



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 |
|-----------------------|
| Michigan |

2. Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report

| Name | Title | Organization |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Harriet Miller-Brown | State 911 Administrator | Michigan State Police |



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 | 143 |
| Secondary | 0* |
| Total | 143 *There are five (5) secondary PSAPs in the State of Michigan, however, they are all operated by private EMS services and receive no direct funding through the fees and surcharges included in this report. |

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 | 1,887* |
| Part-time | 281* |

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

*These figures represent an estimated number of active telecommunicators in Michigan as of May 2017. The numbers are provided to the State 911 office through the telecommunicator training tracking system via the entries by dispatch centers. If subsequent changes are made to the staffing numbers the centers are responsible for contacting the State 911 Administrator's Office in order for the updates to be process into the system. Additionally, the tracking application system does not specify the funding source used to cover the wages for said FTEs. Wages for 911 Telecommunicators are an allowable expenditure of both State and Local 911 funds in Michigan.

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 (\$) | \$204,463,272.53 |
|-----------------------|------------------|

The amount provided to question 3 above is the total of the following:

- 1) Expenses reported by PSAPs: \$194,639,474.11
- 2) The total reported technical costs for network collections by landline telephone companies for 911 network and delivery costs in 2016: \$6,930,217.36
- 3) \$2,893,581.06 for calendar year 2016 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.

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, 2016 to December 31, 2016.

| Type of Service | Total 911 Calls |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Wireline | 1,030,797 |
| Wireless | 5,030,124 |
| VoIP | 321,566 |
| Other (Text) | 4,733 |
| Total | 6,387,220* |

*95% of PSAPs reported call volumes



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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 X
- No

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

The Michigan Emergency 911 Service Enabling Act (Act 32 of 1986, as amended¹) provides funding in the following ways:

- Michigan’s State 911 charge is currently \$0.19 per communications device per month. After 2010, any changes to the State 911 surcharge or the distribution percentages shall be made by the legislature. MCL 484.1401a.
- Sellers of prepaid wireless communications devices are mandated to remit 1.92% per retail transaction, collected from their customer, to the Michigan Department of Treasury. MCL 484.1401c.
- Each of the 83 Michigan counties has the ability to assess a county-wide surcharge on all communication devices billed to an address in the county. In 2016, sixty-seven counties collected 911 surcharges ranging from \$0.20 to \$3.00 under MCL 484.1401b or MCL 484.1401e.
- Communications providers are able to recover their costs through a 911 technical charge of up to \$0.80 a month on customer bills. MCL 484.1401d.

¹[http://www.legislature.mi.gov/\(S\(q5k4ixaztjatoo2szbcdyhye\)\)/printDocument.aspx?objectName=mcl-Act32-of-1986&version=txt](http://www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(q5k4ixaztjatoo2szbcdyhye))/printDocument.aspx?objectName=mcl-Act32-of-1986&version=txt)

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.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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 X

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

For State Collected funds:

- Michigan counties received 82.5% of the total Michigan state 911 charge and the prepaid device 911 charge, remitted based on MCL 484.1401a and 401b. The full distribution of the State 911 Funds is listed on section D below.
- Michigan PSAPs also receive 6% of the total Michigan state 911 charge and the prepaid device 911 charge under MCL 464.1408 (4) (c) for the purposes of training PSAP personnel.

For County collected funds:

- Communications providers remit county 911 surcharge monies directly to the respective Michigan counties imposing the surcharge.

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 | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Local (e.g., county, city, municipality) | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1b. Please briefly describe any limitations on the approval authority per jurisdiction (e.g., limited



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

to fees collected by the entity, limited to wireline or wireless service, etc.)

The Michigan State 911 Committee has issued a list of Allowable Wireless and Wireline 911 Surcharge Expenditures. In accordance with P.A. 379 of 2008, any changes made to the document language must be transmitted to the Michigan Legislature, MCL 484.1401(b)(14). The use limitations contained in the list applies to both the State fees and local 911 surcharges.

(http://www.michigan.gov/documents/ListingofAllowable_14259_7.pdf)

MCL 484.1401b permits that a local (countywide) 911 surcharge may be assessed by the county board of commissioners in an amount not to exceed \$0.42 per month. Additional surcharge not to exceed a total of \$3.00 may be assessed on a countywide basis if approved by voters in that county under a ballot proposal.

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.

The Michigan State 911 Committee has developed a list of Allowable Wireless and Wireline 911 Surcharge Expenditures. In accordance with P.A. 379 of 2008, any changes made to the document language must be transmitted to the Michigan Legislature, MCL 484.1401b (14).

(http://www.michigan.gov/documents/ListingofAllowable_14259_7.pdf?20150501092037)

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

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.

Under MCL 484.1408(4) Statutory distribution of the State 911 fee is distributed as follows:



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

- Treasury receives \$150,000 annually for its administration of the fund.
- 82.5% goes to the counties to fund 911 operations.
- 7.75% is used to pay the 911 service providers for the delivery of wireless calls to the PSAPs under MPSC Docket U-14000.
- 6% is for PSAP training funds.
- 1.88% funds the Michigan State Police PSAPs.
- 1.87% funds the State 911 Office.

MCL 484.1406 (1) Further states, “[T]he funds collected and expended under this act shall be expended exclusively for 911 services and in compliance with the rules promulgated under section 413.”

MCL 484.1408 (4) (a) also authorizes the State 911 Committee to require re-payment of the use of funds considered unreasonable or unnecessary. “...Money received by a county under this subdivision shall only be used for 911 services as allowed under this act. Money expended under this subdivision for a purpose considered unnecessary or unreasonable by the committee or the auditor general shall be repaid to the fund.”

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) | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software) | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Personnel Costs | Telecommunicators' Salaries | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Training of Telecommunicators | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Administrative Costs | Program Administration | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Travel Expenses | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| Dispatch Costs | Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Grant Programs | | <input type="checkbox"/> If YES, see 2a. | X |
| 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. | | | |
| N/A | | | |

E. 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 | \$0.19 (State) \$0.20 to \$3.00 (Local) | State Local (varies by county) |
| Wireless | \$0.19 (State) \$0.20 to \$3.00 (Local) | State Local (varies by county) |
| Prepaid Wireless | 1.92% (State) | State only-Retail Point of Sale for service purchased |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | \$0.19 (State) \$0.20 to \$3.00 (Local) | State Local (varies by county) |
| Other | N/A | 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.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

| Service Type | Total Amount Collected (\$) <u>State</u> |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Wireline | \$23,559,167.00* |
| Wireless | Included in wireline figure above |
| Prepaid Wireless | \$8,457,493.99 |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | Included in wireline figure above |
| Other | N/A |
| Total | \$32,016,660.99 |

*Includes wireline, wireless, and VoIP state fees only (does not include local surcharge)

| Service Type | Total Amount Collected (\$) <u>County</u> |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Wireline | \$70,371,705.16* |
| Wireless | Included in wireline figure above |
| Prepaid Wireless | N/A |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | Included in wireline figure above |
| Other | N/A |
| Total | \$70,371,705.16 |

*Includes wireline, wireless, and VoIP county fees only (does not include state surcharge)

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



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

Local property tax millage, governmental general funds, and revenues from “other” sources such as tower rental and fees charged back to local public safety entities for dispatching services.

| 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> | X | <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 Millages: \$33,575,726.25 Local/County General Funds: \$94,936,536.21 Other Receipts: \$16,093,680.80 (grants, tower rentals, contracts for service, etc.)</p> | | |
| <p>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.</p> | Percent | |
| State 911 Fees | 10% | |
| Local 911 Fees | 29% | |
| General Fund - State | 0% | |
| General Fund - County | 40% | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

| | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Grants | 0% |
| State Grants | 0% |
| Voter-Approved Property Tax Assessments (Millages) | 14% |
| Other | 7% |

F. 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. | | X | <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



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

G. 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. | X | <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>State 911 Fund: In accordance with MCL 484.1407(5), the State Office of the Auditor General performs an annual audit of the State 911 Fund.</p> <p>Local 911 Funds: Independent local audit and annual reporting process to State 911 Committee (SNC) as set out in MCL 484.1406(2)-(4).</p> <p>Additionally, counties are subject to the review process established by the SNC. The SNC targets to review approximately 10% (eight) of the counties each year. Reviews consist of at least one on-site visit, evaluation of PSAP(s) best practices, policies and procedures, facility security/readiness, and proper 911 fund use (going back through the current year, plus two). In 2016 the following counties were reviewed:</p> <p>Genesee</p> <p>Monroe</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 type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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.) | | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

H. 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. | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1a. If YES, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority: | | |
| <p>For State 911 Funds: MCL 484.1401a (4) The initial state 911 charge shall be 19 cents and shall be effective July 1, 2008. The state 911 charge shall reflect the actual cost of operating, maintaining, upgrading, and other reasonable and necessary expenditures for the 911 system in this state. The state 911 charge may be reviewed and adjusted as provided under subsection (5).</p> <p>For County 911 Funds: MCL 484.1401b (3) The charge assessed under this section and section 401e shall not exceed the amount necessary and reasonable to implement, maintain, and operate the 911 system in the county.</p> <p>While not explicitly listed as allowable in the language of the State's Allowable and Disallowable list for State and County 911 funds, NG911 projects and services are considered as equal projects to landline and wireless 911 systems.</p> | | |

| 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. | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2a. If YES, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended. | | |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Amount (\$) | \$1,751,880.86 for the delivery of wireless calls through Peninsula Fiber Network. |
|-----------------------|--|

| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Regional ESInets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | [If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet] | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of Regional ESInet: Upper Peninsula 911 Authority | | | 8 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name of Regional ESInet: | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|

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

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 Upper Peninsula 911 Authority ESInet and utilized for text and call routing.

| 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? | 29 |
| 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? | 33 |

In Michigan, as a best practice, text-to-911 is usually deployed on a county-by-county basis and in the greater metropolitan areas usually one PSAP will provide service for the entire county. For example, Oakland County Sheriff Department is a single PSAP that answers and relays text-to-911 for 21 PSAPs in Oakland and the Macomb County Sheriff Department answers and relays text-to-911 for 10 PSAPs. 39% of Michigan's population was covered by text-to-911 service as of December 31, 2016.

I. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures

| Question | Check the appropriate box | If Yes, Amount Expended (\$) |
|----------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
|----------|---------------------------|------------------------------|



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

| | | | |
|---|----------|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs? | Yes X | No <input type="checkbox"/> | This is incorporated into the other expenditures and is not tracked currently by this office. |
|---|----------|--------------------------------|---|

| 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? | Data not collected. |

| 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? | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

J. 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.

Each year, the State 911 Committee collects data and submits a report to the Michigan Legislature with the following minimal criteria;

- A. The extent of emergency 911 service implementation in the state.
- B. The actual 911 service costs incurred by PSAPs and counties.
- C. The state 911 charge required under MCL 484.1401a and a recommendation of any changes in the state 911 charge amount, or in the distribution percentages under MCL 484.1408.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

D. A description of any commercial applications developed as a result of implementing the 911 Enabling Act.

E. The charges allowed under MCL 484.1401a, 1401b, 1401c, 1401d, and 1401e, and a detailed record of expenditures by each county relating to the 911 enabling act.

That report exceeds statutory reporting of data to provide a comprehensive status report on Michigan's 911 system. The 2016 report to the legislature is available here:

http://www.michigan.gov/msp/0,4643,7-123-72297_47748_47752---,00.html