



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Approved by OMB
3060-1122
Expires: March 31, 2018
Estimated time per response: 10-55
hours

Annual Collection of Information

Related to the Collection and Use of 911 and E911 Fees by States and Other Jurisdictions

Pursuant to OMB authorization 3060-1122 , the FCC’s Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau seeks the following specific information in order to fulfill the Commission’s obligations under Section 6(f)(2) of the NET 911 Act:

A. Filing Information

1. Name of State or Jurisdiction

| State or Jurisdiction |
|-----------------------|
| State of Maryland |

2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report

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



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

B. Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System

1. Please provide the total number of active Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2016:

| PSAP Type ¹ | Total |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Primary | 24 |
| Secondary | 70 |
| Total | 94 |

2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators² in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2016:

| Number of Active Telecommunicators | Total |
|------------------------------------|-------|
| Full-Time | 1,417 |
| Part-time | 94 |

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Amount (\$) | \$97,539,229.74 |
|-----------------------|-----------------|

¹ A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control office. A secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. See National Emergency Number Association, Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (*Master Glossary*), July 29, 2014, at 118, 126, available at https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014_2014072.pdf.

² A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. See *Master Glossary* at 137.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

FY 2016 (July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016) as reported by annual county audits.

4. Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016.

| Type of Service | Total 911 Calls |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Wireline | 1,185,386 |
| Wireless | 3,819,777 |
| VoIP | Unknown |
| Other | 240 |
| Total | 5,005,403 |

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

1. Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian tribe, village or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (please include a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism)? *Check one.*

- Yes
- No

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

Maryland Public Safety Article §1-308 (a) through (g)



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.

No

2. Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees? Check one.

- The State collects the fees
- A Local Authority collects the fees
- A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies
(e.g., state and local authority) collect the fees

3. Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.

9-1-1 fees are collected by each vendor and remitted to the State. 25 percent of the fee collected is remitted to the 9-1-1 Trust Fund for enhancements to 9-1-1, and 75 percent is remitted to each county and Baltimore City for operational expenses in the same percentage as collected by the vendor.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

D. Description of State or Jurisdictional Authority That Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent

| 1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes. | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Jurisdiction | Authority to Approve Expenditure of Funds (Check one) | |
| | Yes | No |
| State | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Local (e.g., county, city, municipality) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (e.g., limited to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.) | | |
| Counties use funds remitted by the State for operational costs as budgeted by each jurisdiction. | | |

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.

Maryland Public Safety Article §1-310 and 311, and §1-313

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



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

E. Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees

- 1. Provide a statement identifying with specificity all activities, programs, and organizations for whose benefit your state, or political subdivision thereof, has obligated or expended funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes and how these activities, programs, and organizations support 911 and E911 services or enhancements of such services.**

The Maryland 9-1-1 Trust Fund may be used by any county (including the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City) for enhancements to 9-1-1 in a process defined in Maryland Public Safety Article §1-309, and is typically used for PSAP telephone equipment, logging recorders, emergency standby electrical power, security, mapping, furniture and training. Application for funds must be made by the county PSAP director, and approved by the majority of voting members present at a public session of the Maryland Emergency Number Systems Board. The Emergency Number Systems Board is defined under Maryland Public Safety Article §1-305 and §1-306.

Additional Funds are passed through the state to each county and the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City in the same percentage collected from the vendor on a quarterly basis. These funds are used to offset operational and maintenance costs for each PSAP.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

| 2. Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. Check all that apply. | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Type of Cost | | Yes | No |
| Operating Costs | Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Personnel Costs | Telecommunicators' Salaries | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Training of Telecommunicators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Administrative Costs | Program Administration | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Travel Expenses | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Dispatch Costs | Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Grant Programs | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If YES, see 2a. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant. | | | |
| 9-1-1 Trust Fund monies are distributed for enhancements to county 9-1-1 service as outlined in question E-1. | | | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected

| 1. Please describe the amount of the fees or charges imposed for the implementation and support of 911 and E911 services. Please distinguish between state and local fees for each service type. | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| Service Type | Fee/Charge Imposed | Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance (e.g., state, county, local authority, or a combination) |
| Wireline | \$1.00 | \$0.25 to state fund, \$0.75 to county |
| Wireless | \$1.00 | \$0.25 to state fund, \$0.75 to county |
| Prepaid Wireless | \$0.60 | \$0.15 to state fund, \$0.45 to county |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | \$1.00 | \$0.25 to state fund, \$0.75 to county |
| Other | N/A | |

2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.

| Service Type | Total Amount Collected (\$) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Wireline | \$20,478,008.00 |
| Wireless | \$27,392,871.00 |
| Prepaid Wireless | \$5,933,865.41 |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | N/A |
| Other | \$169,267.85 |
| Total | \$53,974,012.26 |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

VOIP included in Wireline. Other reflects interest on the 9-1-1 Trust Fund remitted to the counties.

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

Counties are encouraged to seek grant funding for communications related projects. Counties use general funds to for those 9-1-1 costs not covered by 9-1-1 fees.

| Question | Yes | No |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, were any 911/E911 fees that were collected by your state or jurisdiction combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services? Check one.</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>4a. If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.</p> | | |
| <p>County (including the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City) general funds were used to offset difference between 9-1-1 operational costs and 9-1-1 Additional Fee support.</p> | | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

| 5. Please provide an estimate of the proportional contribution from each funding source towards the total cost to support 911 in your state or jurisdiction. | Percent |
|---|----------------|
| State 911 Fees | 41.75 |
| Local 911 Fees | 0 |
| General Fund - State | 0 |
| General Fund - County | 42.10 |
| Federal Grants | 0 |
| State Grants | 16.15 |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

| Question | | Yes | No |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2016, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism? Check one. | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1a. If NO, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's general fund. Along with identifying the amount, please include a statement identifying the non-related purposes for which the collected 911 or E911 funds were made available or used. | | | |
| Amount of Funds (\$) | Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. (Add lines as necessary) | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

| Question | Yes | No |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911? Check one. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1a. If YES, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2016. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.) | | |
| <p>The Maryland 9-1-1 Trust Fund is audited by the Department of Legislative Audits. Additional Fund collections remitted to each county (including the independent jurisdiction of Baltimore City) are audited annually by an independent auditor funded through the 9-1-1 Trust Fund.</p> | | |

| Question | Yes | No |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers? Check one. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2a. If YES, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2016. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.) | | |
| <p>Vendors are routinely contacted to ensure that they are remitting fees as required. No corrective action was needed in 2016.</p> | | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

| Question | Yes | No |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Does your state or jurisdiction classify expenditures on Next Generation 911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures of funds for 911 or E911 purposes? Check one. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1a. If YES, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority: | | |
| Maryland Public Safety Article §1-301(k) | | |

| Question | Yes | No |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| 2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2016, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs? Check one. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2a. If YES, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended. | | |
| Amount (\$) | \$13,714,101.99 (FY 2016 – July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016) | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

| 3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, please describe the type and number of NG911 Emergency Service IP Network(s) (ESInets) that operated within your state. | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| Type of ESInet | Yes | No | If Yes, Enter Total PSAPs Operating on the ESInet | If Yes, does the type of ESInet interconnect with other state, regional or local ESInets? | |
| | | | | Yes | No |
| a. A single, state-wide ESInet | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Local (e.g., county) ESInet | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Regional ESInets | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | [If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet] | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of Regional ESInet: | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of Regional ESInet: | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

4. Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2016.

The Emergency Number Systems Board funds telephone systems and logging recorders that are Next Generation IP enabled systems. During FY 2016, the Board funded IP phone systems for four (4) primary and four (4) backup PSAPs. Maryland has developed requirements for a NG911 Request for Proposals (RFP), and has engaged the services of a consultant to manage the RFP process for Maryland's PSAPs.

| Question | Total PSAPs Accepting Texts |
|--|---|
| 5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts? | 1 |
| Question | Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable |
| 6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2017, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable? | 5 |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures

| Question | Check the appropriate box | | If Yes, Amount Expended (\$) |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Yes | No | |
| 1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

| Question | Total PSAPs |
|---|---|
| 2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program? | Not known, each PSAP's phone system is on an isolated network protected by firewalls. |

| Question | Yes | No | Unknown |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology <i>Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity</i> (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees

- 1. Please provide an assessment of the effects achieved from the expenditure of state 911/E911 or NG911 funds, including any criteria your state or jurisdiction uses to measure the effectiveness of the use of 911/E911 fees and charges. If your state conducts annual or other periodic assessments, please provide an electronic copy (*e.g.*, Word, PDF) of the latest such report upon submission of this questionnaire to the FCC or provide links to online versions of such reports in the space below.**

Maryland's 9-1-1 Trust Fund administered by the Emergency Number Systems Board is a national model. By collecting funds that any county may use for 9-1-1 enhancements, each county provides 9-1-1 service at a consistent level through the funding of telephone equipment, protocol systems and training, regardless of county population or county budget. The Board does more than just funding, and serves a regulatory, oversight and leadership role for Maryland's 9-1-1 community. The Board has convened monthly, and more frequently in sub-committees, to consider a variety of 9-1-1 related issues and projects.

Maryland continues to benefit from an effective 9-1-1 system. Recent Board statewide efforts include working with Verizon, Maryland PSAP personnel and the Maryland Public Service Commission to review the implementation of policies and standards adopted by the Federal Communications Commission and ENSB to minimize disruptions to 9-1-1 service caused by power outages and network failures. Ongoing Board activities include providing a vigorous 9-1-1 training program throughout the state, working with vendors to improve 9-1-1 service delivery, and continuing research, planning and implementation of "Next Generation" technologies.

The Board remains focused on the enhancement of 9-1-1 and the critical role it plays in public safety.