EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

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

FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2015 TO DECEMBER 31, 2015

Submitted Pursuant to
Public Law No. 110-283

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Tom Wheeler, Chairman

December 30, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Heading Paragraph #

I. INTRODUCTION 1
II. KEY FINDINGS 2
III. BACKGROUND 3
IV. DISCUSSION 5
A. Summary of Reporting Methodology 6
B. Overview of State 911 Systems 8
C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanism 13
D. Description of State Authority that Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent 18
E. Description of Uses of State 911 Fees 20
F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected 24
G. Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Use 29
H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees 43
I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures 46
J. Cybersecurity Expenditures 50
K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees 53
L. Public Comments on 2015 Seventh Annual Report 56
V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2016 EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT 64
Appendix A – Summary of State and Other Jurisdiction Responses Regarding 2015 Collections
Appendix B – Overview of Total State and Other Jurisdiction 911 Fees – 2009 – 2016
Appendix C – Information Collection Questionnaire

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 eighth 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, 2015 to December 31, 2015. This report also reflects the second annual 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.

[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).

II. KEY FINDINGS

2. Forty-nine states,[4] the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands responded to this year's data request. The following is a compilation of key findings based on the responses:

- In calendar year 2015, states and other reporting jurisdictions collected 911/E911 fees or charges totaling $2,631,705,008.98.

- Fees and charges collected on a per-state basis ranged from a low of $1,297,671.00 by the US Virgin Islands to a high of $239,800,218.00 by Pennsylvania.

- Twenty-seven states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands reported collecting 911/E911 fees at the state level, six reported collecting fees at the local level, and sixteen states collected fees at both the state and local level.

- The Bureau identified eight states and Puerto Rico as diverting or transferring 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911.

    - Iowa, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Washington, and West Virginia used a portion of their 911/E911 funds to support non-911 related public safety programs.

    - Illinois, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Puerto Rico used 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 2015 was $220,281,586.82, or approximately 8.4 percent of total 911/E911 fees collected.

- Thirty-six states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico reported spending 911/E911 funds on Next Generation 911 (NG911) programs in calendar year 2015. The total amount of reported NG911 expenditures from 911/E911 fees was $164,817,664.55, or approximately 6.26 percent of total 911/E911 fees collected.

- Thirteen states and Puerto Rico reported having deployed state-wide Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets). Fifteen states reported having regional ESInets within the state, and ten states reported local-level ESInets.

- Forty states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico reported on deployment of text-to-911. Collectively, respondents reported 553 PSAPs as being text-capable as of the end of 2015, and projected that an additional 844 PSAPs would be text-capable by the end of 2016.

- While almost every state collects 911 fees from in-state subscribers, nineteen states and American Samoa 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, eight conducted audits in 2015.

- On the topic of cybersecurity preparedness for Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs),

[4] Missouri was the only state that did not respond to this year's data request.

thirty-eight states, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and US Virgin Islands indicated that they spent no 911 funds in 2015 on 911–related cybersecurity programs for PSAPs. Nine states and the District of Columbia 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 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 April 2016, the Bureau sent questionnaires to the Governor of each state and territory and the Mayor of the District of Columbia requesting information on 911 fee collection and expenditure for calendar year 2015.[5] The Bureau received responsive information from 49 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands.[6] The Bureau did not receive responses from Missouri, Guam, and Northern Mariana Islands.

---

[5] *See* Appendix C - Annual Collection of Information Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions (FCC Questionnaire). This year's data collection incorporates recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in its April 2013 report on state collection and use of 911 funds. *See* 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). Consistent with GAO's recommendation, and in order to improve the collection and analysis of data in its annual reports, 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. *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). In previous years, the Bureau has sent questionnaires to the regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), but these offices have either failed to respond, indicated they have no responsive information, or requested that they not be contacted. Accordingly, the Bureau did not include the BIA regional offices in this year's data collection.

[6] Copies of reports from all responding jurisdictions are available on the FCC web site at https://www.fcc.gov/fcc.gov/general/8th-annual-911-fee-report-state-filings. Of the 49 responding states, Nevada and Ohio did not collect the information at the state level but coordinated a response by select Nevada and Ohio counties. Rhode Island, New York, and Wyoming responded to the data request but did not use the supplied questionnaire, instead providing their own response format. Missouri did not respond to the request. American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands used the supplied questionnaire. The Commission did not receive responses from Guam or Northern Mariana Islands.

IV. DISCUSSION

5. This Report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in calendar year 2015, how much they collected, and how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds.[7] 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

6. 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*."[8] 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."*[9]

7. 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. States determine how 911/E911 fee revenues are to be spent, therefore, 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 particular state's 911 funding statute, and also requests information on what uses are deemed permissible under the state's statute and how such uses support 911 or E911 service. Although some state statutes expressly authorize the diversion or transfer of collected 911/E911 fees, the Bureau reviews the reported expenditures to determine whether such diversions or transfers are not "in support of 9-1-1 and enhanced 9-1-1 services, or enhancements of such services" within the meaning of the NET 911 Act. The report on 911/E911 fee diversion in Section G below is consistent with this interpretation.

B. Overview of State 911 Systems

8. To provide a broader context for the information provided on collection and use of 911 fees, the data collection sought information about the total number of Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) that receive funding derived from the collection of 911 fees, the 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.[10]

---

[7] Our analysis includes states that collect and distribute fees over the course of a fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year covered by our reports.

[8] NET 911 Act at §6(f)(1).

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

[10] FCC Questionnaire at 2-3.

9. **Number and Type of PSAPs**. The questionnaire requested that states "provide the total number of active [Primary and Secondary PSAPs][11] in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2015." Table 1 shows that 47 states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands responded to this request, reporting a total of 4,671 Primary PSAPs and 778 Secondary PSAPs, for a total of 5,449 PSAPs dependent on funding derived from the collection of 911 fees.[12] 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.[13] Michigan states that there are five secondary PSAPs in the state, but that they are all operated by private EMS services and receive no direct funding through the fees and surcharges described in its filing.[14]

Table 1 - Number and Types of PSAPS of Reporting Jurisdictions

State	Number of PSAPs				
	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total	Unknown	No Response
AK	38	5	43		
AL	118	0	118		
AR	102	29	131		
AZ	76	10	86		
CA	399	51	450		
CO	91	8	99		
CT	110	0	110		
DE	8	1	9		
FL	154	52	206		
GA	135	23	158		
HI	5	3	8		
IA	114	0	114		
ID	46	2	48		
IL	253	25	278		
IN	91	28	119		
KS	117	0	117		
KY	115	40	155		

[11] 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 .

[12] New Jersey did not respond to this portion of the questionnaire.

[13] American Samoa Response at 3. The PSAP is operated as a unit of the Department of Public Safety Police Services Bureau and funded under the DPS annual operations budget.

[14] Michigan Response at 2.

State	Number of PSAPs				
	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total	Unknown	No Response
LA	57	50	107		
MA	249	81	330		
MD	24	52	76		
ME	26	0	26		
MI	145	0	145		
MN	99	5	104		
MS	103	30	133		
MT	53	0	53		
NC	119	6	125		
ND	22	0	22		
NE	71	0	71		
NH	2	0	2		
NJ				X	
NM	45	2	47		
NV	12	3	15		
NY	134	50	184		
OH	143	60	203		
OK	133		133		
OR	43	14	57		
PA	69	0	69		
RI	1	1	2		
SC	80	0	80		
SD	29	0	29		
TN	140	30	170		
TX	490	64	554		
UT	32	4	36		
VA	121	40	161		
VT	6	0	6		
WA	54	9	63		
WI	139	0	139		
WV	52	0	52		
WY					X
Other Jurisdictions					
AS	1	0	1		
DC	1	0	1		
PR	2	0	2		
USVI	2	0	2		
Total	**4,671**	**778**	**5,449**	**1**	**1**

10. **Number of Telecommunicators**. Respondents were asked to provide the total number of active telecommunicators[15] in each state or territory that were funded through the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2015. As detailed in Table 2, forty-six states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands responded to this data request. Twenty-seven states, Puerto Rico, and US Virgin Islands reported a total of 30,664 full time telecommunicators and 2,360 part-time telecommunicators that are funded through the collection of 911 fees. Eleven states reported they do not know how telecommunicators are funded, seven states and the District of Columbia reported they are not funded by 911 fees, and three states did not respond to the question. American Samoa reported eight telecommunicators, but they are not funded by 911 fees.

Table 2 – Total Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Unknown	Not Funded	NR
AK	270	10			
AL			X		
AR	1,018	187			
AZ				X	
CA				X	
CO	481	11			
CT					X
DE	253	3			
FL	2,260	271			
GA			X		
HI	236				
IA			X		
ID			X		
IL	3,428	N/A			
IN	1,401	257			
KS	1,071	125			
KY	1,238	270			
LA			X		
MA	5,000				

[15] 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 Funded	NR
MD	1,417	94			
ME				X	
MI	1,978	282			
MN			X		
MS	1,365				
MT			X		
NC				X	
ND	230				
NE	590	101			
NH	74	12			
NJ				X	
NM				X	
NV	71	4			
NY					X
OH	661	108			
OK			X		
OR	854				
PA	2,097	267			
RI	30				
SC					X
SD	282	30			
TN			X		
TX	880	19			
UT	790	80			
VA	1,043				
VT	76	31			
WA	1,052	94			
WI			X		
WV	566	107			
WY			X		
Other Jurisdictions					
AS	8				
DC				X	
PR	162				
USVI	35				
Total	**30,917**	**2,363**	**11**	**7**	**3**

11. **Number of 911/E911 Calls**. The questionnaire asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total number of 911 calls the state or jurisdiction received for the annual period ending December 31, 2015. Forty-four states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands reported a cumulative total of 253,844,538 calls of all types during 2015.[16] This represents an increase of 29.4 percent in reported call volume over 2014, although this difference is largely attributable to the increased number of states and territories that reported data this year compared to last year.[17] Of the total reported calls, 156,031,576 calls came from wireless phones, representing approximately 61.5 percent of the total reported call volume, as compared to 2014, when wireless calls comprised approximately 69.2 percent of reported call volume. However, this likely understates the percentage of wireless 911 calls because a number of states reported total 911 calls but did not break out service categories separately.[18] Table 3 provides specific call volume information provided by each state or other jurisdiction for each service type. In addition, the Bureau has included an estimate of annual 911 calls on a per capita basis in each reporting state and jurisdiction.

Table 3 – Total 911 Calls by Service Type

State	Type of Service							Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita[19]
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Unknown	No Response	
AK	66,917	337,349	Unknown	Unknown	404,266			.57
AL[20]	Unknown	1,387,805	Unknown	Unknown	1,387,805			.29
AR[21]	276,035	2,038,786	Unknown	Unknown	2,314,821			.79
AZ	945,863 (includes VoIP)	4,235,749	--	No Response	5,181,612			.81
CA	4,254,595	22,741,803	948,995	1,167,832 (Types Not Specified)	29,113,225			.78
CO	475,394	5,895,735	171,642	--	6,542,771			1.30

[16] Five states stated they did not have access to this information.

[17] In the 2015 Report, 911 call volume data was provided by 38 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the Navajo Nation.

[18] Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands reported total 911 call volumes but did not provide service category subtotals.

[19] Bureau estimate based on United States 2010 Census data for each jurisdiction.

[20] According to Alabama, with respect to wireline, VoIP, and "Other" call types, "[t]hese statistics are maintained at the local emergency communications districts and are not readily available to the state office. Alabama completed their wireless aggregation project in December 2014, which allows for all wireless calls in the state to be routed through the Alabama Next Generation Emergency Network (ANGEN); therefore, we are only able to provide wireless statistics for our state. Based on incomplete reporting from local districts, wireless calls account for approximately 80% to 85% of the 911 calls in the State of Alabama." Alabama Response at 3.

[21] Arkansas reported that prior to 2016 (for calendar year 2015), "AT&T provided call studies to the PSAPs. Because many of the PSAPs were not pulling call studies from their 911 systems regularly, they were unaware that their systems were not working. As a result some of the reported stats were estimated based on the surrounding month's data and the previous year's data for the same reporting period." Arkansas Response at 3.

State	Type of Service							Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita[19]
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Unknown	No Response	
CT	358,275	1,873,491	126,105	--	2,357,871			.66
DE	729,780	553,367	--	--	1,283,156			1.43
FL	2,446,096	19,070,052	461,144	230,873	22,208,165			1.18
GA	--	--	--	--	--	X		--
HI	320,449	1,020,565	49,429	--	1,390,443			1.02
IA	Unknown	827,205	Unknown	--	827,205			.27
ID[22]	Not Specified				662,938			.42
IL	7,551,211	7,117,806	N/A	--	14,669,017			1.14
IN	1,219,984	3,787,054	89,691	148,555	5,245,284			.81
KS	727,672	1,498,473	27,831	142,467	2,396,443			.84
KY	656,664	2,831,848	--	--	3,488,512			.80
LA	▪ Types not specified ▪ 45 of 64 parishes reporting				4,633,500			1.02
MA	864,767 (includes VoIP)	3,032,090	--	--	3,896,857			.60
MD	1,429,626 (includes VoIP)	3,728,697	--	--	5,158,323			.89
ME	138,583	396,511	49,734	--	584,828			.44
MI	1,403,077	5,248,738	342,312	2,814[23]	6,996,941			.71
MN	703,295	2,143,558	52,074	80,676	2,979,603			.56
MS	Not Specified				2,792,209			.94
MT	--	--	--	--	--	X		--
NC	1,425,695	5,730,754	558,161	--	7,714,610			.81
ND	69,190	255,386	1,618	--	326,194			.48
NE	241,207	839,010	--	--	1,080,217[24]			.59
NH	72,885	354,330	48,627	15,600[25]	491,442			.37
NJ	Not Specified				7,850,000			.89
NM	285,751	1,187,718	21,604	3,976	1,499,049[26]			.73

[22] Reported that "30 of 46 PSAPs Responded and not all PSAPs are tracking or were able to pull the requested data for the state report. 662,938 total number of 911 calls delivered for 30 responding PSAPs. Not all could break out the different types. Consequently, those reported a total number." Idaho Response at 3.

[23] Michigan reported that 98 percent of PSAPs reported call volumes and included in "Other" are text-to-911 calls. Michigan Response at 4.

[24] Nebraska entered 1,080,297 for its total. Nebraska Response at 2.

[25] "Other" includes 15,261 Administrative Line calls and 339 texts-to-911. New Hampshire Response at 3.

[26] New Mexico entered 1,495,107 for its total. New Mexico Response at 3.

State	Type of Service							Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita[19]
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Unknown	No Response	
NV[27]	540,676	1,159,970	10,541	1,961,285	3,766,680			1.39
NY	Not Specified				29,417,934			1.52
OH	1,015,705	5,563,016	260,039	191,772	7,030,532			.61
OK	--	--	--	--	--	X		--
OR	319,200	1,315,320	82,189	30,570	1,747,279			.46
PA	2,480,207	6,495,406	418,886	--	9,394,499			.74
RI	Not Specified[28]				514,926			.49
SC	1,430,675 (includes VoIP)	4,292,025	--	--	5,722,700			1.24
SD	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	--	332,645[29]			.41
TN	Unknown	3,120,000	Unknown	Unknown	3,120,000			.49
TX	2,980,196	24,917,198	878,125	229,581[30]	29,005,100			1.15
UT	98,500	904,773	31,483	19,312	1,054,068			.38
VA	1,146,214	3,341,374	--	--	4,487,588			.56
VT	41,826	139,926	18,366	6,283	206,401			.33
WA	999,536	4,906,647	360,298	--	6,266,481			.93
WI[31]	--	--	--	--	--	X		--
WV	988,876	667,704	76,430	259,201	1,992,211			1.08
WY	--	--	--	--	--	X		--
Other Jurisdictions								
AS	6,000	52,320	--	--	58,320			1.05

[27] Cumulative numbers for each call type include totals provided by Boulder City, Carson City, Las Vegas Fire & Rescue, Las Vegas Metro Police Department, and the counties of Douglas, Elko, Esmeralda, Lander, Nye, Sparks, Storey and Washoe.

[28] Rhode Island reported that of the "514,926 incoming 911 calls at its Primary (manned) PSAP, 75 percent were wireless."

[29] South Dakota stated that "total 911 calls is the only information we are able to collect from our PSAPs at this time, because every PSAP has a different CPE and some of their systems do not allow them to pull call counts by service type. However as part of the statewide NG911 project, we are 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. Calendar year 2018 is expected to be the first full year with all PSAPs on the hosted CPE and therefore the call counts will be available by service type." South Dakota Response at 3.

[30] "Other" total includes Multi-line Telephone Systems, telematics, and text to 911 calls. Texas Response at 3.

[31] Wisconsin reported that its "county and municipal governments operate and administer the 911 system and all public safety answering points (PSAPs). 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." Wisconsin Response at 4.

State	Type of Service							Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita[19]
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Unknown	No Response	
DC	442,917	1,022,017	--	--	1,464,934			2.42
PR	Not Specified				2,571,660			.69
USVI	Not Specified				213,282			2
Totals	**39,153,539**	**156,031,576**	**5,085,324**	**4,876,992**	**253,844,538**	**5**	**0**	

12. **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, 2015, regardless of whether such costs are supported by 911 fees or other funding sources. As detailed in Table 4, forty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands provided cost estimates totaling $3,368,446,067.70. Table 4 also includes the Bureau's estimate of reported costs on a per capita basis for each reporting state and jurisdiction. Nine 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.[32]

Table 4 – Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, About Figure Provided or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Estimated Annual Per Capita 911 Cost[33]
AK	$12,837,113.68		$18.07
AL	$112,163,211.00	"This figure is for total expenditures as provided by an independent auditors' report for fiscal period October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2015."	$23.47
AR	$55,055,078.00		$17.17
AZ	$17,630,018.90		$2.76
CA	$87,954,600.00		$2.36
CO	$102,256,610.00	Amount is "(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."	$20.33
CT	$28,625,819.44		$8.01

[32] States lacking complete information include Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

[33] Bureau estimate based on United States 2010 Census data for each jurisdiction.

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, About Figure Provided or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Estimated Annual Per Capita 911 Cost[33]
DE	$100,000,000.00		$111.37
FL	$210,240,763.10		$11.18
GA	Unknown	"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 government. "	--
HI	Unknown	"Each county has their own cost accounting system which the E911 Board has no authority over. Their system is not set up to capture expenses associated with 911/E911 service only. As a result, the counties must perform this task manually which creates other problems such as accuracy and time constraints. We will undergo an effort to work with the PSAPs to assist in accomplishing the task through modifications of their cost accounting system. Hopefully the matter will be resolved by this time next year."	--
IA	$143,193,597.97		$47.00
ID	Unknown	"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 30 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	$140,583,131.00	"Last year we were able to include the City of Chicago at a total of $263,503,493.00. The City's 2015 Audit has not been finalized and they were not able to provide this information. So the number above is for the entire State excluding Chicago."	$10.96
IN	$164,000,000.00		$25.29
KS	$69,487,521.92	"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."	$24.35

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, About Figure Provided or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Estimated Annual Per Capita 911 Cost[33]
KY	$91,576,465.00	"Centralized data collection is new to the CMRS Board so data collection in 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."	$21.10
LA	Unknown	"Currently Louisiana does not have a body that receives a centralized report. This was changed in Act 665 of 2016 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature."	--
MA	$28,184,862.00	"The estimated amount (based upon the amount contracted for Fiscal Year 2016) to provide E911 service is: $28,184,862. This estimated amount includes the costs associated with the legacy E911 service provider contracts, 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."	$4.30
MD	$93,091,148.75	"FY 2015 (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015) as reported by annual county audits."	$16.12
ME	$6,311,588.00	"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 E911 surcharge."	$4.75
MI	$249,337,283.18	"1) Expenses reported by PSAPs: $240,529,770.46. 2) The total reported technical costs for network collections by landline telephone companies for 911 network and delivery costs in 2015: $7,028,674 (figure does not include Baraga County). 3) $1,778,838.72 for calendar year 2015 for the cost of wireless 911 delivery was reimbursed to landline service providers (AT&T, Frontier, and Peninsula Fiber Network) under the Michigan Public Service Commission's Docket U-14000."	$25.23
MN	$26,190,951.58	"This includes NG911 specific expenditures, and the allocation provided to the PSAPs towards their eligible use expenses."	$4.94
MS	$35,494,712.00		$11.96
MT	$13,000,000.00	"The State of Montana distributes approximately $13 million total annually to wireless telecommunications providers, local and tribal governments for support of 911/E911 services. These funds do not cover all of the costs of providing 911/E911 services. Additional costs	$13.14

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, About Figure Provided or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Estimated Annual Per Capita 911 Cost[33]
		are incurred by providers, local and tribal governments and these costs are not reported to the State of Montana."	
NC	$109,413,320.00		$11.47
ND	$16,029,376.00		$23.83
NE	Unknown	"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	$15,503,339.03		$11.78
NJ	$14,000,000.00	"The State of New Jersey funds the statewide enhanced 9-1-1 infrastructure at an annual cost of approximately $14M, the operational, equipment and personnel costs are the responsibility of the PSAP and not reported to the State 9-1-1 Office."	$1.59
NM	$12,871,714.00		$6.25
NV	$15,431,414.00	Number is based on individual responses of Boulder City, Carson City, Las Vegas Fire & Rescue, Las Vegas Metro Police Department, and the counties of Douglas, Elko, Esmeralda, Lander, Nye, Sparks, Storey and Washoe.	$5.71
NY	No Response		--
OH	$147,579,296.16	"This is based on responses from 80 of Ohio's 88 counties."	$12.79
OK	Unknown		--
OR	$126,781,435.00	"42 of 43 PSAPs reporting."	$33.09
PA	$333,226,588.00		$26.23
RI	$5,160,147.59	Amount based on FY 2015 Operating Budget	$4.90
SC	$65,000,000.00	“Estimated”	$14.05
SD	$24,292,661.00		$29.84
TN	$85,000,000.00		$13.39
TX	$232,792,528.76	"Amount equals total 772 ECD wireline/wireless/prepaid wireless revenues collected; for the state 9-1-1 program appropriated wireline/wireless/prepaid wireless and (9-1-1 only) equalization surcharge, and for the municipal ECDs a total cost estimate."	$9.26
UT	$50,000,000.00		$18.09

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation, if any, About Figure Provided or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Estimated Annual Per Capita 911 Cost[33]
VA	$111,600,179.00	"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 $111,600,179."	$13.95
VT	$4,604,830.00		$7.36
WA	$108,612,280.00	"Based on 115% of statewide total E911 excise taxes collected."	$16.15
WI	Unknown	"In Wisconsin, county and municipal governments operate and administer the 911 system and all public safety answering points (PSAPs). 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	$53,261,290.00	"11 out of 52 PSAPs did not provide data."	$28.74
WY	Unknown	"According to Title 16, Chapter 9 of the Wyoming State Statutes for the Emergency Telephone Service Act, Wyoming does not assign over-sight responsibility to a state-level agency for 911 services."	--
Other Jurisdictions			
AS	Not Specified	"The PSAP is operated as a unit of DPS Police Services Bureau and funded under the DPS annual operations budget." American Samoa did not provide a dollar figure.	--
DC	$41,607,447.00		$69.15
PR	$9,947,332.64		$2.67
USVI	$3,516,414.00		$33.05
Total	**$3,368,446,067.70**	**Average State Per Capita Expenditure**	**$18.57**
		National Per Capita Expenditure[34]	**$10.97**

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

13. Forty-six states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands 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.[35] Oklahoma and American Samoa reported

[34] Does not include Missouri, Guam, or Northern Marianas Islands.

[35] Nevada and Wyoming did not respond to the question.

that they have not established a funding mechanism.

14. Of those states that have an established funding mechanism, Table 5 identifies twelve states that enlarged or altered their funding mechanism during calendar year 2015. Arkansas amended the amount apportioned to PSAPs.[36] Six of them – Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee - altered the amount of the fee they collect. North Dakota and Oregon added pre-paid wireless service to the categories of services required to contribute.[37] North Carolina amended its state statute to require the state 911 Board to allocate 10 percent of total service charges to the state's Next Generation 911 Reserve Fund.[38]

Table 5 – States That Amended or Enlarged 911 Funding Mechanism

State	Description
AR	"Yes. During the 2015 Legislative session, ACT919 was passed increasing the amount to be used exclusively for training and all related costs under A.C.A. § 12-10-325. The amount was increased from $120,000 to $200,000 thus reducing the quarterly distribution amount to the PSAPs by $80,000. There were no other alterations to the funding mechanism."
IL	"Senate Bill 96 amended the Emergency Telephone Safety Act and the Wireless Emergency Telephone Safety Act merging the requirements of both Acts into the Emergency Telephone System Act in July 2015. It also amended the Pre-paid Wireless Act. Summary of amendments to the Emergency Telephone System Act: ▪ Transferred the oversight of local 9-1-1 systems from the Illinois Commerce Commission to the Illinois State Police effective January 1, 2016. ▪ Established the Office of Statewide 911 Administrator as a division of the Department of State Police (ISP) effective January 1, 2016. The Administrator is responsible for developing, implementing, and overseeing a uniform statewide 911 system for all areas of the State outside the City of Chicago. The Administrator will be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. First term expires January 1, 2017 and then on a two year cycle thereafter. ▪ Created a 9-1-1 Advisory Board effective on July 1, 2015 with 2 and 3 year terms. ▪ Established a uniform monthly surcharge of $.87 effective January 1, 2016 for wireline, VoIP and wireless connections; this surcharge is collected and disbursed by the State. Where multi voice grade communication channels are connected through a PBX or Centrex service, a 5 [sic] surcharge per network connection will apply. (Same as today.) ▪ Wireline and VoIP 9-1-1 surcharges which were managed and set by the local governments were eliminated. ▪ Established the distribution formula for the $.87 surcharge effective January 1, 2016: o $0.013 to counties under 100,000 population o $0.033 transferred to Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund until June 30, 2017. Thereafter, the amount transferred to the Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund is

[36] Arkansas Response at 8.

[37] North Dakota Response at 4; Oregon Response at 4.

[38] North Carolina Response at 4.

State	Description
	reduced each year until June 30, 2021, when transfers to that fund end. o $0.007 cover ISP administrative costs o After the disbursements listed above, all remaining funds in the Statewide 911 Fund shall be disbursed in the following priority order: o Monthly payment to 9-1-1 authorities that imposed surcharges under section 15.3 on October 1, 2014 of an amount equal to the average monthly wireline and VOIP surcharge revenue for the most recent 12-month reported to the Department for October 1, 2014 filing. o Monthly payment to counties that did not collect a wireline surcharge of an amount equal to population multiplied by .37 multiplied by the rate of $0.69. Counties that do not provide E911 will not receive funds until the service is provided. o Monthly payment to counties without E911 service but have a 911 surcharge as of December 31, 2015 in an amount equal to their population multiplied by .37 by their surcharge rate established by referendum. o All 911 network costs for systems outside of the City of Chicago, to be paid directly to vendors. o All expenses incurred by Administrator and Advisory Board associated with the NG 911 RFP and contract. o Disbursement of Annual Grants for consolidations under section 15.4a, 15.4b and for NG9-1-1 expenses up to: ▪ 2016 = $12.5 million ▪ 2017 = $12.5 million ▪ 2018 = $13.5 million ▪ 2019 = $14.5 million ▪ 2020 = $15.5 million ▪ 2021 = $16.2 million ▪ 2022 = $23.1 million o 2023 and each year thereafter $ 17 million. o All remaining funds shall be distributed to appropriate 911 authority taking wireless 911 based on the postal zip code of billing addresses of subscribers of wireless carriers. ▪ Extended Chicago's authority to impose a local surcharge of $3.90 until July 1, 2017. • Provided that the 911 surcharge shall not be applied to the lifeline subsidized portion of the service. ▪ Allows each telecommunication carrier (non-wireless) to deduct 3% of gross amount of surcharge collected to reimburse for expense of accounting and collecting surcharge. Wireless carriers will be allowed to do the same beginning July 1, 2022. ▪ Remittance of surcharge within 30 days of collection for deposit into the Statewide 911 Fund. ▪ Wireless carriers may still recover 911 service costs that are not reimbursed through the Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund through a direct charge to their respective customers. ▪ Required 9-1-1 systems who must consolidate to file a consolidation plan or waiver to consolidation by July 1, 2016 with the ISP. ▪ Required 9-1-1 systems to have the consolidation plan implemented by July 1, 2017. ▪ The Emergency Telephone Systems Act sunsets on June 30, 2017 Summary of amendments to the Pre-Paid Wireless Act: ▪ Increased the 911 pre-paid wireless surcharge to 3% for the State and 9% for Chicago,

State	Description
	effective on October 1, 2015. Chicago's rate will then drop to 7% effective July 1, 2017.
KS	"The 911 Coordinating Council was empowered, under the initial legislation to increase the 911 fee up to $0.60 per device. The Council exercised this authority in 2015, with the increase taking effect on October 1, 2015."
KY	"Not at the state level (major changes coming in 2016/2017); at the local level Kenton, Campbell and Garrard/Lincoln attempted to amend their local funding mechanism, repealing traditional landline fees and enacting ordinances that asses and collect an annual 911 fee on property (Kenton, Campbell) and on the monthly water utility bills (Garrard/Lincoln). Kentucky Supreme Court has now upheld the constitutionality of these ordinances. Kenton and Campbell are in effect, the Garrard and Lincoln ordinance is not yet in effect, awaiting final lower court action."
NC	"N.C.G.S. 143B-1404 was amended by SL 2015-261 requiring the 911 Board to allocate ten percent (10%) of the total service charges to the Next Generation 911 Reserve Fund. That reserve fund is administered as provided in N.C.G.S. 143B-1407(e). The allocation required by the new law became effective January 1, 2016."
ND	"Yes, 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."
NH	"Effective October 2015 the Enhanced 9-1-1 surcharge was increased to $0.75 per month"
OR	"Amended statute to allow Prepaid Wireless to be collected from a retail Point of Sale."
PA	"Pennsylvania Act 12 of 2015 (Act 12) amended Chapter 53, Emergency Telephone Service, of Title 35 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes (Chapter 53) by establishing a new funding program for public safety answering points (PSAPs) across the Commonwealth, effective August 1, 2015. The new funding program includes a uniform 911 surcharge fee of $1.65, a uniform 911 Fund for collecting surcharges, and updated procedures related to remitting and distributing surcharge revenues. Act 12 was signed into law on June 29, 2015 and took effect August 1, 2015."
TN	"The 911 Funding Modernization and IP Transition Act, which created a new funding mechanism for 911 in Tennessee, took effect January 1, 2015. It provides a uniform 911surcharge of $1.16 on all telecommunications devices in the state that are capable of reaching a PSAP by dialing 9-1-1."

15. The questionnaire 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, 27 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands reported that they collect all 911 fees on a statewide basis, with the collected funds administered by the state.[39]

Table 6 – Authority to Collect 911/E911 Fees

Type of Collection	Number of States/Jurisdictions
State Collection	30
Local Authority	6
Hybrid	16

16. Six states - Alaska, Georgia, Mississippi, Nevada, Wisconsin, 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.[40] Similarly, Mississippi stated that "all funds collected by service providers are awarded directly to the counties."[41]

17. Sixteen states reported using a hybrid approach to 911 fee collection, in which state and local governing bodies share authority over fee collection from customers.[42] For example, South Carolina reported that "46 counties and 4 municipalities receive a quarterly distribution of a portion of the wireless surcharge based on total wireless call volume for that time period, which must be used specifically for 911 or E911 purposes. An additional amount of the wireless surcharge is available for reimbursement to these counties and municipalities for upgrading, acquiring, maintaining, programming, and installing necessary data, hardware and software to comply with certain FCC requirements."[43] Ohio stated that "state funding is collected by the Ohio Department of Taxation and disbursed to the 88 counties."[44]

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

18. 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, the

[39] States include Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, and Virginia.

[40] Georgia Response at 4.

[41] Mississippi Response at 4.

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

[43] South Carolina Response at 4-5.

[44] Ohio Response at 4.

District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands indicated that a state entity has authority to approve expenditure of 911 fees. Nine states described authority resting exclusively with local entities. The majority of responding states – twenty-three - indicated the authority is shared between state and local authorities.

19. The Bureau also sought information on whether states have established a funding mechanism that mandates how collected funds may be used. As indicated in Table 7, states that responded 'no' to this question typically cede control of how 911 funds are spent to local jurisdictions. Forty-two states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands responded that they have a mechanism mandating how 911 fees may be spent, whereas seven states and American Samoa indicated they have no such mechanism.

Table 7 – State Authority for Approval of 911 Fee Expenditures

State	State, Local, or Combined Authority to Approve Expenditures			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
LA		X		Yes
MA	X			Yes
MD	X			Yes
ME	X			Yes
MI			X	Yes
MN	X			Yes
MS		X		No

State	State, Local, or Combined Authority to Approve Expenditures			State Funding Mechanism Mandating *How* Funds Can be Used	
	State	Local	Both		
MT			X	Yes	
NC	X			Yes	
ND		X		Yes	
NE			X	Yes	
NH	X			Yes	
NJ	X			Yes	
NM	X			Yes	
NV		X		No	
NY			X	Yes	
OH			X	Yes	
OK		X		No	
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 - LECs Bill and Keep			Yes	
WV			X	Yes	
WY		X		No	
Other Jurisdictions					
AS	911 Fees Not Collected			No	
DC	X			Yes	
PR	X			Yes	
USVI	X			Yes	
Totals	**State**	**Local**	**Both**	**Yes**	**No**
	17	**9**	**23**	**45**	**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, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands provided a description as requested.[45]

21. Alabama stated that all "funds collected for 911 or E911 have been received by the 88 Emergency Communications Districts (ECDs) in the State of Alabama and have been used to support the activities of those 911 districts by providing funding to maintain, and in some cases enhance, the 911 service provided to their populous."[46] According to Michigan, state 911 fee are distributed to multiple entities, including $150,000 annually to the Treasury for its administration of the fund; 82.5 percent to the counties to fund 911 operations; 7.75 percent to pay the 911 service providers for the delivery of wireless calls to the PSAPs; 6 percent for PSAP training funds; 1.88 percent to the Michigan State Police PSAPs; and 1.87 percent to fund the State 911 Office.[47] Some states pointed out that funds are managed solely at the local level. Colorado stated that "a comprehensive list [of activities] cannot be provided by the state, as spending authority rests in the hands of 58 separate local 911 Authorities, and each may spend funds as they see fit within the authority of CRS § 29-11-104."[48]

22. 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 (46 states), CAD (36 states), and buildings and facilities (29 states).
- With respect to personnel costs, thirty-one states reported applying 911 funds to salaries and forty-two states reported applying funds to training.
- Most states also applied 911 funds to administrative costs, with forty-one covering program administration and thirty-nine applying funds to travel expenses.
- As reported last year, fewer states reported applying 911 fees to dispatch-related costs. Nineteen states reported using 911 fees to reimburse other law enforcement entities providing dispatch service, while twenty-eight states reported that they used 911 funds to lease, purchase, or otherwise maintain radio dispatch networks.

---

[45] Nevada did not respond to this question.

[46] Alabama Response at 7.

[47] Michigan Response at 7.

[48] Colorado Response at 7. *See also* Idaho Response at 6; Louisiana Response at 6; Mississippi Response at 7.

Table 8 – Allowed Uses of Collected Fees

	Operating Costs			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
State	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CPE (hardware and software)**	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CAD (hardware and software)**	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Building and Facilities**	**Salaries**	**Training**	**Program Administration**	**Travel Expenses**	**Reimbursement to Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch**	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks**
AK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
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	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DE	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	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	Yes
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
LA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
MA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MD	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
ME	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
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	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NJ	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
NM	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
NV	Varies by County								
NY	Did Not Respond to Question								

	Operating Costs			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
State	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CPE (hardware and software)**	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of CAD (hardware and software)**	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Building and Facilities**	**Salaries**	**Training**	**Program Administration**	**Travel Expenses**	**Reimbursement to Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch**	**Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks**
OH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
OK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
PA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
RI	Did Not Respond to Question								
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	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
UT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
VA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VT	Yes	No	No	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	Did Not Respond to Question								
Other Jurisdictions									
AS	Did Not Respond to Question								
DC	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
PR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
USVI	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes

23. The Bureau requested information related to the use of 911 funds to support state grant programs. Nineteen states reported that they paid for grants through the use of collected 911 fees, and twenty-eight said they did not.[49] Table 9 provides responding states' descriptions of their grant programs.

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

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	"A total of $110,800.00 was granted to an individual district based on the demonstration of need for purchase of GIS data management and map based computer aided dispatch systems. Grant funds are only available from the state office's administrative 1% and during this time frame only $150,000.00 was available."
CT	"Capital expense grants and transition grants for the purpose of consolidation PSAPs."
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. From January 1, 2015-December 31, 2015, $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."
KS	"The Council has used the grant funds, which are derived from the 1.20% 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 are also utilized to pay nonrecurring costs for the statewide ESInet and call handling system and for recurring costs for the ESInet."

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
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 monies are distributed for enhancements to county 9-1-1 service."
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. In CY2015 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	"Burke County: PSAP Consolidation with Sheriff's Dept., Morganton Police, Valdese Fire Stanley County: Install a 911 Network with Brunswick and Haywood County 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 Gates County: PSAP Equipment Upgrade Henderson County: PSAP Relocation Hertford County: PSAP Consolidation Hertford Co, Murfreesboro PD & Ahoskie PD Orange County: PSAP Equipment Upgrade Swain County: 911 Equipment Enhancement/Replacement Program Caldwell County: PSAP Upgrade and create a backup PSAP Dare County: PSAP Consolidation with Tyrell County Haywood County: PSAP Consolidation with Sheriff's Dept. and upgrade PSAP Equipment Swain-Jackson County: Create Regional PSAP Connectivity E-CATS: Emergency Call Tracking System (call answering statistics) 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 2017-2018 fiscal year. http://psc.nebraska.gov/orders/ntips/911-019.PI-118.14.pdf."
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."
NY	"The Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services (DHSES) supports the following grant programs through the $75 million appropriation: 1. $45 million for Round V of the State Interoperable Communications grant program; 2. $10 million for the PSAP grant program 3. $20 million in capital and targeted grants."

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
TN	"The TECB offered 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 The TECB also made $25 million available to ECDs for CPE equipment used to connect them to the state-wide NG911 platform the state is deploying to modernize Tennessee's 911 infrastructure. The funding plan provided each ECD with a base amount of $120,000 plus an additional amount determined by the district's population. As of January, 2015, the TECB ceased these funding programs due to the new funding law. However, the TECB is still distributing funds from the essential and necessary equipment fund until the funding is exhausted."
TX	"The state 9-1-1 program administered by CSEC provides grants of legislatively appropriated 9-1-1 and equalization surcharge funds to 23 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 UTMB-Galveston, the Department of State Health Services, and TTUHSC to fund emergency medical dispatch services, county and regional emergency medical services and trauma care, and a telemedicine medical services pilot program, 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)."
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."

State	Describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of grant
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, maintenance, and training funds."
WV	"One million ($1,000,000.00) dollars per year is awarded by the Public Service Commission of West Virginia as grants for the construction of cell towers, pursuant to WV Code §24-6-6b"

F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected

24. 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	26	16	5	5
Wireless	36	5	5	3
Prepaid	36	1	3	7
VoIP	25	10	6	6
Other	6	1	0	29

25. Table 11 details the fees that each reporting state and jurisdiction levied on wireline, wireless, prepaid, VoIP and other services during calendar year 2015.

Table 11 – State Description of Service Type and Associated Fees

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
AK	Wireline	Up to 2.00 per phone		X		
	Wireless	Up to 2.00 per phone	X			
	Prepaid	N/A				
	VoIP	N/A				
	Other					X
AL	Wireline	$1.75	X			
	Wireless	$1.75	X			
	Prepaid	$1.75	X			
	VoIP	$1.75	X			
	Other	$1.75	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			
	Prepaid	$0.65 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	$0.65	X			
	Other					X
AZ	Wireline	$0.20 per month each activated wire service account	X			
	Wireless	$0.20 per month each activated wireless service account	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	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 each activated wire service account	X			
	Other	None				X
CA	Wireline	$0.75 of 1%	X			
	Wireless	$0.75 of 1%	X			
	Prepaid	$0.75 of 1%	X			
	VoIP	$0.75 of 1%	X			
	Other	N/A				X
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	None				X
CT	Wireline	$0.51 per access line	X			
	Wireless	$0.51 per access line	X			
	Prepaid	$0.51 per access line	X			
	VoIP	$0.51 per access line	X			
	Other					X
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			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Other					X
FL	Wireline	$0.40 cents per month 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 the previous fee of $0.50 per month, per access line.	X			
	Wireless	$0.40 per month	X			
	Prepaid	$0.40 per month	X			
	VoIP	$0.40 per month	X			
	Other					X
GA	Wireline	$1.50 per month		X		
	Wireless	$1.00 per month		X		
	Prepaid	$0.75 per transaction		X		
	VoIP	$1.50 per month		X		
	Other					X
HI	Wireline	$0.27 per user per month			Hawaiian Telcom Bill and Keep	
	Wireless	$0.66 per user month	X			
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	$0.66 per user month	X			
	Other					X
IA	Wireline	$1.00 per line per month				
	Wireless	$1.00 per line per month				
	Prepaid	$0.51 per transaction				

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**	**None**
	VoIP	$1.00 per line per month	Nomadic VoIP	Static VoIP		
	Other					X
ID	Wireline	$1.00 or $1.25	If collecting $1.00, $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	If collecting $1.00, $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% at point of sale	99% to local 1% to ECC Operations			
	VoIP	$1.00 or $1.25	If collecting $1.00, $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					X
IL	Wireline	Fee ranges from $0.30 to $5.00		X		
	Wireless	$0.73	X			
	Prepaid	1.5% per retail transaction	X			
	VoIP	Fee ranges from $0.30 to $5.00		X		
	Other					X
IN	Wireline	$1.00	X			
	Wireless	$1.00	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**	**None**
	Prepaid	$1.00 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	$1.00	X			
	Other					X
KS	Wireline	$0.60 per subscriber account	X			
	Wireless	$0.60 per subscriber account	X			
	Prepaid	$0.60 per subscriber account	X			
	VoIP	$0.60 per subscriber account	X			
	Other	$0.60 per subscriber account	X			
KY	Wireline	$0.32 to $4.00 (varies by county)		X		
	Wireless	$0.70	X			
	Prepaid	Impose $0.70 per transaction, but collect $0.30 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	$0.32 to $4.00 (varies by county)		X		
	Other	Campbell County: $45 annual fee per occupied residence or business Kenton County: $60 annual fee per real-estate parcel		X		
LA	Wireline	Up to 5% of Tariff Rate on Exchange Service		X		
	Wireless	$0.85 for all Parishes except for Caddo County is $1.00 and Jefferson/St. Bernard is $1.26		X		
	Prepaid	2% at point of sale	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**	**None**
	VoIP	NR		X		
	Other					X
MA	Wireline	$0.75 cents per month through 6/30/15 $1.25 per month effective 7/1/15	X			
	Wireless	$0.75 cents per month through 6/30/15 $1.25 per month effective 7/1/16	X			
	Prepaid	$0.75 cents per month through 6/30/15 $1.25 per month effective 7/1/17	X			
	VoIP	$0.75 cents per month through 6/30/15 $1.25 per month effective 7/1/18	X			
	Other					X
MD	Wireline	$1.00			$0.25 to State Trust Fund $0.75 to county	
	Wireless	$1.00			$0.25 to State Trust Fund $0.75 to county	
	Prepaid	$1.00			$0.25 to State Trust Fund $0.75 to county	
	VoIP	$1.00			$0.25 to State Trust Fund $0.75 to county	
	Other					X
ME	Wireline	$0.45	X			
	Wireless	$0.45	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**	**None**
	Prepaid	$0.45	X			
	VoIP	$0.45	X			
	Other					X
MI	Wireline	$0.19 (state) $0.20 to $3.00 (local)	X	X		
	Wireless	$0.19 (state) $0.20 to $3.00 (local)	X	X		
	Prepaid	1.92% per transaction				
	VoIP	$0.19 (state) $0.20 to $3.00 (local)	X	X		
	Other					X
MN	Wireline	$0.78	X			
	Wireless	$0.78	X			
	Prepaid	$0.78	X			
	VoIP	$0.78	X			
	Other					X
MS	Wireline	$1.00 per residential line $2.00 per commercial line		X		
	Wireless	N/A				X
	Prepaid	N/A				X
	VoIP	$1.00 per line		X		
	Other					X
MT	Wireline	$1.00	X			
	Wireless	$1.00	X			
	Prepaid	None				X

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	VoIP	None				X
	Other					X
NC	Wireline	$0.60	X			
	Wireless	$0.60	X			
	Prepaid	$0.60	X			
	VoIP	$0.60	X			
	Other					X
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					X
NE	Wireline	$0.50 to $1.00 per line		X		
	Wireless	$0.45	X			
	Prepaid	1% of transaction	X			
	VoIP	$0.50 to $1.00 per line		X		
	Other					X
NH	Wireline	$0.75	X			
	Wireless	$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	$0.75	X			
	VoIP	$0.75	X			
	Other					X
NJ	Wireline	$0.90 per month	X			
	Wireless	$0.90 per month	X			
	Prepaid	None				X

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**	**None**
	VoIP	$0.90 per month	X			
	Other					X
NM	Wireline	$0.51 per line per month	X			
	Wireless	$0.51 per line per month	X			
	Prepaid	None				
	VoIP	None				
	Other					X
NV	Wireline	$0.25 or greater per line (varies by county)		X		
	Wireless	$0.25 or greater per line (varies by county)		X		
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	$0.25 or greater per line (varies by county)				
	Other					X
NY	Wireline	$0.35 to $1.00 per month per access line			X	
	Wireless	State: $1.20 per month per device Local: $0.30 per month per device			X	
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	$0.25 or greater per line (varies by county)		X		
	Other					X
OH	Wireline					
	Wireless	$0.25 per month	X			
	Prepaid	.05% at point of sale	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	VoIP					
	Other					
OK	Wireline	Percentage of bill [Not Specified]		X		
	Wireless	$0.50	X			
	Prepaid	$0.50		X		
	VoIP					X
	Other					X
OR	Wireline	$0.75	X			
	Wireless	$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	$0.75	X			
	VoIP	$0.75	X			
	Other					X
PA	Wireline	$1.00 - $1.50 through 7/31/2015 $1.65 effective 8/1/2015			"67 counties and 2 cities (Allentown and Bethlehem) All funds are remitted to the Commonwealth effective 8/1/2015."	
	Wireless	$1.00 through 7/31/2015 $1.65 effective 8/1/2015	X			
	Prepaid	$1.00 through 7/31/2015 $1.65 effective 8/1/2015	X			
	VoIP	$1.00 - $1.50 through 7/31/2015 $1.65 effective 8/1/2015			"Funds are remitted to either the State Treasurer or the 67 Counties and 2 cities (Allentown &	

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
					Bethlehem). All funds are remitted to the Commonwealth effective 8/1/2015.”	
	Other					X
RI	Wireline	$1.00 per access line	X			
	Wireless	$1.26 per line	X			
	Prepaid	2.5% per retail transaction	X			
	VoIP	$1.26 per line	X			
	Other					X
SC	Wireline	$0.45 - $1.00		X		
	Wireless	$0.62	X			
	Prepaid	$0.62	X			
	VoIP	$0.45 - $1.00		X		
	Other					X
SD	Wireline	$1.25 per line	X			
	Wireless	$1.25 per line	X			
	Prepaid	2% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	$1.25 per line	X			
	Other					X
TN	Wireline	$1.16 per line	X			
	Wireless	$1.16 per line	X			
	Prepaid	$1.16 per line	X			
	VoIP	$1.16 per line	X			
	Other	$1.16 per line	X			X

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
TX	Wireline	State 9-1-1 Program (CSEC/RPC): The wireline fee is set by CSEC at $0.50 per access line/per month (the rate is capped by statute at $0.50). Emergency Communications Districts: Residential: $0.20 - $1.44 per local exchange access line/month. Business: $0.46 - $5.40 per access line/month, up to a 100 line maximum in most ECD service areas. Business Trunk: $0.74 to $5.40."	"In the state 9-1-1 program area (CSEC/RPCs), wireline fees are collected and remitted to the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts (Texas Comptroller) and deposited into a general revenue dedicated account (GRD). Funds in the GRD are appropriated by the Texas Legislature to CSEC on a biennial basis to fund 9-1-1 service in the state 9-1-1 program. In ECD (statutory and municipal) service areas, wireline fees are set by each ECD; and collected and remitted directly to the ECD."			
	Wireless	$0.50 per line	X			
	Prepaid	2% of purchase price	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	VoIP	State 9-1-1 Program (CSEC/RPC): The wireline fee is set by CSEC at $0.50 per access line/per month (the rate is capped by statute at $0.50). Emergency Communications Districts: Residential: $0.20 - $1.44 per local exchange access line/month. Business: $0.46 - $5.40 per access line/month, up to a 100 line maximum in most ECD service areas. Business Trunk: $0.74 to $5.40."	"In the state 9-1-1 program area (CSEC/RPCs), wireline fees are collected and remitted to the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts (Texas Comptroller) and deposited into a general revenue dedicated account (GRD). Funds in the GRD are appropriated by the Texas Legislature to CSEC on a biennial basis to fund 9-1-1 service in the state 9-1-1 program. In ECD (statutory and municipal) service areas, wireline fees are set by each ECD; and collected and remitted directly to the ECD."			
	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	1.9% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	$0.76	X			
	Other	$0.76	X			
VA	Wireline	$0.75	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Wireless	$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	$0.50	X			
	VoIP	$0.75	X			
	Other					X
VT	Wireline	2% customer telecommunications charges	X			
	Wireless	2% customer telecommunications charges	X			
	Prepaid	2% customer telecommunications charges	X			
	VoIP	Voluntary	X			
	Other					X
WA	Wireline	State: $0.25 per line County: $0.70 per line			X	
	Wireless	State: $0.25 per line County: $0.70 per line			X	
	Prepaid	State: $0.25 per line County: $0.70 per line			X	
	VoIP	State: $0.25 per line County: $0.70 per line			X	
	Other					X

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
WI	Wireline	Varies by county	Participating local exchange carriers			
	Wireless	None				X
	Prepaid	None				X
	VoIP	None				X
	Other					X
WV	Wireline	Varies by county		X		
	Wireless	$3.00 per line	X			
	Prepaid	6% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	Varies by county		X		
	Other					X
WY	Wireline	Did Not Respond to the Question				
	Wireless					
	Prepaid					
	VoIP					
	Other					
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	Wireline	"N/A"				
	Wireless	"N/A"				
	Prepaid	"N/A"				
	VoIP	"N/A"				
	Other	"N/A"				
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 Internet	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	**Fee**	**State**	**Local**	**Combo or Other**	**None**
	VoIP	$0.76 per line	X			
	Other	Centrex $0.62 PBX Trunks $4.96 per Trunk	X			
PR	Wireline	$0.50 per residential line $1.00 per commercial line	X			
	Wireless	$0.50 per residential line $1.00 per commercial line	X			
	Prepaid	$0.50	X			
	VoIP	None				X
	Other					X
USVI	Wireline	$1.00	X			
	Wireless	$1.00	X			
	Prepaid	$1.00	X			
	VoIP	$1.00	X			
	Other					X

26. 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 $2,631,705,008.98 in 911 fees or related charges for calendar year 2015. Table 12 also includes the Bureau's estimate of annual fee collections on a per capita basis for each reporting state and jurisdiction. Although 911 fees are typically collected on a per customer basis rather than a per capita basis, the per capita estimate nonetheless provides a useful benchmark for comparing fee collections and expenditures across states and other jurisdictions.

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

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita[50]
AK	$4,194,179.23	$8,642,934.45	--	--	--	$12,837,113.68	$18.07
AL	$19,019,481.88	$64,603,268.94	--	$32,817,352.51	--	$116,440,103.36	$24.36
AR	$7,390,852.50	$15,564,456.33	Included in Wireline and Wireless	$4,030,246.16	--	$26,985,554.99	$9.25
AZ	$17,035,154.00			$2,152,519.00	$39,549.00	$19,227,222.00	$3.01
CA	Not Specified					$87,838,234.00	$2.36
CO[51]	$11,217,995.00	$32,949,356.00	$5,495,091.00	$3,070,289.00	--	$52,732,731.00	$10.49
CT	Not Specified					$32,564,308.00	$9.11
DE	Not Specified					$8,159,730.03[52]	$9.09
FL	$19,945,141.00	$63,967,822.00	$17,763,020.00	$6,550,974.00	--	$108,226,957.00	$5.76
GA	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	$17,659,037.41 (GA Fiscal Year 7/1/14-6/30/15)	--	$17,659,037.41	$1.82
HI	$802,130.87	$8,469,123.00	$965,779.00		--	$10,237,032.00	$7.53
IA	$12,390,169.00	$26,124,016.75		$2,033,581.44	--	$40,547,767.19	$13.31

[50] Bureau estimate based on United States 2010 Census data for each jurisdiction.

[51] Colorado reported that its wireline, wireless, and VoIP fee collections are "extrapolated based on partial survey responses from local 911 Authorities." Further, it stated that "updated figures for 2015 are unavailable. This figure is carried forward from the 2015 NET 911 Act Report, reporting 2014 collection data." Colorado Response at 10.

[52] Delaware did not provide a total amount collected. For purposes of overall analysis, the Bureau uses the amount Delaware reported it collected during the 2014 annual period.

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita[50]
ID	$17,244,632.00			$1,593,302.58	$2,128,681.86 (based on $.25 grant monies collected and used for local grants)	$20,952,378.70	$13.37
IL	$32,545,952.00	$57,045,443.00	$5,908,954.00	Included in wireless	--	$95,500,349.00	$7.44
IN	$9,339,826.53	$52,195,417.60	$8,816,671.16	$8,756,942.56	--	$79,108,857.85	$12.20
KS	$19,359,085.98			$1,462,888.26	--	$20,821,974.24	$7.30
KY	$27,500,000.00	$22,500,000.00	Included in Wireline	$3,500,000.00	Unknown	$53,500,000.00	$12.33
LA	Unknown	$36,500,000.00 (est.)	Unknown	$6,250,000.00 (est.)	Unknown	$42,750,000.00	$9.43
MA	$12,172,463.18	$57,321,691.93	$18,884,801.41	$7,129,816.88	--	$95,508,773.40	$14.59
MD	$21,141,813.46	$26,668,465.67	N/A	$5,504,127.19	--	$53,314,406.32	$9.23
ME	$2,117,604.00 (estimated)	$4,089,167.00 (estimated)	$1,095,313.00 (estimated)	$1,100,389.00	--	$8,402,473.00	$6.33
MI	State: $20,176,396.60 Counties: $64,755,058.00			State: $8,402,028.16 Counties: N/A	--	$93,333,482.76	$9.44
MN	$17,722,783.10	$37,149,738.61	$2,567,266.25	$4,671,070.27	--	$62,110,858.23	$11.71
MS	Not Specified					$26,510,538.00	$8.93
MT	Not Specified					$13,000,000.00	$13.14
NC	$14,640,345.46	$45,536,147.06	$11,033,117.77	$9,925,767.02	--	$81,135,377.32	$8.51
ND	$9,998,322.00		N/A	$339,585.00	--	$10,337,907.00	$15.37

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita[50]
NE	$5,858,112.66	$7,012,329.84	Unknown	$1,030,005.04	--	$13,900,447.54	$7.61
NH	$2,335,953.27	$7,541,818.47	$2,439,645.81	$0.00	--	$12,317,417.55	$9.36
NJ	Not Specified					$122,632,000.00	$13.95
NM	Not Specified					$11,146,012.00	$5.41
NV	Washoe Co.: $515,482.00 (includes VoIP)	Washoe Co.: $1,032,455.00 (includes Prepaid)			Washoe Co.: $43,430.00 (reseller)	$1,591,367.00	$3.78 (Washoe County)
NY	Did Not Provide					$185,262,082.00[53]	$9.56
OH	Reporting Counties: $2,868,057.42	State: $25,000,000.00 (estimate includes prepaid) Reporting Counties: $5,093,094.44	Reporting Counties: $628.00	Reporting Counties: $473.72		$40,382,365.16	$3.50
OK	Unknown					--	--
OR	Not Specified					$39,470,386.00	$10.30
PA	$49,661,957.00	$127,605,219.00	$37,891,894.00	$24,641,148.00	--	$239,800,218.00	$18.88
RI	$4,901,092.54	$10,558,468.90	Included in wireline	$885,802.37	--	$16,345,363.80	$15.53
SC	$11,160,000.00 (estimated)	$21,381,001.22	Included in wireline figure	$6,513,281.27	--	$39,054,282.49	$8.44
SD	$3,999,727.00	$8,007,712.00	$55,247.00	$1,031,016.00	--	$13,093,702.00	$16.08
TN	Not Specified					$78,729,854.00	$12.41

[53] In its response, New York did not provide information on total fees collected. However, the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance reports that in 2015 the state collected approximately $185,262,082 from the state's Public Safety Communications Surcharge. *See* New York State, Department of Taxation and Finance, Fiscal Year Tax Collections: 2015-2016, at https://www.tax.ny.gov/pdf/2015-16_Collections/Table%202.pdf.

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita[50]
TX	$69,900,837.00	$108,963,296.00	Included in wireline	$24,885,131.00	$19,189,471.00	$222,938,735.00	$8.87
UT	$8,085,555.00	$18,866,295.00	Included in Wireless	$179,022.00	--	$27,130,872.00	$9.82
VA	$27,525,822.93	$57,905,783.16	Unknown	Included in wireless	--	$85,431,606.09	$10.68
VT	Unknown					$6,256,658.00[54]	$10.00
WA	$4,000,070.00 (State) $11,395,554.00 (Counties)	$15,382,384.00 (State) $42,511,827.00 (Counties)	$3,079,479.00 (State) $8,616,974.00 (Counties)	$2,551,640.00 (State) $6,905,032.00 (Counties)	--	$94,445,461.00	--
WI	Unknown					--	--
WV	$19,405,563.00	$35,810,340.00	Included in wireline	$1,433,419.00		$56,649,322.00	$30.57
WY	Unknown						
Other Jurisdictions							
AS	Not Applicable					--	--
DC	$2,236,576.13	$5,342,986.04	$1,420,166.40	$630,587.93	Centrex: $1,485,025.24 PBX Trunks: $1,0730,889.60	$12,189,231.34	$20.26
PR	Not Specified					$21,896,788.53	$5.88
USVI	Not Specified					$1,297,671.00	$12.20
Total: $2,631,705,008.98							
Average State Amount Collected Per Capita							**$10.55**
National Amount Collected Per Capita							**$8.58**

[54] In its filing, Vermont states that the agent in charge of the Vermont Universal Fund did not provide it with the total amount collected from the state's 2% Universal Service Fee on telecommunications service providers. *See* Vermont Response at 11. In 2015 the Vermont Universal Fund collected approximately $6,256,658 from telecommunications carriers, a portion of which is directed to fund the annual statewide 911 service budget. *See* Independent Auditors' Report, Vermont Universal Service Fund Financial Statements, Years Ended June 30, 2015 and 2014, at http://publicservice.vermont.gov/sites/dps/files/documents/Telecom/USF/Vermont%20Universal.pdf.

27. 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 53 responding jurisdictions listed in Table 13, 22 states, the District of Columbia, and the US Virgin Islands reported combining collected fees with other funds or grants to support 911 services and 25 report they 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

Responses regarding 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, description of federal, state or local funds combined with 911/E911 fees**
AK		X		
AL	X			"Any funds that support 911 are either obtained or contributed at the local level, but not in the form of an additional 911 fee, as that is prohibited by law. Rather, additional funding may be in the form of a contract with responder agencies or some other locally obtained funding from grants, the county/municipality they serve, etc. Also, this additional funding is self-reported by the local district and not all districts report. The most recent submission for fiscal year ending 2015 was provided by 69 of the 88 districts and reports $8,949,358.75 from county/municipal funding, $28,244.04 from federal grants, and $2,201.23 from state grants."
AR		X		
AZ		X		N/A
CA		X		
CO	X			"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		N/A
DE		X		N/A
FL	X			"Emergency Communications Number E911 System Fund Interest: $667,136 County General Revenues: $95,378,141 Annualized state and rural county grant expenditures: $9,647,064"
GA	X			Unknown

Responses regarding 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, description of federal, state or local funds combined with 911/E911 fees**
HI	X			"The fees collected to support 911/E911/NG911 are insufficient to entirely support those services offered by the PSAPs. The amounts of federal, state, local funds, etc. that were combined with fees collected were not disclosed."
IA	X			"In addition to surcharge funding, local PSAPs are often also provided funds through county general fund appropriations, support from Sheriff Office funds, city general funds, and emergency management grants. These costs are broken down in the answer to question 5 of this section."
ID		X		"No fees combined at the State level."
IL		X		
IN	X			"On average, the 911 fee pays for 38% 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, casino funds, other."
KS	X			"Local general fund monies are used extensively to fund 911 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."
LA			X	"Unknown"
MA		X		
MD	X			"County (including the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City) general funds."
ME		X		

Responses regarding 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, description of federal, state or local funds combined with 911/E911 fees**
MI	X			"County Millages: $33,018,238.38 Local/County General Funds: $114,742,581.20 Other Receipts: $20,399,582.70 (grants, tower rentals, contracts for service, etc.)"
MN		X		
MS	X			"Local budgets must supplement funds received from wireline fees collected to cover operation costs."
MT	X			"Local funds"
NC	X			"E911 funds were combined with general fund allocations from each of the 119 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 sources."
NH		X		
NJ		X		
NM		X		
NV		X		
NY			X	
OH	X			"See attached spreadsheet for local responses from 80 of Ohio's 88 counties."
OK		X		
OR	X			"The Distribution to the 9-1-1 jurisdictions is combined with local monies to pay for 9-1-1."

Responses regarding 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, description of federal, state or local funds combined with 911/E911 fees**
PA	X			"Any 911 related expenses not covered by 911 fees are covered by the general fund of the respective County or City."
RI			X	
SC	X			"Local Jurisdictions collect landline 911 fees and combine those fees with the wireless 911 funds distributed by our office to support local 911/E911/NG911 services."
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			"While the exact amount is unknown, all local PSAP jurisdictions contribute additional local funds to augment State and Local E911 excise taxes, in covering the costs of 911 statewide. It is estimated that on average statewide 15% of the actual cost of providing Washington State approved 911 activities comes from these local sources. In many cases this comes from local government general use funds or individual agency user fees. In addition, Washington State Patrol operates 4 Primary and 4 Secondary PSAPs using some funding from their direct budget."
WI		X		
WV		X		
WY			X	
Other Jurisdictions				
AS		X		"N/A. No fees collected."

Responses regarding 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, description of federal, state or local funds combined with 911/E911 fees**
DC	X			"Local Funds: $28,172,500"
PR		X		
USVI	X			"Appropriated general budget in the amount of $1,612,574 for salaries and fringe benefits."
Totals	**24**	**25**	**4**	

28. 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, sixteen states reported that state 911 fees were the sole source of revenue funding 911 services; nine states indicated that 50 to 99 percent of funding came from state 911 fees; thirteen states reported that 50 to 99 percent of funding came from local fees; and one state reported that local fees were the sole source of funding. Ten states report not knowing the proportional contributions.

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%	63%	15%	22.5%	0%	0%
AL	92.8%	0%	0%	7.1%	0.024%	0.002%
AR	32.8%	14.77%	0%	48.52%	0%	3.91%
AZ	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
CA	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund (State)	General Fund (County)	Federal Grants	State Grants
CO	3%	48.6%	0%	48.4% (county and municipal)	"Unknown. Local 911 Authorities are not required to report if and when they receive a grant that benefits, in whole or in part, 911 service."	"Unknown. Local 911 Authorities are not required to report if and when they receive a grant that benefits, in whole or in part 911 service."
CT	100%					
DE	100%					
FL	45%	0%	0%	49%	0%	6%
GA	Reports that information is unknown					
HI	Reports that information is unknown					
IA	46%			54% (includes Sheriff Funds)		
ID	90%	Unknown	0%	Unknown	0%	10%
IL	47%	44% (all local sources)	0%	9%	0%	0%
IN	38%	Not permitted	0%	62%	0%	0%
KS	27%	N/A	0%	73%	0%	0%
KY	19%	28%	8%	42%	<1%	3%
LA	Unknown	Unknown	0%	Unknown	0%	0%
MA	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
MD	51.24%	0%	0%	48.76%	0%	0%
ME	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund (State)	General Fund (County)	Federal Grants	State Grants
MI	11%	25%	0%	64% (Includes 44% General Fund, 12.5% voter-approved property tax assessments, and 7.5% "Other")	0%	0%
MN	100%	0%	0%	"PSAPs may receive general funds from the county in which they operate in addition to the monthly 9-1-1 fee distribution allocated by the legislature. The $13.6M is budgeted by legislature and distributed according to Minn Statute §403. This distribution varies by county according to a designated formula."	0%	0%
MS	0%	"Local budget and fees collected must cover costs. $35,494,712	0%	0%	0%	0%
MT	Reports that information is unavailable					
NC	49%	0%	0%	48%	0%	3%
ND	2%	62%	0%	36%	0%	0%

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund (State)	General Fund (County)	Federal Grants	State Grants
NE	Reports that information is unknown					
NH	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NJ	Unknown	0%	0%	Unknown	0%	0%
NM	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NV	No Response					
NY	No Response					
OH	Variable	Variable	NA	Variable	Variable	Variable
OK	Reports that information is unknown					
OR	28.02%	0%	0%	71.98%	0%	0%
PA	72%	0%	0%	28%	0%	0%
RI	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
SC	45% (estimated)	15% (estimated)	--	--	--	--
SD	54%	0%	0%	18%	1%	2%
TN	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TX	71.64%	28.36%	0%	0%	0%	0%
UT	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
VA	50%	50%	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	Reports that information is unknown					
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
DC	0%	30%	70%	0%	0%	0%
PR	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund (State)	General Fund (County)	Federal Grants	State Grants
USVI	45%	0%	55%	0%	0%	0%

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

29. Under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act, the Commission is required 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* (emphasis added)."[55] Therefore, 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.

30. As in previous reports, we have identified diversion or transfers of 911/E911 funds and categorized them as to whether the funds were directed to other public safety uses or to non-public safety uses such as state General Fund accounts. With respect to funds devoted to other public safety uses, we have generally determined that funds used to support public safety radio systems, including maintenance, upgrades, and new system acquisitions, are not 911-related within the meaning of the NET911 Act and therefore constitute a diversion of 911 funds. However, several states have documented expenses associated with integrating public safety dispatch and 911 systems (e.g., purchase of CAD hardware and software to support integrated 911 and dispatch operations) and asserted that these should be categorized as 911-related expenses. We agree that where sufficient documentation is provided, the expenditure of 911 funds to support integration of dispatch and 911calltaking systems may be categorized as 911-related, and we follow this approach in this report.

31. Table 15 below lists the states that diverted or transferred fees and the amounts diverted or transferred in calendar year 2015. Three states (Illinois, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island) and Puerto Rico self-identified in their responses to the questionnaire that they used collected funds, at least in part, for non-911 related purposes. Five states (Iowa, New Jersey, New York, Washington, and West Virginia) did not self-identify as diverting funds, but the Bureau has determined based on review of the information provided that these states in fact diverted funds for non-911 related purposes within the meaning of the NET 911 Act. The aggregate amount of diverted funds reported by all of the jurisdictions listed in Table 15 is $215,981,751.07, or 8.2 percent of all 911/E911 funds reported to have been collected by all responding states and jurisdictions in 2015.

32. In 2012, Congress passed the Next Generation 911 Advancement Act, Public Law 112-96 (2012 Act), which dedicated $115 million in FCC spectrum auction proceeds to support future matching grants to eligible states and U.S. territories for the implementation and operation of 911, E911, and NG911 services and applications, migration to IP-enabled emergency networks, and training public safety personnel involved in the 911 emergency response chain. The 2012 Act tasked the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the National Telecommunications and

[55] NET 911 Act at §6(f)(2).

Information Administration (NTIA) with administering the grant program, which will be implemented at a later date to be determined. We remind interested parties that Section 6503 of the 2012 Act requires applicants seeking to receive grants under this program to certify that no portion of any designated 911 charges imposed by the state or other taxing jurisdiction within which the applicant is located are being obligated or expended "for any purpose other than the purposes for which such charges are designated or presented."

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

State/Territory	Total Funds Collected (Year End 2015)	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Percentage Diverted	Type of Transfer
States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds				
Illinois	$95,500,349.00	$5,000,000.00	*5.2%*	General Fund
New Hampshire	$12,317,417.55	$2,078,685.85	*16.9%*	General Fund and Public Safety Related
Puerto Rico	$21,896,788.53	$484,016.54	*2.2%*	General Fund
Rhode Island	$16,345,363.80	$11,185,216.24	*68.4%*	General Fund
States/Jurisdictions Identified by Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds				
Iowa	$40,547,767.19	$4,000,000.00	*9.9%*	Public Safety Related
New Jersey	$122,632,000.00	$110,278,000.00	*89.9%*	General Fund and Public Safety Related
New York	$182,262,082.00	$77,254,288.19	*42%*	General Fund
Washington	$94,445,461.00	$6,017,185.00	*6.4%*	Public Safety Related
West Virginia	$56,649,322.00	$3,984,195.00	*7%*	Public Safety Related
Total	**$642,596,551.07**	**$220,281,586.82**	***34.3%***	
Percent Diverted From Total Funds Collected by All States				
Total	***$2,631,705,008.98***	***8.4%***		

1. States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds.

33. Illinois reported that $5,000,000.00 was "transferred out of the Wireless Services Emergency Fund to the State's General Revenue Fund."[56]

34. New Hampshire reported a diversion or transfer of $2,078,685.85. According to New Hampshire, "the Department of Safety, Division of Emergency Services and Communications, receives and forwards to the appropriate local dispatch center all 911 calls [and] provides all network connections and the equipment at the local dispatch center to receive the forwarded 9-1-1 calls."[57] The Division also "funds the State Police Radio Maintenance Section at approximately $1,800,000.00 per year," under the justification that the 911 system uses the microwave system maintained by the State Police, however, "the Division funds all of the State Police Radio Maintenance function."[58] According to New Hampshire, during the 2015 annual period, the state transferred approximately $1,871,427.00 to fund the State Police Radio Communications Maintenance Unit; $12,500.00 to fund the state's Poison Control Project; $95,373.00 to fund broadband communications under the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program; and $99,385.85 to fund the Statewide Interoperability Coordinators Office.[59]

35. Rhode Island reported that in its 2015 fiscal year (ending June 30, 2016), the state collected $16,345,363.83 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: $4,054,086.17 in personnel costs and $1,106,061.42 in operating costs, for a total of $5,160,147.59. Rhode Island reported that all remaining funds collected were distributed for other purposes via the General Fund.[60]

36. Puerto Rico reported diversions of approximately $484,016.54. Pursuant to Act No. 66 of June 17, 2014, as amended, Article 19, approximately $240,916.54 and $243,100.00 was contributed to the "Work Promotion and Economic Activity Fund" under the custody of the Trade and Export Company of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.[61]

37. Two states, California and Virginia, reported that they diverted a portion of the 911 funds collected in calendar year 2015 for purposes outside the scope of their established state funding mechanisms. However, on review of the expenditures at issue, the Bureau concludes that the states have demonstrated a sufficient nexus with 911 to support a finding that the expenditures were 911-related.

- California states that "[a]ll funds collected have been used exclusively for the purposes

[56] Illinois Response at 15.

[57] New Hampshire Response at 6.

[58] *Id*.

[59] *Id*. at 11.

[60] Rhode Island Response at 2-3.

[61] Puerto Rico Response at 11. We note that Puerto Rico also identified a transfer of $12 million pursuant to "Act No. 21 of April 6, 2016, known as "Emergency Moratorium Act and Financial Rehabilitation of Puerto Rico," which provides for the declaration of a state fiscal emergency by the Legislative Branch of Puerto Rico." Because the transfer occurs in the 2016 annual period, we do not count it in this year's report.

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)."[62] California further states that "[w]hile 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."[63] We find that California has shown this expenditure of funds to be in support of 911 communications even though the expenditure was outside the state's statutory funding mechanism. Therefore, we do not identify California as having diverted funds.[64]

- 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 support 911-related activities.[65] We agree that Virginia's expenditure to support 911 dispatch by these agencies is 911-related, and we therefore do not identify Virginia as having diverted funds.[66]

2. States/Jurisdictions Identified by the Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds.

38. Iowa reported that it did not divert or otherwise transfer funds away from 911 or E911 related activities. However, Iowa's report indicates that the state's Homeland Security and Emergency Department was "tasked by the [Iowa] legislature with paying $4,000,000 to Motorola for the statewide interoperability Land Mobile Radio, which was within the scope of the Receipt and Disposition of the 911 language already in Code."[67]

39. New Jersey reported that it did not divert or transfer any collected funds.[68] However, it reported that it collected a total of $122.6 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 Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of related programs." According to New Jersey, with respect to 911 specific costs, approximately $13,122,000.00 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 $110,278,000.00 to offset costs

---

[62] California Response at 12.

[63] *Id*. California states that "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." *Id*.

[64] California made the same showing in its 2015 filing, but was identified in our 2015 Report as having diverted funds in calendar year 2014. Based on our review of California's 2015 and 2016 filings, we revise our findings from the 2015 Report to remove California from that year's list of states that diverted funds.

[65] Virginia Response at 11.

[66] Virginia made the same showing in its 2015 filing, but was identified in our 2015 Report as having diverted funds in calendar year 2014. Based on our review of Virginia's 2015 and 2016 filings, we revise our findings from the 2015 Report to remove Virginia from that year's list of states that diverted funds.

[67] Iowa Response at 7.

[68] New Jersey Response at 11.

related to programs within the New Jersey Departments of Law and Public Safety and Military and Veterans' Affairs.[69]

40. Washington reported that it did not divert or transfer funds, stating that "[d]uring calendar year 2015, no state enhanced 911 excise taxes were expended for any other purpose than that prescribed by [Revised Code of Washington] 38.52.540."[70] However, the state did identify funds transferred to other departments and activities that the Bureau finds are public safety related but not 911-related. According to Washington, the state's "Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) when taken as a whole create a de facto line between 'Call-taking' and 'Dispatch'" and that "state 911 dedicated funds are to be used only in support of call-taking functions (said differently, to get the 911 call from the call-maker to the call-taker) whereas "County 911 dedicated funds" are allowed to support specific "dispatching" functions."[71] Washington states that "for the 2013-2015 and the 2015-2017 fiscal biennia, the [enhanced 911] account may be used for a criminal history system upgrade in the Washington state patrol and for activities and programs in the military department."[72] The state reported spending $5,882,974 of 911 fees "in support of the Washington Military Department activities and programs" and $134,211 of 911 fees "in support of the Washington State Patrol upgrades to the state criminal history system."[73] For this report, we categorize those expenditures as diversions, albeit for public safety uses.

41. Although West Virginia reported that it did not divert funds, of the $56,649,322.00 in 911/E911 fees collected from all sources (wireless, wireline, VoIP; and other services), the Bureau identified approximately $3,984,195.00 of that amount that was apportioned to certain dedicated accounts, as follows: $1,000,000.00 for the Tower Assistance Fund, to subsidize construction of towers, which the state describes as ensuring enhanced 911 wireless coverage; $1,790,517.00 for the state's 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; and $1,193,678.00 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.[74] We categorize these expenditures as non-911 related. We do not agree with the state's characterization of tower construction and radio system maintenance as 911-related programs. Arguably, the state's expenditure of $1,193,678.00 on integrating the West Virginia State Police's radio systems with 911 could be considered 911-related, but the state has not provided sufficient documentation of these expenditures to support such a finding.

42. In Table 16 below, we compare the number of states reporting fee diversions in this reporting year compared to past years.

---

[69] *Id*. at 6.

[70] Washington Response at 12-13.

[71] *Id*.

[72] *Id*.

[73] *Id*.

[74] West Virginia Response at 17-18. The Bureau derived the amounts provided based on a 5% wireless fee to the Department of Homeland Security; a $0.10 per wireless fee collected to the West Virginia State Police; and a set $1,000,000 transfer to the state's Tower Assistance Fund.

Table 16 – States Identified as Diverting 911/E911 Funds (2009 – 2016)

Report Year	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report[75]	2016 Report
States	Illinois	Illinois	Illinois	Illinois	Illinois	Illinois	Illinois	Illinois
	New York	New York	New York	New York	New York	New York	New York	New York
	Rhode Island	Rhode Island	Rhode Island	Rhode Island	Rhode Island	Rhode Island	Rhode Island	Rhode Island
		Arizona	Arizona	Arizona				
		Georgia	Georgia	Georgia				
	Maine		Maine	Maine				
						New Jersey	New Jersey	New Jersey
	Oregon	Oregon	Oregon					
							New Hampshire	New Hampshire
						Washington		Washington
							West Virginia	West Virginia
	Wisconsin	Wisconsin						
						California		
		Delaware						
		Hawaii						
								Iowa
					Kansas			
	Montana							
		Nebraska						
	Tennessee							
Other Jurisdictions						Puerto Rico		Puerto Rico
Total	**8**	**10**	**7**	**6**	**4**	**7**	**6**	**9**

[75] Reflects removal of California and Virginia from the 2015 list.

Report Year	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report[75]	2016 Report
States and Other Jurisdictions That Did Not File a Fee Report								
States Not Filing A Report				Louisiana		Louisiana	Louisiana	
							Missouri	Missouri
					Arkansas			
			Kansas					
				New Hampshire				
			New Jersey					
			Oklahoma					
				Rhode Island				
Other Jurisdictions Not Filing A Report	Northern Marianas	Northern Marianas	Northern Marianas	Northern Marianas	Northern Marianas	Northern Marianas	Northern Marianas	Northern Marianas
		Guam	Guam		Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam
	US Virgin Islands			US Virgin Islands	US Virgin Islands	US Virgin Islands	US Virgin Islands	
					American Samoa	American Samoa		
				District of Columbia				

H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees

43. In order to understand the degree to which states and other jurisdictions track the collection and use of 911 fees, the Bureau 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-five states, the District of Columbia, and the US Virgin Islands indicated that they have established an oversight mechanism; ten states, American Samoa, and Puerto Rico stated they have not.[76]

44. Some states reported local auditing responsibilities with the state providing oversight or review. For example, Arizona stated that the State Auditor General can audit any program within its

[76] New York, Rhode Island, and Wyoming did not respond to the question.

statutory authority and the State 911 office reviews and approves "proposals, reviews, and processes for payment all community-approved invoices [and] determines that funds collected have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism." As of October 2014, Illinois reported that local 911 authorities are required to file an annual financial report detailing a variety of revenue and expenditure information, and they are to be made available for inspection through the website of the Illinois Commerce Commission. Additionally, Illinois' Auditor General has specific requirements for auditing the State's collection and distribution of 9-1-1 funds.[77] Colorado stated that local 911 Authorities are "subject to audit requirements covering all local governments under Colorado Revised Statute Section 29-1-601 *et seq*, [and] each local 911 Authority must include a description of their use of funds collected in their audit, and a copy of each audit report must be made available on the governing body's website if it has one." According to Louisiana, "a number of state laws and acts regulate approved PSAP expenditures, and each district is subject to periodic audits overseen by the Legislative Auditor of the State of Louisiana."[78]

45. 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-seven states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands reported that they have authority to conduct audits of service providers. Nineteen states and American Samoa reported that they do not.[79] California's Revenue and Taxation Code Section 41130 provides that "upon proper notification to the service supplier, the Board of Equalization or its authorized representative shall have the right to inspect and audit all records and returns of the service supplier at all reasonable times."[80] According to Colorado, "the local governing body may, at its own expense, require an annual audit of the service supplier's books and records concerning the collection and remittance of the 911 surcharge funds (CRS § 29-11-103 (3) b)."[81] Nebraska "has the ability to perform remittance audits on wireless carriers."[82] Effective August 2015, the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency has "the power and duty to request information and require audits or reports relating to program compliance from any entity remitting the surcharge to or receiving disbursements from the fund and to subpoena witnesses, administer oaths, examine witnesses, take such testimony and compel the production of such books, records, papers and documents as it may deem necessary or proper in and pertinent to any proceeding, investigation or hearing."[83] Of the jurisdictions indicating they have authority to audit service providers, eight indicated that they had undertaken "authority or enforcement or other corrective actions" in connection with such auditing, twelve states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands indicated no such actions were taken during the period under review, and thirteen did not respond or did not know.

---

[77] Illinois Response at 16.

[78] Louisiana Response at 12

[79] New York, Rhode Island, and Wyoming did not respond to the question.

[80] California Response at 13.

[81] Colorado Response at 14.

[82] Nebraska Response at 10.

[83] Pennsylvania Response at 15.

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 form subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2015
AK	No	No	NA
AL	Yes	Yes	Yes
AR	No	No	NA
AZ	Yes	Yes	No Response
CA	Yes	Yes	No Response
CO	Yes	Yes	No
CT	No	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	Yes	Yes	No Response
IN	Yes	Yes	Yes
KS	Yes	Yes	No Response
KY	Yes	Yes	Yes
LA	Yes	Yes	No
MA	Yes	No	No
MD	Yes	Yes	No
ME	Yes	Yes	No
MI	Yes	No	No Response

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 form subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2015
MN	Yes	Yes	No
MS	No	Yes	No Response
MT	Yes	Yes	No
NC	Yes	No	NA
ND	Yes	No	NA
NE	Yes	Yes	Yes
NH	No	Yes	No Response
NJ	No	No	NA
NM	No	No	NA
NV	No	No	NA
NY	No Response	No Response	No Response
OH	Yes	Yes	No Response
OK	No	No	NA
OR	Yes	Yes	Unknown
PA	Yes	Yes	No
RI	No Response	No Response	No Response
SC	No	No	NA
SD	Yes	Yes	Yes
TN	Yes	No	NA
TX	Yes	Yes	Yes
UT	No	No	NA
VA	Yes	Yes	Unknown
VT	Yes	Yes	Yes
WA	Yes	Yes	Yes

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 form subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers?		Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2015	
WI	Yes		No		NA	
WV	Yes		Yes		No	
WY	No Response		No Response		No Response	
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	No		No		NA	
DC	Yes		Yes		No	
PR	No		Yes		No	
USVI	Yes		Yes		No	
Totals	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
	37	13	30	20	8	15

I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

46. 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 2015. With respect to classifying NG911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures, 44 states and the District of Columbia indicated that their 911 funding mechanism allows for distribution of 911 funds for the implementation of NG911. Six respondents - Alaska, Illinois, Montana, Montana, Puerto Rico, and US Virgin Islands - reported that their funding mechanism does not allow for the use of 911 funds for NG911 implementation. Thirty-six states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico indicated that they used 911 funds for NG911 programs in 2015. 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

Area of Expenditure	States/Other Jurisdictions			Total
General Project or Not Specified	Alabama	Kentucky	Rhode Island	**26**
	Delaware	Louisiana	South Carolina	
	Florida	Maine	Tennessee	
	Hawaii	Maryland	Vermont	
	Idaho	Massachusetts	Virginia	
	Illinois	Mississippi	Washington	
	Indiana	New Mexico	West Virginia	
	Iowa	Nevada	Puerto Rico	
	Kansas	Ohio		
Planning or Consulting Services	Arizona	New Jersey	Texas	**7**
	Idaho	North Carolina		
	New Hampshire	Oregon		
ESInet Construction	California	Kentucky	South Carolina	**15**
	Colorado	Massachusetts	South Dakota	
	Florida	Minnesota	Texas	
	Iowa	North Dakota	Utah	
	Kansas	Pennsylvania	Virginia	
Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades	Connecticut	Kansas	South Dakota	**11**
	Florida	Massachusetts	Texas	
	Hawaii	Nevada	District of Columbia	
	Iowa	Rhode Island		
GIS	Hawaii	Michigan	South Dakota	**10**
	Iowa	North Dakota	Virginia	
	Kansas	Pennsylvania		
	Massachusetts	South Carolina		
NG Security Planning	Washington			**1**
Training	None			**0**

47. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions report the amount of funds expended on NG911 programs in the annual period ending December 31, 2015. Table 19 shows the NG911-related expenditures and projects reported by 36 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Collectively, these jurisdictions spent approximately $164,817,664.55 on NG911 programs, or approximately 6.26 percent of total 911/E911 fees collected. Twelve states did not specify the amount spent for NG911 purposes. Twelve states, American Samoa, and the US Virgin Islands report no expenditures for NG911-related programs.[84]

Table 19 – Funds Spent on Next Generation 911 Programs

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
AL	$516,285.31	"Alabama completed our wireless aggregation project in December 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 phase of the project. All wireless calls in the state are now routed through this network."
AZ	$17,804.00	"Funds were expended for a consultant study of proposed Next Generation 911 network and management solution."
CA	$3,687,206.00	"The State of California has two NG9-1-1 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	$4,083,718.00	"The City of Aurora, Colorado, is installing fiber optic cable for the purpose of preparing for NG911 services. Other local governments may be undertaking NG911 related projects, but did not report them."
CT	Not specified	"Network based components were installed first in the Network Control Centers and Emergency Calling Data Centers. Deployment and transition to 25% of PSAPs."
DE	$2,700,000.00	"Delaware has entered in to an agreement with Intrado (West) to provide 911 service to the centers. This agreement includes voice texting and pictures and video when available. Delaware and Intrado have completed A ALI cutover and are working on voice to start in Q1 2016. Delaware is planning on turning on texting in 2016 as a state wide project. This is a long term contract and should avail Delaware to any NG911 systems for the coming years."
FL	$17,162,709.23	"In 2015, Next Generation 911 expenditures include county expenditures on county NG-911 projects. Expenditure information is collected and reported on the county fiscal year basis (October 1, 2014 - September 30, 2015). These expenditures include next-generation ESI network circuits and services, next-generation E911 database services,

[84] These include Alaska, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin. Wyoming did not respond to the question.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		next-generation E911 call handling equipment, and NG-911 routing services. NG-911 map information on systems implementations for Florida's NG-911 projects is included in the E911 Board 2014 Annual Report, available at: http://www.dms.myflorida.com/business_operations/telecommunications/enhanced_911"
HI	$2,687,000.00	"1. Completed installation of NG911 Viper consoles 2. Initiated soft launch of text-to-911 deployment 3. County of Honolulu deployment of Smart911 database 4. GIS"
IA	$16,000,000.00	"During this reporting period PSAPs continued to upgrade to the NENA i3 standard Next Gen. PSAPs upgraded their CPE's and Recorders to SIP capable/enabled. During this reporting period, PSAPs worked with GeoComm to begin a second data assessment of GIS data that will ultimately be used for NextGen upgrades. During this reporting period, 10 PSAPs began receiving SMS text messaging through the interim, web browser solution. During this reporting period, TCS continued work on building out the secondary ESInet. This is a completely redundant ESInet connecting 13 PSAPs with the CLCs. In case of a large outage, those 13 PSAPs could handle the statewide calls."
ID	Not Specified	"The IECC has formed a NG 911 working group composed of stakeholders from all counties within the state and has begun implementation of the State NG plan. In 2015 we expect to formalize some legislation that will improve NG 911 language in the current legislation. Efforts are under way to firm up 911 costs by utilization of a contractor to calculate state costs and revenue for the entire state."
IL	Not Specified	"A region of 14 9-1-1 authorities joined together calling themselves the Counties of Southern Illinois (CSI) to create a NG9-1-1 system. Seven of the 14 systems were implemented in 2014 and the remaining 7 implemented in 2015."
IN	$8,500,000.00	"The board awarded contracts to INdigital and AT&T during this reporting period. INdigital modernized the current network and AT&T started the build of their network to meet NENA i3 standards."
KS	$4,610,580.68	"Statewide IP Network and hosted call handling solution is currently being deployed. As of 12/31/15, eleven Kansas PSAPs had been migrated to this system. Statewide GIS data remediation is underway, with 93 of 105 counties having completed remediation and moving into data maintenance mode. Planning has begun for migration to geospatial call routing and interconnect with AT&T Nationwide ESINet."

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
KY	Not Specified	"CMRS grant funds were awarded and used for NG911 "interim" solutions that include the acquisition of IP enabled Host/Remote 911 telephony equipment in 38 PSAPs. Grant funds were awarded on the basis of being compliant with our NG911 State Plan. Planning for a regional 911 network to serve a dozen counties in east Kentucky utilizing an existing fiber ring owned by regional co-op telcos was undertaken and reached Governor level approval."
LA	Not Specified	"Jefferson, Tangipahoa, St. Helena, Terrebonne, Washington, and Lafourche parishes have completed text to 911 implementations. Several other parishes are in the process of implementation including West Baton Rouge, East Baton Rouge, Webster, Ouachita, Cameron, Orleans, and Calcasieu parishes."
MA	$9,540,773.00	"During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, the State 911 Department coordinated in the efforts to develop, design, and implement a high speed fiber optic network in Western and parts of Central Massachusetts 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 Next Generation 911 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 Next Generation 911. On August 4, 2014, the Department entered into a contract with General Dynamics Information Technology, Inc. to provide a comprehensive, end-to-end, fully featured, standards-based Next Generation 911 system to replace the current enhanced 911 system. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, system design and test planning development, laboratory trial and testing, site surveys, and other activities were undertaken."
MD	$5,867,257.46	"The Emergency Number Systems Board funds telephone systems and logging recorders that are Next Generation IP enabled systems. During FY 2015, the Board funded IP phone systems for five (5) primary and three (3) backup PSAPs."
ME	$5,070,752.00	"The State of Maine has a single, statewide NG911 system that was fully deployed by August 2014 and was in place for all of 2015."
MI	$608,014.68	"The State 911 Office is working with the Upper Peninsula 911 Authority to utilize data from the Michigan 911 GIS Repository for geospatial routing. GIS data from the repository will be exported to the LVF/ECRF serving the Upper Peninsula 911 Authority ESInet and utilized for text and call routing."
MN	$6,404,339.00	"All 104 PSAPs connected to the ESInet for all call types (wire line, wireless, and VoIP). RFP posted for response for ESInet, IP Selective Routing, and a solution for Text to 911.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		GIS Project Manager position was created and filled to begin the Statewide GIS Centerline project for 911 in preparation for ECRF/LVF."
MS	Not Specified	"The number of NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period under review was 17."
NC	$1,524,654.00	"On December 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 legacy E911 environment to a Next Generation 911 environment for all primary PSAPs, secondary PSAPs, and backup PSAPs. The contract was awarded to Federal Engineering and work began on creating a Concept of Operations, Network Design and Network Cost Analysis. This plan will include issuance of five and possibly six RFPs for NG 911 functional capabilities. These Next Generation 911 functional capabilities are for an ESINet, Hosted CPE, a Network Operations Center (NOC) and Help Desk, CAD interoperability for all PSAPs, GIS operation supporting call routing, 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 National Emergency Number Association's (NENA) i3 next generation standards, requirements, and best practices. It is anticipated that the first PSAP deployments on the ESINet will occur during the fourth quarter of calendar year 2017."
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."
NH	Not Specified	"The Division issued an RFP for NG 9-1-1 CPE, software and Network services with the intent of upgrading to NG 9-1-1 in calendar year 2016. Carrier over Ethernet project was completed in calendar 2015."
NJ	$75,871.14	"Consultant services to begin 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."
NM	NA	"When PSAP equipment is replaced, Next Generation ready equipment is being used."
NV	$242,000.00	Storey County: upgraded county 911 system to a Cassidian Vesta/Sentinal 4 NG911 Phase 2 wireless compatible system. Nye County: went live with new Airbus/Vesta NG911 system in

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		December 2015 Washoe County: Washoe County uses and maintains West Safety Services Advanced "Next Generation" Emergency 911 services for all 3 PSAPs in Washoe County and provide redundancy
NY	Not Specified	"The State Interoperable Communications Grant is a formula-based grant to counties to build out their interoperable network as part of their consortia. This grant also advances Next Generation 911 (NG-911) systems."
OH	Not Specified	"There are a variety of counties who have their "ESInet" built out and ready to go, however none are active NG911 in 2015."
OR	$325,428.04	"State is currently on an Analog Frame Relay Network to allow border to border ALI services. Frame Relay Network will reach end of life by November 2016. RFP has been awarded to provide statewide IP network to be completed before November 2016."
PA	Not Specified	"Pennsylvania is in the early stages of implementation with the ongoing development of regional and statewide Emergency Service IP networks (ESInets) and geo-spatial mapping to provide for 9-1-1 call routing. NG9-1-1 is a core technology change and will be based upon nationwide standards currently being developed by the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) and other 9-1-1 authorities. PEMA's goals are to establish the strategy to implement NG9-1-1 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 • Implement IP capable PSAPs • Develop geographic based routing and database integration • Deploy NG9-1-1 capable, shared applications • Implement "Best Practices" approach"
RI	$630,000.00	"RI E 9-1-1 has purchased the software and hardware necessary for the implementation of NG911. During FY14, FY15, AND FY16, RI E 9-1-1 spent the sum of approximately $630,000.00 for the purposes of purchase of NG911 equipment, hardware and software. This expenditure was approved by the RI legislature (via our budget), the State of Rhode Island Department of Public Safety and the State of Rhode Island Budget Office, and is within the scope of permissible expenditures for RI E 9-1-1 purposes. RI E 9-1-1 maintains a voice and data network within the state that connects RI E 9-1-1 to all local service providers (police, fire and medical) dispatch centers, and transfers a 9-1-1 emergency caller to the appropriate service provider. RI E 9-1-1 is presently implementing a network for NG911 services. This NG911 network will consolidate with our present voice and data network and is expected to assist RI E 9-1-1 in the "roll out" of Next Generation 911

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		services, in particular, "text-to-911." It is envisioned that once RI E 9-1-1 goes live with NG911, the local service responders will be provided with this information on a call-by-call basis, if they have the capacity of receiving the text messages from RIE 9-1-1. Additionally, it is envisioned that RI E 9-1-1 will be utilizing two emergency services IP networks (ESInets) for the implementation of NG911."
SC	$325,000.00	"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 Co. (a coastal county) and Spartanburg Co (an upstate county). South Carolina is in the beginning stages of implementing our 5-year NG9-1-1 Strategic Plan, recently endorsed by the SC Revenue & Fiscal Affairs Board. The plan strongly recommends South Carolina start building statewide NG9-1-1 infrastructure. Current legislation needs to be updated, since it prohibits the state from providing/funding a statewide ESInet with NG9-1-1 Core Services functionality. Legislation also should be updated in order to allow migration to NG9-1-1 from legacy systems. Legislative and Fiscal subcommittees are being organized in order to address the legislative issues keeping South Carolina from moving forward; these subcommittees will also help identify the costs and funding concerns of such a move. Both subcommittees will be made up of a mixture of SC CMRS Advisory committee members and local 911 officials from across the state. Since GIS is such an integral component of NG9-1-1 and counties will need assistance preparing local GIS data for NG9-1-1 standards, a GIS subcommittee is being organized as well. This GIS subcommittee will establish a process to integrate local GIS data into a statewide GIS database to be used in statewide NG9-1-1 Core Services. Like the Legislative and Fiscal subcommittees, the GIS subcommittee will be a collaborative effort of the SC CMRS committee, the state GIS coordinator, and local 911 and GIS officials from around the state."
SD	$3,482,957.00	"During calendar year 2015 we began deploying a statewide hosted CPE. We installed dual host equipment on either side of the state (Rapid City and Sioux Falls). Then we began installation of the leased CPE equipment at each PSAP in the state. By the end of the calendar year, we had cut over six PSAPs to the new hosted CPE. This is phase one of our statewide NG911 project. We also worked with our GIS vendor, GeoComm, to compile all of the existing GIS data in the state and create a statewide seamless GIS dataset. During the 2015 calendar year, GeoComm gathered data from all of the counties and various state agencies. They completed assessments of all the data and then provided reports back to each entity for data remediation. After data remediation, the counties submitted their revised data again for another evaluation and assessment. This second round of assessments and remediation was still on-going at the end of the year.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		The state also worked with their vendor, Comtech TCS (formerly TeleCommunications Systems) to begin preparations for the statewide ESInet. We collected contacts within each of the telecos that serve South Dakota. In December, Letters of Authorization (LOAs) were sent to each of the respective telecos."
TN	$14,000,000.00	"As of July 1, 2015, 86 PSAPs were tested for live traffic and 75 are live on the network. The number of PSAPs live on the NG911 network currently fluctuates between 75 to 90, depending on technical issues. The deployment of NG911 sometimes requires PSAPs to be "rolled off" of the network while equipment upgrades, circuit testing or other technical measures are being undertaken. Equipment is complete in 137 PSAPs across the state and all wireless carriers are now sending calls over NG911. The TECB is currently working to connect wireline and voice over internet protocol ("VoIP") carriers to the network. The TECB is also working on the development and deployment of a state-wide ALI database."
TX	$30,071,313.01	"State 9-1-1 Program: • During the calendar year of 2015, CSEC had 21 of 22 regional planning commissions completing various stages of their ESInet. Some entities were ordering equipment, while others were receiving, installing, and testing. 772 ECDs: • No projects reported. Municipal ECDs: • Purchased Next Gen capable equipment. • Consolidated dispatch center between cities of Addison, Farmers Branch, Coppell and Carrollton, TX • Installed IP enabled CPE with live redundancy at alternate site. • Established contract with Intrado/West for Text-to-911 and to upgrade circuits to TIs. • The City of Dallas has hired a consultant to perform an assessment of the City's 911 call center system (hardware and software), develop specifications and provide implementation management for a new 911 NG911 call center technology solution (hardware and software)."
UT	$1,200,000.00	"There are two more Regional ESInets that are underway in Utah, Davis County and Utah County. Expected completion dates are both 3rd quarter 2016. We have three PSAPs that have connected to a statewide backbone network that currently allows for IP call delivery, and several more in the works. All Regional ESInets currently connect to this backbone network."

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
VA	$1,000,000.00	"Northern VA Regional SIF Project: Knowing that the existing Verizon Selective Router Network for the legacy 9-1-1 system is nearing obsolescence, and that data preparation is a key element of transitioning to NG9-1-1, the Northern Virginia PSAPs have received a PSAP 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. The goal of this SIF project is to develop a regional GIS dataset for Northern Virginia that is suitable for provisioning into a live NG9-1 -1 ECRF/ LVF system residing on the ESInet. Transition to Managed IP Network for 9-1-1 Call Delivery 8 of 121 PSAPs in Virginia have cut off the Verizon or Century Link selective routers in Virginia, and transitioned away from the LEC to a managed IP Network solution through a 3rd-party provider. All 8 of those PSAPs selected West/Intrado as their provider. These transitions are all individual decisions by each PSAP."
VT	$4,604,830.00	"The State of Vermont has and continues to allow expenditures under the 9-1-1 program for Next Generation 9-1-1 services. Vermont's current statewide NG911 system is provided by FairPoint Communications."
WA	$15,037,422.00	"Washington State continued to replace analog 911 telephone equipment in the state's 54 primary PSAPs with NG911 phone systems. A total of 10 primary PSAPs were upgraded during the calendar year. In 2015, the State of Washington continued with a third-party cybersecurity assessment of the state-wide ESInet, and began solicitation of a new ESInet for Washington State."
WV	Not Specified	"Dark Fiber and routers are installed in all PSAPs in WV in preparation for NG911."
Other Jurisdictions		
DC	$4,500,000.00	"The Office of Unified Communications initiated their NG911 projects in 2015, with consulting fees, and procurement of Next Generation 9-1-1 IP logging equipment."
PR	$86,000.00	"Text 911"
Total	**$164,817,664.55**	

48. **ESInet Deployments**. To better track NG911 implementation progress, the Bureau requested that states and other responding jurisdictions provide information on whether they had any Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets) operating during calendar year 2015. 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.[85] As detailed in Table 20, thirteen states and Puerto Rico reported having deployed state-wide ESInets.[86] Fifteen states reported having regional ESInets within the state, and ten states reported local-level ESInets.[87]

Table 20 – Type and Number of ESInets Deployed During Period Ending December 31, 2015

Type Of ESInet	Number of States/Jurisdictions Indicating PSAPs Connected to ESInets		States/Jurisdictions Responding YES		Total PSAPs Operating on ESInets
	No	Yes			
Single Statewide ESInet	34	14	Connecticut Delaware Indiana Iowa Maine Minnesota New Hampshire	North Dakota Rhode Island Tennessee Vermont Washington West Virginia Puerto Rico	503
Regional ESInet	30	15	Arizona California Florida Illinois Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Michigan	Nevada North Carolina Pennsylvania Texas Utah Virginia Washington	367
Local ESInet	38	10	Colorado Florida Hawaii Louisiana Nevada North Carolina	Ohio South Carolina Utah Virginia	88

[85] 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.

[86] We note that deployment of ESInets is an indicator that the state or jurisdiction is transitioning to IP-based routing of 911 calls, but ESInet deployment, by itself, does not mean the state has completed its transition to NG911 service. These states include Connecticut, Indiana, Maine, Minnesota, North Dakota, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia. In 2014, Hawaii reported that it has deployed a statewide ESInet but it did not respond to the question for this report.

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

49. **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 2015. The Bureau also requested that respondents estimate the number of PSAPs that they anticipated would become text-capable by the end of calendar year 2016. Table 21 sets forth the information provided by 40 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Collectively, respondents reported 553 PSAPs as being text-capable as of the end of 2015, and further reported that they anticipated an additional 844 PSAPs would become text-capable by the end of 2016. For purposes of comparison, Table 21 also includes data from the FCC's Text-to-911 Registry as of December 21, 2016, which shows the number of PSAPs that the reporting jurisdictions have registered with the FCC as text capable.[88] While the total number of registered PSAPs is lower than the number of PSAPs that respondents projected would be text-capable at the end of 2016, the Bureau has received data indicating that many additional PSAPs that are not listed in the FCC registry (which is a voluntary registry) are in fact text-capable. Thus, the actual number of text-capable PSAPs as of year-end 2016 may be considerably closer to the projected total in Table 21. We anticipate that our ability to accurately monitor PSAP adoption of text-to-911 will improve with future annual data collections.

Table 21 – Text-to-911 Deployments

State	Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2015	No Response	Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2016	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2016	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 21, 2016[89]
AK	0		2		2	0
AL	14		45		59	3
AR	4		4		8	6
AZ	0		0		0	1
CA	24		100		124	61
CO	43		0		43	49
CT	0		0		0	0
DE	9		0		9	9
FL	19		37		56	13
GA	5		0		5	6
HI	6		0		6	9
IA	10		103		113	11

[88] 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. The FCC has encouraged all text-capable PSAPs to register with the FCC.

[89] Based on the FCC's Registry, the following states and territories are considered to have statewide text-to-911 availability: Delaware, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Vermont, and Puerto Rico. In addition, although Missouri did not file a report, we note that 29 Missouri PSAPs are listed in the FCC Registry as text capable. Accordingly, they are included in the total of 756 provided in Table 21.

State	Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2015	No Response	Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2016	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2016	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 21, 2016[89]
ID	7		19		26	9
IL		X		X	0	14
IN	84		8		92	92
KS	11		51		62	11
KY	1		12		13	3
LA	6		7		13	7
MA	0		2		2	0
MD	1		2		3	1
ME	2		24		26	2
MI	16		14		30	32
MN	0		7		7	0
MS	1		25		26	0
MT	0		4		4	24
NC	68		51		119	81
ND	0		5		5	4
NE	3		10		13	4
NH	2		0		2	1
NJ	0		17		17	19
NM	0		0		0	0
NV	4		1		5	1
NY		X		X	0	11
OH	5		65		70	3
OK		X		X	0	1
OR	0		8		8	8
PA	23		30		53	11
RI	0		0		0	0
SC	5		10		15	12
SD	0		21		21	0
TN	0		0		0	0
TX	137		87		224	149
UT	0		20		20	10
VA	25		20		45	30
VT	6		0		6	6
WA	6		23		29	6
WI	4			X	4	4
WV	0		9		9	1

State	Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2015	No Response	Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2016	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2016	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 21, 2016[89]
WY		X		X		0
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	0		0		0	0
DC	0		1		1	0
PR	2		0		2	1
USVI	0		0		0	0
Totals	**553**	**4**	**844**	**5**	**1,397**	**756**

J. Cybersecurity Expenditures

50. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions provide information on whether they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2015 and, if so, the amounts of those expenditures. As represented in Table 22, 41jurisdictions responded that they did not expend funds on PSAP-related cybersecurity programs.[90] Eight states and the District of Columbia reported that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2015.

51. The Bureau additionally requested information on the number of PSAPs in each state or jurisdiction that implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs in 2015. Table 22 shows that ten states reported that one or more of their PSAPs either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program. Fifteen states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands reported that their PSAPs did not implement or participate in cybersecurity programs.[91] Twenty-two states reported that they lacked data or otherwise did not know whether their PSAPs had implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs.

[90] Georgia reported it did not know whether the state had expended funds on cybersecurity programs. New York and Wyoming did not respond to the question.

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

Table 22 – Annual Cybersecurity Expenditures

State	During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, 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				0
AL		X				0
AR		X				0
AZ		X				0
CA		X				0
CO		X				32
CT		X				0
DE		X				0
FL	X				$157,142.00	51
GA				X		0
HI		X				6
IA	X					114
ID		X				17
IL		X				0
IN	X					0
KS	X					14
KY		X				0
LA		X				0
MA		X				0
MD		X				0
ME	X					26

State	During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, 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				$22,000,000.00[92]	0
MN		X				0
MS		X				0
MT		X				0
NC		X				0
ND		X				0
NE		X				0
NH		X				2
NJ		X				0
NM		X				0
NV		X				0
NY			X			0
OH		X				40
OK		X				0
OR		X				0
PA		X				0
RI		X				0
SC		X				0
SD		X				0
TN		X				0
TX	X				$586,478.61	64

[92] Michigan stated that its "estimated aggregate spend for Cyber Security in 2015 was $22 million. This spend represents multiple categories across multiple centralized Information Technology programs for the state. The estimated spend is comprised of actual costs and estimated costs for program resources required for specific security functions. Included within this amount are cyber expenditures for centralized cyber related infrastructure and services that are used to support three Michigan State Police operated PSAPs in Negaunee, Gaylord, [and] Detroit." Michigan Response at 19.

State	During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, 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	
UT		X				0
VA		X				0
VT		X				0
WA	X				$153,356.00	54
WI		X				0
WV		X				0
WY			X			0
Other Jurisdictions						
AS		X				0
DC	X					0
PR		X				0
USVI		X				0
Total	**9**	**41**	**2**	**1**	**$22,896,976.61**	**420**

52. 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)[93] for networks that support one or more PSAPs. Eleven states and the District of Columbia reported that they do adhere to the NIST Framework, eight states and Puerto Rico reported that they do not, and 27 states, American Samoa, and the US Virgin Islands indicated they did not know.[94]

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

[94] Nevada, New York, and Wyoming did not respond to the question.

Table 23 – Adherence to the NIST Cybersecurity Framework

State	State or jurisdiction adheres 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	
IA	X			
ID			X	
IL		X		
IN	X			
KS		X		
KY			X	
LA			X	
MA			X	
MD	X			
ME			X	
MI	X			
MN			X	

State	State or jurisdiction adheres 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
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	
WV			X	

State	State or jurisdiction adheres 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**
WY				X
Other Jurisdictions				
AS			X	
DC	X			
PR		X		
USVI			X	
Totals	**12**	**9**	**29**	**3**

K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees

53. 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 jurisdictions that responded, 42 described some effort to measure the effectiveness of 911/E911 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. Alabama reported that it has begun collecting data on a biennial basis, with the first result a report a historical survey of state 911 fees.[95] According to Kentucky, state certified PSAPs are subject to various audits to measure effectiveness, including an audit that measures the accuracy of their ability to plot the location of wireless 911 calls; financial audits at least once every six years; and required completion of a PSAP survey to maintain state certification.[96] North Carolina reported that the North Carolina 911 Board completed a rulemaking process, effective July 2016, to establish administrative rules for the state's primary PSAPs that receive 911 funding, including development of an assessment tool to assist PSAP managers.[97] In addition, North Carolina reported that it uses "the Electronic Call Analysis Tracking System (ECaTS) to measure individual call answer times by PSAP, which enabled it to improve call answering times.[98]

[95] Alabama Response at 19-27.

[96] Kentucky Response at 18.

[97] North Carolina Response at 19.

[98] *Id*. According to North Carolina, in January 2014, 33 percent of its PSAPs (42) did not meet the state's standard of 10 second answer time for 90 percent of all 911 calls. In December 2014, that number had decreased to 23 percent, and by December 2015, had decreased to 8.2 percent. North Carolina found that "this indicates that better training, better equipment and more attention to performance was given as a direct result of 911 funding." *Id*.

54. Some states indicate that measuring effectiveness lies with local organizations. Georgia stated that because local governments collect all 911 fees, "there are no state assessments on these funds available detailing the effect achieved from any 911 expenditures."[99] Mississippi reported that the state does not have "a committee, organization, or board that has oversight or that implements the policies and procedures regarding 911/E911 usage [and] responsibility lays solely with the local board of supervisors" to measure the effective utilization of 911 fees.[100]

55. In 2014, the Commission formed an expert advisory committee, the Task Force on Optimal Public Safety Answering Point Architecture (Task Force), to provide comprehensive recommendations on actions that state, local, and tribal 911 authorities can take to optimize cybersecurity, network architecture, and funding. The Task Force completed its work on December 2, 2016, with the adoption of final reports that provide detailed recommendations for state and local NG911 planning and budgeting and a common NG911 "scorecard" to enable jurisdictions to assess the progress and maturity of their NG911 implementations.[101] We anticipate that as states and other jurisdictions incorporate these guidelines into their planning, future fee reports will provide enhanced information on the effective utilization of 911/E911 fees.

L. Public Comments on 2015 Seventh Annual Report

56. As in past reports, this section summarizes public comments received in response to the prior year's report. On January 8, 2016 the Commission issued a Public Notice seeking comment on the 2015 Seventh Annual Report and the sufficiency and accuracy of the reported information.[102] We received input from seven commenters.[103] APCO states that "diverting 9-1-1 fees exacerbates challenges that are already facing resource-constrained PSAPs," and "not only can fee diversion render a state ineligible for federal grants, it also undermines the case for funding made by non-diverting states."[104] T-Mobile concurs, arguing further that "one of the biggest contributors to fee diversion and its impact on 911 funding is the lack of consensus around what activities and investments 911 fees should support," a situation made more complicated by varying state statutes as to what constitutes a permissible use of 911 fees.[105] T-Mobile believes that different statutory allowances means "the amount of fees that are diverted to non-911 activities may actually be higher than the [FCC] report indicates."[106] Lastly, T-Mobile suggests that because "the FCC relies on states to self-report fee diversion [and that many states] do not require an independent audit of 911 fee collections or

---

[99] Georgia Response at 18.

[100] Mississippi Response at 18.

[101] *See* FCC, Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture, at https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/advisory-committees/general/task-force-optimal-public-safety-answering-point.

[102] FCC Seeks Public Comment on Seventh Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, Public Notice, 31 FCC Rcd 84 (Jan. 8, 2016) (*Public Notice*), available at https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/60001536009.pdf.

[103] The Commission received comments from APCO, the Washington State APCO-NENA Chapter, the New Jersey Association of Counties, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and Reply Comments from T-Mobile USA, Inc. and the New Jersey Wireless Association.

[104] APCO Comments at 2.

[105] T-Mobile Reply Comments at 2.

[106] *Id*.

expenditures [then] these self-reports could well be understated even with respect to the permitted uses under state law."[107]

57. Commonwealth of Virginia (Virginia) takes issue with the Bureau designating the state as a diverter in the 2014 period, because "the fee distribution practices Virginia reported to the FCC [in the Seventh Report] are not new and have been reported in each of the six prior years' submissions."[108] According to Virginia, "these practices were not deemed diversions in the past, but now appear to be considered diversions [but] the subject report gives no explanation for the change."[109] Virginia reports that the Virginia State Police plays a critical role in the processing of 911 calls, transferring as many as 211,000 wireless 911 calls annually for answering and processing.[110] According to Virginia, '"the $3.7 million transferred in the Virginia Appropriation Act from the fund to the State Police supports this ongoing role in the provision of 9-1-1 services and is not a diversion of funds away from 9-1-1 services."[111] Virginia also points out that "fewer CMRS providers sought cost recovery over the last several years and [the state] recognized an opportunity to fund 9-1-1 dispatchers with a portion of this funding [and thus] the Virginia Appropriation Act [shifted] a portion of the CMRS provider funding ($8 million) to the Compensation Board," which directly supports dispatchers in 911 centers.[112] Although Virginia agrees that the report does indicate that the diverted funds are being used to support other public safety or emergency response-related programs, Virginia believes that "this statement does not fully characterize the situation in Virginia" and thus Virginia seeks reconsideration of the classification as a diverter.[113]

58. The New Jersey Association of Counties (NJAC) comments that New Jersey "collects in excess of $100 million annually in telecommunication user surcharges, itemized on consumer bills as "9-1-1 System/Emergency Response Fees," [but] the vast majority of 9-1-1 service requests in the State continue to be handled by county and municipal PSAPs [and] the State has not allocated any funding whatsoever through the 9-1-1 Trust Fund to local PSAP operators since 2009."[114] According to NIAC, "[d]ue to this lack of funding, counties operating PSAPs have become self-reliant in improving, maintaining and operating their 9-1-1 systems, despite local residents providing the State a consistent

---

[107] *Id*. at 3.

[108] Commonwealth of Virginia Comments at 1. According to Virginia, "[u]nder the sections of the Code of Virginia that concern 9-1-1 funding, Virginia collects a $0.75 monthly surcharge from all wireless subscribers to fund 9-1-1 services within the Commonwealth. The revenue collected is distributed to cover several 9-1-1 needs. The largest portion (60 percent) of the funding is distributed monthly to the local 9-1-1 centers to support operational expenses. An additional 10 percent of the fund is set aside to provide grants to localities to assist with equipment and services purchases and upgrades. The remaining funding (30 percent) is held to provide cost recovery to commercial mobile radio system (CMRS) providers for the costs of providing Phase I and Phase 2 data in Virginia." *Id*.

[109] *Id*.

[110] *Id*. at 2.

[111] *Id*. According to Virginia, "there are only two other call centers in Virginia processing more wireless 9-1-1 calls than the State Police."

[112] *Id*.

[113] *Id*.

[114] New Jersey Association of Counties Comments at 1. *See also* New Jersey Wireless Association Reply Comments at 2 ("During the years 2006-2009, a portion of the 911 Trust Fund provided grants to New Jersey counties/municipalities. After 2009, no funds were granted to New Jersey counties and municipalities. While grants to locally run PSAPs have been eliminated, the State has allocated 911 Trust Funds to agencies and expense categories that NJWA believes are not consistent with the Act's spirit and intent.").

revenue stream intended for such purposes."[115] New Jersey Wireless Association states that, "while [New Jersey Statutes, section 52:17C-19, establishing the 911 Trust Fund] does not specifically permit these fund diversions, the current and all past administrations in our state have interpreted this Statute, since its inception in 2004, in such a manner that these 911 fee diversions are now a de-facto way of addressing other budget gaps."[116] NJAC urges the FCC to recognize this critical public safety funding diversion and take action to ensure 9-1-1 Trust Fund revenues are spent solely on eligible expenses [as] [d]oing so will help to ensure that local PSAPs have the funding necessary to continue to provide residents with effective, efficient and up to date 9-1-1 systems as intended."[117]

59. The Bureau also sought comment on whether there have been other instances of fee diversion by states or local jurisdictions, including counties or other jurisdictions in state that have local of hybrid fee collection programs.[118] The Washington State APCO-NENA Chapter (APCO-NENA) commented that it is "concerned about the use of 911 funds for purposes other than 911 in Washington State."[119] According to APCO-NENA, although Washington State "correctly answered yes" to Question G regarding the use of collected 911 fees within the state's relevant funding mechanism, "Washington State routinely changes the funding mechanism to permit use of 911 funds for purposes other than 911."[120] APCO-NENA believes that "without a national standard definition for appropriate uses of 911 funds it is left to each state or jurisdiction to determine their own definition/boundaries and expenditure rules" and that "911 funds generated from the current funding model do not entirely cover the cost of providing the 911/E911/NG911 services."[121] T-Mobile notes that Michigan "collects 'Police and Fire' fees, but those fees are deposited in the state's general fund rather than being set aside for police and fire activities."[122] Similarly, T-Mobile points out that Colorado uses 911 fees for "the hiring and training of call takers – which is closely connected to the provision of 911 services, but also may be considered fee diversion."[123]

---

[115] *Id*.

[116] New Jersey Wireless Association Reply Comments at 3.

[117] *Id*.

[118] *Public Notice* at 2.

[119] Washington State APCO-NENA Chapter Comments (Feb. 17, 2016) at 1. *See* also T-Mobile Reply Comments at 3.

[120] *Id*. APCO-NENA points out that in its State Fiscal Year 2013-2015 biennium, the Washington State legislature appropriated State E911 Funds as follows: $10,842,000 to the Washington Military Department Operating Budget – replacing equivalent General Fund (GF)-S with dedicated State E911 Account Funding; $3,867,000 to the Washington State Patrol – Mobile Office Platform; and $2,000,000 to the Department of Corrections – Radio Infrastructure Upgrade. Similarly, in the State Fiscal Year 2015-2017 biennium, the legislature approved appropriations from the State E911 Fund as follows: $8,606,000 – to the Washington Military Department Operating Budget – replaced equivalent GF-S with dedicated State E911 Account Funding; $3,230,000 to the Washington State Patrol –Criminal History Fingerprint System; $ 633,000 for state government policy compensation changes; and $ 130,000 for a King County cardiac arrest response pilot project. *See also* Robert Oenning ("If legislatively approved redirection of funds explicitly collected for support of 911 operations is not considered diversion by the Commission that should be made abundantly clear in the report to Congress. If legislative redirection is considered diversion that should be made clear to the reporting entities, and in this case the report should be appropriately corrected.").

[121] *Id*. at 2.

[122] T-Mobile Reply Comments at 2-3.

[123] *Id*.

60. We sought comment on whether expenditure of 911 fees on NG911-related programs as documented in the Report is effectively contributing to implementation of NG911 services and infrastructure, including deployment of text-to-911.[124] APCO states that "it is important to have a clear picture of current NG9-1-1 deployments, as well as the challenges facing states, in order to facilitate the transition to NG9-1-1 nationwide." APCO believes that because "there is still no consensus-based, standardized definition of NG9-1-1, which makes data analysis and planning the transition to NG9-1-1 more difficult, the responses received for the [annual report] may present an unclear picture of NG911 expenditures." By way of example, APCO points out that some "states reported funds and efforts related to text-to-911 as NG911 expenditures [but] the current, interim SMS text-to-911 solution available in some areas today is more accurately defined as an enhancement to a legacy system as opposed to an initial capability of NG9-1-1."[125] APCO agrees with the Commission that ESInet deployment is an indicator that the state or jurisdiction is transitioning to IP-based routing of 911 calls, but "limiting the definition of NG9-1-1 to IP-based routing overlooks additional needs for staffing, technologists, cyber security, records management systems, logging, and a variety of other requirements."[126] Lastly, ACPO recommends that the Commission "seek additional information to better understand how states should amend any laws or regulations that act as impediments to the deployment of NG9-1-1."[127]

61. APCO urges the Commission "to take a proactive role in properly defining NG9-1-1 as end-to-end (from the caller to the telecommunicator) IP connectivity enabling current voice communications, future multimedia, and other data capabilities to flow from the 9-1-1 caller to the PSAP and be properly reported, archived, and further transmitted between the PSAP and first responders. The definition must be both clear and comprehensive to ensure adequate funding and planning."[128] Finally, APCO recommends revising the annual questionnaire to capture information related to the technical standards that states and their vendors are employing for NG911 components so as to better understand what "these standards entail, how they are applied, and whether they ensure interoperability between systems" and to help "stakeholders identify gaps and determine whether there's a need to complete or refine NG9-1-1 standards."[129]

62. We also sought comment on whether 911 fees are being effectively used by state, local, and tribal jurisdictions to implement cybersecurity best practices within PSAPs as well as adherence to the National Institute of Standards and Technology Cybersecurity Framework.[130] APCO states that as "states and jurisdictions continue to transition to IP-based networks and equipment, cyber security is an increasingly critical consideration."[131] Noting that "cybersecurity programs" may be interpreted to encompass a vast array of practices and initiatives, such as cyber hygiene, workforce training, and hiring cyber security consultants, APCO recommends that the Commission "provide guidance about

---

[124] *Public Notice* at 2.

[125] APCO Comments at 3.

[126] *Id*.

[127] *Id*. at 5.

[128] APCO Comments at 3.

[129] *Id*. at 4.

[130] *Public Notice* at 2.

[131] APCO Comments at 4.

what constitutes a "cybersecurity program" and seek more focused information about the types of cybersecurity programs states and PSAPs are participating in and implementing."[132] In this way, argues APCO, "[u]nderstanding the cybersecurity efforts underway may assist with the development of cybersecurity plans to achieve economies of scale, real time capabilities, and operational efficiencies . . . information [that] will also be useful for promoting increased awareness, transparency, information sharing, and related educational efforts among public safety stakeholders."[133] Lastly, APCO cautions that "while the deployment of IP networks and equipment increases the cyber risk, vulnerabilities also exist for legacy systems [and] [b]oth legacy and next generation PSAPs must be equipped to identify, defend against, and recover from cyberattacks."[134]

63. We sought comment on the role of oversight and auditing in ensuring that collected 911 fees are used according to state and local requirements, and on whether additional efforts are needed to ensure that state and local entities have the authority to monitor and audit 911 fee collections.[135] We did not receive any comments on this line of inquiry.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2016 EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT

64. 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.

---

[132] *Id*.

[133] *Id*.

[134] *Id*.

[135] *Public Notice* at 2.

Appendix A

Summary of State Responses Regarding 2015 Collections

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Funds Collected (2015 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2015 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a % of Total Funds Collected
AK	Local	Local	$12,837,113.68	None	No	None	--
AL	State	Hybrid	$116,440,103.36	None	Yes	$516,285.31	.4%
AR	Hybrid	Hybrid	$26,985,554.99	None	Yes	None	--
AZ	State	State	$19,227,222.00	None	Yes	$17,804.00	.1%
CA	State	State	$87,838,234.00	None	Yes	$3,687,206.00	4.2%
CO	Hybrid	Local	$52,732,731.00	None	Yes	$4,083,718.00	7.7%
CT	State	State	$32,564,308.00	None	Yes	None	--
DE	State	Hybrid	$8,159,730.03[136]	None	Yes	$2,700,000.00	33%
FL	State	Hybrid	$108,226,957.00	None	Yes	$17,162,709.23	15.9%
GA	Local	Local	$17,659,037.41	None	Yes	None	--

[136] 2014 total used as proxy.

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Funds Collected (2015 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2015 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a % of Total Funds Collected
HI	State	State	$10,237,032.00	None	Yes	$2,687,000.00	26.2%
IA	Hybrid	Hybrid	$40,547,767.19	$4,000,000.00 *(9.9%)*	Yes	$16,000,000.00	39.5%
ID	Hybrid	Local	$20,952,378.70	None	Yes	None	--
IL	Hybrid	Local	$95,500,349.00	$5,000,000.00 *(5.2%)*	No	None	--
IN	State	Hybrid	$79,108,857.85	None	Yes	$8,500,000.00	10.7%
KS	State	Hybrid	$20,821,974.24	None	Yes	$4,610,580.68	22.1%
KY	Hybrid	Hybrid	$53,500,000.00	None	Yes	Unknown	--
LA	Hybrid	Local	$42,750,000.00	None	Yes	Unknown	--
MA	State	State	$95,508,773.40	None	Yes	$9,540,773.00	10%
MD	State	State	$53,314,406.32	None	Yes	$5,867,257.46	11%
ME	State	State	$8,402,473.00	None	Yes	$5,070,752.00	60.3%
MI	Hybrid	Hybrid	$93,333,482.76	None	Yes	$608,014.68	.7%
MN	State	State	$62,110,858.23	None	Yes	$6,404,339.00	10.3%

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Funds Collected (2015 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2015 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a % of Total Funds Collected
MS	Local	Local	$26,510,538.00	None	Yes	None	--
MT	State	Hybrid	$13,000,000.00	None	No	None	--
NC	State	State	$81,135,377.32	None	Yes	$1,524,654.00	1.9%
ND	Hybrid	Local	$10,337,907.00	None	Yes	$255,750.00	2.5%
NE	Hybrid	Hybrid	$13,900,447.54	None	Yes	None	--
NH	State	State	$12,317,417.55	$2,078,685.85 *(16.9%)*	Yes	None	--
NJ	State	State	$122,632,000.00	$110,278,000.00 *(89.9%)*	Yes	$75,871.14	.1%
NM	State	State	$11,146,012.00	None	Yes	None	--
NV	Local	Local	$1,591,367.00 (Washoe County)	None	Yes (Counties of Washoe and Nye County)	$242,000.00 (Nye County)	--
NY	Hybrid	Hybrid	$185,262,082.00	$77,254,288.19 *(42%)*	Yes	Not Specified	--
OH	Hybrid	Hybrid	$40,382,365.16	None	Yes	Not Specified	--
OK	State	Local	Did Not Provide	None	No	Unknown	--

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Funds Collected (2015 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2015 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a % of Total Funds Collected
OR	State	Hybrid	$39,470,386.00	None	Yes	$325,428.04	.8%
PA	State	Hybrid	$239,800,218.00	None	Yes	Unknown	--
RI	State	State	$16,345,363.80	$11,185,216.24 *(68.4%)*	Yes	$630,000.00	3.9%
SC	Hybrid	Hybrid	$39,054,282.49	None	Yes	$325,000.00	.8%
SD	State	Hybrid	$13,093,702.00	None	Yes	$3,482,957.00	26.6%
TN	State	Hybrid	$78,729,854.00	None	Yes	$14,000,000.00	17.8%
TX	Hybrid	Hybrid	$222,938,735.00	None	Yes	$30,071,313.01	13.5%
UT	State	Hybrid	$27,130,872.00	None	Yes	$1,200,000.00	4.4%
VA	State	Hybrid	$85,431,606.09	None	Yes	$1,000,000.00	1.2%
VT	State	State	$6,256,658.00[137]	None	Yes	$4,604,830.00	73.6%

[137] Total collected under Vermont Universal Service Fund fee of 2% on all telecommunications service providers.

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Funds Collected (2015 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2015 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a % of Total Funds Collected
WA	Hybrid	Hybrid	$94,445,461.00	$6,017,185.00 *(6.4%)*	Yes	$15,037,4232.00	15.9%
WI	Fees retained in full by service providers	Not Applicable	Did Not Provide	None	Yes	None	--
WV	Hybrid	Hybrid	$56,649,322.00	$3,984,195.00 *(7%)*	Yes	Not Specified	--
WY	Local	Local	Did Not Provide	None	Did Not Provide	Unknown	--
Other Jurisdictions							
AS	None [138]	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	None	Did Not Provide	None	--
DC	City	City	$12,189,231.34	None	Yes	$4,500,000.00	36.9%
PR	State	State	$21,896,788.53	$484,016.54 *(2.2%)*	No	$86,000.00	.4%
USVI	State	State	$1,297,671.00	None	No	None	--
States/Jurisdictions That Did Not File a Report							
Missouri Guam Northern Marianas Islands							

[138] 911 service is budgeted through the executive office of the Department of Public Safety.

Appendix B

Overview of Total State 911 Fees - 2009 to 2016 Reports[139]

State	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report	2016 Report
AK	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	$12,837,113.68
AL	$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	$116,440,103.36
AR	$24,799,338.00	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	$25,290,789.81	$26,985,554.99
AZ	$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	$19,227,222.00
CA	$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	$87,838,234.00
CO	$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.)	$52,732,731.00 (est.)
CT	$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	$32,564,308.00
DE	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	$8,159,730.03[140]
FL	$130,962,053.00	$125,531,674.00	$123,059,300.00	$122,550,767.00	$108,896,142.00	$107,884,715.00	$108,324,754.00	$108,226,957.00
GA	DNP	$8,537,319.00	$8,950,569.00	$13,700,097.00	DNP	$18,462,645.22	$17,538,556.19	$17,659,037.41
HI	$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	$10,237,032.00
IA	$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	$40,547,767.19
ID	$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	$20,952,378.70
IL	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	$95,500,349.00
IN	$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	$79,108,857.85
KS	DNP	$6,705,538.67	DNP	$22,125,937.00	$20,477,020.47	$20,573,217.00	$20,337,748.19	$20,821,974.24
KY	$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	$53,500,000.00
LA	DNP	DNP	$3,017,672.00	DNP	$4,912,926.00	DNP	DNP	$42,750,000.00
MA	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	$95,508,773.40
MD	$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	$53,314,406.32
ME	$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	$8,402,473.00

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

[140] 2014 Total used as proxy.

State	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report	2016 Report
MI	$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	$93,333,482.76
MN	$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	$62,110,858.23
MO	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
MS	$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	$26,510,538.00
MT	$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	$13,000,000.00
NC	$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	$81,135,377.32
ND	DNP	$8,369,366.00	DNP	$9,506,000.00	$9,506,000.00	$9,998,322.00	$10,337,907.00	$10,337,907.00
NE	$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	$13,900,447.54
NH	$10,854,202.82	DNP	$9,832,831.00	DNP	$10,493,486.32	$10,467,786.57	$10,582,269.31	$12,317,417.55
NJ	$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	$122,632,000.00
NM	$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	$11,146,012.00
NV	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	$2,010,341.58	$1,944,446.69	DNP	$1,591,367.00 (Washoe County)
NY	$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	$185,262,082.00
OH	$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	$40,382,365.16
OK	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
OR	$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	$39,470,386.00
PA	$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	$239,800,218.00
RI	$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	$16,345,363.80
SC	$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	$39,054,282.49
SD	DNP	DNP	$8,100,000.00	$8,200,000.00	$9,111,476.00	$13,275,031.00	$13,095,234.00	$13,093,702.00
TN	$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	$78,729,854.00
TX	$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	$222,938,735.00
UT	$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	$27,130,872.00
VA	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	$85,431,606.09
VT	$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	$6,256,658.00
WA	$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	$94,445,461.00
WI	$9,602,745.46	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP

State	2009 Report	2010 Report	2011 Report	2012 Report	2013 Report	2014 Report	2015 Report	2016 Report
WV	$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	$56,649,322.00
WY	$6,700,000.00	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
Other Jurisdictions								
AS	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
DC	$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	$12,189,231.34
Guam	$1,468,363.00	DNP	DNP	$1,779,710.00	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
No. M	NA	NA	NA	NA	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP
PR	$20,952,458.73	$21,876,276.72	DNP	$21,367,260.00	$20,323,323.95	$19,507,889.00	DNP	$21,896,788.53
USVI	NA	$590,812.00	$554,245.00	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	$1,297,671.00
Total	**$1,877,863,271.72**	**$1,749,609,554.27**	**$2,002,117,111.00**	**$2,149,689,191.00**	**$2,322,983,616.36**	**$2,404,510,787.64**	**$2,527,625,360.85**	**$2,631,705,008.98**

Appendix C

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, 2015:**

PSAP Type[141]	Total
Primary	
Secondary	
Total	

2. **Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators[142] in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2015:**

Number of Active Telecommunicators	Total
Full-Time	
Part-time	

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

Amount ($)	

[141] 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 .

[142] 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, 2015 to December 31, 2015.

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, 2015, 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. <u>Description of State or Jurisdictional Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent</u>

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, 2015, 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, 2015, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.

Service Type	**Total Amount Collected ($)**
Wireline	
Wireless	
Prepaid Wireless	
Voice Over Internet Protocol	
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. <u>Description of Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses</u>

Question	Yes	No
1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2015, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for 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, 2015. *(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, 2015. *(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, 2015, 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, 2015, please describe the type and number of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state.					
Type of ESInet	**Yes**	**No**	**If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs Operating on the ESInet**	**If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets?**	
				Yes	**No**
a. A single, state-wide ESInet	☐	☐		☐	☐
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, 2015.**

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

J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures

Question	Check the appropriate box		If Yes, Amount Expended ($)
1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?	Yes ☐	No ☐	

Question	Total PSAPs
2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2015, 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.**