

TENTH ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS
ON STATE COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF
911 AND ENHANCED 911 FEES AND CHARGES
FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2017 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

Submitted Pursuant to
Public Law No. 110-283

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Ajit Pai, Chairman

December 17, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Heading	Page #
I. INTRODUCTION.....	2
II. KEY FINDINGS	2
III. BACKGROUND.....	4
IV. DISCUSSION	5
A. Summary of Reporting Methodology	5
B. Overview of State 911 Systems	6
C. Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanism	17
D. Description of State Authority that Determines How 911/E911 Fees are Spent	21
E. Description of Uses of State 911 Fees	23
F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected	30
G. Diversion or Transfer of 911/E911 Fees for Other Uses	42
1. States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds.	43
2. States/Jurisdictions Identified by the Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds.	44
H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees.....	49
I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures.....	53
J. Cybersecurity Expenditures.....	78
K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees.....	83
L. Public Comments on 2017 Ninth Annual Report	84
V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2018 TENTH ANNUAL REPORT.....	86
APPENDIX A Summary of State Responses Regarding Collections During 2017 Annual Period	87
APPENDIX B Overview of Total State 911 Fees - 2009 To 2017 Reports	91
APPENDIX C State 911 Fees By Service Type	94
APPENDIX D FCC Information Collection Questionnaire	106

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 tenth 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, 2017 to December 31, 2017. This report also reflects the fifth 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.

II. KEY FINDINGS

2. Fifty states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands responded to this year’s data request. The

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).

following is a compilation of key findings based on the responses:

- In calendar year 2017, 50 states and six other reporting jurisdictions collected 911/E911 fees or charges totaling \$2,937,108,459. This is the first time since the Report's inception that all jurisdictions that were sent questionnaires responded with information.
- Twenty-seven states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported collecting 911/E911 fees at the state level, four states reported collecting fees at the local level, and 18 states collected fees at both the state and local level.
- The Bureau identified six states and one territory as diverting or transferring 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911.
 - Montana, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Rhode Island, West Virginia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands diverted 911/E911 fees for purposes other than 911/E911.
 - Montana, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island and West Virginia used a portion of their 911/E911 funds for either non-public safety or unspecified uses (New York, Montana and Rhode Island transferred 911/E911 fees to their general funds).
 - New Jersey, New York, Nevada, West Virginia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands used a portion of their 911/E911 funds to support non-911 related public safety programs.
 - The total amount of 911/E911 funds diverted by all reporting jurisdictions in calendar year 2017 was \$284,968,912.66, or approximately 9.70% of total 911/E911 fees collected.
- Thirty-five states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia reported engaging in Next Generation 911 (NG911) programs in calendar year 2017. The total amount of reported NG911 expenditures from 911/E911 fees was \$198,971,933.06, or approximately 6.77% of total 911/E911 fees collected.
- Sixteen states reported having deployed state-wide Emergency Services IP Networks (ESInets). Thirteen states reported having regional ESInets within the state, and 11 states reported local-level ESInets.
- Fifty states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported on deployment of text-to-911. Collectively, respondents reported 1,381 Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) as being text-capable as of the end of 2017 and projected that an additional 1,103 PSAPs would be text-capable by the end of 2018, for a total of 2,484 text-capable PSAPs. Data from the Commission's Text-to-911 Registry suggests that the expansion of text-to-911 in 2018 has come close to these projections.
- While almost every state collects 911 fees from in-state subscribers, 22 states, the District of Columbia and the Northern Mariana Islands 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 jurisdictions that have audit authority, five states conducted audits in 2017. In addition, Puerto Rico indicated that it conducted an audit even though it also reported that it does not have audit authority.

- On the topic of cybersecurity preparedness for PSAPs, 30 states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded that they did not expend funds on PSAP-related cybersecurity programs. Fifteen states and the District of Columbia reported that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2017.

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 2018, 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 2017.⁴ The Bureau received responsive information from all 50 states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. All jurisdictions provided written responses to the questionnaire, but not all jurisdictions responded to every question and some jurisdictions provided incomplete responses to questions. Readers should refer to the individually filed questionnaires to obtain comprehensive information about a jurisdiction.⁵

⁴ 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). As last year, 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). 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, beginning with the 9th Annual Report, the Bureau ceased contacting the BIA regional offices. Additionally, consistent with the recommendations in the GAO Report and the Bureau's own analysis to improve the usefulness of the data collected, we continue to report on NG911 fees, text to 911, and cybersecurity implementation and funding. See Fifth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, for the Period January 1, 2012 To December 31, 2012, para. 3 (Dec. 31, 2013), Sixth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, for the Period January 1, 2013 To December 31, 2013, para. 34 (Dec. 31, 2014), Seventh Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, for the Period January 1, 2014 To December 31, 2014, para. 46 (Dec. 31, 2015).

⁵ Copies of reports from all responding jurisdictions are available on the FCC web site at <https://www.fcc.gov/9th-annual-911-fee-report-state-filings>.

(continued...)

IV. DISCUSSION

5. This Report describes how states and other entities collected 911/E911 funds in calendar year 2017, how much they collected, and how they oversaw the expenditure of these funds.⁶ 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.*”⁷ 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.*”⁸

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 informed 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 based on individual states’ definitions of permissible expenditures that vary considerably. 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 under the NET 911 Act 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

⁶ The states and other reporting jurisdictions responsible for reporting 911 fees collected in calendar year 2017, provided the underlying data compiled in this report. Our analysis, however, includes states that collect and distribute fees over the course of a fiscal year as opposed to the requested 2017 calendar year covered by our reports. As a general matter, as in past reports, we did not adjust fiscal-year data provided in response to this year’s questionnaire to calendar-year accounting. It was not feasible to analyze all fiscal-year data on a calendar-year basis in a principled manner. First, it was not always clear whether reported data is based on fiscal- or calendar-year accounting; second, jurisdictions split their fiscal years across calendar years according to vastly different accounting schedules (some jurisdictions split their fiscal years evenly in the middle of a calendar year while others, for example, begin their 2017 fiscal year in the last quarter of calendar year 2016). In addition, because we did not adjust fiscal-year data for calendar-year analysis in previous reports, adjusting the data in this report would not allow for continuity of data analysis across each of our reports. Readers wishing to ensure comparison of data between only calendar years are encouraged to review and analyze individual questionnaires available on our website at <https://www.fcc.gov/general/911-fee-reports>.

⁷ NET 911 Act §6(f)(1) (emphasis added).

⁸ *Id.* §6(f)(2) (emphasis added). As noted above, the states and other reporting jurisdictions are responsible for providing the underlying data compiled in this report. The Commission does not audit or otherwise verify the accuracy of the data submitted by the states and other reporting jurisdictions. We have made the underlying data publicly available on our website at <https://www.fcc.gov/general/911-fee-reports>.

(continued...)

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 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.⁹

9. **Number and Type of PSAPs.** The questionnaire requested that states “provide the total number of active [Primary and Secondary PSAPs]¹⁰ in your state or jurisdiction that receive funding derived from the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2017.” Table 1 shows that 50 states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this request, reporting a total of 4,549 Primary PSAPs and 683 Secondary PSAPs, for a total of 5,232 PSAPs dependent on funding derived from the collection of 911 fees.¹¹

Table 1 - Number and Types of PSAPs that Receive Funding from the Collection of 911 Fees

State	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs
AK	40	5	45
AL	117	0	117
AR	102	25	127
AZ	76	10	86
CA	390	50	440
CO	87	10	97
CT	105	4	109
DE	8	1	9
FL	153	56	209
GA	152	Unknown	152
HI	5	3	8
IA	113	0	113
ID	46	3	49
IL	220	49	269
IN	91	30	121
KS	117	0	117

⁹ FCC Questionnaire at 2-3.

¹⁰ 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, https://c.yimcdn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/Standards/NENA-ADM-000.18-2014_2014072.pdf.

¹¹ 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.

(continued....)

State	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs
KY	116	Unknown	116
LA	86	0	86
MA	237	51	288
MD	24	70	94
ME	26	0	26
MI	143	0 ¹²	143
MN	99	5	104
MO	0	0	0
MS	111	31	142
MT	53	NA	53
NC	115	10	125
ND	21	1	22
NE	70	0	70
NH	2	0	2
NJ	0	0	0
NM	41	0	41
NV	10	2	12
NY	133	47	180
OH	143	38	181
OK	135	Unknown	135
OR	43	14	57
PA	69	0	69
RI	1	1	2
SC	69	4	73
SD	28	0	28
TN	140	30	170
TX	511	75	586
UT	31	4	35
VA	119	41	160
VT	6	0	6
WA	51	10	61
WI	0	0	0
WV	52	0	52

¹² Michigan reports that there are “five (5) secondary PSAPs in the State of Michigan . . . [but] they are operated by private EMS services and receive no direct funding through the fees and surcharges in this report.” Michigan Response at 2.

State	Total Primary	Total Secondary	Total PSAPs
WY	33	3	36
Other Jurisdictions			
AS	0	0	0
DC	1	0	1
Guam	4	0	4
No. Mariana Is.	0	0	0
PR	2	0	2
USVI	2	~ ¹³	2
Total	4,549	683	5,232

10. **Number of Telecommunicators.** Respondents were asked to provide the total number of active telecommunicators¹⁴ in each state or territory that were funded through the collection of 911/E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2017. As detailed in Table 2, 49 states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this data request. Forty-five states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported a total of 39,113.50¹⁵ full time telecommunicators and 3,600 part-time telecommunicators that are funded through the collection of 911 fees. Eight states reported they do not know how telecommunicators are funded, two states and American Samoa reported they are not funded by 911 fees, and two states did not respond to the question.

Table 2 – Total Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Reported “Unknown”	Not Funded by Fees	Provided No Response
AK	270	10			
AL	856	117			
AR	1,005	175			
AZ	0	0			
CA	0	0			

¹³ In certain tables of this report, a tilde symbol (~) is used to indicate in a space-saving manner that a jurisdiction did not respond to the question or appears from surrounding information to not have known the answer to the question. The use of a tilde contrasts with instances where jurisdictions provided a literal response such as “unknown” or provided non-responsive information.

¹⁴ A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a “person employed by a PSAP and/or an [Emergency Medical Dispatch] Service Provider qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP.” See NENA Master Glossary at 196, https://c.ymedn.com/sites/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.21-2017_FINAL_2.pdf.

¹⁵ Ohio reported that it has one telecommunicator that is “split-funded,” meaning that half of the funding for a telecommunicator does not come from 911/E911 fees. See Ohio Response at 2.

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Reported "Unknown"	Not Funded by Fees	Provided No Response
CO	476	22			
CT	~	~	X		
DE	253	3			
FL	2,383	196			
GA	~	~	X		
HI	0	0			
IA	~	~	X		
ID	~	~	X		
IL	3,369	464			
IN	1,731	402			
KS	1,100	115			
KY	1,283	288			
LA	663	65			
MA	5,000	Included in Full Time Response			
MD	1,504	97			
ME					
MI	1,874	218			
MN	0	0			
MO	0	0			
MS	986	230			
MT	~	~	X		
NC	~	~		X	
ND	278	21			
NE	537	85			
NH	73	8			
NJ	0	0			
NM	~	~		X	
NV	44				
NY	6,389	363			
OH	659.5 ¹⁶	79.0			

¹⁶ *Id.*

State	Number of Telecommunicators Funded by 911 Fees				
	Full Time	Part Time	Reported "Unknown"	Not Funded by Fees	Provided No Response
OK	~	~	X		
OR	890.0	~			
PA	2,100	280			
RI	35	~			
SC	~	~			X
SD	292	46			
TN	Unknown	Unknown	X		
TX	773	16			
UT	790	80			
VA	935	~			
VT	82	23			
WA	1,592	66			
WI	0	0			
WV	625	131			
WY	Unknown	Unknown	X		X
Other Jurisdictions					
AS	0	~		X	X
DC	0	0			
Guam	22				
Northern Mariana Is.	0	0			
PR	202				
USVI	42				
Total	39,113.5	3,600	8	2	3

11. **Number of 911/E911 Calls.** The Bureau 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, 2017. Forty-four states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico reported a cumulative total of 222,097,267 calls of all types during the 2017 annual period.¹⁷ Of the total reported calls in 2017, 155,231,318 calls came from wireless phones, representing approximately 70% of the total reported call volume. The Bureau believes that the 70% figure likely understates the percentage of wireless 911 calls because a number of states reported total 911 calls but did not break out all service

¹⁷ Arkansas did not specify a response to this question. The U.S. Virgin Islands and five states — Georgia, Idaho, Missouri, Tennessee, and Wisconsin — responded “unknown.”

(continued....)

categories separately.¹⁸ In addition, the ratio of wireless calls to total reported call volume remained steady even though there was a 135% increase in VoIP calls from 2016 and a 378% increase in the number of calls reported as “Other” from 2016 (VoIP calls reported in 2017 increased to 7,666,958 from 5,661,055 in 2016 and the number of calls reported as “Other” increased to 8,907,760 from 2,353,291 in 2016). These increases are not accounted for entirely by a decline in wireline call volume because the reported number of wireline calls declined approximately 6% from 2016 (reported wireline calls decreased from 39,494,900 in 2016 to 37,222,668 in 2017). 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.¹⁹

Table 3 – Total 911 Calls by Service Type

State	Type of Service						Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita ²⁰
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Reported “Unknown”	
AK	64,230	420,065			484,298		0.65
AL	Did Not Specify	2,534,374	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	2534374		0.52
AR	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify		Did Not Specify
AZ	714,436	3,345,113	~	~	4,059,549		0.58
CA	4,656,858	22,344,045	1,121,364	7,660	28,129,927		0.71
CO	274,441	5,645,578	202,669	86,199	6,208,887		1.11
CT	336,684	1,750,869	132,911		2,220,464		0.62
DE	130,720	541,286	62,110	9,970	744,086		0.77
FL	2,315,578	11,820,930	862,869	260,052	15,259,429		0.73
GA	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	~	X	0.25
HI	294,226	1,004,923	54,858	7,022	1,361,029		0.95
IA	195,865	902,348	22,146		1,120,359		0.36
ID	~	~	~	~	~	X	~
IL	2,072,708	7,491,574	364,442	2,242	9,930,966		0.78
IN	579,823	3,800,471	221,087	167,438	4,768,819		0.72
KS	311,979	1,257,438	49,549	3,510	1,622,476		0.56

¹⁸ Alaska, New Jersey, Mississippi, Ohio, South Dakota, and Vermont reported total 911 call volumes but did not provide all service category subtotals that equal the total amount of calls reported.

¹⁹ The Bureau’s per capita estimate is based on United States 2010 Census data for each jurisdiction. Guam’s population is based on World Bank data because census data are unavailable. See Population, Guam, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=GU&view=chart> (last visited October 5, 2018).

²⁰ *Id.*

State	Type of Service						Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita ²⁰
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Reported "Unknown"	
KY	742,961	2,457,215	Included in Wireline	Unknown	3,200,176		0.72
LA	801,646	2,822,631	174,080		3,798,357		0.81
MA	814,734	2,928,226	178,029		3,920,989		0.57
MD	1,346,997	4,007,892	~	~	5,354,889		0.88
ME	120,409	387,111	51,803		559,323		0.42
MI	1,114,894	5,050,435	328,503	5,329	6,499,161		0.65
MN	473,202	2,305,030	136,377	11	2,914,620		0.52
MO	~	~	~	~	~	X	~
MS	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	3,419,030		0.56
MT	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	NA		~
NC	1,265,256	5,407,309	607,263		7,279,828		0.71
ND	40,822	190,016	2,537	141	233,516		0.31
NE	212,756	847,380	14,170	2,198	1,076,504		0.56
NH	52,597	291,041	51,371	17,309	412,318		0.31
NJ	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	8,750,000		0.97
NM	234,437	1,248,089	31,317	5,635	1,519,478		0.73
NV	191,760	340,823	4,333	90,165	627,081		~
NY	7,651,491	11,198,366	650,983	7,090,563	26,591,403		1.34
OH	776,686	4,465,390	300,476	561,501	6,104,053		0.52
OK	925,943	2,092,388	42,628	141,546	3,202,505		0.81
OR	269,807	1,396,495	103,286	39,799	1,809,387		0.44
PA	2,459,559	6,072,375	486,156	6,251	9,024,341		0.70
RI	112,670	348,130			460,817		0.43
SC	Did Not Specify	3,854,468	Did Not Specify		3,854,468		0.77
SD	~	~	~	~	328,900		0.38
TN	~	~	~	~	~	X	~
TX	1,925,007	21,460,325	774,390	254,534	24,414,256		0.86
UT	103,193	925,621	36,044	163	1,065,021		0.34
VA	1,002,508	3,371,750	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	4,374,258		0.52

State	Type of Service						Estimated Annual 911 Calls Per Capita ²⁰
	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Other	Total	Reported "Unknown"	
VT	40,515	132,392	19,772	6645 Unknown	199,791		0.32
WA	795,792	5,586,792	514,792	3,525	6,900,901		0.93
WI	~	~	~	~	~	X	~
WV	1,237,516	667,773	64,243	216,397	2,185,929		1.20
WY	26,500	223,000	2,400	8,400	260,300		0.45
Other Jurisdictions							
AS	9,672	34,943	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	44,615		~
DC	405,310	870,460			1,275,770		1.84
Guam	41,554	~	~	~	41,554		0.25
No. Mariana Is.	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify		~
PR	78,926	1,388,438		481,701	1,949,065		0.58
USVI	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	X	~
Totals	37,222,668	155,231,318	7,666,958	8,907,760	222,097,267	6	0.69

12. **Cost to Provide 911/E911 Service.** The Bureau asked respondents to provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911 service during the annual period ending December 31, 2017, regardless of whether such costs are supported by 911 fees or other funding sources. As detailed in Table 4, 39 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands provided cost estimates totaling \$4,800,557,446.²¹ Table 4 also includes the Bureau's estimate of reported costs on a per capita basis²² for each reporting state and jurisdiction. Eleven states, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands 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.²³

²¹ For a comparison of total costs to total revenue from fees and charges, see Table 13.

²² See *supra* note 19 (noting that per-capita calculations are based on 2010 census data and, where those data are unavailable, World Bank data).

²³ States lacking complete information include Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Nebraska, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

(continued....)

Table 4 – Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Per Capita Expenditures ²⁴
AK	\$15,211,064		\$20.56
AL	\$114,430,061		\$23.47
AR	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	N/A
AZ	\$19,354,097	N/A	\$2.76
CA	\$78,848,130		\$1.99
CO	\$2,988,847	N/A	\$0.53
CT	\$28,795,684		\$8.03
DE	\$10,000,000	“The individual PSAPS handle their own budgetary allotments in regards to [sic] building maintenance, staff salaries, radio dispatch.”	\$10.40
FL	\$216,197,313		\$10.30
GA	Unknown	“The Georgia Emergency Communications Authority Act was passed during the 2018 Legislative Session and signed by Governor Deal in May 2018. The Authority is officially established July 1, 2018, so we are unable to provide those numbers at this time.”	N/A
HI	\$33,000,000		\$23.12
IA	\$143,083,909		\$45.49
ID	Unknown	“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 11 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.”	N/A
IL	\$159,726,140		\$12.48
IN	\$186,103,074		\$27.91
KS	\$82,647,906	“The amount provided . . . 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.”	\$28.37
KY	116,658,319.31	“The total does not include state general funds dollars budgeted to the Kentucky State Police (KSP).”	\$26.19
LA	\$83,387,708		\$17.80
MA	\$60,451,924		\$8.81

²⁴ See *supra* note 19 (noting that per-capita calculations are based on 2010 census data and, and, where those data are unavailable, World Bank data).

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Per Capita Expenditures ²⁴
MD	\$123,766,278	“Fiscal Year 2017 (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017) as reported by county annual audits. This amount may not reflect the total cost for the 70 secondary PSAPs, who do not fall under the state 911 regulatory authority.”	\$20.45
ME	\$7,817,544	“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.”	\$5.85
MI	\$204,410,172		\$20.52
MN	\$77,151,433		\$13.83
MO	Unknown	“Public Service Answering Points are 100% funded by local jurisdictions. They do not file any financial documents with the state.”	N/A
MS	Unknown	Did Not Specify	\$17.64
MT	Unknown	“Per Montana Code Annotated (MCA) Title 10, Chapter 4 the Montana Legislature has delegated the responsibility for hosting public safety answering points (PSAPs) to local government entities. Local government entities are not required to report the total cost of providing 911 services to the State of Montana.”	N/A
NC	\$119,989,333		\$11.68
ND	\$19,020,064		\$25.18
NE	Unknown	“The Nebraska Public Service Commission (NPSC) provides statewide coordination and support. 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.”	N/A
NH	\$13,095,149		\$9.75
NJ	Unknown	“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.”	N/A
NM	\$11,153,583		\$5.34
NV	\$4,581,620	Boulder City PD reports that Clark County does not receive 911 funds. Elko County reports that its projected costs spans two calendar years: "Fiscal Year 7/1/2017 to 6/30/2018 cost projected to be \$1,663,380" Esmerelda County reports: "We do not charge for 911/E911."	\$1.53
NY	\$1,231,436,410.00		\$62.04
OH	\$319,864,027		\$27.44
OK	\$70,000,000.00	“This is an estimate based on reported data from July 1st 2016 to June 30th, 2017. This was our first report required by the State. We received 126 of the 135 PSAP reports however those received cover 97% of the population. Adjustments are being made to the reporting mechanism and plan to improve our data collection.”	\$17.81
OR	\$139,764,099		\$33.74
PA	\$355,739,764		\$27.78

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Per Capita Expenditures ²⁴
RI	\$5,377,000	N/A	\$1.07
SC	Did Not Specify	“We do not collect that type of information. The State 911 office only deals with wireless 911 and the distribution of wireless 911 surcharges back to the PSAPs.”	N/A
SD	\$25,815,851	N/A	\$3.84
TN	\$105,452,052		\$3.73
TX	\$219,623,860		\$70.80
UT	\$64,000,000		\$7.56
VA	Unknown	“For the annual period ending December 31, 2017, PSC staff only collected primary PSAP personnel costs. These costs were collected as part of an annual true-up process related to payments made to localities from the Wireless E- 911 Fund. PSC staff did not track any additional costs for this period.”	N/A
VT	\$4,810,144	N/A	\$0.65
WA	\$155,000,000	“This is based on actual costs reported from the counties. This includes 9-1-1 costs of equipment, maintenance, call taker/coordinator/MSAG/GIS/IT salary/benefits and training. It also includes critical support items which are eligible and make up about 30% of the total, including administrative support, legal, building leases, supplies, etc.”	\$26.74
WI	Unknown	“In Wisconsin, county and municipal governments operate and administer the 9-1-1 systems and all public safety answering points. County and municipal governments do not report to any state agency the number of staff employed, the total cost to provide 9-1-1 services, or a statistical summary of the 9-1-1 service provided. Each county and some municipalities in Wisconsin have entered into a No portion of the funds collected from the 9-1-1 surcharge is shared with any state, county, or municipal agency or department, or any other governmental entity. The 9-1-1 surcharge is limited to the recovery of the telecommunications network expenses for providing the 9-1-1 service, and is retained in full by the participating local exchange carriers. County and municipal expenses related to terminating and responding to 9-1-1 calls are paid for through the respective county and municipal budgets. The total amount of the 9-1-1 surcharge collection is not available. The participating local exchange carriers collect the 9-1-1 surcharge. Those local exchange carriers do not report the results of the 9-1-1 surcharge collection to any state, county, or municipal office.”	N/A
WV	\$52,542,784	\$52,542,784 “is only a partial total because 7 out of 52 PSAPs did not provide data.”	\$90.70
WY	Unknown	“According to Title 16, Chapter 9 of the Wyoming State Statutes for the emergency Telephone Service Act, Wyoming does not assign oversight responsibility to a state-level agency for 9-1-1 services. (16-9-102(a)(iv).”	N/A
Other Jurisdictions			
AS	Unknown	“No separate budgeted line item for PSAP service.”	N/A

State	Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911 Service	Explanation of Reported Figure or Why Estimation Could not be Provided	Per Capita Expenditures ²⁴
DC	\$48,111,410		\$69.33
Guam	\$1,390,274.00		N/A
No. Mariana Islands	N/A	“The CNMI currently does not receive fees for 911 services. Annual appropriations of state and local municipality funds support 911 operations. The costs associated with the 911 lines are for the salary of the four dispatchers which is about \$16,000 annually and monthly expenses for 4 telephone lines. These associated costs are embedded into the Department of Public Safety's annual operating budget. DPS estimates to have answered over 18,300 calls into the 911 lines. These is based on 12,000 calls for police service, 6,000 calls for ambulance service and 300 for fire service.”	N/A
PR	\$13,940,607.30	N/A	\$13.16
USVI	\$3,169,182		\$5.08
Total	\$4,800,557,445.76	Average State Per Capita Expenditure	\$20.03
		National Per Capita Expenditure	\$14.74

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

13. The Bureau’s questionnaire seeks data on the funding mechanisms states use to collect fees. Forty-nine states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. 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.²⁵ Of those states that have an established funding mechanism, Table 5 identifies 10 jurisdictions that enlarged or altered their funding mechanism during calendar year 2017 and sets forth their descriptions of the amendment.

Table 5 – States That Altered or Enlarged 911 Funding Mechanism

State	Description
Illinois	<p>“Public Act 100-0020 amended the Emergency Telephone Safety Act and the Prepaid Wireless 9-1-1 Surcharge Act in July 2017.</p> <p>Summary of amendments to the Acts:</p> <p>Increased the uniform monthly surcharge from \$.87 to \$1.50 effective January 1, 2018 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 surcharge per network connection will apply.</p> <p>Mandated that all 9-1-1 Authorities must have an Emergency Telephone System Board (ETSB) by July 1, 2018. Also required that any new boards created after this date must include a PSAP representative. Provided authority to the State to withhold</p>

²⁵ Missouri, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands each reported that it has not established a funding mechanism at the state level. Missouri Response at 2; American Samoa Response at 2; CNMI Response at 2. We note that American Samoa reported, “No separate budgeted line item for PSAP service. Ther [sic] service is provided by the Department of Public Safety within its regularly budgeted resources.” American Samoa Response at 3. Missouri reported that “Public Service Answering Points are 100% funded by local jurisdictions [that] do not file any financial documents with the state.” Missouri Response at 3.

State	Description
	<p>surcharge or grant money if a 9-1-1 authority did not comply with consolidation.</p> <p>Mandated that the State create 24/7 10-digit transfer list for 9-1-1 authorities use. Added a member representing the Cable Television and Communication Association of Illinois and a member representing the Illinois State Ambulance Association to the Statewide 9-1-1 Advisory Board. Also allows that a representative of the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leader of the House, the President of the Senate, and the Minority leader of the Senate may each appoint a member of the General Assembly to temporarily serve as a non-voting member of the Board during the 12 months prior to the repeal date of this Act to discuss legislative initiatives of the Board.</p> <p>Established the distribution formula for the \$1.50 surcharge effective January 1, 2018:</p> <p>\$0.013 to counties under 100,000 population \$0.026 transferred to Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund from June 30, 2017 to June 30, 2018; \$0.020 from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019; \$0.013 from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020; \$0.007 from July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021. After June 30, 2021 no more transfers will be made to the Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Fund. \$0.017 to cover Illinois State Police (ISP) administrative costs.</p> <p>Beginning January 1, 2018 until June 30, 2020, \$0.12, and on and after July 1, July 2020, \$0.04 shall be used to make monthly proportional grants to the appropriate 9-1-1 Authority currently taking wireless 9-1-1 based upon the United States Postal Zip code of the billing address of subscriber's wireless carriers.</p> <p>After the disbursements listed above, all remaining funds in the Statewide 911 Fund shall be disbursed in the following priority order: 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. 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. 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. All 911 network costs for systems outside of the City of Chicago, to be paid directly to vendors. All expenses incurred by the Administrator and Advisory Board associated with the NG911 RFP and contract. Disbursement of Annual Grants for consolidations under section 15.4a, 15.4b and for NG911 expenses up to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017 = \$12.5 million • 2018 = \$20 million • 2019 = \$20.9 million • 2020 = \$15.3 million • 2021 = \$16.2 million • 2022 = \$23.1 million • 2023 and each year thereafter \$17 million.

State	Description
	<p>All remaining funds shall be distributed to the 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 \$5.00 until January 1, 2021 and then it must not be reduced to \$2.50 or below. Allows each telecommunication carrier (non-wireless) to deduct up to 3% of the gross amount of surcharge collected to reimburse for the 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.</p> <p>The Emergency Telephone Systems Act sunsets on December 31, 2020. 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, effective on October 1, 2015. Chicago's rate will then drop to 7% effective January 1, 2020. Provided that the prepaid wireless 911 surcharge shall not be applied to the lifeline subsidized portion of the service.”</p>
Nevada	<p>The State legislature added an allowance to increase the E911 fee to help pay for body cameras for officers. See NRS 289.830</p> <p>Specifically, the 2017 Nevada State Legislature enacted SB176 increasing the maximum surcharge from \$0.25 per line/\$2.50 per trunk to \$1.00 per line/\$10.00 per trunk. The permissible uses for the surcharge was expanded to include the purchase and maintenance of portable event recording devices and vehicular recording devices. Within the reporting period, the Washoe County Commission adopted Ordinance 1601 (effective October 20, 2017) reflecting SB176's changes.</p> <p>Carson City, Lyon County, and Washoe County enacted local ordinances. Washoe County reports that "[i]n the 2018 reporting period, the County Commission increased the surcharge from \$0.25 per line/\$2.50 per trunk to \$0.85 per line/\$8.50 per trunk."</p>
New Mexico	<p>“Senate Bill 46 was passed in the January 2017 Legislative Session and was signed into law by the Governor. This legislation, which became effective on July 1, 2017, extended E-911 surcharge to VoIP (\$.51 per line) and Prepaid Wireless (1.38% of each retail transaction). Historically, the New Mexico E-911 program was administered by the Department of Finance and Administration (DFA); however, in May 2018, DFA and the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) signed a Joint Powers Agreement to transition the E-911 Program to DoIT.”</p>
New York	<p>“Part EEE of Chapter 59 of the Laws of 2017 repealed §§308-a to 308-y effective December 1, 2017 and added Tax Law §186-g.”</p>
North Dakota	<p>“Yes, in July of 2017 the local fee was enlarged statewide by fifty cents pursuant to Chapter 57-40.6 and for a period of six years. The fee was extended for the expressed purpose of supporting a statewide interoperable radio network.”²⁶</p>
Puerto Rico	<p>“Act No. 66 of June 17, 2014, as amended, Article 19. Establishes that the savings generated by the application of Article 1 of the . . . Act No. 66 will be contributed to the ‘Work Promotion and Economic Activity Fund’ under the custody of the Trade and Export Company of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Act No. 3 of January 23, 2017, Article 16. Establishes that the savings generated will be contributed to a fund to address the government's fiscal crisis. Act No. 21 of April 6th, 2016 declare an</p>

²⁶ See *infra* paragraph **Error! Reference source not found.** (discussing whether North Dakota’s use of 911/E911 funds for deployment of a state interoperable radio network constitutes diversion).

State	Description
	impairment loss of the funds deposited funds at the Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico (GDB). All 9-1-1 funds were deposited at the GDB. The Department of Treasury, Central Accounting issue a Circular Letter CC No. 1300-08-17 on October 24, 2016 that instructs agencies to recognize an Impairment Loss Analysis with a substantial doubt of recovering the \$12 Millions [sic] deposited in the GDB.”
U.S. Virgin Islands	“Act. No. 7981 enacted January 5, 2017 amending title 33 VI Code, chapter 3, section 58 subsection (c) by striking “\$1.00” and inserting “\$2.00”; and (b) subsection (f) by striking all the language and inserting new language that reads: “Each fiscal year, the Department of Finance shall disburse the proceeds of the emergency services surcharge as follows: (1) 40% to the Virgin Islands Territorial Emergency Management Agency; (2) 30% to the Department of Health – Emergency Medical Services Unit for supplies, training and personnel; and (3) 30% to the Virgin Islands Fire Services”
Utah	“Yes. \$0.10 cent increase to the local PSAPs that went into effect July 1, 2017.”
West Virginia	“The fee on CMRS subscriptions increased from three dollars (\$3) to three dollars and thirty four cents (\$3.34) pursuant to PSCWV General Order 187.50.”
Wisconsin	“There have been no changes to the funding mechanism under Wis. Stat. 256.35(3). Under Wis. Stat. 20.465(3)(qm), \$6.7 million annually has been allocated to the Wisconsin Department of Military Affairs beginning in July 2018 for the purposes of administering contracts for an emergency services IP network necessary for NextGen 9-1-1 and for the 9-1-1 Subcommittee to administer its duties under Wis. Stat. 256.35(3s)(d).”

14. The Bureau 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, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that they collect all 911 fees on a statewide basis, with the collected funds administered by the state. Four states reported that 911 fee collection occurs exclusively at the local level, although in some cases such local collection is authorized by state statute. Eighteen states reported using a hybrid approach to 911 fee collection, in which state and local governing bodies share authority over fee collection from customers. For example, Colorado reported that “[s]urcharge funds derived from landlines, contract wireless, and VoIP lines are remitted directly to local 911 Authorities by the carriers . . . [but] [p]repaid surcharge fees are assessed at point-of-sale on the purchase of wireless minutes and remitted to the Colorado Department of Revenue. . . . [which then distributes] [t]hose funds to local governments using a formula based on wireless call volume as a percentage of total wireless calls received in the state.”²⁷

²⁷ Colorado Response at 4-5.

Table 6 – Authority to Collect 911/E911 Fees

Type of Collection	Number of States/Jurisdictions	States/Jurisdictions
State	31	States: Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming
		Other: District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands
Local	4	Alaska, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada
Hybrid	18	Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, West Virginia

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

15. 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, 15 states and Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that a state entity has authority to approve expenditure of 911 fees. Eleven states described authority resting exclusively with local entities. Twenty-four states and the District of Columbia indicated that authority is shared between state and local authorities.²⁸

16. 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-four states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded that they have a mechanism mandating how 911 fees may be spent, whereas seven states and American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands either did not respond or indicated they have no such mechanism.

²⁸ With respect to the District of Columbia, the District reported that under D.C. Official Code § 34-1802(c), “expenditures of fees collected and deposited in the 9-1-1 Fund are subject to the approval of the D.C. Council upon request of the Mayor as part of the annual budget submission [and] Expenditures of 9-1-1 Funds approved by the D.C. Council are then subject to authorization by Congress in an appropriations act pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 34-1802(a).” District of Columbia Response at 5.

Table 7 – State Authority for Approval of 911 Fee Expenditures

State	State, Local, or Combined Authority to Approve Expenditures			State Funding Mechanism Mandating <i>How</i> Funds Can be Used
	State	Local	Both	
AK		Yes		
AL			Yes	Yes
AR			Yes	Yes
AZ	Yes			Yes
CA	Yes			Yes
CO		Yes		Yes
CT	Yes			Yes
DE			Yes	Yes
FL			Yes	Yes
GA		Yes		
HI	Yes			Yes
IA			Yes	Yes
ID		Yes		
IL			Yes	Yes
IN			Yes	Yes
KS			Yes	Yes
KY			Yes	Yes
LA		Yes		Yes
MA	Yes			Yes
MD	Yes			Yes
ME	Yes			Yes
MI			Yes	Yes
MN	Yes			Yes
MO		Yes		
MS		Yes		
MT		Yes		Yes
NC	Yes			Yes
ND		Yes		Yes
NE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NH	Yes			Yes
NJ	Yes			Yes
NM	Yes			Yes

State	State, Local, or Combined Authority to Approve Expenditures			State Funding Mechanism Mandating <i>How</i> Funds Can be Used
	State	Local	Both	
NV		Yes		Yes
NY			Yes	Yes
OH			Yes	Yes
OK			Yes	Yes
OR	Yes			Yes
PA			Yes	Yes
RI	Yes			Yes
SC			Yes	Yes
SD			Yes	Yes
TN			Yes	Yes
TX			Yes	Yes
UT			Yes	Yes
VA			Yes	Yes
VT	Yes			Yes
WA			Yes	Yes
WI				Yes
WV			Yes	Yes
WY		Yes		Yes
Other Jurisdictions				
AS				No
DC			Yes	Yes
Guam	Yes			Yes
No. Mariana Is.	Yes			
PR	Yes			Yes
USVI	Yes			Yes
Totals	State	Local	Both	Yes
	19	11	24	49

E. Description of Uses of State 911 Fees

17. 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-seven states,

the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded to this question.

18. 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. Cumulative responses are provided in Table 8 and individual state responses are provided in Table 9.

Table 8 – Summary of Jurisdictions’ Responses Regarding Allowable Use of Fees²⁹

Allowable Uses		Total Jurisdictions
Operating Costs	CPE	51
	CAD	42
	Buildings and Facilities	32
Personnel	Salaries	36
	Training	49
Administrative	Programs	44
	Travel	44
Dispatch	Reimbursement to Other Law Enforcement Providing Dispatch	20

²⁹ Table 8 is based on data received from 47 states and the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. In previous reports, this table was titled “Summary of State Responses Regarding Allowable Use of Fees,” suggesting that data derived only from “states” even though it was similarly based on data received from states, territories, and possessions. While the Bureau has updated the title to more accurately reflect that the data derive from all types of jurisdictions, the data in Table 8 is comparable to data in previous iterations of this table.

Allowable Uses		Total Jurisdictions
	Lease, Purchase, Maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	31

Table 9 – Allowed Uses of Collected Fees

State	Operating Costs			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
	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	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DE	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
FL	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
GA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Yes
HI	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
IA	Yes	Yes	No	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	Yes	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

State	Operating Costs			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
	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
MI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MN	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
MO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NC	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
ND	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NE	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NJ	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
NM	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
NV	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
NY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
OH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
OK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
PA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
RI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
SC	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
SD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TX	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VT	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
WA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
WI	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
WV	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
WY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Other Jurisdictions									
AS	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify
DC	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

State	Operating Costs			Personnel Costs		Administrative Costs		Dispatch Costs	
	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
Guam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
No. Mariana Islands	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify
PR	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
USVI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify	Yes	Did Not Specify	Yes	No	Yes

19. The Bureau requested information on grants that each state or jurisdiction paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant. Twenty-two states reported that they paid for grants through the use of collected 911 fees, and 24 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands said they did not. Table 10 provides states' descriptions of their grant programs.

Table 10 – State Grants or Grant Programs

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
AK	N/A
AL	“While grant programs are an allowable use for collected funds, there were no grants awarded for the reporting period.”
AR	N/A
AZ	N/A
CA	N/A
CO	N/A
CT	“Capital expense grants for funded municipalities and regional emergency communications centers. Transition grants for the purpose of consolidating 911 services and reducing the number of stand-alone PSAPs.”
DE	N/A
FL	“Collected funds were used to fund the State Grant Program for counties in Florida to maintain and upgrade their E911 equipment as well as to conduct NG911 system upgrades. Funds were also used to support a Rural County Grant Program to specifically assist rural counties in maintaining their E911 systems. The E911 Board approved 48 grants under the Rural County Grant Program that totaled \$1,811,144. The E911 Board also approved 11 grants that totaled \$3,714,330 under the State Grant Program.”
GA	Georgia did not apply for nor receive any state or federal grants for 911/E911 and did not offer any grants for 911/E911.
HI	N/A
IA	“The State did not have any external grants available during this time frame. The state operated a 911 Carryover Grant as detailed in Code of Iowa 34A. During this period, the State offered consolidation grants to local PSAPs up to \$200,000 or half of the associated costs for physical consolidation. Under this grant program \$7 million was approved statewide. With no physical consolidation grants applied for, the State will pass through the remaining \$7 million equally to the PSAPs for funding costs related to the receipt and disposition of 911 calls. The State also offered local jurisdictions GIS grants for the purpose of NG911 GIS data creation, remediation, and maintenance. The total available to counties was \$15,000 per PSAP.”
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

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
	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 IPSCC. Forty [sic] Idaho counties have begun assessing the enhanced fee.”
IL	“During calendar year 2017 the State made \$6,173,786 in grants to local 9-1-1 authorities to assist with PSAP consolidations.”
IN	N/A
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 [s]ervices 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.”
KY	“Outlined in the 2017 Annual Report (Page 19): https://goo.gl/9eEzrj ”
LA	N/A
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 M.G.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 M.G.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	N/A ³⁰
ME	N/A
MI	N/A
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 [sic] 911 service, including acquisition of necessary equipment and the costs of the commissioner to administer the program. After payment of costs of the commissioner to administer the program, money collected shall be distributed as follows: (1) one-half of the amount equally to all qualified counties, and after October 1, 1997, to all qualified counties, existing ten public safety answering points operated by the Minnesota State Patrol and each governmental entity operating the individual public safety answering points serving the Metropolitan Airports Commission, the Red Lake Indian Reservation, and the University of Minnesota Police Department; and (2) the remaining one-half to qualified counties and cities with existing 911 systems based on each county's or city's percentage of the total population of qualified counties and cities. The population of a qualified city with an existing system must be deducted from its county's population when calculating the county's share under this clause if the city seeks direct distribution of its share.

³⁰ In response to question E.2 on the questionnaire (*i.e.*, “Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. Check all that apply.”), Maryland did not indicate that it used any collected funds for grants but in its response to question E.2a (*i.e.*, “[D]escribe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.”) it provided a textual response. However, that response to question E.2a appears non-responsive to the issue of that nature and purpose of any grant (in response to question E.2a, Maryland merely described its use of collected funds). See Maryland Response at 9-10.

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
	<p>(b) A county's share under subdivision 1 must be shared pro rata between the county and existing city systems in the county. A county or city or other governmental authority as described in paragraph (a.), clause (1), shall deposit money received under this subdivision in an interest-bearing fund or account separate from the governmental entity's general fund and may use money in the fund or account only for the purpose specified in subdivision 3.</p> <p>(c) A county or city or other governmental entity as described in paragraph (a), clause (1), is not qualified to share in the distribution of money for enhanced 911 service if it has not implemented enhanced 911 service before December 31, 1998.</p> <p>(d) For the purposes of this subdivision, "existing city system" means a city 911 system that provides at least basic 911 service and that was implemented on or before April 1, 1993."</p>
MO	N/A
MS	N/A
MT	N/A
NC	<p>"ECATS - PSAP Call Data Collection Interpretive Services Contract Orthography Image 17 Orthography Image 18 Graham Relocation-Equipment Refresh Hyde, Dare, Tyrell: Dare Regional Emergency Richmond Co Consolidation of primary and 3 secondary's Chowan Radio Communications Enhance Forsyth PRI PSAP Relocation: Phase 1 Lincoln PSAP Contraction Project Martin PSAP & Regional Backup Facility Mitchell Backup Center Initiative Moore Backup & Locution Prime Alert Pasquotank Backup PSAP Implementation Rowan Backup PSAP Implementation Washington Backup PSAP Implementation Catawba Backup PSAP Implementation Perquimans Backup PSAP Implementation Rocky Mt Backup Plan Implementation."</p>
ND	N/A
NE	<p>"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 2016/2017 fiscal year. http://psc.nebraska.gov/orders/ntips/911-019.PI-118.14.pdf."</p>
NH	N/A
NJ	N/A
NM	<p>"Grants to local governments pay for E-911 equipment and maintenance, generators, dispatch consoles, recorders, dispatch software, GIS equipment and training, 911 training, 911 and data networks, and network termination equipment, such as routers, firewalls and switches."</p>
NV	Did Not Specify
NY	<p>"State Interoperable Communications Grant 2016 - \$45 million Public Safety Answering Point Grant 2016 - \$10 million Capital and Targeted Communications Grant 2016 - \$20 million."</p> <p>"New York's Public Safety Communications Surcharge mandates a grants program, which includes an annual Public Safety Answering Points Grant (PSAP) and an annual Statewide Interoperable Communications Grant (SICG). The PSAP Grant allows the State to assist counties with eligible public safety call-taking and dispatching expenses. State support is in the form of reimbursement to counties for operating expenses in a PSAP, including personnel costs. The grant not only supports eligible applicants' existing operations, but also encourages the development of Next Generation 911 (NG911) technologies. The PSAP Grant also assures development of operational and procedural efficiencies and overall collaboration between different jurisdictions, such as other counties and State agencies. The SICG Program supports infrastructure and interoperability development, including land mobile radio systems development and PSAP improvements. This includes improvements of PSAPs towards NG911. Under the SICG Program, the Capital and Targeted Grant program provide for statewide interoperability. These grants directly support connectivity with and between PSAPs."</p>
OH	N/A
OK	<p>"The State 9-1-1 Management Authority FY2018 budget included an allocation for a State 911 grant program. The allocation was \$1,233,346. However, over the course of this budget year the Authority did not launch the grant program. This allocation has been rolled over to FY2019 where \$3,350,000 has been allocated for a State Grant program. The State Grant program is a duty of the 9-1-1 Management Authority that is outlined in State Statute §63-2864.2."</p>
OR	N/A
PA	<p>"Per 35 Pa.C.S. § 5306.1 (d) (2) Fifteen (15) percent of the revenue collected is set aside to be used to establish, enhance, operate or maintain statewide interconnectivity of 9-1-1 systems. Any of these statewide interconnectivity</p>

State	Description and Purpose of Grants Paid for Through the Use of Collected 911/E911 Fees
	funds distributed to a PSAP will be through an annual grant process. In 2017, PEMA awarded Pennsylvania PSAPs \$30.5 million for 68 projects related to PSAP consolidations, projects that establish or maintain broadband connectivity between PSAPs, NG9-1-1 GIS projects, and projects that allow PSAPs to share 911 system resources.”
RI	N/A
SC	N/A
SD	N/A
TN	“As of January, 2015, the TECB ceased all grant programs due to a change in the funding law. However, the TECB is still distributing funds from the essential and necessary equipment fund until the funding is exhausted. The board paid \$2,024,157 in NG911 equipment and \$5,687,396 in equipment reimbursements through its grant programs.”
TX	“The state 9-1-1 program administered by CSEC provides grants of legislatively appropriated 9-1-1 and equalization surcharge funds to 22 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 the Department of State Health Services and TTUHSC to fund county and regional emergency medical services and trauma care, and a telemedicine medical services pilot program, respectively.)”
UT	“No grants were paid during this time frame due to a lack of appropriations.”
VA	“The PSAP Grant Program is a multi-million dollar grant program administered by the 9-1-1 Services Board. The PSAP Grant Program will financially assist primary PSAPs with non-recurring NG9-1-1 costs, limited legacy equipment purchase, PSAP consolidation projects, and 9-1-1/GIS educational and training opportunities. Funding is made available through the Code of Virginia and administered by the Board.”
VT	N/A
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.”
WI	N/A
WV	“One million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) per year is awarded by the PSCWV as grants for the construction of cell towers in unserved areas, pursuant to W.Va. Code §24-6-6b.”
WY	N/A
Other Jurisdictions	
AS	Did Not Specify
DC	N/A
Guam	N/A
No. Mariana Islands	“The CNMI currently does not receive fees for 911 services. Annual appropriations by state and local municipalities fund 911 operations.”
PR	N/A
USVI	“During the annual period ended December 31, 2017, there were no grants paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees.”

F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected

20. To provide an overview of the sources of 911 fees, the Bureau 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 11 provides an overview of the number of states and localities that levy a fee on each service type.

Table 11 – Summary of State and Local Authorities That Levy 911 Fees

Service Type	State	Local	Both	No Response or No Fee
Wireline	23	16	6	4
Wireless	32	8	6	6
Prepaid	39	2	6	7
VoIP	26	13	4	5
Other	9	3	1	30

21. Table 12 details the average fee by type of service.³¹ Based on responding states’ information, the average wireline 911 fee is \$1.04 per line per month; the average wireless 911 fee is \$0.97 per line per month; the average prepaid wireless percentage of retail transaction 911 fee is 2.12%; the average prepaid wireless flat 911 fee per transaction is \$0.87; the average VoIP service 911 fee is \$0.99 per line per month.³² Eighteen states reported imposing a percentage fee on wireline and wireless service rates.³³ Wisconsin reported that it had no wireless service 911 fee. Five states and Guam reported that they have no prepaid service 911 fee³⁴ and two states, Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands reported they had no VoIP service 911 fee.

³¹ See Appendix C for a detailed description of fees and charges that each reporting state and jurisdiction levied on wireline, wireless, prepaid, VoIP and other services during calendar year 2017.

³² Several states reported other 911 fees, with an average of \$0.71] per line per month.

³³ Arkansas imposes an “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.” Arkansas Response at 11. California reported that it imposes “.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue” on wireline, wireless, prepaid wireless, and VoIP services. California Response at 9. Louisiana reported that it imposed “Up to 5% of Tariff Rate on Exchange Service.” Louisiana Response at 10. Vermont reported that it imposed “2% customer telecommunications charges on wireline, wireless, and prepaid wireless services. It further noted that VoIP 911 fees are collected from subscribers on a voluntary basis. Vermont Response at 8-9.

³⁴ Missouri responded “none/unknown” which was deemed to be indeterminate and was not counted as not having a prepaid wireless fee. Alaska responded “N/A,” which was deemed to mean “none.”

(continued....)

Table 12 – 911 Fee Highlights by Service Type

Service Type	Average 911 Fee ³⁵	State with Lowest Associated Fee	State with Highest Associated Fee	States/Jurisdictions with No Associated Service Fee
		(per line per month)	(per line per month)	
Wireline – Flat Fee	\$1.04	Arizona \$0.20	West Virginia - \$3.01	American Samoa, Missouri Montana Northern Mariana Islands Ohio
Wireless – Flat Fee	\$0.97	Arizona \$0.20	West Virginia - \$3.34	American Samoa, Mississippi Missouri Montana Northern Mariana Islands Wisconsin
Prepaid - Percentage of Retail Transaction	2.12%	OH – .05%	West Virginia - 6.00%	American Samoa, Alaska Hawaii Mississippi Missouri Montana New Jersey Northern Mariana Islands Wisconsin
Prepaid - Flat Fee per Retail Transaction	\$0.87	Nevada - \$0.25	U.S. Virgin Islands - \$2.00	None
VoIP – Flat Fee	\$0.99	Arizona \$0.20	West Virginia - \$3.01	American Samoa, Guam Missouri Montana Northern Mariana Islands Ohio Wisconsin

22. The Bureau 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 13 shows that, in total, states and other jurisdictions reported collecting approximately

³⁵ Because Illinois, New York, and Texas have bifurcated rates (*i.e.*, one rate for specified cities and/or counties and a separate for the remainder of the state), Bureau staff calculated a weighted average rate for each of those states by based on the populations of specific cities and/or counties and the statewide population. For example, Illinois reports a wireless rate of \$5 in Chicago and \$1.50 for the remainder of the state. Staff calculated the weighted average wireless rate for Illinois to be \$2.24 (based on an estimated Chicago population of 2,705,000 and a population of the state outside Chicago of 12,800,000).

(continued....)

\$2,937,108,459 in 911 fees or related charges for calendar year 2017. Table 13 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.³⁶

Table 13 – Total Amount Collected in 911 Fees by Service Type

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost	Fees as a Percent of Cost	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita ³⁷
AK	\$4,159,855.47	\$11,026,936.00	Unknown	Unknown	Did Not Specify	\$15,211,064.24	\$15,211,064.24	100%	\$20.56
AL	\$20,117,531.79	\$73,379,363.14	\$20,774,469.07	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$114,271,364.00	\$114,430,061.00	100%	\$23.44
AR	Unknown	\$15,531,545.56	\$5,202,703.64	Included in Wireless Count	\$2,000,000.00	\$22,734,249.20	\$22,734,249.20	100%	~
AZ	\$15,252,481.00	AZ Dept. of Revenue combines Wireline and Wireless collection.	\$1,626,299.00	Included in Wireline Count	\$113,093.00	\$16,991,893.00	\$19,354,097.00	88%	\$2.42
CA	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$76,916,882.00	\$78,848,130.00	98%	\$1.95
CO	\$14,633,930.00	\$40,562,247.00	\$2,781,883.00	\$5,906,859.00	\$0.00	\$58,574,919.00	\$2,988,847.00 ³⁸	1960%	\$10.45
CT	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$2,016,382.94	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$28,651,232.63	\$28,795,684.00	99%	\$7.98
DE	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$8,246,009.00	\$10,000,000.00	82%	\$8.57
FL	\$12,229,646.73	\$61,495,060.57	\$22,396,572.20	\$18,358,863.05	Not Specified	\$114,480,142.55	\$216,197,313.00	53%	\$5.46
GA	Unknown	Unknown	\$14,969,525.01	Unknown	Unknown	\$14,969,525.01	Unknown	~	\$1.44
HI	\$600,000.00	\$9,750,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,350,000.00	\$0.00	\$11,700,000.00	\$33,000,000.00	35%	\$8.20
IA	\$10,809,437.00	\$26,869,133.95	\$2,242,421.28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$143,083,908.53	0%	\$0.00
ID	\$18,572,310.00	Included in Wireline Count	\$1,753,102.46	Included in Wireline Count	\$2,076,110.20	\$22,401,522.66	Unknown	~	\$13.05
IL	\$13,957,254.00	\$80,595,500.00	\$12,887,395.00	\$19,233,775.00	\$42,898,684.00	\$169,572,608.00	\$159,726,140.00	106%	\$13.25
IN	\$12,184,234.00	\$51,442,098.00	\$13,462,143.00	\$9,927,261.00	\$110,200.00	\$87,125,936.00	\$186,103,074.31	47%	\$13.07
KS	Included in Wireless Count	\$20,983,840.67	\$1,916,780.81	Included in Wireless Count	Included in Wireless Count	\$22,900,621.48	\$82,647,906.12	28%	\$7.86
KY	\$27,184,627.48	\$23,308,544.68	\$8,600,194.40	Unknown	Unspecified	\$59,093,366.56	\$116,658,319.64	51%	\$13.27
LA	\$19,151,460.15	\$38,706,218.03	\$9,690,476.69	Unknown	\$21,169,919.99	\$88,718,074.86	\$83,387,707.77	106%	\$18.94
MA	\$11,386,525.50	\$61,135,862.30	\$9,043,342.11	\$21,351,461.22	\$0.00	\$102,917,091.13	\$60,451,924.00	170%	\$15.00

³⁶ See *supra* note 19 (noting that per-capita calculations are based on 2010 census data and, where those data are unavailable, World Bank data)

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ Colorado reported that unlike “previous years, [where it] provided a total estimated cost of all PSAP operations, including the cost of service from the 911 System Service Provider . . . [t]his year, [Colorado] only include[ed] the cost of service, statewide, for 911 service delivery from the 911 System Service Provider.” See Colorado Response at 3. As a result, the fee as percentage of cost is high, and much higher than last year.

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost	Fees as a Percent of Cost	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita ³⁷
MD	\$21,092,515.00	\$28,267,931.00	\$6,259,294.00	Included in Wireline Count	\$233,069.00	\$55,852,809.00	\$123,766,277.78	45%	\$9.23
ME	\$2,056,737.00	\$4,260,384.00	\$1,107,508.00	\$1,028,369.00	\$0.00	\$8,452,998.00	\$7,817,544.00	108%	\$6.33
MI	\$95,200,958.07	Included in Wireline Count	\$8,325,199.15	Included in Wireline Count	\$0.00	\$103,526,157.22	\$204,410,171.77	51%	\$10.39
MN	\$20,897,888.94	\$47,323,906.28	\$6,408,342.76	\$2,521,294.58	\$0.00	\$77,151,432.56	\$77,151,432.56	100%	\$14
MO	~	~	~	~	~	~	Unknown	~	~
MS	\$31,533,679.85	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$31,533,679.85	\$52,650,630.81	~	~
MT	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$13,000,000.00	\$13,000,000.00	Unknown	~	\$12.38
NC	\$12,135,034.00	\$45,781,224.00	\$11,955,254.00	\$13,019,554.00	~	\$82,891,066.00	\$119,989,333.00	69%	\$8.07
ND	\$13,680,906.79	\$13,680,906.79	\$926,387.48	\$13,680,906.79	~	\$14,607,294.27	\$19,020,064.44	77%	\$19.34
NE	Unknown	\$7,205,943.20	\$1,076,830.33	Unknown	\$0.00	\$8,282,773.53	Unknown	~	\$4.31
NH	\$2,156,693.38	\$8,714,065.00	\$1,653,351.11	\$2,932,131.51	\$780.51	\$15,427,021.51	\$13,095,148.56	118%	\$11.49
NJ	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$121,909,000.00	Unknown	~	\$13.54
NM	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$11,203,573.90	\$11,153,582.74	100%	\$5.37
NV	\$1,092,712.35	\$467,764.36	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,103.30	\$2,291,101.90	\$4,581,620.00	~	~
NY	~	\$189,094,916.24	~	~	~	\$189,094,916.24	\$1,231,436,410.00	15%	\$9.53
OH	\$2,532,737.26	\$25,689,296.16	Included in Wireless Count	\$9,281.50	\$11,505,173.93	\$39,736,488.85	\$319,864,026.77	12%	\$3.41
OK	\$10,433,615.74	\$24,553,359.56	Included in Wireless Count	Included in Wireless Count	~	\$34,986,975.30	\$70,000,000.00	50%	\$8.90
OR	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$43,919,835.00	\$139,764,099.00	31%	\$10.60
PA	\$54,008,997.00	\$179,442,915.00	\$30,225,814.00	\$51,647,701.00	\$1,267,124.00	\$316,592,551.00	\$355,739,764.00	89%	\$24.72
RI	\$5,578,059.00	\$10,535,592.00	\$703,349.00	Included in Wireless Count	\$0.00	\$16,817,000.00	\$5,377,000.00	313%	\$15.87
SC	Did Not Specify	\$22,009,187.87	\$8,099,182.88	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$30,108,370.75	Did Not Specify	~	\$5.99
SD	\$3,682,867.00	\$8,078,548.00	\$1,207,049.00	\$118,802.00	~	\$13,087,266.00	\$25,815,851.00	51%	\$15.05
TN	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	\$102,819,090.00	\$105,452,052.00	98%	\$15.31
TX	\$65,673,425.00	\$111,871,203.00	\$23,083,420.00	Included in Wireline Count	\$19,045,812.00	\$219,673,860.00	\$219,623,860.00	100%	\$7.76
UT	\$5,779,013.09	\$16,394,614.18	\$1,311,826.86	The total is an estimate because the state "D[id] not collect [VoIP Fees] separately.	Did Not Specify	\$23,485,454.13	\$64,000,000.00	37%	\$7.57
VA	\$27,037,734.17	\$59,872,124.27	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$86,909,858.44	Unknown	~	\$10.26
VT	\$2,817,381.00	\$2,237,003.00	\$591,242.00	\$95,679.00	\$239,830.00	\$5,981,135.00	\$4,810,144.00	124%	\$9.59
WA	State: \$3,285,610.50	State: \$16,361,591.00	State: \$2,862,264.00	State: \$3,763,202.75	Did Not Specify	\$98,653,163.15	\$155,000,000.00	64%	\$13.32

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP	Prepaid	Other	Total Fees Collected	Total Estimated Cost	Fees as a Percent of Cost	Estimated Amount Collected Annually Per Capita ³⁷
	Counties: \$9,099,901.80	Counties: \$43,150,987.94	Counties: \$7,655,754.93	Counties: \$10,556,790.35					
WI	Unknown	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Unknown	~	0
WV	\$17,206,759.00	\$37,305,951.00	\$1,426,493.00	\$3,891,592.00	\$358,855.00	\$60,189,650.00	\$52,542,784.00	115%	\$33.15
WY	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	~	~
Other Jurisdictions									
AS	None	None	None	None	None	None	Unknown	~	~
DC	\$2,127,748.00	\$5,390,235.66	\$573,071.51	\$1,943,735.16	\$1,393,273.30	\$11,428,063.63	\$48,111,409.81	24%	\$16.47
Guam	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	~	~	\$2,209,374.00	\$1,390,274.00	159%	~
NMIs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	~	~
PR	\$4,184,564.28	\$12,440,238.95	\$1,566,521.50	\$1,697,681.00	\$0.00	\$19,889,005.73	\$13,940,607.30	143%	~
USVI	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$3,169,181.61	~	~
Total Estimated Fees Collected							\$2,937,108,459		
Total Estimated Cost to Provide 911							\$4,823,291,695		
Total Estimated Fees as a Percentage of Total Estimated Cost							60.89%		
Average Total Estimated Fees as a Percentage of Total Estimated Cost							133%		
Average State Amount Collected Per Capita							\$11.29		
National Amount Collected Per Capita							\$9.02		

23. 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 55 responding jurisdictions listed in Table 14, 22 states, the District of Columbia, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported combining collected fees with other funds or grants to support 911 services. 28 states Guam and Puerto Rico reported they did not. American Samoa did not specify a response to this question.

Table 14 – 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 Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services			
State	Yes	No	If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees
AK		X	
AL	X		“Some local emergency communications districts receive a variety of funding from county/municipal appropriations, federal/state grants, dispatch fees, various service contracts, and donations. The total amount of funding that was combined to 911/E911 fees was \$14,341,105.66 for the fiscal period of October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017. This information is based on self-reported funding data provided by the local districts; only 76 of the 87 reported.”
AR		X	Did Not Specify
AZ		X	N/A
CA		X	
CO	X		“911 surcharge funds are combined with local funds regularly across the state to fund the PSAP operations. 911 surcharge funds are generally not sufficient to fully fund PSAP capital and operational costs, and the difference is made up by city and county governments.”
CT		X	
DE		X	
FL	X		“For the annual period ending Dec. 31, 2017, the 911 fees collected provided approximately 48 percent of operating expenses for 911 operations, with local county general budget appropriations providing the remaining 52 percent of funding to support 911 operations.”
GA	X		“The State of Georgia, through the Department of Revenue, distributes prepaid wireless 911 fees to local governments and all other 911 fees are distributed directly to the local governments from the service suppliers. Most local governments have to supplement the operation of their PSAPs because the locally and state collected 911 fees do not cover its operations.”
HI		X	
IA	X		Did Not Specify ³⁹

³⁹ In response to question F.3 (*i.e.*, “Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding”), Iowa responded, “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*.” See Iowa Response at 10 (emphasis added). In addition, Iowa stated that “[t]hese costs are broken down in the answer to (continued....)

Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services			
State	Yes	No	If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees
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 E911 in Kansas. These funds are derived from property taxes and account for approximately 75% of total funding."
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. State 911 fees are combined at the local level with local general fund appropriations and local 911 fees 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.)"
LA		X	
MA		X	
MD	X		"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."
ME		X	
MI	X		"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.)"
MN		X	
MO		X	Responded "N/A"
MS	X		"Local budgets must supplement funds received from wireline fees collected to cover operation costs."
MT		X	
NC	X		"E911 funds were combined with general fund allocations from each of the 115 Primary PSAPs and 10 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 local general funds. State 911 funds have not been comingled with any other funding sources."
NH		X	

question 5 of this section." *See id.* at 10. However, in response to question F.5, Iowa indicated that "0%" of funding came from grants. *See id.* at 11.

Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services			
State	Yes	No	If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees
NJ		X	
NM		X	
NV	X		<p>Carson City: "911 Surcharge funds are held separately in a Special Revenue Fund – there are not comingled with City funds. Carson City general funds are also used to support 911 services."</p> <p>Douglas County: "\$71,000.00, local funds from 911 Emergency Services"</p> <p>Humboldt County: "Telephone budget monthly fee in the approximate amount of \$118,692"</p> <p>Lyon County: "Lyon County used general budget dollars of \$1,692,287 to operate our 911 system and provide equipment and radio upgrades. The County also used \$174,142 in telephone surcharge funds to pay for purposes already discussed.</p> <p>Pershing County: From County General Fund – collected fees only cover half of the expenses."</p>
NY	X		"Within the provisions of NYS Tax Law establishing the Public Safety Communications surcharge, the State distributes \$75 million to the counties through the PSAP and SICG grants programs. The counties combine their collected local surcharge funds, along with their State-awarded grant funds and their budgeted funds to support 911."
OH	X		"Counties and municipalities use general funds at many localities."
OK		X	
OR	X		"The 60% of the Emergency Communications Account that is distributed out to local 9-1-1 Jurisdictions is on average only about 20% of the operating cost of a PSAP. The remaining 80% of expenditures are paid by local resources such as local general funds, contract fees, and dispatch fees. These other sources may be paid by local cities/counties or Public Safety agencies that work with the Primary PSAP."
PA	X		"Any 911 related expenses not covered by 911 fees are covered by the general fund or other revenue sources of the respective county or city."
RI		X	N/A
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	N/A

Responses Regarding Combination of Collected Fees with any Federal, State, or Local Funds, Grants, Special Collections, or General Budget Appropriations That Were Designed to Support 911/E911/NG911 Services			
State	Yes	No	If Yes, Description of Federal, State, or Local Funds Combined with 911/E911 Fees
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 30% 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 with the majority of funding from their departmental budget. Last biennium 911 also received a proviso for approximately \$5M.”
WI		X	N/A
WV		X	
WY		X	N/A
Other Jurisdictions			
AS	~	~	N/A
DC	X		Local Funds – \$34,241,746.25 Grants - \$594,402.94
Guam		X	
No. Mar.	X		“Annual General Fund appropriations are made to the Department of Public Safety which manages the 911 service for the CNMI. Supplemental appropriations are made by the local municipalities to fund additional staffing and operations, if necessary.”
PR		X	N/A
VI	X		“Appropriated general budget in the amount of \$1,930,553.21 for salaries and fringe benefits.”
Total	25	30	

24. 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 15, 16 states reported that state 911 fees were the sole source of revenue funding 911 services; seven states indicated that 50 to 99% of funding came from state 911 fees; five states and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that 50 to 99% of funding came from local fees; one state reported that the source of fees was split evenly between state and local jurisdictions’ 911 fee collection; and two states reported that local fees were the sole source of funding.⁴⁰ Nine states and American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the District of Columbia reported that state and local General Fund revenues accounted for 50 to 100% of 911 funding. Five states reported not knowing the proportional contributions.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Oklahoma listed state funding as 100% of funding but also listed local funding as 100% of funding. *See* Oklahoma Response at 14.

⁴¹ Ohio responded “N/A – Varies by County,” which Bureau staff deemed to mean “unknown.” *See* Ohio Response at 12.

Table 15 – State Estimates of Proportional Contributions from Each Funding Source

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
AK		100%				
AL	89.10%			3.36%	0.01%	0.47%
AR	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify
AZ	100%					
CA	100%					
CO	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown			
CT	100%					
DE	100%					
FL	42%			52%		6%
GA	Unknown	Unknown				
HI	15%			81%	4%	
IA	20%			35%		
ID	90%	Unknown				10%
IL	75%			25%		
IN	43%	Not permitted		57%		
KS	25%			75%		
KY	23%	27%	0%	46%	1%	3%
LA	10.9 % (Prepaid Wireless)	89%				
MA	100%					
MD	34.00%			54.00%		12.00%
ME	100%					
MI	11%	30%		36%		
MN	100%			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.		
MO		Unknown		Unknown		
MS		100% ⁴²				

⁴² Mississippi reported that “[l]ocal budget and fees collected must cover costs. \$52,650,630.81[.]” See Mississippi Response at 12.

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
MT	NA	NA	NA	NA		
NC	52%			47%		1%
ND	5%	72%		23%		
NE	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
NH	100%					
NJ	Unknown			Unknown		
NM	100%					
NV		35%	Did Not Specify	43% ⁴³	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify
NY	NA	NA	NA	NA		
OH	N/A – Varies by County	N/A – Varies by County	N/A	N/A – Varies by County		
OK	100%	100%		unknown		
OR	20%	80%				
PA	89%			11%		
RI			100%			
SC						
SD	69%			30%	1%	
TN	100%					
TX	75%	25%				
UT	100%					
VA	50%	50%				
VT	100%					
WA	17%	50%	3%	30%		
WI		15%		85%		
WV	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
WY	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify
Other Jurisdictions						
AS			100%			
DC		27.59% (\$13,275,260.62)	71.17% (\$34,241,746.25)		1%	
Guam	100%					
No. Mariana Is.			100%			

⁴³ This number excludes Elko County. In response to question F.5, Elko County, Nevada reported that its local funding as a proportion of all 911 funding was 195.75% and that its General Fund – County Funding as a proportion of all funding was 152006300%. See Elko County Response at 10. Assuming these were dollar amounts and not percentages as reported, it would be possible to calculate the actual percentages, except that Elko County did not provide a total amount collected (it only indicated the amount collected for wireless services). See *id* at 8.

State	State 911 Fees	Local 911 or Other Fees	General Fund - State	General Fund - County	Federal Grants	State Grants
PR	100%					
USVI	39%		61%			

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

25. 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.”⁴⁴ 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.

26. 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 NET 911 Act and therefore constitute a diversion of 911 funds. However, as in past reports, 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 previously found that where sufficient documentation is provided, the expenditure of 911 funds to support integration of dispatch and 911 call-taking systems may be categorized as 911-related, and we continue to follow this approach in this report.

27. Based on the data we have received, we find that six states and the U.S. Virgin Islands diverted or transferred fees in calendar year 2017. As described in Table 16 below, Montana self-identified in its responses to the questionnaire that it used collected funds, at least in part, for non-911 related purposes. Five states and the U.S. Virgin Islands did not self-identify as diverting funds, but the Bureau has determined based on review of the information provided that these jurisdictions in fact diverted funds for non-911 related purposes within the meaning of the NET 911 Act. The jurisdictions listed in Table 16 diverted an aggregate amount of \$284,968,912.66, or 9.70% of all 911/E911 funds reported to have been collected by all responding states and jurisdictions in 2017.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ NET 911 Act 6(f)(2) (emphasis added).

⁴⁵ The reports provided by Alaska, Mississippi, and Missouri indicate that in those states 911/E911 fees are collected and are authorized to be spent purely at the local level. See Tables 6 and 7. These states also have indicated that state statutory restrictions exist to varying degrees on how 911/E911 fees may be spent by localities. We identify these states as not having diverted funds because we have no evidence that diversion has occurred in any of them. However, we note that because our collection of information is at the states level and these states have limited visibility into how fees are allocated and spent at the local level, Bureau staff is unable to fully verify the nature of local allocation or expenditure in each case.

Table 16 – Total Funds Diverted or Otherwise Transferred from 911 Uses

State/Territory	Total Funds Collected	Total Funds Used for Other Purposes	Percentage Diverted	Type of Transfer
	(Year End 2017)			
States/Jurisdictions Self-Identifying as Diverting/Transferring Funds				
MT	Unknown	\$2,000,000.00	Indeterminate	General Fund
States/Jurisdictions Identified by Bureau as Diverting/Transferring Funds				
NJ	\$121,909,000.00	\$94,187,000.00	77.26%	Public Safety Related and Unrelated
NY	\$189,094,916.24	\$170,852,580.07	90.35%	Public Safety Related and Unrelated
NV	\$2,291,101.90	\$1,311,432.00	57.24%	Public Safety Related
RI	\$16,817,000.00	\$11,397,030.00	67.77%	General Fund
USVI	Did Not Specify	\$1,238,628.40	Indeterminate	Public Safety Related
WV	\$60,189,650.00	\$3,982,242.00	6.62%	Public Safety Related and Unrelated
Total	\$390,301,668.14	\$284,968,912.66	73.01%	
<i>Percent Diverted From</i>				
<i>Total Funds Collected by All States</i>				
Total	\$2,937,108.459		9.70%	

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

28. *Virginia.* As in previous years, Virginia reported that it diverted a portion of the 911 funds collected in calendar year 2017 for purposes outside the scope of its established state funding mechanisms. However, on review of the expenditures at issue, the Bureau again concludes that Virginia has demonstrated a sufficient nexus with 911 to support a finding that the expenditures were 911-related.

29. As in 2016, Virginia reported that in 2017 it diverted a total of \$11.7 million of the 911/E911 funds it collected, with \$3.7 million used to help finance the Virginia State Police (VSP) for costs incurred for answering wireless 911 telephone calls, and \$8.0 million to support sheriffs’ 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.⁴⁶ Similar to our finding on 2016, we agree that Virginia’s 2017 expenditure to support 911 dispatch by these agencies is 911-related, and we therefore do not identify Virginia as having diverted funds under the NET 911 Act.

30. *Montana.* Although Montana indicated that 911 and E911 funds collected were used solely for the designated purpose, stating that “money in the wireless enhanced 9-1-1 services account is subject to legislative fund transfers[,]” it also indicated that \$2.0 million had been transferred to the state’s

⁴⁶ Virginia Response at 13.

(continued....)

general fund and used for a purpose unrelated to 911 or E-911.⁴⁷ Because Montana transferred \$2.0 million to the state's general fund, the Bureau concludes that Montana transferred funds for non-911 or E-911 use.

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

31. *New Jersey.* New Jersey reported that it did not divert or transfer any collected funds.⁴⁸ However, New Jersey, in response to Question E.1., stated that, in accordance with New Jersey statute (P.L.2004, c.48), all fees collected were “deposited into the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of related programs”⁴⁹ According to New Jersey, of the \$121,909,000 it collected in 911 fees, approximately \$26,822,000 was applied to “the Statewide 911 Emergency Telephone System” and \$900,000 was applied to “the Office of Emergency Telecommunications Service.”⁵⁰ By the Bureau's analysis, New Jersey applied the remainder to offset costs related to programs within the New Jersey Departments of Law and Public Safety and Military and Veterans' Affairs that are unrelated to 911 or were not demonstrated to be 911-related. Accordingly, the Bureau finds that New Jersey diverted \$94,187,000 in fees for non-911 related uses.⁵¹

32. *New York.* The Bureau has found New York to be a diverter of 911 fees every year since the 2009 Report to Congress, and in 2017 New York continued to operate under a state law framework that provides for such diversion. New York State Consolidated Tax Law §186-f requires the collection of a monthly \$1.20 fee for each mobile device.⁵² In 2017, this resulted in the collection of \$189,094,916.24 in 911/E911 fees. Subsection 186-f(5)(a) provides for the allocation of “forty-one and seven-tenths of the revenues collected and received under this section into the state general fund.”⁵³ This resulted in the diversion of 41.7% of \$189,094,916.24 in fees collected, or \$78,852,580.07, which by itself provides sufficient basis to identify New York as having diverted 911 fees for non-911 purposes. In addition, the information provided by New York indicates that a portion of the remaining 58.3% of 911/E911 fee revenues was diverted for public safety purposes unrelated to 911. Section 186-f provides that “58.3% of the revenue collected is distributed to the statewide Public Safety Communications Account, with the following mandated allocations: \$25,500,000 to New York State Police; \$1,500,000 into the New York State Emergency Services Revolving Loan Fund; and up to \$75,000,000 for the provision of grants or reimbursements to counties for the development, consolidation, or operation of public safety communications systems or networks designed to support statewide interoperable communications for first responders.”⁵⁴ There is no indication that the funds allocated to the New York State Police or the state emergency loan fund are used for 911-related purposes; therefore we conclude that the \$27 million spent on these programs constitutes a diversion.

33. With respect to the \$75 million allocated for public safety grants, New York states that in 2017 it awarded \$45,000,000 in State Interoperable Communications Grants (SICG), \$10,000,000 in

⁴⁷ Montana Response at 12.

⁴⁸ New Jersey Response at 11.

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 6.

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² N.Y. Tax Law § 186-f 2 (McKinney 2017).

⁵³ *See* N.Y. Tax Law § 186-f 5(a) (McKinney 2017).

⁵⁴ New York Response at 5.

(continued....)

Public Safety Answering Point Grants (PSAPG), and \$20,000,000 in a Capital and Targeted Communications Grant (CTCG) in 2017.⁵⁵ We agree with New York that the \$10,000,000 PSAP grant is 911-related. New York explained that:

The PSAP Grant allows the State to assist counties with eligible public safety call-taking and dispatching expenses. State support is in the form of reimbursement to counties for operating expenses in a PSAP, including personnel costs. The grant not only supports eligible applicants' existing operations, but also encourages the development of Next Generation 911 (NG911) technologies. The PSAP Grant also assures development of operational and procedural efficiencies and overall collaboration between different jurisdictions, such as other counties and State agencies.⁵⁶

With respect to the SICG and CTCG, however, the state has failed to demonstrate that the \$65 million in expenditures attributable to these programs is 911-related. New York indicates that it spends SICG and CTCG funds on a mixture of programs:

The SICG Program supports infrastructure and interoperability development, including land mobile radio systems development and PSAP improvements. This includes improvements of PSAPs towards NG911. Under the SICG Program, the Capital and Targeted Grant program provide for statewide interoperability. These grants directly support connectivity with and between PSAPs.⁵⁷

Although New York states that SICG program support for "infrastructure and interoperability development" includes support for PSAP improvements, New York acknowledges that the program also funds land mobile radio and other projects that are not 911-related. Because New York has not specified 911-related expenses or distinguished them from non-911-related expenses, the amount of SICG funds spent on 911 cannot be determined. Similarly, we conclude that the entire \$20,000,000 of the CTCG is non-911 related because the sole stated purpose of the CTCG is to "provide for statewide interoperability,"⁵⁸ and there is no separate delineation of 911-related expenses within the program. Without further documentation, we include \$65,000,000 for SIGP and CTCG in the calculation of diverted funds, for a combined total of \$170,852,580.07.⁵⁹

34. *Nevada.* Nevada reported that in 2017 the "State legislature added an allowance to increase the E911 fee to help pay for body cameras for officers."⁶⁰ Nevada also reported that "[t]he 2017 Nevada State Legislature enacted SB176 increasing the maximum surcharge . . . to include the purchase

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 10.

⁵⁶ *Id.* at 8.

⁵⁷ *Id.*

⁵⁸ New York Response at 8; Governor Cuomo Announces \$45 Million in State Grant Funding to Improve Emergency Communications Statewide (October 11, 2018), <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-announces-45-million-state-grant-funding-improve-emergency-communications> ("The program has allowed counties to make vital improvements in the way first responders can communicate between each other and different regions of the state using land mobile radio systems.").

⁵⁹ We note that New York's statute required it to transfer 58.3% of the 911/E911 fees collected, or \$110,242,336.17, to the Public Safety Communications Account (PSCA), but it has accounted for only \$102,000,000 in 2017 spending out of the PSCA, and has not indicated whether the remaining balance of \$8,242,336.17 was spent for any purpose. Because we have no documentation indicating that the balance was spent, we do not count it as diverted funds for purposes of this report.

⁶⁰ *See* Churchill County, Nevada Response at 4.

(continued....)

and maintenance of portable event recording devices and vehicular recording devices.” The Bureau finds that the expenditure of 911/E911 fees on police body cameras and vehicular recording devices constitutes diversion of 911/E911 fees for non-911 public safety uses. Because Nevada has not provided itemized cost data for the body cameras and recording devices, we cannot determine the amount of funds that were diverted for these uses. However, Washoe County, Nevada reports that “the 2017 Nevada State Legislature enacted SB176 increasing the maximum surcharge from \$0.25 per line/\$2.50 per trunk to \$1.00 per line/\$10.00 per trunk.”⁶¹ This represents a 300% increase in Nevada’s rate. Nevada collected \$2,291,101.90 in 911/E911 fees in 2017 compared to \$437,144 collected in 2016 – an annual increase of \$1,853,957.9, or 424%. Given the 300% increase in the 911 surcharge, the Bureau finds that of this \$1,853,958 year-to-year increase, at least \$1,311,432 is attributable to the higher rate. Accordingly, the Bureau finds that Nevada has diverted at least \$1,311,432 to a non-911 public safety use.

35. *Rhode Island.* Rhode Island reports that “90% of funds collected are deposited into the state General Fund . . . [and that] 10% of all funds collected go to the State Information Technology Investment Fund in accordance with RIGL 42-11-2.5 and further authorized by RIGL 39-21.1-14 (d).”⁶² Rhode also states that the “state General Fund finances 100% of the E-911 program.”⁶³ Rhode Island reported that in its 2018 fiscal year (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018), the state collected \$16,817,000.00 in E911 surcharges, with approximately 90% of the collected fees going into the state General Fund and the remaining 10% being contributed to the state Information Technology Fund.⁶⁴ The state indicated that it used a portion of the General Fund revenues to fund the E-911 program: \$4,044,810 in personnel costs and \$1,375,160 in operating costs, for a total of \$5,419,970. Rhode Island reported that all remaining funds collected were distributed for other purposes via the general fund.⁶⁵ Because Rhode Island transferred fees collected for 911 and E911 support to the general fund and subsequently spent them on non-911 purposes, the Bureau finds that Rhode Island diverted funds for non-911 or E911 use.

36. *U.S. Virgin Islands.* The U.S. Virgin Islands reported that its “Department of Health utilizes [911/E911] funds collected to support the operations of the local Emergency Medical Technicians (EMT) specifically for improvements to the ambulance vehicles, training and travel of the technicians and general operating supplies for the technicians.”⁶⁶ In addition, the “VI Fire Services utilizes the collections of funds to support maintenance and repairs to the fire services equipment and facilities, travel & training of firemen, and to pay the department communication service charge fee.”⁶⁷ The U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that, by statute, 30% of the fees collected are disbursed to the Department of Health and another 30% is disbursed to the Virgin Islands Fire Service. Accordingly, the Bureau finds that the U.S. Virgin Islands has diverted an estimated \$1,238,628.40 for these non-911 purposes.⁶⁸

⁶¹ Washoe County, Nevada Response at 4.

⁶² See Rhode Island Response at 8; Letter from Col. Ann C. Assumpico, Rhode Island Department of Public Safety, to Lisa M. Fowlkes, Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (June 29, 2018) at 2 (Rhode Island Supplemental Letter Response).

⁶³ Rhode Island Response at 8.

⁶⁴ Rhode Island Supplemental Letter Response at 3.

⁶⁵ Rhode Island Supplemental Letter Response at 2.

⁶⁶ U.S. Virgin Islands Response at 8.

⁶⁷ *Id.* at 8.

⁶⁸ Although the U.S. Virgin Islands did not provide an amount for collected fees, it did indicate that 61% of its support for 911 comes from its general fund in the amount of \$1,930,553.21 and that 39% comes from the unspecified amount of state 911 fees. The U.S. Virgin Islands also reported that its total cost of providing 911 (continued....)

37. *West Virginia.* West Virginia reported that it did not divert funds, but the Bureau determined that, of the \$37,305,951.00 in wireless 911/E911 fees collected in 2017, the state apportioned \$3,982,242 to certain dedicated accounts, as follows: \$1,000,000 for the Tower Assistance Fund, to subsidize construction of towers, which the state describes as ensuring enhanced 911 wireless coverage; \$1,865,297.55 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 \$1,116,944.64 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.⁶⁹ We do not agree with the state’s characterization of cellular tower construction as a 911-related program. Arguably, expenditures to integrate the West Virginia State Police’s radio systems with 911 could be considered 911-related, but as in previous years the state has not provided sufficient documentation of these expenditures to support such a finding.

38. In Table 17 below, we compare the number of states identified as diverting 911/E911 funds in this reporting year to the number of states identified in past years.

Table 17 – States/Jurisdictions Identified as Diverting 911/E911 Funds (2009 – 2018)

Report Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
States	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI
	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY	NY
	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	IL	
						NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ
		AZ	AZ	AZ						
										NV
		GA	GA	GA						
	ME		ME	ME						
	OR	OR	OR							
						WA		WA		
							WV	WV	WV	WV
							NH	NH		
	WI	WI								
						CA				
		DE								
		HI								
								IA		
						KS				
MT										MT

service in 2017 was \$3,169,181.61. Thus, the 39% of funds that came from state 911 fees would approximately equate to \$1,238,628.40.

⁶⁹ West Virginia Response at 12, 14, 16. 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. *Id.*

Report Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
		NE								
									NM	
	TN									
Other Jurisdictions						Puerto Rico		Puerto Rico		
										USVI
Total	8	10	7	6	4	7	6	9	5	
States and Other Jurisdictions That Did Not File a Fee Report										
States Not Filing A Report				LA		LA	LA			
							MO	MO	MO	
			OK						OK	
					AR					
			KS							
									MT	
				NH						
			NJ							
									NY	
				RI						
Other Jurisdictions Not Filing A Report	Northern Mariana Islands	Northern Mariana Islands	Northern Mariana Islands	Northern Mariana Islands	Northern Mariana Islands	Northern Mariana Islands	Northern Mariana Islands	Northern Mariana Islands	Northern Mariana Islands	
		Guam	Guam		Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam	Guam	
	U.S. Virgin Islands			U.S. Virgin Islands	U.S. Virgin Islands	U.S. Virgin Islands	U.S. Virgin Islands			
					American Samoa	American Samoa				
				District of Columbia						
									Puerto Rico	
Total	2	2	5	6	5	5	5	3	7	7

39. We remind all states and reporting jurisdictions that the Bureau's assessment of whether 911 fees have been diverted relies on jurisdictions providing clear and specific documentation of how particular expenditures are 911-related, and that lack of such clarity and specificity may lead the Bureau to conclude that expenditures are not 911-related. We recognize that reporting jurisdictions providing documentation of expenditures for this year's report may have relied on our acceptance of the same or similar level of documentation in prior reports to guide their disclosure of expenditure activities. In preparing this year's fee diversion assessment, therefore, we have generally found the same level of

documentation as in prior years sufficient to support findings that jurisdictions have not diverted funds. However, we take this opportunity to advise reporting jurisdictions that for purposes of future reports, we may require additional documentation to demonstrate that certain categories of expenditures have a sufficient nexus to 911 to be considered 911-related.

40. As noted above, the Net 911 Act requires that obligation or expenditure of 911/E911 fees or surcharges be “in support of 9-1-1 and enhanced 9-1-1 services, or enhancements of such services.”⁷⁰ Accordingly, where jurisdictions are reporting use of 911/E911 fees to support public safety expenditures, we expect them to provide documentation sufficient to demonstrate that the expenditures (1) support PSAP functions or operations, (2) have a reasonable nexus to PSAPs’ ability to receive 911 calls and/or dispatch emergency responders, or (3) relate to communications infrastructure that connects PSAPs (or otherwise ensures the reliable reception and processing of emergency calls and their dispatch to first responders). Without such documentation of a 911 nexus, we will presume that an obligation or expenditure is a diversion of 911/E911 fees.⁷¹

41. Finally, as with last year’s report, we remind interested parties that diverting 911 fees may jeopardize their eligibility for federal 911 grants. 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 Information Administration (NTIA) with administering the grant program, which opened on August 10, 2018 and has begun accepting applications.⁷² Section 6503 of the 2012 Act and the implementing rules for the grant program require applicants to certify that in the 180 days immediately preceding the date of the initial application 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.”⁷³

H. Oversight and Auditing of 911/E911 Fees

42. 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 18 below, 41 states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated that they have established an oversight mechanism; seven states and the Northern Mariana Islands indicate that they have no oversight mechanism.

43. 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. Thirty-three states and Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin

⁷⁰ See Net 911 Fee Act § 6(f)(1); *supra* para. 7.

⁷¹ For example, the presumption will apply where a jurisdiction uses 911 fees to pay for purchase or upgrade of land mobile radio systems or funding of police, fire, or emergency medical services not related to processing and dispatch of 911 calls.

⁷² See National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Moving Forward with 911 Grants (August 10, 2018), <https://www.ntia.doc.gov/blog/2018/moving-forward-911-grants>; 911 Grant Program, https://www.911.gov/project_911grantprogram.html (last visited October 30, 2018).

⁷³ See 2012 Act at 126 STAT. 240; 47 CFR § 400.4(a)(5).

Islands reported that they have authority to conduct audits of service providers. Seventeen states, American Samoa, the District of Columbia and the Northern Mariana Islands reported that they do not. Of the 36 jurisdictions indicating they have authority to audit service providers, eight states and Puerto Rico indicated that they had undertaken “authority or enforcement or other corrective actions” in connection with such auditing, 22 states, American Samoa and the District of Columbia indicated no such actions were taken during the period under review, and 20 states, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands did not respond, did not provide a relevant response, or did not know.

Table 18. Description of Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911 Fees

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?	Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider’s number of subscribers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2017 ⁷⁴
AK	No	No	NA
AL	Yes	Yes	Yes ⁷⁵
AR	No	No	NA
AZ	Yes	Yes	None
CA	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
CO	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
CT	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
DE	Yes	Yes	None
FL	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
GA	No	No	NA
HI	Yes	No	NA
IA	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
ID	Yes	No	NA

⁷⁴ Question H.2a of the FCC’s questionnaire asks respondents to “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” if they provided an affirmative response to Question H.2 (*i.e.*, “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”). Respondents were further instructed in question H.2a to write “None” if no audits were conducted. Many respondents left the field blank or provided non-responsive information (*i.e.*, they quoted or described statutory text that either was irrelevant to the call of the question to provide a description of actions undertaken or did not on its face demonstrate that an audit in fact was conducted in 2017). Accordingly, in this Table 18, “Did Not Specify” denotes that either (1) the jurisdiction responded “No” to question H2 but did not write “None” in response to Question H.2a as instructed (*i.e.*, the field for H.2a was left blank) or (2) the jurisdiction responded to Question H.2a by supplying text that did not specify whether an audit of carriers was in fact conducted in 2017. The use of “NA” in this Table 18 denotes that either (1) the jurisdiction did not respond to question H.2a and answered “no” in response to both questions H1 and H2 (*i.e.*, the non-existence of a mechanism or authority to audit leads to a reasonable inference that the issue of whether carriers were audited in 2017 is not applicable) or (2) the jurisdiction wrote “NA” in response to question H.2a. “Unknown” is noted where jurisdictions stated “unknown” or otherwise indicated that it lacked information necessary to form a response.

⁷⁵ The performance of an audit in 2017 is inferred from Alabama’s report that “[u]nder § 11-98-13, Code of Alabama 1975, on a biennial basis, if not more frequently, the 911 Board shall retain an independent, third-party auditor for the purposes of receiving, maintaining, and verifying the accuracy of . . . of the collection of the 911 services charge required to be collected.” See Alabama Response at 16.

(continued....)

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?	Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2017 ⁷⁴
IL	Yes	Yes	No
IN	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify ⁷⁶
KS	Yes	Yes	None
KY	Yes	Yes	Yes ⁷⁷
LA	Yes	Yes	None
MA	Yes	No	None
MD	Yes	Yes	Yes
ME	Yes	Yes	None
MI	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
MN	Yes	Yes	NA ⁷⁸
MO	NA	Yes	Did Not Specify
MS	No	Yes	Did Not Specify
MT	Yes	Yes	NA
NC	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
ND	Yes	Yes	None
NE	Yes	Yes	Yes
NH	Yes	Yes	Yes
NJ	No	No	NA
NM	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
NV	Varies by county ⁷⁹	Yes	Did Not Specify ⁸⁰
NY	Yes	Yes	None
OH	Yes	Yes	Yes

⁷⁶ Indiana reported that a controlling statute requires a yearly audit of PSAPs' expenditures but did not specify whether an audit of carriers is required or whether an audit of carriers in fact occurred in 2017. *See* Indiana Response at 8-9.

⁷⁷ Kentucky responded, "KRS 65.7629 directs the Kentucky 911 Services Board to retain an independent certified public accountant to audit the books of the board, CMRS providers and PSAPs to verify the accuracy of collection and disbursement of the CMRS service charge." *See* Kentucky Response at 14.

⁷⁸ Minnesota does not have a mechanism to audit wireless, prepaid, or VoIP 911/E911 fees charged to subscribers. Minnesota audits only wireline carriers, which covers only about 15% of Minnesota subscribers. And this "audit" is limited to comparing cost-recovery payments made to carriers for maintaining ALI records, which are made on a per-record basis, to the number of records in the ALI database for which carriers remit the 911 monthly surcharge. If there is a disparity of over 5%, then Minnesota requires the carriers to "true up." *See* Minnesota Response at 18.

⁷⁹ The Nevada localities that submitted questionnaires responded to this question as follows: Carson City, Churchill County, Douglas County, and Pershing County responded "yes"; Elko County, Humboldt County, and Washoe County responded "no"; the Boulder City Police Department, Esmeralda County and Lyon County did not respond.

⁸⁰ The responding localities either did not respond to the relevant questions or provided a response that did not whether Nevada in fact conducted an audit of carriers in 2017 (a number of localities indicated that there is a mechanism to dispute surcharges under Nevada Revised Statute Chapter 244A and Carson City noted the authority to dispute a surcharge under Carson City Municipal Code Section 4.05.110).

(continued....)

State	Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?	Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected from subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers?	Conducted Audit of Service Providers in 2017 ⁷⁴
OK	Yes	Yes	None ⁸¹
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes
PA	Yes	Yes	No ⁸²
RI	Yes	Yes	Unknown
SC	No	No	NA
SD	Yes	Yes	Yes
TN	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
TX	Yes	Yes	Unknown ⁸³
UT	No	Yes	Did Not Specify
VA	Yes	Yes	Unknown
VT	Yes	Yes	Yes
WA	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
WI	Yes	No	Did Not Specify
WV	Yes	Yes	None
WY	Yes	No	None
Other Jurisdictions			
AS	No	No	NA
DC	Yes	No	NA
Guam	Yes	Yes	Unknown ⁸⁴
No. Mar. Islands	No	No	Did Not Specify
PR	Yes	Yes	Yes
USVI	Yes	Yes	Did Not Specify
Yes Totals	45	36	9
No Totals	10	20	24

⁸¹ Oklahoma reported that it has “the authority within State Statute §63-2864.8, [but that] a process has not been established.” See Oklahoma Response at 17.

⁸² Pennsylvania has indicated that provider audits will begin in 2018 now that the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency “has executed an agreement with the PA Department of Revenue to conduct audits of service providers.” See Pennsylvania Response at 14. Staff infers from this response that no audits occurred in 2017.

⁸³ Texas stated that it “lacks information regarding specific audits initiated by the Texas Comptroller during calendar year 2017.” See Texas Response at 19.

⁸⁴ Guam reports that its Public Utilities Commission has authority to audit providers’ collection of the . . . 911 surcharge from its [sic] customers [but] this information is not made available to the [agency completing the FCC’s questionnaire].” See Guam Response at 16.

(continued....)

I. Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures

44. 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 2017. With respect to classifying NG911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures, 47 states, Guam and the District of Columbia indicated that their 911 funding mechanism allows for distribution of 911 funds for the implementation of NG911. Alaska, Hawaii, Missouri, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands reported that their funding mechanism does not allow for the use of 911 funds for NG911 implementation.⁸⁵ With respect to expending funds on NG911 programs, 35 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico indicated that they used 911 funds for NG911 programs in 2017. Table 19 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 19 – Number of States Indicating One or More Areas of NG911 Investment

Area of Expenditure	States/Other Jurisdictions	Total
General Project or Not Specified	Delaware Illinois Kentucky Maine Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Montana Missouri Nebraska Puerto Rico Rhode Island and Providence Plantations South Carolina Utah Vermont Wyoming	17

⁸⁵ Alaska Response at 16; Hawaii Response at 18; Missouri Response at 15; Puerto Rico Response at 17; USVI Response at 16. American Samoa did not respond to this question. American Samoa Response at 15.

<p>Planning or Consulting Services</p>	<p>Alabama Arizona Arkansas Florida Guam Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky, Louisiana Maine Maryland Michigan Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New York North Carolina Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania South Dakota Tennessee Texas U.S. Virgin Islands Vermont Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming</p>	<p>33</p>
<p>ESInet Construction</p>	<p>Alabama Arizona California Indiana Iowa Kansas Louisiana North Carolina Ohio Virginia Washington</p>	<p>11</p>

NG911 Core Services	Alabama Arizona Connecticut District of Columbia Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Massachusetts Michigan Nevada Pennsylvania Tennessee Virginia Wyoming	14
Hardware or Software Purchases or Upgrades	Arizona Louisiana Kentucky Maryland New Mexico Tennessee Texas Washington West Virginia	9
GIS	Connecticut Iowa Kansas Louisiana Minnesota Nevada New Mexico North Carolina North Dakota South Dakota	10
NG Security Planning	Minnesota	1
Training	Connecticut	1

45. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions report the amount of funds expended on NG911 programs in the annual period ending December 31, 2017. Table 20 shows the NG911-related expenditures and projects reported by 37 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.⁸⁶ Collectively, these jurisdictions reported spending \$198,971,933.06 on NG911 programs, or approximately 6.77% of

⁸⁶ We note that in response to Question I.2, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire and Wisconsin indicated they did not spend any funds on NG911 programs in 2017, but nevertheless provided a description of NG911-related programs in response to question I.4.

total 911/E911 fees collected. Nine states did not specify the amount spent for NG911 purposes. Eighteen states report no expenditures for NG911-related programs.⁸⁷

Table 20 – Funds Spent on Next Generation 911 Programs

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
AL	\$1,732,375.00	<p>“Funds collected for 911 or E911 have been received by the 87 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. Adamsville (Municipality), Auburn (Municipality), Autauga County, Baldwin County, Barbour County, Bessemer (Municipality), Bibb County, Birmingham (Municipality), Blount County, Bullock County, Butler County, Calhoun County, Chambers County, Cherokee County, Chilton County, Choctaw County, Clarke County, Clay County, Cleburne County, Coffee County, Colbert County, Conecuh County, Coosa County, Covington County, Crenshaw County, Cullman County, Dale County, Daleville City, Dallas County, DeKalb County, Elmore County, Enterprise (Municipality), Escambia County, Etowah County, Fairfield (Municipality), Fayette County, Fort Payne (Municipality), Franklin County, Gardendale (Municipality), Geneva County, Greene County, Hale County, Henry County, Homewood (Municipality), Hoover (Municipality), Houston County, Hueytown (Municipality), Irondale City (Jefferson), Jackson County, Jefferson County, Lamar County, Lauderdale County, Lawrence County, Lee County, Leeds (Municipality), Limestone County, Lowndes County, Macon County, Madison County, Marengo County, Marion County, Marshall County, Midfield (Municipality), Mobile County, Monroe County, Montgomery City, Montgomery County, Morgan County, Mountain Brook, Perry County, Pickens County, Pike County, Pleasant Grove (Municipality), Randolph County, Russell County, Shelby County, St Clair County, Sumter County, Talladega County, Tallapoosa County, Tarrant (Municipality), Tuscaloosa County, Vestavia (Municipality), Walker County, Washington County, Wilcox County, Winston County”</p>
AZ	\$1,969,841.48	<p>“There are 86 Public Safety Answering Points in Arizona that are eligible for 911 funding from the Emergency Telecommunication Services Revolving Fund. During the annual period ending December 31, 2017, funds were expended for 911 equipment upgrades, 911 equipment maintenance and 911 network services including NG911, as well as for the wireless carriers' costs associated with the deployment and maintenance of Wireless E911 Phase II. Equipment upgrade of 104 positions at the Phoenix Police Department's two locations. Deployment and on-going expenditures for Managed Services for 26 PSAPs statewide including 3 PSAPs in Cochise County, 2 PSAPs in Gila County, 1 PSAP Gila River Tribal Nation, 6 PSAPs in Pima County, 5 PSAPs in Pinal County, 2 PSAPs in Santa Cruz County, 3 PSAPs Yavapai County and 4 PSAPs in Yuma County. Remedial maintenance is also important for this program and maintenance and software support contracts are reviewed as they expire.”</p>

⁸⁷ These include Alaska, American Samoa, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Guam, Idaho, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, U.S. Virgin Islands, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
CA	\$4,200,000.00	<p>“Pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 41136. The State of California provides funding for recognized Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in the California that provide 9-1-1 services. Specifically funding is used to:</p> <p>To pay refunds authorized by this part. To pay the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration for the cost of the administration of this part. To pay the Office of Emergency Services for its costs in administration of the ‘911’ emergency telephone number system. To pay bills submitted to the Office of Emergency Services by service suppliers or communications equipment companies for the installation of, and ongoing expenses for, the following communications services supplied to local agencies in connection with the "911" emergency phone number system including: Network costs Customer Premise Equipment (CPE) Costs Database Costs (ALI) Training costs for PSAPs, Max \$3000 per fiscal year Review and analysis of new technology (NG9-1-1 etc.) Strategic planning for Next Generation 9-1-1 Foreign language emergency interpretation services Geographic Information System”</p>
CT	\$8,015,256.00	<p>“9-1-1 Funds provide for the following: NG 911 Equipment; including 911 hardware, software, maintenance, database management GIS services for all PSAPs A Statewide emergency notification system Division salaries and operating expenses Funding for Connecticut State Police emergency telecommunications Subsidies for regional emergency communication centers, multi-town PSAPs, and municipalities with populations greater than 40,000 State 911 training and certification Emergency Medical Dispatch training Capital expense grants Transition grants for the purpose of consolidation of PSAPs Public education initiatives Fiber optic public safety data network Funding for the Dept. of Public Health for collection of EMS data PSAP Training Funds P-25 Switch Interpretation services for limited or non-English speaking callers[.]”</p>
DE	Did Not Specify	<p>“Each county receives an amount from the Fund equal to \$0.50 per month, for each residence exchange access line or residential Basic Rate Interface ("BRI") ISDN arrangement from which the monthly surcharge is collected in that county or the amount received by that county in calendar year 2000 from telephone providers from E-911 surcharges, whichever is greater. The counties shall use these revenues to offset the costs incurred by them in connection with the administration, staffing, street addressing, necessary capital equipment, and training necessary to support the provision of E-911 emergency reporting service. Costs incurred shall be verified by an annual audit as directed by the Board.”</p>
FL	\$7,784,855.00	<p>“Florida Statutes establish and implement a comprehensive statewide emergency telecommunications number system that provides users of telecommunications services within the state with rapid, direct access to public safety agencies by dialing 911. Pursuant to Florida Statutes, the State E911 Plan and rules provide for E911 fee revenue to be allocated to counties to pay certain costs associated with their county and local jurisdiction public safety answering points, NG911, E911, or 911 systems and to contract for E911 services including NG911. E911 service includes the functions of database management, call-taking, location verification, and call-transferring. Department of Health certification, recertification, and training costs for 911 public safety telecommunications, including dispatching, are functions of 911 services. This statewide system and the State E911 Plan, including individual county 911 plans and E911 functions, ensure that the 911 systems are operational and that they are being upgraded and maintained in all counties</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		throughout Florida. E911 Board administration receives funds for operating costs and expenses incurred for the purposes of managing, administering, and overseeing the receipts and disbursements from the fund and for other activities as defined in section 365.172(6), Florida Statutes. Wireless service providers' sworn invoices, submitted to the E911 Board, are reimbursed at the actual costs incurred to provide 911 or E911 service. This includes the costs of complying with FCC orders and costs and expenses incurred by wireless providers to design, purchase, lease, program, install, test, upgrade, operate, and maintain all necessary data, hardware, and software required to provide E911 service.”
HI	\$1,500,000.00	“For calendar year 2017 the E911 Board has not funded any activities, programs or organizations outside of what is allowable under §138-5, HRS. Expenditures for calendar year 2017 were limited to: 1. Purchase or lease and maintenance of all necessary computer hardware and software to provide technical functionality for the enhanced 911 service. 2. Training of personnel in any new and emerging technologies involving enhanced 911. 3. Telecommunications and 911 service expenses to connect to the ESInet. 4. Actual enhanced 911 communications service costs allowed to be recovered under section 138- 4(d). 5. E911 Board administrative costs which includes payroll, meeting travel, legal fees, etc. 6. Public Education in anticipation of deployment of new and/or improved services such as textto- 911. 7. Travel expenses for Board and Committee members. 8. CAD maintenance to minimize or eliminate potential service interruptions. All E9-1-1 expenditures are done for the purpose of providing state-of-the-art equipment and software, and training to facilitate rescues in the shortest possible time while providing first responders with as much information as possible to accomplish successful rescues. The PSAPs are the only organizations that are the beneficiaries of surcharge fees collected for E911 purposes.”
IA	\$10,000,000.00	“The State collects wireless and prepaid surcharge remittance on a quarterly basis. The State passes 60% of the collected surcharge to the local 911 service boards based on a formula of square mileage the service board is responsible for, and call counts. Wireless surcharge is also used to fund the administration of the 911 Program by Homeland Security and Emergency Management. Local 911 Service Board directly collection Wire line Surcharge. In all cases, 911 surcharge is to be used for the receipt and disposition of a 911 call. The State also pays recurring costs for transport costs between selective router and PSAPs. The State pays for ALI database information on a quarterly basis. The state reimburses Wireless Carriers for up to 10% of surcharge generated to recover their actual costs associated with Phase 1 delivery. The State has a contract with Comtech Telecommunications System for Next Gen upgrades to the PSAPs, ESInet monitoring and management of NG911 in Iowa. This includes two call logic centers. The State utilizes the Iowa Communications Network for the ESInet/circuitry itself. The State has also entered into a contract with GeoComm to provide end-to-end GIS services as part of Next Gen upgrades. During this reporting period, County Service Boards entered the maintenance phase of the project, submitting their data to the statewide portal as needed. As part of the overall GIS project, HSEMD has purchased aerial photography which is made available to local jurisdictions for integration with their mapping systems. HSEMD offered local jurisdictions GIS grants for the purpose of NG911 GIS data creation, remediation, and maintenance. The total available to counties was \$15,000 per PSAP. HSEMD entered into contracts with 5 CPE vendors for the enabling of MSRP text messaging. Local jurisdictions are able to select vendors for their internal PSAP systems (CAD, CPE, recorder etc.) The State offers grants in addition to the 60% pass through of all wireless surcharge funds. During this fiscal year, that amount was up to \$200,000 or half of the costs associated with physical

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		consolidation. There is also \$100,000 statewide allocated to 911 Council member travel, Public Education, and telecommunicator training. Statewide, \$7 million was approved for these type [sic] of projects. Any unused funds are passed through to the PSAPs for expenses associated with the receipt and disposition of 911 calls.”
IL	\$289,739.00	“The State's 9-1-1 fees go to support all 9-1-1 related activities throughout the State. The majority of the funds are passed through from the State to local and county governments 9-1-1 Authorities to provide for their operation. These funds may be used for almost any expense that can classified as 9-1-1 related such as Telecommunicator salaries, 9-1-1 equipment costs, lease expenses, radio equipment, mapping expenses, etc. The State also pays telecommunications carriers directly for 9-1-1 network expenses incurred by the local governments.”
IN	\$15,000,000.00	“The Statewide 911 Board expended funds as follows: 1. to pay the board's expenses in administering this chapter and to 2. develop, operate, and maintain a statewide 911 system. The Statewide 911 system is the public safety ESInet operated on behalf of the board by an independent contractor. The public safety ESInet receives all wireless 911 calls from every carrier and routes the call to the appropriate PSAP. The network is also used for Text to 911 Services. The Statewide 911 Board distributes funds to the county auditor in each of the 92 counties. The counties fiscal body (county council) has the statutory authority for the appropriation of funds. The executive branch (county commissioners) have the statutory authority to approve claims for payment from the appropriated funds. IC 36-8-16.7-38 (see 2a above) restricts the use of the 911 funds at the local level.”
KS	\$6,666,447.31	<p>“Collected 911 fees were utilized by the PSAPs for purchases totaling \$19,379,734.52 in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of 911 services – 2.65% of total expenditures Purchase of 911 equipment and upgrades – 19.04% of total expenditures Maintenance and license fees for 911 equipment – 29.52% of total expenditures Training of PSAP personnel – 1.26% of total expenditures Monthly recurring charges billed by service suppliers – 43.79% of total expenditures Installation, service establishment and nonrecurring start-up charges billed by the service supplier – 1.12% of total expenditures Charges for capital improvements and equipment or other physical enhancements to the 911 system – 2.62% of total expenditures The original acquisition and installation of road signs designed to aid in the delivery of emergency service – 0.00% of total expenditures <p>Additionally, the Council expended \$5,193,530.78 in state grant funds on the following statewide projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statewide NG911 System – 84.52% of total grant fund expenditures Council Admin and other expenses – 7.72% of total grant fund expenditures NG911 Program Management – 3.85% of total grant fund expenditures GIS and program technical support – 3.91% of total grant fund expenditures[.]”
KY	Unknown	<p>“The expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes by the Kentucky 911 Services Board is controlled by a statutory formula.”</p> <p>“The ‘organizations’ which receive the greatest share of funds are the local PSAPs, which have been certified by the Board as meeting the statutory and regulatory standards required to receive (and appropriately deliver) a wireless 911 call. Roughly 70% of the \$32 million collected annually is sent to PSAPs which is used to pay for operational costs, including payments to vendors for services or equipment, personnel costs and more as prescribed by regulation. These organizations are the guts of 911 service, answering the public’s 911 calls and dispatching the appropriate responder. Certified PSAPs include all 16 state police</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
		<p>posts throughout the state.”</p> <p>“Ten percent of funds received are deposited into a grant fund, awarded at the Board’s discretion for PSAP consolidation, emergency situations at the PSAP level as well as through an annual competitive process for equipment and/or services as allowed by 202 KAR 6:090. The Board has also used this grant program to direct PSAPs in need of 911 controller upgrades to Host/Remote solutions which allow for the consolidation of PSAP equipment while promoting autonomy in the physical PSAP.”</p> <p>“Roughly 2.5% of wireless funds expended by the Board go to Carriers for a mandated cost recovery program which allows companies to be reimbursed for approved invoices related to their costs for providing equipment used to deliver 911 calls.”</p> <p>“A 2.5% portion of funds collected from the state’s wireless 911 fee goes to pay the 911 Services Board administrative budget. Board members are not compensated but reimbursed for their expenses. This amount pays for staff salaries and basic office expenses. They are also used for contracts for 1) statewide mapping, 2) geo-audits of local PSAPs (QA), 3) legal expenses, 4) financial audits of the Board, PSAPs and wireless providers and 4) consulting services for the development of and migration to a statewide ESI Network (NG 911).”</p>	
LA	Unknown	Parish	Project
		Acadia	“Budgeted upgrade in 911 equipment such as telephone consoles, radio consoles and recording equipment which will be NG-911 Ready”
		Allen	“Working on Text-2-911; mapping system; upgrading computers”
		Ascension	“Equipment in place with possible roll-out to NG911 in 2019”
		Bienville	“CAD and 911 Phone equipment upgrade”
		Bossier	“Upgrading The West VIPER Telephone System with MapFlex and adding additional workstations allowing for inclusion of the Bossier Sheriff’s Dept. Communications Division.”
		Caddo	“In process of evaluating 3 proposals for purchase of NG911 system and equipment. Funds have been budgeted in 2018 for purchase”
		Calcasieu	“Upgrading Phone System to latest NG911 standards in 2018. NG-911 Compliant Computer Aided Dispatch System purchased in 2017”
		Cameron	“Upgrading Phone System to latest NG911 standards in 2018”
		East Baton Rouge	“Ongoing project to upgrade public safety radio backup system”
		Evangeline	“Texting and MMS lines into the 911 system; Training that is specific to NG-911 for dispatchers. Secondary PSAP for 911 system.”
		Iberia	“Procurement of NG-911 capable telephone system in 2018 at a cost of approx. \$450,000”
		Iberville	“[A]ccumulating funds to replace 911 equipment”
		Jefferson	“Implemented A911 I.P. Network NICE recorders”

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
		La Salle	“Currently looking at NG911 equipment demos and taking equipment quotes”
		Lafayette	“Installing a new NG911 West VIPER Telephone system with MapFlex, which provides better location accuracy and allows Text to 911, and a new NG911 CAD system and Mobile Data system for Public Safety Agencies in throughout the Parish. Transitioning to a broadband Automatic Vehicle Location system for Public Safety agencies.”
		Lafourche	“A 911 is an Emergency Services IP network that allows for the delivery of NG-911 functions.”
		Livingston	“Currently implementing Texting to 911”
		Madison	“Install new software and mapping upgrades”
		Natchitoches	“Currently in the final stages of construction of a co-located/consolidated emergency communications center. Hardened facility, COPS, sufficient to support multiple agencies.”
		Orleans	“Synchronization of GIS/MSAG/ANI databases begun in May, 2017 and on-going”
		Plaquemines	“Text to 911 capable”
		Pointe Coupee	“Possible new CAD system within the next 24 Months”
		Rapides	“Continue to upgrade new CAD & Vest equip.”
		Red River	“Text-to-911 - Obtaining Quotes on hardware/software upgrades from West regarding the implementation of text-2-911”
		Richland	“RPSS Implementation by Mid-year”
		Sabine	“Saving to purchase NG-911 and CAD equipment”
		St. Charles	“Implemented in 2017”
		St. Helena	“Negotiated interagency agreement with Tangipahoa to provide dispatch”
		St. Landry	“St. Landry Parish 911 has partnered with St Landry Parish Sheriff’s Office and is currently configuring a new CAD system in order to transmission to NG-911. Also, SLP 911 has recently signed a purchase agreement on an ANI/ALI system that is NG-911 Readyt.[sic]”
		St. Martin	“Upgrade 911 Telephone System”
		St. Tammany	“Yes, Constructing a new co-located 911 center with upgraded 911 equipment”
		Tangipahoa	“Continuation of 9-1-1 System Up Grade”
		Tensas	“Planning for upgrade in 2019”
		Terrebonne	“Upgrade of entire Parish-wide CAD System”
		Union	“Discussion w/U.P.S.O. to piggy -back their CAD System.”
		Vermilion	“Upgrade of Phone, CAD and Mapping within 2 years”
		Washington	“CPE Replacement in 2019”
		West Baton Rouge	“We are currently replacing our 9-1-1 system, work is continuing on a high availability/failover site and our cad is due to be upgraded this year”

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
		Winn	“Developing plan to replace current equipment.”
MA	\$37,707,058.00	<p>“Funds collected are made available to communities in Massachusetts for network, database and CPE; PSAP personnel; PSAP facilities; PSAP CAD and technology; dispatcher training; and PSAP supplies. These funds are made available to the communities by the State 911 Department directly purchasing, installing and maintaining enhanced 911 customer premises equipment used by communities at local and regional PSAPs and through the development, provisioning of training services, and administration of grant programs to assist PSAPs and regional emergency communications centers in providing enhanced 911 service and fostering the development of regional PSAPs, regional secondary PSAPs and regional emergency communications centers.</p> <p>M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B(f) states as follows: The [State 911] department shall disburse funds from the Enhanced 911 Fund for prudently-incurred expenses associated with: the lease, purchase, upgrade or modification of primary and regional PSAP customer premises equipment and the maintenance of such equipment; network development, operation and maintenance; database development, operation, and maintenance; training of 911 telecommunicators regarding the receipt and use of enhanced 911 service information; education of consumers regarding the operation, limitation, role and responsible use of enhanced 911 service; grants associated with enhanced 911 service as set forth in subsection (i) and any other grant approved by the [State 911] department associated with providing enhanced 911 service in the commonwealth; the recurring and nonrecurring costs of communication services providers in providing enhanced 911 service in the commonwealth to the extent required by federal or Massachusetts law or regulation or federal or Massachusetts agency decision or order; and other expenses incurred by the [State 911] department in administering and operating the enhanced 911 system in the commonwealth.</p> <p>The State 911 Department has established written guidelines for all grants administered under the authority of M.G.L. Chapter 6A, Section 18B (i) that allow communities to apply directly to the State 911 Department to receive grant funding for 911 related activities specified in that section. These Grant Guidelines are available on the State 911 Department's website at www.mass.gov/e911.”</p>	
MD	\$9,774,333.58	<p>“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.”</p>	
ME	\$5,208,037.00	<p>“The State of Maine has a statewide 911 system. In 2014 the system was upgraded to an end-to end NENA i3 aligned NG911 system. The Emergency Services Communication Bureau administers the program, which includes a contract for NG911 Services. This contract provides for a single NG911 system that serves every municipality and Indian Reservation in the state. It includes all network and database services, customer premise equipment at each of the 26 municipal, state or county Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), and 24 x 7 support and maintenance. There is no funding that flows through to the PSAPs or to municipalities, counties or state agencies for other purposes. For calendar year</p>	

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		2017, funds were expended for the following activities: Administrative expenses of the Emergency Services Communication Bureau Statewide Contract for NG911 Services Quality Assurance Program Community Addressing and Mapping Support Training for E911 Call Takers and Dispatchers including topics such as NG911 software certification and Basic Dispatcher Emergency Medical Dispatch training, software, and administrative costs Emergency Fire Dispatch training, software and administrative costs Reimbursement of telephone companies for ALI/LIS data base provisioning.”
MI	\$2,530,194.17	“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.”
MN	\$5,937,252.21	“Funds may be used by PSAPs to maintain and enhance public safety for public safety responders and citizens of Minnesota as follows: Lease, purchase, lease-purchase, or maintain enhanced 911 telephone equipment Lease, purchase, lease-purchase, or maintain [sic] enhanced 911 recording equipment Lease, purchase, lease-purchase, or maintain enhanced 911 computer hardware Computer hardware/software for database provisioning [sic], addressing, mapping and any other software necessary for automatic phone and location identification Trunk lines Master Street Address Guide Dispatcher operational skills and equipment proficiency [sic] Equipment in the PSAP for community alert systems Equipment [sic] necessary in the PSAP used to notify and communicate with emergency services requested by the 911[.]”
MS	Did Not Specify	“According to MS Code of 1972 Chapter 5 Section 19-5-313, the local board of supervisors has the authority to approve expenditures for 911 funding received. According to MS Code of 1972 Chapter 5 Section 19-5-333, the Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) distributes funds based on a distribution formula. According to MS Code of 1972 Chapter 5 Section 19-5-357, the MS Board of Emergency Telecommunicators Standards and Training (BETST) sets the training standards and requirements and are authorized to reimburse any expenses related to training to the designated agency or department.”

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
NC	\$32,110.00	<p>“The NC 911 Board provides funding of the collected 911 fee totally for the support of E911 within the State of North Carolina. Funds collected were allocated during calendar year 2017 to 115 primary PSAPs, 10 secondary PSAPs for their costs of providing E911 services in their jurisdictions, four CMRS providers for cost recovery of providing E911, 19 PSAPs in grants for the enhancement of their 911 systems, 3 Statewide grants to benefit all PSAPs in North Carolina and to the administrative fund of the NC 911 Board to pay for the costs of administering the 911 fund. In each allocation of collected 911 funds, the North Carolina general statutes clearly define that the expenditures must be in support of providing E911 services. Those expenditures are reviewed and approved by the 911 Board staff and the North Carolina State Auditor.”</p>
ND	\$1,707,850.16	<p>“Funds are collected and expended locally to support the equipment, staffing, networking, and support services for their 911 public safety answering points. The reporting discussed in 1b above is summarized biennially for the Legislature, illustrating how the funds generated by the fee authorized by state law have been used to support those PSAPs. This summary follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Dispatch Staffing 51% b. Dispatch Contracts 20% c. 911 System / Network 7% d. Equipment 6.5% e. Other Phone Charges 1% f. Facility/Utilities/Other 14.5%”
NJ	\$75,000.00	<p>“9--1--1 SYSTEM AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE FEE (thousands) The estimated revenue from the mobile telecommunications service and telephone exchange service fee in fiscal year 2018 totals \$134.3 million. In accordance with the enabling legislation (P.L.2004, c.48), these funds will be deposited into the 9-1-1 System and Emergency Response Trust Fund account and applied to offset a portion of the cost of related programs listed below:</p> <p>Department of Law and Public Safety Emergency Operations Center and Hamilton TechPlex Maintenance..... 3,773\$ [sic]</p> <p>Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness..... 9,478</p> <p>Rural Section Policing..... 53,398</p> <p>Urban Search and Rescue..... 1,000</p> <p>Division of State Police - Remaining Operating Budget..... 238,174</p> <p>Department of Military and Veterans' Affairs Military Services - National Guard Support Services..... 3,807</p> <p>Department of the Treasury Office of Emergency Telecommunication Services (OETS)..... 900</p> <p>Statewide 9-1-1 Emergency Telecommunication System..... 26,822</p> <p>Total, State Appropriations..... 337,352\$ [sic]”</p>
NV	\$1,147,810.33	<p>Carson City: “AT&T 911 System monthly charges VESTA phone system upgrade Firewall for VESTA Computer Aided Dispatch upgrade Recorder upgrade Law Enforcement Body Cameras Fire Department Tablets”</p> <p>Churchill County: “Funds were expended from our E911 fund to pay CC Communications for the ALI/ANI DBMS system they provided for the County for many years. This ALI/ANI was changed over in late 2017/early 2018 to an in-house system not affiliated with CC Communications. ALI/ANI provide address, GPS details for E911 Dispatch when callers call 911. We continue to pay CC Communications from this fund for the needed 911 trunk/phone lines.”</p> <p>Douglas County: “The 911 surcharge funds are used for the sole purpose of</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
		<p>replacement and maintenance of the E911 system.”</p> <p>Elko County: “Initial phase of the process was to contract with a consultant to identify options for 911 services. The intent was to focus on enhanced 911 or Next Gen. The Phase 1 report has been completed.”</p> <p>Humboldt County: “Fees used to pay for installation and GIS support for developing county map for use of the E911 mapping.”</p> <p>Lyon County: “Lyon County has used the telephone surcharge for the following uses from inception through December 31, 2017: 1) Mobile Data Terminals and associated hardware in Sheriff's vehicles. This allows Dispatch to communicate by computer and also have GPS coordinates of the vehicles. 2) Hosted 911 phone solution and associated telephone carrier costs. This allows Dispatch to receive 911 calls. 3) Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD system). This allows Dispatch to track and dispatch 911 calls and associated information with the calls. Lyon County uses sales tax, property tax, and federal PILT to fund salaries/benefits/services & supplies/capital outlay for all aspects of 911 that aren't being paid for under the telephone surcharge.”</p> <p>Pershing County: “Partially (half in 2017) pays for the cost of the 911 hardware and connections to the telephone company to make it work. Salary of 911 operators is not covered as they are paid under a different budget/funding source.”</p>	
OH	"Minimal administrative amount"	County	Description
		Auglaize	“A new 9-1-1 system from WestTel to include new dual servers, switches, position phones, land line data base, and battery backup system”
		Carroll	“Projected live date July/August 2018”
		Columbiana	“Countywide NG911 service was completed as part of the State of Ohio NG911 pilot project”
		Coshocton	“Received quotes from two vendors”
		Crawford	“Completed installation and setup of new 911 equipment”
		Cuyahoga	“We implemented county-wide, web based text to 911 in July, 2017. We will be upgrading to an i3 integrated system within the next few months.”
		Darke	“We upgraded our 911 equipment to Motorola Callworks in April 2017 but are NG911 ‘ready’”.
		Defiance	“We have the system in place but we have not deployed the system for everyday use.”
		Delaware	“Text to 9-1-1”
		Erie	“Text to 911 and mass notification. Neither project was completed or approved for 2017”
		Fayette	“Mapping enhancements only for 2017”
		Hamilton	“City of Cincinnati completed an upgrade to NG911 capable West Safety Services Viper Platform”
		Harrison	“In the process of implementing NG911, vendor: GDIT”
		Hocking	“IP911”

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
		Huron	“Currently participating in meetings and studies for Ohio’s NG-911 and awaiting implementation at the state level.”
		Jackson	“Yes - a contract for the Motorola Callworks IP-911 System was signed for equipment replacement.”
		Knox	“Decision made on new phone software. Implementation will be in 2018”
		Lake	“Updating Motorola 911 System PSAP.”
		Lawrence	“The second phase of the two part NG update was completed. The IP 911 part of Emergitech's update for NG 911 was completed which included changing the phone system to IP Networking with the cloud.”
		Lorain	“Plan to implement NG911 capable equipment in 2018”
		Lucas	“We converted the radio system to IP.”
		Mahoning	“We attempted [sic] to install an upgraded CAD hosted system, however we had issues with the vendor and are now looking for a new CAD system. Also began negotiations on a new NG911 system - Airbus/Vesta (contract almost completed)”
		Medina	“Upgrade to current NG911 due for completion end of year 2018”
		Mercer	“Text to 911 Implementation was underway in October 2017 and completed in April 2018”
		Miami	“Completed the process to be able to receive text-to-911.”
		Monroe	“Completed the build of a new 911 Center at the New County Jail”
		Montgomery	“Several PSAPs updated phones systems for NG capabilities.”
		Morgan	“Morgan County has been NG911 operational since July 14, 2014.”
		Pike	“November 2017 NG911 was ordered through Frontier using the ARC grant. This project should be complete in 2018”
		Portage	“Completed NG9-1-1 Hosted system in August 2017”
		Richland	“We upgraded our primary call answering software and moved our backup call answering equipment/software to a redundant site. We also increased the number of our incoming 911 trunk line.”
		Scioto	“As of late 2017 we have updated our system to NG911 through Frontier and CAD through Zurcher.”
		Seneca	“Sign contract, but not install”
		Shelby	“We are in the process of implementing a NG911 system”
		Stark	“Equipment upgrade for Motorola Patriot system (underway); Upgrade to New 911 Recording System (underway)”
		Summit	“The Summit County Office of Information Technology conducted a study to determine points of connectivity from the City of Akron to outside jurisdictions. Currently in the process of determining how each

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects	
			community can connect with at least two redundant points.”
		Union	“We’ve been part of the state Pilot project for several years. We are currently in talks with GDiT to deploy NG 9-1-1 through the state SOCC but we are stalled due to contracts/statement of work being in the prosecutors (sic) office. There is an issue with the indemnification clause.”
		Vinton	“Completed new next gen 911 system Emergency Call Works Motorola.”
		Washington	“Completed equipment upgrades to allow NG911. The system has been in place since October 2017 just need to start the process to request text to talk.”
		Wayne	“Finalizing connection between Wayne County and Ashland County.”
OR	\$321,717.20	“The 9-1-1 tax collected by the Department of Revenue . . . may only be spent by the state or the local jurisdiction on behalf of the Primary PSAP in order to provide access to 9-1-1 for the citizens of and visitors to the State of Oregon.”	
PA	Did Not Specify	“Per 35 Pa.C.S. § 5304, each county is to ensure the provision of a 911 system in the county's respective jurisdiction. A county may provide a 911 system to the county's jurisdiction through participation in a regional 911 system. Of the 911 revenue collected, eighty three (83) percent is directed to Pennsylvania's 69 PSAPs via quarterly formula based payments. Fifteen (15) percent shall be used to establish, enhance, operate or maintain statewide interconnectivity of 911 systems. All 911 surcharge revenue is restricted to 911 use only for 911 system operations, services and system enhancements. The political subdivisions that receive 911 funding in Pennsylvania are listed below: Adams County Dauphin County Monroe County Allegheny County Delaware County Montgomery County Armstrong County Elk County Montour County Beaver County Erie County Northampton County Bedford County Fayette County Northumberland County Berks County Forest County Perry County Blair County Franklin County Philadelphia County Bradford County Fulton County Pike County Bucks County Greene County Potter County Butler County Huntingdon County Schuylkill County Cambria County Indiana County Snyder County Cameron County Jefferson County Somerset County Carbon County Juniata County Sullivan County Centre County Lackawanna County Susquehanna County Chester County Lancaster County Tioga County City of Allentown Lawrence County Union County City of Bethlehem Lebanon County Venango County Clarion County Lehigh County Warren County Clearfield County Luzerne County Washington County Clinton County Lycoming County Wayne County Columbia County McKean County Westmoreland County Crawford County Mercer County Wyoming County Cumberland County Mifflin County York County”	
RI	\$39,405.60	“The State of Rhode Island Budget Office has indicated that 90% of funds collected are deposited into the state General Fund. 10% of all funds collected go to the State Information Technology Investment Fund in accordance with RIGL 42-11-2.5 and further authorized by RIGL 39-21.1-14 (d). The state General Fund finances 100% of the E-911 program.”	
SC	Did Not Specify	“The State of South Carolina disbursed \$26,828,138.46 from the CMRS 911 Phone Surcharge fund (wireless) to PSAPS and CMRS providers. The State of South Carolina reimbursed PSAPs a total of \$13,697,315.74 for the purchasing of 911 equipment, hardware and software and recurring charges associated with such equipment. An additional \$11,584,052.14 was distributed to the PSAPs based on	

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		each jurisdiction's total wireless 911 call volume. Finally, \$1,546,770.58 was distributed to CMRS providers for 911 equipment dedicated to providing wireless 911 service. The PSAPs and CMRS providers benefit from the reimbursements by providing them a means to upgrade and purchase new equipment to provide the best possible 911 service throughout the State of South Carolina.”
SD	\$4,171,754.00	“Personnel costs, CPE, CAD, radio, mapping, recorders, workstation equipment, training, consoles, HVAC, building rental maintenance, 911 trunks, uniforms – most any cost within the walls of the PSAP or directly related to operating 911 is allowable.”
TN	\$12,256,900.00	“All 911 funds collected in Tennessee are deposited in the state treasury in a separate interest-bearing fund known as the 911 Emergency Communications Fund. Disbursements from this fund are limited solely to the operational and administrative expenses of the TECB and the purposes as expressed in the state emergency communications laws, Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-101, et seq. See Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-303(d). Authorized operational and administrative expenditures include distribution of the base amount to each ECD, implementation and maintenance of an IP-based NG911 program, and funding to the Tennessee Regulatory Authority for the Tennessee relay services/telecommunications devices access program (TRS/TDAP), which provides assistance to those Tennesseans whose disabilities interfere with their use of communications services and technologies. The TECB annually distributes to each emergency communications district a base amount equal to the average of total recurring annual revenue the district received from distributions from the board and from direct remittance of 911 surcharges for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012. See Tenn. Code Ann. § 7-86-303(e). One sixth of the base amount for each district is distributed by the TECB bi-monthly. The base amounts for each district in the state can be found on the TECB website, http://www.tn.gov/commerce/section/e911 . During fiscal year 2017, a total of \$101,897,729 was collected from the 911 surcharge, including \$311,777 in interest. The Board had total expenditures of approximately \$116.8 million for the fiscal year. Payments to ECDs totaled \$101.6 million, constituting 99.7% of the total revenues collected and 87% of the total expenditures. Payments to ECDs included \$87.7 million for statutory distributions and \$13.9 million for non-recurring support programs The Board paid less than \$41,000 in cost recovery to carriers to operate, maintain or enhance the State's 911 network. Approximately \$11.4 million was expended for NG911 with \$580,000 of this paid to ECDs. Approximately \$3.2 million was expended for administration, including contracts with technical consultants and training. The Funding Modernization Act also requires the Board to reimburse the TRA for the Tennessee Relay Services/Telecommunications Devices Access Program. The Board reimbursed the TRA almost \$1.2 million for these services and programs. For calendar year 2017, the board collected \$84,050,532 in standard 911 fees and \$18,768,558 in prepaid fees. The board paid \$93,195,152 in operating revenue to the ECDS. It also provided \$2,024,157 in NG911 equipment and \$5,687,396 in equipment reimbursements through its grant programs. The board paid ANI/ALI reimbursements of \$81,998.”

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
TX	\$34,984,660.00	<p>“State Administered Activities, Programs, and Organizations:</p> <p>Activities</p> <p>STATEWIDE 9-1-1 SERVICE: Planning, developing, provisioning, and/or enhancement of 9-1-1 service.</p> <p>POISON CONTROL SERVICES: Maintain high quality telephone poison referral and related service, including community programs and assistance, in Texas.</p> <p>9-1-1 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION: Provide for the timely and cost effective coordination and support of statewide 9-1-1 service by CSEC, including regulatory proceedings, contract management and monitoring, and requirements contained in Health and Safety Code § 771.051.</p> <p>POISON PROGRAM MANAGEMENT: Provide for the timely and cost effective coordination and support by CSEC of the Texas Poison Control Network and service providers, including monitoring, administration of the telecommunications network operations, and the operations of Texas' six regional poison control call centers. Funded on a reimbursement basis solely out of collected equalization surcharge.</p> <p>EMERGENCY MEDICAL DISPATCH: Support the regional emergency medical dispatch resource center program.</p> <p>TRAUMA CARE SYSTEM: Support the emergent, unexpected needs of approved licensed providers of emergency medical services (EMS), registered first responder organizations, or licensed hospitals.</p> <p>NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1 TELEMEDICINE MEDICAL SERVICES PILOT PROJECT: Effective September 1, 2015, a pilot project to provide emergency medical services instruction and emergency prehospital care instruction through a NG9-1-1 telemedicine medical service provided by regional trauma resource centers to: (1) health care providers in rural area trauma facilities; and (2) emergency medical services providers in rural areas. (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.151 & 771.160.)</p> <p>Programs</p> <p>9-1-1 NETWORK OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT AND NG 9-1-1 IMPLEMENTATION: CSEC contracts with Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) or, on their behalf for the efficient operation of the state 9-1-1 emergency telecommunications system; provides the RPCs with contract authorization and funding for the replacement of equipment supporting Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) participating in the state's 9-1-1 program; and provides for the planning, development, transition and implementation of a statewide Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of 9-1-1 service.</p> <p>This program supports emergency communications and public health and safety by providing the network, equipment, database and administration necessary to provide 9-1-1 telecommunications service.</p> <p>NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1 IMPLEMENTATION: CSEC provides for the planning, development, transition, and implementation of a State-Level Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of 9-1-1 service. Functional activities include implementation of 1) a CSEC State-level digital 9-1-1 network, otherwise referred to as the emergency services internet protocol network (ESInet); 2) 9-1-1 geospatial database and data management; 3) NG9-1-1 applications and network security provisions; and, 5) standards-based system operations and procedures.</p> <p>This program supports emergency communications and public health and safety by providing a planned transition to NG9-1-1 to ensure existing 9-1-1 centers and public safety providers are able to provide emergency communications and service to the public with advances in communications devices and systems.</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		<p>REGIONAL POISON CONTROL CENTER OPERATIONS AND TEXAS POISON CONTROL NETWORK OPERATIONS: CSEC contracts with six RPCCs to provide poison control services and to assist in maintaining the Texas Poison Control Network. Citizens calling 1-800-222-1222, or a 9-1-1 call transferred from a PSAP, receive medical information to treat a possible poison or drug interaction before medical services are required to be dispatched. CSEC also contracts and funds the telecommunications services necessary to operate and maintain the poison control telecommunications network, including network, equipment and software to facilitate call delivery and treatment.</p> <p>This program supports an enhancement to 9-1-1 emergency communications and public health and safety by providing the network, equipment, databases, administration and staffing to provide poison control service to the public, first responders and health care facilities.</p> <p>REGIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL DISPATCH RESOURCE CENTER: The purpose of this program is to serve as a resource to provide pre-arrival instructions that may be accessed by selected public safety answering points that are not adequately staffed or funded to provide those services. (Health and Safety Code § 771.102.) PSAPs subscribe to emergency medical dispatch services provided by the resource center.</p> <p>This program supports 9-1-1 emergency communications and public health and safety with a resource for pre-arrival instructions when 9-1-1 calls originate from persons in remote or inaccessible areas to which the dispatch of emergency service providers may be difficult or take a long period of time.</p> <p>EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES AND TRAUMA CARE SYSTEMS: The purpose of the emergency medical services and trauma care system is to provide for the prompt and efficient transportation of sick and injured patients, after stabilization, and to encourage public access to that transportation in each area of the state. Equalization surcharge is used to fund the system, in connection with an effort to provide coordination with the appropriate trauma service area, the cost of supplies, operational expenses, education and training, equipment, vehicles, and cost of supplies, operational expenses, education and training, equipment, vehicles, and communications systems for local emergency medical services. (Texas Health & Safety Code § 773.112 (a), (c).)</p> <p>This program supports an enhancement to 9-1-1 emergency communications and public health and safety by enhancing the communications systems and response of local emergency medical service responders.</p> <p>NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1 TELEMEDICINE MEDICAL SERVICES PILOT PROJECT: Effective September 1, 2015, a pilot project to provide emergency medical services instruction and emergency prehospital care instruction through a NG9-1-1 telemedicine medical service provided by regional trauma resource centers to: (1) health care providers in rural area trauma facilities; and (2) emergency medical services providers in rural areas. (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.151 771.160.)</p> <p>Organizations</p> <p>COMMISSION ON STATE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS (CSEC): Established as a state agency under Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 771, CSEC is the state's authority on emergency communications and administers the state 9-1-1 program in which 9-1-1 service is provided by 22 Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs). CSEC is directly involved in the RPC provisioning of 9-1-1 service and in the planning, development, transition, and implementation of a State-Level Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) system.</p> <p>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS: Established under Texas Local Government Code, Chapter 391. Political subdivisions with whom CSEC is</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		<p>required to contract for the provision of 9-1-1 service.</p> <p>RPCs purchase goods and services that provision 9-1-1 service to PSAPs with state appropriated funds that are granted by CSEC.</p> <p>REGIONAL POISON CONTROL CENTERS: Texas Health and Safety Code Chapter 777 designates six regional centers for poison control in Texas. RPCCs provide 24-hour toll-free referral and information service for the public and health care professionals and provide community programs and assistance on poison prevention. Each PSAP in the state of Texas is required to have direct access to at least one poison center.</p> <p>EMERGENCY MEDICAL DISPATCH MONTGOMERY COUNTY HOSPITAL DISTRICT: Funds in the equalization surcharge dedicated account are appropriated to CSEC to partly fund the emergency medical dispatch program. (Texas Health and Safety Code § 771.106.) Appropriated funds are used by CSEC to contract with the Montgomery County Hospital District to operate and maintain the emergency medical dispatch resource center that provides services, on a subscription basis, to PSAPs in Texas.</p> <p>BUREAU OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF STATE HEALTH SERVICES: Funds in the equalization surcharge dedicated account are appropriated by the Texas Legislature directly to the Texas Department of State Health Services, and authorized to be used for the provision and coordination regional trauma services, which may include the cost of supplies, operational expenses, education and training, equipment, vehicles, and communications systems for local emergency medical services. (Texas Health and Safety Code § 773.112 (a) (c).)</p> <p>TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER: Funds in the equalization surcharge dedicated account are appropriated to CSEC to provide a grant to Texas Tech University Health Science Center (TTUHSC) to fund a pilot project to provide emergency medical services instruction and emergency prehospital care instruction through a NG9-1-1 telemedicine medical service provided by regional trauma resource centers to: (1) health care providers in rural area trauma facilities; and (2) emergency medical services providers in rural areas. \$250,000 for both fiscal years 2016 and 2017 have been appropriated for the pilot project. (Health and Safety Code §§ 771.151 771.160.)</p> <p>STATUTORY 772 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION DISTRICTS: The 772 ECD expenditures include ongoing contracts or expenses for Selective Routing, Automatic Location Identification, Customer Premises Equipment, Geographic Information Systems and Mapping, NG9-1-1 transition migration, IP and/or wireless networks, security, legal, regulatory, advocacy, accounting, auditing, emergency notification, training, employer/employee related amounts, and memberships or conferences that support 9-1-1 services and/or enhancements and sponsored by organizations such as the National Emergency Number Association, the Texas Emergency Number Association, and the ATIS Emergency Services Interconnection Forum (ESIF).</p> <p>MUNICIPAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION DISTRICTS (INCL. DALLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE): Municipal ECD expenditures are substantially used to purchase, install, maintain 9-1-1 equipment; and staff and operate PSAPs, including personnel salaries, training of call-takers, dues and subscriptions to professional organizations which enhance the development of 9-1-1 service. Additionally, 9-1-1 funds are used to pay for 9-1-1 network and 9-1-1 database maintenance costs, and reimbursing service providers costs incurred in providing 9-1-1 service. Funds are also used for location services, public education, emergency warning sirens/systems, emergency medical dispatch training and certification, and general support of a Municipal ECDs 9-1-1 division. 9-1-1 funds</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		are often only a minor part of the funding needed to provide 9-1-1 service or operate an emergency communications center.”
UT	\$948,266.90	“Regulations covering the oversight of distribution of the 71 cent fund are found in Utah Code Ann. § 69-2-301 Public safety answering point 911 emergency service account permitted use of funds. The Utah Tax Commission oversees how the collected 71 cent funds is made available for use for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 9-1-1. Regulations covering the oversight of the Unified Statewide 911 Emergency Service Account are found in Utah Code Ann. § 63H-7a-304.”
VA	\$2,225,000.00	“The Wireless E-911 Fund provides funding for the Virginia Information Technologies Agency’s Integrated Services Program (ISP). The ISP is a consolidated, centralized program for delivery of services to local government public safety and geospatial services. The ISP’s responsibilities fall into two primary categories: Public safety communications support, which includes support of the 9-1-1 Services Board, providing technical assistance to all PSAPs, planning for the future of E-911 and supporting the operation of the Virginia Emergency Operation Center (VEOC). Geospatial support, which includes support of the Virginia Geographic Information Network (VGIN) Advisory Board, coordination of enterprise geospatial services, and the establishment of a geospatial data clearinghouse and catalog. The ISP’s strategy is to focus on the following key components: A strong commitment to helping our constituents achieve their business-oriented success; An effective collaborative approach that leverages the Commonwealth’s economies of scale potentials that provides more cost effective solutions for small to mid-size state agencies and local government; and A governance model that is coordinated among all interested stakeholders including the Boards and professional associations. The services offered by the ISP fall into one of three categories: Consultative Services – Providing professional, unbiased technical assistance and consultation to customers. Governance Services – Coordinating with stakeholders to develop and promulgate standards and best practices to ensure that investments made by the Commonwealth are managed in an efficient and effective manner. Collaborative Services – Leading or supporting efforts that increase collaboration among local and state agencies that improve efficiency and the delivery of services to the citizens of the Commonwealth.”
VT	\$4,810,144.00	“Funds appropriated for 9-1-1 services in Vermont support the statewide 9-1-1 system. The State contracts with Consolidated Communications (formerly FairPoint) for a fully-hosted NG911 solution. The funds also support additional telecom circuits used as part of the 9-1-1 program; Enhanced 9-1-1 Board staff who work in support of the 9-1-1 program, including training, information technology, database, GIS/mapping, and administrative staff; and to pay a stipend to each of the six PSAPs to partially offset the cost of 24 call-taker seats distributed in those six PSAPs.”

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
WA	\$16,100,486.23	<p>“RCW 38.52.520 specifies the duties of the State of Washington E911 Coordination Office. Broadly, these duties include: Coordinating and facilitating the implementation and operation of enhanced 911 emergency communication systems throughout the state; Considering the base needs of individual counties for specific assistance, specify rules defining the purposes for which available state enhanced 911 funding may be expended, efforts to modernize their (counties) existing enhanced 911 emergency communications systems; and Enhanced 911 operational costs. RCW 38.52.540 further specifies that Moneys in the (state E911 fund) account must be used only to support the statewide coordination and management of the enhanced 911 system, for the implementation of wireless enhanced 911 statewide, for the modernization of enhanced 911 emergency communications systems statewide, and to help supplement, within available funds, the operational costs of the system, including adequate funding of counties to enable implementation of wireless enhanced 911 service and reimbursement of radio communications service companies for costs incurred in providing wireless enhanced 911 service pursuant to negotiated contracts between the counties or their agents and the radio communications service companies . Additionally, the state enhanced 911 coordinator, with the advice and assistance of the enhanced 911 advisory committee, is authorized to enter into statewide agreements to improve the efficiency of enhanced 911 services for all counties and shall specify by rule the additional purposes for which moneys, if available, may be expended from this account. During calendar year 2017, the State of Washington expended funds to provide the current statewide Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet), as well as build out and transition costs to a new NG911 ESInet II, county 911 operational and equipment replacement/modernization costs, statewide training programs for telecommunicators, statewide 911 planning and collaboration, and contracted legal assistance for the procurement of the new statewide NG911 network. Operational funding, provides assistance to qualifying local jurisdictions for the operation of county and state primary PSAPs including: salary and benefit support for telecommunicators, county 911 coordinators, MSAG, Mapping/GIS, Information Technology, public education and training; PSAP call-taking hardware / software maintenance; and modernization/replacement of authorized PSAP equipment to NG911 standard. Statewide training programs include: Telecommunicator training (basic and advanced), PSAP supervisor, Telecommunicator Emergency Response Team (TERT), Communications training officer (CTO) program, and TTY/TDD/Text-to-911 instruction; Funding to counties to support local telecommunicator training programs, county 911 coordinator training and national conference participation, and CTO trainer salary reimbursement.”</p>
WI	N/A	<p>“Each county and some municipalities in Wisconsin have entered into a contract with participating local exchange carriers to provide its 9-1-1 telecommunications network. These 9-1-1 contracts specify in detail the design of the telecommunications network supporting the local 9-1-1 service, authorizes a 9-1-1 surcharge to pay for expenses related to the network, and identifies the obligations of the parties to build, operate, and maintain the 9-1-1 telecommunications network. See Wis. Stat. 256.35(3)(b). The 9-1-1 network expenses are pooled and all telephone subscribers in a county pay the same amount for the 9-1-1 surcharge. The 9-1-1 contract identifies how much expense each participating local exchange carrier has incurred to provide and maintain the 9-1-1 telecommunications network, and in turn specifies how much money each participating carrier may take as compensation from the pooled 9-1-1 surcharge collection. Some counties have elected to purchase a separate telecommunications network for its wireless 9-1-1 service. The counties that have elected to purchase a separate wireless 9-1-1 network pay for that second network through the county and municipal budget. No</p>

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
		portion of the funds collected from the 9-1-1 surcharge is shared with any state, county, or municipal agency or department, or any other governmental entity. The 9-1-1 surcharge is limited to the recovery of the telecommunications network expense for providing the 9-1-1 service by the participating local exchange carriers. County and municipal expenses related to terminating and responding to 9-1-1 calls is paid for through the respective county and municipal budgets.”
WV	Did Not Specify	“These funds, when remitted to the PSCWV for distribution to the County Commissions of the State, are remitted in accordance with the provisions of W.Va. Code §2-6-6b(b),(c), and (d)(1). The PSCWV passes through all money it collects. The PSCWV does not charge an administrative fee or otherwise retain any portion of the money. One million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) is deposited annually in a fund administered by the PSCWV for redistribution in the form of grants for wireless tower construction subsidization. The funds are designed for the acquisition, equipping, and construction of new wireless towers in unserved areas that provide E911 service coverage and that might not be otherwise available because of marginal financial viability in the tower coverage area. Ten (10) cents of each 911/E911 fee is distributed to the West Virginia State Police to be used for equipment upgrades, for improving and integrating their communication efforts with those of the enhanced 911 systems. The telecommunications service providers retain a three-percent (3%) billing and collection fee before remitting the fees collected to the PSCWV. Five percent (5%) of the 911/E911 fee money remitted to the PSCWV is deposited in a special fund established by the Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management to be used solely for the construction, maintenance and upgrades of the West Virginia Interoperable Radio Project and any other costs associated with establishing and maintaining the infrastructure of the system. The expenditure of 911/E911 fees collected directly by the County Commissions through landline or VoIP telecommunications service provider and 911/E911 fees redistributed to the counties by the PSCWV is statutorily restricted. WV State Law specifies what Enhanced 911 fee revenues may be used for. This is found, for wireline fees, at W.Va. Code §7-1-3cc(b) and, for wireless fees, at W.Va. Code §§24-6-6b(d)(2) and 24-6-6b(g). Each county receives a quarterly disbursement of the funds collected by the PSCWV. See Answer in question D.2a for allowable expenditures.”
WY	Did Not Specify	“Funds collected from the 911 emergency tax imposed pursuant to this act shall be spent solely to pay for public safety answering point and service suppliers' equipment and service costs, installation costs, maintenance costs, monthly recurring charges and other costs directly related to the continued operation of a 911 system including enhanced wireless 911 service. Funds may also be expended for personnel expenses necessarily incurred by a public safety answering point. "Personnel expenses necessarily incurred" means expenses incurred for persons employed to: (i) Take emergency telephone calls and dispatch them appropriately; or (ii) Maintain the computer data base of the public safety answering point”
Other Jurisdictions		
DC	\$1,515,486.55	“The Fund was used solely to defray technology and equipment costs directly incurred by the District of Columbia and its agencies and instrumentalities in providing a 9-1-1 system and direct costs incurred by wireless carriers in providing wireless E9-1-1 service.”
PR	\$319,953.34	“Operating Expenses: - First Semester (Period January 1, 2017 to June 30, 2017) \$ 8,896,808.35 - Second Semester (Period July 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017) \$ 5,043,798.95 All disbursements made by the agency during the period from January 1 to December 31, 2017 with the receipts of the 911 charge were used for the operational expenses of our Bureau.”

State	Amount Spent	Description of Projects
Total	\$198,971,933.06	

46. **ESInet Deployments.** 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 2017.⁸⁸ 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. As detailed in Table 21, 16 states reported having deployed state-wide ESInets, 13 states reported having regional ESInets within the state, and 11 states reported local-level ESInets.⁸⁹

Table 21 – Type and Number of ESInets Deployed During Period Ending December 31, 2017

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	35	16	Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia	743
Regional ESInet	34	13	Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Washington	43

⁸⁸ ESInet deployment 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. 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.

⁸⁹ The following states indicated that they have both regional and local ESInets operating within the state: Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, Nevada, and Virginia.

Type of ESInet	Number of States/Jurisdictions Indicating PSAPs Connected to ESInets		States/Jurisdictions Responding YES	Total PSAPs Operating on ESInets
	No	Yes		
Local ESInet	38	11	Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Louisiana, Michigan, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Virginia	68

47. **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 2017. The Bureau also requested that respondents estimate the number of PSAPs that they anticipated would become text-capable by the end of calendar year 2018. Table 22 sets forth the information provided by 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Collectively, respondents reported 1381 PSAPs as being text-capable as of the end of 2017, and further reported that they anticipated an additional 1103 PSAPs would become text-capable by the end of 2018. For purposes of comparison, Table 22 also includes data from the FCC’s Text-to-911 Registry as of December __, 2018, which shows the number of PSAPs that the reporting jurisdictions have registered with the FCC as text capable.⁹⁰ 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 2018, 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 2018 may be considerably closer to the projected total in Table 22.

Table 22 – Text-to-911 Deployments

State	Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2017	No Response	Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2018	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2018	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 14, 2018
AK	0		2		2	0
AL	21		49		70	4
AR	8		Did Not Specify	1	8	13
AZ	1		28		29	28
CA	130		90		220	210
CO	51		9		60	62

⁹⁰ 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.

State	Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2017	No Response	Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2018	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2018	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 14, 2018
CT	0		109		109	107
DE	0		9		9	9
FL	38		89		127	35
GA	32		5		37	11
HI	8		N/A		8	9
IA	108		5		113	106
ID	24		16		40	32
IL	112		20		132	28
IN	91		0		91	91
KS	87		21		108	95
KY	4		20		24	4
LA	16		25		41	11
MA	0		4		4	0
MD	1		49		50	2
ME	2		22		24	49
MI	7		16		23	45
MN	13		25		38	15
MO	Unknown		Unknown		0	49
MS	11		15		26	0
MT	NA		NA		0	33
NC	92		23		115	84
ND	8		3		11	12
NE	17		37		54	12
NH	2		N/A		2	6
NJ	17		N/A		17	19
NM	0		0		0	0
NV	5		3		8	2
NY	23		26		49	32
OH	12		Unknown		12	11
OK	Unknown		Unknown		0	2
OR	18		12		30	21

State	Text-Capable PSAPs As of Year End 2017	No Response	Estimated Additional Text-Capable PSAPs Launched by Year End 2018	No Response	Total Estimated Text-Capable PSAPs by Year End 2018	Total Text-Capable PSAPs Listed in FCC Text to 911 Registry as of December 14, 2018
PA	40		55		95	27
RI	0		2		2	0
SC	15		Did Not Specify	1	15	18
SD	0		0		0	0
TN	0		5		5	1
TX	272		243		515	374
UT	12		20		32	20
VA	42		20		62	36
VT	6		N/A		6	6
WA	12		6		18	15
WI	7		5		12	9
WV	11		7		18	2
WY	2		2		4	4
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	None		None		0	0
DC	1		N/A		1	1
Guam	0		6		6	0
No. Mar.	Did Not Specify	1	Did Not Specify	1	0	0
PR	2		0		2	1
USVI	0		0		0	0
Totals	1,381	1	1,103	3	2,484	1,763

J. Cybersecurity Expenditures

48. The Bureau requested that states and jurisdictions provide information on whether they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2017 and, if so, the amounts of those expenditures. As represented in Table 23, 30 states, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands responded that they did not expend funds on PSAP-related cybersecurity programs. Fifteen states and the District of Columbia reported that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs in 2017. The Bureau additionally requested information on the number of PSAPs in each state or jurisdiction that implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs in 2017. Thirteen states and the District of Columbia reported that one or more of their PSAPs either implemented a cybersecurity

program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program. Fourteen jurisdictions indicated that their PSAPs did not implement or participate in cybersecurity programs. Twenty-seven states and the Northern Mariana Islands reported that they lacked data or otherwise did not know whether their PSAPs had implemented or participated in cybersecurity programs.

Table 23 – Annual Cybersecurity Expenditures

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2017				Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program.
	Yes	No	Reported	Amount	
			“Unknown”		
AK		X		N/A	
AL	X			Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify
AR		X		N/A	Unknown
AZ		X		N/A	
CA		X		N/A	Unknown
CO		X		N/A	Unknown
CT		X		N/A	Unknown
DE		X		N/A	
FL	X			\$265,130.00	52
GA		X		N/A	Unknown
HI		X		N/A	5
IA	X		X	Unknown	113
ID	X		X	Unknown	18
IL		X		N/A	
IN	X		X	Unknown	Unknown
KS	X		X	Unknown	9
KY		X			3
LA	X		X	Unknown	17
MA	X			Did Not Specify	Unknown
MD	X			\$15,000.00	24
ME	X		X	Unknown	26
MI				Did Not Specify	Unknown
MN	X			Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify
MO		X		N/A	Unknown
MS				N/A	
MT		X		N/A	N/A
NC		X		N/A	Unknown
ND		X		N/A	Did Not Specify
NE		X		N/A	Unknown

State	Jurisdictions reporting that they expended funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs during the annual period ending December 31, 2017				Number of PSAPs that either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program.
	Yes	No	Reported "Unknown"	Amount	
NH		X		N/A	Did Not Specify
NJ		X		N/A	
NM		X		N/A	Did Not Specify
NV			X	N/A	Unknown or Did Not Specify (varies by county)
NY		X		N/A	Did Not Specify
OH		X		N/A	41
OK		X		N/A	Unknown
OR		X		N/A	Unknown
PA	X		X	Unknown	Unknown
RI	X			\$65,235.69	2
SC		X		N/A	Did Not Specify
SD		X		N/A	
TN				Did Not Specify	Unknown
TX	X			\$724,885.00	Unknown
UT		X		N/A	
VA		X		N/A	Unknown
VT		X		N/A	Unknown
WA	X			\$300,000.00	61
WI				N/A	Unknown
WV		X		N/A	
WY		X		Did Not Specify	Unknown
Other Jurisdictions					
AS		X		N/A	None
DC	X			\$423,283.67	1
Guam		X		N/A	
No. Mariana Is.				Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify
PR		X		N/A	
USVI		X		N/A	
Total	16	34	8	\$1,793,534.36	372

49. 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)⁹¹ for networks that support one or more PSAPs. As detailed in Table 24, 17 states and the District of Columbia reported that they do adhere to the NIST Framework, four states and Guam reported that they do not, and 28 states, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands indicated they did not know.

Table 24 – 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	Reported “Unknown”
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
MO			X

⁹¹ See National Institute of Standards and Technology, Cybersecurity Framework, <http://www.nist.gov/cyberframework/> (last visited Nov. 20, 2018).

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.		
MS			
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
WY			X
Other Jurisdictions			
AS			X
DC	X		
Guam		X	
No. Mariana Is.			
PR			X
USVI			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.		
Totals	18	5	31

K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees

50. The Bureau 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, 40 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.

51. Utah reported that the state conducted a performance audit in 2017.⁹² Although the Utah report found that local 911 funds have been maintained and appropriately used, it identified several areas that could lead to more efficient use of 911 fees. For example, the report found that auditing collection of 911 fees is problematic due to the complexity of Utah’s tax system; local 911 fee collection process allows for inaccuracies in filings, resulting in insufficient payment of 911 fees by local telephone companies and inconsistent year-to-year filings; and the Department of Public Safety, which administers distribution of collected fees, could ensure more efficient 911 operation through consistent application of cost sharing among consolidated PSAPs and use of service contracts for dispatch services.⁹³

52. Some states indicate that measuring effectiveness lies with local organizations. Wisconsin reported that it has not undertaken a program to measure the effective utilization of 911/E911 fees and it does not know whether any county or municipality operating a PSAP in Wisconsin has implemented a program to measure or assess the effectiveness of its 911 service.⁹⁴

53. In December 2016, the Task Force on Optimal Public Safety Answering Point Architecture (Task Force), an expert advisory committee the Commission formed in 2014, completed its work on a comprehensive set of recommendations on actions that state, local, and tribal 911 authorities can take to optimize PSAP cybersecurity, network architecture, and funding.⁹⁵ Included in the Task Force’s report are 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. 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.

⁹² State of Utah, Office of the Auditor General, A Review of the Distribution and Use of Local 911 Surcharge Funds, Report to the Utah Legislature, Number 2016-08 (October 2016), https://le.utah.gov/audit/16_08rpt.pdf.

⁹³ *Id.* at 1-3.

⁹⁴ Wisconsin Response at 20.

⁹⁵ See FCC, Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture, <https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/advisory-committees/general/task-force-optimal-public-safety-answering-point> (last visited Nov. 21, 2018).

(continued....)

L. Public Comments on 2017 Ninth Annual Report

54. As in past reports, this section summarizes public comments received in response to the prior year's report. On February 8, 2018 the Commission issued a Public Notice seeking comment on the 2016 Ninth Annual Report and the sufficiency and accuracy of the reported information.⁹⁶ We received input from four commenters.⁹⁷

55. We sought comment on the sufficiency and accuracy of the information in the Report, including additional information concerning the specific impact, if any, that such diversion has had on the provision of 911 service in those states, and whether there have been any other instances of fee diversion by states or local jurisdictions not identified in the Report, including counties or other jurisdictions in states that have local or hybrid fee collection programs.⁹⁸ CTIA notes that seven states and territories did not respond to the Commission's inquiry, which may mean the monetary value of fee diversions in 2016 was greater than that identified in the Report.⁹⁹ In addition, CTIA relays that while the 2016 Report covered state-led fee diversions, it did not account for whether local jurisdictions that collect 9-1-1 fees are engaged in fee diversions.¹⁰⁰ Boulder Regional Emergency Telephone Service Authority (BRETSA) asserts that they have "inquired of regulators and provider-representatives alike as to how providers determine the number of 9-1-1 fees to collect on a broadband connection into an IP-PBX, [and] [n]ot only have neither the regulators or provider-representatives been able to provide an answer, but BRETSA has received inquiries from a broadband provider as to how it is to calculate the 9-1-1 fees it is to remit to BRETSA."¹⁰¹

56. BRETSA urges the Commission to establish "consistency among how competing providers are calculating, collecting and remitting 9-1-1 surcharges on broadband connections to IP-PBXs."¹⁰² BRETSA further asserts that "[t]he uncertainty as to the capability of broadband providers to determine use of their facilities connected to IP-PBXs, how they are calculating 9-1-1 fees, and how they could calculate 9-1-1 fees, can lead to inconsistent remittance of 9-1-1 fees and free-rider problems."¹⁰³ Lastly, BRETSA believes they are unable to identify "which VoIP providers are supplying service in its jurisdiction, let alone whether they are collecting and remitting 9-1-1 fees."¹⁰⁴ BRETSA expresses concern that they have "no way of knowing which over-the-top VoIP providers have customers in its jurisdiction unless they remit 9-1-1 fees."¹⁰⁵ BRETSA urges the Commission to shift "from service-based

⁹⁶ FCC Seeks Public Comment on Ninth Annual Report to Congress on State Collection and Distribution of 911 and Enhanced 911 Fees and Charges, Public Notice, 33 FCC Rcd 1195 (Feb. 27, 2018) (*Public Notice*), <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-seeks-comment-ninth-annual-911-fee-report>.

⁹⁷ The Commission received comments from the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc. (APCO), the Boulder Regional Emergency Telephone Service Authority (BRETSA), CTIA the Wireless Association, and the New Jersey Wireless Association.

⁹⁸ *Public Notice* at 1-2.

⁹⁹ CTIA at 3.

¹⁰⁰ *Id.*

¹⁰¹ BRETSA at 6.

¹⁰² *Id.*

¹⁰³ *Id.*

¹⁰⁴ *Id.*

¹⁰⁵ *Id.* at 7.

(continued....)

9-1-1 fees to connection-based 9-1-1 fees.”¹⁰⁶

57. We sought comment on potential ways to dissuade states and other jurisdictions from instituting 911 fee diversion.¹⁰⁷ CTIA extends support for the Commission to take more assertive measures against jurisdictions that have been diverting 9-1-1 fees.¹⁰⁸ New Jersey Wireless Association (NJWA) agrees with CTIA that the Commission must consider new actions to address misuse of 9-1-1 fees; however, they assert that implementation of the NET911 Act is best done by states.¹⁰⁹ BRETSA notes that Colorado is seeing decreases, even in jurisdictions with ongoing population growth, in remittance of 9-1-1 surcharges.¹¹⁰ They have been unable to determine the reason, and urge the Commission to “adopt regulations and/or develop information which will (i) make auditing of 9-1-1 fee remittances feasible for local and state authorities, (ii) identify whether there is under-remittance of 9-1-1 fees on prepaid service, and (iii) address application of 9-1-1 fee requirements to evolving technologies and markets.”¹¹¹ BRETSA asserts that auditing of service providers by local and state authorities is not cost effective, and thus the Commission should require “service providers report to the Commission on the 9-1-1 fees and taxes remitted to each jurisdiction in which they provide service, and the number of customers they have in each jurisdiction”¹¹²

58. We also sought comment on other mechanisms, including Commission action, which can create incentives for states and other jurisdictions to avoid diverting 911 fees to non-911 purposes.¹¹³ BRETSA argues 9-1-1 fees on prepaid wireless services “are grossly under-recovered based upon analysis of the Colorado Public Utilities Commission staff,” an assertion BRETSA notes is disputed by prepaid wireless providers who fail to release call volume data for individual states, and BRETSA asserts “states are unable to demonstrate that they are not receiving appropriate remittance of 9-1-1 fees.”¹¹⁴ BRETSA urges “[t]he Commission’s collection (i) from states of 9-1-1 fee remittance on prepaid service, and (ii) from prepaid service providers of usage and revenue data,” in order to allow individual states to determine the extent to which prepaid service providers contribute to under-remittance.¹¹⁵ BRETSA further requests that the Commission seek information regarding “(i) calculation of 9-1-1 fees as Multi-Line Telephone Systems evolve from analog PBXs to digital broadband Enterprise Communications Systems, (ii) application of 9-1-1 fees to over-the-top VoIP services, and (iii) preventing avoidance of 9-1-1 fees providing competitive advantages to providers of some services.”¹¹⁶

59. The Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc. APCO asserts the Commission should “clearly define NG9-1-1 as part of the information collection and to

¹⁰⁶ *Id.*

¹⁰⁷ *Public Notice* at 2.

¹⁰⁸ CTIA at 5 (“CTIA agrees with Commissioners O’Rielly and Rosenworcel that more assertive measures may be needed”).

¹⁰⁹ NJWA at 5.

¹¹⁰ BRETSA at 2.

¹¹¹ *Id.*

¹¹² BRETSA at 3.

¹¹³ *Id.*

¹¹⁴ BRETSA at 5.

¹¹⁵ *Id.*

¹¹⁶ *Id.*

(continued....)

request information about how states and their vendors are ensuring NG9-1-1 components are interoperable.”¹¹⁷ Similarly, CTIA recommends the Commission adopt guidelines as to what expenditures qualify as “in support of” 9-1-1 and NG911 and what expenditures do not.¹¹⁸ APCO asserts the Commission should revise its questions about NG911 services and expenditures to recognize additional, “non-traditional” architectural and technological options being made available and to seek more detailed information about the approaches states are taking to NG911.¹¹⁹ NJWA also asserts that clarification is needed as to the definition of NG911 services.¹²⁰ APCO suggests the commission define NG9-1-1 “as end-to end . . . 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 PSAP and first responders.”¹²¹

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE 2018 TENTH ANNUAL REPORT

60. 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.

¹¹⁷ APCO at 2.

¹¹⁸ CTIA at 5-6.

¹¹⁹ APCO at 4.

¹²⁰ NJWA at 4.

¹²¹ APCO at 3.

Appendix A

Summary of State Responses Regarding Collections During 2017 Annual Period

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service (2017 Annual Period)	Total 911 Funds Collected (2017 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes (2017 Annual Period)	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2017 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
AK	Local	Local	\$15,211,064.24	\$15,211,064.24	\$0.00	No	N/A	~
AL	State	Hybrid	\$114,430,061.00	\$114,271,364.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,732,375.00	1.52%
AR	State	State	\$19,354,097.00	\$16,991,893.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,969,841.48	11.59%
AZ	Hybrid	Hybrid	Did Not Specify	\$22,734,249.20	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
CA	State	Hybrid	\$78,848,130.00	\$76,916,882.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$4,200,000.00	5.46%
CO	Hybrid	0	\$2,988,847.00	\$58,574,919.00	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
CT	State	State	\$28,795,684.00	\$28,651,232.63	\$0.00	Yes	\$8,015,256.00	27.98%
DE	State	Hybrid	\$10,000,000.00	\$8,246,009.00	\$0.00	Yes	Did Not Specify	~
FL	State	Hybrid	\$216,197,313.00	\$114,480,142.55	\$0.00	Yes	\$7,784,855.00	6.80%
GA	Hybrid	Local	Unknown	\$14,969,525.01	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
HI	State	State	\$33,000,000.00	\$11,700,000.00	\$0.00	No	\$1,500,000.00	12.82%
IA	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$143,083,908.53	\$0.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$10,000,000.00	25.05%
ID	Hybrid	Local	Unknown	\$22,401,522.66	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
IL	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$159,726,140.00	\$169,572,608.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$289,739.00	17.22%
IN	State	Hybrid	\$186,103,074.31	\$87,125,936.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$15,000,000.00	17.22%
KS	State	Hybrid	\$82,647,906.12	\$22,900,621.48	\$0.00	Yes	\$6,666,447.31	29.11%
KY	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$116,658,319.64	\$59,093,366.56	\$0.00	Yes	Unknown	~

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service (2017 Annual Period)	Total 911 Funds Collected (2017 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes (2017 Annual Period)	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2017 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
LA	Hybrid	Local	\$83,387,707.77	\$88,718,074.86	\$0.00	Yes	Unknown	~
MA	State	State	\$60,451,924.00	\$102,917,091.13	\$0.00	Yes	\$37,707,058.00	36.64%
MD	State	State	\$123,766,277.78	\$55,852,809.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$9,774,333.58)	~
ME	State	State	\$7,817,544.00	\$8,452,998.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,208,037.00	61.61%
MI	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$204,410,171.77	\$103,526,157.22	\$0.00	Yes	\$2,530,194.17	2.44%
MN	State	State	\$77,151,432.56	\$77,151,432.56	\$0.00	Yes	\$5,937,252.21	7.70%
MO	Local	Local	Unknown	~	\$0.00	No	N/A	~
MS	Local	Local	\$52,650,630.81	\$31,533,679.85	\$0.00	Yes	Did Not Specify	~
MT	State	Local	Unknown	\$13,000,000.00	\$2,000,000.00	Yes	N/A	~
NC	State	State	\$119,989,333.00	\$82,891,066.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$32,110.00	0.03%
ND	Hybrid	Local	\$19,020,064.44	\$14,607,294.27	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,707,850.16	11.69%
NE	Hybrid	Hybrid	Unknown	\$8,282,773.53	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
NH	State	Local	\$13,095,148.56	\$15,427,021.51	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
NJ	State	State	Unknown	\$121,909,000.00	\$309,630,000	Yes	\$75,000.00	0.06%
NM	State	State	\$11,153,582.74	\$11,203,573.90	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
NV	Local	Local	\$4,581,620.00	\$2,291,101.90	\$1,311,432.00	Yes	\$1,147,810.33	50.10%
NY	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$1,231,436,410.00	\$189,094,916.24	\$179,094,916.24	Yes	N/A	~
OH	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$319,864,026.77	\$39,736,488.85	\$0.00	Yes	"Minimal administrative amount"	~
OK	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$70,000,000.00	\$34,986,975.30	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
OR	State	State	\$139,764,099.00	\$43,919,835.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$321,717.20	0.73%

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service (2017 Annual Period)	Total 911 Funds Collected (2017 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes (2017 Annual Period)	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2017 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
PA	State	Hybrid	\$355,739,764.00	\$316,592,551.00	\$0.00	Yes	Did Not Specify	~
RI	State	State	\$5,377,000.00	\$16,817,000.00	\$11,397,030.00	Yes	\$39,405.60	0.23%
SC	Hybrid	Hybrid	Did Not Specify	\$30,108,370.75	\$0.00	Yes	Did Not Specify	~
SD	State	Hybrid	\$25,815,851.00	\$13,087,266.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$4,171,754.00	31.88%
TN	State	Hybrid	\$105,452,052.00	\$102,819,090.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$12,256,900.00	11.92%
TX	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$219,623,860.00	\$219,673,860.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$34,984,660.00	15.93%
UT	State	Hybrid	\$64,000,000.00	\$23,485,454.13	\$0.00	Yes	\$948,266.90	4.04%
VA	State	Hybrid	Unknown	\$86,909,858.44	\$0.00	Yes	\$2,225,000.00	2.56%
VT	State	State	\$4,810,144.00	\$5,981,135.00	\$0.00	Yes	\$4,810,144.00	80.42%
WA	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$155,000,000.00	\$98,653,163.15	\$0.00	Yes	\$16,100,486.23	16.32%
WI	Did Not Specify	None	Unknown	\$0.00	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
WV	Hybrid	Hybrid	\$52,542,784.00	\$60,189,650.00	\$3,982,242.00	Yes	Did Not Specify	2.56%
WY	State	Local	Unknown	Unknown	\$0.00	Yes	According to Title 16, Chapter 9 of the Wyoming State Statutes for the emergency Telephone Service Act, Wyoming does not assign oversight responsibility to a state-level agency for 9-1-1 services. (16-9-102(a)(iv).	~
AS	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	Unknown	None	\$0.00	Did Not Specify	None	~

State/Other Jurisdiction	Type of Fund Collection	Authority to Approve 911 Expenditures	Total Estimated Cost to provide 911 Service (2017 Annual Period)	Total 911 Funds Collected (2017 Annual Period)	Total Funds Used for Non-911 Related Purposes (2017 Annual Period)	NG911 Funding Permissible under 911/E911 Funding Authority	Total Funds Used for NG911 (2017 Annual Period)	NG911 Expenditures as a Percentage of Total Funds Collected
DC	State	Hybrid	\$48,111,409.81	\$11,428,063.63	\$0.00	Yes	\$1,515,486.55	13.26%
Guam	State	State	\$1,390,274.00	\$2,209,374.00	\$0.00	Yes	N/A	~
Northern Mariana Islands	Did Not Specify	Did Not Specify	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Did Not Specify	\$0.00	~
PR	State	State	\$13,940,607.30	\$19,889,005.73	\$0.00	No	\$319,953.34	1.61%
USVI	State	State	\$3,169,181.61	Did Not Specify	\$1,238,628.40	No	N/A	~

Appendix B

Overview of Total State 911 Fees - 2009 To 2017 Reports¹²²

State	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report
AK	DNP	\$8,199,046	\$8,649,083	\$12,320,888	\$12,256,620	\$12,448,651	\$13,969,231	\$12,837,114	\$11,595,445	\$15,211,064.24
AL	\$60,465,104	\$29,857,571	\$28,680,846	\$28,401,585	\$28,401,585	\$41,974,724	\$108,787,856	\$116,440,103	\$115,944,883	\$114,271,364.00
AR	\$24,799,338	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	\$25,290,790	\$26,985,555	\$20,161,873	\$22,734,249.20
AZ	\$15,056,353	\$17,460,160	\$16,238,766	\$16,747,691	\$16,445,301	\$16,628,695	\$17,589,404	\$19,227,222	\$20,389,514	\$16,991,893.00
CA	\$106,817,447	\$101,450,093	\$100,000,000	\$85,952,018	\$82,126,695	\$75,714,948	\$97,077,234	\$87,838,234	\$79,648,535	\$76,916,882.00
CO	\$45,000,000	\$45,000,000	\$45,000,000	\$1,907,087	\$42,900,000	\$42,900,000	\$52,257,085	\$52,732,731	\$53,987,426	\$58,574,919.00
CT	\$20,116,091	\$21,397,573	\$20,723,228	\$22,413,228	\$24,001,890	\$35,755,788	\$37,176,000	\$32,564,308	\$1,658,219	\$28,651,232.63
DE	DNP	\$2,259,728	\$8,044,859	\$8,775,757	\$7,623,392	\$7,786,659	\$8,159,730	\$8,159,730	\$8,718,169	\$8,246,009.00
FL	\$130,962,053	\$125,531,674	\$123,059,300	\$122,550,767	\$108,896,142	\$107,884,715	\$108,324,754	\$108,226,957	\$111,799,871	\$114,480,142.55
GA	DNP	\$8,537,319	\$8,950,569	\$13,700,097	DNP	\$18,462,645	\$17,538,556	\$17,659,037	\$19,840,298	\$14,969,525.01
HI	\$8,842,841	\$9,578,764	\$9,544,397	\$9,755,031	\$10,020,045	\$9,599,983	\$10,489,700	\$10,237,032	\$10,634,306	\$11,700,000.00
IA	\$29,054,622	\$31,458,531	\$31,304,377	\$30,664,253	\$30,297,168	\$20,657,733	\$27,820,552	\$40,547,767	\$39,849,592	\$39,920,992.23
ID	\$19,191,410	\$18,673,809	\$18,013,902	\$17,013,000	\$19,313,000	\$20,768,995	\$20,879,778	\$20,952,379	\$22,456,722	\$22,401,522.66
IL	DNP	\$67,000,000	\$69,700,000	\$71,900,000	\$69,200,000	\$71,200,000	\$213,983,628	\$95,500,349	\$234,070,304	\$169,572,608.00
IN	\$71,000,000	\$39,600,000	\$30,000,000	DNP	\$69,515,800	\$73,114,656	\$72,075,593	\$79,108,858	\$86,865,020	\$87,125,936.00
KS	DNP	\$6,705,539	DNP	\$22,125,937	\$20,477,020	\$20,573,217	\$20,337,748	\$20,821,974	\$19,193,708	\$22,900,621.48
KY	\$23,569,921	\$22,979,828	\$54,900,000	\$56,500,000	\$55,700,000	\$53,506,843	\$53,920,232	\$53,500,000	\$111,089,076	\$59,093,366.56
LA	DNP	DNP	\$3,017,672	Did Not File	\$4,912,926	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$42,750,000	\$66,235,990	\$88,718,074.86

¹²² “DNP” indicates that the state or jurisdiction filed a report but did not provide the information.

State	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report
MA	DNP	\$69,694,702	\$75,125,185	\$73,408,835	\$73,677,263	\$74,561,728	\$74,947,715	\$95,508,773	\$117,883,899	\$102,917,091.13
MD	\$57,176,923	\$55,556,616	\$54,560,255	\$52,099,601	\$52,240,761	\$51,716,232	\$54,766,848	\$53,314,406	\$53,974,012	\$55,852,809.00
ME	\$6,664,062	\$6,108,985	\$7,786,855	\$8,416,235	\$8,342,459	\$8,034,327	\$8,340,150	\$8,402,473	\$8,506,670	\$8,452,998.00
MI	\$69,835,672	\$93,000,132	\$87,673,893	\$196,215,849	\$181,204,131	\$178,224,826	\$88,932,891	\$93,333,483	\$102,388,366	\$103,526,157.22
MN	\$51,281,641	\$51,269,514	\$58,821,937	\$58,654,182	\$62,353,897	\$62,056,116	\$61,446,108	\$62,110,858	\$76,542,107	\$77,151,432.56
MO	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	DNP
MS	\$11,758,733	DNP	\$56,335,986	\$60,813,014	\$65,290,042	\$58,175,490	\$31,280,357	\$26,510,538	\$31,884,472	\$31,533,679.85
MT	\$13,172,462	\$13,172,462	\$13,715,064	\$13,626,940	\$13,177,752	\$13,099,542	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	Did Not File	\$13,000,000.00
NC	\$84,613,672	\$87,367,015	\$80,001,662	DNP	\$69,424,897	\$71,688,784	\$78,161,246	\$81,135,377	\$81,801,499	\$82,891,066.00
ND	DNP	\$8,369,366	DNP	\$9,506,000	\$9,506,000	\$9,998,322	\$10,337,907	\$10,337,907	\$12,814,683	\$14,607,294.27
NE	\$13,278,907	\$5,507,240	\$8,128,042	\$14,808,421	\$15,555,734	\$15,663,631	\$13,940,368	\$13,900,448	\$14,061,973	\$8,282,773.53
NH	\$10,854,203	DNP	\$9,832,831	Did Not File	\$10,493,486	\$10,467,787	\$10,582,269	\$12,317,418	\$15,288,598	\$15,427,021.51
NJ	\$130,000,000	\$128,900,000	Did Not File	\$125,000,000	\$126,000,000	\$121,000,000	\$120,000,000	\$122,632,000	\$122,150,000	\$121,909,000.00
NM	\$12,786,328	\$12,073,923	\$13,081,062	\$13,424,002	\$12,028,770	\$11,970,079	\$11,600,163	\$11,146,012	\$10,919,490	\$11,203,573.90
NV	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	\$2,010,342	\$1,944,447	DNP	\$1,591,367	\$437,144	\$2,291,101.90
NY	\$83,700,000	DNP	\$193,194,759	\$194,787,113	\$190,281,716	\$183,219,891	\$185,513,240	\$185,262,082	Did Not File	\$189,094,916.24
OH	\$28,544,924	\$28,164,050	\$29,175,929	DNP	\$28,837,121	\$25,689,296	\$25,736,970	\$40,382,365	\$44,720,083	\$39,736,488.85
OK	DNP	Did Not File	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	Did Not File	\$34,986,975.30
OR	\$87,447,640	\$40,155,054	\$39,592,560	\$39,370,086	\$39,229,319	\$39,115,990	\$39,470,386	\$39,470,386	\$42,832,475	\$43,919,835.00
PA	\$190,239,805	\$116,656,193	\$194,554,260	\$192,297,459	\$184,044,508	\$192,779,782	\$190,711,113	\$239,800,218	\$315,963,650	\$316,592,551.00
RI	\$19,400,000	\$18,200,000	\$15,488,729	Did Not File	\$16,500,000	\$17,454,000	\$17,640,703	\$16,345,364	\$14,021,695	\$16,817,000.00
SC	\$22,000,000	DNP	\$21,988,052	\$22,215,748	\$28,948,882	\$27,690,958	\$28,458,896	\$39,054,282	\$40,880,762	\$30,108,370.75
SD	DNP	DNP	\$8,100,000	\$8,200,000	\$9,111,476	\$13,275,031	\$13,095,234	\$13,093,702	\$12,976,019	\$13,087,266.00
TN	\$51,536,089	\$55,965,000	\$58,500,000	\$94,497,881	\$60,852,140	\$98,199,801	\$67,404,840	\$78,729,854	\$102,699,664	\$102,819,090.00

State	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report	Report
TX	\$197,228,796	\$203,547,360	\$199,025,787	\$209,202,098	\$212,788,623	\$213,215,483	\$208,478,516	\$222,938,735	\$223,315,125	\$219,673,860.00
UT	\$23,366,301	\$2,724,374	\$23,909,566	\$23,070,307	\$26,188,051	\$29,354,710	\$24,572,000	\$27,130,872	\$27,162,203	\$23,485,454.13
VA	DNP	\$52,022,170	\$53,217,635	\$54,079,487	\$51,658,843	\$55,212,204	\$85,187,560	\$85,431,606	\$86,028,766	\$86,909,858.44
VT	\$4,832,374	\$5,487,046	\$4,605,803	\$4,993,132	\$5,416,336	\$4,628,027	DNP	\$6,256,658	\$6,170,851	\$5,981,135.00
WA	\$69,523,163	\$71,036,718	\$71,244,435	\$100,952,115	\$95,417,114	\$95,887,087	\$91,529,550	\$94,445,461	\$95,242,119	\$98,653,163.15
WI	\$9,602,745	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	\$0.00
WV	\$32,278,728	\$33,760,563	\$35,375,580	\$36,176,377	\$37,928,204	\$58,001,075	\$56,323,471	\$56,649,322	\$56,340,460	\$60,189,650.00
WY	\$6,700,000	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	Unknown
Other Jurisdictions										
AS	DNP	DNP	DNP	DNP	Did Not File	Did Not File	DNP	DNP	Does Not Collect Fees	Does Not Collect Fees
DC	\$12,744,103	\$12,714,347	\$12,700,000	DNP	\$12,064,842	\$13,700,000	\$10,488,988	\$12,189,231	\$11,354,347	\$11,428,063.63
Guam	\$1,468,363	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$1,779,710	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$2,209,374.00
No. Mariana Islands	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$0.00
PR	\$20,952,459	\$21,876,277	Did Not File	\$21,367,260	\$20,323,324	\$19,507,889	Did Not File	\$21,896,789	Did Not File	\$19,889,005.73
USVI	Did Not File	\$590,812	\$554,245	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	Did Not File	\$1,297,671	\$1,416,865	Did Not Specify
Total	\$1,877,863,272	\$1,749,609,554	\$2,002,117,111	\$2,149,689,191	\$2,322,983,616	\$2,404,510,788	\$2,527,625,361	\$2,631,705,009	\$2,763,916,948	\$2,937,108,458.51

Appendix C

State 911 Fees by Service Type

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
AK	Wireline	\$2.00	X			
	Wireless	\$2.00	X			
	Prepaid	N/A				
	VoIP	N/A				
	Other					
AL	Wireline	\$1.75	X			
	Wireless	\$1.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.75	X			
	VoIP	\$1.75	X			
	Other	\$1.75	X			
AR	Wireline	An 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.)	DNS			
	Wireless	\$0.65	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.65 (per transaction at point of sale)	X			
	VoIP	\$0.65		X		
	Other	Did Not Specify				X
AZ	Wireline	\$.20 per month for each activated wire service account	X			
	Wireless	\$.20 per month for each activated wireless service account	X			
	Prepaid	.80 of one percent from the retail sale of wireless services. Retailer can retain 3% prior to submittal	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	VoIP	Same as wireline services	X			
	Other	None				
CA	Wireline	.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	Wireless	.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	Prepaid	.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	VoIP	.75 of 1% of Intrastate Voice Revenue	X			
	Other	N/A				X
CO	Wireline	\$0.45 to \$1.75 per access line per month		X		
	Wireless	\$0.45 to \$1.75 per access line per month		X		
	Prepaid	1.4% of retail sales	X			
	VoIP	\$0.45 to \$1.75 per access line per month		X		
	Other	N/A				X
CT	Wireline	\$0.58 / \$0.47	X			
	Wireless	\$0.58 / \$0.47	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.58 / \$0.47	X			
	VoIP	\$0.58 / \$0.47	X			
	Other					X
DE	Wireline	60 cents per line	X			
	Wireless	60 cents per line	X			
	Prepaid	60 cents per line	X			
	VoIP	60 cents per line	X			
	Other					X
FL	Wireline	\$0.40	X			
	Wireless	\$0.40	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.40	X			
	VoIP	\$0.40	X			
	Other		X			
GA	Wireline	\$1.50/month		X		
	Wireless	\$1.50/month		X		
	Prepaid	\$0.75/per transaction		X		
	VoIP	\$1.50/month		X		

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Other					X
HI	Wireline	\$0.27 per connection per month			Hawaiian Telecom Bill & Keep	
	Wireless	\$0.66 per connection per month		X		
	Prepaid	none				X
	VoIP	\$0.66 per connection per month		X		
	Other					
IA	Wireline	\$1.00		X		
	Wireless	\$1.00	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.51		X		
	VoIP	\$1.00/line/month	X			
	Other					X
ID	Wireline	\$1.00 or \$1.25			X	
	Wireless	\$1.00 or \$1.25			X	
	Prepaid	2.5% Point of sale each transaction			X	
	VoIP	\$1.00 or \$1.25			X	
	Other					X
IL	Wireline	\$1.50 state outside Chicago or \$5.00 in Chicago			X	
	Wireless	\$1.50 state outside Chicago or \$5.00 in Chicago			X	
	Prepaid	3% state outside Chicago or 9% in Chicago			X	
	VoIP	\$1.50 state outside Chicago or \$5.00 in Chicago				X
	Other	N/A				X
IN	Wireline	\$1.00	X			
	Wireless	\$1.00	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.00 per transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00	X			
	Other	\$1.00	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
KS	Wireline	\$0.60 per subscriber account		X		
	Wireless	\$0.60 per subscriber account		X		
	Prepaid	1.20% of total retail		X		
	VoIP	\$0.60 per subscriber account		X		
	Other	\$0.60 per subscriber account		X		
KY ¹²³	Wireline	\$2.01		X		
	Wireless	\$0.70	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.93	X			
	VoIP	\$2.01		X		
	Other	\$2.01		X		
LA	Wireline	Up to 5% of Tariff Rate on Exchange		X		
	Wireless	Up to \$1.25 for all Parishes except for Jefferson Parish		X		
	Prepaid	4% Point of Sale	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00		X		
	Other	N/A				X
MA	Wireline	\$1.00 per month	X			
	Wireless	\$1.00 per month	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.00 per month	X			
	VoIP	\$1.00 per month	X			
	Other					X
MD	Wireline	\$1.00			X	
	Wireless	\$1.00			X	
	Prepaid	\$0.60			X	
	VoIP	\$1.00			X	
	Other	N/A				X
ME	Wireline	\$0.45	X			

¹²³ Kentucky's rate for wireline and VoIP services was calculated by averaging the local 911 fees of Kentucky counties. Excluded from that calculation were counties that charge (1) 17% of the base telephone rate (Boyd County); (2) \$45 annually per occupied business/residence (Campbell County); (3) \$0.25 collected on monthly water bill (in addition to the landline fee that was included in calculation) (Garrard and Lincoln counties); (4) \$60 annually per real estate parcel (Kenton County); (5) \$75 annually per real estate parcel (Martin County); and (6) 3% of toll (Wolfe County).

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Wireless	\$0.45	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.45	X			
	VoIP	\$0.45	X			
	Other					
MI	Wireline	\$0.19 State* \$0.20 to \$3.00 Local *\$0.19 changed to \$0.25 May 8, 2018			X	
	Wireless	\$0.19 State* \$0.20 to \$3.00 Local *\$0.19 changed to \$0.25 May 8, 2018			X	
	Prepaid	1.92% State** **1.92% changed to 5% March 8, 2018	X			
	VoIP	\$0.19 State* \$0.20 to \$3.00 Local *\$0.19 changed to \$0.25 May 8, 2018			X	
	Other	N/A				X
MN	Wireline	\$0.95	X			
	Wireless	\$0.95	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.95	X			
	VoIP	\$0.95	X			
	Other					X
MO	Wireline	None/Unknown				
	Wireless	None/Unknown				
	Prepaid	None/Unknown				
	VoIP	None/Unknown				
	Other	None/Unknown				
MS	Wireline	\$1.00 residential/\$2.00 commercial per line		X		
	Wireless	N/A				X
	Prepaid	N/A				X
	VoIP	\$1.00 per line		X		
	Other	.05 per line	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
MT	Wireline					X
	Wireless					X
	Prepaid					X
	VoIP					X
	Other	\$1.00 per subscriber line per month	X			
NC	Wireline	\$0.60	X			
	Wireless	\$0.60	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.60	X			
	VoIP	\$0.60	X			
	Other					X
ND	Wireline	\$1.50-\$2.00		X		
	Wireless	\$1.50-\$2.00		X		
	Prepaid	2.5% of gross receipts @ point of sale	X			
	VoIP	\$1.50-\$2.00		X		
	Other					X
NE	Wireline	\$.50/\$1.00		X		
	Wireless	\$0.45	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.01	X			
	VoIP	\$.50/\$1.00		X		
	Other					X
NH	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75	X			
	Other					X
NJ	Wireline	\$.90/Monthly	X			
	Wireless	\$.90/Monthly	X			
	Prepaid	None	X			
	VoIP	\$.90/Monthly	X			
	Other	None				X
NM	Wireline	\$.51 per line per month	X			
	Wireless	\$.51 per line per month	X			
	Prepaid	1.38% of each retail transaction	X			
	VoIP	\$.51 per line per month	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Other					X
NV	Wireline	Varies by County but prevailing rate seems to be \$0.25 per line \$2.50 per trunk of 10 lines		X		
	Wireless	Varies by County but prevailing rate seems to be \$0.25 per line \$2.50 per trunk of 10 lines		X		
	Prepaid	Varies by County but prevailing rate seems to be \$0.25 per line \$2.50 per trunk of 10 lines		X		
	VoIP	Varies by County but prevailing rate seems to be \$0.25 per line \$2.50 per trunk of 10 lines		X		
	Other	Varies by County but prevailing rate seems to be \$0.25 per line \$2.50 per trunk of 10 lines				X
NY	Wireline	\$ 0.35 or \$ 1.00			X	
	Wireless	\$0.30 or \$1.20			X	
	Prepaid	\$0.30 (effective Dec. 1, 2017) \$0.90 (effective Dec. 1, 2017)			X	
	VoIP	\$ 0.35 or \$ 1.00			X	
	Other	NA				X
OH	Wireline			X		
	Wireless	\$0.25	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.0005	X			
	VoIP					X
	Other			X		
OK	Wireline	Up to 15% of the base tariff rate		X		
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Other					X
OR	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	Wireless	\$0.75	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.75	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75	X			
	Other					X
PA	Wireline	\$1.65		X		
	Wireless	\$1.65	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.65	X			
	VoIP	\$1.65	X			
	Other					X
RI	Wireline	\$1.00/month per device	X			
	Wireless	\$1.26/month per device	X			
	Prepaid	2.5% at point of sale	X			
	VoIP	Included in wireless	X			
	Other	None				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/line	X			
	Wireless	\$1.25/line	X			
	Prepaid	2% point of sale	X			
	VoIP	\$1.25/line	X			
	Other	None				X
TN	Wireline	\$1.16	X			
	Wireless	\$1.16	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.16	X			
	VoIP	\$1.16	X			
	Other	\$1.16	X			
TX	Wireline	\$0.50 ECDs: Res: \$0.20 - \$1.56 Bus: \$0.46 - \$7.20 Bus. Trunk: \$0.50 to \$7.56.	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	Wireless	\$0.50	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.02	X			
	VoIP	Wireline rates applicable.	X			
	Other	State equalization surcharge: \$0.06/month per local exchange access line access line or wireless telecommunications connection (excluding connections that constitute prepaid wireless telecommunications service).	X			
UT	Wireline	\$0.80			X	
	Wireless	\$0.80			X	
	Prepaid	1.90%			X	
	VoIP	\$0.80			X	
	Other	\$0.80			X	
VA	Wireline	\$0.75	X			
	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	By Agreement	X			
	Other	N/A				X
WA	Wireline	\$.25 state / \$.70 county per month			X	
	Wireless	\$.25 state / \$.70 county per month			X	
	Prepaid	\$.25 state / \$.70 county per month			X	

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	VoIP	\$.25 state / \$.70 county per month			X	
	Other					X
WI	Wireline	Varies by county	Participating local exchange carriers			
	Wireless	None				
	Prepaid	None				
	VoIP	None				
	Other					
WV	Wireline	Varies by county; the average rate for all counties is \$3.01		X		
	Wireless	\$3.34 per wireless line	X			
	Prepaid	6% Tax	X			
	VoIP	Varies by county; the average rate for all counties is \$3.01		X		
	Other					X
WY	Wireline	\$0.75		X		
	Wireless	\$0.75		X		
	Prepaid	\$0.02	X			
	VoIP	\$0.75		X		
	Other	Up to \$0.75 per line established county-by-county				X
Other Jurisdictions						
AS	Wireline	None				
	Wireless	None				
	Prepaid	None				
	VoIP	None				
	Other	None				
DC	Wireline	\$0.76 per line	X			
	Wireless	\$0.76 per line	X			
	Prepaid	2% of the sales price per retail transaction occurring in the District, including sales made over the internet.	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	VoIP	\$0.76 for each line, trunk, or path	X			
	Other	\$0.62 per Centrex line in the District of Columbia and \$0.62 per private branch exchange station in the District of Columbia	X			
Guam	Wireline	\$1.00 monthly per acct.	X			
	Wireless	\$1.00 monthly per acct.	X			
	Prepaid	\$1.00 monthly per acct.	X			
	VoIP	N/A				X
	Other	N/A				X
Northern Mariana Islands	Wireline	None				
	Wireless	None				
	Prepaid	None				
	VoIP	None				
	Other	None				
PR	Wireline	\$0.50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	Wireless	\$0.50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	Prepaid	\$0.50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			

State	Service Type and Fee		Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance			
	Type	Fee	State	Local	Combo or Other	None
	VoIP	\$0.50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and government subscribers	X			
	Other	\$0.50 a month for residential subscribers, nonprofit and religious organizations \$1.00 for commercial, professional and -government subscribers	X			
USVI	Wireline	\$2.00	X			
	Wireless	\$2.00	X			
	Prepaid	\$2.00	X			
	VoIP	\$2.00	X			
	Other	Did Not Specify				X

Appendix D

FCC Information Collection Questionnaire

**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

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, 2017:**

PSAP Type ¹²⁴	Total
Primary	
Secondary	
Total	

- 2. Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators¹²⁵ 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	
Part-time	

- 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 (\$)	

¹²⁴ 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.

¹²⁵ 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.

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	
Wireless	
VoIP	
Other	
Total	

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.

--

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.

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

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

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

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

1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.		
Jurisdiction	Authority to Approve Expenditure of Funds (Check one)	
	Yes	No
State	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local (e.g., county, city, municipality)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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.)		

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. 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.**

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personnel Costs	Telecommunicators' Salaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Training of Telecommunicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative Costs	Program Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Travel Expenses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dispatch Costs	Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grant Programs		<input type="checkbox"/> If YES, see 2a.	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.			

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, 2017, 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 (VoIP)	
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, 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? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4a. If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.		

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

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

Question	Yes	No
<p>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></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Amount of Funds (\$)</p>	<p>Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. <i>(Add lines as necessary)</i></p>	

H. 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? <i>Check one.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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>		

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? <i>Check one.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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>		

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? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1a. If YES, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:		

Question	Yes	No
2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2017, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs? <i>Check one.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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, 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 type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Local (e.g., county) ESInet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Regional ESInets	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>
Name of Regional ESInet:				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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, 2017.

--

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?	
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?	

J. 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"/>	

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?	

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.**