**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:

1. **Filing Information**
2. **Name of State or Jurisdiction**

|  |
| --- |
| **State or Jurisdiction** |
| Colorado |

1. **Name, Title and Organization of Individual Filing Report**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| Daryl Branson | State 911 Program Manager | Colorado Public Utilities Commission |

1. **Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**
2. **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, 2018:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PSAP Type[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Total** |
| Primary | 83 |
| Secondary | 5 |
| **Total** | 88 |

1. **Please provide the total number of active telecommunicators[[2]](#footnote-2) in your state or jurisdiction that were funded through the collection of 911 and E911 fees during the annual period ending December 31, 2018:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of Active Telecommunicators** | **Total** |
| Full-Time | 589 (extrapolated from partial survey responses) |
| Part-time | 16 (extrapolated from partial survey responses) |

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2018, please provide an estimate of the total cost to provide 911/E911 service in your state or jurisdiction.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Amount****($)** | We are unable to provide an answer to this question.  |

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

|  |
| --- |
| 911 expenses are locally controlled and public safety answering points are not required to report expenses to the State 911 Program Manager. A survey of the PSAPs did not yield sufficient data points to provide an estimate. |

1. **Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Service** | **Total 911 Calls** |
| Wireline | 247,792 |
| Wireless  | 5,911,601 |
| VoIP | 189,710 |
| Other | 80,652 |
| **Total** | 6,429,755 |

1. **Description of Authority Enabling Establishment of 911/E911 Funding Mechanisms**
2. **Has your State, or any political subdivision, Indian tribe, village or regional corporation therein as defined by Section 6(f)(1) of the NET 911 Act, established a funding mechanism designated for or imposed for the purposes of 911 or E911 support or implementation (please include a citation to the legal authority for such mechanism)?** *Check one.*
* Yes ………………….. [x]
* No ………………..….. [ ]

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

|  |
| --- |
| CRS § 29-11- 102 and 102.5 |

**1b. If YES, during the annual period January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018, did your state or jurisdiction amend, enlarge, or in any way alter the funding mechanism.**

|  |
| --- |
| No. |

1. **Which of the following best describes the type of authority arrangement for the collection of 911/E911 fees?** *Check one*.
* The State collects the fees ………………………………….. [ ]
* A Local Authority collects the fees ……………………….. [ ]
* A hybrid approach where two or more governing bodies

 (*e.g.*, state and local authority) collect the fees …………….. [x]

1. **Describe how the funds collected are made available to localities.**

|  |
| --- |
| Surcharge funds derived from landlines, contract wireless, and VoIP lines are remitted directly to local 911 Authorities by the carriers. Prepaid surcharge fees are assessed at point-of- sale on the purchase of wireless minutes and remitted to the Colorado Department of Revenue. Those funds are distributed to local governments using a formula based on wireless call volume as a percentage of total wireless calls received in the state. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.**
 |
| **Jurisdiction** | **Authority to Approve** **Expenditure of Funds*****(Check one)*** |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| State | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |
| Local (*e.g.*, county, city, municipality) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **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.)** |
| Local governing bodies may expend all collected 911 surcharge fees for any of the purposes outlined inCRS § 29-11- 104. |

1. **Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? *Check one*.**
* Yes ………………….. [x]
* No ………………..….. **[ ]**

**2a.** **If you checked YES, provide a legal citation to the funding mechanism of any such criteria.**

|  |
| --- |
| CRS § 29-11-104 |

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

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

1. **Description of Uses of Collected 911/E911 Fees**
2. **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.**

|  |
| --- |
| A comprehensive list cannot be provided by the state, as spending authority rests in the hands of 58 separate local 911 governing bodies, and each may spend funds as they see fit within the authority of CRS § 29-11-104. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Please identify the allowed uses of the collected funds. *Check all that apply*.**
 |
| **Type of Cost** | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Operating Costs** | Lease, purchase, maintenance of customer premises equipment (CPE) (hardware and software) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of computer aided dispatch (CAD) equipment (hardware and software) | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of building/facility | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Personnel Costs** | Telecommunicators’ Salaries | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Training of Telecommunicators | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Administrative Costs** | Program Administration | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Travel Expenses | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Dispatch Costs** | Reimbursement to other law enforcement entities providing dispatch | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Lease, purchase, maintenance of Radio Dispatch Networks | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **Grant Programs** |  | **[ ]** **If YES, see 2a.** | **[x]**  |
| **2a. During the annual period ending December 31, 2018, describe the grants that your state paid for through the use of collected 911/E911 fees and the purpose of the grant.** |
| N/A. |

1. **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 | 50¢ to $2.00 per access line per month | Local authority |
| Wireless | 50¢ to $2.00 per access line per month | Local authority |
| Prepaid Wireless | 1.4% of retail sales | State |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | 50¢ to $2.00 per access line per month | Local authority |
| Other | N/A | N/A |

1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2018, please report the total amount collected pursuant to the assessed fees or charges described in Question F 1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Type** | **Total Amount Collected ($)** |
| Wireline | $17,430,424 (extrapolated based on partial survey response from local 911 governing bodies) |
| Wireless | $48,798,711 (extrapolated based on partial survey response from local 911 governing bodies) |
| Prepaid Wireless | $2,484,586 |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) | $5,530,083 (extrapolated based on partial survey response from local 911 governing bodies) |
| Other | N/A |
| **Total** | $74,243,804 (estimated) |

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

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

1. **Please identify any other sources of 911/E911 funding.**

|  |
| --- |
| Generally, any portion of PSAP equipment or operations not funded by 911 surcharges is paid for by local governments participating in the operation of a public safety answering point. State or federal grants may also be received for certain 911-related projects, though this is relatively rare. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2018, were any 911/E911 fees that were collected by your state or jurisdiction combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **4a.** **If YES, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.** |
| 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **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 | We are unable to answer this question since we were unable to determine an estimate of the total cost to support 911 in the state. |
| Local 911 Fees |  |
| General Fund - State |  |
| General Fund - County |  |
| Federal Grants |  |
| State Grants |  |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2018, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism?** *Check one*.
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **1a.** **If NO, please identify what amount of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes were made available or used for any purposes other than the ones designated by the funding mechanism or used for purposes otherwise unrelated to 911 or E911 implementation or support, including any funds transferred, loaned, or otherwise used for the state's general fund. Along with identifying the amount, please include a statement identifying the non-related purposes for which the collected 911 or E911 funds were made available or used.** |
| **Amount of Funds ($)** | **Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. (*Add lines as necessary*)** |
|  | NOTE: All purchasing decisions are made by local 911 governing bodies pursuant to § 29-11-104, C.R.S. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. **Oversight and Auditing of Collection and Use of 911/E911 Fees**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Has your state established any oversight or auditing mechanisms or procedures to determine whether collected funds have been made available or used for the purposes designated by the funding mechanism or otherwise used to implement or support 911?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **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, 2018.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* |
| Local 911 governing bodies are subject to audit requirements covering all local governments, per § 29-1-601 et seq, C.R.S. Additionally, each local 911 governing body must include a description of their use of funds collected in their audit, and a copy of each audit report must be made available on the governing body’s website if it has one, per § 29-11-104 (5), C.R.S.No enforcement or corrective action has been required or undertaken. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **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.*
 | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |
| **2a. If YES, provide a description of any auditing or enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2018.** *(Enter “None” if no actions were taken.)* |
| While the state does not have authority to audit service providers regarding the amount of 911 fees collected and whether that amount matches the number of subscribers for that provider, local 911 governing bodies may, at their own expense, require an annual audit of the service supplier’s books and records concerning the collection and remittance of the 911 surcharge funds (§ 29-11-103(3)(b), C.R.S.). |

1. **Description of Next Generation 911 Services and Expenditures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **Does your state or jurisdiction classify expenditures on Next Generation 911 as within the scope of permissible expenditures of funds for 911 or E911 purposes?** *Check one.*
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |
| **1a. If YES, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:** |
| NG911 is not specifically cited as an authorized expense, but § 29-11-104(2)(a)(I)(A), C.R.S. authorizes expenditures of 911 surcharge funds for “costs of equipment directly related to the receipt and routing of emergency calls and installation thereof.” Furthermore, § 29-11-104 (2)(a)(I)(E), C.R.S. authorizes expenditure on “Other costs directly related to the continued operation of the emergency telephone service and the emergency notification service.” These authorizations being technology-neutral, expenditure of 911 surcharge funds on NG911 products and services are allowed. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** |
| 1. **In the annual period ending December 31, 2018, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs?** *Check one.*
 | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |
| **2a. If YES, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.** |
| **Amount****($)** | No funds have been spent by the state in preparation for NG911. According to partial responses to a survey of local 911 governing bodies, they have spent in excess of $12,050,472 in preparation for NG9-1-1 in local equipment and network upgrades, although not all of that will have been expended in 2018. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **For the annual period ending December 31, 2018, 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** |
| 1. A single, state-wide ESInet
 | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  |  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| 1. Local (*e.g.*, county) ESInet
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  |  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| 1. Regional ESInets
 | **[ ]**  | **[x]**  | [If more than one Regional ESInet is in operation, in the space below, provide the total PSAPs operating on each ESInet] | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet: |  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Name of Regional ESInet: |  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

1. **Please provide a description of any NG911 projects completed or underway during the annual period ending December 31, 2018.**

|  |
| --- |
| A tariff to provide ESInet services was filed with the Commission in 2017, and approved on December 28, 2018. Migration of every PSAP to a statewide ESInet is scheduled to commence starting in October of 2019, and complete in October of 2020.It is unknown what local NG911 projects may have been completed or underway by the end of 2018. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs****Accepting Texts** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2018, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?**
 | 59 |
| **Question** | **Estimated Number of PSAPs****that will Become Text Capable** |
| 1. **In the next annual period ending December 31, 2018, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?**
 | 12 |

1. **Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Check the appropriate box** | **If Yes,****Amount Expended ($)** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2018, did your state expend funds on cybersecurity programs for PSAPs?**
 | Yes[ ]  | No**[x]**  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Total PSAPs** |
| 1. **During the annual period ending December 31, 2018, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cybersecurity program or participated in a regional or state-run cybersecurity program?**
 | In statewide surveys, 65 PSAPs answered “yes” the question “Does your PSAP have a cybersecurity program in place?” |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Yes** | **No** | **Unknown** |
| 1. **Does your state or jurisdiction adhere to the National Institute of Standards and Technology *Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* (February 2014) for networks supporting one or more PSAPs in your state or jurisdiction?**
 | **[x]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

1. **Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**
2. **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.**

|  |
| --- |
| Colorado’s incumbent 911 System Service Provider filed a tariff to provide Emerency Services IP Network (ESInet) service statewide in 2017, and that tariff was approved by the Colorado Public Utilities Commission in 2018 (See Decision R18-1063). Per the ESInet tariff, the first PSAPs will be migrated from the 911SSP’s legacy 911 network to the ESInet in October 2019, with the last ones scheduled for migration in October 2020. This is a significant achievement and a first step toward true Next Generation 911. An ESInet Users Group is being formed to direct future development of the ESInet into an NG911 System.A 911 Diversity Working Group is also meeting regularly, under direction from the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, to formulate a plan and pricing mechanism for improving 911 network diversity statewide.In September 2018, the Colorado Public Utilities Commission issued the first annual State of 911 Report, now required under § 29-11-131, C.R.S. A copy of the 2017-2018 State of 911 Report is attached.As in previous editions of this report, the State of Colorado notes that the questions in this report make it difficult to account for local expenditures. 911 in Colorado is primarily a local service. |

1. A Primary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are routed directly from the 911 Control office. A secondary PSAP is one to which 911 calls are transferred from a Primary PSAP. *See* National Emergency Number Association, Master Glossary of 9-1-1 Terminology (*Master Glossary*), Apr. 13, 2018, at 162, available at <https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nena.org/resource/resmgr/standards/NENA-ADM-000.22-2018_FINAL_2.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A telecommunicator, also known as a call taker or a dispatcher, is a person employed by a PSAP who is qualified to answer incoming emergency telephone calls and/or who provides for the appropriate emergency response either directly or through communication with the appropriate PSAP. *See* *Master Glossary* at 192. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)