



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Approved by OMB
3060-1122
Expires: March 31, 2021
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, 2017:

PSAP Type ¹	Total
Primary	143
Secondary	0*
Total	143 *There are five (5) secondary PSAPs in the State of Michigan. However, they are operated by private EMS services and receive no direct funding through the fees and surcharges 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, 2017:

Number of Active Telecommunicators	Total
Full-Time	1,874
Part-time	218

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*), Aug. 8, 2017, at 167, available at https://c.yimcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.21-2017_FINAL_2.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 196.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2017, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.

Amount (\$)	\$204,410,171.77
-----------------------	------------------

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

- 1) Expenses reported by PSAPs: \$195,187,228.96
- 2) The total reported technical costs for landline telephone companies for 911 network and delivery costs in 2017: \$5,616,015.60
- 3) \$3,606,927.21 for calendar year 2017, for the cost of wireless 911 delivery was reimbursed to 911 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, 2017 to December 31, 2017.

Type of Service	Total 911 Calls
Wireline	1,114,894
Wireless	5,050,435
VoIP	328,503
Other	5,329
Total	6,499,161



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
- 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 communications devices billed to an address in the county. In 2017, 69 of the 83 counties in Michigan 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.

*The \$0.19 changed to \$0.25 effective May 8, 2018
** The 1.92% changed to 5% effective March 8, 2018

¹<http://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/mcl/pdf/mcl-act-32-of-1986.pdf>

1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017, 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 fees based on MCL 484.1401a and 484.1401c. (The 82.5% changed to 65% effective May 8, 2018.)
- Michigan PSAPs also receive 6% of the total Michigan state 911 charge and the prepaid device 911 fees MCL 484.1401a and 484.1401c for the purposes of training PSAP personnel. (The 6% changed to 5.5% effective May 8, 2018.)

The full distribution of the State 911 Funds is listed at section D below.

For County Collected Funds:

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



Federal Communications Commission
 Washington, D.C. 20554

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 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 484.1401b (14). The use limitation 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 assess 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



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

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

[Empty box for response to 2b]

D. 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 for the reporting period was follows:

- 82.5% to the counties to fund 911 operations.
- 7.75% to pay the 911 service providers for the delivery of wireless calls to the PSAPs under MPSC Docket U-14000.
- 6% 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 412.”

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.”

As of May 8, 2018, the State 911 fee is distributed as follows:

- 65% goes to the counties to fund 911 operations.
- 25.56% is used to pay the 911 service providers for the delivery of wireless calls to the PSAPs under MPSC docket U-14000 and for IP-based 911 (NG911) under MPSC docket U-20146.
- 5.5% for PSAP training funds.
- 2.44% funds the State 911 Office.
- 1.5% to the Michigan State Police PSAPs.



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

2. Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. Check all that apply.			
Type of Cost		Yes	No
Operating Costs	Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software)	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"/>
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, 2017, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.			
Not Applicable			



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

*\$0.19 changed to \$0.25 May 8, 2018

**1.92% changed to 5% March 8, 2018



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

2. For the annual period ending December 31, 2017, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.

Service Type	Total Amount Collected (\$) State
Wireline	\$20,051,542.18
Wireless	Included in wireline figure above
Prepaid Wireless	\$8,325,199.15
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	Included in wireline figure above
Other	N/A
Total	\$28,376,741.33

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

Service Type	Total Amount Collected (\$) County
Wireline	\$75,149,415.89
Wireless	Included in wireline figure above
Prepaid Wireless	N/A
Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	Included in wireline figure above
Other	N/A
Total	\$75,149,415.89

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



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

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, 2017, 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>	<p>X</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>4a. If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.</p>		
<p>In addition to the State and Local funds reported above: County Millages: \$37,295,029.61 Local/County General Funds: \$89,987,593.48 Other Receipts: \$18,760,779.19 (grants, tower rentals, contracts for service, etc.)</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	11
Local 911 Fees	30
General Fund - State	0
General Fund - County	36
Federal Grants	0
State Grants	0
Voter- Approved Property Tax Assessments (Millages)	15
Other	8



Federal Communications Commission
 Washington, D.C. 20554

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

Question	Yes	No
1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2017, 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? <i>Check one.</i>	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. <i>(Add lines as necessary)</i>	



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

Question	Yes	No												
<p>1. Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911? Check one.</p>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>												
<p>1a. If YES, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2017. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</p>														
<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% of the counties each year which is the equivalent of eight counties. The compliance 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 2017, the following Michigan counties were reviewed:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Mackinac</td> <td>Luce</td> <td>Chippewa</td> <td>Clare</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manistee</td> <td>Oscoda</td> <td>Ogemaw</td> <td>Shiawassee</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ingham</td> <td>Montcalm</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			Mackinac	Luce	Chippewa	Clare	Manistee	Oscoda	Ogemaw	Shiawassee	Ingham	Montcalm		
Mackinac	Luce	Chippewa	Clare											
Manistee	Oscoda	Ogemaw	Shiawassee											
Ingham	Montcalm													

Question	Yes	No
<p>2. Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers? Check one.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
<p>2a. If YES, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2017. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</p>		



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 484.1401(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 484.1401(b)(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, 2017, 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.		
Amount (\$) 	\$2,530,194.17 for the delivery of wireless calls through Peninsula Fiber Network IP-based 911 (NG911) network.	



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

3. For the annual period ending December 31, 2017, 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"/>
Name of Regional ESInet: Great Lakes Consortium			6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, 2017.

In 2017 there were 12 Michigan Counties that went live with an NG911 network. There were also eight more counties that signed contracts in 2017 to deploy NG911 in the near future (those projects are currently underway).

Question	Total PSAPs Accepting Texts
5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2017, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?	7 counties
Question	Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable
6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2018, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?	16 counties

I. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures

Question	Check the appropriate box		If Yes, Amount Expended (\$)
1. During the annual period ending December 31, 2017, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Data not collected

Question	Total PSAPs
2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2017, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?	Data not collected



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

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?	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.
- 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 2017 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature may be accessed at:

https://www.michigan.gov/documents/msp/SNC_2017_Annual_Report_to_the_Legislature_590590_7.pdf