



**Mayor Garret Nancolas — Chairman**  
Idaho Association of Cities  
(208) 455-3011, [gnancolas@ci.caldwell.id.us](mailto:gnancolas@ci.caldwell.id.us)

**Rep. Rick Youngblood**  
Idaho Legislature  
(208) 412-5107, [ryoungblood@house.idaho.gov](mailto:ryoungblood@house.idaho.gov)

**Colonel Ralph Powell**  
Idaho State Police  
(208) 884-7001, [ralph.powell@isp.idaho.gov](mailto:ralph.powell@isp.idaho.gov)

**Chief Scot Haug – Vice Chairman**  
Idaho Chiefs of Police Association  
(208) 773-6364, [scot@postfallspolice.com](mailto:scot@postfallspolice.com)

**Lan Smith**  
Idaho Association of Counties  
(208)365-1754, [lsmith5833@msn.com](mailto:lsmith5833@msn.com)

**Sheriff Len Humphries, Fremont County**  
Idaho Sheriffs Association  
(208) 624-4482, [lhumphries@co.fremont.id.us](mailto:lhumphries@co.fremont.id.us)

**Sheriff Craig Rowland, Bingham County**  
Idaho Sheriffs Association  
(208)-782-3047, [crowland@co.bingham.id.us](mailto:crowland@co.bingham.id.us)

**Chief David Gates**  
Idaho Fire Chiefs Association  
(208) 234-6204, [dgates@pocatello.us](mailto:dgates@pocatello.us)

**Dan Goicoechea**  
Idaho Technology Authority, Chairman  
(208) 334-3100, [dgoicoechea@sco.idaho.gov](mailto:dgoicoechea@sco.idaho.gov)

**Michele Carreras, Treasurer**  
Idaho State EMS Communications Center  
(208) 846-7621, [carreram@dhw.idaho.gov](mailto:carreram@dhw.idaho.gov)

**Brad Richy**  
Director, Idaho Office of Emergency Management  
(208) 422-3001, [brichy@bhs.idaho.gov](mailto:brichy@bhs.idaho.gov)

**Sheriff Ben Wolfinger, Kootenai County**  
DIGB 1  
(208) 446-1300, [bwolfinger@kcgov.us](mailto:bwolfinger@kcgov.us)

**Chief Travis Myklebust, Lewiston**  
DIGB 2  
(208) 791-2083, [TMyklebust@CityofLewiston.org](mailto:TMyklebust@CityofLewiston.org)

**Carmen Boeger, Nampa City**  
DIGB 3  
(208) 318-2259, 208-465-2257  
[boegerc@cityofnampa.us](mailto:boegerc@cityofnampa.us)

**John Moore, SIRCOMM**  
DIGB 4  
(208) 324-1344, [john@sircomm.com](mailto:john@sircomm.com)

**Sheriff Lorin Nielsen, Bannock County**  
DIGB 5  
(208) 236-7116, [sheriff@bannockcounty.us](mailto:sheriff@bannockcounty.us)

**Captain Samuel Hulse, Bonneville County**  
DIGB 6  
(208) 317-8419, (208) 529-1350x1106  
[shulse@co.bonneville.id.us](mailto:shulse@co.bonneville.id.us)

**Wes Jones, Shoshone-Bannock Tribe**  
Idaho Tribal Representative  
(208) 237-0137, [wjones@sbtribes.com](mailto:wjones@sbtribes.com)

June 27, 2017

Mr. Tim May  
Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Annual Information Collection Mandated by the New and  
Emerging Technologies Improvement Act of 2008

Dear Mr. May:

In response to your letter addressed to Governor Otter, and the information requested in that letter, the Idaho Public Safety Communications Commission (IPSCC) submits the attached NET911 Fee Report Questionnaire for the State of Idaho.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide you information about 9-1-1 and E9-1-1 funding in Idaho. If the IPSCC or I can be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Garret Nancolas, Chairman  
Idaho Public Safety Communications Commission

Cc: Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter, State of Idaho  
Attachment: NET911 Fee Report Questionnaire OMB 3060 1122





Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

Annual Collection of Information

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

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

**A. Filing Information**

**1. Name of State or Jurisdiction**

| State or Jurisdiction |
|-----------------------|
| Idaho                 |

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

| Name            | Title    | Organization                                     |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| Garret Nancolas | Chairman | Idaho Public Safety<br>Communications Commission |



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**B. Overview of State or Jurisdiction 911 System**

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

| PSAP Type <sup>1</sup> | Total     |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Primary                | 46        |
| Secondary              | 3         |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>49</b> |

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

| Number of Active Telecommunicators | Total   |
|------------------------------------|---------|
| Full-Time                          | Unknown |
| Part-time                          | Unknown |

Note: The state does not have access to the number of Telecommunicators as that data and number is maintained at the local PSAP level typically at the County level. This data has to be requested of each PSAP and we may or may not get that data depending upon the choice at the local level.

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

|                    |                                   |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Amount (\$)</b> | Unknown at aggregated State Level |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|

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

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



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

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 14 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.

4. Please provide the total number of 911 calls your state or jurisdiction received during the period January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2016.

| Type of Service | Total 911 Calls                   |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Wireline        |                                   |
| Wireless        |                                   |
| VoIP            |                                   |
| Other           |                                   |
| <b>Total</b>    | Unknown at Aggregated State Level |

**4a. Note: 14 of 46 PSAPs Responded and not all PSAPs are tracking or were able to pull the requested data for the state report.**

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

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

- Yes .....  X
- No .....

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

In 1988 the Idaho Legislature passed the Emergency Communication Act, Title 31, Chapter 48 to authorize funding to support implementation of consolidated emergency



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

communications systems through the governance of Idaho counties or by the creation of 9-1-1 service areas. All 9-1-1 fee collections are done at the county level with the exception of the five (5) cities that were providing 9-1-1 services prior to the enactment of the statute. These cities are given allocations by the counties in which they are located or collect fees directly from the providers.

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

No.

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

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

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

The authority to approve the expenditure of 9-1-1 funds in the State of Idaho is controlled at the county level by the boards of county commissioners or a joint powers board pursuant to Idaho Code §31-4809. The statute provides as follows:

“The county treasurer of each county or the administrator for a 911 service area in which an emergency communications system has been established pursuant to this chapter shall establish a fund to be designated the emergency communications fund in which all fees collected pursuant to this chapter, including fees distributed pursuant to section [31-4818\(6\)](#), Idaho Code, shall be deposited and such fund shall be used exclusively for the purposes of this chapter. The moneys collected and the interest earned in this fund shall be appropriated by the county commissioners, or governing board, for expenses incurred by the emergency communications system as set forth in an annual budget prepared by the joint powers board, or in their absence, the county commissioners and incorporated into the annual county budget.”



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

|   |  |                          |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| <b>1. Indicate which entities in your state have the authority to approve the expenditure of funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes.</b>  |  |                          |
| <b>Jurisdiction</b>   | <b>Authority to Approve Expenditure of Funds<br/>(Check one)</b> |                          |
|   | <b>Yes</b>   | <b>No</b>                |
| State   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <b>x</b>                 |
| Local<br>(e.g., county, city, municipality)   | <b>x</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>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.)</b>  |  |                          |
| <p>“The moneys collected and the interest earned in this fund shall be appropriated by the county commissioners, or governing board, for expenses incurred by the emergency communications system as set forth in an annual budget prepared by the joint powers board, or in their absence, the county commissioners and incorporated into the annual county budget.”</p> |  |                          |

**2. Has your state established a funding mechanism that mandates *how* collected funds can be used? Check one.**

- Yes .....
- No ..... **x**

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

The counties are mandated by statues other than the Emergency Communications Act to perform annual audits on all county funds. The emergency communications funds or 9-1-1 funds are accounted for separately under an emergency communications fund but are included in the county audit process. A third party auditor conducts the annual audits for the counties at the county level. The counties are governed by a wide array of state statutes and administrative rules in the process and content of the audits.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

The counties are mandated by statutes other than the Emergency Communications Act to perform annual audits on all county funds. The emergency communications funds or 9-1-1 funds are accounted for separately under an emergency communications fund but are included in the county audit process. A third party auditor conducts the annual audits for the counties at the county level. The counties are governed by a wide array of state statutes and administrative rules in the process and content of the audits.

**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.**

All funds are received at the local level. The only money received at the State level is through the 25 cent grant fund and prepaid monies. Both are given back out in a lump sum (prepaid) or grants (grant fund) for PSAP's requesting funding to upgrade 911 hardware and software to make systems Next Generation ready.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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





Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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 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. Thirty-eight Idaho counties have begun assessing the enhanced fee.

**F. Description of 911/E911 Fees Collected**

| <b>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.</b> |                                     |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Service Type</b>   | <b>Fee/Charge Imposed</b>           | <b>Jurisdiction Receiving Remittance<br/>(e.g., state, county, local authority, or a combination)</b>                    |
| Wireline  | \$1.00 or \$1.25                    | .99 to local, .01 to IPSCC Operations, if collecting \$1.25, .99 to local, .01 to ECC Operations and .25 to Grant Fund   |
| Wireless  | \$1.00 or \$1.25                    | .99 to local, .01 to ECC Operations, if collecting \$1.25, .99 to local, .01 to IPSCC Operations and .25 to Grant Fund   |
| Prepaid Wireless  | 2.5% Point of sale each transaction | 99% to local, 1% to IPSCC Operations   |
| Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)   | \$1.00 or \$1.25                    | .99 to local, .01 to IPSCC Operations, if collecting \$1.25, .99 to local, .01 to IPSCC Operations and .25 to Grant Fund |
| Other   |                                     |  |



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

| Service Type   | Total Amount Collected (\$) |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Prepaid Wireless                                       | \$1,755,021.17              |
| Total Wireline, Wireless, VoIP from \$1.00 Fee         | \$18,563,793.00             |
| \$.25 Grant Monies Collected and used for local Grants | \$2,137,907.75              |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$22,456,721.92</b>      |

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

Total Wireline, Wireless, and VoIP number is based on the 1% the IPSCC receives from the counties. The 1% number was multiplied to arrive at the total \$1.00 number. This is due in part to the audit authority residing at the County level and not at the state level. The State can only ask for this number and only 14 responses were received from 46 PSAPs.

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

None at State level.

| Question  | Yes                      | No                                  |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. For the annual period ending December 31, 2016, were any 911/E911 fees that were collected by your state or jurisdiction combined with any federal, state or local funds, grants, special collections, or general budget appropriations that were designated to support 911/E911/NG911 services? <i>Check one.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**4a. If Yes, please describe the federal, state or local funds and amounts that were combined with 911/E911 fees.**

No fees combined at the State level.



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

| <b>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.</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|---|----------------|
| State 911 Fees  | 90             |
| Local 911 Fees  | Unknown        |
| General Fund - State  | 0              |
| General Fund - County   | Unknown        |
| Federal Grants  | 0              |
| State Grants  | 10             |



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

| Question   | Yes   | No                       |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| <b>1. In the annual period ending December 31, 2016, were funds collected for 911 or E911 purposes in your state or jurisdiction made available or used solely for purposes designated by the funding mechanism identified in Question 5? Check one.</b>   | x   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>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.</b> |   |                          |
| <b>Amount of Funds (\$)</b>  | <b>Identify the non-related purpose(s) for which the 911/E911 funds were used. (Add lines as necessary)</b> |                          |
|  |   |                          |
|  |   |                          |
|  |   |                          |
|  |   |                          |
|  |   |                          |

**Note: The counties are mandated by statues other than the Emergency Communications Act to perform annual audits on all county funds. The emergency communications funds or 9-1-1 funds are accounted for separately under an emergency communications fund but are included in the county audit process. A third party auditor conducts the annual audits for the counties at the county level. The counties are governed by a wide array of state statutes and administrative rules in the process and content of the audits. All of the funds collected are mandated for use by counties in accordance with Idaho Code §31-4804(5). No audit-driven report has been received by the IPSCC indicative or conclusive of any misuse of funds and there is no knowledge of misuse.**



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

| Question  | Yes | No                       |
|---|-----|--------------------------|
| <b>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.</b>  | x   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>1a. If yes, provide a description of the mechanisms or procedures and any enforcement or other corrective actions undertaken in connection with such auditing authority, for the annual period ending December 31, 2016. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</b>  |     |                          |
| <p>The counties are mandated by statues other than the Emergency Communications Act to perform annual audits on all county funds. The emergency communications funds or 9-1-1 funds are accounted for separately under an emergency communications fund but are included in the county audit process. A third party auditor conducts the annual audits for the counties at the county level. The counties are governed by a wide array of state statutes and administrative rules in the process and content of the audits. All of the funds collected are mandated for use by counties in accordance with Idaho Code §31-4804(5). No audit-driven report has been received by the IECC indicative or conclusive of any misuse of funds and there is no knowledge of misuse</p> |     |                          |

| Question  | Yes                      | No |
|---|--------------------------|----|
| <b>2. Does your state have the authority to audit service providers to ensure that the amount of 911/E911 fees collected form subscribers matches the service provider's number of subscribers? Check one.</b>                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | x  |
| <b>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, 2015. (Enter "None" if no actions were taken.)</b> |                          |    |
|   |                          |    |



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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

| Question   | Yes | No                       |
|--|-----|--------------------------|
| <b>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.</b>   | x   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>1a. If yes, in the space below, please cite any specific legal authority:</b>   |     |                          |
| <p><b>Idaho Statutes TITLE 31 CHAPTER 48 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS ACT</b></p> <p>§31-4801 (2). Therefore, it is hereby declared that the intent and purpose of the provisions of this act are to:</p> <p>(a) Provide authority to counties and 911 service areas to impose an emergency communications fee on the use of telephone lines, wireless, VoIP or other communications services that connect an individual or entity dialing or accessing 911 to an established public safety answering point;</p> <p>(b) Provide that the emergency communications fee in section <a href="#">31-4803</a>, Idaho Code, shall be exclusively utilized by the counties or 911 service areas electing to impose it to finance the initiation, maintenance, operation, enhancement and governance of consolidated emergency systems as well as enhanced consolidated emergency systems or next generation consolidated emergency systems;</p> <p>(c) Provide for the agreed-to reimbursement to telecommunications providers for their implementation of enhanced consolidated emergency communications systems by counties or 911 service areas that have implemented enhanced consolidated emergency communications systems;</p> <p>(d) Create the Idaho public safety communications commission that will have the duty to provide the governance structure through which public safety communications stakeholders can collaborate to advance consistency and common objectives, to provide integrated facilitation and coordination for cross-jurisdictional consensus building, to assist in the standardization of agreements for sharing resources among jurisdictions with emergency response communications infrastructure, to suggest best practices, performance measures and performance evaluation in the integrated statewide strategic planning and implementation of interoperability among public safety communications professionals and entities that serve people in Idaho regardless of jurisdiction, to manage the Idaho public safety interoperable communications and data systems fund as established by section <a href="#">31-4820</a>, Idaho Code, and to pursue budget authorizations as set forth in this chapter.</p> |     |                          |

| Question   | Yes                      | No |
|--|--------------------------|----|
| <b>2. In the annual period ending December 31, 2016, has your state or jurisdiction expended funds on Next Generation 911 programs? Check one.</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x  |
| <b>2a. If yes, in the space below, please enter the dollar amount that has been expended.</b>  |                          |    |



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

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





Federal Communications Commission  
 Washington, D.C. 20554

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

The IPSCC has formed a 911 Committee composed of stakeholders from all counties within the state and has begun implementation of the State NG plan. In 2016 we formalized legislation that improved NG 911 language in the legislation. Efforts are under way to firm up 911 revenue costs and income by utilization of a contractor to calculate state costs and revenue for the entire state.

| Question   | Total PSAPs Accepting Texts                             |
|--|---|
| <b>5. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, how many PSAPs within your state implemented text-to-911 and are accepting texts?</b> | 11  |
| Question   | Estimated Number of PSAPs that will Become Text Capable |
| <b>6. In the next annual period ending December 31, 2017, how many PSAPs do you anticipate will become text capable?</b>                       | 10  |



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**J. Description of Cybersecurity Expenditures**

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

| Question  | Total PSAPs |
|---|-------------|
| 2. During the annual period ending December 31, 2016, how many PSAPs in your state either implemented a cyber security program or participated in a regional or state-run cyber security program? | 18          |

| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**K. Measuring Effective Utilization of 911/E911 Fees**

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

At the close of 2016 46 of 46 PSAPs were Phase II compliant. Of the 46 PSAPs 90% are IP ready through the use of the consolidated grant fund in the State of Idaho. The report to the Idaho Legislature can be found at:  
<http://www.bhs.idaho.gov/Pages/ECC/Docs/AnnualReports/ECC%202015%20Annual%20Report%20Final.pdf>

The State NG911 plan may be found at:  
<http://www.bhs.idaho.gov/Pages/ECC/Docs/State%20911%20Plan.pdf>

The state and counties in Idaho enjoy a form of shared governance of authority and control over 9-1-1 related funding. A political climate of local control and independence is prevalent in our citizens and units of local government, and there are drastic differences in the state geography, resource availability, and population density. Since the IPSCC was created in 2016, the Commission has worked with local government and their state associations to find solutions to bring E9-1-1 services to the rural areas throughout Idaho. We believe that the Enhanced Emergency Communication Grant Fund we can be successful in making sure that all of our citizens are able to access the vital public safety services through 9-1-1 regardless of where they choose to live, work and recreate in our state. We also realize that without new funding through the NET 9-1-1 Act or other mechanisms even more stress will be added to a local and state economy and funding system that is already stretched to its limits. Movement to Next Generation 9-1-1 will be difficult if not impossible in the absence of additional appropriations.