.90%	X		
	VoIP	$0.76	X		
	Other	$0.76	X		
VA	Wireline	$0.75	X		
	Wireless	$0.75	X		
	Prepaid	$0.75	X		
	VoIP	$0.75	X		
	Other	NR			
VT	Wireline	2% of customer telecom charges	X		

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	Wireless	2% of customer telecom charges	X		
	Prepaid	2% of customer telecom charges	X		
	VoIP	Voluntary	X		
	Other				
WA	Wireline	$0.25 state / $0.70 county per month			X
	Wireless	$0.25 state / $0.70 county per month			X
	Prepaid	$0.25 state / $0.70 county per month			X
	VoIP	$0.25 state / $0.70 county per month			X
	Other	NR			
WI	Wireline	Varies by County	Participating telecommunications carriers		
	Wireless	None			
	Prepaid	None			
	VoIP	None			
	Other	NR			
WV	Wireline	Varies by County		X	
	Wireless	$3.00 per wireless line	X		
	Prepaid	6% Tax	X		
	VoIP	Varies by County		X	

Service Type and Fee			Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance		
State	**Type**	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**
	Other	NR			
WY	Wireline	NR			
	Wireless	NR			
	Prepaid	NR			
	VoIP	NR			
	Other	NR			
Other Jurisdictions					
AS	Wireline	NA			
	Wireless	NA			
	Prepaid	NA			
	VoIP	NA			
	Other	NA			
DC	Wireline	$0.76 per line	X		
	Wireless	$0.76 per line	X		
	Prepaid	2% at the retail point of sale and sales made over the Internet	X		
	VoIP	$0.76 per line	X		
	Other	Centrex: $0.62/PBX Trunks: $4.96 per trunk	X		
NN	Wireline	NA			
	Wireless	NA			
	Prepaid	NA			
	VoIP	NA			
	Other	NA			

25. The questionnaire 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 12 shows that, in total, states and other jurisdictions reported collecting approximately $2,527,625,360.85 in 911 fees for calendar year 2014.

Table 12– Total Amount Collected in 911 Fees by Service Type

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total
AK	$5,008,297.41	$8,960,933.40	NA	NA	NR	$13,969,230.81
AL	$32,695,123.63	$59,075,842.53	NR	$17,016,889.77	NR	$108,787,855.93
AR	$6,918,253.73	$14,979,871.65	Included in wireless and wireline revenue	$3,392,664.43	NR	$25,290,789.81
AZ	$16,203,911.00			$1,344,443.00	$41,050 (Interest)	$17,589,404.00
CA	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	$97,077,234.00
CO	$11,217,995 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities)	$32,949,356 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities)	$5,495,091 (extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities)	$2,594,643.00	NR	$52,257,085.00
CT	NR	NR	NR	$1,996,000.00	$35,180,000.00	$37,176,000.00
DE	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	$8,159,730.03
FL	$23,210,317.00	$66,583,250.00	$18,531,186.00	Prepaid not segregated in 2014 wireless collections	NR	$108,324,754.00
GA	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	$17,538,556.19 GA FY 7/1/13 - 6/30/14	NR	$17,538,556.19
HI	$872,500.00	$8,749,300.00	$867,900.00	None	None	$10,489,700.00
IA	Unknown	$25,903,929.36		$1,916,622.38	NR	$27,820,551.74

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total
ID	$17,915,474.00			$935,720.66	$2,028,583.50 [$.25 Grant Monies collected and used for local grants]	$20,879,778.16
IL	$67,357,403.00	$116,302,352.00	$4,841,929.00	Unknown on statewide basis	$25,481,944.00	$213,983,628.00
IN	$10,074,138.62	$49,008,797.94	$7,219,523.48	$5,770,258.29	$2,875.15	$72,075,593.48
KS	$19,011,333.44			$1,326,414.75	$0.00	$20,337,748.19
KY	$28,127,385.00	$23,333,734.00	Not provided	$2,459,113.00	None	$53,920,232.00
MA	$11,784,267.00	$44,472,238.00	$13,716,439.00	$4,974,771.00	NR	$74,947,715.00
MD	$21,789,423.69	$27,182,747.00	$0.00	$5,794,677.60	NR	$54,766,848.29
ME	$2,068,738.00	$4,304,298.00	$975,945.00	$982,520.00	$8,650 [Interest]	$8,340,150.00
MI	State: $20,460,912.31 County: $60,606,236.97			State: $7,865,741.41 Local: NA	NA	$88,932,890.69
MN	$18,106,997.78	$36,660,353.54	$2,414,082.73	$4,264,674.10	NR	$61,446,108.15
MS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	$31,280,356.96
MT	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	$13,000,000.00
NC	$8,809,556.60	$51,646,089.43	$9,325,720.91	$8,379,879.44	$0.00	$78,161,246.38
ND	$9,998,322.00			$339,585.00	NR	$10,337,907.00
NE	$6,000,550.00	$7,069,662.00	Unknown	$870,156.00	NA	$13,940,368.00
NH	$2,230,441.04	$6,339,836.83	$2,011,991.44	$0.00	NR	$10,582,269.31
NJ	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	$120,000,000.00
NM	NR	NR	$0.00	$0.00	NR	$11,600,163.44
NV	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
NY	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	$185,513,240.00
OH	NR	$25,736,969.91	NR	NR	NR	$25,736,969.91
OK	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total
OR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	$39,470,386.00
PA	$45,036,138.00	$103,069,152.00	$27,598,118.00	$15,007,705.00	NR	$190,711,113.00
RI	$5,239,998.00	$11,533,457.00	NR	$867,248.00	NR	$17,640,703.00
SC	Unknown	$22,096,561.99	Unknown	$6,362,334.06	$0.00	$28,458,896.05
SD	$4,082,892.00	$7,996,698.00	$55,776.00	$959,868.00	NR	$13,095,234.00
TN	Unknown	$51,716,235.00	$9,890,235.00	$5,798,370.00	$0.00	$67,404,840.00
TX	$69,468,291.24	$109,190,616.00	Included in wireline	$22,499,609.00	$7,320,000.00 (state equalization surcharge)	$208,478,516.24
UT	$21,600,000.00	$2,817,000.00	Included in wireless	$155,000.00	NR	$24,572,000.00
VA	$27,471,224.59	$57,716,335.10	Unknown	Unknown	NR	$85,187,559.69
VT	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
WA	State: $6,321,908 Counties: $12,928,029	State: $17,379,538 Counties: $44,785,541	State: $2,446,805 Counties: $8,297,729	*included in wireless	NA	$91,529,550.00
WI	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	
WV	$19,733,754.00	$35,144,017.14	Included in wireline	$1,445,699.80	NR	$56,323,470.55
WY	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
DC	$1,809,386.17	$5,372,057.31	$1,102,674.44	$575,810.70	Centrex: $962,369.58 PBX Trunks: $666,689.65	$10,488,987.85
NN	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
						$2,527,625,360.85

26. 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 forty-five responding jurisdictions listed in Table 13, twenty-two states report combining collected fees with other funds or grants to support 911 services and twenty-three did not.

Table 13 – States Reporting Whether 911 Fees Are Combined with Federal, State or Local Funds or Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations

Combination of collected fees with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services.				
State	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**If Yes, State's Description of Federal, State or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees**
AK		X		
AL	X			"Any funds that support 911 are contributed at the local level, but not in the form of an additional 911 fee/charge to the citizenry. Rather, additional funding would be in the form of a contract with responder agencies in the district or county/municipal funding dedicated to 911."
AR	X			
AZ		X		
CA		X		
CO	X			"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. 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."
CT		X		
DE		X		
FL	X			"Emergency Communications Number E911 System Fund Interest = $322,455 County General Revenues $105,569,226 Annualized State and Rural County grant expenditures were calculated at $12,294,267"
GA	X			

Combination of collected fees with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services.				
State	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**If Yes, State's Description of Federal, State or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees**
HI	X			"The funding that the State of Hawaii Enhanced 911Board provides to the county PSAPs would be insufficient to fund 100% of the costs to operate a PSAP. The amounts from each additional source cannot be determined at this time."
IA	X			
ID		X		"No fees combined at the State level."
IL		X		
IN	X			"On average, the 911 fee pays for 45 - 50% 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, racino [race track and 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."
MA		X		
MD	X			"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."
ME	X			"General Fund Appropriation for implementation of NG911"

Combination of collected fees with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services.				
State	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**If Yes, State's Description of Federal, State or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees**
MI	X			"General funds, millage collections, and fees are used to support PSAP budgets statewide, the collective financial support of these funding sources totals about 58%, the breakdown is as follows: • State 911 Fee Distribution - 12% • Local 911 Surcharges Received - 30% • Millage Receipts - 16% • General Fund Monies - 37% • Other Receipts - 5% A full list of the funding sources for each Michigan county can be found at: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/msp/2014_Annual_Report_to_the_Michigan_Legislature_464409_7.pdf?20150723151852"
MN		X		
MS			X	"Unknown"
MT	X			"On a case by case basis state funds that were distributed to local governments were combined with local general and/or property tax funds. The amount of local funding is not currently available. Individual local governments may have been recipients of federal grants, but this information is not available."
NC	X			"E911 funds were combined with general fund allocations from each of the 121 Primary PSAPs and 6 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 NG9-1-1."
NE	X			"Local jurisdictions are also supported by general funds. State 911 funds have not been comingled with any other funding source."
NH		X		

Combination of collected fees with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services.				
State	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**If Yes, State's Description of Federal, State or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees**
NJ		X		
NM		X		
NV			X	
NY			X	
OH	X			"State disbursements are sent to each county for use in funding their countywide 9-1-1 systems. Each of Ohio's 88 counties combine these funds with other local funds (general fund, sales tax, property tax, etc.) to fund their 9-1-1 system."
OK		X		
OR	X			"As the State 9-1-1 tax distributed to PSAP governing authorities is only approximately 24% of total PSAP operations, local monies are used for the remainder. It is unknown if any of these governing authorities made use of any federal monies or grant monies or special collections to cover these costs. Some of the entities use "dispatch fees" to fund operations. These are amounts that local entities pay to the PSAP governing authority to dispatch their emergency services."
PA	X			"Any 911 related expenses not covered by 911 fees are covered by the general fund of the respective County or City. County/City General Funds covered $102,265,885 of 911 expenses in calendar year 2014."
RI			X	
SC	X			"South Carolina has 3 counties that are handling 911 calls in an NENA i3 IP environment, 2 of which have requested reimbursements for approximately $710,000.00."

Combination of collected fees with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services.				
State	**Yes**	**No**	**No Response**	**If Yes, State's Description of Federal, State or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees**
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		
UT		X		
VA		X		
VT		X		
WA		X		
WI		X		
WV		X		
WY			X	
Other Jurisdictions				
AS		X		
DC		X		
NN			X	
	22	**23**	**6**	

27. 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 14, thirteen states reported that state 911 fees were the sole source of revenue funding 911 services; four states indicated that 50 to 99 percent of funding came from state 911 fees, six states reported that 50 to 99 percent of funding came from local fees; and two states reported that local fees were the sole source of funding.

Table 14 – State Estimates of Proportional Contribution from Each Funding Source

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund (State)	General Fund (County)	Federal Grants	State Grants
AK	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
AL	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
AR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
AZ	100%					
CA	100%					
CO	3.33%	63.8%	0%	32.86%	Unknown	Unknown
CT	100%					
DE	100%					
FL	45%	0%	0%	49%	0%	6%
GA	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
HI	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
IA	22%	41%	0%	37%	41%	NR
ID	90%	Unknown	0%	Unknown	0%	10%
IL	27%	73%	0%	Unknown	0%	0%
IN	45-50%	Not permitted	None	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
KS	25%	NA	0%	72%	0%	3%
KY	21%	30%	9%	34%	6%	<1%
MA	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
MD	49%	0%	0%	51%	<1%	0%
ME	70%	0%	30%	0%	0%	0%
MI	12%	51%	0%	37%	0%	0%
MN	100%	0%	0%	0	0%	0%
MS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
MT	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
NC	78%	0%	0%	20%	0%	2%

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund (State)	General Fund (County)	Federal Grants	State Grants
ND	2%	62%	0%	36%	0%	0%
NE	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
NH	100%					
NJ	Unknown	0%	0%	Unknown	0%	0%
NM	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NV	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
NY	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
OH	Variable	Variable	NA	Variable	Unknown	NA
OK		100%				
OR	24%	76%	None	NR	Unknown	Unknown
PA	65%	NR	NR	35%	NR	NR
RI	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
SC	45%	Unknown	0%	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
SD	49.5%	0%	0%	25.9%	2.1%	0.27%
TN	100%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
TX	66.68%	33.32%	0%	0%	0%	0%
UT	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
VA	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
VT	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
WA	20%	65%	0%	15%	0%	0%
WI	0%	15%	0%	85%	0%	0%
WV	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
WY	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Other Jurisdictions						
AS			100%			
DC	30%	NA	60%	NA	10%	NA

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund (State)	General Fund (County)	Federal Grants	State Grants
NN	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

28. As in each prior year, 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. The majority of respondents – 40 states and other jurisdictions -- indicate that during calendar year 2014, or fiscal year 2014, they collected 911/E911 funds only for 911/E911 purposes.

29. Eight states – California, Illinois, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Virginia, and West Virginia – report that they used collected funds, at least in part, to support programs other than 911 and E911 service in calendar year 2014. Table 15 below summarizes the estimated total fees diverted by each of the seven states. As discussed below, some of these states (California, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Virginia, and West Virginia) diverted funds to public safety or emergency response programs other than 911/E911, while others (Illinois, New York, Rhode Island) diverted funds for other expenditures or to their state general revenue funds. The aggregate amount of diverted funds reported by these jurisdictions is $223,420,909.00, or 8.8 percent of all 911/E911 funds reported to have been collected by all responding states and jurisdictions in 2014.

Table 15 – Total Funds Diverted or Otherwise Transferred from 911 Uses

State/Territory	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2014)	Total Funds Used for Purposes Other than 911/E911	Percentage Diverted
California	$97,077,234.00	$4,331,000.00	*4.5%*
Illinois	$213,983,628.00	$3,000,000.00	*1.4%*
New Hampshire	$10,582,269.31	$1,872,732.00	*17.7%*
New Jersey	$120,000,000.00	$106,728,000.00	*89%*
New York	$185,513,240.00	$77,254,288.00	*41.6%*
Rhode Island	$17,640,703.00	$12,263,289.00	*69.5%*
Virginia	$85,187,559.69	$11,700,000.00	*13.7%*
West Virginia	$56,323,470.55	$6,271,600.00	*11.1%*
Total	**$786,308,104.55**	**$223,420,909.00**	**28.4%**
Percent Diverted From Total Funds Collected by All Reporting States/Jurisdictions			
Total	***$2,527,625,360.85***	***8.8%***	

30. California stated that "[a]ll funds collected have been used exclusively for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism in support of 911 with the exception of funds that have been appropriated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). While 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. 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."[43]

31. Illinois reported that $3,000,000.00 million "was transferred out of the Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund, a fund in which wireless carriers can seek cost recovery for their 9-1-1 costs, to the Public Utility Fund."[44]

32. New Hampshire reported that of the $1,872,732.00 it diverted from 911/E911 fees, $1,759,482.00 was transferred, as a result of legislative budget action, to fund the State Police Radio Maintenance section, while $113,250.00 was used to fund the State's Poison Control Project.[45]

33. New Jersey reported that it collected a total of $120 million in 911 fees and, in accordance with New Jersey statute (P.L.2004, c.48), the total was "deposited into the 911 System and

[43] California Response at 12.

[44] Illinois Response at 15.

[45] New Hampshire Response at 11.

Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of related programs."[46] According to New Jersey, with respect to 911 specific costs, approximately $12,372,000.00 was applied to "the Statewide 911 Emergency Telephone System" and $900,000 was applied to "the Office of Emergency Telecommunications Service." New Jersey applied the remainder of $106,728,000.00 to offset costs related to programs within the New Jersey Departments of Law and Public Safety and Military and Veterans' Affairs.[47]

34. New York stated that in regard to 911/E911 fund diversion in fiscal year 2014-2015, "[f]unds derived through the [public safety communications surcharge] were used in accordance with the purposes specified in [New York State] Tax Law Section 186-f," including the authorized transfer of a portion of funds to the General Fund. In FY 2014-1 5, $77,254,288 million was transferred to the General Fund from the account.[48]

35. Rhode Island reported that in its 2014 fiscal year (ending June 30, 2015), the state collected $17,640,703.00 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: $4,130,670.00 in personnel costs and $1,189,945.00 in operating costs, for a total of $5,320,615.00. Rhode Island reported that all remaining funds collected were distributed for other purposes via the General Fund.[49]

36. Virginia reported that it diverted a total of $11,700,000.00 of the 911/E911 funds it collected: of this amount, $3,700,000.00 was used to help finance the Virginia State Police (VSP) for related costs incurred for answering wireless 911 telephone calls, and $8,000,000.00 to support sheriff's 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 supporting 911-related activities.[50]

37. West Virginia collected $56,323,470.55 in 911/E911 from all sources (wireless, wireline, VoIP; and other services), and reported diverting $6,271,600.00 of that amount as follows:[51]

- $1,000,000.00 for the Tower Assistance Fund, to subsidize construction of towers to areas that otherwise could not get a tower built to provide enhanced 911 wireless coverage.
- $1,757,200.00 for the 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.

---

[46] New Jersey Response at 6.

[47] *Id*.

[48] New York Response at 2.

[49] Rhode Island Response at 2.

[50] Virginia Response at 11.

[51] West Virginia Response at 17.

- $3,514,400.00 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.[52]

38. In Table 16 below, we compare the number of states reporting fee diversions in this reporting year compared to past years. While the general trend with respect to fee diversion over the past seven years has been downward, the number of states identifying fee diversion in the last two reportable years (2013 and 2014) has remained constant at seven. We also note that in 2013, the Commission improved its information collection process to obtain more detailed information from states regarding their use of funds for non-911/E911 purposes.[53]

Table 16 – States Reporting Diversion of 911/E911 Funds (2009 – 2015)

Report Year	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report
States	Illinois Maine Montana New York Oregon Rhode Island Tennessee Wisconsin	Arizona Delaware Georgia Hawaii Illinois Nebraska New York Oregon Rhode Island Wisconsin	Arizona Georgia Illinois Maine New York Oregon Rhode Island	Arizona Georgia Illinois Maine New York Rhode Island	Illinois Kansas New York Rhode Island	California Illinois New Jersey New York Puerto Rico Rhode Island Washington	California Illinois New Hampshire New Jersey New York Rhode Island Virginia West Virginia
Total	**8**	**10**	**7**	**6**	**4**	**7**	**8**

H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees

39. In order to understand the degree to which states and other jurisdictions track the collection and use of 911 fees, the Bureau for the first time 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 17 below, thirty-eight states and the District of Columbia indicated that they have established an oversight mechanism, ten stated they

[52] West Virginia Response at 17.

[53] See note 6, *supra*. As recommended by the GAO, the Bureau's revised information collection form requires states to provide specific information on the nature of expenditures for purposes other than 911/E911, even when such purposes are deemed permissible under the state's 911 funding statute. The improved information collection may have caused more states to report this year than in previous years that they diverted 911 funds to non-911 public safety programs. Thus, while prior reports have generally identified states that have diverted funds for non-public safety purposes, such as transfer of funds to the state general fund, they may not have fully captured public safety-related diversions for those reporting years.

have not, and two did not respond to the question. Some states spelled out these oversight mechanisms in detail. For example, Oregon stated that the "Secretary of State's Office has the authority to audit any State agency for proper expenditure of public monies", including the Oregon Office of Emergency Management. In addition, Oregon requires each entity that expends public monies, including PSAP governing authorities, to conduct an annual audit.[54] West Virginia reported that by statute "all expenditures of funds by County Commissions in the State of West Virginia [must] be audited by the West Virginia State Tax Commissioner [and further] that the financial activities of the [Public Service Commission of West Virginia] are monitored internally by the State of West Virginia through audits, reviews and studies by the Legislature and externally by an independent private sector auditor in 'Single State Audit.'"[55]

40. 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 two states reported that they have authority to conduct audits of service providers, twenty five reported that they do not, and four did not respond to the question. Under Alabama state code, "on a biennial basis, if not more frequently, the 911 Board shall retain an independent, third-party auditor for the purposes of receiving, maintaining, and verifying the accuracy of any and all information, including all proprietary information, that is required to be collected, or that may have been submitted to the board by voice communication providers and districts, and the accuracy of the collection of the 911 service charge required to be collected."[56] Washington states that the Washington Department of Revenue "conducts periodic audits of service provider excise tax collections for accuracy" but that no reported actions were taken during the period under review.[57] Of the twenty two states indicating they have authority to audit service providers, three indicated that they had undertaken "authority or enforcement or other corrective actions" in connection with such auditing, ten indicated no such actions were taken during the period under review, and nine did not indicate either way.

Table 17. 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
AK	No	No	NA
AL	Yes	Yes	No Response

[54] Oregon Response at 13.

[55] West Virginia Response at 18.

[56] Alabama Response at 14.

[57] Washington Response at 17.

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
AR	No	No	NA
AZ	Yes	Yes	No
CA	Yes	Yes	No Response
CO	Yes	Yes	No
CT	Yes	Yes	No Response
DE	Yes	No	NA
FL	Yes	No	NA
GA	Yes	Yes	No
HI	Yes	No	NA
IA	Yes	No	NA
ID	Yes	No	NA
IL	No	No	NA
IN	Yes	No	NA
KS	Yes	No	NA
KY	Yes	Yes	No
MA	Yes	No	NA
MD	Yes	Yes	No
ME	Yes	Yes	No
MI	Yes	No	NA
MN	Yes	Yes	No

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
MS	No	Yes	No Response
MT	Yes	Yes	No Response
NC	Yes	No	NA
ND	Yes	No	NA
NE	Yes	Yes	Yes
NH	Yes	Yes	Yes
NJ	No	No	NA
NM	No	No	NA
NV	DNP	DNP	NA
NY	Yes	DNP	NA
OH	Yes	No	No
OK	Yes	No	NA
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes
PA	Yes	No	NA
RI	Yes	DNP	NA
SC	No	No	NA
SD	Yes	Yes	No Response
TN	Yes	No	NA
TX	Yes	Yes	No Response
UT	No	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	
VA	Yes		Yes		No	
VT	Yes		Yes		No	
WA	Yes		Yes		No	
WI	Yes		No		NA	
WV	Yes		Yes		No Response	
WY	DNP		DNP		NA	
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	No		No		NA	
DC	Yes		No		NA	
NN	No		No		NA	
Totals	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
	39	10	22	25	3	10

I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

41. In order to track progress of the nationwide transition to NG911, 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 2014. With respect to classifying NG911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures, forty respondents indicated that their 911 funding mechanism allows for distribution of 911 funds for the implementation of NG911. Eight respondents - Alaska, American Samoa, Illinois, Montana, Navajo Nation, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Utah - reported that their funding mechanism does not allow for the use of 911 funds for NG911 implementation. Of the respondents that indicated that their funding mechanism allows for NG911 funding, thirty-two states and the District of Columbia indicated that they used 911 funds for NG911 programs in 2014. Table 18 shows the general categories of NG911 expenditures that respondents reported supporting with 911/E911 funds, although most respondents did not specify NG911 expenditures by category.

Table 18 – Number of States Indicating One or More Areas of NG911 Investment

General Project or not specified	Planning or Consulting Services	Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades	GIS	ESInet Construction	Training	NG Security Planning
AL	DC	CO	CO	CA	HI	WA
HI	FL	FL	FL	CT	TX	
MA	HI	HI	IA	FL		
MS	ID	IA	KS	IL		
NM	KY	KY	MA	KS		
NN	MA	MD	MN	MA		
TN	MD	NC	ND	MD		
VA	MN	ND	NN	ME		
VT	NC	TX	PA	MI		
	NH	WV	SD	MN		
	NJ	WA	TX	NC		
	NN		VA	ND		
	OH			OH		
	TX			PA		
	VA			SC		
				SD		
9	**15**	**11**	**12**	**16**	**2**	**1**

42. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions report the amount of funds expended on NG911 programs in the annual period ending December 31, 2014. Table 19 shows the NG911-related expenditures reported by twenty-eight states and the District of Columbia. Collectively, these jurisdictions spent approximately $227,574,995.97 on NG911 programs, or approximately 9 percent of total 911/E911 fees collected. Five states reported that 911/E911 fees were used for NG911 purposes, but did not report the exact amounts of state expenditures on NG911-related programs.[58] Twelve states, American Samoa, and the Navajo Nation did not report expenditures for NG911-related programs.[59]

Table 19 – Funds Spent on Next Generation 911 Programs

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
AL	$1,228,623.43	AL completed its wireless aggregation project in Dec. 2014, which is as far as the first iteration of Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN) is able to accomplish with the vendor selected during the first phases of the project. All wireless calls in the state are now routed through this network.
AZ	$61,603.00	

[58] These States include Iowa, Kentucky, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

[59] These include Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Illinois, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Utah and Wisconsin.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		No Response
CA	$3,781,336.00	CA has two NG911 ESInet projects under development: the Regional Integrated Next Generation project in Pasadena, and the Mendocino County ESInet project. Both projects utilize a hosted solution currently in place and will be supported with by regional ESInets currently under development.
CO	$22,270,461.00	"Responses . . . 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 (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"
CT	$3,100,000.00	Installation of Public Safety Data Network (PSDN) an ultra-high speed flexible fiber optic network which serves as the base transport infrastructure and interconnectivity pathway for public safety related applications and connectivity for NG911.
DC	$1,872,000.00	The OUC started NG911 discovery and explorations with requirements gathering for a fully integrated NG911 CPE solution and a NG911 i3 network solution for the District of Columbia.
FL	$17,476,934.34	In 2014, NG911 expenditures include county expenditures on county NG911 projects. These expenditures include next-generation ESI network circuits and services, NG911 database and routing services and call handling equipment.[60]
HI	$1,723,800.00	Last half of CY 2013: completion of the statewide deployment of the NG911 enabled Intrado "Viper" platform and related user training. First half of CY 2014: Hawaii County initiated the procurement process for a new NG911-compatible CAD while the Kauai and Oahu PSAPs CAD upgrades were in the implementation process.
IN	$8,000,000.00	The Statewide 911 Board in cooperation with the IN Department of Administration published Request for Service 15-12 in July 2014.

[60] Map information on Florida's NG911 projects is included in the Florida E911 Board 2014 Annual Report, available at: http://www.dms.myflorida.com/business_operations/telecommunications/enhanced_911.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		RFS15-12 calls for a single statewide wireless ESInet (as is the case today) or for multiple ESInet deployments. At the Dec. 2014 meeting of the Statewide 911 Board, award letters were granted to AT&T and INdigital Telecom for build-out and operation of (2) two statewide ESInet that meet the i3 standard and are redundant. Completion date is 18 to 24 months.
KS	$1,649,268.00	GIS Data Enhancement project: This project collects GIS data from all of the PSAP jurisdictions and compares it to our KS NG911 GIS data model for compliance. Deviations from the standard are remediated by contracted GIS vendors, or by the PSAP jurisdiction if they so choose. Once the remediation work is complete, the data is resubmitted for a quality assurance audit to ensure that the deviations have been corrected. Once the data passes the audit at 100% compliance, the PSAP jurisdiction is responsible for continued maintenance as changes occur. When the data is updated through maintenance it is submitted to the Council's GIS Committee for quality assurance and inclusion in the statewide GIS database. This data set will initially be used for wireless Phase 2 call mapping in the statewide call handling system and ultimately be used for geospatial call routing. This project is expected to be complete by the end of 2015. Statewide ESInet and hosted call handling system implementation: This project develops IP network connectivity between the PSAPs and a hosted call handling solution that can be shared amongst the PSAPs. Concurrently, the Council is planning and will deliver SMS text messages to the PSAPs that are connected to the statewide system. Text-to-911 is expected to be delivered to the PSAPs within six to eight months of their coming onto the statewide platform, with this timeframe narrowing as implementation progresses. The current goal will have 30 PSAPs on the statewide system by the end of 2015, with the remaining 87 on by the end of 2017.
MA	$1,583,218.00	Develop, design, and implement a high speed fiber optic network in Western and parts of Central MA to ensure that the needs of the State 911 Department and its PSAPs are addressed and incorporated in the overall development and design of the fiber optic network. This network will prepare the PSAPs for transition to NG911 and will allow for more effective and efficient management of system updates, recordings, and overall system maintenance and monitoring. The State 911 Department also provided funding for additional dedicated resources for MassGIS, a department within the Commonwealth's Information Technology Division, to provide updated, synchronized mapping data and information needed to support the State 911 Department as it prepares for the implementation of NG911.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		On Aug. 4, 2014, the Department entered into a contract with General Dynamics to provide a comprehensive, end-to-end, fully featured, standards-based NG911 system to replace the current enhanced 911 system. During the annual period ending Dec. 31, 2014, system design and test planning development, laboratory trial and testing, site surveys, and other activities were undertaken.
MD	$12,067,230.15	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 ("last-mile" connectivity) to carry 911 trunks and other telephone services, which may be used for an ESInet once one is established.
ME	$6,418,849.00	A contract was executed with FairPoint Communications in Mar. 2013 for NG911 services to transition Maine's aging E911system to a modern standards-based system capable of handling new communication. The process required the legacy E911 system and the NG911 system to operate simultaneously until all PSAPs were on the NG911 network. The first PSAP was transitioned in Mar. 2014. An aggressive implementation schedule resulted in all 26 PSAPs being successfully cutover to the new system by July 23, 2014. This completed one of the nation's first statewide end-to-end NG911 system deployment based on the Detailed Functional and Interface Standards for the NENA i3 Solution.
MI	$177,286.72	The Upper Peninsula 911 Project which supports the eight PSAPS serving all 15 counties of Michigan's Upper Peninsula.[61]
MN	$27,638,145.54	All 104 PSAPs connected to the ESInet for all call types (wireline, wireless, and VoIP). RFP posted for response for ESInet, IP Selective Routing, and a solution for Text to 911. GIS Project Manager position was filled to begin the Statewide GIS Centerline project for 911 in preparation for ECRF/LVF.
NC	$1,285,639.00	Johnston County 911 is implementing a local ESInet that will feature an LTE backup network. This ESInet will have interconnect capabilities with other ESInets in the state that are operated by Intrado. The NC 911 Board issued a Request for Information ("RFI") to

[61] More detailed information can be found at: http://www.upcap.org/programs_services/911.html.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		gather information and statements of interest relating to design, development and implementation of a NG911 communications network throughout NC. This was described as an Emergency Services Internet Protocol (IP) network (ESInet). In addition the RFI gathered information and statements of interest relating to systems having NG911 functionality that would use the ESInet to provide these services to Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs). Responses were received from 13 diverse vendors and several were invited back to make presentations. On Dec. 2, 2014 the NC 911 Board issued an RFP for technical consultant support to create a plan that will meet current 911 needs, provide an ESInet IP backbone for NG911 applications, increase PSAP interoperability, and allow for an error free transition from the current 911 environment to a NG911 environment for all primary, secondary, and backup PSAPs. The contract has been awarded and work will begin shortly. This plan will include issuance of an RFP for NG 911 functional capabilities. These NG911 functional capabilities are comprised of GIS operation supporting call routing, Hosted Call Processing, a Network Operations Center (NOC) and Help Desk, CAD interoperability for all PSAPs, and radio interoperability for all PSAPs. The 911 Board recognizes a likely interplay between its efforts and federal FirstNet development; however the planned RFPs are not intended to replace or supplant the State's FirstNet effort. The NG911 system functions are to be open standards based and consistent with the [NENA] i3 next generation standards, requirements, and best practices.
ND	$255,750.00	Work in progress on deployment of ESInet connectivity to all of the state's 22 PSAPs. As of 6/18/2015, 15 of 22 PSAPs in the state have been connected to the ESInet. Ongoing development of GIS/MSAG records and removal of a certain number of non-selectively routed originating circuits is presently governing the deployment of ESInet connectivity to 3 of the remaining 7 PSAPs with 4 PSAPs either in the process of moving their CPE location or working to meet ESInet network connectivity prerequisites.
NJ	$9,141.00	"Consultant service to begin groundwork for the development of a RFP for the replacement of the State's legacy 9-1-1 network with a state of the art, IP based, Next Generation 9-1-1 network."
NN	No Response	Navajo Nation Division of Public Safety began planning for 911/NG911 in 2014. Activities include: • RFP for NG911 Call Taking Equipment, RFP for new CAD system, quotes for 911 trunks and selective router access. • 911 Service Plan filed with the State of New Mexico

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		• Discussions with the State of Arizona regarding the Navajo Nation's plan to migrate to E911 • Meetings with the FCC to discuss lack of funding available to the Navajo Nation for E911 and NG911 migrations • Dialog with all wireline and wireless carriers providing services within the Navajo Nation to update them on E911 plans. • Currently working with State of Arizona to validate Navajo Nation vs. county boundaries for 911. Correcting GIS shape files for wireless Phase 0 and VoIP currently. Additionally, NN has a broadband network provided by Navajo Communications Company (a Division of Frontier Communications) that can be used for future NG911 network connectivity across the Navajo Nation.
OR	$438,061.62	No Response
PA	No Response	PA is in the early stages of implementation with the ongoing development of regional and statewide ESInets and geo-spatial mapping to provide for 911 call routing. NG911 is a core technology change and will be based upon nationwide standards currently being developed by NENA and other 911 authorities. PEMA's goals are to establish the strategy to implement NG911 throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in a consistent, precise manner while maximizing all available resources including: • Deployment of a Public Safety 99.999% Grade ESInet • Utilize a standards based approach (NENA i3 Standards) • Implement IP capable PSAPs • Develop geographic based routing and database integration • Deploy NG911 capable, shared applications • Converge networks and systems to a "system of systems" • Implement "Best Practices" approach
SC	$710,000.00	We have 3 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 (a coastal county) and Spartanburg (an upstate county). Project should be complete in early 2016 and it will be the first two jurisdictions in the state to interconnect through an ESInet.
SD	$288,773.00	GIS: In Nov. 2014, SD entered into a 5-year renewable contract with GeoComm to create a statewide GIS dataset and maintenance to be used for geospatial 911 call routing. 911 Call Answering: In Dec. 2014, SD entered into a 5-year renewable contract with TCS for our Statewide ESInet, statewide hosted call answering system and managed services.
TN	$73,004,983.00	All wireless carriers were directly connected to the NG911 network.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		There were over 1,250 wireline trunk order submissions, 415 of which were successfully tested. All PSAPs were at some stage of deployment with 85 tested for live traffic and 72 live on the network.
TX	$22,952,496.17	State 911 Program: • Updated Texas NG911 Master Plan • Implemented Enterprise Geospatial Database Management Services (EGDMS) for GIS data development, standardization, and QA/QC processes in preparation for moving ALI Database from MSAG based to LVF based function for NG911. • Procured contracts with vendors for the implementation of the State-level ESInet Phase I. • Collaborated with statewide stakeholders and to complete and adopt standards & policies (NG911 Interoperability; GIS Data; Cybersecurity) • Text to 911 Project plan developed to leverage current ALI MPLS network to support text to 350 PSAPs in State 911 program by connecting to the 2 national TCCs. • Continued implementation of Regional ESInets that will interconnect with other Regional ESInets and the State-level ESInet. 772 ECDs: • Implementation and deployment of Denco Area 911 District's regional ESInet serving their 11 PSAPs. Municipal ECDs: • Purchased and/or installed Next Gen Systems, and Next Gen capable equipment. • Upgraded CPE. • Project underway to connect to NCTCOG network, and deploy an NG911 System.
VA	$1,000,000.00	NG911 Feasibility Study: Virginia completed a feasibility study for the design of a single statewide IP-based 911 network to reduce the length of 911 call set-up time and enable transferability of 911 calls statewide. This study provides a concise list of statewide IP-based 911 network design options to the E-911 Services Board and is a critical first step in the statewide deployment of NG911. The results of this Study will contribute to the blueprint for the Commonwealth's related long-term planning efforts; as well provide insight to localities on statewide NG911 efforts. NoVA Regional SIF Project: Knowing that the existing Verizon Selective Router Network for the legacy 911 system is nearing obsolescence, and that data preparation is a key element of transitioning to NG911, the NoVA PSAPs have received a 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.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		The goal of this SIF project is to develop a regional GIS dataset for NoVA that is suitable for provisioning into a live NG911 ECRF/ LVF system residing on the ESInet.
VT	$4,604,830.00	VT has and continues to allow expenditures under the 911 program for NG911 services and such funds have been used to support the Statewide Next Generation system that was implemented in May 2011. In Nov. 2014 The State entered into a contract with a new vendor for its Next Generation system which will be implemented in July, 2015.
WA	$13,476,567.00	WA began in earnest to replace analog 911 telephone equipment in the state's 55 primary PSAPs with NG911 phone systems. A total of 11 primary PSAPs were upgraded during the calendar year. In 2014, the WA contracted for a third-party cybersecurity assessment of the state-wide ESInet, which is currently underway. Also in 2014, all of WA's PSAPs began assessing options for local Text-to-911 implementation.
WV	No Response	Dark Fiber and routers are installed in all PSAPs in WV in preparation for NG911
TOTAL	**$227,574,995.97**[62]	

43. **ESInet Deployments**. To better track NG911 implementation progress, the Bureau for the first time requested that states and other responding jurisdictions provide information on whether they had any Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets) operating during calendar year 2014. 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.

44. As detailed in Table 20, eleven states reported having deployed state-wide ESInets.[63] Eleven other states reported having regional ESInets within the state, and seven states reported local-level ESInets.[64] We note that 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.

[62] This total reflects only the reported totals of monies spent by the States and territories but may not be reflective of the total expenditures actually made nationwide.

[63] We note that deployment of ESInets is an indicator that the state or jurisdiction is transitioning to IP-based routing of 911 calls, but by itself, does not mean the state has completed its transition to NG911 service. These states include Hawaii, Iowa, Indiana, Maine, Minnesota, North Dakota, New Hampshire; Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia.

[64] Note that Florida, North Carolina, Utah, and Virginia state that they have both regional and local ESInets operating within the state.

Table 20 – Type and Number of ESInets Deployed During Period Ending December 31, 2014

Type of ESInet	Number of States/Jurisdictions Indicating PSAPs Connected to ESInet		States Responding Yes	Total PSAPs Operating on ESInet
	No	Yes		
Single Statewide ESInet	35	11	Hawaii Indiana Iowa Maine Minnesota New Hampshire North Dakota Tennessee Vermont Washington West Virginia	498
Local ESInet	38	7	Colorado Florida North Carolina Ohio South Carolina Utah Virginia	85
Regional ESInet	34	11	Arizona California Florida Illinois Kentucky Michigan North Carolina Pennsylvania Texas Utah Virginia	170

45. **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 2014. The Bureau also requested that respondents estimate the number of PSAPs that they anticipated would become text-capable by the end of calendar year 2015. Table 21 sets forth the information provided by respondents. Collectively, respondents reported 316 PSAPs as being text-capable as of the end of 2014. Respondents further reported that they anticipated an additional 559 PSAPs would become text-capable by the end of 2015. Four states - Hawaii, Maine, New Hampshire,

and Vermont - reported statewide text-to-911 capability.[65] For purposes of comparison, Table 21 also shows the total number of PSAPs in each state that have registered as text-capable with the FCC as of December 16, 2015.[66]

Table 21 – Text-to-911 Deployments

State	Total Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2014	No Response	Total Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2015	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2015	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 16, 2015
AK	0		2		2	0
AL	10-11		31		42	3
AR	0		15		15	0
AZ	0		0		0	0
CA	1		28		29	20
CO	6-24		61		85	21
CT	0		0		0	0
DE	0		0		0	0
FL	2		0		2	4
GA	4		0		4	3
HI	0		8		8	9
IA	1		12		13	9
ID	1		6		7	3
IL	0		0		0	9
IN	88		10		98	89
KS	3		30		33	0

[65] Although Puerto Rico did not file a report in response to this year's questionnaire, we note that Puerto Rico registered that it was text-capable on June 22, 2015 and text to 911 service is available island wide as of December 23, 2015.

[66] 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.

State	Total Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2014	No Response	Total Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2015	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2015	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 16, 2015
KY	1		9		10	2
MA	0		2		2	0
MD	1		7		8	1
ME	2		26		28	25
MI	2		15		17	15
MN	0		7		7	0
MS	1		25		26	0
MT	2		0		2	5
NC	38		19		57	58
ND	0		5		5	0
NE	3		0		3	0
NH	2		0		2	2
NJ	0		21		21	19
NM	0		0		0	0
NV		X	0	X	0	0
NY		X	0	X	0	7
OH	0		0		0	3
OK		X		X		
OR	0		7		7	0
PA	10		30		40	11
RI		X	0	X	0	0
SC	5		20		25	9
SD	0		0		0	0
TN	0		0		0	0

State	Total Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2014	No Response	Total Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2015	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2015	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 16, 2015
TX	103		89		192	114
UT	0		6		6	1
VA	6		50		56	19
VT	2		6		8	2
WA	0		5		5	5
WI	0		1		1	3
WV	3		5		8	1
WY		X	0	X		0
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	0		0		0	0
DC	0		1		1	0
NN	0		0		0	0
Totals	**316**	**5**	**559**	**5**	**875**	**472**

J. Cybersecurity Expenditures

46. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions provide information on whether they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2014 and, if so, the amounts of those expenditures. As represented in Table 22, thirty eight jurisdictions responded that they did not expend funds on PSAP-related cybersecurity programs. Colorado reported that while no cybersecurity programs have been implemented for PSAPs at the state level, some local 911 authorities have cybersecurity programs in place.[67] Five states – Alaska, Maine, Michigan, Texas, and Washington - and the Navajo Nation reported that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2014. The Navajo Nation reported that it spent $8,000; Texas reports that it spent $443,830.16; and Washington reported that it spent $83,473 on cyber projects. Alaska spent approximately $1,900,000 for the state's cybersecurity program, which it reports includes the cost of providing "cybersecurity protections for the 7 State of Alaska PSAPs (6 Alaska State Trooper Posts PLUS 1 at the Ted Stevens

[67] Colorado Response at 18.

International Airport)."[68] Michigan stated that the "estimated aggregate spend for Cyber Security in 2014 was $22,871,649. . . . Included within this amount are cyber expenditures for centralized cyber related infrastructure and services that are used to support three state of Michigan State Police operated PSAPS in Negaunee, Gaylord, [and] Detroit."[69] Seven states did not respond to the question or reported they did not know.[70]

47. The Bureau additionally requested information on the number of PSAPs in each state or jurisdiction that implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs in 2014. Table 22 shows that nine states, the District of Columbia, and the Navajo Nation reported that one or more of their PSAPs either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program. Thirteen states and American Samoa reported that their PSAPs did not implement or participate in cybersecurity programs.[71] Twenty-six states reported that they lacked data or otherwise did not know whether their PSAPs had implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs.

Table 22 – Annual Cybersecurity Expenditures

State	During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?					Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cyber security program
	Yes	No	NR	Unknown	Amount	
AK	X				NA	7
AL		X			NA	"Not reported at state level"
AR		X			NA	Unknown
AZ		X			NA	0
CA		X			NA	Unknown
CO		X			A number of local 911 Authorities report having cybersecurity programs in place, but nothing has been implemented specifically for	"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

[68] Alaska Supplemental Response to Question 9 at 1. According to the supplemental filing, the state spent approximately $1.2 million on "network and host security products"; $300,000 on "software licensing and maintenance costs"; and approximately $400,000 on "Center for Internet Security, Equipment hosting." *Id*.

[69] Michigan Response at 18.

[70] Included in this category are Florida, Georgia, Nevada, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Wyoming.

[71] Illinois and North Dakota, which both responded that this question was not applicable to them, are included in this category.

State	During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?					Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cyber security program
	Yes	No	NR	Unknown	Amount	
					PSAPs from the state level.	program in that calendar year.”
CT		X			NA	Unknown
DE		X				0
FL			X		“Information not Collected”	“Information not Collected”
GA			X		*Unknown*	*Unknown*
HI		X			NA	“All 5 primary PSAPs”
IA		X			NA	Unknown
ID		X			NA	1
IL		X			NA	N/A
IN		X			NA	Unknown
KS		X			NA	“8 of the PSAPs reported that they implemented or participated in a local cyber security program.”
KY		X			NA	“Unsure”
MA		X			NA	“Unknown”
MD		X			NA	“Not Known”
ME	X				“Unable [to determine] as it is part of the overall services required of the NG911 System Service Provider contract.”	“26 As required by CJIS for NCIC”

State	During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?					Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cyber security program
	Yes	No	NR	Unknown	Amount	
MI	X				"The state of Michigan estimated aggregate spend for Cyber Security in 2014 was $22,871,649 . . . Included within this amount are cyber expenditures for centralized cyber related infrastructure and services that are used to support three state of Michigan State Police operated PSAPS in Negaunee, Gaylord, Detroit.	"Data not collected"
MN		X			NA	None
MS		X			NA	0
MT		X			NA	Unknown
NC		X			NA	3
ND		X			NA	N/A
NE		X			NA	0
NH		X			NA	0
NJ		X			NA	None
NM		X			NA	None
NV			X			NR
NY			X		"Cyber security expenditures, if any, are not reported to DHSES at this time."	NR

State	During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?					Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cyber security program
	Yes	No	NR	Unknown	Amount	
OH		X			NA	Unknown
OK				X		Unknown
OR		X			NA	0
PA		X			NA	Unknown
RI			X			"Presently, RI E 9-1-1 is not Internet connected and, as such, does not utilize cybersecurity software for the receipt and transfer of incoming 911 calls. It is envisioned that once our 911 network becomes Internet based (in accordance with answer number 8 above), that we will then incorporate cybersecurity safeguards and protocols."
SC		X			NA	Unknown
SD		X			NA	0
TN		X			NA	Unknown
TX	X				$443,830.16	18
UT		X			NA	0
VA		X			NA	Unknown
VT		X			NA	Unknown
WA	X				$83,473.00	55
WI		X			NA	Unknown
WV		X			NA	5
WY			X			NR
Other Jurisdictions						
AS		X			NA	None

State	During the annual period ending December 31, 2014, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?					Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cyber security program
	Yes	No	NR	Unknown	Amount	
DC		X			NA	"One"
NN	X				$8,000.00	7 PSAPS within the Navajo Nation
Total	**6**	**38**	**6**	**1**	**$25,306,952.16**	**151**

48. 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)[72] for networks that support one or more PSAPs. Nine states reported that they do adhere to the NIST Framework, eight states reported that they do not,[73] and thirty-four indicated they did not know or did not respond to the question.

Table 23 – Adherence to NIST Cybersecurity Framework

State	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?			
	Yes	No	Unknown	No Response
AK		X		
AL		X		
AR			X	
AZ			X	
CA	X			
CO			X	
CT		X		
DE			X	
FL			X	
GA	X			
HI			X	

[72] *See* National Institute of Standards and Technology, Cybersecurity Framework, at http://www.nist.gov/cyberframework/.

[73] Alaska states that "[a]s the NIST CSF (Cyber security Framework) is relatively new, the State Security Office is undertaking a current review of the state's information Security Framework as well as our individual Information Security Policies. In conjunction with this review moving toward and adopting the NIST CSF over the next 12-18 months." Alaska Supplemental Filing at 1.

State	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?			
	Yes	No	Unknown	No Response
IA	X			
ID			X	
IL		X		
IN			X	
KS	X			
KY			X	
MA			X	
MD		X		
ME			X	
MI	X			
MN			X	
MS			X	
MT			X	
NC			X	
ND			X	
NE			X	
NH			X	
NJ			X	
NM		X		
NV				X
NY				X
OH			X	
OK			X	
OR	X			
PA			X	
RI				X
SC			X	
SD		X		
TN			X	
TX	X			
UT		X		
VA			X	
VT	X			
WA	X			
WI			X	

State	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?			
	Yes	**No**	**Unknown**	**No Response**
WV			X	
WY				X
Other Jurisdictions				
AS			X	
DC			X	
NN			X	
Totals	**9**	**8**	**30**	**4**

K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees

49. The questionnaire 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 49 jurisdictions that responded, 26 described some effort to measure the effectiveness of 911/911 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. Seven jurisdictions did not respond to this section. Nine jurisdictions reported that that they had no information responsive to this section. Seven states reported that they were developing a mechanism to measure the effectiveness of expenditures. Finally, the Navajo Nation reported that the questions were not applicable as it had not yet begun spending funds on 911/E911.

50. The efforts of states that have tried to track the performance of programs funded by 911 fees vary considerably. A number of states require periodic reports from PSAPS on the use of funds. For example, Kentucky requires PSAPs receiving wireless funds receive a Geo-Audit that measures the accuracy of their ability to receive a plot wireless 911 calls on the PSAP map. In other states, such as Florida, the State 911 board evaluates PSAP performance. The frequency of various audits and performance measurements also varies widely. Massachusetts requires the [State 911] department to file a written annual report describing grant expenditures to municipalities. Texas has a biennial reporting requirement. Kentucky requires a financial audit of each PSAP every six years.

L. Public Comments on 2014 Sixth Annual Report

51. As in past reports, this section summarizes public comments received in response to the prior year's report. On January 23, 2015 the Commission issued a Public Notice seeking comment on

the 2014 Sixth Annual Report.[74] We received input from five commenters,[75] all expressing concern that state legislatures have diverted funds that were intended to support 911 systems. The Washington State APCO-NENA Chapter (APCO-NENA) commented that the practice in Washington state's recent biennial budgets "has been to change the language of the E911 [funding] statute to meet their funding needs," including diverting "$2 [million for a] Department of Corrections narrow-banding radio project," "$3.5 million . . . to fund computer system upgrades for the criminal history section of the Washington State Patrol," and $10.8 million to the Washington State Military Department for operating expenses."[76] APCO-NENA stated that "the fund has not been drained to the point of impacting the ability to provide basic E911," but the diversions will "at a minimum, extend the timeline for NG911 therefore causing additional unnecessary expenses and at a maximum, could damage the transition to the point of inability to implement."[77] Grays Harbor Communications Center E9-1-1 (Grays Harbor) commented that "[t]his year's Governor's Budget recommendation was presented utilizing $8.0 million to fund the [Washington State] Military Department['s] . . . daily expenses."[78]

52. The New Jersey Wireless Association (NJWA) commented that "88% of the [State of New Jersey's 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund Account (911 Trust Fund)] expenditures were appropriated to offset the operating budget of the NJ State Police and State Homeland Security Department."[79] NJWA reported that New Jersey's state and municipal PSAPs have not received any funds from 911 Trust Fund since 2009, despite those PSAPs handling the "vast majority" of 911 calls.[80] NJWA also argues that the State of New Jersey will "never" be able to implement a new IP-based ESInet, as only minimal funding is allocated to the planning or implementation of a statewide NG911 network.[81]

53. The Yakima County E911 Administrative Board and the Pacific County Communications Agency both commented that "the diversion and withholding of funds from the intended specific purposes hinders the enhancement of the 9-1-1 and NG911 communications systems" and "erodes the credibility and trust of elected officials to garner future public support of future public safety communications systems."[82] Grays Harbor asks the Commission to "find a mechanism to ensure that the funds put in place by the citizens are spent on the items they are intended.[83] NJWA "believes the FCC and Congress should clarify the definitions within or related to the NET911 Act of what

---

[74] FCC Seeks Public Comment on Sixth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, Public Notice, 30 FCC Rcd 344 (Jan. 23, 2015), available at http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=60001015936.

[75] The Commission received comments from the Yakima County E911 Administrative Board, the Washington State APCO-NENA Chapter, the Pacific County Communications Agency, Grays Harbor Communications Center E9-1-1, and the New Jersey Wireless Association.

[76] Washington State APCO-NENA Chapter Comments at 1.

[77] *Id.* at 2.

[78] Grays Harbor Communications Center E9-1-1 Comments at 2 (Grays Harbor Comments).

[79] New Jersey Wireless Association Comments at 2.

[80] *Id.*

[81] *Id.* at 3.

[82] Yakima County E911 Administrative Board Comments at 1; Pacific County Communications Agency at 1.

[83] Grays Harbor Comments at 2.

expenditures are intended under the Act as originally contemplated and subsequently adopted" and that "Congress should mandate that the process and organizations with jurisdiction of the expenditures of 911 Fees be subject to [the Open Public Records Act], to maintain the spirit of transparency within the [NET911] Act."[84]

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2015 SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT

54. 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.

[84] New Jersey Wireless Association Comments at 4.

Appendix A

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, 2014:**

PSAP Type[85]	Total
Primary	
Secondary	
Total	

2. **Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators[86] 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	
Part-time	

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 ($)	

[85] 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 .

[86] 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, 2014 to December 31, 2014.

Type of Service	Total 911 Calls
Wireline	
Wireless	
VoIP	
Other	
Total	

C. <u>Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanisms</u>

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, 2014, 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

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	☐	☐
Local (*e.g.*, county, city, municipality)	☐	☐
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.)		

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. <u>Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees</u>

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.

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)	☐	☐
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)	☐	☐
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility	☐	☐
Personnel Costs	Telecommunicators' Salaries	☐	☐
	Training of Telecommunicators	☐	☐
Administrative Costs	Program Administration	☐	☐
	Travel Expenses	☐	☐
Dispatch Costs	Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch	☐	☐
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	☐	☐
Grant Programs		☐ **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.			

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		
Wireless		
Prepaid Wireless		
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)		
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	
Wireless	
Prepaid Wireless	
Voice Over Internet Protocol	
Other	
Total	

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

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

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.*	☐	☐
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	
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*.	☐	☐

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.*	☐	☐
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.*	☐	☐
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.*	☐	☐
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.*	☐	☐
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	☐	☐		☐	☐
b. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet	☐	☐		☐	☐
c. Regional ESInets	☐	☐	[If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet]	☐	☐
Name of Regional ESInet:				☐	☐
Name of Regional ESInet:				☐	☐

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

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?**	
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?**	

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 ☐	

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?	

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?	☐	☐	☐

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.

Appendix B

Summary of State Responses Regarding 2014 Collections

State and Other Jurisdictions	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures Required	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2014)	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Funding of NG911 Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911
AK	Local	No	$13,969,230.81	None	No	None
AL	State	State and Local Required	$108,787,855.93	None	Yes	$1,228,623.43
AR	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$25,290,789.81	None	Yes	None
AZ	State	Yes	$17,589,404.00	None	Yes	$61,603.00
CA	State	Yes	$97,077,234.00	$4,331,000.00	Yes	$3,781,336.00
CO	Hybrid	No	$52,257,085.00	None	Yes	$22,270,461.00
CT	State	Yes	$37,176,000.00	None	Yes	$3,100,000.00
DE	State	Yes	$8,159,730.03	None	Yes	None
FL	State	State and Local Required	$108,324,754.00	None	Yes	$17,476,934.34
GA	Local	No	$17,538,556.19	None	Yes	None
HI	State	Yes	$10,489,700.00	None	Yes	$1,723,800.00

State and Other Jurisdictions	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures Required	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2014)	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Funding of NG911 Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911
IA	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$27,820,551.74	None	Yes	Does Not Track
ID	Hybrid	No	$20,879,778.16	None	Yes	None
IL	Hybrid	No	$213,983,628.00	$3,000,000.00	No	None
IN	State	State and Local Required	$72,075,593.48	None	Yes	$8,000,000.00
KS	State	State and Local Required	$20,337,748.19	None	Yes	$1,649,268.00
KY	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$53,920,232.00	None	Yes	Does Not Track
MA	State	Yes	$74,947,715.00	None	Yes	$1,583,218.00
MD	State	State and Local Required	$54,766,848.29	None	Yes	$12,067,230.15
ME	State	Yes	$8,340,150.00	None	Yes	$6,418,849.00
MI	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$88,932,890.69	None	Yes	$177,286.72
MN	State	State	$61,446,108.15	None	Yes	$27,638,145.54

State and Other Jurisdictions	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures Required	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2014)	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Funding of NG911 Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911
MS	Local	No	$31,280,356.96	None	Yes	None
MT	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$13,000,000.00	None	No	None
NC	State	No	$78,161,246.38	None	Yes	$1,285,639.00
ND	Hybrid	No	$10,337,907.00	None	Yes	$255,750.00
NE	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$13,940,368.00	None	No	None
NH	State	Yes	$10,582,269.31	$1,872,732.00	Yes	None
NJ	State	Yes	$120,000,000.00	$106,728,000.00	Yes	$9,141.00
NM	State	Yes	$11,600,163.44	None	Yes	None
NV	Did Not Provide	Did Not Provide	Did Not Provide	Did Not Provide	Did Not Provide	Did Not Provide
NY	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$185,513,240.00	$77,254,288.00	Yes	Does Not Track
OH	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$25,736,969.91	None	Yes	None
OK	Local	No	Did Not Provide	None	No	None

State and Other Jurisdictions	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures Required	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2014)	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Funding of NG911 Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911
OR	State	State and Local Required	$39,470,386.00	None	Yes	$438,061.62
PA	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$190,711,113.00	None	Yes	Does Not Track
RI	State	Yes	$17,640,703.00	$12,263,289.00	Yes	$500,000.00
SC	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$28,458,896.05	None	Yes	$710,000.00
SD	State	State and Local Required	$13,095,234.00	None	Yes	$288,773.00
TN	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$67,404,840.00	None	Yes	$73,004,983.00
TX	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$208,478,516.24	None	Yes	$22,952,496.17
UT	State	State and Local Required	$24,572,000.00	None	No	None
VA	State	Yes	$85,187,559.69	$11,700,000.00	Yes	$1,000,000.00
VT	State	Yes	Did Not Provide	None	Yes	$4,604,830.00

State and Other Jurisdictions	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures Required	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2014)	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Funding of NG911 Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911
WA	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$91,529,550.00	None	Yes	$13,476,567.00
WI	Fees retained in full by service providers	No	Does Not Track	None	Yes	None
WV	Hybrid	State and Local Required	$56,323,470.55	$6,271,600.00	Yes	Does Not Track
WY	Local	No	Does Not Track	Did Not Provide	Did Not Provide	Does Not Track
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	None; budgeted through executive office of Department of Public Safety	Department of Public Safety	None	Did Not Provide	Not applicable	None
DC	City	Yes	$10,488,987.85	None	Yes	$1,872,000.00
NN	AZ, NM,	No tribal	None	Did Not Provide	No	None

State and Other Jurisdictions	Type of Fund Collection	State Approval of Expenditures Required	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2014)	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Funding of NG911 Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911
	UT collect 911 fees; no tribal authority to collect fees	authority regarding use of fees collected by AZ, NM, UT				

Appendix C

Overview of Total State 911 Fees - 2009 to 2015 Reports[87]

State or Jurisdiction	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report
Alabama	$60,465,103.67	$29,857,571.09	$28,680,846.00	$28,401,585.00	$28,401,585.00	$41,974,723.93	$108,787,855.93
Alaska	DNP	$8,199,046.36	$8,649,083.00	$12,320,888.00	$12,256,620.07	$12,448,651.46	$13,969,230.81
American Samoa	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Arizona	$15,056,353.00	$17,460,160.00	$16,238,766.00	$16,747,691.00	$16,445,301.00	$16,628,695.00	$17,589,404.00
Arkansas	$24,799,338.00	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	$25,290,789.81
California	$106,817,446.59	$101,450,093.46	$100,000,000.00	$85,952,018.00	$82,126,695.00	$75,714,948.00	$97,077,234.00
Colorado	$45,000,000.00	$45,000,000.00	$45,000,000.00	$1,907,087.00	$42,900,000.00 (est.)	$42,900,000.00 (est.)	$52,257,085.00 (est.)
Connecticut	$20,116,090.61	$21,397,572.52	$20,723,228.00	$22,413,228.00	$24,001,890.00	$35,755,787.70	$37,176,000.00
Delaware	DNP	$2,259,727.83	$8,044,859.00	$8,775,757.00	$7,623,391.53	$7,786,658.53	$8,159,730.03
District of Columbia	$12,744,103.00	$12,714,347.00	$12,700,000.00	DNP	$12,064,842.00	$13,700,000.00	$10,488,987.85
Florida	$130,962,053.00	$125,531,674.00	$123,059,300.00[88]	$122,550,767.00	$108,896,142.00	$107,884,715.00	$108,324,754.00
Georgia	DNP	$8,537,319.00	$8,950,569.00	$13,700,097.00	DNP	$18,462,645.22	$17,538,556.19
Guam	$1,468,363.00	DNP	DNP	$1,779,710.00	DNP	DNP	DNP
Hawaii	$8,842,841.49	$9,578,764.44	$9,544,397.00	$9,755,031.00	$10,020,045.00	$9,599,983.00	$10,489,700.00
Idaho	$19,191,409.99	$18,673,808.67	$18,013,902.00	$17,013,000.00	$19,313,000.00	$20,768,995.00	$20,879,778.16
Illinois	DNP	$67,000,000.00	$69,700,000.00	$71,900,000.00	$69,200,000.00	$71,200,000.00	$213,983,628.00
Indiana	$71,000,000.00	$39,600,000.00	$30,000,000.00	DNP	$69,515,799.65	$73,114,655.69	$72,075,593.48
Iowa	$29,054,622.00	$31,458,531.00	$31,304,377.00	$30,664,253.00	$30,297,168.00	$20,657,733.45	$27,820,551.74
Kansas	DNP	$6,705,538.67	DNP	$22,125,937.00	$20,477,020.47	$20,573,217.00	$20,337,748.19

[87] "DNP" indicates that the state or jurisdiction did not provide the information.

[88] Revised total to reflect the collection of $45,888,321.00 in non-wireless E911 fees and the collection of $77,170,979.00in wireless E911 fees of. The 2011 Report only included non-wireless E911 fees in the total.

State or Jurisdiction	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report
Kentucky	$23,569,921.00	$22,979,827.96	$54,900,000.00	$56,500,000.00	$55,700,000.00	$53,506,843.30	$53,920,232.00
Louisiana	DNP	DNP	$3,017,672.00	DNP	$4,912,926.00	DNP	DNP
Maine	$6,664,062.00	$6,108,985.00	$7,786,855.00	$8,416,235.00	$8,342,459.00	$8,034,327.32	$8,340,150.00
Maryland	$57,176,923.16	$55,556,616.37	$54,560,255.00	$52,099,601.00	$52,240,760.76	$51,716,231.56	$54,766,848.29
Massachusetts	DNP	$69,694,702.00	$75,125,185.00	$73,408,835.00	$73,677,263.00	$74,561,727.61	$74,947,715.00
Michigan	$69,835,671.59	$93,000,132.24	$87,673,893.00	$196,215,849.00	$181,204,130.55	$178,224,825.56	$88,932,890.69
Minnesota	$51,281,641.00	$51,269,514.00	$58,821,937.00	$58,654,182.00	$62,353,897.17	$62,056,115.98	$61,446,108.15
Mississippi	$11,758,733.12	DNP	$56,335,986.00	$60,813,014.00	$65,290,042.40	$58,175,490.31	$31,280,356.96
Missouri	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Montana	$13,172,462.14	$13,172,462.14	$13,715,064.00	$13,626,940.00	$13,177,751.61	$13,099,542.00	$13,000,000.00
Nebraska	$13,278,907.19	$5,507,239.80	$8,128,042.00	$14,808,421.00	$15,555,733.76	$15,663,631.18	$13,940,368.00
Nevada	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	$2,010,341.58	$1,944,446.69	DNP
New Hampshire	$10,854,202.82	DNP	$9,832,831.00	DNP	$10,493,486.32	$10,467,786.57	$10,582,269.31
New Jersey	$130,000,000.00	$128,900,000.00	DNP	$125,000,000.00	$126,000,000.00	$121,000,000.00	$120,000,000.00
New Mexico	$12,786,327.64	$12,073,923.31	$13,081,062.00	$13,424,002.00	$12,028,770.41	$11,970,079.32	$11,600,163.44
New York	$83,700,000.00	DNP	$193,194,759.00	$194,787,113.00	$190,281,716.00	$183,219,891.00	$185,513,240.00
North Carolina	$84,613,672.00	$87,367,015.00	$80,001,662.00	DNP	$69,424,896.51	$71,688,784.47	$78,161,246.38
North Dakota	DNP	$8,369,366.00	DNP	$9,506,000.00	$9,506,000.00	$9,998,322.00	$10,337,907.00
Northern Marianas Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	DNP	DNP	DNP
Ohio	$28,544,923.91	$28,164,049.54	$29,175,929.00	DNP	$28,837,121.12	$25,689,296.16	$25,736,969.91
Oklahoma	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Oregon	$87,447,639.72	$40,155,054.04	$39,592,560.00	$39,370,086.00	$39,229,319.00	$39,115,990.00	$39,470,386.00
Pennsylvania	$190,239,804.99	$116,656,192.90	$194,554,260.00	$192,297,459.00	$184,044,508.00	$192,779,782.15	$190,711,113.00
Puerto Rico	$20,952,458.73	$21,876,276.72	DNP	$21,367,260.00	$20,323,323.95	$19,507,889.00	DNP
Rhode Island	$19,400,000.00	$18,200,000.00	$15,488,729.00	DNP	$16,500,000.00	$17,454,000.00	$17,640,703.00
South Carolina	$22,000,000.00	DNP	$21,988,052.00	$22,215,748.00	$28,948,882.35	$27,690,958.32	$28,458,896.05

State or Jurisdiction	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report
South Dakota	DNP	DNP	$8,100,000.00	$8,200,000.00	$9,111,476.00	$13,275,031.00	$13,095,234.00
Tennessee	$51,536,089.00	$55,965,000.00	$58,500,000.00	$94,497,881.00	$60,852,139.96	$98,199,801.31	$67,404,840.00
Texas	$197,228,795.88	$203,547,359.97	$199,025,787.00	$209,202,098.00	$212,788,623.00	$213,215,483.00	$208,478,516.24
Utah	$23,366,301.00	$2,724,374.00	$23,909,566.00	$23,070,307.00	$26,188,051.00	$29,354,710.30	$24,572,000.00
Vermont	$4,832,374.02	$5,487,046.00	$4,605,803.00	$4,993,132.00	$5,416,336.00	$4,628,027.00	DNP
Virgin Islands	NA	$590,812.00	$554,245.00	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Virginia	DNP	$52,022,170.24	$53,217,635.00	$54,079,487.00	$51,658,842.97	$55,212,203.72	$85,187,559.69
Washington	$69,523,163.00	$71,036,718.00	$71,244,435.00	$100,952,115.00	$95,417,113.85	$95,887,087.00	$91,529,550.00
West Virginia	$32,278,728.00	$33,760,563.00	$35,375,580.00	$36,176,377.00	$37,928,204.37	$58,001,074.83	$56,323,470.55
Wisconsin	$9,602,745.46	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Wyoming	$6,700,000.00	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Total	**$1,877,863,271.72**	**$1,749,609,554.27**	**$2,002,117,111.00**[89]	**$2,149,689,191.00**	**$2,322,983,616.36**	**$2,404,510,787.64**	**$2,527,625,360.85**

[89] Total for the annual period ending December 31, 2010 (2011 Report) revised from $1,924,946,132.00 to $2,002,117.111.00 to reflect correction to Florida total fees.